2011

"I have come from Paris to tell you not to alter a single word:" Joyce's Ulysses and the Paradox of Translation

Stephanie Wilmes

“I have come from Paris to tell you not to alter a single word:” Joyce’s *Ulysses* and the Paradox of Translation

Stephanie Wilmes

English 300
Heesok Chang
Spring 2011

Chapter One: An Introduction

Translation is unavoidable. We encounter it every day: signs, instructions, announcements, and warnings often appear in multiple languages at once. The purpose of these multi-lingual notices is clear: for any warning or direction to be useful it must be understood, and not every person in the world speaks the same language. One can reasonably assume that each iteration of the same direction is conveying the same information. If the information given in each language were completely different, this, too, would render the translation purposeless. When we are forced to rely on translations, we must trust that they are accurate representations of the original text. Often, this is a simple matter, and we take translations for granted.

It is often just as easy to take for granted that a translated novel, article, short story, or even poem is essentially the same the text from which it was translated, as it is to be assured that the "Caution! Wet Floor!" sign reads the same in Spanish as it does in English. A reader who does not know the language in which the text was originally written has no choice but to trust the translator of the text she is reading. The more one examines the process of translation, however, the less one can truly trust any translated work to be an accurate representation of the original. Eventually, one begins to ask if translation is even possible. To the extent that it is, to the extent that translated texts *do* exist, what is the purpose of these texts? What can be learned from then? They are not, and cannot be, exact equivalents of the original. Rather, they are careful *readings* of the original; each translation provides a specific interpretation of the original text, which is visible in the particular choices that each translator made as he rewrote the original text.

The translator begins with the original, or source text, which he must then rewrite into the target language. Traditionally, one assumes that the goal of the translator is to recreate, as closely as possible, in the target language, the meaning of the source text. Alternately, the translator seeks to preserve the *intention* of the source text (Cheu 59). In both theoretical and practical terms, however, this is a difficult, if not impossible goal.

In his article "Translation, Transubstantiation, Joyce: Two Chinese Versions of *Ulysses*," Hoi Fung Cheu explains the essential paradox of translation: as long as the goal of the translator is to "get as close as possible to the 'original intention' of the source material," or to preserve the originality of the source, he will be daunted, because his task involves by its very nature the complete alteration of the original text. No word can be changed; every word must be changed (Cheu 59). Furthermore, there is no objective way to measure how exactly the translation matches the original, because to answer such a question, one must have a clear understanding of what it means for a translation and an original to 'match.' Is one measuring how close the translators have approached the intention of the author? Or how close they have approached the "linguistic effect" of the original? How can one be sure, in the case of a work that exists in multiple, different, editions, which text, exactly, even *is* the original? (Cheu 59).

On a practical level, too, any attempt by the translator to rewrite the source text completely faithfully into another language will meet with obstacles. Walter Benjamin, in his essay "The Task of the Translator," discusses the two traditional approaches to translation, as they are understood by those who view translation as an attempt to transfer meaning between languages: fidelity and license (78). Fidelity, he argues, can never properly reproduce meaning, because the words that make up the original piece do not

simply have literal meanings, but connotations: "sense in its poetic signification is not limited to meaning, but derives from the connotations conveyed by the word chosen to express it" (78). Thus, any word-for-word translation of a literary work will inevitably lose the many layers of meaning that could be conveyed in the original by the connotations of the words used, and any translator who wishes to avoid, or at least lessen, this loss must choose words in the target language that can convey to the text's foreign readers the same nuanced sense as the original. According to Benjamin, the complex nature of words, that each one carries an "emotional connotation," makes literal translation an inadequate method for reproducing meaning and is even "a direct threat to comprehensibility" (78).

Often, translators find that a word with multiple possible meanings in the source language has no similarly nuanced equivalent in the target language. Multiple possible translations appear, and the one that the translator picks will alter the manner in which readers of the translated text will interpret the passage. Cheu provides such an example from his analysis of two Chinese translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*: the English word "hymen" has two possible meanings, given by Cheu as "virgin's membrane," or the more obscure "marriage." The word appears in the original text in the middle of a stream of consciousness that offers no clue as to which meaning would be more appropriate for a translated text that cannot provide another word that encompasses both meanings at once. The two Chinese translators of Joyce made two different decisions, one choosing to use the Chinese word for marriage, and the other, a "common" and possibly offensive term for "virgin's membrane," in accordance with both their readings of the individual sentence, and their reading of the novel as a whole (Cheu 65).

In the process of making choices, picking between possible meanings, and reconstructing wordplay, the translator will inevitably lose some of the nuance and meaning of the original work. At the same time, however, he will introduce *new* levels of meaning to the work, through the use of words that carry connotations in the target language that they do not carry in the source language (Cheu 66). Even the most neutral and most inhuman of translators would be forced by the nature of languages to create a skewed, or "decentered" (Cheu 66), version of the original text. The gap between the original and translated texts only becomes larger when one remembers that the translator, like the original author, is a person with his own opinions, biases, moods, knowledge, and background. In the most extreme cases, one can even see a particular agenda in the work of a translator. The two translations of *Ulysses* discussed by Cheu show clear agendas on the parts of their translators. One, translated by Joyce scholar Jin Di, reveals the author's hope that his Chinese audience will come to appreciate Joyce's artistic merit. Though he claims to present a translation that is as faithful as possible to its source material, his translator's introduction also reveals his bias: he wants to "present… Joyce as an intellectual who is elegant, playful, and, most of all, a genius" (Cheu 62). The second translation, by Wen Jieruo and Xiao Qian, however, wishes to emphasize the shocking, the rebellious, and even the obscene in *Ulysses*. Wen and Xiao's Joyce "is a figure of literary rebellion against colonial power and bureaucratic authority" (Cheu 63). It is not surprising that the two resulting translations differ widely.

Even translators who do not approach their work with a particular agenda in mind are, of necessity, influenced by their changing moods and feelings, as well as their biased understanding of the text that they are translating. As Mogens Boisen explains in his

article “Translating Ulysses,” about his experience working on the Danish version of the text, “Translating is not an exact, objective science—it is a kind of art.” A translator’s work can be even be affected by his mood, to the extent that he could translate the same passage in two strikingly different ways on two different days (Boisen 107).

Clearly, translation will never produce texts that are exact equivalents of their source texts. Most translation, however, does seem to hold as its goal a rewriting of the source text that approaches as closely as is possible, the meaning, the intention, or the effect, of that source text. The original text, itself an artistic work that might exist in multiple versions, even in its original language, as its author and editors revise and rewrite it, begins to appear as a perfect text. The worth of the translation is measured by how closely it can approach this original, ideal, text. In theory, a perfect translation would be an exact copy of the original, and though no translator believes he can achieve this goal, it remains his wish, and as a result, he venerates the original text that exists on a plane that his rewriting will never reach. Translations can be written and written again, and no two versions will ever be exactly the same, even those in the same language. Each will approach the source text in a different way, but none will ever replicate it.

One must ask if this is the only way to view the process of, and products of, translation. Must we view the source text as an ideal, even sacred, text, and its translations as inferior texts, attempts to replicate the original that are failures before they are even begun? If one does not assume that the primary goal of translation is create a replica of the source text, other possibilities of interpretation appear. In later chapters, I will examine the possibility of using translated texts to analyze and interpret the original

text, and the effect of this use of translation on traditional views on the place of translated texts (and original texts) in literature.

In "The Task of the Translator," Walter Benjamin offers an alternate view of the purpose of translation, which actively rejects traditional views of the process and result of translation. The unspoken question at the start of his essay is for *whom* does one translate? The obvious answer is that translations exist for those readers who are unable to access the text in its original language. If one follows this assumption, it is only sensible that a translated text should approach as nearly as possible to its source, so that the readers of the translation may have a clear understanding of the content of the original text. To give foreign readers access to a literary work "seems to be the only conceivable reason for saying 'the same thing' repeatedly" (Benjamin 69). Yet any translator who writes with the intention of serving the reader will be led to a bad translation: he will be primarily concerned with what he can "transmit" or transfer from the original text, and all he will be able to transmit is "information" (69). What is essential in a literary text, however, is not what it "says," or what information is contained within it, but that mysterious "substance…the unfathomable, the mysterious, the 'poetic'" (70). Here, Benjamin encounters another essential paradox of translation: that which it is most necessary to translate, is the most difficult even to pinpoint or define, let alone to rewrite into another language. Whatever element exists in the text that "goes beyond the transmittal of subject matter," and therefore the element most necessary to a good translation, is also "the element that does not lend itself to translation" (75).

This paradox does not disappear when one rejects, as Benjamin does, the basic premise that the translated text is intended for a certain group of readers. But once one

decides that, just as the original text does not exist for the sake of its readers, neither does the translation (70), one is free to look for other purposes of translation, for which the paradox might not be as insurmountable of a problem. For Benjamin, the importance of translation rests in its effect on language itself. The translator should not concern himself with the content of the individual piece on which he works, but with the effect of his work on the language into which he translates. "The task of the translator," he writes, "consists in finding that intended effect…upon the language into which he is translating which produces in it the echo of the original" (76). He quotes Rudolf Pannwitz, who argues that the translator should not attempt to "preserve" his own language, but instead allow it "to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue" (81). Through translation, the target language changes, grows, and develops, as the translator strives to create in his translation the same effect as that created by the original work in its original language.

Rather than attempt to measure the effect of translation on an entire language, however, it is simpler to examine the effect of translation on a single text. What has the translation altered in the original text? How does reading the translation differ from reading the original: does it lend itself to a different interpretation; does it affect the reader's understanding of the original text? What is the value of the translated text? Is the translation only valuable because it allows more people access to a particular text, or does its use expand farther? In the following chapters, I will attempt to address these questions by examining passages from James Joyce's *Ulysses* and its two French translations, the 1929 translation by Auguste Morel, and the 2004 translation led by Jacques Aubert.

Chapter Two: Why *Ulysses*?

