

Monica Paulis

University of Antwerp
Monica.Paulis@student.uantwerpen.be
ORCID: 0000-0003-3761-3655

Is that intertext 'singing'?! 'Plultiplied'¹ multivoicedness in Joyce's *Ulysses* and its amplification in Italian (re)translations: A case study

Introduction

In her 1966 essay *Word, Dialogue and Novel*², the Bulgarian-born philosopher and semiotician Julia Kristeva coined the term “intertextuality”, thus realizing the Bakhtinian concept of “‘the literary word’ as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point(a fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context.”³ According to Kristeva, “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of *intertextuality* replaces that of *intersubjectivity*, and poetic language is read as at least *double*.”⁴ As the French literary theorist – and Kristeva’s own professor – Roland Barthes puts it: “tout texte est un intertexte; d’autres texts sont presents en lui à des niveaux variables, sous des formes plus ou moins

¹ Dialogic intertextual reference to Enrico Terrinoni. “Translating the ‘Plultiiple’: Awaking Joyce in Finnitalian”. *Translation and Literature* 25, no. 2 (2016): 213–21.

² Julia Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” in *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 34–61.

³ Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” 36.

⁴ Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” 37.

reconnaissables: les textes de la culture antérieure et ceux de la culture environnante; tout texte est un tissu nouveau de citations révolues.⁵”⁶

The phenomenon of intertextuality has been studied across a wide range of disciplines within the humanities. Translation Studies is no exception. Studying intertextuality and its rendering in (re)translation allows us to understand more about the situatedness of the source text within its cultural system. At the same time, however, intertextuality reveals the dialogic interactions that occur within the source and target texts on both a contextual and a textual level. Such dialogic interactions have received less attention, although they have an effect on the reception of the (re)translation within the target cultural system. From a dialogic perspective, the source text and the target texts can be seen as a single macrotext⁷, within which (re)translations coexist simultaneously as lingua-cultural, ever-dialoguing, and ever-evolving entities. With a focus on literary intertextuality, that is, the citations of and allusions to other texts, this case study investigates how selected intertextual elements present in James Joyce’s *Ulysses* have been rendered in the first Italian translation, as well as in six subsequent retranslations.

Each new (re)translation adds an intertextual layer to the macrotext, which becomes most visible in subsequent retranslations, when later retranslators interact with previous (re)translations. This dialogue can occur in patterns of disagreement (e.g., when a retranslator rectifies misinterpretations found in previous translations) or agreement (when a translator makes the same choice as their predecessor(s) because of their shared cultural background, e.g., by carrying passages over without modifying them).

In the analysis that follows, we examine what precisely, in terms of *intertextuality*, changes between the first translation and each of the six retranslations, and what, on the other hand, remains unchanged in each subsequent retranslation. For this, we rely on the theoretical framework explained in the following paragraphs.

⁵ Every text is an intertext; other texts are present in it at variable levels, in more or less recognizable forms: the texts of the previous culture and those of the surrounding culture; every text is a new fabric made up of past references (my translation).

⁶ Roland Barthes, “Texte Theorie du,” *Encyclopædia Universalis*, May 22, 2023, <https://www.universalis.fr/encyclopedie/theorie-du-texte/>.

⁷ O’Neill, *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. According to O’Neill, a macrotext is “the sum of an entire shifting system of potentially variable readings, the sum ultimately... of all the translations and readings... that exist” (O’Neill, *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*, 8).

Theoretical framework

Exploring Joyce's *Ulysses* from a Bakhtinian perspective, it is possible to identify different types of intertextuality. In this article we explore what happens to a selection of different intertextual elements in seven of the book's Italian (re)translations, through an analysis conducted following a Descriptive Translation Studies⁸ methodology, a branch of Translation Studies which aims to describe individual translations while emphasizing the importance of focusing on the receiving context.

From a dialogic point of view, *Ulysses* can be defined as a polyphonic novel or, in Bakhtinian terms, as a novel of the second stylistic line, which places the work in opposition to monologic novels, which belong to the first stylistic line⁹. The main characteristic of polyphonic novels is their multivoiced nature. Multivoicedness or, in Bakhtin's words, "double-voicedness"¹⁰, occurs in the novel when heteroglossic and heterologic elements become part of its narrative fabric.

"Heteroglossia"¹¹ and "heterology"¹² are dialogic terms which define two kinds of linguistic/stylistic language variations, respectively from outside and from inside a language. Heteroglossia is a "complex mixture of languages and world views that is always dialogized, as each language is viewed from the perspective of the others."¹³ An example of heteroglossia is the presence of foreign words or expressions in a literary text. This can stretch from the use of a single word, to a complete dialogue between characters in a foreign language. In this article, however, we shall focus on heteroglossic intertextuality, i.e., literary citations included in *Ulysses* in their original language.

