CHAPTER 13

(Re-)reforegnising the Foreign: Notes on the Italian Retranslations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*

Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Ira Torresi

Abstract

The authors discuss the "disruptive potential" of *Ulysses* to the literary polysystem in terms of its generative and re-generative influence on cultural environment of the target language. Translation contributes to linguistic innovation through new writings that include retranslations. Bollettieri Bosinelli and Torresi's discussion of the Italian translations of *Ulysses* traces the differences between the seminal 1960 translation by De Angelis and the recent retranslations by Celati and Terrinoni. What sounded colloquial enough in De Angelis's foreignized translation needs to be "reforeignized" for 21st century Italian readers. While some instances of retranslation attempt to domesticate the original, micro-domestication on the idiomatic level might be actually essential for the macro-foreignization processes to become visible.

1 Introduction

When the first version of this paper came out in 2012 in *Scientia Traductionis,*[1] only Enrico Terrinoni's retranslation of *Ulysses* had been published. At the time, Terrinoni's was the only full retranslation of the book on the Italian market after Giulio De Angelis's, which had been published in 1960 and updated so as to include the amendments of the Gabler edition in 1988.[2] Gianni Celati's

[1] See Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Ira Torresi, "Reforeignising the Foreign: the Italian Retranslations of James Joyce's *Ulysses,"* in *James Joyce & Tradução II,* eds. Erika Mihalycsa and Jolanta Wawrzycka, *Scientia Traductionis* n.12 (2012): 36-44.

2 Famously, an earlier retranslation (Bona Flecchia's *Ulisse,* Florence: Shakespeare and Co., 1995) was withdrawn from the market due to copyright infringement. For the discussion of Flecchia's translation, see Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, "Who is she when she is not at home?," in *A Collideorscape of Joyce: Festschrift for Fritz Senn,* eds. Ruth Frehner and Ursula Zeller (Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 1998), 444-460.

retranslation came out in 2013, and although excerpts had already been published in Italian newspapers, Rosa Maria and I thought that we should wait for the full version before venturing a critical analysis. In the following years, we were both taken by other projects (sometimes jointly) and postponed this endeavour until there was no time left for Rosa Maria to work on it.

I am therefore immensely grateful for a chance to update this article, because it is a way for me to work "with" Rosa Maria again. I integrated the existing essay with examples from, and reflections on, Celati's retranslation, making it as Rosa Maria and I had planned it from the very start. The rest, however, is still pretty much as we jointly planned it (besides a few bibliographical updates), so that her voice can still be heard.

2 A Few Remarks about Terminology

Although this seemingly obscure language might be familiar to those who have ever dealt with James Joyce's works, perhaps we should start by explaining the meaning of the first half of our title, "(re)reforeignizing the foreign."

There is no need to argue that Joyce's English sounds and looks foreign even to native users.[3] Similarly, it has already been argued that Joyce's *Ulysses,* in particular, was conceived and promoted as a subversive, deviant and alienating work from the very start — in other words, that *Ulysses* was treated, as well as designed by its author, to be a "foreigner" in the English-language literary tradition of its time.[4] Such inherent foreignness poses interesting translation problems, as well as opportunities, since it requires a treatment different from the one that, according to Lawrence Venuti, is usually preferred by the publishing industry and market, i.e., domestication — bringing the original closer to the linguistic standards and literary canon of the recipient culture.[5]

3 See Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, "Transcreative Joyce," in *The James Joyce Translation Dossier,* ed. Jolanta Wawrzycka, *Scientia Traductionis* n. 8 (2010), 178-181.

4 See for instance Ira Torresi, "The polysystem and the postcolonial: The wondrous adventures of James Joyce and his *Ulysses* across book markets," *Translation Studies* 6:2, eds. Angela Kershaw and Gabriela Saldanha (London/New York: Routledge, 2013), 217-231.

5 Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility* (London/New York: Routledge, 1995), *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998), and "Strategies of Translation," in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation,* ed. Mona Baker (London/New York: Routledge, 1998), 240-244. For an application of Venuti's theories to Joyce in general, see Serenella Zanotti, "The Translator's Visibility: The Italian Translations of *Finnegans Wake,"* in the *Recent Trends in Joyce Studies* dossier, ed.