Why choose Joyce's *Ulysses* as an example text? It is a notoriously difficult novel; even native English speakers reading it in its original language struggle with it. It is because *Ulysses* is difficult both to read and to translate that it serves as a useful example. Translators attempting to rewrite this text are faced with a unique set of problems, to which there is no objective answer, and the solutions they find provide specific readings of a text that, in its original form, is often enigmatic. At the same time, Joyce himself was deeply protective of his work and interested in the forms in which it reached foreign readers. The first French edition is a particularly notable example of a translated *Ulysses* because of the role that Joyce himself played in its translation.

Every translator faces two basic categories of difficulty: he must attempt to preserve the overall mood or feeling of the text, at the same time as he must rewrite his text word by word, attempting to preserve as much as he can the nuance of each sentence. For the translator of Joyce, each of these tasks is uniquely challenging.

In the postface to the 2004 French translation *Ulysse*, lead translator Jaques Aubert explains in detail several of the problems he and his team of eight translators encountered during their work, starting with the challenge of approaching such a diverse novel. The eighteen chapters of *Ulysses* are written in eighteen different styles, representing eighteen different points of view. The overall effect is one of a collection of voices speaking. Any one translator, working alone, could easily produce a work that is *too* unified, and so the second French translation was done by a team consisting of three writers, a literary translator, and four Joyce scholars, in order to protect this diversity of voices and ensure

"that the text does not resound with a single voice" (Aubert 1166). Aubert and his fellow translators also struggled to retain the "musicality" of the text, especially as it wanders along with the characters' thoughts (1164). Like all of Joyce's translators, they were struck by "the extraordinary subtlety with which [Joyce] subverts the rules" of language, altering the syntax of sentences and playing elaborate word games (1165). It is the challenge of the translators to create a French text that challenges the French language as much as the original text challenges the English language.

Joyce's translators must also ask more mundane questions about their source text as they attempt to rewrite it. Aubert describes the debate among his translation team over the translation of place names and proper names. Is it better to translate the names of streets, like Bride Street, or Bachelor's Walk, in order to preserve the original wordplay, or is it better to preserve the names in English as references to real locations in Dublin? Should one translate the characters' names, in accordance with Joyce's wishes in the first translation, or to retain the English names? Although the translators' initial instinct was to "Frenchify" (*franciser*) the text, the second translation of *Ulysses* keeps the English versions of place and character names in almost all circumstances (Aubert 1166-7).

The French translators made a conscious decision to "maintain, even to accentuate, the strangeness of the text" (Aubert 1167). Each translator must decide what attitude to take toward the 'foreign' elements in Joyce's text, including the radical style choices and the use of foreign languages amid the English text. In his comparison of the two Chinese translations of *Ulysses*, Hoi Fung Cheu notes that while Jin Di's translation retains Joyce's dashes and leaves untranslated the non-English passages in the text, the

translation by Wen Jieruo and Xiao Qian turns the dashes into the more traditional quotation marks, and converts the foreign passages into Mandarin (Cheu 66).

Mogens Boisen, the Danish translator of *Ulysses*, addresses the question of its difficulty directly in his essay for the Translation Issue of the *James Joyce Quarterly*. Many of his reasons are quite practical: for example, he names as his greatest technical difficulty the task of remembering and keeping track of the large number of leitmotifs in the text (Boisen 166). Before he addresses technical questions, however, he offers another reason why Joyce's text provides a particular set of difficulties to its translators: any person attempting such a task almost certainly has a great respect for the original work and its author, and will feel, as Boisen does, that any novel that took "James Joyce, who was extremely knowledgeable, wise, [and a] master of many languages" seven years to write, will provide a challenge perhaps too daunting even to attempt to undertake (166). The infamous complexity of the novel must be tackled by its translators, and not a single word can be ignored. At the very least, "the translator must necessarily understand the essentials" of the novel (Boisen 168). Though Boisen argues that it "would be untrue and absurd" to say that any translator of Joyce understood every nuance of *Ulysses*, or "under[stood] it correctly" (168), still the necessity to find a translated sentence for every single original sentence means that the translator must at least have a theory of at least one possible meaning for each word he reads.

Aubert, Cheu, and Boisen all make reference to the strange, unexpected, and experimental uses to which Joyce puts language, and the challenge that is finding an acceptable translation of the various wordplays in *Ulysses*. Boisen points out that, in a certain sense, Joyce's vocabulary is much simpler for the translator than Shakespeare's;

of the 30,000 different words in *Ulysses*, many are either straightforward to translate, or completely defy translation at all (168). The challenge stems from the care that Joyce took in selecting his words "and all their nuances and shades" (168). Inevitably, some of those shades will be lost in translation, and for the translator whose goal is to create as an accurate copy of the original as possible, such loss is immensely frustrating. When the translator is aware that the author of the original work added these levels of meaning, even on the level of individual words, with attention and awareness, the necessity of destroying these levels of meaning becomes more difficult.

Joyce's wordplay extends beyond his careful choice of words with several meanings. Cheu discusses the different translators that the Chinese translators of *Ulysses* created for Lenahan's palindromes in "Aeolus." Though Jin sees in the palindromes only an example of a character playing with language, and easily replaces them with two equally common Chinese palindromes, Wen and Xiao place their emphasis on "the phonetic puns" (Cheu 67) and attempt in their Chinese version to choose palindromes that also reflect the meaning of the original statement. Unlke Jin, they include a note to explain their translation, which offers their interpretation of the original palindromes (Cheu 66-68).

Even those words in *Ulysses* that Joyce himself made up do not offer a break for the translator, as Nikolai Popov explains in his essay "The Literal and the Literary." Popov describes Joyce as an author who "had a lifelong obsession with the technology of the letter," (11). As a consequence, his work must be read, often, not merely on the level of individual words but even on the level of individual letters. Popov identifies several such instances in *Ulysses*, including the conversation between Bloom and his cat in "Calypso"

(11-13), the 'speech' of a horse 'saying' "Hohohohohome" in "Circe" (14-15), and the various "textual objects" of "Circe" (15-18). Popov critiques various translators' attempts to find meaningful equivalents for these sounds in their target languages, arguing that each has lost something essential from the original text. Much of this loss, however, is unavoidable; what is more striking about Popov's analysis is the attention he pays to the patterns formed by the letters and the possible meanings in those patterns. He hypothesizes, for example, that the "Bbbbbllllllblblblblobschb!" of the "dummymummy" of Bloom in "Circe" might be "a scrambled stuttering-gurgling-lisping rending of Bloom" (16). (Such a reading is impossible if one looks at Morel's French translation, which transforms the cry of the dummymummy into a "Vvrvrvrvrvrvrvrvrpltch" [qtd. in Popov 16], although the German, Italian, and Polish translations referenced by Popov provide a closer 'translation' of the noise.) The seemingly random arrangements of letters on the page begins to appear, under this interpretation, orderly and meaningful. In Joyce's writing, according to Popov, "chos is not simply orderly but reflects upon the orders (and disorders) of our foremost instrument, language" (16). Whether a translator chooses to alter these inventive words or to transfer them into the target language as they are, he must at least be aware of the possible meanings of these strings of letters.

Amid these challenges, there stands one final obstacle to the translation of *Ulysses*: Joyce himself, who stands as a strict guardian over his own work, attempting to enforce the impossible goal of translation, a foreign language version that presents the original text in every particular, every detail, and every nuance. During his lifetime, Joyce was fiercely protective of his work and both interested, and invested, in their translations. One legend, referred to by Boisen (168) and quoted by Cheu, has him appearing at the

home of Danish translator Johanne Kastor Hansen and announcing "I am James Joyce. I understand that you are to translate *Ulysses* and I have come from Paris to tell you not to alter a single word" (qtd. in Cheu 59). (Hansen never attempted a translation of *Ulysses* because she felt that, being already in her 80s, she was too old for such a task. Boisen 168) Cheu refers to Joyce's instruction as a "prankish demand" (59), and it is certainly not intended to be taken literally. However, it is true that Joyce "cared deeply" both about the translation of *Ulysses* and about translation generally (Reynolds 240). He worked with Auguste Morel, Valery Larbaud, and Stuart Gilbert on the first French translation, supervising and commenting on the work until "it was done to his satisfaction" (243). He also met with German translator Georg Goyert after the first German translation appeared, because he found that the work had "numerous errors of interpretation," and he tried, unsuccessfully, to sue a Japanese publisher who printed a pirated translation of *Ulysses* in 1932 (243).

Because it is a challenging text, for both its readers and especially for its translators, because it often requires its translators to pick among various potential meanings of sentences, phrases, and words, and because its author was so heavily involved in its initial translation, *Ulysses* offers a useful example for analysis. By examining passages from the original text and two French language translations, one can observe the effect of reading the translated texts on the reader's comprehension of the original work.

Chapter Three: A History

Ulysses was first introduced to a French audience on December 7, 1921, three months before the complete English text was published in February of 1922 (O'Neill 37). On that date, the Paris literary critic Valery Larbaud presented a lecture at Adrienne Monnier's bookstore La Maison des Amis des Livres, in which he read selected passages of *Ulysses* in translation. He also offered an outline of the book and gave its future French readers an insight into the Homeric references of the novel (37). His lecture was later printed in the *Nouvelle Revue Francaise* and then became the introduction to the first French translation of *Dubliners* (Monnier 430). Monnier, a friend of Joyce's and the first publisher of the French translation of *Ulysses*, later wrote about the experience of encountering the novel for the first time. She emphasizes the unusual nature of Larbaud's lecture. She writes, "It is the first time, I believe, that an English work has been revealed by a French writer before anything has appeared on the subject in English-speaking countries" (430). The French literary public's early introduction to *Ulysses* meant that many of Monnier's circle were eagerly awaiting the opportunity to read the full novel in translation. This opportunity did not come for eight years (431). The first complete French translation of *Ulysses* did not appear until 1929, two years after the novel was translated in its entirety into German (O'Neill 48). What is most notable about this initial French translation is not the years it took to produce, nor the number of translators, both credited and uncredited, who contributed to the text. Rather, it is the role that Joyce himself played in the translation process.

