

## The Reconfiguration of Joyce across Cultures: Two Different Portraits of *A Portrait*

M. TERESA CANEDA CABRERA

### *Abstract*

Drawing from the notion that the inscription of a literary work in a foreign literary system is often subjected to a kind of reinvention in so far as its significance must be re-established and reconstructed according to new values, the paper approaches two different versions of Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in the Spanish language, published in Spain (1926) and Cuba (1964), in order to examine the peculiarities of the two different prologues. The analysis of the two individual critical responses reveals that each author invokes a substantially different reading, ultimately constructing a radically different "portrait" of *A Portrait*. The paper argues that the translation and reception of Joyce's novel in these two ideological contexts of reception must be explored as a complex operation of intercultural negotiation and thus discusses the ways in which the Spanish and Cuban *Retratos* were "reconfigured" to satisfy the demands of different discourses and institutions.

Recent ground-breaking approaches to modernism have developed a line of study that insists on questioning some of the most popular critical assumptions underlying the concept and have, thus, inspired both a reassessment of modernist writers and texts and a redefinition of the modernist project itself. Contemporary perspectives encourage reconsiderations of the critical standards and the vocabulary that helped install certain monolithic views, particularly in reference to high modernism. Thus, if high modernist works were once viewed as characterized by their uncompromising intellectuality, formalism, detachment and reflexivity, today, informed by the changes that have affected the paradigms of Anglo-American criticism in recent decades, we are rereading the modernists as writers that opened new spaces for the expression of varied responses to modernity with equally varied political and social claims on reality.<sup>1</sup>

Whereas the emergence of so many publications concerned with "making modernism new" has definitely made vigorous the exploration of the intricate relations

between literary modernism and the historical contingencies of modernity, it has also infused the discussion with an enlightening debate revealing the competing and contradictory discourses through which modernism has historically been examined. In this respect, my calling on the crucial rethinking that often accompanies contemporary attempts to reread “the modernist tradition” here is aimed at reflecting on how, as we analyse the discourses that have shaped our research practices as well as our critical assumptions, we are also dismantling certain hegemonic notions that have dominated some of the most popular approaches to modernism.<sup>2</sup> The critical interrogation and reconfiguring of the modernist project is inevitably forced to reveal multiple contradictions that ultimately derive from the coexistence of plural and often opposed interpretations concerning the relationship between modernist art and reality. As in the Joycean image of the distorting mirror, which Stephen proclaims a symbol of Irish art in *Ulysses*, modernism becomes a cracked “looking-glass” where fractured reflections reduplicate a shifting image that can never be seen or grasped in a unified way.

This intricate tangle of contradictions becomes exceptionally visible when one explores the reception of writers like James Joyce himself, whose works have traditionally been read in strong association with the different critical views on modernist art.<sup>3</sup> As Keith Booker points out: “Joyce’s texts have changed over the past fifty years because the critical framework within which we read them has changed and because that framework itself is in a very real way constitutive of the texts.”<sup>4</sup> The critic argues that the works of the Irish writer have been subjected to substantially different readings — “[he] was read in apolitical ways and is now increasingly read in political ones” (226)— which in general have emerged as a result of the critical framework or method of interpretation being adopted.

Moreover, in the case of modernist writers with an international reputation like Joyce, the aspect of interpretative mediation is further complicated when those internationally reputed works are translated and accordingly re-inscribed in new contexts of reception. Significantly, the translated text may strike surprising new resonances among its new readers as other social, political and cultural conditionings intervene in reshaping the image of the writer and his/her work through a process of “enframing” which includes not only the obvious linguistic transferences and cultural adaptations but also, in many cases, meaningful ideological manipulations. In this respect, the comparison of different contexts of reception in the case of Joyce’s fiction in general, and *Ulysses* in particular, informs us of the specific version of modernism that the Joycean *oeuvre* has been made to represent for each distinctive community of readers throughout different historical periods.