Heterology, on the other hand, can be defined as the sociolinguistic diversity of utterances within a language¹⁴. In his essay *Discourse in the novel*¹⁵, Bakhtin argues that texts are always rooted in and shaped by the historical and socio-ideological context in which they are composed or

⁸ Gideon Toury, *Descriptive translation studies – and beyond* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2012).

⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 366.

¹⁰ Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 324.

¹¹ Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 324.

¹² Tzvetan Todorov, *The Dialogical principle* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 56.

¹³ Greg Dimitriadis and George Kamberelis, *Theory for education* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 51.

¹⁴ Todorov, *The Dialogical principle*.

¹⁵ Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*.

interpreted. This category encompasses all the kinds of linguistic variations that occur in a text inside the language it uses, ranging from idiomatic expressions, through regional dialects, sociolects, historical variations (archaism and neologism), to socio-professional jargon. From a Bakhtinian perspective, intertextual elements can sometimes be heterologic, especially in the form of historical language variation. This is notably the case in *Ulysses*' "Oxen of the Sun" episode, which narrates a birth story while offering a history of literary styles in English, from Latin and Anglo-Saxon alliterative verse, through pastiches of well-known English authors, spanning different centuries, all the way up to contemporary Dublin slang.

In a nutshell, the occurrence of heteroglossic and heterologic elements in a literary text such as *Ulysses* (i.e., linguistic and stylistic variation) is akin to the presence of multivoicedness within it, which in turn can take the form of intertextual references or allusions. In Bakhtin's view, "[D]ouble-voicedness sinks its roots deep into a fundamental, socio-linguistic speech diversity [heterology] and multi-languedness [heteroglossia]."¹⁶ This is why looking at a literary text from a dialogic perspective offers a comprehensive approach that relates its intertextuality to narrativity (assessing the multivoicedness of narrators and characters) and the stylistic and linguistic aspects implied by multivoicedness. Looking at translation from a dialogic perspective helps to unveil the interwoven interconnectedness of source and target texts and their respective cultural systems. Furthermore, this dialogic approach also helps to identify the several linguistic-stylistic and narrative layers that create multivoicedness within the macrotext containing those texts.

In Joyce's *Ulysses*, multivoicedness is found both on an intertextual and on a narrative level. Since intertextuality by definition implies the presence of 'other voices' in a text, the use of intertextual elements in *Ulysses* always results in multivoicedness. Intertextual multivoicedness is most easily perceivable in passages that contain intertextual citations, but it can also be discerned when intertextual references and allusions are made.

Narrative multivoicedness, on the other hand, is perceivable in passages containing the so-called "Uncle Charles Principle"¹⁷, that is, the set of narrative techniques that James Joyce widely uses to recreate multivoiced

¹⁶ Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 325–326.

¹⁷ Hugh Kenner, *Joyce's voices* (London: Faber & Faber, 1978).

effects throughout his narrative. Kenner's Uncle Charles Principle occurs where the third-person narrator resorts to the character's voice, i.e., where the narrator mimics the idiom, tone, and style of the character who is the object of the narration. As we shall see, intertextual multivoicedness and narrative multivoicedness can coincide.

In our analysis, we will focus specifically on intertextual multivoicedness: we explore how intertextual citations, references and allusions are rendered in the first Italian translation of *Ulysses*, as well as in six of its retranslations. In our analysis, we will discuss the effects that translational and retranslational choices concerning intertextuality have on the recreation of the intertextual multivoicedness that is perceivable in the original. In each (re)translation, intertextual voices may be added, amplified, muted, or attributed a new identity. It is also worth noticing that, sometimes, intertextuality is not, and even cannot be retranslated: concerning intertextuality, "unretranslatability"¹⁸ occurs when intertextual pathways have already been traced in the target system by (a) previous (re)translator(s), and have become (b) canonized translation(s) in the target culture. As a result, any subsequent retranslator, while recognizing these fragments, has no choice but to carry them over unmodified. The unretranslatability of intertextual elements mostly concerns citations, rather than references or allusions, and always occurs in cases of canonized texts of world literature.

The way in which intertextual multivoicedness is rendered (maintained, altered, or lost) in (re)translation(s) has a direct effect on the intertextual dialogue happening between the source text and its recipient through (re)translation. In other words, on a macrotextual level, the reception of intertextual multivoicedness by readers of the target text depends on the (re)translational strategies and techniques chosen by the (re)translators when they recreate intertextual elements.

Below we illustrate in more detail how we looked at intertextuality and (re)translation while employing such a dialogic perspective, and how we analyzed passages containing intertextual elements, while focusing on voice and multivoicedness.

¹⁸ Guillermo Sanz Gallego, Erika Mihálycsa, Monica Paulis, Arvi Sepp, and Jolanta Wawrzycka, "The influence of foregrounding on retranslation: The phenomenon of 'unretranslatability' in Joyce's *Ulysses*," *Parallèles* 35, no. 1 (2023): 102–124.

