REVISITING THE RETRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS:
A CASE STUDY OF TWO CROATIAN TRANSLATIONS OF JAMES JOYCE'S *ULYSSES*

Veronika Mesić, University of Zagreb

Abstract

The retranslation hypothesis was introduced to translation studies by Berman (1990) and Bensimon (1990). According to the hypothesis, retranslations tend to be closer to the source text and more foreignizing in nature, while initial translations aim to bring the source text closer to the target audience by domesticating it. Recent research challenges the validity of some elements of the retranslation hypothesis as well as its universal applicability. The aim of the paper is to examine whether the hypothesis is applicable to the first translation and retranslation of a radically modernist text such as James Joyce's 1922 novel Ulysses*. A comparative analysis of selected segments from two existing translations of the novel into Croatian, the 1957 translation by Zlatko Gorjan and the 1991 retranslation by Luko Paljetak, is carried out. The closeness of the target texts to their source texts is measured in two ways. The first parameter is the number of times a translation strategy is applied. In this part of the analysis the taxonomy of translation strategies provided by Chesterman (2016) is used. Another factor considered to be a suitable parameter for estimating the closeness of a target text to its source text is the preservation of instances of creative language use, particularly suitable for analysing the translations of* Ulysses*. The contradictory findings related to the two observed parameters lead to the conclusion that the retranslation hypothesis does not provide a sufficiently comprehensive methodological framework for explaining the phenomenon of retranslation. In its conclusion, the paper suggests that each translation and retranslation should be observed individually and with respect to the context in which they were created.*

Keywords: retranslation hypothesis, modernist literature, translation strategies

1. Introduction

Translation involves not only the construction of relations between texts and, consequently, cultures but also the molding of words so that they fit the constraints of another language. It inevitably deprives the translated words of the nuances of meaning they had in the source text (ST), while simultaneously enriching them with new layers of meaning. The resulting transformation of meaning is, according to Rosa Maria Bosinelli (2010: 190), what the process of translation has in common with James Joyce's writing strategies. A typical representative of the modernist approach to language, Joyce tends to distort the signifiers of commonplace words and infuse them with meaning that can only be obtained by viewing the word in question as part of a larger scheme, i.e. by following its textual, extratextual and intertextual traces. Consequently, the translation of these types of texts places special emphasis on the translator's role as a reader and interpreter, and highlights the translator's individual ability to innovatively convey instances of creative language use.

The aim of this study[1] is to examine how (and whether) the passage of time affects the translation of a modernist text, by conducting a comparative analysis of the two existing translations of James Joyce's novel *Ulysses* into Croatian: the 1957 translation by Zlatko Gorjan and the 1991 retranslation by Luko Paljetak. The findings of the analysis will be used to verify or reject the retranslation hypothesis, as formulated by Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990) and Gambier (1994, quoted in Dastjerdi and Mohammadi 2013). In section 2 of the paper, key concepts such as retranslation and the retranslation hypothesis are explained, followed by a brief overview of the existing literature on the retranslation hypothesis and the prominent recent research aimed at testing the hypothesis. The ST, *Ulysses*, as well as its specific linguistic and narrative features typical of literary Modernism, will be discussed in section 3. The methodology used to compare and analyze the first translation and retranslation is discussed in section 4, with the findings presented in section 5. Drawing on the conducted research, I will try to establish whether the retranslation hypothesis presents an adequate

---

[1] The study was conducted as the author's M.A. thesis at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. This paper is a revised version of that thesis.

theoretical framework for studying the (re)translation of a radically modernist text.

2. Retranslation and the retranslation hypothesis

Retranslation is defined by Koskinen and Paloposki (2010: 1) as a "second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language". The definition is not straightforwardly applicable, and this is recognized by the authors who admit that the description of the target language (TL) as "the same" can be disputed, seeing that languages change diachronically as well as synchronically (Ibid.). Another problematic aspect of the definition is that it posits the ST as unique ("single source text") although many texts, including literary texts, have several versions due to authorial and editorial revisions (Ibid.). The latter aspect is especially important for this analysis since it involves two STs that are considered variations of the same literary text, as described in section 4.

The retranslation hypothesis emerged from the articles written by Antoine Berman (1990) and Paul Bensimon (1990) that were published in the retranslation-themed edition of the journal *Palimpsestes*. Theorizing translations as always somewhat "inaccomplished" [*sic*], Berman points to retranslations as a means through which a translation can potentially achieve "accomplishment" (qtd. in Susam-Sarajeva 2003: 2), thereby implying a general distinction in quality between the first translation of a work and its retranslations, measurable in terms of closeness to the original (Ibid.). On their path to "accomplishment", retranslations gradually become closer to the ST, and this progress is viewed by Berman as linear (Susam-Sarajeva 2003: 3). The distinction between translations and retranslations is further elaborated by Bensimon, who describes first translations of foreign works as "naturalizations" whose function is to introduce the ST to the target culture (TC) (qtd. in Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010: 27). In order to be more accessible to the readers in the TC, initial translations are therefore "more assimilating" and tend to "reduce the otherness in the name of cultural or editorial requirements" (Gambier qtd. in Koskinen and Paloposki 2003: 21). Retranslations, on the other hand, no longer need to serve this function and can afford to get closer or "return" to the ST (Ibid.). The cited assumptions were subsumed under the term *retranslation hypothesis* by Andrew

Chesterman (2017: 132), who provided a rather succinct formulation of the hypothesis: "Later translations (same ST, same TL) tend to be closer to the original than earlier ones." Following the cited definitions, it is possible to sum up the underlying implications of the retranslation hypothesis:

1. The indiscriminate use of the term "translations" in all given definitions implies that the hypothesis should be valid for all (re)translations, regardless of their linguistic or literary genre.

2. The hypothesis implies a consistent, linear, chronological progress of re(translations) towards a retranslation that is:

   a) closer to the ST and therefore

   b) improved (of better quality).

However, the above listed elements of the retranslation hypothesis do not always comply with the findings and conclusions of empirical research, mainly case studies, which seek to test its validity.

In her study of retranslations of a Swedish children's classic into German and Dutch, Isabelle Desmidt (2009: 679) found that later retranslations were generally further from the ST because translators tended to prioritize TC norms (literary, pedagogical and economical) rather than showing allegiance to the ST. The author points out that none of the articles in the retranslations-themed edition of *Palimpsestes* deal with children's literature, which, combined with the findings from her research, led her to the conclusion that the retranslation hypothesis might not be generally applicable to children's literature (Desmidt 2009: 671). Desmidt's claim is partially confirmed by Anu Heino's (2013) study of the first translation and two retranslations of *Mary Poppins*, a popular children's classic, into Finnish. Heino (2013: 26) focuses on the translation of cultural elements and, following Maria Tymoczko, divides them into three categories: material culture, social culture and the intermediate category. She found that, when it comes to the intermediate category and the category of material culture, the retranslations were indeed closer to the ST. However, the analysis of the social culture category showed that the second retranslation was even more assimilating than the initial translation, thereby disproving the notion that the retranslation hypothesis can be indiscriminately applied to all aspects of the text, i.e. that the retranslation is closer to the ST in its entirety. Similar

conclusions were reached by Lei Feng (2014) in a case study of two English translations of *Sanguo Yanyi* - the first Chinese novel. Although the first translation was overall more domesticated than the retranslation, Feng noticed that the retranslation featured domesticating strategies that were not present in the first translation. The assumption of consistency was also challenged by Sharon L. Deane's (2011) study of the English retranslations of Gustave Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* and George Sand's *La mare au diable*. Deane's research on *Madame Bovary* partially confirms the retranslation hypothesis, as the latest retranslation was found to be linguistically closest to the ST, and an early (second) retranslation the furthest (Deane 2011: 258). However, the behavior of the retranslations that occurred in-between all but followed the retranslation hypothesis' assumption of linear chronological progress, seeing that the first translation and the final retranslation were found to be comparable (Ibid.). A similar conclusion was reached by Natalia Kaloh Vid and Petra Žagar-Šoštarić (2018), who focused on the rendering of Soviet neologisms in five English retranslations of Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Heart of a Dog.* The authors found that, in general, later translations displayed more foreignizing tendencies than the earlier ones, but the hypothesis could still not be applied to all retranslations as the penultimate retranslation was more domesticating than its predecessors (Kaloh Vid and Žagar-Šoštarić 2018: 182).

