

**COLLOCATION AND CONNOTATION IN CHAPTER
“SCYLLA AND CHARYBDIS” OF JAMES JOYCE’S
ULYSSES.
AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF THE ROMANIAN
TRANSLATION**

Andra-Iulia URSA

“1 Decembrie 1918” University of Alba-Iulia

e-mail: ursa_andraiuulia@yahoo.com

Abstract: *The present article was written as part of the PhD dissertation entitled “An analysis regarding the evolution of James Joyce’s writing style in ‘Dubliners’, ‘A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man’ and ‘Ulysses’ and the strategies of translating it into Romanian”. The research starts from the hypothesis that a perfect rendition in a different language of a literary text of this type is nothing more than a utopia. However, a translator should always intend to achieve an equilibrium between the author’s intentions, the form, the content and the target culture. In “Ulysses”, James Joyce experiments with language, abandoning the definition of sense and revolutionises the art of expressing thoughts through words. The current work will concentrate on the thorough analysis of adjectival and adverbial collocations conceptualized in the ninth chapter of “Ulysses”. Our purpose is to investigate how Mircea Ivănescu’s Romanian translation deals with collocations and especially with those that typically represent Joyce’s authorial style. Mircea Ivănescu (1931-2011) is a Romanian poet and the sole translator who accomplished the difficult task of translating the entire novel, although there had been various attempts at translating only chapters of it. It is an approved work of translation, having received both praise and critical appreciation. After more than three decades from this chapter’s translation, our research aims for a further exposition of the similarities and distinctions between the source language text and the target language translation.*

Keywords: Interpretive act; Uncommon collocations; Adjectival collocations; Adverbial collocations; Strategies of translation;

1 Introduction

Ulysses by James Joyce is a modern novel seeking to envisage that, during the early decades of the twentieth century, the ancient myth of military heroism could be replaced with the modern myth of the flawed human condition. The allusions to classical mythology are represented by expressiveness and symbolical actions rather than by similar behaviours or the manner the plot unfolds. Homer’s epic poem of Odysseus’s ten years of

meandering is recreated to happen during a single day of June 16th 1904. According to the aesthetic values of classicism, the text comprises three main parts: *Telemachus*, *Odyssey* and *Nostos*, summing eighteen episodes, each having been allocated a specific art, colour, symbol, technique and organ of the body. After seven years of intense work and struggles to perfect the technique of literary experimentalism, James Joyce's novel was first published in 1922. As the author himself states in the letters to his patron, the nearly 20.000 hours spent in writing *Ulysses* conducted to the use of various methods, changing from one hour to another and from episode to episode, pointing out a number of conflicting views.

“The task I set myself technically in writing a book from eighteen different points of view and in as many styles, all apparently unknown or undiscovered by my fellow tradesmen, that and the nature of the legend chosen would be enough to upset anyone's mental balance” (Ellman, 1975: 284).

Episode 9 in *Ulysses*, “Scylla and Charybdis”, corresponds to Odysseus's trial-by-sea in which he must sail between two mythical monsters. Scylla, the six-headed sea monster was situated on a rock, on the Calabrian side of the strait, while Charybdis was a deadly whirlpool which could swallow an entire ship. In this episode the two monsters are not physical menaces, but oratorical ones. James Joyce allocates to this episode the art of literature and the brain as the organ. The technique used concentrates on the dialectical interaction between opposing point of views, which means that reality is described through various exchanges of logical arguments. The scene happens sometimes around 2:00 p.m., at the National Library of Ireland, and concentrates on a literary debate between Stephen Dedalus and some of Dublin's most eminent and widely known literati. There are constant interruptions and divagations, and Stephen often employs thoughts or words of others from earlier in the day. He speaks with fervour about father motifs in Shakespeare. But this is simply a virtuoso performance, as the young man plays his part in front of a crowd that does not accept him as one of their own. He formulates theories for the academics, but he arrogantly dismisses their very opinions, distancing himself even more from the others and the world itself.

After making his statements, he is asked if he believed in his own theories and he promptly answers: “No” (Joyce, 1992: 290). According to Blamires (1996: 73), this statement is significant in metaphorically suggesting the detachment from

“the Catholic view of man's situation and his destiny, something which he (Stephen-Joyce) cannot believe: but then it is something

which believers themselves believe only against the ever-present pressure of unbelief”.

The author warns his readers against a too great deference to the opinion of those who hold the authority. Thus, the image of Scylla functions as a parallel to Stephen, whose innate strength and potential force can only manifest itself oratorically. The “real” artist, with whom Joyce identifies, shares the logical Aristotelian rhetoric. In contrast, the mystical, whirling Platonic dialectic of the gathered academics promotes the generalised opinions vehiculating among the artists of Joyce’s time: “Art has to reveal to us ideas, formless spiritual essences” (Joyce, 1992: 237).