What we intend to explore in this paper is the notion of re-foreignization: that is to say, restoring *Ulysses* to its legitimate foreignness in a recipient culture that differs not only geographically, but also diachronically, from the culture it was originally intended for. We will do so with reference to the two new Italian translations of *Ulysses* — the first one completed by Enrico Terrinoni in collaboration with Carlo Bigazzi, and the other by Gianni Celati.

Our chapter is divided into two parts: in the first we discuss the notion of retranslation and the problems connected with it. In the second part we will present specific examples of how the foreignizing potential of *Ulysses* was brought to life again in Terrinoni's and Celati's translations.

3 Why Retranslate at All?

On January 1st, 2012, the copyright on the 1922 edition of *Ulysses,* formerly held by the James Joyce Estate, expired in Europe, with all the effects so aptly described by Robert Spoo in his plenary lecture at the 2012 International James Joyce Symposium in Dublin.[6] As a direct consequence, there was a widespread rush to publish new translations of the novel in (and out of) the old continent. This, in turn, stirred a renewed interest in Joyce all over the world, resulting in new translations and editions of all of his works.

This wealth of new translations stimulates reflections on why, apart from the feeling of liberation and for commercial reasons, classics like *Ulysses* tend to be retranslated over and over again. One reason might be that, if translation is a way of reading the original (as Fritz Senn has convincingly argued over the years),[7] then each new translation sheds new light on the same text, thus perpetually expanding and deepening the knowledge held by the scholars' and

---

Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, *mediAzioni n.* 2 (Forli: Dept. SITLeC of the University of Bologna, 2006). For a discussion of the foreignization/domestication issue in translating Modernism, see M. Teresa Caneda-Cabrera, "The Untranslatability of Modernism," in *Modernism,* eds. Astraaur Eysteinsson and Vivian Liska (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007), 675-692. For foreignization/domestication in the translation of *Ulysses,* see Ira Torresi, "Domesticating or foreignizing foreignization? Joyce translation as a test for Venuti's theories," *Papers on Joyce* n. 13 (Seville: Spanish James Joyce Society, 2007), 99-112.

6 Robert Spoo, "The public domains," https://vimeo.com/44010043 accessed 30 June 2019. See also Spoo's book, *Without Copyrights: Piracy, Publishing, and the Public Domain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

7 See for instance Fritz Senn, *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation,* ed. John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984).

readers' communities. This is how Enrico Terrinoni frames his translation of *Ulysses:*

> Translation is one of the myriad impossible possibilities allowed by literary communication. To (re)translate an "open text" like *Ulysses* does not just mean to change its nature by turning it into something else, but it is also a way of reshaping our own perception of the possible world created by the book in past readings. To translate the untranslatable is an attempt to locate and identify the fading profile of new identities.[8]

Retranslation is a form of re-reading, and additionally, it provides the reader with a new key (or new keys) not available in previous translations. This holds even more true for readers who cannot directly access the original because they do not know the language and therefore can only adopt the reading keys provided by the various translations. Actually, it might be argued — as Sam Slote has done — that foreign readers, when they can access multiple translations in their own language, are at an advantage compared with English speakers who tend to read just the original (of course, the wealth of critical material published in English as well as in other languages can count as re-reading, too, but that is another story):

> [O]ne problem English readers have with *Ulysses* is that they have just the one text to read, but non-native speakers can have their choice of translations. The public domain is not just an Irish one: we can now all have our different Joyces.[9]

But apart from an academic or literary interest in developing new insight into the original text, there are several other reasons why a text can or should be retranslated, as Serenella Zanotti has argued in a study on the retranslation of audiovisual materia1.[10] Such reasons range from changes in the norms of translation, to changes in the target culture or in the needs of the target audience,

8 Enrico Terrinoni, "Translating *Ulysses* in the Era of Public Joyce: A Return to Interpretation," in *Bridging Cultures: Intercultural Mediation in Literature, Linguistics and the Arts,* eds. Ciara Hogan, Nadine Rentel and Stephanie Schwerter (Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, 2012), 113-124.

9 Sam Slote, "The Irish International Joyce." Available at https://www.academia.edu/19130744/The_Irish_International_Joyce accessed 5 January 2019. In this passage, Slote quotes Robbert-Jan Henkes.

