Domestication and Foreignization: A Comparative Case Study of the Portrayal of Women in Two Dutch Translations of Bram Stoker's Dracula

Middelkoop, Margaretha

Domestication and Foreignization: A Comparative Case Study of the Portrayal of Women in Two Dutch Translations of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*

M. L. Middelkoop

s2358204

MA Thesis (20 EC)

Linguistics: Translation (MA)

Supervisor: Drs. K. L. Zeven

Second Reader: Dr. A. G. Dorst

1 July 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction

Few novels have retained their original popularity as well as Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897). It has been translated, adapted, and filmed countless times during the span of its existence, with the most recent adaptations including the Netflix series *Dracula* (2020), André Øvredal's film *The Last Voyage of the Demeter* (2023), and Chris McKay's *Renfield* (2023). Recently, French director Luc Besson announced that he is working on a new screen adaptation of the novel: *Dracula – A Love Tale* (Wiseman, 2024). In other words, the classic vampire tale is still immensely popular after 127 years of being in print.

Originally published in 1897, *Dracula* was critically well-received in the United Kingdom. Many reviewers deemed the story frightening and were positive about the novel's plot and comprehensibility ("*Dracula*", 1897; "Stoker's *Dracula*", 1897; "Books of the Week", 1897). Despite its favourable critical reception, *Dracula* contains some controversial elements, especially for the Victorian period in which it was published. For example, the female characters of the novel are portrayed as progressive women, which is in contrast with the conservative stance generally taken towards women during the nineteenth century. This view was also shared by Stoker himself, who was a "social and political conservative" (Luckhurst, 2017, p. 6). The novel became a symbol of repression and male anxiety over the growing independence of women in Victorian society, a development that was regarded as a threat to the existing patriarchy. The novel showcases Stoker's personal beliefs by "punishing" any deviant female character. For instance, Lucy Westenra is killed by the Crew of Light when she becomes a femme fatale through her vampire bite. The three vampire sisters of Castle Dracula are depicted as loose women who are confined to the house. When Mina Harker becomes increasingly more independent as a woman, she is pushed back into her traditional, domestic role. Significantly, only the marriage between Jonathan and Mina survives all of the events of the novel. With this marriage, Stoker aims to show that retaining

the traditional Victorian gender ideology is the only manner in which the patriarchal structure of society can endure (Case, 1993). This gender ideology consisted of a strict division between men and women during the majority of the nineteenth century. Women were confined to the domestic sphere, which meant that they would tend to the household and refrain from acting in public, while men were engaged in the public sphere of work and business (Jordan, 1999). However, the idea that women could also enter the public sphere arose, and increasingly more women occupied themselves in the male-dominated world of work and business towards the end of the nineteenth century (Jordan, 1999). *Dracula*'s depiction of women proposed a reversal of traditional gender roles in late nineteenth-century England, represented in the form of the "New Woman." The New Woman is a type of woman described as "simultaneously over-sexed and mannish, over-educated and asinine," and was regarded as a threat to society (Ledger, 2007, pp. 153-154). Stoker incorporates these changing ideas about women in the female characters in *Dracula*: the three female vampires, Mina Harker, and Lucy Westenra. In the novel, the male characters become anxious when the women are in control, and as a result, they attempt to force them back into their traditional, domestic roles. Two Dutch translations of *Dracula* will be analysed in light of domestication and foreignization to illustrate how the two translators differ in their portrayal of the female characters and to what extent they bring the source text closer to the target audience. Shortly put, domestication and foreignization are translation strategies relating to either bringing the source text closer to the target culture or moving the source text away from the target culture, respectively. These concepts will be analysed in depth in Chapter 1.2. Examining the translations of *Dracula* in terms of these strategies will be the main focus of this MA thesis.

Due to the novel's popularity with the English-reading audience, it is unsurprising that *Dracula* has been translated into approximately 30 languages (Melton, 2003) to accommodate the needs of the non-English-reading audience. The first translations of *Dracula*, into German

and Icelandic, were produced within fifteen years of its publication, when Stoker was still alive (Melton, 2003). There are three important Dutch translations of *Dracula*. The first Dutch translation was made in 1928 by Jeannette Wink-Nijhuis. However, the novel was not as well received in the Netherlands as in the United Kingdom. As will be further explained in Chapter 1.1, Gothic literature received much negative criticism in the Netherlands, mainly due to its contents, and many critics believed that these novels were not "real literature" worthy of being implemented in the Dutch literary culture. The Dutch monthly literary magazine *Boekenschouw* (1906-1942) wrote that *Dracula* is very melodramatic and sensational and that boundaries seem to disappear when figures such as vampires start to be depicted in novels (Gorris et al., 1928/1929, translated from Dutch). The author of the review wonders whether the sensations invoked by the text are "healthy," deems the novel to be "unnatural horror literature," and exclaims that he cannot recount the story as he would go "insane" (Gorris et al., 1928/1929, p. 36, translated from Dutch). In other words, the first Dutch translation of *Dracula* was not well-received by Dutch critics. The second Dutch translation of *Dracula* was made by Else Hoog in 1968, and the third, and most recent, Dutch translation of the novel was made by Piet Verhagen in 2009. The second translation was made 40 years after the first, and the third translation was produced 41 years after the second. In other words, there seems to be a pattern when it comes to Dutch translations of *Dracula*, and every new generation demands a new translation of the novel (Van Poucke, 2017). As aforementioned, the novel contains elements that were frowned upon when it was first published in the Victorian period, such as the portrayal of female characters, but as times change, these elements lose their controversy and become accepted by the next generations. Hence, there seems to arise a need for new translations that accommodate these changes by the reading audience and even translators, which might have implications for the translation approach that a translator uses in the new translation of a novel.

In this MA thesis, the two most recent Dutch translations of *Dracula* will be analysed, and it will be examined whether these translators have adopted a domesticating or a foreignizing translation strategy in their translations of passages containing elements of the New Woman. The portrayal of women will be researched in terms of domestication and foreignization to see whether the translator has retained the conservative stance towards women that existed in the Victorian period or domesticated the female characters to fit contemporary society better. The primary sources that will be used in this thesis are the original English version of Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), the Dutch translation of *Dracula* by Else Hoog (1968), and the Dutch translation of *Dracula* by Piet Verhagen (2009).

The overarching question that this thesis will attempt to answer is: To what extent do the two Dutch translators use domestication and foreignization approaches in their translations of the depiction of the female characters and are these findings in line with the Retranslation Hypothesis? As aforementioned, researching the translations in light of domestication and foreignization will shed light on whether the translator has decided to retain the conservative perspective on women of the 1890s or whether he or she adopted a modern view regarding women in their translations. The Retranslation Hypothesis entails the idea that the first translation of a work is domesticating and that the retranslation is supposedly more foreignizing (see Berman, 1990; Chesterman, 2017; and Desmidt, 2009). The concept of the Retranslation Hypothesis will be further explained in Chapter 1.3. The following sub-questions have been formulated to help answer the overarching question of this thesis:

1. Does the 1968 Dutch translation of *Dracula* by Else Hoog use a domesticating or a foreignizing translation strategy for the translations of the depiction of the female characters?

2. Does the 2009 Dutch translation of *Dracula* by Piet Verhagen use a domesticating or a foreignizing translation strategy for the translations of the depiction of the female characters?

While the reviewed literature, to be discussed in the following chapter, suggests that first translations are more domesticating and retranslations more foreignizing (see Berman, 1990; Chesterman, 2017; and Desmidt, 2009), this thesis will show that the opposite is true for the translations of *Dracula*. As aforementioned, *Dracula* was written in the nineteenth century, more specifically during the Victorian period, which was very conservative regarding gender roles. Stoker himself was a conservative man and the novel is meant to show that independent and progressive women have to be forced back into their traditional, domestic roles for the patriarchal society to survive. The most likely translation strategy for this novel would be foreignization, in order to best convey Stoker's ideas. It is expected that such conservative ideas were more prevalent in the Netherlands in 1968 and less so in 2009. In contrast to the Retranslation Hypothesis, this thesis will show that the Dutch translation from 1968 of *Dracula* uses a more foreignizing approach and adopts the views of nineteenth-century Britain and that the translation from 2009 adopts a more domesticating strategy to reduce the conservativeness of the source text.

The relevance of this thesis lies in the fact that there are few studies on the use of domestication and foreignization in Dutch translations of *Dracula*, although there are studies on this topic in languages other than Dutch. For example, there have been studies on the subject of domestication and foreignization in the Indonesian, Irish, and Turkish translations of *Dracula*. These studies focus on one translation of the source text and analyse certain cultural phenomena, such as culture-specific items and nationalism (see Jaya, 2021; De Brún, 2020; and Gürçaglar, 2001). However, such studies seem to be absent for the Dutch translations of the novel. Jaya (2021) states that it would be interesting to see the outcome of a

study that researches more than one translation of the same work, and this is where the research gap in the literature presents itself for this MA thesis.

Next to this introduction, this thesis consists of four chapters. The first chapter will provide a literature review to present an overview of the research that has already been done on domestication, foreignization, and the Retranslation Hypothesis. It will also discuss the historical background of the Gothic novel and the Dutch Gothic literary culture. The second chapter will present the materials used in this thesis and explain the methods that have been employed during the research in more detail. The third chapter will provide the results and analysis of this thesis, in which specific excerpts of the three works will be compared and analysed in detail. Lastly, the fourth chapter of this thesis presents a discussion of these results and a conclusion that can be drawn from these findings.

One of the limitations of this MA thesis is that the first Dutch translation of *Dracula* is the 1928 translation by Jeannette Wink-Nijhuis, of which the author of this thesis is aware. However, this translation is neither readily available in print nor online, so it was practically not possible to analyse this specific translation. Taking this limitation into consideration, this thesis will deal solely with the two Dutch translations by Else Hoog and Piet Verhagen.

Chapter One: Theory and Background

The following chapter will provide the historical background, theoretical framework, and literature review for this thesis. Section 1.1 will present the historical background for the Gothic as a literary genre and the Dutch Gothic. Section 1.2 will discuss the origins of the concepts of domestication and foreignization, how they were introduced to modern Translation Studies by Lawrence Venuti, and the controversy surrounding the two terms. Section 1.3 will provide a short overview of Retranslation Studies and explain the Retranslation Hypothesis, along with the criticism surrounding the concept. Finally, section 1.4 will discuss three case studies of *Dracula* in light of domestication and foreignization.

It should also be noted that there is a fine line between the strategies of domestication and foreignization and modernization and historicization, respectively, especially when analysing translations in terms of changing cultural values. This chapter will show that domestication and foreignization are highly problematic and vague terms with no exact definitions, which might result in difficulties when attributing one of these strategies to a specific translation. Consequently, there might not always be a precise conclusion as to what translation strategy was used in a translation. Due to spatial limitations, the terms modernization and historicization will not be thoroughly analysed in this thesis, but the author acknowledges both terms in relation to domestication and foreignization.

1.1 Historical Background of the Gothic Novel and the Dutch Gothic

A detailed analysis of *Dracula* in translation requires a discussion of the beginning of the Gothic as a literary genre and how it developed throughout history. This section will first discuss the origins of the Gothic novel and how it changed throughout the nineteenth century, followed by an overview of the Dutch Gothic and how it compares to the British Gothic.

1.1.1 Origins of the Gothic

Gothic as a literary genre emerged in mid-eighteenth-century Britain, with the first self-proclaimed Gothic novel being Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764) (Hogle, 2012). Although there is no set beginning or end to the genre, most critics will argue that the first, traditional period of Gothic literature spanned from the 1760s to the 1820s (Cooper, 2010; Punter & Byron, 2004). However, Gothic literature did not lose its popularity and made a revival at the end of the nineteenth century. This specific period is called the *fin de siècle*, a period at the end of the Victorian era "in which art and politics, culture and science are profoundly, symbiotically interconnected, a period which sees a vitality of language, an exuberance of creativity generated by the end of the century which belies the very concept of endings" (Marshall, 2007, p. 11). Furthermore, Marshall (2007) states that this period is

> conscious of itself as an era of new beginnings, but also one whose movements are defined by the extent to which they developed away from their Victorian roots, and transformed them in the light of the cultural and political possibilities of the period. (p. 5)

In other words, the fin de siècle was a period in which old ideals were increasingly abandoned, a development which aroused "cultural stress" and "anxieties" in many Victorians. These anxieties were of a cultural, political, and social nature, including the surge in decadence, the changing dynamics of British imperialism, and the rise of the New Woman. As Kelly Hurley (2012) argues, "the Gothic is rightly … understood as a cyclical genre that reemerges in times of cultural stress in order to negotiate anxieties for its readership by working through them in displaced … form" (p. 194). This negotiation of anxieties is especially prevalent in a novel such as *Dracula*, as it reflects the growing anxiety surrounding the increasing independence of women. The Gothic genre has often been subject to change,

which is the reason why there is no precise definition for the term, but there are several general conventions that a Gothic story usually follows. For example, Cooper (2010) argues that "Gothic fiction is a fiction that primarily represents fear, the fearful, and the abject" (p. 6). Hogle (2012) states that "a Gothic tale usually takes place … in an antiquated or seemingly antiquated spaces" where "secrets from the past … haunt the characters, psychologically, physically, or otherwise," with the hauntings frequently depicted as "ghosts, specters, or monsters … that rise from within that antiquated space, or sometimes invade it from alien realms, to manifest unresolved crimes or conflicts that can no longer be successfully buried from view" (p. 2). David Punter (2012) suggests that "Gothic in general (…) incarnates a set of stories within which individuals are at the mercy of larger powers" (p. 122). In other words, Gothic tales are usually dark stories with fantastic or supernatural elements and ghostly apparitions.

The Gothic genre can be divided into two periods: the traditional Gothic and the modern Gothic. As aforementioned, Gothic literature first emerged in late eighteenth-century Britain with Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764). With this novel, Walpole wanted to create a new type of romance novel – he wanted to "combine the unnatural occurrences associated with romance and the naturalistic characterization and dialogue of the novel" (Clery, 2010, p. 24). This new type of romance novel was to be influenced by "medieval culture, the aesthetics of original genius and the sublime, and the growing cult of Shakespearean tragedy" (Clery, 2010, p. 25). At the time of publication, there was a "strong resistance from the literary establishment" (Clery, 2010, p. 29), due to which the Gothic did not initially flourish as a genre. However, during and after the 1790s, Gothic novels experienced a surge in popularity (Miles, 2010). For example, the year 1800 saw the most Gothic works published in the traditional Gothic period (Miles, 2010). These traditional Gothic tales were often set in ancient, haunted, or deserted locations, most frequently in a

castle, abbey, or a house, inhabited by ghosts, phantoms, and other supernatural or frightening figures, together with "generic … historical figures," such as "the monk, … the minstrel, … [and] knights" (Miles, 2010, pp. 41-42). Furthermore, Linda Dryden (2003) argues that these stories "appealed to the emotions rather than the rational," emphasising the sensationalist and emotional contents of the Gothic novels (p. 25). She also includes that these tales "were populated with terrified heroines, often sexually threatened by dark and mysterious forces or by exotic villains" (Dryden, 2003, p. 25). The genre was popular as it "became a way of speaking the unspeakable," but its popularity started to decline from 1807 onwards (Miles, 2010, p. 55). Besides *The Castle of Otranto*, the most well-known Gothic novels from this period include Clara Reeve's *The Old English Baron* (1778), Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794), *The Monk* (1796) by Matthew Lewis, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein, or, The Modern Prometheus* (1818) and *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820) by Charles Maturin.

After this "first" period of Gothic literature, the genre remained popular, albeit less dominant, in the United Kingdom. It underwent some changes in terms of key conventions during this time, as "the haunted castles of the traditional Gothic [gave] way to the domestic spaces" mid-nineteenth century (Dryden, 2003, p. 27). This period saw the publication of famous Gothic novels such as Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847) and Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* (1860), which were stories unlike the novels published during the first period of Gothic literature. As aforementioned, the late nineteenth century saw a revival of the Gothic in a period called the *fin de siècle*, even though the genre temporarily declined in the mid-nineteenth century. Linda Dryden (2003) describes the transformation of the traditional Gothic into what she terms the "modern" Gothic. She states that "the traditional Gothic was a fiction about history and about geography," whereas the modern Gothic "focused on the urban present, refracting contemporary concerns through the lens of a literature of terror" (Dryden, 2003, p. 19). In other words, the setting of the Gothic novels changed from rural to urban.