Methodological approach

According to Bakhtin, “[A]ny utterance is a link in a very complex organized chain of other utterances.”¹⁹ From a dialogic perspective, translation can therefore be considered, like any other utterance, as a dialogic act, since the target text incorporates source text material, and the author’s, the narrator’s, as well as the characters’ voices are rendered through the translator’s voice. Within the same logic, re-translation can be defined as the result of a double dialogic act²⁰, since it often incorporates parts of previous translations that were already dialogic renderings of the source text material themselves. Traces of previous translators’ voices can sometimes be detected in target texts, for example, when passages of a previous translation occur unmodified in a subsequent retranslation (as is the case with unretranslatability).

However, when looking at intertextuality, which always implies the introduction of extratextual voices into a text, a whole plethora of dialogic connections is added to the resulting multivoicedness, which no longer originates in the source text itself, but in either the source literary culture, the target literary culture, or, alternatively, a third literary culture. Translating fictional characters’ voices is a stylistic exercise that offers the translators the freedom to find their own creative solution, based on their personal socio-cultural situatedness, while reinventing the narrators’ and characters’ idiolectic voices in the target language, attempting to recreate their original psychological characterization for the recipient of the target text. On the other hand, translating canonized voices like Dante’s or Shakespeare’s is more of a philological exercise.

Therefore, when looking at intertextuality and (re)translation from a dialogic perspective, we identify two interconnected issues. The first is the preservation and transposition of the intertextual pathways present in the original, and the second issue is the recreation of intertextual multivoicedness. When intertextual pathways are lost or presented in a way that is too subtle for the recipient of the (re)translation to appreciate, the original intertextual multivoicedness cannot resonate, nor be perceived within the target text.

¹⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech genres and other late essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 69.

²⁰ Kris Peeters, “Traduction, retraduction et dialogisme,” *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 61, no.3 (2016): 637.

With all of the above taken into account, the following descriptive analysis aims to assess whether, to what extent, where, and how intertextual multivoicedness is both recognized and recreated by the Italian (re)translators, and therefore more likely to be experienced by the recipients of the target texts. In practice, during our analysis we identify the intertextual pathways in the source text and the way in which they are rendered in the target texts, which leads us to understand how exactly target texts re-use previous target texts and what effects there are on the recreation (or not) of intertextual multivoicedness.

More specifically, we look at what happens in the first translation to passages originally containing intertextual elements, in order to assess what translation strategies and techniques are used there. We then shift our focus to the retranslations, in order to understand what happens to the same intertextual elements in retranslation. Subsequently, we look at all our texts comparatively, in order to understand the differences between the first translation and the retranslations, as well as among all the target texts, in the rendering of passages containing intertextual elements, and to assess the effects of these differences on the level of intertextual multivoicedness. Finally, we seek to synthesize which translational strategies and techniques are commonly employed by the Italian (re)translators (e.g., paraphrases, footnotes, endnotes, etc.) in order to recreate that original intertextual multivoicedness, and consequently to offer the recipients of their (re)translations a dialogic multivoiced experience comparable to that available to the recipients of the source text.

So as to describe what translation techniques are used by the (re)translators to reproduce intertextual multivoicedness, we rely on Molina and Hurtado Albir's framework.²¹ Following this framework, we distinguish techniques such as variation (e.g., substituting intertextual elements familiar to the target culture for foreign ones), and compensation (e.g., adding intertextual elements at a later point to compensate for the elimination of intertextual elements present in the original). On the other hand, if the chosen translation strategy is to both reproduce intertextual multivoicedness, and preserve the original intertextual pathways, amplification techniques such as intratextual and extratextual explicitation (through the insertion of footnotes or endnotes) might be used instead.

²¹ Lucía Molina and Amparo Hurtado Albir, "Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach," *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 47, no. 4 (2002): 509–511.

Analysis

Ulysses is a famously intertextually rich text. When looking at what kind of intertextuality is present in *Ulysses*, we can roughly delineate four groups. The first type of intertextuality takes the form of literary citations, references, and allusions, all made by Joyce in their original English version. In translation, the form of these intertextual elements might change (e.g., when an allusion is made explicit thus becoming a reference, or when a citation is missed thus becoming an allusion). Citations and explicit references are more easily preserved in (re)translation than implicit allusions are, since these can easily be missed (especially when translators do not use Don Gifford's 1988 annotated edition²², as was the case for earlier translations). For a target audience not sufficiently familiar with the source culture, the most immediately recognizable elements belonging to this category are probably, as mentioned above, the famous references to Shakespeare.

