

Not so uncanny after all:

Bram Stoker's *Dracula* in translation

Tina Resch



Master thesis in Comparative Literature / ILOS

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

May 2011

NOT SO UNCANNY AFTER ALL:

BRAM STOKER'S *DRACULA* IN TRANSLATION



Illustration inspired from the 1992 motion picture *Bram Stoker's Dracula*, source:
<http://www.holistix.org/person/mz/album-mz-eng.html>

© Tina Resch, 2011

Not so uncanny after all: Bram Stoker's *Dracula* in translation

Tina Resch

<http://www.duo.uio.no/sok/work.html?WORKID=118295>

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

What is the cost of translation? This is the essential question of this thesis. Comparing three interdependent texts, namely a Victorian novel and its Norwegian and German translations, is the means by which an answer to that question shall be given.

Bram Stoker's 1897 novel *Dracula* is today one of the standard works of Gothic fiction. Modern vampire fiction shows clear references to Stoker's original work. Also translation of the text is an intertextual act of interpretation and reference. But do the existing Norwegian and German translations of the text do justice to the original work?

Dracula, being a complex work, composed of diverse texts, albeit edited by a more or less unknown editor. This complexity asks a lot of the reader – and the translator – who has to (re-)construct the plot during the reading process. The reader is confronted with different media, different genres and different registers of languages use in this one *fin-de-siècle* novel.

Additionally, the novel's *then* from 1897 has to be realised in the reader's *now* of 2011, which is a challenge as well: to what degree shall the original text be transported to the reader's *now*, and to what degree has the reader to be led back to the novel's *then*?

Vampire fiction, nowadays being a popular genre following in the wake of Stoker's 1897 novel, has over the years contributed to an increasing degree of simplification concerning the vampire motif. This has apparently left its traces also in the works of translations of the text: a lot of the original's ambiguity, one has to conclude, is reduced or even lost in translation.

In order to prove this claim, the argumentation will approach the problem from two sides: Firstly, the complexity of the original will be demonstrated, with special focus on media, genre and use of language – the text itself is challenged. Secondly, selected text excerpts will be compared to their respective translations – in order to challenge the theory.

Stoker's ambiguous literary work seems to be outsmarting its translators – or is simply in need of a new translation both in Norwegian and in German.

Preface

When deciding to examine the problems of translation, it is easy to fall for the temptation to judge the entire business of text translation as “impossible”. Translation, always being an act of interpretation itself, is always only approaching the original text that is being translated. With every single translation done on one particular text, chances increase for “getting a bit closer” to the original text than the previous translation did – yet, translations can never be a one-to-one copy of an original text.

However, it is impossible to expect every possible reader of literature to learn every existing language in the world in order to read all texts in their respective original language. In other words, we *need* translations. And there are even examples of translation making it easier to understand a certain text: reading Kant is supposed to be “easier” in the English translation than in the German original. This is due to the German nature of constructing long, embedded sentences which at times can be hard to follow from the beginning to the end. The fact that this phenomenon is not common in English forced the translator to separate one “original” sentence into several translated sentences, thus making it easier to follow Kant’s complex argumentation. This example illustrates how helpful translation can be.

In fiction, however, as opposed to non-fictional texts, the problem of translation is a different one: here, not only the *meaning* of words and phrases has to be maintained, but also literary stylistics needs to be considered: a Victorian English novel has to remain somehow “old-fashioned” also in translation, even though the translation is done “today”. A person speaking a thick dialect creates a different image than a speaker of what is regarded as “standard” language. There are many other examples of what a “good” translation “should” consider and maintain in order to do justice to the original. But languages differ, amongst other things, in their variety of synonyms: while there are a certain number of words for describing, for example, a certain colour in one language, there might be fewer synonyms for the same colour in a different language. Of course, this is only one example for the possible differences in lexicon in various languages. But it illustrates how easily a translator can be confronted with difficulties translating a text from one language to another.

In this thesis, I compare Bram Stoker’s novel *Dracula* to one Norwegian and one German translation – English, Norwegian and German are languages which are considered to be fairly “close” to each other. And yet, even though the languages are “close” to each other, problems occur. Dialects and sociolects, as well as other language variations, are an important

element in Stoker's novel, and an extra challenge to the translators. Unfortunately for the translators, the original text appears to be too big a challenge – there are several aspects that serve as “negative” examples of translation, regardless of the obstacles the translators had to overcome. After all, literary translations have to “re-create” the original's atmosphere, and in the case of *Dracula*, a lot of the original's ambiguity and “liveliness” has been lost during the translating process. Hopefully, future translators of Stoker's Victorian classic will manage to maintain the original's atmosphere, in order to make sure that Stoker's uncanny vampire Count will continue to haunt readers for a long time.

This being my second master thesis, I thank everybody involved in this process together with me: The Department for Literature And European languages (ILOS) for making this second thesis technically possible, my supervisor Jon Haarberg for his patience and guidance through the more often as not confusing writing process, Axel Ottenheim for spontaneous late-night phone discussions on the text in general, Arthur Jahnsen for help with the technical gremlins and Kåre Jon Lund for proof-reading and correction.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	11
2	The original	19
2.1	Media and gender	19
2.2	Genre	25
2.3	Language variation (dialects, sociolects, <i>patois</i> , gender)	31
3	Sociolects in translation	35
3.1	The Norwegian translation	36
3.2	The German translation	37
4	Dialects in translation	39
4.1	The Norwegian translation	40
4.2	The German translation	43
5	<i>Patois</i> in translation	47
5.1	The Norwegian translation	47
5.2	The German translation	48
6	Reading text and translation	51
6.1	Mina's journal	52
6.2	The Count's attack on Mina	57
6.3	Van Helsing	65
7	Conclusion	75
	Bibliography	79

1 Introduction

Published for the first time in 1897, *Dracula*, although being probably the most popular work of vampire fiction, is not the first vampire novel. Neither was the book an immediate success at the time it was published, and it took almost sixty years after its publication before the first scholar took an academical look at it (Stoker / Klinger 2008:537). However, the novel is absolutely representative for its time, the Victorian period. And it is the only novel which gained its author, Abraham “Bram” Stoker (1847 – 1912) fame and success, unfortunately not in his own lifetime.

By the time he wrote the novel, Stoker had become close friends with the rising star-actor Sir Henry Irving, and was working as a manager in Irving’s Lyceum theatre. During his work there, he also established a close friendship with actress Ellen Terry, who is also mentioned in *Dracula*. Little is known about her, apart from the fact that she was a close friend of Stoker’s (and even rumored to have had a relationship beyond mere friendship with Stoker, see Maunder 2006: 103) and his short, but flattering mentioning of her in the novel. Throughout the novel, we find several hints leading back to Stoker’s life and relationships to his actual friends and work at the Lyceum theatre.

Stoker wrote several novels and short-stories, but never gained real success with any of them. *Dracula* however, being his first full-length novel (Maunder 2006: 44), became, as mentioned before, his biggest, and unfortunately only notable, success. Even though we cannot give one specific and definite reason why Stoker decided to write a vampire story, we can see that the figure of the count is influenced by Irving’s stage performances. And since Stoker – voluntarily – more or less spent his life in Irving’s shadow, the vampiric undertones of the two men’s relationship are clearly visible, especially if Irving’s egoistical nature is considered (Maunder 2006:7).

Since Stoker usually spent his vacations in Whitby, the connection to the novel’s plot events in Whitby to Stoker’s biography is obvious. After all, Stoker knew not only the area and the local dialect well enough to give especially those events the needed amount of realism, but it was also in the local library he did most of his research for *Dracula*. After having read a book on Wallachian/Moldavian politics and history (the book’s title was *Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia with Political Observations Relative to Them* (London 1820), written by William Wilkenson), Stoker decided to borrow the name of famous Vlad ”Dracula” Tepes for his vampire count. However, Stoker’s count hardly shares much more than the name ”Dracula” with the actual Vlad

Tepes. Romanian mythology features many stories about vampires, so it comes as no surprise that Stoker let his vampire count originate from the area that at that time was known as Transylvania. Apart from that, "Dracula" – or, to be more correct, the word "dracul" – has two meanings in Romanian: "the dragon" or "the devil" – very suitable for a mystic vampire figure that is to haunt Victorian England.

Dracula tells the story of a group of Victorian England's upper class people who are confronted with a vampire count from Transylvania whom they have to fight. The first character we meet (via his diary) is Jonathan Harker, a newly qualified solicitor who is travelling to Transylvania in order to help Count Dracula in buying a real estate in London. We also learn that Harker is engaged to a woman he only refers to as "Mina", of whom we later learn that her full name is Wilhelmina Murray (later Harker). Other characters of what is later to become the London vampire hunting group are not mentioned in Harker's journal so far. The first four chapters exclusively consist of Harker's journal entries and tell about the events at castle Dracula. Harker meets the Count, soon learns that he is actually the Count's prisoner, and after an encounter with three female vampires (whether they are Dracula's wives, sisters or daughters is never clearly stated) of which he is saved by the Count himself, Harker barely makes his escape from castle Dracula. Even though he has been bitten, Harker is still ignorant of the fact that Dracula actually is a vampire – so his injuries are mistaken for a brain fever, as the nun and nurse Sister Agatha of the hospital in Budapest, who takes care of the weakened Harker, states in her letter to Mina. Between those two events (Harker's escape from castle Dracula and him being rescued by the hospital staff in Budapest), chapter five and the following chapters present the other characters of the novel to the reader. Mina's letters to her childhood friend Lucy Westenra and Lucy's answering letters introduce not only those two women to us, but also present us with Dr Seward, Arthur Holmwood and Quincey Morris, three men who all have proposed to Lucy. Lucy accepts Holmwood's proposal, but remains friends with the other two men, even though they have been turned down. An important side figure of the novel is Seward's patient, Renfield. We never learn in what way Renfield is connected to Dracula, but he clearly is. Renfield's actions of catching insects, spiders and later even birds (the animals ascend in size the farther the story continues, or, the closer Dracula gets to the main characters) work as an indicator of Dracula's actions, movements and the immediate danger that he represents to the main characters.

During the events of Harker's escape and what we learned about Mina and Lucy (i.e. during the time these letters are exchanged), Dracula heads for London. He obviously

travels by boat, since the log of the “Demeter”, a Russian vessel, notes strange encounters on board, and apart from that, is transporting “boxes containing mould” (we later learn from Van Helsing that vampires are bound to carry the original soil in which their bodies have been buried in, with them in order to maintain their undead existence). When the ship finally arrives in England, the crew has disappeared, and the captain is found dead. Observers report an animal, looking like a large dog, leaping from the ship – another hint of Dracula’s presence, since we also learn later that vampires have the ability of shape-shifting.

Soon after his arrival in London, Dracula starts attacking Lucy, but it soon becomes clear that his main target is Mina. However, Lucy, being a sleepwalker, is an easier victim for the Count than Mina, at least in the beginning.

With Lucy’s health rapidly vanishing, Seward seeks help of his former mentor, the Dutch professor Abraham Van Helsing. Van Helsing, being a man of science, does not abandon religion and spirituality, and thus quickly identifies the reason for Lucy’s state as the work of a vampire. He does, however, not disclose this to the other characters, as he is well aware of the fact that none of the others would believe him, Seward least of all. Despite all his efforts (amongst other things, several blood transfusions – ironically with blood donated by all the men involved, except Harker), Lucy dies after having been attacked by a giant wolf.

Shortly after Lucy’s burial, children reportedly get injured on their necks, after having met a “bloofer lady” (child lingo for “beautiful lady”), which soon turns out to be Lucy. Now the time has come for Van Helsing to let the other characters know what he knows about vampires. The obviously “undead” Lucy is the proof he needs to convince the others that he is right, and the former circle of friends worrying about Lucy are being transformed to what is generally referred to as “the vampire hunting party”, consisting of Seward, Quincey, Holmwood, Harker and Mina, all of them being led by Van Helsing.

The Count proves not easy to hunt down, and succeeds in attacking Mina several times. Once, he forces her to drink of his blood, thus establishing a telepathic bond between himself and Mina, in order to control her. The vampire hunting party eventually succeeds in using this bond against the Count, tracking his movements via Mina.

Eventually, the vampire hunters succeed in killing the count right before dawn, Quincey Morris being the only one who dies by the hands of gypsies which the Count had hired in order to stop the hunting party.

The novel closes with an optimistic ending, informing us that Harker and Mina have a son whom they name after all the men included in the vampire hunting party, and in honour of their dead friend refer to as “Quincey”.

Dracula is special in several ways; one rather important factor is without doubt its narrative structure. Instead of an omniscient narrator who tells the reader about the events in the novel, the reader is presented with letters, journal entries, newspaper articles and ship’s logs. Those papers are, however, being presented and disclosed by an editor. This editor only shows himself to the reader in a short text passage which is placed before the Author’s Preface (Klinger 2008: 4–5). We can be fairly sure about this editor being a fictionalized version of Stoker himself, since a work of fiction (which *Dracula*, without doubt, is) does not require a real preface by the author. Thus, the Author’s Preface is already a part of the novel, as well as the editor’s information about the order of the “following papers” (Klinger 2008: 4). In other words, the reader only gets to know what Stoker, or his editor-alter-ego, will let him know. In addition, the reader experiences the novel’s plot in a way together with the main characters, since it is their letters, diary entries and other papers he is reading. On the one hand, this brings the reader close to the main characters, on the other hand it keeps the reader at the same time at a certain distance, since whatever other personal thoughts or feelings the characters might have remain undisclosed as long as they are not mentioned in the text. The only advantage the reader has compared to the figures is the complete overview over all letters, journal entries and so on. By this, we are presented with fragments which are related to one another and after a while form a pattern that the reader has to (re-) construct himself.

Another outstanding element of the novel is its modernity: not only are typewriters used – at the time the novel was published, typewriters had just been introduced and were the most modern writing devices. In addition to typewriters, messages and notes are presented in shorthand, phonographic diaries, telegraphs, in short, we are presented with the latest news of technical devices for that time. Additionally, Van Helsing, a renowned scientist, and Dr Seward, his former student, represent the rational and scientific elements in the novel. Yet, Van Helsing does not abandon mystery – he is the one who informs the other figures about supernatural beings such as vampires. Stoker blurs out the lines between myth and rational science here.

Also the changing image of the woman is an element to be noticed. Mina (see below) combines the “best of both worlds” by being a well-educated, intelligent woman

who in spite of her abilities chooses deliberately to be subordinated to her fiancé. Thus, she is both a "good, Victorian" and a "new" woman.

Concerning the other characters (that is, apart from Dracula himself), we can see a clear "A versus B"-pattern: Dracula's direct antagonist is Van Helsing, the Dutch scientist. This character both shares elements with the Count as well as he is the one who leads to the Count's eventual defeat. Both Van Helsing and Dracula are foreigners in Victorian London, the one being a Dutch scholar with limited English skills, the other being a Romanian nobleman who, even though sporting a slight accent, speaks better English than his Dutch antagonist. Both are rather egoistic and one could nearly say reckless characters – Van Helsing's lack of care for his patients when he treats them is relatively similar to Dracula's uncanny and dominating behaviour.

