



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

THROUGH THE EYES OF DIALECT: ANALYZING THE ROLE AND TRANSLATION OF EYE DIALECT IN DRACULA

Arbouw, Amber

Citation

Arbouw, A. (2025). *THROUGH THE EYES OF DIALECT: ANALYZING THE ROLE AND TRANSLATION OF EYE DIALECT IN DRACULA*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master Thesis, 2023](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4258991>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

**THROUGH THE EYES OF DIALECT: ANALYZING THE ROLE AND
TRANSLATION OF EYE DIALECT IN *DRACULA***

by

Amber Arbouw

Master's Thesis

Submitted to the Humanities Faculty

Leiden University

Translation (MA)

July 2025

Abstract

This thesis has aimed to provide insight into the use of eye dialect in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, its Dutch translation by Piet Verhagen, and the translation methods used to create this Dutch target text. It has shown that eye dialect plays a vital role in the novel by providing extratextual information about characters and adding a narrative layer of tension between Count Dracula and his adversaries. While Piet Verhagen's Dutch translation retains some instances of eye dialect, it only partially fulfills these functions of eye dialect, as it does not represent any specific Dutch dialects. Instead, it primarily provides readers with a written form of spoken Standard Dutch.

Verhagen used several translation methods, including creating synthetic varieties of the target language and shifting between standard and non-standard forms, but did not use all of the translation strategies for the translation of non-standard language as described by Morini and Rosa et al. As a result, the Dutch translation loses some of the nuance and character information that are present in the original.

This thesis highlights the need for further research into the use and translation of eye dialect in Dutch literary texts. Increasing awareness of eye dialect's literary and cultural significance can enrich both original Dutch texts and translations, providing readers with a more immersive linguistic experience that reflects the variety that can be found in real-life speech.

Keywords: Eye dialect, translation studies, *Dracula*, non-standard language, dialect representation

Acknowledgements

I would like to take a moment to thank the people who helped make this thesis possible.

This endeavor would not have been possible without my supervisor and professor, Katinka Zeven. Her much-appreciated guidance, encouragement, and thoughtful feedback throughout this process enabled me to create a thesis that I am truly proud to share with the world. Furthermore, she helped make this experience as streamlined and stress-free as possible, for which I am very grateful.

I would also like to extend special thanks to my parents and brother for always being there for me, for letting me practice rubber duck debugging on them, and for always cheering me on. Though you may not have always understood what I was writing about, you have never been anything but supportive. Your moral support has meant everything.

To my friends: thank you for patiently listening to me go on (and on) about a book you had no interest in whatsoever. I'd like to thank my friend Ilse in particular, for the wonderful gift of a beautiful copy of *Dracula*, which became a constant companion during the process of writing this thesis.

Finally, thank you to everyone else who helped me survive this long process — whether through academic advice, caffeine, or shared *Dracula* obsessions. Librarians, baristas, fellow vampire nerds: I truly could not have done it without you.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	6
Background/Theory.....	8
1.1 Eye dialect.....	8
1.1.2 The shortcomings of eye dialect.....	9
1.2 The translation of eye dialect.....	11
1.3 Dutch dialects.....	16
1.3.1 Dutch eye dialect.....	18
1.4 English dialects.....	19
1.5 Eye dialect in <i>Dracula</i>	22
Methodology.....	26
2.1 Research design.....	26
2.2 Passage selection.....	28
2.3 Study Phases.....	30
2.3.1 Phase One: Description.....	30
2.3.2 Phase Two: Comparison.....	31
2.4 Limitations and Advantages.....	33
Analysis.....	34
3.1 Phase One: Description.....	34
3.1.1 Description: Thomas Bilder.....	35
3.1.2 Phonological processes: Thomas Bilder.....	35
3.1.3 Description: Mr. Swales.....	40

3.1.4 Phonological Processes: Mr. Swales	40
3.2 Accuracy of Representation.....	42
3.3 Phase Two: Comparison.....	44
3.31 Comparison: Thomas Bilder.....	44
3.3.2 Phonological Processes: Thomas Bilder (TT).....	44
3.3.3 Comparison: Mr. Swales	48
3.3.4 Phonological Processes: Mr. Swales (TT).....	49
3.4 Methods for Translating Eye Dialect.....	51
3.4.1 Synthetic language	51
3.4.2 Omission of linguistic markers.....	52
3.4.3 Addition of linguistic markers	52
3.4.4 Substandard to standard & fully standardizing	53
3.4.5 Non-standard variety of the target language	54
3.4.6 Maintenance of linguistic markers	55
Discussion	55
Conclusion.....	60
Sources	63

Introduction

The primary focus of this study is the novel *Dracula*. This novel, written by Irish author Bram Stoker, was published in 1897 and has since been a staple of popular horror media. The novel follows a small group of friends as they race against the clock to defeat the terrifying Romanian vampire Count Dracula before he can establish himself in London and cause mass death and despair. The novel is an epistolary work, composed of journal entries, letters, telegrams, and newspaper clippings. The creation and collection of these epistolary elements are carried out by the main characters: Jonathan Harker, his wife Mina, their friends Dr. John Seward and Professor Abraham Van Helsing, as well as Lucy Westenra and her fiancé, Arthur Holmwood. As a result of this composition, the novel gives readers a sense of immediacy and realism. This is because the separate epistolary elements are dated, providing readers with an understanding of the passage of time in the novel.

During their journey to locate and kill the vampire threatening their safety, these main characters meet a variety of individuals from all over England. Some of the characters they encounter speak in dialect, which is represented in the text using eye dialect. Eye dialect is a literary technique in which non-standard spellings are used to represent a character's speech. Often, it will represent a manner of speaking that differs from the standard, making it possible to represent dialects in an orthographic, or written, form. This literary device adds to the realism of the novel, strengthening the effect of its epistolary form. This paper investigates the use and translation of eye dialect in both the original text of *Dracula* and its Dutch translation by Piet Verhagen. The main research question this paper seeks to answer is: In Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, how do the representations of Yorkshire and Cockney eye dialect in the English source text compare to their Dutch translations in Piet Verhagen's 2009 target text, and what translation strategies are used to create these eye dialectal features?

To answer this research question, this paper will use a qualitative, descriptive, and comparative approach to analyze the use and translation of eye dialect in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. This research is organized into a total of five chapters.

In the first chapter, further information about eye dialect is provided in a theoretical background section. This chapter will explain what eye dialect is in further detail, touches upon its shortcomings, and discuss how eye dialect is treated in translation. Furthermore, this chapter shall divulge information about the use of eye dialect in Dutch literary texts, as well as the use of eye dialects in the source text *Dracula*. The second chapter concerns itself with the explanation of the methodological framework on which this paper is based. This includes an expansive overview of how the research has been conducted, as well as a discussion on the limitations of the study. In the third chapter, an analysis is provided of the use of eye dialect in both of the two selected fragments of the source text, as well as their Dutch corresponding target texts. This chapter also provides insight into the translation methods underlying the translation process of these texts. The fourth chapter discusses the implications of these findings and aims to describe what can be learned from how this translation of *Dracula* uses the literary device of eye dialect. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the findings of this paper, answers the research question, and proposes future research on this topic.

The research conducted in this paper aims to describe the role that eye dialect plays in *Dracula*, as well as to describe how this literary device is handled when translated into Dutch. By doing so, this paper hopes to create a better understanding of eye dialect in literary texts, both in their original source texts and in translation.

Background/Theory

1.1 Eye dialect

Eye dialect, as defined by David Brett, is the phenomenon in which unconventional spelling is used to indicate colloquial language use or, nowadays more commonly, a character's uncommon pronunciation or accent (2009). It is a literary device that relies on the phonological and orthographic features of a particular language to depict a dialect (Brett, 2009). In practice, it may appear as spellings such as *an'* to represent *and*, *ye* for *you*, or *dunno* for *do not know*. In literary texts, eye dialect is usually used to “provide added communicative and semiotic value to a text” (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 290).

According to Rosa et al., “a proficient speaker of a given language is able to correlate a cluster of linguistic forms with contextual meaning” (2011). This means that readers can make connections between a character's speech and their sociocultural background. Eye dialect can, for example, give readers of a text information about the speaker's cultural background, as well as their personality, sex, age, education level, occupation, geographic region, and overall social status (Walpole, 1974). Eye dialect is, therefore, a valuable literary device for authors, as it helps them to subtly provide readers with this knowledge.

Ritva Leppihalme states that it is because of the “careful balancing of dialectal and non-dialectal elements” that some texts are able to create their “linguistic richness and individuality” (2014, p. 247). An author's deliberate choice to include eye dialect or other forms of non-standard linguistic expression in their text is one that can provide “essential information for readers” (Lung, 2000, p. 271). If this non-standard linguistic feature is removed in the process of translation, readers are given a text that is less rich in information, and as a direct result of this loss of information, they may have a harder time understanding

the text at hand. Because non-standard linguistic features such as eye dialect have this essential function, translators must approach this form of linguistic expression “with tact, rather than rendered literally” (Lung, 2000, p. 271). Lung does not specifically describe what translating ‘with tact’ entails, though it can be surmised that it comprises of an awareness of the effect of the linguistic feature that is used in the source text, and opting to recreate this effect to the best of their ability in the target text. Therefore, it can be said that it is vital that translators understand the importance of eye dialect so that they are able to translate it in a manner that is suitable for its original intended purpose, thereby maintaining its meaning-carrying function.

1.1.2 The shortcomings of eye dialect

Eye dialect commonly does not provide readers with accurate written transcriptions of the dialects it attempts to portray. However, this is not simply due to negligence on the author’s part, as the function of eye dialect in literary texts is rarely, if ever, to provide readers with a realistic depiction of the pronunciation of a real-life dialect. Instead, eye dialect is primarily used with the intention of ensuring that the assumptions carried by readers are “triggered and, consequently, contribute to the description of the characters in literary texts, who are differentiated, not only by what they say, but also by how they say it” (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 290). This topic will be discussed in more detail in chapter 2.6 of this paper, in which it will be explored in relation to the text *Dracula*.

Accuracy, in terms of translation, is a complicated term. Hans J. Vermeer introduced his Skopos theory to the field of translation to help describe what makes a translation accurate or not. According to this theory, a translation is accurate if it “enables your text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and

precisely in the way they want it to function” (Du, 2012, p. 2191). It is, then, the intention behind why the source text is being translated paired with the function of the target text that determines the translation strategies a translator chooses to use. The Skopos theory, as described by Vermeer, does not directly refer to the translation of eye dialect. However, the theory can be applied to this literary device. With respect to the translation of eye dialect, the theory might suggest that, if a translator chooses to include eye dialect in their text, they should not be restricted by the need to make this eye dialect a one-to-one portrayal of a real dialect. Instead, it is the function, or purpose, behind the eye dialect as it is intended by the author of the source text that should inspire the translation.

Eye dialect in literary texts can be considered to be “literary re-creations that are only marginally concerned with accuracy” (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 290). One might assume that this ‘incorrect’ use of dialect would be a source of annoyance to readers. However, according to Jane Raymond Walpole, quite the opposite is true, as readers of texts that contain eye dialect “have been so well conditioned to the conventions of dialogue that accurate conversational transcripts would dismay them” (1974, p. 191). However, it is necessary to create a balance in eye dialect in dialogue that leans neither too accurate nor too unnatural, stilted, or inappropriate, lest this is also too upsetting to the readers (Walpole, 1974). A form of eye dialect that focuses on representing the dialect at hand, rather than on the message being told through this dialect, may be incomprehensible to readers who are unfamiliar with the dialect. These readers may feel alienated from the text as a result.

It is important to recall that non-standard varieties of speech “are often marked as deviant through nonstandard spellings and special punctuation” (Bucholtz, 2000, p. 1452). A character’s use of non-standard dialectal speech tends to be “associated with peripheral geographic spaces” as well as a “lower socio-cultural status” (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 290). Conversely, non-dialectal speech is frequently affiliated with higher prestige (Ramos Pinto,

2009). This phenomenon is not unique to the English-speaking world, as it is more or less universal among language communities “that are large enough for accent variation to be present” (Watt et al., 2023, p. 31). When an author chooses to use eye dialect to represent a character’s non-standard dialectal speech, this will likely connect the character to a less-than-complimentary sociocultural sphere, paired with the potentially negative connotations this will bring up for the readers of the text. Eye dialect does not only describe speech, but also the perceptions about the people who speak the particular non-standard speech variety which is represented by it. If a speech variety is commonly used as shorthand for negative character traits, readers may grow to connect speakers of this variety with negative character traits (Watt et al., 2023). These perceptions of dialect speakers may lead people to behave differently toward anyone who uses these non-standard varieties of speech. Therefore, the use and translation of eye dialect has to be done carefully, lest it have a real-life damaging effect on how speakers of non-standard dialectal speech varieties are perceived and treated.