This development might be partly due to the ever-growing importance of the city and advancing technology. However, these developments also aroused anxieties in the Victorian people as their conventional society as they knew it had begun to change. Due to the transformation of the traditional Gothic into the modern Gothic, the conventions of the genre also altered. For example, the urban setting resulted in "the modern Gothic [articulating] a fear that civilization may not be an evolved form of being, but a superficial veneer beneath which lurks an essential, enduring animal self" (Dryden, 2003, p. 32). This quote refers to one of the key conventions of the modern Gothic: duality. According to Dryden (2003), duality was not only represented in the Gothic novels but it was in fact based on reality. At the end of the nineteenth century, the city of London, for example, was divided into East and West due to the Jack the Ripper murders, and Victorian society as a whole saw a strict division between men and women (Dryden, 2003). As aforementioned, women were confined to the domestic sphere during the majority of the nineteenth century, which meant that they would take care of the household and refrain from acting in public, while men were occupied in the public sphere of work and business (Jordan, 1999). However, increasingly more women started to enter the public sphere towards the end of the nineteenth century (Jordan, 1999). These real-life dualities only fuelled the contents of modern Gothic literature. The most important modern Gothic novels include *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) by Robert Louis Stevenson, Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890), *The Island of Doctor Moreau* (1896) by H. G. Wells, and Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897).

1.1.2 Dutch Gothic

With the Gothic novel thriving in the United Kingdom, several counterparts in Europe emerged in the form of the French *roman noir* and the German *Schauerroman*. However, there has never emerged a Dutch equivalent of Gothic literature (Van Gorp, 2015, translated

from Dutch). Hendrik van Gorp (2015) argues that it is not surprising that the British Gothic novel had little influence on Dutch literature, as the cultural relations between these two countries were not as great as the commercial ones. Nonetheless, these three Gothic cultures did have some influence on Dutch Gothic literature in terms of readership and translations. During the initial period of Gothic literature, from the 1760s until the late eighteenth century, the famous traditional Gothic novels of Walpole and Lewis, among others, were neither reviewed nor translated into Dutch or read by a Dutch audience (Van Gorp, 2015, translated from Dutch). It was only when Ann Radcliffe's novels were published that the Gothic genre gained popularity in the Netherlands, with her stories bearing the largest influence on the reading of Gothic literature in the Netherlands (Van Gorp, 2015, translated from Dutch). It is significant to note that the Dutch literary tradition differed from the United Kingdom. Around 1800, the book business in the Netherlands was not as commercial a system as it was in the United Kingdom, as the branch was not focused on growth. Its main goal was to preserve the stability of Dutch literature, a stance that would last far into the nineteenth century (Kloek & Mijnhardt, 1990, p. 117, translated from Dutch). In the United Kingdom, the book business was a largely commercialised system, both in the city and in the countryside, which resulted in a far larger reading audience than in the Netherlands (Kloek & Mijnhardt, 1990, p. 117, translated from Dutch). Furthermore, Kloek and Mijnhardt (1990) argue that the Dutch booksellers' purchase policy shows that they preferred to have stability in the literary genres that were already selling and that they did not like to experiment with other genres (p. 118). Besides the differences in sales and the reading system, the fact that there was not a thriving Gothic scene in the Netherlands and that its readers may have been different from the reading audience in the United Kingdom could potentially have influenced the Dutch translations of these Gothic novels and the translation approaches that these translators have employed.

As aforementioned, the Gothic genre experienced a decline in popularity in the United Kingdom around the 1810s, and eventually the traditional Gothic "ended" in the 1820s. Ironically, the popularity of the Gothic in the Netherlands surged at this time. From the mid-1820s to the 1850s, the Netherlands experienced a surge in Gothic novels in terms of translations and reprints, even though this period had already passed in England and Germany (Van Gorp, 2015, translated from Dutch). Van Gorp (2015) argues that this rise in popularity might be due to the success of Sir Walter Scott's historical novels during the 1820s, which led to a combination of the Gothic novel and the historical novel in Dutch literature. This combination of genres was viewed in higher regard than the Gothic sensation novel (Van Gorp, 2015). Some examples of this Dutch "mixture" of genres are J. van Lennep's *De Pleegzoon* (1833), Adriaan van der Hoop Jr.'s *La Esmeralda* (1837) and *De Renegaat* (1838), and Hendrik Arnold Meijer's *De Boekanier* (1840). Other examples of the Dutch exploration of the Gothic genre include novels of the author Jan de Vries, who published *Verhalen* (1845), *De roode bende* (1855), and *Het huis op de heide en Jan van Arragon; twee verhalen* (1861). These novels were all published during the time that the Gothic did not thrive in the United Kingdom, indicating that the Gothic as a literary genre did not flourish in both countries at the same time.

Despite these examples of the Dutch exploration of the Gothic genre, it did not evolve into a Dutch counterpart of the British Gothic, nor did the genre have much influence on Dutch literature as a whole. There are several possible reasons for this, which have to do with the negative criticism that the Gothic genre faced in the Netherlands. In 1799, a Dutch critic stated that Gothic literature contained devil's spells, wizardry, and ghosts, which were all aspects that were detrimental to religion (Van Gorp, 2015, translated from Dutch). Furthermore, Van Gorp (2015) lists nationalism as a possible reason why Gothic is so scarcely found in Dutch literature. It might have been the case that the Dutch reading

audience valued its own Dutch literature more than the English Gothic novel. Willem de Clerq, a Dutch poet, praised Dutch literature for its stability and unwillingness to go to extremes (Van Gorp, 2015, translated from Dutch), which the British Gothic novels did. Van Gorp (2015) states that it was commonly thought that there were no boundaries on the imagination in Gothic novels, which would lead to the derangement of thought and other literature. According to him, that is the reason why critics thought of Gothic literature as "extravagant, heated, loose, sickly elevated, wild, [and] misleading" (Van Gorp, 2015, translated literally from Dutch). In other words, these novels were not thought of as "real" literature worthy of being implemented in the Dutch literary culture. In fact, Gothic novels were seen as dangerous to the people. Van Gorp (2015) explains that contemporary critics of the Gothic felt responsible for certain audiences that loved that kind of literature, such as young people, women, and lowly educated people, who were supposedly easy victims in the reading libraries for all sorts of superstition that were prevalent in Gothic novels (translated literally from Dutch). Furthermore, Van Gorp (2015) argues that the Netherlands did not embrace the British Gothic novel as it was filled with "anti-papist" themes and superstitions, with the Netherlands being predominantly protestant at the time. Several critics around 1825 opposed the Gothic novel to such an extent that they used arguments based on nature and geography to emphasise their dislike: they argued that the Netherlands is a flat country, where there are no hiding places for thieves and bandits as there are in the wild mountain ranges of Calabria or the South-German forests (Van Gorp, 2015, translated literally from Dutch). In other words, Gothic literature was present in Dutch literary criticism, but due to the negative nature of this criticism it never became a distinguished genre in Dutch literature, nor did it yield a Dutch equivalent such as the German *Schauerroman* or the French *roman noir*.

1.2 Domestication and Foreignization

In this section, the concepts of domestication and foreignization will be explained. As these two terms are surrounded by controversy, it is necessary to provide an extensive overview of the terms. Subsection 1.2.1 will discuss the origins of domestication and foreignization and analyse Lawrence Venuti's interpretation of the two concepts, and how he introduced them into modern Translation Studies. Subsection 1.2.2 will discuss the controversy and vagueness surrounding the initial definitions by Venuti and will highlight some critical viewpoints on both the concepts and Venuti's definitions of them.

1.2.1 Origins of Domestication and Foreignization and Lawrence Venuti's Definitions

One of the first scholars to describe the terms domestication and foreignization is the German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher. In his article "Genealogies of Translation Theory: Schleiermacher," Lawrence Venuti (1991) analyses Schleiermacher's famous lecture *Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens* (1813) (translated by André Lefevere) in light of domestication and foreignization. Schleiermacher lists two methods of how the target audience can understand the source language text: "Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him" (Venuti, 1991, p. 129). The former indicates foreignization, and the latter denotes domestication, with Schleiermacher preferring the former (Venuti, 1991). Venuti (1991) notes that Schleiermacher's preference for foreignization underscores his elite status, and argues that "Schleiermacher is enlisting his privileged translation method in a cultural political agenda, wherein an educated elite controls the formation of a national culture by refining its language through foreignizing translations" (p. 131). Venuti (1991) also mentions that Goethe described the two methods of translation four months before Schleiermacher did (p. 132). He criticises Schleiermacher's theory by

arguing that the author-orientation "psychologizes the translated text and thus masks its cultural and social determinations" (Venuti, 1991, pp. 142-143). In other words, he believes that Schleiermacher's approach of "leaving the author in peace" compromises the readability for the target culture. Venuti (1991) states the following:

> In the case of German foreignizing translation, then, the translator enables the German-language reader to understand the individuality of the foreign author so as to identify with him, thereby concealing the transindividual, German-language ideologies … that mediate the foreignized representation of the foreign author in the translation. (p. 143).

Venuti criticises Schleiermacher's idea of what foreignization entails, yet their perspectives on the strategy overlap to a certain degree. In fact, Venuti (1991) also prefers foreignization as opposed to domestication (p. 143). He argues that the target culture always intervenes with translations, and that "the translator … may submit to or resist dominant values in the target language" (Venuti, 1991, p. 146). Venuti (1991) concludes that foreignization can lead to resistance against a particular ideology; it can be used to "intervene in cultural-political divisions"; and it can also "serve an ideology of autonomy in a geocultural politics by seeking to redress the grossly unequal cultural exchanges between the hegemonic nations" (p. 148). In other words, Venuti interpreted Schleiermacher's ideas culturally and politically.

Based on the above-mentioned, it is clear that Lawrence Venuti is a key scholar when it comes to the concepts of domestication and foreignization. He agrees with Schleiermacher that foreignization is the more fitting translation strategy, and argues that the target culture always intervenes with translations, and that "the translator … may submit to or resist dominant values in the target language" (Venuti, 1991, p. 146). Venuti (1991) concludes that foreignization can lead to resistance against a particular ideology; it can be used to "intervene in cultural-political divisions"; and it can also "serve an ideology of autonomy in a

geocultural politics by seeking to redress the grossly unequal cultural exchanges between the hegemonic nations" (p. 148). Furthermore, he argues that

> [a] translated text is judged successful – by most editors, publishers, reviewers, readers, by translators themselves – when it reads fluently, when it gives the appearance that it is not translated, that it is the original, transparently reflecting the foreign author's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text. (Venuti, 1992, p. 4)

In other words, he states that a translation is commonly regarded as "good" when the translator has employed a domesticating strategy. However, Venuti (1992) shows that he is in favour of foreignizing strategies as

> a fluent strategy performs a labor of acculturation which domesticates the foreign text, making it intelligible and even familiar to the target-language reader, providing him or her with the narcissistic experience of recognizing his or her own culture in a cultural other, enacting an imperialism that extends the dominion of transparency with other ideological discourses over a different culture. (p. 5)

Venuti (1992) sees translation as a cultural political act, and domestication and foreignization as a means to influence a text to be translated. This idea applies to this MA thesis, where the changing portrayal of women in two Dutch translations of *Dracula* will be analysed and compared to the nineteenth-century source text. Venuti (1992) believes that

> a translation is never quite "faithful," always somewhat "free," it never establishes an identity, always a lack and a supplement, and it can never be a transparent representation, only an interpretive transformation that exposes

> multiple and divided meanings in the foreign texts and displaces it with another set of meanings, equally multiple and divided" (p. 8).

However, terms such as "faithful" and "free" are vague terms that require a more precise definition, which is one of the criticisms of Venuti's typology.

But how does Venuti define domestication and foreignization himself? In his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995), Venuti introduces domestication and foreignization into modern Translation Studies. Although he does not provide a precise definition for the concepts, he describes domestication as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home" and foreignization as "an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (1995, p. 20). He sees a fluent translation, or a domesticated one, as "immediately recognizable and intelligible, 'familiarised,' domesticated, not 'disconcerting[ly] foreign, capable of giving the reader unobstructed 'access to great thoughts,' to what is 'present in the original'," and by doing so the translator renders his or her work invisible: "the translated text seems 'natural,' i.e., not translated" (Venuti, 1995, p. 5). In other words, Venuti believes that domesticizing a text renders it as if it were written in the target language for the target audience. However, one point of criticism can be given about his idea that domestication gives the reader access to what is "present in the original": in fact, domesticizing might result in readers not having complete access to what is present in the original. Certain crucial cultural elements in the original text might not be transferred into the target text with the same meaning as in the source text. Furthermore, Venuti (1995) argues that

> the 'foreign' in foreignizing translation is not a transparent representation of an essence that resides in the foreign text and is valuable in itself, but a strategic construction whose value is contingent on the current target-language situation.

> Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language. (p. 20)

In other words, the translator can bring the source text closer to the target culture, which will aid the target audience's understanding of the source text, or retain the "foreignness" of the source text, which may result in a lesser understanding of the source text by the target audience. With these two concepts, Venuti (1995) wants to "develop a theory and practice of translation that resists dominant target-language cultural values so as to signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text" (p. 23). This cultural difference of the foreign text is what is especially significant for this MA thesis, as the three works to be analysed were produced over a period of more than 110 years. He argues that "the foreign text is privileged in a foreignizing translation only insofar as it enables a disruption of target-language cultural codes, so that its value is always strategic, depending on the cultural formation into which it is translated" (Venuti, 1995, p. 42).

In his book *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an ethics of difference* (1998), Venuti aims to "expose [translation] scandals by enquiring into the relationships between translation and a range of categories and practices that contribute to its current marginal status" (p. 1). According to Venuti (1998), "a translation always communicates an interpretation, a foreign text that is partial and altered, supplemented with features peculiar to the translating language, no longer inscrutably foreign but made comprehensible in a distinctively domestic style" (p. 5). In other words, Venuti thinks a translation is always domesticating. He uses translations of classical Greek texts and modern Japanese fiction as examples of domesticating translation strategies (Venuti, 1998). For Venuti (1998), a foreign text becomes understandable when the reader can identify the domestic values in the translation, but he is a strong advocate of foreignization and heavily criticises the American tradition of predominantly using domestication as a strategy (Kemppanen, 2012).

1.2.2 Controversy Surrounding the Terms

Due to the fact that Venuti is not entirely clear in his definitions of domestication and foreignization, there have been plenty of scholars to criticise his typology. For example, Anthony Pym (1996) finds Venuti's definitions of the concepts "rather complex and vague" (p. 166). Another critic is Maria Tymoczko (2000), who argues that Venuti is unclear in his definitions, and believes "his shifting terminology is deployed in part to avoid defining his terms with any particularity or specificity of meaning, and it permits him to sidestep defending of justifying his terms as needed" (p. 34). Other critics include Per Ambrosiani (2012) and Igor Kudashev (2017). Ambrosiani (2012) argues that the two terms "need further elaboration in order for them to be even more useful when describing and analysing the relationship between different types of source texts and their related, translated target texts" (p. 80). He defines foreignization as "a situation where a source text linguistic expression that can be classified as 'domestic' is translated in such a way that it can be classified as 'foreign' in the target text" (Ambrosiani, 2012, p. 86). Ambrosiani (2012) describes domestication as "a situation where a source text 'domestic' translation unit, which *could* be translated in such a way that it would be seen as 'foreign' in the target text, is instead translated in such a way that it will *not* be seen as 'foreign'" (p. 87). Kudashev (2017) argues that, due to the vague nature of the concepts, domestication and foreignization "have been interpreted very broadly and even in contradictory ways" (p. 63), which leads to the absence of precise definitions. According to Kudashev (2017), Venuti does not provide "an explicit definition" of both concepts and "he also uses them interchangeably with other term pairs, such as *fluent* vs. *resistant/minoritizing translation*," contributing to the vagueness of Venuti's terminology (p. 64, italics in original).