Another contrast to the count is represented by Wilhelmina "Mina" Murray, later Harker. She is engaged to Jonathan Harker, a solicitor who travels to castle Dracula to help the count buying a real estate in London. Mina, being a modest, calm and very intelligent person, does not mind at all the role a woman has in Victorian England. Although she is Harker's assistant and, as we learn later in the novel, quite experienced in both handling a carriage and firearms, she only does what she has to – and completely accepts her somewhat submissive position. All she has learned in her life, all her abilities, are only used to both match her position in society and – perhaps most important of all – to support her fiancé Jonathan. The reader might wonder whether Jonathan is worth the effort, for at least in the beginning of the novel he appears to be rather a weak figure. He is strict concerning matters of social class, has little interest in cultural matters, although he is politely interested in foreign cultures (in other words, he shows a small amount of interest, yet this interest is not so strong as to motivate him to actually get informed any further by for example reading). Apart from that, he could be described as boring. However, he manages to break out of castle Dracula after having been held captive there for several days, and in spite of his weak physical condition, caused by the Count and his "sister-brides". When he realizes that Mina is in danger (of becoming the Count's victim), he does all he can to save her – which in the end makes him the most eager hunter of the vampire hunting group. Harker is, in other words, a character that undergoes a sort of developmental change in the story.

Another important character in the novel is Lucy Westenra, Mina's young childhood friend. Lucy is around 19 years old at the time of the events in the novel, and she behaves even more childish than is normally expected of a woman that young. Leslie

Klinger even describes her as stupid and ignorant of what is happening around her. Apart from that, she is beautiful and good-hearted, and very naïve. Having additionally the problem of being a sleepwalker, Lucy makes the perfect first victim for Count Dracula when he arrives in England.

The other men in the vampire hunting group, apart from Van Helsing, of course, are Dr. John Seward, a former student of Van Helsing's, Arthur Holmwood, who is engaged to Mina's childhood friend Lucy Westenra, and Quincey Morris, an American friend of the other characters, of whom we do not learn very much.

Dr Seward is a character with whom the reader does not have much sympathy: he is arrogant, treats his patients just as harsh and unsympathetic as Van Helsing does, is eager to gain fame and prestige in the scientific world, but not willing to put in a big effort in order to achieve his aim. This becomes especially obvious whenever he speaks or writes about Renfield, the madman that obviously is under Dracula's influence.

Arthur Holmwood, a very quiet character (Klinger: "Although he must have been educated in traditional schools, he knows little and says less." p. xlvi), is not very distinctly characterized in the novel. We know that he must be wealthy (and probably his wealth is his "purpose" in the vampire hunting party – after all, his money and his influence make certain operations easier, if even possible), and that he has been friends with Seward and Morris for some years. Apart from that, he is not exactly the most enthusiastic person: even though he successfully wooed Lucy just to lose her to Dracula even before they could marry, he does not appear to be too much out for revenge or anything of that sort.

Due to its immense popularity up to this day and its importance concerning the creation of the vampire motif in contemporary fiction, *Dracula* has been translated into various languages. But to what degree do the translations re-create the "original" Victorian setting for the reader? Or do they rather lead the reader to the original? This is what this thesis is going to investigate.

The only (available) Norwegian translation, by Bjørn Carling (1919 - 2005), is from 1974, and obviously, even though there are various editions of the novel available in Danish and Swedish, nobody found it necessary to re-translate Stoker's novel ever since. This is relatively unusual, since no translation can ever be regarded as "definite" edition of an original text. Translation is always interpretation and "re-telling" of the original text, which means that the output varies to a certain degree from translator to translator. Yet, there was only this one edition of a Norwegian translation available. Even though featuring an afterword, this edition contains no information whatsoever on the translator. A preface

on the translation does not exist, either¹. This article does not feature much information on Carling: he was a crime fiction writer himself, and a journalist. Apart from that, he published the first overview over Norwegian crime fiction, for which he is mostly known, as well as translations of American crime fiction and, of course, his translation of *Dracula*.

Concerning the German translation, there was a larger variety of editions to be found. Here, picking the most recent edition (2009) was the most natural choice. However, this thought soon proved itself as being wrong – the edition is the most recent one, but the book’s appendix clarifies that the actual translation was made in 1926, having been only adapted to the most recent rules of German spelling. Nevertheless, as a benefit, the edition chosen for this thesis contains, apart from the main text, a summary from the recent edition of *Kindlers Literaturlexikon*, the German standard lexicon on literature in general. Unfortunately, neither in the additional summary nor anywhere else do we find any information on the translator². Just as the Norwegian edition does the German edition not feature a preface on the novel’s translation, or an afterword or commentary on the translator and his work.

How did the translators capture this Victorian classic? The original text is still as uncanny and haunting today as it was at the time it was first published. Do the translations do justice to Stoker’s complex work? The challenge is strong: given the fact that the novel consists of different text genres, different media and different language registers, the reader has already quite a task to accomplish, namely constructing the plot him- or herself during the reading process. In addition, we must not forget that *Dracula* is a novel from the Victorian period – which means that the novel’s *then* has to be realized in the reader’s *now*: maintaining the “Victorian tone” for a modern-day reader of a different language and culture is the main challenge for any translation of this novel.

As we shall see, a lot of the novel’s complexity and ambiguity is lost or reduced in the translations. My argumentation will be approaching the problem in two main steps: firstly, I shall present the original text’s complexity, with particular respect to media, genre and language variation. Secondly, I will directly compare selected text excerpts to their respective Norwegian and German translations.

¹ The only information to be found on the translator is a small entry on the Norwegian site of Wikipedia: http://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bj%C3%B8rn_Carling, last checked: November 28, 2010.

² Even contacting the publisher only earned a reply of regret, but “the only information the company has on the translator is that he also translated Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*”.

By means of these two ways of approaching the problem of translation, I shall present the complexity of the original and show to what degree the ambiguous novel of 1897 is literally outsmarting its translators – until now.

2 The original

The novel's plot is set in Victorian England and Transylvania. The data on time and place already tell us a lot about the language of the novel: the rise of industrialization, a revival of religious activity, the highly formal conventions of social behavior – all these factors have made their mark on the language of the period. The people were crossing borders from tradition on the one hand and new concepts on the other (for example concerning the role of the woman in society), and their language varied with them.

Since *Dracula* is a composite novel, consisting of texts belonging to different media and genres, the language is only transported to the reader in form of letters, diary entries, newspaper articles and so on – never in direct speech (even dialogues are only re-told, not rendered directly as mimesis). Thus, for investigating the language of the novel, we have to examine the different forms of (written) communication between the novel's characters.

2.1 Media and gender

As Friedrich Kittler puts it, “[W]hat is to be found of people is always that which the media have saved and reproduce.” (Kittler 2009:63, my translation³)

Friedrich Kittler, born in 1943, is a German literary critic and media theorist. His works deal mainly with the role of media and technology within literature. Especially his essay *Dracula's Legacy* (the original German title is *Draculas Vermächtnis*), written in 1982, investigates the influence of media and technology on the fictional world of *Dracula*. The above quote points out the very nature of the novel: the different media are our only reference to the novel's characters, their interactions, thoughts and feelings. We cannot possibly know any more than what is revealed to us within the text and through the different media.

In the case of *Dracula*, the reader is confronted with basically four different sorts of media: handwriting (Mina's and Lucy's letters to each other, Harker's shorthand, sister

³ Original: "Av folk finnes alltid kun det som mediene lagrer og gir videre."

Agatha's handwritten letter to Mina), typewriter (Mina's diary, Mina's letters to Van Helsing), printed media (newspaper articles), and telegrams (being more or less "in between" the classification of media and genre; more on this in the following subchapter). In order to analyze the media and their functions, I will have to name the different genres as well, even though I shall take a closer look at the genres in the next subchapter.

Following Kittler's argument that "[A]lso handwriting, before it ended in libraries, was a medium. The fact that it also was [a form of] technology, was simply forgotten by the archaeologist." (Kittler 2009:71, my translation⁴), I draw the conclusion that media – in whichever form they might appear – are also technologies at the same time. Kittler continues: "Simpler, but no less technological than the future's fiber-optical cables, handwriting simply served as the medium – the term medium did not exist. Whatever was being reproduced, had to go through the filter of letters and ideograms." (Kittler 2009:71–2, my translation⁵)

In other words, despite the fact that handwriting is not as technologically complex as more recent media technology, handwriting is no less a medium and technology. The essential difference between the technology of handwriting and "other" technologies is, according to Kittler, that handwriting (and other forms of writing) only preserves the very same writing, nothing more, nothing less. Kittler traces this conclusion back to the pre-scriptive era, where folk tales, sagas and other historical encounters were passed on orally. Due to the development of writing systems, these "pre-scriptive" events could in the end be preserved after all, even though by then it was no longer possible to verify their true origin or contents (Kittler 2009:73–4).

Dracula presents us with several other technologies, one very important one being the technology of mechanically produced text by typewriter. As Kittler points out, the word "typewriter" itself "[...] is ambiguous. The word meant both typing machine and female typist; [...]" (Kittler 1999: 183). Thus, the term is not only referring to the technical device with which – mostly female – typists were producing their texts, but also to the very person using the machine. In a sense, human being and machine have become one – at least by name. Given the fact that machine-writing is generally regarded as less personal

⁴ Original: "Også skriften, før den havnet i bibliotekene, var et medium. At den også var en teknologi, ble rett og slett glemt av arkeologen."

⁵ Original: "Enklere, men ikke mindre teknisk enn fremtidens lysoptiske kabler, fungerte skriften som mediet rett og slett – begrepet medium fantes ikke. Hva som enn ble overført, måtte gjennom filteret av bokstaver og ideogrammer."

than handwriting, less individual and rather based on benefits and practical usability than on personality, typewriting quickly gets identified as “not (as) human (as handwriting)”. Handwriting, being relatively individual for each human being, is compared to typewriter-written texts more intimate, one might say more “direct” than mechanically produced texts.

Working on a typewriter has changed the very act of writing: firstly, typing is faster than handwriting, provided that the typist is trained. Speed is thus placed above intimacy. By this, the value of the very text has changed, too: instead of investing time and effort more or less exclusively for writing down something which is worth the effort, now so to say everything can be written down in an instant. Whether it is a letter, a literary text, or records of for example accounting or the likes, does not matter – the typewriting machine will produce any sort of text on paper, regardless of the contents.

Secondly, not only the content does not matter anymore, but also the producer of the text is becoming anonymous. This means that whoever is able to write whatever, without being discovered as the producer of the text. In the late 1800s, this opened various possibilities especially for women. Very soon, women were trained and working as typists, writing down what men dictated them – the very act of text creation was still exclusively reserved for men, but nobody objected to women taking over the very act of storing the text on paper in order to assist the male text creators. Writing thus became a “shared” action: men created the texts, women produced them on paper (Kittler 1999: 184). Soon, however, made possible by the anonymity of typing a text, women started to publish their own texts, often safely hidden behind pseudonyms. After a while, not even the pseudonyms were necessary any more (Kittler 1999: 221), and women were able to publish their own texts openly. In other words, the typewriting machine contributed largely to the emancipation of female writers – perhaps even made them possible.

Another aspect of the typewriter is, as I outlined before, the distance and lacking “personality” of a text produced mechanically: Kittler points out that “[O]nly that typed love letters [...] aren’t love letters.” (Kittler 1999:214). This means that intimate texts, such as love letters, are becoming mere texts without any intimacy whatsoever when they are produced with a typewriter rather than written by hand. Kittler gives us various examples on this point, one of them being Franz Kafka’s typed “love” letters to Felice Bauer (the relationship, almost needless to mention, did not last, the engagement was terminated). By this, Kittler highlights his point that texts produced by machines are “less human” because they are less personal and less intimate than handwritten texts.

This leads to a certain difference in text quality concerning Mina Harker's texts in *Dracula*: On the one hand, Mina transcribes (and possibly also edits) Harker's shorthand diary entries and thus discloses them to the reader. She also writes letters to figures such as Van Helsing, clearly keeping a certain distance between herself and the stranger Van Helsing. She does, however, write letters by hand to her childhood friend Lucy Westenra, which emphasizes the closeness and intimacy between the two women. Mina has thus three different roles in the novel: firstly, she is her husband's assistant, transcribing his texts and disclosing them to the reader with a cool distance, not allowing anybody to intrude on her private life. Secondly, she is a woman with her own feelings and thoughts, disclosing them "only" to her close childhood friend (it is rather remarkable that Mina even keeps her own journal *not* in handwriting). Thirdly, she is a dutiful Victorian Woman, contributing as much as she can within her powers to help the vampire hunting party.

We can see similar features in the documents of Dr Seward: as a man of science, he likes to use new technologies, such as typewriters and phonographs. He is using technology in order to make the very act of storing information as convenient and easy as possible for him, in order to be able to fully concentrate on his work as a doctor. Seward ranks emotions at best on second place; first and foremost, he is a man of science, who does not allow himself to be distraught by emotions. The phonograph does, however have the advantage of recording human voice. Even though the phonograph only records and reproduces, the fact that a human voice, including the whole scale of emphasis, tone and so on can be stored and reproduced, represents an advantage to the typewriter – not only words, but also the way they are spoken can be stored and reproduced. Thus, the phonograph is actually more personal than the typewriter, for it makes it possible to capture tone of voice as well as the mere information transported by the words. Still, the phonograph is, like the typewriter, creating a distance between the producer of the text and the produced text. By recording a voice, it is no longer necessary that the speaker is present when the text (or rather, the recording) is being reproduced. Thus, information can be transmitted to a distant person, making it unnecessary for the speaker to be at the same place at the same time as the listener. Apart from that, the very message is not necessarily personal any more: whoever owns the technical device to play the formerly recorded message, will be able to listen to it – thus the texts recorded on phonograph are no longer exclusively directed to a certain listener in particular. But as easy as phonographic recordings can be made and stored, they can also just as easily be destroyed. Kittler reminds us that only Mina's transcriptions of the phonographic recordings are the ones that

are – because stored away safer than the actual phonographs – remaining in the end (Kittler 1993:44). The transcription, however, removes the individuality of the voice from the recording: what was spoken is being written down on paper – again by typewriter. Thus, the individual element of a voice recording disappears due to the written transcription.

The sheer fact that both Mina Harker and Dr Seward use modern technology to produce their texts, leads Kittler to the conclusion of calling them a “fictional desk couple” (Kittler 1999:220), even though the two figures do not have a personal or even intimate relationship to one another, apart from being friends. But Kittler continues that “[D]esk couples have replaced literary love pairs.” (Kittler 1999:220), meaning that in a world where the human act of writing can be replaced by machines, human emotions matter less than they did before. Where text production is made easier, more convenient and less personal, the value of the very emotion behind a text is sinking proportionally.

According to Kittler, technological progress changes society, especially the role of women. He outlines that “[U]nder the media – technological circumstances of 1890, women have two options: typewriter or vampirism.” (Kittler 1993:39, my translation⁶). Given the context of time and technological progress, this appears to be true, at least within the context of *Dracula*. In Mina and Lucy we see where those two options lead to: one of them survives, the other one has to be killed. In a way, this means for the figures (and the people of that time) either to adapt to new technologies, or to fall behind. And even though Mina basically agrees with the classical role as subordinate wife to her husband, among other things by becoming in the end the mother she was intended to be, she still makes use of the technology in order to achieve her own aims.

