The Reception of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece

Trisevgeni Bilia

St Anne's College

University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Michaelmas 2024

SHORT ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the trajectory of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece by examining events of critical reception and translation. Drawing from theoretical models of world literature such as those suggested by Pascale Casanova (2004), Franco Moretti (2000), and David Porter (2011), this thesis proposes an alternative view of Joyce's reception focusing on its more fluid dynamics. Considering also the arguments of Francesca Orsini (2015), this thesis examines the practices through which circulation and dissemination are achieved to discuss peripheral modernism, modernist translation, and reading Joyce in the periphery. By examining acts of translation and critical responses, I argue that the circulation of *Ulysses* in Greece is achieved through strategies characterized by what I call 'unfinishingness': the text is received through readings and translations that do not hide—and often thematize—their unfinishedness. At the same time, these readings correspond to broader issues and debates of the Greek literary space.

Responding to local debates about interior monologue and modernist writing practices, the early readings of the novel consist of fragmentary translations, short notes, and articles in the 1930s-1950s. In the 1960s-1980s, Manto Aravantinou, a poet and translator, shifts the focus to issues of archive and transnational authorship through her critical work on Joyce's Greek notes. Finally, the three existing full-length translations (1969-1976, 1990, 2014) foreground the translator's struggle and raise issues of translation theory and discourse. Each response introduces modes of reading *Ulysses* such as the fragmentary, the weird, the agonistic, and the prismatic, that are directly linked to the unfinishing and the peripheral. The Greek trajectory of *Ulysses* can show us, I suggest, how productive peripheral responses can become as they lead, not only to new modes of reading the novel, but also to revisiting the issue of Joyce in the periphery and in translation.

LONGER ABSTRACT

The Reception of James Joyce's 'Ulysses' in Greece explores the work of James Joyce in Greece with a focus on *Ulysses* by examining events of critical reception and translation. Focusing on responses of criticism and translation throughout the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece, I use this material to discuss modernist translation in the periphery, Joyce in the periphery, as well as peripheral modernism in world literature. Exploring Joyce in relation to world literature, Eric Bulson underlined the need to bridge the gap between Joyce studies and world literature studies suggesting that 'a globalizing approach to Joyce might actually change how we read, study and teach him' (2009, 137). In the last few decades, a significant number of works have explored Joyce in other literatures such as *Transcultural Joyce* (ed. by Karen Lawrence, 1998), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe* (ed. by Geert Lernout and Wim van Mierlo, 2004), as well as Joyce in translation (*Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, 1984; *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century*, 2020), the latter topic being now considered almost a separate sub-field in Joyce studies. Nevertheless, the gap between Joyce studies and world literature, especially regarding peripheral literary spaces remains. Moreover, the concept of periphery in world literature is often referred to as uniform and encompassing all non-central literary spaces without considering the specificities of each space. By focusing on the trajectory of Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece, this thesis seeks not only to contribute to the discussion about Joyce in the world and the transnational connections of his work, but also to examine how Joyce's work is read and translated in the Greek context specifically and what that can tell us about Greece as a peripheral and minor literary space, its response to modernism, and the practice of translation. The Greek trajectory of *Ulysses* can show us, I suggest, how productive peripheral responses to *Ulysses* can become as they lead, not only to new modes of reading the novel, but also to revisiting the issue of Joyce in the periphery and in translation.

Focusing on *Ulysses* as the text by Joyce which raised the most responses in the Greek literary space, this thesis shows that there is an underlying continuity throughout the Irish writer's trajectory in Greece which is expressed by a recurrent revisiting and a constant return to the text. In this thesis, I argue that the circulation of *Ulysses* in Greece is achieved through strategies characterized by what I call 'unfinishingness': the text is received through readings and translations that do not hide—and often thematize—their unfinishedness. It is as if the text is characterized by an openness and provokes recurrent attempts for translation and criticism which, however, constantly invite further responses. These readings and translations correspond to bigger issues and debates of the Greek literary scene, while also allowing a discussion of the issue of Joyce and modernism in Greece and in the periphery.

Drawing from theoretical models suggested by contemporary critics such as Pascale Casanova (2004), Franco Moretti (2000), and David Porter (2011), this thesis proposes an alternative view of Joyce's reception in Greece focusing on its more fluid dynamics. Considering also David Damrosch's emphasis on literary circulation, transmission, and production (2003), this thesis focuses on the specific processes and, therefore on events of translation and critical reading instead of influences and intertextual links. At the same time, this thesis considers Francesca Orsini's arguments about 'multilingual locals' and the significance of analyzing the practices through which circulation and translation are achieved as well as her conceptualization of literature as an 'archive' and not only as a 'current state of play' (2015). Apart from concepts expressing the fluid dynamics of the Greek reception of Joyce such as *world literature*, *trajectory*, *center*, and *periphery*, I also draw from Roland Barthes's literary ontology (1971) by considering the text in its 'writerly' form. Focusing on *Ulysses* in Greece, a modernist text in a peripheral literary space, as a constantly reworked field, this thesis examines fragmentary translations, unfinished projects, and collaborative efforts in tandem with full-length translations and critical works, which reveal an inherent continuity in the Greek trajectory of *Ulysses*. Instead of adhering to a strictly chronological order of events or temporal divisions, this thesis analyzes

responses and the reactions that they trigger, the practices that they involve, and how they correspond to local debates. Through close reading of these responses, or what Sophie Corser has termed 'reading reading' (2022), as well as comparison of translations, I argue that, throughout its Greek trajectory, *Ulysses* is approached through practices which respond to the openness of the text by highlighting and thematizing it. Such practices develop modes of reading that are fragmentary, weird, prismatic, and agonistic, responding to the challenges of reading and translating Joyce's novel in a Greek and, therefore, a peripheral context. At the same time, they allow a reconsideration of conceptualizations of periphery as they highlight the specificities of Greece as a peripheral literary space.

The first chapter explores the early fragmentary translations of *Ulysses* and the first short notes and critical pieces that appeared in the experimental journals *Το 3ο μάτι* [*To Trito mati*] (1935-1937) and *Κοχλίας* [*Kochlias*] (1945-1948) during the period in the 1930s and 1940s. Responding to ongoing debates about interior monologue as a modernist writing practice which led to questions about the novel genre and its evolution in modernism, translated passages of *Ulysses* accompanied by brief notes or commentaries seek to introduce Joyce's novel to the Greek literary space by focusing on its formal aspects. The first translated passage from *Ulysses* appeared in *Το 3ο μάτι* in 1936 by Takis Papatsonis as part of an introduction to interior monologue which included also a translation of a passage from Édouard Dujardin's *Les lauriers sont coupés* (1887). Two more passages, which appeared in *Κοχλίας* (1945, 1946) and were translated by the members of the journal, foregrounded collaborative translation practices while the notes that accompanied them discussed Joyce in relation to literary history and contemporary artistic movements. Finally, an article published in *Κοχλίας* (1947) by poet Zoi Karelli, as well as a lecture by her brother, Nikos G. Pentzikis, which was published in *Μορφές* (1951), are the first critical texts that venture interpretations of Joyce's novel by looking at themes and characters, and focusing on Joyce's writing of the self and his identity as a writer. These early translations were meant to work as examples, and were thus fragmentary, promoting, however, the idea that the text

itself can generate unfinishing examples of a new literary sensibility. The fragmentary way in which *Ulysses* is translated and circulated in *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας* shows that Joyce's novel is part of strategies employed by the two journals, and the literary groups behind those journals, to establish themselves by creating a literary and translational tradition. Moreover, in these early readings, Joyce's *Ulysses* becomes a key text through which the different expressions of modernism between the literary circles of Athens and Thessaloniki can be examined.

The second chapter examines the work of Manto Aravantinou, a poet, translator, and scholar who, inspired by Richard Ellmann, and Hélène Cixous, conducted research in the 'Greek notes', which Joyce kept while learning modern Greek in Zurich (1916-1917). These notes comprise a small part of the Joyce archive and are included in the Zurich notebooks (1915-1919). Working in counterpoint to the negative reviews which have accused Aravantinou of misreading, appropriation, and misinterpretation, the chapter aims to provide a more positive and productive reading of her monograph, *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* (1977). I argue that Aravantinou's approach of the Greek part of Joyce's archive brings to the fore Joyce's writing practice and considers the note as a productive space of meaning, while her research in Joyce's Greek acquaintances aims to propose a reading of the Irish writer through his transnational connections and multilingualism. Focusing on that small and underexplored part of the Joyce archive that are the 'Greek notes' and adopting a peripheral viewpoint, Aravantinou develops new, non-normative, 'weird' modalities of reading Joyce and *Ulysses* in the periphery.

The third chapter turns to the three existing full-length translations of *Ulysses* into Greek and the discourse around them as an example of struggle with Joyce's writing, modernism, and language. The first full-length translation by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos appeared in serialized volumes in 1969-1976, during and after the dictatorship, by Pairidis publications, a marginal press. *Ulysses* became more widely known in Greece with its second translation, this time by Sokratis

Kapsaskis (1990), which received a European award but also caused considerable controversy. The third translation appeared more recently (2014) drawing from the now standardized Gabler edition and including footnotes. At the same time, work by Aris Marangopoulos such as *Ulysses: Οδηγός Ανάγνωσης* [*Odigos Anagnosis*] (2001; 2010; 2022, first published in 1995 as *Ulysses. Οδηγίες προς ναυτιλλομένους: επιστρέφοντας στον Οδυσσέα του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* [*Ulysses. Odigies pros naftillomenous: epistrefontas ston Odyssea tou Tzaiems Tzoys*] provides a critical reading of Joyce along with translated passages and sources. Drawing from recent theorizations of prismatic translation and translators' reactions to it (Reynolds 2019), in this chapter I explore the concept of prismatic agon in relation to the three full-length Greek translations of *Ulysses*. I focus extensively on Kapsaskis's translation (1990), gloss the way in which he frames his work with an apologetic account of his practice, and discuss the reviews that followed. The controversy over Kapsaskis's version of *Ulysses* focused more on broader issues such as the role of literary translation in Greek literature and the ethics of translating rather than the text itself or the study of Joyce in Greece. In this chapter I use prismatic agon (Reynolds 2019) as a productive concept through which to approach the three full-length translations which have traditionally been considered inadequate, arguing instead that they foreground an inherent multiplicity of literary language. Moreover, this chapter explores how translating *Ulysses* into Greek becomes an opportunity for theorization of translation, for developing a relevant discourse, but also for considering the contribution of translation practices to the formation of national literature.

This thesis provides a reconsideration of certain forgotten and neglected events as well as non-canonical writers of modern Greek literature. First, although the marginal journals *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας* have been studied extensively, the specifics of their contents related to *Ulysses*, a key text for both publications, are often overlooked. Through the lens of how they published and presented *Ulysses*, I have tried to provide a closer look on certain aspects of the journals' structure and content. At the same time, the debate over the differences between the Athenian circle of the Generation of

the Thirties and the School of Thessaloniki is revisited with a focus on the translational and critical work produced in Thessaloniki. Another aspect of the originality of this thesis lies in the examination of its material, specifically in revisiting Manto Aravantinou's pioneering work on Joyce which has been largely overlooked. Finally, the first translation of *Ulysses* into Greek is brought to the fore as an event which can be considered as a product of its time, and alongside the other two translations. This thesis, therefore, shifts the focus to minor writers, small groups and projects, and the periphery of modern Greek literature.

Instead of looking at influences and intertextual links, this thesis draws attention to translation and critical reception as practices which form the reading of Joyce in the Greek literary space. By considering the conditions under which each response was produced, and the agents involved, this thesis develops readings of translations and critical reception of *Ulysses* in Greece. In that way, it brings to light work that has been ignored by scholarship such as Aravantinou's studies on Joyce and translations, or the first full-length translation by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos (1969-1976). Instead of providing an account, this thesis discusses the modes of reading *Ulysses* which are developed through constant responses and re-readings of the text, positioning, at the same time, the Greek Joyce reception within the broader context of peripheral modernism. Rather than reception studies offering a framework to talk about translation, it is through translation studies, comparative literature, and world literature that I address the reception of Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece. Finally, showing that Joyce reception in Greece is formed by translation as a way of reading, this thesis aims to contribute to the broader discussion of modernist translation in peripheral spaces, and to introduce a fresh perspective to the developing conversation around Joyce and world literature.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dimitris Papanikolaou for his tireless mentorship, criticism, teaching, and listening. Always supportive, challenging, and present, Dimitris has been crucial in forming my ideas and helping me move forward.

I would also like to thank everyone at the sub-faculty of Modern Greek, especially Kostas Skordyles for his support and his help, as well as my colleagues, Claudio Russello, Billie Mitsikakos, Alice Parinello, Orestis Tzirtzilakis, and Elliot Koubis. Your friendship has been invaluable all these years, and this project could not have been done without you.

I am also indebted to my college advisor, Patrick McGuinness for always being available for a chat, for his advice, his ideas, and his feedback.

I would like to thank the institutions that supported me throughout my studies. First of all, St Anne's College and the Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages for their academic support and for providing me with resources through the MCR Travel Grant (St Anne's College) and the Graduate Travel Grant (MML) to attend events and activities required for my studies. I would like to acknowledge the support of the International James Joyce Foundation for awarding me a scholarship to attend the 2022 Joyce Symposium in Dublin. Thanks are also due to Laura Pelaschiar, John McCourt, and Richard Barlow from the Trieste Joyce Summer School for awarding me a scholarship to attend in 2022; as well as to Anne Fogarty and Luca Crispi from the Dublin Joyce Summer School for awarding me a scholarship to attend in 2023. I extend my gratitude to the Friends of the Zurich James Joyce Foundation for awarding me a scholarship to spend two months at the Foundation. Special thanks to Fritz Senn for generously inviting me back to Zurich, for our endless conversations on Joyce, Homer, translation, and how Homer reads Joyce. Thank you also to Ursula Zeller and Ruth Frehner for their immense help with working at the Foundation, as well as to Silke Stebler. Finally, I would like to thank Frances Illmberger for her help with navigating the Foundation and Zurich, for her hospitality and her friendship. Thanks are due to the European Society for Modern Greek Studies for awarding me a scholarship to participate at the 7th European Congress of Modern Greek Studies in 2023 in Vienna. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the Seeger Center for Hellenic Studies at Princeton University for allowing me to share my work at the Sixteenth International Graduate Conference. Special thanks to Dimitri Gondicas, Nikos Panou, and Lina Chordaki for reading my work and giving me valuable feedback.

For archival assistance I am very grateful first of all to Sofia Bora for her guidance and advice, and to Maria Kokoloyanni at ELIA (Ελληνικό Λογοτεχνικό και Ιστορικό Αρχείο) in Athens, as well as to Yorgos Koumaridis at ELIA in Thessaloniki. Anastasia Rangou and Sotiris Leventis at the Library of the Hellenic Parliament (Βιβλιοθήκη της Βουλής των Ελλήνων) were particularly helpful with locating

sources in the newspapers archive and I am thankful to them too. I would also like to thank the staff at the Special Collections of the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich, as well as the Department of Special Collections and University Archives, McFarlin Library of The University of Tulsa and Grace Cosby for her help. I am particularly grateful to Sabrina Alonso and William Brockman for drawing my attention to invaluable material and generously sharing with me sources and information.

I am also very grateful to Prof. Effie Rentzou for her generosity in allowing me to read her fascinating work on *Το 3ο μάτι*.

Thanks are also due to various communities who shaped my thinking throughout this project. The community of *Greek Studies Now* has been very welcoming, and I am grateful to Kristina Gedgaudaite for her encouragement, and her thoughtful advice. The Oxford Comparative Criticism and Translation network has been a place where I have had the pleasure of hearing about new projects which helped me with my own work. I am grateful to Matthew Reynolds, Adriana Jacobs, and Ben Morgan with whom I had the opportunity to discuss my ideas and hear their thoughts. Georgia Nasseh, Joseph Hankinson, Karolina Watroba, Erin Nickalls, Ola Sidorkiewicz, Anna Saroldi, Alyssa Ollivier-Tabukashvili, Georgie Fooks have helped a lot along the way. I am also indebted to the Joyce community which I got to know on multiple occasions over the past few years at Joyce symposia, summer schools, reading groups. Sam Slote, Valérie Bénéjam, Tim Conley, and Neil Ranger have heard my ideas from time to time and have given me invaluable feedback but have also taught me a lot. Ronan Crowley and Emily Bell have been incredibly generous with their help in navigating the Joyce chaosmos and sharing sources and ideas with me. Two *Finnegans Wake* reading groups have taught me a lot about Joyce and communal reading and I would like to thank the people I have met through them but also the people I met through the Joyce conferences and Zurich workshops. Casey Lawrence, for sharing her work with me, Talia Abu, James Green, Adrian Patterson, Emily Schuck. Stephanie Nelson for her help; Armagan Ekici and Erika Mihálycsa for talking about translation and Joyce; Arianna Autieri and Shelly Harder, both for their kind suggestions and thought-provoking ideas; Zoe Patterson, Maisie Ridgway, Shantam Goyal with whom I spent time studying, reading, and wondering at the Zurich Foundation.

Thanks are due to Dimitris Marathias for providing a very important book and valuable information.

I would especially like to extend my gratitude to Aris Marangopoulos for his encouragement, his help, suggestions, and inspiring insights.

Thanks are also due to Panos Michalopoulos for the best tech support possible, even from miles away.

A big thank you to Rudy Rinaldi and Yanna Yannoulopoulou for drawing my attention to a forgotten translation, for giving me access to the remaining stock of a forgotten publisher, and for providing me with sources much needed. A special thank you to my parents, Eleni and Yannis, my sister Despina,

and my grandmothers, Trisevgeni and Despina, for supporting me. *The sentimentalist is he who would enjoy without incurring the immense debtorship for a thing done* (*U* 9.550).

Finally, to Nikos, the best Joycean I know, for always being there and for everything that he has done. *Love is unhappy when love is away.*

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in parenthetical citations throughout the thesis:

JJA: *James Joyce Archive*. Cited in the text by volume number and page number.

JJII: *James Joyce*, by Richard Ellmann (2nd ed.)

FW: *Finnegans Wake,* ed. Finn Fordham, Robbert-Jan Henkes, and Erik Bindervoet. Cited in the text by page number and line number.

U: *Ulysses*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior. Cited in the text by episode and line number.

LI: *Letters of James Joyce I*, ed. Stuart Gilbert

LII: *Letters of James Joyce II*, ed. Richard Ellmann

SL: *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, ed. Richard Ellmann

Τα ελληνικά: *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, Manto Aravantinou

Details of specific editions used may be found in the bibliography.

Introduction

A Greek note on Joyce

On July 18th 1917, James Joyce wrote a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver in which he told her, among other things, the following:

> A notice appeared in the Greek review *Εσπερία* (29 June, p. 410). I think the editor is entitled to a copy of the book. Dr C. Pouptis, 62 Oxford Street. I wrote him yesterday but sent the letter to 62 Chancery Lane by mistake! I am rather unlucky with the post this week. (*LI* 106-7)

Addressing a Greek diasporic readership based in London and potentially other places in Europe, but also a readership based in Greece, the newspaper *Εσπερία* covered national as well as international news—often indistinguishable during WWI. It was advertised as a 'weekly illustrated newspaper' ('εβδομαδιαία εικονογραφημένη εφημερίς εν Λονδίνω'), it included photos, but also literary pieces for entertainment (mostly translations), and reports from places outside the UK such as Switzerland. The notice that Joyce mentions is part of one such report which appeared in the issue of 29 June 1917 (410) and bears the title 'Τράμματα από την Ελβετίαν' ('Letters from Switzerland'). Dated 19 June 1917, this notice is written by an external reporter who signs as 'Π. Φ. Π.'—an acronym which points towards Pavlos G. Phocas (Παύλος Γ. Φωκάς), a Greek expatriate and one of Joyce's friends in Zurich.[1] The notice reports events concerning Greek politics and affairs, some of which took place in Switzerland at that time: the visit of a Greek politician in Lausanne in support of Greek leader

[1] Loukopoulou (2024) also identifies Π. Φ. Π. as Pavlos Phocas. As Loukopoulou shows, the notice was included, along with other press-notices, in a promotional leaflet published by The Egoist Press in 1918, and it was introduced with Phocas's name ('Mr. PAVLOS PHOCAS in ΕΣΠΕΡΙΑ'). The leaflet is reproduced in Jane H. Lidderdale and Mary Nicholson (1970), *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver, 1876-1961* (London: Faber and Faber).

Eleftherios Venizelos, but also Germany's and Bulgaria's attack at the Macedonian front (1916-1917). The second part of the letter, however, draws attention to something entirely unrelated:

> Λαβών την ευκαιρίαν να γνωρίσω εκ του πλησίον τον γνωστόν Άγγλον συγγραφέα Τζαίημς Τζόϋς, ο οποίος προσωρινώς διαμένει εδώ εις την Ζυρίχην, θεωρώ καλόν να τον παρουσιάσω διά της «Εσπερίας» εις τον Ελληνικόν κόσμον, διότι ο κ. Τζόϋς δεν είνε μόνον διακεκριμένος συγγραφεύς και λάτρης των αρχαίων προγόνων μας, αλλά και φιλέλλην εκ των θερμοτέρων, γνωρίζων αρκετά καλά την νεωτέραν Ελληνικήν.
>
> Having had the opportunity to meet in person the well-known English writer James Joyce, who is staying temporarily in Zurich, I deem it appropriate to present him, through *Esperia*, to the Greek world because Mr. Joyce is not only a distinguished writer and an admirer of our ancient past, but he is also a most fervent philhellene, as he knows the modern Greek language quite well.[2]

In what follows, the reporter recounts Joyce's literary past up to that moment, his first steps with *Chamber Music* and the dire fate of the first edition of *Dubliners* which 'was burnt as immoral' ('του οποίου η πρώτη έκδοσις εκάη, ως ανήθικος') but which, as the author states, Joyce managed to publish freely 'after a true nine-year Trojan war against Puritanism' ('μετά ενναετή δε πραγματικόν Τρωικόν αγώνα εναντίον του Πουριτανισμού, κατώρθωσε να επιτύχη την ελευθέραν έκδοσιν'). Although the reporter simply transliterates the first two titles into Greek—*Chamber Music* and *Dubliners*—he does translate the title of *A Portrait* by using the word 'σκιαγραφία': 'Σκιαγραφία καλλιτέχνου ως νέου ανθρώπου', a term which alludes to sketching or drawing, a technique that is based on using shades and emphasizing the contrast with light—and rather different from the word 'portraito', a direct translation of the word 'portrait' which usually signifies a finalized (oil) painting, picture, and representation, and which is adopted in the existing Greek translations of the title.

The writer of the note refrains from providing a fully formed critical opinion on *A Portrait*. As he is writing for a London-based newspaper, the writer draws attention to Joyce's reputation in London and English reviews of *A Portrait* such as that by H. G. Wells in *Nation* (24 February 1917).

[2] All translations in this thesis are mine unless otherwise indicated. In all quotations I have kept the original spelling.

The notice ends with a reference to Joyce's project at the time, his writing of *Ulysses*, without however disclosing the title. Instead, the writer mentions the general theme and predicts the 'impact' that this work will have, an impact specific to a Greek speaking audience:

> Ο κ. Τζόϋς ετοιμάζει προς έκδοσιν νέον του έργον περί της Ομηρικής εποποιΐας, το οποίον θα προξενήση έκπληξιν εις τον κόσμον των Ελληνικών γραμμάτων, διά την πρωτοτυπίαν του. Τα έργα του κ. Τζόϋς τα χαρακτηρίζει ιδιορρυθμία, δύναμις, αδρότης, σαφήνεια και δροσιά.
>
> Mr. Joyce is preparing to publish his new work about the Homeric epics, which will come as a surprise to the world of Greek letters due to its originality. Mr. Joyce's works are characterized by eccentricity, force, density, clarity, and freshness.

After moving to Zurich in 1915, and while continuing his work on *Ulysses*, which he had already begun in Trieste, Joyce was also preoccupied with his reputation as a writer, trying to promote *A Portrait* which was published in 1916, and his play *Exiles*, while accumulating any sort of material that could be used in his writing. While he had already come to contact with several different linguistic communities in Trieste (McCourt 2000), he continued to cultivate his linguistic interests in Zurich, a place that also offered many such opportunities as it provided shelter from the war to many wandering people. The already known biographical accounts by Herbert Gorman (1941), Richard Ellmann (1982), and Frank Budgen (1972) mention Joyce's interactions with expatriates. Among these expatriates were a few Greeks among whom Pavlos Phocas is mentioned by all three of them, while Paul Ruggiero, another Greek speaker and a student of Joyce also joined occasionally. It was with those two that the Irish writer attempted to expand his learning of modern Greek which he had started in Trieste. Such details, show that the Zurich years were a particularly formative and productive time for Joyce, which, according to Vassiliki Kolocotroni (2019, 141-58: 152), 'more so than Trieste or Paris […] were marked by Babelism and dislocation which seem to have propelled the writing of *Ulysses* but also provided the opportunity for immersion in other languages and cultures, most notably modern Greek'.

Joyce lived in Zurich from 1915 till 1919. During that time, he developed a more 'systematic' contact with and use of linguistic plurality—albeit in his own idiosyncratic way. The kind of interest he had for the modern Greek language is reflected in words and phrases of different idioms and contexts included in the Greek notes that are found in his Zurich notebooks. Pavlos Phocas appears in the Joyce archive as someone who apparently played a significant role in Joyce's learning of the Greek language. His name figures in the Greek notes more than once, in a business letter written by himself and a personal letter copied by Joyce, while evidence suggests his connection to the notice 'in the Greek review *Εσπερία*' which Joyce mentions in his letter to Weaver.

Apart from the reporter's claim that he has personally met Joyce in Zurich, certain sentences found in Joyce's Greek notes, which were part of linguistic exercises, point towards a possible conversation between Joyce and his Greek instructor about *Portrait*.[3] These traces become clearer if we consider a letter from Phocas to Joyce, dated 14 March 1917, in which he includes a Greek translation of Joyce's poem XXXIV 'Sleep now, O sleep now' (*Chamber Music*, 1907) and a note which begins:

> Dear sir James,
>
> Enclosed herewith you find 8 fr., value of your excellent work "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" with my thanks for your kindness to bring me it yourself.[4]

A story of reading, circulation, and dissemination is fleshed out of these interactions, a story not only of an interpersonal connection, but also of an act of reading *A Portrait*, of reading Joyce's work from the point of view of a minority language while addressing not only a diasporic community but also a publishing center, London. The notice that appeared in *Εσπερία* is also part of this story.

---

[3] These are analyzed further in the second chapter of this thesis.
[4] The letter is reproduced in Aravantinou (1977, 223-24). The original (MSS.C.O.2) is kept in the Rare and Manuscripts Division, Cornell University Library. Many thanks to William Brockman for letting me see a scan.

Considering Joyce's preoccupations in 1916 and 1917 and his Greek connections, this event is part of a bigger moment, of an interaction that had developed at the time, and which is indicative of Joyce's interest in minority languages (Kolocotroni, 2019) but also of his efforts to promote his book. He had developed friendships with a few people who were 'teaching' him Greek, Phocas among them, with whom he also discussed his work and specifically *Portrait* during the time it was getting published in London. He had sold the book to Phocas for him to read, and was aware that a 'notice appeared' in a London-based Greek newspaper. It is impossible for now to say for sure whether Joyce had orchestrated it himself, but in another letter to Weaver on 7 July 1917, Joyce wrote 'as regards my novel since I see you want foreign reviews of it I would make the following suggestions' (*LI* 103) and lists correspondents in Francophone Swiss and Italian newspapers. Far from being an arbitrary event, this brief reference to Joyce which appeared in *Εσπερία* is part of a network of events which include language learning, promotion, circulation, reaching out to new readerships, and attempts at translation. At the same time, the content of the notice gives us a glimpse of the reporter's view of Joyce and his work, a view which may very well have been influenced by what Joyce himself had told him, and the conversations they had. Viewed within the context of the Greek trajectory of Joyce, this is the first of a series of encounters of the Irish writer with the Greek literary space, a first introduction to a Greek readership. The next known Greek reference to Joyce in a diasporic newspaper is a translation of the short story 'Eveline', the first ever published translation of a Joyce text into Greek, by writer Thrasos Kastanakis.[5] It appeared in the Paris-based newspaper *Αγών των Παρισίων* [*Agon ton Parision*] in 1929 in the wake of the French translation of *Ulysses* and while Joyce himself was living in Paris. Therefore, Joyce's 'migration' to the Greek literary space, in its initial stages, was mediated by the Greek diaspora, by people who were in direct contact with the author or the literary scene in which he was active.

[5] James Joyce (1929), 'Η Εβελίνα. Διήγημα—Παρουσιασμένο στη Νεοελληνική από το Θράσο Καστανάκη', trans. Thrasos Kastanakis, *Αγών των Παρισίων*, 27 April, 159, 6.

Aside from the biographical significance the notice in *Εσπερία* may hold, it is not easy to determine what kind of impact it may have had on Joyce's recognition among Greek readers.[6] Two years later, the Greek review *Ο Νουμάς* [*O Noumas*], which was being published in Athens by supporters of the demotic language, included two references to Joyce, one about *Exiles* and another about *Portrait* of which the impact is equally unknown.[7] But how are such minor events to be situated within the trajectory of a text or a writer without being dismissed as 'false starts' or unimportant? And how can events that are considered 'false starts' be viewed productively? Francesca Orsini has argued that, while preoccupied with circulation and exchange of texts, world literature models such as those proposed by Pascale Casanova, Franco Moretti, and David Damrosch, often neglect to take into account the *practices* through which circulation, production, and dissemination are achieved failing therefore to provide a more realistic approach to world literature. Practices which often rely on individual initiatives, collaborations, small events, and which take place in multilingual environments, are very often ignored over widely influential transactions and obvious connections (2015, 345-47). Even when they result into texts or translations that are not widely read or are forgotten, they are still part of world literature, since, according to Orsini, 'literature is an archive as well as a current state of play' (349). Recent work has been bringing to the fore the multilingualism involved in Joyce's own creative process as well as his rise to fame; however, that is often sidelined by the Anglocentrism of Joyce studies.[8] Analyzing such practices draws our attention to Joyce's transnational connections which played a

[6] Loukopoulou (2024), argues that the *Εσπερία* notice contributed to Joyce's popularity because of the way it was used by Weaver who reproduced it in a leaflet along with many other such press notices, but also because the newspaper was circulating in London.

[7] See *Ο Νουμάς*, issue 614 (12/1/1919), 78 which includes a short reference to *A Portrait* and in which Joyce's name has been typed erroneously as 'Τζεϊμς Τζούαου', and issue 619 (16/2/1919), 158-59 which published a detailed description of Joyce's play *Exiles*.

[8] A recent example of this is Ronan Crowley's presentation at the 29th International James Joyce Symposium (title: 'Flourishing in Marseille: A Second Major Model for Molly'). Sharing part of his ongoing research on the 'biography' of *Ulysses*, Crowley talked about the 'models' of Molly's character among which was Gisella Norbedo, the Triestine wife of Nicolas Santas, a Greek fruit-seller with whom Joyce was acquainted. The idea that Joyce was inspired by non-Irish women to create Molly was met with disbelief by the audience due to a longstanding view that Molly is a literary impersonation of Joyce's wife, Nora, and therefore based on a woman of Irish origins.

crucial role in his becoming a widely known writer figure as we know him today. Looking at what kind of readerships he reached out to and how, helps us work *with* the challenge of multilingualism. More importantly, examining such practices contributes to better understanding and defining the dynamics and relationships within world literature as well as processes such as textual circulation and dissemination. Minor events such as the note in *Εσπερία* shed light on those practices, the *how* and the *in-between*, as well as the involvement and contribution of the people that surrounded Joyce for a short time—and who may not have been from literary backgrounds. It is difficult to determine how influential such events actually were to Joyce's reputation but also to readerships. At the same time, examining the events themselves and the way in which they happened can bring to the fore hidden connections in a writer's or a text's trajectory.

Structure of the thesis

Considering minor events that have been underexplored, such as the notice in *Εσπερία*, as well as more widely known events, such as published translations, this thesis explores the trajectory of James Joyce in Greece with a focus on *Ulysses* (1922), its translations and critical reception. Starting from fragmentary translations and short critical notes published in experimental periodicals in the 1930s and 1940s, this thesis then goes on to examine the poet Manto Aravantinou and her reading of Joyce through his archive and writing process in the 1960s-1980s, and finally turns to the three existing full-length Greek translations of the novel by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos (1969-1976), Sokratis Kapsaskis (1990), and Eleftherios Anevlavis (2014). Analyzing key moments and events in the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece, whether these are small gestures or organized responses, this thesis examines how Joyce's novel has been read and translated in the Greek literary space. Considering these interactions through terms and concepts drawn from recent scholarship in world literature and translation studies, concepts regarding dynamics between literary spaces such as the

contested distinction 'center-periphery', this thesis argues that they constitute responses to the inherent openness and unfinishedness of the text, an unfinishedness which is productive, and which becomes a crucial part of reading *Ulysses* in the periphery.

The first chapter examines the fragmentary translations and short notes which appeared in the journals *Το 3ο μάτι* [*To Trito Mati*] (1935-1937) and *Κοχλίας* [*Kochlias*] (1945-1948). These translated passages and notes responded to debates about interior monologue, modernist writing practices, and ultimately the novel genre which took place in the 1930s literary scene and developed mostly in Thessaloniki. Starting from the interior monologue debate, which was also a debate about Greek modernist prose as well as Greek critical practice, these translations and short critical texts promote a reading of *Ulysses* as an example, as a way of reading, translating, and writing, as it becomes a text through which writers Nikos Gavriil Pentzikis and Zoi Karelli reflect on their creative process. The events discussed in the first chapter invite us to reconsider established conceptualizations of Greek modernism. The second chapter explores Aravantinou's work on Joyce focusing on her monograph *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* [*Ta ellinika tou Tzaiems Tzoys*, 'James Joyce's Greek] (1977) alongside her broader activity in Joyce studies. Having conducted research in the Joyce archive, and having analyzed his Greek language notes, Aravantinou discussed Joyce's writing process by emphasizing his interest in the Greek language, as well as the significance of Greek people he knew in his life and work. Considering Joyce's exilic status, his connections with the Greek diaspora, and the place of the Greek notes in the rest of the archive, Aravantinou's reading echoes modalities of what recent scholarship has termed as 'weird' (Fisher 2016, Luckhurst 2017) and foregrounds issues of archival reading and transnational authorship. The third chapter turns to the three existing full-length translations of *Ulysses* (1969-1976; 1990; 2014) and focuses on the second translation which was completed by Sokratis Kapsaskis (Kedros, 1990), as well as the critical discourse that developed around it. Taking into account the agonistic context of Kapsaskis's translation, and drawing from recent scholarship on

'translation as a prism' (Reynolds 2019), the chapter reconsiders the three translations by proposing a prismatic reading which foregrounds literary multiplicity.

Examining crucial events in the Greek trajectory of *Ulysses*, the circumstances under which they developed and their interactions with the contemporary developments in Greek literature and criticism, each chapter brings to the fore modes of reading *Ulysses* which respond to the unfinishedness of the text. Following the trajectory of Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece can show us, I suggest, how productive peripheral responses to *Ulysses* can become as they lead to new readings of the novel, while also helping us revisit the issue of Joyce in the periphery and in translation. This thesis argues that the circulation and dissemination of *Ulysses* in Greece is achieved through strategies characterized by what I call 'unfinishingness': the text is received through readings and translations that do not hide—and often thematize—their unfinishedness as well as the text's unfinishedness. 'Unfinishedness' corresponds to the notion that a text, a critical response, or a translation continues to be in process even after completion, which is usually achieved through publication. In this thesis, I aim to show that the unfinishedness of the modernist text, and specifically *Ulysses*, invites constantly further responses which thematize their inadequacy to provide a 'finished' and 'finalized' reading, but rather perpetuate this process by adding new material, re-reading and revisiting it, and 'unfinishing' it. Therefore, I consider the 'unfinishing' as a mode of doing criticism and translation through textual instability. Drawing from Roland Barthes's textual ontology and distinction between 'readerly' and 'writerly' texts, I use the term 'unfinishing' to talk about modes of reading and practices that seek to read through textual unfinishedness and add to it. Throughout the Greek trajectory of *Ulysses*, the modes of reading that develop are fragmentary, weird, prismatic, and agonistic, responding to the challenges of reading Joyce's novel in a Greek context. Talking about 'trajectory', this thesis proposes an examination of the reception of *Ulysses* in Greece, that will be alternative to the glosses provided until now by critics such as Miltos Pechlivanos and Jina Politi (2004, 455-68) or Lambis Kapsetakis (1998-1999, 187-218) and

focuses on its more fluid dynamics and the active interactions between Joyce's novel and Greek translators, writers, and critics rather than influences which are often presented as one-sided. The 'unfinishing' modes of reading *Ulysses*, that these interactions develop, foreground different aspects of the text and constitute different ways of reading in Greece, the peripheral status of which is determined not only by its current state in the world, but also by perceptions of its ancient past.

Why *Ulysses*? Joyce studies in Greece

Although it cannot be stated that Joyce's Greek reception has been non-existent, the Irish writer's work has not been part of largely recognized projects, nor has it been promoted by influential literary figures. Even though there has been no systematic research on the subject, critics like Aris Berlis tend to suggest that Joyce has not been widely read in Greece or that the reception of his work has been flawed (Berlis 1991a; 2001). T. S. Eliot was systematically promoted by George Seferis as the exemplary modernist through lectures, essays, and translations. Marcel Proust became more known in the Greek literary space through Pavlos Zannas's translation of *À la recherche du temps perdu* (1913-1927), a translation of historical significance due to the circumstances under which it was produced.[9] While Joyce's name, as it will become clear in this thesis, has also been connected to certain Greek writers such as Nikos Gavriil Pentzikis and Manto Aravantinou, those have mostly been associated with the Greek literary periphery, rather than the intellectual elite. Studies about Joyce's presence in Greece are not abundant; they are mostly found in the form of articles or book-chapters, and focus on mapping and outlining reception events instead of analyzing them in detail. They also often

[9] Having been arrested in 1968 by the dictatorial regime (which lasted seven years, from 1967 until 1974), Zannas began translating and publishing Proust's *À la recherche* while in prison for political reasons, with limited resources and upon the encouragement of Stratis Tsirkas. After his release in 1972, Zannas kept translating Proust's lengthy novel until he died in 1989 without ever finishing it. By the time of his death, he had translated five volumes out of seven. The two remaining volumes were translated by Panayiotis Poulos who edited the entire translation for its re-publication (1998-2018). Zannas's translation of Proust was also praised by Seferis ([1971] 1992, 263-66) to whom it owes part of its popularity.

emphasize literary influences and intertextual links as main reception events. The issue of Joyce's presence in Greece in terms of translation is first raised by Menis Koumantareas in an article about translations of Joyce's work into Greek, published in the journal *η Συνέχεια* [*Continuity*] (March 1973, 44-5). The journal was part of an intellectuals' resistance movement against the 1967-1974 dictatorial regime which was expressed mainly through the progressive publishing house Kedros and publications such as *Δεκαοχτώ κείμενα* [*Eighteen Texts*] (1970), *Νέα κείμενα* [*New Texts*] (1971), *Νέα κείμενα 2* [*New Texts 2*] (1971), and the journal *η Συνέχεια* (March-September 1973). A preventive censorship law, imposed by the dictatorial regime, had resulted in a 'silence' in literary creation and publishing. The censorship law was lifted in 1969 and was replaced by several regulations in printing and publishing. By using these regulations creatively, the publications mentioned above aimed at promoting original literary and critical work as a form of resistance to the regime's control of free speech and expression (Van Dyck 1998, 37-50). As a result, Koumantareas's article in the first issue of *Συνέχεια* indicated that reading and translating Joyce was endorsed by a certain progressive and anti-dictatorial front. Aravantinou conducted important research on Joyce and was a pioneer in producing Joyce criticism in Greek. Her work, and more specifically her study on Joyce's learning of the Greek language (*Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* [*James Joyce's Greek*], 1977), are discussed extensively in the second chapter. Bibliographical work, which records translations, articles, critical work, references, journal issues that have appeared in Greece about Joyce, has been provided most notably by Greek Joyce scholar Aris Marangopoulos in his reader's guide to *Ulysses* (1995; 2001; 2010; 2022) and has been crucial for this thesis. Apart from an extensive bibliography, the reader's guide is also a source for Greek-speaking readers who want to get started with *Ulysses*: it is a chapter-by-chapter study which includes translated excerpts from the novel, commentary, sources, and interpretations. Marangopoulos's critical work on Joyce extends to an album about *Ulysses* and Dublin (*Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο: Τόποι και Γλώσσες στον Οδυσσέα του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* [*Dear Dirty Dublin: Places and Languages in James Joyce's 'Ulysses'*, 1997; 2022),

and his translation of *Giacomo Joyce* with introduction and annotations (1994; 2018). Along with Marangopoulos's work, an article by Lambis Kapsetakis (1998-1999, 187-218) and a book-chapter by Miltos Pechlivanos and Jina Politi (2004, 455-68) constitute important sources for the study of Joyce in Greece from which I am drawing events. Kapsetakis discusses translations and critical reactions, but focuses on literary responses and argues that, paradoxically, it is Joyce's prose (instead of his poetry) that has influenced Greek post-war poetry. Pechlivanos and Politi's chapter, on the other hand, is one of the few studies about Joyce in Greece written in English as it is included in an edited volume which explores the reception of Joyce Europe (Lernout and Van Mierlo, 2004). At the same time, original Joyce scholarship written in Greek has appeared in the form of articles, for example in a special issue of *Νέα Εστία* (November 2002, issue 1750) which included contributions by Greek critics and translators about the Joyce reception in Greece as well as reading, translating, and teaching Joyce in university, showing that there is an interest in the Irish writer in Greek scholarship. Apart from Marangopoulos, other Greek critics who have written about Joyce are Dimiroulis (1982), Valaoritis (1988), Kallinis (1995), Berlis (1997; 2010), Raizis (1998-2000), Kolocotroni (1999; 2019), Politi (1999), Pechlivanos (2002), Ioakeimidou (2009), Arseniou (2022), Logothetis (2022).[10] In her inspiring study about the afterlives of the *Odyssey* myth in literature and cinema, Maria Oikonomou sees Joyce's novel as a 'machine', according to which the novel is a mechanism which constantly feeds back to its mythical past, and repeats the myth but differently every time (2016, 101-54). To celebrate the *Ulysses* centenary in June 2022, the online journal *Χάρτης* [*Map*] published a special issue on Joyce (issue 42), which was edited by Greek Joyce scholar Aris Marangopoulos. It included a variety of contributions bringing older reception under new methodological frameworks, revisiting biographical material and translations, expanding to new readings, discussions on translations, and creative responses by young as well as more established academics and writers. This special issue encapsulates the interest of

[10] For a complete bibliography see Marangopoulos (2010) and Pechlivanos and Politi (2004).

contemporary Greek criticism in Joyce, an important part of which discusses whether and how Joyce's work can be translated, showing therefore that preoccupations about Joyce in translation still prevail despite the number of existing translations of his works.

Another study of Joyce's influence in Greek literature, which has been published in English, is Evi Voyiatzaki's book, *The Body in the Text: James Joyce's 'Ulysses' and the Modern Greek Novel* (2002) in which she examines Stelios Xefloudas, Nikos G. Pentzikis, and Yorgos Cheimonas as writers who 'have been, or claim to have been, influenced by Joyce' and who receive *Ulysses* 'from quite a Freudian viewpoint as a text with bodily functions relating to man's inner self' (4). In her compelling study, Voyiatzaki sheds light on the connections between Joyce and these three writers, two of whom (Xefloudas and Pentzikis) were associated with journals in which Joyce appeared or was discussed in the 1930s and 1940s, as will be discussed further in the first chapter. Voyiatzaki focuses on Joycean influence and while she examines the discussions on interior monologue that took place in Thessaloniki in the 1930s by the circle of journals *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* [*Makedonikes Imeres*, 'Macedonian Days'] and of which the residue is detected in the journal *Κοχλίας* in the 1940s, she does not explore further the processes behind the fragmentary translations and notes introducing Joyce. Since her focus is on Xefloudas, Pentzikis, and Cheimonas, writers whose major work appeared in the 1960s and 1970s, she understandably examines a period that is much later than when *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας* published translations of excerpts from *Ulysses*. While I draw from Voyiatzaki specifically for her discussion of the literary and critical atmosphere of the 1930s in Thessaloniki and her interpretation of Greek modernism, I am more interested in what happens during the moment of the fragmentary translations of *Ulysses* and their critical notes, as well as the platforms in which they appeared, how they are presented, and what that can tell us about how *Ulysses* was read at that moment. In this thesis I focus on events of translation and criticism as the main events through which Joyce is circulated and disseminated in the Greek literary space. Although Joycean influences and intertextual links in the

Greek literary space are outside the scope of this thesis, I do reflect on certain relevant issues regarding Pentzikis and Karelli in the first chapter as well as Aravantinou in the second chapter. However, separate research is needed not only on writers influenced by Joyce, but more broadly on the concept of Joycean influence and how it can be examined in connection to Greek literature. Voyiatzaki's book is a fascinating start to such a discussion.

Pechlivanos and Politi state that Joyce's reception in Greece is marked by 'motifs of continuity but also of discontinuity, while the reading experience of one generation is not directly passed on to the next' and that its history 'is disrupted and at times violently checked by the ruptures of historical and political change in twentieth-century Greece' (2004, 456). In this thesis I aim to show that the motifs of continuity outweigh those of disruption, and that, by examining Joyce's reception through its more fluid dynamics, we realize that there is an underlying continuity. Focusing on *Ulysses* specifically, for which there is more material in Greek than for any other work by Joyce as is evident in the bibliography provided by Marangopoulos (2010), this continuity is marked by a constant return, a constant revisiting of the text which is expressed through retranslations or re-readings by critics or writers. Rather than outlining events of *Ulysses* reception, in this thesis I examine how these events unfolded, the readings that they promoted, and the ways in which Joyce and *Ulysses* are 'transformed' and interact with the developments in Greek literature. I discuss certain key moments regardless of whether they are fully formed projects or fragmentary translations, major or minor events. I consider the circumstances under which they unfolded, the environment in which they appeared, and the agents involved. In this thesis, therefore, I am more interested in the modes of reading that have developed rather than the number of readings; I am more interested in 'reading reading' (Corser 2022, 4-5) rather than charting readings.

Joyce wrote in a variety of genres and forms: poetry, Bildungsroman, novel, play, challenging every time not only the rules and boundaries of each genre, but also the concept of genre itself. This

can be observed most notably in his last work, *Finnegans Wake* (1939), which defies genres, linguistic rules, poetry and prose distinction, even reading practices. In this thesis I focus on *Ulysses* because as a text, it has incited the most reactions in Greek literary criticism compared to other works by Joyce. As is also apparent in the bibliographies provided by Pechlivanos and Politi (2004), and Marangopoulos (2010), while *Dubliners* has been translated more often throughout Joyce's Greek reception, allowing also for translations of individual stories, it has not produced extensive critical discussion.[11] There has been limited critical engagement with *A Portrait* as well, which has only been translated twice until now.[12] As far as *Finnegans Wake* is concerned, which has only been translated once in its full length, it is in the last few years that more and more relevant articles appear.[13] The textual form of *Ulysses*, on the other hand, has led to discussions about modernist writing practices and novel writing, while its appropriation of the *Odyssey* myth has sparked interest as Odysseus has been a key figure not only for Greek modernism, but also for Greek literature more broadly. Its stylistic hybridity and multilingualism have incited theoretical discussion about translation, in a way that other texts with a remarkable translation history have not, such as Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu* (1913-1927). The form of *Ulysses*, lengthy and encyclopedic, has allowed for different ways of translation, either through fragments and excerpts or in its full length, as well as different ways of reading while it has also challenged common perceptions about translation and reading. For example, Marangopoulos's exegetical guide which provides a chapter-by-chapter 'initiation' and translated excerpts could be considered as proposing an alternative form of translating and reading *Ulysses* in

[11] See translations by Vourdouba, Bernitsas, Antoniou (1971), Aravantinou (1971), Politis (1971), and more recently Doukas (2008), Karayannopoulos (2017), Kappa (2021). *Dubliners* also allows for translations of individual stories. See specifically Kastanakis (1929), Terzakis (1935), Kastanaki (1940), Mavroeidi-Papadaki (1945), Karalopoulos (1946), Papaioannou (1953), Koumantareas (1961), as well as Syrmou-Vekri (2010; 2016; 2018). The last story, 'The Dead', is also found in many translations. See Berlis (1984), Siatras (1988), Gika (2022), and most recently the one by Kyriakidis (2025).

[12] See Sarasiotou (1965) and Berlis (2001).

[13] For the full translation see Anevlavis (2013). Fragments of the text have been translated by Aravantinou (1974; 1975-76), Kapsaskis (1993, reprinted in Arseniou 2006) and Arseniou (2006). For these fragments see Arseniou (2006). As for articles, see for example Arseniou (2022), Chouliaras (2024).

Greek. Compared to the Greek reception of other works by Joyce, *Ulysses* has provided a lot of fruitful material corresponding to several different aspects and issues of Greek literature that have remained underexplored such as alternative and peripheral formations of Greek modernism, archival readings, approaches in translation.

Reading, translating, returning: 'unfinishing' *Ulysses*?

In this thesis I view the events that make up the Greek trajectory of *Ulysses* as recurrent readings of the text while also contributing to it. As a way of approaching these events and their recurring mode, as well as the practices involved, I draw from Barthes's ideas about the ontology of the text as these are presented in his essay 'From Work to Text' (1977). For Barthes, literature lies mainly in the dynamic practice of writing instead of the solidity of a body of achieved forms. The literary text is defined as a network; it is a dynamic process which is held in language and is distinguished from the 'work', which in turn is a self-contained and closed cultural object and remains unchanged. Barthes establishes the text as a space, a field to which there can be different contributions and additions, which can undergo infinite transformations and cannot be attributed to a sole creator. Before 'From Work to Text', Barthes had already distinguished between 'readerly' and 'writerly' literary works (*S/Z*, 1990), between works which, because of their structural elements, lead the reader to adhere closely to the text without leaving much space for interpretation, and works which demand that the reader try hard in order to understand the text and eventually contribute to its writing; a distinction, therefore, between classical, realist texts and modernist, experimental texts as well as the kinds of readers each category generates.

Since Barthes, the distinction between 'work' and 'text' has been complicated and nuanced further by contemporary Anglophone textual scholarship viewing these terms through opposite definitions. Karen Emmerich (2017), developing her argument about the 'making of originals' through textual scholarship such as Shillingsburg (1996), proposes an opening of the 'work' to include

translingual versions complicating also the issue of authorial intent which she expands to include translatorial intent as well. Emmerich argues that 'each new published text in translation is both a translation *and* an edition. Editing and translating are mutually implicated interpretive practices that further the iterative growth of a work in the world' (8). She analyzes translation as a form of translingual editing, and argues not only for the instability of the source, but also for the fact that translations, constituting editorial practices, 'make' the originals. Emmerich's approach of translation being another edition of the text echoes back to arguments in Joyce studies regarding translation, specifically to arguments by Fritz Senn, whose work has defined translation studies in Joyce scholarship, and Patrick O'Neill who has taken further the reading of Joyce translations as a corpus. Senn (1969; 1984) sees translations as a 'running commentary' on the original whereas O'Neill explores how 'the entire corpus of Joyce translations can be regarded as a single and coherent object of study' which, along with the originals, can be seen as 'a single polyglot macrotext' (3). Taking up recent insights regarding readers' reactions to a literary text being continuations of it and adding to the text (Attridge 1990), O'Neill adds literary translations to these reactions and proposes a 'macrotextual' model of reading which requires a 'transtextual' process, that is, reading across languages while keeping in view the translations and the original, focusing on 'the specific relationship between a literary text and any one or more or all of its translations' (10).[14] Emmerich's work has been seminal for my thinking, not only because it explores the instability of the source and translation as a translingual edition of a text, but also because it emphasizes the processes, and the practices behind them. In the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece, I argue, the practices through which each translational or critical event was achieved are crucial for our understanding of how *Ulysses* has been read, rather than the events themselves. This thesis examines whether, rather than the finished translation of a work, it is the

[14] O'Neill defines the 'macrotextual' model as follows: 'all the possible translations combine with their original to *constitute* a new but ultimately inaccessible 'original'—authority recentred in the polyglot *text*' (2005, 10).

identification of the modernist text as a constantly reworked field that becomes crucial in peripheral modernisms, and, in this case, in modernism in Greece. In the Greek reception of *Ulysses*, the textual space is constantly retranslated, added to, commented upon; it is a textual field with which authors identify, which they constantly revisit and unravel, eventually making it look more and more 'unfinished'. Moreover, as it will be shown in the thesis, each Greek translation of *Ulysses*, whether it is an excerpt or a full-length translation, draws from a different version of the text without questioning the source. Through this lens, I propose to examine what happens to *Ulysses* in Greece, its transformations and textual manifestations, and, therefore, contribute to the discussion about modernism and translation in the periphery by shifting the focus to translations of modernist texts in the periphery.[15]

Along the lines of Barthes's perception of literature as being found in the dynamic practice of writing instead of the finished work, it could be argued that world literature lies in the processes and practices that contribute to the circulation and translation of texts instead of being a set corpus of texts that are read beyond the borders of their origins. Moreover, thinking about the instability of the source and translation as an editing practice has helped me approach a topic that occasionally appeared slippery—translation in different forms or critical responses to Joyce's *Ulysses*, a text with a complex composition, publication, and editorial history. *Ulysses* exists in several different versions, which appeared before and after its first full-length publication in 1922, all of which challenge authorial and editorial intent. After several different legitimate and pirated editions of *Ulysses*, which perpetuated

[15] Translation has been extensively discussed in relation to modernism as a method of reading, as a language, and a creative practice (see Yao 2002, Orsini 2015, Rzepa 2016, Harding and Nash 2019, and more recently Wittman 2023). While such discussions often revolve around canonical writers associated to Western modernism, there are also examinations of how translation contributes to peripheral or minor modernisms (Lyall 2019). The two perspectives should not be seen as separate from one another but rather as interconnecting and feeding into each other as they create networks of circulation. Concerning the Greek context specifically, see also the critical re-examination of Seferis's translation of *The Waste Land* which was initiated by Vayenas (1989) and carried out by Kokolis (2001). For a more recent analytical examination see Loulakaki-Moore (2010). Following the debate on Seferis's translation practice, see also Aris Berlis's suggestion that more work on the existing translations of modernist texts into Greek will reveal why modernism in Greece is perceived as something obscure and difficult (Berlis 2002).

errors of the first edition or introduced new errors, in 1984, textual scholar Hans Walter Gabler published a 'critical and synoptic' edition of *Ulysses* aiming to present a 'continuous manuscript', a text that would render visible its different stages of composition. Gabler and his team used pre-publication material as well as the 1922 text, combining both American and Anglo-Saxon editorial methods, a practice which caused controversy in the Joyce world and beyond as to the validity and authority of the text he produced. The edition was criticized by many, most notably by John Kidd who accused the editors of establishing existing errors and introducing new ones. Even though errors were corrected, the controversy, also known as the 'Joyce Wars', had an impact on the broad readership, mainly because of the way it was portrayed in the media as a dispute over the 'true', 'authentic' version of the text, the one closest to what Joyce wrote. The Gabler edition is now widely accepted in Joyce studies as an authoritative text, not because it is considered as representing authorial intent, but because it is viewed as best representing the process and the different stages through which *Ulysses* was composed.[16]

Throughout the Greek trajectory, different versions of the text are used depending on what was readily available to each translator or critic. In the early fragmentary translations discussed in the first chapter, the 1929 French translation and the 1932 Odyssey Press edition have been used as sources. In her monograph *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, Aravantinou mentions that she uses the 1961 Random House edition of *Ulysses* (1977, XXIV), without specifying whether she consults the same edition for her translations of excerpts which were published in several other platforms. The copyright for Kapsaskis's translation (1990) is from the 1942 Modern Library edition and Anevlavis (2014) claims to be using the Gabler edition. As for the first full-length translation, by Nikolouzos and Thomopoulos (1969-1976), it is not clear which edition they have used. The fact that *Ulysses* exists in

[16] For more information on the complex and fascinating composition and publication history of *Ulysses*, see Johnson (2008, xxxviii-lvi) and Groden (1977). For more on the methods applied in the Gabler edition see Gabler (1981), Mahaffey (1991), and Groden (1991).

multiple versions is rarely discussed in the Greek responses examined here. Reviewing Kapsaskis's translation, Ch. G. Lazos (1991) raises the issue of a definitive version, while Marangopoulos outlines the history of the Joyce Wars and explains his choice of relying on the 1968 Penguin edition as the authoritative text (2010, 25-29). In this thesis, I examine examples from the Greek translations of *Ulysses* by considering, wherever possible, the version that has been used as a source text. While keeping in view the different textual manifestations of *Ulysses*, I provide references from the Gabler edition for practical reasons, as the enumeration of lines and pages makes it easier to locate passages. As this thesis shows, even though there is almost no critical discussion over the textual instability of *Ulysses* and its different textual manifestations, it is translational intent that brings this issue to the fore in the novel's Greek trajectory. As each translator uses a different version of *Ulysses* as a source text, and creates yet another 'original' (Emmerich 2017), it becomes clear how translations of different versions of a text un-finish the text and rewrite it. It is in that sense that I propose the concept of the 'unfinishing' to talk about the practices involved in the active return and contribution to the text.

Ulysses, circulation, and translation

Translations were used from very early on in the history of *Ulysses* as a strategy for promotion and circulation. As the book was banned in the English-speaking world for about a decade after its publication, and its readership was very limited, translations were encouraged as a solution for wider circulation of the novel.[17] The first full-length translation of *Ulysses* into French in 1929, by Auguste Morel, with the help of Stuart Gilbert, revised by Valéry Larbaud with the author's collaboration was crucial in disseminating Joyce's work to a larger readership.

[17] For an account of the publication history of *Ulysses*, the bans and trials, see Brooker (2014), Vanderham (1997), and Birmingham (2014). For the publication history of all of Joyce's works, including *Ulysses*, see Herbert (2009).

The ban on *Ulysses* in the USA was lifted on 6 December 1933 upon the decision of the Hon. John M. Woolsey of the US District Court, more than ten years after the novel's first publication in book form. As a result, *Ulysses* is a novel which, for a significant amount of time after its publication, could mostly be accessed in translation. For anyone in Greece who was interested in getting a copy during the first years after its publication, the 1929 French translation would have been a solution; however, it would also have been rather expensive. The writer Stratis Doukas, who wanted to publish a translated excerpt from *Ulysses* in his journal *To 3ο μάτι*, wrote to Nikos G. Pentzikis on 8 September 1935 about Joyce's novel:

> Είναι ένα μεγάλο βιβλίο με παράξενη φόρμα, όπως τόβλεπα τυπωμένο, κι ακριβό· 1000 δρχ. έχει η γαλλική έκδοση· την αγγλική είναι ζήτημα αν θα την έβρισκα. (1977, 32-3)
>
> It is a big book in a strange form, from what I could see of it, expensive too; the French edition costs 1000 drachmas; and who knows if I'd be able to find the English edition.

The French connection and mediation prevail during the first period of the novel's Greek trajectory when Greek translations of excerpts from *Ulysses*, as well as brief references and short critical notes appear in small journals and occasionally the daily press. During that time, that is, the 1930s-1950s, most Greek writers and critics who respond to *Ulysses* draw from French sources or French translations—almost inevitable as a significant part of the initial critical reception of *Ulysses* developed in the French literary space, but also due to the longstanding interaction of Greek writers with the French culture and language. Pechlivanos and Politi state that 'Joyce was read in the original, or, very often in French translation, a habit in keeping with the hegemony of the French language and culture in Greece since the nineteenth century and up to the historical moment when English took over' (2004, 457). As shown in the first chapter, the initial readings and translations of *Ulysses* draw from the French translation. French connections are also observed in the Greek reception of other works by

Joyce, such as in translations of stories from *Dubliners*.[18] Consequently, when examining the first fragmentary translations of *Ulysses*, or the first articles and references to Joyce's novel in the Greek literary space, it is essential to consider what resources were practically accessible to Greek writers and critics at the time. The French mediation is prevalent not only because Greek writers were traditionally more familiar with the language, but also because it was through the French literary space that Joyce established himself as a writer and it was through that language that his work was practically accessible. *Ulysses* was published in Paris and promoted through strategies in which Joyce was often involved, directly or not. One such event was Valéry Larbaud's lecture to advertise *Ulysses* before it was published and for which a few excerpts of the original were translated. During the preparations for this lecture, Joyce gave Larbaud the Gilbert schema, and told him that French writer Édouard Dujardin was his primary influence for developing interior monologue in *Ulysses* (*JJII*, 500; 519-23; Slote 2004a, 364). Another promotional strategy was Joyce's involvement in the 1929 French translation, the exact nature of which has been questioned.[19] What is certain, is that the strategic note 'avec la collaboration de l' auteur', which was included in the edition, was Joyce's way of ensuring that readers would trust that translation as validated by the author himself, and therefore the closest they could have to the inaccessible original (O'Neill 2004, 415).

Such events find their way through in the Greek trajectory of *Ulysses* and impact not only the reception of the novel in Greece, but also more generally Greek critical discourse. This happens with Joyce's acknowledgment of Dujardin as will be shown in the first chapter, but also with the authority of the French translation which, as will be shown in the third chapter, impacts its reading even several

[18] For example, 'Στάχτη' ['Stachti', 'Cinder'], the first Greek translation of 'Clay' which was published in *Νεοελληνικά Γράμματα* [*Neoellinika Grammata*] (1940, issue 182, 1) by Elpida Thr. Kastanaki, wife of Thrasos Kastanakis who had produced the first Greek translation of 'Eveline' (*Αγών των Παρισίων*, 1929) draws from the first French translation of the story titled 'Cendres' (1926) by Yva Fernandez. Fernandez was a friend of Lucia Joyce and had met James Joyce through Shakespeare and Co. (see Hayman and Nadel 1987).

[19] For an account of the translation process see *JJII* (600-02). For Joyce's involvement in the 1929 French translation see Rodriguez (2013) as well as Wawrzycka and Mihálycsa (2020, 9-11).

years later. Finally, T. S. Eliot's review of *Ulysses* ('*Ulysses*, Order and Myth', *The Dial*, November 1923; 1975, 175-78), which introduced the term 'mythical method', was also encouraged by Joyce and ended up playing a crucial role in Greek literature as well. Poet and Nobel laureate George Seferis appropriated the 'mythical method' as a key term not only in his reading and writing, but more broadly in his cultural program which influenced Greek modernism and Greek criticism.[20] *Ulysses* therefore, along with its translational history and Joyce's interventions, permeate the Greek literary space in various forms.

Joyce translation studies

Even though translations of *Ulysses* started appearing quite early after its publication and under the auspices of the author himself, the book is, to this day, considered among the most challenging books to translate. Its stylistic hybridity, allusions, and cultural and historical references, as well as the way in which Joyce uses language to create ambiguity make *Ulysses* a novel that challenges conceptions of translatability. From the 1960s onwards, when the *James Joyce Quarterly* published its first issue on translation, edited by Fritz Senn (Spring 1967, vol. 4 no. 3), an entire area in Joyce scholarship is devoted to exploring translations of Joyce's works or the broader connections of the Irish author with the practice of translation. Senn has been one of the first scholars to highlight the importance of translation in relation to Joyce's work, arguing that even bad translations can bring to the fore aspects of the original (1967, 163-64: 164). Some of his articles were revised and reprinted in his book *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation* (1984), in which Senn draws from his perspective of a non-native English speaker and proposes translation as an approach of reading Joyce, as if reading Joyce

[20] Apart from his mythical poetics which started developing fully in *Μυθιστόρημα* [*Mythistorima*] (1935), see also Seferis's lecture on Cavafy and Eliot which promoted a reading of Cavafy according to the 'mythical method' and shaped the critical reception of Cavafy as a historical poet. For more on Seferis's strategies of cultural politics, see Lambropoulos (1988).

is a struggle with a foreign language. Since then, translation studies in Joyce scholarship emerged with special issues in several journals, the 2007 edition of *Joyce Studies in Italy* (*Joyce and/in Translation*, ed. Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Ira Torresi), parts in *JJQ* issues 27 (Spring 1990, no. 3) and 41 (Fall 2003 – Winter 2004, no. 1/2), the 2010 issue of *Scientia Traductionis* (8), as well as a unit in the Summer 2010 issue of *JJQ* titled 'Translatorial Joyce' and edited by Jolanta Wawrzycka. Book-length studies have explored the issue of Joyce and translation through translation studies theory, such as Patrick O'Neill's *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation* (2005) which draws from system theory and, as mentioned earlier, proposes a 'transtextual' reading keeping in view all translations of a text and the original. Apart from introducing a methodological approach, O'Neill also provides a historical overview of translations of Joyce's work, while in his later work he focuses on translations of *Finnegans Wake*, their histories as well as comparative studies of individual choices (*Impossible Joyce: Finnegans Wakes*, 2013; *Finnegans Wakes: Tales of Translation*, 2022), but also comparisons of translations of *Anna Livia Plurabelle* through the lens of Joyce's involvement (*Trilingual Joyce: The Anna Livia Variations*, 2018). In 2020, a volume of essays titled *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century* (ed. by Jolanta Wawrzycka and Erika Mihálycsa) narrowed the focus on retranslations of Joyce's works, comparative approaches of different translations in a language, and the issue of translating Joyce while having a long critical and translational tradition behind.

Joyce reception studies

A considerable amount of the Joyce scholarship that has appeared charts Joyce's reception in other countries responding to questions of Joyce's influence in other literary traditions and languages. The two-volume *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe* (ed. by Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo, 2004) has been a valuable resource that covers Joyce's presence in European literatures without, however, aiming to provide any overarching argument regarding textual circulation and translation. Other works, such

as *Transcultural Joyce* (ed. by Karen Lawrence, 1998) examine transnational connections but without placing them in a broader context of world literature dynamics. Most recently, José Vergara's *All Future Plunges to the Past: James Joyce in Russian Literature* (2022) explores Joyce's influence on certain Russian writers and the impact that reading Joyce had on the formation of Russian literature through intertextuality theory. Arguing for a world literature approach of Joyce, Eric Bulson claimed that '[a] truly global view of Joyce's reception will produce the estrangement […] [of not knowing] and enable us to see him in entirely new ways' (2009, 137-47: 145). However, while scholarship focusing on receptions of Joyce's work grows, the response to Bulson's call for bridging the gap between Joyce studies and world literature studies has remained limited (2009, 137). Instead of viewing Joyce as a single phenomenon, world literature theory provides a framework through which to consider Joyce as part of the hierarchies and dynamics that prevail in the world literary space and allows us to focus on the practices and processes involved in the trajectories of his works. As a result, viewing Joyce in the context of world literature provides insights on the circulation and dissemination of his work, and allows us to draw conclusions on how responses in other spaces are structured based on their own specificities.