10 Serenella Zanotti, "The retranslation of audiovisual texts: focus on redubbing," in *Minding the gap: Studies in linguistic and cultural exchange for RMBB,* eds. Raffaella Baccolini, Delia Chiaro, Christopher Rundle and Sam Whitsitt (Bologna: Bologna University Press, 2011), 145-157:147.

down to ideological and political factors. It is also important to notice that new translations do not erase previous ones, but are supplementary to them, and old translations remain part of the memory of the receiving culture and literary canon.

The reasons summarised by Zanotti foreshadow a more specific one, which applies to the retranslation of classics like *Ulysses.* If a classic and/or its first-ever translation are left unchallenged by other translations that can function as critical (re)readings, they run the risk of being perceived as unchanging literary monuments cast in stone, of "be[ing] approached with a mixture of awe and reverence that could act to obscure their subversive origins," as Andre Lefevere writes with reference to Catullus.[11] And, as we have already pointed out in this paper, the "subversive origins" of *Ulysses* can hardly be doubted. *Ulysses* has a disruptive potential that is generative and regenerative not only of the literary polysystem but also, starting from there, of the cultural environment at large. But such disruptive and generative potential can only be preserved and kept active through innovation, in the form of new writings or rewritings (including retranslations) that make the work relevant and disruptive again for today's readers and their cultures.[12] The examples in the following section might better illustrate how a foreign (in all senses) classic like *Ulysses* can be re-foreignized for the Italian readership by using a language and extratextual allusions that are more functional in the light of the linguistic and cultural evolution that has naturally occurred on the Italian scene since the publication of the first Italian translation (I/De Angelis, 1960).[13]

4 Bottoms, Trams, and Jalap: Reforeignization Made Real

A first possible advantage of a retranslator vis-à-vis the original translator is that s/he works on already broken ground, and therefore can more easily — if s/he so wishes — dare to detach him/herself more from the original, using the

11 Andre Lefevere, *Translating literature: practice and theory in a comparative literature context* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992), 92.

12 Cf Lefevere: "The literary system is supposed to have an impact on the environment by means of the works it produces, or the *rewritings* thereof" (1992: 23; our emphasis).

13 Considering that the new translations by Celati and Terrinoni were carried out on the 1922 edition of *Ulysses, we* have not compared them with the Gabler edition of the original and the 1988 Italian post-Gabler revision by De Angelis. Instead, page references for the 1922 edition of *Ulysses,* as reproduced by Oxford University Press in 1993 *(U* 1922), and page numbers for the De Angelis 1960 translation (I/De Angelis) refer to the 1971 *I Meridiani* edition (James Joyce, *Ulisse,* trans. Giulio De Angelis, Milan: Mondadori).

first translation as a sort of springboard to land more closely to a grammar, a syntax and lexical usages that are more peculiar to the current target language (i.e., "sound more natural" in it). This domestication of the linguistic surface might pave the way for a readier acceptance of the foreign content of the passage in question, or of the novel in general.

An instance of this kind of surface domestication that actually serves the purposes of foreignization is the new rendering of Buck Mulligan's slang in "Telemachus." In example 1, De Angelis's translation appears to follow more closely the grammatical and syntactic structure of the original, while Terrinoni and Celati feel free to rewrite Mulligan's line in a way that sounds more appropriate for a naturally occurring conversation:

ex.1: Lend us a loan of (*U* 1922, 5)[14]

> Mollaci in prestito (I/De Angelis 7)
> (give us [low register] a loan of)
>
> Prestami (I/Terrinoni 34, I/Celati 7)
> (lend me)

In the following example, the two new translators choose different paths. Terrinoni updates De Angelis's collocation "piantare baccano" rewriting the whole sentence without a verb, in a credible imitation of spoken colloquial Italian. His lexical choice for the rather neutral English "noise" ["casino"], locally lowers the register — etymologically, a "casino" is a brothel, but the term is now metonymically used for any noisy, crowded place (similarly to its synonym, "bordello"). Celati, conversely, keeps De Angelis's "baccano," and tries to defuse its old-fashioned flavour by using a neutral "far(e)," a more literal "make," instead of the old "piantare":

ex. 2: If he **makes any noise** here (*U* 1922, 7)

> Se fa tanto di **piantare baccano** qui (I/De Angelis 11) (if he does as much as **make noise** here)

14 As Fritz Senn aptly commented (personal communication, 2012), the complete sentence, "Lend us a loan of your noserag," is "actually a classical trope, here with an Irish inflection, a 'figura etymologica.' [It therefore] strains upwards rather than towards the vernacular." Here we group the example together with the others under the general definition of "slang," because it both contributes to characterize Mulligan's vivid style of speech and is translated as if it were actually an instance of slang (at least by De Angelis).

