

**FRAGMENT FROM JOYCE'S  
*PORTRAIT OF AN ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN*  
VS. ITS RUSSIAN TRANSLATION DONE BY  
M.P. BOGOSLOVSKAYA-BOBROVA:  
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSLATOR'S STRATEGIES**

by

**ALEXANDRA PALMER**

An essay submitted to the  
School of Humanities  
of the University of Birmingham  
in part fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

**Master of Arts  
in  
Translation Studies**

Centre for English Language Studies  
Department of English  
University of Birmingham  
Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT  
United Kingdom

January 2004

**ST/00/01**

Find one or more translations of the fragment from Joyce's *Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man*, used in Activity 4, Unit 3. Comment on the strategies used by the translator and, if necessary, provide your own suggestions. Alternatively, you can choose a source text portraying a similar conflict.

## 1. Introduction

I have chosen to analyze a Russian translation of the fragment from J. Joyce's *Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man* done by M.P. Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova in the late nineteen-thirties. The translation analyzed in this essay is taken from the revised edition published in 1997. The revision performed by S. Khoruzhiy concerned mostly the correction of mistakes found in Irish and especially Catholic themes. As Khoruzhiy points out Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova was translating 'in the atmosphere of cultural isolation' that made mistakes of the kind unavoidable. Khoruzhiy stresses that changes he made were minimal, for Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova's translation was done at a 'high level of literary excellence' (see Khoruzhiy's commentary to the revised edition).

I will focus on the strategies used by the translator when rendering the conflict - colonizer vs. colonized - into the target language. I will rely in my analysis on G. Toury's concept of translation as a 'norm-governed activity' ('The Translation Studies Reader', 2000, Ch. 16), the concept of the 'Third Space' developed by H. Bhabha ('The Location of Culture', 1994) and the 'analytic of translation' proposed by A. Berman ('The Translation Studies Reader', 2000, Ch. 21). I will then summarize the results of the analysis to draw a conclusion about the role of norms in this particular instance of translation, the (in)ability of the translator to avoid the 'deforming tendencies that intervene in the domain of literary prose' (Berman, 2000:287) and, finally, the (in)ability of the translator to successfully render the conflict portrayed in the fragment.

The fragment from Joyce's *Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man* (ST) and Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova's translation (TT) are presented as separate appendices: Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, correspondingly. In addition, I have provided a back translation, as close to literal as possible, of TT (see Appendix 3: BT).

## 2. Analysis of the Translator's Strategies

### 2.1 TT and Norms

The starting point for my analysis of the translator's strategies lies beyond the actual product of her work. The very decision to translate Joyce is worth commenting on. The late nineteen thirties in Russia were a time of Stalin's dictatorship associated with political and physical terror. Innocent people were routinely arrested, sent to prison or labour camps or shot without a trial. In most cases the 'legal grounds' for the arrests were espionage or ideological propaganda like, for instance, translating a banned author. Joyce was a banned author at the time. Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova was literally risking her life when choosing to ignore the *translation policy* imposed by the communist government. She chose to set her own standards as to what should be translated. This was under the circumstances an act of courage: civil, professional and human. This is as well in Toury's terms a vivid example of progressive *non-normative behaviour*. *Preliminary norms* - restrictions on what may be translated as ideologically suitable for the Soviet people - were deliberately broken by the individual translator; as a result the Russian readership was introduced to one of the most influential writers of the twentieth century.

*Operational norms* – here, restrictions on how to translate to make the translation acceptable - unlike preliminary norms did not present Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova with a difficult choice between either accepting the official or adhering to her own viewpoint. This is largely due to the nature of ST itself. The language of *Portrait* is not yet that purely Joyce's language of *Ulysses*. The genre - psychological novel - is not new to European literature. As a result, the *initial norm* – adherence to the target culture - does not dominate the translator's choices and TT may be overall viewed as a unity rather than an opposition of adequacy and acceptability in translation. However, 'even if no clear macro-level tendency can be shown, any micro-level decision can still be accounted for in terms of adequacy vs. acceptability' (Toury, 2000:201).

I will analyze those ‘micro-level decisions’ and their relation to *textual-linguistic norms* in the following section of this essay.

### 2.1.1 ST Linguistic Material vs. TT Linguistic Material

The focal point of the chosen fragment from *Portrait* is the linguistic conflict between the two nouns *funnel* and *tundish*. Hence, the opposition of ST linguistic material and that of TT is complicated by the opposition within ST itself. I will examine the choices the translator makes to cope with this double opposition. Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary provides the following definitions:

- *funnel* (15c) a utensil that is usu. a hollow cone with a tube extending from the smaller end and that is designed to catch and direct a downward flow;
- *tundish* (14c) FUNNEL (Webster’s, 1993:473; 1272).

