

# Phonetic and semantic structures in the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses*

Árpád Mitruly

## ABSTRACT

This study delved into the challenges and intricacies of intertextuality present in Hungarian translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, focusing particularly on Shakespearean references and analyzing intertextual linguistic data between English and Hungarian equivalents. It examines the applicability of Antoine Berman and Paul Bensimon's retranslation hypothesis, alongside phonetic and semantic structures. By examining intertextual references, the study elucidates the challenges faced by Joyce's Hungarian translators and offers insights into the source text's reception. Allusions and cultural references in *Ulysses* can be linked back to Shakespeare's oeuvre. Through meticulously chosen text segments, the study supports the notion that retranslations adhere more closely to the original text, employing a foreignizing approach, while first translations tend towards domestication. Categorized according to semantic and phonetic attributes, segments from Shakespearean works and their Hungarian counterparts highlight nuances of intensity and expressivity. Analysis of Shakespearean intertextualities reveals a close link between translation and retranslation, suggesting that retranslations maintain the source text's characteristics more faithfully.

Keywords: *Retranslation; Intertextuality; Semantic and phonetic structures; Expressivity.*

This study focuses on the challenges and problematic aspects of intertextuality in the Hungarian translations of James Joyce's novel *Ulysses*, with particular emphasis on Shakespearean references and the analysis of intertextual linguistic data between the English and Hungarian equivalents. The relevance of the research lies in the applicability of Antoine Berman (1990) and Paul Bensimon's (1990) retranslation hypothesis, as well as in the analysis of phonetic and semantic structures. The verification of the Berman/Bensimon hypothesis in the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses* is carried out through the analysis of intertextual references, which would not only provide an explanation for the challenges faced by Joyce's Hungarian translators but also result in a better understanding of the source text in the target culture. The allusions, puns, and cultural adaptations found in *Ulysses* can be traced back to several works by William Shakespeare. The study provides evidence in support of the Berman/Bensimon hypothesis through carefully selected segments of the text, suggesting that retranslations tend to adhere closer to the source text and exhibit a more alienating translation style

(foreignization), whereas the goal of the initial, major translations is to bring the source text closer to the target language (domestication) (KEMPPANEN et al., 2012). The examined segments are derived from well-known works of Shakespeare and their Hungarian translations: *Hamlet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, *Othello*, *Pericles*, etc. The segments are categorized based on their semantic and phonetic characteristics, with particular emphasis placed on capturing their intensity and expressivity, reflecting the motivation behind the diverse phonetic and semantic solutions employed by the Hungarian translators of *Ulysses*.

The aim of my research is to examine whether the retranslation hypothesis is valid concerning the Shakespearean intertexts in the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses*, and whether Berman's hypothesis can be supported by the analyzed segments. For the selected intertextual references, I use the following sources: James Joyce's *Ulysses* (Gabler's edition, 1986) in English, and its three Hungarian translations: by Endre Gáspár (1947), Miklós Szentkuthy (1974, revised in 1986 by Tibor Bartos) and by the translation team András Kappanyos – Marianna Gula – Dávid Szolláth – Gábor Zoltán Kiss (2012, revised in 2021). The comparative analysis of the Hungarian (re)translations will be conducted using the selected Shakespearean segments and intertextual references, while highlighting the phonetic and semantic nuances.

### 1. Semantic structures in the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses*

The semantic nature of the relationship between translations can be traced back to the fact that within a sentence, one element is interpreted in relation to another element. In the case of Hungarian translations of *Ulysses*, we can also observe – in a synonymous context – the coreferentiality between text passages. In this semantic context the main focus lies on the interchangeability of elements within sentences and their manifestation, as well as why one translator might use, for example, ellipsis where another translator uses repetition. In most cases we may notice that only the informational content of the lexical units is repeated, but their semantic content differs. Therefore, it is worth exploring the system of changes in expressivity and intensity. Attila Benő defines expressivity as follows: “it is an informational surplus value that arises to increase the efficiency of communication. This surplus value is related to otherness, deviation from the norm” (BENŐ, 2000, p. 436). The narrower sense of expressive linguistic nature originates from Péter Mihály's conception of expressivity (PÉTER, 1991, p. 41), which states that the realized aesthetic context within the text considers intensification, emphasis, and otherness. However, the issue of expressivity deserves some clarification, as we are capable of confusing it with emotional expression. Jaroslav Zima and Georg Michel concur that one of the key attributes of expressivity is conspicuousness

or visibility, and they see the essence of the concept in “the mentally or emotionally motivated highlighting of a particular element of communication,” (PÉTER, 1991, p. 42) resulting in deviation from translational norms.