“Whirlpool images occur several times, associated with the swirling deeps of Platonist metaphysics in which Russell and the librarians are whirled. By contrast rapiered Stephen, weaponed with logic on his Aristotelian rock (Kinch, the knife-blade), continually sticks his neck out to snatch bitingly at the statements of the others, taking on allcomers at once” (Blamires, 1996: 62).

Poet and translator Mircea Ivănescu stand as a prominent figure when it comes to introducing *Ulysses* to Romania. So far, he has been the only Romanian man of letters who succeeded in translating the entire novel. After a scrupulous work that extended over a period of twelve years, the Romanian *Ulise* was published in 1984. Over the years, the critical reception pointed out the exceptional character of the translation. Of course, taking into account the intricacies of James Joyce’s personal style, imprecisions or unsolved linguistic ambiguities are inevitable in translation. But, regarded as a whole and including the personal annotations, “what Ivănescu has managed is a cultural translation, rather than a mere linguistic conversion” (Oțoiu, 2004: 203). The chapter “Scylla and Charybdis” is richly supplied with annotations, as Mircea Ivănescu himself states when introducing the episode, which makes for a better and more accurate understanding of the translator’s interpretation:

“It seemed that for this chapter the translation should be accompanied by a relatively more abundant number of annotations as to a large extend the answers, thoughts, psychological evolutions of characters, Stephen’s improper erudition and his sarcastic collocutors illustrate the eloquent irony and the careful meticulousity which Joyce employed in imagining and constructing the novel.”¹ (Joyce, 1992: 427 – our translation).

¹ “Ni s-a părut că aici traducerea ar putea fi însoțită de note relativ mai abundente deoarece într-o foarte mare măsură replicile, gîin-durile, evoluțiile psihologice ale personajelor,

This research on translation is conducted consistently by comparing corpora of source language and target language collocations in the aforementioned chapter. Translation is a process marked by several phenomena, such as linguistic, cultural or ideological. This enabled investigation and classification of diverse strategies of translation over time. Some of the strategies were structured in a simplistic manner, such as Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy (1995), which referred mainly to two types of translation: direct/literal translation and oblique translation, the latter including seven subcategories. Other theorists referred to means of contending with certain difficulties of translating. From Mona Baker's (1992/2018) point of view, there are a series of strategies used by professional translators when dealing with different types of non-equivalence. However, for this study we settled on the elaborate taxonomy conceived by Chesterman (1997). According to the author, this systematic grouping of strategies is a heuristic one, which can be easily applied in practice, "it seems to differentiate enough, but does not get bogged down in "unportable" detail; and it is flexible and open-ended. It comprises three primary groups of strategy: mainly syntactic/grammatical (coded as G), mainly semantic (S) and mainly pragmatic (Pr)" (Chesterman, 1997: 93).

However, when coping with an act of literal translation, it is insufficient to reduce the analysis to strategies of translation. The systematic study of translation theories has led to the emergence of other types of realities as well. In the book *Contra Instrumentalism: A Translation Polemic*, Lawrence Venuti, an eminent figure when it comes to visions of translation, sets forth the idea of how translation is simply an act of interpretation. Consequently, according to his opinion, there are no errors in translation and the concept of untranslatability does not exist.

"Translating operates by building an interpretive context in a language and culture that differ from those that constitute the source text. When translated, therefore, the source text becomes the site of multiple and conflicting interpretations—even when the translator consults a dictionary on every word (indeed, dictionaries can proliferate the possibilities)" (Venuti, 2019: 67).

Therefore, with Venuti's vision as a landmark and using Chesterman's framework, this study proceeds into analysing the Romanian translation as a concept of interpretation, determining similarities or differences in meaning

erudiția deplasată a lui Stephen ca și ironiile interlocutorilor săi, ilustrează ironia elocventă și meticolozitatea atentă cu care, aici, ca pretutindeni în restul cărții, Joyce și-a gândit și construit romanul".

at the level of some adjectival and adverbial collocations that mark the personal style of James Joyce.