Joyce was initially convinced that *Ulysses* could never be translated into another language (Ellmann 573). A translator would not only face the difficulty of rewriting the text into another language, but also of placing it in "another cultural matrix" (Reynolds 240). A potential translator would have to contend with the book's "many local Irish allusions," references to Irish history, and "colloquial Dublin speech" (240). The popularity of Larbaud's lecture, however, convinced him that a translation should be attempted (Ellmann 573). Larbaud himself, though in favor of a translation, was only willing to rewrite portions of the novel himself, a plan to which Joyce was strongly opposed (573). Instead, the young writer and translator Auguste Morel was asked to undertake the work; he agreed, under the condition that Larbaud and Joyce would provide assistance, but was not able to begin the translation until 1924 (O'Neill 38).

The final translation of *Ulysses* credits Morel as its translator; his work was "assisted" by Stuart Gilbert and "reviewed entirely" by Larbaud and Joyce. This is an incomplete summary, however, of the complicated process by which Joyce's novel came to be rewritten into French. Gilbert became involved in the project after reading an early excerpt, published by Morel in 1926 (Ellmann 613). He wrote to Joyce in May 1927, pointing out several significant errors in the translation and offering to assist in the project as "an unpaid advisor" (O'Neill 40). Gilbert began to meet with Joyce on an almost daily basis, causing unavoidable strain with both Morel and Larbaud; Larbaud, embroiled in an argument with Joyce's French publishers Monnier and Sylvia Beach, almost quit the *Ulysses* project entirely (Ellmann 613).

Any detailed account of the process of translation includes stories of interpersonal quarrels and disagreements among the various players. At times, Joyce's role seems to

have been that of mediator; Joyce biographer Richard Ellmann cites Gilbert as saying that "Joyce liked to think of himself as a diplomat negotiating among major powers" (613). The process was an inevitably complex one. Morel worked on the translation for five years, primarily assisted by Gilbert, Larbaud, and Joyce, but with varying amounts of assistance from at least four other translators: Jacques Benoist-Méchin, Léon-Paul Fargue, Sylvia Beach, and Adrienne Monnier (O'Neill 41). Despite the difficulties inherent in any collaborative work, it remains difficult to imagine any one person undertaking the work, even with the knowledge that individual translators have successfully written complete translations of Joyce's books. The combined expertise, and complementary talents, of multiple translators was certainly necessary when Joyce himself, with his strict ideas about the interpretation of his own work, and his high standards for its translation, was waiting to read each draft. Ellmann summarizes each man's particular talent: "Morel was imaginative, Gilbert precise and clever, and Larbaud brilliantly sensitive to style" (614n).

Joyce, too, was aware of his translators' diverse abilities, as well as their shortcomings, and the manner in which they balanced each other. In 1928, shortly before the official publication of the French text, he wrote to Harriet Weaver, he praises the "great care and devotion" that Morel took to his work, at the same time that he called Larbaud's final revision "absolutely necessary…as he is very accurate; slow, fastidious" (Letters 335).

Joyce himself seems to have taken the role of overseer and advisor. In addition to his frequent meetings with Gilbert, he was available to answer questions of interpretation or to lend, or refuse, approval to already translated passages. Morel, he writes to Weaver,

"had taken a good deal of license here and there," even "incorporating whole sentences of his own manufacture," which Joyce immediately removed (334-5). Morel's translation was also, unsurprisingly, influenced by his own history and his own bias. Joyce explains, again in his letter to Weaver, "by dint of brooding on it he sees one aspect to the exclusion of another. In his case it is the coarseness…Or perhaps I should say the violence…He is in fact a French colonial born. Perhaps this explains it" (335). A translation by Morel alone would run the risk of being too influenced by his own reading of the text. (It was this risk that Jacques Aubert hoped to avoid when he assembled his team of eight translators for the 2004 re-translation of *Ulysses*.)

Joyce also advised by answering specific questions posed by his translators; in his letter to Harriet Weaver, he refers to this process of answering questions as 'solving difficulties:' Larbaud "sent me a list of difficulties which I solved for him" (Letters 334). In other words, he provided, upon request, "the best possible French equivalent of his English phrases and sentences" (Reynolds 242). "Best" in this instance means only the closest equivalent in terms of sound, meaning, and nuance, according to the author of the original text: though Joyce was the most qualified person to offer an interpretation or an explanation of the novel that he wrote himself, it is still only an interpretation, and even Joyce's directions were not always readily acceped by all. One story, recounted both in Ellmann's biography and in an article by Mary Reynolds, concerns an argument between Joyce and the French printer over the translation of Molly's final monologue. Just as the original English version of *Penelope* had included minimal punctuation, so had the French translation; the text did not even include accent marks. When the printer replaced the missing accent marks, calling their absence "an insult to the French language"

(Reynolds 242), Joyce "insisted they be removed" again (Ellmann 573). Joyce argued that the accents were like "Molly's hairpins," which must be removed in the same way that a woman about to go to sleep will remove her hairpins (Reynolds 242). Joyce wrote to Adrienne Monnier explaining his reasoning and, after she sided with the printer, eventually wrote to Larbaud to make a final decision. Larbaud wrote back "Joyce a raison Joyce ha ragione," or "Joyce is right" in both French and Italian (Ellmann 573).[1]

The collaboration between Morel, Gilbert, Larbaud, and Joyce was the only French translation of *Ulysses* to exist until 2004, and today there are only two full translations of the text. By contrast, there existed 3 Japanese translations of Ulysses as of 2005, and in general, there are fewer translations of Joyce's work into French than into any other language (O'Neill 48). One obvious reason for the small number of French translations is the high quality of the early efforts to rewrite Joyce into French (48). Aubert spends several pages of his postface to the 2004 translation defending his work, and explaining why it is necessary to have a second translation at all, especially as the first translation was done with the help of the author himself. Though he himself wished to undertake a translation of the novel, when he edited Gallimard's multi-volume collection of Joyce's *Oevures* he chose to include Morel, Larbaud, and Gilbert's translation of *Ulysses.* It

---

1. Despite this supposed victory, my copy of Morel's translation retains accent marks throughout Molly's monologue. In Patrick O'Neill's book *Polyglot Joyce,* he points out that Bona Flecchia's Italian translation of *Ulysses* does follow Joyce's advice, and removes all accents from the episode, a decision that has been criticized by Rosa Maria Bosinelli. She points out that the absence of accent marks will confuse and slow down an Italian reader, "to a degree that is…quite inappropriate for the rapid logic of Molly's monologue" (O'Neill 174).

appeared in the second volume, published in 1995. Gallimard chose to include Morel's work "neither on grounds of editorial convenience nor in pious recognition of the heroic efforts of [the] translators," but because "*Ulysse*, on its own merits, had come to occupy and unshakable position in the edifice of French literature" (O'Neill 46-7). This original translation has a particular importance even beyond France simply because of Joyce's involvement in its production. This "strategically publicized participation" has ensured that the book "would become an authoritative reference on matters of interpretation" for more than simply its French readers (41).

Chapter Four: An Analysis

It is common to speak of "translation loss" when comparing a translated text and an original text. But, as Nikolai Popov points out, "what can be found in translation—*and nowhere else*—is…the more interesting question" (5). What can be learned, for example, from comparing Morel and Aubert's translations to Joyce's original *Ulysses*, or from comparing these two translations to each other? The following pages are an attempt to answer this question, through an examination of two passages, one from "Lotus Eaters" and one from "Penelope." All back-translations from French into English are mine, unless otherwise credited. All definitions of French words are quoted from the Larousse-*Chambers Dictionnaire Francais-Anglais/English-French.*

Brings out the darkness of her eyes. Looking at me, the sheet up to her eyes, Spanish, smelling herself, when I was fixing the link in my cuffs. Those homely recipes are often the best: strawberries for the teeth: nettles and rainwater: oatmeal they say steeped in buttermilk. Skinfood. One of the old queen's sons, duke of Albany was it? had only one skin. Leopold, yes. Three we have. Warts, bunions and pimples to make it worse. But you want a perfume too. What perfume does your? *Peau d'Espagne*. That orangeflower water is so fresh. Nice smell those soaps have. Pure curd soap. Time to get a bath round the corner. Hammam. Turkish. Massage. Dirt gets rolled up in your navel. Nicer if a nice girl did it. Also I think I. Yes I. Do it in the bath. Curious longing I. Water to water. Combine business with pleasure. Pity no time for massage. Feel fresh then all the day. Funeral be rather glum. (Joyce 69)

Fait ressortir la couleur sombre de ses yeux. Me regardait, le drap remonté jusque sous les yeux, Espagnole, respirant sa propre odeur, tandis que je fixais mes boutons des manchettes. Ces recettes ménagères sont souvent les meilleures fraises pour les dents ; orties et eau de pluie ; et on dit aussi de la farine d'avoine détrempée dans du babeurre. Aliment de la peau. Un des fils de la vielle reine, le duc d'Albany, je crois n'avait qu'une seule peau. Oui, Léopold. Nous en avons trois. Poireaux, oignons et bourgeons pour les agrémenter. Il vous faut aussi un parfum ? Quel parfum est-ce que votre ? Peau d'Espagne. Cette fleur d'oranger. Savons pure crème. Eau si fraîche. Quelle bonne odeur ces savons. J'ai le temps d'aller prendre un bain, là-bas au coin. Hammam. Turc. Massage. La crasse se ramasse en rond dans le nombril. Plus agréable si c'était fait par une jolie fille. Je pense aussi a. Oui, je. Le faire dans le bain. Drôle d'envie que j'ai là, moi. L'eau retourne à l'eau. Joindre l'utile à l'agréable. Pas de temps pour un massage, dommage. Rafraîchi pour toute la journée. Un enterrement ça vous éteint. (Morel 80)