Qualche altro **casino** qua dentro (I/Terrinoni 37)
(any other **mess** in here)

Se si mette a **far baccano** (I/Celati 11)
(if he starts to **make noise**)

Below, in example 3 from the same scene, De Angelis had chosen to render the non-marked verb "give" with a marked "appioppare," which was both low-register and pejorative. In this case Terrinoni updates the verb with the more contemporary reflexive "beccarsi," which is, however, equally low-register and carries a similarly negative connotation. One can "appioppare" – give – only something that is unwanted by the receiver; and one "si becca" – gets – only something that is unwanted, such as a cold or, as Mulligan's threat goes, a beating. Celati seems to revert to the original non-marking of the verb (he actually does without the verb altogether) but preserves the colour of Joyce's "ragging," translating it as "sgrugnata," a non-standard, low-register colloquial Italian word that comes from "grugno," literally a "pig's snout" and metonymically, "(human) face":

ex. 3: a ragging worse than they gave Clive Kempthorpe *(U* 1922, 7)

una lezione peggio di quella che hanno **appioppata** a Clive Kempthorpe (I/De Angelis 11)
(a lesson worse than that they **gave** [pejorative, old colloquial] Clive Kempthorpe)

una bella lezione, peggio di quella che **s'è beccato** Clive Kempthorpe (I/Terrinoni 37)
(quite a lesson, worse than the one Clive Kempthorpe **got for himself**)

una **sgrugnata** peggio di quella a Clive Kempthorpe (I/Celati 11)
(a **face-smashing** [colloquial] worse than Clive Kempthorpe's)

In other places of the same dialogue between Mulligan and Stephen, De Angelis seems to be influenced by lexical suggestions that Terrinoni and Celati ignore. In the following example, in order to preserve the idiomaticity of the original, De Angelis follows the suggestion of the word "nose" and uses an Italian idiom that revolves around its Italian equivalent "naso," but has a different meaning from the idiom used by Joyce and might even lead to a different characterization of Stephen, since it indicates a disapproving facial expression

(wringing one's nose) that possibly betrays not so much a feeling of resentment as one of annoyed snobbish superiority. Terrinoni, on the other hand, rewrites the sentence choosing to ignore its idiomaticity, but preserving its colloquial flavour. Celati simply takes out any allusion to noses, neutralizing the question into standard Italian:

ex. 4: What have you **up your nose** against me? (*U* 1922, 7)

Che cos'e the ti fa **torcere il naso** contro di me? (I/De Angelis 11)
(What is it that makes you **wring your nose** against me?)

Che ti **ho fatto**? (I/Terrinoni 37)
(What have I **done** to you?)

Cos'**hai** contro di me? (I/Celati 11)
(What do you **have** against me?)

In example 5, conversely, while De Angelis pursues the same verb-preposition sequence of the English phrasal verb, both Terrinoni and Celati choose an Italian idiom that, in addition to sounding more natural in contemporary Italian, makes up for the lost idiom in the previous example:

ex. 5: Cough it up (*U* 1922, 7)

Sputa fuori (I/De Angelis 11)
(Spit it out)

Sputa it rospo (I/Terrinoni 37, I/Celati 11)
("Spit the toad" [idiomatic: get it off your chest])

Examples 1-5 seem to confirm that retranslation does respond to the need of bringing the work back in line with the target readership's expectations, once the previous translations have lost their grip on the receiving culture and language. This, however, does not necessarily mean that such instances of retranslation are an attempt to domesticate the original, quite the opposite: micro-domestication might be necessary to make the macroforeignization processes emerge. In the case of "Telemachus" in particular, the lively dialogue between Mulligan and Stephen acts as a counterpoint to the more experimental language used elsewhere. One might even argue that erasing the variation between standard and non-standard usage through-

out the novel (i.e., having all parts of the book sound odd to contemporary readers) would not quite serve the purpose of fully revealing the disruptive potential of Joyce's writing. Updating Mulligan's colloquial language in such a way that it sounds more familiar than the Italian used by De Angelis (which had all too naturally grown obsolete after 50-odd years), turns out to be functional to the purpose of expressing such potential again — in other words, it is a practical application of the principle of "reforeignizing the foreign."