Kaisa Koskinen (2012) argues that domestication and foreignization present a strict dichotomy, yet she advocates for a less strict distinction between the two concepts. She proposes that "we experience the translations as either affectively positive or negative depending on our own (natural) tendencies and predilections, our previous life experiences, and how our acculturation and socialization have predisposed us towards particular aesthetic solutions" (Koskinen, 2012, p. 13). Otherwise put, she states that

> emotional distance need not have anything to do with cultural distance, and strategies labelled domesticating and foreignizing may be received in unexpected ways depending on the reader's affective stance to these strategies, to the text itself and to the reading context. (Koskinen, 2012, pp. 13-14)

She believes that the reader might have either a positive or a negative impact on the reader, depending on their perspective of both foreignization and domestication. Some readers can experience a text negatively when it has been translated using a foreignizing approach, rendering the text less understandable than had it been domesticized, and vice versa. Furthermore, Koskinen (2012) criticizes Venuti for the strict distinction that he has created between the concepts, as she believes the "two categories are not historically stable: what was once considered foreignizing may later be construed as domesticating" (p. 16). However, Koskinen (2012) also proposes an argument in favour of the distinction, as she argues that "any translation method that unsettles fluency of reception and disturbs the reader can be considered foreignizing" (p. 16), so how easily and "fluent" the reader reads a text. Besides Venuti, Koskinen (2012) also criticises Schleiermacher's ideas:

> It would be too much a simplification, thus, to argue that domesticating strategies bring the text to the reader, or that foreignizing translations make the reader cross the distance. This Schleiermacherian image has perhaps unhappily left us with a spatial conceptualization of these translation strategies: one close

> at hand and the other farther away. This imagery of a *physical* distance, with either the reader or the writer being asked to bridge that distance, may obscure the fact that we are actually dealing with degrees of *emotional* affinity more than with degrees of cultural affinity. (p. 17, italics in original)

She proposes to use terms such as "affinity versus estrangement, familiarity versus strangeness, or naturalness versus unnaturalness" instead of the complex terms domestication versus foreignization (Koskinen, 2012, p. 17). She explains that "domesticating strategies can be used for arousing interest by linking the new to the already familiar, and … not likely to cause negative affect" and that foreignizing, "although it has greater risk of arousing negative affect, … is less likely to leave the reader entirely unaffected" as it is "[aimed] at creating momentary experiences of the unexpected" (Koskinen, 2012, pp. 20-21).

As aforementioned, the vagueness surrounding domestication and foreignization has led many scholars to interpret and define these two terms broadly. For example, Rowena Coles (2012) defines domestication as "a translation strategy that is based on an adherence to domestic literary canons" and foreignization as a strategy "where the translator maintains a close adherence to the foreign text, motivated by the desire to preserve the linguistic and cultural differences of the original" (p. 46). By "cultural differences," she means that … Kudashev (2017) describes domestication as "adapting the text for the reader" and foreignization as "staying close to the original" (Kudashev, 2017, p. 63). Koskinen (2012) provides a simplified definition: domestication "is often equated with reader-orientedness" and foreignization "with staying close to the source text" (p. 14), and she notes that when analysing Venuti's work on these concepts, they become very complex and need a more precise definition. Tahir Gürçaglar (2001) uses the term domestication to describe strategies that result in the source text being completely adapted to the target culture, and Doni Jaya (2020) argues that a translator domesticizes if "s/he plans to adapt as many SC contents into

TC elements … to make TT sound more natural (as if it had been written in TL) to facilitate reading, and to increase comprehensibility" (p. 427).

Piet van Poucke (2012) sees the concepts of domestication and foreignization as specific translation choices of the translator instead of a strict dichotomy. He characterises foreignizing translations as "translations that remain close to the original, not only on a lexico-semantic but also on syntactic and stylistic levels," referring to Schleiermacher's idea that the author should be left in peace during the translation (Van Poucke, 2012, p. 140). He describes domesticating translations as "translations [that] bring the writer toward the reader … and adjust the target version of the original to the taste and expectations of the target public" (Van Poucke, 2012, p. 141). Van Poucke (2012) proposes a system in which there are various degrees to domestication and foreignization in the form of Strong Foreignization, Moderate Foreignization, Moderate Domestication, Strong Domestication, and Neutral Translation. He has developed this system to test whether it is possible to measure the degree of foreignization and domestication in a literary translation by means of using mathematics and statistics. He defines Strong Foreignization as a strategy that "immediately confronts the reader with features that are strange to his or her TC: culture-specific items and elements in the ST discourse that the reader is unfamiliar with" (Van Poucke, 2012, p. 145). He classifies Moderate Foreignization as a "deliberate literal (or direct) translation" and he lists calques ("when more idiomatic alternatives are available in the TL but are not used by the translator"), specification, explicitation, and addition as examples of this strategy (Van Poucke, 2012, p. 145). Van Poucke (2012) sees Moderate Domestication as a shift that "[adapts] the original text to some idiomatic and stylistic norms of the TL, i.e. when significant changes in form or meaning are encountered in the translation when compared with the ST" (p. 146). He describes Strong Domestication as a translation in which "no trace

of the ST can be found … neither of the original form, nor the original meaning" (Van Poucke, 2012, p. 147). Lastly, he defines Neutral Translation as

> all cases of translation whenever the translation remains *unmarked*, i.e. those cases where the translator did not really meet a translation problem and was able to use the most *obvious* choice of words, that is, in a manner of speaking, the first suggestion presented to the translator who is looking up an entry in a dictionary. (Van Poucke, 2012, p. 148, italics in original)

He uses these types of domestication and foreignization to attempt to measure the degree of domestication and foreignization in literary translations.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter and throughout section 1.2, the terms domestication and foreignization are very vague and complex. Therefore, it is sometimes difficult to attribute one or the other to a specific translation. In addition to this, in the context of this thesis, the concepts of modernization and historicization are closely related to both domestication and foreignization in literary translation. According to Holmes (2021), modernization involves "[seeking] 'equivalents' (which are … always equivalent only to a greater or lesser degree) to 're-create' a contemporary relevance" (p. 37). In contrast, historicization "[attempts] to retain the specific aspect" of the source text, "even though that aspect is now experienced as historical rather than as directly relevant today" (Holmes, 2021, p. 37). Again, the author of this thesis acknowledges the relatedness between the four strategies, but due to the limited size of this project, the latter two concepts will not be thoroughly analysed in this chapter.

1.3 Retranslation Studies and the Retranslation Hypothesis

Next to domestication and foreignization, another key concept in this thesis is the Retranslation Hypothesis. The former two concepts and the idea of the Retranslation Hypothesis are intertwined as the latter hypothesises that a first translation is more domesticizing than later translations, which are arguably more foreignizing (Berman 1990). This subsection will provide a brief introduction to Retranslation Studies and analyse the Retranslation Hypothesis as proposed by Antoine Berman (1990) and Andrew Chesterman (2017). Furthermore, this section will also discuss the criticism surrounding the Retranslation Hypothesis.

1.3.1 Retranslation Studies

Retranslation is a field of study within Translation Studies, and it "denotes a second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language," which frequently occurs in "older, classical works" (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010, p. 294; Desmidt, 2009, p. 670). Although the act of retranslation has existed for hundreds of years, the field became heavily researched around 30 years ago (Peeters & Van Poucke, 2023). According to Desmidt (2009), "retranslations result from the wish to meet the requirements of the receiving culture, requirements that are obviously not (no longer or not entirely) met by the existing translation(s)" (p. 670). As cultures change over time, it is not surprising that their norms and values change as well, resulting in a demand for new translations. Isabelle Desmidt (2009) argues that "every generation may take a different view on what is a good, i.e., functional, translation and may ask for the creation of a new translation" (p. 670). Dirk Delabastita (2010) argues that

> [t]ranslation (*import*) can make up a sizeable proportion of the total literary field in cultures when we compare it with newly produced works in the

> literature (*production*) or with works from the past that are still being pressed into literary service in the present (*tradition*). These exact proportions may vary strongly between cultures and they are likely to fluctuate across time within a culture. (p. 69)

In other words, the fluctuations within a culture over time result in the demand for retranslations of literary works, as new generations might not or cannot identify themselves with the old, earlier translations of a specific work.

However, there are some complexities to acknowledge when discussing retranslation. For example, Koskinen and Paloposki (2010) argue that source texts are likely to change over time and that "the 'same' language is not a stable variable" (p. 294). There is also the complex distinction between retranslation and revision. Revision is the process of adapting an earlier translation in order for it to be republished, and so it does not focus on the original source text. In practice, however, the labels revision and retranslation have been attributed to works randomly, making it difficult to distinguish if a certain translation is in fact a retranslation or a revision (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010). The benefit of literary retranslation is that it allows for research on "the changing translation norms and strategies, the standardization of language, or the effects of the political or cultural context," "with the source text and the target language being constant" (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010, p. 295). So, although there are many different complexities in this field of translation, it is a key concept when studying literary translation.

1.3.2 The Retranslation Hypothesis

The aforementioned change in cultures and the rise of different translations has led translation scholars to wonder "whether or not retranslations have common …

characteristics," which is where the Retranslation Hypothesis emerges (Desmidt, 2009, p. 671). The Retranslation Hypothesis is most commonly attributed to Antoine Berman, and was later operationalized by Andrew Chesterman (2017) in 2000. Berman's article "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction" (1990) is one of the key texts on retranslation, and in this article he proposes a scheme that has now become known as the Retranslation Hypothesis (Koskinen, 2012). Berman (1990) argues that the original source texts always remain "young," but that their translations become "old." This results in retranslations having to be made, as the first translation does not communicate the source text as well to the next generation as it did before. However, Berman (1990) does argue that there are "great translations," which are translations that remain "young" and that endure as long as the original source text. Furthermore, Berman argues that "the quality of subsequent translations improves, and the target audience becomes better prepared for more foreignizing translations" (Kudashev, 2017, p. 69). In other words, the first translation takes a more domesticating approach and the retranslation arguably takes a more foreignizing approach. As Koskinen (2012) argues, Berman means to say that "first translations tend to be assimilationist (or, domesticating), and this creates a need for a retranslation that stays closer to the original (i.e. that would be more foreignizing)" (p. 23).

Berman's ideas about first and subsequent, old and young translations pave the way for Chesterman (2017) to formulate the Retranslation Hypothesis. In his paper "A causal model for Translation Studies," Chesterman (2017) argues that there are three types of models of translation: the comparative model, the process model, and the causal model. According to Chesterman (2017), "only the causal model can accommodate all four types" of hypotheses: interpretive, descriptive, explanatory, and predictive (p. 123). He bases his interpretive hypotheses of retranslations on Berman's proposed hypotheses about great translations and retranslations, and formulates the descriptive Retranslation Hypothesis as follows: "Later

translations (same ST, same TL) tend to be closer to the original than earlier ones" (Chesterman, 2017, p. 132). In his explanatory hypothesis, Chesterman (2017) argues that

> [r]etranslations tend to be closer to their original texts because … later translators take a critical stance to the earlier translation, seek to improve on it ...[;] the existence of the earlier translation in the target culture affects the potential reception of the new one, and the translator knows this …[;] the target language has developed and allows the translator more freedom of movement …[;] TC … translation norms have become more relaxed, allowing a closer link to the source text. (p. 133)

Chesterman's (2017) predictive hypothesis is that "later translations of a given text will be found to be closer than earlier ones" (pp. 133-134). Despite these hypotheses about Berman's ideas on retranslation, Chesterman (2017) acknowledges that a lot of research needs to be done to test these hypotheses, which is another reason why this thesis is relevant. However, this thesis will refute these hypotheses and show that the later translation is more domesticating and the earlier translation more foreignizing, specifically in terms of the portrayal of women.

The Retranslation Hypothesis is a heavily debated concept within the field of retranslation. Multiple scholars question the validity of the Hypothesis, and even whether Berman should be the most frequently quoted scholar on the topic. For example, Peeters and Van Poucke (2023) state that "Berman never presented his ideas as a 'hypothesis'" and "never claimed that retranslations are by definition 'closer' to the source text" and argue that the concept of the Retranslation Hypothesis should be attributed to Paul Bensimon's article "Présentation" (1990) (p. 6). Furthermore, Peeters and Van Poucke (2023) argue that "closeness" cannot be measured in a translation, and that this variable is dependent on the target culture, and even propose that the hypothesis should be abandoned as a whole.

Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) also refer to Bensimon in their discussion of the Retranslation Hypothesis. They argue that Berman claimed that first translations "are often 'naturalizations of the foreign works'" that "[seek] to integrate one culture into another, to ensure positive reception of the work in the target culture," and that "later translations of the same originals do not need to address the issue of introducing the text: they can … maintain the cultural distance" (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004, p. 27). In other words, Bensimon and Berman both refer to first and later translations bearing differences from one another. Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) question the Retranslation Hypothesis as they feel there are two major problems. The first problem is "the *reason* for retranslations: Do first translations really 'date', always? Or is it that *domesticating* first translations date, creating a need for foreignizing retranslations …?" (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004, p. 28, italics in original). The second problem concerns "the *profiles* of first and retranslations …: do first translations tend to be more domesticating, and retranslations more foreignizing?" (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004, p. 28, italics in original). Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) analyse several Finnish retranslations in order to explore the validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis. They conclude that there is not enough evidence for the Retranslation Hypothesis to be valid, as "there are no inherent qualities in the process of retranslating that would dictate a move from domesticating strategies towards more foreignizing strategies," and as there are various retranslations that do not fit into the Retranslation Hypothesis scheme (Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004, p. 36). Later, Koskinen and Paloposki (2010) again claim that the concept of the Retranslation Hypothesis is generally agreed to be insufficient to explain retranslation. They argue that "it has been shown that although one can find examples that fit the model, it is not in the nature of first translations to be domesticating and of the second and subsequent translations to be closer to the original" (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2010, p. 296).

Another scholar who questions the Retranslation Hypothesis is Igor Kudashev (2017), who agrees with Koskinen and Paloposki (2010) (see also Paloposki & Koskinen, 2004) that the Retranslation Hypothesis can be dismissed. He notices that the Retranslation Hypothesis is still being tested, but argues that these attempts are "fruitless," "due to the fact that even another piece of evidence in favor of the Retranslation Hypothesis would not refute the previous counter-arguments" (Kudashev, 2017, p. 69). Kudashev (2017) believes that the Retranslation Hypothesis should be reformulated, considering that

> it is possible to make some generalization about certain aspects of retranslation of a particular kind of texts in a particular culture and within a limited timeframe for a specified target group, if one takes into account these and other major factors which influence the selection of a translation strategy. (p. 69)

With this proposed reformulation of the Hypothesis, Kudashev (2017) aims to shift the focus from domestication and foreignization in retranslations to all the changes that happen during the process of retranslation and the cultural reasons behind these changes. This idea is important for this specific case study as the cultural changes over the course of the production of the three works to be analysed in this thesis entail the changing social positions of women, which is the light in which *Dracula* and the two Dutch translations will be analysed.

1.4 Case Studies of *Dracula* and Domestication and Foreignization

Dracula has been researched in light of the concepts of domestication and foreignization several times. This subsection will discuss some of these research projects, more specifically of *Dracula*'s translations into Indonesian, Irish, and Turkish.