2. What is collocation and why is it important?

J.R. Firth, one of the leading figures in linguistics during the middle of the twentieth century, drew attention to the fact that meaning is not restricted to single lexical units and that “you shall know a word by the company it keeps” (Firth, 1957: 179). The word “collocation” was borrowed into English from the Latin *collocare* around the sixteenth century, as part “of the flood of words pouring into English from Latin in response to pressures created, among other things, by the huge amount of translation from classical texts during the period” (Barnbrook et al., 2013: 6). With the passing of time, from the very first existing texts containing the word to the current dictionaries, there have been slight variations in the description of the use of the word “collocation”. However, generally speaking, as suggested by its Latin roots *cum-*, meaning “with” and *-locus*, meaning “place”, collocation refers to the way words co-occur or are placed together in a sentence. Moreover, these juxtapositions are set to happen in order to obtain productive speech.

“Collocation is the way words combine in a language to produce natural-sounding speech and writing. For example, in English you say ‘strong wind’ but ‘heavy rain’. It would not be normal to say *‘heavy wind’ or *‘strong rain’. And whilst all four of these words would be recognized by a learner at pre- intermediate or even elementary level, it takes a greater degree of competence with the language to combine them correctly in productive use.” (*Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English*, 2002: vii)

Words alone can seldom express an entire meaning, that is why word combinations provide a context from which it gets easier to understand what exactly is conveyed. According to Manning and Schütze, collocations have a feature of *limited compositionality*. “We call a natural language expression compositional if the meaning of the expression can be predicted from the meaning of the parts” (Manning & Schütze, 1999: 151). When it comes to the idea of *non-compositionality*, idioms own the most extreme feature, as it can be seen in the examples “let the cat out of the bag” or “break a leg”, which have an indirect relationship with the original meanings of the words in the expressions. A cat is not actually let out of a bag and no one breaks any legs, so the words aren’t perceived according to their literal meanings. As stated by Phillip (2011: 24), there is a similarity between collocations and idioms, since both are “recurrent combinations of words, making them institutionalised lexical items or, at the very least, institutional word combinations”. In general, most collocations show a milder characteristic of

non-compositionality. In the example “the march of progress” or “the march of time”, a new meaning is added to the original one, suggesting a steady forward movement or progression and it can only be used in a composition that expresses the course of an action. It would be incorrect to say “the march of money”. However, the main difference between idioms and collocations rests in the relationship each constitutive word has with its original meaning. “An idiom expresses an idea which cannot normally be inferred from the meanings of its constituents, while a collocation expresses an idea which can be inferred to some extent without the contribution of contextual cues” (24-25).

According to the BBI Dictionary, collocations are divided in two major groups: *grammatical collocations* and *lexical collocations*. The former group contains eight major types of combinations, while the latter consists of seven types. “A grammatical collocation is a phrase consisting of a dominant word (noun, adjective, verb) and a preposition or grammatical structure such as an infinitive or clause” (BBI, 2010: xix). In contrast, lexical collocations contain nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs and do not consist of prepositions, infinitives or clauses.

The importance of collocations lies in the frequency with which they are used when trying to convey a message. “No piece of written or spoken English is free of collocations” (*Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English*, 2002: vii). Moreover, when employing collocations, speeches tend to be more precise. This happens because most single words hold a wide range of meanings, some of them distinct and others related. The exact meaning is dictated by a specific context, more precisely, by other words that surround and combine with the central word, i.e. by collocations. As Singleton states, “we need to know about collocational patterns in order to function smoothly in lexical terms in either our mother tongue or any other language we may know” (Singleton, 2000: 56). Whenever we use fixed expressions and established form of words, the speeches that we produce tend to become more fluent, as we are spared the trouble of building up from scratch every construction we want to use.

For the translator, for whom the collocation is an important contextual element, which can usefully or unfavourably affect the translation, it is a challenge to narrow down the possibilities to find the best translation option. The struggle often ends with sacrificing the author’s originality in attempting to convey the meaning of a structure. It takes knowledge and ability on the part of the translator to be creative and imaginative in this decision-making process. Many of Joyce’s lexical innovations are used in a way which affects and disrupts the ordinary and basic meaning of words. This experimental writing style makes use of neologisms, unconventional word spellings, lexical ambiguities and “personal collocations”, as Firth (1957: 195) calls

these collocations that result from a writer's established use of language. When it comes to literary translation, such personal collocations of an author are invested with stylistic features and become objects of interest in conveying the stylistic effect.

3. Collocation and connotation

The issue of connotation is particularly relevant to the linguistic studies. Connotation is understood as an adjacent meaning added to the basic one, voluntarily evoked. This secondary meaning is mostly generated by emotions through a set of images, experiences or values. In a literary text, a translator has to give precedence to its connotations, since, "if it is any good, it is an allegory, a comment on society, at the time and now, as well as on its strict setting" (Newmark, 2001: 16). The connotation of a linguistic structure is clearly different from its explicit or primary meaning and it holds a cultural baggage specific to a certain community. For instance, the connotations of the English "jailbird" (Joyce, 1992: 266) and its Romanian translation *ocnaş* (Joyce 1992: 249) are very different: a "jailbird" is a criminal who has been repeatedly in jail, while *ocnaş* is an ex-convict condemned to work daily on a mine site. Connotation is therefore involved with ideas of specific use, experiences and beliefs.