The second type is the transcultural intertextuality introduced by Joyce into the text in English. This group encompasses international canonical texts that exist in many languages (including Italian, our target language of choice), such as the Bible. Biblical references and allusions are usually easily recognized by translators with Western backgrounds, and easily translated by finding the corresponding passage in the canonized target language's translation of the Bible.

Finally, the third type of intertextuality is that created through the use of citations in foreign languages other than the source language and the target language of choice (in our case, Italian), such as citations from German, French, and Latin authors. This is probably the most easily recognizable type of intertextuality from the perspective of any Italian recipient (including translators), as it is always marked by heteroglossic linguistic elements, which stand out against the rest of the text. They are also the easiest to transpose into the target text without diminishing the resulting intertextual multivoicedness, as normally these passages are carried over untranslated and continue to produce the same intertextual, multivoiced effect they create in the source text.

However, as Rainier Grutman observes, “[W]hen the target language of a translation is none other than the embedded foreign language of the

²² Don Gifford, *Ulysses Annotated. Revised and expanded edition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

source text [...] the linguistic elements that signaled Otherness in the original run the risk of having their indexical meaning reversed and being read as 'familiar' signs of Sameness (and vice versa)."²³

This is why we consider target language intertextuality (in our case, intertextual elements in Italian) as a separate fourth group. Besides the occasional heteroglossic elements that pepper *Ulysses* and contribute to its narrative multivoicedness, such as colloquial expressions (like exclamations or conversations between characters in Italian) and words based on the Italian language (like Bloom's occasional attempts at speaking Italian), which are a direct result of Joyce's knowledge of both standard Italian and the Triestino dialect, there are two main categories of intertextual elements inserted by Joyce in *Ulysses* in the Italian language: (mainly) Dantean literary citations and allusions, and the titles or texts of Italian songs, especially in the "Sirens" episode.

The presence in *Ulysses* of musical references in Italian can easily be explained by providing context. At the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, Italian opera was a part of the average European person's general culture: opera was what people would sing to themselves, comparable to what we do today with popular songs in English, even in non-English speaking countries. Moreover, one cannot forget that Joyce was himself a talented tenor and that he made his character Molly an opera singer. Keeping this in mind, it should not be astonishing that Leopold Bloom remembers some lines from Mozart's *Don Giovanni*.

For the sake of conciseness, in this study we focus solely on Shakespeare, the source of the largest portion of intertextual elements that can be found in *Ulysses*, and Dante, the most recognizable Italian author among the citations and allusions made by Joyce in *Ulysses*. The links between the Irish writer's work and Dante's *Divina Commedia* have been acknowledged by scholars like Howard Helsing, who highlights the fact that Dante served as a model for one of Joyce's main characters, Stephen Dedalus, whom he refers to as the "Irish Dante"²⁴. Beyond this immediate connection, however, uncountable references to Dante's masterpiece can be found in the intertextual fabric of *Ulysses*, starting with the title itself, as Ulysses is one of the characters met by Dante during his journey through hell.

²³ Rainier Grutman, "Refraction and recognition: Literary multilingualism in translation," *Target* 18, no. 1 (2006): 22.

²⁴ Howard Helsing, "Joyce and Dante," *ELH* 35, no. 4 (1968): 591.

The intertextual value of the *Divina Commedia*, however, goes far beyond the presence of Dantean allusions and citations. As Fraser explains, *Ulysses* resonates with the dynamics of initiation found in Dante's Purgatory XXV, where "Stattius tells Virgil and the pilgrim about the development of the embryo up until the moment when a joyful Creator breathes in a self-reflecting soul and, in that moment, the embryo transforms into a *fante*, a speaker"²⁵. The symbolic death at the poem's conclusion corresponds with the return to the womb of Dante's Purgatory XXV. This dynamic can, according to Fraser²⁶, be read as Dante's definition of poetic practice. Joyce recognizes the implications of Dante's return to the embryo and he integrates it into his own art of textual transformation. According to Fraser²⁷, in fact, there is a complex relationship in *Ulysses* between the intertext that mentors the literary novice, and thus the reader, and Joyce's need to sever this bond and become silent so that the intertext might "sing"²⁸. Joyce uses Dante's dynamic of initiation, aiming at potentially transforming the reader into a writer of their own text through the use of intertextuality. By embracing Dante's poetics, Joyce creates yet another layer of dialogical intertextual connectedness with the Italian poet.

Below we analyze five excerpts containing Shakesperean and Dantean citations or allusions, for the purpose of assessing if the intertextual elements 'sing' in (re)translation, or, to put it another way, if the intertextual multivoicedness permeating the original can be heard in the target texts as well. Speaking practically, through this analysis we aim to understand if and how (through which translation strategies) the intertextual pathways present in the source text are recreated in (re)translation, e.g., through the use of explicative footnotes or endnotes.