Although some empirical research validates the retranslation hypothesis, even the authors whose findings support the hypothesis voice their criticism regarding the hypothesis' narrow theoretical framework. For example, Dastjerdi and Mohammadi (2013), whose research on retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice* into Persian found the retranslation hypothesis valid, criticize Berman's notion of retranslations' potential "accomplishment" (improvement) by pointing out that closer, more supplemented retranslations do not necessarily make better translations, as they do not always fare better in the target context (Dastjerdi and Mohammadi 2013: 108). The authors also claim that closeness established in later translations cannot be proven to stem from the retranslations' subsequent position in relation to the original translation or, as they put it, from "the increased knowledge of the re-translator of the source text through the course of time" (Ibid.). Another author whose results supported the retranslation hypothesis, Siobhan Brownlie (2006), claims that the theoretical framework

offered by the hypothesis is not sufficient for establishing characteristics of a retranslation since every retranslation is shaped by an array of factors other than its (temporal, sequential) relation to the original translation: "rather than through reference to a general historical progression, the nature of translations and retranslations is best explained through particular contextual conditions" (Brownlie 2006: 166).

The studies presented above show that the existing research has successfully questioned the validity of the previously outlined elements of the retranslation hypothesis. More precisely, the following elements of the retranslation hypothesis have been brought into question:

1. that it is equally applicable to all literary genres (Desmidt 2009; Heino 2013)

2. that retranslations gradually become closer to the ST (Deane 2011) in all aspects of the studied text (Kaloh Vid and Žagar-Šoštarić 2018)

3. that closer retranslations are universally accepted as being improved (Dastjerdi and Mohammadi 2013).

The discrepancies that arise when it comes to establishing universal characteristics of retranslations or their motivations are important since they illustrate one stable characteristic of retranslation – a tendency to eschew generalization. In order to examine whether the elements of the retranslation hypothesis will be validated by the analysis of the first translation and retranslation of *Ulysses* into Croatian, it is first necessary to elaborate on the nature of the novel and to try to trace the main linguistic characteristics of the text, as well as identify potential challenges with respect to translation.

3. Linguistic and narrative features of *Ulysses*

Modernism, also known as cultural modernity, refers to artistic practices that began with the late 19th century and continued well into the 20th century, with literary Modernism reaching its peak between 1910 and 1925 in the Anglo-American context (Levenson 2005: 1). Advances of technological and social modernity, as well as the impact of thinkers such as Freud, Nietzsche and Marx heavily influenced art and literature of the period. The notion of the destabilized subject and the belief in the existence of the unconscious mind, advocated by

psychoanalysis, influenced the transfer of the literary narrative from the external to the internal, psychological plane (Daiches 1997: 1154), resulting in innovative techniques such as the stream of consciousness and the appearance of the unreliable narrator, whose style of narration mirrored the unreliable nature of human memory (Levenson 2005: 2). Furthermore, the rise of the new conceptualization of language known as the "linguistic turn" posited language as no longer simply reflecting the world but actively forming it (Bell 1999: 16), inspiring modernist writers to create literature that manifested an elevated degree of linguistic self-consciousness, both by focusing on the level of the signifier and by indulging in radical linguistic experiments (Levenson 2005: 4). This tendency saw its culmination in the works of James Joyce, whose famous novel *Ulysses,* published in 1922, went on to become emblematic not just of Joyce's own *oeuvre*, but also of the entire epoch of Modernism.

The novel revolves around everyday events that took place in Dublin within the time frame of a single day, June 16 1904, primarily through the focalizing lens of Leopold Bloom, an advertising canvasser, his wife Molly Bloom, a singer, and a young teacher and aspiring writer, Stephen Dedalus. It is divided into eighteen chapters that roughly parallel the narrative structure of Homer's classical epic poem *Odyssey*, with each episode of the novel bearing a title somehow related to the narrative of the epic poem. The novel also adopted the poem's central motif of homecoming, while the characters and actions of Leopold, Stephen and Molly vaguely mirror the characters of the hero Odysseus, his son Telemachus and wife Penelope.

Joyce's atypical use of language with the purpose of mockery is what makes *Ulysses* a typical modernist novel: he parodies Homeric epithets with neologisms, primarily compounds, that combine corporeal motifs and colloquial language. Joycean compounds are diverse both in terms of their constituent words and the number of those words, ranging from simple combinations of two nouns or two adjectives to entire phrases compressed into a single word. Furthermore, by condensing Odysseus' perennial voyage into Bloom's single-day journey, Joyce opens the narrative space for the shifting perspectives of the same event, allowing for the employment of various novel narrative techniques such as

interior monologue[2], free indirect speech and stream of consciousness[3]. Although the characters' idiolects differ among themselves as well as from the language of the narrator, their thoughts often appear in segments sometimes as small as a single sentence or phrase, making it harder for the reader, and, more importantly, the translator, to identify which narrative category, and which character, the utterance belongs to. Along with the described problem of determining if an utterance originates from the narrator or a character, there is also the challenge of interpreting sentences whose parts are omitted as a consequence of ellipsis. The narrative gradually becomes more convoluted as the character's internal musings of the present and the past, impressions and associations, often in form of elliptical sentences and sentences consisting of single phrases, slowly assume dominance over the third-person narrator. The culmination of this narrative technique can be seen in the final chapter, where ellipsis is employed as a tool for portraying the typical process of thought in which thoughts are constantly interrupted by other thoughts, resulting in what Anthony Burgess (1975: 52) terms "ellipsis of thought". Consequently, the ability of the reader/translator to recreate meaningful, separate units while disregarding the lack of punctuation is what ultimately determines how accessible this text, often mythicized due to its supposed hermeticism, will be for the reader/translator. Along with ellipsis, there are numerous other rhetorical figures in the novel, primarily those of repetition. Words are repeated in succession for emphasis (epizeuxis), or to contrast two homographs (antanaclasis). Occasionally, the same word is repeated at the beginning of sequential sentences (anaphora), while some of these sentences also end with similar expressions (symploce). Smaller linguistic units are also subject to repetition, namely vowel sounds (assonance), consonant sounds (alliteration) and roots (polyptoton). The use of these rhetorical figures was primarily supposed to imbue the words with musicality and rhythm, which are also achieved through

---

[2] Interior monologue is a narrative technique that refers to "the written representation of a character's inner thoughts, impressions, and memories as if directly 'overheard' without the apparent intervention of a summarizing and selecting narrator" (Baldick 2001: 126).