This clearly shows that media and technology cannot be regarded isolated from the gender discussion: since the role of the woman has changed due to technological progress, and especially in the media-related technological progress, the entire media discussion is also a discussion of gender. And Mina is the best example to prove this: “...and Mina Murray, later Harker, [is] already in 1890 up to date concerning time and future. She derisively leaves the erotic dreams of free choice of partner to the so-called “modern women”; her own dreams are more practically centered around a typist career with her

⁶ Original: „Unter den medientechnischen Bedingungen von 1890 haben Frauen zwei Optionen: Schreibmaschine oder Vampirismus.“

future husband.” (Kittler 1993:30, my translation⁷). Mina, being perfectly comfortable with the role of the woman in society, is at the same time well-educated and intelligent and focused on “practical” things, instead of chasing romantic fantasies and dreams of many women of that time. Her “rebellion” against the Victorian role of women is not only more subtle, but also more sophisticated. She has long since realized that the true power belongs to the typists rather than to those who dictate to them. Instead of chasing romantic fantasies of “freedom”, she rather concentrates on becoming a skilful “assistant” to her husband, who, on the outside, holds the power. And she is proven right: not only does Jonathan suffer severely from the aftermath of having been the Count’s captive (punishment for leaving Mina behind?), but he is also so much in distress that he simply hands over his journals to Mina without even taking one more look at them (Kittler 1993:31).

Actually, Mina is the true key figure in the entire novel: without her, the vampire hunting party would have had no success whatsoever in hunting down the Count. Not only does she transcribe Harker’s journals, she also collects Lucy’s letters, newspaper articles, the ship’s log of the “Demeter” – in short, all documents the reader of the novel is presented with. Mina is also the one who transcribes Seward’s phonographic diaries – because Seward himself is not even able to find again any particular parts in his own recordings. Seward, the man of science, is more fascinated with new technologies than he is able to handle them properly. Mina, in contrast, learns very quickly to handle the new technology, by keeping one ear to the phonograph and her hands on the typewriter (Kittler 1993:42). In short, whenever secondary literature speaks of “the Harker papers”, the Harker in question is Mina, not her husband, for she is the one who collected, sorted and transcribed all the papers disclosed to the reader in the novel. Our half-fictional author (the one addressing the reader in the Author’s Preface) might have received the papers from Jonathan Harker, but the true compositor is Mina.

The last attempt of the men to keep the woman out of the vampire hunting business in chapter 21 even proves to be a vital error with nearly fatal consequences: while the men get the whole picture of what is going on out of the dying Renfield, they leave Mina unattended and unprotected. When they finally realize that Mina is the Count’s next target, they arrive only to witness the Count’s triumph for having not only bitten Mina, but also forced her to drink of his blood in turn – in other words, having made her “his”. At this

⁷ Original: “...und Mina Murray, nachmalige Harker, schon 1890 auf der Höhe von Zeit und Zukunft. Die erotischen Träume von freier Partnerwahl überließ sie höhnisch sogenannten „modernen Frauen“; ihre eigenen Träume kreisten sehr viel praktischer um eine Sekretärinnenstelle beim künftigen Gatten.“

point, it seems as if the male domination has won over the woman's liberation after all. But this triumph would also mean the destruction of all progress, since it is the Count and his "old" ways which are to be defeated by the modern English empire. Thus, the "male triumph" is at once marked to be negative, even for the men.

Van Helsing's sense of utilitarianism (one might also call it recklessness and ignorance of others) – as with Renfield – proves to be the only solution to this dilemma. The Count's established telepathic bond to Mina also works the other way around: Not only is the Count able to follow Mina whenever he pleases, but via hypnosis, the vampire hunting party can use Mina in precisely the same way. Again, Mina's usefulness is her weapon. As much as the men would like to maintain the old order of men being superior to women, they need Mina if they want to succeed in their task.

What does all of this tell us about Mina? Not only is she more intelligent and reasonable than most of her "fellow women", she also does not mind certain restrictions applying to women of her time, for she knows that in truth she is the one with the true power. After having realized how wrong it was to exclude her from the vampire hunting party, the men finally realize that Mina is their only chance to defeat the Count. When everything is over and done with, Mina returns to "her" position of wife, mother and loving assistant, yet still knowing that the weakened Harker will constantly need her. Mina does not mind that the superficial power belongs to her husband, for she is perfectly sure that in truth it is her who is the important element in both the novel's story and her own marriage. Klinger describes her as following: "A "man's brain" is the unfortunate description applied by Van Helsing to her intellect, but Mina has little patience with the "New Woman". Even though she is comfortable handling a carriage or a pistol, she clings to homely values and is willing to allow the men around her to put her on a pedestal." (Klinger, 2008:xliv). Her consent to the classical role of the woman – becoming a man's wife and mother of his children – does not mean that she is not independent and strong. In fact, she is not only independent, but also stronger than her husband, for she chooses her role herself.

2.2 Genre

The term *genre* describes the main and subordinate classes of literature; the three "main" classes being lyrical poetry, epical poetry and drama (Von Wilpert 2001:290–1).

Subordinate to these three main classes are respectively text types such as ode, hymn, or

elegy for the lyrical class, epos, novel, or novella for the epical class, epical or tragedy, comedy, or absurd comedy for the dramatic class (Lothe, Refsum, Solberg 2007:209–10). Those subordinate classes can again be divided into several subcategories, and so forth. In other words, *Dracula* belongs to the epical “main” category, being of the subcategory *novel*. This novel is a composite novel consisting of various subclasses (such as journal entry, newspaper article, letter and so forth) which, lastly, are the topic of this chapter. In order to avoid confusion, I shall refer to these latter subclasses as *genre*.

To begin with, the different genres presented to the reader in the novel, tell us something about the characters’ relations to each other: Harker uses a coded journal, well-knowing that Mina is able to read and transcribe his shorthand. Thus, he shares his personal journal with her, and – basically – with no one else. Mina and her friend Lucy exchange hand-written letters, which highlights their close friendship (otherwise, Mina uses the typewriter to correspond with other figures in the novel, see the above subchapter). The letters exchanged between Lucy and Mina are very intimate and personal ones. We learn from them that Mina and Lucy have known each other since they were children, that they are very close friends who know everything there is to know about each other’s lives, and that Lucy must be some years younger than Mina. Apart from that, the farther the plot moves on, these personal letters express and highlight the confusion of “the normal people” placed around the events of the novel. Neither Mina nor Lucy have had a medical education, and we shall see later that even this kind of knowledge is not helpful against the Count, or else Dr Seward would not have had to send for Van Helsing at all. In short, Mina and Lucy are just as ignorant of the Count’s true nature as everybody else would be, at least until the point of Van Helsing joining in. Thus, their letters are representative for the common people (i.e. people who have no “knowledge” about vampires).

Dr Seward, the man of science, keeps both a journal and a phonographic diary. This highlights his fondness of science and new technology, since phonographs were the most modern form of recording and storing whichever content (be it a journal, a work report or whatever else a person might want to record) at the time the novel was published. But even though he includes many notes related to his work in his journal, the journal itself is of a private nature. Seward’s thoroughness concerning his data on for example Renfield only highlights his personality of a man devoted to science.

The letters he writes are only to his colleagues, Dr Van Helsing and Dr Patrick Hennessy, in order to do whatever he can do to help his friends solving the mystical

encounters with the Count. Thus, even his letters are not exactly personal documents, but rather very formal ones. This is also highlighted by the fact that also Seward, just as Mina, uses the typewriter for producing his letters. The letters exchanged between Seward and Van Helsing are of a more formal nature than for example the letters between Mina and Lucy. Although Seward and Van Helsing have known each other for a long time (after all, Seward was Van Helsing's student), their relationship does not extend the typical "professor-student" – relationship. After all, Seward only sends for Van Helsing because he cannot find any solution on his own to save Lucy's life. Thus, even though everybody is writing in the polite and apparently "hearty" way, it is obvious that their definition of the term "friendship" is different from Mina's and Lucy's definition of that term.

Mina and Lucy both keep journals, too, and in contrast to for example Dr Seward, who keeps his journal partially for professional reasons (for example to keep track on Renfield's psychological development), their journals, being of a more private nature, highlight the general confusion that arose due to the events linked to the Count's stay in London by telling the reader about their personal feelings and thoughts. Both Mina's and Lucy's journal are even more personal than the letters they exchange. Since a journal is only meant for the eyes of the person who writes it, the journals tell us about the writer's personality, about their fears, wishes and thoughts. In short, via the journals, we learn about the character's personality. We learn how naïve Lucy really is, how considerate Mina is in contrast, and how different these two characters are in general.

One thing that is rather striking concerning the personal journals of Mina, Lucy and Harker is their large amount of details. Mina, for example, even bothers to quote a dialect that is not familiar to her (Klinger 2008:123–7). Apart from that, she generally seems to quote conversations word for word. This is rather unusual to be found in a journal. A journal is a very personal form of storing information, the purpose of keeping a journal is to note down and perhaps reflect on things that have happened in the journal writer's life, and a journal is not meant for any audience other than the journal writer. Thus, Mina's extremely detailed recordings of even such "unimportant" things as a person's dialect – especially one she is not even familiar with – is highly unusual.

The newspaper articles and interviews – although taken from fictional newspapers – work as "guarantors of reality". By having included printed stories from newspapers on the strange things happening to the novel's figures when the Count arrives in London, Stoker gives his story an air of realism. Especially since he mentions the actress Ellen Terry (chapter 13) when reporting about the "bloofer lady"-incidents: including a

real person in a fictional newspaper article enhances the means of realism in the text. One problem is however to be mentioned concerning the newspaper articles, or rather one article: the use of language in the very article is not typical for newspapers. I shall investigate this problem more detailed in the following subchapter. However, the newspaper article I just referred to contains an interview with a zookeeper and tells the reader about a wolf that had escaped from the zoo, and by the end of the interview, suddenly returns to the zoo as if nothing had happened. Putting together all information we get about vampires within the novel, the newspaper article “proves” that the Count is not able to shape-shift to whichever creature he likes. He actually had to “borrow” a wolf from the zoo. He could, however, obviously control the animal, but we do not learn that from the newspaper article. Instead, this fact is one of the many details the reader has to find out for themselves, more or less.

Another “enhancement” to realism is the ship’s log of the *Demeter*. When even a ship’s log, which is supposed to only report on facts such as how many items are on board, how many crewmembers are working or sick and the like, features notes on “strange encounters” happening on board, the story not only becomes more realistic, but also more uncanny at the same time. The log covers the time between July 6 and August 4; the accounts between July 6 and July 18 are written in retrospect. Within days, the neutral reporting style of the log gradually becomes more of a personal journal written by the ship’s captain.

It is rather important to mention that the ship’s log is actually incorporated into a newspaper article, which again has been “Pasted in Mina Murray’s Journal” (Klinger, 2008:137). The very ship’s log is thus presented to the reader via two “filters”, namely the newspaper article and Mina’s journal. Thus, the direct style of the ship’s log is made indirect reporting. The newspaper article provides the reader with an “epilogue” to the ship’s log, since the captain did not survive this journey. The whole text, newspaper article and incorporated ship’s log, is pasted into Mina’s journal. This can be interpreted as a form of confirmation of the story told, especially via Mina’s journal: by adding an “actual” newspaper article, the entire story becomes more trustworthy due to realism.

The reason for the varying use of letters and telegrams in order to communicate with each other is obvious: letters are either written to express personal feelings to the letter’s receiver, or to give a detailed “report” on past events, while telegrams have a more practical purpose and are used for “short-notice”-announcements. Other letters we find in the novel are solicitor’s letters which do not require immediate response. Those letters are

not important for the main story of the novel, but they enhance the notion of realism by giving the figures “a life apart from the main story”.

The “last” letter to mention is the one from the nun Sister Agatha from Budapest to Mina, informing her of Harker’s “sickness”. One might question why Sister Agatha did not send a telegram, since it was fairly urgent that Mina travels to Hungary to meet her sick fiancé. Then again, a telegram is too short of format to include all the information that Sister Agatha gave in her letter, so writing a letter was the right choice after all.

And then there are three memoranda; one written by Lucy, one by Van Helsing and one by Mina. Even though the memoranda are mainly intended to their writers themselves, just as the journals are, these memoranda have the format of letters to no one in particular. And similar to journal entries, the memoranda are of a very personal nature. Lucy’s last memorandum can almost be read like a farewell letter, written by a person who is aware that she is going to die soon (Klinger, 2008:219–22).

Since Van Helsing’s letters, telegrams etc. are mainly a subject to the investigation of *patois*, I will come back to them in the following subchapter.

The main problem with all those different genres has already been outlined in the subchapter above: Mina Harker is the true editor of all papers. Especially all “personal” papers, that is, all letters, journal entries, telegrams and memoranda, are not guaranteed to be authentic, since they all went through Mina’s hands and typewriter. It is Mina who put everything in the order we find in the novel, it is her who collected all documents and most importantly, transcribed all of them. And even the newspaper articles and the “Demeter’s” ship log might have been edited by Mina before they were put together with the other papers.

This leads to problems regarding the trustworthiness of the papers. If really everything has been edited by Mina, how much of what is told in the novel can actually be believed? Of course, there has to be an editor who presents the reader with the collected papers, who “tells” the story of *Dracula*. But still, the fact that one of the characters who have been directly involved in what happened, is the editor of the papers, makes it difficult to accept any authenticity concerning the papers. One could even go as far as to accuse Mina of having created the entire story to be a victorious one for her and her family. After all, it is the Harkers who survive all of the encounters with the Count, regardless of how dangerous and life-threatening the situations were for especially them (for example Harker’s being trapped in castle Dracula, or Mina being severely wounded and bound to the Count). Many of the “lesser important” characters lose their life, apparently on account

of the Count, but Mina and her husband are among the few who cope with everything of the story mysteriously well.

In short, we cannot be certain of how much of the papers have in fact been directly edited, deleted or rephrased by Mina, or to what degree any editing has taken place. Thus, we are facing a problem concerning the general trustworthiness of the “Harker papers”.

In order to stress my point concerning the trustworthiness, I separate the genres in two main groups: personal and official. Letters, journal entries, memoranda, telegrams and the likes, whether originally handwritten or not, belong to the first group. The newspaper articles and interviews, as well as the ship’s log, belong to the second group. Let us for a moment ignore the fact that Mina edited all these papers before disclosing them to the reader.

I have already outlined the characters’ personalities in the introduction, so I shall not repeat myself here. Most of what we learn about them is disclosed to us via their journals, letters and so on and only secondarily through their interactions with other characters. However, as I mentioned, the letters and journals tell us most about the characters’ personalities.

Harker’s journal, for example, tells us a lot about Harker as a person. Not only is he an eager, young and recently qualified solicitor who is rather enthusiastically starting off to Castle Dracula in order to “do a good job”, he is also, “[Al]though interested in foreign customs, [he is] prudish, lacking in intellectual curiosity, and fixed in his habits, with a rigid sense of class and propriety.” (Klinger 2008:xlvi). All this can be found out about him by reading his journal entries disclosed in the novel.