Peripheral Joyce

Finally, this thesis looks at reading and translation practices in relation to a modernist text in a peripheral literary space and a space that is conscious of its peripherality. 'Center' and 'periphery' are terms widely used in world literature scholarship but also constantly contested and questioned. Pascale Casanova (2004) views literature as governed by strict hierarchies and power dynamics which determine textual mobility from the center to the periphery. Drawing from Herderian models and focusing on nineteenth- and twentieth-century book markets, Casanova considers France and specifically Paris as the center of the 'world republic of letters', a space from which, texts or writers

that have gained recognition, move towards the periphery. Casanova argues that there are significant transnational relations to be considered, defying thus national perspectives. According to her model, texts from 'literarily disinherited countries', the periphery of the world literary space, which are consecrated by autonomous critics are transmuted and denationalized, in other words, become universal.[21] Although criticized for its Eurocentrism, Casanova's work speaks to the topic of this thesis, as the narrative of Joyce's participation and establishment in the French literary space aligns with her arguments.[22] The process of 'consecration' by the center is observed in Joyce's trajectory as, despite the number of spaces he inhabited beforehand, it is when he lived there and associated with the literary and publishing circles of Paris that he became known as a writer. However, going back to Phocas's notice in *Εσπερία*, it seems that consecration in Paris, that is, *in* the center, might not have been possible, or at least not in the same way, had not this series of minor appreciations or 'false starts' first occurred. Before moving to Paris, Joyce was trying to make himself known while in Zurich through promotional strategies such as reaching out to potential readers and reviewers, and enlisting the help of people who, even if not closely affiliated with any literary scene, had connections to the press. One such example is the notice published in *Εσπερία*. The road to consecration, therefore, started first with other connections, occasionally non-literary, leading eventually to minor recognition. As far as consecration in the center is concerned, autonomous critics, such as Ezra Pound and Valéry Larbaud, indeed played a significant role in Joyce's popularity—the latter, as we saw, by organizing a promotional event for *Ulysses*; however, it was not just isolated figures who made it possible. In Paris, Joyce was part of an entire network which had formed around him. Apart from Larbaud, Sylvia Beach,

[21] 'Consecration, in the form of recognition by autonomous critics, signifies the crossing of a literary border. […] For texts that come from literarily disinherited countries, the magical transmutation that consecration brings about amounts to a change in their very nature: a passage from literary inexistence to existence, from invisibility to the condition of literature—a transformation that I have called *littérisation*.' (Casanova 2004, 126-27)

[22] Regarding the debate around Casanova's Eurocentrism but also her arguments more broadly, see Prendergast (2001) and (2004). For further critiques on the orientation of Casanova's model see Ganguly (2008), Orsini (2015), and very recently Chua (2025). Damrosch (2022) and David (2023) reconsider the debates and critiques against Casanova through a more positive light and suggest that her arguments should be nuanced by considering her viewpoint.

owner of the bookshop and lending library Shakespeare and Co., Adrienne Monnier, also a bookshop owner, as well as writers such as Robert McAlmon and Ernest Hemingway promoted Joyce's work in various ways. Therefore, as Orsini (2015) also points out, Casanova's model should be nuanced further to accommodate consideration of the practices through which 'consecration' is achieved. As shown here, autonomous critics did not appear until later in Joyce's trajectory, after multiple 'minor appreciations' had taken place and had brought attention to the writer and his work.

Casanova emphasizes universality and suggests a conceptualization of the periphery as a homogeneous space. Although she explains how texts are disseminated from the center to the periphery, she does not explore further the actual trajectories, or the processes involved. Franco Moretti (2000) focuses on issues of circulation and transformation by proposing the method of 'distant reading' as opposed to the close reading methodology which he considers incompatible with the desire for engaging critically with a broad geographical and linguistic range of texts beyond the canon, as world literature studies require. He uses the modern novel as an exemplary form that was 'diffused' across cultures, 'as a wave that runs into branches of local traditions and is always significantly transformed by them' (67). Moretti's evolutionary point of view clarifies how world literature functions as a system in comparison to national literatures. Drawing from Moretti and arguing that texts travel through space and time, David Porter (2011, 244-58) highlights the importance of determining *trajectories* instead of literary nationalities and stable origins. He criticizes Casanova and Moretti for relying on three assumptions: the coherence and viability of national literatures, the 'close reading' methodology with a preference for the text's original language, and the Eurocentrism underlying their work. David Damrosch (2020) disagrees with the two scholars as well, including his own previous writings in his disagreement, specifically his book *What is World Literature?* (2003). Damrosch detects 'theoretical monism' in Casanova and Moretti, as well as in his own earlier claim that world literature is 'a mode of circulation and of reading' (2003, 5) and underlines the need to bring to the surface and

deploy the singularity of works and cultures (267). A more nuanced critique is articulated by Francesca Orsini (2015, 345-74), who accuses world literature scholarship of 'viewing any local that is not a "center" as derivative, peripheral, unimportant' (351) and suggests a more fruitful approach of the local, through multilingualism:

> Rather than ambitious or expansive models that seek to cover—and contain—the whole space of the world, approaches that explore the pluralities of space and time, hold together local and wider perspectives, work multilingually, and take in hierarchies of language and literary value but are not blinded by them seem to me both productive for and *appropriate* to the work of world literature. (351)

Orsini proposes the concept of the 'multilingual local' to underline the multilingual interactions within local communities (352) and suggests a focus on the local practices of these communities, which often include translation, as crucial for a more realistic articulation of world literature.

Orsini looks at inherently multilingual communities in India; I do not mean to suggest that Greece should be viewed in exactly the same way. What I am drawing from Orsini is the need to take into account the geopolitical, historical, cultural, and linguistic specificity of each region and reconsider spatial examinations by focusing on communities rather than vaguely delineated geographical areas. I also propose looking at the Greek literary space through its geopolitical characteristics—its proximity to Europe but also its position at the borders of Europe, its linguistic characteristics—a minor language, but also its historical specificity—its claim to an ancient past which is considered the basis of western civilization. I use the term periphery in the sense of locality but also in the sense of a space that constantly and consciously looks up to a center.

Gregory Jusdanis sees peripheral modernity as belated and incomplete 'because it cannot culminate in a faithful duplication of Western prototypes' (1991, xiii) and although his focus is on Greece, his conclusions refer to 'nonwestern societies'. While it is essential to examine each locality according to its specificity, I agree with Jusdanis's suggestions about modernization in Greece being

impacted not only by the European but also the classical (67), and, I would even suggest, by their intersection. Greece is a peculiar kind of periphery as it is often seen as both central and peripheral. Due to its claim to a classical past, it is often seen as partaking in the center that is the West, and is even overlooked as living in the shadow of that past as well as of the imposing traditions of the West. At the same time, Greek is also considered a minor language and a minor literature due to its current geopolitical status. The recent interest of world literature studies in peripheries often overlooks the Greek literary space under the assumption of it being a 'European literature'.[23] The Greek literary space is a periphery defined by a constant oscillation between the shadow of the ancient past and the proximity to major literatures, between the center and the periphery.

In her study on the syncretist aesthetics of Argentinian writers Borges and Piglia, and Greek writers Kalokyris and Kyriakidis, Eleni Kefala uses the distinction center-periphery to question its legitimacy (2007, 24). Showing how fluid such terminology can be, that 'periphery can be everywhere and center can be nowhere', Kefala suggests that

> […] since and because of their encounter with modernity, the cultural and ideological practices of 'peripheral' countries in general and of Argentina and Greece in particular are closely associated with those of the *nation*. In such 'peripheral' localities, the notions of *culture* and *nation* are inseparable whilst literature frequently undertakes the task to define, defend or even challenge national identities such as Greekness and Argentineness. (19-20)

Kefala suggests that Greece and Argentina are peripheries that have developed similarly in terms of their reactions to modernity and their modernization processes. By looking at the aesthetics of the intellectual elite known as the 'Generation of the Thirties', she argues that modernizing cultural

[23] See, for example, Averis, Littler, and Weiss-Sussex (2023), Deckard et al. (2016), Doyle and Winkiel (2005). See also *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (2012), ed. by Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough and specifically, the essay by Sanja Bahun, 'The Balkans Uncovered: Toward *Historie Croisée* of Modernism' (25-47), which situates Greece and Greek literature within the Balkans and argues that the Balkans have been seen as 'both part of Europe and not part of Europe; a bridge between the East and the West and the impossibility of such a bridge' (28). Bajun, however, notes that 'In comparison to other Balkan modernisms, Greek modernist literature was fortunate: widely available in translation in all major languages, it is also the subject of many excellent studies in English' (34).

practices in Greece were associated with the nation. Poets like Seferis and Odysseas Elytis sought to establish the concept of Greekness by emphasizing continuities between the past and the present. They sought to redefine the canon and establish a continuity not only with early modern tradition, but also between antiquity and modern reality, an ancient past, that is, which was widely recognized by Europe. By focusing on the intellectual elite, however, Kefala entirely ignores prose fiction as well as other configurations of Greek modernism such as the writers of the so-called 'School of Thessaloniki' who, apart from developing an interest in prose, also had different conceptualizations of Greekness that were not based on nationalist concerns. Although recognized as a literary center, Thessaloniki is also considered a regional literary space, situated in the Greek periphery with Athens as a center.

In what follows, I am more interested in communities, interactions, processes, and practices rather than a set body of responses, and one-sided influences. The notice which was published in *Εσπερία* in June 1917, and mentioned Joyce alongside war events and the repercussions of the National Schism in Greece, very likely did not have a significant effect on the Irish writer's fame among the Greek public. It shows, however, what the author's interactions were in Zurich. Looking at minor, forgotten events, in tandem with finished projects and full translations invites us to reflect on how to address such events. It allows us to properly approach the continuity, but also to reflect on the serendipity that prevails in the process of circulation and translation, and brings to light writers, works, and approaches that have evaded the canon. Apart from tracing *Ulysses* in Greece and trying to make sense of the relevant responses, this thesis also reflects on aspects of Greek literature that have remained underexplored. The first chapter questions what we mean by the term 'Greek modernism', the second chapter encourages a reconsideration of critical practices and what is considered a 'correct' or 'valid' reading, while the third chapter proposes a rethinking of the discourse about translations—even those which are considered 'bad'. This thesis encourages thinking about Greek literature *outside* of the canon, as well as the interactions *with* the canon. Trajectories of texts are more messy and

perhaps even more unpredictable than we tend to assume in our critical practice, and while this is commonly known, it is rarely discussed critically. Focusing on the practices instead of just the results can be a start to a better understanding of this serendipity, a better understanding of world literature.

Chapter 1: *Ulysses* in fragments: the early translations of *Ulysses* in the Greek periodical press

Introduction

In 1945, in the aftermath of WWII and Greece's German Occupation, three friends in Thessaloniki decided to publish a journal that would include subjects related to 'Literature. Poetry. Fine Arts. Philosophy. Life.'. They chose the title *Κοχλίας* [*Kochlias*] (the snail), for its spiral shape as a symbol of progress. In fall 1945, Yorgos (or Yorgis) Kitsopoulos, along with Lefteris Koniordos and Yannis Svoronos started planning an ambitious publication with which they sought to fill a gap in their contemporary literary sphere, to propose an alternative response to modernity than the one developed by the Athenian literary circle, and would provide material and approaches that they considered to be missing from the Greek literary space. Reaching out to other writers and artists from the circle of the Thessaloniki-based writer Nikos Gavriil Pentzikis, who already had some experience in journals, Kitsopoulos, Koniordos, and Svoronos aimed to introduce texts and writers from abroad, but also aspired to incite critical discussion and exchange of ideas. Despite and perhaps because of its take on modernism and the avant-garde, *Κοχλίας* (1945-1948) was almost entirely ignored and dismissed during its circulation while the fact that it originated from the periphery also contributed to its low popularity (Kouroudis 1997, 32-4). Years later, in the 1980s, a reconsideration of Greek modernism and its manifestations led to critical recognition of marginal journals like *Κοχλίας* some of which were reprinted in bound volumes. The group of *Κοχλίας* published original work and translations while they promoted their working practices as based on collaboration, self-criticism, and communality. *Κοχλίας* is now known for the amount and variety of translations it published, eighty translations from a wide range of writers and texts, from philosophy (Berdyaev, Kierkegaard, Plotinus), and byzantine literature (Michael Psellos), to Charles Baudelaire, Henry Miller, Franz Kafka, and most notably two passages

from James Joyce's *Ulysses*. The variety of texts that appeared in *Κοχλίας* make one wonder about the sources of the journal's team and how they gained access to them.

Nikos G. Pentzikis, a writer and artist, who was also involved in a previous publication, *Το 3ο μάτι* [*To Trito mati*, 'the third eye'] (1935-1937), had a crucial role in suggesting texts for translation in *Κοχλίας* as the most well-read in the group. Apart from the years he had spent studying in France, Pentzikis also kept a significant number of books and journals which he shared with the rest of the *Κοχλίας* group and which they read, translated, and discussed for publication. These texts allegedly came from a chest full of books and literary journals that Stelios Xefloudas, a writer and friend, had brought from France, where he was studying, and had entrusted to Pentzikis upon his return. In his interview with Kostas Kouroudis in February 1991 (published in 1997), Kitsopoulos claimed that

> Ο Ξεφλούδας είχε ζήσει χρόνια στο Παρίσι. Με την επιστροφή του έφερε ένα μπαούλο με άγνωστα βιβλία της N.R.F., για τα οποία ο Μόλχο δεν είχε ιδέα. Έφερε στη Θεσσαλονίκη ακριβώς ό,τι νεότερο υπήρχε στη λογοτεχνία της εποχής εκείνης και τα 'δωσε να τα κρατάει ο Πεντζίκης. […] Οι Τζόυς, Μπέκετ, Έλιοτ, Κάφκα και ένα σωρό άλλοι βρίσκονταν μέσα στο μπαούλο. (1997 [1991], 45-46)[1]
>
> Xefloudas had spent years in Paris. When he returned, he brought a chest full of unknown books of N.R.F. [*Nouvelle Revue Française*] about which Molcho had no idea. He brought to Thessaloniki precisely the newest stuff from the literature of the time and he gave them to Pentzikis to keep. […] Joyce, Beckett, Eliot, Kafka and many others were in the chest.[2]

In an article about *Κοχλίας* that Kitsopoulos published in 1994, three years after his interview to Kouroudis, he talks about 'quite a few chests full of books' ('κάμποσα μπαούλα γεμάτα βιβλία', 1994,

[1] In all references to the interviews in Kouroudis's study, *Το περιοδικό "Κοχλίας". Θεσσαλονίκη (1945-1948). Εισαγωγή, συνεντεύξεις, βιβλιογραφία* (Paiania: Bilieto, 1997) I include the date of publication of Kouroudis's study and the date of the interview referenced in brackets.

[2] Kitsopoulos refers to the owner of a central bookshop by the same name in Thessaloniki. 'Molcho' bookshop opened in 1888; it was one of the main distributors of foreign books and international press in the city for many years. Xefloudas returned to Thessaloniki in 1930; however, later in this passage Kitsopoulos says that they were reading *The Waste Land* in 1943. As he does not specify the date, it is unclear whether in the quote he refers to Mair Molcho, the owner before German Occupation, or his son, Solon/Salomon Molcho, who took over after Occupation. As the family who owned the bookshop was Jewish, their business was seized by the Germans during Occupation (1941-1944).

163-77: 164). Yorgos Stoyiannidis, another member of *Κοχλίας* and a poet, paints a more colorful picture of how the chest of books figured in the group's gatherings: 'Ο Πεντζίκης είχε πολλά βιβλία σ' ένα μπαούλο και όταν είχε όρεξη—μπορώ να πω πως πάντοτε είχε—άνοιγε σαν ένας πειρατής το μπαούλο, έβγαζε από μέσα τον θησαυρό και μας διάβαζε. Τα βιβλία τα είχε φέρει από το εξωτερικό.' (1997 [1991], 71).[3] Karolos Tsizek, one of the youngest members of *Κοχλίας*, an artist and translator, replied in his interview as follows:

> Το μπαούλο αυτό δεν το θυμάμαι, αλλά τώρα που μου το είπατε και το σκέφτομαι, νομίζω ότι έχετε δίκιο. Υπήρχε μια αρκετά μεγάλη ποσότητα γαλλικών βιβλίων στο παραθαλάσσιο σπίτι του Πεντζίκη. Τα είχε φέρει και τα είχε αφήσει εκεί ο Ξεφλούδας, επιστρέφοντας από την Γαλλία. Αποτελούσαν ουσιαστικά την προσωπική του βιβλιοθήκη. Υπήρχαν μεταξύ των τα πιο έγκριτα γαλλικά λογοτεχνικά περιοδικά. (1997 [1995], 91)
>
> I do not recall that chest, but now that you mention it and the more I think about it, I think you might be right. There was a rather big number of French books in Pentzikis's beach house. Xefloudas had brought them and left them there when he returned from France. They were essentially his personal library. Among them were the most prestigious French literary periodicals.

The story changes in every account. Occasionally the chest of books is transformed into multiple chests, and it eventually becomes a writer's library. But whatever the truth behind these contradicting accounts, this story underlines aspects of textual circulation that are often overlooked in literary history, world literature, and translation studies such as the serendipity which often seems to characterize the way in which texts and books cross borders. Literary and textual migration can be achieved through organized projects of translation and criticism, but, more often than not, they also happen through random discoveries, personal libraries and archives, and small communities. Books are circulated among friends and are read fragmentarily. Another aspect that the story of the chest of books highlights is that of individual initiatives and preferences which often direct small community

[3] 'Pentzikis had a lot of books in a chest and whenever he felt like it—and let me tell you that he always did—he opened the chest like a pirate, he took out the treasure and read to us. He had brought those books from abroad'

projects but are, however, influenced by canons. Xefloudas brought books and journals that appeared in Paris, the center of literary consecration at the time according to Pascale Casanova (2004), he gave these resources to Pentzikis, who distributed and suggested texts for translation and commentary, while the other members studied these texts, discussed them, and translated them. Just like the notice with which I started this thesis, the one that Pavlos Phocas wrote about Joyce in the London-based diasporic newspaper *Εσπερία*, so with this chest of books and journals: it is another example of a minor event reflecting circumstances of textual circulation. Even the intermingling of different versions of the story about the chest of books, as part of the group's fluctuating and fleeting collective memory, helps us understand the circumstances under which *Κοχλίας* was produced, how the texts were circulated among the members of the group, how they were being read, and how the translations were carried out. *Κοχλίας*, along with *Το 3ο μάτι*, which had appeared a decade earlier, were the first publications to include translated passages from Joyce's *Ulysses*. The two journals share common characteristics and approaches, while certain members, like Pentzikis and his sister, poet Zoi Karelli, were involved in both. Unlike the notice published in *Εσπερία*, the impact of *Κοχλίας* and *Το 3ο μάτι* has been traced more extensively and more is known about the practices involved in their creation and reception. Although it might seem like just an anecdote, the story of the chest of books leads to multiple acts of translation, including parts of Joyce's *Ulysses*. It is also an indication of how texts crossed borders materially and arrived at a peripheral literary space such as Greece through writers and intellectuals who traveled and spent time abroad. The story of the chest of books is only the starting point that allows us to understand how Joyce's *Ulysses* was first translated, published, and circulated in Greece.

This chapter will examine the early fragmentary translations of Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece, which were published in the avant-garde journals *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας* along with the introductions and short commentaries with which they appeared. Examining the circumstances under which these

translations were produced, the chapter will then turn to two figures who emerge from these translations, Karelli and Pentzikis, and two critical pieces they wrote in which they draw from and reflect on *Ulysses* in various ways. Exploring how these early fragmentary translations of *Ulysses* and short notes about Joyce reflect the first acts of reading Joyce's novel in Greece, this chapter argues that, during that period, *Ulysses* in Greece is read and presented in short form, in fragments and notes published in periodicals, as part of specific strategies which seek to create a literary canon and a translational tradition, and establish certain writers. During its early reception, *Ulysses* is not read in its entirety due to the challenges of gaining access to a copy of the book, that is, the text in its full form, but also the challenges of its language and style. At the same time, these challenges form a mode of reading *Ulysses* as it is read with a focus on its appearance, its critical reputation, and its formal features. In this first period of the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece, Joyce's novel is linked to debates over interior monologue, it becomes an example and a starting point through which to discuss and develop interiority in prose and therefore an alternative model of modernism in the Greek literary space, other than the one 'imposed' by the Athenian literary circle and represented by the Generation of the Thirties. *Ulysses* becomes a textual space for exercises of translation, through which different translation practices are adopted. What seems to be a haphazard dissemination of different parts of a text is actually a conscious and recurring process of reading which aims at establishing a literature and *Ulysses* is used as a key text for that strategy.

First appearances: *Ulysses* in the periodical and daily press

Following the short notice published in London-based *Εσπερία*, Joyce is mentioned in another Greek diasporic newspaper, this time based in Paris and titled *Αγών των Παρισίων* [*Agon ton Parision*], on 27 April 1929. In the wake of the 1929 French translation, and while Joyce himself was living in Paris,

Greek writer Thrasos Kastanakis presented what is known as the first ever translation of a Joyce text into Greek, that of the short story 'Eveline' from *Dubliners* ('Η Εβελίνα. Διήγημα—Παρουσιασμένο στη Νεοελληνική από το Θράσο Καστανάκη').[4] The short introductory note which accompanied it shows evidence of reading Joyce through his French reception, a mediation which, although expected in this case, permeates a large part of Joyce's Greek trajectory. The note cites Joyce's titles, *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, in Greek, but visibly drawn from the titles of the French translations: 'Άνθρωποι του Δουβλίνου' and 'Δαίδαλος'.[5] Comparing Joyce to Marcel Proust, the note presents him as a 'unique interesting figure of new English literature' and a 'researcher' of the 'introspection of the contemporary human'.[6] Kastanakis's translation of 'Eveline' is the first in a long line of Greek 'Evelines' that appeared since then in various platforms, individual translations in literary journals of varying fame or impact, as well as book-length translations of *Dubliners*. Pechlivanos and Politi (2004, 455-68: 456) draw parallels between the adventures of 'Eveline' in Greek and the Greek reception of Joyce to illustrate the fragmentation that has prevailed in the latter. Nevertheless, instead of fragmentation as indication of a flawed 'transportation' of a writer's work, this varied trajectory of a short story by Joyce illustrates the precise conditions under which a text often crosses borders, the multiple ways and paths it follows and the trajectories it forms. It also shows the way in which Joyce was first available to the Greek readers, through a short story which may have felt more familiar to them due to Greece's long migration history.[7] A couple of months after Kastanakis's 'Εβελίνα', another literary critic who was familiar with the French literary space, Kleon Paraschos, presented *Ulysses* in

[4] James Joyce (1929), 'Η Εβελίνα. Διήγημα—Παρουσιασμένο στη Νεοελληνική από το Θράσο Καστανάκη', trans. Thrasos Kastanakis, *Αγών των Παρισίων*, 27 April (159), 6.

[5] 'Άνθρωποι του Δουβλίνου' appears to be a translation of *Gens du Dublin* (1926), the title of the French translation by Hélène du Pasquier, Jacques-Paul Renaud, Yva Fernandez, and 'Δαίδαλος' from the French translation *Dedalus: Portrait de l'artiste jeune par lui-même* (1924), trans. Ludmila Savitzky.

[6] 'ξεχωριστή ενδιαφέρουσα φυσιογνωμία της νέας αγγλικής λογοτεχνίας', 'Μαζί με το γάλλο Μαρσέλ Προύστ, στέκει ένας από τους πιο ιδιόρρυθμους, τους μεγαλοφυείς ερευνητές της πολύμερης και θολής, και αντιγνωμούμενης εσωθεώρησης του σύγχρονου ανθρώπου' (Kastanakis 1929, 6)

[7] It should be noted, however, that in French as well as in Czech, the first Joyce translation to appear was 'Eveline' (by Hélène du Pasquier in French in 1921 and by Oskar Zika in Czech in 1922). See Lernout and Van Mierlo (2004).

the Athenian newspaper *Πρωία* [*Proia*, 'Morning'] by first trying to pinpoint Joyce's nationality: 'Δεν ξεύρω αν είνε γνωστό στους αναγνώστας μου το όνομα του Άγγλου—Ιρλανδού κυριολεκτικώτερα—συγγραφέως Τζέϊμς Τζόϊς.'[8] Citing Stuart Gilbert, Paraschos describes *Ulysses* as the most discussed and overexplained work 'in England' in the last hundred years.[9] The mediatory role of the French reception is more visible this time, not only because Paraschos, like the note to Kastanakis's 'Εβελίνα', refers to *Portrait* by using its French title, but also because he uses explicit references to French sources, such as the French translation of *Ulysses*, as well as Gilbert's review in *La Nouvelle Revue Française*. While this is explained by the familiarity that Greek intellectuals traditionally maintained with the French language and culture, it also indicates Joyce's strong presence in French criticism. As it was published and promoted in Paris, and was banned in the English-speaking world, *Ulysses* was often read as a book established in the French space, while Joyce was often compared to French writers such as Marcel Proust or, as shown later, Emile Zola and Stéphane Mallarmé. Even though there was awareness that *Ulysses* was written in English, in the early critical responses in Greece during the 1930s until the 1950s, its Irishness is rarely perceived or highlighted as a distinct characteristic. The paradox between Joyce's origins, the language in which *Ulysses* is written, and the space in which it was published is not questioned by early Greek criticism, as attention is drawn to the text's formal features. *Ulysses* is viewed as a novel coming from the literary center of Europe, by a widely acknowledged and established writer, proposing new writing practices and forms.

After citing a short translated excerpt from 'Sirens', Paraschos draws attention to the technique of the novel and specifically to its interior monologue, which he defines as 'the almost entirely accurate

[8] Kleon Paraschos (1929), 'Ο "Οδυσσεύς" του Τζέϊμς Τζόϊς', *Η Πρωΐα*, 23 June, 5. 'I do not know if my readers are aware of the name of the English—more literally Irish—writer James Joyce.'

[9] 'Κανένα έργο εδώ και εκατό χρόνια στην Αγγλία, γράφει ο κριτικός της «Νέας Γαλλικής Επιθεωρήσεως», του οποίου δανείζομαι τας κρίσεις, δεν προεκάλεσε τόσες ερμηνείες και συζητήσεις και δεν παρεξηγήθη σε τέτοιο βαθμό, όσο ο «Οδυσσεύς» του Τζόϊς.' (Paraschos 1929, 5)

photographic representation of thoughts, as these are formed in the characters' consciousness'.[10] What Paraschos, in a newspaper of general interest, terms the 'great originality of *Ulysses*' ('η μεγάλη πρωτοτυπία του "Οδυσσέως"') becomes the main point of reference for *Ulysses* during the first few decades of its Greek trajectory.[11] Between the 1930s and 1950s, *Ulysses* appears in marginal publications run by small literary circles. These publications originate from or are affiliated with the Greek periphery and specifically Thessaloniki. By discussing and translating passages of *Ulysses*, the agents involved respond to bigger debates and conversations that unfold at the time surrounding modernity, modernism, modern Greek literature, and their respective writing practices. Fragmentary and collaborative translations, along with short introductory and contextualizing notes, as well as articles that combine critical and personal writing aspire to introduce Joyce and *Ulysses* to the Greek readership by discussing the novel as an event. They explore it through its critical reception, its reputation, and its writer. At the same time however, instead of being singled out, *Ulysses* is read within a wider range of literary texts in these small publications which promote art, new ideas, and literary innovation through foreign as well as local literature, original work and translation. As we will see, Joyce's novel becomes part of the 'publishing program' of the avant-garde journals *Το 3ο μάτι* (1935-1937) and *Κοχλίας* (1945-1948), and of the literary circles and individuals that were attached to those publications. Both journals aimed at promoting foreign literature and new techniques, and therefore at proposing ways of renewing Greek literature. These seemingly erratic and fragmentary responses to *Ulysses*, reflect the way in which Joyce's novel is read—or not read—in the beginnings of its trajectory in the Greek literary space. *Ulysses* becomes a text through which writers develop their thinking about

[10] Όσον αφορά την καθαρή μυθιστορηματική τεχνική, η μεγάλη πρωτοτυπία του «Οδυσσέως» είνε ο «εσωτερικός μονόλογος». Ο εσωτερικός μονόλογος είνε η ακριβεστάτη σχεδόν φωτογραφική απόδοσις των σκέψεων, όπως διαμορφώνονται στην συνείδησι των ηρώων του έργου.' (Paraschos 1929, 5)

[11] There are more 'appearances' of Joyce in the Greek press during that period than those discussed here. See, for example, the literary periodical *Ο Νουμάς*, issue 614 (12/1/1919), 78 which includes a short reference to *A Portrait* and in which Joyce's name has been typed erroneously as 'Τζέϊμς Τζούαου', and issue 619 (16/2/1919), 158-59 which published a detailed description of Joyce's play *Exiles*. For a full list of such references see Marangopoulos (2010), Pechlivanos and Politi (2004).

reading, writing, translating, as well as their approach to modernity, proposing thus an alternative modernism to the one that had been shaped by more central literary figures in Greece in the 1930s.

This chapter, therefore, focuses on appearances of *Ulysses* in Greek periodicals during the 1930s-1950s that constitute or are related to acts of translation which aim to introduce modernist writing practices and participate in the creation of a literary tradition in Thessaloniki and the establishment of the writers involved. More specifically, the chapter looks at the practices behind these responses as key elements of the text's circulation and dissemination, and focuses on *how* these practices shape the first readings of *Ulysses* in Greece by promoting a fragmentary approach as a novel of innovation and modernity, an example of modernist writing leading to further contemplations about genre as well as developing a critical discourse. In what follows, I will examine three translations of passages of *Ulysses* and the short critical notes that accompanied them, which appeared in the journals *Το 3ο μάτι* (1935-1937) and *Κοχλίας* (1945-1948) while also considering two texts, by Karelli and Pentzikis, which were the first to provide critical insights on *Ulysses*. Alongside close reading, I will also examine these instances by considering recent developments in periodical studies. Critics such as Sean Latham and Robert Scholes (2006) have foregrounded the need to reconsider critical approaches of the periodical form through print culture instead of employing exclusively methodologies of literary studies, such as close reading. More recently, Gustav Frank and Madleen Podewski (2022) underscored the need to examine periodicals as texts themselves and not simply as "'containers", "vessels" or "quarries" of information' (36), avoiding thus to isolate a text from the rest of the periodical's content and materiality. On the other hand, Felix Brinker and Ruth Mayer (2022) oppose to only adhering to 'distant reading', or focusing only on the journals' formal features. Discussing specifically journals and modernity, they propose instead a consideration of what they call 'mediality' and 'periodicity' of the journals and promote an exploration of 'how periodicals contribute to a pervasive understanding and "feel" of modernity around 1900' (2022, 8).

Following these approaches, I examine the translated extracts of *Ulysses* in relation to the rest of the content in the periodical issues they appear. Specifically, I look at how *Ulysses* is presented and framed, the structure and content of the issues in which passages and references to Joyce's novel are included, and the texts and writers alongside which they are published. Periodicals are types of publication that favor the short form. Far from being a short-form text, *Ulysses* is presented in a fragmentary way adapting, therefore, to the periodical form and is accompanied by brief introductions, commentaries, and notes. Its fragmentariness, as well as its critical framing reflect how *Ulysses* is being read at the time, not only by the journals' readers (who were very few), but mostly by the agents themselves, the translators and editors who were also writers. In what follows, I also focus on the text itself, the passages that have been published, the way in which they have been translated, and the kind of criticism that is provided. Examining the fragmentary appearances of *Ulysses* in Greek in *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας* allows us to view their form and content of these two journals as complementing each other. More than that, it allows us an understanding of the methods employed through which *Ulysses* is read and circulated during the early period of the Greek trajectory of Joyce's novel. If, as Brinker and Mayer (2022) argue, periodical press in modernity is entangled with and contributes to processes of modernization, then peripheral periodical press is crucial not only in peripheral modernities and modernisms, but also in how processes of modernization from the center are perceived, questioned, perpetuated, and transformed in the periphery. A focus on content as far as *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας* are concerned, on original work but mostly on translation and criticism, allows us a view of what texts, writers, and tendencies from abroad were received and being responded to by small groups and minor writers; an examination of form helps us understand the way in which new material, whether original or in translation, was presented and circulated. Such an examination, therefore, reveals not only what the first readers (in this case the translators and writers) of *Ulysses* in Greece were interested in, but

also how *Ulysses* becomes part of strategies of canonization, establishment, and contribution to critical discourse.

To 3ο μάτι: an alternative response to modernism

An interesting case of coexistence of the Athens and Thessaloniki literary circles in the same platform is found in the artistic and literary journal *To 3ο μάτι* [*To Trito Mati*, 'The Third Eye'] (1935-1937). The 'group of friends' ('μια ομάδα φίλων', as per the cover) which published *To 3ο μάτι* was composed of writer Stratis Doukas, architect Dimitrios Pikionis, artist Nikos Chatzikyriakos-Gikas, painter Spyros Papaloukas, and theater director Sokratis Karantinos, all of them from different artistic backgrounds who became well known in their respective fields later. Although most of them were based in Athens, where the journal was published, Doukas had established connections with the literary and artistic scene of Thessaloniki. One such connection was Pentzikis, with whom Doukas discussed at length his aspirations for the publication, as Doukas's letters to Pentzikis reveal.[12] While Pentzikis contributed to the journal with translations and original work, his input in *To 3ο μάτι* extended also to editorial suggestions and decisions alongside Doukas, even though he was never mentioned officially on the cover as a member of the editorial team. Although it was published in Athens, *To 3ο μάτι* expressed a different approach of modernism than the one that the Generation of the Thirties had started developing at the same time. Through Doukas and the involvement of Pentzikis and his sister and poet Zoi Karelli, *To 3ο μάτι* developed a connection with the literary and artistic scenes of Thessaloniki, expressing also an interest in interiority as a writing and an artistic practice. However, Doukas's enlisting of Pentzikis and Karelli, was not warmly received by the rest of the editorial team who did

[12] Doukas's letters to Pentzikis have been published under the title *Μαρτυρίες και κρίσεις* [*Martyries kai kriseis*, 'Testimonies and accounts'] (1977).

not share their literary interests. Chatzikyriakos-Gikas was envisioning a journal that would be more artistic than literary; while he also claimed that *Το 3ο μάτι* was partly founded as a way of securing financial help to Doukas. In his letters to Pentzikis, Doukas describes how he had been left alone to manage the journal without any help; lack of resources and insufficient management are reflected in the erratic publication—instead of monthly installments as initially planned, they ended up publishing double and triple issues later than the month stated on the cover. These problems, as well as bad communication and conflicts led to the journal's termination only two years after its first issue and having published twelve issues in total. Doukas did not proceed with another journal even though he had envisioned it, but his aspirations are traced in the project of *Κοχλίας* of which the mastermind was Pentzikis.

Aspiring initially to bring to the fore the importance of fine arts and specifically plastic arts in cultural expression, and their crucial role in exploring interiority, the interdisciplinary editorial team of *Το 3ο μάτι* announced their aims prior to publication by circulating a manifesto-like proclamation which was reproduced in the first issue.[13] They sought to respond to the surge of art and painting observed around the world in the beginning of the twentieth century through movements related to modernism (expressionism, dada, surrealism among them) which brought to the surface human interiority.[14] They wished to include in their publishing program new expressions which could be found in 'tradition' ('παράδοση') as well as 'the avant-garde' ('πρωτοπορία'), with a focus on formal experimentation. The editorial team explained their chosen title *Το 3ο μάτι* (the third eye) as expressing the need for a 'stronger, new, more dramatic vision', a 'third eye' in order to escape 'the mainstream, the mundane

[13] For references to *Το 3ο μάτι* I use the collective reprint of its issues in facsimile form published by ELIA: *Το 3ο μάτι (1935-1937)* (Athens: ELIA, 1982). Page numbers, which did not exist in the original issues, have been added in this volume from which I draw for references. See here the first issue in *Το 3ο μάτι* (1982, 1-4). For more on *Το 3ο μάτι* see Sartori (2010).
[14] *Το 3ο μάτι* (1982, 3).

and the trite of everyday life'.[15] This seemingly spiritual title indicated the avant-garde tendencies of the editorial team and their desire to break new ground. At the same time, the title's typographical appearance, which combined letters and a number, was one of the ways in which the artistic-literary journal showed its interest in combining different elements and connecting different arts, literatures, and traditions. *Το 3ο μάτι*, therefore, was a publication which sought to bring innovative forms and works while also revisiting Greek folk tradition. Declaring their refusal to engage with linguistic issues, the group of *Το 3ο μάτι* aimed at focusing on language *through* art instead of the other way around (1982, 4). A tendency for 'extroversion' marks the journal's aims, as its members showed an interest in the artistic developments around the world rather than in local linguistic issues which would result in a limited scope of the publication's content. The refusal of the journal's group to engage with the Greek language question, a local issue which had a strong impact on literature and art, and their interest in progress and avant-garde movements from abroad complicates Dimitris Tziovas's view of Greek modernism as a movement which focused on language and the aestheticization of the national identity politics (Tziovas 1997). Effie Rentzou has examined the journal *Το 3ο μάτι* as proposing a model of modernism, alternative to the one promoted by the Generation of the Thirties during the same period, while also being the only Greek magazine of that time to combine visual art and literature. Analyzing the journal's content, Rentzou brought to the fore the attempt, expressed in *Το 3ο μάτι*, to draw synchronic connections (between Greece and other cultures) as well as diachronic connections (between different layers of Greek tradition). *Το 3ο μάτι*, she argued, went beyond the national ideology that preoccupied the Generation of the Thirties at the time. Finally, through a comparison of *Το 3ο μάτι* with French magazines of the same period, specifically *Cahiers d'art*, *Documents*, and *Minotaure*,

[15] 'ΤΙΤΛΟΣ: όταν πρόκειται για τέχνη, και γενικώτερα, όταν πρόκειται να βγει κανείς απ' το τετριμμένο, τους κοινούς τόπους της καθημερινής ζωής, χρειάζεται μια δυνατότερη, νέα, δραματικώτερη ΟΡΑΣΗ. χρειάζεται ένα ΤΡΙΤΟ ΜΑΤΙ', *Το 3ο μάτι* (1982, 2-3)

Rentzou showed the participation of *Το 3ο μάτι* in broader European modernist tendencies.[16] Apart from *Το 3ο μάτι*, other marginal journals of that time, such as *Ο Κύκλος* [*O Kyklos*, 'The Circle'] (1931-1939, 1945-1947) or *Νέοι Πρωτοπόροι* [*Neoi Protoporoi*, 'The New Avant-garde'] (1931-1936), express similar tendencies of 'extroversion' and innovation allowing, therefore, for a reconsideration of the prevalence of the Generation of the Thirties as the only manifestation of Greek modernism and pointing to a different understanding of the modern in this local context.

Το 3ο μάτι appears in 1935, which is often considered the inaugural year of Greek modernism due to the publication of George Seferis's *Μυθιστόρημα* [*Mythistorima*]. The developments of European modernism were, at that time, reaching the Greek literary space. Yorgos Theotokas had already published his essay *Ελεύθερο Πνεύμα* [*Elefthero Pnevma*, 'Free Spirit'] (1929), which became the manifesto of the so-called Generation of the Thirties, a literary circle formed by an Athens-based intellectual elite. Identified often as the only manifestation of modernism in the Greek literary space, the Generation of the Thirties focused on the Greek landscape, classical antiquity, the continuity between the ancient past and the present, Greekness, and national identity, especially as far as poetry was concerned. Such characteristics have led critics to view Greek modernism as 'introverted' and 'ethnocentric' as opposed to modernism in Europe which promoted capitalism and imperialism (Tziovas 1997). At the same time, however, the literary production of Thessaloniki-based writers turned to the city's byzantine history and mystical tradition, developing more esoteric writing and focusing on the inner workings of consciousness. The interior style that the Thessaloniki-based writers cultivated in prose writing and the development of interior monologue has been considered their main innovation which led to the term 'School of Thessaloniki'. Members of the Generation of the Thirties

[16] This material is from unpublished work which Professor Effie Rentzou graciously shared with me: a presentation she gave at the conference *Les littératures européenes dans les revues littéraires de l' Europe du Sud et du Bassin méditerranéen (1919-1939)* (Tours, 27-28 November 2008) titled 'Réfracter les mots et les images: la revue grecque *To Trito Mati* (1935-1937)', as well as a talk she gave at Princeton University in 2006 titled 'What "The Third Eye" Sees: A Greek Periodical of the 1930s'. I am very thankful to Professor Rentzou for allowing me to read this work.

were writers like Yorgos Theotokas, Angelos Terzakis, and poets like Nikos Engonopoulos and Odysseas Elytis, along with their central figure, George Seferis, critic Andreas Karantonis, and their patron and editor, Yorgos Katsimbalis. On the other hand, prose writers such as Alkiviadis Yannopoulos, Yorgos Delios, Stelios Xefloudas, as well as Nikos G. Pentzikis and poet Zoi Karelli have been thought of as the nucleus of the School of Thessaloniki. Both literary circles produced their own journals in which they developed literary, critical, and translational work. The Generation of the Thirties published *Τα Νέα Γράμματα* [*Ta Nea Grammata*, 'New Letters'] (1935-1940, 1944-1945) while the School of Thessaloniki formed around the journal *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* [*Makedonikes Imeres*, 'Macedonian Days'] (1932-1939, 1952-1953), published by Petros Spandonidis, and later *Κοχλίας* (1945-1948).

The 'School of Thessaloniki' has been disputed both as a term and as a literary formation, while its relation to Greek modernism has only recently been reconsidered. Some scholars, even though they recognize a separate group having appeared in Thessaloniki, tend to consider it part of the Generation of the Thirties.[17] Tziovas has shown that the School of Thessaloniki should be distinguished from the Generation of the Thirties, both of them, however, belonging to Greek modernism while he highlights that the Thessaloniki writers emerged as 'the more authentic representatives of modernist fiction in Greece compared with their Athenian colleagues' (1997, 32). At the same time, instead of focusing on the two centers, Athens and Thessaloniki, Tziovas urges for an examination of the 'interaction between the different groups and trends as well as between the various arts' to suggest that Greek modernism is much more complex than originally thought (37-38).

[17] See Vitti (1995) and Voyiatzaki (2002). Voyiatzaki (2002) presents the 'School of Thessaloniki' as part of the Generation of the Thirties but at the same time bases her argument on the innovations of the modern novel achieved by writers of whom two were crucial figures of the School of Thessaloniki (Xefloudas, Pentzikis), while the third one, Yorgos Cheimonas, worked in the legacy of that circle.

On the other hand, the idea of the Thessaloniki-based writers being known as a literary 'School' has been rejected also by some of the writers-members.[18]

Regardless of taxonomy and terms, however, the Thessaloniki-based writers engaged with a variety of texts and writers from abroad, producing translations and critical discourse on subjects like interiority in prose, interior monologue, the novel genre, or literary criticism in Greece. *Ulysses* was one of the texts with which they engaged as it was a novel which interested them in terms of formal experimentation, modernist writing, and genre. One of the first instances where Joyce comes to be the center of critical focus is the early debate on the interior monologue which took place in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* in the 1930s. In the very first issue of the journal, Spandonidis mentioned Joyce in connection to interior monologue in his reflections on 'expressionism', a term that the critic used for interiority in contemporary prose (1932 (1), 29-32). However, while Spandonidis's observations were part of a broad interest in interiority, attempts at defining these tendencies more precisely and critically were incited by Karantonis in his review of Xefloudas's novel *Εσωτερική συμφωνία* [*Esoteriki symfonia*, 'Interior symphony'] (1932 (5-6), 209-13). Another critic, L. Piniatoglou, responded to Karantonis's attempts by providing a brief overview of the history of interior monologue in Joyce's work, and the Irish writer's acknowledgment of Édouard Dujardin as his main influence for the writing practice (1932 (7), 247-50). Apart from *Ulysses*, Piniatoglou also included *Anna Livia Plurabelle* as an example of the technique under discussion, one of the first references to the initial stages of *Finnegans Wake* in Greek criticism. In the same issue, a young critic, Dimitris Mentzelos, also intervened to support some of Piniatoglou's points and question the available sources about Joyce's attribution to Dujardin, a story that was recorded by Valéry Larbaud (1932 (8), 292-3). Mentzelos suggested that new research of the origins and features of interior monologue should be carried out instead of accepting Larbaud's claims. Finally, Piniatoglou replied that such interactions, and specifically

[18] See for example Stergiopoulos (1985) and Kazantzis (1991).

Karantonis's responses, are indications of the lack of critical skills in Greek criticism. Reflecting the antagonism between the literary circles of Athens and Thessaloniki, and although the focus was on mapping interior monologue, the debate reveals broader issues that preoccupied the Thessaloniki-based writers and not only them. Using interior monologue as a starting point, the above critics reflect on Greek texts that were being published at the time (by Theotokas, Varnalis, Xefloudas) and question the ways in which these engage with the literary developments abroad. Their ambivalence regarding interior monologue focuses mostly on its ontology, whether it is a literary device, a writing practice, or a genre, rather than on its characteristics as a narrative device. These critics do not explore further its differences with stream of consciousness or narrated monologue. On the contrary, they are quickly led to reflections about interiority in prose, the novel and its evolution, and the role interior monologue plays in it. This debate, therefore, is more geared towards questions of genre than it is towards the specifics of narrative devices. As I now move on to examine *Το 3ο μάτι*, the first journal where an extensive translation of *Ulysses* appeared, it is important to consider that both experimental modernist journals *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας*, and, as I will argue, the interest in Joyce per se, are related to specific questions about art, consciousness and language, interiority and expression, as well as the formation of Greek modernism.[19]

Ulysses in *Το 3ο μάτι*: a response to the debate on interior monologue

Three years after the debate discussed above, *Το 3ο μάτι* returned to the same issue providing a more substantial and organized theoretical approach of the modernist writing practice, along with concrete textual examples from foreign literature. The first issue, in October 1935, reproduced the editorial

[19] For more on the debate in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες*, see Voyiatzaki (2002, 7-26). For an analysis of interior monologue in Greek literature see Mike and Gana (1987) and Kakavoulia (1997).

team's proclamation regarding the journal's aims along with a follow-up text by δ.π. (Dimitrios Pikionis), and a theoretical text by Nikos Chatzikyriakos-Gikas titled 'Characteristics of the new art: Art and Time'.[20] Apart from the editorial proclamation, the first issue was introduced with texts reflecting on contemporary art; it included contributions by members of the editorial team and external collaborators, as well as texts by Nietzsche and Plato (10-11), along with gravures by Hans Erni and Alberto Giacometti from the album *23 Gravures* (1935) which was presented in a separate note (28). A gravure by Chatzikyriakos-Gikas from the same album was also included below which was printed a text titled 'Ο εσωτερικός μονόλογος' ('Interior monologue'), without signature and composed of four paragraphs, which continued and occupied half of the next page (25-6). The text was written in the form of an introduction and was followed by a passage from Dujardin's novel *Les lauriers sont coupés* (1887), translated by Stavrakios Kosmas, Pentzikis's pen name (25-7). While it has been assumed that Pentzikis also wrote the introductory text, further research has shown that it was likely written by Karelli (Aravantinou 1983a, 233; Vlachodimos 2007). Despite the broad title, which conveys the idea of the note being a general introduction, the text itself opens with a direct reference to Joyce:

> Επειδή μια απ' τις πιο σημαντικές μορφές της σύγχρονης λογοτεχνίας στάθηκε το έργο του James Joyce, κι' επειδή γύρω του έγινε ολόκληρη φιλολογία—μελέτη και κριτική—που κατέληξε ορθά ή εσφαλμένα να ονομάσει τη νέα τούτη μορφή του μυθιστορήματος «εσωτερικό μονόλογο», αν και δύσκολα εφαρμόζει μια απλή ετικέτα σ' ένα τόσο ποικίλλο, παράδοξο, πολύπλοκο και πολύτροπο έργο σαν τον «Οδυσσέα», όμως συμφέρον είναι να μορφώσει κανείς μια γνώμη εξετάζοντας απ' την αρχή του και ιστορικά την εμφάνιση, την εξέλιξη και την παράδοση του εσωτερικού μονολόγου πριν αντιμετωπίσει το ίδιο έργο που δημιούργησε τόσο θόρυβο με την παρουσία του. (25)
>
> Since one of the most important forms of contemporary literature has been the work of James Joyce, and because there has been a lot of scholarship around it—analysis and criticism—which, rightly or not, ended up naming this new form of novel 'interior monologue', even though it is difficult to assign a simple label on such a multivalent, paradoxical, complex, and multimodal work like *Ulysses*, it is, however, useful to form

[20] d. p., 'Δευτερολογία', *Το 3ο μάτι* (1982, 4), and Nikos Chatzikyriakos-Gikas, 'Χαρακτηριστικά της νέας τέχνης: Τέχνη και εποχή', 5-9

> an opinion by examining from its beginnings and historically the appearance, evolution and tradition of interior monologue before facing the work itself which caused such a commotion with its presence.

From this very first and rather lengthy sentence it might be presumed that the real aim of this tribute or introduction to interior monologue was, in fact, an introduction to Joyce and *Ulysses*. In this note, interior monologue is presented as a 'new novel form' ('τη νέα τούτη μορφή του μυθιστορήματος'), as a term that risks becoming a 'label' that will characterize *Ulysses* in its entirety. The note's claim is that tracing the genealogy of interior monologue is necessary in order to fully understand it as a writing practice. It responds, therefore, to calls for original theoretical work that had already been expressed by Mentzelos in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* as well as to the critic's own survey of interior monologue which he published in *Κύκλος* (1933). At the same time, the note returns to Joyce's attribution of interior monologue to Dujardin referring to and drawing from Larbaud's preface to the re-issue of *Les lauriers*.[21] The note in *Το 3ο μάτι* reformulates what had previously been discussed in the debate on interior monologue in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* in terms of historical background, origins, and characteristics, confirming that the theoretical preoccupation with interior monologue was not limited to the systematization of a literary device. Instead, it stood as an urgent call to rethink the genre of the novel, and more broadly an exploration of the limits of prose writing in modernity. Recognizing the differences between interior monologue as a literary technique and as a form or style, the writer of the note in *Το 3ο μάτι* claims that 'interior monologue had not been acknowledged before J. Joyce. His *Ulysses* acquires the necessary dimensions to impose this technique'.[22] In other words, while the interior monologue existed, it had not been used extensively or developed sufficiently in order for it to be

[21] In that preface Larbaud provided a history of interior monologue as he had known it from Joyce: 'Et c'est ainsi qu'un jour il [Joyce] me dit que cette forme avait déjà était employée, et d'une manière continue, dans un livre d'Édouard Dujardin […]', 7, ('And that was how, one day, he [Joyce] told me that that form had already been used systematically in a book by Édouard Dujardin […]').

[22] 'Πριν από τον J. Joyce δεν είχε αναγνωριστεί ο εσωτερικός μονόλογος. Ο «Οδυσσέας» του πέρνει (sic) τις κατάλληλες διαστάσεις για να επιβάλλει αυτή την τεχνοτροπία.' (25)

recognized as an autonomous *form* of writing. The note may be on the surface calling for a 'historicization' of a literary device; but what it really is about, is the search for a modernist form.

Although the note does not provide a detailed presentation of Joyce, the writer points out that 'with rare generosity, Joyce indicated E. Dujardin as the first one to use interior monologue in his book *Les lauriers sont coupés*' hinting, in that way, at Joyce's alleged reluctance to reveal his sources as well as the commotion that this attribution caused.[23] While Dujardin was considered a minor symbolist and had been relatively unknown until then, Joyce's attribution led to renewed interest in his work and brought recognition to the French writer. His novel *Les lauriers*, which had been published first in *La Revue Independente* in 1887 and had long been out of print, was brought to light as a representative text for this new technique and was therefore re-issued in 1924 with a preface by Larbaud himself. Apart from the re-issue of *Les lauriers*, Dujardin also responded to this new-found recognition by publishing a study on interior monologue, openly acknowledging Joyce's contribution to its development while a long-term connection between Joyce and Dujardin—as well as Larbaud and Dujardin—followed.[24] Joyce's habit of associating his name and fame with writers that were considered minor, like Dujardin and Italo Svevo, was often a strategic move. In the case of Dujardin, it was a strategic sharing of his sources without compromising his fame that should be viewed in the context of the promotional schemes devised by the Irish author and his Parisian circle, Larbaud, Sylvia Beach, Andrienne Monnier.[25]

To highlight the significance of interior monologue as an evolving technique, and through Larbaud's preface, the writer of the note in *To 3ο μάτι* reproduces a historical overview of this 'form'.

---

[23] 'Ο Joyce με σπάνια γενναιοφροσύνη υπέδειξε τον E. Dujardin ως εκείνον που μεταχειρίστηκε πρώτος εσωτερικό μονόλογο στο βιβλίο του «Οι Δάφνες Κόπηκαν».' (25)

[24] Édouard Dujardin (1931), *Le monologue intérieur : son apparition, ses origines, sa place dans l'œuvre de James Joyce* (Paris : Albert Messein)

[25] Ellmann comments tersely on this interaction: 'The method of the *monologue intérieur* was of consequence only because Joyce saw what could be done with it' (footnote, *JJII* 520).

The note lists writers of different genres whose works use monologue in various ways such as Montaigne and his essays, Browning and his poetry, dramatic monologue more broadly, while turning also to monologue through the evolution of the novel form mentioning, more specifically, the epistolary novel, the confessional style, and the novel written as a diary. The writer of the introduction, however, also notes Joyce's innovation in interior monologue compared to past manifestations of the technique:

> Η διαφορά μεταξύ του J. Joyce και των προγενέστερων, που μεταχειρίστηκαν ένα είδος εσωτ. μονολόγου είναι, ότι εκεί ξεχωρίζει η διευθύνουσα σκέψη του συγγραφέα, ενώ στον Joyce δίνεται στον αναγνώστη άμεση η επαφή με τα πρόσωπα του βιβλίου. (26)
>
> The difference between J. Joyce and the predecessors who used a kind of interior monologue lies in the fact that there, the writer's directing thoughts break through, whereas in Joyce the reader is in direct contact with the characters of the book.

The writer reveals the reason why Joyce is presented as the main representative of interior monologue: because he managed to develop a further level of interiority through which the characters of the novel are reflected entirely unmediated. Joyce, according to the note, has achieved an 'immediacy' between reader and character while the writer is entirely invisible in the text. The note presents interior monologue as a writing practice with various manifestations and which, in Joyce, becomes a distinct form in its own right. As a result, this tribute to interior monologue in *Το 3ο μάτι* continues the debate that took place in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* by proposing a new conception of the novel genre, a novel in which the writer leaves no trace, is entirely invisible, and the characters are presented, act, and think in unmediated ways. At the same time, however, the novel is in dialogue with other genres as it uses a technique that is found in poetry and drama. In the novel, however, that technique is developed in such a way that it transforms it. The interior monologue tribute in *Το 3ο μάτι* not only contributes to a rethinking of the novel genre which had already began in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες*, but also furthers the

debate by providing passages from Dujardin's *Les lauriers* and Joyce's *Ulysses* introducing therefore the issue of translation.

Both the note and the Dujardin translation comprise an introduction to interior monologue which appeared in the first issue of *Το 3ο μάτι* as the first part of a tribute to be continued. Exploring the origins of the introductory note about interior monologue, Dimitris Vlachodimos (2007, 930-41) examines the letters by Doukas to Pentzikis (*Μαρτυρίες και κρίσεις*, 1977), in which their collaboration on the publication of *Το 3ο μάτι* can be traced. Evidence from the correspondence suggests, as Vlachodimos also illustrates, that the introductory note was most likely written by poet Zoi Karelli, sister of Pentzikis. Moreover, we learn from that correspondence that it was Chatzikyriakos-Gikas who had initially suggested publishing Joyce in *Το 3ο μάτι* and that the journal's tribute to interior monologue was to be more extensive (1977, 36-39: 36-37). The original plan was to include an essay on the writing practice by Pentzikis, which did not appear in the end.[26]

The different interactions among the members and contributors of *Το 3ο μάτι*, which can be traced in Doukas's letters to Pentzikis, reveal that the entire tribute to interior monologue, including the presentation and translation of Joyce's *Ulysses*, was a product of communal work and interest, a collaborative project to which different people contributed in various ways, either by suggesting material, by providing resources, by commissioning translations, or by writing and translating. Most of all, it was a project in which Pentzikis and Karelli, who belonged to the Thessaloniki literary circle played a crucial role. Doukas confessed to Pentzikis that he assigned most of the work for the tribute to interior monologue (the introduction, a separate essay which never appeared, and the Dujardin translation) to Pentzikis and Karelli because he did not trust anyone in Athens to carry out such work

[26] Doukas wrote to Pentzikis: 'Η υπόθεση έχει ως εξής: Τώρα και ένα μήνα, ο κ. Χατζηκυριάκος μας είχε συστήσει για φιλολογικό κομμάτι του πρώτου φύλλου, μετάφραση από τον Τζόις. Δυστυχώς και η γαλλική μετάφρασή του και το αγγλικό κείμενο, είναι αρκετά δυσεύρετα' ('This is how it is: Over a month now, Mr. Chatzikyriakos had suggested a translation from Joyce for the literary section of the first issue. Unfortunately, its French translation and the English text are both rather difficult to find.' (1977 [26. VIII. 35.], 28-30: 28).

as, he claimed, they did not have substantial experience with or knowledge of interiority as opposed to Thessaloniki-based writers.[27] The distinction between the literary circles of Athens and Thessaloniki and the work cultivated by each of them as well as their attitudes towards translation, is reproduced in *Το 3ο μάτι*. Doukas envisioned *Το 3ο μάτι* to be closer to the literary space of Thessaloniki rather than that of Athens: 'Πραγματικά όμως, το περιοδικό θα είναι περισσότερο της Θεσσαλονίκης, παρά της Αθήνας.'[28] Doukas saw translation as an activity for Pentzikis and Karelli, while *Ulysses* as a text was closer to them, rather than to Takis Papatsonis who had also offered to translate it.[29] Doukas felt that texts like *Ulysses* were more compatible with the interests of Thessaloniki writers, but also that the practice of translation was more familiar to them. The number of translated texts published in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* shows that translation was one of the main practices of the Thessaloniki writers which was developed further a decade later in *Κοχλίας*. Their preference for prose texts and the diversity of the writers from which they drew, shows a tendency for expansion towards different languages and literatures. Translations were used as a way of bringing new material and creating a corpus of translations and therefore a translational tradition alongside a canon of original work. As a result, the Thessaloniki writers are characterized by an extroversion in terms of how they approached foreign literature. While the Generation of the Thirties also engaged in translation, as can be seen in *Τα Νέα Γράμματα*, they emphasized their original work and translation's contribution to it. Seferis specifically used translation as a personal exercise through which to develop his own poetics and test

[27] 'Αλλά αυτό προέρχεται οπού εδώ δεν έχω εμπιστοσύνη σε κανέναν, ούτε πότε, ούτε πώς θα το βγάλουν. Έπειτα και το θέμα είναι ένα από τα σπουδαιότερα, και όπως τους είπα και στην προηγούμενη συνεδρίαση, εδώ στην Αθήνα «δεν υπάρχουν άνθρωποι να μιλούν με τον εαυτό τους».' ('But this is because here I do not trust anyone about when they will accomplish it or how [the work for the interior monologue tribute]. After all, this is one of the most important subjects, and, as I told them at our last meeting, here in Athens "there are no people who talk with their self".') (1977 [26. VIII. 35.], 28-30: 29)

[28] 'Seriously, though, the journal will belong to Thessaloniki more than to Athens' (21). See also the entire letter in which Doukas reassures Pentzikis that he had planned *Το 3ο μάτι* with the Thessaloniki writers in mind (1977 [VIII. 35], 1977, 20-4).

[29] 'Στην προσφορά του αυτή, δοκίμασα, βαθιά μέσα μου, μιαν άρνηση, σα να στερούμουνα κάτι δικό σας. Ήθελα τον Τζαίιμς Τζόις να τον μετέφραζες εσύ, ας ήταν κι από τα γαλλικά.' ('At that offer of his I felt, deeply inside me, a refusal, as if I were being deprived of something that was yours. I wanted you to translate James Joyce, even if it were from the French.') (1977 [8. IX. 35.], 32-34: 32)

the limits of the Greek language, its forms and expressions (Loulakaki-Moore 2010). *Ulysses*, therefore, becomes in this instance a key to understand an emerging distinction between the two literary centers of Greece regarding how each of them used translation, but also what texts interested each of the groups and why.

'(Η αρχή του μονολόγου της κυρίας Μπλουμ)': *Ulysses* translated for the first time

Takis Papatsonis, a poet, essay writer, and translator, had promised Doukas a translation of *Ulysses* from the English: 'Μου υποσχέθηκε και ο Παπατσώνης για μετάφρασή του [του βιβλίου του Τζόις] από το εγγλέζικο' (1977 [19. IX. 35], 36-9: 37).[30] Although belonging to a previous generation, Papatsonis is often considered part of the literary sphere of the 1930s. He was an Athenian poet who developed interactions with the literary circle of Thessaloniki and was often involved in their publications. His education had been mostly in French while, as shown by his translations, he was also familiar with Anglophone literature.[31] Papatsonis contributed to both *Το 3ο μάτι* in the 1930s and *Κοχλίας* in the 1940s as well as other journals such as *Κύκλος*, while he produced several literary translations from French and English. His translation of the opening of 'Penelope' in *Το 3ο μάτι* is the only instance of him working on *Ulysses* and generally on Joyce. Appearing in issue 4-5-6 (January-February-March 1936, 162-3), of which the overarching theme was literature, and following again a drawing by Chatzikyriakos-Gikas, the translated passage was titled 'ΙΙ. Εσωτερικός Μονόλογος. James Joyce. Ulysses' with a subtitle in parentheses '(Η αρχή του μονολόγου της Κυρίας Μπλουμ)' ['II. Interior Monologue. James Joyce. Ulysses (The beginning of Mrs Bloom's monologue']. It was presented as

[30] 'Papatsonis promised me a translation [of Joyce's book] from the English'.
[31] Papatsonis had translated, for example, Edgar Allan Poe, Christina Rossetti (*Κύκλος*, 5-6 (1932), 187-88), while he had also translated T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* into Greek (*Κύκλος*, 5 (1933), 186-203), before Seferis's canonical translation. For more on Papatsonis as a translator see Vasilis Letsios (2018).

the second part of the interior monologue tribute which began in the first issue, and corresponded to the opening of the last episode of the novel (*U* 18.01-74 in the Gabler edition).[32]

Papatsonis's translation of the opening of 'Penelope' follows certain conventions of the time including domesticating practices, specifically regarding names of people and places which were often rendered in a hellenized manner or translated word-by-word into Greek. For example, Mrs and Mr Riordan become 'κυρία Ριορδάνη' and 'κύριος Ριορδάνης'; the 'City Arms hotel' becomes 'το ξενοδοχείο «Τα Εμβλήματα της Πόλεως»'. Nevertheless, Papatsonis adheres to the text without taking significant liberties in terms of interpretation, style, or syntax. More specifically, Papatsonis has kept the stylistic idiosyncrasies of the episode without attempting to introduce syntactical norms. As 'Penelope' consists of Molly Bloom's continuous monologue with very limited punctuation, no commas and two full stops, Papatsonis has followed this closely in his translation. However, apostrophes have been added despite their complete absence in the English original in contractions (e.g. 'Ill', 'she didnt', 'Id'). Papatsonis translates into demotic Greek but without introducing provocative neologisms. On the contrary, he uses occasionally more formal phrasing, which is closer to the language variety of *katharevousa*, alongside colloquial expressions and popular forms of words ('στοματάρα κατακτητού', 'που θαρρεί πια πως ηύρε εν τω προσώπω του ένα καλό τομάρι για γδάρσιμο', 163), a combination which contributes to the overall stylistic eccentricity while it also renders Molly as a character who uses linguistic diversity to express irony. As far as obscenity is concerned, an example of which is found in Molly's accusations of their former maid, Papatsonis keeps to the tone of the original: 'that slut that Mary' (*U* 18.55-6) becomes 'εκείνο το βρωμόπραμα την Μαίρυ' (163), or

[32] It may be contested whether that should be considered the first ever translation of a passage from *Ulysses* as Kleon Paraschos cites a much shorter translated passage from 'Sirens' in his article about Joyce's novel in the newspaper *Πρωία* (1929), as mentioned in the beginning of the chapter. The translation of the opening of 'Penelope' in *Το 3ο μάτι*, however, is the first conscious presentation of an extensive translated passage from *Ulysses*. Due to the way in which it is presented, attention is drawn to the passage itself, whereas in Paraschos's article, it is embedded in the review as supportive citation for the writer's arguments.

'if I thought he was with a dirty barefaced liar and sloven like that one' (*U* 18.73-4) becomes 'αν ήξευρα πως πηγαίνει με μια ξεδιάντρωπη μια ψεύτρα μια πατσαβούρα σαν και τούτη' (163). The translated passage is cut off abruptly at the end without any punctuation or any other indication about whether the text continues or not. Whether this happened because of lack of space or other typographical limitations it cannot be determined; however, the fact that the text becomes more explicit after that point suggests the possibility that the translator or the journal avoided to include more. In any case, the abrupt pause invites a reading of *Ulysses* as a passage detached from its context and with no explanation as to what comes next or whether there is something after at all. In this first presentation, *Ulysses* is read as a fragment, a piece that begins and ends abruptly. Moreover, the translation renders the syntactical freedom and fluidity of that section of the novel without, however, conveying the fact that interior monologue is not used in the same way in the rest of *Ulysses*.

Although it could be argued that Papatsonis develops a rather conservative approach in his translation of 'Penelope' as he keeps to the tone of the original and the acceptable conventions of his time, in the passage he does adopt a certain liberty regarding a crucial part of the episode. Apart from its stylistic and syntactical eccentricity, 'Penelope' is an episode known for its constant repetition of the word 'yes', a word with which the episode also opens and closes. 'Yes' is used with various meanings throughout the episode, reassuringly, ironically, assertively, even negatively or to change the subject, but most notably it is used as a way of creating rhythm. In his own translation, Papatsonis has not adhered to this repetition, as out of the six 'yeses' of the passage, he translates three of them as 'ναι' while the other three are rendered as expressions of reassurance or confirmation meaning 'of course' or 'certainly': 'ασφαλώς' [sure] (162), 'βέβαια' [of course] (162), 'είμαι βεβαία' [I am certain] (162). Despite not taking significant liberties with the text at a first glance, upon a closer reading of Papatsonis's translation, it becomes clear that there are certain instances in which the translator uses what look like set expressions even though they are not commonly used in the Greek language. For

example, the expression 'old faggot' in the phrase 'that old faggot Mrs Riordan' (*U* 18.04), a dialectal expression, is translated by Papatsonis as 'γρηά τούρτα' ('εκεινής της γρηάς τούρτας της Κας Ριορδάνη', 162). While understandable in Greek as a dismissive reference to an old woman, it is not commonly used. The use of the word 'τούρτα' is surprising—unless it is part of someone's personal idiosyncratic idiom. In his brief overview of the Greek translations of *Ulysses*, Marios V. Raizis (1998-2000, 32: 97-105) deems this choice 'ανόητα παράξενη' ('foolishly odd', 100) while Maria Athanasopoulou calls it 'an impressive' image (2021, 60-74).[33] In the English text, 'faggot' is a dated Hiberno-English and regional English expression for an annoying, troublesome, or useless woman.[34] Another example of such a difference is found in the phrase 'και να σου μια νοσοκόμο θάμπαινε επί σκηνής' (162) which, in the given context, is comprehensible as a metaphorical expression in Greek. The word 'σκηνή' also emphasizes Bloom's overtly dramatic reactions (according to Molly) when he is hurt or sick and the theatricality he employs to attract attention and care, details about which Molly expresses her bitterness in the passage. Yet the rendering still raises the question of why a metaphorical expression has been chosen as a translation of the literal 'on the carpet': 'then wed have a hospital nurse next thing on the carpet' (*U* 18.20-1).