Example 1: Shakesperean citation

To be or not to be (U11.905) / (U15.1965)

Essere o non essere (De Angelis, 1325)/*Essere o non essere* (De Angelis, 2193)
+ endnote

²⁵ Jennifer Margaret Fraser, *Writes of passage: Dante, Joyce and the dynamics of literary initiation* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2002), ii.

²⁶ Fraser, *Writes of passage: Dante, Joyce and the dynamics of literary initiation*, ii.

²⁷ Fraser, *Writes of passage: Dante, Joyce and the dynamics of literary initiation*, ii.

²⁸ Fraser, *Writes of passage: Dante, Joyce and the dynamics of literary initiation*, iii.

Essere o non essere (Flecchia, 222)/*Essere o non essere* (Flecchia, 385)

Essere o non essere (Terrinoni 2012, 1170) + endnote / *Essere o non essere* (Terrinoni 2012, 1995)

Essere o non essere (Celati, 1245) / *Essere o non essere* (Celati, 2154)

Essere o non essere (Biondi, 355) / *Essere o non essere* (Biondi, 600)

Essere o non essere (Ceni, 1042) / *Essere o non essere* (Ceni, 1159)

Essere o non essere (Terrinoni 2021, 549)+ endnote / *Essere o non essere* (Terrinoni 2021, 985)

In this example, all six translators recognize what is probably the most famous line in all of Shakespeare²⁹ and propose the same translational solution: its canonized Italian version, “Essere o non essere”³⁰, as translated by Carlo Rusconi. Because of its recognizability and its canonical status, this citation cannot be retranslated differently. However, both De Angelis and Terrinoni add a footnote. De Angelis’ footnote is inserted at the second occurrence and reads “W. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, III, I, 56”. The first translator also offers the original line, “To be or not to be”, which has the effect of reproducing the original multivoicedness, albeit in a footnote. Terrinoni, on the other hand, is less explicitating and only indicates the title, the act, and the scene (*Hamlet*, act III, scene I), without mentioning the author, nor the original verse or exact line. This footnote can be found at the first occurrence of this intertextual element both in the 2012 retranslation and in its 2021 revision.

Through the retranslators’ decision to shorten or drop the footnote completely, the citation is, on a macrotextual level, seemingly unanimously considered ‘unretranslatable’. This dialogue within the target texts adds to the overall multivoicedness of the macrotext.

²⁹ Joyce uses this line in other occasions in *Ulysses*, mingling it with other verses or distorting it. However, U11.905 and U15.1965 are the only two occasions on which the line stands alone.

³⁰ William Shakespeare, *Teatro completo di Shakespeare*, trans. Carlo Rusconi (Torino: Cugini Pomba e Comp. Editori, 1852), 44.

Example 2: Shakesperean citation

Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit!(U8.67-68) / (U9.170)

Amleto, io son lo spirito di tuo padre (De Angelis, 789) + endnote/ *Amleto, io sono lo spirito di tuo padre* (De Angelis, 944) + endnote

Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit (Flecchia, 119) + endnote/ *Hamlet, I am thy father's spirit* (Flecchia, 149) + endnote

Amleto, sono lo spirito di tuo padre (Terrinoni 2012, 765) + endnote / *Amleto, sono lo spirito di tuo padre* (Terrinoni 2012, 928) + endnote

Amleto, io son di tuo padre lo spirito (Celati, 668) /*Amleto, io sono lo spirito di tuo padre* (Celati, 835)

Amleto, son lo spettro di tuo padre (Biondi, 198)+ footnote / *Amleto, son lo spettro di tuo padre* (Biondi, 242) + footnote

Amleto, io sono lo spirito di tuo padre (Ceni, 626) + endnote / *Amleto, io sono lo spirito di tuo padre* (Ceni, 779) + endnote

Amleto, sono lo spirito di tuo padre (Terrinoni 2021, 297) + endnote / *Amleto, sono lo spirito di tuo padre* (Terrinoni 2021, 367) + endnote

In this second example, we have another famous Shakespearean citation, this time uttered first by Leopold Bloom and later repeated by Stephen Dedalus. All (re)translators, like Joyce, use italics to mark the passage. De Angelis provides in a footnote the exact location of the cited line(*Hamlet*, I, V, 9) and, in the first of the two, also warns the reader that the line has been slightly modified by Joyce. In the original, in fact, the spirit does not call Hamlet by his name. Joyce's adding *Hamlet* can be interpreted as an aid to the reader, exerting an indexical function as to the presence of intertextuality, since Joyce explicitly adds not only the name, but also the source of the intertextual citation. As in the previous example, De Angelis is again the only translator who deems it necessary to explicitate that Shakespeare is the author of *Hamlet*.

In both occurrences, Flecchia, the first retranslator, carries over the citation in English, offering the reference to *Hamlet* and an Italian

translation in a footnote. By leaving the citation in the source language, she compensates for the loss of multivoicedness that occurs in other passages when transposing the citations that are already present in the source text in Italian, into the Italian target text.