4. An analysis of the Romanian translation

James Joyce's style is known for extending the connotations of a single word, "across a 'chain' of similar sounding words" (Wales, 1992: 109). The thoughts of the characters are intermingled in the process. For instance, when Buck Mulligan mocks Stephen's theory, a cluster of words sharing similar sounds appear: "—Cuckoo! Cuckoo! Cuck Mulligan clucked lewdly" (Joyce, 1992: 263). The foolish imitation of the bird hints at the insanity of Stephen's idea. The narrator, represented by his alter-ego, Stephen Dedalus, mocks Mulligan's name, using a slang word which denotes a man subservient to women and continues with the derogatory collocation hinting at the characteristic sound made by a hen and implying his disgust toward the main antagonist of the novel. As English and Romanian don't share the same flexibility related to the connotative feature of words, when conveyed, using a literal translation, although the original meaning is rendered, inevitably the sound effect is lost: "— Cucu! Cucu! clămpăni Cuck Mulligan libidinos" (254).

When it comes to collocations consisting of a dominant noun and of one or several adjectives, the general rule in English is to place the adjectives before the noun, while in Romanian the order is reversed. That is why "hesitating soul" (235) is transposed to "suflet ezitant" (219) and "unoffending face" (241) is translated with "chip neameninţător" (223).

However, when in Romanian the adjective is placed before the noun, the dominant word receives an appreciative connotation, as in the collocation “great poet” (235), which is translated as “mare poet” (219).

James Joyce begins the episode with adjective + noun collocations, depicting not only the aspect of the characters engaged in the conversation, but their attitudes as well. The collocation “quaker librarian” (235) refers to Thomas William Lyster, the librarian of the National Library of Ireland between 1895 and 1920. According to the *Online American Heritage Dictionary*, a “quaker” is a member of the Religious Society of Friends, a Christian sect founded by George Fox around 1650, whose central belief is the doctrine of the Inner Light. These members reject sacraments, ritual, and formal ministry. In English, the construction has a pejorative connotation. As stated by the *Online American Heritage Dictionary*, during the seventeenth century, it was used as a derogatory nickname “the Friends have never called themselves Quakers”. The corresponding Romanian collocation is extended and has a disparaging connotation as well “bibliotecarul, quaker notoriu” (219), (lit. “the librarian, a notorious quaker”). According to Chesterman’s taxonomy (1997: 108-109), this is a strategy of translation of “explicitness change”, in which translators add elements in the target language translation, in order to make explicit which is only implicit in the source text. As stated by Gifford and Seidman (1989: 192), “during his tenure as librarian the oddity of his religious faith made him the object of suspicion and considerable mockery”. Thus, the additional adjective is used by the translator in order to highlight the librarian’s infamous position. Romanian collocations formed with the adjective *notoriu* receive a pejorative meaning, implying a behaviour exceeding the normal or permitted limits. Although Joyce employs in this first paragraph a series of adjective + noun collocations meant to set the scene in a calm and friendly environment, suitable for a pleasant conversation, and at the same time hinting at the peaceful attitude of the librarian, Ivănescu perceives the contemptuous disposition of the men of letters. While reading the Romanian translation, Joyce’s construction “quaker librarian”, repeated twelve times throughout the episode, is at times replaced with the modulated *bibliotecar puritan* (lit. “puritan librarian”). Even though the translator annotates the origin of quakers, he does not offer further explanations regarding the differences between the two denominations. Perhaps the translator employed this strategy of adaptation or “cultural filtering”, as Chesterman names it (1997: 108), for the purpose of readability, to bring the text closer to its readers, as Romanians are more familiar with the term “puritan”. Both Quakers and Puritans came to existence as keen Protestants, when they grew discontent with the Church of England, they are considered distinct groups and there are a series of differences between them. On the one hand, Puritans spent hours in prayer and Bible reading, believing

that their duty was to be obedient to the will of the Creator. “The popular image of Puritans is of earnest, narrow-minded people, disparagers of normal human pleasures” (Rosman, 1992: 61). Quakers or the Religious Society of Friends, on the other hand, believed in Jesus, rejected formal rituals and got actively involved in helping others. Moreover, they held a different status from other Protestant sects in the eyes of Irishmen. From their arrival in Ireland in 1654, “Quaker responses to the condition of Ireland were positive and always distinctive. Both Irish and English Friends were actively concerned with the welfare of the island, much of which seemed sunk in eternal poverty” (Hatton, 1993: 4). Through benevolence, active implication to eradicate Irish misery, intense labour and charitable giving especially during the Great Famine of 1846-1849, they increased their reputation and “made a significant contribution to the development of modern relief policies” (14). However, by the twentieth century, despite their good intentions, Ireland’s economic needs could no longer be satisfied by the methods that the Quakers had taken until then. Moreover, there was something about their unyielding convictions that made for uneasiness and incited hostility from others.