Interesting examples of the translation and criticism of modernism functioning as institutionalization<sup>5</sup> can be found in countries with a strong governmental control of their cultural politics. The traditional reference to *Ulysses* as “empty formalism,” the product of a deranged mind representing the decline of the capitalist society, was first constructed by the Soviet Marxist literary criticism of the 1930s and, in many cases, survived well into the 1960s in most countries in the Eastern European socialist block.<sup>6</sup> Thus, in his study of the reception of Joyce in East Germany, Wolfgang Wicht explains that “in their search for a scapegoat to represent the sins of literary degeneration, the champions of Stalinist cultural dogmatism found their main target in James Joyce.”<sup>7</sup> As the critic documents, Georg Luckács’s militant stance against modernism and his anti-Joycean attitude shaped the thinking of party aligned critics: “Luckács told his readers that Joyce led literature into the errors of formalism, subjectivism and irrationalism” (74). Wicht argues that “dogmatism became the official doctrine” (75) in the 1950s when party ideologues bluntly declared that socialism was opposed to modernist formalism and thus stigmatized modernism because of its bourgeois decadence: “Terms like formalism, decadence, modernism and avant-garde became synonyms” (75).

Paradoxically, while in Great Britain and the United States *Ulysses* was condemned for staying too close to reality (as controversy arose due to the allegations of blasphemy and obscenity) and banned until 1933 and 1936 respectively,<sup>8</sup> across Eastern Europe Marxist cultural politics and aesthetics dismissed Joyce’s modernist novel for its detachment from the real and its employment of non-realist forms of representation. In this context, the Irish author was accordingly presented as the arch-enemy of socialism: “Joyce was declared the chief culprit who had committed the crimes of violating the decency of realism [. . .] and of producing a petty-bourgeois travesty of capitalist reality completely inadmissible to a socialist society” (71).

The reception of Joyce in the early years of Stalinist cultural politics in the former GDR is but one of the many examples, perhaps one of the most eloquent ones too, that illustrates the implications at work behind the production of different images of Joyce’s modernism in different political and cultural scenes. Those of us working across literary traditions and cultures have often observed how the inscription of a writer or an individual literary work in a foreign literary system is subjected to a kind of reinvention since a new significance must be re-established and reconstructed according to the values of the foreign culture. Scholarly work, critical reviews, literary histories, anthologies, criticism and editions, but also translations for non professional readers, help conform the image of the

writer and his/her work in the new context. This aspect has been discussed by translation critics such as André Lefevere and Lawrence Venuti. Lefevere focuses specifically on translation as a pivotal mechanism in the transference of ideology. For him the translation of literature, either if inspired by an ideological or aesthetic programme or produced as a reaction against political or stylistic constraints, functions always as a type of rewriting.

Drawing on Lefevere's notion of "rewriting" —"All rewritings whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way"<sup>9</sup>— and Venuti's emphasis on the intervening aspect of translation as mediation between cultures, a "domesticated" understanding of foreignness —i.e. the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs and representations that pre-exist in the target language determining the production, circulation and reception of texts<sup>10</sup>— I intend to discuss two paradigmatic instances of what I see as "ideological transactions" in the reception, or rather "reconfiguration," of Joyce's modernism across two different cultures.

My concern here is not with translation explicitly but rather with the "rewriting" and "reconstitution" represented by "criticism and edition." In this respect, I propose to look at the two different critical introductions that appeared in two different translations of Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in the Spanish language, published in Spain (1926) and Cuba (1964). As I will explain, judging from each of the two individual critical responses, we seem to be faced with two very different "portraits" of *A Portrait*, two cracked mirrors reflecting two radically different images of Joyce. Despite the fact that the two translated texts share the same language, the "version of the novel" favoured by each of the two prefaces shows that each translation is shaped by the values and beliefs peculiar to each culture and, furthermore, demonstrates to what extent each specific translation was produced to satisfy the specific demands of a particular ideology within that culture.