Based on the rendering of Menton's name with a French accent ('Μαντόν', 163), Raizis (1998-2000) assumes that Papatsonis worked from the French text although he attributes any shortcomings to the translator's incompetence in the English language. However, it is also important to consider in what ways *Ulysses* was available in the Greek literary space in the 1930s. As Doukas mentions in his letters to Pentzikis, the people involved with *Το 3ο μάτι* were struggling to find a copy of *Ulysses* in English as well as in French (1977 [26. VIII. 25.], 28-30: 28; [8. IX. 35.] 32-4). Either text, therefore,

[33] Athanasopoulou's article focuses on a translation draft of the same passage by George Seferis which has been found in his archive but was never published. She compares certain choices in Seferis's draft to Papatsonis's translation in *Το 3ο μάτι* and through the choices for 'old faggot', which Seferis translates as 'παλιογκρανκάσα', she concludes that Seferis's choices indicate a 'cerebral' translator whereas Papatsonis is more 'instinctive' (2021, 67).
[34] See Slote, Mamigonian, Turner (2022, 1253) who also cite *OED*.

could have been used as a source text depending on what was readily available. Considering the challenges and locating the two examples mentioned earlier in the 1929 French translation, we find the phrase 'de cette **vieille tourte** de Mme Riordan' (817) as well as 'et tout de suite une infirmière **entrerait en scène**' (817), phrases which Papatsonis replicates in his translation. As the critics have correctly sensed, the French translation is thus proven to have played a significant, if not crucial, role in this early translation of *Ulysses* in *Το 3ο μάτι*.

More examples from the passage reveal that the 1929 French translation influenced strongly Papatsonis's rendering of the opening of 'Penelope', to the point that it could be argued that the French translation was used as the only source text. In certain cases, such as those cited below, Papatsonis uses the same expressions and vocabulary as the French rendition:

> 'that he thought he had a great leg of' (*U* 18.04-5)[35]
> 'qu'il pensait être dans ses petits papiers' (Morel 1929 (1930), 817)
> 'με την ελπίδα πώς τον είχε γραμμένο κάπου στα χαρτάκια της διαθήκης της' (Papatsonis 1936, 162)

> 'and his boiled eyes of all the big stupoes I ever met' (*U* 18.43)
> 'et ses yeux de poisson bouilli de tous les gros imbéciles' (Morel 1929 (1930), 818)
> 'τα μάτια του μάτια βραστού ψαριού καθώς όλοι αυτοί οι ηλίθιοι' (Papatsonis 1936, 163)

Translating from the French impacts the text as certain literal expressions are rendered metaphorically, whereas certain metaphors are translated into literal expressions and abstract images become more specific. Papatsonis, therefore, replicates the shifts introduced in the French translation. For example, his rendering of the metaphorical and rather broad 'he had a great leg of' introduces a literal and more specific expression as it clarifies that Bloom was hoping to inherit money by being nice to Mrs Riordan. As far as the second example is concerned, the image of the 'boiled eyes' as 'μάτια βραστού ψαριού' becomes more specific through a simile. A comparative examination of 'Penelope' in *Το 3ο μάτι* with

[35] 'to have a great leg of' is also a Hiberno-English expression meaning 'to have a great influence on'. See Slote, Mamigonian, Turner (2022, 1253).

the 1929 French translation leads to the conclusion that Papatsonis translated from the French rather than the English. At the same time, however, there are examples that show Papatsonis's own contribution to the process. The example below provides a combination of Papatsonis translating word-for-word and of inventing a solution as he translates one part directly from the French, and another by using an expression that retains the primary meaning of the word used in the French transforming it into a new expression:

> 'and the end of the world **let us have a bit of fun first** God help the world if all the women were her sort' (*U* 18.08-9)
> 'et la fin du monde **payons-nous un peu de bon temps d'abord** et quel Enfer serait le monde si toutes les femmes étaient de cette espèce-là' (Morel 1929 (1930), 817)
> 'και για το τέλος του κόσμου και **κερδεμένος καιρός είναι όσο ζούμε ακόμα** και τι Κόλαση θάταν ο κόσμος αν όλες οι γυναίκες ήταν σαν κ' ελόγου της' (Papatsonis 1936, 162)

Although 'God help the world' (underlined above) is a rather straightforward phrase, Papatsonis uses the French rendering which he translates as 'τι Κόλαση θάταν ο κόσμος'. At the same time, he uses the literal meaning of the French word 'se payer' (to buy oneself something, to gain) to translate as 'κερδεμένος καιρός είναι όσο ζούμε ακόμα', 'time lived is time gained' (in bold letters above). While Papatsonis keeps close to the original that is available to him, he also devises creative solutions for metaphorical expressions by preserving the primary meaning of the words of which the metaphor is composed. It is understandable, therefore, due to the use of the French translation, that the word 'γουρουνοφωτογραφία' (162), which causes Raizis to wonder, is closer to the French 'cette photo cochonne' (817) rather than the English original 'smutty photo' (*U* 18.22).

Whether the English original was read or used at all, it is very difficult to determine as the majority of the examples point towards the French rendering. The number of affinities between the French 'Penelope' and Papatsonis's translation suggest most probably that the French translation was the only text available to Papatsonis rather than a lack of familiarity with the English language. This

does not mean that Papatsonis could not translate from the English as Raizis claims; he was a prolific translator who produced many translations of English texts, before and after 'Penelope', from a wide range of traditions and movements and *Το 3ο μάτι* includes an important stage of his translational work. Apart from the opening of 'Penelope', Papatsonis also published other translations in the same journal such as essays by John Ruskin, a collaboration with Nikos Kazantzakis on a passage from *Gardens of Japan* (1928) by Jiro Harada, and a translation of the play *Ubu Roi* (1896) by Alfred Jarry.[36] Despite the initial aim of the *3ο μάτι* team for a translation from the English, it is very likely that they did not manage to source a copy of *Ulysses* in English—which highlights their wish to have a translation of Joyce even though they did not have access to the text in the first place.

A close examination of the translation of the opening of 'Penelope' in *Το 3ο μάτι* shows how *Ulysses* is read during the period of these initial fragmentary translations. The book itself, especially the English text, was largely inaccessible even to those who participated in the literary sphere and knew about it. However, the book's availability is not the only factor that affects the way in which *Ulysses* is read and translated. The fragmentary approaches also stem from a focus on form and genre which is cultivated by the recent literary and artistic developments in European modernism. In their initial proclamation, the group of *Το 3ο μάτι* had declared an interest in formal experimentation, which is reflected not only in the content they chose for publication, but also in the journal's typographical aesthetics. In his persistent efforts to find material for the journal, and to enlist Pentzikis's help especially regarding Joyce, Doukas also reveals the reason of his own fascination with *Ulysses*:

> Του βιβλίου του [του Τζόις], δεν έχω υπόψη παρά την τυπογραφική φόρμα του, κάτι που σπάνει κάθε τόσο, μονόλογος, διάλογος, ένα σωρό πράγματα, που εναλλάσσονται. Αυτή η φόρμα του, είναι κάτι που το κάνει πολύτιμο, παρά τον όγκο του, σήμερα μάλιστα, που είναι κατ' αρχήν αχώνευτο κάθε μεγάλο βιβλίο. (1977 [8. IX. 35.], 32-4: 33-4)

[36] John Ruskin, 'Τρεις μελέτες: Το φύλλο, Το βουνό, Το σύννεφο' trans. by T. K. Papatsonis, 50-61
'Τιαπωνέζικοι κήποι: Ν. Καζαντζάκης, Τ. Κ. Π.', 69-71
Alfred Jarry, 'Ubu-Roi' trans. by T. K. Papatsonis, 158-59

> Of his [Joyce's] book, I am only aware of its typographical form, something that breaks every now and then, monologue, dialogue, a whole lot of things, which alternate. It is that form that makes it valuable, despite its size, especially nowadays, when every lengthy book is by default unbearable.

Doukas confesses plainly that he only knows *Ulysses* through the text's 'typography' without discussing further issues of plot or characters. By 'τυπογραφική φόρμα', Doukas refers to the form of the text as it is set on the page, but also the narrative form in which it is written, the intermingling of monologue and dialogue, and the different types of texts (newspaper, catechism, drama) from which Joyce draws for the novel and which are reflected not only stylistically but also in the typographical appearance of *Ulysses*. Apart from the journal's collective interest in formal experimentation, Doukas's approach of *Ulysses* could also be considered alongside his own work, *Η ιστορία ενός αιχμαλώτου* [*I istoria enos aichmalotou*, 'A Prisoner of War's Story'] (1929), and how that interacts with concepts of form, genre, writing, and language. Chatzikyriakos-Gikas was the one who had suggested including it in *Το 3ο μάτι*; he had lived in Paris when *Ulysses* was first published, while he was also probably aware of the edition of *Ulysses* illustrated by Henri Matisse which came out in 1935, the year that *Το 3ο μάτι* started circulating, but it is not clear whether and how he had read the text.[37]

What these references show is how the early reception of *Ulysses* in Greece is marked by idiosyncratic reading experiences through which the interest in Joyce's novel in the 1930s focuses mostly on the novel's formal features and the way in which these challenge the already established literary forms and norms. *Ulysses* is considered in terms of its implications about genre and the evolution of the novel. As we will see later, in *Κοχλίας*, this approach evolves into strategies of developing a literary, critical, and translational culture. The decision to include Joyce's *Ulysses* in a

[37] Apart from the illustrations by Matisse, which are closer to the *Odyssey* than to *Ulysses*, this edition is also interesting in terms of typography. In 'Aeolus' specifically, the episode which takes place at the newspapers' offices and imitates journalistic writing and the newspaper's typographical setting with its intermittent headings, the Matisse edition uses different fonts for each heading introducing therefore one more layer of differentiation between the different sub-sections.

journal and the initiatives that aimed at translations of parts of *Ulysses* did not necessarily stem from prior reading experience of this specific text, but reflected instead a more strategic interest and reading of the text as a source to be dismantled and decoded. *Ulysses* is used to support arguments about modernist writing practices, as an example of writing, and as a means through which to rethink the genre of the novel whereas in *Κοχλίας*, the interest in *Ulysses* extends to its reputation and its challenges in translation while finally, it becomes a work which raises issues of the relation between the writer and the self. Throughout all these acts of reading *Ulysses*, however, Joyce's novel is consciously read in fragments and excerpts as the interest is not in the book in its entirety, but in the text which is endless. Consequently, *how Ulysses* is read is not only related to how it appears in the final publication, the final result, but also how it has been fashioned to appear in the two journals discussed here, how it has been shaped on the basis of circulation, accident, access, debate, and literary exploration. Doukas, finally, talks to Pentzikis about his reading experience of *Ulysses* after Papatsonis's translation:

> Διάβασα χθες πέντε αράδες από τον μονόλογο της Κας Μπλούμ. Γέλασα. Τόχε καταφέρει ο Παπατσώνης. Κι ο *Ubus* [sic] δεν είναι άσχημος. (1977 [VIII. 36.], 68-9: 69)
>
> Yesterday I read five lines from Mrs Bloom's monologue. I laughed. Papatsonis did manage it after all. *Ubus* [sic] is not bad either.

For the people discussed here, *Ulysses* is a chance to exercise translation skills as well as reading skills. At the same time, it becomes a way to discuss modernist writing modes such as interiority. In what follows, two more translations, this time published in the Thessaloniki-based journal *Κοχλίας* a decade later, but inspired by the legacy of *Το 3ο μάτι*, reflect the collaborative practices that were adopted in terms of translating and reading *Ulysses*. Instead of an example of technique, *Ulysses* now becomes an exercise in translation and writing, a text of philosophical significance or personal attachment even. By examining these initial fragmentary translations, we gain the sense of those translators', writers', and editors' workshop, of their moment of creation.

The 'Hades' passage in *Κοχλίας*: collaboration, disagreement, and discontent

In the sixth episode of *Ulysses*, known as 'Hades', Leopold Bloom attends the funeral of Paddy Dignam, an acquaintance of his who has died suddenly. The episode narrates the funerary procession towards Glasnevin cemetery and the funeral, allowing us for the first time in the novel a glimpse of Bloom in the company of other Dubliners. Through Bloom's interior monologue, we hear his reflections on death and afterlife, his loved ones who are dead, while we also find out more about how his peers see him. Apart from his thoughts on various facts, such as what happens to the human body after death, or the fear of being buried alive and how to make sure that a person has died, Bloom also recalls familiar scenes of death and memories such as his father's suicide, and its impending anniversary in a few days, his daughter burying a dead bird when she was little, and the death of his son, Rudy, a few days after he was born, which keeps returning to both Bloom and Molly's thoughts throughout the novel. Jeri Johnson highlights these as 'ghostly memories', memories that 'haunt' Bloom but also the text itself as specific words are repeated throughout the episode corresponding to the Technic of 'incubism' according to the Gilbert schema (2008, 803). As a result, 'death' and 'dying' are found in various contexts: 'darkened deathchamber' (*U* 6.846), 'Ivy Day dying out' (*U* 6.855), 'dying to embrace her in his shirt' (*U* 6.852), 'Priests dead against it' (*U* 6.984) as well as other relevant words such as 'hell' ('Hoping you're well and not in hell', *U* 6.858), 'tomb' ('Love among the tombstones', *U* 6.759), or 'devil' ('Devilling for the other firm', *U* 6.984). The title that Joyce used for this episode in his schemata, 'Hades', is often translated into Greek as 'Ἅδης' but also as 'Νέκυια', using its Homeric correspondence, Book XI of the *Odyssey*. In Book XI, Odysseus descends to the underworld, upon Circe's advice, to ask Teiresias about his return to Ithaca. During his descent, Odysseus encounters the souls of people he used to know when they were alive, such as companions

and warriors from the Trojan war, as well as his mother who has died while he has been away. Among the shades he also encounters Elpenor, one of his companions who had just died by falling off a roof on Circe's island after excessive drinking. Odysseus is surprised by how quickly his companion has arrived at the underworld. Elpenor, who in the Gilbert schema is given as a Homeric parallel for Dignam, urges Odysseus to perform the necessary funerary rites for his soul to rest. Odysseus's surprise is transformed into Bloom's passing thought that Dignam 'Got here before us, dead as he is' (*U* 6.510).

Towards the end of the funeral (*U* 6.839-72), when the gravediggers have lowered the coffin and start covering it, Bloom thinks about the moment of dying and what happens after, as well as the danger of being buried alive and how to avoid such mistakes. At the same time, more practical issues are being dealt with, such as the newspaper report for the funeral for which reporter Joe Hynes jots down the names of the attendees, mistaking the mysterious man in the macintosh for someone named 'M'intosh' (*U* 6.873-901). As the crowd disperses, some of the attendees walk over to Parnell's grave (*U* 6.917-27), while Bloom reflects on the symbolism and conceptions of death, and spots a rat moving among the dug-up graves (*U* 6.928-79). In a more Rabelaisian tone, Bloom wonders whether the dead communicate with each other whenever a new one joins them (*U* 6.990-4) and decides that there is 'plenty to see and hear and feel yet' (*U* 6.1003). After an awkward interaction with John Henry Menton (*U* 6.1007-32), the episode ends in high spirits: 'Thank you. How grand we are this morning!' (6.1033).

The summary above is of the final part of the 'Hades' episode (*U* 6.839-1033) and corresponds to the translation of a passage from *Ulysses* which appeared in the first issue of the Thessaloniki-based journal *Κοχλίας* in December 1945, approximately a decade after Papatsonis's 'Penelope' in *Το 3ο μάτι*.[38]

[38] James Joyce (1945), 'Τζέημς Τζόυς, Ο Οδυσσέας. Απόσπασμα: Σελ. 115-120 του αγγλικού κειμένου, στην έκδοση «The Odyssey Press, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna, Σελ. 123-129 στη γαλλική μετάφραση της N. R. F.', trans. by Zoi Karelli, Yorgis Kitsopoulos, Karolos Tsizek, Yannis Svoronos, Nikos Gavriil Pentzikis, Lefteris Koniordos, Takis Iatrou, *Κοχλίας* 1, 12-13

Κοχλίας, the story of which was discussed in the beginning of this chapter, started as a journal that aimed at bringing new texts and writers, local as well as from abroad.[39] As a journal, it drew from Doukas's ambitions which did not materialize in *Το 3ο μάτι*. *Το 3ο μάτι* had similar aspirations of covering new ground, however, it was more oriented towards art, painting, and architecture due to the backgrounds of its editors, while its literary parts were shaped by Doukas. Even though the attitude adopted in *Κοχλίας* was subtler, *Κοχλίας* should be considered as continuing the work that had begun with *Το 3ο μάτι*. The two publications present a lot of similarities in terms of content and approach, while key contributors to both included Pentzikis, Karelli, Papatsonis, Doukas, Chatzikyriakos-Gikas.

Translations comprised a significant part of what was published in *Κοχλίας* and it was the journal's main medium of introducing texts and writers to the reading public. Apart from the translations, its members contributed also with original work, poetry, prose, essays. During its first year, the journal included short critical notes which provided general information and commentary on the texts published in each issue. These notes were published anonymously at the end of each issue under the rubric Paraskies [Παρασκιές', 'Penumbrae'] and provided information or commentary on the texts and writers included. The notes covered every writer whose work was published in the issue; they presented local writers, even members of the journal's group alongside foreign and established writers. The writers were presented one by one and in order of appearance, suggesting not only a comparison, but also a common narrative thread, a continuity among all the writers and works presented. The absence of signatures and attributions in 'Paraskies' conformed with the collaborative translations and the idea of collegiality that the *Κοχλίας* members were keen on projecting.[40] But they also express a tendency to initiate or continue discussion, to not assume authority, to transform

[39] For references to *Κοχλίας*, I use the reprint of its issues in the collective volume published by ELIA: *O Κοχλίας, 1945-1948* (Athens: ELIA, 1983). The page references correspond to the pagination of the volume which is separate for each year of the journal.

[40] As Kitsopoulos pointed out, unsigned notes are considered to express the general opinion of the journal and represent the entire team (1997 [1991], 48).

reading literature into a communal activity. However, in later accounts, it is revealed that the notes were mostly written by Pentzikis and Kitsopoulos; Pentzikis is often thought of as the 'mastermind' of *Κοχλίας*. The 'Paraskies' notes are found in twelve out of twenty-two published issues (December 1945-November 1946) and, as they represent the communality and collaboration that the group tried to convey through *Κοχλίας*, their evolution throughout the issues also reflects the changes in the dynamics of the group. In the second year of the journal (January 1947-January 1948), when the 'Paraskies' column was no longer printed, certain essays or prose pieces appeared occasionally in articles that addressed the other members and commented on the content of previous issues while there were also extensive opinion pieces on a specific text or writer, written by one of the members of *Κοχλίας*.

Κοχλίας circulated from December 1945 until January 1948, during the main period of the Greek Civil War which, however, is not mentioned in the journal. Apart from the three founders of the journal, Kitsopoulos, a writer, Svoronos, who worked on the typographical aesthetics of the publication, and Koniordos, who provided financial support, other members were Pentzikis, Karelli, Karolos Tsizek, a graphic designer who could read Czech and became a prolific translator after *Κοχλίας*, as well as poets Yorgos Themelis, Takis Varvitsiotis, Yorgos Stoyannidis, and painter Takis Iatrou. Every member's contribution to the journal depended on their individual skills, abilities, resources, and time. Comparing his own inclusive approach about accepting new writers and contributions in his journal *Διαγώνιος* [*Diagonios*, 'Diagonal'] (1958-1983), poet Dinos Christianopoulos later claimed that the members of *Κοχλίας* had formed a rather closed and exclusive group and, although they published texts of writers and poets who were not regular members (such as Papatsonis and Sinopoulos), they did not easily accept contributions from new people (Kouroudis 1997 [1991], 129-44). Each issue of *Κοχλίας* had a specific theme according to which the texts were chosen and organized but, unlike *Το 3ο μάτι*, their focus was on texts and less on other artistic media.

The first issue of *Κοχλίας*, published in December 1945, focused on death and afterlife and included philosophical and literary texts, and poems. The translation of the passage from 'Hades' was placed towards the end of the issue, preceded by three poems by Kitsopoulos with relevant titles—'Οι Πεθαμένοι' ('The Dead'), 'Οι Κλέφτες' ('The Thieves'), and 'Οι Τυμβωρύχοι' ('The Graverobbers'), (8-11)—and followed by a passage from *Gargantua* by François Rabelais. In various ways and adopting different tones, Kitsopoulos's poems, the passage from *Gargantua*, and the passage from 'Hades' all explore the boundaries between life and death, the world of the living and that of the dead, and the crossings and connections between the two realms. On the page where the passage from 'Hades' is presented, no explanatory information about its context or its place in the narrative has been included, but it is indicated clearly that it is an extract from a lengthier work. Underneath the title above the passage, 'ΤΖΕΗΜΣ ΤΖΟΫΣ. Ο ΟΔΥΣΣΕΑΣ' [JAMES JOYCE. ULYSSES], the editorial team included page citations from an English edition as well as the French translation, sharing their sources openly: 'Απόσπασμα: Σελ. 115-120 του αγγλικού κειμένου, στην έκδοση The Odyssey Press, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna, Σελ. 123-129 στη γαλλική μετάφραση της N.R.F.'[41] The translation was signed by all seven members of *Κοχλίας*: Zoi Karelli, Yorgis Kitsopoulos, Karolos Tsizek, Yannis Svoronos, Nikos Gavriil Pentzikis, Lefteris Koniordos, Takis Iatrou signed this contribution labeling it not as 'μετάφραση' ('translation'), but as 'μεταφραστική προσπάθεια' ('translational attempt'). As far as appearance and paratextual information are concerned, the translated passage is framed by a refusal of finalization and indications of textual openness as well as its connection to other texts.

Κοχλίας was known for its collaborative practices not only in critical writing, but also in its translations. However, as Kouroudis also points out, the collaborative translations, which were produced, or at least those which were signed by more than two people, comprise a very small part of

[41] 'Extract: P. 115-120 from the English text in the edition The Odyssey Press, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna, P. 123-129 in the French translation of the N.R.F.'

the journal's translation corpus (1997, 23-24). Translations signed by two names, which, as will be discussed later, is the case for the second passage from *Ulysses* they published, were more frequent, while towards the second year of the journal's circulation collaborative translation practices were almost entirely abandoned. In the interviews conducted and recorded by Kouroudis (1997) many members stated that the aim of the journal and the editorial team was to put forward the communal aspect of their work. Karelli talks about the collegial environment as an important aspect of *Κοχλίας* and presents the practice of collaborative translations as indicative of the group's aim for openness and discussion instead of finalization and unchangeability (1997 [1991], 64-68). Kitsopoulos also underlines the importance of collaboration in the translations which focused on writers with whom they had personal experience and interest, and to which everyone contributed regardless of language skills especially in the first translations; at the same time, he claims, there was constant interaction and questioning to ensure the quality of translations (1997 [1991], 46).

The Joyce passages and the process of their translation are recalled, years later, by more than one member of the *Κοχλίας* group. Although none of them comment extensively on the choice of the specific passages, the novel, or the writer, they refer to the specific translations as memorable moments that were indicative of how they worked and how *Κοχλίας* was produced. In his interview, Tsizek recalls the translation process of the 'Hades' passage:

> Ακόμα θυμάμαι την βραδιά που συγκεντρωμένοι πολλοί μαζί στο φαρμακείο [του Πεντζίκη] μεταφράζαμε ένα απόσπασμα από τον *Οδυσσέα* του Τζόυς. Φαντάζει λίγο αστείο, μετά από την «μεταφραστική προσπάθεια» να ακολουθούν εφτά ονόματα. Κι όμως, ήμασταν, συνολικά, εφτά. Τον κύριο λόγο τον είχε, βέβαια, ο Πεντζίκης, αλλά κάθε τόσο κάποιος άλλος μπορούσε να επέμβει με κάποια παρατήρησή του. Το δεύτερο απόσπασμα από τον *Οδυσσέα* του Τζόυς μεταφράστηκε μόνο από τον Πεντζίκη και τον Κιτσόπουλο. (1997 [1995], 95)
>
> I still remember that evening when many of us were gathered at the pharmacy [Pentzikis's pharmacy], translating an excerpt from Joyce's *Ulysses*. It seems somewhat funny, having seven names after the 'translational attempt'. And yet, we were indeed seven in total. Pentzikis, of course, was in charge, but every now and then someone

else could intervene with an observation. The second excerpt from Joyce's *Ulysses* was translated only by Pentzikis and Kitsopoulos.

That moment of translation is also described by both Kitsopoulos, who ended up having a directorial role in the journal, and Pentzikis. Kitsopoulos, specifically, mentions their choice of translating the name 'in Wisdom Hely's' into a pun as the result of a productive and lively process (1997 [1991], 46). What the *Κοχλίας* group read as a pun, is a reference to Charles Wisdom Hely, the owner and director of Hely's Ltd, a stationery store, printer, and publisher, in which Bloom used to work: 'For instance some fellow that died when I was at Wisdom Hely's' (*U* 6.968-69). Pentzikis, specifically, influenced by the 1929 French translation which translated it as 'chez Lesage Hely', and taking advantage of the phonetic potentialities of the phrase in conjunction with its meaning, initially suggested translating it as 'Σοφούλης Χέλης' ['wee wise eel'] (1997 [1991], 52). Other members of the group, realizing that the specific rendering could be construed as a mocking reference to Themistoklis Sofoulis, the Greek prime minister at the time, disagreed and another choice prevailed which is found in the published passage: 'Χέλης Φιλοσόφου'. Regardless of whether their reading was close to the text or not, locating this 'pun' shows that the translators of *Κοχλίας* were also paying attention to how the phrase sounds and its appearance, but also that they were anticipating the pun in Joyce. Consequently, translation, and especially of *Ulysses*, was seen primarily as a creative process of rewriting and reformulating sound. In his lecture 'Περίπατος στην ακρογιαλιά' ['Peripatos stin akrogialia', 'Walk by the seashore'], which will be discussed at the end of this chapter, Pentzikis talks about the ability of words to express meaning through their sound indicating his phonetic approach to translation.[42] Moreover, what is

[42] Ανακάλυπτα τη σημασία πούχε, το ότι ο ήχος μιας λέξης, εκτός από το νόημα που δηλώνει, μπορεί να μιμήται τον αχό του πραγμάτου [sic]. Βάθαινα χάρις στην ονοματοποιία, στη σημασία που μπορεί νάχη και να λάβη το όνομα, δηλώνοντας πρόσωπο, γενηά και τόπο ταυτόχρονα, γεμίζοντας από τη μνήμη ποικίλων σχέσεων', (I discovered the significance of the fact that, a word's sound, apart from the meaning it denotes, it can imitate/replicate the echo of the thing. Due to onomatopoeia, I understood more about the meaning that a name can have and acquire, by denoting the person, the origin and the place at the same time, and overflown with the memory of various relations.), (1951, 14)

worth noting here is the process through which the translators of *Κοχλίας* chose the specific solution, a process which the members highlight in their accounts years after the circulation of the journal. By adhering to that narrative, the former members of *Κοχλίας* project a specific version of their translation practice, a practice rooted in collaboration, lively and productive discussion, adding, editing, revising, and the simultaneous combination of different contributions. Even though these collaborative practices in translation concerned mostly the first year of the journal and few translations, the members of the group preserve the memory of the Joyce translation as representative of their work in *Κοχλίας*.

Nevertheless, in his article published while Kouroudis was still conducting his research, Kitsopoulos presents a different scene according to which the translation of the passage from 'Hades' was the product of a highly competitive fight over whose opinion would be heard and whose solution would be adopted in the translation (1994, 163-77). As Kitsopoulos describes, Karelli had drafted a translation of the passage from the English as she was familiar with the language, while Pentzikis 'was holding on tightly' to the French translation.[43] Calling the translation process a 'show' in which everyone played a different part and some of the members remained silent, Kitsopoulos here shares what actually happened behind the scenes of the translation of 'Hades' revealing that not all seven people who signed the translation participated equally or substantially. Nor was the collaboration a smooth one after all. Kitsopoulos and Tsizek were trying their best to contribute, while others remained silent as Pentzikis dominated the process by trying to impose his own approach. Pentzikis insisted on translating the first name of 'Wisdom Hely's' following the French translation, as the first

[43] 'Η Καρέλλη, που ήξερε αγγλικά, είχε κάνει μια προεργασία από το αγγλικό κείμενο κι' ο Πεντζίκης βαστούσε σφιχτά τη γαλλική μετάφραση της N.R.F. Τους άλλους δεν τους πολυθυμάμαι. Στην παράσταση, που άρχισε, έπαιζα εγώ κι' ο Τσίζεκ. Ο Ιατρού είχε ανοίξει επιδεικτικά το στόμα του και δεν έβγαζε άχνα. Πρωταγωνιστούσε επιθετικά ο Πεντζίκης.' (1994, 168-69)

name is also translated in the French.[44] Referring to the competitiveness that marked their work during their gatherings, Kitsopoulos described their collaborative practices as a 'boxing match', a constant disagreement. Although there was cooperation among the members of *Κοχλίας*, there was at the same time competition which did not coincide with the collegial image they were trying to project in print and, years later, in their interviews. This competition prevailed as the journal went along and was, eventually, one of the reasons that led to the end of *Κοχλίας*.

The narrative of collaborative translations could be considered alongside the strategy of the notes in 'Paraskies' which were not signed and presented the members of *Κοχλίας* alongside known or unknown figures of world literature. Their insistence on stories of a collaboration—which was not always there—was a way for the members of the journal to avoid singling out prevailing figures or celebrities. Translating texts of foreign literature and associating their names with the work of established writers who had not become widely known in the Greek literary space was a way for them not only to bring new material, but also to establish their name in the literary sphere. Moreover, the exclusivity they maintained as a group, as well as their habit of sharing information about their practices through texts of self-criticism are strategies that show an effort to create a literary tradition and a canon of original works as well as translations. The Thessaloniki-based writers and the interiority they cultivated were still being ignored by the Athenian intellectual elite. Following *Το 3ο μάτι*, *Κοχλίας* tried in a more systematic and organized way to express an approach of modernism based on reading new foreign writers, translation, and criticism. *Ulysses*, presented through passages, becomes again a key text in these strategies, reflecting the efforts of the group for reflection on translation practices, for commentary on the contemporary literary history and, finally, for critical interpretation. It is the only text among those they published from which both translated passages are labeled as

[44] In his interview to Kouroudis, Pentzikis himself claims that he did not know English: 'Εγώ αγγλικά δεν ξέρω. Στον Τζόυς μετέφραζαν εκ του αγγλικού και γω τα βόλευα στα ελληνικά.' ('I do not know English. In Joyce they translated from the English and I fixed it in the Greek.'), (1997 [1991], 52)

'μεταφραστική προσπάθεια' showing therefore not only a consciousness of the challenges of the text, but also a consideration of the openness of the translation process. It reflects, therefore, the efforts of the group for canon creation and recognition.

Reading closely the passage of 'Hades' as it has been translated in *Κοχλίας*, one can trace its eventful translation process in the way in which the English and French texts can be 'read' in it. Instead of having been translated exclusively either from the English original or the French translation, the Greek translation of the passage from 'Hades' draws simultaneously from both sources, which are specifically cited in the beginning of its final version. For example, the first sentence of the passage has been translated as

> Γύρω στ' ασκεπή κεφάλια χαδιάρικη αύρα ψιθύριζε. Ψίθυρος. (12)

which mirrors the word order in the French rendering of the phrase with the verb at the end of the sentence instead of that in the English original:

> Autour des têtes découvertes une brise caressante murmurait. Murmure. ([1929] 1930, 123)
> Gentle sweet air blew round the bared heads in a whisper. Whisper. (1932, 115; *U* 6.839)

However, a few lines below in the same paragraph, the phrase 'Ξεψυχώντας να την αγκαλιάσει με τα πουκάμισά του' is closer to the English original rather than the slightly deviating French translation:

> Ξεψυχώντας να την αγκαλιάσει με τα πουκάμισά του. (12)
> Dying to embrace her in his shirt. (115; *U* 6.852)
> Le mourant en chemise qui veut la prendre dans ses bras. (123)

Traces of both the French and the English texts alternate throughout this Greek translation of 'Hades', even within the same paragraph and they can be located in lexical as well as syntactical choices. For example, the sentence 'Σκυμμένος στα δυο με την ψαλλίδα του **που κάνει κλαπ**' (12) follows the syntax

of the French 'Plié en deux avec son secateur **qui claque**' (126) instead of the somewhat ambiguous English 'Bent down double with his shears **clipping**' (117; *U* 6.935). In the phrase 'Κι' αν ήταν ζωντανός όλο αυτό το διάστημα' (12) the translators have drawn from the English in terms of syntax 'And if he was alive all this time?' (115; *U* 6.865-66), rather than the French 'Et s'il n'avait pas cessé de vivre' (123). An example of alternation between the English and the French can be found in the following:

> —Ακριβώς παίρνω τα ονόματα, λέει ο Χάϊνες με χαμηλή ανάσα. Ποιο είναι το μικρό σου όνομα; Δε το θυμάμαι ακριβώς. (12)
> —I am just taking the names, Hynes said below his breath. What is your christian name? I'm not sure. (116; *U* 6.880-81)
> —Je suis en train de recueillir les noms, dit Hynes parlant dans son gilet. Quel est votre nom de baptême ? Je ne sais plus au juste. (124)

In the first period, the English expressions are found in the choices of 'Ακριβώς' (a word-for-word rendering), and 'με χαμηλή ανάσα', whereas the last phrase 'Δε το θυμάμαι ακριβώς' echoes the French 'au juste'.

Apart from cases of syntactical similarities that show how the translators used the two versions of the episode, there are also cases of interpretation where the simultaneous use of the English and French is transparent. In the Greek 'Μαγείρευα καλό ιρλανδέζικο στιφάδο' (13) the translators have ignored the French 'Je faisais du bon haricot de mouton' (126) in favor of the English original 'I cooked good Irish stew' (118; *U* 6.940), an instance in which the Irish specificity is considered more pertinent in order to place the locality of the text. At the same time, a paragraph later, the translators have chosen a more specific rendering of the abstract phrase 'Apollo that was' (118; *U* 6.959) by drawing from the French translation 'C' était Apollon, ce peintre' (126) and therefore translating as 'Απόλλων λεγόταν ο ζωγράφος' (13). Finally, the Greek translation of the phrase below responds to both the English original and the French translation:

Devilling for the other firm. (119; *U* 6.984)
Ils travaillent pour l'autre raison sociale. (127)
Δουλεύουν για μιαν άλλη φίρμα. (13)

In this sentence, the translators render the idiomatic 'devilling' through the French 'ils travaillent' while the word 'φίρμα' corresponds semantically to both the English and the French texts and is connected etymologically to the English 'firm'. An acoustic similarity has been achieved between the Greek rendering and the English text, as not only 'φίρμα' echoes 'firm', but also the word 'δουλεύουν' repeats similar sounds found in 'devilling', which brings us back to the example of 'Wisdom Hely's'.[45]

The approach of the *Κοχλίας* translators highlights that translation was a creative process for them and not simply a means of transferring meaning from one language to another. As a result, *Κοχλίας* was not simply a journal that published foreign literature, but focused on translation as an act and a creative process. Towards the end of the passage, the Greek translation becomes closer to the French which, it could be argued, is indicative of the 'boxing match' that took place among the translators of *Κοχλίας*—and perhaps of Pentzikis getting his way.

A comparative close reading of the passage from 'Hades' in the English original, the 1929 French translation, and the Greek translation in *Κοχλίας* shows a process of active translating which involved editing, agonistic togetherness, and revisiting. The members of *Κοχλίας* translated from the English and the French, engaging in a constant questioning of both these texts while the French translation is also transformed into a source that is consulted as an original text. Tracing the pattern of choices from the English original and the French translation, it can be argued that these two texts are in a competitive relation with each other in the Greek translation as they appear interchangeably in the same paragraph or even in the same sentence. Not only that, but the act of checking the French

[45] Slote, Mamigonian, and Turner cite the *OED* for the meaning of 'to devil' as working in the name of someone else who receives credit for said work (2022, 213). As a result, the Greek 'δουλεύουν' is not too far from 'devilling' in terms of semantics either.

translation alongside the English original, of going back and forth between different versions of the text, validating, therefore, the Greek translation, is visible in the published passage. The Greek translation of the passage of 'Hades' encloses both versions while providing a third version without hiding the process through which it was produced. This process is not only reflected in the text itself, but also in the way that the passage is framed, the detailed citations of the English and the French texts, and the collective signature, as well as the labeling of the passage as a 'translational attempt'. Thematizing their translation practice, the translators present not a finished nor a finalized translation, but an initial contribution to translating *Ulysses*, one of the many stages in a multivalent and ongoing process. By sharing their sources, they allow their readers to potentially engage in their own research, compare, and contrast. At the same time, they also put forward a transparency and an honesty regarding their translation practice which, as per Kitsopoulos's account, was tumultuous. Appealing to the sources they used is a way for the group to direct their readers to form their own opinion, but also to make up for the conflicts they had over different translation choices, and to provide information about their practice. By using the label 'translational attempt' they indicate that their translation is an ongoing process while also acknowledging its instability and rendering it part of the reading experience.

Joyce, symbolism, and naturalism: notes about *Ulysses* in *Κοχλίας*

A first reading of the note that accompanied the 'Hades' passage gives the impression of a broadly informative text which seeks to briefly introduce the Irish writer and his work to the reader. The note is included in 'Paraskies', at the end of the issue.[46] Opening abruptly without introduction, the note places Joyce in a literary historical context:

[46] The note about the translation of the passage from 'Hades' is found in *Παρασκιές*, *Κοχλίας* 1 (1945), 15-6.

> Ο Τζέημς Τζόυς συνεχίζει το συμβολιστικό κίνημα: (Ο Μαλαρμέ πάντα επιθυμούσε να γράψει ένα βιβλίο που να περιέχει ολόκληρη την ζωή ενός ανθρώπου). (15)
>
> James Joyce takes the symbolist movement further: (Mallarmé always wanted to write a book which would contain someone's entire life).

At the same time, the opening of the note reminds the reader of the current issue's underlying theme and, therefore, what connects Joyce with the rest of the content included, that is, texts which are all in one way or another about death, the moment of death, and afterlife (Pentzikis, Kitsopoulos, Rabelais). It also points towards the concept of the symbol, another underlying theme throughout the specific issue of *Κοχλίας* as it opens with a text by philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev titled 'Περὶ συμβόλου' ('Of the symbol', 1-2) from his book *Freedom and the Spirit* (1927), and includes poetry by Karelli and Kitsopoulos with influences from *symbolisme*. The chosen passage from 'Hades' is also read in the context of symbolism as is apparent in the note. Listing the titles of Joyce's other works (which echo the titles of their French translations), the note returns to interior monologue and Joyce's 'debt' to Dujardin, as was also mentioned ten years earlier in *Το 3ο μάτι*. This time, however, there are more details that are specific to Joyce's novel. The ban of *Ulysses* in England is mentioned, while a summary of the novel's plot is given along with its correspondence to the *Odyssey*. Meanwhile, Bloom's interior monologue, which runs through the passage of 'Hades', is described as composed of 'many things—events, and thoughts that are reflected through them, along with elliptical phrases drawn from the common tongue'.[47] This kind of background was absent from the Joyce publication in *Το 3ο μάτι* since there Molly's monologue was presented as an exemplary case for a theoretical discussion. On the contrary, in the note accompanying the 'Hades' passage, there is an effort to distinguish between different cases of interior monologue depending on the character to which it belongs. In the last part

[47] 'Ένα πλήθος πράγματα—γεγονότα και σκέψεις που ανακλώνται απ' αυτά, μαζύ με φράσεις ελλειπτικές παρμένες απ' την κοινή λαλιά, συγκροτούν τον εσωτερικό μονόλογο του κ. Μπλουμ.' (1945, 15)

of the note, Joyce's method is compared to that of a painter, his words and phrases are seen as his primary material that he molds in order to produce work, while his style is presented as classical and pure. Finally, the note includes a brief mention to *Finnegans Wake* which is called 'the epic of a night in Dublin' ('η εποποποιΐα [sic] μιας νύχτας στο Δουβλίνο', 16) and with which Joyce completes his artistic œuvre. Upon a first reading, therefore, this note functions as a brief and general introduction of Joyce as a writer, which was not offered in *Το 3ο μάτι* as the focus was on his writing technique. It is a note which includes general information while also raising certain issues without, however, analyzing them further. Although on its own this note might seem unimportant, reading it alongside the note that accompanied the second translation from *Ulysses* which was published five months later in *Κοχλίας*, reveals more about the journal's approach of the Irish writer.

In the sixth issue published in May 1946, the *Κοχλίας* group included a translation of a passage from 'Proteus', the third episode of *Ulysses*.[48] In 'Proteus', Stephen Dedalus, whose childhood and adolescence are narrated in *A Portrait*, and who is the main character of the first three episodes of *Ulysses* before Bloom appears, is walking by the beach on Sandymount strand. Very little happens in this episode in terms of plot; Stephen is thinking about visiting his aunt Sara but eventually decides against it and continues his stroll. In 'Proteus' the reader becomes more acquainted with Stephen's character, as it has been formed since his 'flight' from Ireland with which *A Portrait* ended, a gap of time during which he had to return to his mother's deathbed. In the first two episodes, 'Telemachus' and 'Nestor', we learn more about what has happened in Stephen's life between the end of *A Portrait* and the beginning of *Ulysses*, we see him in his interactions with other people and find out about his living situation and work; in 'Proteus' we become familiar with the developments in Stephen's artistic and philosophical thinking. *A Portrait* ended with a series of entries from Stephen's diary; *Ulysses* opens

[48] James Joyce (1946), 'Τζέημς Τζόυς. Ο Στήβεν παρά θιν' αλός. Απόσπασμα απ' την αρχή του «Οδυσσέα»', *Κοχλίας*, 6: 100-2.

with Stephen's interior monologue. The written monologue of the diary has now evolved into interior monologue—a development described in the introduction to the technique in *To 3ο μάτι*, without, however, the correlation between *A Portrait* and *Ulysses* being included. The passage from 'Proteus', which was translated and published in issue six of *Κοχλίας*, is drawn from the episode's final pages (*U* 3.265-505) where Stephen sees the carcass of a dog and a live dog, as well as two figures which he takes for 'cocklepickers'. He sits on a rock and scribbles a poem, puts the paper and the pencil back in his pocket, and, contemplating the tide, the sea, and what is under the waters, he leaves as a ship sails behind him.

In contrast to the 'Hades' passage, the translation of the 'Proteus' passage in *Κοχλίας* did not include page references to the original nor to the French translation. It was presented instead under the title 'Ο Στήβεν παρά θιν' αλός' ['O Stephen para thin' alos', 'Stephen by the seaside'], which suggested an autonomy of the passage as it underlined its place in the journal. At the same time, the subtitle 'Απόσπασμα απ' την αρχή του «Οδυσσέα»' ('Extract from the beginning of *Ulysses*') indicates the place of the excerpt in the novel. By using the Iliadic phrase 'παρά θιν' αλός' meaning 'by the seaside', the title also foregrounds the text's Homeric connections. In contrast to the translation of the passage from 'Hades', the translation from 'Proteus' is signed by only two members of the *Κοχλίας* group this time, Kitsopoulos and Pentzikis. As was the case with the translation of 'Hades' discussed earlier, in the translation of the passage from 'Proteus' there are again phrases which are closer to the French rendering, admittedly more frequent than in the translation of 'Hades'. The translation approach, therefore, seems to have been similar to the one followed in the 'Hades' translation, that of alternating between the English and French texts, but with a focus on the French translation and under less tension as there were only two translators this time. Despite the different process and circumstances, the translation is labeled, once again, as 'μεταφραστική προσπάθεια' ('translational attempt'). Kitsopoulos revealed the following regarding the 'Proteus' translation:

> Στο άλλο απόσπασμα του «Οδυσσέα», μεταφράσαμε ο Πεντζίκης και γω. Είχε κάνει την προεργασία από το κείμενο της N.R.F. και «Ο Στήβεν παρά θίν' αλός» βγήκε με άνεση και πολύ πιο νόμιμα, χωρίς χτυπήματα κάτω απ' τη ζώνη. Δεν μπορώ να θυμηθώ γιατί δεν ήταν η Καρέλλη, ούτε ποιος είχε το αγγλικό κείμενο. Εκείνο που θυμάμαι είναι πως στη «μεταφραστική αυτή προσπάθεια» ο Πεντζίκης αλώνισε καταπώς ήθελε, πράγμα που μια σύγκριση ανάμεσα στις δυό μπορεί να το αποδείξει. Όταν δεν τούφερνες αντίρρηση, έχανε κάθε ενδιαφέρον, καταλάγιαζε. (1994, 169)
>
> In the other passage from *Ulysses*, it was Pentzikis and I who translated. He had prepared a preliminary draft from the N.R.F. text and 'Stephen by the seaside' was produced with ease and much more legitimately, without 'low blows'. I cannot recall why Karelli was not there, nor who had the English text. What I recall is that, in that 'translational attempt', Pentzikis had his way, something that a comparison between the two shall prove. When he was not being contradicted, he lost every interest and abated.

In the passage of 'Proteus', the second Joyce translation published in *Κοχλίας*, the French translation is easier to discern than it was in 'Hades', and that is where Pentzikis's work can be traced. Pentzikis's intervention is observed, however, in other elements as well, such as the Iliadic allusion of the title, as well as the note that accompanies the translation. The phrase 'παρά θιν' αλός' in the title is drawn from two instances in the *Iliad* where Achilles, feeling wronged or in grief, withdraws by the seaside to meet his mother. Pentzikis uses this phrase again in a lecture given in 1950 and published in 1951, as well as in his novel *Το μυθιστόρημα της κυρίας Έρσης* [*To mythistorima tiw kyrias Ersis*, 'Mrs Ersi's novel'] (1966).[49] The difference between translation processes in the two Joyce publications in *Κοχλίας* shows how engagement with the text evolves. Even if definitive from the beginning, Pentzikis's involvement is declared and foregrounded clearly in the translated passage from 'Proteus'. *Ulysses* is starting to become associated with the work of individual writers rather than groups.

The note which accompanies the translation of the 'Proteus' passage was not included in 'Paraskies', which continued until the last issue of 1946, but was placed directly below the translation

[49] The title 'παρά θιν' αλός' for the passage but also for the episode of 'Proteus' more broadly is reproduced by Aravantinou (1983, 157).

(102). While the note for the 'Hades' passage pointed towards Joyce's symbolist connections, the note for 'Proteus' introduces a different association:

> Σχετικά με τον Τζέημς Τζόυς αναφέρουμε τον Νατουραλισμό. (102)
> Regarding James Joyce we should mention Naturalism.

Despite the different opening statements of each note which seem to suggest general conclusions about Joyce's work, they correspond to their respective translated passages. The recurrent vocabulary of death in 'Hades' encourages a symbolist reading of the passage, while the content of the entire issue of the journal responds to aspects of symbolism and the symbol. On the other hand, the highly detailed descriptions and narrative of 'Proteus' are elements closer to naturalism. However, the note accompanying the 'Proteus' passage moves beyond a generalizing introduction, as it expands on naturalism in painting and the movement's failure to evolve further in literature by following its theoretical principles. According to the note for 'Proteus', naturalism in literature resulted in a strict academic discourse and an overuse of language. Using *Ulysses* as a starting point, the note touches upon the continuity and interaction between literary movements and emphasizes the role of symbolism in salvaging the forms of expression that naturalism, through its academicism, had rendered meaningless. As for Joyce, he is presented in the note as the author whose work incarnates fully the theoretical aims of naturalism:

> Στην εργασία του Τζόυς συγκεφαλαιώνονται όλες αυτές οι μοντέρνες αναζητήσεις, έτσι που το έργο του μπορεί να θεωρηθεί όχι πια σαν το αριστούργημα της νατουραλιστικής σχολής, μα σαν το άκρο επίτευγμα του θεωρητικού της πλάνου. (102)
>
> All these modern questions come together in Joyce's work, in such a way that his work can no longer be considered as the masterpiece of the naturalist school, but as the ultimate achievement of its theory.

The note accompanying 'Proteus' places Joyce in a much more clearly defined context than the one corresponding to 'Hades'. Instead of simply being presented as an idiosyncratic albeit important writer,

there is now a more precise outline of the Irish author's role in both naturalism and symbolism. More than that, Joyce's use of the Homeric epics is discussed alongside the theoretical principles of naturalism:

> Γι' αυτό αν η παρομοίωση όπως έγινε των μυθιστορημάτων του Ζολά με τον Όμηρο είναι εντελώς σόλοικη και βέβηλη, η εργασία του Τζόυς στέκει τουλάχιστον σαν μια σωστή σύγχρονη ερμηνεία των Ομηρικών επών. Γιατί μεταφέρει την Ομηρική σύμπτωση του φανταστικού με την πλατύτερη έννοια του ρεαλισμού, στην σχετική σύμπτωση του υποκειμενικού με τον ρεαλισμό του καιρού μας που κοινά τον βλέπουμε σαν την ντετερμινιστική πραγματικότητα του νατουραλισμού. (102)
>
> And if the comparison between Zola's novels and Homer was entirely wrong and sacrilegious, Joyce's work stands at least as a true contemporary interpretation of the Homeric epics. Because it shifts the Homeric coexistence of the imaginary with realism in its wider sense, to the relative coexistence of the subjective with the realism of our time which we generally see as the deterministic reality of naturalism.

The association of Joyce with the Homeric epics in the note is not based on the number, frequency, or faithfulness of parallels or correspondences found in *Ulysses*. It rather draws from the way in which contemporary literary tendencies inform these correspondences. The note suggests that Joyce manages to rewrite the Homeric epics, not by simply changing the temporality of plot and characters, but by employing the principles and forms of contemporary literary movements. Moreover, the note highlights that Joyce transfers the Homeric antitheses into his own time and work. It proposes, therefore, a more nuanced interpretation of Joyce's 'mythical method' than the one given by T. S. Eliot in his review '*Ulysses*, Order, and Myth' (originally published in *The Dial* in 1923), and reproduced by George Seferis in his essay 'Κ. Π. Καβάφης, Θ. Σ. Έλιοτ· παράλληλοι' ['C. P. Cavafy, T. S. Eliot; parallels']. While Eliot had described Joyce's use of myth as 'a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history' (1975, 175-8), and Seferis had included the aspect of history in the term 'mythical method', the *Κοχλίας* note focuses on how Joyce rewrites myth through contemporary literary forms.

The note accompanying the 'Proteus' passage goes one step further than the 'Paraskies' note corresponding to the 'Hades' passage in the first issue. While the 'Hades' note introduces Joyce and focuses on *Ulysses*, providing a summary of the plot, its main points and informative background, the note for 'Proteus' takes Joyce's work as a starting point for theoretical considerations regarding artistic and literary history. Although the first note remains closer to factual information about *Ulysses*, it also compares Joyce's method to that of a painter's, an analogy which is explained analytically in the second note. The differences between the two presentations of Joyce in *Κοχλίας*, the translations and the accompanying notes, and the aspects covered by each of them reflect, first of all, the evolution that the journal underwent since its first issue and the changes in the dynamics of the team that published it. The tension encapsulated in the translation of 'Hades', as well as the accompanying brief note are revealing of the competitiveness that prevailed among the members of *Κοχλίας* as they were striving to give shape to the publication they had envisioned. Their processes and practices solidified as they produced more issues, and the dynamics among them settled, while individual writers are starting to express an interest in Joyce, a change which is reflected in the second Joyce translation and its respective note in the sixth issue. Joyce's *Ulysses* appears in *Κοχλίας* first as part of the group's strategies of cultivating a tradition and gaining recognition through association with foreign writers and their work. The accounts about the translation process of 'Hades' illustrate the image that the *Κοχλίας* members were trying to promote for the journal and for themselves as Thessaloniki writers. Appearing as a community, these writers sought to create a literary tradition in the space in which they were based as a counterexample to the Athenian tradition; by blending their original work with translations that they produced themselves, and critical-essayistic work, they aimed for literary recognition. And while these seem to have been the initial aims of *Κοχλίας*, as the journal progressed certain figures unavoidably stood out. Tracing the progress of Pentzikis's involvement from the first to the second Joyce translation reveals him as a figure who developed a personal interest in the Irish writer. He

approaches Joyce through his preoccupation with visual art, painting, and the interaction between different art forms, while the title 'Ο Στήβεν παρά θιν' αλός' reflects his reading of Joyce through Homer. *Ulysses*, therefore, in *Κοχλίας* becomes part of a group of writers' promotional strategies, a translation workshop, and a way of understanding literary history, while it is eventually taken up by specific writers as a text which raises issues that preoccupied them in their own writing.

Joyce was brought in the critical discussions of *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* as an example of issues surrounding modern novel writing, whereas in *Κοχλίας* he becomes a starting point through which to develop a discourse around art history and theory. In 1932, the debate in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* focused on interior monologue and referred to Joyce as a crucial part of the technique's origins. In 1936, *Το 3ο μάτι* sought to contribute to the conversation about interior monologue by providing a textual example, introducing the aspect of translation and reading. Ten years later, *Κοχλίας* did not approach *Ulysses* explicitly through the past debates, but highlighted broader issues of literary taxonomy focusing on art movements and intermediality, touching upon Joyce's Homeric connections and his place in the world literary space. At the same time, the interior monologue debate was still present as the passages published in *Κοχλίας* were also excerpts of interior monologue, but not from 'Penelope', which was considered the exemplary chapter for the technique. The passages were from the monologues of the other two main characters, Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus, instead of Molly, whose monologue was considered the most representative. Both Joyce translations were labeled 'translational attempts'—the only translations in the *Κοχλίας* issues to be labeled as such, which shows how translation of *Ulysses* was perceived in comparison to other texts. Moreover, both Joyce-related notes in *Κοχλίας* raise the issue of language, style, and writing in his work, as if they are study materials for someone who wants to work on their writing. The translated texts, therefore, are also viewed as sources of study for further writing, as translation workshops, as initial contributions anticipating further revising, and retranslations. As a result, while I agree with Voyiatzaki (2002) that Joyce influenced strongly the

thinking around the modern Greek novel, especially as far as certain writers are concerned, this can also be a limiting way of reading the early reception of Joyce in Greece. While *Ulysses* is certainly connected with a developing critical discourse about modern writing practices, Joyce's work becomes a way through which to develop critical thinking on literary and art history, theory, as well as the interaction between different art forms and media. Presented initially as an example of translation experimentation, collaboration, and anonymity*, Ulysses* becomes a work on which to anchor critical discourse, as well as writing style and practice. Consequently, it eventually acquires special meaning for certain members of *Κοχλίας*, specifically Pentzikis and Karelli, and their progress as writers.

Karelli and Pentzikis: early critical writing about Joyce

In the thirteenth issue of *Κοχλίας*, in January 1947, Karelli published an article titled 'Η αγάπη κι' ο θάνατος. Εκδοχές και παρατηρήσεις διαβάζοντας τον Οδυσσέα του Τζέϊμς Τζόϋς' ['Love and death. Glosses and observations while reading James Joyce's *Ulysses*'].[50] The article appeared a year before her second poetry collection titled *Η εποχή του θανάτου: εκδοχές και παρατηρήσεις* [*The era of death: glosses and observations*] (1948). Drawing from Joyce's *Ulysses* and not only from the passages that had already been published in the journal, Karelli's piece could be read in the context of her preparation for her poetry collection. Providing her own critical approach on the themes of love and death in *Ulysses* as a pair of opposites which are also interconnected, Karelli introduces a philosophical interpretation of Joyce's novel which also leads to further reflections on the writer and the self in terms of Joyce. Influenced by her background in religious metaphysics and mysticism, Karelli examines the concept of love in the sense of 'αγάπη' (*agape*) in the different forms it is manifested in the novel, such as mother's love,

[50] Zoi Karelli (1947), 'Η αγάπη κι' ο θάνατος. Εκδοχές και παρατηρήσεις διαβάζοντας τον Οδυσσέα του Τζέϊμς Τζόϋς', *Κοχλίας* 13: 1-3, 7.

father's love, and considering *eros* a version of it. Both love and death, contrasting concepts that have long preoccupied Joyce scholarship, are viewed through the lens of existentialism and Christianity, Karelli's primary interests throughout her work.

A prolific poet, essayist, and playwright, Karelli had only started publishing her work in the 1930s; her first appearance was a reflective piece in the first issue of *Το 3ο μάτι* ('Διαθέσεις' ['Diatheseis', 'Dispositions'], 1935, 16-17), while her first poem was published in *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* in 1937 ('Φατεπουρσικρί' ['Fatepoursikri'], issue 11-12, 290). In the editorial of that issue, which introduces the contributions that follow, it is stated that Karelli, along with her brother Pentzikis (who also had a text in that issue) and Doukas were part of a literary circle, a 'school', which was trying to break away from tradition.[51] They are presented as still new to the literary sphere while their work is described as 'γυμνάσματα', exercises rather than fully formed literary production.[52] Karelli published her first poetry collection, *Πορεία* [*Poreia*, 'Route'], in 1940, and gained recognition through her involvement in *Κοχλίας*. She had received a multivalent education, not usual for women at the time, and, having knowledge of four languages (English, French, German, Italian), she was one of the members of *Κοχλίας* who could read and translate from many different writers. In *Κοχλίας*, she also maintained a strong presence as a writer where she contributed with poems and prose in seventeen out of twenty-two issues. The prose she published in the journal is often of an idiosyncratic and reflective style, essayistic but not scholarly as she combines analytical and critical insights on writers and texts with more personal writing and poetic style. Apart from philosophical and existential ruminations, these pieces include also her reflections and comments on the texts she reads and occasionally on texts presented in *Κοχλίας*. Her article about Joyce's *Ulysses* draws from the novel which had been among the journal's main interests,

[51] See Anonymous (1937), 'Τύρω απ' την κίνηση', *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* 11-12, 265-69: 267.
[52] 'Ο κ. Ν. Πεντζίκης, η Κα Καρέλη [sic], ο κ. Στρατής Δούκας κ' ένας δυό άλλοι, έχουν κάμει έναν κύκλο δικό τους, μια σχολή ιδιαίτερη. Έχουν ταλέντο, έχουν αξία. Πάνε να σπάσουν την κλασσική παράδοση. Γνώμη μας είναι ότι η προσπάθειά τους περνάει ακόμα την περίοδο της ασκήσεως. Γυμνάσματα είναι τα γραπτά τους.', (1937, 267)

but it also briefly addresses Papatsonis and refers to his poem 'V Day', published in an earlier issue. After *Κοχλίας*, Karelli kept publishing essays in journals like *Μορφές* [*Morfes*, 'Figures'], *Ευθύνη* [*Efthyni*, 'Responsibility'], *Ροτόντα* [*Rotonta*, 'Rotunda'] which, however, were more argumentative and analytical and less idiosyncratic than her early prose work.[53] Her early pieces could be read as closely connected to her formation as a poet, as preparatory notes and drafts, reflections on the creative process, and it is such a reading that I propose for her article on Joyce. In 'Η αγάπη κι' ο θάνατος', Karelli draws from Joyce's *Ulysses* to discuss the contrasting concepts of love and death in relation to art. At the same time, however, she engages critically with *Ulysses* and comments on certain passages which she also cites in translation.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, Karelli was among those responsible for the first translation of Joyce, the passage from 'Hades', for which she had provided a translation draft from the English. It is not known whether she participated at all in the second translation, the passage from 'Proteus'; however, it is possible that she had helped with it too because, even though the French text prevails, traces of the English text can be located as well. Seven months after the passage from 'Proteus', and while she kept publishing in *Κοχλίας*, Karelli's article on *Ulysses* appeared in the first issue of the journal's second year. Using the first person, a motif which appears in her early reflective prose writing and does not always denote an autobiographical first person, Karelli begins with a statement: 'Είμαι άνθρωπος αδύνατος και ζητώ την αγάπη, της αγάπης την έννοια, έχω της αγάπης την έγνοια' ('I am a weak human asking for love, the meaning of love, I am care about love', 1). Adopting a free associative and poetic style throughout her piece, Karelli searches for the concept of love in the plot and the themes of *Ulysses*. She argues that love is absent in *Ulysses*, because it is a formally perfect work of art which leaves no space for human emotion. Starting from 'Circe', the 'dream episode' which takes place at a brothel in Nighttown, Karelli suggests that it is there that *eros* can be found as an

[53] She republished many of these essays in *Παρατηρήσεις* (2 vols) 1982-1994 (Athens: Astrolavos/Efthyni).

expression of love, but it is eventually refused by the writer. Reflecting on the technical and formal artistry of the novel in comparison to its 'creator', Karelli argues that *Ulysses* is an impeccable creation of a genius, yet cruel writer, a masterpiece in which the mind prevails over emotion:

> …γιατί στο έργο του, που είναι συντριπτικά δυνατό, από άποψη τεχνική, όπου, όλα, και κυριώτατα το αίσθημα, καθαρά αποδείχνεται μέσο, η αγάπη κι' η ανθρώπινη αδυναμία για χάδι, γι' αυταρέσκεια κι' αυτοϊκανοποίηση δεν έχουν θέση. […] Η ανθρώπινη σκληρότητα του Τζόϋς είναι μοναδική όπως είναι μοναδική η τεχνική τελειότητα του «Οδυσσέα». Η κυριαρχία του νου πάνω στο αίσθημα, το μέτρημα του αισθήματος, εκμηδενίζει και μένει ακέραια η εντύπωση της τέχνης. (1)
>
> …because his work, which is devastatingly strong, in terms of form, where everything and, most of all, emotion is clearly proven to be a means, love and human yearning for a touch, for self-love and self-satisfaction have no place. […] Joyce's human cruelty is as unique as the formal perfection of *Ulysses*. The mind's dominance over emotion, the control of emotion negates and only the impression of art remains intact.

As seen in the material analyzed until now, the translations of *Ulysses* that had already appeared in the Greek literary space were published to highlight a specific formal aspect of the novel or to contextualize it within literary history and latest developments in literary tendencies. Karelli's piece is one of the first attempts to discuss other aspects such as plot and characters, and to explore interpretations. Looking at excerpts from 'Circe', Karelli illustrates her point about the absence of love and concludes that amid the absence of love and emotion in *Ulysses*, it is only the word, in the sense of *logos*, that Joyce 'loves':

> Ποιον; τι αγαπάει ο τεχνίτης; Ο άνθρωπος παιδεύεται, μα δεν μπορεί να δοκιμάσει άλλην αγάπη, έρωτα, διαφορετικόν από κείνον για τον εαυτό του. […]
> Ο Τζόϋς αγαπάει τον λόγο. Αυτόν παιδεύει. Τον εξαρθρώνει, αυτός, που κατορθώνει την πιο τέλεια ενορχήστρωση, την πιο καθαρή, δυνατή μουσική συμφωνία. Ο τεχνίτης του λόγου ερωτεύεται τον λόγο, μ' αυτόν συζεί. Τον τρώγει κι' απ' αυτόν κατατρώγεται. Γίνεται ο ίδιος λόγια. Βλέπω ακριβώς το σώμα του Τζόϋς, στον «Οδυσσέα», λόγον ολόκληρον, να σχηματίζεται ολόκληρος με λόγια, άνθρωπος όλων των ειδών, κρατάει λόγια κατάλληλα για όλα τα μέρη, μέλη αναλόγως απ' το σώμα του. (2)
>
> Whom? what does the artificer love? Man struggles, but he cannot feel another love, another passion, different than the one he feels about himself. […]

> Joyce loves the word. That is what he plays with. He dismantles it achieving the most perfect orchestration, the clearest, strongest symphony. The artificer of the word falls in love with the word, he lives with it. He eats it up and is eaten up by it. He becomes himself words. I can see clearly Joyce's body, in *Ulysses*, the whole *logos*, composed entirely out of words, a jack of all trades, he keeps appropriate words for all parts, which are respectively parts of his body.

Focusing this time on Joyce's identity as a writer, rather than as a person, Karelli views Joyce-writer as a being made of words. This distinction between Joyce as a person and Joyce as a writer alludes to the binarism that characterizes Karelli's poetics. Binaries, opposite pairs, and contrasting elements run through her poetic and prose work, and stem from the concept of duality in human nature, that is, the contrast between human as a being that is subject to decay and death, and, on the other hand, the divine element, the presence of god in human existence. Originating from Karelli's Christian metaphysics and existential anxiety, this duality, therefore, is about the contrast but also the connection between the material and the immaterial aspects of human existence, the corporeal and the spiritual (Kotini 2019). For Karelli, this duality is found in writers too, that is, between person and writer, corresponding to the material-immaterial contrast. It is in this context that her view of Joyce as a cruel creator, but also as a body made of words should be placed as she focuses on Joyce as an artificer.

Apart from the work's formal perfection, which is achieved at the expense of emotional depth, Karelli also attributes the absence of love to the lack of faith and god. Keeping Christian philosophy in view, Karelli draws on what has been viewed as the aspect of heresy in *Ulysses* which she interprets as denial of faith. One such example is Stephen's refusal to pray by his mother's deathbed. While this does not happen in *Ulysses*, it is something that belongs to the recent past of the novel and is being referred to and recalled throughout the text. Even though Stephen has not repented, the incident as well as the image of his dying mother is a memory that haunts him and, therefore, comes back in the form of his mother's ghost in 'Circe' and it is that scene on which Karelli focuses:

THE MOTHER

(*comes nearer, breathing upon him softly her breath of wetted ashes*) All must go through it, Stephen. More women than men in the world. You too. Time will come.

STEPHEN

(*choking with fright, remorse and horror*) They say I killed you, mother. He offended your memory. Cancer did it, not I. Destiny.

THE MOTHER

(*a green rill of bile trickling from a side of her mouth*) You sang that song to me. *Love's bitter mystery.*

STEPHEN

(*eagerly*) Tell me the word, mother, if you know now. The word known to all men.