Similarly to what happens with linguistic features, retranslation is often needed to make extratextual references as transparent and plausible as the author meant them, even in the face of a changing material world. Example 6 is a case in point. It is extracted from the "HELLO, CENTRAL!" fake piece of news in "Aeolus," reporting a blackout that blocks traffic:

ex. 6: eight lines tramcars with motionless **trolleys** (*U* 1922, 142)

otto linee tranvai con **trolley** immobili (I/De Angelis 203)

le otto linee, tram con gli **archetti** immobili (I/Terrinoni 166)

le otto linee dei tramway con la **motrice** immobile (I/Celati 204)

The word "trolley" used by De Angelis (in both pre-and post-Gabler editions) was a loan from English that at that time mainly indicated the bars that connected an electric tram to the wires overhead. The word still retains this technical meaning in current Italian, but it has gained an additional, and far more popular, usage — a suitcase on wheels — that would override this specific meaning if the word were to be used in a current translation. Today, De Angelis's sentence would be primarily interpreted as "eight lines tramcars with motionless suitcases [on them]." It is therefore clear that Terrinoni's solution of changing "trolleys" into its literal Italian synonym "archetti" seems more functional because it prevents contemporary readers from wondering about the role of suitcases in that passage (and perhaps losing sight of the other "oddities" in the "Aeolus" episode). Celati's choice of "motrice" (power car) goes further down this domesticating line, as it substitutes a technical word with one that has a different referent but is far more widely known, or even easier to imagine for those who have never taken a tram. On the other hand, Celati makes up for this choice with a distinctly foreignizing "tramway," which is not used in current Italian.

A similar translation strategy that is influenced by the changes in the recipient language and culture can be observed in the constrained translation of the term "jalap":

ex. 7: made his tin by selling **jalap** to Zulus *(U* 1922, 7)

ha fatto il gruzzolo vendendo **scialappa** agli Zulu (I/De Angelis 10)

ha fatto i soldi vendendo **gialappa** agli zulù (I/Terrinoni 36)

Whereas in 1960 De Angelis had a choice between two equally correct and possible spellings of the word ("gialappa" and "scialappa"), the spelling he chose is now virtually excluded by the visibility obtained by the other form thanks to a group of extremely popular TV and radio commentators called "Gialappa's Band" (or just "la Gialappa's"). The group's Wikipedia page reports that the name was coined during the 1986 Mexico world championship, the first series of soccer games they commented for a radio show, in connection with the bout of intestinal problems suffered by several players, which they jocularly blamed on a Mexican laxative plant, jalap (gialappa). This detail about the meaning of the group's name might not be universally known to all consumers of Italian popular culture, but the spelling is – and this would make in itself the alternative spelling for the same referent, "scialappa," virtually impossible today, while it was perfectly functional in De Angelis's times. Celati's translation avoids the conundrum by replacing jalap with "castor oil," a different referent with the same function:

ha fatto il grano vendendo **olio di ricino** agli Zulu (I/Celati 10)
(he made a fortune [colloquial] selling castor oil to Zulus)

The influence of media language can similarly be traced in another specific translation choice made by Terrinoni (and this time, Celati follows suit). In Molly's monologue, we often find what goes under the euphemistic definition of "explicit language," an area whose boundaries inevitably move or blur with time and changing norms of politeness. One is faced, then, with the problem of preserving the unconventional nature of the original, even at the cost of detaching oneself from formal equivalence strictly intended. In the following example, we will only focus on the rendering of the word "bottom":

ex. 8: any man thatd kiss a womans **bottom** Id throw my hat at him *(U* 1922, 727)

> se un uomo è capace di baciare il **sedere** di una donna non ne darei 2 soldi (I/De Angelis 1040)
>
> chiunque bacia il **culo** a una donna mi fa cascare le braccia (I/Terrinoni 736)
>
> a un uomo così capace di baciare un **culo** di donna non darei due soldi (I/Celati 980)

De Angelis's translation reads "sedere," lexically similar since it is the semi-polite way of alluding to a bottom; today, it sounds and looks completely devoid of any shade of vulgarity. Terrinoni's and Celati's translations, on the other hand, feature "culo," literally "arse" – a formally stronger, more vulgar word than in the original. Whereas its usage in 1960 would have been frankly out of the question, the word is no longer taboo in the Italian media discourse of 2012/13 (and even less so in private discourse), which neutralizes much of its perceived vulgarity, while it aptly recreates the essence of Molly's voice for a contemporary readership.