The Russian counterparts of *funnel* and *tundish* chosen by Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova are correspondingly *воронка* and *цедилка*. The following is my translation of the definitions found in S.I. Ozhegov’s Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language:

- *воронка* an appliance for pouring liquids – a cone shaped reservoir with a draining tube in the bottom;
- *цедилка* (coll.) a utensil for filtering liquids (Ozhegov, 2000:97; 872).

According to Ozhegov, *воронка* and *цедилка* are not interchangeable. The former is used for *pouring*, the latter – for *filtering* liquids. It is not clear if *воронка* and *цедилка* have structural similarities, for the shape of *цедилка* is not specified. The noun *цедилка*, however, is derived from the verb *цедить* that means ‘strain, filter’, but also ‘pour something drop by drop’ (Contemporary Russian-English Dictionary, 2002:742). So, the sense of *pouring* is common to both *воронка* and *цедилка*. On the other hand, it is possible to filter something

by means of *воронка* and a piece of cheesecloth. That makes *filtering* common to both appliances as well. Hence, despite the dictionary's definition, *воронка* and *цедилка* are in fact similar in terms of their functional purpose.

The English words *tundish* and *funnel* are not merely similar: according to Merriam Webster's, for instance, *tundish* means *funnel*. The two nouns are not, however, completely interchangeable: *funnel* is the first sense in the entry for *tundish*, but in the entry for *funnel* the noun *tundish* is not mentioned at all. This suggests (although the dictionary does not provide any specific labels for the nouns in question) that *funnel* is viewed as an accepted literary norm; while *tundish* is 1) confined to a limited group of language users, or 2) pertains to the colloquial way of expression, or 3) its usage is both limited and colloquial.

The linguistic opposition within ST is rendered well into TT, for the relationship between TT *воронка* and *цедилка* is indeed similar to that of ST *funnel* and *tundish*:

ST		TT	
<i>funnel</i>	<i>tundish</i>	<i>воронка</i>	<i>цедилка</i>
literary	pertains to colloquial	literary	colloquial
denote the same appliance		denote similar appliances	

The major opposition of ST linguistic material and TT linguistic material in the above example is dealt with successfully. So is the opposition of adequacy and acceptability. Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova chooses the direct equivalent for *funnel* (*воронка*) thus keeping the translation adequate. Her next decision – the choice of *цедилка* to render *tundish* - is governed by the linguistic norms generated by the tradition of domestication that dominates the process of translating fiction into Russian in the first half of the twentieth century. Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova follows

this tradition and chooses a reader-friendly word *цедилка* thus making the translation acceptable to the Russian readership.

## 2.2 ST Conflict: Colonizer vs. Colonized

A cursory reading may identify the opposition between *funnel* and *tundish* as merely a linguistic problem. However, it is a linguistic way to reflect the major opposition underlying the whole fragment: the conflict of British and Irish or, in this context, colonizer and colonized. Hence, the translator's task is further complicated by the necessity of both rendering that conflict and achieving the same linguistic effect.

As ST unfolds language becomes a barometer of the conflict between the dean ('colonizer') and Stephen ('colonized'). To use distinctions from Henri Gobard's analysis cited by A. Brisset ('The Translation Studies Reader', 2000, Ch. 24, p. 345), the dean's British English when opposed to Stephen's *vernacular language*, Irish, acquires for Stephen the features of *vehicular*, *referential* and *mythical languages*:

*The language in which we are speaking is his before it is mine. ... His language, so familiar and so foreign will always be for me an acquired speech. (A learned out of necessity *vehicular language*.)*

*He felt with a smart dejection that the man to whom he was speaking was a countryman of Ben Jonson. (A tied to cultural traditions *referential language*.)*

*How different are the words *h o m e, C h r i s t, a l e, m a s t e r, on his lips and on mine!* I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. (Verbal magic, a *mythical language*.)*

This mythical quality of the dean's language is partially lost in TT that reads:

*I cannot calmly utter or write these words* (see Appendix 3).