1.2 The translation of eye dialect

In reality, the task of translating eye dialect can be a difficult one for translators, as they must evaluate when to partake in the acts of standardization and dialectalization, while also maintaining the balance between the linguistic variety and “the speaker, the medium, and the context in which it is used” (Ramos Pinto, 2009, pp. 290–291). According to David Brett, the task of translating eye dialect is “daunting, if not totally doomed to failure” (2009, p. 59-60). A translator, then, may only succeed in partially transferring the effect intended by the source text’s use of eye dialect.

One common method of translating non-standard writing is by creating target texts that are more like the standard variety (Ramos Pinto, 2009). This practice of creating target

texts that are less specific or unique is common throughout the field of translation. Though eye dialect can be considered a specific or unique form of language, it does not necessarily need to be seen as a literary device that adds to the difficulty of the text at hand. Instead, Ramos Pinto states that eye dialect can potentially be used to avoid “a negative reaction to the use of oral discourse features to suggest non-standard discourse”, which suggests that eye dialect is considered to be less offensive to readers than other depictions of non-standard language (2009, p. 302). The use of eye dialect, then, is not only something that presents an issue for translation, but also something that can be used as a tool for translators faced with the task of translating non-standard speech varieties.

In translation studies, the terms ‘standardization’ and ‘normalization’ are used more or less interchangeably to refer to the practice of using a form of language that is more similar to the standard variety of the target language. For example, Károly Polcz defines standardization as a shift “to the standard language use in the target culture ..., usually leading to a more homogeneous, more conventional and more standard target language text” (2016, p. 23). Specifically referencing translation into English, Ritva Leppihalme describes this same translation method as “a rendering of regional elements by standard English ones” (2014, p. 247). Similarly to these two definitions, Yun Xia describes normalization as “the tendency of translators to conform to the conventionally established and standard practices typical of the target language, which would in turn result in relatively higher conservativeness and repetitiveness, and a lower diversity of language use in translation” (2014, p. 6). Silvia Bernardini and Adriano Ferraresi, in turn, describe normalization as “a preference for the more normal or typical options afforded by the target language system” (2011, p. 231). As is made clear from these definitions, the two terms are essentially used interchangeably. One difference in how they are used that must be mentioned is that normalization appears to be more commonly used in relation to machine translation than standardization. While the two

terms are very similar in denotation, the term ‘normalization’ can be considered by some to be somewhat offensive, as it carries the connotation that the source text material is in some way unnatural. For this reason, this paper will refer to this translation technique as ‘standardization’ from now on, unless quoting an author who chooses to use a different term. By doing so, this paper hopes to prevent labeling non-standard speech as being in any way unnatural or inferior to standard speech varieties.

In a 1993 paper, Mona Baker described what she believed to be ‘universal features of translation’. These features were intended to be “features which typically occur in translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems” (Baker, 1993, p. 243). The second of Baker’s universal features was that of the translators’ “tendency towards disambiguation and simplification” (Baker, 1993, p. 244). In this paper, Baker does not directly relate this universal feature to eye dialect or any other forms of non-standard speech. However, this universal feature of simplification can certainly also be applied to eye dialect. The eye dialect present in a source text can be removed in a target text, such as when it is replaced by a standard language variety. In such a situation, the eye dialect is being simplified. Therefore, though Baker fails to mention the translation of eye dialect, it is important to reiterate that this universal feature of translation applies to it.

Similarly to Baker’s theory of universal features of translation, Gideon Toury also sought to discover features that are widespread throughout the field of translation. He identified two specific processes that happen extremely frequently when a text is translated. Toury named these recurring processes ‘translation laws’. The first of these two laws, the law of growing standardization, states that “in translation, source-text textemes tend to be converted into target-language (or target-culture) repertoremes” (Toury, 1995, p. 268). Here, this means that a feature specific to the source text is often replaced by a feature of the target

language, which is perhaps less unique or more conventional, thereby standardizing the text through translation. As Toury's law of standardization is incredibly general, and thus should be applicable to all translated texts, he does not specifically mention how it may apply to individual textual elements such as eye dialect. However, this law does provide evidence for the fact that the standardizing technique commonly used for non-standard speech, such as eye dialect, is not unfounded. It is simply a realization of a common occurrence found throughout the field of translation. Thus, Toury's rather general law of translation can certainly be applied to the study of eye dialect in translation, and even gives insight into why this technique is used so frequently by translators who are tasked with translating eye dialect.

However, standardization of non-standard speech is not the only option available to translators. Various researchers have analyzed the diverse ways in which translators approach the task of translating eye dialect, of which standardization is only one. For example, Sara Ramos Pinto presents four different options for translating non-standard varieties of language. Each of these four options is dependent on the maintenance or non-maintenance of the space and/or time coordinates of the source text (2009). One option that is available to translators is, for example, to opt for a non-standard speech variety that is present in the language area of the language they are translating into. By doing so, they would be altering the spatial coordinates of the source text. Alternatively, when presented with a speech variety that is rather old-fashioned, translators may translate it into a non-standard speech variety that is more modern and, therefore, more familiar to them. Though Ramos Pinto does mention eye dialect in her paper, she does not specifically discuss how her four options for translating non-standard language varieties can be applied to the translation of eye dialect. Still, it can be assumed that, when applied to the translation of eye dialect, this method provides translators with the possibility to adjust the eye dialect of the source text to a written representation of a

dialect that has the most similar effect on readers, not restricting them by forcing them to comply with the spatial or temporal elements of the source text's eye dialect.

Massimiliano Morini has also provided an overview of some other strategies translators can apply when presented with a text that contains dialectal speech. The first three strategies Morini discusses are more conventional ones: fully standardizing the text, using two or more variants of the target language, or using a non-standard variety of the target language (2006). Morini also adds a fourth strategy, namely the creation of a synthetic language variety in the target language. In this strategy, the synthetic language created by the translator “would be made up of incorrect or slightly modified words and phrases and regional words and expressions picked up more or less at random” which would then be standardized “according to the phonetic rules of the national language” (Morini, 2006, p. 130). Though Morini’s overview of translation strategies that can be applied to dialectal speech, such as eye dialect, fails to explicitly mention this literary device, it can certainly be applied to the translation of it. Given that eye dialect is merely an approximation of dialect, and rarely an accurate representation of it, one may even argue that all translated texts that contain eye dialect employ Morini’s fourth strategy. These texts provide readers with incorrect or modified versions of the dialects they represent, and are created from the phonetics of the language from which they originate.

Alexandra Assis Rosa et al. also describe the use of an additional ‘centralizing method’ that can be utilized to translate linguistic variation. In this centralizing method, there is a shift to “some form of less prestigious variety, although there is a shift toward varieties that are not as negatively evaluated as those depicted in the ST” (Rosa et al., 2011, p. 50). Similarly to the previously discussed paper by Morini, Rosa et al. also neglect to touch upon how this particular method can be applied to eye dialect. However, assumptions can be made about how this method may be applied to eye dialect in practice. When eye dialect is

centralized, it may, for example, be translated into a form of speech that is considered to be less prestigious than the standard speech variety, but which is still less negatively evaluated or stigmatized than the one that is intended in the source text. By doing so, the use of eye dialect is maintained, though its original status as a representation of a non-standard speech variety is weakened, with all the loss of textual information and richness as a result.

Once more, these various translation strategies show that standardization, though a common technique, is not the only one that can be applied to the translation of eye dialect. Translators should be aware of “the social significance of non-standard usage in the original” and translate accordingly to “achieve semantic and stylistic adequacy” (Lung, 2000, p. 268). However, they should not feel limited by standardization alone, but should instead feel free to explore alternative techniques. As has been demonstrated by the various strategies discussed, translators have a variety of linguistic tools and techniques available to them, which can help them in translating eye dialect without forcing them to use a standardizing approach.

1.3 Dutch dialects

Though statistics between research papers often differ, a survey carried out by the Netherlands' National Census Bureau (CBS) in 1998 suggests that over half of the population (52%) of the Netherlands occasionally speaks a dialectal form of Dutch (Goeman & Jongenburger, 2009). Within the Netherlands itself, the primary dialectal oppositions can be found between the west of the country and the eastern and southern peripheral dialect areas (Hagen & Giesbers, 1988). These oppositions are primarily caused by the central position taken by the western provinces of Noord-Holland and Zuid-Holland. For centuries, these two provinces have served as the “center of the development and spread of the standard language” (Hagen & Giesbers, 1988, p. 31). This has created a linguistic pattern in the Netherlands in

which a dialect's contrast with the standard Dutch language increases with distance from the linguistic center of standard speech present in Noord- and Zuid-Holland (Hagen & Giesbers, 1988). As a result, the highest number of dialect speakers can be found at the periphery of the country. Westerners consider their speech to be "part of the standard", while people in other regions of the country consider speech that is linguistically close to the standard to be 'posh' (Goeman & Jongenburger, 2009, p. 40). Additional dialects can be found in the broader Dutch language area, which includes the Netherlands, Flanders, and the former colonies of the Netherlands.

As previously discussed in this paper, the use of non-standard dialectal speech often carries many, often negative, connotations. The use of dialect in the Netherlands is no exception to this phenomenon. Research by van Bezooijen and Ytsma has found that speakers of standard Dutch score higher on self-assurance, activeness, reliability, fairness, and level of education than accented speakers of Dutch (1999). Further research found that speakers of the standard variety of Dutch were attributed with a high status but a low score in solidarity, with the reverse being true for speakers of non-standard varieties (Grondelaers et al., 2009).

The presence of these varied dialects, combined with the stereotypes and connotations they carry, suggests ample opportunity to create Dutch literary texts that feature non-standard dialectal speech in the form of eye dialect. However, little to no research has been done on this topic, making it difficult to discuss the prevalence of eye dialect in Dutch literary texts or its translation into other languages. Nonetheless, we do know that 70% of the Dutch population regrets the decline of the use of dialects, even if they don't speak a dialect themselves (Goeman & Jongenburger, 2009). This indicates a clear interest in and appreciation for the use of dialects, which sadly is not represented in academic research. As Dutch dialects deserve to be represented in academic research on this topic, eye dialect in Dutch literary texts must be explored more widely. By doing so, it may be possible to garner a

more universal appreciation of Dutch dialectal speech, even among those few individuals who may normally not be appreciative of it.

1.3.1 Dutch eye dialect

Research by Goeman and Jongenburger has shown that over 50% of the population of the Netherlands sometimes speaks a dialect, with 51% of the population claiming to use dialect to speak to their children (2009). However, other studies have indicated a severe drop in dialect use over the course of time, which includes a decline in the number of dialect-speaking children in primary school (Driessen 2006; Kraaykamp, 2005). Whether one speaks dialect is determined by their “attitudes, childhood experiences, and personal habits that are the expression of one’s own individual lifestyle” (Goeman & Jongenburger, 2009, p. 61). In order to promote or maintain the use of dialect in the Dutch language, children should have access to “early childhood socialization in dialect, combined with traditional styles of life” (Goeman & Jongenburger, 2009, p. 58).

The children’s book series about the character Nijntje, first created by Dick Bruna in 1955, has become a staple of Dutch children’s literature. The books, which are aimed at young, beginning readers, have garnered much national and international popularity. The various Nijntje books have been translated into over 50 languages (*Internationaal*, n.d.). In 2013, the Dutch publishing house Noordboek even began publishing dialect translations of books from the Nijntje series (*Streektalen Groot Succes*, n.d.). These translations use eye dialect to approximate dialects from all over the Netherlands, including dialects from Friesland, Brabant, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Maastricht, Groningen, and Leiden. As of March 2025, a total of 42 dialectal translations of Nijntje are available. These dialectal books, described as ‘streektal’ (regional language) books by Noordboek, have sold over 300,000

copies (Omrop Fryslân, 2019). The existence of these books containing dialects, paired with their popularity among Dutch readers who read to or with children, suggests a strong desire for Dutch dialects to be passed on to future generations. In this case, eye dialect can be used as a tool to make these dialects more tangible and teachable to children.

The *Nijntje* books are not the only pieces of Dutch literature that include dialect. Others include *Kom hier dat ik u kus* by Flemish author Griet Op de Beeck, and *De hemel van Heivisj* by Benny Lindelauf, which contains dialect from the province of Limburg. However, eye dialect is not used to represent the non-standard speech varieties represented in these novels. Instead, non-standard grammar and lexemes are used. It is important to distinguish between literary texts that are published entirely in non-standard language varieties, as is the case for the regional versions of the *Nijntje* books, and those that use eye dialect as a literary device to characterize speech or setting, as can be found in *De hemel van Heivisj*. Though there certainly are Dutch books in which eye dialect is used as a literary device to represent non-standard speech varieties, this is rarely clearly indicated, making these books difficult to find. In order to carry the appreciation for eye dialect found in the dialectal *Nijntje* books over to Dutch adult literature, it is important to make readers more aware of its existence.

Non-standard spellings are used in the Dutch translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, as translated by Piet Verhagen in 2009. This particular translation shall form the basis of the research performed in this paper. Hopefully, by using this Dutch translation that contains eye dialect as the focus text of this paper, it shall play a small part in informing readers of eye dialect in Dutch literary texts.