[3] According to *The Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms*, the term is used interchangeably with the term *interior monologue* by some critics, while other view stream of consciousness as a separate technique "emphasizing continuous 'flow' by abandoning strict logic, syntax, and punctuation (Baldick 2001: 127). Seeing that *Ulysses'* final chapter ("Penelope") features a type of interior monologue that differs from the way the technique is used in the rest of the novel, namely in terms of punctuation and syntax, I will be using the term stream of consciousness only in the context of the final chapter.

the use of various onomatopoeic neologisms. The majority of onomatopoeic expressions incorporate references to popular songs of the late 19th century, some of which function as the novel's musical leitmotifs. Further, allusions are not limited to popular culture but rather span across the entire literary canon, and are oftentimes woven by Joyce into puns and wordplays. The described narrative techniques and rhetorical figures, along with the other outlined characteristics of modernist fiction that are manifested in *Ulysses*, inevitably present a challenge when it comes to its translation. Therefore, they will be paid special attention when comparing the two existing translations into Croatian.

4. Methodology

4.1 The source texts

Two STs were used in the analysis: the 1960 edition almost identical to the one used by Zlatko Gorjan, and the 1986 edition, used by Luko Paljetak. Gorjan used The Bodley Head's 1952 edition (Grubica 2007: 35), a reprint of the publisher's 1937 edition which included Joyce's corrections of The Bodley Head's first edition of *Ulysses*, published in 1936 (Herbert 2004). As for the impact of the two different STs on this analysis, I should point out that in the course of my work it gradually became evident that there were not a great number of discrepancies between the two STs, at least when it comes to the segments analyzed. Of the thirty-seven observed discrepancies, thirteen are related to changes in capitalization, while the remaining changes mostly pertain to syntax, punctuation and addition (of a single word or a connector).

4.2 The sample

For the purpose of the study a page-long segment of the text was taken from five chapters of the novel (constituting a total sample of five textual segments) and analyzed. The samples were selected at random, having in mind the idea that all parts (initial, middle and final) of the novel should be included in order to better reflect the diversity of the text. The selected samples were taken from the following chapters:

1. Chapter 3, "Proteus"

2. Chapter 7, "Aeolus"

3. Chapter 11, "Sirens"

4. Chapter 15, "Circe"

5. Chapter 18, "Penelope"

The wide range of chapters chosen for analysis enabled me to obtain a more comprehensive grasp of the novel's language, especially since the latter becomes more convoluted as the narrative progresses, ranging from the initial chapter's classic prosaic style to the final chapter's stream of consciousness.

4.3   Parameters of closeness

All studies on the retranslation hypothesis are inevitably founded on the notion of closeness, i.e., all the authors mentioned above draw conclusions on the retranslation hypothesis from research that involves measuring closeness of the TTs to the ST. However, the majority of the authors undertake their research without dwelling on the concept itself, and none of the studies I consulted for this research provide a universal definition of closeness. Furthermore, even if we do assume that closeness is a self-evident category, the problem remains of how, and whether, it can be measured and "examined in a systematic and repeatable manner" (Deane 2011: 27). The idea of closeness as universally measurable is undermined by the vast methodological heterogeneity found in the case studies that examine it, both in terms of textual elements that are analyzed and the classifications that are employed (see Kaloh Vid and Žagar-Šoštarić 2018; Deane 2011; Dastjerdi and Mohammadi 2013; Koskinen and Paloposki 2010; Davies 2003).[4] The one common denominator of all the reviewed studies is that their authors tend to combine existing classifications or their categories into a new, hybrid model tailored specifically for the text that is being studied. A similar approach will be applied in this study in order to better reflect all specificities of the studied text.

---

[4] Due to the limited scope of this paper, I cannot discuss in more detail the theoretical problems regarding the concept of closeness and the approaches to measuring it. For a more detailed inquiry into these issues see Deane 2011.

The first parameter of closeness can be drawn from one of the interpretative hypotheses offered by Andrew Chesterman (2017) in his discussion of the retranslation hypothesis. Chesterman points out that the retranslation hypothesis presumes that closeness can be validly measured in terms of "frequency of strategies ABC" (Chesterman 2017: 131). One way to go about this would be to measure the number of occurrences of strategies as Chesterman understands them. In his classification, the term strategy is reserved for those situations that "involve the choice between possibilities" and are not necessary for producing a grammatically correct version of the text in the TL (such as adding articles when translating from a language which does not include them to English) (Chesterman 2016: 90). Chesterman sees the use of these strategies as an alternative to using "the target version that comes immediately to mind" (Ibid.). Provided that this version is grammatically correct, we could speculate and say that this version would also be the one that is closer to the ST as it does not involve unnecessary interventions. Consequently, a smaller number of occurrences of translation strategies would signal a TT closer to the ST and vice-versa. In order to measure the number of occurrences of translation strategies I used Chesterman's classification of translation strategies (2016), which comprises three main groups of strategies – syntactic, semantic and pragmatic – and their subcategories. The category of syntactic strategies refers to changes that "manipulate form", and it includes subcategories such as literal translation, phrase structure change and scheme change (Chesterman 2016: 91). Semantic strategies "manipulate nuances of meaning" both on the level of lexical semantics and on the level of clause meaning, and include subcategories such as synonymy, paraphrase and trope change (Chesterman 2016: 98). Pragmatic changes "manipulate the message itself", meaning that they have to do with the selection of information from the ST and most often arise from the translator's overall approach to a given text (Chesterman 2016: 104). Common pragmatic strategies include cultural filtering, explicitness change and information change (Ibid.). The number of occurrences of identified strategies is used as the first parameter for determining the level of closeness.

The second parameter for measuring closeness is based on Peter Newmark's (1988: 39-44) classification of texts according to their function. Drawing on Jakobson's adaptation of Bühler's functional theory of language, Newmark

classifies texts according to their primary function, i.e., to the main purpose of using language. In line with this he proposes five functions: expressive, aesthetic, informative, vocative, phatic and metalingual (Ibid.). According to Newmark, the main characteristic of expressive texts is that they act as a medium for the author's expression of feelings and their "expressiveness" is constituted by personal components such as "unusual ('infrequent') collocations; original metaphors; 'untranslatable words, particularly adjectives of 'quality' (…); unconventional syntax; neologisms; strange words (archaisms, dialect, odd technical terms)," instances of creative language which form an idiolect that is different from "ordinary language" (Newmark 1988: 40). Keeping in mind the linguistic characteristics of *Ulysses*, as described in section 3, it can be said that the novel is primarily marked by its expressive function. However, the novel's lyrical segments and an overall focus on sound are also indicative of its aesthetic function. The language reflecting the aesthetic function is designed "to please the senses" both through sounds and metaphors (Newmark 1988: 42). Consequently, an aesthetic text is characterized by sound-effects that include "onomatopoeia, alliteration, assonance, rhyme, metre, intonation, stress" (Ibid.). The translation of expressions that make up creative language in the ST is not an easy endeavor since they tend to function on the level of the signifier, meaning that they are often inextricably linked to the language they were created in. In this regard, Newmark points out that creative language common to expressive texts should not be "normalized" (omitted, paraphrased) (Newmark 1988: 40) and admits that sound effects are often impossible to translate, but notes that they can be compensated for (Newmark 1988: 42). Preserving the instances of creative language requires a great amount of skill and creativity from the translator, and even in the case of the same ST, different translators will produce translations with varying amounts of creative language. Taking into consideration the importance of transferring *Ulysses'* expressive-aesthetic function, I assume that the mentioned amount of creative language, i.e., how successfully instances of creative language are rendered in the TTs, should be taken into account as an important parameter of closeness. The majority of instances of creative language listed by Newmark fall under the categories of either rhetorical tropes or rhetorical schemes, and the strategies used to translate them can be tracked via categories of *scheme change* and *trope change* provided in Chesterman's classification. These categories also include subcategories that will allow us to