In his article "Translation Ideology in literary translation; A case study of Bram Stoker's "Dracula" translation into Indonesian" (2021), Doni Jaya aims to examine the

ideology employed by the literary translator in the translation of culture-specific terms in the Indonesian translation of *Dracula*. Jaya (2021) begins his study by arguing that "a literary translator has to be able to not only transfer the information contained in the source text … but also preserve the ST's aesthetic quality in the target text," with the aesthetic quality denoting a variety of "literary devices such as figures of speech, idiomatic expressions, emotional expressions, allusions, quotations, imagery, and characterization" (p. 425). Furthermore, Jaya (2021) mentions the assumption that translation ideology consists of two extremes: foreignization and domestication, with foreignization meaning that the translator stays as close to the source text as possible, and domestication meaning that the translator adapts the source text to the target culture. In this article, Jaya (2021) uses the term "divergent units" for "translation units which contain potentially divergent cultural elements or contents" (p. 428). In his methodology, Jaya (2021) describes that he first prepared the data, namely by collecting all the possible source cultural elements and placing them in a column, and dividing them into the following categories: people, places, cultural objects, cultural practices, cultural concepts, quotations, foreign languages, and metaphors, after which he determined which strategy had been employed for each element. Jaya (2021) lists six ways in which cultural elements can be translated: "transfer without any additional information"; "transfer with additional information in the form of footnotes or descriptive noun phrase"; translating hypernyms; "expansion by adding hypernyms or extra qualifiers"; "using their descriptive or functional equivalents"; and omission (p. 439). Then, he lists the following possible ways to translate the metaphors: "using the same metaphor"; "using their nonfigurative meaning"; and "using a different metaphor which has the same or similar nonfigurative meaning" (p. 439). Jaya (2021) concludes that the translator in question used both foreignizing and domesticizing translation strategies in the Indonesian translation of *Dracula*, which emphasises the aforementioned ambiguity that surrounds these two concepts. However, the translator most

frequently employed a domesticating approach. Jaya (2021) also mentions that his study is based on a limited number of data, i.e., one translation, and that it would be interesting to see the results of more than one translation of the same work.

Sorcha De Brún (2020) aims to explore the Irish-language translation of *Dracula* in her article "'In a Sea of Wonders:' Eastern Europe and Transylvania in the Irish-Language Translation of Dracula." She analyses Seán Ó Cuirrín's translation from 1933 and explores how "his approaches to concrete and abstract elements of the novel affect plot, character, and narration," and how he employed "additional poetic techniques" in the process (De Brún, 2020, p. 70). De Brún (2020) argues that Ó Cuirrín made notable changes to *Dracula*, mostly concerning the plot. For example, all Shakespearean references in the novel were omitted or replaced by quotations from Irish-language literature in the translation (De Brún, 2020). Furthermore, Ó Cuirrín did not translate the references to classical Greek and Roman mythology that were presented in the source text (De Brún, 2020). Ó Cuirrín also changed Count Dracula's speech in the target text: in the source text, the Count is not a native speaker of English and therefore he speaks in a very formal way, but in the translation, the Count is made to be a fluent speaker of Irish and uses and informal register in his speech (De Brún, 2020). In other words, the translator used a strong domesticating strategy in his translation of *Dracula*.

In her article "Adding towards a Nationalist Text: On a Turkish Translation of Dracula," Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar (2001) aims to explore a "concealed [Turkish] translation" of *Dracula* by Ali Rıza Seyfi from 1928, how it has nationalist undertones in the target text and "the role of translation in nationalist identities" (p. 125). It is noteworthy that the target text was presented as an original Turkish novel, and not as a translation, and that this is how the public viewed this book. It can also then be assumed that the translator domesticized the source text in the process. This point is proven by the fact that Seyfi renamed the novel after

an evil Turkish figure, making the source text seem Turkish from the beginning and that the translator set the translation in Istanbul, along with adding more Turkish plot elements to the book (Gürçağlar, 2001). Seyfi has also omitted or summarized several parts regarding the women in the novel, Mina and Lucy, for example, the letters they write to each other or the diary entries regarding marriage, friendship, and spending time with family (Gürçağlar, 2001). Furthermore, Seyfi has also made omissions, changes, and additions to Christian elements in the source text (Gürçağlar, 2001). Gürçaglar (2001) concludes her article by stating that Seyfi had turned *Dracula* into nationalist, Turkish literature, indicating the extreme use of domestication that the translator has employed.

The three case studies discussed above show that the concepts of domestication and foreignization can be analysed in terms of larger notions such as culture-specific items, nationalism, and political agendas, rather than only on the lexical and syntactical levels that are often examined in studies on domestication and foreignization.

This chapter has provided the literature review for this thesis. It has discussed the historical background of the British and Dutch Gothic, the origins and definitions of domestication and foreignization, Retranslation Studies, and the Retranslation Hypothesis, and has presented case studies concerning *Dracula* and domestication and foreignization. The next chapter will present the methods and materials used for this thesis.

Chapter Two: Materials and Methods

In this chapter, the materials and methods employed in this thesis will be examined. These materials and methods all contribute to answering the overarching research question of this thesis: To what extent do the two Dutch translators use domestication and foreignization approaches in their translations of the depiction of the female characters and are these findings in line with the Retranslation Hypothesis? Section 2.1 deals with the materials used for this thesis, and provides an overview of *Dracula*'s publication history, its contents, and the relevant controversial elements present in the novel. Furthermore, it will shed some light on the Dutch translations of *Dracula*. Section 2.2 will look at the methods employed in this thesis, explain how the source and target texts were analysed, and how the results will be interpreted.

2.1 Materials

As Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is the main text to be analysed in this thesis, it is necessary to briefly look at the origins of the novel and why it contains some elements that were considered controversial in the Victorian age. This is important as these controversial elements are the main reason why this thesis analyses the two Dutch translations of *Dracula* in terms of domestication and foreignization and how these controversial elements have been rendered over the course of time. The elements that were considered controversial in the Victorian age were considered as such to a lesser degree in later times or not at all in society today, which is also why the notions of modernization and historicization are relevant in this research project. These societal changes render *Dracula* an interesting case to analyse in terms of the abovementioned translation strategies. In 2.1.1, *Dracula* as a novel will be discussed, including its publication history, its contents, and its controversial elements. In 2.1.2, the three existing Dutch translations of *Dracula* will be highlighted.

2.1.1 Bram Stoker's *Dracula*

In order to properly understand the novel *Dracula*, it is important to consider the publication history of the novel and its author. Born in Dublin, Bram Stoker was an Irishman, yet he was very much engaged in the London theatre scene, where he worked for the English actor Henry Irving (Luckhurst, 2017; Frayling, 2003). He was a "social and political conservative" and was generally regarded as a respectable man in the Victorian society (Luckhurst, 2017, p. 6; Frayling, 2003). The novel came forth out of Stoker's anxieties about his masculinity (Frayling, 2003), and the idea for it occurred in a dream:

> It was a bad dream, which on 8 March Bram Stoker dutifully jotted down on another piece of Lyceum headed notepaper: 'Young man goes out,' he wrote, 'sees girls one tries to kiss him not on lips but throat. Old Count interferes – rage & fury diabolical – this man belongs to me I want him.' This bad dream was eventually to turn into Jonathan Harker's fictional journal entry for the night of 15 May in the novel … (Frayling, 2003, p. x)

Stoker's dream perfectly represents the male anxieties that are represented in the novel, as the traditional gender roles are partly reversed. For example, the three vampire sisters in Castle Dracula capture Jonathan, and not the other way around. However, the anxiety is completed when the "Old Count" interrupts and claims the man for himself. According to Frayling (2003), Stoker himself was greatly disturbed by the dream and viewed the aspects of it as unmentionable. After this dream, Stoker began writing the novel in the mid-1890s and finished it in the summer of 1896 (Frayling, 2003).

At the time of publication, many developments in all aspects of society were in progress, such as the colonial expansion of Great Britain; the increasing power of Germany,

Russia, and America; the faltering of the economy; political unrest; the growing group of women demanding more political representation; fear of immigrants; the unrest in Ireland, and many more (Luckhurst, 2017). In other words, the novel was published at a turbulent time for the Victorians, while also containing elements that would disturb its readers as they threatened to change society as they knew it. These elements are what make *Dracula* a novel of transgressions of contemporary norms and values: for example, the shift in traditional gender roles, the "foreign" folklore and superstitions infiltrating the "British" culture of the novel, and the Count's endeavours to bite and kill his victims would be considered controversial. The turbulent time and the disturbing reading are thus connected: reading the novel might frighten the readers to such an extent that they believe this story could become a reality.

Dracula generally succeeded in frightening its readers, as many reviewers deemed the story dreadful and were positive about the novel's plot and comprehensibility ("*Dracula*", 1897; "Stoker's *Dracula*", 1897; "Books of the Week", 1897). Frayling (2003) also argues that many reviewers considered the book thrilling. Yet, many critics did not regard the novel as a qualitative good work. Luckhurst (2017) states that,

> [o]n publication, the book was regarded as a cynical pot-boiler that was seeking slightly too hard to join what some newspapers denounced as the Culture of the Horrible, written by a hack writer better known for his management of the Lyceum Theatre under famous actor Henry Irving. (p. 3)

The view that Stoker would later be remembered for his other business endeavours rather than for *Dracula* was shared by other critics. According to Frayling (2003), "the *Athenaeum* … reckoned that *Dracula* was wanting in 'constructive art as well as in the higher literary sense. It reads at times like a mere series of grotesquely incredible events'" (p. vii, italics in original). Furthermore, Frayling (2003) states that

> [late] Victorian readers seem to have read the book as an early piece of techno-fiction: blood transfusions, phonograph recordings and shorthand typing in an adventure yarn about a committee of the forces of good (science, religion, and social connections) versus the demon king and his ilk from the land beyond the forest in the east. (Frayling, 2003, p. viii)

In other words, critics and the Victorian reading audience seemingly did not appreciate the novel's contents as Stoker intended them to be conveyed. The aforementioned controversial elements and transgressions might have caused them to regard the work as an unbelievable piece of fiction rather than a metaphor for the changing Victorian society.

Now that the publication history of *Dracula* has been established, it is necessary to briefly consider the novel's contents and see why it was seen as a transgression of contemporary Victorian culture. *Dracula* is an epistolary novel, i.e., it is told through diary entries and letters, and it starts with the English solicitor Jonathan Harker. He is visiting Count Dracula at his castle in Transylvania to aid him with the purchase of a new property in England. However, Jonathan quickly becomes a prisoner of the Count and is taunted by the three vampire sisters who reside at the castle. Eventually, Jonathan manages to escape and flees into the Romanian countryside, while the Count boards a ship to England. Meanwhile, Jonathan's fiancée Mina corresponds with her friend Lucy Westenra via letters, mainly about the marriage proposals that Lucy has received from Dr John Seward, Quincey Morris, and Arthur Holmwood. Mina and Lucy go on a holiday together in Whitby, but unbeknownst to them, Dracula is stalking Lucy. Later, Mina goes to Budapest to see Jonathan after she receives a distressing letter from him, but in the meantime, Lucy becomes very ill. Unaware that she has been attacked by the Count, the three men and Professor Abraham Van Helsing try to cure her. However, Lucy dies and is buried, but after several children have seen her at night, the men visit her grave and realise that she is, in fact, a vampire. The group of men kill

her in an attempt to stop her nightly appearances. Then, Jonathan and Mina return. At this point, the "Crew of Light" is formed: Jonathan, Dr Seward, Morris, Holmwood, Professor Van Helsing, and Mina decide to fight the Count. Renfield, a patient of Dr Seward at his asylum, reveals to the Count that the group is planning to fight him, and in return, Dracula attacks Mina several times. The group tries to capture Dracula in his London home, but they fail, and they learn that the Count is fleeing to his castle in Transylvania. As the Count attacked Mina, she is now able to see his movements when she is in a hypnotic state. It is in this condition that Mina guides the group of men to the Count's location in Transylvania, where Jonathan eventually kills him.

In *Dracula*, Stoker combines the traditional and modern Gothic, as described in Chapter 1.1. According to Catherine Wynne (2016), *Dracula* "harks back to early Gothic's preoccupation with the supernatural, decayed aristocracy and incarceration in gloomy castles in foreign locales as well as a 19th-century Gothic preoccupation … with science and disease" (p. 11). In other words, it is a mixture of the traditional and the modern Gothic with on the one hand the elements of an ancient location and supernatural elements, and on the other hand the scientific concepts present in the novel. One of the most interesting aspects of the novel is the shift in traditional gender roles, which is most prominent in the characters of Mina and Lucy. The latter can be described as the prototype New Woman, who, as mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis, is a sort of femme fatale who is both educated and asinine. She is "the site of the novel's focus on various types of dis-ease (infection, cultural anxiety about the sexualized 'New Woman,' and fear of empire)" (Wynne, 2016, p. 4). The prominence of the New Woman renders the novel an excellent book to analyse in terms of domestication and foreignization. Furthermore, the selection of the materials to be analysed in Chapter 3 will focus on this specific aspect, as the changing identities of women are such a prominent part of the novel. Ultimately, Lucy is seen as a threat to the patriarchy, which is the reason that she is

killed. In contrast to Lucy, Mina is a combination of the traditional Victorian woman and the New Woman. On the one hand, she tries to aid her fiancé and later husband in every way possible, submitting herself to his "superiority," and on the other hand, it is through her that the destruction of the Count is made possible (Hindle, 2003). Although she is initially dissuaded from contributing to the Count's downfall, it is through her that the group of men eventually reach him. As Frayling (2003) argues, Victorian society demanded that the vampires had to be defeated so that "Mina Harker can become a conventional, repressed young lady again" (p. xi). Yet, Mina plays a pivotal role in the downfall of the Count – without her, the men would have failed in their quest. Hindle (2003) states that "*Dracula* might seem to repeat the traditional theme of men rescuing damsels in distress, but what the novel is really trying to rescue … is 'an embattled male's deepest sense of himself as male'" (p. xix). In other words, it is a novel about male anxiety, especially about the growing independence of women in the real Victorian world and how that would influence men's position in society.

2.1.2 Dutch Translations of *Dracula*

It is important to note beforehand that there is very little research done on Dutch translations of *Dracula*. Therefore, not much information is available about these translations of the novel, nor about the translators and the circumstances in which they produced these translations. Nevertheless, they are important to note in this thesis about *Dracula* and therefore, they will be discussed briefly.

The first Dutch translation of *Dracula* was made by Jeannette Wink-Nijhuis in 1928. At the beginning of the twentieth century, she was regarded as one of the best upcoming poets, and she was the first to translate *Dracula* into Dutch, a translation that would last for 40 years ("Verdwenen dichteressen", 2013, translated from the original Dutch work). However,

her name is now overshadowed by Belgian author Herman Teirlinck, who published novels under the name Jeannette Nijhuis, which is why there is relatively little known about the real Jeannette. The translation was published by Van Holkema & Warendorf's Uitgevers-Maatschappij in 1928. It did not yield a lot of literary criticism, yet some critics deemed the novel crazy and absurd ("De eerste Nederlandse versies van 'Dr. Jekyll' en 'Dracula'", 2023). As mentioned in the Introduction, the Dutch monthly literary magazine *Boekenschouw* (1906-1942) wrote that *Dracula* is very melodramatic and sensational and that boundaries seem to disappear when figures such as vampires start to be depicted in novels (Gorris et al., 1928/1929, translated from the original Dutch work). The author of the review wonders whether the sensations invoked by the text are "healthy," deems the novel to be "unnatural horror literature," and exclaims that he cannot recount the story as he would go "insane" (Gorris et al., 1928/1929, p. 36, translated from the original Dutch work).

This specific translation of *Dracula* by Jeannette Wink-Nijhuis is extremely rare and is searched for by collectors worldwide, and it is commonly regarded as one of the most mysterious translations of *Dracula* in existence ("De eerste Nederlandse versies van 'Dr. Jekyll' en 'Dracula'", 2023). In fact, it was only recovered by the Dutch National Library in 2023, almost a century after its publication. The second Dutch translation of *Dracula* was made by Else Hoog in 1968, almost forty years later. It was first published by Van Ditmar, and later by Bruna in the *Fantasy & Horror* series ("De eerste Nederlandse versies van 'Dr. Jekyll' en 'Dracula'", 2023). The third, and, at the time of writing this thesis, last Dutch translation of *Dracula* was made by Piet Verhagen in 2009, which was published by Boekerij.

Due to the limited amount of information available about these Dutch translations of *Dracula*, this section cannot be regarded as exhaustive on this topic. It is possible that there is more information about the Dutch translations, but this is either untraceable or unavailable to the author of this thesis. As aforementioned in the Introduction, due to the rarity of the first

Dutch translation, only the latter two Dutch translations of *Dracula* will be analysed in this thesis. These two translations will still be useful to analyse in terms of domestication and foreignization and the aforementioned Retranslation Hypothesis, due to the fact that these translations were produced at a different time in history and are translated differently in terms of the portrayal of women.