1.4 English dialects

A wide variety of regional dialects are spoken in England, as people tend to “speak in a manner which identifies them as coming from a particular place” (Trudgill, 1990, p. 1). It is unclear how many dialects of English are spoken in England, though the Survey of English Dialects carried out by between the years of 1950 and 1961 involved 313 localities (Orton & Dieth, 1962). It can be imagined that this number would only increase if the dialects spoken in other English-speaking parts of the world, such as the United States, Singapore, and Jamaica, were taken into consideration. However, the number of dialects that are actively spoken in England is decreasing as time goes on, as dialect attrition has been “widespread in England over the past century, and has affected every structural level of the language” (Britain, 2009, p. 123). When a dialect is no longer used, it must be replaced with something else. Though it may be thought that an eradicated dialect would be replaced with a standard variety, research by David Britain has found that this is not the case. He has found that locally distinct dialects are being replaced by more widespread regional ways of speaking, which are characterized by the reduction of non-standard features and the increased contact between speakers of different dialects (2009). It can therefore be said that, while a number of dialects spoken in England are slowly dying out, this does not mean that dialect has become less important in the English language as spoken in England. Instead, older dialects being replaced by new ones is an indication that dialect is still as important a part of the English language as it has always been. Therefore, it is vital that the use of dialect, both written and spoken, continues to be researched in an academic setting. If this is not done, these remaining dialects and their new counterparts risk not being represented accurately.

The dialects of English can be placed in opposition to the standard speech variety of English. While Received Pronunciation, commonly referred to as RP, is often said to be the standard speech variety in England, it has been found that only 3 to 5% of the population of Britain speaks using this accent (Trudgill & Hannah, 1982). RP is considered by some to be

“a very narrow class-based and region-based variety of English pronunciation”, having been based on the speech of highly educated Southern speakers (Upton, 2004, p. 218). It is therefore no surprise that Received Pronunciation is only spoken by a small percentage of the inhabitants of England, with all others using different accents or dialects.

Yorkshire and Cockney are among the most widely researched and discussed of these English dialects. The Yorkshire dialect is spoken in an area in the north of England that, among others, includes Sheffield, Leeds, and York, whereas the Cockney dialect is spoken in London. As was discussed previously, the general use of dialect often carries a negative connotation. This also rings true for these two dialects, with Cockney even being described as “the most generally despised and downtrodden” dialect found in England (W. Matthews, 1938, p. xi). Whereas Received Pronunciation represents the speech of well-educated individuals from the South, the Cockney dialect “has long been associated with the white working class in East London” (Cole, 2021, p. 14). Research has shown that speakers of Cockney are evaluated quite negatively, and especially receive lower scores on their assumed social status (Cole, 2021). They are also considered to be “most likely to display morally bad behaviours”, and are “evaluated as more threatening in ‘indirect’ threats” than other dialects (Paver et al., 2025, pp. 2, 9). Similarly negative, speakers of the Yorkshire dialect were frequently depicted in literature as being “both isolated and comically stupid”, as well as “boorish, rustic, and uneducated” (Cooper, 2025, p. 17).

The negative connotations carried by dialects such as Cockney and Yorkshire are frequently represented in British media. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the 1964 movie *My Fair Lady*. In this film, Eliza Doolittle, a woman who speaks using the Cockney dialect, is mentored by phonetics professor Henry Higgins. He hopes to teach her how to speak the standard variety of English, as this will, in his eyes, turn her into a refined lady. In his opinion, her use of a non-standard dialectal form of English has a negative effect on her

classiness. His opinion of the non-standard form of English that Eliza speaks at the beginning of the film is representative of the disdain for the use of dialect that is still alive to this day. Though this example taken from *My Fair Lady* concerns dialectal use in general, and not eye dialect specifically, it can be assumed that, within the context of English as spoken in England, a similar stigma against dialect is reflected in both written eye dialect and spoken dialect. Therefore, when a character's speech is represented using a dialectal form, translators should be mindful of the connotations this carries, and take this into consideration in their translation process, lest they risk losing this extratextual information provided by the use of the dialect.

1.5 Eye dialect in *Dracula*

In Bram Stoker's novel *Dracula*, eye dialect is not only used a considerable number of times but also plays a significant role in the success of its vampire-hunting group of main characters. *Dracula* is a text in which translation and multilingualism are already present within both the source text and its fictional universe (Delabastita, 2014). In the very first chapter of the novel, Jonathan Harker mentions using a polyglot dictionary to make sense of the "many nationalities in the crowd" (Stoker, 1897/2019, p, 9). Jonathan and the other characters of the novel are frequently led "out of their native cultural habitat into strange linguistic territory", as they travel through Germany, the Romanian historical region of Transylvania, Hungary, and Bulgaria during the events of the novel (Delabastita, 2014, p. 26).

However, even within the boundaries of England, which is the native country of multiple of the novel's characters, the main characters are frequently presented with unfamiliar language in the form of dialectal speech. These dialect-speaking characters whose

speech is represented using eye dialect include Swales, an elderly man living in Whitby who speaks in a Yorkshire dialect; Thomas Bilder, a zookeeper from London who uses a Cockney dialect; Thomas Snelling from the London neighborhood Bethnal Green; Snelling's boss Joseph Smollet from the London neighborhood Walworth; and a laborer called Sam Bloxam, also from Walworth. Although their own speech is not reported using eye dialect, the vampire-hunters themselves do "evince a common interest in the different ways in which English can be spoken and transcribed," which includes an interest in the transcription of eye dialect (Ferguson, 2004, p. 240). Though the characters certainly are interested in eye dialect, they are also aware of its shortcomings. Jonathan Harker, for example, finds himself hindered from finding the residence of a person of interest due to the use of eye dialect when writing their address, stating in his journal that "phonetic spelling had once again misled me" (Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 427). Still, it is the transcription of dialectal speech, used by a variety of other characters throughout the novel who are mentioned above, which serves "the interests of the good characters by providing important information" (Delabastita, 2014, p. 29). The presence of these characters' dialectal speech indicates the fascination with non-standard speech varieties, which is present throughout the novel.

Though a character's use of eye dialect can be used to indicate a "level of education and literacy substantially lower than the average", this connotation is somewhat negated by the narrative of *Dracula*, in which the dialect-speaking Joseph Smollet is described by Jonathan Harker as "a decent, intelligent fellow, distinctly a good, reliable type of workman, and with a headpiece of his own" (Brett, 2009, p. 49; Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 423). Similarly, Mina Harker, after using eye dialect to thoroughly represent Mr. Swales' Yorkshire accent, notes that she "did not quite understand his dialect", while also calling him "a good person to learn interesting things from" (Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 107; Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 104). Stoker, then, presents these speakers of dialects as having "a natural sense of truth, decency and good

humour” (Delabastitia, 2014, p. 29). By presenting speakers of dialect as displaying positive traits, Stoker appears to wish to negate the negative connotations and stereotypes conventionally carried by non-standard dialectal speech varieties. Still, the novel does not ignore the presence of eye dialect’s more negative connotations. Sam Bloxam, whose dialogue is depicted using eye dialect, for example, is said to be a “smart enough fellow, though rough of speech and bearing” (Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 427). Here, Stoker resorts to the more common perception of dialectal speech being unpolished and indicative of a lower intellect. From this, it can be understood that Bram Stoker uses eye dialect as a literary device to call upon his readers’ preconceived notions about dialect speakers, while also shining a more positive light on dialectal speech.

Contrary to the novel’s heroes, the character Dracula has an “obsessive concern with linguistic perfection and standardization” (Ferguson, 2004, p. 238). According to Christine Ferguson, his “unwillingness or inability to bastardize the language in the same manner as its domestic speakers” ultimately contributes to his failure to conquer England (2004, p. 239). On the topic of his English, Dracula himself says, “But alas! as yet I only know your tongue through books. To you, my friend, I look that I know it to speak” as well as “True, I know the grammar and the words, but yet I know not how to speak them” (Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 32). Evidently, Count Dracula believes there to be a singular ‘correct’ form of English, with all other forms of English being inferior. However, the England in which Dracula later finds himself is full of individuals who “manifest their national identity through a willingness to transform English to meet their own needs, free from the vampiric dream of breaking rules of syntactical or supernatural law” (Ferguson, 2004, p. 239). Dracula’s inability to master and destroy these non-standard forms of English mirrors the doomed nature of his mission to master and destroy English civilization. Thus, it is the non-standard dialectal speech, which is

presented through eye dialect, paired with the main characters' interest in this non-standard form of language, which leads to the vampire-hunters' eventual victory over Count Dracula.

Interestingly enough, the speech of one of the non-English main characters in the novel, Abraham Van Helsing, who does not speak standard English, is not depicted using eye dialect. Though the reasoning behind this is unclear, it may be argued that, even though Bram Stoker's writing in *Dracula* challenges the negative connotations typically associated with eye dialect, he was anxious to avoid using it in close relation to one of the novel's main characters. By doing so, he prevented readers from potentially forming negative opinions about a pivotal figure in the story. The speech used by Van Helsing, though not standard or fluent, is represented as a "bizarre and often garbled form of English" (Ferguson, 2004, p. 239). While this is often attributed to the fact that, as a Dutchman, English is a second language for him, "Van Helsing's countless language errors are barely representative of typical Dutch/English linguistic interference" (Delabastita, 2014, pp. 30–31). Van Helsing's non-standard use of English is not surprising, as characters in the novel describe him as "one of the most advanced scientists of his day; and he has, I believe, an absolutely open mind," and also remark that "his views are as wide as his all-embracing sympathy" (Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 183). This is made most evident by how quickly he is able to recognize that the mysterious illness afflicting Lucy Westenra is no simple disease, but rather the result of a vampire. His open-mindedness—his acceptance of the supernatural and paranormal—is thus only enhanced by his non-rigid approach to the English language. In this manner, Van Helsing, though not a speaker of the standard variety of English for which *Dracula* so deeply yearns, emerges as an ideal linguistic and ideological opposite to the vampire.

Beginning on March 8, 1890, Bram Stoker began taking notes for what would later become the novel *Dracula* (Stoker et al., 2008). These notes, now housed in the Rosenbach Museum & Library in Philadelphia, provide a glimpse into the research carried out by Stoker

throughout his writing process. In his notes, Stoker references the book *A Glossary of Words Used in the Neighbourhood of Whitby* by Francis Kildale Robinson (Stoker et al., 2008). From this glossary, he wrote down a ten-page-long alphabetical list of terms, of which he included thirty-eight terms in *Dracula*. Further dialectal words, which are not found in Stoker's notes, can also be found in the text. Though some of these dialectal words are quite different from their standard English variants, others are attempts at orthographically representing the phonology of the Yorkshire accent spoken in and around Whitby. An example of this would be *ails* for *evils*, *drucken* for *drunken*, and *oot* for *out* (Stoker et al., 2008, p. 142-147). From these notes containing eye dialect, it becomes clear that Stoker did not wish to merely add eye dialect to his novel for the sake of adding flair to the text, but that he most certainly had an interest in, and an appreciation for, the local dialect of Whitby. Though this is not reflected in his notes, it is likely that Stoker's research into the Cockney dialect used in the novel was treated with the same amount of care as the research that went into the Yorkshire accent found in Whitby. By using eye dialect to represent non-standard speech varieties, Bram Stoker demonstrates that he believed these two dialects and their eye dialect representations provide his readers with added communicative value.

Through the contrast between Count Dracula and the heroic characters of the novel, it becomes abundantly clear how vital a role eye dialect plays in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. Ridding the text of eye dialect in a translation takes away an important element of conflict from the story, making it less rich in nature. Therefore, this linguistic device should be included in any translations of the novel, no matter how complicated this task may be.

Methodology

2.1 Research design

This study employed a qualitative, descriptive, and comparative approach to analyze the use and translation of eye dialect in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. By describing and comparing the speech patterns of two characters—one with a Yorkshire accent and the other with a Cockney accent—in both their original text and in translation, this paper explored the effects of eye dialect and how these features are handled in translation from English to Dutch.

The selected Dutch translation of *Dracula* was translated by Piet Verhagen and was published by the Amsterdam-based publishing house Boekerij in October 2009. This version was chosen for a few reasons. Firstly, it was reprinted in April 2010 — only six months after it first came out — which indicates that it was popular and sold well enough to be printed again. Secondly, as far as is known, no newer Dutch translations of *Dracula* have been published since then. This means Verhagen's version is the most recent translation, and the one most Dutch readers are likely to read today. This is relevant for the purposes of this study, as it ensures that the findings of this study reflect the experience of the current audience of the novel, rather than being based on an outdated version.

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* remains a culturally significant and widely consumed piece of literature. Over a century after its publication, the novel continues to inspire new versions and adaptations of the text, which take the form of various types of media. A few recent examples are the online epistolary publication *Dracula Daily*, a project that was started in 2021, in which readers are emailed parts of the novel in real-time in the order they happen in the story; the 2024 blockbuster movie *Nosferatu*; and the television show *Interview with the Vampire*, which is still ongoing as of April 2025. These pieces of media are each connected to Stoker's *Dracula*, as this work has become the blueprint for the modern vampire. Therefore, even if some of these works are narratively further removed from *Dracula*, they still have an important connection to this novel.