observe precisely how the rhetorical tropes and schemes are dealt with, i.e. whether they are *preserved*, *substituted*, *omitted* or *added (compensated for)* (Chesterman 2016). Preservation implies that the translator will try to recreate the ST scheme in the TT (*ST scheme X → TT scheme X*). Substitution refers to the substitution of one rhetorical scheme with another that will have a similar function as the original (*ST scheme X → TT scheme Y*) and in omission the scheme is "dropped altogether" (*ST scheme X → TT scheme Ø*) (Chesterman 2016: 97-98). This category also includes the translator-initiated addition of a rhetorical scheme when one is not present in the ST (*ST scheme Ø → TT scheme X*) (Chesterman 2016: 98). Although Chesterman does not elaborate on this strategy, its primary purpose seems to be compensation.[5] The category of trope change describes the translation of figurative expressions (such as metaphors), also known as rhetorical tropes (Chesterman 2016: 101). The approaches to translation of rhetorical tropes offered by Chesterman are analogous to the ones offered for rhetorical schemes: *preservation* of the same trope found in the ST (*ST trope X → TT trope X*), *substitution* (ST trope X → TT trope Y), *omission* (*ST trope X → TT trope Ø*), and *addition* (ST trope Ø → TT trope X) (Chesterman 2016: 101-103).

It is important to note that the overall number of rhetorical tropes and schemes contained within the analyzed segments greatly exceeds those identified in the analysis, and this is so because of a number of factors. Firstly, the text is so abundant with rhetorical figures that to identify and enumerate them all would require a robust separate analysis, which would go beyond the scope of this research paper.[6] Secondly, as some rhetorical figures do not impact translation, they are not relevant for this research and are omitted. For example, aporia, a figure of speech "in which a speaker deliberates, or purports to be in doubt about a question" (Baldick 2001: 17), does not require creative adjustments of the signifier (as opposed to alliteration), and its rendition in translation does not produce ungrammaticalities (as opposed to metaplasms).

---

[5] I was first led to this conclusion by the findings in my analysis, which showed that the translators introduced those rhetorical schemes and tropes that were otherwise typical of the text. Chesterman confirms this notion in a separate chapter on compensation, where he writes that, although compensation is not listed as a strategy in his classification, it is represented by strategies such as trope and scheme change (Chesterman 2016: 112).

[6] This is finely illustrated by Kevin Dettmar, who analyzed a segment of text from the "Sirens" chapter of *Ulysses* and compiled a "mock-serious list", named so for the fact that the figures identified in thirteen sentences amounted to forty (Dettmar 1996: 157-159).

Further, as some of the figures overlap with Chesterman's translation strategies (e.g. asyndeton, the omission of conjunctions between words, phrases, and clauses (Baldick 2001: 21), can also be described as cohesion change), in such cases I prioritized Chesterman's strategies as his classification constitutes the primary methodological framework in this research.

5. Findings

5.1 Quantitative analysis.

The analysis of the selected segments has shown that Zlatko Gorjan's first translation (FTr) contains a larger number of occurrences of translation strategies, 418, than the retranslation by Luko Paljetak (RTr), in which 299 occurrences were identified. As each analyzed segment of the FTr demonstrates a larger number of occurrences of strategies used than the corresponding segment of the RTr, we may assume that this tendency is indicative of the entire TTs. The data regarding each chapter are provided in Table 1.

Table 1   Occurrences of translation strategies by chapters

Target text	FTr					RTr				
Chapter	3	7	11	15	18	3	7	11	15	18
Occurrences of strategies	81	60	105	48	125	49	36	79	41	93
Total	**418**					**299**				

The most commonly used syntactic strategies in both TTs are scheme change, cohesion change and clause structure change. When it comes to semantic strategies, both translators mostly relied on trope change, paraphrase and synonymy, while the majority of pragmatic changes in both texts comprised explicitness change, cultural filtering and information change. A detailed account of occurrences of syntactic strategies is provided in Table 2, occurrences of semantic strategies are presented in Table 3, and occurrences of pragmatic strategies in Table 4.

Table 2   Occurrences of syntactic strategies in the FTr and RTr

TRANSLATION STRATEGY	OCCURRENCES			
	FTr		RTr	
All syntactic strategies	**164**		**129**	
1: Literal translation	2		3	
2: Loan, calque	6		9	
3: Transposition	14		6	
4: Unit shift	20		14	
5: Phrase structure change	17		8	
6: Clause structure change	20		19	
7: Sentence structure change	5		1	
8: Cohesion change	26		22	
9: Level shift	0		0	
10: Scheme change	54		47	
x→Ø		25		28
x→x		14		13
x→y		8		5
Ø→x		7		1

Table 3   Occurrences of semantic strategies in the FTr and RTr

TRANSLATION STRATEGY	OCCURRENCES			
	FTr		RTr	
All semantic strategies	**140**		**110**	
1: Synonymy	25		17	
2: Antonymy	1		0	
3: Hyponymy	16		15	
4: Converses	2		3	
5: Abstraction change	2		2	
6: Distribution change	6		6	
Expansion		3		3
Compression		3		3
7: Emphasis change	13		3	
8: Paraphrase	29		21	
9: Trope change	44		43	
x→Ø		22		28
x→x		15		14
x→y		4		1
Ø→x		4		1
10: Other semantic changes	2			

Table 4   Occurrences of pragmatic strategies in the FTr and RTr

TRANSLATION STRATEGY	OCCURRENCES			
	FTr		RTr	
All pragmatic strategies	**114**		**60**	
1: Cultural filtering	26		10	
Domestication		17		9
Foreignization		9		1
2: Explicitness change	46		33	
Implication		16		9
Explication		30		24
3: Information change	23		5	
Addition		10		2
Omission		13		3
4: Interpersonal change	7		6	
5: Illocutionary change	8		2	
6: Coherence change	1		0	
7: Partial translation	0		0	
8: Visibility change	0		0	
9: Transediting	0		0	
10: Other pragmatic changes	3		4	

The findings related to the overall number of occurrences of translation strategies suggest that the RTr, with fewer occurrences of strategies, is indeed closer to the ST than the FTr. However, when it comes to translation of rhetorical schemes and tropes, the opposite seems to be the case. The FTr contains more occurrences of strategies of preservation, substitution and compensation, as opposed to the RTr, in which omission of these figures is more common. The number of preserved rhetorical figures is only slightly higher in the FTr (29) than in the RTr (27). However, the FTr also manifests more occurrences of substitution (12 in the FTr as opposed to 6 in the RTr) and compensation (11 in the FTr and 2 in the RTr), while the RTr features more occurrences of omission (56 in the RTr as opposed to 47 in the FTr). Therefore, if we measure "closeness" of a translation to a ST by the preservation of instances of creative language, the FTr seems to be closer to the ST than the RTr.