THE MOTHER

Who saved you the night you jumped into the train at Dalkey with Paddy Lee? Who had pity for you when you were sad among the strangers? Prayer is allpowerful. Prayer for the suffering souls in the Ursuline manual and forty days' indulgence. Repent, Stephen. (*U* 15.4181-98)

Karelli translates the passage as follows:

> Η Μητέρα.— (Έρχεται πιο κοντά κι' ανασαίνει γλυκά απάνω του, την πνοή της από βρεμμένες στάχτες). Όλοι πρέπει να το περάσουμε Στέφεν. Στον κόσμο περισσότερο γυναίκες από άντρες. Και συ επίσης. Θα έρθει ο καιρός.
>
> Στέφεν.— (Που πιέζεται από φόβο, τύψη και φρίκη). Λένε πως σε σκότωσα μητέρα. Πρόσβαλε τη μνήμη σου. Δεν τώκανα εγώ, ο καρκίνος. Η μοίρα.
>
> Η Μητέρα.— (Ένα πράσινο νάμα χολής κυλάει από τη μια γωνία του στόματός της). Μου τραγουδούσες εκείνο το τραγούδι. «Της αγάπης το πικρό μυστικό».
>
> Στέφεν.— (Με απληστία). Πες μου το λόγο μητέρα, αν τώρα τον ξέρεις. Τον λόγο, που γνωρίζουν όλοι οι άνθρωποι.
>
> Η Μητέρα.— Ποιος σ' έσωσε τη νύχτα εκείνη, που πήδηξες στο τραίνο, στο Ντάλκεϋ με τον Πάντυ Λη. Ποιος σε λυπούνταν, σαν ήσουν λυπημένος ανάμεσα στους ξένους. Η προσευχή είναι παντοδύναμη. Προσευχή για τις πονεμένες ψυχές, στο εγχειρίδιο των Ουρσουλίνων και σαράντα μέρες μετάνοιες. Μετάνοιωσε Στέφεν. (2)

In 'Proteus', Stephen asks himself 'What is that word known to all men?' (*U* 3.435), a question which remains unanswered in the text in all editions until the 1984 critical and synoptic edition by Hans Walter Gabler. In his corrected edition, Gabler restores a passage in the episode of 'Scylla and

Charybdis'—which had been missing from all previous editions and was redacted from a manuscript—in which Stephen returns to the question in his monologue and answers it ('Do you know what you are talking about? Love, yes. Word known to all men', *U* 9.429-30). The restoration of this passage has been contested (see Slote, Mamigonian and Turner 2022, 380-1), while it has also brought a revisiting of love and death in *Ulysses* through Aristotle and Aquinas (Kimball 1987, Finneran 1996). Karelli, however, was very likely translating from the 1932 Odyssey Press edition which was cited in the beginning of the 'Hades' passage. But even if she was using another edition, it would not have included the restored passage in 'Scylla and Charybdis' with Stephen's rumination. Despite that, she makes the connection between Stephen's question and his theory about Shakespeare developed in 'Scylla and Charybdis', while her philosophical standpoint forms her reading of the passage as a reference to Aristotelian readings in medieval philosophy. Karelli translates Stephen's question in 'Circe' by using 'λόγος' for 'word': 'Πες μου το λόγο μητέρα, αν τώρα τον ξέρεις. Τον λόγο, που γνωρίζουν όλοι οι άνθρωποι'. For Karelli, therefore, Stephen looks not only for a 'word' (λέξη) but for *logos*, for discourse which, however, is composed of words.[54] The only love that exists in *Ulysses*, according to Karelli, is the love for the word and for words. Even though she initially claimed that there is no form of love in *Ulysses*, she eventually concludes that the form of love she discerns is for the word, the material out of which the text and, therefore, what she sees as the 'masterpiece of form' ('τεχνικώτατο αριστούργημα', 1) is made.

In her examples from 'Circe', Stephen's dead mother and her ghost, Bloom's memories and vision of his dead son Rudy, Karelli detects death as a contrast to love. For Karelli, death is the final encounter with god, and therefore love for death is the will to finally meet god. In her piece, death is seen in its materiality and is explored through the characters' connection to it, through the apparitions

[54] It is also worth noting that in the passage from 'Proteus', Pentzikis and Kitsopoulos translated 'Ποια είν' αυτή η λέξη που όλοι γνωρίζουν;' (1946, 101), on which Karelli does not comment in her article.

of Stephen's mother and Rudy in 'Circe' and the individual effect they have on the characters. In her poetry collection *Η εποχή του θανάτου*, however, the concept of death is explored through another aspect as well, through war experience, referring specifically to WWII, its death toll, and its impact on Thessaloniki.

All in all, Karelli approaches Joyce's *Ulysses* to discuss themes that preoccupied her in her poetry and her thinking. At the same time though, she engages in a critical discussion of key scenes from 'Circe', an episode which had not been translated or discussed until then, and through her background in Christian philosophy and existentialism, she discerns references to medieval philosophy which in Joyce criticism have been traced as drawn from Aquinas's reading of Aristotle. Her reading and translation of Stephen's question to his mother's apparition shows a sensitivity to the philosophical implications of *Ulysses* indicating a more critical reading of Joyce's novel than what had been proposed until then by the previous translations and notes. Karelli engages in close reading and interpretation of love and death in *Ulysses*, while both 'love' and 'death' have been considered as possible answers to Stephen's question (Ellmann 1972). Finally, Karelli concludes that Joyce as a writer is interested in transitional periods as well as the concept of transition highlighting thus his medieval sources of classical tradition: 'Ο Τζέϊμς Τζόϋς χριστιανός της φθοράς όντας, ατενίζει τον αρχαίο ελληνικό κόσμο, στα πρόθυρα ενός Μεσαίωνα' ('James Joyce, a Christian of decay, gazes at the ancient Greek world on the brink of medieval times', 7).

In his 1950 lecture titled 'Περίπατος στην ακρογιαλιά' ('Walk by the seashore'), Pentzikis returns to the theme of death in *Ulysses*, more specifically concerning Stephen's character:[55]

> Παρ' όλες τις σκέψεις του σχετικά με αυτοκτονίες και τη φαντασία του που βλέπει πνιγμένους, ο Στήβεν ως ζωντανός μέσα στο βιβλίο ανασαίνει αναπνοές πεθαμένων. Γι' αυτό βέβαια πολύ σωστά, στο τέλος του περιπάτου του «παρά θιν' αλός», καθώς αποχωρεί

[55] The lecture was published in the journal *Μορφές* (1951), 52-52: 13-18 and 54: 64-69 and was later reprinted with minor revisions under the title 'Δυνατότητες της αμεσότητας' in *Προς εκκλησιασμό* (1986 [1970], 7-27).

> στα ίδια, εγκαταλείποντας τους ρεμβασμούς του, τον βλέπουμε να ταυτίζεται με τη σκιαγραφία ενός πλοίου μακρινού μέσα στη σιωπή. (1951, 66)
>
> Despite his thoughts about suicides and his imagination through which he sees drowned people, Stephen, as a living being in the book breathes the breaths of the dead. And of course that is why, towards the end of his walk *para thin' alos*, as he returns to the same, abandoning his reveries, we see him identifying himself with the outlines of a ship faraway in the silence.

In his lecture, Pentzikis uses the motif of walking by the seashore to develop his ideas about immediacy in literature, in language, and modes of expression. Mentioning a wide variety of writers from the byzantine to the modern tradition, Pentzikis focuses on characters and suggests a correlation between Achilles, Hamlet, and Stephen Dedalus. Providing further commentary on the translation of the passage of 'Proteus', Pentzikis argues that Stephen is made of the thoughts of other people, which the character repeats, touching upon Joyce's method of pastiche, quoting, and recycling sources. Through this confusion of quotations and imitations, Pentzikis suggests, only silence remains. Pentzikis looks for Joyce in Stephen's character but he concludes that he is not to be found there. The issue of identification between writer and character in the context of interiority has preoccupied Pentzikis in his own work; speaking of his first novel, *Αντρέας Δημακούδης* (1935), he states that he no longer constructs characters in imitation of himself because that entails having to justify his existence and actions through them. At this stage, after having translated Joyce and having read the novel through its place in literary history, both Karelli and Pentzikis turn to questions related to Joyce's identity as a writer. Their interest in the writer-figure does not focus on the writer's biography, but on the issue of the self in writing and how that is distinguished from the writer's life, and the characters he creates. *Ulysses*, therefore, becomes a text through which Karelli and Pentzikis reflect on their own writing practice and poetics, and form their own identity as writers.

Conclusion

During its early trajectory in Greece, *Ulysses* is presented as a textual space for further experimentation. It is presented in fragments, passages that are detached from their context and published alongside other texts with which they are connected thematically. It is translated as a sample of a writing practice, it is translated collaboratively in the form of a workshop, and it becomes a text through which to talk about formal experimentation, literary history, interaction of art forms, and writing of the self. Looking at how *Ulysses* is presented in these periodicals, by whom, and alongside what other texts, the ways in which it was edited and translated, published, contextualized, as well as how it was referred to in the press gives us a sense of how it was read and not read at the time. As a book that was difficult to access, it had not been translated in its entirety, and the platforms which translated and published excerpts were somewhat niche. Apart from that, however, the interest that develops is not in the book in its entirety, but in the text and the implications it holds for the evolution of the novel genre. *Ulysses* is still read by its translators, the journals' editors, and the agents involved in the periodicals. Their reading practices are reflected in the journals, not only through the content of the accompanying notes, but also and more importantly in the form that the text takes. *Ulysses* is read fragmentarily, it becomes an exercise, an 'étude' in translating and writing, and in developing a critical discourse. The way in which *Ulysses* is presented is often detached from the novel's composition and publication background, for example the elements that led to its bans; it is read through its technique, through the challenges it poses to a reader and a translator. Moreover, *Ulysses* is read in anticipation of its future trajectory: of all the translations published in all the issues of *Κοχλίας*, only the two Joyce translations were labeled as 'μεταφραστική προσπάθεια' (translational attempt), indicating therefore that *Ulysses* was a text which they anticipated to be retranslated and revisited.

At the same time, along with communal readings of the novel, *Ulysses* also becomes a text through which certain writers reflect on their practice. Karelli, who was more familiar with the English

text than the other members of the group, writes the first extensive critical piece on *Ulysses* drawing from her own existential inclinations. Despite that, it is her brother, Pentzikis, who has been established as the Greek writer closer to Joyce, with the beginnings of this connection being manifested in his involvement in *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας*. It is as a counterpoint to Pentzikis's reception of Joyce, that I proposed Karelli's work towards the end of this chapter.

Karelli's focus on issues of life and writing and of life/writing, even though returning to a topic well known in Joycean circles and Joycean criticism, was a very important addition to Joyce's introduction to Greece. This thread of questioning the connection between Joyce's work and biography is picked up by another female Greek poet, critic, and translator, who proposes a critical reading of Joyce's work and life by zooming in on Joyce's writing process. In the 1960s, Manto Aravantinou enters the Greek Joyce scene bringing to the fore aspects that had not been in the center of the Thessaloniki-based journals that first discussed the Irish writer. Influenced by the poststructuralist turn and being aware of the work that had been done on Joyce in Greece (notably for her, by Karelli), Aravantinou turns to Joyce's archive and Joyce's Greek connections while also developing an approach of translation through sound and acoustic similarity, elements of which we saw in Pentzikis's practice. Karelli reflected on Joyce's identity as a writer by exploring opposite but ultimately connected binaries to develop her own poetics; Pentzikis explored the issue of character development in Joyce as well as the dialogue between *Ulysses* and other texts. Aravantinou, on the other hand, as will be discussed in the next chapter, proposes a reading not only of Joyce's archive, but also of his work by examining the Irish writer's attachment to language.

Chapter 2: Manto Aravantinou and the Joyce archive: a case of transnational authorship

Introduction

One of the perennial problems when reading and studying *Ulysses* concerns the characters of the novel, after whom they are modeled, which person in Joyce's life was the inspiration for each of them, to whom they allude, therefore, their significance for Joyce. Stephen Dedalus, for example, has long been considered Joyce's 'alter ego', as his character and his experiences are very similar to Joyce's life and experiences; *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, therefore, has often been read as an autobiographical novel. The models for Leopold and Molly Bloom have also been at the center of many conversations and research over time and still are. In his field-defining biography of Joyce, Richard Ellmann proposed at least three different women as having a share in the construction of the character of Molly. However, even Ellmann argues that, while in terms of appearance there are many possible models for Molly, in terms of the character's intellect Joyce had Nora in mind (*JJII* 376). A few of the possible models suggested by Joyce's biographer were women whom the Irish author met in Trieste, giving therefore credence to Molly's partially southern European origin. After examining some candidates, Ellmann claims that the character of Molly

> …is closer to that of the buxom wife of a fruit store owner named Nicolas Santos, with whom he [Joyce] was acquainted in Trieste and in Zurich. Signora Santos stayed indoors all day to preserve her complexion, for which she mixed her own creams. That Mrs. Santos had a share in Mrs. Bloom was an open secret in the Joyce family later. (*JJII* 375-76)[1]

[1] However, Ellmann continues: 'But the seductiveness of Molly came, it seems, from Signorina Popper. For the Spanish quality in her, Joyce drew upon one of the many daughters of Matt Dillon, an old friend of his family who is mentioned in *Ulysses* too. The daughter had been in Spain, smoked cigarettes, and was considered a Spanish type.' (*JJII* 376)

In her study titled *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* [*Ta ellinika tou James Joyce*, 'James Joyce's Greek'] (1977), Greek poet Manto Aravantinou, follows Ellmann's hypothesis and takes it further by researching the background of Nicolas Santas (as his name is found in registration cards and letters) as one of the Greeks whom Joyce met. Aravantinou's research topic concerns Joyce's Greek connections in Trieste and Zurich, as well as the Greek part of his archive. Therefore Santas, a Greek expatriate whom Joyce met in Trieste, is one of the figures that interest Aravantinou.

Nicolas Santas was a fruit-seller born in Corfu in 1878 and married to Gisella Norbedo, who was born in 1880 and was from the area of Istria; they lived in Trieste and Zurich at around the same time as Joyce, and later in Barcelona and Marseilles. Santas was 'illiterate, but could recite many long passages of the *Odyssey* learned by ear', information given by Frank Budgen (1972, 174), Joyce's friend in Zurich, but reproduced and perpetuated by other sources. Aravantinou informs us that Gisella Norbedo died before 1938; for Santas, she says, she did not manage to find a date of death. In her 1977 book, Aravantinou uses the story of the Santas couple as a starting point for her discussion of minor figures:

> Σ' αυτή την έρευνα προσπαθούμε ν' ανιχνεύσουμε […] τον κ. Νικόλα Σάντα, τον αγράμματο Έλληνα που όμως απάγγελνε ραψωδίες, από την Οδύσσεια, τη γυναίκα του, τη γενναιόδωρη κυρία Σάντα, τη φιλάρεσκη και πληθωρική, που πίσω απ' τον μπάγκο της εξηγούσε στον Τζόυς πώς φτιάχνει με τα χέρια της τις κρέμες προσώπου, πώς δεν έβγαινε απ' το σπίτι της πριν το ηλιοβασίλεμα για να μην καταστρέψει ο ήλιος την επιδερμίδα της, λεπτομέρειες που έθελγαν τον Τζόυς. Το αρχέτυπο της Μόλλυ ίσως; Όχι. «Μια χοντρή γυναίκα ήταν αυτή η Ελληνίδα», εκμυστηρευόταν η Νόρα στην κ. Jolas στο Παρίσι. (1977, 76-7)
>
> In this research we are trying to trace […] Mr. Nicolas Santas, the illiterate Greek who, however, recited rhapsodies from the *Odyssey*, his wife, the generous Mrs. Santa, coquettish and buxom, who, behind her counter, explained to Joyce how she makes her face creams, how she never went outside before sunset to protect her complexion from the sun, details that charmed Joyce. The model for Molly, perhaps? No. 'She was a fat woman, that Greek', Nora confided in Mrs. Jolas in Paris.

Upon publication of *Dubliners*, Joyce had asked his publisher, Grant Richards, to send six copies of the book to Santas.[2] Aravantinou suggests that 'obviously, along with onions, potatoes, and oranges, Santas also sold the books of the greatest writer of the century'.[3]

Aravantinou's study, *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, focuses on Joyce's Greek connections as well as his interest and attempts to learn the modern Greek language. Drawing from Gorman, Ellmann, Budgen and Joyce's correspondence, as well as her own archival research, Aravantinou unravels the stories of the Greek people that Joyce met while living in Trieste and Zurich, including also a reading and analysis of the notes that the Irish author kept while learning modern Greek, along with photographic reproductions of the relevant notebooks. As she states herself, her research concerns details and people that, because of their marginal or precarious status, have remained largely unrecorded and therefore overlooked in archives:

> Το πρόβλημα της έρευνας αυτής αφορά σε ανθρώπους ανώνυμους και επώνυμους, άεργους, μεροκαματιάρηδες ή και ανεπάγγελτους, Ρωμιούς, Εβραίους και Σέρβους, ναυτικούς ή μικρομεσάζοντες, αεριτζήδες και τραπεζίτες […] (1977, 76)
>
> The problem of this research concerns anonymous and eponymous people, unemployed, day laborers or claiming no profession, Romioi, Jews and Serbians, sailors or petty brokers, crooks and bankers […].

These people will remain largely anonymous and unidentified, and it is a pity, Aravantinou claims, because it was their language and their idiom in which Joyce was interested, fascinated as he was by the figure of Odysseus and looking for similar contemporary figures who preserved historical memory while chasing a fleeting present (76). These 'anonymous' people with whom Joyce met and conversed even briefly are, for Aravantinou, as important as the literary circles he engaged with later in Paris and, as they remain unrecorded not only in public records but also in Joyce studies, she attempts to trace

[2] Order dated 16.6.1914, which is photo-reproduced in Aravantinou (1977, 221-2)

[3] 'γιατί προφανώς ο Σάντας, μαζί με τα κρεμμύδια, τις πατάτες και τα πορτοκάλια, πουλούσε και τα βιβλία του μεγαλύτερου συγγραφέα του αιώνα.' (78)

some of them. She focuses specifically on those who spoke Greek and from whom Joyce learned the language, to argue that they contributed significantly to the composition of *Ulysses*, but also to Joyce's thinking about language. Modern Greek in Joyce's archive becomes a language that serves multiple purposes: communication, affective connection, exchange, writing, memory. Aravantinou's focus is the Greek language in its various forms, its orality and low idiom, which, she argues, is what intrigued Joyce to pursue it after his regret for not having learned classical Greek, and it is through that lens of idiomatic variety that she reads Joyce's Greek notes.

In *Τα ελληνικά*, the Greek notes are presented not only as part of Joyce's archive, but also as a source of information about those people, the Greeks he met, those who taught him the language, with whom he discussed his work, and with whom he even developed friendships. Aravantinou argues that the Greek people he knew and his attempts to learn the Greek language, were seminal to Joyce's thinking and writing, his development as a writer and his composition method, highlighting and thematizing aspects such as anonymity and minority.

While the previous chapter focused on the early translations and readings of *Ulysses* as these are found in marginal publications, events that could be considered minor, in this chapter, minor events become themselves the subject of critical discourse about Joyce in the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece, minor events which have to do with Joyce's biography and archive, and the Greek connections that can be traced there. Aravantinou explores minor events, specifically minor figures in Joyce's biography and a very small and underexamined part of the Joyce archive, to 'unlock' Joyce's writing and propose an alternative reading of Joyce, a reading through the multilingual, through the transnational, and the translational.

In this chapter, I will focus on Aravantinou's work on Joyce, particularly her 1977 monograph *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, while also considering her broader work on Joyce who became a life-project for her. Throughout her preoccupation with the Irish author, Aravantinou translated part of

his work, participated in relevant symposia and wrote about him trying to bring him to a wider audience as her other monograph *Τζαίημς Τζόυς: Ζωή και έργο* (1983) illustrates. I argue that Aravantinou's work, relying on Joyce's biography and archive, involved interpretations and re-imaginings, which evolved into the creation of her own version of a Joycean archive. I also argue that the attitude she maintained and the discourse she adopted to talk about her own work relating to Joyce, declaring its 'inadequacy' and its unfinishedness, can be seen as a critical gesture pointing towards what she perceives as an inherent openness and invites further and diverse approaches and responses to Joyce. Grounded in her archival work, the reading proposed by Aravantinou is based on the different ways Joyce used language, on the transnational connections and the multilingualism that marked his life and work, and is a reading which, even though is now taken up by Joyce scholarship, was considered at the time inadequate and tenuous.

The concept of the archive used in the chapter draws from Jacques Derrida's ideas as expressed in *Mal d' archive* (1995), as well as in his lecture at the 1984 Joyce Symposium in Frankfurt 'Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce' in which he raised the issue of Joyce anticipating the archiving of his documents. I also draw from Dimitris Papanikolaou (2018) and the term 'αναταραχή αρχείου' or 'archive trouble' which refers to revisiting and reframing archives through embodied acts which also take into account and respond to the present, a dynamic process of revisiting the past and reconstructing it, in order to think about the present. The archive is not limited to the material documents and writings of an author, but extends to several other material and immaterial entities that are related to the writer and their work. It can include, therefore, the writer's library, immaterial life-events, moments, and people who were related to the writer as well as the writing process itself. In Aravantinou's work, the archive is presented as consisting of a network of texts and notes, as well as of moments and memories, as foregrounding connections between personal and communal history. Aravantinou approaches the archive as a space which allows a view of the author's writing process

while it is happening. Through her reading, processes of accretion, elision, and transformation become visible and reveal the archival note as a productive, generative space. Joyce's archive is approached as a network of texts that involves other people apart from Joyce, the communities with which he interacted. Moreover, it becomes a space which Aravantinou is compelled to revisit and re-enter, a space where naming, anonymity, language acquisition, and multilingualism become key concepts through which to read Joyce's work.

Aravantinou: poet, translator, critic

Manto Aravantinou (1923/1926-1998) was a Greek poet of what in Greek literary history is described as 'the first postwar poetic generation', a term which includes those poets who experienced WWII and started publishing in the 1960s. Alongside her poetry, Aravantinou produced substantial critical and translational work around Joyce in the 1970s and 1980s. One of the main contributors in the avant-garde journal *Πάλι* [*Pali*, 'Again'] in the 1960s, Aravantinou lived abroad during a significant part of the military dictatorship (1967-1974), an experience which defined her view of her work as part of a peripheral literature and more generally the way in which she thought about Greek literature and Greek identity in the world. In 1968 she won a scholarship to work in West Berlin, and in the beginning of the 1970s started her doctoral studies in Paris (Paris Sorbonne III) on James Joyce's Greek and his Greek friends. After receiving a Ford scholarship in 1974-1975, Aravantinou traveled to the USA where she undertook research in several libraries holding parts of the Joyce archive. During that research she traced Joyce's correspondence with certain Greek people he knew, and his Greek notes which are part of the Zurich notebooks (1915-1919) and are held at the Poetry Collection at the University at Buffalo.

Joyce's physical archive is scattered among several collections. The four major collections, which had already been established by 1960 when Aravantinou was starting to develop an interest in

the Greek notes, are at the British Library, the Poetry Collection at the University at Buffalo, Cornell University, and Yale University. There are, however, many more institutions which keep collections of Joyce's manuscripts or relevant material such as Harvard University, Princeton University, Yale University, the New York Public Library.[4] In the introduction to her monograph, Aravantinou recounts her journey in search for the notes after having found out about them through the catalogue of an exhibition for a collection of papers that Joyce left behind in Paris when he fled to Zurich in World War II. These papers, which were saved from his apartment by his friend Paul Léon and brother-in-law Alexander Ponizowski, were exhibited in 1949 at the Librairie La Hune in Paris; Aravantinou first became aware of these notes at a trip to Paris ten years later, in 1959, when she bought the catalogue of the exhibition which included photographs of the documents. This prompted her to travel to USA in search for these notes. In her monograph, she recounts how, starting from Princeton, she then went to the New York Public Library, Harvard, and Yale. At Cornell she found a translation of a Joyce poem by one his Greek friends in Zurich, Pavlos Phocas, as well as a letter by Nicolas Santas, and eventually, at Buffalo, she located the Greek notes (1977, XXII-XXV). The archival approach she develops in *Τα ελληνικά* therefore, is directly related to her studies and experience in locating the notes. Focusing on a very small and underexplored part of a vast archive, Aravantinou also develops the idea of searching for something that is hidden and conveys this sense in her reading. Moreover, apart from the fact that the monograph itself stemmed from that research, her reading of the archive is informed by the scholarly environment and the tendencies in Joyce studies that prevailed

[4] Other collections of Joyce's manuscripts are kept at the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin, the Croessmann Collection at Southern Illinois University, the Rosenbach Museum and Library in Philadelphia, the Henry E. Huntington Library in San Marino, California, the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, the University of Tulsa, University College Dublin, the National Library of Ireland, the Zurich James Joyce Foundation. For more on the Joyce archive and collections, as well as for specific information about what the four major collections include, see Groden (2010, 81-104).

in Paris at the time, but also her own work, interests, and the projects in which she had been involved in Greece.

Aravantinou studied Joyce at a time and place where ideas related to the poststructuralist movement were developing and circulating, especially in Joyce studies. Her approach to Joyce's notes as a network, her focus on the note as a generative space as well as the concept of life as writing can be traced back to ideas that were taking shape at the time, which are found in Hélène Cixous's thesis on Joyce *(L'Exil de James Joyce ou l'Art du remplacement*, 1968) and later in Derrida's *Mal d' archive*. In the introduction to her monograph, Aravantinou highlights Cixous's work as groundbreaking: 'Τόλμησε όμως κάτι εντελώς καινούργιο: μια σημειολογική προσέγγιση του έργου' (1977, XX).[5] A philological interest in modernism, along with a shift of the focus towards Joyce's writing process and prepublication material as well as the poststructuralist turn brings about a more systematic interest in Joyce's manuscripts and archive, leading to the publication of *James Joyce Archive*, sixty-three volumes of Joyce's photo-reprinted manuscripts and notes between 1977 and 1979.[6]

Aravantinou was also active in the Joyce studies community at the time. Her research work had brought her in contact with established members of the community such as Jean-Jacques Mayoux and Thomas Connolly, as well as Richard Ellmann with whom she corresponded about Joyce's interest in modern Greek.[7] An extract from *Τα ελληνικά* was published in French as a contribution in the volume of *L' Herne* about Joyce.[8] Her active participation in the international Joyce community is also reflected in her reports of the 1975 symposium in Paris and the 1982 symposium in Dublin. A detailed

[5] 'She dared to do something entirely new: a semiotic approach of the work.'
[6] For a detailed account of this project see Groden (2010).
[7] About her contact with Mayoux and Connolly, see Aravantinou's introduction to *Τα ελληνικά.* As for her communication with Richard Ellmann, a letter by him, in which he asks her for more information regarding Joyce's experience with learning Greek, is found in her archive, which is kept at ELIA-MIET (Ελληνικό Λογοτεχνικό και Ιστορικό Αρχείο του Μορφωτικού Ιδρύματος της Εθνικής Τραπέζης). Parts of that correspondence are also kept in the Richard Ellmann papers, Special Collections and University Archives, McFarlin Library, University of Tulsa.
[8] Manto Aravantinou (1985), 'James Joyce et ses amis grecs', in Jacques Aubert, Fritz Senn (eds), *James Joyce* (Paris : Éditions de l'Herne), 58-64.

account about the former can be found in the journal *Ηριδανός* [*Iridanos*] (1975-1976, 13-27: 22-7) while her report of the latter was included in her monograph *Τζαίημς Τζόυς: Ζωή και έργο* [*Tzaiems Tzoys: Zoi kai ergo*, 'James Joyce: Life and work'] (1983a, 194), the text of which was based on a series of talks she gave on the radio for the Joyce centenary in 1982. Her report of the 1975 Paris Symposium in *Ηριδανός* is particularly enlightening as it provides not only a detailed account of the people who spoke and the issues that were discussed, but also details regarding her own perspective of an already growing academic community and the tensions that arose.

Aravantinou's poetry comprises six collections titled *Γραφές* (*Grafes* meaning *Writings* or *Inscriptions* or *Scriptures* or *Scripts*).[9] Poet Nanos Valaoritis, with whom she collaborated in *Πάλι* and corresponded frequently, describes her poems as close to realism without becoming prose. Her poems are considered avant-garde, experimental, and genre-bending, they draw elements from surrealism—without however subscribing to the movement—and they are written in the form of an accretive narrative but with distinct rhythm and musicality. Despite the absence of metaphors, Valaoritis sees Aravantinou's poetry as a metaphor for the act of writing.[10] Apart from her poetic work, Aravantinou also translated Joyce's texts into Greek: *Dubliners* (*Δουβλινέζοι*, 1971), *Giacomo Joyce* (1977), *The Cat and the Devil* (*Η γάτα και ο διάβολος*, 1977), as well as excerpts from *Finnegans Wake* ('Ερμηνευτικές προτάσεις για το "Ξύπνημα των Φίνεγκαν"', *Χνάρι* ['Suggestions of interpretation for "Finnegans Wake"', *Chnari*], 1974, and 'Ερμηνευτικές προτάσεις για το *Finnegans Wake*', *Ηριδανός* ['Suggestions of interpretation for *Finnegans Wake*, *Iridanos*] 1975-76), and 'Penelope' from *Ulysses* ('Από τον "Οδυσσέα": Μονόλογος της

[9] *Γραφή Α'* (1962), *Γραφή Β'* (1964), *Γραφή Γ'* (1971), *Γραφή Δ' και Ε'* (1983), see also the collective volume of her poetry published posthumously by Marathias, introduced by Nanos Valaoritis, and including her seventh poetry collection which was never completed, Manto Aravantinou (1998), *Γραφές Α, Β, Γ, Δ, Ε, Ζ*, introduction by Nanos Valaoritis (Athens: Marathias).

[10] Έστω κι αν δεν υπάρχουν επί μέρους «μεταφορές» στις «Γραφές», όμως ολόκληρη η σειρά τους είναι μια μεγάλη μεταφορά της «γραφής», σε πολλαπλά επίπεδα, ως γλώσσα, συνείδηση, μνήμη, λησμονιά, απουσία, παρουσία, ενός εφιάλτη γεμάτου από την αγωνία της ατομικής και της συλλογικής ύπαρξης, σε μια διαρκή αναζήτηση του νήματος που μας συνδέει με το παρελθόν, σε μια ατμόσφαιρα ατέλειωτης δοκιμασίας. (1998, 12). For more on Aravantinou's poetry see the special issue of *Μανδραγόρας* 22-23 (December 1999), and specifically Arseniou's contribution (35-43)

"Πηνελόπης"—Molly Bloom, *Ταχυδρόμος* ['From "Ulysses": "Penelope's" monologue—Molly Bloom', *Tachydromos*], 1982). Translated passages from *Portrait*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake* were included in her 1983 monograph, *Τζαίημς Τζόυς: Ζωή και έργο*. According to references in newspapers as well as drafts found in her archive, Aravantinou was preparing a full-length translation of *Ulysses* which, however, remained unfinished.[11] In her autobiographical work *Μετα-γραφή ή Εμπειρία συνόρων* [*Meta-grafi i Empeiria synoron*, 'Trans-script or Experience of borders'] (1975), to which she referred as a chronicle, she recorded her experiences as a funded scholar and self-exile in West Berlin, where she studied the life and work conditions of Greek migrants. Apart from her active participation in the avant-garde journal *Πάλι* (1963-1967), Aravantinou also worked in the French journal *Change* with Nanos Valaoritis and Andreas Pagoulatos. Far from being an isolated event in the trajectory of Joyce in Greece, therefore, Aravantinou's work should be viewed in conversation with the developments in Joyce scholarship in France at the time along with her own work as well as with her other projects in the Greek literary space and abroad. Her fascination with the archive and her reading of it, as well as of Joyce's work is informed by the scholarly and literary environments in which she worked, the projects in which she was involved, but also her personal experiences of migration and exile.

Aravantinou reading Joyce

In the introduction to her 1977 monograph on Joyce's Greek, *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, Aravantinou outlines the challenges of reading Joyce's work:

> Όμως να γράφεις τη ζωή αντί να τη ζεις, να την οραματίζεσαι γραμμένη και βιωμένη, σημαίνει να κάνεις το χρόνο μεσ' απ' τη γραφή, χρόνο αποκλειστικά προσωπικό, και την πορεία της τέχνης προσωπική σου ιστορία. Αυτή λοιπόν η θελληματική σύγχυση ανάμεσα στη ζωή, τη γραφή και το χρόνο, κάνει την όποια έρευνα του έργου του πολύ ευαίσθητη και συχνά δυσπρόσιτη. (XVIII-XIX)

[11] See the introductory note to her *Finnegans Wake* translations in *Χνάρι* (1974, 62-67: 62).

> But writing life instead of living it, envisioning it being written and being experienced, means rendering time exclusively personal through writing, and turning artistic progress into your own personal story. It is this intentional confusion between life, writing, and time which makes any research on his work highly sensitive and often unapproachable.

Aravantinou sees Joyce's life as interconnected with his work in such a way that it becomes impossible to distinguish between the two. By focusing on one of them, one inevitably brings the other component into the conversation. By using the term 'σύγχυση' ('confusion') between life and writing, Aravantinou refers to Joyce's writing practice, as well as to his texts, the process and the result: 'Είναι, αλίμονο, πάρα πολύ παρών σαν δημιουργός, σαν σχολιαστής, σαν κριτικός, σαν το ίδιο το δημιούργημα· επεμβαίνει και καθοδηγεί σχεδόν τον ερευνητή και τον κριτικό' (XIX).[12] Although she discusses general aspects of Joyce's work, such as his modernist and experimental writing, historical and political themes, Aravantinou is mostly interested in the fictionalization of life-events and real-life people, a key feature of Joyce's writing. She embraces the idea that writer and work, creator and creation, even more so when it comes to Joyce, are blended and inseparable, and that is reflected in her approach in both her monographs. A discussion of Joyce's life-events, how these made their way in his work, as well as his linguistic interests which defined his transnational encounters, runs through *Τα ελληνικά*. In the opening of the preface to her 1983 monograph, the title of which encapsulates the mingling under discussion, Aravantinou claims:

> Κανένας συγγραφέας, απ' τους παλαιότερους ως τους νεότερους, σ' ολόκληρη την παγκόσμια ιστορία της λογοτεχνίας, δε συμπύκνωσε και δε συγκέντρωσε, με τόση επιμονή, πείσμα, διαύγεια και ευαισθησία τις πιο προσωπικές, πολύμορφες και διαπροσωπικές πράξεις της ζωής του στο έργο του. (7)
>
> No other writer, old or contemporary, in the entire world history of literature, has ever condensed or gathered, with such persistence, tenacity, clarity, and sensitivity the most personal, multivalent, and interpersonal acts of his life in his work.

[12] 'He is, alas, very present as a creator, as a commentator, as a critic, as the creation itself; he intervenes and almost guides the researcher and the critic'.

Moreover, Aravantinou claims that Joyce's work is not a regeneration or a reconstruction of life, it is 'life itself' and, even more so, life presented upside down and transformed.[13] In this later monograph, which was based on a series of talks she gave on the radio about the Irish author in 1982, Joyce's birth centenary, she incorporated translated passages from *Ulysses* and included revised versions of translated passages from *Finnegans Wake* which had appeared in *Χνάρι* and *Ηριδανός*, the only Greek translations of *Finnegans Wake* at the time. Calling them 'translational attempts' ('δοκιμές μετάφρασης', 201) she professes that the translated extracts are 'incomplete notes' ('λειψά σημειώματα', 203) with no intention to encourage 'irresponsible' publishers or translators to produce 'translational atrocities' ('μεταφραστικές αθλιότητες') like in the case of the full-length translation of *Ulysses* by Pairidis publications, translated by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos (1969-1976).[14]

Aravantinou is not simply deciphering Joyce's texts by using the writer's life-events where fiction and reality are clearly distinguished from one another. What happens in the case of Joyce, Aravantinou claims, is that work, text, and life are interlocked and inseparable in such a way that life is seen as a written text and the written text is part of life:

> Έγινε ο δημιουργός και το δημιούργημα, η προέκταση του «εγώ» στο έργο του και του έργου του στο «εγώ», παίζοντας κάθε στιγμή με την πραγματικότητα και το «πραγματικό»: την πραγματικότητα όπως διαγράφεται στο έργο του: δηλαδή τη ζωή την ίδια, στην αμεσότητα ενός ειρωνικού σχόλιου. (1977, XVIII)
>
> He became the creator and the creation, the extension of the 'I' in his work, and of his work in the 'I', each moment playing with reality and the 'real': reality as is apparent in his work: which means life itself, with the immediacy of an ironic comment.

Aravantinou sees this intermingling as an obstacle in reading and developing a critical discourse for Joyce, and expresses fear of not being able to add anything insightful: 'Φοβάμαι πως δεν μπορούμε να

---

[13] 'Το έργο του όμως δεν είναι καθόλου η ανάπλαση ή η ανοικοδόμηση της ζωής, το έργο του είναι η ζωή η ίδια'. 'Είναι όλα αυτά και πιο πολύ η αναποδογυρισμένη εικόνα της, πολύ ή μόλις αλλαγμένη, διαστρεβλωμένη, δύσκολα αναγνωρίσιμη.' (1983a, 7)

[14] The Pairidis translation was the first full-length Greek translation of *Ulysses* to appear, a translation that has been overlooked in contemporary scholarship and which will be discussed at length in the third chapter.

πούμε παρά πολύ λίγα πια για το συγγραφέα και το έργο του, γιατί ο ίδιος είπε τόσα πολλά για τον εαυτό του, και μάλιστα παραπάνω απ' ό,τι μπορούσε να πει ποτέ συγγραφέας για τη δουλειά του' (1977, XVII).[15] With this statement she does not only mean the information that Joyce shared through personal correspondence, or material that he circulated such as the schemata, but also the texts themselves, the events narrated in them or the characters for which the Irish author drew from real life. Aravantinou resorts to a specific part of the Joyce archive as a forgotten document which can reveal more about the writer and his work, and especially a particular aspect concerning his relationship with the Greek language.

Τα ελληνικά, for which Aravantinou drew from her doctoral research, focuses on a specific aspect of Joyce's life and work, that is, his relationship with the Greek language, culture, and people that he met while living in Trieste (1904-1915) and Zurich (1915-1919). The monograph spans a formative period for the Irish writer, during which he wrote and published *Dubliners* and *A Portrait*, and wrote a major part of *Ulysses*. Aravantinou's main sources are the notes which Joyce kept while learning modern Greek, his correspondence including letters he received from Greek people he knew, his biography as it had been recorded by Gorman, Ellmann, and Budgen, as well as interviews and biographical information she acquired from Joyce's acquaintances and relatives of the Greeks he knew. In its greater part, *Τα ελληνικά* is based on Aravantinou's research and interpretations of Joyce's Greek notebooks, a small and underexplored part of the Joyce archive. Aravantinou's monograph is, therefore, one of the few works that provide a reading of the Greek notebooks in their historical context. Although it seems like Aravantinou focuses on a very specific and minor aspect of Joyce's life and work, her monograph sets the foundation for broader conclusions about Joyce's

[15] 'I am afraid there is but little to say about the writer and his work because he has already said so much about himself, and even more than any writer could ever say about their work.'

multilingualism which suggest an alternative reading of his work that takes into account his transnational connections with diasporic communities and people outside the literary circles.

Accounts about the Greeks that Joyce knew can be found in Gorman (1941), Ellmann (1982), Budgen (1972), and Kolocotroni (1999) while scholarly work on Joyce's Greek notes and his interest in the Greek language has been limited so far. Lack of familiarity with modern Greek in the prevailing Anglophone context in Joyce studies, as well as emphasis on the aspect of classical Greek in Joyce's work, have resulted in the Greek notes being seen usually as simple language learning notes, and therefore of little importance for critical discussion despite the variety of their contents. Scholars such as Michael Groden (1980) and Rodney Wilson Owen (1983) provide mostly descriptive accounts and examine them in the context of the broader Joyce archive. Owen, specifically, refers to the content of the Greek notes to argue that Joyce was working on *Ulysses* at that time (1916-1917), while he also briefly discusses the Irish writer's interest in the Greek language. In his volume on Greek and Hellenic culture in Joyce, R. J. Schork (1998), a classicist, devotes a chapter to the modern Greek aspect in which he summarizes Aravantinou's points regarding the Greek notes and the Greek acquaintances, while he also provides a list of modern Greek examples from *Finnegans Wake*.[16] Attempts at listing modern Greek words used in *Finnegans Wake* have also been made by Ioanna Ioannidou and Leo Knuth (1971; 1973; 1975). More recent insights on the Greek part of Joyce's archive can be found in an article by Dipanjan Maitra (2016), who focuses on the journalistic texts that Joyce had copied as a writing exercise, engaging thus with a political aspect that the notes foreground and illustrating the Irish writer's interest in the political and historical events that concerned Greece in 1916. However, in these readings Aravantinou's work is often mentioned in passing or is simply overlooked. Vassiliki Kolocotroni (2019) provides a more productive reading of the Greek notes while also taking into

[16] For a discussion of R.J.Schork's work on classical references in Joyce (Greek-Hellenic and Latin-Roman) see also a review by Kolocotroni (2000).

account Aravantinou's work, placing these notes in the context of 'Joyce's participation in the construction of linguistic communities, both lived and imagined' (143) and reading them through episodes of dislocation and babelism. Kolocotroni suggests that these notes contain links that remain unexamined, contribute to our understanding of Joyce's interest in the Greek language, and can be viewed as indication of his interest in minority languages which were 'fundamental to his vision of a community of speakers and learners of the non-hegemonic word' (143). An analysis of Joyce's Greek notes will not only reveal overlooked and neglected details and links, Kolocotroni argues, but will also shift the focus from the significance of classical Greek to that of modern Greek in Joyce's work. While ancient Greek and classical antiquity play a fundamental role in Joyce, I suggest that it is through an examination of the modern Greek aspect that we can gain a better understanding of his interest in the classical. Modern Greek was a tangible reality that Joyce could approach and hear, something that he could not do with classical Greek, a dead language with which he could only engage through the written word. Joyce's affective connection with anything Greek is found in numerous examples. Apart from his fascination with the *Odyssey* myth and the figure of Odysseus, the Irish author declared his superstitious affection for Greek people in numerous instances. The famous example has been the cover of *Ulysses* which he insisted on having it in the blue and white colors of the Greek flag, and the Greek flags that decorated Shakespeare and Company at the time of publication of *Ulysses*.[17] Sound, orality, and idiom were elements that the modern Greek language could offer, a language which he

[17] Joyce's declarations of Greeks bringing him luck can be found in his letter to Harriet Shaw-Weaver (24 June 1921, *LI*, 167), and in Budgen (1972, 173-175). This superstition—one of Joyce's numerous superstitions—probably stems from the help he received by certain Greeks in Trieste (Baron Ambrogio Ralli and Count Francesco Sordina) to flee to Zurich in the beginning of WWI. However, his general interest in Greek culture had already formed as can be seen in his fascination with the Greek Orthodox liturgy which he attended in Trieste and about which he wrote to his brother Stanislaus (McCourt 2000, 58-62). The myth about Joyce's obsession with anything Greek persists in accounts by people who knew him according to which Joyce's drinking bouts with friends ended with the singing of the Greek national anthem or that, at the time of his death, one of the two books on his bedside table was a Greek dictionary as per Carola Giedion-Welcker's account. Seferis mentions the Greek flags in the display of Shakespeare and Company and the misunderstanding to which he was led when he saw them (*Δοκιμές Γ'*, 323). While it cannot be determined how accurate all these are, what they show is a pervasive affective connection which Aravantinou frames critically in her work.

saw as a portal to the ancient world. Returning to Aravantinou's work is important because she emphasizes these elements, while at the same time providing information about key moments in Joyce's life. She reads the Greek notes not only through the lens of linguistic acquisition, but by also bringing to the surface the affective connections which Joyce developed with the language and the people who spoke it, the friendships and the memories that emerge from these notes. Furthermore, by reading through the Greek notes and 'unlocking' their potential, Aravantinou finds the opportunity to speak about Joyce's texts, which maintain a central position in scholarship and in the canon, and specifically about *Ulysses* from a peripheral perspective, that of a Greek female critic, as well as a self-exile. She approaches the Greek part of the Joyce archive as a space where foreignness and locality collide, reading, therefore, the notes through the lens of language exchange and translation. Preoccupied with bringing to the fore the Greek element in Joyce, not as a unique trait, but as part of his transnational connections Aravantinou offers a new reading of the Joyce archive as a creative network, one that allows her to rewrite its elements as well as Joyce's texts. In what follows, I will discuss Aravantinou's reading of Joyce's *Ulysses* through her research on the Greek notes and his Greek friends, and examine how it corresponds to the text and the archive, while also considering the ways in which her reading adds to the archive and rewrites the text.

Misreadings, appropriation, and misinterpretation: the critical reception of Aravantinou's *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*

With *Τα ελληνικά*, Aravantinou made a significant and original contribution to Greek Joyce scholarship which, as we saw in the first chapter, until then constituted mostly of references and notes in literary journals which explored aspects of Joyce's work and reflected on how Joyce could be used for the development of Greek novel writing. The abundance of biographical details that Aravantinou includes in her monograph responds to the lack of a Greek biography of Joyce, while her commentary and

analysis of the Greek notes provides an aspect of the Irish writer which was not widely known, and which could appeal to a Greek audience. However, her work was negatively received by critics who accused her of mistakes, misreadings, and misinterpretations of Joyce's notes and work, but also of attempting to 'appropriate' or 'localize' Joyce, or of lacking a solid and substantial research topic. Such opinions, expressed by M. Byron Raizis (1979), Yannis Metaxas (1978), and Jina Politi (1978), raise issues that Aravantinou's work already addresses in one way or another. At the same time, they indicate how Aravantinou's work was received by established scholars since Raizis, Politi, and Metaxas were academics while also reflecting the preconceptions that existed in the Greek literary sphere as far as reading Joyce was concerned. Revisiting these reviews brings to the fore the broad scope of Aravantinou's monograph which, at the time, however, was dismissed as full of errors and misreadings.

Raizis's review has been crucial for Aravantinou's reception in the Anglophone context as it was written in English—whereas *Τα ελληνικά* was never translated—and published in *James Joyce Quarterly*, one of the main publications for Joyce studies.[18] This has resulted in a rather limited reading of Aravantinou's study as unreliable, since Anglophone scholars who refer to *Τα ελληνικά* to answer the question of whether Joyce knew any Greek, usually cite Raizis's review as it is more accessible to them and their readers.[19] Characterizing Aravantinou's study as 'amateurish', Raizis recognizes, however, that the information and proofs she includes in her book 'by far surpass the brief and sketchy mentions of Joyce's Greek and Greek friends by any major critic or biographer to this day' (522). Nevertheless, Raizis focuses specifically on what he calls the 'deliberate or highly imaginative changes in the spelling of Joyce's Greek names, or the substitution of Miss Aravantinou's Greek for Joyce's'

[18] M. Byron Raizis (1979), 'Reviewed Work: *Ta Hellenikά tou Tzaíems Tzóys* (*The Greek of James Joyce*) by Manto Aravantinou', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 16 (4), 521-24.

[19] Schork (1998), for example, references Raizis and claims that 'Aravantinou's book must be used with caution' (see endnote 2, 295). Ames (2005) cites Raizis's review to briefly refer to Aravantinou's argument on Joyce's fluency in modern Greek. Maitra (2016) also cites Raizis to contextualize Aravantinou's work.

(523) which he locates in page 129 of *Τα ελληνικά*, concluding that 'Miss Aravantinou's page 129 is full of such gross misreadings or reconstructions which ingeniously turn Joyce's innocent parodies of classical Greek into disguised pornography in Modern Greek' (523).

Aravantinou is criticized for finding Greek words where there are none, an easy accusation to make when reading Joyce, but a kind of criticism which ignores not only the centrality of error and misunderstanding in Joyce's text, but also a mode that is prevalent in Joyce's writing which permeates *Ulysses* and mostly *Finnegans Wake*, that of the multilingual imperative.[20] In *Finnegans Wake*, the number of languages included and the combination of them in every word leads to the impression of hearing a language in words where it is not. It is very often that the actual word might only derive from two languages and be completely foreign to any other language. Whether and in what way that was deliberate as far as Joyce was concerned, is beyond the scope of this project, even though it would be something to be researched further. What should be noted here though, is that Aravantinou pays attention to this multilingual imperative, along with the idea of 'hearing' multiple languages in the text even if they cannot be properly located, and approaches it as a form of poetics of Joyce's work.[21]

The reading practices that *Finnegans Wake* invites as a text have been widely acknowledged in scholarship. Fritz Senn observes that '[t]he reader of *Finnegans Wake* often feels himself in a world full of tricky déjà vus, of elusive voices uttering vaguely familiar sounds that get more familiar, if not always more clear, with each successive tour, guided or unguided through the maze' (1984, 87). Aravantinou however, emphasizing sound as recalling a certain language, approaches this characteristic as a mode of reading Joyce and provides examples of what she sees as linguistic references to the Greek language

[20] For further discussion on the role of error in Joyce's texts see Conley (2003).
[21] See also her suggestion of how to read *Finnegans Wake*, according to which words gain meaning by being pronounced: 'Από προσωπική πείρα ξέρω, πως ο καλύτερος τρόπος, είναι το διάβασμα με δυνατή φωνή· λέξεις που δεν βρίσκονται σε κανένα λεξικό, και δεν ανήκουν σε καμμιά γλώσσα, ξαφνικά αποκτούνε εννοιολογική σημασία, όταν ακουστούν ηχητικά! Τότε αποκτούν ταυτότητα.' [I know from personal experience that the best way is to read aloud; words that are found in no dictionary and belong to no language suddenly, when heard aloud, acquire a semantic meaning! It is then that they acquire identity.', *Ηριδανός* (1975-1976, 3: 15)

or to Joyce's Greek encounters, examples which have been criticized as misreadings of words. While these examples might be stemming mostly from acoustic similarities rather than etymologically established connections, that does not negate the existence of modern Greek words and phrases in *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* that are linked to entries in the Greek notes. Aravantinou, therefore, seems to be conscious of what is happening in the two texts. She recognizes not only the multilingualism that Joyce tried to achieve, but also the multilingual imperative, its constantly shifting ground, the feeling that there are simultaneously several languages at play. Paraphrasing Ellmann, but also being conscious of it herself as is evident in her monograph, Aravantinou states that 'Joyce knew that the resemblances between two sounds, like the resemblances between two people, when put together, give other sounds or other resemblances and further interconnections with other people and other identities'.[22] More than that, Aravantinou uses the multilingual imperative to develop her own interpretations of Joyce's Greek notes. Questioning her reading method, Raizis ignores the fact that Aravantinou not only reads closely Joyce's work, but also takes into account his writing process, and his interest in language, orality, and sound.

Aside from the methods employed, Aravantinou's *Τα ελληνικά* was also questioned regarding the researcher's motives. Yannis Metaxas, who reviewed *Τα ελληνικά* for the literary journal *Διαβάζω* [*Diavazo*, 'I read'], believed that Aravantinou's non-academic and literary background played a role in how she presented her findings and arguments.[23] Titled 'Η στρατηγική της οικειοποίησης του «Άλλου»' ('The strategy of appropriating the "Other"'), Metaxas's review contemplates Aravantinou's ulterior motives for engaging in such a research and publishing such a study, and hints at its shifting between the academic, the literary, and the fictional, as he claims that Aravantinou actually 'aims at creating a

[22] 'Κι ακόμα ο Τζόυς ήξερε πως οι ομοιότητες δύο ήχων, όπως κι οι ομοιότητες δύο ανθρώπων, ενωμένες δίνουν άλλους ήχους ή άλλες ομοιότητες και άλλες διασυνδέσεις με άλλους ανθρώπους και άλλες ταυτότητες' (1977, 85). See also Ellmann (1977, 91).
[23] Yannis Metaxas (1978), 'Η στρατηγική της οικειοποίησης του «Άλλου»', *Διαβάζω*, 12: 62-64.

completely new literary text that will have as its starting point her "dialogue" with Joyce's work'.[24] But what Aravantinou is really after, according to Metaxas, is a 'hellenization' of Joyce. Metaxas criticizes this localizing of the Irish writer as one of the two strategies developed in her book, the other being more immediately visible, namely her arguments about Joyce learning Greek and recreating the real-life Greeks he knew into fictional characters of *Ulysses*.

Instead of a study on Joyce, Metaxas reads *Τα ελληνικά* as a literary project that aims at redefining the Greek literary canon and Greek literary history, that is, an inherently Greek project. Joyce's 'hellenization', Metaxas suggests, constitutes Aravantinou's (mis)appropriation of the Irish writer as a Greek writer, that is, an act of localizing Joyce which the reviewer identifies as a typically peripheral response to the lack of similarly great authorial figures in Greek literature:

> …μιαν άλλη προοπτική οικειοποίησης […] καθώς αντιμετωπίζει τη λέξη «ελληνικά» όχι πια σαν γράμμα-λαλιά αλλά κυρίως σαν προβληματική-γλώσσα που ενέχει παγκοσμιότητα κι αποκλείει—υποτίθεται—τον τοπικισμό και τον εθνικισμό. Πρόκειται δηλαδή για την αγαπητή τακτική των κατοίκων τούτης της μικρής χώρας με το ένδοξο παρελθόν […] να ταυτίζουν το «ελληνικός» με το «οικουμενικός-παγκόσμιος». (1978, 64)
>
> …another opportunity for appropriation […] as she no longer uses the word 'Greek [language]' as a written-spoken language, but mostly as an issue-language which encompasses globality and—supposedly—excludes localism and nationalism. It is a beloved strategy of the inhabitants of this little country with the glorious past […] to identify the 'Greek' with the 'universal-worldwide'.

Metaxas, therefore, sees *Τα ελληνικά* as a project of consecrating a foreign writer as 'Greek' because of the study's argument regarding Joyce's connections to the Greek language. According to Metaxas, Aravantinou is following a tendency that prevails among Greeks who need to prove that great foreign writers showed an interest in Greek to feel validation about their language and literature. Seeing, therefore, *Τα ελληνικά* as an example of criticism that withholds anxieties of the periphery, he suggests

[24] 'σκοπεύει στη συγγραφή ενός νέου εν τέλει λογοτεχνικού κειμένου που 'χει για αφετηρία το «διάλογό» της με το έργο του Τζόυς', (1978, 62).

that Aravantinou tries to transform Joyce into a canonical figure for the Greek literary canon because Greek literature lacks such a writer. Additionally, he claims, she tries to prove Joyce's superiority through the Greek notes, through his affinity with the Greek language, which she views as a 'universal' language. More than that, underlying this critique, is another implicit accusation of Aravantinou attempting to present herself as creatively affiliated to Joyce through their biographical similarities—and eventually identifying with him—in an attempt to make herself emerge as the Joycean literary figure that Greek literature lacks.

Aravantinou, however, goes further than that. Through her reading of the archive, Aravantinou moves away from the imposing figure of the Author, to trace and reconstruct the network around the writer. She is preoccupied mostly with the people around *Ulysses* and those who eventually made their way into *Ulysses* as models for or parts of characters. Focusing on the Greek diasporic community, with which Joyce associated himself, she makes the case of its members being 'odyssean prototypes' for the novel. She focuses on what she finds to be an underexplored part of the network around Joyce and, eventually, of the Joyce archive as well, in order to trace at least some of these 'anonymous and eponymous people' (1977, 76), those who spoke Greek. However, as she also makes clear, there are other figures that interest her, of non-Greek origin. Her focus on the Greeks is connected to the aspect of language, the fact that she had the opportunity to do research on the Greek notes and to trace the transformations of the language in Joyce's work. Her reading and examination of the Greek part of the Joyce archive highlights it not only as part of the Irish writer's archive, but also as an archival space for the Greek diasporic community of the time, one of the communities that Joyce was in contact with. Through her research, Aravantinou identifies Joyce not as a Greek writer, but as a writer of the diaspora, an exilic writer, a writer who, being himself away from his country, became one with the diasporic, wandering, and minor figures that surrounded him, and which became his writing material. Metaxas's text, however, is also important because it raises issues of canonization,

consecration, and textual circulation. *Τα ελληνικά* brings to the fore the issue of transnational connections between writers, literary spaces, and literary traditions, especially those that are not always recorded systematically.

Such reviews highlight aspects of world literature, textual circulation, and transnational authorship that *Τα ελληνικά* touches upon, and which concern the trajectory of Joyce and *Ulysses* in Greece. The preconceptions they express hide their own anxieties towards Greek literature, Greek identity, and its positionality within the world. Jina Politi, for example, in the review she wrote in the major newspaper *Καθημερινή* [*Kathimerini*, 'Daily'], points out that Joyce supported Victor Bérard's theory about the *Odyssey*'s semitic origins, claiming, therefore, that the exact nature of Joyce's connections with Greek culture does not really 'honor' the (modern) Greeks.[25] It should be noted, however, that Joyce was introduced to Bérard's theory at around the same time that he developed connections with the Greeks he met in Zurich. Both Ellmann (1982) and Budgen (1972) present Joyce's socializing with Greeks alongside his interest in Bérard's theory and the connections between Jews and Greeks. Writing from an academic point of view, Politi suggests that Aravantinou lacks a research topic and aim. Furthermore, she claims that the triviality of the content of the Greek notes is the reason they had remained underexplored, whereas tracing the people, the models behind the novel's characters is pointless. Politi views Aravantinou's study as a 'creative reading' of Joyce coming from a poet and necessarily based on textual transformations and re-imaginings, rather than a scholarly one. Finally, she also suggests that, since Aravantinou cannot give a definitive answer to certain questions, she has followed a wrong interpretation.[26] Both Metaxas and Politi see Aravantinou's

---

[25] Jina Politi (1978), 'Σε αναζήτηση ερμηνευτικού μίτου', *Η Καθημερινή*, 20 April, 7.
Victor Bérard developed his theory in his book *Les Phéniciens et l' Odyssée* (1902), which fascinated Joyce.

[26] 'Για ένα πράγμα, ωστόσο, μπορούμε νάχουμε απόλυτη βεβαιότητα: πως στην ανάγνωση των έργων του Τζόυς, άμα πιάσει κανείς το σωστό, ερμηνευτικό μίτο, φτάνει πάντα στην έξοδο των λαβυρίνθων του. Τα έργα του, όπως και το ανθρώπινο σύμπαν, εμπεριέχουν το σύστημα και τους νόμους των αποδεικτικών διαδικασιών για την ανάγνωσή τους. Αν κάποιος δεν φτάνει στην έξοδο αυτό σημαίνει ότι περιπλανήθηκε σε λάθος μονοπάτι.' (For one thing we can be certain: when reading Joyce's works, if one picks up the right interpretative thread, one always reaches the end of their labyrinths. His works,

project through her identity as a poet and approach her work as more literary than critical questioning the validity of her critical practice. However, such reviews ignore multilingual approaches of Joyce which read his work through his writing process.

Aravantinou is not trying to 'consecrate' Joyce nor highlight the superiority of the Greek language or people even though the peripheral status of the Greek language as a minor language is one of the main strands that guide her thinking. Through examples from the notes, and by tracing the trajectories of these Greek people and their interactions with Joyce, she shows that the Irish writer was interested in the peripheral and the minor, in the different forms of minor languages, and the potentialities of the word, the idiom, and the register. Her aim is to show that it was the contact with the language, and the anonymous people who shaped Joyce's work. More specifically, it was that kind of contact with the spoken form of the language, through the every-day people who spoke it, rather than through textbooks or high-brow literature.

Aravantinou is not only considering the peripheral status of the Greek language and the Greeks she is researching, she is also conscious of her own peripheral status as a Greek critic. Her views on peripherality and the peripheral status of the Greek language are informed by her personal experience as a poet and a self-exile, and are evident in her life-writing piece, *Μετα-γραφή ή Εμπειρία συνόρων* (1975) which resulted from her scholarship in West Berlin.[27] These views were also shared by the circle of the avant-garde journal *Πάλι* of which she was a member. The members of *Πάλι* were preoccupied with issues of world literature, the positionality of contemporary Greek literature and its dissemination.[28] At the same time, Aravantinou's peripheral perception is also reflected in her poetry.[29]

---

like the universe, contain the system and the laws of conclusive processes for their reading. If one does not reach the exit, that means that one has wandered down a wrong path.) (1978, 7)

[27] This experience leads her also to reflect on the exilic situation more broadly. See *Μετα-γραφή* (1975, 55-59).

[28] See Valaoritis (1997).

[29] See Valaoritis's introduction to the collective volume of Aravantinou's poetry. He suggests that in her poems the private and the public are reflected in a way that pertains to the cultural space as a postcolonial and peripheral nation with an unsettled identity (1998, 12).

Her exilic experience, which informs this perception, influences her in considering the aspect of exile as an important factor in Joyce's linguistic experiments and affective connections. Finally, through her approach, Aravantinou also proposes a way of practicing criticism more openly when it comes to Joyce. Her reading of an established writer through a peripheral and minor viewpoint which is both her personal viewpoint but also an underexplored aspect she locates in Joyce's work, introduces new modalities in reading Joyce, modalities that emphasize and thematize these dynamics.

In what follows, I will offer an alternative reading of Aravantinou's critical work culminating in three different but interconnected glosses of her approach. Considering what has been written so far about Aravantinou and her research on Joyce, I seek to develop a more positive approach of her reading as productive, which invites new responses, arguing that her work can be re-read and validated as she offers new ways of talking about Joyce in the periphery and, in this case, in the Greek literary space. By taking into account her agency as a critic and a translator, I will examine how her peripheral viewpoint affects her reading of a cosmopolitan, established author figure and how that is conveyed in her critical work. Furthermore, I will consider how she interprets and comes to terms with Joyce's archive to speak about Joyce's Greek acquaintances and his attempts to learn Greek, as well as Joyce himself and his texts; how her reading of the archive through the aspect of translation, interacts with the texts; and, finally, in what ways it changes these texts. Through peripheral, archival, and Joycean glosses, it becomes clear that Aravantinou not only provides an alternative reading which draws from her intellectual background and her original work, but most of all constructs her own Joycean archive introducing an outside perspective of reading Joyce which focuses on issues and elements that are considered established. A more positive reading of *Τα ελληνικά* will bring to the fore neglected aspects of it, but also aspects of Joyce's Greek connections and use of language, while at the same time reconsider the critical and translational modes introduced by a peripheral reading.

Joyce's Greek notes: language, idiom, community

The Greek notes are part of a bigger corpus of written material compiling the Zurich notebooks, which contain the notes that Joyce kept while living in Zurich between 1915 and 1919. During that time, Joyce tried to gain basic knowledge of modern Greek by conversing with a few people he met who spoke the language. Based on her research findings, Aravantinou identifies Pavlos Phocas, the writer of the *Εσπερία* notice mentioned in the opening of this thesis, who was a Greek of the diaspora and 'a clerk in a Zurich commercial house' (Budgen, 174), as Joyce's instructor in Modern Greek.

Joyce's Greek notes are now kept at the University at Buffalo, in a collection of documents which the Irish author left behind in Paris after escaping to unoccupied France in the beginning of WWII and moving back to Zurich where he stayed until his death in 1941. In the published facsimiles of Joyce's archive, the Greek notes have been included in a volume containing miscellaneous notes in Italian, French, and Greek; the original manuscripts are divided today between the Joyce collections of Cornell and Buffalo.[30] The editors of the volume have arranged the Greek notes in such a way as to show what they believe to be 'a progress from aided to unaided work in the language' (1979, viii). They reflect Joyce's efforts to learn modern Greek and contain entries in his own handwriting as well as in his instructor's. Starting with the Greek alphabet and vocabulary lists, and progressing to full sentences, it is clear that there was a process of teaching and learning between Joyce and Phocas however idiosyncratic that was. Notes of certain words in both varieties of the Greek language at the time, *dimotiki* and *katharevousa*, show that the difference in idioms and, therefore, register was part of the learning process. Notes of sentences following later, which also include questions and answers, facilitate a reimagining of the exchange and conversation that took place between Joyce and his

[30] The facsimiles of the Zurich notebooks among which the Greek notes are found and from which I have been working are in James Joyce (1979), *James Joyce Archive. Notes, Criticism, Translations and Miscellaneous Writings: A Facsimile of Manuscripts and Typescripts*, vol. III, prefaced and arranged by Hans Walter Gabler (New York, NY: Garland Publishing Inc.). The Greek notes correspond to manuscripts Buffalo VIII.A.6.a-j, 4, 2, 1 and are found in pages 288-353 of the volume.

instructor during those sessions. More than that, these show Joyce's interest in both oral and written forms of the language, as he has not only noted parts of their conversation, but has also copied business letters and newspaper articles. Finally, the notes also include two short anecdotal texts written in Greek, in Joyce's handwriting, which remain unidentified.

The Greek notes consist of scattered details that usually interested Joyce, as he was in the habit of gathering and taking notes of different things which he would happen to hear or see and which he then used as writing material for his texts (Budgen 175-76). The encyclopedic variety of these notes which contain popular songs, a folk klephtic song, profanities, an ecclesiastical incantation, homonyms, copies of newspaper articles, of personal and formal correspondence, Homeric verses, and the Greek national anthem reflect not only the teaching and learning process that took place, and the idioms that interested Joyce, but also the kind of material that he was looking for when learning another language and especially modern Greek, a language for which he already had an affective connection. As a result, these notes reflect Joyce's attitude towards the process of language learning, which was influenced by his years as a teacher of English at the Berlitz school in Trieste. Apart from that, however, learning a language and especially modern Greek was a process which, for Joyce, would include linguistic play, etymological speculation, and taking advantage of the (un)translatability of that language. In her reading, Aravantinou highlights these points by focusing on specific examples and unfolding, therefore, the potentialities of the note.

Alongside material evidence of language acquisition, the Greek notebooks also contain allusions to Joyce's texts and especially *Ulysses* on which he was working at the time. Among the sentences he wrote in Greek, there are references to *Ulysses* as well as to *A Portrait*. In *Τα ελληνικά*, Aravantinou searches for deeper connections between the notebooks and Joyce's text using the archive as a tool of interpretation: 'αλλά η αληθινή βοήθεια και η πρώτη επαφή προέρχεται απ' τις σημειώσεις του ίδιου του Τζόυς, απ' τα λάθη, απ' τις κοινολογίες, απ' τις βαρετές ποιητικές περιγραφές

της πρώτης γραφής, σ' όλα τα βιβλία του' (1977, XIX).[31] Using this less examined part of the Joyce archive to unlock Joyce's texts, Aravantinou claims that it is more than just language learning notes. She argues:

> Τελικά, θα μπορούσαμε να πούμε πως το έργο του Τζόυς αντιπροσωπεύει μόνο τη σμίκρυνση και τη συρρίκνωση των σημειώσεων, των πρόχειρων γραφών που δημιουργούν ένα τεράστιο όγκο, πράγμα που δείχνει πόσο η ζωή η ίδια, το υλικό του προφορικού λόγου, το άλεκτο ή η συντομογραφία του φθόγγου, πετρωμένα, διατηρημένα, αλλαγμένα, συνεργάστηκαν όλα μαζί για να υπάρξει το βιβλίο. (1977, XXI)
>
> After all, we could say that Joyce's [published] work represents only the diminution and condensation of the notes, the immense volume of drafts, which show how life itself, the material of the spoken word, the unarticulated, or the abbreviation of the note, all of them, solidified, preserved, transformed, collaborated towards the emergence of the book.