All her successors, however, switch back to Italian. Terrinoni introduces two notes providing the title, the act, and the scene, in both his retranslations. Celati, on the other hand, opts for only using italics, which have indexical value, yet does not provide any notes. What is worth noticing is that he offers two slightly different translations, the first of which is more poetical. Biondi uses footnotes, pointing out in the first one that the citation is from *Hamlet*, Act I Scene V, also explicitating that Leopold Bloom wrongly remembers the citation, since in the original the spirit does not call Hamlet by name. While De Angelis had already suggested that the citation was slightly twisted, Biondi is the first translator to fully explicitate the mis-citation. Moreover, Biondi connects the first note to the second, suggesting that Stephen Dedalus, in a successive episode, will also remember the citation incorrectly, since he and Leopold are each other's double. In the second note, Biondi does not explicitate the title, the act, and the scene, but does nonetheless stress once again that in the original line the spirit does not call Hamlet by his name, and that Bloom, Stephen's double, made the same mistake in the previous episode.

While the line from Shakespeare's play itself is immediately recognizable, it is worth noticing that, as opposed to what we have seen in the first example, more than one canonized Italian translation of this line coexists in the Italian cultural system. Because of this absence of a singular canonical translation, the translators must decide on their approach: Flecchia leaves the citation untranslated, Biondi freely retranslates *spiritas spettro* (*specter*) instead of *spirito*, and Celati offers a different translation in the second occurrence, thus weakening the link between Bloom and Dedalus.

Finally, Ceni seems to synthesize and funnel the voices of his predecessors's participation in the macrotextual dialogue into one translational solution, by using italics, explicitating in his first footnote the exact location of the original line, and highlighting in the second that, in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the spirit does not call his son by his name. By doing so, Ceni maximizes the amplification of intertextual multivoicedness in this passage.

Example 3: Shakesperean allusion

The sense of beauty leads us astray (U9.735)

Il senso della bellezza ci porta fuori strada (De Angelis, 623)

Il senso della bellezza ci devia (Flecchia, 161)

Il senso della bellezza ci porta lontano (Terrinoni 2012, 237)

Il senso del bello ci porta fuori strada (Celati, 517)

Il senso della bellezza ci porta fuori strada (Biondi, 259)

Il senso della bellezza ci svia (Ceni, 844)

Il senso della bellezza ci porta lontano (Terrinoni 2021, 399)

This third example shows that not all the Shakesperean intertextuality present in *Ulysses* is equally recognizable. This line presents not a quote from Shakespeare, but an implicit allusion to the bard included in an allusion to another author, namely Oscar Wilde. In dialogic terms, the allusion to Shakespeare is made through the implicit dialogue with and inclusion of Wilde's voice. In this case, intertextuality takes the form of a 'Chinese box' structure, where one intertextual element is presented inside another one. According to Gifford, "The sense of beauty leads us astray", is an observation characteristic of Wilde's melancholy mood.³¹ Wilde, in *The Portrait of Mr W.H. (The Riddle of Shakespeare's Sonnets)*, remarks in the answer to the question, "What do the Sonnets tell us about Shakespeare? – Simply that he was the slave of beauty."³²

None of the Italian (re)translators, however, recreate this subtle original intertextual pathway by providing a footnote. As a consequence, the 'Chinese box'-like intertextual multivoicedness is lost in all of the Italian versions. As opposed to what we have observed with the more

³¹ There are, however, other interpretations concerning this intertextual element. See e.g., Erlene Stetson, "Literary Talk: Extended Allusions in 'Ulysses,'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 19, no. 2 (1982): 178–81. According to Stetson, this line might also be an allusion to a line from Edward Young's very popular *Night thoughts*. See also Joseph O'Leary, "The Palm of Beauty: Yeats, Rilke, Joyce," *Journal of Irish Studies* 21 (2006): 45. According to O'Leary, in this passage Joyce is alluding to Yeats.

³² Gifford, *Ulysses Annotated. Revised and expanded edition*, 233.

easily recognizable examples of Shakespearean intertextuality that were recreated by the Italian (re)translators, the risk of citations of, and certainly of allusions to internationally lesser-known Anglophone writers becoming lost to the Italian (re)translator and thus to the Italian reader, is proportional to their fame.

When looking at the seven solutions from a macrotextual perspective, due to the variety of renderings, the dialogue becomes highly multivoiced. It is, however, worth noticing that Biondi's retranslation is identical to the first translation. Through this retranslational choice the intertextual multivoicedness of the passage in Biondi's retranslation is therefore also enriched with De Angelis' voice.

With Italian being the target language of choice, it is interesting to look at how intertextual elements already present in Italian in the source text are rendered in the Italian (re)translations, and how translators try to avoid losing the otherness signaled by the use of Italian in the original.