5.2 Qualitative analysis

5.2.1 Syntactic strategies

5.2.1.1 Clause structure change

This category refers to changes that "have to do with the structure of the clause in terms of its constituent phrases" (Chesterman 2016: 94). They include the order of sentence constituents (subject, verb, object, complement and adverbial) as well as changes to the clause structure in terms of "active vs. passive voice, finite vs. non-finite structure, transitive vs. intransitive" (Chesterman 2016: 94). In both TTs, an almost identical number of occurrences of clause structure changes (20 in the FTr and 19 in the RTr) is identified, and the most common strategy in both TTs is the reordering of clause constituents, most prominent in the final chapter, "Penelope". We may speculate that the translators tried to demarcate the clauses so that the readers would not fail to realize that the clause is intended as a continuation of another clause, from which it is separated with inserted clauses and phrases. Such is the case in Example 1, in which Molly gloats over the fact that she secretly disposed of her husband's old magazines.

Example 1

ST: in those roasting engines stifling it was today Im glad I burned the half of those old
         Freemans and Photo bits leaving things like that lying around hes getting very careless and threw the rest of them up in the W C Ill get him to cut them tomorrow for me (Joyce 1960: 894)

FTr: uvijek na tim usijanim strojevima danas bilo strašno zagušljivo drago mi je što sam spalila polovicu starih Freemanâ i Ilustracijâ pušta sve da leži bilo gdje postaje vrlo neuredan drugu sam polovicu bacila u WC neka ih sutra razreže (Joyce 1957: 901-902)

RTr: u tim užarenim strojevima danas je bilo zagušljivo drago mi je što sam spalila polovicu onih starih primjeraka Freemana i Foto-revije sve ostavlja da leži bilo gdje postaje vrlo neuredan a drugu sam polovicu bacila gore u WC natjerat ću ga da mi ih sutra izreže (Joyce 1991: 734)

In Example 1, the underlined clause *and threw the rest of them up in the W C* is a continuation of the clause *Im glad I burned the half of those old Freemans and Photo bits*, with which it is coordinated with *and.* In both FTr and RTr a

change in the positions of the object and the verb is introduced, which results in a change in the sentence structure. The V-O-A order of clause elements in the ST is changed into O-V-A in both TTs. Consequently, in both TTs the clause can function independently of the clause preceding it, creating the impression that the text consists of comprehensive, unrelated units. This is particularly visible in the FTr, in which Gorjan reinforced the clauses' independence by omitting the coordinating conjunction. We may also observe that both translators consistently ignored the omission of apostrophes in words such as *Im*, *hes* and *Ill*. The omission of this type of metaplasm can be justified by the fact that the figure is very hard to recreate in the TL. The use of the type of contractions in which two words are combined and the missing letters are replaced with an apostrophe is not common in the TL, which means that a stylistic omission of an apostrophe would hardly be noticed by the reader. The same cannot be said for another rhetorical figure visible in Example 1, the hyperbaton, present in the clause *stifling it was today.* Here the translators disregarded the function of the atypical word order: the word *stifling* functions as a bridge between the phrase preceding it and the clause following it and can be interpreted as belonging to both. Similar to the previous example, the translators disregarded the atypical word order and translated the sentence as if it was unrelated to the phrase preceding it. However, unlike Paljetak, who dropped the scheme altogether, Gorjan substituted it with the ellipsis of the copula *je* that should have preceded the verb *bilo*, presumably in an attempt to maintain the ungrammaticality of Molly's idiolect.

5.2.1.2 Cohesion change

This category refers to changes that are undertaken to make the text more (or less) cohesive, and affect "intra-textual reference, ellipsis, substitution, pronominalization and repetition, or the use of connectors of various kinds" (Chesterman 2016: 95). The FTr displays 26 cohesion changes while the RTr displays 22. As is visible in Example 1, Gorjan tends to omit connectors in the cases in which their omission leads to a more comprehensive text. However, it is the addition of connectors that is more prominent in both FTr and RTr, which is not unexpected if we take into account the fact that connectors are often

intentionally omitted by the author in those segments of the ST that feature interior monologues.

Other cohesion changes in the FTr are mostly related to pronominalization. For example, in Gorjan's translation pronouns such as *it* are often replaced by the noun they refer to. Paljetak, on the other hand, seems to show a preference for adding demonstrative and personal pronouns. The purpose of both of the described changes is presumably to facilitate the understanding of reference relations in the text. Both tendencies are illustrated by Example 2, in which Bloom is admiring the sounds produced by the printing machine in the "Aeolus" episode.

Example 2

ST:	Almost human the way <u>it</u> <u>sllt</u> to call attention. (Joyce 1960: 154)
FTr:	Zvuči gotovo ljudski, kad <u>stroj</u> kaže <u>sllt</u>, da bi <u>nas</u> upozorio. (Joyce 1957: 151)
RTr:	Na gotovo ljudski način <u>sllt</u> privlači <u>našu</u> pažnju. (Joyce 1991: 127)

On the basis of the co-text the ST reader can infer that the pronoun *it* refers to the machine. Gorjan clarifies this by replacing the pronoun *it* with the noun *stroj*. Another cohesion change in the FTr is the addition of the pronoun *nas,* also present in the RTr in form of the pronoun *našu*, added to clarify whose attention is being called for by the machine. It is important to point out that additions introduced within a cohesion change differ from those categorized as information change, as the latter refers to the addition/omission of information that is "new (non-inferable)", meaning that it cannot be obtained from the context (Chesterman 2016: 106). We should also note that the onomatopoeic neologism *sllt* is preserved by both translators in its original form. Preservation of onomatopoeic neologisms is common throughout the TTs, although both translators occasionally adapt them that to the phonology of the TL. For example, the neologism imitating the whistle of a train, "frseeeeeeeefronnnng" (Joyce 1960: 894), was preserved and adapted to "frilliiiiiifronnng" by Gorjan (Joyce 1957: 901) and "frsiiiiiiiifronnng" by Paljetak (Joyce 1991: 734). Similarly, Paljetak phonologically adapted the onomatopoeic neologism appearing in the "Sirens" chapter, "ClipClap" (Joyce 1960: 329) to "KlipKlap" (Joyce 1991: 258).

5.2.2 Semantic strategies

5.2.2.1 Paraphrase

Along with trope change, paraphrase is the most commonly used semantic strategy in both TTs, with 29 identified instances in the FTr and 21 in the RTr. Chesterman defines paraphrase as resulting "in a TT version that can be described as loose, free, in some contexts even undertranslated," and notes that the strategy usually disregards the semantic element of the expression in order to maintain "the pragmatic sense of some higher unit such as a whole clause" (Chesterman 2016: 101). While the use of paraphrase is less common in the RTr than in the FTr, the motivation behind the use of the strategy seems to be the same in both TTs since the strategy is most often used in the cases in which the translators are unable to preserve a rhetorical trope. Example 3 is taken from the "Proteus" episode and is part of Stephen's interior monologue as he observes the corpse of a drowned man.

Example 3

   ST: Bag of <u>corpsegas</u> sopping in foul brine. (Joyce 1960: 63)

   FTr: Vreća <u>mrtavštine</u> kvasi se u slanoj vodi. (Joyce 1957: 66)

   RTr: <u>Plinovita vreća lešine</u> kvasi se u blatnoj slanoj vodi. (Joyce 1991: 54)

The underlined rhetorical trope, the compound *corpsegas,* is one of the many Joycean compounds. Gorjan frequently translates these neologisms with TL neologisms, thereby preserving the trope. However, in this case, he decided to paraphrase it and substitute it with a neologism derived from the adjective *mrtav* [dead]: *mrtavština*. The derivative does not transfer the semantics of the lexemes in the original compound and completely omits the noun *gas*, but it manages to transfer the disgusting effect of the expression since the suffix *-ština* tends to be present in pejorative expressions in the TL, such as *boleština, budalaština, magluština, prljavština.* We may speculate that the word *prljavština* might also be the reason why Gorjan omitted the adjective *foul*, as he may have tried to incorporate it into the derivative. Paljetak, on the other hand, preserves neologisms less frequently, and in this example, he also decided to paraphrase the neologism as *plinovita vreća lešine* but omitted the rhetorical trope.