Aravantinou, therefore, reads the Greek notes in the context of their archival characteristics, as writings and rewritings which have transformed the spoken word into something solid and stable and which eventually become a book. She does not dismiss the aspect of language learning that these notes represent. Rather, she argues that there is more to this process of language acquisition which allows us to approach Joyce's published work. Biographical details also become part of the archive because life itself is attached to writing in Joyce; it can be viewed as a written piece as well as writing material. Life itself is viewed in the context of the archive which, as used by Aravantinou, becomes more than just an assemblage and structuring of items. It is connected to the text as well as to the act and process of writing. The archive becomes a constantly unfolding productive space which encourages multiple rewritings, constant additions and reconstructions.

Aravantinou seems to be basing her premise that Phocas and a few other 'Greek friends' taught Joyce Greek on the information given by Ellmann in his biography of Joyce, and Budgen who wrote

[31] 'and yet the real help [in knowing Joyce's work] and the first contact come from the notes of Joyce himself, from the mistakes, the trivialities, the boring poetic descriptions of the first draft, in all his books'

about his friendship with Joyce during their time in Zurich. She also clarifies that Ellmann drew material from Gorman, Joyce's first biographer who received 'guidance' by the Irish author himself. Referring to the time that Joyce spent in the various cafés and restaurants in Zurich between 1916 and 1918, Ellmann narrates that Joyce met up and became friendly with a group that called themselves 'Club des Étrangers' among which there was 'Paul Phokas who satisfied his need for a Greek friend with whom he could discuss his work' (*JJII* 407-408). Through this 'Club', Joyce also met Paul Ruggiero, a pupil of his 'who was employed in a bank' (*JJII* 408) and who ended up being a close friend, as he helped the Joyce family to flee to Zurich when WWII broke out. Ruggiero was by the side of the family during Joyce's last days, while he also contributed to cultivating Joyce's posthumous fame.[32] What little information Ellmann gives about the 'Club des Étrangers' and Joyce's interactions with Phocas in Zurich come from an interview with Ruggiero. According to Ellmann, 'they spoke Italian together and sometimes Greek, for Joyce had picked up a smattering of the language in Trieste, and Ruggiero knew it because he had spent several years in Greece' (*JJII* 408). Ellmann, therefore, hints that Joyce had already learnt some Greek in Trieste, before meeting Phocas in Zurich. He also claims that Joyce regretted his ignorance of classical Greek and that '[h]is imperfect acquaintance with the language served the useful purpose, however, of making him wild and daring in etymological speculation, a favorite subject when with Ruggiero and Phokas' (*JJII* 408).

While Ellmann does not give specific information on what form of language learning took place among the group, Aravantinou proposes explicitly that Joyce and Phocas 'exchanged' language lessons; Joyce taught Phocas English, and in exchange, Phocas taught Joyce modern Greek. However, Aravantinou's conceptualization of language lessons in the case of Joyce does not align with systematic and organized sessions of language teaching. Although she uses the term 'lessons' ('μαθήματα'), for

[32] The Paul Ruggiero archive in the Special Collections of Zentralbibliothek Zürich attests to that. Ruggiero had kept copies of all works by Joyce, as well as newspaper articles and references about him, while he also provided information to Ellmann during his work on Joyce's biography.

Aravantinou, these 'lessons' were part of the conversations and meetings at the restaurant where the Club des Étrangers assembled, according to Ellmann. A close examination of the Greek notes indeed suggests that Phocas was Joyce's interlocutor, but it is also important to identify Aravantinou's conceptualization of the 'Greek lessons' that Joyce received because it shows that, along with tracing Joyce's language learning, she is also interested in the people that formed a network around Joyce and especially those who spoke Greek, as well as the process of this idiosyncratic language learning which followed the Berlitz style and with which Joyce was familiar. Aravantinou aims to convey the broader role that the Greek language and community played in Joyce's work and archive, as contributors and collaborators to his writing instead of simply indicating connections and elements of the Irish writer that would render him more familiar to the Greek public. Therefore, through her discussion of the so-called 'Greek lessons', we understand how Aravantinou positions herself towards Joyce and his work as well as towards her own critical and translation work.

Whether Joyce had indeed learned to speak and write modern Greek and to what extent is a long-standing question which has not been resolved. Joyce himself declared that he 'spoke or used to speak modern Greek not too badly' (*LI* 167). Venturing to provide an answer—while a project on its own—will not affect our reading of Joyce's trajectory in Greece or the reception of Aravantinou's work. In the end of her introduction to *Τα ελληνικά*, Aravantinou provides clear conclusions regarding this topic:

> Ο Τζόυς σίγουρα δεν θα μπορούσε να γράψει ένα βιβλίο στα ελληνικά. Μπορούσε όμως να διαβάσει τους τίτλους μιας ελληνικής εφημερίδας. Ο ίδιος δήλωνε: «Μιλάω αβίαστα τα νέα ελληνικά». Προφανώς εδώ παινευόταν. Βεβιασμένα ή αβίαστα τα ελληνικά που μίλαγε—δεν έχει και τόση σημασία, κι εξάλλου δεν υπάρχει σχετική μαρτυρία. Αβίαστη ήταν μόνο η επιθυμία του να μιλάει ελληνικά. (XXV)
>
> Surely Joyce could not have written a book in Greek. He could, however, read the headings of a Greek newspaper. He himself claimed: 'I speak modern Greek effortlessly'. He was obviously exaggerating. Whether he spoke Greek effortlessly or not—that does not really matter, and, in any case, there is no such testimony. What was effortless was his desire to speak Greek.

The fact that Aravantinou's conclusions on Joyce's fluency are only mentioned briefly in her introduction shows that her research was mostly geared towards finding connections in the archive between Joyce and certain people, and therefore looking into Joyce's writing and creative process through a very small part of his life and archive. The Greek notebooks are part of evidence showing that the Irish writer did try to learn modern Greek as there is a progress from a basic level to more complex elements: from the Greek alphabet and declension of basic nouns to vocabulary, sentences, texts (even if copied), and translations. It is also uncertain whether Phocas was the only person involved in the process. There are two main handwritings that can be discerned in the Greek notes: one of them belongs to a person who was learning to write in the Greek alphabet (Joyce's) and the other is more stable and confident. Aravantinou takes Phocas as the most likely 'instructor' and it is only Phocas's name that appears more than once in the Greek notes, either in his own signature, or in Joyce's handwriting. Among the sentences included, two examples, which are in Joyce's handwriting and reflect exercises of spoken dialogue, read: 'Είσθε ο κύριος Παύλος; Πολύ ορθώς' (Buffalo VIII.A.1-6, *JJA* 3.346 'Are you Mr Pavlos? That is correct') and 'είσθε ευχαριστημένος με την πρόοδόν μου, κύριε διδάσκαλε;' (Buffalo VIII.A.1-7, *JJA* 3.347 'Are you satisfied with my progress, teacher?'). In the last two pages, as arranged in the *JJA* (3.351-52), there are two notes that have been copied by Joyce and both seem to have been written originally by Phocas although the name has been copied only under the second note. The first one is a small note in which Phocas informs Joyce that he has found a job at an office and will be working all morning and afternoon. The second letter is lengthier and seems to have been written a day after the first one. In the second letter, Phocas expresses his wishes for the upcoming Easter informing Joyce about the different dates between the Catholic and Orthodox Easter. The last part of the letter is one of the clues that led Aravantinou to articulate her hypothesis,

and which indeed implies that there were some sort of 'lessons' taking place between Phocas and Joyce:

> Λυπούμαι πολύ που τώρα δεν θα έχω αρχετόν
> καιρόν διά να συναντώμεθα και εξακολουθήσωμεν
> τας συνδιαλέξεις μας. Εντούτοις όταν έχετε καιρόν
> μετά τας 7 το εσπέρας μου γράφετε μίαν ημέραν πριν.
> Διατελώ μετά φιλικών χαιρετισμών
> υμέτερος
> ΠΑΥΛΟΣ. Γ. ΦΩΚΑΣ.[33]

> I am very sorry I will no longer have enough
> time to meet and continue
> our conversations. However, whenever you have time
> after 7 in the evening, write to me a day in advance.
> With kind regards
> yours
> PAVLOS. G. PHOCAS.

Instead of determining Joyce's fluency in Greek, Aravantinou focuses on how to read Joyce's work through the Greek archive and the use of Greek words in his work. Although a big part of her monograph is about Joyce and his life in the different cities before Paris, Aravantinou does not focus on the 'genius' of the author-figure, like Karelli and Pentzikis did as we saw in the first chapter, but on the writer amidst a vibrant community of people from different backgrounds that contributed to his work and his writing process in multiple ways. *Τα ελληνικά* consists of an introductory historical overview and three sections which are structured according to the three places that defined Joyce before Paris, before acquiring fame: Dublin, Trieste, and Zurich. In each section, Aravantinou presents not only Joyce's personal and artistic trajectory, but also how the other people, with whom he interacted, affected him. She discusses the Greeks who played a significant role in his life and presents the research she conducted in their own stories and background. Count Francesco Sordina, Baron

[33] Buffalo VIII.A.1-12 (*JJA* 3.352). The transcription follows the spelling of the manuscript.

Ambrogio Ralli, Nicolas Santas, Paul Ruggiero, Antonios Chalas, and Pavlos Phocas are figures whose trajectories and encounters with Joyce she charts. Aravantinou argues that their contribution to Joyce's work was as important as that of the intellectual and literary figures with whom he associated in Paris. In the end, Aravantinou includes photographic reproductions of the Greek notebooks as well as letters, with relevant information and analysis, providing thus a part of the Joyce archive which was not easily accessible to the wider Greek public at the time. As a result, along with her archival research in the Greek notebooks, Aravantinou also unravels the history of Greeks of the diaspora connecting thus the Joyce archive with the Greek diasporic community.

Peripheral, archival, Joycean: Aravantinou's readings of the Greek Joyce archive

Inspired by Ellmann, Aravantinou's approach focuses on transformations of life-events into literary fiction and writing. Informed by her poetic and poststructuralist background, she also pays attention to the aspect of language, how language, and specifically Greek, is used by Joyce and how it is transformed. Aravantinou explores the different uses to which Joyce put the language, its sound, its script, its appearance, its different forms, idioms, and registers, but also other resonances it had for the Irish writer such as the affective connections it created. Starting from describing the experience of reading Joyce's text as 'a series of small discoveries, wonderful surprises, and waiting for *the constant unfinishedness of the phrase*, the surprise of the unarticulated, the eternal originality of the word, the infinite imagination in his writing' (my italics),[34] Aravantinou conveys the ungraspability and inadequacy she, like others, feels when tackling Joyce and *Ulysses*, an inadequacy which, however, she frames critically. In the introduction to *Τα ελληνικά*, Aravantinou consciously declares that:

[34] 'μια αλυσίδα από μικρές ανακαλύψεις, από θαυμάσιες εκπλήξεις, από αναμονές για το συνεχώς ατελείωτο της φράσης, τον αιφνιδιασμό του άλεκτου, το αιώνια καινούριο της λέξης, το άπειρο της φαντασίας στη γραφή του' (1977, XVII)

> Αυτή η μελέτη λοιπόν δεν είναι παρά η αρχή, που εγκαλεί απαιτητικά μια συνέχεια από άλλες προσεγγίσεις, που κι αυτές δε θα είναι τελειωμένες ούτε τελειωτικές, αφού η γραφή του Τζόυς δεν τελειώνει ποτέ, γιατί κάθε φορά ξαναγράφεται, ανάλογα με το μελετητή και τον αναγνώστη που την προσεγγίζει. (1977, XVII)
>
> This study, therefore, is nothing but the beginning which demandingly invites a continuation of other approaches, which will be neither finished nor finite, since Joyce's writing never ends because it is rewritten every time, depending on the researcher and the reader who approaches it.

Aravantinou proposes an open way of reading Joyce critically. Apart from her intellectual honesty on how she positions herself in relation to Joyce and his text, and recognizing the critical tradition before her, she maintains this attitude to also invite dialogue and to create a productive space for further approaches. As a result, instead of claiming a solid presence in the Joyce-related critical field, she consciously acknowledges that her work is part of a larger network of responses to which more will be added. Although Aravantinou's approach was criticized as haphazard as we saw in Politi's review, it aligns, however, with Fritz Senn's reading of Joyce's writing as a kind of writing that does not allow for big definitive statements. For Senn, maintaining an open approach in criticism can prove more productive as it invites dialogue and debate (1984). According to John-Paul Riquelme's commentary on Senn's critical stance, an approach which focuses on opening new possibilities rather than answering questions could be seen as 'the critic's equivalent of an act of translation' (1984, xv-xvi) due to the constant inviting of new solutions. Aravantinou's archival reading foregrounds the tension between foreignness and locality that is at play in the Greek notes. Considering the role that translation plays in the archive of language learning, as well as in Aravantinou's background with her engagement in translation, it is her approach too that could be read as one in which translation becomes a mode of reading Joyce. In *Τα ελληνικά*, therefore, translation is no more simply part of a language exchange process, and of a linguistic archive, it is also a way of reading the archive.

Aravantinou's peripheral viewpoint becomes more prominent once we consider the centrality of the material she works on, and the way she uses it. She focuses on notes, small details, phrases,

words, and short texts, and attempts to find out how they connect to Joyce's work while she also attempts to find out how Joyce spoke about his work in the Greek he was learning. Analyzing the sentences which Joyce had written in Greek as an exercise, Aravantinou traces elements of his texts, mainly *A Portrait* and *Ulysses* and, through them, argues that Joyce's texts could also be considered 'Greek' as he is willing to speak about them through that language. Sentences like 'Εχω καταστρεψει το κλειδι μου' ('I have destroyed/lost my key', Buffalo VIII.A.1–1, *JJA* 3.341) allude, she claims, to *Ulysses* (1977, 146). She grounds this claim on the crucial role that keys play in the novel. Stephen is forced to hand to Buck Mulligan the key to Martello Tower where they are both staying but only Stephen pays for the rent. Bloom is seeking to place an advertisement for a tea merchant named Alexander Keyes having devised the motto 'House of Keyes' with a drawing of two crossed keys. When returning at home with Stephen late at night, Bloom realizes he has forgotten his key. Another example which, according to Aravantinou, reflects Joyce's broader interest in the *Odyssey* and, therefore, his preparatory work for *Ulysses*, is the phrase 'Ο Οδυσσεύς ἑκαμε το ξύλινον ἄλογον (Δούρειον ἱππον)' ('Odysseus made the wooden horse', Buffalo VIII.A.1–7, *JJA* 3.347). This is also one of the phrases that encapsulate the interaction between pupil and instructor as: the phrases 'ξύλινον' and '(Δούρειον ἱππον)' as well as the 'Ο' from 'Οδυσσεύς' are written in the instructor's more confident handwriting as corrections. Such phrases indicate for Aravantinou that Joyce was always preoccupied with his own writing which was part of his life and was trying to develop it not only by thinking about it in another language, but also by discussing it. She reads this as an example of Joyce's writing process of transforming life events, of which every-day life was composed, into writing material, but also as an indication of Joyce identifying with the odyssean heroic figure (1977, 129).

In *Τα ελληνικά*, some of these notes are read as more than complementary metatextual information. They become semantically open fields that are reworked, revealing thus new ways through which to read the text. Aravantinou's approach of the notes alludes to ideas articulated by

Derrida a few years later, in 1984, at the Ninth James Joyce Symposium in Frankfurt, about Joyce and his archive: that Joyce preserved his archive, kept notes, sketches, corrections, and variations for them to become a tool for his future readers, critics, and scholars (1988, 27-76). Specifically, as Derrida claimed in his lecture, Joyce 'withheld his signature up to the moment that seemed right', meaning that the Irish writer continued reworking and rewriting his texts up to the last minute when he finally added his 'signature' as a form of closure, as confirmation that the text would become a public document from that moment onwards.[35] Apart from the written name, an inscribed date can also be considered a form of signature. Joyce 'signed' his texts with the name of place and date of composition: Molly's final words in *Ulysses* are followed by the inscription '*Trieste-Zurich-Paris 1914-1921*' which signals the text as a geographically and chronologically marked public document. Derrida is preoccupied with the signature, as a form of claiming something, of quoting or mentioning something, and discusses the postcard as a kind of publication. 'Any public piece of writing, any open text, is also offered like the exhibited surface, in no way private, of an open letter […]' (1988, 30) which, if reworked, can unlock a moment, an event or even a time period. Joyce's Greek notes also function in a similar way: they contain two signatures—two different handwritings that stand as signatures, those of Joyce and Phocas, as well as Phocas's signature in his own handwriting or copied by Joyce—that lead Aravantinou to view that part of the archive as a collaborative and communal product, not simply a set of private notes, but also as an open surface, a public document that concerns and records information about a diasporic community. By unlocking the multiple potentialities of the Greek notes,

[35] See here a footnote that Derrida includes in his talk in which he claims that 'closure is impossible' in Joyce and, therefore, in Joyce studies. He attributes this to Joyce's watching over his archive and his reception to come. That is why, conscious of the importance that the archive would eventually have, he saved notes, sketches, corrections, and variations, and in his own way contributed to his own reception almost by planning it. This is also reminiscent of the initial reception of *Ulysses*, which was partly orchestrated by the author himself, partly by the people who surrounded him (1988, 74, note 18).

Aravantinou reads the Greek part of Joyce's archive as a document that can speak about that period and about Joyce's text through a Greek diasporic viewpoint.

Among the Greek notes in Joyce's handwriting, Aravantinou focuses on a sentence which she reads as referring to *A Portrait*:

> Είναι γι' αυτό το βιβλίο που θα γράψει ελληνικά, σ' ένα απ' τα σημειωματάρια της Ζυρίχης, 12 χρόνια αργότερα: «Έχω γράψει ένα μυθιστόρημα το οποίον ονομάζεται "Αυτοεικών", διάγραψε το "εικών" και πρόσθεσε "γραφία" […]. Αυτογραφία ή αυτοεικών, δηλαδή: Γραφή της εικόνας μου ή γραφή του εαυτού μου». Αυτά τα τόσο τέλεια τζοϋσικά ελληνικά αποδίδουν νομίζω και χαρακτηρίζουν όχι μόνο «Το Πορτραίτο του Καλλιτέχνη» αλλά και κάθε δικό του βιβλίο. Γιατί και η γραφή και η «εικών», συνδεμένα με την αυτοπαθητική αντωνυμία Αυτό, καλύπτουν όλο το σημειολογικό φάσμα. (1977, 48)
>
> It is about this book that he writes, 12 years later, in Greek, in one of the Zurich notebooks: 'I have written a novel which is titled "Self-image". He crossed over "image" and added "-ography". Selfography or self-image, which means: a Writing of my image or a writing of myself. This perfect Joycean Greek renders, I think, and characterizes not only *A Portrait of the Artist* but each one of his books. Because both writing and 'image', being connected with the reflexive pronoun 'auto' ['self'], cover the entire semantic spectrum.

Aravantinou here, focuses on Joyce's attempt to speak about his novel, *A Portrait*, in Greek and to translate the word 'portrait', a part of the title, as accurately as possible. The sentence is thus written in his notes: 'Έχω γράψει ένα μυθυστόριμα το οποίον ονομάζεται «Αυτο~~εικόν~~γραφία»' (Buffalo VIII.A.1–1, *JJA* 3.341) with the 'γραφία' having been added, possibly as a correction by Phocas, right above the overwritten 'εικόν' [sic]. The choice of both words, the one he has crossed and the one written over it, reveals that he was trying to find a close translation, a Greek equivalent for the word 'portrait', the painting or depiction of the *self*. A neologism that he could have coined with the help of the Greeks he met, such as Ruggiero and Phocas, his friend and possibly his instructor in Greek, Aravantinou interprets 'Αυτο~~εικόν~~γραφία' as 'the writing of the image' or the 'writing of the self'. On the other hand, the coined word here, the deleted 'αυτοεικόν' which became 'αυτογραφία' alludes to the term and the concept of 'autobiography', a term which also characterizes *A Portrait* as it has been

read as an autobiographical novel. Considering 'αυτοεικόν' or 'αυτογραφία' as the appropriate terms to refer to *A Portrait*, Aravantinou claims that this overwritten and rewritten term represents accurately the oscillation between signifiers and signified, a tension which permeates Joyce's texts: 'Αναρωτιέμαι, ήξερε πόσο αυτή η διαγραμμένη μισή λέξη του αναπαριστούσε τόσο ανάγλυφα αυτές τις συνεχείς εναλλαγές από σημαίνοντα και σημαινόμενα;' (1977, 49).[36] Based on that, Aravantinou wonders about the content of this image or script, whether it is the script, the writing of the actual self or the writing of the written, the inscribed—and semi-fictional or fictional—self. She concludes that it is about the 'self-image of self-writing' ('Αυτοεικών λοιπόν της Αυτογραφίας μου', 49) which leads to a negation of the image and the script, the writing, because they are changed, the former by the writer himself and the latter by the reader. Aravantinou takes this example as an opportunity to discuss Joyce's use of the Greek language as a foreign language which he employed to expand the meaning of the term 'autobiography' in order to render it appropriate for his own text. The new term he coins from the modern Greek through etymological speculation and play, while also reminiscent of what has been recently called 'autofiction', encapsulates what Aravantinou sees as Joyce's inseparability between life and writing: the creation and the writing of the self that is not entirely fictional and does not consist of a writing simply *about* the self as autobiography is usually perceived. The terms composed by Joyce in collaboration with his instructor(s)—both 'αυτοεικών' and 'αυτογραφία'—describe the different manifestations of the self (the self as a portrait, the self actively writing and being written) and therefore cover the entire semantic spectrum of the title *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, the text as well as the other texts by the Irish writer. Moreover, this example showcases Aravantinou's underestimated poetic insight into Joyce's process.

[36] 'I wonder, did he know how tangibly that overwritten half word represented those constant oscillations between signifiers and signified?'

Although it was in Zurich that Joyce studied modern Greek more 'systematically', Aravantinou argues that most elements and key sources for Joyce's language, words, and names are to be traced in his time, experiences, and connections in Trieste. It was there, she claims, that he was inspired by the different forms of the language because he associated with people from various backgrounds, but also because he taught at the Berlitz school. Paraphrasing Ellmann, Aravantinou draws attention to the puns and transformations of names and characters such as Bella Cohen in 'Circe' who becomes Bello, or Leopold Bloom who becomes Henry Flower in his correspondence with Martha Clifford.[37] Ellmann explores the pun as a key to Joyce's work which creates the 'doubling' of everything that the Joycean universe contains, stating that, for Joyce, 'the act of writing was also, and indissolubly, the act of liberating' (1977, 90). Drawing from Ellmann, as well as her own research which she presented at the 1975 Paris symposium,[38] Aravantinou develops her analysis of the concept of liberation and adds her own example of 'doubling' and transformation which she supports through her knowledge of the Greek language, an example which she sees as relevant to Joyce's Greek notes and language learning. Basing her example also on the idea of expatriation that Ellmann mentions ('Words are expatriated and repatriated like Dubliners'), she develops it in connection to the concept of freedom, a connection which, considering her exilic background and peripheral viewpoint, resonates with her personal experiences. As a result, she gives an example of what she reads as a pun in the Greek language responding to this connection. Focusing on Henry Flower and Leopold Bloom, she reflects on the translation of the name in Greek so it can preserve its double meaning as, apart from the association with the flower, she also suggests an etymological connection between the name of Henry *Flower* or Leopold *Bloom*, and 'free', 'liberated', that is, vegetable growth and liberty.[39] Furthermore, she detects

[37] Aravantinou (1977, 84-6). See also Ellmann (1977, 90-5).
[38] See Aravantinou's report from the 1975 Paris Symposium in *Ηρωδανός*, 3: 22-7. In her presentation (25-6) she talked about the morphological and semantic transformations of Bloom's name.
[39] This etymological connection is drawn from Émile Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des Institutions Indo-Européenes* (1969) which Aravantinou cites.

the word 'free' in another phrase from 'Scylla and Charybdis', in the phrase-word 'Leftherhis', which she renders as 'Leftheris' and she considers it an alternative name for Bloom, one among the multiple names that are cited in the episode and that, according to Aravantinou, define Odysseus:

> Leftherhis
> Secondbest
> Leftherhis
> Bestabed
> Secabest
> Leftabed (9.701-6)

'Scylla and Charybdis', where this array of neologisms is found, is one of the chapters focusing on Stephen Dedalus, in which Bloom appears only briefly. At around two in the afternoon, Stephen and other characters have gathered in the National Library of Ireland and are discussing Shakespeare's work and life. Stephen explains his aesthetic theory about Shakespeare and the interaction between his work and life, how Shakespeare's plays can be interpreted through his life and vice-versa, 'a theory of composition and reception' through which Stephen 'demands a contextual mode of reading that keeps the author in view', thinking about personal transformation and addressing the failure of literature to transform readers (Flack 2020, 75). During the discussion, Stephen also argues that Ann Hathaway, Shakespeare's wife was unfaithful to him, an unfaithfulness which Shakespeare recorded in the plays. Proof of Shakespeare's bitterness towards her is that in his will 'He left her his Secondbest Bed' (9.683-713). The array of words quoted above is the echo of this discussion transformed into a rhythmical pattern. Buck Mulligan, on the other hand, has just seen Bloom at the National Museum admiring the behind of a Greek-styled statue of Venus: 'His pale Galilean eyes were upon her mesial grove. Venus Kallipyge. O, the thunder of those loins!' (9.615-16). Setting all this contextual information aside, but certainly inspired by the topics developed in 'Scylla and Charybdis', Aravantinou focuses on this array of words that have been put together to make new, musical phrases, which, although referring to Shakespeare, she interprets as names or characterizations that define Odysseus,

or the Odyssean figure identified here as Bloom. She reads the first word as the Greek name 'Lefteris', a short version of 'Eleftherios' which is etymologically connected to the word 'eleftheria', that is, freedom or liberty, and, therefore, an etymologically related synonym of Henry Flower as suggested above. Moreover, she translates the phrases-words 'secondbest', 'bedabest', 'secabest', 'leftabed' as adjectives:

> secondbest=δευτεροκαλύτερος
> bedabest=κρεβατοκαλύτερος
> secabest=ξεροκαλύτερος ή σεξοκαλύτερος
> leftabed=κρεβατοξεχασμένος ή αριστεροκρέβατος (1977, 85)

As 'antiquity mentions famous beds' (9.718), Aravantinou homes in on the connections suggested by the word 'bed', an object which, apart from Shakespearean biography, is also crucial in the *Odyssey* as well as in the Blooms' household in *Ulysses*. She translates this wordplay as adjectives which pertain to Odysseus and specifically the bed that he had crafted using the trunk of an olive tree as a bedpost:

> Και που όλα αυτά τα ονόματα, κύρια και επίθετα, σημαίνουν το μόνο σημαινόμενο και κύριο άξονα του βιβλίου: τον «Οδυσσέα», που 'χτισε μονάχος το κρεβάτι του, που το ξέχασε, που ξενοκοιμήθηκε, που το άφησε ξερό (sec), δηλαδή άκληρο, και που είναι δεύτερος, αφού πρώτος είναι ο Leftheris=ελεύθερος. (1977, 85)
>
> And all these names, nouns and adjectives signify the only signified and main axis of the book: 'Odysseus' who built his bed all by himself, the bed which he forgot, in which he slept again, which he left dry (sec), that is, with no offspring, and where he comes second as the one to come first is Leftheris=the free one.

Apart from the discussion about Shakespeare's beds in 'Scylla and Charybdis', another example of the bed's symbolism is the bed that Leopold and Molly Bloom share, which had been brought from Gibraltar, and is now slowly falling apart as the 'loose brass quoits' jingle with every movement echoing the fragility of their own relationship and contrasting the steadier bed that Odysseus had built and which serves as the secret and point of recognition between him and Penelope (XXIII.181-206). Among the sentences found in the Greek notebooks, Joyce has included the phrase 'η κλίνη είναι το

άλφα και το ωμέγα μας' ('the bed is our alpha and omega/our beginning and end', Buffalo VIII.A.1–6, *JJA* 3.346). Aravantinou reworks this part of the text by associating it with the bed of Odysseus and Penelope, therefore returning to the Homeric 'original' of *Ulysses*, the *Odyssey* and revisiting the Homeric text as an archive of the Joycean text. Aravantinou brings Joyce's archive in interaction with the mythical archive. This results into a different form of the Greek part of Joyce's archive, which, being constructed by Aravantinou, becomes her own performance of the Joycean archive.

More than notes of language learning and experimentation, Aravantinou presents the Greek part of Joyce's archive as a record of time past, through which information but also memories resurface. Aravantinou explores the origins of the Greek notes and the conditions under which they were created and locates traces of the Greek 'lessons' and the interactions between Joyce and Phocas and potentially other Greeks in the form of tributes interwoven in the text of *Ulysses*. A prominent example of such a tribute, which Aravantinou views as a reference to Phocas but also to the Greek language, is analyzed in her monograph:

> Τι έκανε με το Φωκά, το δάσκαλό του στα ελληνικά; Τον βρήκα σ' ένα μακρύ κατάλογο αγίων: «Ο Άγιος Παύλος Φωκάς ο εκ Σινώπης», να περνάει πρώτος στην τάξη, πριν απ' τον Άγιο Συμεών το Στυλίτη, πριν απ' τον Άγιο Στέφανο τον Πρωτομάρτυρα, και τον Άγιο Ανώνυμο και τον Άγιο Επώνυμο και τον Άγιο Ψευδώνυμο και τον Άγιο Ομώνυμο και τον Άγιο Παρώνυμο και τον Άγιο Συνώνυμο. Έτσι οι προθέσεις που του δίδαξε ο Φωκάς, σε όλους τους συνδυασμούς με το όνομα, που δεν είναι κανένα, φτάνουν να καταργούν το όνομα, τον άγιο και την αγιοσύνη του. (1977, 133-34)
>
> What did he do with Phocas, his instructor in Greek? I found him in a long list of saints: 'Saint Pavlos Phocas of Sinope', first in his class before Saint Simeon Stylites, before Saint Stephen Protomartyr and Saint Anonymous and Saint Eponymous and Saint Pseudonymous and Saint Homonymous and Saint Paronymous and Saint Synonymous. Hence the prefixes that Phocas taught him, in every combination with the 'name' ['onoma'], which is none, manage to negate the name, the saint, and his saintliness.

The above should be read alongside the passage from *Ulysses* to which it refers, the list of saints in 'Cyclops':

> and S. James the Less and S. Phocas of Sinope and S. Julian Hospitator and S. Felix de Cantalice and S. Simon Stylites and S. Stephen Protomartyr and S. John of God […] and S. Owen Caniculus and S. Anonymous and S. Eponymous and S. Pseudonymous and S. Homonymous and S. Paronymous and S. Synonymous (12.1690-98)

Reading the passage from 'Cyclops' listing the different saints, established and imaginary, Aravantinou proposes the reference to 'S. Phocas of Sinope' as a reference and a tribute to Phocas, their friendship and the time they spent together. Paraphrasing the quote from *Ulysses* into 'Saint Pavlos Phocas of Sinope', Aravantinou underlines in a spontaneous note: 'Έτσι ξώφλησε το χρέος του ο Τζόυς: ο κ. Παύλος Φωκάς της Ζυρίχης, ο μικροϋπάλληλος σε μικροεπιχειρήσεις έγινε Άγιος. Και παρόμοια μεταχείριση δεν έκανε σε κανένα ο Τζόυς, ούτε σε φίλο του, ούτε σε εχτρό!', (1977, 134: asterisk).[40] Such a direct and beatifying reference in the text appears to be an honorary tribute not achievable by everyone.

The passage is also read as a tribute to what brought them together, the Greek language and the 'lessons' reflected in the Greek notebooks. The Ulyssean (No-man) and all-inclusive saints alluding to Greek prefixes, Eponymous, Pseudonymous, Homonymous, Paronymous, Synonymous, are considered an affective tribute to the Greek that Phocas taught Joyce. Aravantinou suggests that the linguistic game that follows the reference to S. Phocas of Sinope is exactly what links Joyce writing this to his former tutor of Greek—an overblowing of signifiers that ends up destabilizing and reframing the signified of saintliness by playing with Greek prepositions and ways around the signifier 'onoma'. Additionally, the wordplay itself is also an allusion to their 'lessons' and the playful puns they would devise, hints of which can be detected in the notebooks, especially in regards to the concept of the 'name' and names. For example, a potential discussion of the odyssean episode of the 'Cyclops',

[40] 'That is how Joyce paid off his debt: Mr Pavlos Phocas of Zurich, a small employee in small businesses, became a Saint. And Joyce never reserved such a treatment for anybody, neither friend nor enemy!'

the name and the Odyssean No-man (Οὐτις) can be traced through manuscripts VIII.A.4–29 and 30 (*JJA* 3.331-2) where we find notes of words such as 'ξεσπάω=I burst out', 'μεθυσμένος=drunk', and 'πίνω=I drink' followed by two copied Homeric couplets one of which is from the *Odyssey* episode of the Cyclops 'Οὖτις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα· Οὖτιν δέ με κικλήσκουσι / μήτηρ ἠδὲ πατὴρ ἠδ' ἄλλοι πάντες ἑταῖροι' (IX.366-67).[41] The other couplet is from Telemachus's departure from Ithaca to Pylos and Sparta (II.420-1) and contains the phrase 'ἐπὶ οἶνοπα πόντον' (epi oinopa ponton), along the winedark sea, which is repeated throughout *Ulysses*. Manuscript VIII.A.4–30 contains notes of the words for 'home' and 'rent' as well as the analysis of a pseudoetymology of the name Οδυσσεύς (Odysseus) as originating from the words 'ούτις' and 'Ζευς' meaning 'NO/GOD'.[42] Name changes run throughout Joyce's work but are also detected in the Greek part of his archive, in which, as Aravantinou's arguments suggest, the act of naming and the concept of the name are central.[43] Starting from the premise that nameless everyday people impacted significantly Joyce's work by providing him with language and writing material, and became odyssean models for *Ulysses*, Aravantinou's *Τα ελληνικά*, through Joyce's Greek connections, explores the idea that the very anonymity and simultaneous visibility of those people is crucial for Joyce's writing process, and it is from them that he draws the concept of transformation which is not limited to the transformation of life-events into writing, or real-life people into fictional characters, but extends beyond that, to develop into the transformation of names, the absence of name into the emergence of a name and vice versa, and which results into transformation of characters. Aravantinou's discussion of name changes in connection to transformation is a nod to the work of semioticians Cixous and Jacques Lacan whose talks she had

[41] My name is Noman. / My family and friends all call me Noman' (trans. Emily Wilson).
[42] For a reading of this manuscript see also Kolocotroni (2019).
[43] See here the joking limerick playing with the Greek surname 'Soutsos' and the Greek word for 'prick' and written in the 'instructor's' handwriting (VIII.A.2–2, *JJA* 3.338). What I find interesting, is that the surname could also refer to two romantic phanariote poets who were known at the end of the nineteenth century. It is impossible to determine whether Phocas was talking to Joyce about Greek literature. However, it is interesting to consider from what kind of conversation this limerick may have stemmed.

attended at the 1975 Joyce Symposium in Paris. Cixous's doctoral dissertation, *L' Exil de James Joyce ou l' Art du remplacement* (1968), drew from Joyce's biography and focused on the Irish author's poetics of exile defining it as the writer's linguistic exile. Lacan also focused on the life and work of Joyce with a preoccupation on names in his thirteenth seminar *Le Sinthome* (1975-1976), a previous form of which was presented in the Paris Symposium. In her report of the conference, published in *Ηριδανός* (1975-1976), Aravantinou sketched the main arguments of both scholars who argued for the significance of minority languages in reading Joyce. Although the symposium was geared towards *Finnegans Wake*, hence the focus on languages, Aravantinou shows in *Τα ελληνικά* how such arguments are relevant to *Ulysses* as well as the entirety of Joyce's work.

Informed by a semiotics background, Aravantinou interprets this linguistic play between the 'name', the Greek prefixes, and the act of naming not only as an exclusive tribute to Phocas, but also as a tribute to the Greek people he met: 'Ο[μ]ως πίσω απ' το διαφανές λογοπαίγνιο εμείς διακρίνουμε τους Έλληνες, ανώνυμους και επώνυμους, εκατοντάδες Ρωμιούς της διασποράς, αυτούς που γνώρισε ή και δε γνώρισε […]', (1977, 134).[44] Aravantinou sees similar tributes in the form of linguistic references to the Greek language elsewhere in the text, in *Ulysses* as well as in *Finnegans Wake* and relates them to the Greeks that Joyce knew. Last but not least, Aravantinou traces the trajectories of those Greeks after their time with Joyce in Trieste or Zurich. She provides their letters to Joyce (1977, 225-34), a translation of Joyce's poem 'Sleep Now' from *Chamber Music* (already mentioned in the introduction) by Phocas, whom Aravantinou deems 'the first ever translator of Joyce in our language' (223-24) as well as photos of Francesco Sordina (95), Ruggiero (123), and Phocas (125, 134, 135, 139). Aravantinou proposes the Greek part of the Joyce archive as a space of affective connections,

[44] 'However, behind this transparent wordplay, we detect the Greeks, anonymous and eponymous, hundreds Romioi of the diaspora, those he did meet or even those he did not meet […]'

transnational encounters and acquaintances, which are used as material for the text and for the writing process.

What has been read as misreading and misinterpretation in Aravantinou's work is a proposal of reading along with the multilingual imperative and its poetics in Joyce's work. What has been perceived as 'hellenizing' and 'appropriating' Joyce through universalizing the Greek language and context is, instead, an active consideration of the transnational and specifically the peripheral connections, the minor events and figures. Finally, what was seen as a wrong path in interpretation was a tracing of the different transformations as well as the concept of transformation in Joyce's work. Returning to Aravantinou's research topic we realize that she emphasizes the minor, the ephemeral or at least the temporary, and the marginal, the peripheral:

> Σ' αυτή την έρευνα προσπαθούμε ν' ανιχνεύσουμε τους φίλους της στιγμής ή κάποιας μεγαλύτερης διάρκειας, τους συντρόφους του μεθυσιού και των μπαρ, τους μικροδανειστές, που τον έχαναν και τους έχανε, τους Έλληνες ραφτάδες, τα γκαρσόνια στα καφενεία, τους μανάβηδες και μπακάληδες της Piazza Ponterosso, τους κατ' ευφημισμό «εμπόρους εσπεριδοειδών» […]. (1977, 76)
>
> In this research we are trying to trace the momentary friends, or the more permanent ones, the drinking companions and those at the bars, the low-lenders, who lost him and whom he lost, the Greek tailors, the coffee-shop waiters, the fruit-sellers and the grocers at Piazza Ponterosso, those who euphemistically called themselves 'citrus fruit merchants' […].

Inspired by Ellmann, Aravantinou uses him as her main source achieving, however, different results. While Ellmann focuses on Joyce as the author-figure and his genius, Aravantinou shifts the focus to the people that surrounded him, and considers how they interacted with Joyce and therefore how they had an impact on him, what kind of traces they left and how these can be located in the archive but also in Joyce's work. Shifting the focus from the writer who is usually perceived as the main figure towards the anonymous or eponymous yet minor and temporary friends and people, requires a shift from the central to the peripheral, from the major to the minor. How does this kind of consideration

of the Greek part of the archive and Joyce's Greek acquaintances affect our reading of Joyce, and of *Ulysses*? What kind of mode does Aravantinou introduce through this shift in perspectives?

'Coming events cast their shadows before' (8.526): 'Weirding' Joyce?

In his article 'The weird: a dis/orientation', Roger Luckhurst defines weird fiction as a 'slippery genre' marked by pseudobiblia, that is, the invention of fake books, fake libraries, fake traditions (2017, 1041-61). He places pseudobiblia at the core of the 'weird' archive, an archive that is out of the edges of the literary archive, composed of imaginary texts, books, and other elements. Therefore, weird fiction generates its own 'archive fever', what Derrida (1995) saw as a constant need for structuring and preserving memory; it writes its own literary forebears into existence, creating, thus, its own literary past and tradition, and attempting, at the same time, a canonization and establishment of its own. Mark Fisher (2016), on the other hand, defines the 'weird' as a mode of reading that can be detected in texts of different genres, rather than a genre in and of itself. The weird, according to Fisher, is a mode of perception allowing us to 'see the inside from the perspective of the outside' and expressing 'that which does not belong' (10). Although the examples he provides do not manage to disperse potential associations with the concept of genre, it could be argued that his definition of the weird could also be used to describe Aravantinou's critical study of Joyce and his texts. From her perspective as a woman reading and translating Joyce in the periphery, which could be considered an 'outsider's perspective', Aravantinou invites us to read the texts and the archive and texts of a cosmopolitan, internationally acclaimed, and established male writer figure, texts which could be considered 'central'. Moreover, she allows us to see the 'inside' of Joyce's work and life through the 'outside' perspective of the Greek notes, a small and seemingly insignificant part of the Joyce archive. It could be argued, therefore, that her reading of this small part of the archive develops new modes of reading Joyce related to what in recent scholarship has been called 'weird'. Considering the re-imagining that leads

to the creation of another archive, from a series of notes on linguistic acquisition, to a record of private and public history, and their affective connections, it could be argued that definitions such as those proposed by Fisher and Luckhurst could also be used to frame critically Aravantinou's approach as developed in *Τα ελληνικά*. The weird has been considered a genre-specific term, referring to genres such as science fiction, speculative fiction, and the gothic. Fisher admits that the major examples of the weird indeed belong to such genres, but, as he suggests, these associations have concealed the term's specificity. In his exploration of the weird, the eerie, and the *unheimlich*, Fisher argues that '[t]hey are all affects, but they are also modes: modes of film and fiction, modes of perception, ultimately, you might even say, modes of being. Even so, they are not quite genres' (9).

Responding to etymological speculation and playful multilingualism, characteristics of Joyce's work, Aravantinou uses the archive not only as a tool of interpretation but also of translation. Moreover, she views the archive as a productive space in which she can rewrite Joyce's text and reconstruct it, producing further responses and inviting endless possible interpretations. Aravantinou recreates her own Joycean exilic archive, and places it as the archive behind the Greek Joycean text which she recomposes. This Greek Joycean archive is composed not only of Joyce's Greek notebooks, but also of the 'hidden' Greek and the tributes that Aravantinou locates as interwoven in Joyce's texts, the affective connections that lie behind the structure of the Greek notebooks, and the stories of the anonymous and marginal people he met with even briefly, the Greek people whom Joyce knew. Aravantinou's Joycean archive includes her own experiences as an exile, and her own positionality towards the Greek language as a writer abroad as well as towards Joyce as an established author. By creating an archive composed of both Joyce's life and text, and her own experience, Aravantinou writes a literary history of Joyce and the Greek language from her own peripheral viewpoint, reading Joyce through a transnational context.

Several elements in Joyce's texts could be considered 'uncanny', such as the mysterious M'Intosh who appears again and again and whose identity is never revealed. However, instead of imposing another label on Joyce's writing, I am suggesting the concept of the weird as an affective and translational modality, a productive mode of reading Joyce in the periphery. The concept of the weird can be used to define ways of reading an established writer like Joyce from a peripheral point of view, in peripheral spaces; it can be used as a way of examining and framing critically transnational connections which are often considered minor and finally, it can be a way of addressing peripheral responses, minor events in a writer's trajectory, or critical responses to minor events.

Aravantinou translating 'Penelope'

Aravantinou's attention to literature as process was not only limited to her work on Joyce, but formed her own poetry as well. In a 1983 interview in the review *Διαβάζω* (58-72), she described her work as a recording of the moment of poetry: 'προσπαθώ να απομονώσω ακριβώς, και να περιγράψω, και να καταγράψω τη στιγμή που η ποίηση συντελείται' (1983b, 60).[45] In the same interview she declared that Joyce was a significant part of her life, as she had started reading his works already in the mid-1950s. She also repeats what she had already declared in her introduction to *Τα ελληνικά*, about being encouraged to conduct research on Joyce's Greek acquaintances by writer Stratis Tsirkas:[46] 'Θα 'χα σταματήσει στα ελληνικά αν δεν υπήρχε η παρότρυνση του Τσίρκα, που μου είχε πει: Κάτι πρέπει να κάνεις με τους Έλληνες και τον Τζόυς', (62). Aravantinou alludes to her semiological approach and emphasizes her interest in words or keywords which hold many different potentialities. At the same time, she states that she does not see differences between languages, but a language in which we move.

[45] 'I am trying to isolate, and describe, to record the moment during which poetry happens'.
[46] 'I would have stopped at the Greek [words] if it weren't for Tsirkas's prompting, who had told me: you need to do something about the Greeks and Joyce.' Tsirkas was also the one to encourage Pavlos Zannas to translate Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu*.

While she mentions her preoccupation with Joyce as an ongoing process, she does not discuss at all her experience with or thoughts on translation, an important aspect in her reading of Joyce. The first text by Joyce which she translated, *Dubliners*, was completed while she was self-exiled during the junta, and published it in 1971 under her initials.[47] Regarding *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, however, Aravantinou worked on translations which she kept revising and refused to finalize. Among the translations she published was the opening of 'Penelope' in 1982, included in the journal *Ταχυδρόμος* for the Joyce centenary (24/1466, 80-1). The translation was accompanied by a photo of Nora Barnacle, Joyce's lifelong partner, alluding to the common assumption about the connection between Joyce's Penelope, that is, Molly's character and Nora while the caption indicated that Nora never read *Ulysses* because she found it and the heroine it featured obscene.

In *Ulysses*, Joyce took great care to form each character's speech depending on their social class and background. Bloom's obsession with scientific factoids and meandering way of explaining his thoughts are reflected in his interior monologue and so are Stephen's literary and philosophical preoccupations. Molly, on the other hand, until the very end, is only presented to the reader through others' memories, viewpoints, and references and mostly through male characters. Apart from what the other characters say or reminisce about her, the only extended view of Molly is in 'Calypso', during her morning interaction with Bloom. Nevertheless, she is only known fully to the reader in her monologue in the last episode. Although Joyce has been praised for being able to pen down exactly what is going on in a woman's mind, and even though 'Penelope' has been read as an example of *écriture féminine* (Henke 1988), it is still a female character's interior monologue written by a male author.[48] Aravantinou has been the only female translator of this episode into Greek known until now.

---

[47] As Koumantareas remarks, three translations of *Dubliners* appeared in 1971-1972. It is interesting to reflect on whether the translators felt a resonance of the book's 'paralysis' with the political situation at the time.

[48] See here Casey Lawrence (2023), *'The New Womanly Man': Cross-dressing and Gender Inversion in Joyce and his Contemporaries*, PhD thesis, Trinity College Dublin. In chapter 3, 'Feminine Fiction: Authorial Cross-dressing or Écriture Féminine?' (175-253), Lawrence examines critical references to 'Penelope' as *écriture féminine*—which Cixous herself never argued—

She published the opening of the episode (corresponding to 18.01-154) in *Ταχυδρόμος*, and included another passage in her monograph *Τζαίημς Τζόυς: Ζωή και έργο* (1983, 175-78, corresponding to 18.748-808), while a typewritten manuscript of the entire episode in translation is kept in her archive.[49] Comparing the two passages, published in *Ταχυδρόμος* and her monograph, with the manuscript, the latter is clearly an earlier draft, at least as far as the published passages are concerned. Considering her trajectory as a Joyce critic and translator, I will close this chapter by looking at the opening of 'Penelope' in *Ταχυδρόμος* and examine how her reading of Joyce through his archive and his writing process informs her translational method. In what follows, I will focus on certain examples in comparison with the respective rendering by Papatsonis (1936), as well as the three full-length translations which will be discussed at length in the third chapter.

As already discussed in the previous chapter, Papatsonis relied significantly on the French translation for his 'Penelope' which was published in *To 3ο μάτι*, while the translation itself reads like an exercise, serving also as a sample for interior monologue, a modernist writing practice. The idea of sampling and exercise is manifested in its stilted style to which the use of the French text has also contributed:

> Yes because he never did a thing like that before as ask to get his breakfast in bed with a couple of eggs since the City Arms hotel when he used to be pretending to be laid up with a sick voice doing his highness to make himself interesting for that old faggot Mrs Riordan that he thought he had a great leg of and she never left us a farthing all for masses for herself and her soul (18.01-6)

> Ναι βέβαια γιατί ποτέ του ως τώρα δεν είχε ξανακάμει τέτιο πράγμα να ζητήση το πρωινό του να του το φέρουν στο κρεββάτι μαζί με δυό αυγά από τον καιρό του ξενοδοχείου «Τα Εμβλήματα της Πόλεως» που ήταν φορές που έκαμε τον άρρωστο στο κρεββάτι κ' έπαιρνε φωνή κλαψιάρικη παίζοντας το μεγάλο παιχνίδι πώς να κινήση το ενδιαφέρον εκεινής της γρηάς τούρτας της Κας Ριορδάνη με την ελπίδα πως τον είχε γραμμένο κάπου στα χαρτάκια της διαθήκης της ούτε μια πεντάρα η αθεόφοβη δεν μας

or *parler femme*, and argues that such interpretations actually stand in contrast to Cixous and Irigaray who introduced these terms, proposing that 'Penelope' could be read as a case of 'authorial cross-dressing'.

[49] The passage included in her 1983 monograph was reprinted in the journal *Συντέλεια* [*Synteleia*] (1990, 1: 50-2). The typewritten manuscript is found in Aravantinou's archive in ELIA, folder 4.2.

> άφησε όλο και λειτουργίες για τον εαυτό της και για την ψυχή της (Papatsonis, *Το 3ο μάτι*, 162)

Aravantinou, on the other hand, adopts a different approach by focusing on the text's orality through several aspects such as rhythm, pace, and idiom:

> Βέβαια ποτέ δεν έκανε ένα τέτοιο πράγμα να ζητάει το πρωινό του στο κρεβάτι με δυό αυγά μελάτα απ' τον καιρό του Σίτυ Αρμς Οτέλ τότε που παράσταινε τον άρωστο ξαπλαρωμένος η αφεντιά του και με ξέψυχη φωνή να καταφέρει να μπουρδουκλώσει εκείνη την ξυλόγρηα την κυρία Ριορντάν ματσωμένη τη νόμιζε κι ούτε φαρδίνι δε μας άφησε όλα συλείτουργα κι ευχέλαια για τη σπαγγοραμμένη την ψυχούλα της (1982, 80)

Papatsonis's Molly appears more detached from these memories and events than Aravantinou's does. Aravantinou's translation echoes Molly's irony for her husband through colloquial terms such as 'ξαπλαρωμένος' (instead of the conventional 'ξαπλωμένος'), or 'να μπουρδουκλώσει' to highlight Bloom's deceit. Concerning the idiomatic 'old faggot', for which Papatsonis had adhered to the French expression and which resulted in a more humorous characterization rather than an insult, Aravantinou draws from the word's etymology (fag, a bundle of sticks) and translates as 'ξυλόγρηα'. Moreover, Aravantinou achieves a textual economy while preserving the orality and the text's idiosyncratic syntax. For example, the rhythm of the phrase 'ματσωμένη τη νόμιζε κι ούτε φαρδίνι δε μας άφησε' reflects an immediacy in Molly's speech. The colloquial 'ματσωμένη' corresponds to the character's social status reflecting another aspect of Aravantinou's method of translating speech by considering the background of the character who speaks, something that was also at the center of Joyce's writing practice. For example, for the phrase 'and his boiled eyes of all the big stupoes I ever met', which Papatsonis translates as 'τα μάτια του μάτια βραστού ψαριού καθώς όλοι αυτοί οι ηλίθιοι' (163), Aravantinou translates 'μπαγιάτικο το γουρλωμένο μάτι τέτοιο κοιμήση δεν έχω ξαναδεί'.

Compared to Papatsonis, Aravantinou's Molly appears even bolder and more confident with using vulgarity—vulgar in the sense of the obscene as well as the common tongue—which could also

be explained by the temporal distance between the two translations and what was considered acceptable each time. Throughout the passage, Papatsonis keeps to the tone of the source text, as mentioned in the previous chapter. Molly's reference to Mary, the maid with whom Bloom was flirting, in the phrase 'if I thought he was with a dirty barefaced liar and sloven like that one' (18.73-4) becomes in Papatsonis 'αν ήξευρα πως πηγαίνει με μια ξεδιάντρωπη μια ψεύτρα μια πατσαβούρα σαν και τούτη' (163) while Aravantinou, adding a fourth expletive, draws attention to the rhythm that is often inherent in cursing: 'σαν τον σκεφτόμουνα με κείνη τη λιγδιάρα την ξεδιάντροπη την ψεύτρα ένα τσόλι'. She translates using the accretive syntax or listing that is often employed in acts of cursing or swearing, predominantly acts of orality. While the full-length translations which appear a few years before and after Aravantinou's 'Penelope' do not propose different solutions in terms of the obscenity itself, their rendering is closer to written rather than oral speech with their addition of 'και' in between expletives:

> 'όταν ήξερα πως ήταν με κάποια ξετσίπωτη ψεύτρα και βρωμιάρα όπως εκείνη' (Thomopoulos, 1169)
> 'όταν σκεφτόμουνα πως πήγαινε με αυτή τη βρωμιάρα ξεδιάντροπη ψεύτρα και ακατάστατη' (Kapsaskis, 769)
> 'όταν σκεφτόμουνα ότι ήταν με μια βρομιάρα ξεδιάντροπη ψεύτρα και λέτσα' (Anevlavis, 1038)

As this example shows, Aravantinou's approach in 'Penelope' is also distinct in comparison to the three existing full-length translations of *Ulysses* into Greek by Nikolouzos and Thomopoulos (1969-1976), Kapsaskis (1990), and Anevlavis (2014). Although these are the main focus of the next chapter, a brief examination of a few further examples along with Aravantinou's translation illustrates the different approaches not only between a female and male translators, but also between a poet-translator and Joyce scholar, and translators without such a solid background in research on Joyce.

In the first few pages of the episode, not too long after the point where Papatsonis's translation stopped, Molly thinks about sex and the misconceptions around it, and how unsatisfactory she finds it. She then wonders:

> why cant you kiss a man without going and marrying him first you sometimes love to wildly when you feel that way so nice all over you you cant help yourself I wish some man or other would take me sometime when hes there and kiss me in his arms theres nothing like a kiss long and hot down to your soul almost paralyses you then I hate that confession when I used to go to Father Corrigan (18.102-7)

Molly then moves on to her awkward experience of having to talk about someone who had touched her in confession. All four translations of this passage, by Aravantinou, Thomopoulos, Kapsaskis, and Anevlavis, preserve the meaning without proposing significant deviations from the source text. At the same time, they achieve different results concerning point of view and style, which encourage different readings of Molly's character and the text.

> γιατί να μη μπορούμε να φιλήσουμε έναν άντρα χωρίς να τον στεφανωθούμε στην αρχή σε ξετρελαίνει που αισθάνεσαι έτσι ωραία όλα γύρω σου που δεν αντέχεις άλλο πια και λαχταράς έναν άντρα να σε πάρει στην αγκαλιά του και δεν υπάρχει τίποτα στον κόσμο όσο ένα μακρύ ζεστό φιλί που φτάνει κι ανεβαίνει και θερμαίνει την ψυχή σου και σε παραλύει και αντιπαθώ φριχτά αυτές τις εξομολογήσεις όταν πήγαινα να δω τον πάτερ Κάριγκαν (Aravantinou, 81)

> γιατί να μην μπορεί μια γυναίκα να φιλήσει έναν άντρα χωρίς να τον παντρευτεί στην αρχή σου αρέσει αυτό τρομερά όταν αισθάνεσαι την επιθυμία τόσο όμορφα όλα γύρω σου που δεν αντέχεις στον πειρασμό λαχταρώ έναν άντρα να με παίρνει πότε-πότε όταν είναι εδώ και να με φιλάει μέσα στην αγκαλιά του και δεν υπάρχει τίποτα σαν το παρατεταμένο και θερμό φιλί που φτάνει ως μέσα στην ψυχή σου και σχεδόν σε παραλύει και μ' όλο που αντιπαθώ αυτού του είδους τις εξομολογήσεις όταν πήγαινα να ιδώ τον παπα-Κόριγκαν (Thomopoulos, 1171)

> γιατί να μην μπορείς να φιλήσεις έναν άντρα χωρίς να πας πρώτα να τον παντρευτείς κάποτε το ζητάς τόσο άγρια όταν νιώθεις έτσι τόσο όμορφα σ' όλο το κορμί σου δεν μπορείς να το αποφύγεις λαχταράω αυτόν ή κάποιον άλλον άντρα να μ' έπαιρνε κάποτε εκεί που βρίσκουμαι και να με φιλούσε μέσα στην αγκαλιά του δεν υπάρχει τίποτα όπως ένα μακρύ και ζεστό φιλί που κυλάει βαθειά μέσα στην ψυχή σου σχεδόν σε παραλύει ύστερα σιχαίνομαι την εξομολόγηση τότε που πήγαινα στον πατέρα Κόρριγκαν (Kapsaskis, 770)

> γιατί δεν μπορείς να φιλήσεις έναν άντρα χωρίς πρώτα να πας να τον παντρευτείς μερικές φορές το ζητάς άγρια όταν αισθάνεσαι έτσι τόσο όμορφα παντού σ' όλο σου το κορμί δεν μπορείς να αντισταθείς επιθυμώ κάποιον άντρα ή άλλον να μ' έπαιρνε κάποια φορά όταν είναι εκεί και να με φιλούσε μέσα στην αγκαλιά του τίποτα δεν είναι σαν ένα φιλί μεγάλο και ζεστό μέχρι τα φυλλοκάρδια σου σχεδόν σε παραλύει ύστερα σιχαίνομαι αυτή την εξομολόγηση όταν πήγαινα στον πατέρα Κόρριγκαν (Anevlavis, 1039-40)

Not all of the above translations use the same grammatical person to render 'why cant you kiss a man…'. The two recent ones by Kapsaskis and Anevlavis follow the original by translating into the second person, which is used to convey the generalizing mode of Molly's question. Thomopoulos translates by adding more details in an attempt to clarify that Molly is wondering about things that women specifically are and are not allowed to do: 'γιατί να μην μπορεί μια γυναίκα να φιλήσει έναν άντρα'. Aravantinou, on the other hand, changes the text's second person singular and translates by using first person plural conveying that Molly is thinking about all women and not just herself: 'γιατί να μη μπορούμε να φιλήσουμε έναν άντρα'. Aravantinou's first person plural renders Molly's question as inclusive, thinking about women through the communal aspect whereas the other translations render this question as reflective and specific. In the same vein, Aravantinou changes the grammatical person in the phrase 'I wish some man or other would take me' by using second person singular, 'και λαχταράς έναν άντρα να σε πάρει στην αγκαλιά του', alluding thus to a shared experience of desire, something that Molly knows is true not just for herself but for other women too. Although the grammatical person of the initial question, which Kapsaskis and Anevlavis have maintained as second singular, could also be read as an expression of communality, the use of the first person in Molly's articulation of desire, which both these translators also preserve, could be seen as rendering the entire passage as an exclusively individual wish. While the choices by Kapsaskis and Anevlavis are the closest to the source text, their translations highlight the idea of exclusivity of this desire as specific to Molly, whereas Aravantinou foregrounds the aspect of female desire as a communal issue. Finally, another interesting transformation is found in the phrase 'a kiss long and hot down to your soul almost

paralyses you' which Aravantinou has rendered through a climactic repetition of verbs creating a rhythm and highlighting the progressive movement of the kiss: 'ένα μακρύ ζεστό φιλί που *φτάνει κι ανεβαίνει* και *θερμαίνει* την ψυχή σου και σε παραλύει' (my italics). Thomopoulos renders this in an almost scientific style which creates a distance in this intimate reference: 'σαν το *παρατεταμένο* και *θερμό* φιλί που φτάνει ως μέσα στην ψυχή σου και σχεδόν σε παραλύει' (my italics). Kapsaskis and Anevlavis are, again, the closest to the original turn of phrase: 'ένα μακρύ και ζεστό φιλί που κυλάει βαθειά μέσα στην ψυχή σου σχεδόν σε παραλύει' (Kapsaskis), 'ένα φιλί μεγάλο και ζεστό μέχρι τα φυλλοκάρδια σου σχεδόν σε παραλύει' (Anevlavis). Apart from creating a rhythm, Aravantinou's rendering highlights also the kiss as an embodied act, as acquiring an agency of its own.

Moving between written and oral speech, Aravantinou's 'Penelope' acquires a theatrical effect whereas the other three translations are grounded in the monologue's written form. In the above comparison, Aravantinou's translation highlights Molly's desire as intimate but also as a shared female desire while in the three full-length translations, desire is rendered with a focus on the specific character, without considering its communal aspect. Molly's monologue by Aravantinou appears in a confessional light, intimate and immediate, whereas in the other three translations it is read as a contained act, as reflective and occasionally proclamatory, as disassociated from its 'speaker'. Aravantinou highlights the orality of the text not only by using idiomatic speech and vulgarity in her translation, but also by recreating a rhythm which invites a reading out loud. Moreover, she draws attention to the connection between language and social class and, therefore, the construction of the character by emphasizing the register. Her sensitivity to the spoken word as manifested in her translation is informed by her reading of Joyce's archive and creative process.

Conclusion

Aravantinou's research in Joyce's Greek acquaintances and Greek language lessons proposes a reading of Joyce through his transnational connections while also taking into account his ever-changing and accretive writing practice. By focusing on transnational connections that have not received as much attention by scholarship as others (such as Paris and the author's Parisian circle) and by researching unknown figures and minor events, Aravantinou explores modes of reading and writing about Joyce through the aspects of minority and peripherality. Her interest in recovering the peripheral, the minor, the unrecorded, or the half-noted in relation to one of the greatest figures of world literature allows her to cultivate alternative modalities through which to read Joyce more productively. Her work on Joyce's Greek notes focuses on a small part of a vast archive while her reading is also impacted by her own status and identity as a Greek poet who has experienced exile. Throughout her poetic but also her critical work, Aravantinou shows an attention to language, idioms, and register, a preoccupation she shared with Joyce and which she observed in his writing practice during her research.[50] This attention to idiom and register not only informs her own reading of Joyce's Greek notes and connections, but is also found in her translation of Molly's monologue. In contrast to the other four translations which keep close to the source text and its textual aspect, Aravantinou emphasizes colloquial and slang expressions, orality and theatricality. For Aravantinou, Joyce and his work became a life-project which intertwined with how she viewed herself as a poet. Throughout her life she kept returning to Joyce from different angles, the text, the archive, translation, and criticism, without ever declaring her work finished. Her unwillingness to finalize her work is manifested in her introduction to *Τα ελληνικά*, and her approach to the archive, but also in the translation of *Ulysses* to which she was returning again and again but did not publish, in the translated passages from *Finnegans Wake* which

[50] According to accounts, Joyce paid great attention to the realism and accuracy of the characters' language in literature (Power 1999).

she revised, even in the way in which she talks about her doctoral thesis which apparently remained unfinished:

> Και βεβαίως [ο Τσίρκας] είχε απόλυτο δίκιο, και η έρευνά μου δεν τελείωσε καθόλου, έχει πάρα πολλά στοιχεία μέσα που ελπίζω κάποιος να τη φέρει εις πέρας. Εγώ απλώς νύξεις έκανα. Άλλωστε δεν μ' ενδιαφέρει να τελειώσω αυτή τη διατριβή. Νομίζω ότι έχω πολλά πράγματα να κάνω: δηλαδή η Γραφή Ε' μου έδειξε ότι έχω κι άλλα πράγματα να κάνω. (1983b, 62)
>
> And of course, he [Tsirkas] was absolutely right, and my research is in no way finished, there is a lot of evidence in it that I hope someone will complete it. I just provided hints. I am not interested in finishing this thesis, anyway. I think I have a lot of things to do: that is, *Γραφή Ε'* made me realize that I have other things to do, too.

Aravantinou's entire trajectory as a Joyce translator, reader, and scholar, and the weird modality that her reading introduces highlight practices of returning, revisiting, re-reading, and rewriting as processes which keep unraveling the text while also adding to it, ongoing 'unfinishing' processes. The first attempts at a critical readings of Joyce and specifically *Ulysses* which were discussed in the previous chapter, Pentzikis's insights and Karelli's article, posed questions about writing the self, and the writer's identity. In contrast to the division between the writing self and the 'I' of the writer which Karelli introduced influenced by her Christian education and philosophical interests, Aravantinou, from a poststructuralist background, suggested reading through the 'confusion' between life and writing, through the transformation that ensues, and through Joyce's multilingualism which creates a language of its own. The following chapter moves away from critical readings and focuses on the existing full-length translations of Joyce's *Ulysses* into Greek. While multilingualism is seen by Aravantinou as a poetics, in the full-length translations it becomes a challenge, a problem which contributes to agonistic readings of Joyce's text.