*Adherent expressivity* constitutes a significant aspect of this chapter, as it is “solely of semantic nature” (PÉTER, 1991, p. 44). Péter also highlights that adherent expressive structures “include cases of grammatical expressivity that are not indifferent from the perspective of emotional expression, such as the intensification of nouns (‘X még gazemberebb, mint Y’ [X is even more of a scoundrel than Y]), the interchange of personal forms (‘*Dolgozatunk?*’ [Are we working?]), the personal use of impersonal verbs (‘Fájok’ [I’m hurting]), the interchange of complements (‘Érted haragszom’ [I’m angry at you])” (PÉTER, 1991, p. 44), as well as various metaphorical and metonymic transfers of added meanings. The majority of the Shakespearean references manifest in terms of appropriate synonyms, phonetic correspondences, and metaphorical/metonymic transfers, which are based on contextual symbolic meanings and, occasionally, vivid metaphorical transfers of meaning. Let’s take a closer look at some examples of semantic translation variations:

**“I’ll tickle his catastrophe”** (Joyce 1986, p. 73)

Based on the characteristics of Péter’s adherent expressivity, let’s examine the intertextual reference “I’ll tickle his catastrophe,” which originates from the second part of Shakespeare’s *Henry IV*. Considering the context, it is clearly a threat: “Away, you scullion! You rampallian! You fustilarian! *I’ll tickle your catastrophe!*” (*Henry IV*, Part 2, II.i.65–66), in which “catastrophe” means “a sudden disaster, wide-spread, very fatal, or signal.”<sup>1</sup> Joyce alters the pronoun from “your” to “his,” and the adoption of the intertext varies in the Hungarian translations:

**Ellátom a baját**, elhiheti. (Gáspár 1947, p. 68/I)

**Megtáncoltatom én a bűdöst.** (Szentkuthy 1974, p. 107)

**Majd én megcsiklandozom a katasztrófáját**, azt elhihetitek.  
(Revised 2021, p. 94)

These examples demonstrate different methods of integrating intertextuality into the Hungarian translations, reflecting variations in semantic and stylistic choices made by the translators. The translation by Gáspár establishes an active-passive agent dynamic, being overly cautious and delicate, reflecting less the Shakespearean humor, and it cannot be said

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=catastrophe&tl=true> (accessed on 21 February 2024).

that “tickle” [csiklandoz] is in a semantic relation with the structure “ellátom a baját” [I’ll fix him], but rather it reflects the innocent though threatening nature of the sentence structure. Gáspár’s and Szentkuthy’s solutions are synonymous in terms of their word usage (“ellátom” – “megtáncoltatom” [I’ll make him/her dance], both of them in the imperative mood), although Gáspár’s segment translation is less expressive than the later translators’ approaches, as it does not create the metaphorical, metonymic transfer of meaning that occurs in the source text. In Szentkuthy’s chosen equivalent, we already find connections to the source text. In his case, there is an additional and pejorative sense associated with the meaning: according to the *OED*, “tickle” can also refer to someone who is unstable, easily upset, or can be tipped over (cf. “megtáncoltatom”), which has a positive and humorous meaning, thus requiring an equivalent with a similar positive and humorous connotation, which together ultimately creates a network of identical meanings between the source and target texts. The word “büdös” [stinky] appears as a noun in this context and humorously refers to a person’s bottom, lower part, or possibly to the unpleasant smell resulting from flatulence. Szentkuthy’s interpretation is a perfect example of creating the semantic relationship. The Revised translation enhances the humorous-vulgar ambiguity (“catastrophe” [katasztrófa] – “fenék” [buttocks]), clearly reflects the semantic relation of the adopted Shakespearean segment, and brings back the playfulness presented in the original. From this linguistic reference, it is clear that it is worth making an expressivity-based distinction between translation and retranslations, as metaphorical and metonymic transfer are realized differently.

“fortune’s knave” (Joyce 1986, p. 38)

At the beginning of the Proteus episode, a very interesting line is uttered, which makes a hidden reference to Shakespeare’s play *Antony and Cleopatra*: “A primrose doublet, fortune’s knave, smiled on my fear” (Joyce 1986, p. 38). Numerous Hungarian translations of Shakespeare’s works have been made over the years. For the examination of the text excerpt derived from *Antony and Cleopatra*, I analyzed the translations by István Vas and Károly Szász more closely:

„Caesarnak lenni: nyomorú dolog. /

Nem maga a sors, **rabszolgája csak** /

**A sorsnak ő is.**” (Károly Szász, V.ii.2–4)

„Caesarnak lenni hitvány semmiség. /

Nem ő a Sors, csupán **a Sors lakája**; /

Teszi, amit akar.” (István Vas n.p.)