As a conclusion, we have observed that the different genres within the novel fulfill various purposes: some of them are means to enhance a certain perception of reality, such as the newspaper articles, others give us information about the characters’ background and personality. The level of style varies from typical Victorian formal style and dialect use, children’s language and patois to rather unusual language use within newspaper style. The mode of the text depends on the very sort of text: for obvious reasons, a journal entry is more narrative and subjective than a ship’s log, which by its very nature is more descriptive than narrative. And it is rather difficult to make any clear statement on the “intended” reader of all those documents: we know that Mina Harker is the editor of all papers. As readers, we only know what Mina decided to let us know. To begin with, each of the documents once had its originally intended readers: a ship’s log is

supposed to be read by harbor authorities and other ship's captains, owners and so on, but never by the public. A journal is only meant for the eyes of the person who writes it. Newspaper articles are addressed to the public in general, while letters and telegrams are addressed to one person in particular (namely the addressee). However, all this information on "who is supposed to read what" is not of any use, since we as readers are not only intruding in the characters' personal affairs, we are doing so because Mina, as an editor, collected and arranged the papers in the order we are reading them in *Dracula*. Thus Mina has not only taken the single texts from their original destinations and placed them in a different context, she has also disclosed them to extern persons, namely us, the readers.

2.3 Language variation (dialects, sociolects, *patois*, gender)

Even though set in an upper-class Victorian London environment, the language of the characters is quite heterogeneous. Not all of the novel's characters belong to this high social class, some are not from London, others are foreigners (Van Helsing), or children. This leads not only to varieties in sociolect and dialect, but also to "incorrect" use of the English language (the latter being hereafter referred to as *patois*). These varieties are consequently quoted "as heard" in the novel, which means that for example a dialect is written down as it sounds when spoken. By preserving dialects, sociolects and other varieties even in written form, Stoker generates a very realistic fictional world, where different characters "lead their individual lives", which makes them trustworthy and realistic within their fictional boundaries. Thus, language has within *Dracula* the same function as it has in reality as well: not only being a means of communication, language gives hints on social group identity and conventions common for a certain period. Stoker is not the first one to mark his figures by their language: as Erich Auerbach points out, writers as ancient as Petronius marked their figures by their use of language (Auerbach, 1959:34). Auerbach continues to point out the amount of realism which is created by this apparently simple stylistic technique: by letting a simple, uneducated figures speak their own jargon, including all the grammatical mistakes, all the clichés and other little imperfections, the image of the fictional world is becoming more realistic and less fictional – an imitation, or *Mimesis*, of reality (Auerbach, 1959:33–5).

Mina, Lucy, Harker, Morris, Holmwood and Seward do not only belong to the same social class (Victorian upper class), but are also familiar to each other, they are friends. Their sociolect is what connects them to each other. Apart from that, there are varieties that indicate the actual closeness to each other between certain characters: Harker and Mina communicate differently with each other than they would do with other characters of the novel. The letters between Mina and Lucy are more intimate than letters between Mina and, for example, Van Helsing: while Mina writes to “[M]y dearest Lucy”, she would never use a tone this intimate with Van Helsing, not even at later events.

The quoted Whitby dialect has the function of bringing the reader closer to Mina; by writing down what she heard, Mina presents the reader with the same problem she faced herself: not entirely understanding what the local, Mr. Swales, actually said to her. Only Klinger’s annotated version features a Whitby glossary in the appendix, which makes it easier – for the reader only – to understand the dialect. Readers of the “common” editions, though, might have trouble understanding what he said to Mina. Mina, on the other hand, appears to get along relatively well with understanding this dialect so unfamiliar to her. She admits once that “[...] I did not quite understand his dialect.” (Klinger 2008:125), but generally she seems to be perfectly able to keep the conversation going whenever she talks to Swales.

Another interesting variation is the quotation of Cockney in the novel. The Cockney part is to be found in a (fictional) newspaper article, which is uncommon. Newspapers usually feature a homogeneous language standard, in other words: they do not quote dialects as spoken, which makes it odd to find the zookeeper answering the interview questions in his Cockney dialect.

Another important factor is Van Helsing’s incorrect use of English. Being Dutch, he is marked by – in spite of his broad and highly sophisticated general knowledge – an incorrect use of the English language. This is slightly strange, precisely due to Van Helsing’s otherwise high level of education and knowledge. Klinger introduces him as “[...] the Dutch physician, philosopher, man of letters, lawyer, folklorist, and teacher Abraham Van Helsing.” (Klinger 2008:xliv) Why then has this sophisticated man a so poor knowledge of the English language? One possible reason may be that, by his poor English, Van Helsing is marked as the second foreigner apart from Dracula himself (who, ironically, has better knowledge of English than his Dutch antagonist). Van Helsing’s patois does, moreover, make him more human – despite his broad knowledge of many different sciences, he does not know *everything*. He is – in contrast to the count – no

supernatural and uncanny being that has powers beyond a normal mortal. However educated he may be, and however cruel his – eventually necessary – actions against the Count may at first glance appear to the other protagonists, by his *patois* Van Helsing represents the – at first glance weaker, but in the end victorious – human side in the fight against the supernatural creature Count Dracula.

The last aspect of language variation which has to be considered is the difference between male and female language – in other words, gender. Especially considering the temporal context of the novel – Victorian England, the beginning of industrialization – the difference in gender is an interesting aspect, not least because Stoker was often attested of having shaped the image of the so-called “New Woman” which is supposed to be typical for the *fin-de-siècle* context *Dracula* is set in. Whether Mina is the archetypical “New Woman” or not, she does clearly show features of individuality and emancipation which can be regarded as new for the time the novel was published. Not only is Mina intelligent and sophisticated, she is also having equal rights concerning her engagement (later marriage) with Harker. She is not only his spouse, but also his partner and assistant. She prefers homely values and gladly accepts the dominance of the men around her, but she chose this herself rather than having been forced into this position. And, as Klinger points out, she proves herself not only able in her occupation as an assistant school mistress, but she is also, as we have seen earlier, the strongest character in the novel. Given all these facts, Mina’s language may show different features than for example Lucy’s. Lucy, in contrast to Mina, is a typical, if slightly naïve young woman of her time. Knowing the formal social restrictions that apply to her as a woman, she – only in jest – wishes to revolt against the established structures, even though she never does. In the end, Lucy is a typical, upper-class girlish young woman who romantically dreams of taking the roles of old Shakespearean female characters, but who never so much as objects to the social structures that determine her all too short life. Apart from Mina and Lucy, Sister Agatha is the only other female character who appears directly (i.e. not being only named in other figures’ journal entries or else, but directly writing to Mina). Her being a nun, there are no surprises to be found in her use of language, except perhaps the fact that her English is without errors, even though she obviously is Hungarian. Thus, the contrast between Mina’s and Lucy’s use of language and the male characters’ English will be the main object of the investigation of gender-related language variation.

3 Sociolects in translation

Translating sociolects can be – at least in comparison to other language variations – regarded as a relatively easy task. A sociolect does not only refer to language variation in general (in contrast to a dialect), but also to direct speech acts in certain social environments. Sociolects include certain social codes agreed upon within the respective social classes; for example “upper class”-language and “lower-class” language. Sociolects are also often called “social dialects”, a term that is “more correct” in describing what they are. Sociolects are both determined by regional and social variations, thus they can be regarded as forms of dialect. Although I shall also present the phenomenon of dialect more specifically in the next chapter, I shall now point out the main characteristics of the term “dialect” in general, in order to discuss the term “sociolect” in specific.

Chambers and Trudgill point out that “[I]n common usage, of course, a dialect is a substandard, low status, often rustic form of language, generally associated with the peasantry, the working class, or other groups lacking prestige.” (Chambers / Trudgill 1980:3). This common definition would mean that both dialects and sociolects are generally associated with low standard language. From a linguistic point of view, this definition is wrong, but then again, novel readers are not necessarily linguists. And non-linguists still associate dialects and certain sociolects with low status. This “lack of education”, at least within spoken language, however, is precisely what makes language “alive”. In English, small “imperfections” such as the so-called *g-dropping* (not pronouncing the phoneme /g/ at the end of a word, such as in “doing” or “going”), for example, are rather characteristic for spoken language and cannot (yet) be regarded as truly “incorrect” use of language. Also contractions, such as *n’t*, *’ve*, or *’d* are - in certain contexts of spoken language – rather regarded normal than the “correct” *not*, *have* or *would* (Andersson/Trudgill 1990:23). It is important to differentiate between *accent* and *dialect*. What matters here is the use of *dialect*, especially in written language, since *Dracula* presents us with various written-down sociolects and dialects.

In any case, sociolects and dialects show us that a language is “alive”, that actual people are speaking and using it, and that their specific use of language presents us with some background information concerning social life, status and so forth.

This means that sociolects and dialects are important variations of language which should, if possible, be considered within translation.

As I pointed out earlier, the term *sociolect* can be substituted with the term *social dialect*. This means that a sociolect is nothing else than a dialect defined not by geographical, but by social parameters instead. The Victorian upper-class English of Mina and her friends is one example for a sociolect. Another example is the way that Seward and Van Helsing communicate with each other. Their sociolect is marked by a higher-than-average level of scientific terminology, for both are doctors of medicine.

Sociolects are, in other words, giving us information about not only the speaker's social class, but also about the relationship between two or more speakers.

Apart from that, "[A]ll dialects are both regional *and social*, since all speakers have a social background as well as a regional location." (Trudgill / Chambers 1980:54, my italics) – which means that we must not ignore the importance of social factors (such as background, interaction and the likes) within language.

3.1 The Norwegian translation

The Norwegian translation of the novel offers especially today's readers an equivalent to Stoker's Victorian English: the translators decided to use the language of *fin-de-siècle* Norway, approximately the same time period that the original *Dracula* was written in. This equivalence of time has two more or less immediate effects on the reader: for the first, by reading this old-fashioned Norwegian, the reader is presented with the novel's period through the language itself. For the second, by staying this close to the temporal features of the original language, the translation can be regarded as closest possible compared to the language of the original.

Also the specific aspect of sociolect is, as anticipated, translated close to the original language. The formal way which is typical for Victorian English upper class, is maintained in the Norwegian translation, as are the differences of register and style: close friends, even though belonging to the same social class, communicate slightly less formal with each other than they would communicate with strangers.

The best example for this high level of formal usage is the use of the third person singular: while modern Norwegian usage is similar to the English one, this was not the case concerning "old fashioned" Norwegian. In English, even in Victorian English, there is no longer a marker for the formal or informal usage of the third person singular; the word *you* is used in both cases. In modern Norwegian, even when being polite and addressing

strangers, it is common to use the word *du*, whereas in fin-de-siècle Norwegian, the word *Dere* was more common. Both the writing with a capital *d* and the difference to the informal *du* were thus markers of formal language use. The writing is not as relevant as the difference in words, at least concerning spoken language.

This difference in formality is an outstanding indicator for the relationships between the figures. While Mina and Lucy address each other with the informal *du* in their letters, Mina would never dream of using the same pronoun when corresponding with Van Helsing – even after him joining the vampire hunting party. Van Helsing is always addressed with the formal *De* or *Dere*, even though words as “dear friend” and suchlike might be used in letters to him. This formal use of the addressing pronoun might at first glance contradict terms such as “friend”, but then again, the novel is set in Victorian England, thus maintaining a far more formal way of addressing anybody who is not a friend as intimate as family members.

3.2 The German translation

The language of the German translation is, similar to the Norwegian translation, close to the language of fin-de-siècle Germany; slightly old-fashioned, but not poetically exaggerated.

Since even recent German is a more formal language than English or Norwegian, the formal aspects of the translation are not as strongly visible to a German reader as they are for a Norwegian or English reader of recent date, or rather: the formal ways of addressing each other are nothing strange or old-fashioned for a German reader, they are merely normal, still today.

Thus, the German translation is relatively close to the Victorian English original, with the only difference that even modern German is spoken in a way which is no longer common in English or, for that matter, in Norwegian. Since, however, German readers are familiar with this aspect of the German language, and since the translator of the German edition chose a slightly more formal language in general, the time of the novel is still being marked as “Victorian” for a German reader, despite the fact that modern German is still more formal than English.

4 Dialects in translation

Translating dialects is according to Gregory Rabassa, “[T]he transfer of local or regional idiom into another language, [and], must be listed as another of the impossibilities of translation” (Frawley, 1984: 24). In other words, according to Rabassa, it is impossible to translate dialects. Peter Newmark, in contrast, states that “[...] the translator cannot afford the luxury of saying that something cannot be translated.” (Newmark, 1988: 6).

Confronting these two contrasting points of view, we are facing one of the great dilemmas in translation: we cannot ignore language variation, but we cannot translate them directly, either. So, how to deal with this problem? Finding geographical equivalents is one option. In the case of *Dracula*, more specifically the Cockney dialect, this would mean to not only find an equivalent for so-called working class English, but also for working-class English from the eastern part of London. In more general terms, we are looking for working-class language spoken in a geographically specific part located in the capital city of the country in which the target language is spoken, in our case, either Oslo or Berlin. But would this option work out? I am going to examine this more closely for each of the two translations in the following chapters.

Another option might be a more individual decision made by the translator, namely simply finding an equivalent that seems appropriate, regardless of the geographical circumstances. This would mean to find a working class dialect from whichever place in Norway or Germany, as long as the chosen equivalent is widely regarded as typical working-class-language. Compared to the previous option, the translator has no formal justification for his choice other than personal taste and the majority’s agreement.

Both options are more or less equally justifiable, depending mostly on the native speakers’ common agreement of suitability. If not the capital city is known for its working-class dialect, but a different part of the country is, then it is appropriate to use that specific area as the model for working-class dialect. Then again, every larger city or community might have its own local “working-class” sociolect, its own local “upper-class” use of language. This is the main problem for the translator concerning dialects and local language varieties, including sociolects to some point. There is no definite “correct” solution for this problem, either, since all the various possible solutions have both their advantages and disadvantages, without any of them being “entirely correct”.