Chapter 3: A translator's odyssey: the full-length translations of *Ulysses* in Greece

Introduction: 'Volta' and 'Studio', cinema and circulation

It was towards the end of 1909 when James Joyce conceived of and set out on his enterprise of founding what he thought was going to be the first cinema in Dublin, an ambitious business scheme among the many others he devised. While in Trieste, Joyce came up with several business projects such as importing Irish tweeds, or becoming a professional tenor, and although none of them resulted in profits or success, they were indications of the Irish author's entrepreneurial spirit which is observed later in the promotional strategies he devised to establish himself as a writer. However, his aspiration to open the Volta cinema in Dublin, although market-driven, was at the same time an opportunity to promote films and, more generally, the habit of going to the cinema, which was already very popular in other European cities, such as Trieste, but had not been taken up in Ireland yet, at least not to that extent.[1] The films that were shown at the Volta cinema were silent with intertitles in languages such as French, Italian, or German instead of English, the language most familiar to the audience in Dublin. The lack of English or American films and the foreignness of the material shown, the fact that the viewing material had to be sent all the way from Trieste, as well as Joyce's own absence, combined with erratic programing and management led to the failure of the project. The Volta cinema was sold to an English firm, the Provincial Cinematograph Theatres, within only five months after its opening, in mid-June 1910.[2] When Joyce was informed that he would not receive a share of the sale price, he felt deceived as he thought he deserved some profit for providing the idea to his partners. A letter

[1] There might not have been any cinemas in Ireland yet, that is, halls exclusively devoted to the purpose of screening and watching films, but films were already being shown in other venues. See 'Introduction' in McCourt (2010). For more information on Joyce's Volta project see McKernan, 'James Joyce and the Volta Programme' in McCourt (2010, 15-27).
[2] See also Joyce's letter to his brother Stanislaus dated 13 June 1910 (*LII*, 285-86).

from Ettore Schmitz (the Triestine writer Italo Svevo), written in reply to Joyce's complaints on the matter, highlights the Irish author's obsession with this project as well as the contrast between his overlapping identities, those of an entrepreneur, cinema owner, and 'literary man':

> You were so excited over the cynematograph-affair [sic] that during the whole travel I remembered your face so startled by such wickedness. And I must add to the remarks I already have done that your surprise at being cheated proves that you are a pure literary man. To be cheated proves not yet enough. But to be cheated and to present a great surprise over that and not to consider it as a matter of course is really literary. (15 June 1910, *LII*, 286; also quoted in *JJII*, 311)

A 'pure literary man' had ventured to bring cinema to Dublin in a more systematic form in the beginning of the twentieth century by recruiting foreign investors and circulating foreign films which the Irish audience could not follow easily. Despite its 'outlandishness' and the fiasco in which it resulted, this project also aimed at a certain artistic education and cultural dissemination. It aimed to introduce new material, new ideas, and, most of all, a new habit that would bring the people of Dublin closer to the other more developed European cities. Apart from Joyce's preoccupation with Ireland's status within Europe and the world, as well as his own relationship with his home country which he sought to re-establish through that project, this act also foregrounds the Irish writer's interest in the medium of film, cinematography, and cinematicity, an aspect that is discernible in his writing, but also in his way of reaching out to the public, in circulation and dissemination.[3]

More than half a century later, at the other end of Europe, filmmaker Sokratis Kapsaskis, a man who, among other qualities has also been considered literary, embarked on his own cinema project in the center of Athens. A few months after the coup d' état on 21 April 1967, which

[3] For an extended discussion on cinematicity in Joyce's work, see Williams (2020). Williams shows that cinematicity in Joyce is not only a response to the advent of cinema, but also stems from other visual media and forms of entertainment that were circulating before film, such as the magic lantern, shadowplay etc, and which were formative for the author's work. More specifically, Williams claims that by the time of *Ulysses*, 'inter-mediality between Joyce's narrative style and cinematic techniques was so synergetic and pervasive as to attract enthusiastic attention from film-makers themselves.' (10)

established a seven-year military dictatorship (1967-1974), in October 1967 Kapsaskis opened the art cinema 'Studio' for which he had managed to get license before the coup. It is there that he started screening foreign films while also promoting the work of young Greek directors and artists. While the 1960s and the events of 1968 were unfolding around the world, Greece was experiencing a time of political oppression and cultural stalemate to which Kapsaskis responded by importing, screening, and making available to the Greek public works by major filmmakers of the 1960s. The dictatorship, also known as the 'Colonels' junta', had imposed numerous restrictions on every aspect of public and private life, among which was preventive censorship of the press, of publications, and art.[4] These restrictions have been considered to have brought a halt to Greek artistic and literary production during those seven years. Although there was still literary and cultural activity, many writers refused to publish either out of fear or to resist censorship, while translations of foreign works flourished at the time as a means of survival for publishers and writers-translators.[5] At the same time, many writers and artists found a way to work around those limitations while events and 'gestures' emerged as a way of resisting the regime and providing alternative platforms for artistic expression, engagement, and cultural dissemination. Some of them also subverted the limitations imposed by the laws of the dictatorial regime by using them in their creative process, one example being the publication of *Δεκαοχτώ κείμενα* [*Dekaochto Keimena*, 'Eighteen Texts'] by the historical publishing house Kedros in 1970, immediately after preventive censorship was lifted.[6] At the same time, small publishing houses appeared, which circulated literary texts as well as political theory and philosophical texts in paperbacks, many of which were translations (Axelos 1984; Kornetis 2013, 158-224). Amidst this climate, Kapsaskis introduced to the Greek audience major directors such as Jean-Luc Godard,

[4] For further details on life and publishing under the dictatorship as well as on the restrictive laws that were imposed after preventive censorship was lifted in 1969 see Van Dyck (1998) and Kornetis (2013).
[5] See also Asimakoulas (2005) and Mygdali (2012).
[6] For more information on the publication of *Δεκαοχτώ κείμενα* (*Eighteen Texts*), see Van Dyck (1998), and Kornetis (2013). For a detailed analysis of this event as a 'gesture' see Papanikolaou (2002, 2010).

Federico Fellini, Ingmar Bergman, Grigori Kozintsev, Luis Bunuel, Elia Kazan, as well as the British New Wave directors Tony Richardson, Lindsay Anderson, and Peter Watkins. He also promoted the work of young Greek filmmakers and set up a space for events, exhibitions, and studying. The cinema was shut down by the police more than once while it also had to relocate. Despite the obstacles, 'Studio' remained, during the seven-year dictatorship and throughout the 1980s, a productive cultural space for audience and artists alike.[7] Within this context, the act of founding 'Studio' can be seen as a gesture for the purposes of circulation, dissemination, filmic and artistic 'education', as a form of activism which aimed at providing the Greek public with access to the cinema and cultural development from abroad. Kostis Kornetis (2013) singles it out as an example of certain cinema halls which functioned as spaces for information exchange during the junta.[8] In contrast to the 'Volta' project that Joyce instrumented, Kapsaskis's 'Studio' responded to dire political circumstances, rendering it thus more of an act of resistance rather than an entrepreneurial market-driven scheme. Nevertheless, both cinema schemes stemmed from passion projects and individual initiatives; they aimed primarily at cultural dissemination and circulation, and at cultivating a certain cinematic and wider education, while they are both characterized by a dedication to a cause. Kapsaskis ran 'Studio' until 1985 when he decided to turn to another passion project of his and, I suggest, also somewhat related to his cinematic venture in terms of mediating work, the translation of Joyce's *Ulysses*, which is often considered his most significant literary achievement. Having already published three poetry collections, three novels, critical work on Dionysios Solomos and with no solid background in literary translation or previously published work on Joyce that is known until now, Kapsaskis's decision to embark on the long project of translating *Ulysses* might initially seem almost inexplicable.

---

[7] Information about 'Studio' can be found in Papadimitrakopoulos (2014 [2003]) as well as on the report from a tribute to Kapsaskis that took place at 'Studio' on 30 October 2017 which can be found on https://www.ermias.gr/el/culturalactions/kapsaski-apotimisi.html [accessed 12 March 2024].

[8] 'Apart from offering a space for mimicking foreign student movements, cinema halls—especially Alkyonis and Studio in Athens and Thymeli in Salonica—served as sites for information exchange and recognition.' (178)

The 'usylessly unreadable Blue Book of Eccles' (*FW* 179.26-7) finally in Greece

The two previous chapters examined events in the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece which formed connections with broader significant moments in the development of Greek literature and its interaction with central literary spaces. After the early fragmentary translations of *Ulysses* and the short notes debating interior monologue and modernist writing in the 1930s and 1940s, after Manto Aravantinou's readings of Joyce's Greek notes through the lens of transnational authorship and multilingualism in the 1960s and 1970s, this chapter will consider the three existing full-length translations of *Ulysses* into Greek as comprising one more significant event in the Joyce trajectory in Greece which raises broader issues that not only correspond to the development of Greek literature, but rather to debates regarding issues of translation, readership, and world literature. Whereas up until now the two 'events of reception' discussed in this thesis were focused on importing Joyce and bringing his work to the Greek literary space—either as a way of renewing Greek literature, or as a way of highlighting overlooked associations—it is at the moment of the full-length translations that issues of interaction and positionality within the world literary space come to the forefront. While all events examined in this thesis are examples of local 'encounters' that, as Francesca Orsini (2015) has argued, contribute to mapping and understanding the 'workings' of world literature, it is in the moment of the full-length translations that these encounters, although starting from individual initiatives, lead to theorization of issues of locality and literary translation and are supported by institutions and cultural agency.

This chapter will examine the three full-length translations of *Ulysses* (Pairidis 1969-1976, Kedros 1990, Kaktos 2014) which signal the moment of *Ulysses* in Greece as a printed and bound book, situated within a wider surge of lengthy novels in the Greek literary space and a development

of the Greek publishing market. Issues such as theory and practice of translation, as well as the surrounding discourse, (un)translatability, reading foreign literature in the original and in translation, instability of the translated text and the source, formation of readership and national literature, as well as circulation and dissemination and the practices through which these are achieved, have all been appearing in various forms in the previous chapters. With the full-length translations of *Ulysses*, however, these are now more easily considered through the lens of institutionalization, systematization, and cultural agency. *Ulysses* in translation is now part of publishing programs, it enters the literary market, it is considered for prizes, it contributes to theoretical discourse about translation and becomes part of the Greek canon of translations. *Ulysses*, which was known through fragmentary translations, notes, and critical readings, acquires now the shape of a book in the Greek literary space. Although stemming from individual initiatives and personal projects, the circulation and dissemination of *Ulysses* are now achieved through institutionalized platforms. Within this institutionalization, the rise of the translator figure foregrounds issues of authority and mediation in relation to the author. The aspect of cinema discussed earlier that is, Kapsaskis's project of importing and screening foreign films at a time of political crisis, is a preamble not only for the practices of circulation and dissemination, but also for mediation which is foregrounded in the discourse surrounding the full-length translations of *Ulysses*.

For this chapter, I am drawing from scholarship on Joyce and translation such as Patrick O'Neill (2005), Ira Torresi and Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli (2007), as well as Jolanta Wawrzycka and Erika Mihálycsa (2020). As discussed in the introduction, O'Neill introduces a 'macrotextual model' for reading Joyce which generates a multilingual text requiring 'transtextual reading'. Following Fritz Senn's earlier approach of reading Joyce as translation (1984), O'Neill views the act of translation as always adding meanings and contributing to the *über*-text instead of reducing the original text. Drawing from Lawrence Venuti's analysis of the translator's invisibility, Torresi and Bollettieri

Bosinelli state that 'in Joycean translation, the translator is inescapably *visible*—and although this might make non-translation-oriented Joyce scholars cry scandal, the real scandal in translation is pretending not to see that the translator *is* there, and should be acknowledged as co-authoring figure rather than as a shadow of the original author' (2007, 12, citing Venuti 1995 and 1998, esp. 31-34). (In)visibility runs throughout the chapter as we will see in the case of the first translators, Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos, and the context of the first publication of *Ulysses* in 1969-1976, but also in Kapsaskis's account about his *Οδυσσέας* [*Odysseas*]. Another line this chapter follows, is the rise of the figure of the translator and the development of translation studies as an academic discipline in Greece towards the end of the twentieth century. Furthermore, the contributions in Wawrzycka and Mihálycsa (2020) focus on translations and retranslations in specific languages, showing that the revolutionary textuality of Joyce's work 'provokes and resists permanent (re)translation, soliciting translatorial creativity and excess that hybridizes the receiving language, occasionally going against the grain of TL norms and received styles' (19). Along with the above, I also draw from scholarship on the concept of 'prismatic translation' as it has been formulated recently by Matthew Reynolds (2019) to explore how the three existing Greek translations of *Ulysses* form a textual space foregrounding literary multiplicity considering, at the same time, the translator as an embodied agent (Woods 2013).

This chapter will mainly focus on the 1990 translation by Sokratis Kapsaskis while also considering the other two, by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos (1969-1976), and Eleftherios Anevlavis (2014). I will examine these translations not as inadequate endeavors isolated from one another, but as contributing to an evolving landscape. David Damrosch's suggestion that 'we will gain a better sense of the real shape of national literatures if we think of them as less in terms of national languages than of national markets' (2014, 347-60: 351) is at the center of this chapter. Terms like 'national language' and 'national literature' are being more and more complicated by world literature studies in debates of defining world literature and its object of study, and raise questions

regarding the place and position of these terms in a globalized literary space.[9] However, these concepts are embedded in the power dynamics according to which markets function, and therefore become crucial to our perception and examination of world literature, especially considering the time period on which this chapter focuses, that is, the end of the twentieth century when circulation of texts has become easier.[10] The national book market becomes a significant factor when translations are circulating in a more institutionalized setting, are getting published in book-form and often with state subventions, are being reviewed in national newspapers etc. In contrast to the early fragmentary translations in avant-garde journals or Aravantinou's critical work, the full-length translations of *Ulysses* are intertwined with the prevailing tendencies of the Greek literary market at the time of their appearance. As a result, translation and literature are also seen as parts of a market network in this chapter.

In his seminal essay 'The Task of the Translator', an introduction to his translation of Charles Baudelaire's *Tableaux parisiens* (1923), Walter Benjamin highlighted the importance of transparency in translation by arguing that '[a] real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not block its light, but allows the pure language, as though reinforced by its own medium, to shine upon the original all the more fully' (2015, 79). In his theorization of 'prismatic translation', Reynolds (2019) explores further Benjamin's notions of transparency and light as he draws from the metaphor of translation as a prism to address analytically the inherent multiplicity of translation, that is, its potential to produce endlessly multiple and different versions of a text. At the same time, Reynolds also considers the metaphor of translation as a channel, that is, its function of carrying across meaning

[9] For the concept of the nation in global modernism discourse see Thacker (2016); for a discussion of the way in which comparatists have been viewing 'national' literatures see Damrosch (2020, 207-52); for a discussion of national spaces and borders see Gardini et al, (eds.) *Minding Borders: Resilient Divisions in Literature, the Body and the Academy* (2017) and François's essay in the volume, 'The Mother Tongue as Border' (115-34).

[10] See also Apter (2006) who, discussing publishing markets, foresees that nation-states will become obsolete due to the development of a global literary market and that national literatures will eventually cease to exist as they will no longer be profitable marketing labels in bookselling (100). It could be argued, however, that publishing markets are in fact relying on such terms.

from one language to another and producing the same text. Reynolds suggests that the two contrasting metaphors, the channel, which underlines translation's one-sidedness, and the prism, which highlights its inherent multiplicity, necessarily co-exist in discourses about translation and haunt each other. Analyzing these contradictions, Reynolds uses the term 'prismatic agon' to address analytically the reaction of anxiety that translators develop towards the prismatic processes of translation. Prismatic agon occurs when it is understood that 'translation necessarily generates and participates in a multitude of differences' (35), causing doubts to the translator regarding their practice. Even when the idea of translation as a channel prevails, that is, translation achieving equivalence, the awareness of its multiplicity triggers doubts over an already existing translation of a work. Reynolds' examples, however, focus on established writers-translators who translate into English (Elizabeth Barrett Browning, John Dryden, Ciaran Carson, Lydia Davis), viewing these reactions as personal feelings that are expressed in their own discourse. But what happens when translators are not well-known writers, come from literary spaces or translate into languages that are traditionally considered peripheral and minor? Does the positionality of the literary space into which a work gets translated affect discourses about translation? In what ways does a prismatic view of translation, and more importantly, the oscillation between translation as a channel and as a prism, and prismatic agon develop in such cases? And what happens when a translator's reactions to their work are addressed to the reader and frame the translation? Or when accounts by translators are not available to us at all? These are a few of the questions I will explore in what follows. The channel and prism metaphors, and the concerns that the prismatic processes of translation may cause to translators constitute useful tools with which to approach Kapsaskis's apologetic preface to his 1990 translation, the dismissive reviews it received, and the debate that ensued, but also the translation by Nikolouzos and Thomopoulos (1969-1976) which preceded it and which is today almost forgotten, or Anevlavis's translation (2014) which seems to be closer to the developments in Joyce scholarship but at the same

time re-foreignizes the text. As Kapsaskis chooses to frame his translation with a discussion of his struggle with the text, agonistic reactions are extended to the translated text itself and affect its reading, as is reflected in the reviews. Prismatic agon therefore is not restricted to his own account and practice, but allows us to reconsider the other two translations as well, even if they lack similar accounts.

The three Greek translations of *Ulysses* in context

The 1990 translation by Kapsaskis is preceded and followed by the other two full-length translations which appeared approximately two decades before and after respectively. The first, one of a rather obscure history and henceforth referred to as the 'Pairidis translation', was *Οδυσσέας*, translated by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos and published in the period between 1969-1976, serialized in seven or nine volumes.[11] It was published by the marginal publishing house Pairidis and is completely overlooked in contemporary literary conversation apart from sparse brief comments. In the first overview of Greek translations of Joyce's work, in 1973, writer Menis Koumantareas refrains from passing a final judgment on the grounds that the Pairidis translation had not been completed yet—at the time of his writing, there had only been five volumes (1973, 44-5). However, feeling the need to point out the issues that emerge from a first reading of the Pairidis translation, Koumantareas talks about sloppiness in translation as well as in typographic appearance, which he finds unappealing. Apart from the lack of contextual framing which he characterizes as 'monstrous' ('τερατώδες'), Koumantareas is also concerned with another matter of appearance, that is, the publisher's decision to circulate the book in several smaller volumes a decision which, says Koumantareas, conveys the

[11] The volumes do not bear dates of publication. The date is provided by Raizis (1998-2000) and Pechlivanos and Politi (2004), while Marangopoulos (2010) gives an approximate start date of 1966-67. As for the number of volumes, until now I have been able to find two different versions, one in seven and one in nine volumes. Each volume of the former contains three episodes, with the fifth volume being split into two parts (1st part: 'Nausicaa' and 'Oxen of the Sun', 2nd part: 'Circe'), while in the nine-volume version, of which a copy can be found in the Zurich James Joyce Foundation, the sixth volume is also split into three: 'Eumaeus', 'Ithaca', and 'Penelope'. That makes pagination differ from one version to another. In this thesis I use the seven-volume version.

impression of *Ulysses* being a fast-produced work, a clearance sale.[12] Aravantinou mentioned 'irresponsible translators and even more irresponsible publishers' and referred to what seems to be the Pairidis translation as 'chopped up, incomplete, and very expensive', an example of 'translational atrocities' (μεταφραστικές αθλιότητες).[13] Finally, in one of his critiques against Kapsaskis's 1990 translation, in an attempt to dispel false assumptions that the latter was the first Greek translation of *Ulysses* and therefore groundbreaking, translator Aris Berlis points out that the Pairidis translation preceded it and that it was 'bad, awful' ('*κακή, κάκιστη*', 1991c, 12). These few and brief references to the Pairidis translation, all point towards a translation that was done hurriedly and carelessly, circulated in the context of the Greek dictatorship and its aftermath, one that was considered inadequate, and which was quickly forgotten as the lack of critical discourse about it shows.

In his own brief comparison of the Greek translations of *Ulysses*, M. V. Raizis (1998-2000) refers to an interview he had with one of the two translators who participated in the Pairidis translation, Yannis Thomopoulos. According to that interview, Thomopoulos's knowledge of English was limited, and he worked by consulting a dictionary as well as the 1929 French translation. Although the appearance of this translation, along with the translation of *Dubliners* by the same publishing house might seem like a mystery in the Greek Joyce trajectory, it is very much a product of its time. The fact that a key modernist text is translated and circulated—in several volumes—by a marginal press, even though it appears to be a costly undertaking due to the length of the text, and at that specific time of the dictatorship points towards another translation project that is being carried out at the same time under dire circumstances, that of Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu* by Pavlos Zannas while he was in prison. Considering also the number of small publishing presses that appeared at the time, this

[12] 'μου φαίνεται ακόμη ύποπτη η βιασύνη να ξεπεταχτεί το έργο σε δόσεις, που θυμίζει αόριστα εκπτώσεις και ξεπούλημα' (1973, 46)

[13] 'Το παράδειγμα της ελληνικής μετάφρασης του *Οδυσσέα*, κουτσουρεμένης, ατέλειωτης και πανάκριβης ελπίζω να μην επαναληφθεί.' (1983, 203)

translation becomes part of a pattern; many of these presses circulated translations in paperbacks (Kornetis 2013, 161) and very often without contextual framing (2013, 165-66).[14] The Pairidis translation of *Ulysses* could also be viewed as an example of a small-scale initiative, one of the arbitrary events that are often part of a writer's or a text's trajectory, a local practice, even though forgotten in its own locality. It is potentially an opportunity to ask ourselves how to talk about and critically frame such seemingly arbitrary gestures and encounters in literary trajectories, such 'false starts', as they are often called, attempts to bring a text or a writer into another literary space which are barely noticed and of which the impact is difficult to determine. As for the publisher himself, his name, Iakovos Pairidis, appears in the credits of a few Greek films either in photography (*Μακεδονικός Γάμος* [*Makedonikos Gamos*, 'Macedonian Wedding'], 1960, dir. Takis Kanellopoulos), or as a cast member (*Μέρες του '36* [*Meres tou '36*, 'Days of '36'], 1972; *Ο Θίασος* [*O Thiasos*, 'The Traveling Players'], 1975, dir. Theodoros Angelopoulos). His publishing house, which, as the evidence suggests, was a small press mostly run by himself, published paperback (but also hardback) translations of short texts by Nikolai Gogol, William Faulkner, T.S. Eliot, Arthur Rimbaud, Natalie Sarraute, Thomas Mann as well as theoretical texts on cinema and theater. *Ulysses* is the lengthiest text he published, and Joyce is the only writer by whom he published more than one works, as well as a collection of essays.[15] In his edition of *Dubliners*, the stories have been split among three different translators. Practices such as translation commissions, plain paperback covers, serialization, and publication in installments in the case of *Ulysses* show that there was an eagerness in publishing and circulating while they also attest to the publishing house's limited resources. Moreover, all these characteristics show Pairidis to be a part of, or to have tried to be a part of the cultural development and book market surge that, as Kornetis

[14] See also Asimakoulas (2005), Axelos (2008), and Mygdali (2012).
[15] Even though most of the non-fiction he published had to do with cinema, Pairidis published a collection of translated essays about Joyce's work by Harry Levin and Ezra Pound: Ezra Pound and Harry Levin (n.d.), *6 δοκίμια για τον Τζόυς*, trans. Manolis Chairetakis (Athens: Pairidis). Pound's essays had appeared in *The Egoist*, *The Future*, and *The Dial* while Levin's essays are chapters from his book *James Joyce: A Critical Introduction* (1960).

(2013) argues, took place during the dictatorship after preventive censorship was lifted in 1969. And while such evidence gives us a sense of what Pairidis publications might have been like, Iakovos Pairidis still remains a mystery. The only image I have of him is from his voter's identity card, dated 1946, according to which he was born in 1920 and used to live, in 1946 at least, in Pireaus, while what is written under 'employment', although not easily decipherable, is most probably the word 'κινηματογραφιστής' (cinematographer).[16] The Pairidis translation, therefore, introduces the cinematicity affinity which Kapsaskis's involvement brings to the practice of translating *Ulysses* as a practice of cultural dissemination and a form of translation across media.

Many details remain unknown about the other two translations as well, despite their being much more recent. The latest translation, published in 2014 by Kaktos publications was completed by Eleftherios Anevlavis; in his introduction, the translator claims that he has used the now standardized Gabler edition as his source text, while he does not explore further any translation or composition issues but focuses instead on the text, its interpretations, and a general background. The footnotes, strongly influenced by Don Gifford and Robert J. Seidman, *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (1988), provide some explanatory background to the text, while many of them are also employed to explain certain translation choices and puns. This translation too appears to be an individual initiative, owing to Anevlavis's personal interest in Joyce which is mostly manifested in his work on *Finnegans Wake* which he translated and published in 2013.

Eleftherios Anevlavis is a doctor and has worked mainly as a pneumonologist in the public health sector in Greece, while he is also a writer and a translator of Joyce. He identifies himself as an 'amateur translator';[17] he has written books and he has been involved in literary projects in connection

[16] The voter's identity card is found among other documents and the remains of the publisher's stock in a storage room in Athens which was kept by Pairidis's son, Feidias. After Feidias died, this room is being looked after by Rudy Rinaldi who very kindly allowed me to have access.

[17] See Eleftherios Anevlavis (2012), 'Εξομολόγηση του μεταφραστή', *Νέα Εστία* 1856, 261-78

to the Greek writer and playwright Paris Tacopoulos who openly considered Joyce as one of his main influences.[18] Specifically, Anevlavis has written a critical-exegetical guide about Tacopoulos's experimental novel *Κενή διαθήκη* [*Hollow Testament*], as well as a book about the main character of *Κενή διαθήκη*, Monikin—who corresponds to HCE in *FW*—and an essay about *Finnegans Wake*.[19] Anevlavis's other works include books of polemical essays such as *Ανευλαβή κείμενα* [*Anevlavi keimena*], 2014) against the political system in place.[20] Playing often with his own surname (Ανευλαβής meaning blasphemous) in his texts, he used to be known for his notoriously execrative appearances on television. As far as his work on Joyce is concerned, Anevlavis has produced the first and so far only full-length translation of *Finnegans Wake* into Greek (*Η Αγρύπνια των Φίννεγκαν*, Kaktos, 2013) as well as the third Greek translation of *Ulysses* (*Οδυσσέας*, Kaktos, 2014) with a preface by Takopoulos. During the years prior to the publication of *Η Αγρύπνια των Φίννεγκαν*, Anevlavis published in the journal *Νέα Εστία* excerpts from his translational work accompanied by commentary (Anevlavis 2008), as well as a text about his translation practice titled 'Εξομολόγηση του μεταφραστή' ['A translator's confession'] along with an introduction to *Finnegans Wake* (Anevlavis 2012). Anevlavis stands out as an idiosyncratic, counter-cultural figure whose work on Joyce and translation somewhat contradicts his public image. However, it brings us back to another aspect of Joyce reception history, namely the fact that Joyce studies as a field tends to attract eccentric figures and idiosyncratic readings (Conley 2020, 123-50; Corser 2022, 102-3).

In what follows, I will focus on the 1990 translation by Kapsaskis as a translation that defined the moment when *Ulysses* appeared in Greece as a printed and bound book, translated in its full form,

---

[18] As Pechlivanos and Politi note, Paris Tacopoulos's fiction is an example of Joycean and specifically wakean influence as in his novel *Κενή διαθήκη* [*Hollow Testament*] 'the author playfully moulds a new hermetic lexicon of Greek à la Joyce' (2004, 468). For more on Tacopoulos see https://www.paristacopoulos.gr/.

[19] See Eleftherios Anevlavis (2016), *Η Κενή διαθήκη του Πάρι Τακόπουλου. Περί τίνος πρόκειται; Αποσκότησόν μου* (Athens: Kalligrafos) and (2020), *Μόνικιν ή ο τελευταίος των μουνικανών θρυμματοθυμάται* (Athens: Kalligrafos) as well as (2014), *Η αγρύπνια των Φίννεγκαν του Τζέημς Τζόυς. Περί τίνος πρόκειται;* (Athens: Kaktos)

[20] Such stances might be seen as idiosyncratic and eccentric. Anevlavis is also known for his appearances in television shows of yellow journalism.

and became accessible to the broader public. Among the three full-length translations, Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* was the one that gained the most recognition as it also won the European literary translation award *Aristeion* in 1992. It was regarded as a major achievement but also an inadequate one as it was criticized in the daily press and sparked controversy over broader issues of translation and readership expressing local anxieties about translating and reading in translation. Through the concept of prismatic agon, I will examine the discourse around the 1990 translation as well as Kapsaskis's own account and show how his work leads to theoretical discussions that express contrasting views about literary translation. Taking into account the circumstances under which each translation appeared, I will use the concept of prismatic translation to discuss how the three translations foreground a multiplicity of literary language and can be reconsidered as different 'refractions' of the text.

'Finally, *Ulysses* in Greek, but for whom?': Reviews, readership, and translation ethics

Kapsaskis's translation of *Ulysses* appeared at a time of significant developments in the Greek literary market and academic landscape which certainly played a role in its being established as a canonical translation even though the Pairidis translation had come first. The growth of the book market in the 1980s and 1990s is marked by a surge in novel writing and publishing. As shown by Dimitris Tziovas (1988) and Roderick Beaton (1999, 283-95), the 1980s is the time of short, 200-page 'easy-reads', a development that is reinforced by a surge in translations. In the 1990s, a turn towards lengthier narratives and chunkier novels is also reflected in translations. The publication of *Ulysses* in 1990 should, therefore, be viewed in the context of the tendencies of the Greek book market and as a turning point. Kapsaskis had already worked in rendering works of art accessible so the aspect of individual initiative should also be taken into account as the evidence suggests that *Ulysses* was a passion project of his. However, Kapsaskis's gesture and, most of all, the reception of his translation become clearer when we consider not only his background, but also the development of translation

studies at the end of the twentieth century in Greece. This development is reflected in events such as the opening of the Department of Foreign Languages, Translation and Interpreting in 1986 in Corfu as part of the Ionian University and later the literary journal *Μετάφραση* [*Metafrasi*, 'Translation'] which started circulating in 1995. There was an increasing interest in translation not only as a concept, but also as an academic subject and, as Kapsaskis's account of his own translation practice shows, there was a growing discussion of what translation requires as a process and a product.

Amid these developments, it would not be an exaggeration to say that in the late 1980s, the Greek literary space is ready for the translator to gain more visibility, to be recognized now as an important figure who contributes to the production of the text. Apart from the institutionalization of translation studies and translation practice with the opening of a higher education department, a more systematic approach of translation is also foregrounded in relevant theoretical discussions. Towards the end of the 1970s and while still working on his translation of Proust's *À la recherche*, Zannas started writing theoretical essays about the practice and the role of the translator, engaging with established translation theorists and thinkers such as George Steiner, Walter Benjamin, and Jorge Luis Borges. He was a founding member of the Literary Translation Center at the Institute Française d' Athènes where he also taught. Moreover, in the 1980s, poet and critic Nasos Vayenas proposed a critical re-evaluation of Seferis's canonical translation of *The Waste Land*, raising a debate which lasted until at least the 2010s.[21] Zannas passed away suddenly in 1989; by the late 1990s the journal *Μετάφραση* was publishing tributes to translators, ('πορτραίτα μεταφραστών', 'translators' portraits') among which it included a tribute to Zannas.[22] However, while translator-figures gain more and more acknowledgment, the translator's actual visibility in the text is still contested. Kapsaskis's preface is an interesting example as, apart from his prismatic agon, he also talks about his confrontation with his own visibility in the

[21] See Vayenas (1989), Kokolis (2001) and Loulakaki-Moore (2010).
[22] See 'Πορτραίτα μεταφραστών: Παύλος Α. Ζάννας', ed. Ondet Varon-Vasar, *Μετάφραση '97*, 3: 87-124

text and with his reading of *Ulysses*. Instead of an attempt at an account of visibility, Kapsaskis's preface is an effort to make amends for what is 'inevitably lost' to support his reasoning behind his approach and therefore explain any potential mistakes. More than that, I read his preface as an effort to make amends for what he sees as his accidental, yet unavoidable, visibility. By providing this confessional and apologetic account, Kapsaskis underlines his own attitude towards *Ulysses* and emphasizes the respect he is expected to show to a masterpiece coming from the world literature center—if not originating, at least established there. He involves the reader by inviting them to reflect on his practice and possible solutions, but, at the same time, he also secures his own position as a 'good', meaning 'invisible', translator. The interest that developed at the time for a more theoretical and systematic discourse about translation is also reflected in the reviews of Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας*, reviews that emphasize the 'flaws' of what they see as an inadequate translation, but also raise further crucial issues about reading in translation, readership formation, and Greek literature at the end of the twentieth century.

Out of the three translations of *Ulysses* into Greek, Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* stands out as the moment-defining one as it generated a more systematic approach to translating Joyce's novel, a discussion that has been considered delayed in the Greek literary space.[23] This discourse started from Kapsaskis himself and his preface but continued in the reviews and comments that followed publication. Along with the praises it received, Kapsaskis's translation also caused a controversy which unfolded in the columns of daily newspapers. It started from locating specific 'mistakes', and soon expanded on broader issues related to Greek literature and translation. Issues such as a translation's quality and how to assess it, as well as identifying the readership for such a translation and the more general themes of 'translating modernism' and multilingualism were at the center of those debates.

[23] Pechlivanos and Politi (2004) point out that there has been a delay in Joyce's reception in Greece both in terms of translations as well as in terms of critical discussion of translating Joyce.

The key figure in the debate, and the loudest critic of Kapsaskis's translation was Aris Berlis, a public intellectual known for his translation of 'The Dead'.[24] Berlis went on to translate *A Portrait*, but also other English writers such as Virginia Woolf (*The Waves*, *To the Lighthouse*) and Emily Brontë (*Wuthering Heights*), as well as Irish writers such as Flann O'Brien (*The Third Policeman*) and Ciaran Carson (*Shamrock Tea*), while he also edited a translation of Ellmann's biography of Joyce.[25] In what follows, I will trace this controversy in critical pieces which appeared in the daily press after Kapsaskis's translation; some of these notes are laudatory or at least positive, some others are more critical towards *Οδυσσέας* (1990). Although occasionally connected to personal antagonisms, the arguments that stem from this controversy reflect the different stances towards Greek literature and the literary market in relation to world literature and international currents. These pieces appeared in national newspapers and were therefore widely accessible to a broader audience than if they had appeared in literary journals or other similarly specialized publications as we saw happening with the material related to the early reception of *Ulysses* in Greece. Kapsaskis's agon gives space to the reviewers to disapprove or to develop a discourse around translation as a practice while prismatic views of translation find their way in as well. Even though the main topic is Joyce's *Ulysses* and its translation, the text and the writer are quickly sidelined by more theoretical discussions about translation that touch upon local issues related to reading. Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας*, therefore, is a book which is seen as a major—but also questionable—contribution to the Greek Joyce trajectory, and ends up foregrounding issues of locality as well as peripheral positionality within the world literary space. The question of a finished and definitive translation of *Ulysses* is at the bottom line of this controversy and while this seems to negate

[24] James Joyce (1984), *Οι νεκροί*, trans. Aris Berlis (Athens: Krystallo), re-issued by Ypsilon (1996). Apart from Berlis, 'The Dead' has been translated and published as a standalone novella multiple times. See Siatras (1988), Gika (2022) and more recently Kyriakidis (2025).

[25] See James Joyce (2001), *Πορτραίτο του καλλιτέχνη σε νεαρά ηλικία*, trans. Aris Berlis (Athens: Patakis) and Richard Ellmann (2005), *Τζέημς Τζόυς*, trans. Athina Dimitriadou, ed. by Aris Berlis (Athens: Scripta).

the notion of unfinishingness, the latter returns not only as a mode of practice, but becomes also a theoretical approach.

Kapsaskis's translation was published in December 1990, sold out, and was immediately reprinted. According to the 'best-sellers' lists of the book review *Διαβάζω* [*Diavazo*, 'I read'], Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* was in the top ten for twelve weeks following its publication.[26] Apart from the significance of the event itself, other factors such as the expanding literary market, the growing interest in the 'best-sellers', the fact that the book appeared before the holiday season also contributed to its commercial success. On February 9, 1991, the newspaper *Ta Νέα* [*Ta Nea*, 'The News'] published an extensive and laudatory review by Kostas Stamatiou (42-3) while the book was also briefly mentioned by the academic Yorgos Veltsos in his regular column *Εκ Μεταφοράς* [*Ek Metaforas*, 'Metaphorically'] (1991a, 34) in the same installment. Covering two pages and adopting a celebratory tone, Stamatiou's review included a full overview of Joyce's life and work, information on the Joyce reception in Greece, insights on his own personal experience with reading and attempts to translate *Ulysses*, and a brief history of the text—such as the publication history of *Ulysses*, the bans, the obscenity trial, details that Kapsaskis does not provide—as well as extensive information on plot and structure. Suggesting a cinematic interpretation of Joyce's writing through which to navigate the novel's fragmentation, Stamatiou adopts an agonistic terminology by deeming Kapsaskis's achievement a 'herculean labor' ('ηράκλειος άθλος'). He does not proceed to any detailed analyses of the translation, but, as if in anticipation of objections, he mentions the employment of *katharevousa*, in instances where more formal English is used, for lack of a better solution: 'Ηταν μια κάποια λύση. Ο έχων να προτείνει καλύτερη, ας μας γράψει.' (43).[27] Concluding his review, Stamatiou states that: 'Δεν έχουμε, λοιπόν,

[26] See 'Η αγορά του βιβλίου' in *Διαβάζω* issues 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 262.
[27] 'It was some kind of solution. Whoever can propose a better one, may write to us.' The Cavafian reference here seems out of place, but it is part of a general such tendency in critical and public discourse. The controversy over Kapsaskis's translation is marked by subtle yet recurring references to Cavafy, something which could be considered further as an implicit comparison of the two figures.

παρά να ευχαριστήσουμε και να ζητωκραυγάσουμε: Επιτέλους, ο «Οδυσσέας» και ελληνικά!' (43), a statement which provoked Berlis's negative reaction.[28] Veltsos, on the other hand, referred briefly to *Ulysses* and cited an excerpt from the opening of 'Proteus' in Kapsaskis's translation. Amid his own reflections on topics that preoccupied him at the time, Veltsos also articulated a reading of *Ulysses* as Joyce's reinvention of the *Odyssey*, as a perversion in which misreading and miswriting are manifestations of an anxiety of influence.[29]

A few days later, in the literary section of the newspaper *Καθημερινή* [*Kathimerini*, 'Daily'], Berlis wrote a review in response to the above, questioning whether Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* was really an achievement worth of attention: 'Επιτέλους για ποιον, αλήθεια;' (1991a, 12).[30] Berlis suggested that there are 'few consistent and unseen' readers of Joyce who 'will remain faithful to the original as best as they can, not out of arrogance or love for the foreign, but because they know well that the result of any translation of Joyce's mature work, in any language, will always necessarily be something between desperately poor (or infuriatingly bad) and disappointingly mediocre.'[31]

Berlis raises the issue of untranslatability from an unexpected angle, as he argues that *Ulysses* is a text already translated by its author, which therefore negates and prevents any attempt of rendering by anyone else. According to the critic, the inherent 'translatedness' of the text, and of Joyce's work in general, results into the impossibility of the text being translated by anyone else. Additionally, Berlis analyzes Kapsaskis's translation of the opening of 'Proteus', which Veltsos (1991a, 34) had also quoted in his piece, and comments on its mistakes. Claiming that every attempt to translate *Ulysses* ultimately

---

[28] 'There is nothing left to say, but to give our thanks and cheer: Finally, *Ulysses* in Greek, too!'

[29] 'Ο Τζόυς επινοεί εκ νέου την «Οδύσσεια» *κλίνοντας* προς το σημείο μιας ποιητικής δια-στροφής απ' όπου η παρανάγνωση και η παρατύπωση κερδίζει ως «αγωνία της επίδρασης»', (Veltsos 1991a, 34).

[30] 'Really, finally for whom?' (Berlis 1991a, 12).

[31] 'Επιτέλους για ποιον, αλήθεια; Όχι, βέβαια, για τους ευάριθμους όσο και αφανείς, συνεπείς αναγνώστες του Ιρλανδού συγγραφέα στην Ελλάδα. Αυτοί θα παραμείνουν πιστοί κατά τις δυνάμεις τους στο πρωτότυπο κείμενο, όχι από ξιπασιά ή ξενοζηλία, αλλά επειδή γνωρίζουν καλώς ότι το αποτέλεσμα οποιασδήποτε μετάφρασης του ώριμου τζοϋσικού έργου, σε οποιαδήποτε γλώσσα, θα κυμαίνεται πάντα κατά αδήριτο ανάγκη μεταξύ απελπιστικά φτωχού (ή εξοργιστικά κακού) και απογοητευτικά μετρίου.' (Berlis, 1991a, 12).

limits or distorts the text's meaning, Berlis foregrounds Kapsaskis's translation as an act of betrayal, as well as an indication that Greek readers do not have the linguistic skills to read the original, lacking therefore an intellectual autonomy. In his response to Berlis's review, Veltsos connects the reviewer's stance to the idea of national pride as he ironically exclaims 'Joyce λοιπόν και ξερό ψωμί. Όχι «ξιπασιά» ή «ξενοζηλία», όπως σημειώνει ο κ. Μπερλής, αλλά εθνική υπερηφάνεια και «Ulysses», «Ulysses» στο πρωτότυπο!' (1991b, 36).[32] The issue of whether there should be translations, and specifically whether or not *Ulysses* should be translated, becomes an issue of what the production of translations signifies for the Greeks' linguistic and reading skills. In his review, Berlis sees translation not in its utilitarian sense, but as a creation which should be *like* the original and of the same quality, and which should not be attempted at all when there is not adequate knowledge or skills. While this points towards considering translation a creative practice in itself, it still adheres to the idea of translation as secondary work. At the same time, such a view also dismisses the *practical use* of translations which is to make texts accessible in other languages and to whoever does not know the language of the source text. Therefore, according to Berlis, if a translation is not at the level of the original, it is entirely useless and has no value. Apart from commenting on specific choices within that passage, Berlis also questions the translator's proper understanding of the text, and his failure to consult relevant scholarship. He criticizes what he claims are easy choices, such as the use of *katharevousa* which 'is used lavishly, for no reason, to solve all kinds of stylistic problems'.[33] Finally, among the faults and errors he finds in Kapsaskis's translation, Berlis points out the 'underestimation [by the translator] of the huge dangers that committing to such a translational enterprise would entail' highlighting the decision

[32] 'Joyce it is, then, and nothing else. Neither "arrogance" nor "love for the foreign", as Mr. Berlis notes, but national pride and *Ulysses*, *Ulysses* in the original!' (Veltsos 1991b, 36).

[33]'αβασάνιστες και εύκολες επιλογές (η καθαρεύουσα χρησιμοποιείται αφειδώς, χωρίς λόγο, για να λύσει παντός είδους υφολογικά προβλήματα)' (Berlis 1991a, 12).

to translate as a responsibility, but without specifying whether that is towards the text or the reader or both.[34]

Throughout his review, Berlis seems to be referring to two types of readers: readers like himself, with an academic background, access to resources, knowledge, and ability to read literature in English, and the broader readership which was the main target audience of the publishers and of translations like the one by Kapsaskis. Berlis's response paradoxically denies the necessity of a translation of *Ulysses* while at the same time acknowledges the existence of a readership for the specific translation which is in danger of forming a distorted, faulty image of Joyce and his work. A well-known tendency emerges here, that of 'protecting' the common reader—a reader whose profile is not clearly defined in this controversy but is assumed lacking the appropriate background—from bad translations or challenging texts.

Contrary to Kapsaskis's prismatic agon over potential alternative ways with which he could have translated *Ulysses*, Berlis's view of translation aligns with the metaphor of translation as a channel used by Reynolds (2019), according to which translation achieves equivalence. This is most notably manifested in his comparison to translation as a vehicle:

> Και η επίγνωση των εγγενών αυτών δυσκολιών διαμορφώνει και ένα μεταφραστικό ήθος: η έλλειψη μεταφράσεων είναι τελικά προτιμότερη από την παρουσία κακών ή ανεπαρκών μεταφράσεων, όπως είναι προτιμότερο να πηγαίνουμε με τα πόδια (μας) παρά με ελαττωματικό, άχρηστο ή και επικίνδυνο (ξένο) αυτοκίνητο. (Berlis 1991a, 12)
>
> Moreover, the awareness of these inherent difficulties forms a translation ethics: a lack of translations is, after all, preferable to having bad or inadequate translations, just as it is preferable to go around using our (own) two feet rather than a faulty, useless, or even dangerous (foreign) car.

[34] 'Υποτίμηση των τεράστιων κινδύνων που θα συνεπαγόταν η ανάληψη του μεταφραστικού εγχειρήματος', (Berlis 1991a, 12).

According to Berlis, not only should we not translate lest we fail, but we should also not use translations because it is preferable for the reader to trust their own abilities rather than rely on the questionable mediation of someone else, a translator in this case.

A few days later, in another column in *Ta Néa*, literary scholar G. P. Savvidis (1991, 28) expressed mild support of Berlis's argument, while also posing broader and more theoretical questions. He touched upon the delay in translations of foreign texts into Greek and explored the possibility of the term 'translation' accommodating alternative processes and practices instead of only word-to-word rendering, by asking whether subtitles for a film adaptation of *Cyrano de Bergerac*, which was very popular with the Greek audience at the time, could be considered a form of translation of Edmond Rostand's text. Savvidis is left wondering: 'Κάποτε μας εδίδασκαν πως η ποίηση είναι ό,τι χάνεται στη μετάφραση. Βρε, μπας και συχνά ισχύει ακριβώς το αντίθετο;' (1991, 28).[35] Veltsos, on the other hand, responds echoing Benjamin, and refers to Derrida's essay 'Des Tours de Babel' (1985) to talk about linguistic affinities as well as the 'impossibility of finishing, of totalizing' in translation. While Veltsos sees translation as an opportunity for linguistic multiplicity, Berlis believes in the purity of the original which is transferred to the reader, hence Veltsos's ironic connection between independence from translations and national pride. Contrary to Berlis, Veltsos proposes translation as an opportunity for linguistic multiplicity and draws attention to its processual aspect, that is, the need to translate and retranslate in order to have good translations, pointing towards the multiplying effect of the practice. He also argues for the translator's autonomy and independence as opposed to working in the author's shadow. In a response to Veltsos, Berlis finds the former's theoretical articulations weak, a 'caricature' of Benjamin's theory as developed in 'The Task of the Translator' (1991b, 12). From today's perspective, this long debate on the translation of *Ulysses* provides important insights into the

[35] 'They used to teach us that poetry is what gets lost in translation. Well, mightn't the exact opposite often be true?' (Savvidis 1991, 28).

contradictions in the reception of Kapsaskis's work. It also reflects how Joyce's novel was viewed at the time in the Greek literary space, as well as the anxiety over translation habits. Most importantly, it helps recontextualize Kapsaskis's own preface to his translation which can also now be seen as responding to similar anxieties about translation, center and periphery—even if it does so in a remarkably different way. It is for this reason that I decided to present the debate on Kapsaskis's translation first, before turning, in what follows, to his own introductory and self-reflective comments.

The 1990 translation: Kapsaskis on translating *Ulysses*

Years after Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* was published, the writer Ilias Ch. Papadimitrakopoulos, who edited the translation, recounted Kapsaskis's practice:

> Στην περίοδο αυτή [1988] τοποθετώ, κάπως σχηματικά, την εν συνεχεία αποκλειστική (και θα προσέθετα: μανιακή) ενασχόληση του Καψάσκη με τον Σολωμό και τον *Οδυσσέα* του Τζόυς. (Papadimitrakopoulos 2014, 118)
>
> It is around that time [1988] that I place what eventually turned out to be the exclusive (and, I would add, obsessive) preoccupation of Kapsaskis with Solomos and Joyce's *Ulysses*.

> Σε εξαντλητικές, ολονύκτιες, αλλά και συναρπαστικές συζητήσεις ο Σωκράτης καταθέτει τις προσωπικές του εκδοχές, τα βιβλιογραφικά δεδομένα, αναλύει τα λεκτικά παιχνίδια, τις πολλαπλές αναγνώσεις κ.λπ., παρενείροντας κάθε τόσο σπαρταριστά ανέκδοτα από την κινηματογραφική του εμπειρία… (2014, 119)
>
> During exhausting, all-night, but also fascinating discussions, Sokratis lays out his personal drafts, the bibliographical data, analyzes the wordplays, the multiple readings etc, every now and then intercepting hilarious anecdotes from his filmic experience…

> Πιστεύω ότι, τελικώς, ο *Οδυσσέας* στη μετάφραση του Καψάσκη, δεν αποτελεί μόνον ένα μεταφραστικό επίτευγμα αλλά και ένα απολαυστικότατο ανάγνωσμα—αρκεί ο αναγνώστης να το προσπελάσει αθώα και απλά, σαν μυθιστόρημα, κι όχι εκ προοιμίου έμφοβος από το μυθικό βάρος του βιβλίου. (2014, 120-21)
>
> I believe that, after all, *Ulysses* in Kapsaskis's translation, does not simply constitute a translational achievement, but also a highly enjoyable read—as long as the reader

> approaches it innocently and simply, like a novel, and not *a priori* fearful of the book's mythical weight.

One of the numerous gaps in the full-length translations of *Ulysses* in Greece is to be found in the lack of texts or accounts by the translators involved. The first translation to appear, by Pairidis publications, did not include any introductory or explanatory text by either translator apart from a short biographical note about the author. Although it was carried out by two translators, it does not seem to have been a collaborative translation as the work was shared between them.[36] The change from Nikolouzos to Thomopoulos is never explained. While the first translation is framed by a certain 'silence', lacking background or even introductory information by its translators, the third one, by Anevlavis, includes a general introduction to Joyce's text by the translator himself, without, however, providing details about his own translation practice. Kapsaskis, therefore, is the only translator among the four who is driven to hold himself accountable of his own translation approach and process.

> Κατά τη διάρκεια της μακρόχρονης απασχόλησής μου με τη μετάφραση του Οδυσσέα έφτασα συχνά μπροστά σε ανυπέρβλητες δυσκολίες και αρκετές φορές αποφάσισα να διακόψω το εγχείρημα.
> Τελικά, όπως διαπιστώνετε, αυτή η μετάφραση τελείωσε και τώρα, αντί προλόγου, νιώθω την ανάγκη να καταγράψω εδώ μερικές από τις δυσκολίες μου και ν' απαριθμήσω μερικές περιπτώσεις λέξεων ή φράσεων, τις οποίες, για διάφορους λόγους, η μετάφρασή μου δεν κατόρθωσε να αποδώσει. (Kapsaskis 1990, 7)

> During my long-term work on the translation of *Ulysses*, I often encountered insurmountable difficulties and there were many times that I decided to abandon this enterprise.
> After all, however, as you can see, this translation is over and now, in lieu of a preface, I feel the need to record here some of the difficulties and to outline some cases of words or phrases, which, for various reasons, my translation did not manage to render.

[36] Nikolouzos translated as far as 'Hades' and Thomopoulos carried on from 'Wandering Rocks' until the end. The third volume, containing 'Aeolus', 'Lestrygonians', and 'Scylla and Charybdis' bears both translators' names without any clarification as to whether it is a collaborative translation or they shared the episodes between them.

Kapsaskis, addressing the reader in a confessional tone, recounts the obstacles that the text posed, the solutions that he devised, as well as what he could not solve, what was left untranslated or, most importantly, what was *lost* in the process—the idea of 'loss' is recurrent throughout the preface. Kapsaskis gives detailed information about his approach, the help that he 'enlisted' and received, the different people who were involved, such as the writer I. Ch. Papadimitrakopoulos, and the translators John Solman and Geoffrey Cox, providing thus what looks like a transparent account of what appears to be a work of many people instead of one. This 'in lieu of a preface' becomes, therefore, an honest address to the reader of *Ulysses*, discussing the unstable status of translation as a process and as a product, and providing them access not only to the text, through its translation into the reader's language, but also to the very process of translating *Ulysses*. The discourse used sets the tone for Kapsaskis's confrontational manner towards the reader as well as the text. Words or phrases such as 'ανυπέρβλητες δυσκολίες' ('insurmountable difficulties'), 'το εγχείρημα' ('this enterprise'), 'νιώθω την ανάγκη να καταγράψω' ('I feel the need to record'), 'δεν κατόρθωσε να αποδώσει' ('did not manage to render') convey a sense of a struggle which the translator underwent to complete the translation at hand. Along with its confessional style, its appeal to honesty and transparency, and its admissions of weakness, this preface frames the full-length translation of *Ulysses* as a work of struggle, with an agonistic tension, from the part of the translator. For Kapsaskis, losses in the translation process, especially of *Ulysses*, were inevitable and the only thing he can do is to make them known to the reader by giving specific examples in his preface. At the same time, he also allows a view of what other solutions could have been adopted or have been adopted by one other translation.

Kapsaskis's confessional tone unfolds throughout the preface, starting from his revelation that he used the 1929 French translation quite frequently:

> Κατ' αρχήν πρέπει να πω ότι, παρ' όλο που μετέφρασα από το πρωτότυπο, θεωρώ βέβαιο ότι δεν θα κατάφερνα να ολοκληρώσω αυτή την εργασία αν, για την ανεύρεση λύσεων στις δυσκολίες που μου παρουσιάζονταν, δεν κατέφευγα στη γαλλική μετάφραση. (1990, 7)

> First of all, I should say that, although I translated from the original, I am sure that I would have not been able to complete this project had I not resorted to the French translation, to look up solutions to the difficulties that arose.

He also adds that he had access to the German translation with the help of his daughter, a native speaker of the language. What is more, Kapsaskis, through Ellmann, provides a history of the two translations, the French by Auguste Morel and others (1929) and the German by Georg Goyert (1927; 1930), in order to show his rationale behind consulting them. Apart from the fact that both translations were completed shortly after the publication of *Ulysses*, with a lapse of a few years, the common factor in both was Joyce's own involvement which Kapsaskis considers as a *de facto* authorial approval. Justifying his choices, Kapsaskis states:

> Μετά απ' αυτές τις πληροφορίες και επειδή (καθ' όσο ξέρω) μετά την πρώτη έκδοση της γαλλικής μετάφρασης του 1929 δεν υπήρξαν απορριπτικές κριτικές, ούτε επιχειρήθηκε ποτέ μια νέα μετάφραση, θεώρησα θεμιτό, σε περιπτώσεις που υπήρχαν αμφιβολίες ως προς την πλήρη κατανόηση του πρωτοτύπου, να προσφεύγω στη γαλλική μετάφραση για την ανεύρεση της εξήγησης, που το πρωτότυπο μου αρνιόταν. Αυτός είναι ο λόγος που, κάπως επίμονα, επέμεινα στο ιστορικό της γαλλικής μετάφρασης. (1990, 9)
>
> After all this information and because (as far as I know) there were no negative reviews after the first publication of the 1929 French translation, nor was there ever an attempt for a new translation, I considered it legitimate, in the cases where there was doubt as to a complete understanding the original, to resort to the French translation in order to find the explanation that the original denied me. That is the reason why, I insisted, somewhat persistently, on providing the history of the French translation.

The 1929 French translation bears a note that has raised numerous discussions regarding its composition history and the nature of Joyce's involvement: 'Traduit de l'anglais par M. Auguste Morel, assisté par M. Stuart Gilbert. Traduction entièrement revue par M. Valéry Larbaud avec la collaboration de l'auteur'. Researching the translators' archives, Liliane Rodriguez (2013, 122-41) has traced Joyce's participation and presents it as significant, whereas Wawrzycka and Mihálycsa (2020, 10-11) caution against taking Joyce's involvement for granted. Kapsaskis, reproducing this note and seeing a 'wise hierarchy' in it ('ο κολοφώνας του βιβλίου περιείχε μια σοφή ιεραρχία', 8) at the time of

his translation, relies on it and considers the 1929 French translation an authorially authorized translation, bearing the author's seal of approval. More than that, through the discussion of the examples in the rest of the preface, Kapsaskis shows that he consulted the French translation alongside the English text and, in many cases, adopted the solutions of the French translators. The French translation is therefore presented as a second source text for Kapsaskis's translation of *Ulysses*, not entirely unusual if we consider the broader mediatory role that the French Joyce reception has played in the Irish author's trajectory in Greece. Kapsaskis is also preoccupied with transfusing authority and attaching validity to his translation which will no less help him secure a readership. While this could be seen as a theological connection of Kapsaskis's work with an originating text or translation, as argued by Theo Hermans (2007, 1-25), it could also be read in the context of tendencies regarding authority that have long existed in Joyce studies. Apart from underlining Joyce's involvement in the French translation, Kapsaskis also cites Stuart Gilbert's study *James Joyce's* '*Ulysses*' (1930) and makes sure to mention Joyce's connection with its writing too. Not only is there a need to 'validate' his work, but there is also a need to approach it more critically and systematically, or at least to invite others to do so albeit by appealing to the presence of the author.

Examining the relationships between author, reader, and text in *Ulysses*, and discussing in detail the work of precious scholars who engaged with issues of authority in Joyce, Sophie Corser (2022) argues that the question of how we should read Joyce has been pertinent since the beginnings of Joyce studies.[37] Referring to Joyce's involvement and arrangement of the first critical readings of *Ulysses* as 'critical propaganda', a term coined by Patrick A. McCarthy (1991, 25), Corser states that 'Joyce's "critical propaganda" did not establish how to read *Ulysses*, it secured instead that "how" as a central, ongoing question of Joyce studies' (48). And it is this question which has led to constant revisitings of Joyce's presence in his texts. The early critical works by Stuart Gilbert, Valéry Larbaud, and Frank

[37] For previous work on authority and Joyce see, for example, Mahaffey (1988) and Rabaté (1991; 2001).

Budgen have relied on Joyce's involvement to establish certain ways of reading *Ulysses* and some of its puzzles, such as the Homeric correspondences. In the preface to his translation, Kapsaskis refers to these works exactly because of their authorized status. While, as Corser argues, Joyce's meddling in the early criticism of his work complicates the role of the critics and 'muddies the question of how we should read *Ulysses*' (41), Kapsaskis is in no doubt: he views them as clearly valid critical texts and appeals to them to prove his own translation's authority.

A history of non-Anglophone Joyce reception focusing on the authorially authorized criticism would reveal a lot about this particular issue in different literary spaces of different status and power within the world literary system. Especially in the periphery, it would be interesting to examine how much scholars rely on critical texts that have been approved or instrumented by Joyce (in the case of Joyce's work), and whether there are any significant differences with the history of Anglophone Joyce reception as analyzed by Corser. Considering what has been discussed previously, especially regarding the sources that Greek critics used for their definitions of interior monologue, one can already discern how Joyce's meddling interferes with the reading of his work in Greek criticism. Relying on such sources for translation, as Kapsaskis does, could also be examined as an additional aspect of the issue of authority. Seeing Kapsaskis as one such case, one could argue that it is his peripherality and his minor status (in terms of language) which leads him to rely even more on authorially authorized critical texts, despite the fact that he is translating and writing the preface so many years after their publication.[38] He appeals to them not only because he considers them valid, but also because he knows that they will be perceived as valid by his audience and his critics. This striving for authority is connected, therefore, to the discourse he develops, his confessional tone, and the apologetic attitude he maintains towards the result of his translation. As a peripheral translator of a centrally established

[38] See John Kearns (2017), '*Finneganów tren*, *Da Capo al Finne*, and *Finnegans _ake*: Krzysztof Bartnicki, translation and authorship' for a discussion about translation, authority, and *Finnegans Wake* which, however, does not discuss the aspect of the peripheral.

and notoriously challenging novel with a long history of reception and reading, Kapsaskis uses authority not simply to establish his own authority as a translator, but mostly to support and justify his work and the choices he has made in it, and protect it against critical attacks.

While Kapsaskis provides a short history of two of the earliest translations of *Ulysses*, he does not discuss at all the composition and publication history of the novel or the textual issues that mark its history and which may also affect his own translation practice. Although his translation was published in 1990, there is no reference at all to the different editions and textual variants of *Ulysses* including the issue of Hans Walter Gabler's edition (1984, 1986) and the co-called 'Joyce wars' which ensued in the 1980s during which time Kapsaskis was working on his translation.[39] The controversy around Gabler's editing practice had shaken the Joyce world in such a way that a translator working on *Ulysses* would have heard about them. In lack of any archival material, it is difficult to determine whether Kapsaskis was aware of this controversy or had engaged at all with this issue. Given his long-term preoccupation with translating *Ulysses*, which is also confirmed by Papadimitrakopoulos ([2003] 2014), it is difficult to imagine Kapsaskis having no knowledge of the controversy. The controversy between Gabler and John Kidd, his most outspoken attacker, culminated in 1988 during which time Kapsaskis was already making significant progress with the translation (Papadimitrakopoulos [2003] 2014). It is possible that Kapsaskis did not wish to engage with another textual variation, or that he simply could not, due to copyright. In his preface to the translation, the absence of any reference to the textual history of *Ulysses* results in conveying the idea of the text as a stable, settled entity. On the contrary, Kapsaskis is aware that he is himself producing and presenting an unsettled translation.

Another issue that Kapsaskis interestingly enough does not discuss concerns the edition of *Ulysses* he uses for his translation. More specifically, he works from the 1942 Modern Library edition, a reprint of the 1940 American edition which uses the text published by Random House in 1934

[39] For more on the 'Joyce wars' see Brannon (2003).

proofread against a copy of the 1932 Odyssey Press edition (specific printing unknown). This text, coming from a 1929 pirated edition published in New York by Samuel Roth, contains many errors (one of which will be discussed below).[40] However, as far as Kapsaskis is concerned, there is no problematization or even discussion of the source text he uses, and despite his intended transparency in the preface, the reader is nowhere informed about the textual instability and indeterminacy of *Ulysses*. It is not clear whether and in what ways Kapsaskis took into consideration the textual history of the text he was translating. It is also not clear whether he considered this contextualization necessary for his readers, since, in his preface, there seems to be an interest in what the reader needs to do in order to read and comprehend. While he goes to great lengths to establish the authority of his translation, the authority of the source text he used is never challenged in his preface. This lack of contextualization becomes all the more intriguing considering how *Ulysses* is framed in the 1942 Modern Library edition from which Kapsaskis translates. The text is accompanied by a foreword by Morris L. Ernst, the lawyer who defended *Ulysses* on behalf of Random House, focusing on the novel as a legal case;[41] the full text of the decision of the United States District Court (December 6, 1933) by Judge John M. Woolsey according to which the ban on *Ulysses* could be lifted;[42] and, finally, a letter from Joyce himself to the publisher of Random House, Bennett A. Cerf. In his letter to the American publisher, Joyce outlines his adventures in publishing his works in Europe and the United States and finally declares:

---

[40] For a detailed discussion of the different editions and variants of *Ulysses*, see Slote (2004b). For the American edition specifically see pp. 20-23: 'For the 1940 Modern Library imprint, he [the publisher, Bennett A. Cerf] had the 1934 edition rigorously proof-checked against one of the Odyssey Press printings in order to remove the most egregious errors. This solved the more immediate problems […], but this new edition was still far from perfect as some mistakes from Roth's edition remained. Complicating matters further, the 1949 Random House reprint reverted back to the uncorrected 1934 text and so for many years American trade editions of *Ulysses* remained unreliable.' (21)

[41] 'The *Ulysses* case marks a turning point. It is a body-blow for the censors. The necessity for hypocrisy and circumlocution in literature has been eliminated. Writers need no longer seek refuge in euphemisms. They may now describe basic human functions without fear of the law.' (1942, vii)

[42] It is worth noting Judge Woolsey's articulation of his decision that *Ulysses* does not constitute pornography: 'But my considered opinion, after long reflection, is that whilst in many places the effect of "Ulysses" on the reader undoubtedly is somewhat emetic, nowhere does it tend to be an aphrodisiac.' (1942, xiv)

> It is therefore with the greatest sincerity that I wish you all possible success in your courageous venture both as regards the legalization of *Ulysses* as well as its publication and I willingly certify hereby that not only will your edition be the only authentic one in the United States but also the only one there on which I will be receiving royalties. (1942, xvii)

The 1942 Modern Library edition follows the 1934 Random House edition in providing the above framework for *Ulysses* as a printed and bound book. In these editions and with such a specified contextualizing foreword, *Ulysses* is read through its immediate trajectory in the United States while also framed by the publication history of Joyce's previous works in the UK and Ireland: a history of an obscenity trial and censorship, sometimes expressed through extremity.[43] More than that, these editions bear the 'authorial stamp' of the writer, which proves their authenticity in contrast to the pirated first American *Ulysses*. Even though Kapsaskis translated from an edition framed by a discourse about authenticity, authorial approval, authorization, as well as legal discourse, he does not discuss this framework at all. On the contrary, he focuses on its translation history—albeit with authorial authority in mind—and, therefore, presents to the Greek reader a completely different framing of the text by focusing on the translation process. The reading he promotes is still one of agonism, of constant struggle for and around *Ulysses*, but it focuses on the struggle of bringing and reading the text into another language rather than the struggle of publishing, circulating, overcoming censorship, and silence. Along with the constant difficulty that the translation process presents, the struggle for a translated *Ulysses* in its full form emerges and, therefore, Kapsaskis's impulse to see the book as a finished translated product. This denotes not only a struggle, but also a need to have a full translation of *Ulysses* in Greece, and this, I would suggest, affects our reading of the other two translations as well. Once the process of translation is over, the aspect of struggle is detected in Kapsaskis's agon over the

[43] Earlier in his letter to Cerf, cited in the 1942 Modern Library edition, Joyce mentions the burning of *Dubliners* as soon as it came out in Dublin as a 'new and private *auto-da-fé*'.

other possible solutions and ways of translating *Ulysses*, an agon that is caused by the prismatic quality of translation, the awareness of the variety of approaches and solutions that could have been adopted, what Reynolds (2019) terms a 'prismatic agon'. Consequently, what matters to Kapsaskis is creating a 'history' of *Ulysses* in Greece, rather than exploring the text's past in its original language, and therefore the impulse to see the finished translation as a printed and bound book with an impact.

A similar silence regarding the composition and publication history of *Ulysses* marks the other two translations. In none of the volumes of the serialized *Οδυσσέας* by Pairidis publications is there a discussion of the background of the text. Of course, when the Pairidis translation was circulating, the Gabler edition and the controversy surrounding it were yet to come. On the other hand, in the Kaktos translation, Anevlavis provides more information regarding the general history behind Joyce's novel as well as the publication history and the bans, but does not go into details about the different editions and textual manifestations of *Ulysses*. Anevlavis claims that he is translating from the Gabler edition, while also providing a short bibliography of the resources he used and which the reader could use as well. All in all, through the full-length translations and the discussions about them, the reader is under the assumption that the text of *Ulysses* is a stable, non-changing entity, while the translation is constantly conceived as an unsettled text.

Post How Many Pills? Puns and other difficulties

An example which highlights the way in which Kapsaskis uses the original as a settled text is the translation of the pun 'POST NO BILLS. POST 110 PILLS.' (8.101) which in 'Lestrygonians' Leopold Bloom remembers having seen on the wall of a public urinal as he reflects on various forms of advertisements. In the 1942 Modern Library edition it has been erroneously printed as 'POST NO BILLS. POST NO PILLS.' (151). It is this latter altered pun which Kapsaskis attempts to render and which he discusses in his preface without considering the possibility of other variants. In the 1922

edition, as well as in the Gabler edition which presents a restored version of the text and is now widely accepted, the second 'POST' is followed by what seems to be the number 110, which in fact is the word NO with the diagonal line of the N having faded and making it look like 11. As a result, the pun reflects a sign on the wall of a public urinal saying 'POST NO BILLS' and which has been transformed into the phrase 'POST 110 PILLS' which serves as an impromptu advertisement for a 'clap doctor' selling pills. This pun, therefore, shows the process of erasure, the intervention which alters the meaning of the original public sign. In the 1942 Modern Library edition used for the Kedros translation, the error is in the second phrase which replicates the word NO rendering the pun—and the advertisement—moot: 'POST NO BILLS. POST NO PILLS.' When Kapsaskis discusses the phrase as a translation issue to which he attempted to find a solution, he does not consider the transformation of NO into the number 110, but only that of BILLS into PILLS. As a result, he considers a specific instance which poses a problem in translation based on one of the variants of the text in English. But we do not know how this added aspect of the original variant would have interfered with his reading and rendering of the pun into Greek. Rejecting the solution adopted in the 1929 French translation as a 'complete failure',[44] Kapsaskis leaves the pun untranslated while inserting an in-text explanation of the process of erasure (in bold below):

> Fly by night. Just the place too. POST NO BILLS. POST NO PILLS. Some chap with a dose burning him. (1942, 151)
>
> Το πουλάκι μέσα στη νύχτα. Και στην κατάλληλη θέση. **Για πόσο καιρό όμως; Η γραμμένη από τον Δήμο στους τοίχους απαγόρευση POST NO BILLS ξεβάφει με τον καιρό και γίνεται POST NO PILLS.** Για κάποιον που την έχει αρπάξει και τον τσούζει. (190)

In his translation, Kapsaskis resolves the pun and instead 'explains' the meaning of these phrases and the erasure by using description, while he also adds a question, spoken internally by Bloom, concerning

[44] The French translation renders this as 'CABINET DE CONSULT. TA BINETTE DE CON!' ([1929] 1930, 172)

the erosion of the signs on the wall: 'για πόσο καιρό όμως;'. Apart from providing an interpretation directing the reader, this explanation, also, does not comply with the textual memory of *Ulysses* which the reader is invited and challenged to develop. Reading closely, we realize that the 'fading' of certain letters was an intentional erasure and transformation of the sign into an ad by 'that quack doctor for the clap': 'Didn't cost him a red like Maginni the dancing master self advertisement. Got fellows to stick them up himself for that matter on the q. t. running in to loosen a button.' (1942, 151; 8.96-100). The text returns to this in 'Circe' (*U* 15.2633-40):

THE FLYBILL
K.11. Post No Bills. Strictly Confidential. Dr Hy Franks

HENRY
All is lost now.