One should also bear in mind that "bottom" is important in the "Penelope" episode, as is made clear by Joyce himself in a letter to Frank Budgen:

> *Penelope* is the clou of the book. The first sentence contains 2500 words. There are eight sentences in the episode. It begins and ends with the female word *yes.* It turns like the huge earth ball slowly surely and evenly round and round spinning, its four cardinal points being the female breasts, arse, womb and cunt expressed by the words *because, bottom* (in all senses bottom button, bottom of the class, bottom of the sea, bottom of his heart) *woman, yes.* though probably more obscene than any preceding episode it seems to me to be perfectly sane full of amoral fertilisable untrustworthy engaging shrewd limited prudent indifferent *Weib.*
> *(L*1 170)

5 Conclusion

It can be argued that *Ulysses* lends itself particularly well to transcreation, since it is an open work not only in Umberto Eco's sense in his theory of the *opera aperta* (unlimited semiosis, generation of multiple meanings),[15] but also

15 Umberto Eco, *Opera aperta* (Milan: Bompiani, 1962).

in the sense of a work open to new and re-newed relationships with readers (and translators among them) – as Paola Pugliatti and Romana Zacchi call it, "an inexhaustible text."[16] It has earned the name that Brook Thomas gave it in the title of his 1982 study: "A book of many happy returns,"[17] paraphrasing what one says to a beloved person to celebrate an anniversary and wish her or him long life. It seems to us that each new translation is in fact a way to wish long life to a beloved text, and the wish really works only if the translator is inspired by true affection. Just as Italo Calvino writes, "It is no use reading classics out of a sense of duty or respect, we should only read them for love"[18] – a statement that is all the more valid if one replaces "reading" with "translating." Without any kind of affection towards *Ulysses,* it would be very hard to embrace the plurality of meanings embedded in Joyce's text, and the challenge of translating it. Joyce's sarcastic words in the ALP chapter of *Finnegans Wake* come to mind: "howmulty plurators made eachone in person? Latin me that my Trinity scholard!" *(FW* 225.25-26).

We are convinced that no scholar, whether from Trinity or elsewhere, will ever be able to disclose all the possible interpretations of *Ulysses.* As Terrinoni writes:

> *Ulysses* is, if I am allowed the adjective, a "plural" text, plural as the universe, according to Portuguese poet Fernando Pessoa. It is even more plural when it gets translated. It becomes plural in the sense that Borges meant when he said that an original text can sometimes be unfaithful to its translation. Though translation is in many ways akin to a love affair, one must admit that there is little room for faithfulness or unfaithfulness when we are asked to radically modify the cultural and linguistic horizon of a literary text. Translation is always rewriting, and a work like *Ulysses* gives us the opportunity to test this very plurivocity of the language, used in interconnection with the multiculturality of the universe described by Joyce in so much detail. [...] [Translating] is, to employ Stephen Dedalus's famous metaphor in "Nestor" – the second episode of

16 Paola Pugliatti and Romana Zacchi, *Terribilia Meditans: La coerenza del monologo interiore in* Ulysses (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1983), 5. The definition is taken from the dedication to "the readers of *Ulysses:* not the hasty readers [...] but the Patient Readers, whose reading time [...] is all the time that can be devoted to reading. Those Readers, in short, who contributed to make *Ulysses* an inexhaustible text" (our translation).

17 Thomas Brook, *James Joyce's* Ulysses: *A book of many happy returns* (Baton Rouge/London: Louisiana State University Press, 1982).

18 Italo Calvino, *Why Read the Classics?* Trans. Martin McLaughlin (London: Penguin, 2009), 6.

> *Ulysses* — like standing on a "pier," a "disappointed bridge," casting a nottoo-cold eye at distant shores in order to re-imagine possible encounters, and wait for new social and communicative exchanges with the Other.[19]

We therefore believe we should all be most grateful to the translators who have accepted or will accept the challenge of translating Joyce, because they give us the opportunity of re-thinking our own identity as readers, as well as the new identities that are re-shaping the world around us.

---

19 Enrico Terrinoni, "Translating *Ulysses* in the Era of Public Joyce," 120-123.