Undoubtedly, the shocking differences between the Cuban and the Spanish *Portraits* have much to do with the prevailing political and intellectual climate of each of the two countries when the translations were published. If, as I have suggested earlier, the translation of a literary text requires to be explored as a complex operation of intercultural negotiation, ultimately the two literary critics responsible for introducing the translation of Joyce's novel in the two different countries function as cultural agents reshaping and intervening in the foreign/original text. As Lefevere reminds us:

Two factors basically determine the image of a work of literature as projected by a translation. The two factors are, in order of importance, the translator's ideology [. . .] and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time the translation is made. (41)

The critic draws attention to the way in which when a foreign text is translated it comes into being for the first time for a specific community of readers at an equally specific historical moment. In the same vein, Venuti claims that the effects of a translation depend not only on the discursive strategies employed by the translator “but also on the various factors in their reception, including the page design and cover art of the printed book, the advertising copy, the opinion of reviewers and the uses made of the translation in cultural and social institutions” (68). There are moments in the cultural and political history of a community when literary translations are produced to satisfy the specific demands of a specific group or institution. Since different cultures may assign different functions to translations of the same texts depending on the audience they are intended for and on what they are supposed to represent, ultimately the impact of a literary translation, its reception and circulation, will always mirror the cultural and political agendas, as well as the ideological positions and commercial interests of particular groups. Under these circumstances, as I will discuss in reference to *A Portrait*, the translators and critics may appropriate the source text to make it serve their ends.

In his exhaustive study on the Spanish critical response to Joyce, Alberto Lázaro<sup>11</sup> explains that Joyce's aesthetic innovations were discussed enthusiastically throughout the twenties and thirties in the pages of quite a few renowned journals edited in Madrid and the geographical periphery as well.<sup>12</sup> Between 1921 and 1927 *La Pluma*, *El Imparcial*, *Revista de Occidente* and *La Gaceta Literaria*, among others, published a number of reviews declaring an early and enthusiastic advocacy of Joyce in its pages, particularly in the aftermath of the publication of *Ulysses* in Paris in 1922. Despite the impressive list of sympathetic responses, the Irish writer seemed to have been approached, nonetheless, with a cautious reticence, mainly because of his questionable morality for certain conservative Spanish sensibilities of the time. This is, at least, what one may conclude from the fact that the 1926 translation of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, first published as *El artista adolescente (retrato)* and translated by the poet Dámaso Alonso, appeared under the pseudonym of Alfonso Donado.<sup>13</sup> The original edition of the translation (incidentally the first translation of a complete work by Joyce into Spanish) also included a prologue written

by the critic Antonio Marichalar, based on his own *James Joyce en su laberinto*, which had first appeared in 1924 in the journal *Revista de Occidente*.

Both Alonso's translation and Marichalar's prologue represented not only a pioneering approach to Joyce's early novel in the peninsula but also functioned as an authoritative reading that was to exert an important influence on subsequent generations of readers. As Francisco García Tortosa has noted, "La traducción [. . .] consigue la altura literaria de otras obras del traductor y por este motivo entra a formar parte del escaso grupo de traducciones al español con una cierta relevancia en la historia de la literatura."<sup>14</sup>

Although Marichalar's prologue includes episodes from the writer's biography, addresses the topic of Joyce's heightened realism and rebellious anti-traditionalism, and repeatedly explains his "modern sensibility" against the inescapable background of *Ulysses*, with numerous passages devoted to an extended discussion of the innovative use of the "interior monologue" in *A Portrait*, it is nevertheless a concern with the novel's treatment of Catholicism that dominates most of the introduction. As Lázaro puts it "Marichalar emphasizes the religious dimension of Joyce's oeuvre" (424). Certainly, through his approach, which often becomes an obvious attempt to account for the work's "obscenity" and "heresy" before a majority Catholic readership, the Spanish critic proffers a portrait of the novel predominantly as a representation of a world irreverently "grotesque" yet, in his view, essentially "Christian" at heart.