(*Virag unscrews his head in a trice and holds it under his arm*)

VIRAG'S HEAD
Quack!

Kapsaskis's rendering of the repeated 'Post No Bills' in 'Circe' does not coincide with the translation he provides in 'Lestrygonians': 'Απαγορεύεται η αποστολή χαρτονομισμάτων διά του ταχυδρομείου.' (565) forgetting, therefore, what Bloom has been thinking about earlier in the same day.[45]

In his preface, Kapsaskis explains his rendering of the faded advertisement as an example of what he calls 'wordplay' ('λεκτικά παιχνίδια'), one of the main categories of what he terms as 'translational difficulties' ('μεταφραστικές δυσκολίες'), which he encountered when translating *Ulysses* (1990, 7). He divides these difficulties into the following categories: words or phrases with multiple readings ('λέξεις ή φράσεις με πολλαπλά σημεία ανάγνωσης'); wordplay ('λεκτικά παιχνίδια'); comprehension difficulties due to the timelapse ('δυσκολίες κατανόησης λόγω παρόδου των ετών');

[45] See also the explanation in the relevant note in Slote, Mamigonian, Turner (2022, 282).

difficulties due to different background of the reader ('δυσκολίες λόγω διαφορετικής παιδείας'); potential of multiple readings ('δυνατότητες πολλαπλών αναγνώσεων'); Bible quotations ('αποσπάσματα από τη Βίβλο'). One could argue that these are common challenges which each translator approaches differently depending on their ideology and the accepted norms or idiosyncrasies of the target culture in terms of literary translation. On the other hand, pointing out these difficulties highlights the issue of how topographical and culture-specific details of life in Dublin in 1904 have been used, a crucial aspect of *Ulysses*. Kapsaskis, therefore, is highly preoccupied with the text's materiality and Irish specificity, which he sees as one of the main obstacles in reading and translation. Kapsaskis claims that such a challenge cannot be dealt with fully in translation attempting thus to talk about his translation practice in a more theoretical manner.

Along with seeing the book printed and bound, Kapsaskis is also interested in making the translation as readable and accessible as possible. Through authorially authorized sources, as well as explanations about the 'distance' and the 'differences' between original and translation—even between original and French translation—Kapsaskis seeks to convince the reader about the translation's reliability and readability. For example, in his discussion of one of the obstacles, an explicit pun on the names of Beaumont and Fletcher ('better were they named Beau Mount and Lecher for, by my troth, of such a mingling much might come', *U* 14.356-57), Kapsaskis explores possible solutions and explains the inadequacy of each of them to maintain the reference to the two writers and the explicit pun at the same time.[46] Wondering about one of the possible solutions, which consists of transliterating the names and adding their meaning in Greek in a parenthesis or in a footnote, the translator states:

> Όμως, αν αρχίσει να προσθέτει επεξηγήσεις ή υποσημειώσεις στο κείμενο, είναι κάτι που θα χρειαστεί να επαναλάβει πολλές φορές και πρέπει να προβληματιστεί για τη μορφή

[46] Kapsaskis chooses to transliterate the name-puns: 'θα ήτο καλύτερον ούτοι να ελέγοντο Μπω Μάουντ και Λέτσερ, διότι, μα την πίστην μου, εξ ενός παρομοίου ζευγαρώματος, πολλά ηδύναντο να προέλθουν' (1990, 454-55).

> που θα πάρει τελικώς ένα κείμενο, που, δεν πρέπει να το ξεχνάμε, δεν είναι μελέτη, αλλά μυθιστόρημα. (1990, 13)
>
> But if he [the translator] starts adding explanations or footnotes to the text, this is something he will need to repeat many times and he ought to reflect on the final form of the text, which, let's not forget, is not a study, but a novel.

There is, therefore, a preoccupation with the textual appearance of the translation and a concern about this appearance not disrupting the reading experience and pleasure. At the same time, when analyzing certain 'differences' between the original and the French translation, which he uses as an aid, Kapsaskis refers to the practice of adding in-text explanations to render certain phrases more comprehensible. He explains that the French translators did that 'in order to soften the text's difficulty' ('ν' απαλύνουν τη δυσκολία του κειμένου') and, as a result, this is something he implements in his own translation for the same reason occasionally without realizing it.[47] Kapsaskis sees certain translation practices, such as adding footnotes, as disrupting the reading experience and aims at 'preserving', as accurately as possible, if not the reader's pleasure, then at least an experience that would be as close as possible to that of a text without the translator's mediation. The majority of *Ulysses* editions, and the 1942 Modern Library edition lack footnotes entirely. Moreover, he sees them as disrupting genre. While Kapsaskis's silence over broader issues of interpretation could be seen as an invitation to the reader to draw their own conclusions, it is also an indication of how Kapsaskis sees himself as a translator. He regards himself as having a mediatory and, as much as possible, non-intervening role in the Greek reader's access to Joyce's *Ulysses*. Because of this mediatory role, Kapsaskis uses, perhaps even performatively, the authorially authorized sources to protect his work against dismissing or negative critique and to ensure its validity to his readers. His use of the French translation on the grounds that it had not been succeeded by a retranslation until then and Joyce had approved of it evokes a somewhat Biblical

[47] 'Οφείλω να πω ότι κι εγώ, ηθελημένα ή αθέλητα, ακολούθησα αυτό το δρόμο, και παρ' όλο που ο κ. Solman μου επεσήμανε αρκετές φορές στο κείμενό μου αυτές τις προσθήκες, τελικά δεν τον άκουσα και αρκετές λέξεις επεξηγήσεις παρέμειναν στην ελληνική μετάφραση.' (1990, 10)

connection between that and his own translation, as if his work is transfused with authority by 'Joyce's hand'. Kapsaskis's approach in translating *Ulysses* indicates a significant consideration of the reader's enjoyment of the book. At the same time, being conscious of presenting an unsettled translation, he is aware of other potential translations, the prismatic status of translation, and shares this agon with the readers.

'Mkgnao' becomes 'Νιάου': multilingualism and metempsychosis in *Odysseas* (1990)

> «Mkgnao», «Mrkgnao», «Mrkrgnao» ή «Νιάου», «Ννιάου», «Νννιάου»; Όσο κι αν φαντάζει αστείο ή σχολαστικό, ο Τζόυς με το ιδιωματικό «Mrgnao» [sic] διεκδικεί για λογαριασμό της λογοτεχνίας το δικαίωμα να αναπαράγει την αναπόφευκτη τροπικότητα του ορατού και του ακουστού. Ο Σωκράτης Καψάσκης, ο Έλληνας μεταφραστής, δεν απέδωσε αυτή τη διαφορά ανάμεσα στο ιδίωμα και στην επίσημη γλώσσα. Ωστόσο, του αναγνωρίζουμε ότι η μετάφραση του «Οδυσσέα» είναι πραγματικός άθλος. (Lazos 1991, 57)
>
> 'Mkgnao', 'Mrkgnao', 'Mrkrgnao' or 'Meow', 'Mmeow', 'Mmmeow'? No matter how silly or pedantic, through the idiomatic 'Mrgnao' [sic] Joyce claims for literature the right to reproduce the ineluctable modality of the visible and the audible. Sokratis Kapsaskis, the Greek translator, did not render this difference between idiom and standard language. However, we do acknowledge that translating *Ulysses* is a true achievement.

A few months after the controversy discussed earlier, and adopting a calmer approach, the translator Ch. G. Lazos wrote in the review *Αντί* [*Anti*] (465, 3 May 1991) about Kapsaskis's translation through the angle of modernist writing, multilingualism, and language difference. He highlighted two issues that he claimed were problematic in the translation, one of them being the lack of information about the original text and the edition from which Kapsaskis translated, contrasting with the extensive discussion of the 1929 French translation in the preface. The other issue that Lazos questions is related to Kapsaskis's method of trying as much as possible to 'help' the Greek reader through choices like in-text 'explanations' rendering many sentences closer to syntactical norms than they are originally.

Objecting to the notion of 'helping' the reader, Lazos argues that this has unfathomable consequences for the text as it also affects phrases that did not present any translational challenges in the first place. On the contrary, Lazos suggests, translation should preserve the meaning of the original and, for texts that resist interpretation like *Ulysses*, it should preserve the resistance to meaning.[48] Lazos's vision of translation as an interaction of meanings takes into account the inherent multiplicity of the process corresponding, therefore, to a prismatic view of translation. At the same time, his idea of how a challenging text should be translated and therefore disseminated goes against Berlis's dismissive views of the common reader as incapable of reading a translation of *Ulysses*.

Instead of criticizing the translator's knowledge and sources, Lazos focuses on the result and on Kapsaskis's methods through specific examples pertaining to the economy of the text, the textual connections, and its linguistic idiosyncrasies. One of Lazos's examples, examines the rendering of the cat's speech in 'Calypso' which, although seemingly unimportant, indicates Kapsaskis's interest in readability. Calypso opens with Bloom eating and preparing breakfast for his wife, Molly when suddenly a cat appears and a '—Mkgnao!' is heard. Bloom replies '—O, there you are', his first interaction in the novel being an act of translation as he understands the cat's hunger: '—Milk for the pussens, he said' (4.15-24). The cat's voice is transcribed in the text as 'Mkgnao!', instead of its standardized representation in English known as 'meow' or 'Miaow!' (4.462), the latter being Bloom's own utterance when he later responds to the cat. Hugh Kenner highlights the cat's 'Mkgnao!' as one of the details that Joyce recorded accurately in order to compel us 'to read what we had never thought to read with attention' (1987, 46).[49] Jennifer Levine explains this as the author's attempt to transcribe

[48] 'Παρ' όλα αυτά πιστεύω ότι η μετάφραση δεν πρέπει να εξομαλύνει τις ενδεχόμενες δυσκολίες του κειμένου, προσφέροντας ένα κοινότοπο και συνήθως λανθασμένο νόημα, αλλά ότι, αντιθέτως, οφείλει να διατηρεί την μη αποκρισιμότητα του νοήματος και, συνεπώς, να επιτρέπει τη δίχως τέλος *συμπλοκή* των νοημάτων.' (Lazos 1991, 57-58)

[49] Considering Kapsaskis's background as a filmmaker, it is interesting that Kenner associates this type of detail with early cinema as, as readers of *Ulysses* 'we seem to be told everything, held as were early cinema audiences by the novel fascinations of watching the perfectly commonplace take its course in an unfamiliar medium.' (1987, 46)

the cat's speech as closer to reality as possible (2004, 128) while John Gordon reads this moment of diverse and changing utterances as an example of Bloom's progressively heightened audibility (2009, 31-40).[50] The difference between the cat's speech and Bloom's attempts at meowing is something the reader is made alert to. In his translation, however, Kapsaskis uses the standardized cat's meowing in Greek, that is, 'νιάου', which Lazos argues is a 'wrong translation' exactly because it is Bloom who later translates the cat's voice into his own human idiom.[51] Specifically, Kapsaskis renders 'Mkgnao!', 'Mrkgnao!', and 'Mrkrgnao!' as 'Νιάου!', 'Ννιάου!', and 'Νννιάου!' (81-82) while later Bloom also replies to her with a 'Νιάου!' (95). Using the cat's voice as an example of the modernist interest in idioms, Lazos sees this as a failed translation because the idiom has not been rendered, the language difference has not been highlighted, but has been translated by and thus incorporated into the standard form. In his next example, which focuses on the names of Bloom's octuplets in 'Circe', Lazos extends his discussion from idiom to multilingualism. The 'eight male yellow and white children' that Bloom births each have a name from a different language: 'Nasodoro, Goldfinger, Chrysostomos, Maindorée, Silversmile, Silberselber, Vifargent, Panargyros' (15.1826-28), but are translated by Kapsaskis as 'Χρυσομύτης, Χρυσοδάκτυλος, Χρυσόστομος, Χρυσοχέρης, Αργυροχαμόγελος, Αργυριάδης, Λαμπράργυρος, Πανάργυρος' (543). Lazos points out that in such cases, where Joyce has used words or names from several different languages, Greek among them, Kapsaskis has translated all of them into Greek resulting into a loss of the multilingual effect.

Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* appears not only at a time of developing interest in translation studies or expansion of the book market and potential readerships, but also at a time during which interest in

[50] Looking at the cat's repeated but progressively differentiated utterances, and Bloom's response, Levine suggests that 'the writer of *Ulysses* makes it clear that, unlike Bloom, he has an obligation to the truth of that cat's talk, and the ability to transcribe it. With the idiosyncratic 'Mkgnao' and its variants Joyce claims the poet's prerogative to mint new words as necessary. He also identifies the essential conventionality of language: 'Miaow' will never be quite the same again.' (129)

[51] 'Όσο κι αν φαίνεται παράδοξο, αυτή η μετάφραση είναι λανθασμένη. Άμεση απόδειξη το γεγονός ότι πιο κάτω, όταν ο Μπλουμ μεταφράζει τη φωνή της γάτας στο επίσημο ιδίωμα των αγγλικών λέει «–*Miaow*!»,' (58)

Joyce had grown stronger than ever in the Greek literary space. Aris Marangopoulos, whose bibliographical and critical work on Joyce was then developing, published two books about *Ulysses* shortly: *Ulysses, Οδηγίες προς ναυτιλλομένους: επιστρέφοντας στον 'Οδυσσέα' του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, 1995 [*Ulysses, Instructions for seafarers*]; *Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο: Τόποι και γλώσσες στον 'Οδυσσέα' του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, 1997 [*Dear Dirty Dublin: Places and languages in James Joyce's 'Ulysses'*]. The other two translations, *Οδυσσέας* (Pairidis, 1969-1976) and *Οδυσσέας* (Kaktos, 2014), were not discussed in such detail in literary criticism even though they both followed similar domesticating approaches, especially regarding multilingualism and language difference, without proposing significant alternatives. For example, both Nikolouzos (who translated 'Calypso' for Pairidis) and Anevlavis translate the cat's speech in variations of the standardized way with Nikolouzos only deviating slightly: 'Μιάόουου!', 'Μιαόουου!', 'Μρμιαόουου!' (1969-1976, 102-103); 'Νιάου!', 'Νιάου!', 'Νιάου!' (2014, 93-94). Concerning Bloom's octuplets in 'Circe', both Thomopoulos, this time, and Anevlavis follow an approach similar to Kapsaskis's: 'Χρυσομύτης, Χρυσοδάχτυλος, Χρυσόστομος, Χρυσοχέρης, Αργυροχαμόγελος, Ασημάκης, Λαμπράργυρος, Πανάργυρος' (1969-1976, 789); 'Χρυσομύτης, Χρυσοδάκτυλος, Χρυσόστομος, Χρυσοχέρης, Αργυρόγελος, Αργυριάδης, Υδράργυρος, Πανάργυρος' (2014, 734-35).

While their rendering of multilingualism shows a conservative approach to the process of translation, all three translations adopt different solutions when it comes to language play. This is evident in the example of Molly's mispronunciation of the word 'metempsychosis' which we only partly hear through Bloom. In this case, the translator is invited to recompose what Molly might have said and recreate a mispronunciation that will work acoustically and lexically as a resignification in the target language. When Bloom brings breakfast, Molly asks him about the meaning of a word she has found in a book and which she is not sure how to pronounce:

> She swallowed a draught of tea from her cup held by nothandle and, having wiped her fingertips smartly on the blanket, began to search the text with the hairpin till she reached the word.

—Met him what? he asked.
—Here, she said. What does that mean?
He leaned downward and read near her polished thumbnail.
—Metempsychosis?
—Yes. Who's he when he's at home?
—Metempsychosis, he said frowning. It's Greek: from the Greek. That means the transmigration of souls.
—O, rocks! she said. Tell us in plain words. (*U* 4.333-43)

Molly tentatively pronounces the word she is enquiring about, but we never 'hear' how exactly she pronounced it. We only have access to what Bloom hears and repeats: 'Met him what?'. When Molly asks 'who's he when he's at home?', an idiomatic phrase for 'tell us in plain words', the reader also understands that she has heard the words 'he' or 'him' in 'metempsychosis'.[52] Later in the day, in 'Lestrygonians' as well as in other episodes, Bloom recalls more than once Molly's coined word as 'met him pike hoses' and it is then that we have a clearer idea of what she said, but still through Bloom's ears and memory: 'Met him pike hoses she called it till I told her about the transmigration' (*U* 8.112), 'Karma they call that transmigration for sins you did in a past life the reincarnation met him pike hoses' (*U* 8.1147-48). Only in 'Penelope' we finally hear Molly herself recalling the word but still half of it: 'and that word met something with hoses in it and he came out with some jawbreakers about the incarnation he never can explain a thing simply the way a body can understand' (*U* 18.565-67).

The advantage that Greek translators have, 'μετεμψύχωση' being a Greek word, also works as a disadvantage as it becomes challenging to replicate Molly's phonetic rehearsal and find other words that would sound similar while at the same time producing an erratic and potentially humorous meaning. Kapsaskis takes advantage of the etymology of the word:

Ρούφηξε μια γουλιά τσάι από τη φλιτζάνα της που δεν την κρατούσε από τη λαβή και, αφού σκούπισε γρήγορα τα ακροδάχτυλά της στην κουβέρτα, άρχισε να ψάχνει το κείμενο με τη φουρκέτα, μέχρι που βρήκε τη λέξη.
— Με την ψυχή σου, τι; τη ρώτησε.
— Εδώ, είπε αυτή. Τι σημαίνει αυτό;

[52] See also Slote, Mamigonian, Turner citing Partridge who notes 'when it's [or he's] at home': 'a derisive tag implying contempt or incredulity' (2022, 124).

Έσκυψε προς τα κάτω και διάβασε πλάι στα βαμμένα νύχια της.
— Μετεμψύχωση;
— Ναι, είπε αυτή. Τι σημαίνει;
— Μετεμψύχωση, είπε αυτός, συνοφρυωμένος. Είναι ελληνικό· προέρχεται από τα ελληνικά. Σημαίνει τη μετοίκηση των ψυχών.
— Ω, διάολε! είπε αυτή. Πες το μας με απλά λόγια. (1990, 91)

Kapsaskis omits Molly's alternative interpretation, 'who's he when he's at home?', which he replaces with the more generic 'τι σημαίνει;' and renders the mispronunciation by using the word's etymology to achieve acoustic similarity: 'met him pike hoses' becomes, in Bloom's monologue, 'με την ψυχή σου εσύ': 'Με την ψυχή σου εσύ, την ονόμαζε η Μόλλυ, μέχρι που της εξήγησα για τη μετενσάρκωση.' (190), 'Κάρμα ονομάζουν αυτή τη μετοίκηση, για αμαρτίες που διέπραξες σε μία προηγούμενη ζωή, μετενσάρκωση, με την ψυχή σου εσύ' (223).

In the Pairidis translation, this linguistic play is affected by the change of translators and, I suggest, by the serialization of the novel which results in interruptions in the translation process. In 'Calypso', Nikolouzos avoids linguistic play as in the interaction between Bloom and Molly, he renders Bloom's question 'Met him what?' as 'Πώς το 'πες;' and Molly's 'Who's he when he's at home?' as 'Από πού βγαίνει αυτό;' (117). In 'Lestrygonians', included in the third volume which both Nikolouzos and Thomopoulos translated, Bloom's memory of 'met him pike hoses' has been rendered in an abstract way which highlights the nonsensical nature of Molly's mispronunciation and the event of 'not hearing properly': 'Τα μυαλά του και μια λίρα, τόλεγε ώσπου της εξήγησα για τη μετεμψύχωση' (275), 'Κάρμα ονομάζουν αυτή τη μετεμψύχωση για τις αμαρτίες που έκανες σε μια προηγούμενη ζωή, η μετενσάρκωση, ό,τι θέλεις ακούς' (324). On the other hand, Anevlavis translates almost literally 'Met him what?' as 'Μετ τι;' (109), and Molly's question based on her obscure phonetic interpretation 'Who's he when he's at home?' as 'Ποιος είν' αυτός όταν αυτός είναι σπίτι;' (110) while he explains the misunderstanding in the English text in a footnote. Anevlavis repeats this solution in every reference of the phrase 'met him pike hoses' throughout the text, albeit not with the expected consistency as he

translates it slightly differently every time.[53] In the Pairidis translation, there is no consistency in the rendering of the specific language play throughout the text. While the first instances in 'Calypso' and 'Lestrygonians' show the translators' effort for simplification, in the episodes where the phrase 'met him pike hoses' reappears, it is either translated differently in each instance ('Sirens', 'Eumaeus', 'Ithaca'), or omitted entirely ('Nausicaa'). Finally, in 'Penelope', the only instance where we hear Molly herself remembering that morning's interaction and Bloom's general tendency to complicate his explanations, the different solutions in each translation, even if they have not been applied consistently throughout the text, show the translators' approaches:

> 'and that word met something with hoses in it' (18.565)
> 'κι άρχισε να ξεστομίζει λέξεις που να σου φύγει η μασέλα γύρω απ' την ενσάρκωση' (Thomopoulos, 1196)
> 'κι αυτή η λέξη με την ψυχή σου εσύ' (Kapsaskis, 784)
> 'κι εκείνη η λέξη συνάντησε κάτι με μαρκούτσια' (Anevlavis, 1057)

In the Pairidis translation the first translator, Nikolouzos, initially tried to bypass the challenge of recreating a mispronunciation in Greek by preserving the general sense of Molly's inability or refusal to understand. In the episodes translated by Thomopoulos there is an attempt at reproducing Molly's interpretation through other nonsensical phrases, but this variates every time—an example which highlights the conditions under which the translation was completed and its 'naïve' status. Kapsaskis, on the other hand, takes advantage of the word's etymology and recreates a phrase by drawing from how the word could potentially sound to a Greek speaker who is not familiar with more formal vocabulary. Kapsaskis, therefore, hints at the difference between formal vocabulary and more demotic vernaculars, a difference which he develops further in his translation of the 'Oxen of the Sun' episode. Finally, Anevlavis opts for a preservation of what happens in the original by translating word for word

[53] Specifically, Anevlavis either preserves the tentative enunciation in Greek ('μετ εμ ψύ χωση', 294), transliterates the mispronunciation into Greek partly ('μετ εμ ψι χόσες', 432, 457, 462, 593, 'μετ εμ πσι χόσες', 916) or entirely ('μετ ιμ πάικ χόσες', 964), or, finally, translates it word-for-word resulting in a phrase like 'τον συνάντησε δόρυ μαρκούτσια' (251).

and giving information about the English text. In this case, the reader becomes aware that the translation cannot be read on its own, but that it rather keeps the original constantly within view.

Regardless of which solution could be considered more successful, or what could be a successful solution in this case, all three translations of this language play add to the text, constituting therefore different refractions of the miscommunication between Bloom and Molly. At the same time, they also complement one another, each of them highlighting a different aspect of the interaction between Bloom and Molly. While Pairidis focuses on the idea of dialogue, explanation, and miscommunication, Kapsaskis attempts to replicate the scene by using the structure and forms of the Greek language to bring to the fore the characters' social and linguistic backgrounds, something that might have stemmed from his leftist background. Anevlavis, on the other hand, provides an insight of Bloom's reflections on Molly's mispronunciation and the joke that it generates. The dialogue on metempsychosis in 'Calypso' is the first time we see Bloom and Molly interact in the novel, and the only time we hear Molly speak without having access to her thoughts like in 'Penelope'. The reader becomes aware of the couple's dynamics as well as details about the characters such as Molly's immediacy contrasting with Bloom's convoluted discourse which is seen through an ironic light in 'Cyclops'. Each choice, therefore, gives information about how each translator approached the text, this first interaction between two main characters, as well as their own practice. It also shows how the translators approached the text's linguistic diversity and attention to language, something that is manifested in further detail in their translations of the episode of 'Oxen of the Sun'.

'Oxen of the Sun': 'the most difficult episode in an odyssey' (*SL* 249)

> Νομίζω ότι αυτός ο πρόλογος παρατράβηξε. Ίσως να έχει ένα ύφος απολογητικό. Μπορεί. Ναι, δεν μπόρεσα να δώσω λύσεις σ' ένα σωρό προβλήματα. Θέλησα πάντως σ' αυτόν εδώ τον πρόλογο να δώσω και το μέτρο των δυσκολιών που τέθηκαν στο έργο μου. (Kapsaskis 1990, 19)

> I think that this preface has gone too far. Maybe its style is rather apologetic. It might be. Yes, I could not provide solutions to many problems. In any case, in this preface I wanted to expose the kind of difficulties that arose in my task.

In a letter to his patron Harriet Shaw Weaver, in which he informs her of his work, Joyce states: 'I am working now on the *Oxen of the Sun* the most difficult episode in an odyssey, I think, both to interpret and to execute' (25/2/1920, *SL* 249). In the fourteenth episode of *Ulysses*, Bloom has gone to the Holles Street Maternity Hospital to enquire after his friend Mina Purefoy who has been in labor for three days and is yet to give birth. There, apart from Nurse Callan, an old acquaintance of his, he encounters a group of medical students and doctors in the commons' hall, who are drinking and conversing loudly over subjects such as motherhood, pregnancy, abortion, birth, and its complications, while the cries of women in labor are intermittently heard from upstairs. The narrative is delivered in a procession of historically successive English prose styles drawn from several anthologized texts and authors of English literary history alluding to a process of gestation, growth, and birth but, as Jeri Johnson highlights, this is achieved through recirculation and recycling (2008, 907). After it is announced that Mrs Purefoy has given birth, the group migrates to Burke's pub nearby to continue drinking, as the narrative converts into a colloquial oral style, 'a frightful jumble of Pidgin English, nigger English, Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel', as Joyce describes in a letter to Frank Budgen (20/3/1920, *SL* 251-52). The stylistic development reflects the growth of the fetus in the womb but not in a teleologically progressive way (Johnson, 907). Sarah Davison (2022) has pointed out that there are no clearly defined sub-parodies devoted to a specific author or text; even if it seems like this is the case, Joyce adds anachronisms, hibernianisms, idiosyncratic elements, in such a way that every parody is also a pastiche. The ability of language to echo the past is used in every possible way in this episode. Agonistic concepts such as struggle and labor run throughout the episode both in terms of content—Mrs Purefoy's state along with all the other women who are heard now and again,

the contrast with the bawdy conversation downstairs—and form—the gradual stylistic development, the constant change of style which also poses obstacles to the reader. Joyce is not simply imitating styles of his predecessors; he draws words and phrases from them and re-writes them in a *mimetic* way, mimesis being here an interplay between style and action in which the action lies. More specifically, there is a tension between style and subject matter that is productive, where the style augments the meaning by contributing and adding to it. As Johnson also points out, 'the characters and events themselves are produced through the styles (not despite them)' (906). This characteristic is found not only in 'Oxen of the Sun', but in many other episodes in *Ulysses*, about which Sam Slote has coined the term 'double mimesis', defining it as a simultaneous representation of action and representation of style.[54] The characters are developed through the styles: for example, the gothic style of Horace Walpole and Sheridan Le Fanu that is used to refer to the appearance of Haines, the Englishman, reflects the enmity that his presence evokes as a 'Sassenach' (14.1010-37):

> But Malachias' tale began to freeze them with horror. He conjured up the scene before them. The secret panel beside the chimney slid back and in the recess appeared – Haines! Which of us did not feel his flesh creep! He had a portfolio full of Celtic literature in one hand, in the other a phial marked *Poison*. Surprise, horror, loathing were depicted on all faces while he eyed them with a ghostly grin. (*U* 14.1010-15)

In this episode, Joyce re-uses styles by other texts or writers, drawing from histories of English prose style.[55] He does not simply retrieve them as they are, fragmented and cited in secondary sources, but he also rewrites them by adding Hiberno-English forms, avoiding therefore plain imitation. By using the history of English prose style thus, he inscribes his own writing in it while also challenging and

[54] Slote has spoken about it on many occasions, one of them being his lecture at the 2022 Trieste James Joyce Summer School titled '"Eumaeus": Literally the Antepenultimate Episode'.
[55] In the same letter to Budgen quoted earlier, Joyce lists the writers from whom he is drawing. However, he draws from them in the way in which they have been included in the two histories of English prose styles: George Saintsbury (1912), *A History of English Prose Rhythm* (London: Macmillan) and William Peacock (1903), *English Prose from Mandeville to Ruskin* (London: Oxford University Press). For a more detailed analysis of the sources and the writers recycled in 'Oxen', see Janusko (1983). Davison (2022) provides more sources for 'Oxen'.

satirizing it. He is confronting his predecessors while simultaneously moving away from them. By devoting an entire episode to the history of English prose styles, Joyce adds this 'pastiche' to the canonical literary history. 'Oxen', therefore, is not only 'the most difficult episode […] to interpret and to execute', but it is also one of the greatest challenges for a translator. Instead of including it in his list of main difficulties, Kapsaskis actually closes his preface with an extensive discussion of how he approached the episode.

In order to render 'Oxen' in another language, a possible solution would be to create a pastiche out of established translations of every text and writer that is 'parodied' in the episode—assuming such a canon of translations is available in the target language.[56] Using the different writers and texts in their respective manifestations in the target language would perhaps be the closest 'translation' or 'rewriting' of such an elaborate and demanding episode. Alternatively, the translator can take up the challenge of rewriting 'Oxen' by producing a 'mimesis', a stylized imitation of texts and writers of his target culture. In that case, the episode is no longer about the history of English prose style, but about the history of the target language's prose style. A third option would be to translate the episode by simply focusing on the plot, choosing to ignore its linguistic and stylistic diversity. Applying one of the last two solutions results in a paradox because in the original 'Oxen', the characters are, in their majority, Dubliners (or Irish) who speak in the literary styles of the English literary canon, the literature of the Empire albeit in a Hibernian version—the 'canon' includes a few non-English writers such as Jonathan Swift. After deciding how to approach the episode in translation, the translator of 'Oxen' is called to tackle the paradox of Irish characters speaking in a Hibernized imperial style, and how that can be conveyed in translation.

---

[56] Armagan Ekici's approach of translating *Ulysses* into Turkish, as he analyzes it in his chapter in Wawrzycka and Mihálycsa (2020, 179-201), is very interesting in the sense that he draws from canonical translations of the writers and texts parodied wherever available. He describes his strategy as using 'archaisms that produce a text on a similar level of readability as the English text, and, where possible, to use the modern Turkish translations of the parodied English texts.' (187)

In what follows, I would like to propose a reading of 'Oxen' as an agonistic episode, that is, a text that is marked by different forms of struggle, and examine how the Greek translations, the choices but also the act of translation as well as the relevant discourse, convey this agonistic reading. Focusing on Kapsaskis's translation as 'canonical', and as a translation that came out at a time when translations started being more under analytical scrutiny, I will argue that the awareness of and struggle over the text's translational multiplicity is mostly apparent in his approach to 'Oxen'. Prismatic agon is particularly manifested here as the episode, even in the original, is already putting the reader through the process of translation. Therefore, to translate it into another language requires to think about how to convey this demand of translation that is imposed by the text. Kapsaskis here considers the different ways in which 'Oxen' could be translated depending on the resources available and the translator's abilities and is worried about the limits of his own translation admitting, at the same time, that he could not have produced any other version. His prismatic agon does not only concern his own rendering or what he could have done but anticipates future versions, and what he could *not* have done.

As already discussed, the episode itself is characterized by agonistic elements on various levels. One form of struggle is in the very event that is narrated, Mina Purefoy's three-day labor and the eventual birth of her son. Another aspect is found in the form of the episode, the successive styles, and the constant change and challenge that it poses to the reader. At the same time, the succession of styles and the mimesis also convey a struggle with the act of writing and with language, a textual struggle, while it is also a way for Joyce to convey his own confrontation with his predecessors as he is performatively writing with and against his forefathers.

In every rendition of 'Oxen' in Greek the translator has been, in one way or another, influenced by at least one aspect of what is known as the Greek language question, the great linguistic debate concerning the appropriate form of language or idiom to use that marked the history of Greek

language and literature. This debate, starting from the beginnings of the Greek state, ended officially in the 1970s during the *metapolitefsi* period but had affected Greek society deeply in every level while its traces lingered for quite a while.[57] The linguistic controversy between the varieties of *katharevousa* and *dimotiki* proved fruitful for Greek writers as they had in their disposal a variety of idioms and registers that the different linguistic forms provided. This variety is taken up in translation as well and is visible in the Greek translations of *Ulysses*. Each translator of *Ulysses*, affected by this debate and its historical and political background, responded accordingly to the linguistic and stylistic challenges of 'Oxen' and, therefore, brought into the translation his own forms of struggle with the language and the text. Even though in all three renderings we can detect a 'flattening' of style which renders the stylistic diversity of the multiple parodies less acute, the Greek translations convey the agonistic tone of the episode through language-specific choices and by considering the political and historical background of the time of production. Kapsaskis, as the only translator providing his reflections on the episode, frames it with his own efforts and his reading. In what follows, I argue that Kapsaskis includes the reader in his attempts to translate 'Oxen' and I suggest a consideration of the other Greek translations of 'Oxen' in light of Kapsaskis's discussion. The conditions under which the other two translations were produced are also to be taken into account.

'Oxen of the Sun' in Greek: from mimesis to the language question

At the end of his preface, Kapsaskis broaches the issue of 'Oxen' by giving an account of the main events of the episode, the way it is written, and listing the English writers who are being 'imitated' or 'parodied'. He claims that there are two main obstacles for the Greek translator:

[57] See here Alexandros Argyriou's essay 'Το ύφος μιας γλώσσας και η γλώσσα ενός ύφους' included in *Δεκαοχτώ Κείμενα* (1970, 189-203), where he discusses the repercussions of the language question on Greek society, thinking, and expression.

> Στον Έλληνα μεταφραστή τίθενται αμέσως δύο προβλήματα. Πρώτον, πέρα από ένα πλήρη έλεγχο της αγγλικής γλώσσας ήταν αναγκαία και η γνώση του ύφους του έργου αυτών των «παρωδούμενων» συγγραφέων, και δεύτερον, ήταν αναγκαία η ανεύρεση και η επιλογή Ελλήνων επωνύμων συγγραφέων, αντίστοιχων (ή περίπου) χρονολογιών με εκείνων της αγγλικής λογοτεχνίας, προς μίμηση ή παρωδία τους. (Kapsaskis 1990, 20)
>
> The Greek translator faces two problems. First, apart from an absolute control of the English language, it was necessary to be aware of the style of these 'parodied' writers, and second, it was necessary to find and choose known Greek writers, of (approximately) similar periods as those of English literature, to produce an imitation of them or a parody.

Kapsaskis admits that he did not have adequate knowledge of the English language in order to 'decode' the style of each writer, while the French translation did not help with that either as it imitates French writers and texts to rewrite the parody. But for Kapsaskis, the second problem was the greatest one because, as he claims, the Greek language did not have similar potentials and history of evolution, and, therefore, there have not been enough texts or writers from the fourteenth century onwards that he could have used to produce a parody or an imitation along the lines of the Joycean parody. Even if the sources he considered necessary were available, Kapsaskis declares that he would not have been able to achieve such a parody.[58] That is why, Kapsaskis explains, he focused on conveying the meaning ('μια εννοιολογική προσέγγιση'), and, having, at the same time, complete awareness of his weakness, he hopes he achieved something more than a 'translational attempt' ('μεταφραστική απόπειρα').[59] In the broader context of his apologetic preface, this particular admission of inability to translate 'Oxen', could be seen as Kapsaskis's acknowledgment of his inadequacy to bring *Ulysses* into Greek and of what he sees as the untranslatability of *Ulysses*. He is only translating the events narrated in the episode

[58] 'Κι αν ακόμη είχα καταφέρει να ξεπεράσω την αρχική δυσκολία της αποκωδικοποίησης του ύφους των παρωδούμενων συγγραφέων, φοβάμαι ότι το δεύτερο σκέλος του προβλήματος θα έμενε άλυτο. Η ελληνική γλώσσα δεν είχε μια παρόμοια δυνατότητα εξέλιξης, καταγραμμένη σε λογοτεχνικά κείμενα επώνυμων συγγραφέων, από τον δέκατο τέταρτο αιώνα μέχρι τις μέρες μας, τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμεύσουν ως μοντέλα για «παρωδία ή μίμηση», αλλά και αν ακόμα υπήρχε κάποιος που θα υποδείκνυε κάποιες πιθανές λύσεις, εγώ δεν θα κατόρθωνα να επιτύχω αυτή την παρωδία.' (1990, 21)

[59] 'Όπως διαπιστώνει ο αναγνώστης που κρατάει στα χέρια του τον τόμο αυτό, τελικά άλλαξα γνώμη και αποφάσισα να συνεχίσω, προσπαθώντας, σ' αυτό το κεφάλαιο, να επιτύχω μόνο μια εννοιολογική προσέγγιση του κειμένου και έχοντας πλήρη γνώση της αδυναμίας μου να επιτύχω στα «Βόδια του Ήλιου» κάτι περισσότερο από μια «μεταφραστική απόπειρα».' (1990, 21)

while informing the readers that there is always *something else* that they cannot access because it requires further knowledge that neither he nor they have but which is also something lacking in the Greek language, and is therefore impossible to translate.

Kapsaskis's decision to focus on the meaning consists of translating the main narrative of 'Oxen' without adhering to the stylistic changes within the parody. That concerns Bloom's arrival at the Maternity Hospital, his conversation with Nurse Callan, the bawdy discussion and misogynistic jokes of the medical students and the other men drinking there, the announcement of the baby's birth, and their migration to Burke's pub. Although he confesses that he did not attempt to render the different styles that are used in the episode, Kapsaskis has decided to preserve the sense of stylistic and linguistic diversity by resorting to an equivalent in the history of the Greek language. More specifically, he takes advantage of the diglossia that had resulted from the language question and which had prevailed in the Greek language until the 1970s, and uses the two main varieties, *katharevousa* and *dimotiki*.[60] For the bigger part of the episode, which is written in a procession of English prose styles, Kapsaskis has used *katharevousa*, whereas he turns to a colloquial demotic when the group leaves the hospital to go to the pub and the text turns to oral slang. Kapsaskis also mentions in his preface that the help of the writer I. Ch. Papadimitrakopoulos was crucial in rendering 'Oxen' into Greek *katharevousa*. Papadimitrakopoulos, in his own account of Kapsaskis's labor on the translation, deems the idiom they used for the greatest part of 'Oxen' a 'wild *katharevousa* (with elements of a bastardized *katharevousa*…)' ['μια άγρια καθαρεύουσα (με στοιχεία μιξοκαθαρεύουσας…)'], 2014, 115-21: 120]. However, it is not clear in the text whether Kapsaskis and Papadimitrakopoulos attempted to differentiate the *katharevousa* they used throughout the different subsections as the entire part set in the Maternity Hospital has been rendered into a uniform archaizing style. Nevertheless, it could certainly be argued that they have conveyed a level of linguistic diversity in the translation, albeit not

[60] For a detailed analysis of the language question and its history see Mackridge (2009).

as elaborate and polyphonic as Joyce's, but with its own nuances by using a historicized language. The *katharevousa* they have used indeed highlights the artificiality and foreignness of the text, as well as its pompousness in a similar manner as the elaborate styles in the original, while they have added many elements of *dimotiki* such as colloquial words. For example, in the original, the phrase 'Dope is my only hope' (*U* 14.1024) attributed to Haines when he appears suddenly, is considerably incompatible with the gothic novel style of the section. Kapsaskis has rendered it rather conventionally following the norms of the *katharevousa* variety: 'Το ναρκωτικόν είναι η μόνη μου ελπίς…' (475). However, he adds colloquial elements in other phrases such as 'με την σάκκαν αυτού κρεμασμένην ως φυσεκλίκι από του ώμου' (475) for 'his booksatchel on him bandolierwise' (*U* 14.1047) or 'δια κασετίνας πλήρους αστραφτερών μπιχλιμπιδιών' (476) for 'his case of bright trinketware' (*U* 14.1052). Moreover, the 'bastardized *katharevousa*' ('μιξοκαθαρεύουσα') as Papadimitrakopoulos calls it, corresponds with the English prose literary styles that are imbued with hibernian elements. Having men drinking and conversing about monstrous births in an archaizing, purified, and formal form of Greek has a similar effect as when they converse in the manner of Jonathan Swift, Charles Dickens, or John Ruskin to name a few. When the group migrates to the nearby pub, Kapsaskis's translation converts to an oral demotic mainly composed of highly colloquial and slang expressions.

Although Kapsaskis's approach is somewhat flattening as he renders the multiple subsections by using only one version of an idiom, the use of *katharevousa* already has a different effect because of the connotations and historical echoes it holds for Greek readers in the 1990s. At the time the translation started circulating, most readers would have been familiar with the issues of the language question, the usage of *katharevousa* and its implications, as well as those of the demotic idiom, and many of them might even have had first-hand experience of that diglossia in its multiple levels. As a result, Kapsaskis's choice is not very far from what the episode is achieving in its original language as it manages to draw attention to its writing and its language by appealing to the reader's linguistic and

historical experience. Kapsaskis, with the help of Papadimitrakopoulos, uses both varieties of a historically marked linguistic difference, underlining the artificiality of the archaic, 'purified' idiom, and the colloquialism of the demotic idiom. Apart from rendering (partly at least) the self-referentiality of the written language that is found in the procession of English prose styles, the usage of the *katharevousa* idiom here coincides with the scientific or pseudo-scientific discourse that is employed in the conversation of the medical students in 'Oxen'. *Katharevousa* as an idiom has been associated with high registers, the scientific, academic, and legal discourse, which, alongside their pseudo counterparts, are at the center of 'Oxen'.[61] However, there are also narrative or descriptive passages for which Joyce draws from chronicles, travelers' tales, but also from writers like Daniel Defoe, Laurence Sterne, and, as mentioned earlier, gothic novel writers like Horace Walpole and Sheridan Le Fanu. Kapsaskis uses *katharevousa* for these passages as well. Specifically, Haines's appearance which is written in a gothic style is translated as follows:

> Όμως με την αφήγησιν του Μάλαχι ήρχισαν να παγώνουν εκ φρίκης. Επέτυχεν ώστε η σκηνή να εμφανισθή ενώπιον των οφθαλμών των. Το μυστικόν φάντωμα παρά το τζάκι εγλίστρησε προς τα οπίσω και ανεφάνη εντός αυτού ο… Χένης! Ποίος εξ ημών δεν ησθάνθη να του ορθούται η θρίξ; Εις την μίαν χείρα εκράτει χαρτοφύλακα γέμοντα κελτικής λογοτεχνίας, και εις την άλλην φιάλην με την επιγραφήν *Δηλητήριον*. Έκπληξις, φρίκη, αηδία είχον καταγραφεί εις τα πρόσωπα όλων καθώς ούτος ητένιζε αυτούς με μακάβριον χαμόγελον. (Kapsaskis 1990, 474)

Even though the supporters of *katharevousa* had envisioned the idiom as the prevailing form of linguistic expression in written and oral speech, it was mostly associated with the written form (due to the fact that it was used in all aspects of public life, that is, official documents, announcements, newspapers, textbooks etc.). Consequently, even though Kapsaskis explicitly states that he refrained

[61] See for example the description of the medical students' discussion relating to birth complications, 'all the cases of human nativity which Aristotle has classified in his masterpiece with chromolithographic illustrations', in 14.955-77. The idiom replicated in Kapsaskis's translation (473) is close to the language adopted usually in medical discourse, resulting therefore in a domesticating rather than a foreignizing rendering.

from imitating written styles and searching for analogies, he has provided an imitation of a language that was widely known to the public in its written form.[62]

In his discussion of 'Oxen', Kapsaskis claims that the Greek language had not had the same potentials of evolution as the English language. He presents this as one of the reasons for which he did not attempt to find analogies in Greek for each distinct English style rewritten in 'Oxen'. Whether he thought that the Greek language had a rich history yet incomparable to English, or he thought that there are not enough texts that record and showcase this evolution, it is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, this claim explains why Kapsaskis chose the solution of *katharevousa-dimotiki* binary and reveals the translator's own reading of 'Oxen' as an episode that focuses on language and its growth but completely discards the aspect of written style which concerns the multiple ways in which language can be used in prose. For him, the episode is about linguistic rather than stylistic development, and that is why he is struggling to find analogies. A stylistic approach would reveal that there are, in fact, ways to translate 'Oxen' by using examples from Greek texts and writers—as, for instance, the *katharevousa* of Emmanouil Roidis is different to that of a scientific text, and both are very different, for example, from a Byzantine or a New Testament text, types of the Greek language with which the Greek public is still familiar. Such a mixture could be used for a stylistic mimesis in a Greek 'Oxen'.

Aris Marangopoulos, who is today considered one of the main Greek Joyce scholars, draws attention to the stylistic diversity of 'Oxen' rather than its linguistic challenges. In his reader's guide, *Ulysses: Οδηγός ανάγνωσης* [*Ulysses: Odigos Anagnosis*, 'Ulysses: A reader's guide'], in which he includes an episode-by-episode analysis with translated passages and commentary, he analyzes the different subsections of 'Oxen' through the kinds of style that each of them replicates (2010, 293-322).[63]

---

[62] Kapsaskis uses *katharevousa* in many other instances throughout *Ulysses* to denote and convey stylistic deviations such as the journalistic style, and the scientific and academic discourse in the catalogues of 'Cyclops' or the catechism of 'Ithaca'. Aris Berlis (1991a) criticized him for using *katharevousa* as a go-to solution for every stylistic deviation.

[63] Marangopoulos's *Ulysses: Οδηγός ανάγνωσης* (2001; 2010; 2022) was initially published in 1995 under the title *Ulysses, Οδηγίες προς ναυτιλλομένους: Επιστρέφοντας στον 'Οδυσσέα' του Τζαίημς Τζόυς.*

Marangopoulos suggests that a rendition of 'Oxen' should convey the practice of *anthologizing* that marks the episode as Joyce drew from anthologies for its composition. In his reader's guide Marangopoulos does not translate the entire episode, neither does he translate the gothic-like passage discussed earlier in the three full-length translations. He translates instead a passage which imitates Thomas de Quincey's *Confessions of an Opium Eater* (1821), and the last few lines from the closing of the episode which replicates a variety of vernaculars.[64] Marangopoulos discusses the plot, the Homeric correspondences, the hermeneutical approaches, and the technic of 'Oxen of the Sun'. He breaks down the episode into the various parodies, for which he provides titles ('Ο λόγος ως μηχανισμός του ασυνειδήτου' ['the word as a mechanism of the subconscious'], 'ο λόγος ως η φωνή της αποκάλυψης' ['the word as the voice of the apocalypse'] etc) and summaries, and identifies the styles that are being imitated. As a result, for the gothic-like passage discussed earlier, in which Haines appears, Marangopoulos explains:

> 15. Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΩΣ ΓΟΤΘΙΚΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ
>
> Ο Χέηνς εμφανίζεται πίσω από το τζάκι με τον τόμο της κέλτικης λογοτεχνίας στο ένα χέρι και μια φιάλη που γράφει *Poison* στο άλλο. Ανάμεσα στο μαύρο πάνθηρα του πρωινού του εφιάλτη και το στοιχειό του Μάναναν, ομολογεί, σε ύφος gothic story,* ότι είναι ο δολοφόνος στην υπόθεση της αδελφοκτονίας Τσάιλντς αλλά: *το φταίξιμο είναι στην ιστορία.* Η αδελφοκτονία της Ιρλανδίας παιγμένη από την Αγγλία ως αμλετικό δράμα…** (2010, 303)
>
> 15. THE WORD AS A GOTHIC STORY
>
> Haines appears behind the fireplace with a volume of Celtic literature in one hand and a bottle labeled *Poison* in the other hand. Between the black panther of his morning nightmare and the ghost of Mananaan, he confesses, in a gothic-story style, that he is the murderer in the Childs fratricide case but: *history is to blame.* Ireland's fratricide is staged by England as a Hamletic drama…

In two endnotes, Marangopoulos informs the reader that the passage is possibly drawing from Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), which is considered the first gothic novel (first endnote), and explains the references of the passage to previous parts of the novel such as the Childs murder (which

[64] These translations correspond to *U* 14.1080-1095 (1968, 411) and *U* 14.1578-91 (1968, 425).

is mentioned in 'Proteus'), Haines's phrase 'it seems history is to blame' (which he utters in 'Telemachus'), as well as the '*Poison*' as an allusion to *Hamlet* (second endnote). Marangopoulos, therefore, provides a paraphrase-exegesis of the passage, which he does for all extensive 'parodies' of the episode. He 'translates' but by 'disassembling' the text into its main components (plot, allusions, style) and guides the reader in how to approach and re-assemble it, inviting them therefore to a rewriting of the text. This is an approach he adopts not only for 'Oxen of the Sun', but for the entire novel as he analyzes every episode in such a way.

In his translation of the passage written in imitation of de Quincey, Marangopoulos adopts the sentence structure and rhythm of the source text:

> A region where grey twilight ever descends, never falls on wide sagegreen pasturefields, shedding her dusk, scattering a perennial dew of stars. She follows her mother with ungainly steps, a mare leading her fillyfoal. Twilight phantoms are they, yet moulded in prophetic grace of structure, slim shapely haunches, a supple tendonous neck, the meek apprehensive skull. They fade, sad phantoms: all is gone. (*U* 14.1080-83)

> Μια περιοχή όπου το γκρίζο λυκόφως αιώνια κατέρχεται, ποτέ δεν πέφτει σε απλωμένα σφακοπράσινα βοσκοτόπια, στάζοντας το δείλι του, σκορπίζοντας μια αιώνια αστεριών δροσιά. Ακολουθεί τη μητέρα της με απαίδευτα πατήματα, φοράδα που οδηγεί κορίτσι το πουλάρι της. Κι αν του λυκόφωτος είναι οπτασίες πλάθονται όμως σε προφητικής χάρης καλούπι, λεπτοί καλόσχημοι γλουτοί, λυγερός νευρώδης λαιμός, πράο καταδεκτικό κρανίο. Σβήνουν, θλιμμένες οπτασίες: όλα φύγανε. (2010, 293)

The vocabulary he uses corresponds to the lyrical tone of the text ('κατέρχεται', 'στάζοντας το δείλι του') while he also emphasizes it through a syntactical shift: '*σκορπίζοντας μια αιώνια αστεριών δροσιά*' instead of 'μια αιώνια δροσιά αστεριών' for the phrase 'scattering a perennial dew of stars'. Marangopoulos attempts to create stylistic fluctuations by using a language that is commonly used and its potentialities, such as its syntactical flexibility, the ability to make compound words ('σφακοπράσινα'). In contrast to what happens in the three full-length translations, the translated excerpts from 'Oxen' in Marangopoulos's reader's guide, as well as in his album *Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο* (1997), do not attempt to rewrite the text by mimicking older varieties of the Greek

language; instead, they focus on a prose style that uses older or literary forms and flexible sentence structure. Urging against translations that 'flatten' the episode's stylistic fluctuations by only using one style, Marangopoulos argues for the importance of focusing on stylistic diversity and imitation rather than finding analogies for every parody, proposing thus a way of translating 'Oxen' that contrasts with the 'untranslatability' put forward by Kapsaskis.[65]

'Oxen of the Sun' in the other two translations

Kapsaskis's admission that there are other ways through which the episode could be translated and that he chose what he considered more appropriate depending on his abilities, as well as the prismatic processes that he hints at, direct us to the other two Greek translations of Joyce's novel, the one published by Pairidis—where 'Oxen' belongs to the part completed by Thomopoulos—and the one completed by Anevlavis. There seems to be a similar struggle in these two translations as to how to render not simply the stylistic fluctuations, but the episode in its entirety. In the Pairidis translation, the entire episode has been rendered into *dimotiki*, with no attempt to highlight the stylistic diversity or the different discourses of certain passages by using other forms of the language or idioms. The different passages where Leopold Bloom appears as a noble knight or a traveler, have been translated into a simple accessible demotic which runs throughout the entire episode while more colloquial and slang phrases are employed towards the end. While the stylistic diversity is not immediately apparent, Bloom's different names and 'titles' are translated, alternating and substituting one another across subsections. Bloom is identified as 'ο ξένος που βάδιζε', 648 ('some man that wayfaring was', 14.71), 'ο ταξιδιώτης Λεόπολντ', 650 ('the traveller Leopold', 14.126), 'μικρός' or 'παιδί', 652 (for 'childe'

[65] Marangopoulos has revised his reader's guide multiple times (1995; 2001; 2010), and republished it, along with *Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο* (1997) for the centenary of 2022. Revisions are found in the translated excerpts as well, something which shows that Marangopoulos's translation process includes retranslation and revisiting.

(14.160) which actually means 'a young man of noble birth') and 'σερ' ('sir'). Dixon appears as 'ένας νεαρός μαθητευόμενος ιππότης που τον έλεγαν Ντίξον', 650 ('a young learningknight yclept Dixon', 14.125) and Haines as a frightening specter:

> Αλλά η αφήγηση του Μαλαχία άρχιζε να τους παγώνει από φρίκη. Έκαμε να παρουσιαστεί η σκηνή εμπρός στα μάτια τους. Το μυστικό φάντωμα πλάι στο τζάκι γλίστρησε προς τα πίσω και απομέσα φάνηκε ο… Χέινς! Ποιος από μας δεν ένιωσε να του σηκώνεται η Τρίχα; Κρατούσε στο ένα χέρι έναν χαρτοφύλακα γεμάτον με κελτική λογοτεχνία, και στο άλλο μια φιάλη με την επιγραφή *Δηλητήριο*. Έκπληξη, φρίκη, αηδία είχαν ζωγραφιστεί σε όλα τα πρόσωπα καθώς τους κοίταζε μ' ένα μακάβριο χαμόγελο. (Thomopoulos 1969-1976, 689)

The phrases through which the characters are introduced or mentioned are preserved in the form of a mocking imitation, a parody, but the style of the passages in which they appear has been replaced by a an everyday demotic and remains the same, giving no explanation for the sudden changes in those figures' presentation. In the Pairidis translation, the reader is confronted with the question as to why, all of a sudden and well into the book (it is the fourteenth out of eighteen episodes after all), the protagonist is called by names that are not only out of place, but are also alternating without any obvious pattern. There might be an understanding of vague irony considering the content that the reader has already encountered (before 'Oxen', major stylistic diversities are found in 'Sirens', 'Cyclops', and 'Nausicaa'), and an understanding that there is an element of parody but it is not supported by anything else in the text and is not carried forward, making this parodic element appear arbitrary. Even though the choice of adopting the demotic throughout could initially be seen as domesticating 'Oxen' as it is more readable, a foreignizing, mystifying effect is still achieved by Thomopoulos, but through the omissions of the stylistic deviations. While the translation of these unexpected attributes conveys irony, the mimetic effect in which the style is produced through the characters is not achieved.

In the history of translations of *Ulysses* into Greek, the Pairidis translation is a first-generation translation of *Ulysses*, which lacks sophistication and is as literal as possible, what O'Neill defines as a 'naïve' translation (2005, 14). It could be argued, therefore, that its simplistic rendering of 'Oxen' is predictable and anticipated in that sense. However, the historical context of this translation should also be taken into account. Its publication is suggested to have started in 1969, two years after the establishment of the oppressive military dictatorship that lasted until 1974. One of the effects of the regime was a return to a systematic use of the archaizing *katharevousa*, a 'purified' form, an artificial language variety of Greek which Peter Mackridge defines as 'a hybrid consisting of lexical and grammatical features belonging to different historical stages of spoken Greek from Classical times to the present day' (2009, 29). At a time when the language question was slowly being settled as it had evolved into a gradual decline of the *katharevousa* idiom and a wider embrace of the *dimotiki*, the military junta re-established *katharevousa* more systematically in Greek public life and education. Opposers of *katharevousa* also often coincided with the opposition to the regime and writing and publishing in the demotic idiom became a form of resistance or at least an indication of opposition, of an anti-dictatorial gesture. Considering that Pairidis publications was one of the small presses that appeared at the time, many of which were run by supporters of the leftist ideology, it could be argued that the constant use of *dimotiki* throughout *Ulysses* was more than just an easy way to get the translation done, as it carried also political meaning. The translators would have been very familiar with *katharevousa* and would have been able to use it in writing and therefore in translation. Consequently, translating *Ulysses* and 'Oxen', such a stylistically complex and polyphonic text into *dimotiki* could also be seen as a conscious choice rather than an indication of ignorance, sloppiness, or lack of skill.[66]

[66] For more on writing and publishing during the dictatorship, see Van Dyck (1998), Kornetis (2013). On the issue of language, diglossia, and style see Argyriou (1970), and Alexiou (2002).

On the other hand, Anevlavis (2014) follows Kapsaskis's choice of translating the biggest part of 'Oxen', originally written in the procession of English prose styles, into *katharevousa* and then reverting to demotic slang for the last part. While it also includes demotic elements, Anevlavis's *katharevousa* emphasizes its archaic echoes:

> Αλλά η διήγησις του Μαλαχία ήρχισε να τους παγώνει με φρίκην. Ούτος επέτυχεν ως διά μαγείας να εμφανισθή η σκηνή ενώπιόν των. Το κρυφόν φάντωμα πλησίον της καμινάδος ολίσθησεν και εις την εσοχήν ενεφανίσθη… ο Χέινς! Ποίος εξ ημών δεν ησθάνθη την σάρκαν του να φρικιά! Ούτος είχεν ένα χαρτοφύλακα πλήρη κελτικής λογοτεχνίας εις την μίαν χείρα, εις την άλλην φιάλην επιγραφομένην *Δηλητήριον*. Έκπληξις, τρόμος, απέχθεια απεικονίζετο εις όλα τα πρόσωπα ενώ αυτός τους παρετήρει με απόκοσμον μοχθηρόν μειδίαμα. (Anevlavis 2014, 640)

Anevlavis's 'Oxen' has a similar effect to Kapsaskis's, but it appears twenty-four years later. It is now read by an audience that might not be as familiar with the implications of the language question as the 1990s Greek readership would have been. Many readers of the 2010s would have had memories of living in a linguistically divided environment, but a big part of the readers would also feel more estranged when faced with an older form of their spoken language that is no longer in use.[67] Although the connotations might be lost on some readers, by using this archaizing idiom, Anevlavis creates the effect of a linguistic and temporal distance and difference. Compared to the translations by Thomopoulos and Kapsaskis, the notion of 're-foreignization', that Bollettieri Bosinelli and Torresi (2020) have argued happens when translating *Ulysses*, becomes more prominent in Anevlavis's translation. By using an idiom that is already quite unfamiliar to the readership, and will be increasingly more foreign for the readers to come, Anevlavis restores the initial foreignness of the episode.[68]

---

[67] See also the controversies over the need of this generation for intralingual translations of writers who wrote in *katharevousa* such as Emmanouil Roidis, Alexandros Papadiamantis, Yeorgios Vizyinos. Dimitris Kalokyris's translation of Roidis's *Η Πάπισσα Ιωάννα* into *dimotiki* in 2005 raised a big debate (even though a similar attempts had preceded Kalokyris). See 'Το σκάνδαλο της μετάφρασης Ροΐδη', *Διαβάζω* (2006) 459, 48-62.

[68] Bollettieri Bosinelli and Torresi argue for the notion of '*re*-foreignization' in *Ulysses*, that is about 'restoring *Ulysses* to its legitimate foreignness in a recipient culture that differs not only geographically, but also diachronically, from the culture it was originally intended for', (2020, 258-70: 260)

Despite the solutions they adopt to create alienation in style, all three translations end up doing what Marangopoulos describes as a 'flattening' of the stylistic fluctuations (2010, 322). Such translations, however, rewrite 'Oxen' by using other references of struggle that are familiar to the Greek reader, such as references to debates over written language, or language in general, as well as freedom of expression, while they also convey the notion of translation as a prism, by each presenting a different version. Furthermore, Kapsaskis informs us of his own personal agonistic stance towards the episode which entailed a struggle with the English and the Greek language, the limitations of these languages, as well as his own personal boundaries. As a result, the episode of 'Oxen', in which labor is a central concept, becomes in translation an episode of translational struggle. In its Greek manifestations specifically, it becomes an episode about linguistic struggle among everything else. Whereas in the original 'Oxen' language and style are seen as the elements through which labor, gestation, and fertilization are realized, in the Greek translation, these components are mostly connected with agonistic concepts rather than the idea of recycling and reproduction. In a 'transtextual reading' of all three Greek translations, the dynamics change. 'Oxen' is still an agonistic episode, but the balance between the aspects of struggle shifts. What comes to the fore is a register binary and the tension within rather than a multiplicity of literary styles. Instead of an imperialistic literary canon, such a struggle echoes issues pertaining to the Greek language question and its debates. More than that, 'Oxen', as it has been translated in Greek, foregrounds also the struggle of free expression in connection to the restrictions imposed by the military junta and its own regulations over 'appropriate' language, the struggle of the non-native reader (due to cultural and temporal distance) and the translator with the limitations of the language and his own personal limitations.

Kapsaskis's 'in lieu of a preface': prismatic agon and the reader as translator

In his overall apologetic preface, Kapsaskis admits weakness, limited solutions, and inability especially in terms of 'Oxen of the Sun' due to lack of familiarity with the writers referenced and the development of the English language. His choices in 'Oxen' could be seen as an effort to not 'disrespect' any language, neither English nor Greek nor Joyce's text. One way of reading Kapsaskis's apology is as an admission of his inability, as a presentation of a half-translation, a 'translational attempt' ('μια «μεταφραστική απόπειρα»') as he claims, and as a way to deal with what he claims is untranslatability. Kapsaskis's humbleness towards the reader but also towards the text and its writer—after all he adopts the notion of the translator's secondary status in relation to the author figure—can be seen initially as an admission of defeat. Upon a closer reading of his preface however, it could be argued that Kapsaskis's approach is much more nuanced. By explaining the reasoning behind his choices and analyzing his sources and other possible options and solutions, not only does he allow the reader to understand his working method step by step, but he also presents the process of translation as a constant struggle with texts and languages. Additionally, Kapsaskis expresses his own agon over the alternative forms that the translation could have taken, or can take in the future. The reader is to decide for themselves whether the choices—at least those that Kapsaskis explains in the preface—but also the whole translation process as he has approached it can render *Ulysses* adequately. Moreover, the reader is invited not only to understand, but also to think about translation as a product and a process, as both a finished and unraveling, unfinishing text, and to participate in it. Instead of an admission of defeat, the preface is rather an opening to the reader to think critically about the translated text and the book in their hands, to think about how it was produced, how it came to acquire this form, and the 'original' text behind it. Kapsaskis challenges his readers to think about that which is *not* there making them aware of the inherent multiplicity of translation and the prismatic processes that it requires, and invites them to take part in these processes. The reader, therefore, is invited and

invoked to rewrite and translate *Ulysses*. As a result, with his translation and discussion of his choices, which frames his *Οδυσσέας*, Kapsaskis also 'carries across' the inherent openness of Joyce's novel, the feature that invites any reader to a rewriting and therefore invokes multiple, unfinishing readings of the novel. Even though there is no mentioning of the multiple textual variants and editions of the text, the Greek audience understands that *Ulysses* is an open novel which is constantly rewritten by its readers. Kapsaskis's prismatic agon contributes to a mode of retranslating and re-reading the novel, an unfinishing mode with which critics, translators, and writers have been responding and reading *Ulysses*, and to which the common reader is now invited. Consequently, while presenting the original text as settled and finished, he promotes the unsettled status of translation as a modality through which to read *Ulysses*, a modality which corresponds with that of the unfinishingness which characterizes the responses in the Greek trajectory of *Ulysses*.

Conclusion: is *Ulysses* translatable?