4.1 The Norwegian translation

Following my first suggestion of finding a geographical equivalent would hypothetically “work” for the Norwegian translation, since, coincidentally, the working class of fin-de-siècle Oslo – just as the Victorian London working class – was located in the eastern part of the Norwegian capital. Thus, the formal guidelines provided by the original text can be transferred one-to-one to the Norwegian translation. The Norwegian working-class dialect would thus be the most appropriate and, speaking in terms of translation, the closest translation of the English original text. Let us compare a bit of Cockney to the Norwegian translation:

“Now, sir, you can go on and arsk me what you want. You’ll excoose me refoosin’ to talk of perfeshunal subjects afore meals. I gives the wolves and the jackals and the hyenas in all our section their tea afore I begins to arsk them questions.” – “How do you mean, ask them questions?” I queried. “Ittin’ of them over the ‘ead with a pole is one way; scratchin’ of their hears is another, when gents as is flush wants a bit of a show-orf to their gals. [...]” (Klinger 2008:213)

And in comparison, the Norwegian translation:

“Nå kan Dere gjerne spørre om hva Dere vil. Dere må virkelig unnskyldte at jeg ikke ville prate om saker som angår profesjonen før vi hadde spist. Selv pleier jeg å servere teen for ulvene og sjakalene og hyenene i hele avdelingen vår før jeg begynner å komme med spørsmål til dem.” – ”Hva mener De med det, komme med spørsmål til dem?” forhørte jeg meg, i håp om å få ham i det pratsomme hjørnet. ”Å slå dem i hue med en kjepp er en måte, å klø dem bak øra er en annen, når herremenner med flust med gryn gjerne vil at jentene deres skal ha noe å glane på. [...]” (Stoker / Carling 1974:144)

As we have seen, the translator did not choose to use the possibility of using the Oslo East-End dialect when translating the zookeeper’s words. Instead, he chose a slightly more colloquial style than was at the novel’s time considered standard Norwegian. By using this colloquial style, the translator marked the zookeeper as not as sophisticated as his interviewer, just as we can see in the original. Yet, there is a difference between *clear working-class* and *slightly more colloquial than average*, which makes the social difference between the two men (interviewer and interviewee) less clear than the original does. Of course, by using words such as *hue* instead of *hodet* for *head*, and the ending *a* as a plural marker in *øra* (instead for the “correct” *ørene*), the translator gives the reader the clear information that the zookeeper belongs to the working class (or at least a lower social

class than the interviewer), but still, the class difference in the Norwegian translation is not as clear as it is in the English original.

One argument for the translator's choice might be that, even though the geographical factors are the same for English and Norwegian, this alone is not a valid reason for justifying a one-to-one translation. After all, it is mere coincidence that the regional factors are the same for London and Oslo. This argument can be countered by stating that once the regional factors are alike, by coincidence or not, the translator should, in order to translate as close as possible with respect to the original, use whatever options he has at hand. In other words, it is the sheer fact of the regional similarities that should count for the translator, regardless of whether these regional similarities are coincidental or not. After all, even translators can be lucky.

Yet, the translator's solution of the dialect problem cannot be regarded as entirely "wrong". He did clearly mark the social difference between zookeeper and interviewer, he maintained the difference in style and register, and he presents the reader with a so to speak "acceptable" translation of the working-class language of fin-de-siècle Victorian England.

How did the translator take care of the other dialect in the novel, the Whitby dialect? In contrast to the zookeeper's Cockney, the Whitby dialect is entirely based on geographical factors, not on any social class whatsoever. Still, the speaker's background cannot be disregarded entirely, as we shall see. Instead of working-class slang words, we do find traces of language use commonly associated with the language of seamen:

"I must gang ageeanwards home now, miss. My granddaughter doesn't like to be kept waitin' when the tea is ready, for it takes me time to cammle aboon the grees, for there be a many of 'em, an' miss, I lack belly-timber sairly by the clock."
(Klinger 2008:123)

This quote reads as follows in the Norwegian translation:

"Jeg må nok komme meg hjemover nå, frøken. Datterdatteren min liker ikke å måtte vente når teen er ferdig, og det tar tid for meg å gå ned trinnene for det er mange av dem." (Stoker / Carling 1974:71)

The first thing we notice here is that the last half of the sentence, Mr. Swales stating that he is awfully hungry, has been left out in the translation. This alone is not too much of a problem, for the information stated is in no way important for the novel's action. Yet, it is

not clear to see why this part has been left out – it is not too important, but it would not have been too much of a problem to translate, either.

What is more important here, however, is again the observation that there is no equivalent to the original's use of dialect to be found in the Norwegian translation. Especially the case of Cockney deserves attention here: Cockney is so heavily marked as “language (variation) of the working class”, that it is recognized as such at all times and beyond doubt. In other words, Cockney clearly marks a certain social class (namely the working class) and is especially within fiction an important element of a character's “personality”. To put it simple, Cockney is not used without any reason – which makes it even more important concerning a text's translation.

Since Cockney and Whitby dialect are the only two major dialects in *Dracula*, the translator would have had a relatively easy task to solve the dialect problem. First of all, there are actually two forms common in written Norwegian: *bokmål* (“the language of the book”) and *nynorsk* (“new Norwegian”), the latter being a composite language set together by the various dialects of Norwegian. This leads to the argument that the translator might, for example, have written the “general” text in bokmål, and expressed the Whitby dialect in nynorsk, while using a more colloquial variation of bokmål or any Norwegian dialect for expressing the English Cockney.

Apart from that, the Norwegian language is even without the existence of Nynorsk very rich in dialects. The translator could easily have picked any dialect, geographically equivalent to the original language or not, to express the original's dialects.

As I mentioned before, one might argue that it is not sufficient for dialect translation to pick any TL dialect at random in order to translate a SL dialect – yet, to ignore the SL dialect completely and translate dialect to standard language cannot be the solution, either. Dialects represent a language variation which is too important to ignore within translation. Apart from marking a certain group, dialects represent a speaker's identity, background and individuality, especially when the use of dialect is being placed within an otherwise homogenous language environment (in our case, formal Victorian upper-class English). This contrast is too strong to be “without further meaning” for the text, and thus must not be ignored.

4.2 The German translation

Starting again with the hypothetical option of finding a geographical equivalent for translating dialects, we would have to look for a dialect spoken by the working-class of eastern Berlin. This time, the approach is not giving us the same results as in the Norwegian translation. There are several reasons for this: every area in Germany does not only have its own characteristic dialect, but also its own distinct working-class and thus its own working-class language. So why choose Berlin, if for example Northrhine-Westphalia has a more commonly known working-class dialect? Following the principle of TL's capital "TL's capital and a certain area of this capital" is not sufficient here. There are, nevertheless, several working-class dialects a translator can choose from. And even the strict paradigm of keeping close to the TL's capital is not an entirely wrong choice; it is only not the optimal choice.

In the case of the German translation, opting for the translator's personal choice, or the "common agreement" of the majority, would be the better option.

The translation would not lose anything compared to the original text by simply changing the geographical coordinates of a certain class' dialect, as long as it is still obviously a dialect of for example the working class that is presented.

However, let us take a look at the German translation's approach to the dialect-dilemma:

"An' when you said you'd report me for usin' obscene language that was 'ittin' me over the 'ead; but the 'arf-quad made that all right. I weren't a-goin' to fight, so I waited for the food, and did with my 'owl as the wolves, and lions and tigers does. But, Lor' love yer 'art, now that the old 'ooman has stuck a chunk of her tea-cake in me, an' rinsed me out with her bloomin' old teapot, and I've lit hup, you may scratch my ears for all you're worth, and won't git even a growl out of me. Drive along with your questions. I know what yer a-comin' at, that 'ere escaped wolf."

This passage reads in the German translation as follows:

"Und wenn Sie dann sagen würden, Sie wollten über mich berichten, daß ich so grob mit Ihnen gesprochen, so wäre das so, als wie ich meinen Tieren mit der Stange über den Kopf schlage. Doch ein halber Sovereign würde alles gut machen. Aber, Gott segne Sie, jetzt, wo meine Alte mir ein Stück Teekuchen in den Rachen geschoben, mich mit dem Inhalt ihres großen Teetopfes ausgeschwenkt hat, und mein Pfeifchen brennt, können Sie mich hinter den Ohren kratzen, so viel Sie wollen, und ich werde nicht einmal knurren. Fragen Sie nur weiter. Ich weiß ja ohnehin, warum Sie kommen, es ist wegen des entflohenen Wolfes." (Stoker / Widtmann 2009: 181)

This is indeed remarkable: in the German translation, there is no trace of working-class dialect whatsoever to be found. Quite the contrary, not only does the zookeeper use a rather sophisticated register of language, absolutely free from dialect-related slang words or word changes, but – for working-class sociolects in German absolutely surprising – also correct grammar. The German word *wegen*, which translates to English as *due to, because of* or *on account of*, requires in German the case called *genitive*, marked usually by the word *des* (the genitive variety of the definite articles *der* and *das*). However, this grammatical feature is about to disappear from modern day German, as an increasing number of German speakers uses the incorrect *dative* case after *wegen*. Many people, especially members of low social classes, use the incorrect variant *dem* instead of *des* after *wegen*. Why is this so important to mention? It is so important because of the recent date of this translation. Not only does the zookeeper use a register “too high” for his social class, but the last thing the modern average native speaker of German expects of a common Victorian Cockney zookeeper is that this zookeeper speaks better German than themselves.

This leads to two major observations: the first is the lack of social marker for the Cockney zookeeper, as the translator did not even attempt to find an equivalent to the Cockney dialect, just as we have observed in the Norwegian translation. The second is that, apart from not showing any sign of “general” working class language, the zookeeper’s use of language is in fact more sophisticated than both his social class would “allow” and more correct than the average native speaker’s level of German. And even though it is not the intention of this thesis to judge over “acceptable” or “unacceptable” solutions of translation, this translation solution must be labeled as a solecism which easily could have been avoided by the translator.

As for the Whitby dialect, let us examine the translator’s solution once more, beginning with a different passage:

“It be all fool-talk, lock, stock, and barrel; that’s what it be, an’ nowt else. These bans an’ wafts an’ boh-ghosts an’ bogles an’ all anent them is only fit to set bairns an’ dizzy women a-belderin’. They be nowt but air-blebs! [...]” (Klinger 2008: 124)

This very strong example for dialect usage reads as following in the German translation:

“Das ist alles Unsinn, das ganze Zeug; so und nicht anders is es. Diese Hexen und Vorzeichen und Koblode und Gespenster und Teufel sind doch alle nur erdacht, um Kinder und schwache Weiber zittern zu machen. Sie sind nichts weiter als Einbildung. (Stoker / Widtmann 2009: 88)

For reasons of clarification, here is a translation of the dialect words to standard English: *bans*: curses, *wafts*: ghosts, *boh-ghosts*: terrifying apparitions in human or animal shape, *bogles*: hobgoblins, *all anent them*: all concerning them (Klinger 2008:527–8).

Not only did the translator add one more element of superstition to Mr. Swales' rant (in the original, there is no mention of "devils", in German *Teufel*), he also translated the original terms in a way that is more appropriate for a German reader. This last factor may not be exactly the same as in the English original, but is definitely justifiable by making the translation easier to read for a German reader. However, this is the only positive remark that can be made on the German translation concerning this passage.

Mr. Swales is obviously rather angry about what he is talking about, especially evident by the use of an exclamation mark at the end of the last quoted sentence. This exclamation mark, and thus all the emotions shown in the original, has disappeared in the German translation, taking away all the original's emotionality and making the speech seem rather indifferent in comparison.

Once again, despite the fact that there is no such thing as a "perfect" translation of a text, the German translation must be regarded as not even being close to whatever the "optimal solution" might be.

5 *Patois* in translation

The term *patois* needs a brief introduction. Originally, some certain Creole languages are called *Patois*, but the term also refers – in a pejorative sense – to dialects and other variations of the French language, generally regarded as “un-sophisticated” or even “primitive”. Since the pejorative meaning of *patois* is referring to what the majority of speakers regard as incorrect use of language, the term has over time established as a description of incorrect language use in general, no longer reserved for the French language only.

Concerning translation, *patois* is without doubt the most “tricky” field of language. The term *patois* refers especially in this thesis to the at times incorrect use of a language, due to language barriers, lacking language education or acquirement, and other factors of that sort. Nevertheless, simply adding a few grammatical mistakes or incorrect vocabulary to the TL does not create a proper translation of *patois*.

Patois can have a broad variety of background reasons. In the case of *Dracula*, we are presented with Van Helsing’s limited language skills concerning English on the one hand, and the language of children on the other. Both are *patois*, both are incorrect use of English, but they are of two different qualities. While Van Helsing’s incorrect English is based on a foreigner’s limited language skills, the *patois* of children is based on not yet fully developed language skills. In other words, child *patois* is likely to disappear over time, when the child grows up and enhances their language skills, while the *patois* of a foreigner is more likely to remain as it is, perhaps undergoing slight improvements with further language learning.

The following subchapters will examine the translations of Van Helsing’s letters and the child language concerning the “bloofer lady”-incidents.

5.1 The Norwegian translation

Concerning the use of *patois*, there is none to be found in Van Helsing’s use of language in the Norwegian translation. The grammar is correct, the words are elaborate and well-chosen, and nothing in Van Helsing’s language use is giving us any hint of him being a foreigner joining the vampire hunting party. One aspect is remarkable: both in the English original and the Norwegian translation, the Dutch Van Helsing makes German

exclamations rather than Dutch ones when he is very shocked. In chapter 10, Dr Seward's diary, dated on September 10, Van Helsing exclaims the words "Gott im Himmel!" when he sees in what state the vampire-bitten Lucy is in (Klinger, 2008:202 and Stoker / Carling, 1974:135). Klinger comments on this: "Notably a German expression, not Dutch. Again, this is another instance of Stoker's carelessness in erasing traces of the "real" Van Helsing, see note 14 on page 8." (Klinger, 2008:202, note 40). The note Klinger refers to in the quoted section is to be found in the Author's Preface, which, as I pointed out earlier, is already a part of the fictional novel, but suggesting to the reader that the following events have actually taken place in reality. Klinger "accepts" this suggestion and concludes that the very name "Abraham Van Helsing" is a pseudonym for in fact three persons who have been involved in the "real vampire hunt". One of those three persons, Klinger suggests, is a German professor. Klinger concludes that not only the name "Van Helsing" is a pseudonym, but also that Van Helsing's Dutch nationality is "not real" in the sense of the "real" Van Helsing being a German rather than Dutch. (Klinger, 2008: 8 note 14).

Also the children's *patois* has been "corrected" in the Norwegian translation. Instead of finding any equivalent to "bloofer lady", the translator corrected the term to the Norwegian correct translation of "beautiful lady", being "[den] pene dame[n]" (Stoker / Carling, 1974: 185 – 6).

One might argue that in the "bloofer lady"-case, it is rather difficult to find a Norwegian equivalent. After all, the word "bloofer" is orthographically relatively close to the word "bloody", which gives the word a double meaning: on the one hand, it is incorrect children's lingo for "beautiful", on the other hand, keeping the orthographical closeness to "bloody" in mind, it gives us a hint on the beautiful lady's being a vampire. It would, however, be too far away from the original word to translate "bloofer" with "blodig" in Norwegian, especially since no child in their right mind would go and play with a "bloody" lady.

5.2 The German translation

Van Helsing's language in the German translation does not show any traces of *patois* whatsoever. Quite the contrary; his language is elaborate, very sophisticated and correct. The Van Helsing of the German translation is the sophisticated figure of Stoker's original, but without the human factor of slightly incorrect use of a – *for him* – foreign language.