This introduction to the Spanish translation of *A Portrait* construes Joyce's novel mainly as the typical product of a "religious writer": "En toda su obra se reflejará siempre esa preocupación religiosa" (xiv), "la vocación de Joyce es artística, pero su preocupación es íntimamente religiosa" (xxii).<sup>15</sup> Interestingly enough, Marichalar observes that:

mientras los libros de Joyce eran denunciados por las sociedades moralizadoras de Norteamérica [. . .] En tanto el puritanismo hugonote le tacha de escritor pornográfico, se ve tratado de jesuita por sus compañeros [. . .] en el herético Joyce la voz orgía readquiere su sentido órfico de purificación: su obra es casi un auto de fe (xiv).

Thus, the critic, who also refers to Stephen Dedalus as "un estupendo producto moderno de la filosofía escolástica" (xxiv) and explicitly calls the novel "un auto de fe" (xiv), manages to exempt Joyce from possible attacks by Spanish Catholic orthodoxy. Likewise he claims that:

Con sus osadías, con sus crudezas, con sus irreverentes alardes, la obra de Joyce nos presenta al hombre miserable [. . .] al hombre desamparado y aterido cuando le falta Dios. Y todo ello viene a demostrar que la obra de Joyce es íntimamente cristiana en su raíz. (xxiv)

The obsession with absolving *A Portrait* on the basis of its being a religious novel seems to have turned into a major concern for the author of the prologue. What I find extremely paradoxical here is that, whereas Stephen Dedalus's *non serviam* in *A Portrait* has been read in the Anglo-American context as illustrative of Joyce's own sense of disenchantment with the Catholic church in Ireland, "the portrait of the renegade Catholic artist as hero"<sup>16</sup> (and early reviewers in Britain, Ireland and the US hailed the work as original yet tended to express their rejection of the "coarseness" and "vulgarity" of the book, explicitly condemning the irreverent treatment of religion)<sup>17</sup> in the context of church-dominated Spain in the 1920s, the critical response to Joyce's novel conveniently remains tributary to the ideology of Catholicism.<sup>18</sup> In this respect, Marichalar contributes to the "rewriting" of *A Portrait* as a "Catholic" novel and puts into practice an interesting strategy of domestication/manipulation. By making Joyce's image fit in with the dominant ideology, the introduction to the translation makes a clear attempt to negotiate the "safe" enlistment of a novel intended for a (mainly) Catholic readership.<sup>19</sup>

As suggested earlier, the idea that translation is not a neutral activity but rather an ideologically marked transaction, since the same text may be appropriated to perform radically different functions, is exceptionally true in those cases in which translations must accommodate the programmatic intentions of institutions or communities whose ideology dictates what is acceptable. In a study on translation and political engagement, the critic Maria Tymoczko convincingly demonstrates that the translation of early Irish texts was central to the emergence of Irish cultural nationalism between 1890-1916. Tymoczko discusses in detail the "transformations"<sup>20</sup> which the narratives of Cú Chulainn underwent so that the hero would come to epitomize the ideal of militant Irish nationalism at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. The patriotic translators reshaped Cú Chulainn's legendary biography with the idea of turning him into a heroic model of resistance to English colonial oppression. As the critic claims, these translations were not only refracted in plays, poems and subsequent nationalist narratives which popularized idealized images and representations of the hero but, in addition, "the trajectory of these translations set to the Easter Rising of 1916 was a literal one" (29), since, as we are reminded, Cú Chulainn was a model for the poet Patrick Pearse, one of the leaders of the 1916 political uprising. Conversely, Tymoczko explains that fifty years after the Irish State had won independence from Britain, the writer Thomas Kinsella challenged the nationalist traditions of noble heroism through a translation of the same narratives in

which he “heightened the comic, earthly and sexual aspects of the texts, as well as Cú Chulainn’s anti-heroic and grotesque qualities” (30). Tymoczko argues that Kinsella’s demythologizing translation was aimed as a response to what he himself experienced as the constraints of Irish cultural politics in the 1960s.<sup>21</sup>

