

JOYCE STUDIES IN ITALY

1 New Series

14 Old Series

# JOYCE IN/AND ITALY

*edited by*

FRANCA RUGGIERI

ENRICO TERRINONI

EDIZIONI   
ROMA 2013

*Volume pubblicato con il contributo  
dell'Università degli Studi Roma Tre*

TUTTI I DIRITTI RISERVATI

È vietata la traduzione, la memorizzazione elettronica,  
la riproduzione totale o parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo,  
compresa la fotocopia, anche ad uso interno o didattico.  
L'illecito sarà penalmente perseguibile a norma dell'art. 171  
della legge n. 633 del 22/04/1941

ISSN 2281-373X

© 2013, Edizioni Q – Roma

[www.edizioniq.it](http://www.edizioniq.it)

e-mail: [info@edizioniq.it](mailto:info@edizioniq.it)

Single copy Price € 18

Subscription Rates (one issue annually):

Personal: € 18

Institutional: € 30

Address: James Joyce Italian Foundation  
Dipartimento di Lingue, Culture e Letterature Straniere  
Via Valco di San Paolo, 19  
00146 Roma  
[joyce\\_found@os.uniroma3.it](mailto:joyce_found@os.uniroma3.it)  
[franca.ruggieri@uniroma3.it](mailto:franca.ruggieri@uniroma3.it)

## CONTENTS

Franca Ruggieri <i>Foreword</i> .....	p. 11
--	-------

### JOYCE AND/IN ITALY

Andrea Binelli <i>Isotopy as a Critical and Translational Paradigm in the 'Italian' Ulysses</i> .....	15
--	----

Francesca Caraceni <i>A study of Anthony Burgess's Italian version of Finnegans Wake's incipit</i> .....	29
---	----

Gabriele Frasca <i>Gadda a reader of Joyce? / Gadda lettore di Joyce?</i> .....	39
--	----

Francesco Marroni <i>Horcynus Orca and Ulysses: Stefano D'arrigo's Dialogic Vortex</i> .....	49
---	----

Franco Marucci <i>Translator de Angelis and critic Pagnini on how to render a passage in Ulysses</i> .....	67
---	----

### JOYCEAN GLEANINGS

Jacques Aubert <i>Lacan and the Joyce-effect</i> .....	79
---	----

Geert Lernout  
*In the Track of the Sun and Joyce's use of sources  
in Ulysses: a case-study*..... 89

Fritz Senn  
*Ulyssean Historionics in Everyday Life*..... 100

#### BOOK REVIEWS

Maria Domenica Mangialavori, *La memoria intermittente  
e la musica lontana. Joyce. Woolf, Berio.*  
Luca Aversano ..... 123

James Joyce, *Ulisse. Trans. Gianni Celati*  
Elisabetta D'Erme ..... 127

Franca Ruggieri, *James Joyce, la vita, le lettere*  
John McCourt..... 135

Maria Cristina Cavecchi, *Cerchi e cicli. Sulle forme della memoria in Ulisse;*  
Roberto Baronti Marchiò, *A Thought-Tormented Music. Browning and Joyce;*  
Maria Grazia Tonetto, *The Beauty of Mortal Conditions*  
Enrico Terrinoni..... 139

TRANSLATOR DE ANGELIS AND CRITIC PAGNINI  
ON HOW TO RENDER A PASSAGE IN *ULYSSES*

---

Marcello Pagnini (1921-2010) taught Joyce repeatedly in his courses on English Literature at the University of Florence until his retirement, but never wrote a book or a self-contained essay on the subject. I was one of his students when, in the early seventies, he, as was his usual academic method, gave a seminar that combined “Proteus” from *Ulysses* with *Hamlet* and *The Tempest*. However, on different occasions he gave no less than three public lectures on *Ulysses*, and his hand-written notes are still extant among his papers. Widely well-known as an expert on English and American Modernism, Pagnini saw Eliot and Pound as its main representatives, and left on them a few ground-breaking and magisterial essays (see my own *Il critico ben temperato. Saggio bibliografico sull’opera di Marcello Pagnini*, “Rivista di Letterature moderne e comparate”, LXIV, 2, 2011, 205-223). Yet anyone checking the Index of names in Pagnini’s books becomes aware of the high number of references to Joyce, and a whole section of the essay “Il continuo mentale nella sua rappresentazione narratologica” (now contained in his *Letteratura e ermeneutica*, Firenze 2002, 161-179) offers a sophisticated and insightful discussion of Joycean “stream of consciousness”.