Following my previous argumentation, this means that the German Van Helsing is more “superhuman” than his English original counterpart. Again, just as we have seen in the Norwegian translation, it is difficult to give any clear “solution” to the problem of *patois*. And yet again, my argument is that orientating themselves on the actual mistakes Van Helsing makes in his English, would have been the closest possible solution. Then again, this solution is not always working out, either, since the translation sometimes rephrases the original so much that it is no longer possible to “copy” the original’s mistakes. I shall illustrate my point by quoting from chapter 11, Dr Seward’s diary, dated on September 13; Van Helsing has just learned that Mrs Westenra has – not knowing what she actually was doing – undermined his treatment for Lucy by removing the garlic and opening the window. In the original, he exclaims the following:

“[...] This poor mother, all unknowing and all for the best as she think, [...]”
(Klinger, 2008:210, my emphasis)

The same passage reads as follows in the German translation:

“Diese arme Mutter tut unbewußt und in bester Absicht etwas, das [...]“
(Stoker / Widtmann, 2009:177, my emphasis)

Not only is the incorrect use of the verb in the third person singular corrected, but “all for the best as she think[s]” becomes “with best intention[s]” (my translation of “in bester Absicht”) – which makes it impossible to copy the incorrect conjugation of the English verb “think”. Rephrasing the original in order to transport the original’s content as complete as possible is a technique in translation which on the one hand moves a bit “too far away” from the original order of words, but which sometimes is nevertheless necessary in order to transport the full meaning completely. Still, it would have been a possibility to stay closer to the English original, for two reasons: firstly, keeping the words close to the English “all for the best as she thinks” (which would be “allein für das beste, so wie sie denkt”) would sound rather strange for a speaker of German. Thus, staying close to the English original in terms of word order would solve the problem of giving the German Van Helsing a “foreign accent”. Secondly, this would save the translator the trouble of simply copying incorrect language use, because the “English-based German” alone serves the purpose of marking Van Helsing as the foreigner he is.

Concerning the language of the children, however, we are presented with a huge difference to the original. The “bloofer lady” suddenly has become the “bloody lady” (“die blutige Dame”) in the German translation (Stoker / Widmann, 2008:232 – 3). As I pointed out in the previous chapter, the orthographical closeness between “bloofer” and “bloody” (or “blutig” in German) is visible. Yet still, no child would voluntarily go and play with a “bloody” lady, let alone the fact that the children, after the “bloofer lady”-incidents, were mimicking the events of their short disappearances, and in turns taking the roles of the “bloofer lady” themselves. My assumption is that the translator was ignorant of the fact that “bloofer lady” is children’s incorrect pronunciation of “beautiful lady” and was being somewhat misled by the orthographical closeness of “bloofer” and “bloody”.

One might argue that translating “bloofer” with “bloody” instead of “beautiful” can be justified with both the necessity of pointing out that Lucy has in fact become a vampire, and that vampire do after all possess the power to control minds – thus, a “bloody” lady could have persuaded the children against their will to follow her. The latter argument is however not very consistent: if a vampire is able to control minds, then why would a vampire let the children get away with the memory of the incidents? Therefore, I stay with my previous argumentation that, even though there is without a doubt an orthographical closeness between “bloofer” and “bloody”, it is not close enough to the original, which, according to Klinger, rather gives us a notion of “bloofer” being incorrect children’s language meaning “beautiful” (Klinger, 2008:261).

6 Reading text and translation

In this chapter I shall present text excerpts and their translations. My main intention is examining each excerpt's medial relevance, genre and language. Of course, not all three aspects are equally featured in each excerpt, but as a matter of fact, all three aspects can be found throughout the novel. This is grounded on the novel's very nature as a composite novel, as I explained in chapter II. The translations are presented in order to examine major differences between the original and the translations respectively. Is the text altered in the translation, and if so, to what degree? How did the translators interpret the text in their translations?

Compared to translations, the original text generally is the text with the “highest priority” – after all, the original text is the one text that makes the translations possible in the first place, and in most cases necessary. It would be impossible to expect every reader in the world to learn all languages there are in order to be able to read literature outside of one's own native tongue. Translations are always a helping device in order to be able to read a text even though it is originally written in a language outside of the reader's own knowledge. But the main reason for translation is at the same time the main problem: languages vary. One language might have a larger variety in words in order to describe a certain thing, the other language might not. Umberto Eco informs us that it is even possible that one language (in this case I am referring to Target Language *only*) might even at first glance contribute *more* to the text than the original language (Eco 2001:44). Yet, Eco continues that “[T]ranslating sometimes means rebelling against one's own language, when it introduces effects of sense that were not intended in the original.” (Eco 2001:45) Translators, as we can see, have to be very careful on getting as close to the text as possible, but at the same time they have not only to be careful concerning not contributing *enough*, but also not to contribute *too much* to the original text. And even if it is possible to get “close” to the original's language, the problem is not only located in the vocabulary. Figures of speech, metaphors, social contexts, or any other thinkable aspect of language and culture play an important role. A translator always moves on a fine line between closeness to the text and transporting the text's “true meaning” – thus, translation is always an act of interpretation in itself. For “the common reader”, this might be of lesser importance – as long as the story's “main point” is made clear, and as long as the translation is easy to read and to some extent entertaining (after all, that is what most people expect from fiction), it does not matter too much how “close” the translation really

is to the original. Eco even goes as far as to suggest the following: "A first hypothesis is that one can change the literal meaning of single sentences in order to preserve the meaning of the corresponding micro-propositions, but not the sense of major macro-propositions. But what about many intermediate 'shallow' stories (between the literal meaning of single sentences and the global sense of an entire novel)?" (Eco 2001:39). Eco answers this question by stating that as long as the "global" sense is being kept up (in our case, this would mean, as long as the text tells us the story of a group of Victorian upper-class people, led by a Dutch man of science, hunting down a vampire count from Transylvania), minor changes are not only pardonable, sometimes they are even necessary.

Thus, it is legitimate to ask why it matters so much how "good" a translation is, or even *what* a "good" translation is. None of the differences in translation I am going to examine here are altering the plot. In both translations, the book starts and ends with the same content as the original, the story that is being told is the same. And yet, there are subtleties in the original text which might not be present in the translations – or *vice versa*. These subtleties do matter for close reading of a text. But the main question remains: do the translations bring the text closer to the reader or the reader to the text?

Apart from that, it is hard to tell to what degree a translation is "allowed" to vary from the original, if it is supposed to present, in our case, Bram Stoker's novel *Dracula* and not some other Victorian story that just happens to tell about incidents involving a vampire count.

I will start by presenting my reading of the text excerpts and then continue to examine the translators' versions.

6.1 Mina's journal

In Mina's journal, we not only find many hints on the Count's true nature (even though the novel's protagonists are not able to interpret them before it is almost too late), but also the clearly expressed purpose of her journal being *not* meant for her eyes only. In order to hunt the vampire and stop him from his "taking over", the protagonists soon decide to collect their personal notes, journals and general observations, each of them reading about *everything* that has happened to the others, crossed their minds or has been observed by them. Private notes about personal feelings are just as important as "neutral" observations, for every detail matters for the success of the vampire hunters. Especially notions of

irrational fear “for no apparent reason” are of importance, since the vampire hunters are precisely after a supernatural being.

The Count’s supernatural features and the fear he causes immediately after his arrival in England are made clear fairly early in the novel; right after he sets off for England, “strange things” happen, including a suddenly increasing number of deaths around him. The novel begins with Harker’s journal, telling us of his journey and then the strange events at Castle Dracula. We follow his journal for the first four chapters of the novel. Harker’s story finds a preliminary end when he learns two things: first, he is kept captive at the castle, and second, the Count has obviously left the castle in order to travel somewhere else. At a point of high suspense, namely when Harker plans to escape from the castle, the “narrating” point of view suddenly changes to Mina and her friend Lucy: chapter 5 contains the letters the two women exchange, concerning mostly Lucy’s relatively recent engagement, plus some telegrams between Lucy’s fiancé Arthur Holmwood and Quincey Morris.

Chapter 6 contains Mina’s journal entries for the first time. Both she and Lucy are staying in Whitby, and have made it a habit to take walks along the shore and to sit on a bench there. The peculiar thing about this seat and the particular part of the shore where the two women like to walk and sit is that it seems to consist entirely of sailor’s graves.

We learn during the chapters 5 to 7 what happens “meanwhile”, concerning Harker’s stay at Castle Dracula: first, we follow Harker’s adventures to Transylvania, after that, we learn what happens in England *while* Harker is abroad. However, these two apparently different stories run together: the events in England must take place more or less at the same time the Count leaves Harker behind in the castle. Bearing this in mind, it is not difficult for the reader to “guess” the cause for the strange events on the Russian ship *Demeter* – which are documented in Mina’s diary. Mina had a reason for pasting the newspaper article that reports about the *Demeter*, including the ship’s log, into her journal: she herself, Lucy and a Whitby local witnessed a ship close to the Whitby harbor “acting strangely”, as if it wasn’t being steered at all. The ship ran aground at Whitby, more or less before Mina’s very eyes, so it is of course not surprising that she is eager to find out what had happened. Incidentally, it is rather particular that the vessel’s name is *Demeter*, of all possible names: Demeter, whose name translates to *Earth-Mother* (Hard, 2008: 126), being the Ancient Greek goddess of fertility (Hard 2008:128), stood patron for a vessel which eventually brings death to Victorian London. This irony can by no means be accidental. Also the fact that the vessel transported *soil*, this soil being the soil of the

Count's grave, puts the vessel's name and function in a highly ironic juxtaposition. Soil, being associated with life and growth, turns in our case out to be the refuge for an uncanny creature that means to bring death literally over England.

Having been an eye-witness to the results of the strange events aboard the *Demeter*, Mina, driven by both curiosity and a sense of duty, attends the burial service for the ship's captain, which takes place in Whitby. In her journal she reports about the events that happened during the service, especially concerning Lucy, whom Mina regards as being of a very delicate nature:

Lucy is so sweet and sensitive that she feels influences more acutely than other people do. Just now she was quite upset by a little thing which I did not much heed, though I am myself very fond of animals. One of the men who came up here often to look for the boats was followed by his dog. The dog is always with him. They are both quiet persons, and I never saw the man angry, nor heard the dog bark. During the service the dog would not come to its master, who was on the seat with us, but kept a few yards off, barking and howling. Its master spoke to it gently, and then harshly, and then angrily; but it would neither come nor cease to make a noise. It was in a sort of fury, with its eyes savage, and all its hairs bristling out like a cat's tail when puss is on the warpath. Finally the man, too, got angry, and jumped down and kicked the dog, and then took it by the scruff of the neck and half dragged and half threw it on the tombstone on which the seat is fixed. The moment it touched the stone the poor thing became quiet and fell all into a tremble. It did not try to get away, but crouched down, quivering and cowering, and was in such a pitiable state of terror that I tried, though without effect, to comfort it. Lucy was of pity, too, but she did not attempt to touch the dog, but looked at it in an agonised sort of way. I greatly fear that she is too super-sensitive a nature to go through the world without trouble. She will be dreaming of this to-night, I am sure. (Klinger / Stoker 2008: 155)

As the Whitby local, Mr Swales, had pointed out earlier, the tombstone on which the seat that Mina and Lucy usually (and during the funeral) use is located, marks the grave of a suicide. In other words, this grave is not blessed by any priest and thus the only immediate refuge the Count can enter so shortly after his arrival in England, which makes it very likely that he is in fact resting there at the day of the captain's funeral.

This episode shows us how animals in general and sensitive people are able to sense the presence of a vampire. The dog is highly disturbed, and also Lucy is clearly in fear of something neither Mina nor anybody else present is able to fathom. Perhaps it is precisely Lucy's sensitiveness that makes her the ideal first victim in England – after all, the Count has no trouble whatsoever to get hold of her in the same night via her habit of sleepwalking. In any case, the uncanny element of the vampire being a threatening and

supernatural creature becomes clear here. The threat is so subtle that only animals or sensitive persons notice it is even there – and yet it is so strong that it clearly disturbs those who do notice it. It is the very feeling of “something not being as it should be”, without being able to exactly point out what it actually is that is “not as it should be” which makes this scene so uncanny. As readers, we have the advantage of knowing already here that it must be the Count’s presence, but at the same time we are aware that Mina and Lucy cannot yet know what we know.

And as we can see already here, even though the Count had just arrived in Whitby two days before, he did not waste any time, but found himself a “suitable victim”, namely Lucy, rather quickly. Indeed, as Mina’s journal shows in the following chapter, the Count preyed on Lucy in the same night (the funeral was held on August 10, and Mina’s journal entry in the next chapter is dated on August 11, telling the reader about the previous night). Did Lucy perhaps even sense the immediate danger for herself already during the funeral? This is as probable as Lucy’s sensing of the Count hiding under the suicide’s tombstone. It also emphasises the fact that Lucy, being so very sensitive, is more likely to be a victim for the vampire than Mina, at least at first. Mina does not feel especially in danger until shortly before the Count’s actual attack to her, while Lucy obviously both senses and fears the inevitable (namely, the Count preying on her and eventually killing her). This explains why Mina does not share her friend’s fear at this time of the plot and blames Lucy’s reaction to the disturbed dog on her being of such a sensitive nature. Apart from that, none of the protagonists (apart from Harker, who has not returned yet from his journey and thus had no chance yet to report of the events at Castle Dracula) has yet any notion of the existence of vampires, let alone any suspicion that such a creature might be after them. And especially Mina, with her sensible nature is hardly likely to believe in any supernatural beings threatening her and her friends and family after only one “strange incident”.

Mina’s choice of words is also worth mentioning: she compares a dog to a cat when describing the dog’s disturbed behaviour. This might highlight the strong confusion and fear the dog is experiencing, but it is still rather uncommon to compare two animals which are, at least according to clichés, “natural enemies”. Dogs and cats do not behave alike when in distress, so the comparison is rather hard to explain.