The question arises as to whether readers of the Hungarian *Ulysses* would be able to notice this and other similar Shakespearean intertexts or references while reading, which in most of the cases is recognizable to English native speakers and readers of *Ulysses*. Comparing the solutions of Szász and Vas, they seem to move in a similar semantic range, but the designators “sors lakája” [fate’s servant] and “rabszolga” [slave] differ in their intensity and expressivity. According to the Hungarian Interpretive Dictionary, “lakáj” means ‘a liveried servant employed by a noble, wealthy, aristocratic family,’ while “rabszolga” means ‘a completely deprived, oppressed, exploited person.’ In terms of their expressive nature, “lakáj” [noble people’s servant] does not reflect vulnerability as much, but due to the foreignness of its conceptual content, it remains suggestive. The intertextual reference in the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses* reads as follows:

Egy sárgakabátos, **a szerencse kölyke**, mosolygott félelmemen.  
(Gáspár 1947, p. 36)

Kankalinszínű zeke (**Fortuna fornikátora**) mosolygott rettenésem.  
(Szentkuthy 1974, p. 57)

Kankalinmellényben, **a sors lakája** mosolygott rettegésem.  
(Revised 2021, p. 49)

Gáspár’s solution reflects a friendly and light-hearted tone, but “kölyke” [scallywag, imp] is not quite the accurate equivalent of the noun “knave.” According to the *OED*, “knave” refers to a person characterized by dishonest, unprincipled, cunning, rascal qualities, whereas “kölyke” creates a somewhat ambiguous mental image. On the other hand, Szentkuthy uses the English word “fornicator” to convey the characteristics of a lascivious, lewd person, and in terms of phonetic expressivity, does not object to the exotic, alliterative borrowing of sounds (which may be interpreted as compensations, as Joyce lacks alliterative “f” sounds) and the use of foreign-sounding words. From a linguistic aesthetic perspective, Szentkuthy’s solution distinguishes itself from that of his fellow translators by capturing a sense of strangeness that could potentially influence the emotional and atmospheric dynamics (ZOLNAI, 1923, p. 22). The translation team uses István Vas’s translation of Shakespeare, thereby creating the Shakespearean intertextuality in the Hungarian context, and at the same time referring to the meaning of “lakáj” as “chamberlain, noble people’s servant.” It is observable that the three different Hungarian translations use nearly similar phrases but with varying degrees of expressivity. Regarding their differences in meaning, it can be noted that their stylistic variations establish a similar degree of connection between the context and the atmosphere of the text, albeit employing different linguistic techniques.

We can speak of similar semantic expressivity in the structure “age has not withered it” (*U*9.1011). The highlighted linguistic data in the translations

of Károly Szász and István Vas appears as follows: “E nőnek kor nem árt” [Age does not harm this woman], “Nem fogja ezt az asszonyt a hervadás” [Withering cannot do any harm to this woman]. In the source language Shakespeare uses “her,” but Joyce overlooks this and renders it impersonal, with the pronoun “it,” referring to a specific object or thing that withstands the passage of time. In the Hungarian translations it appears as:

Megkövesülten ott van a sírkövén, amely alatt a nő négy csontja nem fog pihenni. **A kor nem hervasztotta el.** Szépség és béke nem hallgattatta el. (Gáspár 1947, p. 171)

Ott áll megkövesedve síremlékén, amely alá nem kerülhetett felesége csontja. **Az idő nem mosta el őket.** Szépség és béke el nem tüntette. (Szentkuthy 1974, p. 261)

Ez áll megkövülve síremlékén, amely alá nem kerülhettek felesége földi maradványai. **Az idő nem fogta.** Szépség és béke el nem hervasztotta. (Revised 2021, p. 219)

It seems that Gáspár and Vas employed a similar translation strategy for the word “wither.” The lexeme “wither” appears in several Shakespearean works, such as in *Richard II*: “To crop at once a too long *withered* flower” (II.i.45); *Richard III*: “Is like a blasted sapling *withered* up!” (III.iv.75); *The Taming of the Shrew*: “A vengeance on your craftly *withered* hide!” (III.i.). From these, it is clear that in Shakespeare’s works, the term is mostly used in the sense of ‘withering, wilting, drying up.’ The translators of Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*, Szász and Vas, convey the meaning used in Shakespeare’s works (“withering, wilting, drying up”) to the target language. However, Szentkuthy and the translation team deviate from this metaphorical meaning, and associate it with the passage of time. In the case of Szentkuthy’s and the team’s translation, we may observe a more dynamic transfer of meaning. All three translations demonstrate that the semantic flexibility of the Hungarian language provides translators with ample lexical space. The examples mentioned so far already illustrate the fact that the source text always presents a challenge for foreign language translators. The target text solutions the translators generate may coincide with each other, but their common feature is to maintain the coherence between source text and target language, resulting in different linguistic solutions.