Giulio de Angelis, the first Italian translator of *Ulysses* in 1960, revised and updated his Mondadori translation in 1988 in the light of Gabler’s “critical and synoptic edition” of the novel published in 1984. From the inception of this translation in the 1940s, as one can easily surmise, de Angelis had contacted and consulted several Joyce scholars abroad and especially in Italy to submit queries, solve problems and sound opinions about his linguistic choices and interpretive cruxes. I was recently fortunate enough to be able to view the whole of Pagnini’s academic correspondence, and to my surprise I found the two letters that will be given below. Written in March 1988, they concern a passage in the “Eumaeus” episode of the novel which de Angelis suspected to be corrupted in previous English editions and

which, he thought, Gabler had made even more incomprehensible. Before I reproduce the two letters, along with a tentative translation, I append a few words of introduction.

The general Joyce reader knows very little—the bare bones—about Giulio de Angelis. Being myself interested at the moment in Joyce's relationships with Italian culture and literature, and in the problems of translation, I am one of those who would avidly welcome more information. It is almost certain that de Angelis never got to know Joyce personally: when Joyce died in 1941 de Angelis was 16 years old. He was born in Florence though his surname does not sound typically Florentine, and Tuscany is nowadays the seventh *regione* out of twenty in Italy in terms of frequency of the surname. He was certainly no academic, and this may be the reason for the cold, “standoffish treatment”—as an American friend of de Angelis said—he usually received from Italian scholars of the time. In Italy until the 1980s, English literature university courses were taught in Italian, and when in one of his seminars Pagnini once needed to read a passage from *Ulysses* in translation he hardly failed to suppress a note of diffidence and irony towards “il nostro buon de Angelis”. To judge, however, from the tone of his letter, as will be seen, Pagnini had privately a far different opinion of the translator, and showed him esteem and courtesy. I remember that de Angelis' *Guida alla lettura dell'Ulisse*, today much revaluated from a historical perspective, was expressly not included among the set books of Pagnini's courses. In other words de Angelis had the fame of a foolhardy amateur in academic circles.<sup>1</sup>

In about 20 lines of an interest biosketch we are here informed that he was indeed born in Florence, moved to Genoa when he was 14, returned to Florence when the war broke out, studied Greek and Latin at the local liceo classico and was highly proficient in modern languages. He then took a degree in English in 1947, discussing a dissertation entitled “De Quincey e la lingua inglese” at Florence university under the supervision of one of the pioneers of English studies in Italy, Giordano Napoleone Orsini. Pagnini and de Angelis may have got to know each other at the Faculty of Letters of Florence university, since Pagnini, four years de Angelis' senior, graduated there in 1946 (with a certain delay owing to the war). Yet de Angelis never became an academic as I said, and possibly never tried to become one for all his talent (though we do not know why), and instead taught English for

<sup>1</sup> See: <http://sius.archivi.beniculturali.it>

years in secondary schools. Apart from *Ulysses* he also translated works by Faulkner, G. Greene, Hawthorne, Steinbeck and Virginia Woolf. I happen to have edited in 1979, before I began studying Joyce seriously, de Angelis' translation of *The Waves* (Milan, Rizzoli, with an Introduction by Stephen Spender). Just to give an idea of his linguistic flair, de Angelis was also the translator of French and German works (including, no less, *Venus im Pelz* by von Sacher-Masoch!). And to testify to his curious eclecticism, in the Sixties he wrote on cinema and music in specialized journals, while also translating English librettos for the Maggio Musicale Fiorentino. Guido Fink, visiting him in the late eighties, found a house inordinately full of books and records. Music was another passion de Angelis had in common with Pagnini.