The above-mentioned example, which clearly speaks for the essential role of translation whenever it participates in the formation of cultural and political identities, may well be seen as parallel to the way in which the Spanish and Cuban *Retratos* have been used to negotiate radically opposed ideological positions for different readerships. In the case of *A Portrait*, if the Spanish response in the years following the 1926 translation reflects the concerns of a Catholic sensibility which in the Franco era became institutionalized through a strong alliance between Government and Church,<sup>22</sup> in Cuba, the introduction of Joyce’s novel in 1964, only five years after the Socialist/Castro Revolution, was subjected to a significant instrumentalization, as the text’s ideology was reinterpreted in the historical context of the new “free” Cuba.

The translation of *A Portrait* was published in Havana in 1964 as part of a collection significantly called “Biblioteca del Pueblo,”<sup>23</sup> devoted to popularizing world-acclaimed writers including other modernists such as Frank Kafka, Thomas Mann, John Dos Passos and William Faulkner, whose forthcoming works were announced in an appended section called “otros autores de nuestro tiempo.” In a preface entitled “Al lector,” the author, Edmundo Desnoes,<sup>24</sup> hails Joyce’s *A Portrait* since he explains, “la experiencia de Joyce tiene muchos puntos de contacto con la circunstancia social del escritor hispanoamericano” (xiv). Further parallelisms between the two islands, Ireland and Cuba, are mentioned by the author as he widely discusses similarities between the two countries’ common colonial past:

Irlanda, en la época que escribió, era una colonia de Inglaterra [. . .] El ambiente de torpeza primitiva, que obligó en más de una ocasión a Joyce a exclamar que Irlanda era el país más atrasado de Europa, recuerda un poco a nuestra situación. (xiv-xv).

Desnoes introduces Joyce to the Cuban readership as the only modern European writer concerned with national independence and underdevelopment —“De la gran literatura europea contemporánea, Joyce es el único que plantea el problema de la soberanía nacional y el subdesarrollo” (xv) — and suggests that the words with which Stephen Dedalus expresses his alienation before the language imposed by “the conqueror,” “nos parecen las palabras que un cubano podría lanzar al colonizador español” (xiv). Interestingly enough, a large part of the introduction discusses relevant events in Ireland’s

modern history in a clear attempt to produce an image of the social and historical context of the novel that can be reinterpreted in the light of Cuba's contemporary moment, thus linking the colonized identity of the two "imagined" communities.

The "original" *A Portrait* is mentioned using an indiscriminate mixture of fiction and fact, mainly an abrupt juxtaposition of biographical aspects, historical references and plot analysis that ultimately aim at making Joyce's novel congenial to the official ideology of the revolution. Undoubtedly, one of the most interesting examples for a discussion of translation as reconfiguration can be found in a reference to James O'Kelly, "uno de los lugartenientes más fieles de Parnell" (xv), who, according to the author, supported the cause of a free Cuba in his writings after visiting the island as a journalist during the Cuban War of Independence. Furthermore, the author emphatically reveals that: "O' Kelly, que había estado en Cuba, fue el único amigo personal que no participó en la traición que desilusionó al joven Stephen de la política irlandesa" (xvi).

The mention of Parnell's betrayal, the great political crisis which dominated Joyce's early life,<sup>25</sup> is eloquent in itself as it explicitly acknowledges the importance of Irish politics in Joyce's work in general and in *A Portrait* in particular. In this respect, the prologue reveals an appreciation of history and colonial tensions which must be considered exceptional, particularly at a time when critics tacitly acknowledged that the concerns of Joyce's *A Portrait* were primarily aesthetic rather than political.<sup>26</sup> Through his calculated choices, the author of the prologue reinterprets Joyce's narrative to make it conform to the themes of struggling for freedom from oppression and fighting for independence, which formed the basis of Cuban national identity for the ideologues of the Revolution.<sup>27</sup> Ultimately, then, the Cuban version of *A Portrait* cannot be seen "just" as a translation, in the sense of it becoming merely the transcription of a foreign text, but rather as a reconfiguration, a deliberate and conscious act of self-expression and political legitimization. Desnoes's project exhibits in a especially clear way a process of identity formation which Venuti has explained as follows:

In creating stereotypes, translation may attach esteem or stigma to specific ethnic, racial, and national groupings [. . .] In the long run, translation figures in geopolitical relations by establishing the cultural grounds of diplomacy, reinforcing alliances, antagonisms and hegemonies between nations.<sup>28</sup>

As we have seen, through a hybrid discourse which combines literary and biographical references together with revolutionary propaganda and patriotic overtones, Desnoes tacitly contributes to the establishment of "geopolitical relations" and "alliances"

with Ireland. Yet, the critic focuses not only on stressing the common links between the identity of Ireland and of Cuba, as former colonies. The prologue also, towards the end, proves to be an interesting example of political didacticism serving the cause of revolutionary propaganda. A final reference to a hypothetical encounter between Joyce and Lenin is used as an excuse to explain the parallelism between the writer's literary accomplishments and Lenin's political achievements:

Por aquella época Zurich era un a estación central de exilados europeos [. . .] En el café Odeón coincidieron varias veces, probablemente sin llegar a conocerse, Lenin y Joyce. Uno destruiría la vieja sociedad burguesa en Rusia y daría a todos los hombres la posibilidad de una vida más justa y plena; el otro profundizaría en la conciencia del hombre ensanchando nuestra realidad. (xviii)

This highly politicized portrait of Joyce's art influences significantly the actual interpretation of the novel which is thus read in terms of the individual's alienation by the destructive forces of society: "[el] *Retrato* [. . .] es el credo de un artista cercado por una sociedad que lo rechaza, que vive obsesionada por el dinero y atemorizada por la tradición y las convenciones" (xiii). The idea that Joyce's art powerfully affects reality by first making an impact on the individual conscience is repeated through the preface: "la literatura tiene sentido sólo cuando nos da una visión penetrante, más intensa de la realidad" (viii).

Of particular interest is the way this interpretation of the novel, in light of social and political doctrines that sustained revolutionary ideology, also entails a reinterpretation of the value and function of Joyce's modernist aesthetics. In his prologue, the author writes that "la literatura que cuenta las cosas como estamos acostumbrados a verlas, es una estafa para el lector" (viii), and goes on to state that "Joyce trabajó la realidad desde diferentes ángulos [. . .] la perforación de la realidad desde varios ángulos creó una nueva visión" (xvi). Implicitly, the suggestion is that Joyce's modernist style may well be a revolutionary alternative to (traditional) realist forms of representation since, ultimately, the defamiliarizing techniques deployed in *A Portrait* contribute to the creation of a more intense and penetrating vision that functions not as a distraction from reality but, rather, as a potential critique of it.

Whose portrait does *A Portrait* ultimately reveal? Is the novel the apologetic picture of a Catholic artist, aloof from the world and concerned only with his own personal crisis, or is it, instead, a revolutionary piece of fiction that resists servitude to existing social orders and systems of power? The reception of *A Portrait* in both Spanish and Cuban cultural arenas is emblematic of the different implications that Joyce's work may acquire

as it transcends its original space to be rewritten in different contexts of reception. Appropriated by different discourses and institutions, the image of the artist emerges reconfigured through two radically different portraits.

Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example the comprehensive study on modernism, Astradur Eysteinnsson and Vivian Liska, eds., *Modernism* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> For revisionist studies of modernism see Steven Giles, *Theorizing Modernism* (London: Routledge, 1993); Peter Nicholls, *Modernisms* (London: MacMillan, 1995); Hugh Witemeyer, *The Future of Modernism* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997) and Steven Matthews, *Modernism* (London: Arnold, 2004).