2.2 Methods

This section will explain the methodology that was employed in this thesis, discuss how the source and target texts were analysed, and how the results of this project will be interpreted. This thesis consists of a comparative case study, specifically of the close reading of the original English version of *Dracula*, and the two Dutch translations by Else Hoog and Piet Verhagen. By conducting this close reading, the author of this thesis hopes to shed light on the societal changes in the cultures in which these works have been produced, and how the translations have been affected by these societal changes in terms of their translations of the female characters. The body of this thesis consists of a close reading of excerpts from Bram Stoker's *Dracula* and the two aforementioned Dutch translations. The selected excerpts best reflect the controversy surrounding the portrayal of women in the novel for the purposes of this thesis. These excerpts contain both narrative and dialogue and have been taken from the entire novel. However, due to the limited size of this thesis, not the entire novel could be analysed, so the number of excerpts to be examined is limited. The excerpts will focus on two characters, Mina Harker and Lucy Westenra, as they are the most important female characters of the novel. Therefore, this thesis is not an exhaustive study and there may be other important excerpts to be analysed in this light, but these were not selected for this research project.

First, a dataset has been manually created from the three texts. This dataset was made by re-reading the English source text and noting any excerpt that reflected the controversial portrayal of the female characters, specifically focussing on two characters: Mina and Lucy. In total, 49 useful examples were found in the novel. Then, the corresponding translations were located in the two Dutch versions. All of these excerpts were then manually copied into a table, consisting of three columns for all three texts to be analysed. From these 49 excerpts, the 20 most relevant and interesting examples were selected for the analysis of this thesis, with ten excerpts per character. In this manner, both characters will be equally analysed and the contrast between the two women will be illustrated. The number of excerpts to be analysed was limited to 20 in order to be able to provide in-depth analyses for each example, rather than prioritizing a large number of examples and compromising on the analysis. Furthermore, these examples were selected based on the significant differences between the two translations in terms of the portrayal of Mina and Lucy.

By comparing the excerpts in the table, the author of this thesis is able to see if the translator used a domesticating or a foreignizing translation strategy for a particular excerpt, and how these decisions affect the Dutch translations. Although the concepts of domestication and foreignization are vague and complex, as discussed in Chapter 1, they are crucial for the comparison of the excerpts. As aforementioned, these strategies are concerned with bringing the source text closer to the reader or moving the source text away from the reader, respectively, and have an overlap with the concepts of modernization and historicization. However, the author has chosen to use domestication and foreignization as the main focus of this thesis, rather than modernization and historicization, to establish the validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis. As discussed in Chapter 1, research has been done on whether it is possible to measure the degree of domestication and foreignization in a literary translation (see Van Poucke 2012). In his study, Van Poucke (2012) compares small text units, i.e.,

"transemes," in literary translation, for which he uses a quantitative model to measure the degree of domestication and foreignization. However, this method will not be employed in this thesis as the chosen excerpts are more complex than a single word or sentence, and therefore, the quantitative model would be unsuitable for this thesis. With this methodology, the author of this thesis hopes to shed light on the changing Dutch translations of the depiction of the female characters in the English source text, and show that these translations differ according to the time in which they were produced. It will also show that the translation by Piet Verhagen (2009) is more domesticating than the translation made by Else Hoog (1968).

As aforementioned, there are some limitations to this research project. Firstly, this project is not an exhaustive study due to the limited size of this thesis. As there are only 20 excerpts to be analysed in the coming chapter, there might be other excerpts that are equally, if not more important to be examined. However, as abovementioned, these 20 excerpts were the most relevant for the purposes of this thesis, and show the differences between the two translations in terms of their portrayal of women in light of domestication and foreignization best. Furthermore, the present author selected passages from the source text rather than from the target texts, which might also result in other important passages being overlooked or not being included in this thesis. Finally, as aforementioned, the terms domestication and foreignization remain problematic. Therefore, it is sometimes difficult to assign one of the two strategies to a particular excerpt.

This chapter has analysed the primary materials that will be used in this thesis and explained what methodology will be employed to yield the results that will help to answer the overarching research question of this project. The next chapter will present the results and analysis, in which the findings of the research will be presented and analysed.

Chapter Three: Results and Analysis

In this chapter, the results and analysis of the close reading of the portrayal of women in the two different Dutch translations of *Dracula* will be presented. It should be repeated here that there are significant issues surrounding the terms domestication and foreignization. As aforementioned in Chapter 1, there is a thin line between these two concepts and the concepts modernization and historicization. In this chapter, there may be translations of excerpts that lean towards domestication, but actually resemble the idea of modernization. Likewise, there might be excerpts in which the attributed foreignization parallels historicization. If this is the case for a particular example in the following chapter, these parallels will be explained in the relevant text excerpt.

This chapter will show that the Dutch translation from 1968 portrays the female characters mostly in the same way as the source text does, i.e., in a foreignizing manner, and that the Dutch translation from 2009 has modernised the depiction of women as befitting contemporary society, i.e., in a domesticating way. Furthermore, the results of this chapter will contribute to answering the overarching research question, as presented in the Introduction: To what extent do the two Dutch translators use domestication and foreignization approaches in their translations of the depiction of the female characters and are these findings in line with the Retranslation Hypothesis? Through close reading, this chapter aims to show that the translation from 2009 brings the source text closer to the reader than the translation from 1968 in terms of the cultural context provided in the Introduction and Chapter 1.

The two main female characters of the novel are Mina Harker and Lucy Westenra. As Stoker presents these two women as the novel's most important representatives of women in the Victorian period, they will be the focus of this analysis. As aforementioned in Chapter 2, ten excerpts will be analysed per character. However, it is noteworthy that there are three

other important female characters in *Dracula*: the three vampire sisters of Castle Dracula. Although they are relatively minor characters, they still play a significant role in the depiction of "new women" as being lascivious and sexually liberated. In fact, there is a strong link between the sexually free sisters and the idea that Lucy transforms into a femme fatale after Count Dracula bites her. This chapter will be divided into two sections, with both discussing one of the female characters. Section 3.1 will analyse the passages concerning Mina Harker, and section 3.2 will analyse the excerpts about Lucy Westenra. They will be looked at in this particular order as this is the order in which they are introduced in the novel, so this thesis will adhere to the novel's structure.

Due to the limited size of this thesis, all text examples to be discussed in the following chapter can be found in the appendix at the end of this thesis. This appendix contains the full relevant passages, with the specific text that is analysed in this chapter placed in bold. Throughout the coming chapter, there will be references to the corresponding example in the appendix when discussing these specific text passages, which will be placed in italics in the text. Furthermore, as mentioned in Chapter 2, there may be other significant passages in *Dracula* and the two Dutch translations that are worthy of comparison or research. However, the scope of this thesis limits the number of excerpts that can be properly analysed, and thus other important passages might not be mentioned.

3.1 Mina Harker

One of the most important female characters of the novel, if not the most, is Mina Harker (or, Mina Murray before she was married). At the beginning of the novel, she is still Jonathan's fiancée, but they marry soon after he escapes Castle Dracula, hence the reference to her as Mina Harker. She is first introduced to the reader in her letters to Lucy, which is their main form of communication. These letters are of a private nature and are not meant to

be read by any other person than themselves, and certainly not by other men, as these letters clearly express the women's feelings and desires. What makes Mina stand out from the contemporary Victorian woman is that she is a working middle-class woman, which is illustrated in the first letter to Lucy: "Forgive my long delay in writing, but I have been simply overwhelmed with work. The life of an assistant schoolmistress is sometimes trying" (Stoker, 1897, p. 62). As Mina is married to a man who works in a respectable profession, i.e., solicitor, she does not have to work for her own interests, since her husband can provide for her. However, Mina wants to have an occupation, emphasising her progressiveness for the Victorian age. Due to her inquisitiveness, she possesses many skills with which she attempts to aid her husband in any way she can. For example, she practises stenography to match Jonathan's studies; she memorises the train schedules to and from Exeter to quickly help Jonathan during his travels; and she studies maps of Transylvania to aid the Crew of Light in their final mission to kill the Count. On the one hand, Mina represents the perfect traditional wife for Jonathan, and on the other hand, she symbolises the aforementioned New Woman through her independence. As Van Helsing expresses, "she has man's brain – a brain that a man should have were he much gifted – and woman's heart" (Stoker, 1897, p. 250), emphasising her combination of both masculine and feminine aspects. Despite her sexual ambiguity, Mina is still repressed in her actions as she attempts to help the Crew of Light in the final stages of their mission. Due to her intellectuality and her direct link with the Count through her bite, the men believe she has become too involved in the men's business and exclude her from the mission. Later, however, they realise that they need her "man's brain" and readmit her to their quest. This awareness signifies that these men have become dependent on the thinking of a woman, which is a reversal of the traditional gender roles of the Victorian period.

Mina's sexual ambiguity is represented throughout the entirety of *Dracula*. One of the first instances where she displays interest in the concept of the New Woman occurs in example 3.1. This passage is from a letter to Lucy, in which Mina discusses contemporary traditions regarding marriage proposals. In the source text, she writes: *But I suppose the New Woman won't condescend in future to accept; she will do the proposing herself. And a nice job she will make of it, too! There's some consolation in that*. Mina implies that a new generation of women is emerging, one that will equal or even usurp the traditional role of men in relationships. In the Dutch translation from 1968, this passage is translated as: *Maar ik veronderstel dat de „Nieuwe Vrouw" in de toekomst geen genoegen meer zal nemen met aanvaarden alleen; zij zal zèlf het aanzoek willen doen. En ze zal het goed doen ook! Dat is een troostvolle gedachte.* This is a fairly literal translation of the source text. It is suggested that the woman would rather propose to the man in the future than the man to the woman. Furthermore, the element of *alleen* implies that there is little room for a refusal of the proposal: although it is possible to refuse, the most likely choice for a woman would be to accept. In the translation from 2009, however, it is suggested that solely accepting a marriage proposal is denigrating to a woman: *Alleen zal de 'Nieuwe Vrouw' van de toekomst waarschijnlijk weigeren zich te verlagen door een aanzoek aan te nemen en er zelf een doen. En ze zal er zeker iets moois van maken! Dat zal me troosten.* In this translation, it is suggested by the element of *waarschijnlijk* that there it is probable that a woman refuses a marriage proposal. This is in contrast with the 1968 translation, where *alleen* limits this probability, and the translation was made at a time when it was uncommon to refuse a marriage proposal. In contemporary society, women have the freedom to refuse a marriage proposal and it is considered as a real possibility that she might do so, also because of the changing attitudes towards marriage. In other words, the translation from 2009 proposes a

more liberal outlook on women's role in accepting or refusing a marriage proposal than the translation from 1968.

Example 3.2 is taken from another letter from Mina. She writes to Lucy after she receives a letter from a nurse in Budapest, where Jonathan is hospitalised. In the letter, the nurse includes that Mina does not need to be concerned about another woman in Jonathan's life in case she might think that was the reason for his long delay to England. Although Mina is not jealous, she does disclose to Lucy that she is glad that no other woman was *a cause of trouble*. In the translation from 1968, this is translated as *de oorzaak van alle ellende*, a translation that includes an addition to the source text. Here, the translator has included the word *alle*, which would mean that the source text would have to be the *cause of all trouble* instead of *a cause of trouble*. The translator does not take into consideration that there might be other factors contributing to the trouble that the couple is experiencing, apart from other women. In the translation from 2009, these factors are taken into consideration, as the translation leaves out the element of trouble: *dat er geen andere vrouw in het spel was*. Rather than implying that a woman is the cause of all trouble, this translation simply eliminates one of the possible reasons for Jonathan's delay. In other words, where the 1968 translation closely adheres to the source text in its depiction of women being the main cause of trouble for other women, the 2009 translation presents a more positive outlook on women and better fits Mina's self-expressed non-jealousy.

The next text excerpt to be analysed relates to a turbulent period for Mina and Jonathan. Example 3.3 is set shortly after Jonathan's employer, Mr Hawkins, has passed away, and Mina struggles to keep up appearances for her husband. She confides in Lucy, but Mina is unaware that Lucy is lying on her deathbed in Whitby. Therefore, this letter remains unopened by her. In the letter, Mina states that *I have no one here that I can confide in*. In the translation from 1968, this sentence is rendered more emotionally than in the source text,

namely: *ik heb hier niemand bij wie ik mijn hart kan uitstorten*. While accurate, this translation emphasises the stereotype that women are generally very sentimental. It also suggests that Mina wants to have a conversation about her feelings in which she is the only agent. The translation from 2009, however, is a more literal translation of the source text: *ik heb hier niemand die ik in vertrouwen kan nemen*. This rendering is less emotional than the translation from 1968. It also suggests that Mina actually wants a conversation partner, i.e., Lucy, with whom she wants to talk about her current situation rather than pour her heart out as the only agent in the conversation. In other words, the translation from 1968 deviates from the source text by rendering the translation more emotional and reinforces the stereotype of the sentimentality of women. The translation from 2009, however, adheres more closely to the source text, which results in Mina being portrayed as less emotional and more rational and mature.

Shortly after Mr Hawkins has passed away, Jonathan and Mina visit London together. Now a married couple, they walk with their arms intertwined, yet Mina feels uncomfortable as that is not the image of herself that she wants to portray to the outside world. Therefore, Mina is not the one initiating physical touch, but Jonathan. In example 3.4, Mina writes: *Jonathan was holding me by the arm, the way he used to in old days before I went to school*. In the translation from 1968, this passage is translated as: *Jonathan hield mijn arm vast, net als vroeger voordat ik naar school ging*. While this is a literal translation of the source text, it depicts Jonathan as being in control of Mina, almost like a father figure, and renders her almost childlike - as if she is brought to school. Although the reader knows that she is, in fact, a teacher, this translation reads as if she is not. In contrast, in the translation from 2009, the sentence is translated as: *Jonathan hield me bij de arm, zoals hij altijd deed voor ik lerares werd*. In this translation, the childlike element of going to school is disregarded and replaced by her real profession. This proposes a more liberal outlook on the social position of women

than the translation from 1968, where Mina is made to look like a child instead of a woman with a profession. In other words, the translation from 2009 suggests that Mina is more of an independent woman than is proposed by the 1968 translation.

When the Crew of Light is in the midst of their mission to kill Count Dracula, they decide that Mina should be left out of the business as she is a woman and this case might be of harm to her, without her opinion on the matter. In example 3.5, Dr Van Helsing argues that she should not be involved in the case in the future, as *it is not good that she run a risk so great*. In the translation from 1968, this sentence is translated as *het is niet goed dat zij een zo groot risico loopt*. This is a literal translation of the source text, in which Mina has no opportunity to choose whether she wants to take the risk or not. In the translation from 2009, however, she is attributed some agency: *zo'n groot risico mag ze niet nemen*. Although both translations imply that she is excluded from the group, the wording in the translation from 2009 conveys the idea that Mina does have some agency over her actions. Although Van Helsing states that the risk is too great for her, the translation from 2009 suggests that she could refuse the men's decision. The translation from 1968, however, reinforces the idea that the men do not need Mina's approval and grant her no agency.

After the men have informed Mina of their decision that she has been excluded from the hunt for Count Dracula, they order her to go to bed while they go to Carfax, the Count's home in London, to find clues regarding his whereabouts. In her diary, Mina writes that the men cannot expect her to simply go to sleep, and she specifically states how worried Jonathan would be if she were not asleep upon his return. In example 3.6, Mina states that she will pretend to sleep, *lest Jonathan have added anxiety about me*. In the translation from 1968, this sentence is translated as *opdat Jonathan geen extra ongerustheid over mij zal hoeven koesteren*. Although this passage is not about how Mina acts as a woman, it is about how she is treated as one. She shows how much anxiety Jonathan would have should she not be asleep

when he returns. The translation from 1968 conveys this same idea by using words such as *extra* to emphasise the importance of Mina being asleep. In the translation from 2009, Jonathan's anxiety is more reduced than in the first translation: *om te voorkomen dat Jonathan zich ongerust maakt*. In comparison, the later translation almost renders Jonathan distant by leaving out the word *extra*. Taking their situation into consideration, it would make sense for Jonathan to be worried about his wife. However, the addition of the word *extra* in the translation from 1968 makes Mina appear as a helpless woman about whom a man would be concerned in any case, rather than Jonathan being concerned about her due to the dangerous situation they are in. The translation from 2009 presents a more toned down version, signalling that Jonathan is as anxious as he is due to the threatening Count Dracula.