The following is my alternative translation that, questionably, renders ST *unrest of spirit* better:

*Я не могу со спокойствием духа произнести или написать эти слова  
(I cannot with peace of mind - literally *peace of spirit* - utter or write  
these words).*

The dean's attitude towards his own language does not undergo any changes, but his perception of the world around him is affected by Stephen. To paraphrase Brisset (2000:347), the existence of an Irish language is suddenly perceived by the dean as tangible proof of the existence of an Irish people. This connection of the language and the people receives even a stronger emphasis in TT: a ST impersonal territorial reference '*in Ireland*' in 'Is that called a *tundish in Ireland?*' is transformed into a TT less geographically specific, but personalized reference '*у ирландцев*' ('*among the Irish*'). It is hard to tell due the limited context of the short fragment whether this transformation has been intended or not, but it does not misinterpret ST idea, the effect of a sudden 'discovery' of the Irish by the dean. This sudden discovery does not, however, have a profound influence on the latter. He might or might not give it another thought, just like he might or might not look up the word *tundish*.

The changes Stephen goes through are deep and painful. Stephen abruptly loses ties with his mother tongue, it becomes 'his [the dean's] language' to him. New ties are not built, for Stephen does not accept the dean's language, either. That leaves Stephen in a way without a language and without a culture. Or rather he is caught in between the two cultures unable to identify himself with either of them. He occupies in Bhabha's terms the '*inbetween* or Third Space'. According to Bhabha, however, the 'Third Space' is a chance to reconcile the opposed cultures: '... by exploring this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves' (Bhabha, 1994: 39). The focus of Bhabha's



approach is not on the conflict, the opposition of colonizer and colonized loses its actuality. The focus is on bringing together rather than dividing, the ‘culture’s *hybridity*’ rather than the ‘*diversity* of cultures’. The hybrid culture of the ‘Third Space’ is the true culture through which the interwoven histories of peoples may join in one true history.

*‘There is no such thing as a homogeneous culture ... the ideology of homogeneity rejects all dialogism and is, thus, a form of totalitarianism’*  
(Brisset, 2000: 353).

‘The meaning of culture’ (hybridity) is, however, a ‘burden’ (Bhabha, 1994: 38). Accommodating oneself in the ‘Third Space’ takes time. The ‘Third Space’ may well become Stephen’s new home, but for now he is ‘unhomed’, though not homeless: ‘the unhomeliness ... is the condition of extra-territorial and cross-cultural initiations’ (Bhabha, 1994: 9). In Stephen’s case the ‘unhomeliness’ is not physical, for he remains at home. He experiences a psychological condition and arising from it feelings of reluctance, doubt and rejection.

The fact that ‘the little word [tundish]’ is capable of causing such a rapid change in Stephen’s perception of himself and the world around him suggests that the way for this kind of change has long been prepared. The words – *funnel* and *tundish* – are merely triggers that bring into motion the complicated mechanism of colonizer vs. colonized relations. The importance of those triggers, however, cannot be overestimated, especially in the process of translation.

### **2.2.1 TT: Rendering ST Conflict**

ST linguistic material is successfully realized in TT (see 2.1.1). The difficulty of rendering ST conflict into TT ‘arises ... from the absence in the target language a subcode equivalent to the one used by the source text in its reproduction of the

source language' (Brisset, 2000:344). An 'equivalent' of the opposition between British English and Irish does not exist in the Russian language.

One of the possible solutions suggested in the course on 'Socio-Translation' would be 'to leave the English words which Stephen alludes to, and which sound foreign to him, in English and in italics' (Unit 3, p.60). In that way, however, 'the feeling of "strangeness" towards the English language' would not be fully re-created, for it would not be 'the same feeling'. The English language is foreign and for that reason is *a priori* 'strange' to the Russian reader. English words in italics inserted into TT would probably emphasize that kind of 'strangeness'. The translation would be *imposed* on the target culture, rather than *introduced* into it (Toury, 2000:203). Due to that imposition the Russian reader may questionably experience a feeling of reluctance towards the language that is not his/her mother tongue; a feeling similar to that experienced by Stephen. However, the similarity ends here. The same feeling of 'strangeness' would be re-created only if TT language, Russian, would suddenly sound foreign, or 'strange', to the Russian reader; the effect Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova manages to achieve as it is described further in the section.

The languages opposed in ST share 'the same linguistic heritage, ... there is *diglossia* rather than *bilingualism*' (Brisset, 2000: 353). Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova attempts to render this *diglossia* by adopting a domesticating strategy. She chooses to introduce into the target culture a *version* of the original work (Toury, 2000:203)

*'A domesticating strategy would not be recommended since it would either encourage an erroneous identification of contexts, or wipe out any information regarding the socio-linguistic situation of the source context, therefore making the protagonist's thoughts seem meaningless'* (Socio-Translation, Unit 3, p.61).

