

# REFOREGNISING THE FOREIGN: THE ITALIAN RETRANSLATION OF JAMES JOYCE'S *ULYSSES*



ROSA MARIA BOLLETTIERI & IRA TORRESI

**Abstract:** The paper explores the notion of *re-foreignization* – i.e. the restoration of a literary work that was not intended to be mainstream, but has in time become a classic, to its original foreignness. This notion is explored with specific reference to the new Italian translation of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, which is meant for a recipient culture that differs not only geographically, but also diachronically, from the culture the original was intended for. The Italian translation we focus on was recently completed by Enrico Terrinoni in collaboration with Carlo Bigazzi, and at the time of writing is the only full retranslation of the book after the one by Giulio De Angelis (1960). Our paper is divided into two parts: in the first one we discuss the notion of retranslation and the problems connected with it. In the second part we present several specific examples of how the foreignizing potential of *Ulysses* was brought to life again in Terrinoni's translation.

**Keywords:** Enrico Terrinoni; foreignization; Italian translation; James Joyce; *Ulysses*.

**Resumo:** Este artigo explora a noção de *re-estrangeirização* – i.e. a restauração de uma obra literária que não se intentava que se tornasse mainstream (mas que, com o tempo se tornou um clássico) à sua estrangeiridade original. Essa noção é explorada através da referência específica à nova tradução italiana do *Ulysses* de James Joyce, voltada a uma cultura receptora que difere não só geograficamente mas também diacronicamente da cultura para a qual o original foi escrito. A tradução italiana sobre a qual nos detemos foi completada recentemente por Enrico Terrinoni, em colaboração com Carlo Bigazzi, e na época da escrita deste artigo é a única retradução integral do livro, após a de Giulio De Angelis (1960). Nosso artigo está dividido em duas partes: na primeira discutimos a noção de retradução e os problemas relacionados a ela. Na segunda apresentamos diversos exemplos específicos de como o potencial estrangeirizador do *Ulysses* veio à tona uma vez mais na tradução de Terrinoni.

**Palavras-chave:** Enrico Terrinoni; Estrangeirização; Tradução ao italiano; James Joyce; *Ulysses*.

### A few remarks about terminology

Although seemingly obscure language might not be all too unusual for 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, "reforeignizing the foreign."

There is no need to argue, again, that Joyce's English sounds and looks foreign even to native users.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, it has already been repeatedly 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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 one of the two new Italian translations of *Ulysses*, recently completed by Enrico Terrinoni in collaboration with Carlo Bigazzi, at the time of writing the only full retranslation of the book after De Angelis's. Another retranslation, by Gianni Celati, is due to come out in 2013, and although some edited excerpts have al-

---

<sup>1</sup> See for instance Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, "Transcreative Joyce," in *The James Joyce Translation Dossier*, ed. Jolanta Wawrzycka, *Scientia Traductionis* n. 8 (Santa Catarina:UFSC, 2010), 178-181.

<sup>2</sup> See for instance Ira Torresi, "The polysystem and the postcolonial: The wondrous adventures of James Joyce and his *Ulysses* across book markets," forthcoming in the special issue *Translation Studies*, ed. Angela Kershaw and Gabriela Saldanha (London/New York: Routledge, spring 2013).

<sup>3</sup> 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. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, *mediAzioni* n. 2 (Forlì: Dept. SITLeC of the University of Bologna, 2006), [http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it/images/stories/PDF\\_folder/document-pdf/2006/dossier2006/Joyce/5%20zanotti.pdf](http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it/images/stories/PDF_folder/document-pdf/2006/dossier2006/Joyce/5%20zanotti.pdf). For a discussion of the foreignization/domestication issue in translating Modernism, see M. Teresa Caneda-Cabrera, "The Untranslatability of Modernism," in *Modernism*, ed. Astradur Eysteinnsson and Vivian Liska (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007), pp. 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.

ready been published in Italian newspapers, we will wait for a final and full version before venturing a critical analysis.

Our paper is divided into two parts: in the first one we will 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 translation.

### Why retranslate at all?

On January 1<sup>st</sup>, 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 latest International James Joyce Symposium in Dublin (June 2012). As a direct consequence, there was a widespread rush to publish new translations of the novel in (and out of) the old continent.<sup>4</sup> This, in turn, stirred a renewed interest in Joyce all over the world, resulting in new translations and editions of all of his works.<sup>5</sup>

This wealth of new translations stimulates reflections on why, apart from the feeling of liberation and from commercial reasons that might be the object of another full paper, classics like *Ulysses* tend to get 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),<sup>6</sup> then each new translation sheds new light on the same text, thus perpetually expanding and deepening the knowledge held by the scholars' and readers' communities. Enrico Terrinoni frames his translation of *Ulysses* in the same way:

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.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In addition to Terrinoni's and Celati's Italian translations already mentioned, a partial list of *Ulysses* translations published or announced for publication as of June 2012 include the Brazilian *Ulysses* translated by Caetano W. Galindo, with an introduction by Declan Kiberd (São Paulo: Penguin); the Hungarian *Ulysses*, translated by Marianna Gula, András Kappanyos, Gábor Zoltán Kiss and Dávid Szolláth (Budapest: Európa); the Finnish *Ulysses*, translated by Leevi Lehto (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press); and *Ulixes*, translated into Dutch by Robbert-Jan Henkes and Erik Bindervoet (Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak & Van Genneep).