As *Dracula* is still so well-known and relevant to this day, it places the research conducted in this paper in a modern context, in which the text continues to resonate with readers. As was mentioned previously, eye dialect is a recurring and important feature of the novel. This literary device adds linguistic richness, is used to represent the speech of multiple characters, provides readers with extratextual information about the characters and their environment, and, potentially most significant of all, enhances the opposition between Count Dracula and the heroes of the tale. Therefore, the use of eye dialect in the novel *Dracula* is most certainly deserving of closer academic attention.

2.2 Passage selection

The passages analyzed in this paper were chosen by way of purposive sampling, which is a non-probability sampling method that involves “the selection of cases from a pool or population without random sampling” (M. Elliot et al., 2016). In this case, the passages of text were selected based on the frequent use of eye dialect they were perceived to contain, as well as their similar lengths. This approach aimed to identify passages of text that are not only similar in length, making their comparison more equal, but that would also provide ample examples of the use of eye dialect, which is so relevant to this study.

The first passage containing eye dialect that was discussed in this paper appears in Chapter Six of the novel, on pages 106-107 (Stoker, 1897/2019). In this scene, readers are introduced to Mr. Swales, an elderly inhabitant of Whitby. He is a frequent visitor to the graveyard of Whitby, where Mina Harker and Lucy Westenra first meet him. In this particular passage, Mr. Swales monologues about the supernatural legends of Whitby. He presents himself as a very skeptical person, saying that supernatural creatures and events such as ‘bans’ and ‘wafts’ —Yorkshire dialect for curses and ghosts— are not real, and are only intended to

scare children and women (Robinson, 1876). Furthermore, he voices the opinion that ‘tombsteans’— eye dialect for tombstones — are simply sentimental items, riddled with lies and without a true purpose for the deceased (Robinson, 1876). These rather shocking and controversial opinions, which are contested by Mina and Lucy, present him as a down-to-earth, somewhat argumentative person, whose dislike of anything supernatural or overly sentimental, especially when it involves the dead, stands in opposition to the later events of the novel.

As recorded in Mina’s journal, Mr. Swales’ speech is consistently represented using eye dialect, which showcases his Yorkshire accent. Though the use of non-standard speech is commonly used in literature to indicate a character’s lower intellect and social standing, in the case of Mr. Swales it is likely being used to indicate his wisdom and the purity of his beliefs, as is the view of dialect held by so-called preservationists (Ferguson, 2004, p. 234). Whatever its intended purpose may be, Mr. Swales’ frequent use of eye dialect makes his speech a compelling topic of research for this paper. For this reason, this particular passage of the novel was selected as the first fragment of text to be investigated in this paper.

The second passage, found on pages 226-227 of Chapter Eleven of the novel, features the speech of Thomas Bilder (Stoker, 1897/2019). He is first introduced to the novel by way of an interview with a journalist from *The Pall Mall Gazette*, who seeks him out to discuss the topic of a wolf that has escaped from the London Zoölogical Gardens. In this particular fragment of the text, Bilder speaks to the unnamed reporter about the suspected whereabouts of the escaped animal. Though it is unknown why Bram Stoker chose to represent Bilder’s speech using eye dialect, one may argue that, in this fragment of text, it harkens back to the “less than sophisticated stage of human consciousness” that some contemporaries of the novel linked to the use of dialect (Ferguson, 2004, p. 234). If this opinion on dialect, and eye dialect as an extension, is taken into account, Bilder’s non-standard usage of speech can be connected

to the animalistic nature of his occupation. Unlike Mr. Swales, Bilder uses the non-standard speech variety of Cockney. This dialect is traditionally used by “the urban working class population of London and the East End area of the city” (Ranzato, 2018, p. 237). Similarly to Mr. Swales, Bilder’s speech is also consistently represented using eye dialect. This makes his speech yet another valuable topic of study for this paper.

This paper, therefore, used the non-standard speech of the characters Mr. Swales and Thomas Bilder from the novel *Dracula* to discover how eye dialectal speech was represented in the English source text, and how this non-standard speech variety was later translated into Dutch.

2.3 Study Phases

2.3.1 Phase One: Description

The first phase of the research concerned itself with the description of how eye dialect was used in the selected fragments of the text. To do so, the above-mentioned selected passages of text were examined for eye dialectal speech forms. These speech forms were often identified based on Bram Stoker’s own notes on the dialectal speech used in the novel, as annotated and transcribed by Robert Eighteen-Bisang and Elizabeth Miller; as well as on research materials such as William Matthews’ book *Cockney past and present: a short history of the dialect of London* on the Cockney dialect, and Paul Cooper’s book *Yorkshire Dialect in the Nineteenth Century: Enregisterment, Authenticity, and Identity* on the Yorkshire dialect. Though W. Matthews’ book is dated as a reference work, having been published in 1938, it was still used for this paper since it provides a thorough discussion of the Cockney dialect as it existed at the time that *Dracula* was being written. However, as a result of its age, this book does fail to use IPA notations of the specific sounds it discusses, resulting in occasionally ambiguous

descriptions. For this paper, approximations of the sounds discussed by W. Matthews are presented by way of IPA notation. Cooper's book, though much more recently published, accomplishes the same historical relevancy by describing the Yorkshire accent as it existed in the nineteenth century. An advantage of this more recent source is that it includes the use of IPA notations to represent sounds, which prevents any ambiguity.

For the Yorkshire accent, the primary written characteristics that were sought out in the selected passage of text were: Definite Article Reduction (DAR), H-dropping, non-standard realizations of the diphthongs /əʊ/, /eɪ/, /aʊ/ and /aɪ/, /l/-dropping, the realization of /t/ as /r/, and the long representation of /ɑ/ (Cooper, 2025).

For the Cockney accent, the written characteristics that were sought in particular were: the use of a darkened and vocalized /l/; a diphthongal realization of the /e:/ and /o:/ vowels using an er-glide; a raised pronunciation of /ǎ/; the pronunciation of /ǒ/ as /aw/; the pronunciation of /th/ as either /f/ or /v/; the addition of /t/ and /d/ after certain consonants; H-dropping, as well as the insertion of /h/ at the beginning of words; the substitution of /i/ for /æ/, the rounding of /i:/ when accompanied by /æ:/; the pronunciation of /ʊ/ and /aʊ/ as /ɑr/ or /ɑh/; /o:/ before /l/, rounded /a/, and the use of the glottal stop (W. Matthews, 1938).

After these eye dialectal representations of forms of speech, as well as any others that could be discovered, were identified in the selected passages of text, the effects that these forms have on the text as a whole could be described in more detail. With this descriptive phase of the research, this paper aimed to demonstrate the frequency with which certain forms of eye dialectal speech are used in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, as well as the effect that these non-standard representations of speech have on the text and its readers as a whole.

2.3.2 Phase Two: Comparison

The second phase of this paper concerned itself with comparing the use of eye dialect in the English-language source text with its Dutch translation. This phase involved a side-by-side comparison of the selected passages featuring Mr. Swales and Thomas Bilder in both the source text and their equivalent passages in Piet Verhagen's 2009 Dutch translation of *Dracula*. For each of these two passages, the specific uses of eye dialect as determined in phase one of the research process were used as reference points to discover if and in which ways the use of eye dialect was translated. Furthermore, additional usages of eye dialect in the Dutch target text that were not present in the source text were also pointed out and examined.

This phase of the study, as mentioned previously in this paper, was based on the theoretical background provided by research conducted by both Massimiliano Morini and Alexandra Assis Rosa et al. on the topic of the translation of dialectal, or otherwise non-standard, speech. Although Sara Ramos Pinto's theoretical work also addresses and can be applied to the translation of eye dialect, it was not included in the theoretical framework of this paper for several reasons. Firstly, the main translation procedures for the translation of literary varieties, as identified by Ramos Pinto, do not include the practice of changing the location or the period to which the non-standard speech variety can be linked when translating it into another language. This technique, which is most clearly identifiable in Ramos Pinto et al.'s spatial and temporal translation shifts, but which can also be identified in Morini's fourth translation technique of creating a synthetic language, was deemed important to this paper. This is because, as the Dutch language contains a multitude of dialects, it was assumed that a Dutch translation of a literary text such as *Dracula* would be inclined to make use of this by applying a spatial shift to be able to use Dutch eye dialect as a translation of the already existing English eye dialect instances. For this reason, the theory provided by Ramos Pinto, though certainly relevant to the study of non-standard speech varieties as a whole, was not applied to this study. Using the translation strategies defined by Morini and Rosa et al. as a

guide, this study was able to describe what appears to have occurred in the translation process from the English source text to the Dutch target text.

By contrasting how two different dialects — Cockney and Yorkshire — were treated in the Dutch translation, this study also sought to discover if the separation of these two dialects as wholly different dialects was preserved in the translation. As was mentioned previously, the Cockney and Yorkshire dialects each carry unique connotations for readers of the source text, which add to the richness of the source text. Whether, and how, these nuances are maintained in the target text can therefore have a great impact on how Dutch readers experience the text, as they may miss this additional layer of information presented by the dialectal connotations when the two separate English dialects are merged into a singular Dutch dialect.

2.4 Limitations and Advantages

Due to the limited scope of this research, only a small selection of eye dialect instances in *Dracula* could be examined. As a result, the speech of characters such as Thomas Snelling, Joseph Smollet, and Sam Bloxam, who also make use of eye dialect in the novel, has not been included in the analysis. Even though these are only minor characters in the novel, they still add richness to how the novel *Dracula* shows the various ways in which language can be used. Future studies would benefit from analyzing these additional passages to provide a more comprehensive look into the role that eye dialect plays throughout the entire novel. This would then help develop and broaden our understanding of the use and translation of eye dialect in literary texts such as *Dracula*.

Though the previously mentioned selection of textual fragments for this study is certainly limiting, it is not the sole limitation of this study. There is a wide variety of novels

and texts across languages and genres where eye dialect plays a crucial role. Though Bram Stoker's *Dracula* is, as mentioned previously, incredibly relevant as a topic of study for this paper, it is only one of countless literary texts containing eye dialect whose translation can and should be studied academically. Researching other literary works would help researchers better understand the different ways in which eye dialect is used and how it is translated, especially in stories from different periods, types of genres, or cultures.

Furthermore, by only comparing the source text to a single translation, this study may miss important elements that would be visible by examining translations by various translators. It might prove to be beneficial to re-conduct this research with other translations of *Dracula*, both between the English and Dutch language pairs as well as in other language pairs. It may be particularly interesting to do so with language pairs outside the Western languages, as a larger cultural gap between source and target text may have a strong impact on the translation of eye dialect.

The advantage of such a selective study is that the small details of the chosen text can be discussed in their entirety. Due to the limited scope of this paper, the selection of more than just these two fragments of text would force the analysis to potentially make hasty generalizations, resulting in a less-than-satisfactory exploration of the topic at hand. Additionally, there is the advantage that, by focusing on such a limited selection of texts, this study is able to explore the use of eye dialect to represent two very specific dialects. Potential differences between how the two dialects are treated in translation could therefore be seen in more detail than might have been possible in a larger-scale project, encompassing more dialects.

Analysis

3.1 Phase One: Description

3.1.1 Description: Thomas Bilder

In the fragment of Thomas Bilder's speech taken from Chapter Eleven of *Dracula*, a total of twenty-nine instances of eye dialect word forms have been identified. In the following section of this chapter, these eye dialectal forms will be discussed in detail. The primary focus will be on grouping the eye dialectal words based on the linguistic processes underlying these eye dialectal non-standard speech forms, treating them as linguistic markers of non-standardness, identifying what methods were used to translate them, and determining whether they are representative of the Cockney accent. By doing so, it will be possible to construct a more comprehensive comparison between this source text fragment and its target text equivalent later in the chapter.

3.1.2 Phonological processes: Thomas Bilder

The primary eye dialectal characteristic of his speech was G-dropping, which appeared ten times in the selected text. In the process of G-dropping, words that end in the phoneme [ŋ] instead have a consonant that is realized as [n] in unstressed morpheme-final syllables, as is often the case when the phonemes are at the end of a word. It was found in the following words: *a-'idin'*, *'a-gallopin'*, *bein'*, *chivvin'*, *somethin'*, *fightin'*, *providin'*, *a-hidin'*, *a-shiverin'*, *wonderin'*, *a-walkin'*, and *leavin'*. The realization of [ŋ] as [n] is very common, as "almost every English-speaking community exhibits a social or stylistic alternation between the two possibilities" (Wells, 1982, p. 262). Commonly, the [n] form is considered to be the lower-class form, though this differs somewhat from community to community. With his eye dialectal representation of G-dropping, Bram Stoker chose to use an apostrophe to emphasize this [n] form. As noted by J.C. Wells, this is a common practice for representing G-dropping

in written text (1982). As shall be made clearer throughout this chapter, Stoker also used apostrophes to represent other elided or altered phonemes.