Fait ressortir le noir de ses yeux. Me regardait, le drap remonté jusqu'aux yeux, espagnole, qui flairait ses propre odeurs, tandis que je remettais mes boutons de manchettes. Ces recettes de bonne femme sont souvent les meilleures : pour les dents des fraises : orties et eau de pluie : de la farine d'avoine, à ce qu'on dit, mise à tremper dans du babeurre. Nourrissant pour la peau. L'un des fils de la vieille reine, était-ce le duc d'Albany ?, n'avait qu'une seule peau. Leopold oui. Trois que nous en avons. Verrues, oignons et boutons pour ne rien arranger. Mais il vous faut un parfum également. Quel parfum est-ce que votre ? *Peau d'Espagne*. Cette eau de fleur d'oranger est si fraîche. Sentent bon ces savons oui. Savon pure crème. Le temps d'aller prendre un bain pas loin d'ici. Hammam. Turc. Massage. La crasse s'accumule dans le nombril. Plus agréable si c'était fait par une agréable jeune fille. Je pense aussi que je. Oui je. Le faire dans le bain. Drôle d'envie que je. L'eau retourne à l'eau. Joindre l'utile a l'agréable. Dommage de ne pas avoir le temps pour un massage. On se sent frais toute la journée ensuite. L'enterrement va plutôt être sinistre. (Aubert 125)

In this excerpt from "Lotus Eaters," the reader follows Bloom into a chemist's shop as he runs his morning errands before Paddy Dignam's funeral. Just before the quoted paragraph, he orders "sweet almond oil and tincture of benzoin….orangeflower water…and white wax" (Joyce 69) for Molly. He goes on to think of her, of the various products in the chemist's, of the bath he will take after he is finished shopping, and, finally, of Dignam's funeral later that day. Bloom's distinctive voice, which meanders from thought to thought, often speaking in fragments or forming new words, takes on a new sound and a new rhythm when transformed into French. Morel and Aubert are both more conservative writers than Joyce; they do not stretch the rules of French grammar or create new French words in the way that Joyce does in English. Of the two, Aubert chooses the more literal translation of the original text, attempting to create a French text that matches as closely as it can the English version. Morel is less precise, and more creative, though in only one instance does he significantly alter the text by taking creative liberty with Bloom's thoughts, rearranging them and fragmenting in a way that is not present in the Joycean text. Both translators are forced by the constraints of their language to alter the rhythm of the text. To give the reader the same information in French as in English, the French author must use more words. As a result, both translated passages are longer than the English paragraph.

The most obvious example of this difference in French and English wordcounts is in the translations of the word "skinfood." Neither translator chooses to create a French word with similar meaning, but rather to break down the meaning of the English and present that meaning in French words. They define first, and then translate. In neither French translation does the reader see Bloom playing with language in the way that he

does in Joyce. At the same time, the flow of his thoughts slows slightly as a result of the additional words. In their translations, Morel and Aubert also offer different interpretations of the English word, which, because it is an invention out of Bloom's thoughts, is inevitably ambiguous. In Morel "skinfood" becomes "Aliment de la peau," or 'food of the skin,' and in Aubert, "Nourrissant pour la peau," or 'nourishing for the skin.' Morel's interpretation reads strangely, as the context implies that the "skinfood" is the home remedy for the skin, or food *for* the skin, rather than created by the skin or of the skin. He does, however, retain the strange combination of skin (peau) and food (aliment), which is lost in Aubert's translation. His emphasis is on the nourishing nature of the home remedies for the skin, and he uses a word, nourrissant, that can also be used to describe creams or other products common to a chemist's shop. Bloom's creativity is lost as the phrase becomes less jarring and contextually out of place.

Morel and Aubert diverge in their translations from the first line of the paragraph, where each chooses a different interpretation of the word "darkness" in "Brings out the darkness of her eyes." Morel writes "Fait ressortir la couleur noir de ses yeux," and Aubert, "Fait ressortir le noir de ses yeux." Neither translator chooses the most literal translation of 'darkness' in terms of eye color, "le coleur foncé de ses yeux." Morel uses instead the word "sombre," whose secondary definition is "gloomy, melancholy," and which thus adds connotations to the phrase that do not exist in the original. Aubert's word choice, "le noir," is arguably a more exact equivalent to "darkness," but also seems stronger than Joyce's word choice.

Bloom's thoughts continue: "Looking at me, the sheet up to her eyes, Spanish, smelling herself, when I was fixing the link in my cuffs." Both translators change the

present progressive "looking" to the past tense "looked" or "watched" (regardait), and both make reference to Molly smelling, not "herself" but more specifically "sa propre odeur" (Morel) or "ses propres odeurs" (Aubert)—her own smell. Aubert also adds, for unclear reasons, an unnamed subject to his translated sentence, instead of using a progressive verb as Joyce and Morel do: "Me regardait, le drap remonté jusqu'aux yeux, espagnole, *qui* flairait ses propre odeurs, tandis que je remettais mes boutons de manchettes" (emphasis mine).

Morel and Aubert pick different translations for "homely recipes," in the following sentence fragment. Morel chooses "recettes ménagères," and Aubert, "recettes de bonne femme," both roughly equivalent expressions with the same meaning as the English: home or traditional recipes, although each of the three versions calls to mind different images in the reader's mind. Aubert's is the only one to bring to mind women specifically by using the word "femme." Aubert also makes the decision to switch "strawberries for the teeth" to read "for the teeth strawberries" (pour les dents des fraises), which leads the reader to assume that the "nettles and rainwater" of the next clause, despite the separating punctuation, are also "for the teeth." In Joyce, as well as in Morel, the "nettles and rainwater" stand as a half thought within Bloom's chain of associations, cures for nothing specific.

Bloom's thought "skinfood" leads him to another tangent, "One of the old queen's sons, duke of Albany was it? had only one skin. Leopold, yes," which Morel translates as "Un des fils de la vielle reine, le duc d'Albany, je crois n'avait qu'une seule peau. Oui, Léopold," and Aubert as, "L'un des fils de la vieille reine, était-ce le duc d'Albany?, n'avait qu'une seule peau. Leopold oui." Aubert retains the question in the middle of

Bloom's thought, but Morel changes "duke of Albany was it?" into "the duke of Albany, I believe." In this way he alters the cadence of Bloom's tone, and makes the sentence flow easier without the interruption of uncertainty in the middle.

The two translators, and particularly Morel, take comparatively great liberties with the next sentences, "Three we have. Warts bunions and pimples to make it worse." Bloom's thoughts are characteristically fragmentary, but seem to continue on from his previous line of thought: the Duke of Albany was said to have "had only one skin," but most people have "three," which are "ma[d]e worse" by "warts bunions and pimples." Aubert's translation, "Trois que nous en avons. Verrues oignons et boutons pour ne rien arranger," uses literal translations for "warts," "bunions," and "pimples," but changes "to make it worse" to "pour ne rien arranger," where "arranger" means roughly "to suit" or more literally "to straighten." Rather than focus on what the warts, bunions, and pimples do to one's skin, the French sentence phrases the idea to focus on what they do *not* do: they do not suit the skin, or improve it. The word for "pimple" that Aubert uses, "bouton," has several other, more common definitions, including "bud," as in "rosebud," and "button." Because the word for "bunion," "oignon," also has another, considerably more common meaning, "onion," and because Bloom's thoughts are already fragmentary and often turn in unexpected ways, the French reader faces a more ambiguous sentence than does the English reader. Morel's translation is even more surprising. He seems to play off of the double meaning of "oignon," translating "pimples" as "bourgeons," whose primary meaning is "buds," and "warts" as "poireaux," which means "leeks" and which does not seem to have a meaning that corresponds with the English word that it replaces. Morel further alters Joyce's words by changing "to make it worse" into "pour les

agrémenter," or "to decorate them." Here, Bloom is thinking about how leeks, onions/bunions, and buds/pimples decorate the skin, a more fanciful and also a stranger thought than that which passes through Joyce's Bloom's head.

As the reader continues, she sees again that it is Morel, again, who provides the more creative, or the less faithful, translation of Bloom's thoughts. Where Joyce has "But you want a perfume too. What perfume does your? *Peau d'Espagne*," Morel writes, "Il vous faut aussi un parfum? Quel parfum est-ce que votre ? Peau d'Espagne." He transforms the first fragment into a question, so that wehere Joyce's Bloom seems to be *reminding* himself that he also planned to buy perfume, Morel's Bloom appears to be *asking* himself he really wants perfume at all. Perhaps this Bloom is even *hearing* or imagining someone else asking him if he wants perfume. Morel also chooses not to italicize *Peau d'Espagne*, perhaps assuming that it was italicized in the English only because it was a French phrase in the middle of English text. Aubert retains the italics, as the phrase is also a name of perfume, the answer to the half-asked, half-remembered question "What perfume does your?" from Martha's letter to Bloom. The words do not jump out of Morel's text as they do from Joyce's and Aubert's, creating an extra, if minor, layer of ambiguity.

The largest change that Morel makes to Joyce's text, however, is in his translation of the following phrases. In Joyce, the fragments read "That orangeflower water is so fresh. Nice smell those soaps have. Pure curd soap." Bloom's thoughts are certainly not complete sentences, but they are simple to follow; the reader understands them as a string of observations and stray thoughts that follow logically, one from the next. First Bloom notes that the orangeflower water he has ordered is "fresh," and then he makes another

positive observation of the soaps in the shop: that they have a "nice smell." Finally, he clarifies to himself that the nice smelling soaps are "pure curd soap." Aubert provides a mostly straightforward translation: "Cette eau de fleur d'oranger est si fraîche. Sentent bon ces savons oui. Savon pure crème." The most significant alteration he makes to the text is his inclusion of the word "oui" (yes) in the second fragment, an extra affirmation that is notable primarily because of the role that the "yes" plays in the final episode of the novel. Compared to Morel's translation, however, Aubert's is conservative.