“when churchyards yawn” (Joyce 1986, p. 136)

Based on expressivity, intensity, and the explicit nature of the Shakespearean intertextual references, it can be concluded that translators

mostly succeeded in preserving semantic equivalences, functional relationships of sentence structures, and coherence of translation units, although they managed to represent these to varying degrees and in different ways. Furthermore, it can be noted that due to the translation's expressive distinction, semantic harmony is achieved between the semantic ranges of the source and target language equivalents. The following example, taken from *Hamlet*, demonstrates the translator's interest in establishing functional networks of textual coherence in the target language, as modifications made during translation result in a tighter coherence with the original in terms of meaning. We can observe three different Hungarian translations of the *Hamlet* excerpt:

'Tis now the very witching time of night,  
**When churchyards yawn** and hell itself breathes out  
Contagion to this world. (III.ii.419–20)

Most van az éjnek rémjáró szaka,  
**Minden sír ásít**, s maga a pokol  
Dögvészt lehell ki. (János Arany 1866, pp. 283–84)

Ez most az éj kísértet-ideje,  
**Ásít a sok sír**, s maga a pokol  
Lehel dögvészt a földre. (István Eörsi 1983, p. 91)

Éjjel van, boszorkányok ideje:  
**tátong a temető**, és a pokol  
eheli pestisét. (Ádám Nádasy 1999, p. 113)

The highlighted segment is realized with various stylistic differences in the Hungarian adaptations of *Ulysses* as:

The shadows of the tombs **when churchyards yawn**. (Joyce 1986, p. 136)

Éjszakai árnyak kóborolnak a körül fekvő halottak közt. Síri árnyak **a tátongó temetőben** [in the yawning cemetery] (Gáspár 1947, p. 84)

Sírdombok árnyai, **mikor a temetők ásításra nyitják szájukat**

The intertext also seems to contradict the principles of the retranslational hypothesis (see GALEGO et al., 2023), as the retranslators employed certain lexical elements that are essential for establishing equivalence, although incidental formal coincidences may also occur. The occasional resemblance of disputed intertextual reference can also be explained by the use of the dictionary meanings of words since it happens that two translators that use two different translation strategies and methods apply the same dictionary meaning. Potential metaphorical and metonymic transfers of meaning, paronomasia, personification, enumeration, heteroglossia indeed provide an opportunity to present previously used meaning (even cultural adaptation) from a new perspective. With this motivation, when it comes to the observed references, the emphasis is rather on their differences and distinctions. András Kappanyos's opinion is entirely valid in this regard, as he states that "if the translator merely translates linguistic patterns (sentences, paragraphs, texts), then a significant part of their task remains undone" (KAPPANYOS, 2013, p. 322). The depiction style of *Ulysses*, typically characterized by the convergence of various linguistic registers, intentional blending of authorial styles, and narrative polyphony, can unequivocally be associated with Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia<sup>2</sup>. The translators of the latest Hungarian translation of *Ulysses*, as stated in the special issue of the *Alföld* (see KAPPANYOS, 2010, pp. 52–59) journal dedicated to the then forthcoming retranslation of *Ulysses*, mentioned that they consider not only Szentkuthy's translation (both the 1974 version and the 1986 re-edited version by Tibor Bartos, which was incidentally not authorized by Szentkuthy), but also Gáspár's translation as their basis. Although the new *Ulysses* translation no longer explicitly acknowledges this, they adopt or combine Gáspár's early (often stylistic) solutions with later Szentkuthyan approaches in numerous instances. The question then arises whether we can speak of "unretranslatability" in such cases, which idea derives from Guillermo Sanz Gallego's hypothesis that argues for the influence of foregrounding devices (such as paronomasia, heteroglossia, ellipsis, etc.) on retranslations. Thus, drawing attention to the fact that retranslations tend to show an overlap and outline a translational pattern with their older translations of the same text: "If a first translation manages to reproduce a passage with foregrounding maintaining the same effect expressed in the source text, then the options for alternative translations are reduced to such

<sup>2</sup> Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984). Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Edited by Caryl Emerson, University of Minnesota Press. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt22727z1> (accessed 13 February 2024).

an extent that a case of unretranslatability might be provoked” (GALLEGO et al., 2023, p. 102).