Few probably know that de Angelis was not commissioned by Mondadori to translate *Ulysses* in collaboration with three eminent dons, Cambon, Izzo and Melchiori (in alphabetical order). Such a collaboration never took shape. On the contrary, as Anna Maria Aiazzi clearly indicates in her excellent article "Il plasmarsi di una traduzione memorabile: Giulio de Angelis traduce *Ulysses* di Joyce" ("Rivista di Letterature moderne e comparate", LXII, 4, 2009, 447-473), de Angelis began and completed the translation "blindfold", without any contract with a publisher, and only during the work or towards its completion did he submit it to Mondadori. I was myself until recently ignorant of this fact, having long wondered why Mondadori failed to get Alessandro Francini Bruni involved in the translation or to appoint him to the panel of revisers. Francini Bruni was no doubt, when the translation got under way, the closest surviving Italian friend of Joyce, and could thus provide plenty of background information. He had been living in Florence continuously since the early Twenties, but he does not appear to have been consulted by de Angelis in any way whatsoever. Strange and mysterious though it may seem, Signora de Angelis lately confirmed to me verbally that her husband had never heard of, let alone ever met, Alessandro Francini Bruni.

A letter de Angelis received from the American dramatist Thornton Wilder in 1949, and provided by Aiazzi in her article, proves that, despite the fact that the French and German translations of *Ulysses* had by then already appeared, influential writers and critics continued to consider *Ulysses* untranslatable, and that anyone who attempted such a task was a "madman". Wilder discouraged de Angelis because Joyce in person was not at his disposal for queries, as he had been for previous translators, and because he lacked a wide range of tools, such as books of criticism, dictionaries, and

“a great English-language library”. But to know more of the actual progress of the work by de Angelis, of the equipment with which he worked, and of the variety of his contacts with experts, one would have to sift in depth the “fondo de Angelis” now at the Gabinetto Vieusseux in Florence—something which is beyond the scope of this essay.

As far as his approach to the Joycean text is concerned, Aiazzi, who received the information from Signora de Angelis, tells us that de Angelis did not deal with the single chapters in the order in which they appear in the novel; and also that he conceived the colossal project on his own initiative, and exclusively for his own pleasure. The first draft was typed by de Angelis’ own mother, and it was then sent, with added hand-written revisions, to Mondadori. When the publication of this Italian *Ulisse* was approved, Mondadori asked for the advice of no less than five Joyce experts. As Aiazzi maintains, this close, police-like checking, decreases as the pages turn, as if the revisers had become a little tired and had gradually relented; and yet we cannot but agree that their revising policy is sometimes incoherent: the triumvirate—Cambon, Izzo and Melchiori—worked on the manuscript separately, and their corrections and suggestions were organized and finalised in Milan by Mondadori employees (people of the calibre of Debenedetti, Sereni and Vittorini). Comparing select excerpts, we find that in some cases they rendered more literal, in some others more colloquial and Tuscan-sounding, de Angelis’ linguistic and stylistic options. How strange that the three professors, none of them Tuscan-born, should try to out-tuscanize a Tuscan!

As I anticipated, de Angelis wrote the following letter to Professor Pagnini in March 1988, a few months before the publication of his revised translation, and while reading the proofs. His own revisions, sent to Mondadori, were contained in 19 “most thick foolscap sheets” which G. Fink said he had once seen. De Angelis may have no doubt contacted many other eminent Joyce scholars in the course of this revision; to Pagnini he submitted a difficult passage from towards the end of the “Eumaeus” episode. No other letters between them survive, though some may have been lost. The tone of the two letters makes one think that Pagnini had been previously consulted by de Angelis. I am not in the position to state the degree of friendship between the two following their university years. Pagnini to be sure did not mention de Angelis frequently in his “table-talk”. De Angelis’ letter, however, reveals only moderate deference and even a little irony. Significantly, he opens the letter off-handedly with “Caro Pagnini”



and proceeds on first-name terms. Pagnini, far from considering the letter annoying, was evidently flattered by the query and answered promptly (after only three days, and in term time), as if wishing to prove his Joycean competence, and that he had carefully reread the passage in question. He sounds sure of what he says, even slightly patronizing. He responds to “Caro Pagnini” with a “Carissimo Giulio”.

Here is de Angelis’ hand-written letter:

18-3-88

Caro Pagnini,

scusa se ti faccio perdere un po’ di tempo per una questione sulla quale mi servirebbe il tuo illuminatissimo parere.

Sta per uscire (a maggio) la nuova edizione di *Ulysses*, di cui sto rivedendo le bozze. È stato un lavoro improbo collazionare il testo definitivo (Penguin – Student Edition) col vecchio testo e rifare – tra l’altro – gran parte della punteggiatura, restituendo i moltissimi pezzi (parole singole, frasi, periodi spesso anche *trasposti*) e eliminando i molti errori (anche i miei di traduttore, con l’occasione).