The earlier (and Joyce approved) translation reads: "Cette fleur d'oranger. Savons pure crème. Eau si fraîche. Quelle bonne odeur ces savons." Morel not only writes a more fragmented text he also, and more significantly, changes the order of the clauses. Bloom's thoughts now read "That orangeflower. Pure curd soap. Water so fresh. What nice smell these soaps." Bloom's first phrase is split in two, and its second part intermingled with the later fragments, which are themselves switched around. First, and most obviously, this creates an added difficulty for Morel's reader, who unlike Joyce's (or Aubert's), cannot follow a straightforward logic from one thought to the next. These thoughts are jumbled, confused, and almost nonsensical; to find sense within them one must experiment with different revisions, trying to rearrange the broken puzzle pieces to form a coherent picture. The rhythm of the original is altered as well; instead of transitioning from a complete thought, to an unordered sentence, to a fragment, Morel's Bloom's thoughts are completely fragmented and short throughout this excerpt. Bloom, as a character, appears more unfocused, and his thoughts more confused. Finally, when Morel rearranges the clauses, he changes the meaning of the thoughts being expressed. "Orangeflower water" is no longer a connected phrase, and "pure curd soap" no longer

directly follows the reference to the shop's "nice smell[ing]" soaps. It now seems, at least upon an initial reading, that Bloom is referencing four things, instead of two: an orange flower, pure curd soap, water that is fresh, and nice smelling soap. Only if one rearranges these puzzle piece thoughts does a meaning comparable to Joyce's appear, and even then it exists only as one possible reading of the text, not as the definitive, straightforward reading of the words as they appear on the page.

The next lines of the passage feature only small deviations among the three versions. In Morel, Bloom plans to get a bath "over there at the corner" ("la-bas au coin") and in Aubert, "not far from here" (pas loin d'ici), instead of "round the corner" as in Joyce. Morel loses the repetition of "nice" in "Nicer if a nice girl did it," by replacing the first "nice" with "plus agréable" and the second with "jolie," though Aubert, who uses "agréable" in both instances. (He includes "jolie" as well, though there is no equivalent in Joyce; the English-speaking Bloom, unlike his French-speaking counterparts, does not imagine that "nice girl" washing him is also "pretty.")

Bloom's next thoughts provide a challenge for both of his translators, as they become both more fragmented and more ambiguous. Joyce writes, "Also I think I. Yes. I. Do it in the bath. Curious longing I." In Jacques Derrida's essay "Gramophone Ulysses," he refers to this section and the "extremely deficient" (301) Morel translation, which reads "Je pense aussi à. Oui, je. Le faire dans le bain. Drôle d'envie que j'ai là, moi." Derrida insists on the essential difference between "I think I" and Morel's, "I think also of" which does not convey the sense of infinite reverberation that one finds in Joyce. For Derrida, the French should read "je pense je," an exact word for word rewriting of the English, because only this brings the reader to "*I* think the *I* or the *I* thinks *I*, and so on" (Derrida

301). Morel's translation conveys, as does the English, a thought that is begun but never finished, or a half-formed beginning. But this is all it does. In Derrida's interpretation, Bloom's "I think I" *is* a complete thought, in which the "I" is both subject and object, thinking itself, contemplating itself, even creating itself through thought.

Aubert's translation does include a second "je" but still does not allow for the Derrida reading: "Je pense aussi que je. Oui je. Le faire dans le bain. Drôle d'envie que je." Aubert's "I think also that I" more closely resembles Morel's sentence than it does Joyce's. It retains only one reading of Bloom's original sentence, that of a half-started thought, and does not allow the reader to attempt to make sense of it as its own complete thought. The "I/je" here can only be the subject of another clause that is never completed; it cannot function as the object, as the "I" of the English text can.

Joyce's "Curious longing I" becomes, in Morel, "Drôle d'envie que j'ai là, moi" and in Aubert the slightly more fragmentary, "Drôle d'envie que je." Aubert's translation is almost as exact as is possible, except that, as with "I think I," he adds a "que/that," which invites the reader to assume that the rest of Bloom's sentence is simply cut off, a thought from which he was distracted. It is less likely here that the reader would choose to interpret the "curious longing" as a complete thought in and of itself, that is, not a longing *for* something, but an ambiguous and transitory feeling of desire or nostalgia.

Morel's and Aubert's translations of the final two sentences of the paragraph also differ significantly. For "Feel fresh all day," Morel writes, "Rafraîchi pour toute la journée," or "Refreshed for the whole day," and Aubert writes, "On se sent frais toute la journée ensuite," or "One (you) feels fresh the whole day after." Morel retains the fragmentary nature of the original sentence, skipping a subject as well as the word "feel."

Aubert, on the other hand, transforms the fragment into a sentence, giving it the impersonal subject "on." The Morel sentence, like Joyce's, implies that the subject of the sentence is an omitted "I," referring to Bloom himself. At the same time, the English sentence and its first French translation more closely resemble advertising slogans than does Aubert's version. Joyce and Morel give sentences that could be read as promises, instead of simply general statements like Aubert's.

Finally, for "Funeral be rather glum," Morel provides the translation, "Un enterrement ça vous éteint," and Aubert, "L'enterrement va plutôt être sinistre." Neither translator is able to find a straightforward French equivalent for the English word "glum." Morel, in his translation, changes the entire structure of the sentence so that the funeral isn't the subject with a certain quality, but a subject who acts; it "deenergizes" you. Aubert does not make as drastic a syntactic change, though he does, again, turn Joyce's fragment into a complete sentence by cahgning "be" into a conjugated future "will be." Instead of glum, he imagines that the funeral will be "plutôt sinistre," where "sinistre" means something like "dreary."

The Bloom of Morel's translation is subtly different from the Bloom of Aubert's, and both are modified reincarnations from Joyce's original Bloom. Morel's Bloom, for example, appears more easily distracted, even more confused, than either Joyce's Bloom, or Aubert's. Though Aubert's translation may be, by some measures, 'closer' to Joyce's text than Morel's, it too presents subtle differences to its reader, including a Bloom more likely to speak in complete sentences, and an additional "oui" to add to the ever resonant "yes" of the novel, the "yes" that echoes most famously in Molly's final speech.

O that awful deepdown torrent O and the sea the sea crimson sometimes like fire and the glorious sunsets and the figtrees in the Alameda gardens yes and all the queer little streets and the pink and blue and yellow houses and the rosegardens and the jessamine and germaniums and cactuses and Gibraltar as a girl where I was a Flower of the mountain yes when I put the rose in my hair like the Andalusian girls used or shall I wear a red yes and how he kissed me under the Moorish wall and I thought well as well him as another and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes. (Joyce 643-4)

O cet effrayant torrent tout au fond O et la mer écarlate quelquefois comme du feu et les glorieux couchers de soleil et les figuiers dans les jardins de l'Alameda et toutes les ruelles bizarres et les maisons roses et bleues et jaunes et les roseraies et les jasmins et les géraniums et les cactus de Gibraltar quand j'étais jeune fille et une Fleur de la montagne oui quand j'ai mis la rose dans mes cheveux comme les filles Andalouses ou en mettrai-je une rouge oui et comme il m'a embrassée sous le mur mauresque je me suis dit après tout aussi bien lui qu'une autre et alors je lui ai demandé avec les yeux de demander encore oui et alors il m'a demandé si je voulais oui dire oui ma fleur de la montagne et d'abord je lui ai mis mes bras autour de lui oui et je l'ai attiré sur moi pour qu'il sente mes seins tout parfumés oui et son cœur battait comme fou et oui j'ai dit oui je veux bien Oui. (Morel 703-4)

O ce torrent effrayant tout au fond O et la mer la mer cramoisie quelquefois comme du feu et les couchers de soleil en gloire et les figuiers dans les jardins d'Alameda oui et toutes les drôles de petites ruelles et les maisons roses bleues jaunes et les roseraies les jasmins les géraniums les cactus et Gibraltar quand j'étais jeune une Fleur de la montagne oui quand j'ai mis la rose dans mes cheveux comme le faisaient les Andalouses ou devrais-je en mettre une rouge oui et comment il m'a embrassée sous le mur des Maures et j'ai pensé bon autant lui qu'un autre et puis j'ai demandé avec mes yeux qu'il me demande encore oui et puis il m'a demandé si je voulais oui de dire oui ma fleur de la montagne et d'abord je l'ai entouré de mes bras oui et je l'ai attiré tout contre moi comme ça il pouvait sentir tout mes seins mon odeur oui et son cœur battait comme un fou et oui j'ai dit oui je veux Oui. (Aubert 1156-7).

The last lines of *Ulysses* follow Molly's final thoughts of the night before she falls asleep. The stream of conscious narrative, which has flowed quickly from its first page, skipping punctuation marks and allowing sentence fragments to combine and interrupt each other, moves faster and faster in the last lines until it reaches Molly's final Yes. The French translators aim to recreate this pace, and the sensation that the reader experiences as she follows Molly's train of thought, at the same time as they must make decisions relating to vocabulary and grammar. A different grammar or word choice can alter the way in which a careful reader interprets Molly's character or the character of her lover in the passage; it can alter how she understands the events taking place; it can even change the emotions inspired by the passage.

Just as neither French translation can sound the same as the English text—despite Joyce's paradoxical request (change to quote), every word must be changed, and the two languages are made up of different sounds—the two French texts also create different impressions, even upon a first, casual reading. The Aubert translation invites itself to a quicker reading, both by skipping conjunctions like "and/et" and by deleting words that he deemed extraneous. Joyce's "and the pink and blue and yellow houses" becomes, in Aubert "et les maisons roses bleues jaunes," while in Morel the "ands" are retained: "et les maisons roses et bleues et jaunes." Aubert makes a similar change to "and the rosegardens and the jessamine and geraniums and cactuses," which becomes "et les roseraies les jasmins les géraniums les cactus" (versus "et les roseraies et les jasmins et les géraniums et les cactus" in Morel). Morel's translation is, in one sense, closer to the English: it does not delete any words that do appear in the original version. Morel and Aubert are both forced, however, by the rules of their language to *add* to the original text

by including articles. Aubert seems to compensate for this by deleting conjunctions from the phrase, so that the flow of the sentence fragment more closely imitates the English text. Aubert also keeps up the pace of the final lines for his readers by writing "quand j'etais *jeune* une fleur de la montagne" instead of "quand j'etais *jeune fille* et une Fleur de la montagne" ("as a girl where I was a Flower of the mountain" in Joyce) and "commes les *Andalouses*" instead of "commes les *filles Andalouses*" ("like the Andalusian girls" in Joyce) (emphasis mine). That Molly was a young *girl*, and not a young boy, and that it was the Andalusian *girls* and not the Andalusian *boys* or *children* generally that wore flowers in their hair, must appear obvious to Aubert and his fellow translators, who do not retain the additional words. With the deletion of the word "fille," however, Molly's femininity is de-emphasized. The English word "girl," like the French word "fille" gives information about the person's age *and* gender in a way that the word "young/jeune" does not.