John Eglinton, who according to Gifford and Seidman (1989: 194) is the pseudonym of the Irish essayist and literary critic, William Kirkpatrick Magee, is described using the collocations “glitter eyed” and “rufous skull” (Joyce, 1992: 236). These collocations are rather uncommon, suggesting the stiff and judgemental nature of the character. In Romanian, the first construction is rendered literally. However, when it comes to the second collocation, by using the strategy of “information change” (Chesterman, 1997: 109), the idea of the reddish, brownish colour of Eglinton’s hair is no longer conveyed. Instead, the translator uses the adjective “stufos” (Joyce, 1992: 220), (lit. “thick haired”), hinting at the idea that his dishevelled hair and bony head represent altogether intelligence but also a rudimentary way of thinking. Furthermore, the rather uncommon collocation “spare body” (239), as the adjective is commonly used in collocations referring to extra money or time, refers to the character’s modest constitution and unintimidating aspect. In Romanian, Ivănescu employs a common collocation, “trupul slab” (225), (lit. “thin body”), as its equivalent. The translator engages into using the semantic strategy of “synonymy” (Chesterman, 1997: 102), picking the closest synonym for the adjective. Its literal meaning refers to someone whose body lacks excess flesh, but it could also imply lack of strength or firmness. In front of Stephen’s theory for ever-changing forms, Elington shows mockery with his “carping voice” (Joyce, 1992: 241), another personal collocation that Joyce employs in order to highlight the persistent and unjustified criticism of the essayist. In Romanian, the collocation is rendered literally, implying the same attitude: “vocea cârcotaşă” (226).

Poet A.E, which stands as a pseudonym for the famous poet of the Irish Literary Revival George Russell, is described by Joyce with the collocations “face, bearded”, “an ollav, holly eyed” (236). These images suggest wisdom, as “the ollaves were pre-Christian Irish masters of learning and poetry” (Gifford & Seidman, 1989: 194), but also mysticism and a trait of higher spirituality, A.E being perceived by others as someone who is worthy of reverence. Mircea Ivănescu translates the structure literally: “un ollav cu ochi sfințiți” (Joyce, 1992: 220), which does not necessarily hint at something complimentary. In Romanian, apart from the primary meaning of the adjective *sfințiți* (lit. “blessed/holy”), another meaning of the word refers to someone tipsy or mentally confused, especially in the construction “cu ochi sfințiți” (lit. “blessed/holy eyed”). The first meaning of the adjective is generally used in collocations showing that a certain object has been cleansed of evil spirits such as *apă sfințită* (lit. “holly water”).

Mr. Best, another enthusiastic and agreeable librarian, is described by Joyce using collocations that show approbation and steadiness “unoffending face” (238), “quiet voice” (242). Although his own contributions to the Hamlet conversation are merely points of received wisdom, his role is to maintain the discussion into equilibrium. In Romanian, the translator uses synonymy and literal translation strategy. The choice of adjectives implies a similar reaction to the character: “chip neamenințător” (223 – lit.: “unthreatening face”) and “glasul liniștit” (229 – lit.: “quiet voice”). However, an “offence” provokes a feeling of displeasure or annoyance, while “threat” holds a more pejorative connotation, implying the risk of inflicting pain or harm.

Later in the episode, Stephen’s main antagonist joins the discussion. Buck Mulligan’s appearance in the scene is marked by the collocation “ribald face” (248), reflecting Joyce’s and implicitly Stephen’s tormented feelings at the sight of this irreverent who has a habit of showing up and making Stephen look foolish. The Romanian translator renders the collocation employing the strategy of “abstraction change” (Chesterman, 1997: 103): “chip nerușinat” (Joyce, 1992: 236), (lit. “shameless/impudent face”). In this way, the adjective “ribald”, referring to “coarse, obscene, or licentious, usually in a humorous or mocking way” (*Collins English Dictionary Online*: 2014), becomes less abstract when translated. In English, the collocation refers to Buck’s humorous, mocking behaviour towards Stephen. Its Romanian equivalent hints at the character’s bold, mischievous and disrespectful behaviour, traits that also dictate lack of shame and a sort of satisfaction every time Stephen is ridiculed.