Yet another way in which the text represented Bilder's non-standard speech variety is through the eye dialectal presence of H-dropping. Similar to G-dropping, the linguistic process of H-dropping entails the removal of a phoneme, which in this case is [h]. H-dropping occurs when “the [h] of standard accents is absent”, resulting in forms that begin either with a vowel or with a glottal stop (Wells, 1982, p. 253). The Cockney dialect is known for its use of glottal stops, primarily in lieu of [t] sounds (Wells, 1982). Though “there is little evidence that the glottal stop was used in early Cockney”, the H-dropping in Bilder’s speech may be Stoker’s attempt at representing Cockney’s glottalization (1938, p. 167). In the selected text from *Dracula*, H-dropping can be found five times, in the words ‘*ere*, *a-’idin*’, ‘*im*, and ‘*isself*.

In contrast to H-dropping, the phenomenon of H-insertion is also present in the text. In the selected text from Thomas Bilder, this is represented using eye dialect in the word *hinfant* (standard *infant*). H-insertion is the process of adding the [h] sound in positions where it normally would not occur. Though H-insertion is less common in the Cockney dialect than H-dropping, some speakers of the non-standard variety use it to over-correct for the dropping of this sound, resulting in [h] sounds being found in positions where they would not occur in standard speech (W. Matthews, 1938). This eye dialectal spelling thus represents a true element of the Cockney dialect.

When Bilder’s speech is represented using the eye dialectal form *gard’ner*, this depicts the linguistic phenomenon of a syncope. Like H-dropping, syncope involves the omission of a sound, though this happens from the middle of a word instead of at the beginning of it (McArthur & Lam-McArthur, 2018a). It commonly affects “the first of two weak vowels following a strong vowel” (Algeo, 1974, p. 23). Syncope is not a feature that is unique to

Cockney, as it in fact is common all throughout spoken English, no matter the dialect or accent. The eye dialectal spelling of *gard'ner* (standard *gardener*) is therefore supported by a real linguistic process. Once again, the removed sound is commonly represented in the text using an apostrophe, as is also the case here.

A common feature of speech in English is the deletion of [d] or [t] phonemes in word-final consonant clusters (Edwards, 2011). This feature is also represented in the speech of Thomas Bilder, as it is a feature of Cockney. In the words *Lor'* and *an'*, the word-final /d/ phoneme is replaced with an apostrophe. That this deletion occurs in these two words is not surprising, as it is known to occur often after a set few consonants, including [r] and [n] (W. Matthews, 1938, p. 173).

According to Ian Hancock and Loreto Todd, the word *ain't* is “one of the most widespread nonstandard forms” in the English language (2005, p. 31). Therefore, it is not surprising that it is also used in the eye dialectal representations of the dialectal speech in *Dracula*. In the context of Bilder's speech, *ain't* is used twice as a negative auxiliary verb, replacing the standard speech forms ‘has not’ and ‘is not’. It thus serves as a form of contraction and non-standard negation. When used in literature, the word *ain't* is often utilized to signal “a speaker's low social status or regional origins” (Hancock & Todd, 2005, p. 31).

The eye dialectal form *dessay* (standard *dare say*) is a written representation of the combination of two phonological phenomena. Firstly, the /r/ phoneme found in rhotic pronunciations of ‘dare say’ is not represented, as the Cockney accent is non-rhotic (Fox, 2017, p. 202). Therefore, it is not written in the eye dialectal representation of the Cockney pronunciation. Secondly, through the process of coalescence, which is when sound units are fused, the two words are combined into a singular one (P. Matthews, 2014).

When a sound is inserted into a word in a position where it typically does not occur, this is called epenthesis (McArthur & Lam-McArthur, 2018c). An example of epenthesis drawn from Bilder's speech is found in the word *orf* (standard *off*). Here, the [ɹ] phoneme is added into the middle of what would be pronounced as [ɒf] in standard British English. According to W. Matthews, this intrusive r is "another old Cockney habit to facilitate pronunciation" (1938, p. 177).

The eye dialectal form *wot* (standard *what*) represents the Cockney accent's non-standard pronunciation of vowels. In Cockney, the standard variety rounded vowel [ɑ] is instead pronounced closer to [ʌ]. This pronunciation has long been used in the Cockney dialect, with eye dialectal representations of it often differing in how it is represented (W. Matthews, 1938, p. 167). By using the eye dialectal form *wot* to represent the standard variety word *what*, Bram Stoker managed to represent this feature of the Cockney accent in Bilder's speech.

The dialectal form *babby* (standard *baby*) is yet another reflection of a non-standard pronunciation of a vowel. However, it is not one of the ones mentioned by W. Matthews as being common in the Cockney accent. Instead, it is a representation of the vowel [eɪ] in the standard-speech variety word 'baby' being altered to the vowel [æ]. This difference in pronunciation can be caused by the lowering of the vowel. This pronunciation, though not necessarily related to Cockney, can be found in other English accents. The non-standard pronunciation *babby* can, for example, be found in the West Midlands' Birmingham dialect. It therefore is not a wholly unfounded eye dialectal form, though it does not accurately represent the Cockney accent.

Another eye dialectal word which receives its non-standard spelling due to how its vowel is pronounced differently from its standard speech variety version is *yer* (standard *your*). In the case of this word, the standard variety vowel [ɔ] is replaced with the vowel [ɒ] in

the Cockney accent. To represent this difference in pronunciation, Stoker utilizes the Cockney accent's habit of using a more centralized pronunciation of this particular vowel, resulting in the written form *yer* (W. Matthews, 1938).

By including a non-standard form such as *a-shining*, Bram Stoker represented the linguistic process of A-prefixing in his text. A-prefixing occurs when the prefix *a-*, which is pronounced as [ə], is attached to a verbal *-ing* form (McQuaid, 2017). A-prefixing is characteristic of a few dialects of English, most notably that of Appalachian English (McQuaid, 2017). However, it is not a standard characteristic of Cockney, making A-prefixing an unusual inclusion into a text that intends to represent Cockney. Still, it is an additional non-standard form that adds linguistic richness to this text.

When the non-standard form *hisself* is used by Thomas Bilder, he is using a process known as analogy. In this process, new forms are created that are based on already existing forms (McArthur & Lam-McArthur, 2018b). In the case of *hisself*, the pre-existing forms are the reflexive pronouns — such as *myself*, *herself*, and *themselves* — which consist of a personal pronoun plus the suffix *-self* or *-selves* (“Pronouns: Reflexive (Myself, Themselves, Etc.),” 2025). Following this pattern, the non-standard word *hisself* is formed by combining the personal pronoun *his* with the suffix *-self*, mimicking the structure of standard reflexive pronouns. The non-standard spelling *hisself* is a form of eye dialect, as it is an orthographic representation of non-standard speech.

In the case of *afeared*, the eye dialectal form is created by adding the suffix *-ed* to the root *fear*, which results in the form *afeared* instead of the standard speech form *afraid*. This non-standard form might at first appear to be eye dialectal, as it is a written representation of this element of non-standard speech. However, the use of *afeared* does reflect an older construction that was used in late Old English. Nowadays, this pronunciation is only found in regional or non-standard speech varieties (“Afeared, Adj.,” 2023). As it has this historical

prerequisite, the spelling *afeared* cannot be considered a true eye dialectal spelling, even if it might at first appear to be one.

3.1.3 Description: Mr. Swales

Though Mr. Swales' non-standard speech variety is not Cockney, but rather Yorkshire, the eye dialect used to represent his speech does share similarities with that of Thomas Bilder. The fragment of text containing his speech that was selected for this paper contains a total of thirty-six instances of eye dialectal speech, some of which are similar to the eye dialect used by Bilder. In the following part of this chapter, the instances in which eye dialect is used to represent Mr. Swales' speech shall be investigated and described more closely. There will be a focus on how these eye dialectal forms used by Mr. Swales function as linguistic markers of regional and social variation, so that similarities and differences between his speech and that of Thomas Bilder become clearer.

3.1.4 Phonological Processes: Mr. Swales

The single most frequently used form of eye dialect in the fragment of Mr. Swales' speech that was selected for this paper was elision, or "the use of a speech form that lacks a final or initial sound which a variant speech form has" ("Elision," 2025). Specifically, it was the elision of the [d] sound at the end of the word *and*, resulting in the eye dialectal form *an'*. This occurs a total of eighteen times in the thirty-six eye dialectal words used by Mr. Swales in this fragment of text. Elision also occurs with the [f] sound in this text, resulting in the eye dialectal form *o'* a total of three times. In his description of the Yorkshire accent, Paul Cooper does not mention this form of elision as being a part of the speech of individuals in Yorkshire in the Nineteenth Century. However, elision does occur as a feature of regional dialects in

general, particularly in informal and rapid speech (Vukasojević & Perošević, 2024).

Therefore, this eye dialectal spelling does represent a pronunciation that is consistent with spoken language, though not necessarily unique to the Yorkshire dialect.

Yet another prevalent eye dialectal feature of Mr. Swales' speech was G-dropping, which was also a regular occurrence in the speech of his Cockney counterpart. In Mr. Swales' speech, the process of G-dropping was represented using eye dialect a total of twelve times, consisting of eleven words. It was used in the words *somethin'*, *printin'*, *preachin'*, *cuttin'*, *holdin'*, *tumblin'*, *nothin'*, *tryin'*, *trimmlin'*, *ditherin'* and *lyin'*. As was noted previously, G-dropping is not representative of a singular dialect or accent, and instead has a widespread usage, though it often carries the connotation of being used by lower-class individuals.

Other than the use of G-dropping, the word *trimmlin'* (trembling), is given additional eye dialectal elements to represent its non-standard pronunciation (Stoker et al., 2008, pp. 142–143). The choice of vowel suggests that the standard speech variety vowel [ɛ] is pronounced as [i] in the Yorkshire accent. However, this difference in vowel pronunciation is not supported by any research. Additionally, the removal of the [b] sound from its written representation suggests that consonant cluster reduction has taken place. This is a process in which parts of a consonant cluster are removed during speech, often to reduce “the overall complexity of the syllable in which the cluster occurs” (Ohala, 1999, p. 416). By removing the written letter representing the [b] sound from the spelling of the word, Stoker represents this feature of spoken English in his text.

The phonological process of a vowel shift is responsible for both the eye dialectal forms *steans* and *tombsteans*. The [əʊ] vowel that would normally be found in the word *stones* is instead represented with a vowel that would suggest a pronunciation closer to [iə]. To reflect this vowel shift in writing, the eye dialectal form *steans* is used. Non-standard realizations of the vowel [əʊ] are found in descriptions of the Yorkshire accent of the

nineteenth century. However, in this accent, they are pronounced as either /ɔu/, /o:/, /ə:/, or /ə:/ (Cooper, 2025, p. 5). The pronunciation that is suggested by Stoker's eye dialectal spelling is therefore correct in asserting that a non-standard pronunciation may be used, though it does not reflect a true Yorkshire pronunciation.

A suggested vowel shift also occurs for the eye dialectal form *parsons*. In the case of this eye dialectal representation, the vowel [ɜ:] is altered to suggest that its pronunciation is more similar to the vowel [ɑ]. This altered pronunciation of [ɜ:] is not considered to be a part of the actual Yorkshire accent as it was spoken in the nineteenth century.

The spelling *ye* represents the final instance of a vowel shift being represented in the speech of Mr. Swales. Here, the standard variety vowel [u:] is instead represented in a manner that suggests it is pronounced as [i] in the Yorkshire accent. Once more, this non-standard pronunciation is not mentioned in any relevant research on the Yorkshire accent. Thus, it can be assumed that it is a non-standard pronunciation that Stoker did not base on this dialect.

3.2 Accuracy of Representation

As was briefly touched upon previously in this chapter, the eye dialectal spellings used to represent Thomas Bilder's and Mr. Swales' speech do not always accurately represent the Cockney and Yorkshire manners of speaking. It should, once again, be mentioned that eye dialect is not always intended to accurately represent the dialect or accent it is intended to be. Instead, eye dialect is primarily used with the intention of ensuring that "certain assumptions and images will be triggered and, consequently, contribute to the description of the characters in literary texts, who are differentiated, not only by what they say, but also by how they say it" (Ramos Pinto, 2009, p. 290). To do so, it is less important whether the eye dialectal spellings represent phonological processes that actually occur in the non-standard variety at

hand. Instead, the main aim of eye dialect is to trigger these assumptions and images in readers, with the representation of realistic phonological processes being pushed to the background.

With this in mind, it is admirable that some eye dialectal forms used in the two texts were able to accurately represent the Cockney and Yorkshire non-standard varieties of English. However, it is also no surprise that other eye dialectal spellings, such as *babby*, *gard'ner*, and *a-shining*, were not necessarily representative of the real dialects as they were spoken contemporaneously with the period in which the novel was written. However, these spellings do represent non-standard pronunciations found in other dialects, or pronunciations that pertain to spoken non-standard English as a whole. These eye dialectal spellings, therefore, do add to the linguistic richness of the text, while not being totally unfounded spellings of the words they represent.