A closer examination of the text reveals not only the general effects of the two translators' choices, but also the small changes in mood and meaning that result from diverse rewritings of Joyce's vocabulary and sentence (or, often, sentence fragment) structure. Morel and Aubert make different vocabulary choices in three particular instances, starting with their translations of the word "crimson" in "the sea crimson sometimes like fire." Aubert picks the closest French equivalent, "cramoisie," while Morel chooses the word "éclarate," or, "scarlet."

The two translators also differ in their choices for the word "queer." Joyce uses it in the sentence fragment "and all the queer little streets," where "queer" means something like "odd or unconventional" (Heritage). In Morel, the phrase becomes "et toutes les

ruelles bizarres," and in Aubert, "et toutes les drôles de petites ruelles." "Bizarre" means approximately "odd, peculiar, strange," (Larousse), and though it seems to jar strongly to the English reader, the French word does not carry the same connotations, that of being strongly out of place and even incorrect, as its English homonym. Aubert's translation uses a secondary meaning of "drôle," meaning "strange, funny, peculiar" (Larousse) to imitate Joyce's "queer." Including the word "petite" along with the word "ruelle," which already implies a small or secondary street (rue) emphasizes the small, quaint nature of the streets as Aubert envisions them. The word "drôle," too, is softer, more common, than "bizarre."

In the last lines of the text, Molly says that she "drew him [Bloom] down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume." Morel's translation is straightforward and literal: Molly pulls Bloom to her "pour qu'il sent mes seins tout parfumés." The French reader using Morel's text would be led toward the same reading as the reader using Joyce's English: the word is part of a string of references to perfumes throughout the text, and brings to mind ideas of sweet, pleasant, though artificial, smells. The French reader using Aubert's text is given a different image: Molly draws Bloom to her to smell "tout mes seins mon odeur." The word "odeur," like "odor" in English, provides a different set of sensations than "parfumés/perfumed." It implies, if not a bad smell, certainly not the agreeable smell of perfume. At the same time, Molly's "odeur" is certainly her own smell; it is not artificial or applied. Though she no longer seems as sweet smelling as a flower, this Molly is still linked, though in a different manner, with the Molly who was a "Flower of the mountain" as a girl: natural and of the earth. By the end of *Penelope*, the reader is familiar with Molly's straightfoward tone, her occasionally crass language, and

her honesty. That she would refer to "mes seins, mon odeur" is not, in this context surprising or out of place, though it does emphasize one understanding of Molly over another.

Molly's monologue is not constructed out of sentences in the traditional sense; though deciphering where one thought ends and another begins is often straightforward, the style of Molly's rambling thoughts as well as the lack of proper punctuation often leads to jumbled sentence fragments, especially as Molly drifts closer and closer to sleep. The reader must untangle the meaning of these sometimes interlocking fragments, and the translator must either manipulate French grammar to create a similarly tangled sentence fragment, or pick a possible interpretation of the Joycean text and use this interpretation as a guide for his own translation.

One such example is a sentence fragment mentioned, in part, above. It is a section of Molly's memory of her girlhood in Gibraltar. The English text reads, "Gibraltar as a girl where I was a Flower of the mountain." Morel's becomes, "Gibraltar quand j'étais jeune fille et une Fleur de la montagne," and Aubert's, "Gibraltar quand j'étais jeune une Fleur de la montagne." The English text is not even properly a sentence fragment, but a collection of partial or unfinished clauses. It invites the reader to rearrange it in an attempt to gain meaning. Perhaps it could read "In Gibraltar, where I was a Flower of the mountain, as a girl," except that there is no "in." Even such a reading is imperfect: it is only the beginning of a sentence, not a full sentence with an independent clause. The meaning of the fragment is not difficult to discern; the vocabulary is simple and the experience to which it alludes, that of remembering one's youth, realistic and straightforwardly referenced. Where the difficulty in comprehension arises is on the

grammatical level: the reader is not sure how to read the sentence because it is one of many dependent clauses, possible beginnings that lead the reader in one direction of thought, and then veer away in other direction without warning: “as girl,” “where I was a Flower of the mountain,” and later “when I put the rose in my hair.”

In both French translations, the sentence part becomes much easier to understand. Morel’s text reads, literally, “Gibraltar when I was a young girl and a Flower of the mountain,” and Aubert’s reads, “Gibraltar when I was young a Flower of the mountain.” The fragment becomes one coherent dependent clause; it still dangles, unfinished and unattached to any more complete thought, as if part of a thought that was started but never finished, as the thinker moved on too quickly to other memories. For the reader, however, it is easier to move smoothly through the French texts. She is pulled in only one direction, and though she does not seem to reach a destination, there is no need to attempt to rearrange the words or clauses to improve the clarity of the phrase. Neither Morel nor Aubert has changed the meaning of the fragment, nor has either translator picked one interpretation of the text over another. Rather, both of the French texts simplify the original so that its meaning becomes more quickly apparent to the reader.

A similar example of jumbled sentence fragments appears among the last lines of the novel, as Molly’s thoughts accelerate even faster: “and then he asked me would I say yes my mountain flower,” which reads in Morel, “et alors il m’a demandé si je voulais oui dire oui ma fleur de la montagne,” and in Aubert, “et puis il m’a demandé si je voulais oui de dire oui ma fleur de la montagne.” In *Polyglot Joyce*, Patrick O’Neill refers to this sentence’s “portmanteau grammar,” and breaks down its possible readings (175). It “includes all of ‘He asked me would I;’ her own anticipatory reply as well as her present

affirmation of it, 'Yes;' the expanded reiteration 'He asked me to say yes;" and her present memory of him saying 'Say yes, my mountain flower;" (175). Morel provides, according to O'Neill, a "moderating influence" on this mixed up grammar, transforming it into 'and then he asked me if I would say yes say yes my flower of the mountain.' No longer can one read into this sentence "the expanded reiteration 'He asked me to say yes.'" The reader attempting to rearrange the sentence, to play with its puzzle pieces, is given fewer options, fewer possible solutions to the question, 'what *is* Molly saying here?' To the extent that the confused sentence reflects Molly's state of mind, or her "growing excitement" (O'Neill 175), her character is, if slightly, altered when her syntax is simplified.

Aubert's translation differs from Morel's only in his use of "puis" instead of "alors" for "then," and, more significantly, in his inclusion of the word "de" before "dire." This small change allows the reader to rearrange Molly's words into the French sentence "il m'a demandé de dire oui," or "he asked me to say yes."

Another example of ambiguity appears in the line "and I thought well as well him as another," which is translated by Morel as "et je me suis dit après tout aussi bien lui qu'une autre," and by Aubert as "et j'ai pensé bon autant lui qu'un autre." O'Neill explains the effect of the repetition of the word "well" in the original text: "the repetition of the word 'well,' used first as an interjection, and then as an adverb…contributes to the accelerating pace of Molly's reflections" (174). Neither Morel nor Aubert, nor almost any of the translators examined by O'Neill, is able to replicate this repetition. A different complication, however, is introduced by Morel, who uses the phrase "après tout," or "after all," as his equivalent for Molly's first "well." O'Neill argues that the "ambiguous

placement" of this phrase allows for two readings: the "after all" could refer to a "retraction...of a previous decision *not* to let Mulvey kiss her," or possibly to a "rationalizing reflection that it was indeed going to be Mulvey or someone else, 'after all' (174). Aubert translates Molly's first "well," with "bon," which, though it is an arguably 'closer' translation of the individual word, does not introduce the same complexity of competing possible meanings that one sees in Morel. Aubert also imitates Joyce more exactly with his literal translation of "I thought," as "j'ai pensé." Morel has Molly remember that she "said to herself" ("je me suis dit"), a perhaps minute change that is, however, unique to Morel among the twenty translations analyzed by O'Neill. He interprets this decision as a clue to the reader to choose the second of the two possible interpretations of the earlier "après tout" (174).

Molly continues "and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes," which becomes, in Morel, "et alors je lui ai demandé avec les yeux de demander encore oui," and in Aubert, "et puis j'ai demandé avec mes yeux qu'il me demande encore oui." Morel's translation is an almost exact word for word literal translation of the Joyce text (with the exception that "my eyes" is replaced with "the eyes," an acceptable French construction that, though it sounds strange to the English speaker's ear when translated directly, does not sound out of place in French). Aubert chooses to translate "to ask/demander" using the subjunctive instead of the infinitive, so that his text literally reads "and then I asked with eyes that he ask me again yes." In this sentence, though it is still clear from context that Molly is communicating directly to her lover, this address is de-emphasized. There is no exact equivalent for the word "him," or "lui."

In the last two sentence fragments of the novel, Morel and Aubert again make changes that alter the reader's perception of the text, or of Molly's character. Molly's memory continues: "And first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes." In Morel, the text becomes "et d'abord je lui ai mis mes bras autour de lui oui et je l'ai attiré sur moi pour qu'il sent mes seins tout parfumés oui." Morel does not change Joyce's verb "put" in any significant way, but provides a literal translation with the French verb "mettre," though he does describe Molly pulling Bloom down "on top of" her (O'Neill 175) instead of simply "to her." O'Neill suggests that this word choice is both more "graphic" and "more urgent" (175). Aubert also picks arguably stronger words for his description of Molly's memory. His translation reads "et d'abord je l'ai entouré de mes bras oui et je l'ai attiré tout contre moi comme ça il pouvait sentir tout mes seins mon odeur oui." Aubert's Molly "surrounds" Bloom with her arms instead of simply putting her arms around him, and she draws him "completely against" herself instead of simply "to" herself. When faced with another example of ambiguous phrasing in the English text, both translators also choose a reading that characterizes Molly as more aggressive and in control. O'Neill references the two possible interpretations of the 'so' in "so he could feel my breasts all perfume" (175-6). If 'so' is taken as causative, Molly is pulling Bloom down *so that* he can feel her breasts; she is acting with an intention, knowing the inevitable result. If 'so' is taken as resultative, that Bloom could feel her breasts after she pulls him to her is a consequence of her actions that Molly did not plan. This interpretation, by far the less popular among the translators analyzed by O'Neill, implies a "less aggressively worldly-wise young Molly Bloom" (O'Neill 176). Both Morel, who uses the phrase "pour qu'il sent," "so

that he smelled," and Aubert, who translates with the expression "comme ça il pouvait sentir," or "like this he could smell," choose to interpret the 'so' as causative and thus, again, to emphasize Molly's "sexual aggressiveness" (O'Neill 176). The French Mollys appear more forceful and more urgent than the English Molly.