<sup>5</sup> By way of example, retranslations of other Joycean works that came out in the first half of 2012 include those by Friedhelm Rathjen (*Ein Porträt des Künstlers als junger Mann*, Zürich: Manesse Verlag, and *Geschichten von Shem und Shaun: Tales Told of Shem and Shaun*, Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag), Radu Paraschivescu (*Oamenii din Dublin*, Bucharest: Humanitas) and Antoaneta Ralian (*Portret al artistului la tinerețe*, with a preface by Dana Crăciun, Bucharest: Humanitas).

<sup>6</sup> See for instance Fritz Senn, *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. by John Paul Riquelme (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1984).

<sup>7</sup> Enrico Terrinoni, "Translating *Ulysses* in the Era of Public Joyce: A Return to Interpretation" (working title), in *Bridging Cultures: Intercultural Mediation in Literature, Linguistics and the Arts*, ed. Ciara Hogan, Nadine Rentel and Stephanie Schwerter (Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, forthcoming in 2012).

Retranslation, then, is a form of re-reading, and additionally, providing the target reader with a new key (or new keys) that previous translations had not yet disclosed. This holds even more true for readers that 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 languages, 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):

One 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.<sup>8</sup>

But apart from an academic or literary interest in developing new insight into the original text, there are also several other reasons why a text can or should be retranslated, as Serenella Zanotti writes in a recent study about the retranslation of audiovisual material.<sup>9</sup> Such reasons range from changes in the norms of translation, to changes in the target culture or in the needs of the target audience, 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 André Lefevere writes with reference to Catullus.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> The examples in the following section might better illus-

---

<sup>8</sup> Sam Slote, “The Irish International Joyce,” published online at: <http://www.ucd.ie/joyce2012/writings-on-joyce/articles/the-irish-international-joyce-sam-slote/index.html> (last visited 7 June 2012). In this passage, Slote quotes Robbert-Jan Henkes.

<sup>9</sup> Serenella Zanotti, “The retranslation of audiovisual texts: focus on redubbing,” in *Minding the gap: Studies in linguistic and cultural exchange for RMBB*, ed. Raffaella Baccolini, Delia Chiaro, Christopher Rundle and Sam Whitsitt (Bologna: BUP, 2011), 145-157: 147.

<sup>10</sup> André Lefevere, *Translating literature: practice and theory in a comparative literature context* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992), 92.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Lefevere (1992: 23): “The literary system is supposed to have an impact on the environment by means of the works it produces, or the *rewritings* thereof” (our emphasis).

trate 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/DA*, 1960).<sup>12</sup>

### 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 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 examples 1-3, De Angelis's translation appears to follow more closely the grammatical and syntactic structure of the original, while Terrinoni feels free to rewrite Mulligan's lines in a way that sounds more appropriate for a dialogue occurring naturally:

- (1) Lend us a loan of (*U* 5)<sup>13</sup>  
 Mollaci in prestito (*I/DA* 7)  
*Give us [low register] a loan of*  
 Prestami (*I/T* 34)  
*Lend me*
- (2) If he **makes any noise** here (*U* 7)  
 Se fa tanto di **piantare baccano** qui (*I/DA* 11)  
*If he does as much as **make noise** here*  
 Qualche altro **casino** qua dentro (*I/T* 37)  
*Any other **mess** in here*
- (3) a ragging worse than they gave Clive Kempthorpe (*U* 7)  
 una lezione peggio di quella che hanno **appioppata** a Clive Kempthorpe (*I/DA* 11)  
*a lesson worse than that they **gave** [pejorative, old colloquial] Clive Kempthorpe*

<sup>12</sup> Considering that the new translation by Terrinoni (James Joyce, *Ulisse*, trans. Enrico Terrinoni with Carlo Bigazzi, ed. Enrico Terrinoni, Rome: Newton Compton, 2012; in this text, *I/T*) was carried out on the 1922 edition of *Ulysses*, we have not compared it with the Gabler edition of the original and the 1988 Italian post-Gabler revision by De Angelis. Instead, page references for the original (*U*) are from the 1922 edition, as reproduced by OUP in 1993, and page numbers for the De Angelis 1960 translation (*I/DA*) refer to the 1971 *I Meridiani* edition (James Joyce, *Ulisse*, trans. Giulio De Angelis, Milan: Mondadori).