Example 3.7 is an excerpt from Jonathan's personal diary. He dreads Mina's involvement in the men's business, yet credits her for her skills and knowledge with which she has helped them thus far. Specifically, he praises her energy, brains, and *foresight* as important features. In the translation from 1968, *foresight* is translated as *overleg*, suggesting that one of Mina's best contributions to the group is her ability to consult and discuss her findings with the men. In the translation from 2009, however, *foresight* is translated as *vooruitziende blik*, assigning her a completely different quality than in the earlier translation. Here, she is praised for her ability to think one step ahead of the Count instead of her good communication with the men. In other words, the translation from 2009 places Mina in a more independent and contributing position than the translation from 1968 does.

Later in the novel, Mina writes in her diary that she agrees to be excluded from the mission. According to her, the men believe she does not belong in the business as she is a woman, and this is no women's affair. The reader later learns about her unhappiness with being left out of the mission. In example 3.8, Mina states that she *acquiesced* to be excluded from the hunt for the Count. In the translation from 1968, this verb is translated as

toegestemd, which suggests that Mina herself agreed with the idea of the men instead of disagreeing with it and defending herself. In the translation from 2009, however, *acquiesced* is translated as *neergelegd*, which suggests that although she eventually accepts her fate, she does not actively agree with the proposal. Although she has to accept the men's decision in both cases, she actively agrees with it in the translation from 1968, while she does not in the translation from 2009.

When Lucy passes away, Mina loses her only female friend. In addition, she is also not included in the hunt for Count Dracula; consequently, she feels emotional and lonely. In a diary entry shown in example 3.9, she writes that Jonathan cannot see her crying. This statement reinforces her image as a progressive woman who defies a certain female stereotype, i.e., their emotional and sensitive reputation. Mina writes that *he shall never see it*, which suggests her resolute intention that Jonathan will not see her in a "weakened" state. In the translation from 1968, this phrase is translated as *mag hij het niet zien*, which suggests that there will be a possibility that he sees her crying, even though she does not want him to. The translation from 2009 adheres more to the source text and retains the resoluteness that Mina expresses. There, the phrase is translated as *zal hij het niet zien*. In contrast with the translation from 1968, this translation suggests that Mina will not give Jonathan the opportunity to see her cry. However, there are some problems with assigning either domestication or foreignization to this particular example. The modal *shall* is an ambiguous verb and it was used in a different way in the nineteenth century than it is now. This would imply that for this example, it would be a case of either modernization or historicization. Due to this problem and the fact that the terms domestication and foreignization are so complex, no precise conclusion can be drawn for this particular excerpt.

The final example of Mina to be discussed in this chapter can be found in example 3.10, written by Jonathan in his diary. Noticing the sadness that has overcome Mina, he

decides to send her back to their home in Exeter. He argues that her *daily tasks* would interest her more than living *in ignorance* in London, as she is not involved in the men's business anymore. In the translation from 1968, *daily tasks* is translated as *dagelijkse beslommeringen*, which has a negative connotation of the monotony of daily household chores. Furthermore, *in ignorance* is translated as *in onwetendheid*, suggesting that Mina knows absolutely nothing of the men's business. In the translation from 2009, *daily tasks* is translated as *dagelijkse taken*, which sounds more neutral than *beslommeringen*, and has less of a negative connotation. *In ignorance* is translated as *in het duister tasten*, which means the same as *onwetendheid*. However, the wording implies that she is still actively trying to gather knowledge about the affair. In other words, Mina is more passive and submissive in the translation from 1968 than in the translation from 2009, where she is attributed more activity in her actions and independence.

In short, Mina Harker is frequently portrayed as a more passive woman in the translation from 1968, and a more active one in the translation from 2009. She is also more emotional in the earlier translation, whereas she is depicted as more emotionally stable and independent in the later one.

3.2 Lucy Westenra

After Mina, the other most important female character in *Dracula* is Lucy Westenra. She is the opposite of Mina, and can be described as a "femme fatale." Like the three vampire sisters, she is sexually more liberated than the typical Victorian woman, she does not have an occupation or work in any way, and she is described as a simple-minded girl. As mentioned in section 3.1, the reader becomes acquainted with Lucy and Mina through their correspondence via private letters. These letters illustrate the close relationship between the two women, which only strengthens the male anxiety that surrounds this novel. Very intimate female

relationships were deviant from the norm in the Victorian period, and anything that deviated from the norm in that respect can be seen as a threat to the male patriarchy.

Lucy's sexually liberated mind comes to the fore when she writes to Mina about the three marriage proposals that she has received: "Why can't they let a girl marry three men, or as many as want her, and save all this trouble?" (Stoker, 1897, p. 67). Her behaviour shows a certain curiosity to know what it would be like to have the opportunity to marry multiple men, instead of only one. In this way, she poses a threat to the structure of society as a whole, where men have control over women and not the other way around. Her reputation as femme fatale also contributes to her early downfall in the novel. During her holiday in Whitby with Mina, she is attacked by the Count and slowly transforms into a vampire. As a vampire, Lucy changes into a promiscuous woman, posing a direct threat to the men. When Van Helsing proposes to kill Lucy in her vampire state, he does so as a way to re-establish order in their threatened reality where deviant women are unacceptable. Here, the male anxiety present in the novel comes to the fore again. When Lucy is killed, the patriarchal order is re-established, and there is once again a world in which men dominate women.

In the first letter that Lucy writes to Mina, the former's sexual liberty comes to the fore when she tells Mina that she has found a suitable man for her, were she not already engaged to Jonathan. In example 3.11, Lucy describes Dr Seward as handsome, well-off, and *really clever*. In the translation from 1968, *really clever* is translated as *echt knap*. Furthermore, the excerpt contains a repetition of the word *knap*. While *knap* means *clever*, it can also be interpreted as *handsome*, especially due to the repetition in the example. This repetition emphasises Lucy's focus on Dr Seward's beauty instead of his intelligence. In the translation from 2009, *really clever* is translated as *heel intelligent*, disregarding all ambiguity and focusing solely on his intelligence. Although *knap* can also refer to intelligence, it is significant that the translation from 1968 depicts Lucy as being more focused on the looks of

Dr Seward than she is in the translation from 2009. In other words, the translation from 1968 shows a more stereotypical femme fatale and thus more closely follows the source text in this regard, making it a more foreignizing translation. The translation from 2009 is more domesticating as Lucy is not solely focused on a man's beauty, but also praises his intelligence.

The excerpt in example 3.12 is set in the same letter, in which Lucy declares her love for Arthur Holmwood to Mina. The most significant part of this passage is the change of repetition that occurs in the translations. In the source text, Lucy exclaims: *I love him; I love him; I love him!* However, in both Dutch translations, it is only said twice: *ik houd van hem; ik houd van hem!* (1968) and *ik hou van hem! Ik hou van hem!* (2009). The fact that the repetition is shortened might be due to the fact that it was unusual for a woman to express her love so extremely for a man she has not married yet. The fact that she says it three times in the source text emphasises the idea that Lucy disregards the contemporary norm regarding a woman's love for a man and marriage. Although the two translations are not different from each other, it is noteworthy that the repetition has been shortened in the same manner in both works, rendering Lucy less emotional than in the source text.

In another letter to Mina, Lucy expresses her joy that they are both engaged at the same time and how they will settle down in their new lives. In example 3.13, Lucy states that they *are going to settle down soon soberly into old married women*, which is a rather negative perspective. Arguably, Lucy does not yet want to settle down and live the life that is stereotypical for married, Victorian women. In the translation from 1968, this future is depicted more positively: *binnenkort nuchtere, gevestigde, getrouwde vrouwen zullen zijn*. The element of *old* is omitted in this translation, reflecting the stance that marriage is the norm for young women and something to look forward to in their lives. The elements of *soberly* and *settle down* are retained in the translation, which reinforces the idea that deviance

from the norm was unacceptable for women. However, the negative perspective from the source text is adopted in the translation from 2009: *binnenkort ingetogen oude echtgenotes zullen zijn*. Here, the element of becoming old is retained, and the translator has opted for *ingetogen*. This translation suggests that Lucy and Mina will not be able to continue living their lives as they do now, and instead have to comply with the norms of marriage. In other words, the translation from 1968 is more representative of marriage as the norm for young women, and is thus more foreignizing. In contrast, the translation from 2009 abandons that ideal and is thus more domesticating. Due to the fact that the norms regarding marriage depend on time and culture, this example could also be a case of historicization and modernization. Therefore, there is no exact strategy that can be attributed to either translation in this particular example.

As Lucy prepares to become a married woman, she thinks of all the values a married woman should possess. One of the most important values to her is that of honesty. In example 3.14, she writes: *I must be fair*. In the translation from 1968, this sentence is translated as *ze moet eerlijk zijn*. Instead of translating *I* as *ik*, this translation shifts the responsibility of being honest to all women in general instead of only to Lucy. This generalisation reinforces the norms that women had to comply with. In the translation from 2009, the sentence is translated literally as *ik moet eerlijk zijn*, leaving Lucy responsible for her own honesty instead of generalising all women. Where the translation from 1968 deviates from the source text and presents a generalisation that all women must be honest, the 2009 translation follows the source text more closely and focuses on Lucy alone.

The following passage, example 3.15, shows why Lucy thinks women marry men. According to her, it is because *we think a man will save us from fears, and we marry him*. The source text implies that a woman cannot save herself from her own fears, and needs a man to solve this problem for her. The translation from 1968 retains the *fear*-element: *dat we denken*

dat een man ons kan redden van onze angsten en daarom trouwen we met hem. This translation is a literal translation of the source text, and it also suggests that a woman's main reason to marry is to be saved specifically from her fears. In contrast, the translation from 2009 abandons the element of fear: *dat we denken dat een man ons tegen alles zal beschermen als we met hem trouwen*. Instead of saving a woman from her fears, it is implied that a woman will be protected from anything if she marries a man. Furthermore, it is suggested that it is not the only reason why a woman marries a man, but that the protection happens if a woman marries a man. It is not implied that the marriage will inevitably take place, it is proposed as a possibility in the 2009 translation. In other words, the earlier translation can be seen as more foreignizing and the later translation as more domesticizing. However, like in example 3.13, the translations in this example could also have been a case of historicizing and modernizing the perspectives on marriage. So, there is no concrete conclusion for this particular example.

Eventually, Lucy receives three marriage proposals, from Dr Seward, Arthur Holmwood, and Quincey Morris, respectively. In example 3.16, she wonders why a girl cannot marry three men and does not want to reject any of them, but she states that *this is heresy, and I must not say it*. While the two Dutch translators use the same translation (*Maar dat is ketterij en ik mag het niet zeggen* (1968) / *Maar dat mag ik niet zeggen, want het is ketterij* (2009)), they use a different sentence structure. The translation from 1968 adheres to the same sentence structure as the source text, which might suggest that the translator wanted to convey that Lucy is reiterating a norm or a convention that she has been taught, and that she would not want to suggest to the contrary. The translation from 2009, however, suggests that Lucy reiterates the norm but does not necessarily agree with it. Due to the change in sentence structure, it might be interpreted as being sarcastic. So although the translations do

not differ, the change in sentence structure renders the tone of the sentence differently in both translations.

When Lucy explains to Mina how she rejected Quincey Morris' marriage proposal in one of their letters, her refusal does not seem very steadfast. The former confesses that she kissed him out of pity, despite settling for Arthur Holmwood's marriage proposal. Significantly, Lucy asks Mina the question *wasn't it?* in example 3.17 to reassure herself that she made the right choice in kissing Morris. After the kiss, she writes: *I am afraid I was blushing very much*. In the translation from 1968, this sentence is rendered as *ik moest helaas hevig blozen*, which, arguably, is not what Lucy meant. This translation implies that to blush is disagreeable, while Lucy's character would not be ashamed of blushing. In the translation from 2009, the sentence is translated as *ik vrees dat ik hevig bloosde*, which conveys the same meaning as the source text. In this translation, the act of blushing is not regarded as something unfortunate but as a natural reaction to Lucy's situation. Where the translation from 1968 renders Lucy's situation as unfortunate, it is portrayed as something natural in the translation from 2009. Thus, the later translation is less conservative than the earlier one in terms of what a woman should be ashamed of doing.

During the period when Lucy is ill, there is an encounter between herself, Lucy's mother, and Dr Seward. Unaware that Lucy has rejected Dr Seward's marriage proposal, Lucy's mother states that he needs a wife to take care of him. This causes an awkward situation between the three of them in the room. In example 3.18, Lucy's mother exclaims: *You want a wife to nurse and look after you a bit; that you do!'* In the translation from 1968, this sentence is translated as: *U moest een vrouw hebben om u te verplegen en een beetje voor u te zorgen; dat is het!* In the translation from 2009, this sentence is rendered as: *U hebt een vrouw nodig om u te verplegen en voor u te zorgen, dat is zeker!* In the 1968, it is implied that a man needs a woman to take care of him, while in the 2009 translation it is suggested that it

would be helpful to have a woman to take care of the man. So, although these three sentences do not relate to women's behaviour, they do relate to how a woman should take care of her husband, and even nurse him. Furthermore, in the translation from 1968, the phrase *dat is het* implies that marrying a woman is the only solution to Dr Seward's problems, while in the translation from 2009, it is implied that it could contribute to his life. Once again, the 2009 translation is supposedly more liberal than the 1968 translation: in the former, it is suggested that a wife is not a necessity but rather an addition to a man's life. However, there is a problem with terming these translations as either domesticating or foreignizing. For example, the modal *moest* in the 1968 translation might have been used differently in the 1960s than it is used nowadays. In that case, it becomes more of a choice between modernization and historicization instead of purely domestication or foreignization. Thus, it is challenging to provide a precise conclusion for this example.

After Lucy has passed away, Dr Van Helsing and Dr Seward discuss the circumstances in which she died. In example 3.19, Van Helsing exclaims that due to the fact that all the men participated in the blood transfusions, *this so sweet maid is a polyandrist*. The translation from 1968 translation renders this sentence as *dan deed die zo lieftallige maagd aan veelmannerij*. This translation carries a negative connotation and a paradox, as the words *maagd* and *veelmannerij* stand in stark contrast to each other. The 2009 translation, however, disregards the word *maagd* and uses the following translation: *dan is die zo lieve meid een polygame vrouw*. *Maid* is translated here as *meid*, abandoning the norm that a woman should be a maiden before marriage. In other words, the translation from 2009 supposedly has a more liberal stance toward a so-called *polyandrist* than the translation from 1968. However, it might also be a case of modernizing the translation for readers that would otherwise have misunderstood the meaning of the word *maid* in translation. Therefore, as in the previous

example, there is no precise conclusion for this example in terms of domestication and foreignization.

The last example of Lucy to be discussed in this chapter is set when the men are looking at her dead body in the coffin. It is implied that she is more beautiful in death than she was in life, suggesting the idea that a passive, silenced woman is more beautiful than an active, independent one. In example 3.20, it is said that she is now more *radiantly beautiful* than ever and that she wears a *delicate bloom* on her cheeks. In the translation from 1968, this is translated as *stralender schoon* and *een teer blosje*. The translation from 2009 renders these phrases as *knapper en stralender* and *een tedere blos*. Although both translations convey the same meaning, there is a slight nuance in the description of Lucy. For example, the translation from 1968 uses the word *schoon* instead of *knap*, which might also bear connotations of hygiene next to beauty. Furthermore, the word *teer* denotes that the bloom was extremely delicate, more than *teder*. In other words, the wording in the translation from 1968 stresses the idea that Lucy is more beautiful when she is passive. While the translation from 2009 bears the same meaning, there is a slight nuance compared to the earlier translation.

This chapter has provided the results and analysis of the close readings of *Dracula* and the two Dutch translations. It has shown that generally, the 2009 translation adapts to contemporary society, in which women are granted a more active and independent stance than the more passive and submissive stance that was expected of them in Victorian society. The next, and final, chapter of this thesis will discuss these results and draw a conclusion based on these findings.

Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusion

The following chapter will provide the discussion and conclusion of this MA thesis. In this thesis, two Dutch translations of *Dracula* were compared to each other and to the source text in order to find out how the female characters were portrayed in the translations, and how that differed for both Dutch works. This chapter will answer the following research question, mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis: To what extent do the two Dutch translators use domestication and foreignization approaches in their translations of the depiction of the female characters, and are these findings in line with the Retranslation Hypothesis? In addition, the two sub-questions will be answered:

1. Does the 1968 Dutch translation of Dracula by Else Hoog use a domesticating or a foreignizing translation strategy for the translations of the female characters?
2. Does the 2009 Dutch translation of *Dracula* by Piet Verhagen use a domesticating or a foreignizing translation strategy for the depiction of the female characters?

First, this chapter will provide short summaries of what has been discussed in Chapter 3, after which the research questions will be answered, from which a conclusion can be drawn. Then, the limitations of this thesis will be acknowledged, and finally, some suggestions for further research will be provided.

Chapter 3.1 discusses Mina Harker, whom the reader learns to know as a New Woman. Mina's personality in the novel is uncovered through her correspondence with Lucy Westenra, with some letters containing expressions and emotions that were not regarded as suitable for Victorian women. Mina stands out from the traditional Victorian woman as she is a working middle-class woman, even though she does not have to be. Still, despite her having her own job, she tries to help her husband Jonathan, and in fact, all the men in the novel, in any way that she can. For example, Mina studies the train schedules and learns stenography,

but she also plays a great part in the quest of the novel, which is to destroy Count Dracula. Through her hypnosis and her extensive knowledge of the Transylvanian area, the men have a great advantage over the Count. These actions ultimately render her an active agent in a novel in which women are suppressed and silenced and represent her sexual ambiguity: on the one hand, she is a traditional Victorian woman, and on the other hand, she symbolises the progressive New Woman. The ten excerpts discussed in 3.1 show that Mina is portrayed differently in the translation from 1968 than in the translation from 2009. The translation from 1968 adheres more to the idea of the traditional Victorian woman and how she should act more passively in contrast to the translation from 2009, which grants Mina a more active role and depicts her more as an independent woman. In terms of domestication and foreignization, the translation from 1968 can be regarded as more foreignizing than the translation from 2009, which results in the later rendering of Mina being closer to the contemporary view of womanhood. The source text is brought closer to the reader and thus becomes more understandable in the 2009 translation. It can be concluded that the Retranslation Hypothesis is refuted for the portrayal of Mina.

Chapter 3.2 explores the excerpts relating to Lucy Westenra, the femme fatale in the novel. She can be regarded as sexually more liberated than the stereotypical Victorian woman of the nineteenth century. As aforementioned, the reader becomes acquainted with Lucy through her correspondence with Mina. However, in contrast to Mina, Lucy does not have an occupation and also does not aid the men in their business. Instead, it is suggested that Lucy spends more time talking and writing about men. This idea is illustrated in her letters to Mina when she writes about the three marriage proposals that she has received and how she would like to marry all three of the men, for example. Furthermore, Lucy is portrayed as being a threat to Victorian society as she is deviant from the norms regarding love and intimacy and her way of being in control over the men. These characteristics contribute to her early

downfall in the novel, when she is eventually killed by the Crew of Light and the traditional gender roles are restored. Again, the translation from 1968 adheres more closely to the source text than the later translation and more strongly conveys the traditional ideas about womanhood in the Victorian period. Lucy is rendered more autonomous in the translation from 2009 and more like a passive agent in the translation from 1968, causing her character, and thus the source text, to be brought closer to the contemporary reader. As a result, the translation from 2009 is more domesticating than the translation from 1968, which is shown to be more foreignizing, similar to section 3.1. Once again, it can be concluded that the Retranslation Hypothesis can be refuted for the portrayal of Lucy.

In short, the overarching research question can be answered as follows: although the two Dutch translators do not use domestication and foreignization in terms of culture-specific items, for example, they do use the two strategies in terms of the depiction of women, dependent on the culture and time in which the two translations were produced. As for the sub-questions, it can be observed that the translation from 1968 by Else Hoog uses a more foreignizing approach in terms of the depiction of women and that the translation from 2009 by Piet Verhagen employs a more domesticating strategy. Not only does that prove that the Retranslation Hypothesis is not true for these two Dutch translations of *Dracula*, but it also shows that the depiction of the female characters changes in the Dutch translations over time. Mina and Lucy are both depicted differently in the two Dutch translations. They receive more autonomy and freedom in the translation from 2009, whereas they are depicted as more passive agents and traditional women in the translation from 1968. In other words, the later translation adapts the source text to contemporary society and its stance towards the independence of women. Furthermore, this translation renders the female characters not as outsiders of society but as more active agents with more freedom of choice than in the Victorian era. The source text is made more understandable and fitting for the contemporary

reading audience. Once more, it is important to consider the vagueness and complexity of the terms domestication and foreignization when concluding this thesis. As there is a fine line between domestication and foreignization and modernization and historicization, an excerpt might sometimes tend more towards the latter two concepts instead of the former two. This is a risk when comparing literary translations to a novel that was published 127 years ago, and proves that domestication and foreignization are a difficult perspective for analysing literary translations. In some cases it might be a combination of both strategies, or a case of modernizing or historicizing.

At the end of this thesis, it is important to note the limitations that this research project has been subject to and how it impacts the results of this thesis. First of all, it is noteworthy that this thesis is by no means an exhaustive study. Although the dataset of this thesis consists of 20 excerpts, many more passages are important to look at in terms of the changing depiction of the female characters. However, due to the limited size of this project, not all of these passages could be discussed. Furthermore, some passages might have been overlooked in the process of selecting the excerpts. Secondly, the author of this thesis is aware that there is an earlier Dutch translation of *Dracula*, namely the 1928 translation made by Jeannette Wink-Nijhuis. However, due to the absence of this version online and its unavailability in print, it could unfortunately not be included in this thesis and thus not be considered for the testing of the Retranslation Hypothesis.

Reflecting on what has been researched in this thesis, a suggestion for future research is to look at the rendering of the speech of non-English characters in the novel. *Dracula* contains several characters that are not English, such as the Dutch Dr Van Helsing, the Romanian Count Dracula, and the American Quincey Morris. Throughout the novel, their speech is characterised by the use of incorrect grammar and slang words, for example. Therefore, it might be interesting to analyse and compare the source text and the two Dutch

translations to see whether the translations of these instances of incorrect grammar change over time and discuss this in light of the Retranslation Hypothesis, as has been done in this MA thesis. Furthermore, it might be an interesting research project to analyse the first Dutch translation of *Dracula* from 1928 in the same manner as the other two translations that have been explored in this thesis. A final suggestion for future research might be to analyse the three vampire sisters in Castle Dracula in light of the changing portrayal of women and domestication and foreignization, as they have been excluded from this thesis due to spatial limitations.

References

Ambrosiani, P. (2012). Domestication and foreignization in Russian translations of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. In H. Kemppanen, M. Jänis, & A. Belikova (Eds.), *Domestication and foreignization in translation studies* (pp. 79–100). Frank & Timme, Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur.

Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*, *4*, 1-7.

Books of the Week: Novels. (1897). [Review of the book *Dracula*, by B. Stoker]. *The Manchester Guardian*, 9.

Case, A. (1993). Tasting the original apple: Gender and the struggle for narrative authority in 'Dracula'. *Narrative*, *1*(3), 223-243.

Chesterman, A. (2017). A causal model for Translation Studies. In Y. Gambier, F. Pöchhacker & G. Toury, *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected papers 1993-2014*, (pp. 123-135). John Benjamins.

Clery, E. J. (2010). The genesis of "Gothic" fiction. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (pp. 21-40). Cambridge University Press.

Coles, R. (2012). Domesticating the trauma of war in translation. *Libri Et Liberi*, *1*(1), 45-66. https://doi.org/10.21066/carcl.libri.2012-01(01).0047.

Cooper, L. A. (2010). *Gothic realities: The impact of horror fiction on modern culture*. McFarland & Company.

De Brún, S. (2020). "In a sea of wonders:" Eastern Europe and Transylvania in the Irish-language translation of Dracula. *Philologica*, *12*(1), 70-83. doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2020-0006.

Delabastita, D. (2010). Literary translation. In L. van Doorslaer, Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies Vol. 2* (pp. 69-78). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Desmidt, I. (2009). (Re)translation revisited. *Translators' Journal*, *54*(4), 669-683.

Dracula. (1897). [Review of the book *Dracula*, by B. Stoker]. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, *84*(2175), 21.

Frayling, C. (2003). Preface. In M. Hindle (Ed.), *Dracula* (pp. vii-xii). Penguin Classics.

Gorris, G., Lamers, G., Van Rooy, A. H. M. I., Schilte, J., Slijpen, A., Sterck, J., Verschaeve, C. (1928/1929). [Review of the book *Dracula*, by B. Stoker]. *Boekenschouw: Geillustreerd Letterkundig Maandblad*, *22*, Uitgeverij "Foreholte" Voorhout, 36.

Gürçaglar, S. T. (2001). Adding towards a nationalist text: On a Turkish translation of Dracula. *Target: international journal of translation studies*, *13*(1), 125-148. doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1075/target.13.1.08gur.

Hindle, M. (2003). Introduction. In M. Hindle (Ed.), *Dracula* (pp. xvii-xxxix). Penguin Classics.

Hogle, J. E. (2012). Introduction. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, J. S. (2021). *Translated! Papers on literary translation and Translation Studies* (R. Van Den Broeck, Ed.). Brill.

Hurley, K. (2012). British Gothic fiction, 1885-1930. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (pp. 189-207). Cambridge University Press.

Jaya, D. (2021). Translation ideology in literary translation; A case study of Bram Stoker's "Dracula" translation into Indonesian. *Wacana*, *21*(3), 424-445. doi: 10.17510/wacana.v21i3.987.

Jordan, E. (1999). *The women's movement and women's employment in nineteenth century Britain*. Routledge.

Kemppanen, H. (2012). The role of the concepts *domestication* and *foreignization* in Russian translation studies. In H. Kemppanen, M. Jänis & A. Belikova (Eds.), *Domestication and foreignization in translation studies* (pp. 49-62). Frank & Timme, Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur.

Kloek, J. J., Mijnhardt, W.W. (1990). Negentiende-eeuwse leescultuur. *De Negentiende Eeuw*, *14*(2-3), 113-119.

Koskinen, K. (2012). *Domestication*, *foreignization* and the modulation of affect. In H. Kemppanen, M. Jänis & A. Belikova (Eds.), *Domestication and foreignization in translation studies* (pp. 13-32). Frank & Timme, Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur.

Koskinen, K., Paloposki, O. (2010). Retranslation. In L. van Doorslaer & Y. Gambier (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies: Volume 1*, (pp. 294-298). John Benjamins.

Kudashev, I. (2017). Challenges of measuring domestication and foreignization in translations. *Electronic Journal of the KäTu Symposium on Translation and Interpreting Studies*, *10*, 63–72.

Kuipers, A. (2023, August 8). *Nu te zien in de KB: de eerste Nederlandse versies van 'Dr. Jekyll' en 'Dracula'*. KB Nationale Bibliotheek. https://www.kb.nl/blogs/de-eerste-nederlandse-versies-van-dr-jekyll-en-dracula.

Ledger, S. (2007). The new woman and feminist fictions. In G. Marshall (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Fin de Siècle* (pp. 153-168). Cambridge Core. https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521850636.

Luckhurst, R. (2017). Introduction. In R. Luckhurst (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Dracula* (pp. 1-8). Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, G. (2007). Introduction. In G. Marshall (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Fin de Siècle* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge Core. https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521850636.

Melton, J. G. (2003). *All things Dracula: A bibliography of editions, reprints, adaptations, and translations of Dracula*. CESNUR. https://www.cesnur.org/2003/dracula/. Accessed 4 March 2024.

Miles, R. (2010). The 1790s: the effulgence of Gothic. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (pp. 41-62). Cambridge University Press.

Paloposki, O., Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær & D. Gile (Eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in Translation Studies: Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001*, (pp. 27-38). John Benjamins.

Peeters, K., Van Poucke, P. (2023). Retranslation, thirty-odd years after Berman. *Parallèles*, *35*(1), 3-27.

Punter, D. (2012). Scottish and Irish Gothic. In J. E. Hogle (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Gothic Fiction* (pp. 105-124). Cambridge University Press.

Punter, D., Byron, G. (2004). *The Gothic*. Blackwell Publishing.

Pym, A. (1996). Venuti's visibility. *Target*, *8*(1), 165-177.

Stoker, B. (1897). *Dracula*. Penguin Classics.

Stoker, B. (1968). *Dracula* (E. Hoog, Trans.). Arbeiderspers. (Original work published 1897).

Stoker, B. (2009). *Dracula* (P. Verhagen, Trans.). Boekerij. (Original work published 1897).

Stoker's (Bram) Dracula (Book Review). (1897). [Review of the book *Dracula*, by B. Stoker.] *The Academy*, *52*(1316), 98.

Tymoczko, M. (2000). Translation and political engagement. *The Translator*, *6*(1), 23–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799054.

Van Poucke, P. (2012). Measuring foreignization in literary translation: An attempt to operationalize the concept of foreignization. In H. Kemppanen, M. Jänis, & A. Belikova (Eds.), *Domestication and foreignization in translation studies* (pp. 139–157). Frank & Timme, Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur.

Van Poucke, P. (2017). Aging as a motive for literary retranslation: A survey of case studies on retranslation. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, *12*(1), 91-115.

Venuti, L. (1991). Genealogies of translation theory: Schleiermacher. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, redaction*, *4*(2), 125-150. doi:10.7202/037096ar.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference*. Routledge.

Venuti, L., Ed. (1992). *Rethinking translation: discourse, subjectivity, ideology*. Routledge.

Verdwenen dichteressen. (2013, January 25). Neerlandistiek. https://neerlandistiek.nl/2013/01/verdwenen-dichteressen/.

Wiseman, A. (2024, February 17). *Caleb Landry Jones & Christopher Waltz To Lead Luc Besson's Next Movie, Ambitious Origin Story 'Dracula – A Love Tale': EFM Hot Project*. Deadline. https://deadline.com/2024/02/luc-besson-dracula-caleb-landry-jones-christoph-waltz-origin-movie-efm-1235828022/. Accessed 29 February 2024.