The chapter consists of two distinct parts of the dialogue between Stephen Dedalus and the academics. While it is linguistically established so that the characters should be able to prove their literary knowledge, the

emotional association that the words carry sets the readers into Stephen's own world of ideas and mental meanderings. We find that Joyce employs different adverbs with the past tense of the verb "said", which is mentioned 79 times in the chapter, according to each character's inner emotions. Stephen enters the philosophical fray, defending Aristotle: "The schoolmen were schoolboys first, Stephen said superpolitely. Aristotle was once Plato's schoolboy" (Joyce, 1992: 236). The word root implies respect for Dublin's literary elite and a desire to be accepted among these men of letters. In Romanian, the collocation is rendered as "spuse Stephen mai-mult-decît-politicos" (Joyce 1992: 221), (lit. "Stephen said more-than-politely"), the translator using the synonymy strategy. As an answer to Eglinton's mockery of his youth, the meaning of this construction implies that Stephen is deliberately eager to continue with his aspirations to grandeur, despite the general opinion that his behaviour is delusional. The choice of the translator to use a comparative degree of comparison points out how deeply involved the young professor is when it comes to art theories.

John Eglinton replies to Stephen's remark: "And has remained so, one should hope, John Eglinton sedately said" (236). As if he had been administered a sedative in order to neuter his own feelings and emotions, the essayist rests calm and composed, untouched in his platonic beliefs. In Romanian, the author's critical tone towards Eglinton's attitude is not as harsh: "zise așezat" (221), (lit. "calmly/composedly said"). This translation of the adverb, by using a synonym for the source language word, shows an emotional restraint and a speech without intensity, highlighting that the academic is certain of his indisputable theory. As the episode continues and Stephen shows off his theory of a dynamical form of art, he becomes high-spirited: "Stephen said with tingling energy" (239). In English, the adjective suggests a crescendo of sensations, an arousing excitement that keeps the character's monologue up and going. In Romanian, the adjective has no equivalent, hence the "paraphrasing strategy" (Chesterman, 1997: 104). The Romanian translation "spuse Stephen vibrînd de energie reținută" (Joyce, 1992: 224), (lit. "Stephen said vibrating with restrained energy") suggests self-restraint and an intentionally held-down energy.

As the conversation continues and Eglinton states the opinion of some biographer who condemns Shakespeare's early marriage to Ann Hathaway as a mistake, Stephen gets angry: "Bosh! Stephen said rudely. A man of genius makes no mistakes. His errors are volitional and are the portals of discovery" (241). The adverb of this collocation conveys the impolite manner of the reaction. In Romanian, the collocation becomes "spuse Stephen aspru" (227), (lit. "Stephen said harshly"). The translator employs a synonym for the source text adverb that expresses hostility and also hints at the tone with which these words are pronounced.

Eglinton's reaction is depicted by means of an alliterative collocation: "A shrew, John Eglinton said shrewdly, is not a useful portal of discovery, one should imagine." (241). According to *Collins Online Dictionary*, the noun "shrew" has a double meaning. It can either refer to a type of small mouse, or to "a bad-tempered or mean-spirited woman". In Romanian, the translator uses the "trope change" strategy, which applies in the situation of rhetorical tropes, i.e. expressions used in a figurative sense (Chesterman, 1997: 109). Therefore, Mircea Ivănescu tries to render the metaphor in a similar wordplay, but it results in a distortion of the original form: "O scorie, spuse veninos ca un scorpion John Eglinton" (Joyce, 1992: 227) – (lit. "A shrew, said poisonously as a scorpion John Eglinton").

As the peaceful librarian comes back into the room, he tries to make the conversation calm with his composed presence. "Mr Best's quiet voice said forgetfully" (242). The groups of collocations evoke Joyce's intention to blur the real conversation and to set the focus on a different topic. The same effect is produced by the Romanian translator who paraphrases the adverb, resulting in an adjective phrase: "spuse glasul liniștit, aducător de uitare al domnului Best" (228) – (lit. "Mr. Best's quiet, forgetful voice said"). As the quaker librarian came from "the leavetakers", he expressed admiration for Stephen's point of view: "and, covered by the noise of outgoing, said low" (244). This is an unusual collocation, as the adverb owns commonly the function of an adjective and it is placed near the noun "voice". However, in this situation, it may refer not only to the librarian's soft way of speaking, but also to his position. The translation strategy of paraphrasing results in employing a common Romanian collocation: "spuse cu glas scăzut" (231) - (lit. "he said in a low voice").