As his notes on dialectal speech indicate that Bram Stoker had, at the very least, an interest in accurately representing the non-standard speech varieties of his characters, it is not surprising that the eye dialectal spellings in these two fragments of *Dracula* are quite close to accurately describing non-standard speech. However, this non-standard speech represented in the texts does not tend to coincide with the dialects that would be expected of the characters. This may be explained by Bram Stoker's own experience with the two dialects discussed in this paper. Born in Dublin, Ireland, Stoker eventually moved to London, where he lived until his death (Stoker et al., 2008). During this time, it is likely that he became familiar with the pronunciation present in the Cockney dialect that is spoken in this city. While Stoker did visit Whitby for a period of three weeks in the summer of 1890, it can be assumed that the Yorkshire accent spoken there would have been less familiar to him than the Cockney dialect of London would have been (Stoker et al., 2008). This would explain why his notes for *Dracula* include notes on the dialect used in Whitby, but not of that used in London. It

therefore makes sense that *Dracula*, being published in 1897 — after eight years of Stoker living in London — would represent Cockney pronunciations better than it does Yorkshire ones. Still, by including both non-standard speech varieties in his novel, Stoker managed to showcase the existence of these versions of English, with the added benefit of the additional textual richness and information they provide.

3.3 Phase Two: Comparison

3.3.1 Comparison: *Thomas Bilder*

The Dutch translation of the selected fragment of Thomas Bilder's speech, as translated by Piet Verhagen, can be found on pages 151 and 152 of the target text. In this small part of the translated novel, a total of seventy-four eye dialectal spellings are present. The source text, however, contained only twenty-nine eye dialectal forms. It is therefore quite obvious that the Dutch translation expanded quite extensively on the source text's use of eye dialect.

3.3.2 Phonological Processes: *Thomas Bilder (TT)*

The primary recurring phonological processes that are represented in this Dutch translation is that of final-consonant deletion, which occurs twenty-two times in total. It thus accounts for more than half of all the eye dialectal spellings contained in this fragment of the translated text. In the words *honde* (standard *honden*, dogs), *schrikke* (standard *schrikken*, to get scared), *teruggekome* (standard *teruggekomen*, to come back), and *stukke* (standard *stukken*, pieces), *galoppere* (standard *galloperen*, to gallop), *wolleve* (standard *wolven*, wolves), *verhale* (standard *verhalen*, stories), *kunne* (standard *kunnen*, can), *vorme* (standard *vormen*, to form), *schoppe* (standard *schoppen*, to kick), *scheure* (standard *scheuren*, to tear), *zorregge* (standard

zorgen, to care for), *rille* (standard *rillen*, to shake), *hale* (standard *halen*, to get), *gekropen* (standard *gekropen*, crawled), *oge* (standard *ogen*, eyes), *kijke* (standard *kijken*, to look), *ete* (standard *eten*, food), *wandele* (standard *wandelen*, to walk), *kinderwage* (standard *kinderwagen*, perambulator), *opkijke* (standard *opkijken*, be surprised), *eige* (standard *eigen*, own) the word-final obstruent is removed. For each of these words, the word-final consonant that is deleted is [n]. According to Bruce C. Donaldson, “It is normal practice in ABN to ‘drop one’s n’s’”, with ABN being an outdated term, meaning Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands (Standard Civilized Dutch), for standard Dutch. (1983, p. 55). It primarily occurs that an [n] sound is dropped “after a schwa at the end of a morpheme” (Van De Velde & Van Hout, 2000, p. 209). The dropping of the [n] sound results in words that normally would end on -en instead being pronounced as ending on -e in standard spoken language. The eye dialectal spellings given above, where the removal of the [n] sound is depicted using eye dialect, therefore represent a true element of Dutch spoken language. However, it represents a feature of the Dutch standard language variety, and not a specific dialect of the language. As was discussed previously in this paper, translators often elect to standardize non-standard elements of literary texts. This use of a phonological feature from the standard spoken variety of Dutch, rather than from a dialect, therefore appears to reflect this practice.

The consonant [n] is also removed from the eye dialectal spelling of *kolekelder* (standard *kolenkelder*, coal cellar). In this case, the consonant is not removed from the end of the word, but instead is taken from the middle. This makes it an eye dialectal representation of the process of cluster reduction, in which the [n] sound is removed during spoken language to reduce the complexity of the syllable in which it normally would occur. This process was already discussed in the discussion of the phonetic processes referenced to create Thomas Bilder’s eye dialectal speech in the source text. Therefore, it can be seen that, for the

representation of non-standard Dutch and non-standard English, similar phonological processes can be referenced to create eye dialectal spellings.

Additionally, the word *wolleve* (standard *wolven*), *wollef* (standard *wolf*), *erreges* (standard *ergens*), *hallef* (standard *half*), and *zichzellef* (standard *zichzelf*) appear to reflect a pronunciation in which an additional unstressed vowel, [ə], is inserted. Bruce C. Donaldson refers to this using the Sanskrit term *svarabhakt*, which refers to “the insertion of a vowel to break up a troublesome consonant cluster” (1983, p. 186). Thus, these eye dialectal spellings reflect this feature of spoken language, which also occurs in Dutch.

Yet another frequently represented phonological process in this Dutch translation of *Dracula* is that of the use of clitics. Clitics are “pronounced with very little emphasis, usually shortened, and typically phonologically attached to a host word” (Aarts, 2014). Clitic pronunciations of certain words are standard in Dutch. In fact, according to Bruce Donaldson, “*t* or [ət] is the normal pronunciation of *het* today” (1983, p. 163). In this text, eye dialectal spellings of clitic pronunciations can be found in the words ‘*t* (standard *het*), ‘*n* (standard *een*), ‘*m* (standard *hem*), *d’r* (standard *haar*), and *da’s* (standard *dat is*). They account for twenty of the seventy-two eye dialectal spellings in this fragment of the target text. Given that clitics are considered to be the standard pronunciation of certain words, the eye dialectal use of them in a written text does not reflect an element that is unique to dialectal Dutch. Instead, they represent a feature of spoken standard Dutch that is traditionally not used in written Dutch.

Additional specific forms of clitics that are represented multiple times in this fragment of the translated text are the cliticization of the subject pronoun *hij* (he) to a preceding verb or function word. This accounts for an additional eight of the eye dialectal spellings in this fragment of text. Examples of this process at work in the text at hand are *dat-ie* (standard *dat hij*, that he), *as-ie* (standard *als hij*, if he), *waar-ie* (standard *waar hij*, where he), *is-ie*

(standard *is hij*, is he), *gaat-ie* (standard *gaat hij*, he will), and *vind-ie* (standard *vind hij*, he will find). The use of these non-standard spellings is likely not restricted to just one dialect of Dutch, and instead is likely to be a part of spoken Dutch as a whole.

The non-standard spelling *as-ie*, on top of the previously discussed process of cliticization, also represents the phonological process of /l/-elision. Here, the [l] sound that would be present in the standard-speech variety is removed in the eye dialectal representation of the word. This process can also be seen in the spelling *as* (standard *als*, if), which occurs five times in the selected fragment of text.

For the word *kindermeissie* (standard *kindermeisje*, nanny), the diminutive ending *-je* is instead given the eye dialectal ending *-sie* in this text. This form of non-standard diminutive is a characteristic trait of the Dutch that is spoken in the provinces of Holland (Donaldson, 1983). This non-standard spelling, therefore, does reflect the pronunciation of this word as it can be found in a specific dialect of the Dutch language.

The spelling *lewaai* (standard *lawaai*) appears to suggest that the vowel [a] is instead pronounced in a manner that is similar to the vowel [ɤ]. This suggested pronunciation that is represented through this eye dialectal spelling is not referenced to be a feature of any Dutch dialects. This eye dialectal spelling, therefore, does not accurately represent spoken non-standard Dutch. However, it does add linguistic richness to the text and may help inform readers about the social class of Thomas Bilder, as dialectal speech in literary texts tends to indicate a speaker's lower social class.

Yet another non-standard spelling that appears to suggest the affectation of the pronunciation of a vowel is that of *warschijnlijk* (standard *waarschijnlijk*). Here, it appears to be the case that the long vowel [a:] is shortened to be more akin to the vowel [a]. This variation in pronunciation is created in the translated text by removing one of the two vowels

from the word *waarschijnlijk*, resulting in the non-standard variety *warschijnlijk*. This pronunciation could not be found in any sources on Dutch dialects. Therefore, it most likely does not represent a real-life Dutch dialect, and instead was used in this target text to add linguistic richness and extra-textual information about the speaker.

The eye dialectal word *ze* (standard *zijn*, his) is pronounced without any stress in this text. As a result, the eye dialectal spelling of the word suggests that the standard variety vowel [ei] is instead pronounced closer to [ə]. Additionally, the word-final [n] sound in the standard variety word is removed. As mentioned previously, it is a standard practice for speakers of ABN to drop [n] sounds at the end of many words (Donaldson, 1983). It is therefore no surprise that this also happened for the word *zijn*, resulting in the eye dialectal spelling *ze*.

In both the words *m'neer* (standard *meneer*) and *m'sschien* (standard *misschien*), the vowel pronounced as [ə] is deleted from the spelling and replaced with an apostrophe. This is a case of schwa elision, which is when, in speech, the [ə] sound is removed to facilitate an easier pronunciation of the word at hand. In the case of both *m'neer* and *m'sschien*, the removed [ə] sound is represented using an apostrophe. In Dutch, the rule for schwa elision is that it can occur if a “word has two consecutive syllables headed by schwa, the first of these schwas may be deleted, provided that the resulting onset consonant cluster be an obstruent + liquid cluster” (Wiltshire & Booij, 1996, p. 128). As this is not the case for either of the words *meneer* and *misschien*, the eye dialectal spellings used do not represent any true variety of spoken Dutch. Still, these eye dialectal spellings add richness to the text and are similar to the source text in their use of apostrophes to represent removed sounds.

3.3.3 Comparison: Mr. Swales

On pages 71 and 72 of Piet Verhagen's Dutch translation of *Dracula*, readers are provided with the translation of the fragment of Mr. Swales' speech of which the source text was previously investigated in this paper. In this fragment of the translated text, a total of fourteen eye dialectal spellings are used, whereas the source text version contained thirty-six. While the translated text of Thomas Bilder's speech contained many more dialectal terms than its source text, the opposite is true for Mr. Swales' speech. In this fragment of the novel, the number of eye dialectal spellings has been reduced by more than half.

3.3.4 Phonological Processes: Mr. Swales (TT)

Clitics, which are word forms that are shortened, pronounced without much emphasis, and attached to a host word, were not only found in the speech of Thomas Bilder but also in that of Mr. Swales. In his case, the clitic forms 't (standard *het*, it), d'r (standard *er*, there), d'rop (standard *er op*, on it), 'n (standard *een*, a), and z'n (standard *zijn*, his) could be identified. Though these words are always pronounced in the manner that their eye dialectal spelling would suggest, they would not normally be written this way. Therefore, these shortened spellings are indeed eye dialectal in nature. However, they do not correspond to a Dutch dialect and instead are representations of spoken standard Dutch (Donaldson, 1983).

An eye dialectal spelling that is repeated thrice in the selected fragment of Mr. Swales' speech is that of the word *ammel* (standard *allemaal*, all sorts). This eye dialectal spelling of the word suggests that multiple phonological processes are at play when a speaker of a non-standard variety pronounces this word. Firstly, the unstressed vowel [ə] appears to be removed from the standard pronunciation, explaining why this sound is not represented in the eye dialectal spelling of it. It bears repeating that this schwa elision is not representative of schwa elision as it would occur in real-life spoken Dutch, as it only occurs when two consecutive

syllables are headed by schwa, which is not the case for *allemaal*. Secondly, the [l] sound in the initial syllable appears to be absent, which may suggest a dialectal /l/-elision or a simplification of the consonant cluster in which the [l] sound is normally used. In this way, it is similar to the speech of Thomas Bilder, in which [l] sounds were also removed from the pronunciation. No literature could be found on the complete removal of [l] sounds in Dutch, but perhaps this is a feature that occurs in spoken or connected Dutch. Third, the final vowel used in *ammel* suggests that the [a] vowel of the standard-variety pronunciation is instead pronounced as [ə]. While “most varieties of Dutch have more front qualities” for the vowel [a], no literature could be found on the pronunciation of this vowel as [ə] (Collins & Mees, 2003, p. 131). Therefore, the eye dialectal spelling of this vowel does not represent true spoken Dutch of a standard or dialectal nature.

Another eye dialectal spelling that appears to suggest the removal of a sound can be located in the spelling *wor* (standard *word*, become). In this case, the eye dialectal spelling indicates that the word-final [d] sound is removed in the dialectal pronunciation of it. This is similar to the deletion of [d] or [t] phonemes in word-final consonant clusters that also occurred in both of the target text fragments. This non-standard manner of pronunciation, while common in English, could not be located in any literature on the pronunciation of Dutch.