5.2.3 Pragmatic strategies

5.2.3.1 Cultural filtering

The category of cultural filtering encompasses the changes of domestication, naturalization and adaptation in the cases in which "SL items, particularly culture-specific items, are translated as TL cultural or functional equivalents," and foreignization, exoticization and estrangement in the cases in which such items are "borrowed or transferred directly" (Chesterman 2016: 104).

In line with the overall results, the FTr features considerably more occurrences of cultural filtering than the RTr, both in terms of foreignization (9 instances in the FTr and 1 in the RTr) and domestication (17 instances in the FTr and 9 in the RTr). Both translators also tend to use domesticating strategies more often than foreignizing. Although the text includes a large number of cultural references, the strategy of cultural filtering becomes most prominent in the translation of allusions to popular songs of the period which appear throughout the novel. Let us look at Example 4, in which Molly is singing in her head the chorus of a song, *Love's Old Sweet Song,* which she will be performing in her upcoming tour.

Example 4

ST1:	and the water rolling all over and out of them all sides like the end of <u>Loves old sweet sonnnng</u> (Joyce 1960: 894)
FTr:	a posvuda po njima i iz njih teče voda kao svršetak. <u>Za jedan časak radosti</u> (Joyce 1957: 901)
ST2:	and the water rolling all over and out of them all sides like the end of <u>Loves old sweetsonnnng</u> (Joyce 1986: 901)
RTr:	a voda kôla po njima i curi iz njih na sve strane kao kraj <u>Stare slatke ljubavneeee pjeeeessssme</u> (Joyce 1991: 734)

Love's Old Sweet Song was created in 1884 and "enjoyed great popularity in home parlors as well as on the concert stage" (Hunt, n.d.) but was (is) relatively unknown in the target context. Consequently, neither of the translators transferred the reference in its original form. Paljetak paraphrased it by transposing the possessive noun *Loves* (which, in line with the rest of the chapter, lacks an apostrophe) into the adjective *ljubavne* and reordered the clause constituents. The translation sounds more as a description of a song than

a title of a hypothetical song, despite the fact that the translator retained the capitalization of the first word. It is also worth noting that, in this example, the STs slightly differ: the words *sweet sonnng* are separated in ST1 and merged into a compound in ST2. Paljetak dropped this rhetorical trope but preserved another one, onomatopoeia, by stretching the letters of the words *ljubavneee pjeeessssme* in order to create sound words, as opposed to Gorjan, who omitted this trope by simply citing the domesticated version of the song's title. *Za jedan časak radosti* is a popular song created in the mid-19th century by composer Ilija Okrugić Srijemac, a Croat from the Serbian region of Vojvodina (Andrić Penava 2014: 62), whose songs would have been close to Gorjan due to the fact that they come from the same background and cultural context.[7] The song was popular and would probably resonate with many readers of Gorjan's translation, while the fact that its melody was taken from an Italian song (Andrić Penava 2014: 83) makes it different from rural folk songs, which is important if we bear in mind that *Love's Old Sweet Song* was a modern song performed in urban contexts (Hunt, n.d.). Finally, it is important to note that the translators applied their solutions consistently whenever the song was referenced (see, for example, page 91 in ST1 and the corresponding pages 95 in the FTr and 79 in the RTr), which was not the case with the songs referenced in Example 5.

Example 5

ST1:	wd give anything to be back in Gib and hear you sing <u>in old Madrid</u> or <u>Waiting</u> (Joyce 1960: 894)
FTr:	sve bih dala kad bih opet bila u Gibu te da vas slušam kako pjevate <u>Stari Madride moj</u> ili <u>Waiting</u> (Joyce 1957: 901)
RTr:	dala bih sve da sam opet u Gibu i da te slušam kako pjevaš <u>Čekanje</u> i <u>U starom Madridu</u> (Joyce 1991: 734)

While Paljetak translates the underlined titles of these popular songs literally, Gorjan domesticates *in Old Madrid* by paraphrasing it into *Stari Madride moj*, a title that could easily pass as a Croatian song if *Madrid* were to be replaced with a Croatian city or region[8], while *Waiting* is directly transferred as a result of a

---

[7] According to *Hrvatska enciklopedija*, Zlatko Gorjan was born in Srijemska Mitrovica (Vojvodina, Serbia) in 1901 ("Gorjan, Zlatko").

[8] The use of possessive pronouns in the titles of songs dedicated to a city, region or country is quite common in Croatian music and poetry. Canonical examples would include the title of the national anthem *Lijepa naša domovino* and Vice Vukov's *Tvoja zemlja.* At the same time*,* there is also an array of (more or less) popular songs that turned up in a quick Internet search: *Zagrebe*

foreignizing strategy. It is also worth mentioning that Gorjan, unlike Paljetak, did not apply this solution consistently and translated the title of the song as *U starom Madridu* the next time it appeared (see in ST1 page 758 and the corresponding pages 780 in the FTr and 632 in the RTr).

Finally, I would like to point out that Gorjan exhibits an interesting tendency to directly transfer some culture-specific items (either in their original form or by adapting them phonologically) for which TL equivalents exist, which suggests that their introduction might be motivated by an attempt to exoticize the text. In the "Penelope" episode, Molly recollects her childhood in Gibraltar and the "mosquito nets*"* she used to have there (Joyce 1960: 894). Gorjan translates the word *mosquito* as *moskito,* instead of using the established, standard TL equivalent *komarac.* Furthermore, in the sentence "Lawn Tennyson, gentleman poet" (Joyce 1960: 63) Gorjan transfers not only the word *Lawn* but also the word *gentleman,* leaving it in its original form despite the existence of the established equivalent *gospodin* (which is used by Paljetak) and the established phonological adaptation *džentlmen.*

5.2.3.2 Explicitness change

The strategy of explicitness change can be used either to make the text more explicit (explication) or more implicit (implication). Chesterman notes that the strategy of explication tends to be one of the most common translation strategies in general. This is also true for the analyzed segments, in which it was one of the most commonly used pragmatic changes. As may be expected, the analyzed segments of the FTr feature more occurrences of both strategies, with 30 explications and 16 implications. On the other hand, the analyzed segments of the RTr contain 24 explications and 9 implications. There are two main types of situations in which Gorjan resorts to explication. The first one is when he presumably attempts to facilitate the understanding of information that is otherwise obtainable from the context or from extratextual knowledge of the culture (this kind of information is also available in annotated versions of the texts, such as Gifford and Seidman's that was used in this analysis). The second type of situation in which Gorjan, as well as Paljetak, resort to explication is when he has to deal with rhetorical figures, namely rhetorical tropes. Example 6

---

moj, Splite moj, Moje Zagorje, Lipa moja Slavonijo, Slavonijo moja, Moja Dalmacijo, Dalmacijo moja.

is taken from the introduction to the "Sirens" chapter that features fragments of texts that will reappear later in the same chapter. This specific segment includes fragments of Bloom's interior monologue, which is permeated by thoughts about his wife's encounter with her lover Blazes Boylan. The thoughts are infused with associations stemming from the conversations overheard at the hotel bar.