<sup>3</sup> I have discussed at length the contradictions and paradoxes concerning the critical reception of modernism in reference to Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in my *La estética modernista como práctica de resistencia en A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (Vigo: Universidade de Vigo, 2002).

<sup>4</sup> M. Keith Booker, *Joyce, Bakhtin and the Literary Tradition*. (Ann Arbor: The U of Michigan P, 1995) 227. All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>5</sup> For a discussion of concepts such as "enframing" and "institutionalization" see Susan R. Horton, "The Institution of Literature and the Cultural Community," in *Literary Theory's Future*, ed. Joseph Natoli. (Urbana: U of Urbana P, 1989).

<sup>6</sup> See Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo eds. *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*, vol 1 (London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004).

<sup>7</sup> Wolfgang Wicht. "The Disintegration of Stalinist Cultural Dogmatism: James Joyce in East Germany, 1945 to the Present" in *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*. Vol. 1, eds. Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo (London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004) 71. All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>8</sup> For a study of Joyce's battles with censorship in the United States see Jeffrey Segall, *Joyce in America: Cultural Politics and the Trials of Ulysses* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P, 1993). See also Paul Vanderham, *James Joyce and Censorship: The Trials of Ulysses* (London: Macmillan, 1998). Drawing on personal interviews and primary sources, Vanderham traces the trajectory of the trials from 1920, when the editors of the *Little Review* were charged with obscenity for printing four of the instalments from *Ulysses*, to 1934, when the United States Court of Appeals upheld the historic 1933 decision by Judge J.M. Woolsey lifting the ban. For a well documented study of Joyce's struggles with the censors in the United Kingdom see Carmelo Medina, "Sifting through Censorship: The British Home Office *Ulysses* Files (1922-1936)," *James Joyce Quarterly* (37.3/4) 479-509. For a detailed account of Joyce's response to censorship specifically in the context of Edwardian ideologies of social purity and sexual politics see Katherine Mullin, *James Joyce, Sexuality and Social Purity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003).

<sup>9</sup> André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, (New York: Routledge, 1992) i. All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>10</sup> Lawrence Venuti. "Translation, Community, Utopia". *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, (London and New York: Routledge, 2000) 468-488. All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>11</sup> Alberto Lázaro, "A Survey of the Spanish Critical Response to James Joyce" in *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*. Vol. 2, eds. Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo, (London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004) 422-433. All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>12</sup> See also Carlos García Santa Cecilia, *La Recepción de James Joyce en la prensa española, 1921-1976* (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1997). For the reception of Joyce in the geographical periphery see Teresa Iribarren, "The Reception of Joyce in Catalonia" in *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*. Vol. 2, eds. Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo, (London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004) 445-454, and Antonio Raúl de Toro Santos, "La

---

huella de Joyce en Galicia” in *Joyce en España I*, eds. García Tortosa and de Toro Santos (A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, 1997) 31-37.

<sup>13</sup> I am grateful to John Beattie who was the first to call my attention to this question. In the course of a lecture hosted by the English Department of the University of Vigo in 2001 he explained that Dámaso Alonso, who translated the novel during his academic stay at Cambridge, wished to relegate his translation work to a secondary role in order not to handicap his chosen career as a writer. Interestingly enough, Beattie also suggested that the translator might have opted for anonymity wishing not to offend those, including his own mother, who would have abhorred the fact that he could lend his name to the propagation of certain unorthodox moral ideas. Lázaro accepts the same reasons to explain the use of the pseudonym. See Alberto Lázaro, “A Survey of the Spanish Critical Response to James Joyce” in *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*. Vol. 2, eds. Geert Lernout and Wim Van Mierlo, (London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004) 426.

<sup>14</sup> Francisco García Tortosa, “Las traducciones de Joyce al español” in *Joyce en España I*, eds. García Tortosa and de Toro Santos (A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, 1994) 21.