The ‘erroneous identification of contexts’ is unlikely, for ST linguistic material is successfully matched by that of TT (see 2.1.1). The re-created TT context with the emphasis on the opposition of literary and colloquial lexical items is not the equivalent of a broader ST context, but a component of the latter. In other words, TT context is restricted, but not erroneous. Domestication does not fully convey the ‘information regarding the socio-linguistic situation of the source context’. However, partial information loss is compensated by intertextuality, ‘through which texts are recognized in terms of their dependence on other relevant texts’ (Hatim and Mason, 1990:120). The intertextual references – *Ireland, Lower Dramcondra, the best of English, a countryman of Ben Jonson* – help the reader to situate the text (ST and TT alike) in a certain socio-linguistic environment.

The intertextual references are transferred into TT with minimal mediation as ‘in the case of ... references to well-known texts’ (1990:128). Beaugrande and Dressler (cited by Hatim and Mason) determine mediation as

*The extent to which one feeds one’s current beliefs and goals into the model of the communicative situation (1990:127).*

A certain level of cultural knowledge is assumed. The reader is expected, for instance, to know (or be capable of finding out) the basic facts about *Ireland*: its status, location and language. S/he is also expected to be able to form associations that might be intuitive rather than based on actual knowledge: for example, it is unlikely that the reader who does not come from the Irish cultural background would know about *Lower Dramcondra*. However, it is assumed that s/he would be able to make correct geographical and linguistic assumptions about it relying on the already possessed knowledge of Ireland.

The pros of the domesticating strategy in this particular instance of translation outweigh the cons, for what is ultimately achieved by it is the re-creation of a similar, if not the same, feeling of ‘strangeness’. For the reader who sees the

novel's world with Stephen's eyes, the language of Stephen becomes the natural choice. The reader associates her/himself with Stephen and shares the same apprehension towards the dean and the dean's language. That does make a very familiar Russian word *воронка* (*funnel*) sound different, indeed, 'so familiar and so foreign', to the Russian reader. Psychologically s/he rejects the dean's way of expression, but is at the same time drawn to it as to cultural and educated. Hence, the colloquial *цедилка* (*tundish*) loses its appeal, whilst the literary norm *воронка* (*funnel*) is not accepted by the reader, either. As a result, s/he feels estranged from the language s/he speaks. In other words, the reader experiences the feeling of 'strangeness' towards her/his language, Russian, the way Stephen does towards English.

In addition, the multiple repetition in both ST and TT of *funnel* (*воронка*) and *tundish* (*цедилка*) may reinforce the psychological feeling of 'strangeness' towards one's language. Interestingly, multiple repetition of a lexical item may affect the way it sounds: when continuously repeated an item may sound 'strange'.

### **2.3 TT and 'Deforming Tendencies'**

The analytic of translation proposed by Berman ('The Translation Studies Reader', 2000, Ch. 21) focuses on the universal deforming tendencies of which the following three are of interest in relation to this essay.

#### *1. 'The Effacement of the Superimposition of Languages'*

'This is the central problem posed by translating novels – a problem that demands maximum reflection from the translator' (Berman, 2000: 296). Interestingly enough it is the twelfth out of the twelve problems discussed in the analytic. The positioning, questionably, imparts more weight to the problem that comes last.

According to Berman, any novel is characterized by the superimposition of languages, for it ‘mobilizes and activates the totality of “languages” that coexist in any language’ (2000: 287). The degree of this ‘poly-lingualism’ varies in novels by different writers. It is very high in prose by Joyce. Berman makes an interesting connection between Joyce’s poly-lingualism and the writer’s ‘lack of control’ over his work ‘where the most scrupulous attention is paid to form’ (2000: 287). *Portrait* is not typical of Joyce in that respect; it is not ‘the limit case – Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* and its sixteen agglutinated languages’ (2000: 296). However, the fragment from *Portrait* analyzed in this essay is not homogeneous.

The superimposition of British English and Irish in the heart of ST is not effaced in TT. The same feeling of ‘strangeness’ towards one’s language is re-created in TT (see 2.2.1) with the effect that the dean and Stephen speak the same and yet different languages. Hence, the translation is not homogeneous and ST ‘*heteroglossia* or diversity of languages’ (Bakhtin cited by Berman, 2000:296) is successfully preserved in TT.