## 2. Phonetic structures in the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses*

Dávid Szolláth refers to the phonetic changes within Gáspár’s and Szentkuthy’s translations as “phonetic translations,” marking all those correspondences that reflect the phonetic proximity of words in different languages (SZOLLÁTH, 2019, p. 26), and noting that sometimes they occur as hapaxes. However, these phonetic solutions, executed by the Hungarian translators of *Ulysses*, create Joycean basic features and language-forming procedures. The elements of inherent expressivity are to be sought in phonetic, lexical, derivational, or grammatical correspondences. Various phonetic correspondences materialize in the phonetic contact between languages, reflecting the logic of convergence. A similar translational attitude can be observed among the Hungarian translators of *Ulysses*, where Szentkuthy’s phonetic matching methods stand out in particular. One may observe the following phonetic transference:

No **girl** would when I went **girling**. (Joyce 1986, p. 448)

Egy **lány** sem akart, ha **lányozni** mentem. (Gáspár 1947, p. 117/II)

Egyetlen **gerle** se **gerjedt** be nekem. (Szentkuthy 1974, p. 633)

Egyetlen **lány** sem akart velem, amikor a **lányok** után jártam.  
(Revised 2021, p. 512)

According to Dávid Szolláth, “Szentkuthy sometimes considered the English text as invoking and a call for creating rhyme responses” (SZOLLÁTH, 2019, p. 32), which translational characteristic can be observed in other segments translated by him as well. Szentkuthy often embellishes his sentences with rhymes, and he does not use them randomly but rather their strong motivation evokes the alliterative, rhyming nature.

Inherent expressivity, similarly to adherent expressivity, manifests within the linguistic system and can be based on phonetic (sound-related), lexical (vocabulary-related), derivational (related to methods of formation), or grammatical factors. Péter Mihály highlights the broader expressive nature of onomatopoeic words as well, noting that “they usually have no synonyms” (PÉTER, 1991, p. 43), such as the palindrome “tattarrattat” in “I knew his *tattarrattat* at the door” (JOYCE, 1986, p. 615), which is based on unusual phonetic elements with its onomatopoeic nature, and is used by Joyce for

rhythmic and forceful vocalization, akin to knocking on a door. The lexeme imitates the sound phenomenon of knocking on a door, while its pronunciation suggests the rhythmic and percussive nature of finger tapping on wood. Furthermore, words created through word formation also belong to inherent expressivity (PÉTER, 1991, p. 43), such as “jeopard,” “pardy,” and “deliverly.”<sup>3</sup> Thus, both phonetic and semantic expressivity are integral parts of research in the sense that they help us distinguish linguistic data from each other.

“**Puck Mulligan footed featly**” (Joyce 1986, p. 177)

Phonetic associations can be bewildering in Joyce’s works. Such passages indicate significant expressive content through their sound and rhythmic realization. The abovementioned structure’s multisensory referentiality is profound: “Puck,” the mischievous fairy from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and “footed featly” represents an intertextual reference to *The Tempest*.

Come unto these yellow sands,  
And then take hands:  
Courtsied when you have and kiss’d  
The wild waves whist:  
**Foot it featly** here and there;  
And, sweet sprites, the burthen bear. (I.ii.376–81)

Sárga tengerpartra jöszte  
Kedveseddel, kézbe’ kéz!  
Csókot váltva, ölelközve  
(Hab pihen, elült a vész)  
**Lejtsetek’**, míg kedvbe’ tart!  
SzellemeK zengjék a dalt! (Károly Szász n.p.)

Babits Mihály: Jer a sárga homokon;  
Kezed megfogom;  
Simogasd a szeleket;  
Csöndbe, gyerekek.  
Erre-arra, **lengeteg**:  
Daloljatok, szellemeK. (Mihály Babits, n.p.)

In Shakespeare’s text, the use of alliterative words is noteworthy (“wild waves whist,” “foot it featly,” “sweet sprites,” “burthen bear”), which is realized differently in Hungarian translations: the “e-é” sounds in words are associated with the alliterations in the source text: “kedveseddel” [with your sweetheart],

<sup>3</sup> See Restuccia, L. Frances – Limon, K. John. „Wordplay: God and Pun in ‘Ulysses.’” *James Joyce Quarterly*, 21(3), 1984, p. 277. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25476600> (accessed 26 January 2024).