Now, I shall take a look at the Norwegian translation of the passage:

Lucy er så søt og følsom at slikt går sterkere inn på henne enn på andre mennesker. Akkurat nå er hun oppskaket over en liten ting som jeg ikke brydde meg noe stort om, selv om jeg også er svært glad i dyr. En av mennene som ofte kommer opp her for å speide efter båtene, hadde med seg sin hund. Den er bestandig med ham. Begge er rolige, og jeg hadde aldri sett mannen sint eller hørt hunden gjø. Under begravelsesseremonien ville hunden ikke komme frem til sin herre som stod på benken sammen med oss, men holdt seg noen meter unna og gjødde og ulte. Dens herre snakket først rolig til den, og så hissig og deretter sint, men den ville hverken komme eller slutte med bråket. Det var et slags raseri. Hundens øyne var ville og håret reiste seg som halen på en katt når pus er på krigsstien. Til slutt ble mannen også sint og hoppet ned og sparket til hunden, og så tok den in nakkeskinnet og halvveis trakk og halvveis slengte den inn på den gravhellen som benken er plassert på. I det øyeblikk den kom nær stenen, ble det stakkars dyret stille, og så begynte det å skjelve over det hele. Hunden prøvde ikke å komme vekk, men trykket seg ned, dirrende og skremt, og var så ynkelig redd at jeg forsøkte å trøste den, skjønt uten resultat. Lucy var også full av medfølelse, men hun prøvde ikke å røre hunden, bare å fortvilet på den. Jeg er virkelig redd for at hun har en altfor følsom natur til å kunne leve her i verden uten å få det vanskelig. Hun kommer til å drømme om dette til natten, det er jeg sikker på. (Carling / Stoker 1974:95)

And, lastly, the German translation:

Lucy ist so zart und empfindlich, daß alle Eindrücke viel tiefer auf sie einwirken wie auf andere. Eben jetzt war sie ganz aufgeregt durch ein kleines Ereignis, auf das ich gar nicht recht geachtet hatte, obgleich ich Tiere sehr gern habe. Einer der Leute, die oft da heraufkamen, um nach den Booten zu sehen, hatte einen Hund. Dieser ist immer bei ihm. Beide sind äußerst ruhigen Temperamentes. Ich habe den Mann ebensowenig einmal ärgerlich gesehen, als ich den Hund einmal bellen hörte. Während der heiligen Handlung wollte der Hund absolut nicht zu seinem Herrn kommen, der auf der Bank neben uns stand, sondern hielt sich in einer gewissen Entfernung, heulend und bellend. Sein Herr sprach ihm erst gütlich zu, dann ernst, schließlich ärgerlich, aber der Hund kam nicht heran und hörte auch nicht zu bellen auf. Er befand sich in einem Zustande von Wut, seine Augen glühten wild auf und all sein Haar sträubte sich, wie der Schweif einer Katze auf dem Kriegspfad. Zuletzt wurde der Besitzer auch ärgerlich, er sprang herunter, nahm den Hundm prügelte ihn, faßte ihn am Fell und brachte ihn, halb ziehend, halb stoßend, zu dem Grabstein, auf dem der Sitz befestigt ist. In dem Augenblick, als das arme Geschöpf diesen berührte, wurde es ruhig und begann heftig zu zittern. Er versuchte gar nicht zu entfliehen, sondern duckte sich nieder, bebend und sich krümmend, und befand sich in einem so erbärmlichen Zustande, daß ich, wenn auch vergebens, den Versuch machte, es zu beruhigen. Lucy war gleichfalls voll Mitleid, aber sie konnte sich nicht entschließen, das Tier anzurühren, sondern sah es nur mit Todesangst in den Augen an... Ich fürchte, sie ist eine zu sensitive Natur, um ohne Störung das Leben zu ertragen. Sie wird heute Nacht von all dem träumen, das weiß ich. (Widtmann / Stoker 2009:117)

The translations give us interesting variations of how Lucy reacts in this episode: in the original, she looks at the disturbed dog in agony, in the Norwegian translation, her agony

becomes "a desperate way" of looking at the dog, and in the German translation it is even "mortal fear" with which Lucy observes the dog. Pain, despair and mortal fear – these are three different things. The original version suggests Lucy's pity for the dog – the dog suffers, and "poor Lucy" sympathises with the disturbed animal. Why is she "desperate" in the Norwegian translation? One possible explanation might be that she shares the dog's fears, feels the same, and wishes she could get away from the animal that presents her with reasons to be afraid. This would mean that the Norwegian translation enhances Lucy's feelings towards the disturbed dog. The German translation points to Lucy sharing the dog's disturbance, making her equally frightened as the dog is. This would suggest that Lucy is in a way able to "foresee" the events of the coming night (the Count preying on her), even though she might not exactly know what is threatening her. In any case, both the Norwegian and the German translation are interpreting Lucy's "agonised look" as something stronger, turning it to despair and mortal fear respectively.

6.2 The Count's attack on Mina

We learn about the Count's attack at Mina in chapter 21, in a rather long entry in Dr Seward's diary. Here, I shall present Mina's report of the events, as they were quoted in Seward's diary, after Van Helsing asked her to tell the vampire hunting party what had happened:

After a pause in which she was evidently ordering her thoughts she began: – "I took the sleeping draught which you had so kindly given me, but for a long time it did not act. I seemed to become more wakeful, and myriads of horrible fancies began to crowd in upon my mind – all of them connected with death, and vampires, with blood, and pain, and trouble." Her husband involuntarily groaned as she turned to him and said lovingly: "Do not fret, dear. You must be brave and strong, and help me through the horrible task. If you only knew what an effort it is to me to tell of this fearful thing at all, you would understand how much I need your help. Well, I saw I must try to help the medicine to its work with my will, if it was to do me any good, so I resolutely set myself to sleep. Sure enough sleep must soon have come to me, for I remember no more. Jonathan coming in had not waked me, for he lay by my side when next I remember. There was in the room the same white thin mist that I had before noticed. But I forget now if you know of this; you will find it in my diary which I shall show you later. I felt the same vague terror which had come to me before and the same sense of some presence. I turned to Jonathan, but found that he slept so soundly that it seemed as if it was he who had taken the sleeping draught, and not I. I tried, but I could not wake him. This caused me a great fear, and I looked around terrified. Then indeed, my heart sank within me:

beside the bed, as if he had stepped out of the mist – or rather, as if the mist had turned into this figure, for it had entirely disappeared – stood a tall, thin man, all in black. I knew him at once from the description of the others. The waxen face, the high aquiline nose, on which the light fell in a thin white line; the parted red lips, with the sharp white teeth showing between, and the red eyes that I had seemed to see in the sunset on the windows of St. Mary’s Church at Whitby, I knew, too, the red scar on his forehead where Jonathan had struck him. For an instant my heart stood still, and I would have cried out, only that I was paralysed. In the pause he spoke in a sort of keen, cutting whisper, pointing as he spoke to Jonathan: – “Silence! If you make a sound I shall take him and dash his brains out before your very eyes.” I was appalled and was too bewildered to do or say anything. With a mocking smile, he placed one hand upon my shoulder and, holding me tight, bared my throat with the other saying as he did so: “First, a little refreshment to reward my exertions. You may as well be quiet; it is not the first time, or the second, that your veins have appeased my thirst!” I was bewildered, and, strangely enough, I did not want to hinder him. I suppose it is a part of the horrible curse that such is, when his touch is on his victim. And oh, my God, my God, pity me! He placed his reeking lips upon my throat!” Her husband groaned again. She clasped his hand harder, and looked at him pityingly, as if he were the injured one, and went on: “I felt my strength fading away, and I was in a half swoon. How long this horrible thing lasted I know not; but it seemed that a long time must have passed before he took his foul, awful, sneering mouth away. I saw it drip with the fresh blood!” The remembrance seemed for a while to overpower her, and she drooped and would have sunk down but for her husband’s sustaining arm. With a great effort she recovered herself and went on: – “Then he spoke to me mockingly, “And so you, like the others, would play your brains against mine. You would help these men to hunt me and frustrate me in my designs! You know now, and they know in part already, and will know in full before long, what it is to cross my path. They should have kept their energies for use closer to home. Whilst they played wits against me – against me who commanded nations, and intrigued for them, and fought for them, hundreds of years before they were born – I was countermining them. And you, their best beloved one, are now to me, flesh of my flesh, blood of my blood, kin of my kin; my bountiful wine-press for a while; and shall be later on my companion and my helper. You shall be avenged in turn; for not one of them but shall minister to your needs. But as yet you are to be punished for what you have done. You have aided in thwarting me; now you shall come to my call. When my brain says “Come!” to you, you shall cross land or sea to do my bidding; and to that end this!” With that he pulled open his shirt, and with his long sharp nails opened a vein in his breast. When the blood began to spurt out, he took my hands in one of his, holding them tight, and with the other seized my neck and pressed my mouth to the wound, so that I must either suffocate or swallow some of the – Oh my God! my God! what have I done? What have I done to deserve such a fate, I who have tried to walk in meekness and righteousness all my days. God pity me! Look down on a poor soul in worse than mortal peril; and in mercy pity those to whom she is dear!” Then she began to rub her lips as though to cleanse them from pollution. (Klinger / Stoker 2008:395–7)

As a first striking element, it is rather unusual to present spoken language in a diary entry, especially language so eloquent that it is very unlikely to actually have been quoted as

heard. The very detailed descriptions of the events of the Count's attack are also rather uncommon, especially given the fact that Mina is still in shock at the time of this entry. Yet, she still manages to give the hunting party and the reader a very detailed report of what had happened just some minutes before the men stormed the Harkers' bedroom. Seward must have edited her use of language in his quotation; it is rather unlikely that Mina spoke in these highly formal and eloquent sentences so short after the attack. St John Butler pointed out clearly that "[...] literary texts bear little, if any, resemblance to natural speech as recorded and transcribed." (St John Butler 1999:50), so *Dracula* is no exception. As a piece of literary fiction, even the "quoted" language is edited and stylised, and not to be confused with *actual* quotation. And yet, Mina's extremely strong self-control is striking. Some well-placed exclamations might well help the "realistic" picture of a woman in shock, but they alone do not make the whole picture more realistic. But is this even necessary? The main horror in this scene comes from the sudden appearance of the Count in the Harkers' bedroom, his demonstration of physical power against Mina and his spiteful speech. It was either a matter of timing coincidence that the Count appeared out of the fog in the very instant Mina turned her head, or – even worse – he might as well have materialised and waited until the terror-stricken Mina turned her head towards him eventually. The latter alternative gives us a picture of the uncanny "monster" lurking and waiting in the dark, only waiting to be discovered by the scared victim before attacking.

Also the Count's rather long speech provokes fear: first of all, the mere length and eloquence of it highlights that the Count has nothing at all to fear himself; he is reassured in *him* being the one in power in this very situation. Secondly, by explaining his plans and motives, he demonstrates how sure he is about his own success. He does not only *intend* to defeat the vampire hunters and make Mina his "very own"; in his statement these things *are definitely going to happen*.

Let us have a look at the Norwegian translation:

Efter en pause da hun åpenbart ordnet tankene sine, begynte hun: "Jeg tok den sovemedisinen som De hadde vært så snill å gi meg, men det varte lenge før den virket. Det var som om jeg ble mer våken, og en masse redde fantasibilder trengte seg inn på tankene mine – alle hadde de noe å gjøre med død og vampyrer, og med blod og smerte og alt vondt." Hennes mann stønnet uvilkarlig, og hun snudde seg mot ham og sa kjærlig: "Ikke vær lei deg, kjære vennen min, du må være modig og sterk og hjelpe meg med å komme igjennom denne forferdelige oppgaven. Om du bare visste hva det koster meg å fortelle om disse redselsfulle tingene, da ville du forstå at jeg nå i høy grad trenger din hjelp. Javel, jeg innså at jeg måtte ty til viljen for å få medisinen til å virke, om jeg ville ha noen glede av den. Altså bestemte jeg meg for å sovne. Søvnens må nok også snart være kommet, for jeg husker ikke mer. Jeg våknet ikke da Jonathan kom inn, for det neste jeg

husker er at han lå ved siden av meg. I værelset var det da den samme tynne, hvite tåken som jeg hadde lagt merke til før. Men jeg glemmer visst nå at dere kanskje ikke vet om det; dere vil finne det i dagboken min som jeg skal vise dere siden. Jeg følte den samme vage skrekken som tidligere var kommet over meg, og hadde den samme følelsen av at det var noen der. Jeg snudde meg for å vekke Jonathan, men oppdaget at han sov så dypt, at det lot til at det var han som hadde tatt sovemedisinen og ikke jeg. Jeg forsøkte å vekke ham, men klarte det ikke. Det gjorde meg fryktelig redd, og jeg så meg forskrekket omkring. Da sank hjertet i livet på meg, for ved siden av sengen, som om han var trådt ut av tåken – eller kanskje heller som om tåken hadde tatt hans skikkelse, for tåken var nå helt forsvunnet – stod en høy, tynn mann, helt i sort. Jeg kjente ham med en gang fra de andres beskrivelse av ham. Det voksbleke ansiktet, den høye ørnenesen som lyset falt på i en smal hvit stripe, de røde leppene som var adskilt slik at de skarpe, hvite tennene syntes, og de røde øynene som jeg syntes jeg så i solnedgangen på Mariakirkens vinduer i Whitby. Jeg kjente også det røde arret på pannen der Jonathan hadde hugget til ham. Et øyeblikk stod hjertet helt stille, og jeg ville ha skreket om jeg ikke hadde vært som lammet. Mens jeg lå slik, sa han i en skarp, gjennomtrengende hvisken, idet han pekte på Jonathan: ”Vær stille! Kommer det en lyd fra Dem, så tar jeg ham og knuser hodet hans foran øynene på Dem.” Jeg var vettskremt og var altfor forvirret til å kunne gjøre eller si noe som helst. Med et spotsk smil la han en hånd på skulderen min og holdt meg fast. Med den andre hånden blottet han halsen min, og så sa han: ”Først en liten forfriskning som lønn for mitt strev. Bare ta det rolig! Det er ikke første gang og ikke annen gang heller, at Deres årer tilfredsstiller min tørst!” Jeg var stadig forvirret, og underlig nok hadde jeg ikke noe ønske om å hindre ham. Det hører vel med til denne fryktelige forbannelsen, at det blir på den måten når han har rørt ved ett av sine offer. Og så – å, min Gud, min Gud, ha barmhjertighet med meg! Han presset de stinkende leppene sind mot halsen min!” Hennes mann stønnet igjen. Hun knuget hånden hans enda hardere og så medlidende på ham, som om det var ham dette var gått ut over. Så fortsatte hun: ”Jeg følte kreftene svinne, og jeg var halvveis besvimt. Hvor lenge dette redde varte, det vet jeg ikke, men jeg har inntrykk av at det må ha gått lang tid før han tok bort den fæle, avskyelige, onde munnen sin igjen. Jeg så at dryppet friskt blod fra den!” Minnet om det ble visst for meget for henne, og hun sank sammen og ville ha sagnet overende hvis ikke ektemannens arm hadde støttet henne. Men den kraftanstrengelse kom til hektene igjen og fortalte videre. ”Så sa han hånlige: ”De ville altså forsøke å sette Deres kløkt opp mot min, akkurat som de andre. De ville hjelpe disse mennene med å jage meg og hindre meg i mitt forehavende! De skjønner vel nå og de andre begynner nok å skjønne det og vil snart forstå det fullt ut, hva det vil si å krysse min sti. Deres venner skulle heller ha passet bedre på hjemme hos seg selv. De har spunnet renker mot meg – men jeg som har hersket over hele folkeslag og lagt opp råd og slåss for mitt folk i hundrer av år før de ble født, jeg overlistet dem. Og De, som de er mest glad i, tilhører nå meg, er kjøtt av mitt kjøtt, blod av mitt blod, er blitt en av min slekt. En tid skal De være min gavmilde vinpresse, og så vil De bli min kamerat og hjelper. De skal få øve gjengjeld, for hver og en av dem vil måtte tilfredsstille Deres tørst. Men først skal De straffes for det De har gjort. De har hjulpet til med å motarbeide meg, så herefter må de komme når jeg kaller. Når min hjerne sier ”Kom!” til Dem, må De dra over land og sjø for å gjøre som jeg befaler. Og det oppnår jeg på denne måten!” Dermed rev han opp skjorten sin, og med de lange, skarpe neglene åpnet han en blodåre i brystet. Da blodet begynte å sprute, tok han begge hendene mine i sin ene og holdt dem fast, og med den andre hånden grep han meg i nakken og

presset munnen min mot såret, slik at jeg enten ville blitt kvalt eller måtte svelge noe av – Å Herregud, Herregud! Hva har jeg gjort? Hva har jeg gjort at dette kan ramme meg, jeg som har prøvet å vandre I ydmykhet og rettferdighet alle mine dager. Gud, ha medlidenhet med meg! Se i nåde til denne arme sjel som er i dødelig fare og verre enda! Ha medlidenhet med dem som har henne kjær!” Hun begynte å gni leppene som om hun ville fjerne besmittelsen. (Carling / Stoker 1974:298–300)