## 2. ‘*The destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization*’

The superimposition of languages within ST is complicated by the fact that one of them, Irish, is vernacular. ‘The vernacular language is by its very nature more physical, more iconic than “cultivated” language’ (Berman, 2000:294). The expressiveness and the ‘orality’ of vernaculars are difficult to recapture in the process of translating.

Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova does not adopt the traditional method of *exoticization* to preserve the vernacular Irish of ST. She neither uses a typographical procedure of italics, nor emphasizes the vernacular according to a certain stereotype of it (Berman, 2000: 294). Instead the translator successfully renders the foreign vernacular with a local one. Berman states:

*‘...a vernicular clings tightly to its soil and completely resists any direct translating into another vernicular’* (Berman, 2000: 294).

Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova’s success does not contradict the ‘rule’ formulated by Berman, but rather proves another time that there is always an exception to the rule and that in the process of translating no strategy should be *a priori* considered unacceptable.

### 3. *‘Qualitative impoverishment’*

Verniculars are referred to as ‘physical, or iconic’ (see above). ‘A term is iconic when, in relation to its referent, it “creates an image”, enabling a perception of resemblance’ (Berman, 2000: 291). The dean and Stephen are looking at the same item, which the dean refers to as *funnel*. What Stephen sees is *tundish*; the item and the name are one. Etymologically *tundish* means ‘funnel for filling a tun, a large cask, especially for wine’ (Merriam Webster’s, 1993:1272). The very ‘texture’ of the word *tundish* creates a visual image of pouring a liquid into a reservoir by means of a special appliance. The vernicular *tundish* is richer, more ‘visible’ than *funnel*. So is the colloquial *цедилка* (*tundish*) in comparison to the neutral *воронка* (*funnel*). The noun *цедилка* forms an immediate visual association with the verb *цедить* (*strain, filter, pour*). The translator manages to re-create the same effect of the written word, *цедилка* (*tundish*), materializing and acquiring the characteristics of the item it denotes.

### 3. **Summary**

Different norms influence TT to a different degree. Due to the nature of ST – familiarity of language and genre - the *initial norm* and *operational norms* do not dominate the translator’s strategies. TT may be analyzed as a series of separate translator’s choices rather than an illustration of a clear-cut translation tendency. The choices analyzed in this essay concern rendering ST linguistic material with

that of TT. Those choices are influenced by *textual-linguistic norms*, which in turn originate in the tradition of *domestication* dominant at the time ST was translated into Russian.

Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova does not, however, merely submit to the influence of norms. Within the adopted domesticating strategy she creatively manages to balance adequacy and acceptability of her translation. The translator's independent thinking reaches the point of professional and human courage when she chooses to ignore the *translation policy* imposed by the government. *Preliminary norms* (or rather their negation) probably bear the strongest influence on TT. The translation was made possible due to the individual translator's progressive *non-normative behaviour*. Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova's translation may in Toury's terms be considered a product of a 'norm-governed activity'. However, TT proves that individuality may not only co-exist with norms, but may also influence the latter.

TT is a translation product of high quality. Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova's approach characterized by professionalism and creativity should be an example for translators to follow. She proves that the universal *deforming tendencies* are not impossible to avoid in the process of translation. She also questions the absoluteness of translation 'rules' by demonstrating how an uncommon translation practice - rendering ST vernicular by means of TT vernicular - proves to be a success.

Finally, the *domesticating strategy* adopted by the translator allows for ST conflict – colonizer vs. colonized - to be successfully rendered into TT. The translator manages to re-create the same feeling of 'strangeness' towards one's language as well as the 'unhomely' feeling of the 'Third Space'. The inevitable restrictions of TT context are compensated by *intertextuality* that helps to reconstruct the specific socio-linguistic environment of ST.

## References

*The Translation Studies Reader* edited by Venuti, L., 2000, London and New York: Routledge:

- Berman, A. *Translation and the Trials of the Foreign*, Ch. 21;
- Brisset, A. *The Search for a Native Language: Translation and Cultural Identity*, Ch. 24;
- Toury, G. *The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation*, Ch.16.

Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture*, London and New York: Routledge.

*Contemporary Russian-English Dictionary* edited by Taube, A. and Daglish, R., 2002, Moscow: Russky Yazyk Publishers.

*Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language* edited by Ozhegov, S. and Shvedova, N., 2000, Moscow: "Azbukovnik".

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*, London and New York: Longman.

Joyce, J. 1916. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Unit 3 of Socio-Translation, course materials, Center for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham.

Joyce, J. 1997. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, translated by Bogoslovskaya-Bobrova, M., Moscow: "Terra".

*Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, tenth edition, 1993, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.

Millan-Varela, C. *Translation and Post-colonial Approaches*, Unit 3 of *Socio-Translation*, course materials, Center for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham.



## Appendix 1: ST

- To return to the lamp, he said, the feeding of it is also a nice problem. You must choose the pure oil and you must be careful when you pour it in not to overflow it, not to pour in more than the funnel can hold.
  
- What funnel? asked Stephen.
  
- The funnel through which you pour the oil into your lamp.
  
- That? said Stephen. Is that called a funnel? Is it not a tundish?
  
- What is a tundish?
  
- That. The ... the funnel.
  
- Is that called a tundish in Ireland? [asked the dean.] I never heard the word in my life.

It is called a tundish in Lower Drumcondra, said Stephen laughing, where they speak the best of English. – A tundish, said the dean reflectively. That is a most interesting word. I must look that word up. Upon my word I must.

(...)

The little word [tundish] seemed to have turned a rapier point of his sensitiveness against this courteous and vigilant foe. He felt with a smart dejection that the man to whom he was speaking was a countryman of Ben Jonson. He thought: The language in which we are speaking is his before it is mine. How different are the words *home*, *Christ*, *ale*, *master*, on his lips and on mine! I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. His language, so familiar and so foreign will always be for me an acquired speech. I have not made or accepted its words. My voice holds them at bay. My soul frets the shadow of his language.

## Appendix 2: TT

- Ну, хорошо, вернёмся к лампе, - сказал он. – Заправлять её тоже дело довольно трудное. Нужно, чтобы масло было чистое, а когда наливаешь его, надо следить за тем, чтобы не пролить, не налить больше, чем может вместить воронка.
- Какая воронка? – спросил Стивен.
- Воронка, через которую наливают масло в лампу.
- А...- сказал Стивен. – Разве это называется воронкой? По-моему, это цедилка.
- А что такое «цедилка»?
- Ну, это ... воронка.
- Разве она называется цедилкой у ирландцев? – спросил декан. – Первый раз в жизни слышу такое слово.
- Её называют цедилкой в Нижней Драмкондре, - смеясь сказал Стивен, - где говорят на чистейшем английском языке.
- Цедилка, - повторил задумчиво декан, - занятное слово. Надо посмотреть его в словаре. Обязательно посмотрю.

(...)

Казалось, это словечко [цедилка] обратило язвительное остриё его настороженности против учтивого, бдительного врага. Со жгучей болью унижения он почувствовал, что человек, с которым он беседует, соотечественник Бена Джонсона. Он подумал:

- Язык, на котором мы сейчас говорим, - прежде всего его язык, а потом уже мой. Как различны слова – семья, Христос, пиво, учитель – в его и в моих устах. Я не могу спокойно произнести или написать эти слова. Его язык – такой близкий и такой чужой – всегда останется для меня лишь благоприобретённым. Я не создавал и не принимал его слов. Мой голос не подпускает их. Моя душа неистовствует во мраке его языка.

### Appendix 3: BT

- Very well, then, let us return to the lamp, - he said. – To fill it up is also quite a difficult job. It is necessary for the oil to be pure, and when you are pouring it you must watch carefully not to spill, not to pour more than a funnel can hold.
- What funnel? – asked Stephen.
- The funnel through which one pours the oil into the lamp.
- Ah... - said Stephen. – Is it really called a funnel? In my opinion, it is a tundish.
- And what is a ‘tundish’?
- Well, that... a funnel.
- Is it really called a tundish among the Irish? – asked the dean. – It is the first time in my life I hear such a word.
- It is called a tundish in Lower Dramcondra, - said Stephen laughing, - where they speak pure English.
- A tundish, - repeated the dean reflectively, - an interesting word. It is necessary to look it up in a dictionary. Without fail I will look it up.

(...)

It seemed that the little word [tundish] had turned a stinging point of his alertness against the courteous, vigilant enemy.\* With a burning pain of humiliation he felt that the man he was conversing with was a countryman of Ben Jonson. He thought:

- The language in which we are speaking now – is first of all his language, and only then mine. How different are the words – family, Christ, beer, teacher – on his and mine lips. I cannot calmly utter or write these words. His language – so familiar and so foreign – will always remain acquired for me. I was not creating or accepting its words. My voice does not let them come near. My soul is raging in the gloom of his language.

---

\* *εραζ* may be back translated as *foe*, however, a noun *νεδρυγ* would have, questionably, rendered the poetic quality of *foe* better