Among the reflections about local issues and theoretical concerns, the reviews of Kapsaskis's translation discussed in this chapter return to the same question: is it, after all, possible to translate *Ulysses*? Rejecting Kapsaskis's translation altogether, Berlis believes that a potentially satisfying translation of *Ulysses* will be a 'heroic and beautiful failure' which 'will bear imprinted marks of the struggle to achieve the best result possible'.[69] On the other hand, Veltsos supports constant striving and (re)translating, a practice which, he claims, can only secure progressive improvement in translations, and Greek translations of *Ulysses*, while no translation can be a perfect reproduction of

[69] 'Είναι τελικά δυνατόν να μεταφραστεί ο «Οδυσσέας»; Θα μπορούσε να γίνει μια καλή μετάφραση; Αν υπάρξει ευτυχής συγκυρία πολλών προϋποθέσεων, πιθανόν να έχουμε μια μετάφραση ικανοποιητική, που θα φέρει έκτυπα τα σημάδια του αγώνα να επιτευχθεί το καλύτερο δυνατό. Μια τέτοια μετάφραση θα ήταν μια ηρωική και ωραία αποτυχία.' (Berlis 1991a, 12)

the original.[70] For Veltsos, Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* is only the beginning of the many translations of *Ulysses* that should follow in order to contribute to a more holistic approach of Joyce's text. At the same time, Veltsos, referencing Derrida, underlines the importance of 'visible' traces in the translated text, 'imprinted' signs of yearning for the original that cannot be fully translated.[71] Lazos, on the other hand, sees *Ulysses* as a text that demands and at the same time refuses translation, and claims that there cannot be a definitive translation of *Ulysses* just like there cannot be a definitive version of the original text, one of the few references to the instability of *Ulysses* in Joyce's Greek trajectory. Lazos views Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας* specifically as a productive failure, which invites rethinking about local forms, genres, and language, and a reconsideration of the relations between Greek literature and other literatures. Drawing from Derrida's lecture '*Ulysses* Gramophone', Lazos concludes that Kapsaskis's translation is a good translation but not a strong one, one that *Ulysses* demands and denies at the same time. According to Lazos, Kapsaskis's failures reflect the state of contemporary Greek literature and prose and its inability to accommodate Joyce's modernism, foreign genres, forms, and texts.[72] For Lazos, Kapsaskis's translation is merely 'good' because it is accessible, but through its domesticating approach it has failed because it has not managed to preserve the multiplicity of meanings of the original, its idiomatic specificity, and its resistance to interpretation. An agonistic vocabulary marks all these reviews as well as Kapsaskis's preface. Apart from the agonistic terms and the implications of translating *Ulysses* as a struggle or as giving a battle, and even though they contradict one another, these reviews also propose practices of revisiting and repetition, and question the idea of

---

[70] 'Είμαι της γνώμης πως καμία μετάφραση και πολλώ μάλλον η μετάφραση του «Οδυσσέα» που ανθίσταται στις φιλόλογες Σειρήνες, δεν έχει ως μόνο προορισμό τη νοηματική τελείωση.' (Veltsos 1991b, 36)

[71] 'Τον ζήλο του αυτόν [του μεταφραστή] ονομάζω *ζήλο-τυπία* (έντυπο δηλαδή ζήλο για το αδύνατο μεταφραστικό ολοκλήρωμα).' (Veltsos 1991b, 36)

[72] […] δεν είναι μια ισχυρή μετάφραση, αντίστοιχη με εκείνην που απαιτεί και με ζηλοτυπία αρνείται ο *Οδυσσέας*. Είναι μια καλή μετάφραση η οποία τείνει να αφομοιώσει το κείμενο του Joyce και να το αποδώσει με βάση τα κυρίαρχα σχήματα της σύγχρονης ελληνικής πεζογραφίας. Από αυτή την άποψη συνεπώς, ο τρόπος κατά τον οποίο αποτυγχάνει ενδέχεται να ορίζει το στίγμα της σύγχρονης πεζογραφίας μας και ταυτοχρόνως να δίνει λόγο για την αδυναμία της να οικειωθεί τη νεωτερικότητα του Joyce.' (Lazos 1991, 59)

completeness, problematizing, therefore, the very notion of a finished and definitive text which some of these reviews demand from a translation and struggle to find in Kapsaskis's *Οδυσσέας*. Even though part of this controversy stems from Kapsaskis's visibility in the translation, all reviewers conclude with the expectation that an ideal or satisfying translation of *Ulysses* will bear visible and traceable marks of the translation process.

Views of translation as a channel and as a prism emerge in all these reviews. But even when 'channeling' views are expressed, such as in Berlis's review, there is a recognition of the potential of multiple translations. Moreover, they all express an agon over the possible variations of translation, its prismatic quality. However, in this controversy, as well as in Kapsaskis's preface, further questions stem from the reflections on translating *Ulysses*, questions related to the state of Greek literature, criticism, translation theory, and readership. A prismatic view of translation allows us not only to read all three translations as different 'refractions' of *Ulysses*, but also to reconsider them through Kapsaskis's agonistic preface. Prismatic agon, therefore, is not limited to Kapsaskis's personal reaction towards his work. It is extended to the reader, and is proposed as a possible way of reading translation. Prismatic agon marks the full-length translations of *Ulysses* in Greece, not only because Kapsaskis expresses his doubts, but mainly because of the theoretical discussion that ensues, because of an attempt at prescriptive discourse which starts from translation—translation as an act, a process and a field of study—and ends up focusing on local practices and the target literature itself. The oscillation between channel and prism, the awareness of the one-sidedness and the multiplicity that co-exist in translation and the discussion it generates, appear in the discourse about the Greek translations of *Ulysses* and can help us reconsider them more productively, as an evolving network, while also understanding the practices involved.

Agonistic approaches, weird modalities, fragmentary readings characterize the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece. They all entail recurring practices and draw attention not only to the processual

aspect of the text, but also to the peripheral status of the Greek literary space. Thinking back to Orsini's argument about encounters in small communities, 'multilingual locals', and the role of translation in them (2015), as well as Karen Emmerich's experience with translating *Γλαύκος Θρασάκης* [*Glafkos Thrassakis*] which involved significant editorial intervention (2017), it becomes more and more clear that world literature is not a canon universally accepted, or the writers who achieve popularity outside the borders of their place of origin, or texts that are approved by certain critics. World literature is the processes of circulation and dissemination often within localities, the institutions, individual initiatives, and the practices involved in them as well as texts that do not get translated or circulated (Orsini 2015, 349). Practices that involve questioning, reading and returning, translating, revising, and retranslating are encouraged in the peripheries and are formed by the specificity of the literary space. *Ulysses* in Greece goes through processes of editing, reading, writing, all of which involve translation. Such processes unsettle the text, question its completeness, and try to read it through its unfinishedness. The unfinished is a characteristic of the text which is taken up by such processes and practices and is opened up, added to, revisited. Motivating new readings, an active approach develops, that of the 'unfinishing' and becomes a modality through which to read and talk about a centrally established and unfinished modernist text in a peripheral literary space.

Conclusion: 'unfinishing' *Ulysses*

> '[…] η γραφή του Τζόυς δεν τελειώνει ποτέ, γιατί κάθε φορά ξαναγράφεται, ανάλογα με το μελετητή και τον αναγνώστη που την προσεγγίζει.'
> '[…] Joyce's writing never ends because it is rewritten every time, depending on the researcher and the reader who approaches it.'

This phrase, from the opening of Aravantinou's monograph *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* (1977, XVII), marks Joyce's writing not simply as incomplete or open, but also as if it is being un-finished again by every new approach, every researcher and reader. This is reflected in the tentative way in which the agents involved speak about their responses to *Ulysses*. In *Κοχλίας*, the Joyce translations were the only ones labeled 'μεταφραστική προσπάθεια' ('translational attempt'). In the preface to his translation of *Ulysses*, Kapsaskis expresses openly that he worked to the limits of his capabilities and anticipates more and different retranslations. Referring to his rendering of the most challenging episode, 'Oxen of the Sun', Kapsaskis also uses the term 'μεταφραστική απόπειρα' which could be seen retrospectively as a characterization of his entire translation. Finally, apart from her designation of her monograph as 'nothing but the beginning', Aravantinou also expressed disinterest in finishing her dissertation on Joyce and saw her research as being simply about giving hints which someone else would take up and develop further in the future (1983b, 62). Presenting her translations of passages from *Finnegans Wake*, translations which she published, revised, and republished, she used the term 'δοκιμές μετάφρασης' as well as 'λειψά σημειώματα' (1983a, 201).

The awareness expressed by the agents involved in the trajectory of Joyce and *Ulysses* in Greece, which leads them to label their responses as 'attempts', 'drafts', 'notes' or 'hints', shows something about the entire process of circulation and dissemination of *Ulysses* which problematizes the world literature models proposed by Pascale Casanova (2004) and Franco Moretti (2000). Considering the precise circumstances under which texts and writers cross borders reflects the

obstacles and difficulties in the processes of circulation and dissemination. Moreover, it allows us to view the people involved in these processes as embodied agents with their own approach, skills, ideology, initiative, and doubts. Along with concepts that have been established in world literature scholarship such as consecration, popularity, marketability, language and its major/minor status, the study of practices can be a more accurate representation of how these processes are achieved. Attention to literary markets, as suggested by David Damrosch (2014), invites a consideration of who is involved in the market and in what ways. Moreover, the study of practices can help us frame critically events that are considered 'minor' or 'false starts' contributing to an accurate representation not only of world literature, but also of local literatures. Focusing on small multilingual communities, Francesca Orsini (2015) argues for the study of minor events and the consideration of texts that do not get translated or circulated alongside with those that do. This thesis shows that such an approach can also be productive in other literary spaces of contested status, such as the Greek literary space which, due to its geographical and cultural specificity, is often seen as a European literature and is therefore assumed to be western and central, but, at the same time, is considered a literature of a minor language which is often overlooked in world literature scholarship.

Using, therefore, the term 'unfinishing' to talk about the practices and strategies involved in the circulation and dissemination of *Ulysses* in Greece emphasizes not only the awareness of unfinishedness, but also the idea of it as inviting further responses. Moreover, it highlights the processual aspect of those practices, the fact that they consist of recurring acts, re-readings, and revisitings of the text. As discussed in the first chapter, in the 1930s and 1940s a group of writers belonging to the Thessaloniki School keep returning to *Ulysses* multiple times through translations of three different passages. Starting from issues of form and genre, they then turn their focus to the work itself and its place in literary history and finally move on to questions concerning its themes and characters all the while engaging with its textuality through translation. During that time, *Ulysses*

becomes a key text for strategies of canonization, literary establishment, and forming an alternative response to modernism. In the 1960s-1980s, Aravantinou presents Joyce through the Greek part of his archive and the way in which he used language and idiom in his work. She examines the minor figures and events in Joyce illustrating their impact on his work, foregrounding issues of biography and transnational authorship. Finally, after the first full-length translation of *Ulysses* in the late 1960s and 1970s which has been overlooked, the second translation, this time by Sokratis Kapsaskis in the 1990s, draws attention to the struggle of the translator. Kapsaskis's translation and preface, as well as the discussion formed in the reviews promote translating *Ulysses* as a recurring practice. With the full-length translations, the issue of *Ulysses* as a book raises questions about who reads *Ulysses* in translation.

Through the practices they incorporate, these events create new ways of reading *Ulysses* in the Greek literary space which keep the text's unfinishedness in view and are based on fragmentary, weird, agonistic, and prismatic modes. Considering all these strategies adopted throughout the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece, and the way in which they involve translation without seeking finality, raises the question of what exactly constitutes a translation of *Ulysses*, at least into Greek. In his reader's guide, *Ulysses: Οδηγός ανάγνωσης* (2001; 2010; 2022), published initially as *Ulysses. Οδηγίες προς ναυτιλλομένους: επιστρέφοντας στον Οδυσσέα του Τζαίημς Τζόυς*, (1995) and in *Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο: τόποι και γλώσσες στον Οδυσσέα του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* (1997; 2022), Aris Marangopoulos provides a reading of *Ulysses* through translated passages, commentaries, interpretations, and visual sources such as photos and advertisements. Aiming at 'initiating' and inviting the reader's participation, Marangopoulos's work could be viewed as another act of translating *Ulysses* in Greece which has been published, revised, and re-issued multiple times, marked therefore by unfinishing strategies. Marangopoulos has not published a full-length translation of *Ulysses* nor of any other work by Joyce apart from the fragmentary *Giacomo Joyce* (1994; 2018). While he has provided more critical work on Joyce, Marangopoulos's published translations of the Irish writer seem to only focus on passages or fragments, an attitude which could

also be seen as avoiding finality along the lines of the previous events discussed in this thesis. Marangopoulos's work on Joyce is worthy of a study of its own, not only due to spatial limitations, but also due to the potential approaches that such work could generate. Viewing *Ulysses* and Joyce as a work and a writer that require 'initiation', Marangopoulos does not only focus on strictly critical readings, but opens up Joyce to the common reader. His exegetical books aim at facilitating a reading of *Ulysses*, while his references to the English text without providing a full-length translation invite the reader to think about and attempt translation. The unfinishingness in reading *Ulysses* is extended here to the common reader. I did not engage extensively with Marangopoulos's work because I viewed it as part of an examination of reading communities and readerships, whereas in this thesis I was more interested in critics and translators as readers, and critical reading. Throughout its trajectory in Greece, *Ulysses* is read through constant rewriting, retranslating, and adding; it is read as a fragmentary text, as a peripheral text, as an agonistic text. Continuity outweighs the discontinuities observed by Pechlivanos and Politi (2004): Aravantinou was in contact with Pentzikis (Lazaris 1984), and so was Kapsaskis who was aware of the Joyce translations in *Κοχλίας* (Papadimitrakopoulos 2014 [2008]). The fragmentary work done by the translators of the Thessaloniki School, therefore, had a much greater impact on the trajectory of *Ulysses* and Joyce in Greece than previously thought.

An examination of all these responses reveals *Ulysses* in the Greek literary space to have been mostly translated by non-canonical or minor writers, marginal groups and publications. This pattern is already observed in the early reception of *Ulysses* which is orchestrated mostly by writers of the School of Thessaloniki while the intellectual elite of the Generation of the Thirties did not show the same interest. Although Joycean influences have been traced in the work of established writers, their critical or translational engagement with Joyce's texts is more subtle and does not aim at textual circulation and dissemination. One such exception is Kosmas Politis who translated *Dubliners* (*Δουβλινέζοι*, 1971) while *Eroica* (1938) has been read as intertextually linked to 'The Dead' (Mackridge,

1979). Stratis Tsirkas, on the other hand, whose trilogy *Ακυβέρνητες Πολιτείες* [*Drifting Cities*] has also been read as in dialogue with *Ulysses* in terms of the narrative forms it employs, engaged with Joyce only privately, as part of his writing process and not for scholarly or translational purposes (Pechlivanos 2008). Translation and critical reading of Joyce were employed as more strategically formed responses, as seen in *Το 3ο μάτι* and *Κοχλίας*, or became part of passion projects like in the cases of Aravantinou and Kapsaskis. Neither of these is the case with George Seferis, for example, whose work has been read as in interaction with Joyce (Valaoritis, 1988, Kapsetakis 1998-1999) although the connections are sparse. Joyce figures in Seferis's essays and diary writing only in the form of brief references. In his 1941 essay about the reception of English literature in Greece, 'Pour les voyageurs du «Sea-Adventure»' ('Για τους ταξιδιώτες του Sea-Adventure'), Seferis describes his first memory of Joyce when he still knew nothing about him: a photo on the display of Shakespeare and Company surrounded by Greek flags the year that *Ulysses* was published (*Δοκιμές Γ'*, 56-69; 315-25). In a diary entry for 19 January 1941, Seferis notes his thoughts upon reading about Joyce's death, while another entry recorded a year later could be read as an indication of Seferis reading (about) Joyce:

> *Σάββατο, 14 Μάρτη [1942]*
> Διαβάζοντας μια βιογραφία του James Joyce, συλλογίζομαι τούτη την παράξενη σύμπτωση: Όσο προχωρεί η *Οδύσσεια* που γράφει, χάνει το φως του. Λίγους μήνες προτού την τελειώσει, έχει τέτοιες κρίσεις στα μάτια που κυλιέται από τους πόνους στο πάτωμα. Ο τυφλός Όμηρος, ο τυφλωνόμενος Joyce. (*Μέρες Δ'*, 196)
>
> *Saturday, 14 March [1942]*
> Reading a biography of James Joyce, I am thinking about this strange coincidence: As he progresses with the *Odyssey* he is writing, he is losing his sight. A few months before finishing it, he has such episodes that make him roll on the floor from the pain. Homer blind, Joyce going blind.

Seferis's 'interaction' with Joyce is often seen in the context of the development of the 'mythical method' in his poetry, a term used by T. S. Eliot to define the way in which myth is used as an organizational schematic of order for reality in *Ulysses* (1923). Eliot was encouraged to write this review

by Joyce, as part of the latter's efforts to promote the novel. Seferis, however, in his own strategic reading, used the term 'mythical method' to propose a comparison of Eliot and C. P. Cavafy, focusing on the aspect of myth (*Δοκιμές Α',* 324-63), a reading aligned with his own poetics of returning to classical tradition as well as his interpretation of Cavafy. While this dialogue is often read as a Joyce influence, it is through the lens of Eliot's reading and the connection that Seferis had developed with the poet that it should be viewed. Finally, although Seferis never published any translation of Joyce's work, Maria Athanasopoulou (2021) has shown that the poet had attempted to translate the opening of 'Penelope' as a draft of a translated passage, shorter than the one published by Takis Papatsonis in *Το 3ο μάτι*, is found in one of his notebooks. Athanasopoulou suggests that the draft could be dated from the 1930s, when 'Penelope' was part of the discussions about interior monologue. Considering Seferis's translation practice (Loulakaki-Moore 2010) and his interest in translating writers who influenced him as a form of linguistic and poetic exercise, the fact that this attempt was never developed further can tell us something about the poet's interest in Joyce being more reluctant. What is more, it can also be read as a reaction with elements of the 'unfinishing', which we see developing further in Seferis's retranslations of *The Waste Land*. Maria Oikonomou (2016) shows how the *Odyssey* myth in *Ulysses* functions as a machine through which the novel speaks back to its mythical tradition and repeats it differently every time. Unfinishing reactions could also be seen as responding to this mechanism of repetition which defies reproduction, especially considering that translation reproduces but does not replicate. Further exploration of other modernist texts and their translations can show to what extent unfinishing strategies are employed and how they form the reading of the text in translation.

Critical discussion around Joyce's reception in Greece has been limited to accounts of translations, influences, and references by venturing neither a closer reading of these responses, nor a distant reading within broader contexts such as peripheral modernism or world literature. Discussions

of Greek translations of Joyce often focus on mistakes and misrenderings of culture specific details, while discussions of Joyce's presence in Greek literature turn towards Joycean influences in the work of canonical writers and connections without considering other interactions that are achieved through translation and critical reception, acts which aim at textual circulation and dissemination. This thesis develops readings of translations and critical reception of *Ulysses* in Greece by considering the conditions under which these are produced, and the agents involved. As a result, it brings to light work that has been ignored by scholarship such as Aravantinou's studies on Joyce and translations, or the first full-length translation by Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos (1969-1976). Instead of providing an account, this thesis discusses the modes of reading *Ulysses* which are developed through constant responses and re-readings of the text, positioning, at the same time, the Greek Joyce reception within the broader context of peripheral modernism.

Returning to Eric Bulson's call for thinking about Joyce in relation to world literature (2009), this thesis suggests that a more expanding approach, which will chart and explore the trajectories of Joyce in other languages and literatures is needed. Tracing the different paths and transformations, the circulation and dissemination of Joyce's texts, and the practices through which these are achieved, will allow for a reconsideration of Joyce in the world and the transnational connections of his work. Aiming to contribute to such an approach, this thesis also shows that a study of the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece and the unfinishing aspects of that story can help us reconsider modernist trajectories in peripheral literary spaces. They can help us read more productively projects and responses that have been viewed as inadequate but also revisit minor figures who have been excluded from the canon. Looking at the trajectory of *Ulysses* in Greece also invites a reconsideration of the concept of periphery and highlights the need to problematize it and examine its complexity and its specificity depending on the space, the circumstances, and the temporality. More than that, this thesis shows that it is events related to translation that promote further reading of *Ulysses*, rather than influences and intertextual

links. What became obvious through this thesis was that Joyce's reception in Greece is formed by translation as a way of reading. Rather than reception studies offering a framework to talk about translation, therefore, in this thesis it was through translation studies, comparative literature, and world literature that I addressed the reception of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in Greece.

Bibliography

Alexiou, Margaret (2002), *After Antiquity: Greek Language, Myth, and Metaphor* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Ames, Keri Elizabeth (2005), 'Joyce's aesthetic of the double negative and his encounters with Homer's *Odyssey*', in Colleen Jaurretche (ed.), *Beckett, Joyce and the Art of the Negative*, 15-48 (Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publishers).

Anevlavis, Eleftherios (2008), 'Άννα Λίβυα Πλούραμπελ', *Νέα Εστία* 1812, 1023-66.

Anevlavis, Eleftherios (2012), 'Εξομολόγηση του μεταφραστή', *Νέα Εστία* 1856, 261-78.

Anevlavis, Eleftherios (2014), *Η αγρύπνια των Φίννεγκαν του Τζέημς Τζόυς. Περί τίνος πρόκειται;* (Athens: Kaktos).

Anevlavis, Eleftherios (2016), *Η Κενή διαθήκη του Πάρι Τακόπουλου. Περί τίνος πρόκειται; Αποσκότησόν μου* (Athens: Kalligrafos).

Anevlavis, Eleftherios (2020), *Μόνικιν ή ο τελευταίος των μουνικανών θρυμματοθυμάται* (Athens: Kalligrafos).

Anonymous (1919), 'Ξένη Φιλολογία', *Ο Νουμάς* 614, 12 January, 78.

Anonymous (1919), 'Ξένη Φιλολογία', *Ο Νουμάς* 619, 16 February, 158-59.

Anonymous (1935), 'Ο Εσωτερικός Μονόλογος Ι', *Το 3ο μάτι* 1, reprinted in (1982), *Το 3ο μάτι (1935-1937)*, 25-26 (Athens: ELIA).

Anonymous (1945), note about Joyce, *Παρασκιές*, *Κοχλίας* 1, reprinted in (1983), *Ο Κοχλίας, 1945-1948*, 15-16 (Athens: ELIA).

Apter, Emily (2006), *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature* (Princeton, NJ; Oxford: Princeton University Press)

Aravantinou, Manto (1974), 'Ερμηνευτικές προτάσεις για το "Ξύπνημα των Φίνεγκαν"', *Χνάρι*, 2: 62-67.

Aravantinou, Manto (1975) *Μετα-γραφή ή Εμπειρία συνόρων* (Athens: Ermis).

Aravantinou, Manto (1975-1976), 'Ερμηνευτικές προτάσεις για το *Finnegans Wake*', *Ηριδανός*, 3: 13-27.

Aravantinou, Manto (1977), *Τα ελληνικά του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* (Athens: Ermis).

Aravantinou, Manto (1983a), *Τζαίημς Τζόυς: Ζωή και έργο* (Athens: Themelio).

Aravantinou, Manto (1983b), 'Μαντώ Αραβαντινού: «Καταγράφω τη στιγμή που η ποίηση δημιουργείται…»'. Συζήτηση με τη Νατάσα Χατζιδάκι, *Διαβάζω*, 81: 58-72.

Aravantinou, Manto (1985), 'James Joyce et ses amis grecs', in Jacques Aubert and Fritz Senn (eds.), *James Joyce*, 58-64 (Paris : Éditions de l'Herne).

Aravantinou, Manto (1990), 'Τζέημς Τζόυς. Απόσπασμα από τον «Οδυσσέα»', *Συντέλεια*, 1: 50-52.

Aravantinou, Manto (1998), *Γραφές Α, Β, Γ, Δ, Ε, Ζ*, introduction by Nanos Valaoritis (Athens: Marathias).

Argyriou, Alexandros (1970), 'Το ύφος μιας γλώσσας και η γλώσσα ενός ύφους' in *Δεκαοχτώ Κείμενα*, 189-203 (Athens: Kedros).

Arseniou, Elisavet (1999), 'Κειμενικότητα στο έργο της Αραβαντινού;', *Μανδραγόρας*, 22-23: 35-43.

Arseniou, Elisavet (2006), '*Finnegans Wake*: Πολιτική ταυτότητα, πρωτοπορία και δοκιμές απόδοσης στα ελληνικά.' And 'Επίμετρο μεταφράσεων του *Finnegans Wake*', *Νέα Συντέλεια* 5-6-7, 32-50

Arseniou, Elisavet (2022), 'Η μηχανή «Finnegans Wake» και το σχιζοαναλυτικό μέλλον της ανάγνωσης', *Χάρτης* 42. Accessed through https://www.hartismag.gr/hartis-42/afierwma/i-mikhani-finnegans-wake-kai-to-skhizoanalitiko-mellon-tis-anaghnosis [last accessed on 13 November 2024].

Asimakoulas, Dimitris (2005), 'Brecht in dark times: Translations of his works under the Greek junta (1967-1974)', *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies*, 17 (1): 93-110.

Athanasopoulou, Maria (2021), 'Ο James Joyce του Γιώργου Σεφέρη: μεταγραφή και σχόλιο ενός ανέκδοτου μεταφραστικού σπαράγματος', *Δέλτος*, 9: 60-74.

Averis, Kate; Littler, Margaret; Weiss-Sussex, Godela (2023), *Contested Communities: Small, Minority and Minor Literatures in Europe* (Cambridge: Legenda, MHRA)

Axelos, Loukas (1984), *Εκδοτική δραστηριότητα και κίνηση ιδεών στην Ελλάδα: μια κριτική προσέγγιση της εκδοτικής δραστηριότητας στα χρόνια 1960-1981* (Athens: Stochastis).

Bahun, Sanja (2012), 'The Balkans Uncovered: Toward *Historie Croisée* of Modernism' in Mark Wollaeger, with Matt Eatough (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (New York, NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press), 25-47

Barthes, Roland (1977), 'From Work to Text' in *Image Music Text*, essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath, 155-64 (London: Fontana Press).

Barthes, Roland (1990), *S/Z* trans. Richard Miller; preface by Richard Howard (Oxford: Blackwell).

Beaton, Roderick (1999), *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Benjamin, Walter (2015), 'The Task of the Translator', in *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zorn, with an introduction by Hannah Arendt, 70-83 (London: The Bodley Head).

Berlis, Aris (1991a), 'Η μετάφραση του «Οδυσσέα»: το μυθιστόρημα του Τζέιμς Τζόις στα ελληνικά', *Η Καθημερινή*, 22 February, 12. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Berlis, Aris (1991b), 'Επιλεγόμενα στην κριτική της μετάφρασης του «Οδυσσέα»', *Η Καθημερινή*, 8 March, 12. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Berlis, Aris (1991c), 'Και πάλι για τη μετάφραση του «Οδυσσέα»', *Η Καθημερινή*, 5 April, 12. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Berlis, Aris (2001), 'Η πρόσληψη του Τζαίημς Τζόυς στην Ελλάδα', in *Κριτικά Δοκίμια*, 117-23 (Αθήνα: Ύψιλον).

Berlis, Aris (2002), 'Πώς μετέφρασα το Πορτραίτο', *Νέα Εστία* 1750, 685-90.

Birmingham, Kevin (2014), *The Most Dangerous Book: the Battle for James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (London: Head of Zeus).

Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria; Torresi, Ira (eds.) (2007), *Joyce and/in Translation*, *Joyce Studies in Italy* 10 (Roma: Bulzoni).

Bollettieri Bosinelli, Rosa Maria; Torresi, Ira (2020), '(Re-)refore[i]gnizing the Foreign: Notes on the Italian Retranslations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*' in Jolanta Wawrzycka and Erika Mihálycsa (eds.), *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century*, 258-70, European Joyce Studies 30 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi).

Brannon, Julie Sloan (2003), *Who Reads 'Ulysses'? The Common Reader and the Rhetoric of the Joyce Wars* (New York, NY; London: Routledge).

Brinker, Felix and Mayer, Ruth (2022), 'Fleeting, Fast, and Everywhere: An Introduction to Periodical Modernity' in Felix Brinker and Ruth Mayer (eds.), *Modernity and the Periodical Press: Trans-Atlantic Mass Culture and the Avant-Gardes, 1880-1920*, 1-16, Studies in Periodical Cultures 2 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi).

Brinker, Felix and Mayer, Ruth (eds.) (2022), *Modernity and the Periodical Press: Trans-Atlantic Mass Culture and the Avant-Gardes, 1880-1920*, Studies in Periodical Cultures 2 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi).

Brooker, Joseph (2014), 'Reception History' in Sean Latham (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to 'Ulysses'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 19-32.

Budgen, Frank (1972), *James Joyce and the Making of 'Ulysses' and Other Writings* (London: Oxford University Press).

Bulson, Eric (2009), 'Joyce and World Literature' in John McCourt (ed.), *James Joyce in Context*, 137-47 (Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press).

Casanova, Pascale (2004), *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press).

Casanova, Pascale (1999), *La republique mondiale des lettres* (Paris : Editions du Seuil).

Chouliaras, Yorgos (2024), 'Θεώρημα του ενός βιβλίου', *Χάρτης* 61, accessed through [https://www.hartismag.gr/hartis-61/klimakes/thewrima-toi-enos-vivlioi] [last accessed 29 March 2025]

Chua, Han Au (2025), 'Revisiting Pascale Casanova's world literary space', *Textual Practice*, 39(3).

Cixous, Hélène (1968), *L'Exil de James Joyce ou l'Art du remplacement* (Paris : B. Grasset).

Cixous, Hélène (1976), *The Exile of James Joyce* (London: John Calder Ltd).

Conley, Tim (2003), *Joyces Mistakes: Problems of Intention, Irony, and Interpretation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Conley, Tim (2020), *The Varieties of Joycean Experience* (London: Anthem Press).

Corser, Sophie (2022), *The Reader's Joyce: 'Ulysses', Authorship and the Authority of the Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Damrosch, David (2003), *What is World Literature?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Damrosch, David (2014), 'Translation and National Literature' in Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, ed. by Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter, 347-60 (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons).

Damrosch, David (2020), *Comparing the Literatures: Literary Studies in a Global Age* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Damrosch, David (2022), '*La République mondiale des lettres* in the World Republic of Scholarship' in Gisèle Sapiro and Delia Ungureanu (eds.), *Pascale Casanova's World of Letters and Its Legacies* (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill), 39-53.

David, Jérôme (2023), 'Of rivalry and revolution: Pascale Casanova's *World Republic of Letters*' in Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, 2nd ed. (Abingdon: Routledge), 85-90.

Davison, Sarah (2022), 'Oxen of the Sun' in Catherine Flynn (ed.), *The Cambridge Centenary Ulysses: The 1922 Text with Essays and Notes*, 520-28 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Deckard, Sharae; Lawrence, Nicholas; Lazarus, Neil; Macdonald, Graeme; Mukherjee, Upamanyu Pablo; Parry, Benita; Shapiro, Stephen (Warwick Research Collective) (2016), *Combined and Uneven Development: Towards a New Theory of World Literature* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1988), '*Ulysses* Gramophone: Hear say yes in Joyce' in Bernard Benstock (ed.), *James Joyce: The Augmented Ninth*, 27-76 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1995), *Mal d'archive* (Paris : Éditions Galilée).

Dimiroulis, Dimitris (1982), 'Ποιος φοβάται τον Τζέϊμς Τζόϊς; Αποσημειώματα χρονογράφου', *Χάρτης*, 3: 294-298.

Doukas, Stratis (1977), *Μαρτυρίες και κρίσεις* (Athens: Kedros).

Doyle, Laura and Winkiel, Laura (2005), *Geomodernisms: Race, Modernism, Modernity* (Indiana: Indiana University Press).

Dujardin, Édouard (1925), *Les lauriers sont coupés*, préface de Valéry Larbaud (Paris : Albert Messein).

Dujardin, Édouard (1931), *Le monologue intérieur: son apparition, ses origines, sa place dans l'œuvre de James Joyce* (Paris : Albert Messein).

Dujardin, Édouard (1935), 'Οι δάφνες κόπηκαν', trans. Stavrakios Kosmas, *Το 3ο μάτι* 1, reprinted in (1982), *Το 3ο μάτι (1935-1937)*, 25-27 (Athens: ELIA).

Ekici, Armagan (2020), '"Probably not a bit like it really" (*U* 4.99): *Ulysses* in Two Turkish Translations', in Jolanta Wawrzycka and Erika Mihálycsa (eds.), *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century*, 179-201 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi).

Eliot, T. S. ([1923] 1975), '*Ulysses*, Order, and Myth' in Frank Kermode (ed.), *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, 175-78 (London: Faber and Faber).

Ellmann, Richard ([1959] rev. ed. 1982), *James Joyce* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ellmann, Richard (1972), '*Ulysses' on the Liffey* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press).

Ellmann, Richard (1977), *The Consciousness of Joyce* (London: Faber & Faber).

Ellmann, Richard (2005), *Τζέημς Τζόυς*, trans. Athina Dimitriadou, ed. by Aris Berlis (Athens: Scripta).

Emmerich, Karen (2017), *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals* (New York, NY; London: Bloomsbury Academic).

Ernst, Jutta; von Hoff, Dagmar; Scheiding, Oliver (eds.) (2022), *Periodical Studies Today: Multidisciplinary Analyses*, Studies in Periodical Cultures 1 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill).

Finneran, Richard J. (1996), '"That Word Known to All Men" in "Ulysses": A Reconsideration', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 33 (4): 569-82.

Fisher, Mark (2016), *The Weird and the Eerie* (London: Repeater).

Flack, Leah Culligan (2020), *James Joyce and Classical Modernism* (London: Bloomsbury Academic).

François, Anne Isabelle (2017), 'The Mother Tongue as Border' in Nicola Gardini, Adriana X. Jacobs, Ben Morgan, Mohamed-Salah Omri, Matthew Reynolds (eds.), *Minding Borders: Resilient Divisions in Literature, the Body and the Academy* (Cambridge: Legenda, MHRA), 115-34.

Frank, Gustav; Podewski, Madleen (2022), 'The Object of Periodical Studies' in Jutta Ernst, Dagmar von Hoff, and Oliver Scheiding (eds.), *Periodical Studies Today: Multidisciplinary Analyses*, 29-53, Studies in Periodical Cultures 1 (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill).

Gabler, Hans Walter (1981), 'The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts: Practice and Theory of the Critical Edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*', *Text: transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship*, 1: 305-26.

Ganguly, Debjani (2012), 'Global literary refractions: Reading Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* in the post-Cold War era', *English Academic Review*, 25(1): 4-19.

Gardini, Nicola; Jacobs, Adriana X.; Morgan, Ben; Omri, Mohamed-Salah; Reynolds, Matthew (eds.) (2017), *Minding Borders: Resilient Divisions in Literature, the Body and the Academy* (Cambridge: Legenda, MHRA).

Gifford, Don and Seidman, Robert J. (1988), *'Ulysses' annotated: notes for James Joyce's 'Ulysses'*, 2nd ed. rev. and enl. by Don Gifford (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

Gordon, John (2009), "'Mkgnao! Mrkgnao! Mrkrgnao!": The Pussens Perplex' in Morris Beja and Anne Fogarty (eds.), *Bloomsday 100: Essays on* '*Ulysses*', 31-40 (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida).

Gorman, Herbert S. (1941), *James Joyce: A Definitive Biography* (London: John Lane).

Groden, Michael (1977), *'Ulysses' in Progress* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Groden, Michael (1980), *James Joyce's Manuscripts: an Index* (New York, NY: Garland).

Groden, Michael (1991), 'Contemporary Textual and Literary Theory', in George Bornstein (ed.), *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, 259-86 (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).

Groden, Michael (2010), *'Ulysses' in Focus: Genetic, Textual, and Personal Views* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida)

Henke, Suzette A. (1988), 'Speculum of the Other Molly: A Feminist/Psychoanalytic Inquiry into James Joyce's Politics of Desire', *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, 21 (2/3): 149-64.

Hayman, David and Nadel, Ira (1987), 'Joyce and the Family of Emile and Yva Fernandez: Solving a Minor Mystery', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 25(1), 49-57.

Hermans, Theo (2007), *The Conference of the Tongues* (Manchester: St Jerome Pub.).

Homer (2018), *The Odyssey*, trans. by Emily Wilson (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company).

Ioakeimidou, Lito (2009), 'Οι *Δουβλινέζοι* του James Joyce και οι *Τρεις Γυναίκες* του Κοσμά Πολίτη: Από τον ρεαλισμό στην αποτύπωση της εσωτερικότητας' in Eleni Politou-Marmarinou and Sofia Denisi (eds.), *Το διήγημα στην ελληνική και στις ξένες λογοτεχνίες: Θεωρία – γραφή – πρόσληψη*, 446-61 (Athens: Gutenberg).

Ioannidou, Ioanna and Knuth, Leo (1971), 'Greek in "The Mookse and the Gripes" (*FW* 152-156)', *A Wake Newslitter*, New Series VIII (6): 83-88.

Ioannidou, Ioanna and Knuth, Leo (1973), 'Greek in "The Mookse and the Gripes" (concluded) and in "Burrus and Caseous' (*FW* 157-168), *A Wake Newslitter*, New Series X (1): 12-16.

Ioannidou, Ioanna and Knuth, Leo (1975), 'Greek in *Finnegans Wake*', *A Wake Newslitter*, New Series XII (3): 39-54.

Janusko, Robert (1983), *The Sources and Structures of James Joyce's 'Oxen'* (Epping: Bowker)

Johnson, Jeri (2008), 'Composition and Publication History' in James Joyce, *Ulysses: the 1922 text*, ed. with an introduction by Jeri Johnson, xxxviii-lvi (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Joyce, James (1924), *Dedalus: Portrait de l'artiste jeune par lui-même*, trans. Ludmila Savitzky, (Paris : Éditions de la Sirène).

Joyce, James (1926), 'Cendres', trans. By Yva Fernandez, *La Revue Nouvelle*, 15 February, 1-7, reprinted in *Gens de Dublin* (1926), trans. Hélène du Pasquier, Jacques-Paul Renaud, Yva Fernandez, introduction by Valery Larbaud, (Paris : Librairie Plon)

Joyce James ([1929] 1930), *Ulysse*, traduction française intégrale de Auguste Morel, assisté par Stuart Gilbert ; entièrement revue par Valéry Larbaud et l'auteur (Paris : La Maison Des Amis Des Livres).

Joyce, James (1929), 'Η Εβελίνα. Διήγημα—Παρουσιασμένο στη Νεοελληνική από το Θράσο Καστανάκη', trans. Thrasos Kastanakis, *Αγών των Παρισίων*, 27 April, 159: 6.

Joyce, James (1932), *Ulysses* (Hamburg, Paris, Bologna : The Odyssey Press).

Joyce, James (1935), 'Εβελιν', trans. Angelos Terzakis, *Νεοελληνικά Γράμματα*, 28 April, 8-9.

Joyce, James (1935), *Ulysses*, illustrated by Henri Matisse (New York: Limited Editions Club).

Joyce, James (1936), 'II. Εσωτερικός μονόλογος. James Joyce. Ulysses. (Η αρχή του μονολόγου της Κυρίας Μπλουμ)', trans. Takis K. Papatsonis, *Το 3ο μάτι* 4-5-6 reprinted in (1982), *Το 3ο μάτι (1935-1937)*, 162-63 (Athens: ELIA).

Joyce, James (1940), 'Στάχτη', trans. Elpida Thr. Kastanaki, *Νεοελληνικά Γράμματα* 182, 1; 5.

Joyce, James (1942), *Ulysses* (New York, NY: Modern Library).

Joyce, James (1945), 'Τζέημς Τζόυς, Ο Οδυσσέας. Απόσπασμα: Σελ. 115-120 του αγγλικού κειμένου, στην έκδοση «The Odyssey Press, Hamburg, Paris, Bologna, Σελ. 123-129 στη γαλλική μετάφραση της N. R. F.', trans. Zoi Karelli, Yorgis Kitsopoulos, Karolos Tsizek, Yannis Svoronos, Nikos Gavriil Pentzikis, Lefteris Koniordos, Takis Iatrou, *Κοχλίας*, 1: 12-13. Reprinted in (1983), *Ο Κοχλίας, 1945-1948*, 12-13 (Athens: ELIA).

Harding, Jason and Nash, John (eds.) (2019), *Modernism and Non-translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Herbert, Stacey (2009), 'Composition and publishing history' in John McCourt (ed.) *James Joyce in Context*, 3-16.

Joyce, James (1945), 'Ο νεκρός', trans. Sofia Mavroeidi-Papadaki, *Νέα Εστία* 37 : 48-51, 120-23, 187-90, 273-75, 342-44, 401-04.

Joyce, James (1946), 'Τζέημς Τζόυς. Ο Στήβεν παρά θιν' αλός. Απόσπασμα απ' την αρχή του «Οδυσσέα»', *Κοχλίας*, 6: 100-102. Reprinted in (1983), *Ο Κοχλίας, 1945-1948*, 100-102 (Athens: ELIA).

Joyce, James (1946), 'Eveline: Διήγημα', trans. N. I. Karalopoulos, *Γράμματα* 7: 34-37.

Joyce, James (1953), 'Οι αδελφές', trans. Vangos Papaioannou, *Νέα Εστία* 54: 1046-50.

Joyce, James (1957), *Letters of James Joyce I*, ed. Stuart Gilbert (London: Faber and Faber).

Joyce, James (1961), *Το πορτραίτο του καλλιτέχνη*, trans. Mairi Sarasiotou (Athens: Galaxias).

Joyce, James (1966), *Letters of James Joyce II*, ed. Richard Ellmann (London: Faber and Faber).

Joyce, James (1975), *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, ed. Richard Ellmann (London: Faber and Faber).

Joyce, James (n.d. [1969-1976]), *Odysseas*, trans. Leonidas Nikolouzos and Yannis Thomopoulos, 6 vols. (Athens: Pairidis).

Joyce, James (1971), *Δουβλινέζοι*, trans. Manto Aravantinou (Athens: Galaxias).

Joyce, James (1971), *Δουβλινέζοι*, trans. Sotiris Bernitsas, Stella Vourdouba, Stavros Antoniou (Athens: Pairidis).

Joyce, James (1971), *Δουβλινέζοι*, trans. Kosmas Politis (Athens: Govosti).

Joyce, James (1977), *Giacomo Joyce*, trans. Manto Aravantinou (Athens: Chatzinikoli).

Joyce, James (1977), *Η γάτα και ο διάβολος*, trans. Manto Aravantinou (Athens: Chatzinikoli).

Joyce, James (1979), *James Joyce Archive. Notes, Criticism, Translation and Miscellaneous Writings: A Facsimile of Manuscripts and Typescripts*, vol. III, prefaced and arranged by Hans Walter Gabler (New York, NY.: Garland Publishing Inc.).

Joyce, James (1982), 'Πηνελόπη – Ο μονόλογος της Μόλλυ' trans. Manto Aravantinou, *Ταχυδρόμος*, 24/1466: 80-81.

Joyce, James (1984), *Οι νεκροί*, trans. Aris Berlis (Athens: Krystallo).

Joyce, James (1988), *Ο νεκρός*, trans. D. N. Siatras (Athens : Siatras).

Joyce, James (1990), *Odysseas*, trans. Sokratis Kapsaskis, ed. I. Ch. Papadimitrakopoulos (Athens: Kedros).

Joyce, James (1993), 'Βιβλίο Ι, επεισόδιο 8, Anna Livia Plurabelle, σελ. 215-216', *Προσωπείο*, 10: 14, reprinted and accessed through Arseniou (2006).

Joyce, James ([1986] 1993), *Ulysses: the Corrected Text*, ed. Hans Walter Gabler with Wolfhard Steppe and Claus Melchior (New York, NY: Random House).

Joyce, James (1994), *Giacomo Joyce*, trans. Aris Marangopoulos (Athens: Smili).

Joyce, James (2001), *Πορτραίτο του καλλιτέχνη σε νεαρά ηλικία*, trans. Aris Berlis (Athens: Patakis).

Joyce, James (2008), *Ulysses: The 1922 text*, ed. with an introduction by Jeri Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Joyce, James (2008), *Λουβλινέζοι*, trans. Nikiforos Doukas (Athens: Ars Brevis).

Joyce, James (2010), *Αραβία*, trans. Vania Syrmou-Vekri (Athens : Bilieto).

Joyce, James (2012), *Finnegans Wake*, ed. Finn Fordham, Robbert-Jan Henkes, and Erik Bindervoet (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Joyce, James (2013), *Η αγρύπνια των Φίννεγκαν*, 2 vols., trans. Eleftherios Anevlavis (Athens: Kaktos).

Joyce, James (2014), *Odysseas*, trans. Eleftherios Anevlavis, with a preface by Paris Takopoulos (Athens: Kaktos).

Joyce, James (2016), *Οδυνηρή Υπόθεση*, trans. Vania Syrmou-Vekri (Athens: Bilieto).

Joyce, James (2017), *Λουβλινέζοι*, trans. Thomas Karayannopoulos (Athens: Oxy).

Joyce, James (2018), *Πανσιόν*, trans. Vania Syrmou-Vekri (Athens : Bilieto).

Joyce, James (2018), *Τζάκομο Τζόις*, trans. Aris Marangopoulos (Athens: Topos).

Joyce, James (2021), *Λουβλινέζοι*, trans. Andreas Kappa (Athens: 24 Grammata).

Joyce, James (2022), *Οι νεκροί*, trans. Konstantina Gika (Athens : Nikas).

Joyce, James (2025), *Οι νεκροί*, trans. Achilleas Kyriakidis (Athens : Metaichmio).

Jusdanis, Gregory (1991), *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).

Kakavoulia, Maria (1997), 'Interior monologue: recontextualizing a modernist practice in Greece' in Dimitris Tziovas (ed.), *Greek Modernism and Beyond: Essays in Honor of Peter Bien*, 135-50 (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).

Kallinis, G. (1995), 'Οι Νεκροί του J.J. στην *Eroica* του Κοσμά Πολίτη: μία πολύπλοκη περίπτωση διακειμενικότητας', *Παλίμψηστον* 14/15: 231-242.

Kapsetakis, Lambis (1998-1999), 'Στοιχεία σχετικά με την τύχη του James Joyce στη νεοελληνική λογοτεχνία', *Μολυβδοκονδυλοπελεκητής*, 6: 187-218.

Karantonis, Andreas (1932), 'Στέλιου Ξεφλούδα «Εσωτερική Συμφωνία»', *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες*, 5-6: 209-13.

Karelli, Zoi (1947), 'Η αγάπη κι' ο θάνατος. Εκδοχές και παρατηρήσεις διαβάζοντας τον 'Οδυσσέα' του Τζέϊμς Τζόϋς', *Κοχλίας*, 13: 1-3, 7. Reprinted in *Ο Κοχλίας* (1983), 1-3, 7.

Karelli, Zoi (1982; 1994), *Παρατηρήσεις*, 2 vols. (Athens: Astrolavos-Efthini).

Kazantzis, Tolis (1991), *Η πεζογραφία της Θεσσαλονίκης 1912-1983* (Thessaloniki: Ekdoseis Vanias).

Kearns, John (2017), '*Finneganów tren*, *Da Capo al Finne*, and *Finnegans _ake*: Krzysztof Bartnicki, translation and authorship' in Michelle Woods (ed.), *Authorizing Translation* (London; New York, NY.: Routledge), 96-113.

Kefala, Eleni (2007), *Peripheral (Post) Modernity: the Syncretist Aesthetics of Borges, Piglia, Kalokyris and Kyriakidis* (New York, NY: Peter Lang).

Kenner, Hugh (1987), '*Ulysses*', revised edition (Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Kimball, Jean (1987), 'Love and Death in "Ulysses": "Work Known to All Men"', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 24 (2): 143-60.

Kitsopoulos, Yorgos (1962), 'Παράδοση εσωτερικότητας [Οι πεζογράφοι της Θεσσαλονίκης]', *Νέα Εστία*, 850: 1782-85.

Kitsopoulos, Yorgos (1994), 'Ανηρτημένο παρελθόν – "*Κοχλίας*" 1946-1948 – Τάφος νηπίου', *Νέα Πορεία*, 474-476: 163-177.

Kokolis, X. A. (2001), *Ο μεταφραστής Σεφέρης: αρνητική κριτική* (Athens: Kastaniotis).

Kolocotroni, Vassiliki (1999), '"Familiar Materials": Joyce among Europeans', *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies*, 20: 209-22.

Kolocotroni, Vassiliki (2000), Reviewed works: *Latin and Roman Culture in Joyce* by R. J. Schork; *Greek and Hellenic Culture in Joyce* by R. J. Schork, *Translation and Literature*, 9 (1): 126-30.

Kolocotroni, Vassiliki (2019), 'The "perpetual immunity" of the word: Joyce and world peace' in Caroline Pollentier and Sarah Wilson (eds.), *Modernist Communities Across Cultures and Media*, 141-58 (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida).

Kornetis, Kostis (2013), *Children of the Dictatorship: Student Resistance, Cultural Politics and the 'Long 1960s' in Greece* (New York, NY: Berghahn Books).

Kotini, Theoni (2019), *Κάθεται μονάχος ο διπλός τούτος άνθρωπος: η ποιήτρια Ζωή Καρέλλη (1901-1998)* (Athens: Idryma Takis Sinopoulos, Ekdoseis Gavriilidis).

Koumantareas, Menis (1973), 'Οι μεταφράσεις Τζόυς στην Ελλάδα', *Η Συνέχεια*, 1: 44-45.

Kouroudis, Kostas (1997), *Το περιοδικό "Κοχλίας". Θεσσαλονίκη (1945-1948). Εισαγωγή, συνεντεύξεις, βιβλιογραφία* (Paiania: Bilieto).

Lambropoulos, Vassilis (1988), 'Who has been Reading Masterpieces on Our Behalf? George Seferis, Makriyannis, and the Literary Canon', in *Literature as National Institution. Studies in the Politics of Modern Greek Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 44-65.

Latham, Sean and Scholes, Robert (2006), 'The Rise of Periodical Studies', *PMLA*, 121 (2): 517-31.

Lawrence, Casey (2023), *'The New Womanly Man': Cross-dressing and Gender Inversion in Joyce and his Contemporaries*, PhD thesis, Trinity College Dublin.

Lawrence, Karen (ed.) (1998), *Transcultural Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lazaris, Nikos (1984), 'Ν. Γ. Πεντζίκης, ένας συγγραφέας πολιούχος', *Γράμματα και τέχνες*, 26: 11-12.

Lazos, Ch. G. (1991), 'Πώς μεταφράζεται η φωνή της γάτας;', *Αντί*, 3 May, 465: 56-59.

Lernout, Geert and Van Mierlo, Wim (2004), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, 2 vols (London; New York, NY: Thoemmes Continuum).

Letsios, Vasilis (2018), 'Ο μεταφραστής Τ. Κ. Παπατσώνης', *Φρέαρ*, 22: 276-88.

Levine, Jennifer (2004), 'Ulysses' in Derek Attridge (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*, 122-48 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lidderdale, Jane H. and Nicholson, Mary (1970), *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver, 1876-1961* (London: Faber and Faber).

Logothetis, Iraklis D. (2022), *Τα κανάλια της Κίρκης. Μια ανάγνωση του δέκατου πέμπτου κεφαλαίου από τον Οδυσσέα του Τζέημς Τζόυς* (Athens: Nikas).

Loulakaki-Moore, Irene (2010), *Seferis and Elytis as translators* (Bern; Oxford: Peter Lang).

Loukopoulou, Eleni (2024), 'James Joyce's Portrait in London's Greek Newspaper *Hē Hesperia* (1916-20), *Journal of European Periodical Studies*, 9 (2).

Luckhurst, Roger (2017), 'The weird: a dis/orientation', *Textual Practice*, 31 (6): 1041-61.

Lyall, Scott (2019), 'Minor Modernisms: The Scottish Renaissance and the Translation of German-language Modernism', *Modernist Cultures* 14(2), 213-35.

Mackridge, Peter (1979), 'Symbolism and Irony in Three Novels by Kosmas Politis', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 5: 77-93.

Mackridge, Peter (2009), *Language and National Identity in Greece, 1766-1976* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Mackridge, Peter (2011), 'Συμβολικές και ειρωνικές δομές στην *Eroica*', in *Eroica*, Kosmas Politis (Athens: Estia), κε'-πς'.

Mahaffey, Vicki (1988), *Reauthorizing Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Mahaffey, Vicki (1991), 'Intentional Error: The Paradox of Editing Joyce's *Ulysses*' in George Bornstein (ed.), *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*, 171-92 (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).

Maitra, Dipanjan (2016), 'Of contorted politics: A note on the VIII.A notebooks of 1916', *Genetic Joyce Studies*, 16: 1-10.

Marangopoulos, Aris (1995), *'Ulysses', Οδηγίες προς ναυτιλλομένους: Επιστρέφοντας στον 'Οδυσσέα' του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* (Athens: Delfini).

Marangopoulos, Aris (1997), *Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο: Τόποι και γλώσσες στον 'Οδυσσέα' του Τζαίημς Τζόυς* (Athens: Kedros) revised and reprinted in 2022 as *Αγαπημένο Βρωμοδουβλίνο: Τόποι και γλώσσες στο 'Ulysses' του Τζέιμς Τζόις* (Athens: Topos).

Marangopoulos, Aris (2001), *'Ulysses': Οδηγός Ανάγνωσης* (Athens: Kedros), revised and reprinted by Topos (2010; 2022).

McCarthy, Patrick A. (1991), 'Stuart Gilbert's Guide to the Perplexed', in Janet Egleson Dunleavy (ed.), *Re-Viewing Classics of Joyce Criticism*, 23-35 (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press).

McCourt, John (2000), *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste, 1904-1920* (Dublin: Lilliput Press).

McCourt, John (ed.) (2009), *James Joyce in Context* (Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press).

McCourt, John (ed.) (2010), *Roll Away the Reel World: James Joyce and Cinema* (Cork: Cork University Press).

McKernan, Luke (2010), 'James Joyce and the Volta Programme' in John McCourt (ed.), *Roll Away the Reel World: James Joyce and Cinema*, 15-27 (Cork: Cork University Press).

Mentzelos, Dimitris (1932), 'Γράμματα για τον εσωτερικό μονόλογο', *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες* 8: 292-93.

Mentzelos, Dimitris (1933), 'Ο εσωτερικός μονόλογος', *Κύκλος*, 4: 163-68.

Metaxas, Yannis (1978), 'Η στρατηγική της οικειοποίησης του «Άλλου»', *Διαβάζω*, 12: 62-64.

Mike, Mairi and Gana, Lena (1987), 'Εσωτερικός μονόλογος (Αναδρομική περιδιάβαση και σύγχρονη προβληματική μιας αφηγηματικής τεχνικής', *Φιλόλογος*, 48: 136-60.

Moretti, Franco (2000), 'Conjectures on World Literature', *New Left Review* I: 54-68.

Mygdali, Christiana (2012), *Politics of translation, poetics of culture: the case of Greek translations under the Junta (1967-1974)*, PhD thesis, University of Oxford.

O'Neill, Patrick (2004), 'French Joyce: Portrait of an Œuvre' in Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo (eds.), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, vol. 2 (London: Thoemmes Continuum) 411-21.

O'Neill, Patrick (2005), *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

O'Neill, Patrick (2013), *Impossible Joyce: Finnegans Wakes* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

O'Neill, Patrick (2018), *Trilingual Joyce: The Anna Livia Variations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

O'Neill, Patrick (2022), *Finnegans Wakes: Takes of Translation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Oikonomou, Maria (2016), *Κουπιά και φτερά. Ο μύθος της Οδύσσειας στη λογοτεχνία και στον κινηματογράφο του μοντερνισμού* (Athens: Nefeli).

Orsini, Francesca (2015), 'The Multilingual Local in World Literature', *Comparative Literature* 67 (4): 345-74.

Owen, Rodney Wilson (1983), *James Joyce and the Beginnings of 'Ulysses'* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press).

P. F. P. (1917), 'Γράμματα από την Ελβετίαν', *Εσπερία*, 29 June, 410.

Papadimitrakopoulos, Ilias Ch. ([2003], 2014), 'Σωκράτης Καψάσκης: από το «Studio» στον *Οδυσσέα*' in *Υποκείμενα*, 115-21 (Athens: Gavriilidis).

Papadimitrakopoulos, Ilias Ch. ([2008] (2014), 'Νίκος Γαβριήλ Πεντζίκης' in *Υποκείμενα*, 171-79 (Athens: Gavriilidis).

Papanikolaou, Dimitris (2002), 'Η τέχνη της χειρονομίας: Ξαναδιαβάζοντας τα *18 Κείμενα*', *Νέα Εστία*, 1743: 444-60.

Papanikolaou, Dimitris (2010), '"Κάνοντας κάτι παράδοξες κινήσεις": ο πολιτισμός στα χρόνια της δικτατορίας', in Vangelis Karamanolakis (ed.), *Η στρατιωτική δικτατορία 1967-1974*, 175-96 (Athens: Ta Nea).

Papanikolaou, Dimitris (2018), *Κάτι τρέχει με την οικογένεια: έθνος, πόθος και συγγένεια την εποχή της κρίσης* (Athens: Patakis).

Paraschos, Kleon (1929), 'Ο "Οδυσσεύς" του Τζέϊμς Τζόϊς', *Η Πρωΐα*, 23 June, 5.

Peacock, William (1903), *English Prose from Mandeville to Ruskin* (London: Oxford University Press).

Pechlivanos, Miltos (2002), 'Σημειώσεις για την πρόσληψη του Τζόυς στην Ελλάδα', *Νέα Εστία*, 1750: 644-63.

Pechlivanos, Miltos and Politi, Jina (2004), 'Hellenize it: Joyce in Greece' in Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo (eds.), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, vol. 1, 455-68 (London; New York, NY: Thoemmes Continuum).

Pechlivanos, Miltos (2008), *Από τη* Λέσχη *στις* Ακυβέρνητες Πολιτείες*: η στίξη της ανάγνωσης* (Athens: Polis).

Pentzikis, Nikos Gavriil (1951), 'Περίπατος στην ακρογιαλιά', *Μορφές,* 52-53: 13-18 and 54: 64-69.

Pentzikis, Nikos Gavriil ([1970] 1986), 'Δυνατότητες της αμεσότητας' in *Προς εκκλησιασμό*, 7-27 (Thessaloniki: Agrotikes Synetairistikes Ekdoseis).

Piniatoglou, L. (1932), 'Γράμματα', *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες*, 7: 247-50.

Politi, Jina (1978), 'Σε αναζήτηση ερμηνευτικού μίτου', *Η Καθημερινή*, 20 April, 7. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Politi, Jina (1999), *Στα όρια της γραφής. Δοκίμια για τους Μπέκετ, Τζόυς, Κάφκα* (Athens: Agra).

Politis, Linos (1998), *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, 9th edition (Athens: MIET).

Porter, David (2011). 'The Crisis of Comparison and the World Literature Debates', *Profession*, 2011: 244-58.

Pound, Ezra and Levin, Harry (n. d.), *6 δοκίμια για τον Τζόυς*, trans. Manolis Chairetakis (Athens: Pairidis).

Power, Arthur (1999), *Conversations with James Joyce* (Dublin: Lilliput Press).

Prendergast, Christopher (2001), 'Negotiating World Literature', *New Left Review*, 8: 100-21.

Prendergast, Christopher (2004), 'The World Republic of Letters' in Christopher Prendergast (ed.), *Debating World Literature* (London: Verso), 1-25.

Prendergast, Christopher (ed.) (2004), *Debating World Literature*, (London: Verso).

Rabaté, Jean-Michel (1991), *James Joyce, Authorized Reader* (Baltimore, MD; London: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Rabaté, Jean-Michel (2001), *James Joyce and the Politics of Egoism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Raizis, M. Byron (1979), 'Reviewed work: *Ta Helleniká tou Tzaíems Tzóys* (The Greek of James Joyce) by Manto Aravantinou', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 16 (4): 521-24.

Raizis, Marios V. (1998-2000), 'Οι ελληνικές μεταφράσεις του *Οδυσσέα* του James Joyce', *E. E. F. S. P. A.*, 32: 97-105.

Reynolds, Matthew (2019), 'Prismatic Agon, Prismatic Harmony: Translation, Literature, Language' in Matthew Reynolds (ed.), *Prismatic Translation*, 21-47 (Cambridge: Legenda).

Rodriguez, Liliane (2013), 'Joyce's Hand in the First French Translation of *Ulysses*' in Daniel Ferrer, Sam Slote, and André Topia (eds.), *Renascent Joyce*, 122-41 (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida).

Rzepa, Joanna (2016), 'Translation and Modernism: Mapping the Relationship' *Exchanges* 3(2), 241-246.

Saintsbury, George (1912), *A History of English Prose Rhythm* (London: Macmillan).

Sartori, Elena (2010), *Το περιοδικό Το 3ο μάτι (1935-1937)*, PhD thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Savvidis, G. P. (1991), 'Από τ' ολότελα, όντως καλή κι η Παναγιώταινα;', *Επιφυλλίδες*, *Τα Νέα*, 28 February, 28. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Schork, R. J. (1998), *Greek and Hellenic Culture in Joyce* (Gainesville, FL.: University Press of Florida).

Seferis, Yorgos ([1971] 1992), 'Η Κιβωτός του Νώε' in *Δοκιμές Γ'. Παραλειπόμενα (1932-1971)*, 263-66 (Athens: Ikaros)

Seferis, Yorgos (1981). 'Κ. Π. Καβάφης – Θ. Σ. Έλιοτ· παράλληλοι', in *Δοκιμές Α'* (Athens: Ikaros), 324-63.

Seferis, Yorgos (1984), 'Κ. Π. Καβάφης, Θ. Σ. Έλιοτ· παράλληλοι', in *Δοκιμές Α' (1936-1947)*, 324-63 (Athens: Ikaros).

Seferis, Yorgos (1992), 'Για τους ταξιδιώτες του «Sea-Adventure», in *Δοκιμές Γ'. Παραλειπόμενα (1932-1971)*, 315-25 (Athens: Ikaros).

Seferis, Yorgos (2020), *Μέρες Δ΄* (Athens: Ikaros).

Senn, Fritz (1967), 'The Issue is Translation', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 4 (3): 163-64.

Senn, Fritz (1970), '*Ulysses* in Translation' in Thomas F. Staley and Bernard Benstock (eds.), *Approaches to* Ulysses*: Ten essays*, 249-86 (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press).

Senn, Fritz (1984), *Joyce's Dislocutions: Essays on Reading as Translation*, ed. John-Paul Riquelme (Baltimore, MD; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press).

Senn, Fritz (1995), *Inductive Scrutinies: Focus on Joyce*, ed. Christine O'Neill (Dublin: The Liliput Press).

Shillingsburg, Peter ([1984] 1996), *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).

Slote, Sam (2004a), "Après mot, le déluge' 1: Critical Response to Joyce in France' in Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo (eds.), *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, vol. 2 (London: Thoemmes Continuum) 362-81.

Slote, Sam (2004b), '*Ulysses* in the Plural: The Variable Editions of Joyce's Novel', *The National Library of Ireland Studies* 5 (Dublin: National Library of Ireland).

Slote, Sam; Mamigonian, Marc A.; Turner, John (eds.) (2022), *Annotations to James Joyce's 'Ulysses'* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Spandonidis, Petros (1932), 'Καθρεφτίσματα', *Μακεδονικές Ημέρες*, 1: 29-31.

Stamatiou, Kostas (1991), 'Ο Ιρλανδός Τζόυς, ο Εβραίος Μπλουμ και ο αιώνιος «Οδυσσέας»', *Τα Νέα*, 9 February, 42-43. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Stergiopoulos, Kostas (1985), 'Σχολή Θεσσαλονίκης: Ένα θέμα για συζήτηση', *Νέα Εστία*, 1403: 330-39.

Thacker, Andrew (2016), 'Placing Modernism' in David Bradshaw, Laura Marcus, Rebecca Roach (eds.), *Moving Modernisms: Motion, Technology, and Modernity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 11-26.

Tziovas, Dimitris (1988), 'Η ώρα της πεζογραφίας ή η εξάντληση της ποίησης', *Πόρφυρας*, 47: 68-71.

Tziovas, Dimitris (ed.) (1997), *Greek Modernism and Beyond: Essays in Honor of Peter Bien* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield).

Valaoritis, Nanos (1988), 'Τιώργος Σεφέρης και James Joyce', *Σχολιαστής*, 60: 77-79 and 61: 77-79.

Valaoritis, Nanos (1997), *Μοντερνισμός, πρωτοπορία και 'Πάλι'* (Athens: Kastaniotis).

Van Dyck, Karen (1998), *Kassandra and the Censors: Greek Poetry since 1967* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Vanderham, Paul (1997), *James Joyce and Censorship: Trials of 'Ulysses'* (London: Palgrave Macmillan).

Varon-Vasar, Ondet (ed.), 'Πορτραίτα μεταφραστών: Παύλος Α. Ζάννας', *Μετάφραση '97*, 3: 87-124.

Vayenas, Nasos (1989), *Ποίηση και μετάφραση* (Athens: Stigmi).

Veltsos, Yorgos (1991a), 'Ευφυία', *Εκ μεταφοράς*, *Τα Νέα*, 9 Feburary, 34. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Veltsos, Yorgos (1991b), 'Επιτέλους στα αγγλικά', *Εκ μεταφοράς*, *Τα Νέα*, 2 March, 36. Access provided by the Hellenic Parliament Library.

Venuti, Lawrence (1995), *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation* (London and New York, NY: Routledge).

Venuti, Lawrence (1998), *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (London and New York, NY: Routledge).

Vergara, José (2022), *All Future Plunges to the Past: James Joyce in Russian Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Vitti, Mario (1995), *Η Γενιά του Τριάντα'. Ιδεολογία και μορφή*, revised edition (Athens: Ermis).

Vlachodimos, Dimitris (2007), 'Η «μητρότητα» της ανυπόγραφης εισαγωγής στον «Εσωτερικό μονόλογο»', *Νέα Εστία*, 1800: 930-41.

Voyiatzaki, Evi (2002), *The Body in the Text: James Joyce's 'Ulysses' and the Modern Greek Novel* (Lanham, MD; Oxford: Lexington Books).

Wawrzycka, Jolanta and Mihálycsa, Erika (2020), *Retranslating Joyce for the 21st Century* (Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi).

Williams, Keith (2020), *James Joyce and Cinematicity: Before and After Film* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Wittman Emily O. (2023), *Translation and Modernism: The Art of Co-Creation* (New York, NY: Routledge).

Wollaeger, Mark with Eatough, Matt (eds) (2012), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (New York, NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woods, Michelle (2013), *Kafka Translated: How Translators Have Shaped Our Reading of Kafka* (New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic).

Yao, Steven G. (2002), *Translation and the Languages of Modernism* (New York, NY; Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Issues and sources from the journals *Κοχλίας* and *Το 3ο μάτι* were accessed through the following reprints:

(1983), *Ο Κοχλίας, 1945-1948* (Athens: ELIA)

(1982), *Το 3ο μάτι (1935-1937)* (Athens: ELIA)

Special issues

Μανδραγόρας (1999), 22-23: 33-58, special issue about Manto Aravantinou

Νέα Εστία (2002), 1750: 587-690, special issue about James Joyce

Χάρτης (2022), 42, special issue about James Joyce, accessed through https://www.hartismag.gr/hartis-42/afierwmata/tzeims-tzois [last access 21 November 2024]

James Joyce Quarterly, (1967), vol. 4 (3), special issue about Joyce and translation

James Joyce Quarterly, (1990), vol. 27 (3), Part 1: 'Joyce and Translation, 447-87.

James Joyce Quarterly, (2003 – 2004), vol. 42 (1/2), articles about Joyce in translation, 37, 39-42, 43-45, 47-60.

James Joyce Quarterly, (2010), vol. 47 (4), Part 1: 'Translatorial Joyce', ed. Jolanta Wawrzycka, 515-588.

Scientia Traductionis (2010) 8, special issue about Joyce and translation

Other sources

Rentzou, Effie (2006), 'What "The Third Eye" Sees: A Greek Periodical of the 1930s', talk given at Princeton University [unpublished].

Rentzou, Effie (2008), 'Réfracter les mots et les images : la revue grecque *To Trito Mati* (1935-1937), paper presented at the conference *Les littératures européenes dans les revues littéraires de l'Europe du Sud et du Bassin méditerranéen (1919-1939)*, Tours, 27-28 November [unpublished].

Slote, Sam (2022), '"Eumaeus": Literally the Antepenultimate Episode', lecture, Trieste James Joyce Summer School.

'Φίλοι του Σωκράτη Καψάσκη—Αποτίμηση εκδήλωσης', 31 October – 1 November 2017, https://www.ermias.gr/el/culturalactions/kapsaski-apotimisi.html [accessed 12 March 2024]