“kézbe’ kéz” [hand in hand], “lejtsetek” [pl. you slope!] “kedvbe” [in good spirits], “szellemek zengjék” [spirits sing]; “kezed” [your hand], “szeleket” [the winds], “gyerekek” [children], “lengeteg” [fluttery], “szellemek” [ghosts]. Following all this, let’s consider how “foot it featly” is translated in *Ulysses*:

Puck Mulligan **footed featly**, trilling. (Joyce 1986, p. 177)

Puck Mulligan **fürgén táncikált** és dudorászott. (Gáspár 1947, p. 173)

Buck Mulligan hangicsál, **vidoran vihorász**. (Szentkuthy 1974, p. 166)

Puck Mulligan **fürgén patázott**, trillázott. (Revised 2021, p. 222)

Joyce uses the same alliterative form as Shakespeare, but the translations transfer it into Hungarian in different ways. In Gáspár’s translation, this phonetic affinity is not so noticeable, he rather tries to convey the literal melodic tone with the dancing and humming figures: “fürgén táncikált és dudorászott” [he/she swiftly danced and hummed]. Szentkuthy, once again, notices the need to capture the humorous alliterative sound borrowed by Joyce from Shakespeare, achieved through the repetition of the “v” sound: “vidoran vihorász” [chirfully chirped]. The translation team takes a different approach and does not replicate this alliterative nature in the intertextual structure, instead, they compensate by rhyming the endings of a different structure, the past tense forms of “fürgén patázott” [hoofed sprightly] and “trillázott” [trilled], highlighting the endings “-ott.”

152

“**a rugged rough rug-headed kern**” (Joyce 1986, p. 170)

Stephen’s continuous fragments of imagination appear in the text several times. Of course, he is unable to express his thoughts directly, there is always something interposing. One theme to which he seems to cling is the artistry and language of Shakespeare. His expressions are poured into the language and poetry of the author’s works, which become literary intertextual references for us. The allusion to *Richard II* sounds like the following:

Now for our Irish warres,

We must supplant those **rough rug-headed Kernes**,

Which live like venom. (II.i.155–57)

Most ír hadunk felől:

Ideje megtörnünk a **parasztokat**,

Kik, lázadozva, mérgül élnek ott. (Károly Szász, n.p.)

Károly Szász simply translated the excerpted intertext as “parasztok” [peasants], distorting the meaning of the structure. Only the “Kernes/Kerns” can be paralleled with Szász’s equivalent. According to the *OED*, “Kernes” has a historical connotation: “light-armed Irish foot soldiers who come from poorer social strata.” In the episode of *Scylla and Charybdis*, it appears as follows:

Enter Magee Mor Matthew, a **rugged rough rug-headed kern**, in strossers with a buttoned codpiece, his nether socks bemired with clauber of ten forests, a wand of wilding in his hand. (Joyce 1986, p. 170)

Belép Magel Mor Matthew, **kedves rongyos rosszképű csavargó**, szűk nadrágban, begombolt nadrágkorccal, harisnyáján tíz erdő lucskával, vadonybottal a kezében. (Gáspár 1947, p. 165)

Entrée: Magee Mor Matthew **ragyarongy, bozontos bugris**, térdnadrágban, gombos gatyapőccel, szárain száz vadon sikálatlan sara, vadalma-vessző a kezében. (Szentkuthy 1974, p. 255)

Belép Magee Mor Matthew, **bárdolatlan, bozontos bugris**, alsónadrágban, gatyapőccel, szárain tíz vadon sikálatlan sara, vadalma-vessző a kezében. (Revised 2021, p. 214)

153

Following their intensity and expressivity, the highlighted excerpt in Joyce’s novel establishes a cultural and intertextual connection with the Shakespearean text, thereby presenting a strong reference for the English reader, supported by the textual context. Károly Szász’s translation of Shakespeare generated ambiguity for Hungarian readers and is less adherent to form, but for the translators of *Ulysses*, the transfer does not pose a significant problem. The alliterative nature of “rough rug-headed Kernes” attempts to create the same expressive effect in readers of the Hungarian translations through a somewhat disproportionate and imprecise but playful formulation, indicating the barbaric Irishness and the associated fabric pieces. Joyce further enhances Shakespeare’s alliteration by incorporating “rugged,” thus intensifying the expressive sound (repetition of the “r” sound). In the Hungarian translations, the Hungarian expressions should also alliterate in a similar manner. However, in Gáspár’s translation, considering the role of “kedves” [dear] in the sentence, it is realized more as an adjective and reflects less the phonetic expressive nature of the sentence structure. It is worth noting the words following the