A great number of unusual collocations are employed by James Joyce when describing Mr. Best's contributions to the conversation. Most of these collocations are created using adverbs obtained through the process of derivation, as in the example "Mr Best said youngly. I feel Hamlet quite young" (246), which is translated literally into Romanian, maintaining both the form and the meaning of the source language collocation: "spuse domnul Best tinereste. Eu îl simt pe Hamlet tânăr de tot" (233). However, when it comes to the translation of the unusual collocation placed next to a wordplay, "Mr Secondbest Best said finely" (254), it is impossible for the Romanian translation to render the pun, as the proper name cannot be translated: "spuse cel de al doilea bun domn Best" (244) – (lit. "the second good Mr Best said"). It is interesting how for this structure Mircea Ivănescu combined literal translation with "level shift" strategy, hence the substitution of the superlative degree of comparison "best" with the positive "good". In the case of the collocation "gentle Mr Best said gently" (256), the translator omits the adverb: "spuse blîndul domn Best" (247) – (lit. "gentle Mr Best said").

James Joyce is well known for using repetitions which produce “in communicative terms, an excess of meaning, a new kind of textual redundancy” (Wales, 1992: 149). In this episode, these lexical repetitions produce clusters of collocations: “swiftly rectly creaking rectly rectly he was rectly gone” (Joyce, 1992: 379) describing the moment the “quaker librarian” was called by the attendant to go and he started moving with haste. Through literal translation, the structure’s fluidity is partly rendered in Romanian and the adverb “directly” is not compressed every time it is used: “Grăbit, pe dată scîrîind, 'ndată-'ndată se ndduse” (253) - (lit. “swiftly, directly creaking, rectly rectly, he was rectgone”).

Another example of collocational cluster is: “a rugged rough rugheaded kern” (374). According to the annotations of Gifford and Seidman (1989: 240), this construction makes allusion to Shakespeare: “Richard II in Shakespeare’s *The tragedy of King Richard II* callously turns from the news of John of Gaunt’s death: ‘Now for our Irish wars:/ We must supplant those rough rugheaded [shaggy-haired] kerns [Irish foot-soldiers].’” When envisaged in Romanian, the image of the kern with a strong unrefined constitution, is represented with clothes torn into shreds and with skin seriously injured: “un vajnic pedestraş irlandez, zdrenţuit, zdrelit, cu părul zburlit” (Joyce, 1992: 248 – lit.: “a ragged skinned rough shaggy-haired kern”). A number of translation strategies have been used for this structure. The noun “kern” was explicated, as there is no equivalent in Romanian, the adjective “rough” was rendered using the literal translation strategy, while for “rugheaded” a semantic strategy of synonymy was employed. However, the choice of translation in the case of the adjective “rugged” is unsettled. Using a semantic strategy, it was replaced with its homonym “ragged”, perhaps in an attempt to render the rhythmic and alliterative aspect of language, as an extra adjective was also added by the translator: *zdrenţuit- zdrelit- zburlit*.

5 Conclusion

James Joyce was fascinated by the ambiguity of language and he was inclined to employ lexical constructions either to condense or to displace ideas. Such is the case of unusual collocations, that convey distorted meanings. Analysing this type of collocations in context provides access to deeper layers of meaning. The value of novelty stands in Joyce’s stylistic artistry that creates a playful language in which secondary meanings are voluntarily evoked. This creative exploitation of lexical constructions leads to the production of puns which constitute a challenge for every translator. As man of letters Adrian Oţoiu concludes, “so far Ivănescu’s exemplary work has remained an unmatched achievement. Undoubtedly, there are oversights, missed allusions, unsolved puns or covered-up innuendo” (Oţoiu, 2004: 203). However, the eminence of the accomplishment yields a skilful choice of

words and mastery in producing constructions that, to some extent, bring style and meaning into harmony.

The selected chapter comprises a series of philosophical inquiries and statements about Shakespeare's life and work. Through verbal prowess, young Stephen Dedalus expresses a fantasist interpretation of *Hamlet* which is perceived with resistance by the platonic literary men gathered at the National Library. He is still the lone young man alienated from society, concerned with his own place in the universe, his own reality and identity. Stephen betrays disdain towards the men of letters and their traditional literary views, but also a desire for acceptance, as he feels bitterly disappointed at not being considered for Russell's collection of "young Irish bards". Therefore, the episode is portrayed in an eloquent but scornful and mocking manner.