<sup>13</sup> As one of the editors aptly commented, the complete sentence, “Lend us a loan of your nose-rag”, “is actually a classical trope, here with an Irish inflection, a ‘figura etymologica’. [It therefore] strains upwards rather than towards the vernacular” (Fritz Senn, personal communication). Here we group the example together with the others under the improper 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).

una bella lezione, peggio di quella che **s'è beccato** Clive Kempthorpe (I/T 37)  
*quite a lesson, worse than the one Clive Kempthorpe got for himself*

In other places of the same dialogue between Mulligan and Stephen, De Angelis seems to be influenced by lexical suggestions that Terrinoni ignores. 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:

- (4) What have you **up your nose** against me? (U 7)  
 Che cos'è che ti fa **torcere il naso** contro di me? (I/DA 11)  
*What is it that makes you wring your nose against me?*  
 Che ti **ho fatto**? (I/T 37)  
*What have I done to you?*

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

- (5) Cough it up (U 7)  
 Sputa fuori (I/DA 11)  
*Spit it out*  
 Sputa il rospo (I/T 37)  
*"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 actually necessary to make the macro-foreignization 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. Moreover, one might argue that erasing the variation between standard and non-standard usages of language throughout 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 has all too naturally grown obsolete after 50-odd years), then, turns out to be functional to the purpose of expressing such potential again – in other words, is a practical application of the principle of "reforeignizing the foreign," as our title goes.

Similarly to what happens with linguistic features, retranslation is often needed to make extratextual references as transparent and plausible as the author meant them to be, 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:

- (6) eight lines tramcars with motionless **trolleys** (*U* 142)  
 otto linee tranvai con **trolley** immobili (*I/DA* 203)  
 le otto linee, tram con gli **archetti** immobili (*I/T* 166)

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 has gained an additional, and far more popular, usage – a suitcase on wheels – that would override this specific meaning if the word were used again 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 “archetti” (literally, violin bows) seems more functional if not strictly correct from the terminological point of view, 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).

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*:

- (7) made his tin by selling **jalap** to Zulus (*U* 7)  
 ha fatto il gruzzolo vendendo **scialappa** agli Zulu (*I/DA* 10)  
 ha fatto i soldi vendendo **gialappa** agli zulu (*I/T* 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 ruled out 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 unthinkable today, while it was perfectly possible and functional in De Angelis’s times.

The influence of media language can similarly be traced in another specific translation choice made by Terrinoni. 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”:

- (8) any man thatd kiss a womans **bottom** Id throw my hat at him (*U* 727)  
 se un uomo è capace di baciare il **sedere** di una donna non ne darei 2 soldi (*I/DA*  
 1040)  
 chiunque bacia il **culo** a una donna mi fa cascare le braccia (*I/T* 736)

De Angelis’s translation reads *sedere*, lexically quite similar to the original 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 translation, on the other hand, features *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 (and even less so in private discourse), which neutralizes much of its perceived vulgarity, while it aptly recreates the gist of Molly’s phrase for a contemporary readership.

One should also bear in mind that “bottom” is an important word and concept for 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 ... 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*.<sup>14</sup>

## Conclusion

It can be argued that *Ulysses* lends itself particularly well to recreation, since it is an open work not only in the sense that Umberto Eco gave in his theory of the *opera aperta* (unlimited semiosis, generation of multiple meanings),<sup>15</sup> but also 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.”<sup>16</sup> It has well earned the name that Brook Thomas gave it in the title of his 1982 study: “A book of many happy returns,”<sup>17</sup> para-

<sup>14</sup> Letter by Joyce to Frank Budgen, 16 Aug., 1921, *Letters I*, 170.

<sup>15</sup> Umberto Eco, *Opera aperta* (Milan: Bompiani, 1962).

<sup>16</sup> 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).

<sup>17</sup> Brook Thomas, *James Joyce’s Ulysses: A book of many happy returns* (Baton Rouge/London: Louisiana State UP, 1982).



phrasing 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"<sup>18</sup> – a statement that holds all the more true 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 scholar!" (*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 Terri-  
noni 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 multicultural-  
tural-ity 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 *Ulysses* – like standing on a "pier," a "disappointed bridge," casting a not-too-cold eye at distant shores in order to re-imagine possible encounters, and wait for new social and communicative exchanges with the Other.<sup>19</sup>

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.

**Rosa Maria Bollettieri & Ira Torresi**

*rosa.bollettieri@unibo.it*

*ira.torresi@unibo.it*

*PhDs, Professors, University of Bologna*

---

<sup>18</sup> Italo Calvino, *Why read the classics?* Trans. Martin McLaughlin (London: Penguin, 2009), 6.

<sup>19</sup> Enrico Terrinoni, "Translating *Ulysses* in the Era of Public Joyce".