Finally, reader and translators arrive at the famous last line of the novel, in which Molly remembers the moment she accepted Bloom's marriage proposal: "and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes." The two French translations differ only slightly in their interpretations of this phrase. In Morel, the book ends: "et son coeur battait comme fou et oui j'ai dit oui je veux bien Oui," and in Aubert, "et son cœur battait comme un fou et oui j'ai dit oui je veux Oui." Although O'Neill points out the "range of suggested implications" in the phrase 'going like mad,' (176), both Morel and Aubert pick words that mean "madly, crazily," (O'Neill 176). Aubert chooses to have Bloom's heart beat "like a madman," rather than "like mad," as in Morel, but both choose words in the same range of meaning. Molly's final repeated affirmations are translated straightforwardly by both translators; the only difference between them is that Morel chooses to strengthen Molly's final "I will" into "je veux bien," where Aubert omits the "bien" so that his translation both flows faster, without even one small extra word to slow the reader down, and more literally matches the Joycean text.

Ulysses is a novel that plays with language even on the level of the individual letter, so that how a word appears on the page can lend an additional level to a reader's understanding of the text. Inevitably, any translation will be forced to alter some of this wordplay, simply because different languages arrange their letters differently to form words; even two words that are essentially equivalents of each other will appear

differently on the written page. The French texts of *Ulysses* both lose, for example, the "yes" embedded in the word "eyes" in the phrase "and then I asked him with my eyes." The English reader, provided that she is reading and not listening to the text being read, will see another example of the refrain of "yes"es that builds throughout Molly's monologue, from the first word to the last emphatic acceptance of Bloom's proposal. There is no way to preserve this hidden 'yes' in the French, where "oui" (yes) and "yeux" (eyes) share no letters in common.

At the same time, Morel and Aubert are both able to use the particulars of the French language to *add* echoes to their text that do not exist in the English. Along with the word 'yes,' another refrain throughout *Penelope* is Molly's repetition of the exclamation "O," seen twice even in the excerpt above. Because the French yes, "oui," begins with an "o," the translated texts are able to link the "yeses" with the "o's" throughout the monologue. The O, unconnected to the "yes" in the English version, "serv[es] at least visually as an alliterative link between [the] opening *oui* and [the] closing *Oui*" in both French versions (O'Neill 177). The repeated "O" also brings to mind the French word "eau," or "water," in this way acting as a constant reference to the 'flowing' nature of Molly's monologue (177).

Chapter Five: An Alternate View of Translation

Is Aubert's translation of *Ulysses* necessary? Morel's 1929 translation was the only French translation of the novel for 75 years, a translation approved by the author himself, and which for that reason seems to hold more authority than any translation completed after Joyce's death could ever hope to hold. Aubert himself was clearly aware of the fame of the original French translation, one he himself had chosen to include in the second volume of Joyce's *Oeuvres* in 1995 (O'Neill 46), and of the distinction that Joyce's name lent to that translation. He begins his postface to his 2004 translation with a section entitled "Un temps pour retraduire…" (a time to retranslate…), in which he addresses the unspoken question that must cross the mind of anyone familiar with the translation whose first page announces that it was created "avec le collaboration de l'Auteur:" why do we need another translation of *Ulysses* at all?

Aubert begins by specifying the role played by Joyce, which, he emphasizes, was largely a peripheral one. Though Joyce was ready to answer questions posed to him by his translators, the front page of the book is correct when it attributes the translation first and foremost to Morel (Aubert 1162). In other words, the authorized translation should be regarded as any other translation, as imperfect, and as readily available for improvement, as any other translation, despite Joyce's name on its cover. Aubert lists several reasons for retranslating *Ulysses*. First, any translation that is "historically close" to the original will include errors, simply because its translators will be not have time to understand its full complexity (1162). The team that contributed to the 2004 translation was able to take advantage of "almost a century of study" by Joyce scholars, which has

revealed more of the novel's references and its complexities, and which they can use to present a more complex and complete French text than any that could be produced as soon after the original writing as was Morel's translation (1162). Aubert also sees Morel's translation as "necessarily dated," a reflection of both the French language of 1929, and the "aesthetique and literary ideology of its time" (1162-3).

Aubert states outright in his postface that "no translation [has] the…numerous lives as an original text" (1162). For him, a translation is of necessity a different category of work than an original piece of writing, and the most central difference between them is that an original work can be immortal, while a translation will inevitably become dated. Unlike an original work, a translation will always clearly be a product of the time it was produced. It is not clear why an original work would not suffer the same fate. In fact, any piece of writing is influenced by the circumstances under which it was written: a Victorian novel is easily distinguishable from a novel published in 2011, for example. But this is not seen as a handicap for an original work in the way that Aubert views it as a problem for a translation. Unspoken in Aubert's argument is the assumption that the translation's primary goal should be to match the original as closely as it can. This is why a translator can benefit from approaching the text decades after its original publication; this is why a translation that is over-influenced by the time that in which it was written suffers more than an original work that is similarly dated. The translation will always be compared to an inevitably better version of itself: the first version; the original work will not. In this way, Aubert follows the traditional understanding of translation, which privileges the place of the original author and sees all rewriting of his work as necessarily inferior.

In his introduction to *Polyglot Joyce*, Patrick O'Neill labels this theory of translation the "prototextual theory," because it prioritizes the original, or proto-, text. In this model, "the translator's task is the essentially hopeless one of recovering and repeating a unique original" (7). Though this is the most common way of viewing translation, it is not the only possible model. O'Neill also outlines two other models, both of which view the translator as more than an invisible rewriter whose work will always be notable primarily for its inferiority to the original text. Instead of placing the author in a central role, however, one could choose to privilege the reader, who is constantly changing a text simply by reading it, thinking about it, or discussing it. Each reader, in his or her own small way, recreates the text; the translator literally recreates the entire text by rewriting it into another language. Here, authority is metatextual; it rests in the text itself, which is "sometimes actually and always potentially translated by the further textualizing process of its reception by successive readers;" it does not rest in the author (9). Translation is only a "particularly graphic example" of a larger method of understanding texts (9).

O'Neill takes this re-imagining of translation one step farther by positing a third model, in which all of the re-writings of an original text combine to form a *macrotext*. Instead of viewing *Ulysses* as one text, with one author; or as many texts that one can view as "a serial proliferation of variable individual readings;" it becomes the *sum* of the various texts already acknowledged in the second model (8). The word "Joyce" itself no longer refers to one person, but to an entire system, encompassing all of the author's texts in their original languages as well as in their translations (9). It is impossible for any one reader to grasp the entirety of this "Joyce system," because even a hypothetical reader with the ability, and the desire, to read *Ulysses*, for example, in all of its various

translations, would still only succeed, through this process of reading and interpretation, in creating *another* reading and extending the system (9). This model opens up new possibilities for anyone who wishes to analyze a particular text. Instead of limiting himself to a single text, either the original text or one of its translations, or even to a simple comparison of texts in which the translated text is measured by its resemblance to the original, or by how 'closely' it imitates that original, the reader can use what O'Neill refers to as a *transtextual* reading model that treats the original text, and a number of its translations, as a single text (10). The reader is still comparing these texts to each other, in the same way he could compare two different texts to each other, but because these texts are both different (for being in two different languages), and the same, the effect is altered. The conclusion one comes to is an interpretation of one text, one story, one character, or one universe.

O'Neill goes on to give various examples of the effect of his theory on readings of *Dubliners*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegan's Wake*. He discusses the effect of translator errors, the necessity of translators working in languages that differentiate between formal and informal *you* to make decisions as to the relationship between characters that an author writing in English would not need to consider, and the challenges posed by wordplay. His examination of wordplay is the most intriguing, and provides the clearest example of his theory. Wordplay provides such a challenge to the translator because readers of the original text can take multiple different meanings out of the same phrase, but no equivalent phrase exists in the target language that will give readers of the translated text the same number of options for interpretation. The translator must, then, pick one interpretation. Through his analysis of three examples of wordplay in Joyce's works,

O'Neill concludes that while any one translation must, of necessity, limit the number of interpretations of a specific phrase, a reading of multiple translations at once in fact expands the number of interpretations available (112). For example, he analyzes the moment in *Ulysses* in which Molly mispronounces the word "metempsychosis," and Bloom reports her mispronunciation as "met-him-pike-hoses" (114-6). Each translator is tasked with finding a translation that both make sense in his language as a mispronunciation, and also carries a double meaning similar to the one in Joyce's text, where "met him" is a reference to Molly's upcoming meeting with Boylan, and "pike hoses" functions as "potentially Freudian imagery" (115). Some translators do not retain any of the phallic imagery of the phrase; others convey Bloom's apprehension about Molly's affair through other linguistic methods; still others emphasize different fears that Bloom may have about Molly's sexuality, as in Wollschlager's German "with him, any number of trousers," a suggestion that Bloom may suspect his wife of infidelity with multiple men (115). The suggestive nature of Molly's mispronunciation is sometimes stronger than in the English, as in the Spanish ("things get put in") and Italian ("put it in what"). In the Czech, Molly's mispronunciation reads as "I'm fondling my tits," which, though it emphasizes Bloom's focus on Molly's sexuality, does not reference Boylan as explicitly as does the English text (116). Bloom becomes a more complex character when one examines all of these translations in contrast, at once concerned, and not concerned, and concerned in various degrees, with his wife's upcoming affair. Which is the 'real' Bloom? One could argue that it is Joyce's Bloom who is the most "accurate," because the first, but if one conceives of Bloom as no more than a character, who exists only in so far as he is depicted by words on a page, he is equally 'real' in any language, in

any form. By examining translated *Ulysses* the reader finds herself with a multiplicity of plausible Blooms, a collection of various readings all originating from one moment.