This study observes how Joyce's creativity is represented in Mircea Ivănescu's Romanian translation. The parallel between the two texts means to draw comparisons between some of the personal collocations employed by James Joyce in this chapter and the way they were perceived and rendered into Romanian by the translator. The selection of adjective + noun and verb + adverb collocations was dictated by Stephen's and implicitly by the narrator's attitude and feelings during the lively conversation. The pejorative connotations attributed to the unusual word combinations reveal feelings of bitter contempt toward the intellectuals. Even though Mircea Ivănescu's translation is well documented and the historical and cultural allusions are accompanied by annotations, the choice of words betrays at times imprecisions. The strategies used in order to mimic Joyce's style mostly succeed into rendering the correct meaning of words, forming collocations with the same trait of negative connotations, but do not provide the same vocal patterns. Mainly because of the conformity to the norms of the target language Joyce's authorial collocations are at times rendered using common arrangements and the alliterative collocations become stiff constructions when translated. The choice of strategies is, of course, for the most part dictated by the differences between the two languages and at times by the cultural barriers. Most utterances are conveyed literally, but for others more elaborate strategies are applied, in an attempt to provide explicitness. Finding synonyms to substitute for ambiguous source text adjectives or adverbs provides correct and easy to understand structures, but makes the language stiff and rigorous. By paraphrasing adverbs that in English express abstract sensations, the translator makes the language flat and full of clichés, linguistic trait that James Joyce vehemently contended for. All in all, to a great extent, the target text results in more clear sentences, free of ambiguities and of abstruse words, making it friendlier with its readers. At times, Joyce's vision intermingles with the translator's way of perceiving

characters and their demeanours, leaving nothing implied and creating a language rigid and dignified.

However, as mentioned in the introduction, this study is purely analytical, as we did not discuss errors in translation, but simple acts of interpretation: “To identify an error in a translation, the source text and its contents must be fixed so as to exhibit a departure, and that fixing is an interpretive act” (Venuti, 2019: 56). Moreover, as Venuti continues to set forth, when analysing a work of translation, the text is taken out of its historical context and cultural environment that determine the process of interpretation. The translated text is then inserted “in a timeless, universal realm where judgments of correctness or error are summoned to advance, through an analytical sleight of hand, a competing interpretation” (59).

References:

- Academia Română, Institutul de lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan”. (1998). *DEX. Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române/ Explanatory dictionary of Romanian language* (2nd ed.). București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3d ed.). London/New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group. (Original work published 1992).
- Barnbrook, G., Mason, O., & Krishnamurthy, R. (2013). *Collocation applications and implications*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benson, M., Benson, E., Ilson, R. (2010). *The BBI combinatory dictionary of English: Your guide to collocations and grammar* (3rd ed. revised by R. Ilson). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Blamires, H. (1996). *The new Bloomsday book: A guide through Ulysses* (3rd Ed.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1966)
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Collins English dictionary – Complete and unabridged*. (2014). <https://www.thefreedictionary.com>
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics 1934-1951*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gifford, D., & Seidman, R. J. (1989). *Ulysses annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses* (2nd ed. revised and expanded). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hatton, H. E. (1993). *The largest amount of good: Quaker relief in Ireland 1654-1921*. Kingston & Montreal/London/Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Joyce, J. (1992). *Ulysses: With an introduction by Declan Kibert*. London: Penguin Books.
- Joyce, J. (1996). *Ulise* (Traducere și note de M. Ivănescu). București : Editura Univers.

- Oțoiu, A. (2004). 'Le sens du pousser': On the spiral of Joyce's reception in Romania. In G. Lernout & W. V. Mierlo (Eds.), *The reception of James Joyce in Europe. Vol. I: Germany, Northern and East Central Europe* (pp. 198–213). London/New York: Thoemmes Continuum.
- Oxford collocations dictionary for students of English*. (2002). Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford dictionary of idioms* (2nd ed.). (2004). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (First published 1999).
- Philip, G. (2011). *Colouring meaning: Collocation and connotation in figurative language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- quaker. (n.d.) *American heritage® dictionary of the English language*, Fifth Edition. (2011). Retrieved November 3, 2020 from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/Quaker>
- ribald. (n.d.) *Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged*, 12th Edition 2014. (1991, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2014). Retrieved February 14 2020 from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/ribald>
- Rosman, D. (1996). *From catholic to protestant: Religion and the people in Tudor England*. London: UCL Press.
- shrew. (n.d.) *Collins English dictionary – Complete and unabridged, 12th Edition*. (2014). Retrieved November 3, 2020 from <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/shrew>
- Singleton, D. (2000). *Language and the lexicon: An introduction*. London: Arnold.
- Venuti, L. (2019). *Contra instrumentalism: A translation polemic*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, Trans. & Eds.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wales, K. (1992). *The language of James Joyce*. London: MacMillan.