Example 4: Danteancitation

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (U9.831)

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (De Angelis, 2791)

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (Flecchia, 163) + endnote

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (Terrinoni 2012, 240) + endnote

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (Celati, 526)

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (Biondi, 262) + footnote

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (Ceni, 857)

nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita (Terrinoni 2021, 405)

The opening line of the *Divina Commedia* is probably the most famous Dantean citation, and as such it represents, just as with Shakespeare's "To be or not to be", an example of unretranslatibility. In the case of Joyce's use of Italian citations, however, the heteroglossic nature of the passage in the source text coincides with the target language. Consequently, this kind

of heteroglossia cannot but disappear in the Italian (re)translations. Some of the translators, however, have attempted to reconstruct its heteroglossic function; although all (re)translators transpose the citation in Italian, they also maintain the use of italics as in the original, thus signaling to their readers that the citation may have been in Italian in the original as well. Three of the retranslators make that possibility explicit in a footnote. Flecchia adds an explicating note which reads “Dante, *Inferno*, I, 1”, while Terrinoni (2012) limits himself to “*Inferno*, I”. Interestingly, Biondi’s footnote does not explicate the author or the precise location of the citation – which in the case of *Inferno*, I, 1 can indeed be considered redundant for the Italian reader – but makes his reader aware of the fact that the citation is in Italian in the source text, thus signaling the original multivoicedness.

However, within the macrotextual dialogue, this multivoicedness is lost again, since both Ceni’s retranslation and Terrinoni’s 2021 revised retranslation do not include any footnote. On the other hand, by dropping the footnote he had previously inserted in the 2012 version, Terrinoni seemingly backs the translational decision made by the first translator, therefore introducing, from a dialogic perspective, a new dialogic connection within the macrotext.

Example 5: Dantean allusion

I should think you are able to free yourself. You are your own master, it seems to me. (U1. 636–37)

direi che si è sempre in grado di liberarsi. Si è padroni di se stessi, mi pare. (De Angelis, 259)

mi sembra che ci si possa render liberi. Mi sembra che si sia maestri di se stessi. (Flecchia, 16) + endnote

devo immaginare che lei sia in grado di liberarsene. È lei il padrone di se stesso, mi sembra. (Terrinoni 2012, 212)

direi che lei sia in grado di liberarsi. Lei è padrone di se stesso, mi pare. (Celati, 102)

direi che lei è in condizione di affrancarsi. Lei è il padrone di se stesso, mi pare. (Biondi, 36)

riterei che sia in grado di liberarsi. È padrone di se stesso, a me pare. (Ceni, 101)

dovrei immaginare che lei sia in grado di liberarsene. È lei il padrone di se stesso, mi sembra. (Terrinoni 2021, 37)

Similarly to what we have seen in the third example with a Shakespearean allusion made through Oscar Wilde's voice, in this excerpt Joyce constructs an intertextual pathway based on an allusion to Virgil's words reported by Dante at the end of *Purgatorio* (Canto XXVII, 139–142). At this point in the *Divina Commedia*, Virgil is leaving Dante to continue on his own, reassuring him that there is no need for him to wait for his words or deeds anymore, since Dante's will is now finally free from passions, directed towards the good and purified, and it would be a mistake not to indulge it. Virgil therefore pronounces Dante 'lord of himself'.

“Non aspettar mio dir più né mio cenno;
libero, dritto e sano è tuo arbitrio,
e fallo fora non fare a suo senno:
per ch'io te sovra te corono e mitrio.”

“Expect no more of word or sign from me;
Free and upright and sound is thy free-will,
And error were it not to do its bidding;
Thee o'er thyself I therefore crown and mitre!”

(Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 1867)

Flecchia is the only (re)translator to insert a footnote in which, following Gifford's suggestion³³, she attributes the allusion to Virgil's farewell in *Purgatorio* XXVII 139–142. On a macrotextual level, therefore, the dialogue initiated by Flecchia finds no response. As a consequence, the intertextual pathway constructed by Joyce in the original through the use of this 'Chinese box' intertextual element fades, and the intertextual multivoicedness of the passage is lost in (re)translation.

³³ Gifford, *Ulysses Annotated. Revised and expanded edition*, 25.

Conclusion

The abundance of intertextual elements in *Ulysses* leads to the appearance of intertextual multivoicedness within the source text. As with narrative multivoicedness (mostly perceivable in passages displaying the Uncle Charles principle), recreating intertextual multivoicedness represents a challenge for (re)translators, who need to carefully choose what they believe to be the most suitable translation strategies. As opposed to narrative multivoicedness, however, the degree of perception of intertextual multivoicedness experienced by the recipient of a(re)translation depends not on their subjective socio-cultural situatedness, but rather on their familiarity with the literary canon of both the source and the target cultures. In line with Kristeva's definition of intertextuality as the "intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point"³⁴, intertextuality is best perceived, and therefore replicated in (re)translation, within the common space created by the intersection between the source and target cultures.