Il nuovo testo in alcuni punti mi lascia perplesso (ad es. non mi convince molto una grafia del tipo *tranquility* invece di *tranquillity* e tipo *MUSTERRED* invece di *MUSTERED*).

Ma c’è un passo sul quale – appunto – attirerei la tua attenzione perché *francamente* mi sembra incomprensibile sia nella *prima* versione, sia e ancor di più in quella definitiva che mi sembra peggiore.

Per semplificare trascrivo da p. 661 (Shakespeare & Co) e da p. 533 (Penguin):

*Eumeo* – 1<sup>a</sup> versione

Marble could give the original, shoulders, back, all the symmetry. All the rest, yes, Puritanism.

2<sup>a</sup> versione

Marble.....all the symmetry, all the rest.

Mi sembra che *all the rest* non abbia senso dopo l’enumerazione *shoulders, back, all the symmetry*. Cosa sarebbe *all the rest*? Si parla come tu ricordi delle statue nude che Bloom ha ammirato (fine *Scilla e Cariddi*).

Ma il guaio comincia ora

1<sup>a</sup> versione

*It does though, St. Joseph's sovereign.....* whereas no photo could, because it simply wasn't art, in a word.

Non ho mai capito molto bene quale possa essere la misteriosa parola nascosta dai *dots*.

2<sup>a</sup> versione

Dopo *Puritanisme* (perché in francese?) il testo prosegue: *It does though St. Joseph's THIEVERY, alors (Bandez!) FIGNE TOI TROP. Whereas no photo.....*

Tra i tanti dubbi: che cos'è secondo te "*St. Joseph's thievery*"? (ladrocinio – furto – anche refurtiva?). Può alludere alla gravidanza di Maria e allo Spirito Santo?

E le parole francesi? *Bandez* mi risulta essere: Abbiate un'erezione o fatevelo rizzare. FIGNE è argot per *culo*, ma non esiste come verbo (ammenché non si traduca *Inculate troppo*, che ovviamente non ha senso?

Non hai l'impressione che il testo sia corrotto e siamo di fronte ad un grosso pasticcio?

Scusa di nuovo, ma avevo bisogno di una consulenza ad altissimo livello.

Se per te è più semplice telefonami.

Grazie. Cordiali saluti Giulio de Angelis

And here is an English translation of the letter:

03/18/88

Dear Pagnini,

I'm sorry to waste some of your time with a question on which I need your most illuminating opinion.

My new edition of *Ulysses* is about to be published (in May), and I am reading the proofs. It was a daunting job collating the final text (Penguin – Student Edition) with the old text and redo – among other things – most of the punctuation, replacing the very many pieces (single words, phrases, periods often *transposed*) and eliminating many errors (also my own, as it happens).

The new text leaves me perplexed in some places (e.g. I am left unconvinced by the transcription of “tranquility” instead of “tranquillity”, and of MUSTERRED instead of MUSTERED.

But there is a passage on which – to be sure – I would like to draw your attention because it frankly seems to me incomprehensible in the first version, and even more in the final one which I think is worse.

To make it easier I’ll transcribe it from p. 661 (Shakespeare & Co.) and p. 533 (Penguin):

“Eumaeus” - 1st version

Marble could give the original, shoulder, back, all the symmetry. All the rest, yes, Puritanism.

2nd version

Marble ..... all the symmetry, all the rest.

It seems to me that *all the rest* does not make sense after enumerating *shoulders, back, all the symmetry*. What could *all the rest* be? As you will remember the reference is here to the naked statues that Bloom admired (end of “Scylla and Charybdis”).

But the trouble begins now:

1st version

*It* does though, St Joseph’s sovereign..... whereas no photo could, because it simply was not art, in a word.

I’ve never been able to understand what the mysterious word hidden by the dots could be.

2nd version

After *Puritanisme* (why in French?) the text continues: It does though St. Joseph’s thievery, alors (Bandez!) FIGNE TOI TROP. Whereas no photo .....

Among the many questions: what do you think “St. Joseph’s thievery” is? (larceny – theft – even stolen goods?) May it allude to the pregnancy of Mary and to the Holy Spirit?