Example 6

ST:　　　Horn. Hawhorn. When first he saw. Alas! Full tup. Full throb. (Joyce 1960: 329)

FTr:　　　Stojak-rog, tvrd ko glog. Kad pogleda prvi puta. Ah! Mahniti zamasi. Ovan probija. (Joyce 1957: 312)

RTr:　　　Rog. Glogorog. Kad prvi put on vidje. Vaj! Pun otprcaj. Pun otkucaj. (Joyce 1991: 258)

　The two initial one-word sentences include a wordplay that will reappear throughout the chapter ("Hunter with a horn. Haw. Have you the?" (Joyce 1960: 374); "Horn. Who had the?" (Joyce 1960: 374). The wordplay refers to the sentence Bloom previously overheard, a question posed to Blazes Boylan by Lenehan, one of the characters at the hotel bar: "Got the horn or what?" (i.e. Are you sexually aroused?) (Gifford and Seidman 2008: 292). With that in mind, it becomes clear that the word *Horn* (a slang for erection) functions as a double entendre, which Gorjan attempts to preserve by making it a bit more explicit and pairing it with the euphemism *Stojak.* Paljetak translates the word literally, omitting the double entendre. It is important to mention that the double entendre would be regarded as preserved if Paljetak had translated the sentence to which the word *horn* refers, *Got the horn or what?,* to include the mention of a *horn*, but he failed to translate the expressions consistently.[9] The second sentence combines the word *horn* and the noun *hawthorn* into a newly-coined blend that pairs a double entendre with an allusion to a literary motif. Although most prominent in medieval literature, the motif of the hawthorn plant, a symbol of carnal love as opposed to spiritual love, could be encountered in British literature created as late as the 19th century (Eberly 1989: 41). Both translators retained the allusion to hawthorn: Paljetak preserved the compound by creating a loan-based neologism *glogorog,* while Gorjan decided to substitute it with an

---

[9] Paljetak translated the sentence as "Je li ti se digao, ili što ti je?" (Joyce 1991: 270). Gorjan was equally inconsistent, translating the sentence as "Svrbi l' ga stidak, što li?" (Joyce 1957: 326).

explicating simile, *tvrd ko glog.* The second double entendre is represented by the word *tup,* a British expression that denotes a ram when used as a noun, and when used as a verb it means "to copulate with (a ewe)", used of a ram ("tup", n., v.). The double entendre is a continuation of the previous one (*horn)* and now revolves around a horned animal. Before we analyze the translations, it is important to note that Gorjan made a coherence change and switched the two sentences, meaning that the sentence *Ovan probija.* is the translation of the sentence *Full tup.* Here, again, the translator attempts to transfer the double entendre by explicating it: he retains the meaning of *tup* as a noun (*ovan*) but makes the adjective *full* more explicit by transposing it into the verb *probija.* The other sentence, *Full throb,* is an attempt to make the reference to a sexual act more explicit, and the translation *Mahniti zamasi* contains expressions which could be interpreted as distanced synonyms of the expressions *full* and *throb*, but are in fact explications of the expressions' figurative meaning, underpinned by the pluralization of the noun *throb*. In the process, Gorjan also drops the rhetorical scheme symploce, which was constituted by the same word featured at the beginning of both sentences and the same sound in their end. Paljetak retains the rhetorical scheme but substitutes the trope; the double entendre *tup* is replaced with the newly-coined derivative *otprcaj.* The word is derived from the root *prc,* a vulgarims common in, for example, the poetry of Marin Držić, where it denotes both a goat and a phallus (Marjanić 2009), meaning that Paljetak's solution managed to reflect both the reference to the animal and to the sexual act. The prefix *ot-* and the suffix *-aj* were chosen so that the word *otprcaj* would rhyme with the word *otkucaj* (thereby preserving the symploce). These examples illustrate the way in which both translators resort to explication in order to preserve the double entendre, with Gorjan using the strategy more often, making the text far more explicit both in terms of clarity and vulgarity.

5.2.3.3 Information change

The strategy of information change refers either to the addition of new information that is not present in the ST but is "deemed to be relevant to the TT readership", or omission of ST information that is deemed to be irrelevant (Chesterman 2016: 106). As opposed to information that is added and omitted in the process of explication and implication respectively, this information is non-inferable (Ibid.). In line with the other results, the FTr features notably more

occurrences of both types of information change (23 in the FTr as opposed to 5 in the RTr). The most common situations in which Gorjan resorted to omission include the situations in which he presumably was not able to discern the meaning of a word (e.g. *affly*, the abbreviation for affectionately, was omitted from the episode "Penelope" (Joyce 1960: 895; Joyce 1957: 902) and those in which the omissions do not seem to be results of a deliberately applied translation strategy and more consequences of an oversight. I base my speculation on the fact that the phrases in question are uncomplicated and would not interfere with the surrounding translation choices, such as the phrase *what a shame* in Example 7, taken from "Penelope".

Example 7

ST:	from the B Marche Paris <u>what a shame</u> my dearest Doggerina she wrote on what she was very nice what's this her other name was<u> just a P C</u> to tell you I sent the little present (Joyce 1960: 894)
FTr:	iz B Marchéa iz Pariza moja najdraža Doggerina pisala je na čemu to bila je vrlo draga kako se ono još zvaše dopisnici da vam javim da sam vam poslala onaj mali darak (Joyce 1957: 902)
RTr:	iz Pariza iz B Marchéa prava šteta moja najdraža pudlice pisala je bila je vrlo ljubazna kako joj je ono bilo ime <u>pišem ti dopisnicu</u> samo zato da ti javim da sam ti poslala jedan mali poklon (Joyce 1991: 734)

This example is also illustrative of Paljetak's use of information change, to which he mostly resorts when trying to simplify the ambiguities typical of the novel's narrative techniques, the interior monologue and the stream of consciousness. As outlined in section 3, the stream of consciousness technique used in "Penelope" presupposes sentence-building based on ellipses of thought. One example of ellipsis of thought is present in the line *her other name was just a P C to tell you*, in which the segment *was just a* can be viewed in two ways: as continuing on the phrase *her other name* (and the rest of the sentence is then omitted due to ellipsis) or as preceding the noun *P C* (in that case, the beginning of the sentence is omitted). Paljetak opted for the latter interpretation and added *pišem ti* in order to dissolve the ambiguity and create a clause, *pišem ti dopisnicu*, thereby dropping the ellipsis and interfering with Joyce's style of narration. On the other hand, Gorjan maintained the ambiguity of the segment, despite personifying the word *p c* into *dopisnici*.

An example of Gorjan's addition is related to his tendency to create rhetorical figures (most often compounds) where there are none in the ST (Example 8).