Interestingly, while each retranslation adds a layer into the intertextual multivoiced fabric of the macrotext, instances of unretranslatability which are related precisely to that intersection between the source and target cultures tend to turn the macrotextual dialogue into a harmonious choir of voices simultaneously pointing at the original intertextual pathway.

As a result, intertextual elements tend to 'sing' in the Italian translations, either *unisono*, when unretranslatability comes into play, or on different frequencies and at a different volume, depending on the intertextual category they belong to.

Indeed, from this case study we can conclude that depending on the type of intertextuality at hand, and the translation strategies used, retranslators seek to highlight the original intertextual pathways and make them accessible to the recipient of their (re)translation. By choosing amplification techniques³⁵ such as explicitation, and notes, (re)translators not only embrace Joyce's need to step out of his linguistic-cultural situatedness, and into the intertextual dialogue of literary cultures, but also his need to amplify the original intertextual multivoicedness, so that it may be perceived by the target recipient of the text.

³⁴ Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue and Novel," 36.

³⁵ Molina and Hurtado Albir, "Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach," 509-511.

As we have seen, the degree of explicitation in notes varies from simple textual references (e.g., the title and the act), through naming the author (e.g., Shakespeare), to suggesting interpretations (e.g., concerning why a citation might have been altered by Joyce). Sometimes notes are used to provide the Italian translation of a citation left in English in the translated text, thus compensating for the inevitable loss of heteroglossia in passages involving intertextuality in the Italian language in the source text. Other times, notes are used to indicate that the citation was in the target language in the source text already, which results in a similar compensation effect. In all these cases, explicative notes prove their strategic importance in the perpetuation of intertextuality and intertextual multivoicedness, even in the presence of intertextual elements where source and target languages are the same, e.g., in the case of the references to Dante. Although this kind of explicitation may seem redundant to the Italian recipient, notes indicate that the citation was in Italian in the source text as well. As such, they have an indexical value that strengthens the clue given through the typographical use of italics (to indicate that a passage was carried over untranslated from the original), and make the target text recipient aware of the heteroglossic effect that tops the original intertextual multivoicedness in the source text.

It is worth noting that when (re)translators choose not to use explicative notes as a part of their translation strategy, yet let their reader be free to experience the musicality of the text (as in Celati's case), the chances for the 'plultiplied' intertextual multivoicedness that Joyce so meticulously created in the original, to resonate beyond the text, are reduced. This is especially the case with allusions and citations which are less recognizable by the average recipient of the (re)translation, such as the intertextuality referring to lesser-known authors, and 'Chinese box' intertextuality.

All in all, the decisions made by each (re)translator concerning how and how much to explicitate intertextual elements, influence both the recreation and reception of intertextual multivoicedness. From our case study it can be concluded that through the employment of extratextual amplification techniques (explicative notes), the recipient of the target text can be guided towards recognizing the intertextual pathways created by the author in the source textwhile, at the same time, still being given the chance to experience the musicality of the text. This is due to the fact

that the use of this strategy enables the relegation of explicitation to the paratext. As a result of this detachment, the reader of the target text can ultimately be brought closer to, if not hearing, at least feeling the original ‘multiplied’ multivoicedness ‘singing’ beyond the text.

Monica Paulis

Abstract

Although Mikhail Bakhtin never used the term intertextuality in any of his writings, the dialogic concept that every utterance echoes other utterances and, analogously, every text also echoes other texts, provided the basis for Kristeva’s (1966) theory of intertextuality and has proved to be of fundamental importance for the study of literature ever since.

The presence of intertextual elements in a literary text (such as citations of and allusions to other literary works) always represents a challenge to the translator. In this article we explore different types of intertextuality in James Joyce’s *Ulysses*. During our analysis, we describe how the source text, the first Italian translation, and no less than six subsequent retranslations interact with one another from a dialogic perspective, in the presence of such elements. Because of the abundance of intertextuality, stylistic and linguistic variety, and multivoicedness, Joyce’s masterpiece is a well-known example of apolyphonic novel. While analyzing dialogic interactions taking place within the “macrotext”³⁶ constituted by the source text and its Italian (re)translations, we therefore also discuss the effects generated by the way in which intertextuality is rendered in (re)translation. The specific ways in which translations recreate the original’s multivoicedness orient the dialogic experience of the recipients of the (re)translations.

Keywords: James Joyce, dialogism, intertextuality, retranslation, multivoicedness

Słowa kluczowe: James Joyce, dialogizm, intertekstualność, retranslacja, wielogłosowość

³⁶ Patrick O’Neill. *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).