And the French words? *Bandez* seems to me to signify “Have an erection or get it to be raised”. FIGNE is slang for arse, but does not exist as a verb (unless one translates “Do fuck too much”, which obviously does not make any sense? Don’t you have the impression that the text is corrupt and that we are facing a big mess?

Sorry again, but I needed advice at the highest level.

If for you it’s easier call me on the phone.

Thank you. Sincerely, Giulio de Angelis

This is Pagnini’s typed answer:

Pistoia, 21 3 88

Carissimo Giulio

mancano i riferimenti contestuali, sia per l’una che per l’altra delle redazioni; e dunque il lavoro delle inferenze va, per forza di cose, a ruota libera.

A occhio e croce direi che il testo Shak. & Co. sia meno oscuro dell’altro. “Simmetry” direi che si riferisca, senz’altro al culo della statua. “Puritanism” potrebbe essere un vocativo – come dire “culo e tutto il resto (cioè anche la fica). Si signor Puritanesimo!” – la statuaria antica fa queste cose! – “E le fa, per la Sovrana di San Giuseppe (eufemismo per “per la Madonna!”), e al contempo una paronomasia: *sovereign – suffering*)... meglio di una fotografia, data la superiorità dell’arte!”

Il testo Penguin puzza di guasti. A parte il *Puritanisme* (che non mi pare sia motivato eccetto forse dal fatto che, più avanti si passa dall’inglese al francese) “Joseph’s thievery” può essere ancora un eufemismo, parallelo all’altro – il che farebbe pensare che il testo Shak. & Co. fosse un emendamento [*sic*] –, e cioè la ‘refurtiva’ di San Giuseppe con riferimento a Gesù Bambino, al momento della fuga in Egitto, e dunque il furto a Erode –, e allora l’imprecazione sarebbe “per il Bambino Gesù!”. Infine, sempre pensando al culo della statua, “fattelo rizzare, e poi infilatici ben dentro!” Con l’ironia sulla buona resa dell’arte.

Tutte fantasie? Posso esser d’accordo: ma, in fondo, autorizzate.

Per “tranquility” e “masterred” direi che si tratta senz’altro di refusi!

Allego il saggio della Paola Gullì, che spalanca le aporie del nuovo “Joyce”.

[...]

Un abbraccio in odore di antichità!

And here is the translation of Pagnini’s answer:

Dearest Giulio,

contextual references, for both of the editions, are missing, and therefore the range of the inferences, given these circumstances, is immense.

At a guess I would say that the Shak. & Co. text is less obscure than the other. “Symmetry” I would take doubtless to mean the arse of the statue. “Puritanism” could be a vocative – as if one said “arse and everything else (i.e. even the pussy). Yes, Mr. Puritanism” – the ancient statuary does these things! – “And it makes them, for the sovereign of St. Joseph (euphemism for “Our Lady”, and at the same time a paronomasia: *sovereign - suffering*) ... better than a photograph, given the superiority of art!”

The Penguin text smells of corruptions. Apart from *Puritanisme* (which does not seem to be motivated, except maybe for the fact that there is later a switch from English to French), “Joseph’s thievery” may still be an understatement, parallel to the other – which suggests that the Shak. & Co. text is an emendation – namely the ‘swag’ of St. Joseph with reference to the Child Jesus at the time of the flight into Egypt, and therefore the theft to Herod – and then the curse would be “for the Child Jesus!”. Finally, still having in mind the arse of the statue, “Make it stand on end, and then stick it all inside!” With irony on the good outcome of art.

All fantasies? I can agree: but, substantially, authorized.

As to “tranquillity” and “mastered” I would say that they are certainly typos! I attach the essay by Paola Gulli, who opens up the aporias of the new “Joyce”. [...]

A hug in the odour of antiquity!

The passage in question had appeared in the 1960 translation as follows: “Il marmo sì rendeva l’originale, spalle, didietro, tutta la simmetria. Tutto il resto, via, era puritanesimo. Però, però il sovrano di San Giuseppe... laddove nessuna foto ci arriva perché non è arte, via, in una parola”.

In the final result de Angelis adopted at least one of Pagnini’s suggestions (“la sovrana” for “il sovrano”): “Il marmo sì rendeva l’originale, spalle, didietro, tutta la simmetria, tutto il resto. Via, era puritanisme. Però, però la sovrana di San Giuseppe alors (Bandez!) Figne toi trop... Laddove nessuna foto ci arriva perché non è arte via in una parola”.