Wynne, C. (2016). Introduction. In C. Wynne (Ed.), *Bram Stoker and the Gothic: Formations to transformations* (pp. 1-13). Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix

Appendix A: List of excerpts

No. of excerpt	*Dracula* (1897)	*Dracula* (1968)	*Dracula* (2009)
3.1	Some of the 'New Women' writers will some day start an idea that men and women should be allowed to see each other asleep before proposing or accepting. **But I suppose the New Woman won't condescend in future to accept; she will do the proposing herself. And a nice job she will make of it, too! There's some consolation in that**. (p. 100)	Sommige medewerkers van de „Nieuwe Vrouw" zullen op een goede dag het idee opperen dat man en vrouw elkaar eerst slapend mogen zien, alvorens een aanzoek te doen of te aanvaarden. **Maar ik veronderstel dat de „Nieuwe Vrouw" in de toekomst geen genoegen meer zal nemen met aanvaarden alleen; zij zal zèlf het aanzoek willen doen. En ze zal het goed doen ook!**	Sommige schrijfsters onder de 'Nieuwe Vrouwen' zullen zeker ooit met het idee komen dat het mannen en vrouwen toegestaan zou moeten zijn elkaar te zien slapen, alvorens een aanzoek te doen of te accepteren. **Alleen zal de 'Nieuwe Vrouw' van de toekomst waarschijnlijk weigeren zich te verlagen door een aanzoek aan te nemen en er zelf een doen. En ze zal er zeker iets**

		Dat is een troostvolle gedachte. (p. 97)	**moois van maken! Dat zal me troosten**. (p. 99)
3.2	I do believe the dear soul thought I might be jealous lest my poor dear should have fallen in love with any other girl. The idea of *my* being jealous about Jonathan! And yet, my dear, let me whisper, I felt a thrill of joy through me when I *knew* that **no other woman was a cause of trouble**. (p. 115)	Ik geloof heus dat die lieve schat dacht dat ik misschien jaloers was, voor het geval mijn arme lieveling verliefd was op een ander meisje. Het idee, dat ik jaloers zou kunnen zijn op *Jonathan*. En toch, engel, laat me je toefluisteren dat ik een steek van vreugde door me heen voelde gaan toen ik zeker wist **dat geen andere vrouw de oorzaak van alle ellende was**. (p. 112)	Ik geloof echt dat de lieve ziel meende ik jaloers was, bang dat mijn arme schat op een ander verliefd geworden was. Jaloers op Jonathan! Het idee! Maar toch, mijn lieve – ik zeg het fluisterend – voelde ik een schok van blijdschap door me heen gaan toen ik wist **dat er geen andere vrouw in het spel was**. (p. 114)
3.3	Forgive me dear, if I worry you with my troubles in the midst of your own happiness;	Vergeef me, schat, dat ik je met mijn moeilijkheden lastig val te midden van je eigen	Vergeef me, mijn lieve, dat ik je lastigval met mijn zorgen juist nu je zo gelukkig bent, maar

	but, Lucy dear, I must tell someone, for the strain of keeping up a brave and cheerful appearance to Jonathan tries me, and **I have no one here that I can confide in**. (p. 169)	geluk; maar Lucy, liefje, ik moet het aan iemand kwijt, want de inspanning om Jonathan steeds met een dapper, opgewekt gelaat tegemoet te treden mat me af en **ik heb hier niemand bij wie ik mijn hart kan uitstorten**. (p. 166)	lieve Lucy, ik moet het tegen iemand zeggen, want de inspanning een dappere en opgewekte façade voor Jonathan hoog te houden is een beproeving, en **ik heb hier niemand die ik in vertrouwen kan nemen**. (p. 170)
3.4	**Jonathan was holding me by the arm, the way he used to in old days before I went to school.** I felt it very improper, for you can't go on for some years teaching etiquette and decorum to other girls without the pedantry of it biting into yourself a bit; but it was Jonathan, and he was my	**Jonathan hield mijn arm vast, net als vroeger voordat ik naar school ging.** Ik vond het zeer ongepast, want je kunt niet jaren lang etiquette en decorum onderwijzen aan andere meisjes zonder er zelf een beetje pedant van te worden; maar het was Jonathan en hij was	**Jonathan hield me bij de arm, zoals hij altijd deed voor ik lerares werd.** Ik vond het erg ongepast, want je kunt andere meisjes niet verscheidene jaren etiquette en welvoeglijkheid bijbrengen zonder dat de pedanterie ervan een beetje op jezelf overgaat. Maar het was

	husband, and we didn't know anybody who saw us – and we didn't care if they did – so on we walked. (p. 183)	mijn man en we kenden niemand van degenen die ons zagen – en het kon ons trouwens niet schelen dat ze ons zagen – en zo liepen we voort. (p. 179)	Jonathan en hij was mijn echtgenoot, en we zagen niemand die ons kende en bovendien kon het ons niets schelen, dus liepen we gewoon verder. (p. 184)
3.5	**It is not good that she run a risk so great.** We men are determined – nay, are we not pledged? – to destroy this monster; but it is no part for a woman. Even if she be not harmed, her heart may fail her in so much and so many horrors; and hereafter she may suffer – both in waking, from her nerves, and in sleep, from her dreams. (p. 250)	**Het is niet goed dat zij een zo groot risico loopt.** Wij mannen zijn vastbesloten – nee, we hebben gezwóren – dit monster te vernietigen; maar het is geen rol voor een vrouw. Zelfs als haar geen kwaad zou overkomen, dan nòg kan haar hart haar in de steek laten bij zoveel en grote gruwel; en daarna zal zij wellicht lijden – als zij wakker is van zenuwen,	**Zo'n groot risico mag ze niet nemen.** Wij mannen zijn vastbesloten, nee, hebben we niet gezworen dit monster te vernietigen? Maar het is geen werk voor een vrouw. Zelfs als ze niet gewond raakt, zullen zo vele verschrikkingen haar hart wellicht te zwaar belasten, zodat ze na afloop misschien aan haar zenuwen zal lijden, zowel wakend

		als zij slaapt in haar dromen. (p. 244)	als slapend, in haar dromen. (p. 249)
3.6	Manlike, they have told me to go to bed and sleep; as if a woman can sleep when those she loves are in danger! I shall lie down and pretend to sleep, **lest Jonathan have added anxiety about me** when he returns. (p. 258)	Mannelijk als ze zijn, hebben ze me bevolen naar bed te gaan om te slapen; alsof een vrouw zou kunnen slapen wanneer degenen die ze liefheeft in gevaar verkeren! Ik ga naar bed en zal net doen alsof ik slaap, **opdat Jonathan geen extra ongerustheid over mij zal hoeven koesteren**, wanneer hij terugkomt. (p. 252)	Als typische mannen hadden ze me opgedragen naar bed te gaan en te slapen – alsof een vrouw kan slapen als de mensen die ze liefheeft in gevaar verkeren! Ik zal gaan liggen en doen alsof ik slaap, **om te voorkomen dat Jonathan zich ongerust maakt** als hij terugkomt. (p. 257)
3.7	Somehow, it was a dread to me that she was in this fearful business at all; but now that her work is done, and that it is due to her energy and brains and	Om de een of andere reden vond ik het verschrikkelijk dat ze bij deze zaak was betrokken; maar nu haar werk klaar is en het aan háár energie en	Op de een of andere manier maakte het me bang dat ze zelfs zijdelings bij deze afschuwelijke zaak betrokken was, maar nu haar werk gedaan is en

	foresight that the whole story is put together in such a way that every point tells, she may well feel that her part is finished, and that she can henceforth leave the rest to us. (p. 264)	hersenen en **overleg** is te danken dat de hele geschiedenis zo samengevoegd is dat ieder punt tot zijn recht komt, mag ze terècht het gevoel hebben dat haar rol ten einde is en dat ze van nu af aan de rest aan ons kan overlaten. (p. 257)	dankzij haar energie en hersenen en **vooruitziende blik** het hele verhaal op zo'n manier gerangschikt is dat elk detail telt, heeft ze waarschijnlijk het gevoel dat haar deel van onze taak erop zit en ze de rest aan ons over kan laten. (p. 263)
3.8	They all agreed that it was best that I should not be drawn further into this awful work, and I **acquiesced**. But to think that he keeps anything from me! (p. 273)	Ze waren het er allemaal over eens dat het beter was als ik niet verder bij dit afschuwelijke werk werd betrokken en ik heb **toegestemd**. Maar te bedenken dat hij iets voor me verbergt! (p. 267)	Ze zijn het er allemaal over eens dat het beter is als ik niet verder bij dit afschuwelijke werk betrokken blijf, en daar heb ik me bij **neergelegd**. Maar het idee dat hij iets voor me verborgen houdt! (p. 272)
3.9	I must hide it from Jonathan, for if he knew that I had been crying twice in one morning –	Ik moet het niet aan Jonathan laten merken, want als hij wist dat ik twee maal gehuild had	Ik mag het Jonathan niet laten merken, want als hij wist dat ik op één morgen twee keer

	I, who never cried on my own account, and whom he has never caused to shed a tear – the dear fellow would fret his heart out. I shall put a bold face on, and if I do feel weepy, **he shall never see it.** I suppose it is one of the lessons that we poor women have to learn… (p. 274)	op één ochtend – ik, die nog nooit heb gehuild om mijzelve en die door zijn schuld nimmer een traan heb hoeven laten – de arme kerel zou er vreselijk over tobben. Ik zal me vrolijk voordoen, als ik me huilerig voel **mag hij het niet zien.** Ik veronderstel dat dat een van de lessen is, die wij arme vrouwen moeten leren… (p. 268)	gehuild had… Ik, die nooit voor mezelf huil en die hij nooit een traan ontlokt heeft… De arme kerel zou zich dood piekeren. Ik zal me groothouden, en als ik huilerig word, **zal hij het niet zien.** Dit is waarschijnlijk een van de lessen die wij arme vrouwen moeten leren… (p. 273)
3.10	I think she would be happier in our own home, with her **daily tasks** to interest her, than in being her amongst us and **in ignorance**. (p. 280)	Ik geloof dat ze zich in ons eigen huis, met haar **dagelijkse beslommeringen** om haar bezig te houden, gelukkiger zal voelen dan hier bij ons, **in onwetendheid**. (p. 273)	Ik denk dat ze gelukkiger zal zijn in ons eigen huis, met haar **dagelijkse taken** om zich bezig te houden, dan hier bij ons te wonen en **in het duister te tasten**. (p. 278)

3.11	He is an excellent *parti*, being handsome, well off, and of good birth. He is a doctor and **really clever**. Just fancy! (p. 63)	Hij is een uitstekende *parti*, knap, rijk en van goede familie. Hij is dokter en **echt knap**. Stel je voor! (p. 62)	Een uitstekende partij, want hij is knap, welgesteld en van goede geboorte. Hij is arts en **heel intelligent**. Stel je voor! (p. 61)
3.12	But oh, Mina, **I love him; I love him; I love him!** There, that does me good. I wish I were with you dear, sitting by the fire undressing, as we used to sit; and I would try to tell you what I feel. (p. 64)	Maar, oh Mina, **ik houd van hem; ik houd van hem!** Daar, dat doet me goed. Ik wou dat ik bij je was, lieveling, dat we ons samen voor het vuur zaten uit te kleden, net als vroeger; en dan zou ik proberen je te zeggen wat ik voel. (pp. 62-63)	Maar, o, Mina, **ik hou van hem! Ik hou van hem!** Zo, dat lucht op. Ik wou dat ik bij je was, mijn lieve, ons net als vroeger uitkledend bij het vuur, en dan zou ik proberen uit te leggen wat ik voel. (p. 62)
3.13	Some girls are so vain. You and I, Mina dear, who are engaged and **are going to settle down soon soberly into old married**	Sommige meisjes zijn zo ijdel! Jij en ik, Mina, die verloofd zijn en **binnenkort nuchtere, gevestigde, getrouwde vrouwen zullen zijn**,	Sommige meisjes zijn zo ijdel! Jij en ik, mijn beste Mina, die verloofd zijn en **binnenkort ingetogen oude echtgenotes zullen zijn**, kunnen het

	women, can despise vanity. (p. 64)	kunnen de ijdelheid verachten. (p. 63)	ons veroorloven ijdelheid te minachten. (p. 63)
3.14	A woman ought to tell her husband everything – don't you think so, dear? – and **I must be fair**. Men like women, certainly their wives, to be quite as fair as they are; and women, I am afraid, are not always quite as fair as they should be. (p. 65)	Een vrouw behoort haar man alles te vertellen – vind je niet, engel? – en **ze moet eerlijk zijn**. Mannen houden ervan als vrouwen, en zeker hun echtgenotes, even eerlijk zijn als zijzelf; en vrouwen zijn helaas niet altijd zo eerlijk als ze zouden moeten zijn. (pp. 63-64)	Een vrouw hoort haar man alles te vertellen, vind je ook niet, mijn lieve? En **ik moet eerlijk zijn**. Mannen hebben graag dat een vrouw, zeker als ze echtgenote is, even eerlijk is als zij. En vrouwen, ben ik bang, zijn niet altijd zo eerlijk als ze horen te zijn. (p. 63)
3.15	I suppose that we women are such cowards that **we think a man will save us from fears, and we marry him**. (p. 66)	Ik veronderstel dat wij vrouwen zulke lafaards zijn **dat we denken dat een man ons kan redden van onze angsten en daarom trouwen we met hem**. (p. 65)	Ik geloof dat wij vrouwen zulke lafaards zijn **dat we denken dat een man ons tegen alles zal beschermen als we met hem trouwen**. (p. 64)

3.16	Why can't they let a girl marry three men, or as many as want her, and save all this trouble? **But this is heresy, and I must not say it**. (p. 67)	Waarom kan een meisje niet met drie mannen trouwen of met zoveel mannen als haar willen en zich zo al deze ellende besparen? **Maar dat is ketterij en ik mag het niet zeggen**. (p. 66)	Waarom kan een meisje niet met drie mannen trouwen, of met zoveel als haar willen, dan kunnen we ons al deze problemen besparen. **Maar dat mag ik niet zeggen, want het is ketterij**. (p. 66)
3.17	That quite won me, Mina, for it *was* brave and sweet of him, and noble, too, to a rival – wasn't it? – and he so sad; so I leant over and kissed him. He stood up with my two hands in his, and as he looked down into my face **– I am afraid I was blushing very much** … (p. 67)	Dat overtuigde me helemaal, Mina, want het was dapper en lief van hem en nobel ook, jegens een rivaal – nietwaar? – en hij was nog wel zo droevig; dus boog ik me voorover en kuste hem. Hij stond op met mijn beide handen in de zijne en terwijl hij neerkeek op mijn gelaat – **ik moest helaas hevig blozen** … (p. 67)	Dat veroverde echt mijn hart, Mina, want het was zo lief en dapper van hem, en ook zo nobel jegens een rivaal, vind je ook niet? En hij was zo verdrietig, dus ik boog me naar hem toe en kuste hem. Hij richtte zich op met mijn twee handen in de zijne, en hij keek op me neer, en **ik vrees dat ik hevig bloosde** … (p. 66)

3.18	‘We owe you so much, Dr Seward, for all you have done, but you really must now take care not to overwork yourself. You are looking pale yourself. **You want a wife to nurse and look after you a bit; that you do!**’ (p. 139)	„We zijn u zoveel verschuldigd, dr. Seward, voor alles wat u heeft gedaan, maar u moet er nu werkelijk voor zorgen dat u zelf niet overwerkt raakt. U ziet zelf helemaal bleek. **U moest een vrouw hebben om u te verplegen en een beetje voor u te zorgen; dat is het!**” (p. 137)	‘We zijn u zo veel verschuldigd, dr. Seward, voor wat u gedaan hebt, maar u moet echt oppassen dat u zich niet overwerkt. U ziet zelf ook bleek. **U hebt een vrouw nodig om u te verplegen en voor u te zorgen, dat is zeker!**’ (p. 140)
3.19	Ho, ho! **Then this so sweet maid is a polyandrist**, and me, with my poor wife dead to me, but alive by Church’s law, though no wits, all gone – even I, who am faithful husband to this now-no-wife, am bigamist.’ (p. 187)	Ho! Ho! **Dan deed die zo lieftallige maagd aan veelmannerij** en ik, met mijn arme vrouw die voor mij dood is, maar volgens de wetten van de Kerk leeft, hoewel zonder verstand, alles verdwenen – zelfs ik, die een trouw	Ho, ho! **Dan is die zo lieve meid een polygame vrouw**, en ik, met mijn arme vrouw dood voor mij, maar levend volgens de kerkelijke wet, hoewel geen verstand, geen besef, zelfs ik, die een trouwe echtgenoot ben van deze niet-meer-

		echtgenoot ben van deze niet-vrouw-meer, ik ben bigamist!" (p. 184)	echtgenote, ben bigamist.' (p. 188)
3.20	There lay Lucy, seemingly just as we had seen her the night before her funeral. She was, if possible, more **radiantly beautiful** than ever; and I could not believe that she was dead. The lips were red, nay redder than before; and on the cheeks was **a delicate bloom**. (p. 213)	Daar lag Lucy, schijnbaar juist zoals we haar hadden gezien op de avond voor de begrafenis. Ze was zo mogelijk nog **stralender schoon** dan ooit; en ik kon niet geloven dat ze dood was. De lippen waren rood, ja roder dan ooit tevoren; en op haar wangen lag **een teer blosje**. (p. 209)	Daar lag Lucy, precies als op de avond voor haar begrafenis – misschien zelfs nog **knapper en stralender**. Ik kon niet geloven dat ze dood was. De lippen waren rood, ja, nog roder dan vroeger, en op de wangen lag **een tedere blos**. (p. 213)