aforementioned adjective (“rongyos rosszképű csavargó” [ragged, rough-looking tramp]), where Gáspár still tries to convey the repetition of the alliterative “r” sound, thus partially reflecting the expressive effect created in the source text. In Szentkuthy’s case, we can observe several alliterative sounds (“ragyarongy, bozontos bugris” [hairy hobo, bushy scoundrel]), which appear in a varied manner. The two consonantal solutions doubly express the alliteration. In the Revised translation of *Ulysses*, the triple alliteration created in the source text can be traced, albeit now realized in the “b” sound (“bárdolatlan bozontos bugris” [rough bushy scoundrel]). The Hungarian reader lacks an Irish reference point. Gáspár’s accumulation of adjectives (“kedves rongyos rosszképű” [dear ragged, rough-looking]) – without any conventional punctuation use – is realized in the “scoundrel.” According to the Hungarian explanatory dictionary, this can also refer to a person who has no permanent residence, especially someone who lives from crime, which may perhaps be remotely compared to the Irish soldier from a poorer social class. Szentkuthy’s solution serves as an example of the relationship between the translated Shakespearean work and *Ulysses* by saying “bugris” [scoundrel] because this term can denote uneducated, uncultured peasants (similar to Szász’s translation). The historical realia of “parasztok” [peasants] (“Kernes”) simplifies and distorts the original, whereas Szentkuthy’s solution is closer to the Shakespearean world. If these were not enough, the translation team – using Szentkuthy’s “bugris” – creates the alliteration present in the source text, thus finding the appropriate expressive equivalent for the segment.

154

The examples provided so far serve as evidence that the evocative and associative power of meaningful content continuously intensifies when the word denotes a less familiar concept, and when we encounter a figure that, due to its unique expressive qualities, necessarily differs between translations and retranslations. These differences in expressivity and intensity also support the essence of Berman’s retranslation hypothesis, which suggests that retranslations are closer to the source text, more explicit, and carry basic features related to the meaning of the source text.

**“Lucrece’s bluecircled ivory globes”** (Joyce 1986, p. 162)

In the case of Szentkuthy’s translation, numerous compensations and solutions can be observed if we pay sufficient attention. He follows an outstanding logic of word creation, as one can see comparing the designated excerpts between English and Hungarian. We can observe that Szentkuthy tries to recreate the same phonetic resonance as Joyce. Striving for completeness and for the sake of comparison, I have included the translations of the other two translators alongside Szentkuthy’s translation.

Ravisher and ravished, what he would but would not, go with him from **Lucrece's bluecircled ivory globes** to Imogen's breast, bare, **with its mole cinquespotted**. (Joyce 1986, p. 162)

Meggyalázó és meggyalázott, amit akart, de nem akart, vele megy **Lukrécia kékeres elefántcsont halmaitól** Imogen csupasz **kebléig, ötfoltos anyajegyével**. (Gáspár 1947, p. 157/I)

A leteperő és a letepert, amit szeretne de nem szeretne, **Lukrécia kékeres elefántcsont almáitól** Imogén keblére menekülni vele, a meztelenhez, **ötpöttyös mellbimbója hívja**. (Szentkuthy 1974, p. 242)

Leteperő és letepert, amit szeretne is meg nem is, vele tart **Lukrécia kékerű elefántcsont halmaitól** Imogén csupasz, **ötpettyes anyajegyű kebléig**. (Revised 2021, p. 203)

In the segment “Lucrece’s bluecircled ivory globes,” the repetition of the “u” and “c” sounds are realized in Szentkuthy’s translation through the repetitions of the “é” sounds, which can be observed throughout the entire sentence (see Szentkuthy’s translation), and then inserts a strongly motivated rhyming word (“mellbimbója hívja” [her nipple calls]). One of the fundamental characteristics of Szentkuthy’s translation methods is the phonetic and stylistic approach, so Szentkuthy’s *Ulysses* can also be compared poetically to Joyce’s *Ulysses*. This striking, varied, and arbitrarily inventive nature sometimes resulted in obscure meaning transmission. In the latest Hungarian translation of *Ulysses*, there seems to be a differentiation, and most often the translation team corrects what Szentkuthy or Gáspár may have perceived differently. Remaining within the realm of alliteration and rhyme, let’s take the following example: “Peter Piper pecked a peck of pick of peck of pickled pepper” (JOYCE, 1986, p. 157). It is clearly a heightened alliterative nursery rhyme-like play of words. Szentkuthy translates it as follows: “Csak a tajkafajku szajka fajka tajka,” (SZENTKUTHY, 1974, p. 236) which replaces the “r” sound with “j” sound in words. The original wordplay is “tarkafarkú szarka farka tarka,” meaning “the pied-tailed magpie’s tail is pied,” which creates a rhyming effect with a playful, rhythmic cadence. In contrast, the translation team maintains both the alliterative and rhyming effect, while preserving the source phrase “Peter Piper”: “Peter Piper fapipája papi fapipa” (REVISED, 2021, p. 188), meaning “Peter Piper’s wooden pipe is a priestly wooden pipe.” Structurally, the phonetic correspondences show a stronger coherence in meaning and a leveling across languages in the translation by the translation team. Most of such corrections typically occurred in places where

“Szentkuthy places excessive weight on the phonetic features compared to the semantic ones” (KAPPANYOS, 2013, p. 118).