O'Neill shows that it is possible to view translated texts as tools to aid in our understanding of the original text. In his essay, "Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce," Jacques Derrida provides another way of approaching a multi-lingual *Ulysses*. Though Derrida's official topic in this essay is the use of the word "yes" in *Ulysses*, his entire speech is, of necessity, also concerned with the interplay of languages in *Ulysses* and *Ulysse*. Derrida presented his speech to the Ninth International James Joyce Symposium in French, but the text to which he was referring was originally written in English, and it is to both the English, and the French translation by Morel, that he refers throughout his speech. Derrida's essay at once focuses on the differences between the texts, and glides easily between them. He does not use the French *text* to provide an added insight into the English; rather he approaches the English text through the French *language*.

Derrida's central question is that of the *yes* in *Ulysses*, and among the several paradoxes that it provides to the reader attempting to understand its use and meaning, and the effect of its numerous echoes in the novel, is the question of its translation. Does the English "yes" mean the same thing as the French "oui"? What does it mean when the man who is approaching the question of "yes" in an English language novel is speaking in French, so that his very first word is "oui"?

To the first question, one can at least answer, that "oui" is not used in the same way that "yes" is within the *Ulysses/Ulysse* text. There are more "ouis" in the French text than there are "yeses" in the English, according to Derrida's count (266; 288). The

French both adds "ouis" for emphasis, and translates English phrases like "I will" or "I do" with "oui." The second question appears to be completely unanswerable, because it concerns, again, the issue of untranslatability. No sentence that references the language in which it is spoken can truly be translated. Derrida's first French sentence, which appears in English translation as "Oui, oui, you are receiving me, these are French words" (256) becomes nonsensical when taken out of its original language. "These are French words" becomes a false statement as soon as it is translated. Again and again, from this first line forward, Derrida's speech plays with the untranslatable, as he uses the peculiar coincidences of his French language to draw connections throughout the *Ulysses* text. These connections, because they are based on coincidences of sound and spelling, do not translate into English. One must note, however, that they are not observations that apply only to the French *Ulysse* text. Derrida has read both texts, and often criticizes the French for what it does not, or cannot, translate from the original novel. He points out that when Morel's text renders "a step farther," in Bloom's sentence to Stephen that he would "go a step farther," as "un peu plus loin," it loses "the association 'stepfather,'" and all the references to genealogy that are so central to the text (261). He refers to the translation "je vous dois," for "A.E.I.O.U." as "bad…and didactic" because it erases the play between the list of vowels and the English "I owe you/IOU," and with it the "relationship between the debt and the vowels" (294). I have already mentioned Derrida's distaste for Morel's translation of "I think I" in "Lotus Eaters."

Derrida still privileges the English version of the text, but he no longer privileges the English language as the language of interpretation. Insight can be gained into a novel like *Ulysses*, which repeats the same images and the same references throughout, inviting

its readers to turn the process of reading into a treasure hunt, and so to see the surprising connections in seemingly disparate moments, by tracing different associations: x reminds me of y, which I see again here, and so on. Derrida uses the associations he finds between French words, and occasionally between French and English words, to make these connections. Speaking of the recurring motif of the coming of Elijah, he writes, "I want to insist (in French) on the fact that seats must be *booked*, reserved with Elijah, Elijah must be *praised*, and the *booking* of this *praise* is none other than the *book*, which stands in lieu of *eternity junction*, like a transferential and teleprogramaphonic exchange" (278). This sentence, translated into English, no longer has the logic of its French version. One must know that Derrida's italicized words are, in French, "louer," (booked), "louer" (praised), "location" (booking), and "louange" (praise). (The text from which I quoted above provides the original French in brackets in the text.) The connection between "booking" and "book," however, is considerably stronger in English than in French, where there is only a tenuous alliteration between "louange" and "livre."

When Derrida discusses the "self-affirmation of the *yes,*" he refers to the multiple examples of 'sending to the self,' in the novel, a phenomenon that is translated as "the scene of 'sending oneself to oneself, having it off with oneself,'" but which can be said succinctly in French with the verb "s'envoyer." The literal meaning of the word is "to send oneself," but it carries sexual connotations as well, with which Derrida also plays as he examines examples of this occurrence in the text (303-4).

Even the title of his speech reflects this trans-linguistic strategy: "Hear Say Yes in Joyce" borders on the nonsensical in English, but in French it is a clever wordplay based on the similarities between the word for "yes" (oui) and the word for "hearsay" (ouï-

dire). The French title, "l'oui dire de Joyce," though it says, word for word, "the yes say of Joyce," brings to the French listener's mind the word "ouï-dire," as well. But this "play on…*l'oui-dire* and *l'ouï-dire* can be fully effective in French, which exploits the obscure, babelian homonymy of *oui* with just a dotted 'i' and ouï with a diaresis" (267). Derrida chose this title in part because it was "sufficiently untranslatable" (267): his argument will be put forth in French, and emphasizing both the centrality of language to his argument, and of the French language in particular.

*

Translated texts are not simply inferior copies of original texts, which inevitably and of necessity distort the meaning of the original language text. Rather, they should be considered as literary works in their own right, and particularly notable and unique ones because they exist in a middle space of creation, re-creation, and analysis. The translator is, at once, reader, writer, and critic. Because he is tasked with re-writing an entire text, the translator must be the most thorough of readers, with at least some idea of how to interpret every ambiguity of every sentence, and the most honest of critics, unable to ignore passages or issues in the text that do not fit into his view of that text (O'Neill 8).

The work that translators produce has, then, multiple uses, and a theory of translation that attempts to view translated texts as tools for interpretation has multiple consequences. The most obvious use for a translation is to allow those who cannot read the original text to access it. These additional readers can bring new insights into the text, including insights that are inaccessible to readers of the original text. Derrida analyzes *Ulysses* from the position of a French speaker and draws connections that an English speaker, viewing the text from a different linguistic perspective, could not draw.

O'Neill, in his analysis of various "mistakes" made by Joyce's translators, shows that even translations that are, objectively, wrong, can open up doors for readers who are no familiar with the original text to interpret the text in new and interesting ways, precisely because they believe the translation is an accurate depiction of the original text (101-6). O'Neill gives, among his examples, the mis-translation of "Mount Mellerary" in "The Dead" as "Mont-Cillerary" in the first French translation of *Dubliners*. A French reader could easily believe that the mountain's name is connected to the celery, or *céleri* that Freddy Malins is eating when his mother mentions his trip Mount Melleray, either thinking that the celery jogged Mrs. Mallins's memory, or, if the reader is aware that the mountain is misnamed in the French text, that it inspired her slip of the tongue (103).

The reader who has knowledge of multiple languages can compare the original text to its translation(s) and thus gain a new insight into the original text. A translation can provide a reader with an interpretation of an ambiguous passage that she may not have seen before, or even provide an argument for that interpretation by showing the consequences of that interpretation on the surrounding text. The subtle changes that a translation makes to a character can alter a reader's perception of that character.

This expansive view of translation inevitably leads to a new understanding of the very idea of a *text* and an *author*. A text is no longer a static piece of writing, easily contained in a single volume or set of volumes. It is, rather, a constantly expanding metatext of the type envisioned by O'Neill. The translations function as a part of the text, which grows as it is rewritten and re-interpreted. They are part of the afterlife, or the eternal life, of the text (Benjamin 71).

At the same time as the concept of a "text" as a single, easily imagined, easily demarcated entity disappears, the concept of an "author" as a single person also deteriorates, and the authority of an author over his own text becomes tested. Despite Joyce's careful attempts to control the translations of his work, he could no more succeed in approving every published translation as he could succeed in approving every reader's private interpretation of his work. After his death, his texts live on, new translators and new readers both continuing to rewrite and recreate his words. If we view both the original, "proto-," text and its translations as a metatext, and look for meaning in the individual texts as well as in a comparison between texts, what happens to the concept of the author? Who is the author of the metatext, and what does it mean to be the author of that text? What power does this person (or these people?) have to control the meaning of the text? Should we alter our idea of an author so that the word is no longer so strictly associated with a specific person, but rather with a creative force that can be employed by many different people in relation to one text? This examination of translation theory does not attempt to answer these questions, but rather to show that the answers to them are not as obvious as it may seem.

Works Cited

Aubert, Jacques, et al, trans. *Ulysse.* By James Joyce. Paris: Gallimard, 2004. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*." *Illuminations*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1968. 69-82. Print.

Boisen, Morgens. "Translating 'Ulysses.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 4.3 (1967): 165-9. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 February 2011.

Cheu, Hoi Fung. "Translation, Transubstantiation, Joyce: Two Chinese Version of 'Ulysses.'" *James Joyces Quarterly* 35.1 (1997): 59-70. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 February 2011.

Derrida, Jacques. "Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce." *Acts of Literature*. Ed. Derek Attridge. Trans. Tina Kendall and Shari Benstock. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

---, ed. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. New York: Viking, 1957. Print.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Ed. Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppe, and Claus Melchoir. New York: Vintage, 1986. Print.

Monnier, Adrienne, and Sylvia Beach. "Joyce's Ulysses and the French Public." *The Kenyon Review* 8.3 (1946): 430-44. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 February 2011.

Morel, Auguste, Stuart Gilbert, Valery Larbuad, and James Joyce, trans. *Ulysse*. By James Joyce. Paris: Gallimard, 1929. Print.

O'Neill, Patrick. *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2005. Print.

Popov, Nikolai. "The Literal and the Literary." *The Iowa Review* 32.3 (2002/2003): 1-25. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 February 2011.

Reynolds, Mary T. "Joyce's Interest in Translation and China." *James Joyce Quarterly* 36.2 (1999): 240-5. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 February 2011.

Works Consulted

Gifford, Don, and Robert J. Seidman. *Notes for Joyce: An Annotation of James Joyce's Ulysses*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1974. Print.

Gilbert, Stuart. *James Joyce's Ulysses: A Study*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952. Print.