The final non-standard spelling in this selected text is that of *zouen* (standard *zouden*, would). Since the removed [d] sound from this word is not part of a word-final consonant cluster, it must be discussed separately from the previous eye dialectal spelling. In the case of *zouen*, the intervocalic [d] that is removed from the spelling of the word appears to suggest a pronunciation in which the [d] is elided or removed between vowels. This manner of pronunciation is also not considered to be a feature of dialectal and/or standard Dutch, as it could not be found in any literature on the language.

3.4 Methods for Translating Eye Dialect

It is not possible to ascertain exactly what methods the translator used to handle the presence of eye dialect in this text. However, by comparing the original text with the translation, insights can be gained on what might have occurred during the translation process. As discussed previously, both Rosa et al. and Morini talk about methods that translators can use to translate non-standard speech varieties. Eye dialect, which is the use of unconventional spellings to indicate colloquial language use or a character's uncommon pronunciation or accent, is an example of such a non-standard speech variety. While Morini's methods tend to apply more to a whole-text approach, Rosa et al.'s strategies focus on smaller-scale techniques. However, the two authors do have a significant amount of overlap. By comparing the two source texts with their target texts, and identifying which of Morini and Rosa et al.'s methods can be identified as a result, it is possible to give insight into how the feature of eye dialect is handled in translation from English to Dutch in this translation of *Dracula*.

3.4.1 Synthetic language

Morini discusses the translation method of creating a synthetic language variety in the target language to translate non-standard language varieties, of which eye dialect could be an example. When examining the source and target texts with Morini's method in mind, it becomes clear that the translator did indeed create new, made-up forms of Dutch. Most of the elements of eye dialect found in the source text are replaced with features of Dutch that can be found in real dialects or spoken forms. This means that the translator primarily used a natural non-standard variety of Dutch, sticking to what already exists in the language. However, certain eye dialectal spellings in the two target texts that were investigated did not appear to

represent pronunciations found in either standard or non-standard Dutch. These include the spellings of *lewaai*, *warschijnlijk*, *m'neer*, *m'sschie*, *ammel*, *wor*, and *zouen*. From the presence of these forms, it can be understood that Piet Verhagen utilized the method of creating a synthetic form of the target language in his translation of these two fragments of the novel. This, therefore, only occurs seven times in the eighty-eight eye dialectal spellings spread throughout the two fragments of text. As a result, it is quite clear that this is only one of the various methods he applied.

3.4.2 Omission of linguistic markers

Rosa et al. mention the translation method of the omission of linguistic markers in relation to the translation of non-standard speech varieties. As this text is not translated word-for-word, it is not surprising that some of the words used in the source text do not have a one-to-one equivalent in the translated text. This applies to both standard variety words and eye-dialectal words. As a result, it is difficult to judge when the translator of the text explicitly chose to omit eye dialectal spellings, and when the words represented by these spellings simply did not have a place in the translated text. For this reason, it is not possible to determine whether the omission of linguistic markers signaling a non-standard speech variety occurred in Piet Verhagen's translation of *Dracula*.

3.4.3 Addition of linguistic markers

Similarly to omission, Rosa et al.'s method of the addition of linguistic markers to signal a variety is difficult to identify when comparing a source text with a target text. However, the use of eye dialect in the word class of articles in the target text—a word class not represented in this way in the source text—can be seen as an example of this translation method.

Specifically, this applies to the words ‘*n* (standard *een*, a/an) and ‘*t* (standard *het*, the). These markers signal a non-standard speech variety through eye dialectal spelling, and while they are absent in the source text, they are clearly present in the target text. Since articles do not represent a non-standard variety in the source text, the fact that they do so in the target text indicates the addition of linguistic markers. In both Thomas Bilder’s and Mr. Swales’ speech in the target text, articles were the word class that contained the highest number of eye dialectal spellings. In their source text equivalents, however, articles were not represented using eye dialectal spelling even once. Thus, it is clear that by representing articles with eye dialectal spellings in his translation, Piet Verhagen made use of the translation method of adding linguistic markers, as described by Rosa et al.

3.4.4 Substandard to standard & fully standardizing

The shift from a non-standard variety – also referred to as a substandard variety by Rosa et al. – to a standard variety is yet another method that is closely related to the translation method of omission. This method, which can be considered equivalent to Morini’s whole-text method of standardizing, involves the standardization of instances of non-standard speech varieties. For the purposes of this paper, it means that an eye dialectal spelling in the source text is represented using a standard spelling in the target text. In the two selected fragments of speech from Thomas Bilder and Mr. Swales, this method can be observed in a few instances. Examples include the use of *tuinman* for the eye dialectal spelling *gard’ner*, *banger* for *more afeared*, and *schuilhoudt* for *a-’idin*. While Piet Verhagen had the option to use eye dialectal spellings to represent these words, he did not utilize this option. Therefore, it is clear that one of the translation methods he used to address the presence of eye dialect in the source text, *Dracula*, was shifting these substandard words to standard versions.

3.4.5 Non-standard variety of the target language

However, the other two shifts of contextual meaning signaled by linguistic markers that were identified by Rosa et al., namely the shift from substandard A to substandard B and the shift from standard to substandard, are more clearly identifiable in these two texts. An instance of a shift from substandard speech variety A to B in the speech of Thomas Bilder is the eye dialectal word *providin* 'being translated using the similarly eye dialectal word *zorrege*. Similarly, the fact that, in that same fragment of text, *'isself* is translated using the eye dialectal phrase *ze eige* is another example of this translation method. Though this method of shifting between eye dialectal English and Dutch is often used in Thomas Bilder's speech, it was not applied to Mr. Swales's speech. Thus, it can be seen that Piet Verhagen did use this particular translation method, though he restricted its use to the speech of only one of the two characters investigated in this paper.

An instance of a shift from standard to substandard in Thomas Bilder's speech can be found in the word *kindermeissie* (standard *kindermeisje*, nanny), which is used as a translation for the standard speech variety word *nursemaid*. Similarly, *wor* (standard *word*, become) is used as a translation for the standard speech variety phrase *makes me*. Yet another example of this phenomenon would be the translation *da's* (standard *dat is*, that is), for the standard speech variety word *that's*. For all of these instances, the source text used a standard spelling, while the target text uses an eye dialectal spelling. It is therefore quite clear that Piet Verhagen used the method of shifting a standard language variety to a substandard language variety in his translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*.

These two methods of shifting are similar to Morini's method of using a non-standard variety of the target language to supplement the presence of a non-standard speech variety in

the source language. This is because all three methods result in a target text in which eye dialect is present, though it may differ from the eye dialect used in the source text, if any was used at all to begin with.

3.4.6 Maintenance of linguistic markers

Yet another of Rosa et al.'s methods that bears similarities to Morini's method of using a non-standard variety of the target language is that of the maintenance of linguistic markers signaling a variety. Maintaining linguistic markers signaling a variety in a translated text means that the non-standard, in this case, eye-dialectal, spelling of the source text is kept unaltered in the target text. For this set of texts, that would mean that the Dutch target text would contain eye dialectal representations of English words. This is not the case in either Thomas Bilder's speech or Mr. Swales' speech. Therefore, it can be concluded that Piet Verhagen did not use this translation method in the process of translating these two fragments of *Dracula*.

Discussion

The analysis of the two fragments taken from Bram Stoker's *Dracula* reveals that the English source text employs the literary technique of eye dialect. These non-standard spellings of words appear in the speech of both Thomas Bilder and Mr. Swales. This indicates that eye dialect is not a single-use literary device in this text, but rather a recurring stylistic feature. The two source texts each rely on phonological processes that are characteristic of either the Cockney or the Yorkshire dialect, depending on the implied regional background of the speaker. This variation of eye dialectal use suggests that Bram Stoker, at the very least, aimed to reproduce these two dialects to some extent.

While the Dutch target text also makes use of eye dialectal spellings, the way in which it does so differed considerably from the source texts. While the source texts used eye dialect to represent dialectal pronunciations, the target texts, as translated by Piet Verhagen, mostly used eye dialectal spellings to represent spoken standard Dutch. Only one instance in which an eye dialectal spelling could represent a dialectal pronunciation was found. As a result of this, it can be said that the influence of dialect, which is so vital to the novel *Dracula*, is greatly reduced or even removed from the Dutch target text. This approach aligns with the broader Dutch literary tradition, in which eye dialect is not commonly found in literary texts aimed at an adult audience, such as the one that would read *Dracula*. However, the existence of Dutch children's books containing eye dialect, such as the previously mentioned *Nijntje* books, suggests a desire within the Dutch literary sphere to change this, and to introduce more eye dialectal representations of non-standard varieties of spoken Dutch, perhaps first for children and then for adult readers.

This contrast between the source and target texts becomes even clearer when considering the differences in how the eye dialect is used. For the target text that contains the speech of Thomas Bilder, the number of times eye dialect was used increased significantly when compared to the source text (twenty-six to seventy-four), while it was reduced for the text containing Mr. Swales' speech (thirty-six to fourteen). The extension of the use of eye dialect for Bilder shows that, while the Dutch translation of *Dracula* does not aim to represent specific dialects of Dutch, it does show that the translator was at least aware of the added richness which eye dialect provides in a text. It is thus a shame that this literary device was not used as extensively in the speech of Mr. Swales. Had this been done, readers of the target text would be more likely to experience the same linguistic richness as readers of the source text.

To better understand the translator's approach, it is worth examining the strategies used by Piet Verhagen in his translation of the two selected fragments. A variety of methods for translating non-standard language were employed. He employed Massimiliano Morini's techniques, including creating a synthetic version of the target language, standardizing the non-standard speech variety, and using a non-standard variety of the target language to supplement the non-standard variety of the source text. Additionally, he applied Alexandra Assis Rosa et al.'s methods: adding linguistic markers to signal a non-standard speech variety; shifting from a substandard to a standard language variety; shifting in the opposite direction from a standard to a substandard variety; and shifting from one substandard variety (A) to another (B). All of these methods were used in the creation of the two fragments of the target text. The only methods described by Morini and Rosa et al. that he did not utilize in his translations in an identifiable manner were the maintenance of linguistic markers signalling a variety, the omission of linguistic markers signalling a variety, and using two or more variants of the target language. However, it must be noted that it is not necessary for a 'good' translation to utilize all of the translation methods described by these two researchers. Instead, what is most important is how they are used.

The wide array of translation methods that Piet Verhagen used in his translation of the eye dialect in *Dracula* demonstrates that it is indeed possible for translators to apply these translation methods to the translation of texts that contain eye dialect. In fact, since it is not known whether Piet Verhagen was aware of these methods prior to beginning his translation, it could even be argued that these strategies are inherent to the practice of translation. Morini and Rosa et al.'s methods, then, accurately represent the reality of translating eye dialect.

These findings highlight that eye dialect does indeed play a role in *Dracula* in both the original source text and Piet Verhagen's Dutch translated text. However, what is represented through this eye dialect differs greatly between the source and target texts. The source text

uses eye dialect to provide extratextual information about the speakers, including where they are from and what social class they might belong to. Readers can use this information to gain a deeper understanding of the context in which the story takes place. For readers of the Dutch target text, this extratextual information is lost, as the Dutch eye dialect no longer represents a specific dialect of the language, but instead represents spoken, or connected, speech.

Therefore, these readers are not able to access the bank of preconceived notions carried by dialects, making the text less rich in the information it provides. However, the Dutch target texts do still contain eye dialectal spellings of standard spoken Dutch, showing that the translator understood the linguistic richness that eye dialect adds to a text. Readers of this target text thus still benefit from this feature of eye dialectal spellings.

The presence of dialect, which is represented through eye dialect, is absolutely vital to the novel *Dracula*. Not only does it indirectly tell readers something about the speakers who use it, but the fact that the main characters of the novel are so open to and interested in eye dialect helps set them apart from the villain of the story, Count Dracula, who greatly values the use of standard English. If this eye dialect, and thus what it represents, is removed from the text through the process of translating, an important element of the story is lost. Though translations such as the one provided by Piet Verhagen do an excellent job of expressing other important parts of the novel, the eye dialect of the source text suffers. If certain translation methods had been used more liberally in the translation process, more of the original meaning of the eye dialect might have been preserved in the target text. For example, think of the following translation methods: the maintenance of linguistic markers signalling a variety; the shifts from non-standard variety A to non-standard variety B, and standard variety to non-standard; the use of two or more variants of the target language; the use of a non-standard variety of the target language; the creation of a synthetic language variety in the target language; or the addition of linguistic markers signalling a variety. If these methods had been

used more extensively, the original intentions of the eye dialect in *Dracula* might then have also been carried over to the target text more clearly.

However, it must be reiterated that the translation of eye dialect is a difficult task. Researching dialects is time-intensive and often quite challenging. As many literary translators work under tight deadlines, researching dialects is not always a justifiable use of the time they are allotted for a translation. Furthermore, it is often difficult to find dialects in the target language that evoke the same associations for target readers as the original dialect does for readers of the source text. Therefore, while it certainly is beneficial to remind translators of the importance of eye dialect in texts, we cannot expect them to use eye dialect to the same degree as the source texts. Still, it is important that translators are at the very least aware of eye dialect, and that they have the appropriate tools, such as the methods described by Morini and Rosa et al., to deal with it.