## Conclusions

The confirmation of the Berman hypothesis relies on the verification of selected linguistic data, which ultimately facilitated the scholarly approach to the Hungarian translations of *Ulysses*. The linguistic segments highlighted in the study as being difficult to translate or resistant to translation, particularly concerning Shakespearean intertextual formations, are noteworthy for several reasons. Their “untranslatability,” or rather the complexity of finding suitable forms of expression, is based on intricate structural factors that essentially involve the relationship between the words and meaning or expressions in the source text, resulting in ambiguity and synonymy in the expressions to be produced in the target language. The exploration of semantic and phonetic translation variations served to support Berman’s theory of retranslation, demonstrating that retranslations are closer to the source text, while initial translations adapt the source text to the target audience, reflecting a domesticating tendency. The examined Shakespearean intertextualities, possibilities of paronomasia, semantic and phonetic features reveal a close relationship between translation and retranslation, providing evidence that retranslations tend to follow the characteristics of the source text more closely. According to Berman’s translation philosophy, the goal would be to displace the target language reader and educate them towards the foreign or unfamiliar. Therefore, retranslations strive ethically to be faithful to the source text, based on the most accurate reproduction of formal, substantive, semantic and phonetic similarities. Despite the qualitative and structural advancements observed in retranslations, which seemingly faithfully reproduce the characteristics of the source text, it is important to consider that both translations and retranslations contain elements that to varying degrees are difficult or even impossible to translate (such as wordplay, realia, ellipsis, heteroglossia), thereby disrupting the tendencies outlined by the retranslation hypothesis.

BAKHTIN, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited by Caryl Emerson, University of Minnesota Press, 1984. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt22727z1>. Accessed 13 February 2024.

BENŐ, Attila. Az expresszivitás változásai román kölcsönszavainkban. *Magyar Nyelv*, 96(4), 2000, 436–445.

BENSIMON, Paul. Présentation. *Palimpsestes*, 4, iv–xiii, 1990.

BERMAN, Antoine. La reduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*, 4, 1–7, 1990.

HOSSEIN – AMENE: *Revisiting „Retranslation Hypothesis”: A Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslations of Pride and Prejudice*, Islamic Azad University, Iran, 2013.

JOYCE, James: *Ulysses*. Eds. Hans Walter Gabler et al., Vintage Books, New York, 1986.

JOYCE, James. *Ulysses I–II*. (trans. Gáspár Endre), Nova Irodalmi Intézet, Budapest, 1947.

JOYCE, James. *Ulysses*. (trans. Szentkuthy Miklós), Európa Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1974.

JOYCE, James. *Ulysses*. (trans. GULA, Marianna – KAPPANYOS, András – SZOLLÁTH, Dávid – KISS, Gábor Zoltán), Helikon Kiadó, Budapest, 2021.

KABERGS, Valérie – HANS, Ausloos. „Paronomasia or Wordplay? A Babel-Like Confusion Towards a Definition of Hebrew Wordplay.” *Biblica*, 93(1), 2012, 1–20. JSTOR <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42615077>. Accessed 04 March 2024.

KAPPANYOS, András. *Bajuszbögre, lefordíthatlan. Műfordítás, adaptáció, kulturális transzfer*. Akadémiai Doktori Értekezés. MTA BTK Irodalomtudományi Intézet, 2013.

KAPPANYOS, András. Joyce mint klasszikus auctor és mint magyar invenció. *Alföld: Irodalmi művészeti és kritikai folyóirat*, 61(9), 2010, 52–59.

KEMPPANEN, Hannu – JÄNIS, Marja – BELIKOVA, Alexandra (eds.). *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*. Frank & Timme,

Berlin, 2012.

PÉTER, Mihály. *A nyelv és érzelm kifejezés eszközei és módjai*. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 1991.

RESTUCCIA, L. Frances – LIMON, K. John. Wordplay: God and Pun in „Ulysses.” *James Joyce Quarterly*, 21(3), 1984, 275–278. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25476600>. Accessed 26 January 2024.

SANZ GALLEGO, Guillermo – MIHÁLYCSA, Erika – PAULIS, Monica – SEPP, Arvi – WAWRZYCKA, Jolanta. „The influence of foregrounding on retranslation: The phenomenon of ‘unretranslatability’ in Joyce’s *Ulysses*.” *Parallèles*, 35(1), 2023, 102–124.

SENN, Fritz. „Errant Commas and Stray Parentheses.” *European Joyce Studies*, 23, 2014, 11–32. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44871366>. Accessed: 02 March 2024.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Shakespeare összes művei*. Európa Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1964.