Example 8

ST1:   my goodness the heat there before the levanter came on black as night and the <u>glare</u> of the rock standing up in it like a big giant (Joyce 1960: 894)

FTr: o sveti Bože kakve li pasje vrućine prije no što je uždio istočnjak crno kao noć a <u>sablasnoblistava</u> pećina uzdizala se ispred toga poput gorostasa (Joyce 1957: 901)

RTr: kakva je tamo bila vrućina prije nego što je zapuhao istočnjak crn kao noć s blijeskom na hridini koja se u njemu i uzdiže kao gorostas (Joyce 1991: 734)

The noun *glare* was transposed by Gorjan into the adjective *blistava* [glistening] and paired with the added adjective *sablasno* [ghostly] (this adjective is neither present nor implied in the ST). The segment of the ST in Example 8 does not contain Joycean compounds nor any other rhetorical tropes that Gorjan could not preserve and thus might want to substitute (both similes, *black as night* and *like a big giant* are preserved in the FTr). Yet he decided to add the newly-coined compound *sablasnoblistava*, a word interesting not only for its novelty but also for its auditory effect – were the words *sablasno* and *blistava* written separately, their similar sounds (s, b, l) would have constituted alliteration. As mentioned in section 4.3, this procedure can be interpreted as compensation, an attempt to convey the specificities of the text by creating them anew and in doing so compensate for the instances in which such specificities (in this case compounded neologisms) had to be omitted.

6. Conclusion

The paper presents a comparative analysis of two Croatian translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses* conducted with the purpose of testing the retranslation hypothesis. In order for the retranslation hypothesis to be tested two parameters of closeness were examined: the number of occurrences of translation strategies, and the omission or preservation of rhetorical figures. According to the first parameter, taken as a measure of the closeness of a TT to a relevant ST, it may

be concluded that the retranslation is closer to the ST than the initial translation due to the smaller number of translation strategies. However, the analysis of the segments using the second parameter does not support the retranslation hypothesis, as more instances of creative language were preserved in the first translation. This leads me to conclude that the retranslation hypothesis may not be valid for all aspects of the text. Further, numerous instances of foreignization, as well as substitution and compensation of rhetorical figures present in the first translation lead me to the conclusion that the passage of time is not the only relevant factor when it comes to the preservation of the text's estranging effect. On the basis of the conducted analysis, it seems that the preservation of the ST's estranging effect was mostly influenced by the individual style and decisions of the translators, which cannot be viewed as determined exclusively by the fact that one of the translations was a first translation and the other a retranslation.

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the retranslation hypothesis does not provide a sufficiently comprehensive methodological framework for studying the phenomenon of retranslation. This case study has shown that each translation and retranslation should be observed individually and with respect to the type of the ST that is being translated as well as to the context in which respective TTs were created.

References

Andrić Penava, Ivana. 2014. "Ilija Okrugić Sriiemac – hrvatski preporoditelj u Srijemu". *Godišnjak za znanstvena istraživanja* (6): 61-112.

Baldick, Chris. 2001. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, Michael. 1999. "The metaphysics of Modernism". In: Levenson, Michael (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 9-32.

Bosinelli, Rosa Maria Bollettieri. 2010. "Transcreative Joyce". *Scientia Traductionis* 8: 190-193.

Brownlie, Siobhan. 2006. "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory". *Across Languages and Cultures* 7(2): 145–170.

Burgess, Anthony. 1975. *Joysprick: An Introduction to the Language of James Joyce*. NY/London: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2016. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Revised Edition, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2017. *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers 1993-2014*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Daiches, David. 1997. *A Critical History of English Literature: The Restoration to the Present Day*. London: Mandarin.

Dastjerdi, Hossein Vahid and Mohammadi, Amene. 2013. "Revisiting 'Retranslation Hypothesis': A Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslations of Pride and Prejudice". *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, Scientific Research Publishing*. www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?PaperID=35717. Accessed on: 3 May 2019.

Davies, Eirlys E. 2003. "A Goblin or a Dirty Nose?", *The Translator* 9(1): 65–100.

Deane, Sharon L. 2011. *Confronting the Retranslation Hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British Literary System*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh Research Archive. URL: https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/5494. Accessed on: 7 September 2019.

Desmidt, Isabelle. 2009. "(Re)translation Revisited". *Meta* 54(4): 669-683.

Dettmar, Kevin. 1996. *The Illicit Joyce of Postmodernism*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Eberly, Susan S. 1989. "A Thorn Among the Lilies: The Hawthorn in Medieval Love Allegory". *Folklore* 100(1): 41-52.

Feng, Lei. 2014. "Retranslation hypotheses revisited: A case study of two English translations of Sanguo Yanyi - the first Chinese novel". *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 43: 69-86.

Gifford, Don and Seidman, Robert J. 2008. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

"Gorjan, Zlatko." Hrvatska enciklopedija, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža. http://www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=22732. Accessed on: 1 December 2019.

Grubica, Irena. 2007. "Hrvatski prijevodi Joyceovog Uliksa", *Književna smotra* 146(4): 33-48.

Heino, Anu. 2013. *Assessing the Validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis in the Finnish Translations of the Novel Mary Poppins*. Master's thesis. University of Vaasa. OSUVA. URL: https://osuva.uwasa.fi/handle/10024/4782. Accessed on: 17 June 2019.

Herbert,Stacey. 2004. "Draft for 'Ulysses in Print: the Family Tree': An Installation for the Exhibitio'James Joyce and Ulysses at the National Library Ireland'", *Genetic Joyce Studies* 4. URL: http://www.antwerpjamesjoycecenter.com/GJS4/GJS4%20Herbert.htm. Accessed on: 30 November 2019.

Hunt, John. "Love's Old Sweet Son." The Joyce Project. URL: http://www.joyceproject.com/notes/040035oldsweetsong.htm. Accessed on 1 July 2019.

Joyce, James. 1957. *Uliks*, translated by Zlatko Gorjan. Rijeka: Otokar Keršovani.

Joyce, James. 1960. *Ulysses*. London: Bodley Head.

Joyce, James. 1986*. Ulysses: The Corrected Text*. Edited by Hans Walter Gabler. New York: Vintage Books.

Joyce, James. 1991. *Uliks*. Translated by Luko Paljetak. Rijeka: Otokar Keršovani.

Joyce, James. 2004. *Ulysses*. Narrated by Jim Norton and Marcella Riordan. Naxos Audiobooks. https://www.scribd.com/audiobook/237915671/Ulysses. Accessed on: 7 May 2019.

Kaloh Vid, Natalia and Žagar-Šoštarić, Petra. 2018. "Soviet Language in English Retranslations: Mikhail Bulgakov's The Heart of a Dog", *Translation and Literature.* 27(2): 165–183.

Koskinen, Kaisa and Paloposki, Outi. 2010. "Retranslation". In: Gambier, Yves and van Doorslaer, Luc (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*. 294–298.

Koskinen, Kaisa, and Outi Paloposki 2003. "Retranslations in the Age of Digital Reproduction". *Cadernos de Tradução* (1:11). pp. 19–38.

Levenson, Michael. 2005. "Introduction". In: Levenson, Michael (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–8.

Marjanić, Suzana. 2009. "Psovke". In: Tatarin et al. (eds.), *Leksikon Marina Držića*. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža. URL: https://leksikon.muzej-marindrzic.eu/psovke/. Accessed on: 8 October 2019.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Paloposki, Outi and Koskinen, Kaisa. 2004. "A Thousand and One Translations". In: Hansen, Gyde et al. (eds.). *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies* Amsterdam: Benjamins Translation Library. 27–38.

Quinn, Arthur. 1982. *Figures of Speech: 60 Ways to Turn a Phrase*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs M. Smith Inc.

"Sea change". Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014, HarperCollins Publishers. URL: https://www.thefreedictionary.com/sea+change. Accessed on: 23 November 2019.

"tup". Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition 2014. HarperCollins Publishers. URL: https://www.thefreedictionary.com/tup. Accessed on: 9 December 2019.