<sup>15</sup> The pagination refers to the 4th edition of *Retrato del Artista Adolescente. Gente de Dublín*. Prólogo de Antonio Marichalar. Traducción de Alonso Donado [sic]. (México: Editorial Porrúa, 1998)

<sup>16</sup> Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1959) 148.

<sup>17</sup> See Morris Beja, “The Early Response to A Portrait of the Artist: Comments and Reviews” in *James Joyce: Dubliners and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. (London: Macmillan, 1973) 74-80.

<sup>18</sup> Until 1931, when the Republic was proclaimed, Church and State in Spain were not separated. The Constitution of 1812 specifically stated that the religion of the Spanish people was Apostolic Roman Catholicism, “the only true one.” Later, the relationship between Church and State was based on the Concordat of 1851. Although the provisional Constitution of 1868 deprived the Church of all privileges and broke up religious orders, the Constitution introduced in 1869 forced the State to maintain the Catholic religion. When Primo de Rivera came to power in 1923 the slogan which he identified with his regime was “Country, Monarchy, Religion.” See Harry Gannes, “Church over Spain” in *Spain in Revolt*. (New York: Knopf, 1937)182-190.

<sup>19</sup> The same Catholic interpretation of the novel is endorsed in an article published in *La Gaceta Literaria* in 1928, “su obra está íntima, esencialmente impregnada de la substancia del catolicismo”. Qtd. in Lázaro (425).

<sup>20</sup> Maria Tymoczko, “Translation and Political Engagement,” *The Translator* 6.1 (April 2000) 29. All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>21</sup> For a more extended discussion of the role of translation in Ireland see Michael Cronin, *Translating Ireland. Translation, Languages, Cultures* (Cork: Cork UP, 1996).

<sup>22</sup> For a thorough discussion of the context of reception and the censorship problems faced by *A Portrait* during Franco’s regime see Alberto Lázaro, “James Joyce’s Encounters with Censorship, 1939-1966,” *Joyce Studies Annual* 12 (2001) 38-54.

<sup>23</sup> James Joyce, *Retrato del Artista Adolescente*. Prólogo de Edmundo Desnoes. (La Habana: Editorial Nacional de Cuba, 1964). All future quotations will be documented parenthetically.

<sup>24</sup> A brief reference on the sixth page acknowledges that Edmundo Desnoes is also responsible for the “revised translation”. Although a comparative study of the two translations is beyond the scope of this paper, it must be noted that substantial differences can be detected particularly in reference to semantic and syntactical choices which mainly account for linguistic uses peculiar to Latin American Spanish. Probably, the most important innovation in the Cuban translation is the translator’s constant visibility in the text through the use of explanatory footnotes absent from the 1926 Spanish translation.

<sup>25</sup> See Dominic Manganiello *Joyce’s Politics* (London: Routledge, 1980). On this particular issue the critic comments: “Parnell’s fall from power stamped itself indelibly on Joyce’s imagination, and he concentrated mainly on this aspect of the Parnell era when he sat down to reconstruct its events about two decades later in *A Portrait*. Parnell’s fall possessed that dramatic

THE RECONFIGURATION OF JOYCE ACROSS CULTURES:  
TWO DIFFERENT PORTRAITS OF A *PORTRAIT*

---

quality which other events did not, and produced those polarised attitudes and divisions in Irish society which helped to shape events in the early twentieth century.” (3) See also James Fairhall, “Parnell and Irish Politics,” in *James Joyce and the Question of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 123-146.

<sup>26</sup> Until relatively recently, when attention to Joyce from political perspectives helped debunk the myth of his withdrawal from history and politics, most critics neglected the specific colonial tensions represented in *A Portrait*. Manganiello’s book published in 1980 is often referred to as the first study on Joyce and politics (see note 25).

<sup>27</sup> See Damián J. Fernández and Madeline Camara Betancourt, *Cuba, the Elusive Nation: Interpretation of National Identity*. (Gainesville: U P of Florida, 2000).

<sup>28</sup> Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation*. (London and New York: Routledge, 1998) 68.