Finally, it must be mentioned that this study only investigated two very small fragments of the novel *Dracula*. If other instances of the use of eye dialect had been selected for study, the results might have been very different. It might, for example, be discovered that Piet Verhagen did indeed use the remaining translation methods described by Morini and Rosa et al. that were previously stated to be missing from his translations. Future research on the translation of eye dialect, whether on this text or on literary texts as a whole, would do well to keep this in mind. Such research might benefit from investigating a broader array of textual fragments from these same two texts, or other texts of a similar nature. This would either help support the findings of this paper or would result in surprising new findings that might better prepare future translators for the task of translating eye dialect.

Conclusion

This thesis has attempted to provide insight into the use of eye dialect in the novel *Dracula*, its Dutch translation, and the translation methods that have been utilized to achieve this target text. It has been found that eye dialect plays an important role in the novel; it provides extratextual information about the characters who use this non-standard form of language, but it also adds a narrative layer of tension between Count Dracula and his adversaries. While Piet Verhagen's Dutch translation does still contain eye dialect, it only partially fulfills these same roles, as the target text does not represent any particular dialects of Dutch. Instead, it primarily provides readers of the novel with a written reproduction of spoken, also known as connected speech, standard Dutch. Piet Verhagen used the following translation methods to create these eye dialectal spellings in his target text: creating a synthetic version of the target language, standardizing the non-standard speech variety, using a non-standard variety of the target language to supplement the non-standard variety of the source text, adding linguistic markers to signal a non-standard speech variety; shifting from a substandard to a standard language variety; shifting in the opposite direction from a standard to a substandard variety; and shifting from one substandard variety (A) to another (B). From the translation methods that can be used to translate non-standard language varieties, such as eye dialect, as described by Massimiliano Morini and Alexandra Assis Rosa et al., he did not appear to use the following: the maintenance of linguistic markers signalling a variety, the omission of linguistic markers signalling a variety, and using two or more variants of the target language.

As a result of the translation methods that Piet Verhagen elected to use in his translation of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, the eye dialect used in the Dutch target text only partially reflects the function and meaning that it holds in the source text. As the target text does not use eye dialect to represent any specific Dutch dialects, the extratextual information that is provided by the stereotypes that the use of dialects carries is removed. Therefore,

readers of the Dutch target text do not have access to the same suggested information about Thomas Bilder and Mr. Swales that readers of the source text do. Furthermore, it is an important element of *Dracula* that its main characters are interested in and accepting of the use of dialect, which is represented by how they routinely choose to use eye dialect to represent these dialects. Because of this, they place themselves in opposition to Count Dracula, who asks Jonathan Harker to “tell me when I make error, even of the smallest” in his use of English (Stoker, 1897/2019, p. 33). If the use of eye dialect is removed or reduced, as it was in the Dutch translation that was selected as the topic of study of this paper, this additional layer of opposition is removed.

The research process of this paper made it abundantly clear that more research needs to be done on the use of eye dialect in Dutch literary texts. It is important to examine more Dutch literary texts, both old and new, to understand how eye dialect is used, what effect it has on the story, and how it is received by Dutch readers. Furthermore, the translation of eye dialect from and into Dutch must be researched in more detail. By researching this topic more deeply, it may be discovered why the use of eye dialect in Dutch texts — whether original or translated — appears to be so uncommon, and it might even be discovered that it is less uncommon than previously thought. This would help create a better understanding of the Dutch literary sphere, and perhaps even open it up to new developments, increasing the use of eye dialect and giving more readers insight into the wonderful world of dialects.

This paper has aimed to be a small stepping stone on the path toward greater awareness of eye dialect in Dutch texts, and especially in translation. By studying the use and translation of eye dialect in only one text, this study hopes to inspire future researchers to pursue similar analyses in this or other literary texts. The use and translation of eye dialect should be celebrated and encouraged, as it provides readers with a richer, more immersive linguistic experience that better reflects the diversity of real-life speech. By researching eye

dialect, its translators, and the readers who consume it, we can gain a clearer understanding of how eye dialect connects language and culture — not just as a way to make writing more interesting, but as a way to make texts more meaningful.

Sources

- Aarts, B. (2014b). Clitic. In *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199658237.001.0001>
- Afeared, adj. (2023). In *Oxford University Press eBooks*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oed/1704406228>
- Algeo, J. (1974). Syncope in English. *South Atlantic Bulletin*, 39(4), 22.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3198226>
- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies — Implications and applications. In *John Benjamins Publishing Company eBooks* (p. 233).
<https://doi.org/10.1075/z.64.15bak>
- Bernardini, S., & Ferraresi, A. (2011). Practice, description and theory come together – normalization or interference in Italian technical translation? *Meta Journal Des Traducteurs*, 56(2), 226–246. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1006174ar>
- Brett, D. (2009). Eye Dialect: Translating the Untranslatable. In *Lost in Translation. Testi E Culture Allo Specchio*.
- Britain, D. (2009). One foot in the grave? Dialect death, dialect contact, and dialect birth in England. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2009(196–197).
<https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2009.019>
- Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1439–1465.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(99\)00094-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(99)00094-6)
- Cole, A. (2021). Disambiguating language attitudes held towards sociodemographic groups and geographic areas in South East England. *Journal of Linguistic Geography*, 9(1), 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jlg.2021.2>

- Collins, B. D., & Mees, I. (2003). *The phonetics of English and Dutch* (Fifth Revised Edition). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047402503>
- Cooper, P. (2025). *Yorkshire dialect in the nineteenth century: Enregisterment, Authenticity, and Identity*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003424925>
- Delabastita, D. (2014). Chapter 1: Thrilled by Trilby? Dreading Dracula? Late-Victorian thrillers and the Curse of the Foreign Tongue. In *The Voices of Suspense and Their Translation in Thrillers* (Vol. 39). Brill. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1163/9789401210690_004
- Donaldson, B. C. (1983). *Dutch: A Linguistic History of Holland and Belgium*. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/dona001dutc02_01/dona001dutc02_01.pdf
- Driessen, G. (2006). Ontwikkelingen in het gebruik van streektalen en dialecten in de periode 1995-2003. *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen*, 75, 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttwia.75.10dri>
- Du, X. (2012). A brief introduction of Skopos theory. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(10). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.10.2189-2193>
- Edwards, J. G. H. (2011). Deletion of /t, d/ and the Acquisition of Linguistic Variation by Second Language Learners of English. *Language Learning*, 61(4), 1256–1301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00672.x>
- Elision. (2025). In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/elision>
- Elliot, M., Fairweather, L., Olsen, W., & Pampaka, M. (2016). Purposive sampling. In *A Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

- Ferguson, C. (2004). Nonstandard language and the cultural stakes of Stoker's Dracula. *ELH*, 71(1), 229–249. <https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.2004.0015>
- Fox, S. (2017). Chapter 10: Cockney. In *The History of English: Varieties of English* (Vol. 5, pp. 187–209). De Gruyter.
- Goeman, T., & Jongenburger, W. (2009). Dimensions and determinants of dialect use in the Netherlands at the individual and regional levels at the end of the twentieth century. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2009(196–197). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2009.016>
- Grondelaers, S., Van Hout, R., & Steegs, M. (2009). Evaluating regional accent variation in standard Dutch. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 29(1), 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x09351681>
- Internationaal*. (n.d.). Nijntje. Retrieved April 25, 2025, from <https://www.nijntje.nl/internationaal>
- Kraaykamp, G. (2005). Dialect en sociale ongelijkheid: Een empirische studie naar de sociaal-economische gevolgen van het spreken van dialect in de jeugd. *Pedagogische Studiën*, 82, 390–403. <http://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/54665/54665.pdf>
- Leppihalme, R. (2014). The two faces of standardization: on the translation of regionalisms in literary dialogue. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 117–140). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315759999-8>
- Lung, R. (2000). Non-standard language in translation. *Perspectives*, 8(4), 267–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2000.9961395>
- Matthews, P. (2014). The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199675128.001.0001>

- Matthews, W. (1938). Cockney Past and Present: A Short history of the Dialect of London. In *Notes and Queries* (Vol. 174, Issue 16, pp. 286–287). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/174.16.286>
- McArthur, T., & Lam-McArthur, J. (2018a). Syncope. In L. Fontaine (Ed.), *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199661282.001.0001>
- McArthur, T., & Lam-McArthur, J. (2018b). Analogy. In L. Fontaine (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press eBooks.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199661282.001.0001>
- McArthur, T., & Lam-McArthur, J. (2018c). Epenthesis. In L. Fontaine (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press eBooks.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199661282.001.0001>
- McQuaid, G. A. (2017). A comprehensive survey of a-prefixing in Southern Appalachia. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 11(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12242>
- Morini, M. (2006). Norms, Difference, and the Translator : Or, how to Reproduce Double Difference. *Revue Des Littératures De L'Union Européenne*, 4, 123–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1400/102323>
- Ohala, D. K. (1999). The Influence of Sonority on Children's Cluster Reductions. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 32(6), 397–422.
- Omrop Fryslân. (2019, February 18). Populariteit van “Nijntje” in diverse streektalen neemt toe. *Omrop Fryslân*. <https://www.omropfryslan.nl/nl/nieuws/869286/populariteit-van-nijntje-in-diverse-streektalen-neemt-toe>

- Orton, H., & Dieth, E. (1962). Survey of English Dialects. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue Canadienne De Linguistique*.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100019575>
- Paver, A., Wright, D., Braber, N., & Pautz, N. (2025). Stereotyped accent judgements in forensic contexts: listener perceptions of social traits and types of behaviour. *Frontiers in Communication*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1462013>
- Polcz, K. (2016). Standardization as Manipulation in Film Translation. *Audiovisual Translation: Dubbing and Subtitling in the Central European Context*, 23–33.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Karoly-Polcz/publication/320383903_Standardization_as_Manipulation_in_Film_Translation_Audiovisual_Translation/links/59e0e530458515393d4f1baa/Standardization-as-Manipulation-in-Film-Translation-Audiovisual-Translation.pdf
- Pronouns: reflexive (myself, themselves, etc.). (2025). In *Cambridge-grammatica*.
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/nl/grammatica/brits-grammatica/pronouns-reflexive-myself-themselves-etc>
- Ramos Pinto, S. (2009). How important is the way you say it?: A discussion on the translation of linguistic varieties. *Target : International Journal of Translation Studies*, 21(2), 289–307. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.21.2.04pin>
- Robinson, F. K. (1876). A glossary of words used in the neighborhood of Whitby.
<http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA57659445>
- Rosa, A. A., Falcão, L., Mouta, R., Sengo, S. V., & Botas, T. (2011). Luso-Canadian Exchanges in Translation Studies: Translating Linguistic Variation. *Anglo Saxonica*, 3, 39–68.

http://alexandra.assisrosa.com/HomePage/Publications_Publicacoes_files/Assis-Rosa-et-al-2012.pdf

streektalen groot succes. (n.d.). Nijntje. Retrieved March 17, 2025, from

<https://www.nijntje.nl/nieuws/streektalen-groot-succes>

Stoker, B. (2019). *Dracula*. Penguin Random House UK. (Original work published 1897)

Stoker, B., Eighteen-Bisang, R., & Miller, E. R. (2008). Bram Stoker's notes for *Dracula*. In

McFarland eBooks. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB07349126>

Toury, G. (1995). Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond. In *Benjamins translation*

library (1st ed.). J. Benjamins Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.4>

Trudgill, P. (1990). *The dialects of England*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA44233134>

Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (1982). *International English*. (Vol. 1). Edward Arnold.

Upton, C. (2004). Received Pronunciation. In *A Handbook of Varieties of English: A*

Multimedia Reference Tool. De Gruyter Mouton.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197181-016>

Van Bezooijen, R., & Ytsma, J. (1999). Accents of Dutch. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 13,

105–129. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.13.07bez>

Van De Velde, H., & Van Hout, R. (2000). N-deletion in reading style. *Linguistics in the*

Netherlands, 17, 209–219. <https://doi.org/10.1075/avt.17.20van>

Vukasojević, S., & Perošević, S. (2024). Elision and Weak Forms as the Manifestations of

Connected Speech in Everyday English. *Journal Of Philology and Intercultural*

Communication Revue De Philologie Et De Communication Interculturelle, 8(2), 42–

54. https://jpic.mta.ro/assets/JPIC_Vol.VIII_Nr.2.pdf#page=43

- Walpole, J. R. (1974). Eye dialect in fictional dialogue. *College Composition and Communication*, 25(2), 191. <https://doi.org/10.2307/357177>
- Watt, D., Levon, E., & Ilbury, C. (2023). Accent Bias. In *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Prescriptivism*. Routledge.
- Wells, J. C. (1982). *Accents of English I: An Introduction*. <https://www.amazon.com/Accents-English-Introduction-J-Wells/dp/0521297192>
- Xia, Y. (2014). *Normalization in translation: Corpus-based diachronic research into Twentieth-century English–Chinese fictional translation*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.