And the same passage reads in German:

Nach einer Pause, in der sie offenbar ihre Gedanken ordnete, begann sie: "Ich nahm den Schlaftrunk, die Sie mir verschrieben hatten, aber lange blieb die Wirkung aus. Ich glaube, ich wurde dadurch sogar noch munterer; zahllose unheimliche Phantasien begannen sich in meinem Gehirn zu drängen, alle standen in Verbindung mit dem Tode und mit Vampyren, mit Blut, Schmerz und Leid.“ Ihr Gatte stöhnte unwillkürlich; sie wandte sich zu ihm und sagte zärtlich: "Rege dich nicht auf, Liebster. Du mußt stark und tapfer sein und mir helfen, das Entsetzliche zu ertragen. Wenn du verstündest, welche Überwindung es mich kostet, von diesen furchtbaren Dingen überhaupt zu sprechen, würdest du begreifen, wie sehr ich deiner Hilfe bedarf. Nun, ich sah, daß ich der Arznei mit meiner Willenskraft nachhelfen müsse, wenn sie mir etwas Schlaf verschaffen sollte; ich nahm mir also ernstlich vor zu schlafen. Jedenfalls ist dann der Schlaf rasch gekommen, denn ich erinnere mich an gar nichts mehr. Jonathan, der nach Hause kam, störte mich nicht in meiner Ruhe; als ich erwachte, lag er in seinem Bette. Im Zimmer war derselbe dünne Nebel, den ich schon vorher bemerkt habe. Aber ich weiß ja nicht, ob Sie darüber informiert sind. Sie werden Näheres in meinem Tagebuch finden, das ich Ihnen nachher zu lesen gebe. Ich fühlte dieselbe unbewußte Angst wie vorher und hatte das unangenehme Gefühl, als sei noch jemand bei mir. Ich wollte Jonathan wecken; er schlief aber so fest, daß man meinen konnte, er habe an meiner Stelle den Schlaftrunk genommen. Ich versuchte nochmals, ihn zu wecken, aber vergebens. Eine fürchterliche Angst ergriff mich und ich sah mich entsetzt um. Dann überwältigte mich das Grauen: neben meinem Bett, als sei er aus dem Nebel herausgestiegen, oder besser, als hätte der Nebel seine Gestalt angenommen, stand ein großer, schlanker Mann, ganz in Schwarz gekleidet. Ich erkannte ihn sofort aus den früheren Beschreibungen. Das wachsbleiche Gesicht, die hohe Adlernase, deren schmaler Rücken sich wie ein scharfes, weißes Band vom Gesicht abhob; die geöffneten roten Lippen, zwischen denen die scharfen, weißen Zähne hervorschimmerten; die roten Augen, die ich damals bei Sonnenuntergang bei der Marienkirche in Whitby gesehen zu haben vermeinte. Ich sah die rote Narbe auf seiner Stirn, die ihm mein Gatte geschlagen. Einen Augenblick stand mir das Herz still; ich hätte gern geschrieen, aber ich war vollkommen gelähmt. Da sprach er in scharfem, durchdringenden Flüstertone, indem er auf Jonathan deutete: "Schweig! Wenn Du einen Laut von Dir gibst, dann nehme ich den da und zerschmettere ihm den Kopf vor deinen Augen.“ Ich war so entsetzt und kraftlos, daß ich nicht wußte, was sagen und was tun. Mit höhnischem Lächeln legte er eine Hand auf meine Schulter und sagte, indem er mit der anderen meinen Hals entblößte: "Vorerst aber noch eine kleine Erfrischung zur Entschädigung für meine Mühe. Du wirst Dich ruhig verhalten; es ist nicht das erste oder zweite Mal, daß ich meinen Durst an Deinem Blute stille.“ Ich war entsetzt, vermochte ihm aber seltsamerweise keinen Widerstand zu leisten. Es ist das wohl ein Teil des Zaubers, der auf dem Opfer lastet. Und er preßte seine heißen Lippen an meine Kehle!“ Ihr Gate stöhnte wieder. Sie umklammerte seine Hand noch fester und sah ihn mitleidig an, als sei ihm all

das Leid geschehen, statt ihr, und fuhr fort: "Ich fühlte meine Widerstandskraft völlig schwinden und war halb ohnmächtig. Wie lange das Furchtbare währte, ich weiß es nicht. Eine ziemlich lange Zeit schien aber verflossen zu sein, als er seinen unheimlichen, blutbefleckten Mund von meinem Halse löste. Ich sah schwere, rote Tropfen davon herniederfallen!" – Die Erinnerung schien sie zu überwältigen und sie sank zusammen; hätte der starke Arm ihres Mannes sie nicht gestützt, wäre sie zu Boden gefallen. Mit großer Anstrengung raffte sie sich wieder auf und erzählte weiter: "Dann sagte er höhnisch zu mir: "Auch Du wolltest, wie jene Anderen, dein Gehirn gegen mich ausspielen. Du wolltest den Männern helfen, Jagd auf mich zu machen, und mich in meinen Plänen zu stören! Du weißt nun, und die Anderen wissen schon zumteil und sollen es nun bald alle wissen, was es heißt, meine Pfade zu kreuzen. Sie sollten ihre Kräfte besser zu Hause zusammengehalten haben. Während sie ihre Kombinationsgabe gegen mich ins Treffen führten, gegen mich, der Nationen geboten, für sie gedacht und für sie gefochten hat; Jahrhunderte, ehe ihr geboren wart – untergrub ich ihre Stellung. Du aber, die sie alle lieb haben, bist nun mein Eigen, Fleisch von meinem Fleisch, Blut von meinem Blut, bist meinesgleichen, bist eine Zeit lang meine vortreffliche Weinkelter und später meine Genossin und Helferin. Aber jetzt muß ich dich erst strafen für das, was du mir getan. Du hast mit geholfen gegen mich zu streiten, von nun an sollst du meinem Rufe Folge leisten. Wenn ich in Gedanken sage "Komm!", so sollst du über Länder und Meere hinweg zu mir kommen; darum noch dies eine!" Er riß sein Hemd auf und öffnete mit seinen langen, spitzen Nägeln eine Ader an seiner Brust. Als das Blut zu spritzen begann, nahm er meine beiden Hände in eine der seinen und hielt sie fest umspannt; mit der anderen Hand ergriff er meinen Nacken und presste meinen Mund auf die Wunde, so daß ich entweder ersticken oder schlucken mußte von dem - - - o mein Gott, o mein Gott! Was habe ich getan? Womit habe ich dieses entsetzliche Schicksal verdient, die ich doch mein Leben lang in Bescheidenheit und Rechtschaffenheit zu wandeln mich bemüht habe. Gott sei mir gnädig! Schau hernieder auf die arme Seele in schlimmerer als Todesgefahr und erbarme dich in Gnaden derer, die mich lieb haben!" Dann begann sie ihre Lippen heftig zu reiben, wie um sich von einer eklen Beschmutzung zu reinigen. (Widtmann / Stoker 2009:374–6; alternating capitalisation of the word *Du* quoted as in the text)

The demonstration of power from the Count is clearly visible in his language, but is shown far more clearly in the German translation: I have earlier pointed out that, in contrast to English, both "old-fashioned" Norwegian and modern-day German feature a polite and formal form of addressing somebody in the second person (*du – De / Dere* in Norwegian, *Du – Sie* in German). Of course, when the Count speaks to Mina, he is not using the polite form of addressing – nobody would take the bother of maintaining the code of politeness to their "inferior victim", and so the Count is no exception here. Also his "mocking" way of speaking to Mina makes it clear that we cannot expect any form for polite addressing from him in this episode. Here, the translation is enhancing the menacing demonstration of superior power from the Count: by emphasising the lack of formal addressing, it becomes very clear who is "in power" in this situation. And yet, despite this demonstration of power

beyond any doubt, the Norwegian translation maintains the formal way of addressing. This is indeed puzzling. What reasons could the Count possibly have to keep up the rules of politeness when clearly addressing a victim of his? Is the foreign, mystical Count so much in control of himself that, although being mocking, he obeys the codes for politeness in the Norwegian translation? Was *fin-de-siècle* Norway even stricter concerning behavioural codes than Victorian England? This is not very likely. The Norwegian translation, however, conveys an image of Victorian England which is even more restricted to strict social codes than Victorian England in fact was.

Another difference comes from the German translation: in both the original and the Norwegian translation, Mina states clearly that she did not *wish* to stop the Count from biting her. In the German translation, this statement is altered to Mina *not being able* to intervene. Both translations keep up the argument that it is the vampire's direct influence on his victim which makes the victim helpless, but the difference in the German translation is that the Count is not affecting Mina's willpower, but simply stops her from intervening, at least physically. The German translation gives no explicit statement of how Mina is psychologically affected by the Count – in contrast to both the original text and the Norwegian translation. Mina might in the German translation not be physically able to make any attempts of defense, but she gives no clear statement that she did *not* object to the Count biting her. It is this very lack of wish to intervene which highlights the Count's influence on his victims – since the victim would naturally object to being bitten by a vampire, yet finds themselves in a state of “strange lethargy” or similar in the immediate presence of the Count. Furthermore, the words “[...] strangeIy enough, I did not want to hinder him” in the original suggest a suppressed wish for breaking the strict Victorian taboos, as often discussed in secondary literature (for example Punter 2004:231). The German change from *not wishing* to *not being able* to hinder the Count thus does not include this hidden wish for breaking out of the strict Victorian conventions.

Another rather striking difference is the use of adjectives when the Count bites Mina: the original and then Norwegian translation describe this event as the Count placing “his reeking lips” upon Mina's throat, implying something unclean by the description of the Count's mouth being foul-smelling. The German translation, however, describes the Count's lips as “hot”, giving no implication whatsoever of anything reeking. Apart from that, it is rather strange that an “un-dead” being with no blood circulation and thus no body temperature comparable with that of a living being (dead bodies are *cold*) *and* being in need of blood has warm, not to mention, “hot” lips.

Until this encounter, we have not met the Count “directly” since Harker’s journal entries at the beginning of the novel. All the time, he was present, but only observed from afar, never in direct action or speech. And still, the Count is mostly indirectly present in the novel: apart from Jonathan, as he states in his journal in the first four chapters, Renfield shortly before the attack against Mina and Mina now in the quoted episode, the Count has never interacted in direct speech with any of the characters. Apart from some glimpses in the one shape or the other, they do not even meet the Count. It is rather remarkable that the character who gives the novel its title, the threat that the entire plot is circled around, is hardly directly present in the novel. However, he does not leave the protagonists or the reader in any doubt about him being the major threat, even though it is not clear in what respect exactly: he tells Mina that she now knows “what it is to cross [his] path.” – but what path exactly is this? Is this vampire of noble descent nothing more than an ordinary parasite? Indeed, vampires do show parasitic features: they live on their victims’ blood until said victim dies or becomes a vampire themselves. We have seen in Harker’s journal in the beginning of the novel that the people in Dracula’s home country are highly superstitious and cautious. They no longer leave their houses without protection, they warn Harker against going out at night time and take any precautions in order to hinder the vampire from entering their homes. Thus, it is very likely that the Count’s “path” was leading him to new places. Places where people have not yet heard of vampires, where they do not even believe in their existence and thus are not cautious. Compared to the people in Transylvania, the English people are fairly easy prey for the Count. And obviously, it was time for the Count to move on – after his “hundreds of years” before, obviously staying in his “home” area, the amount of prey is very likely to have thinned out for him, as his extreme appetite shows aboard the *Demeter*. This is somewhat disappointing: the mysterious vampire Count, this fearsome, yet fascinating creature, follows in the end only one very basic instinct: hunger. All the suspense of the novel is being taken away in the moment the fearsome Count is being defeated – in the end, it was only a hungry creature, comparable with a wild animal outside its original hunting grounds. Just as any other rather primitive “life” form, the Count is simply driven by the instinct of “survival”. Even worse: contrary to even primitive life forms, the vampire is not so much interested in reproduction – in the end all his “fellow” vampires are nothing more than competitors for prey. It is not about keeping the species going, it is only about the egoistic, basic hunger of the vampire that needs to be satisfied. Seen from this perspective, the Count of Stoker’s novel has little more in common with the Romantic vampire that was

a figure of mystery, combining villain and victim in one being (McEvoy, 2007:19–27, in Spooner/McEvoy 2007). This might of course be explained by the Victorian restrictions on the one hand, and the Count as breaker of taboos on the other. The Victorian vampire embodies everything a good Victorian upper-class citizen is to refuse and even shun. This explains as well why the vampire hunters *must* be successful in hunting and killing the vampire that threatens their society.

6.3 Van Helsing

Van Helsing, the Dutch leader of the vampire hunters, does, apart from some few letters and telegrams, not appear “unmediated” in the novel, that is, other than one letter and some telegrams, he does not produce any text himself. His actions and speeches are only disclosed to the reader by means of the other characters’ journals, mostly Seward’s. In this case, that is, concerning the following text excerpt, Van Helsing’s speech is quoted in Mina’s journal. It is, of course, rather difficult to “trust” quoted texts, since written language never resembles actual speech. And still, we see the corrections compared to the original – Van Helsing’s incorrect use of language is only visible in the English original, not so in the translations.

At the beginning of his speech in chapter 18, Van Helsing finally tells the hunting party that they are actually a *vampire hunting party*:

“There are such things as vampires, some of us have evidence that they exist. Even had we not the proof of our own unhappy experience, the teachings and the records of the past give proof enough for sane peoples. I admit that at the first I was sceptic. Were it not that through long years I have train myself to keep an open mind, I could not have believe until such time as that fact thunder on my ear. ‘See! see! I prove; I prove.’ Alas! Had I known at the first what now I know – nay, had I even guess at him – one so precious life had been spared to many of us who did love her. But that is gone; and we must so work that other poor souls perish not, whilst we can save. The *nosferatu* do not die like the bee when he sting once. He is only stronger; and being stronger, have yet more power to work evil. This vampire which is amongst us is of himself so strong in person as twenty men; he is of cunning more than mortal, for his cunning be the growth of ages; he have still the aids of necromancy, which is, as his etymology imply, the divination by the dead, and all the dead that he can come nigh to are for him to command; he is brute, and more than brute: he is devil in callous, and the heart of him is not; he can, within limitations, appear at will when, and where, and in any of the forms that are to him; he can, within his range, direct the elements: the storm, the fog, the thunder; he can command all the meaner things; the rat, and the owl, and the bat – the moth, and the fox, and the wolf; he can grow and become small; and he can at times vanish and come unknown. How then are we to begin our strife to destroy him? How shall we

find his where; and having found it, how can we destroy? My friends, this is much; it is a terrible task that we undertake, and there may be consequence to make the brave shudder. For if we fail in this our fight he must surely win: and then where end we? Life is nothings: I heed him not. But to fail here, is not mere life or death. It is that we become as him; that we henceforward become foul things of the night like him – without heart or conscience, preying on the bodies and the souls of those we love best. To us for ever are the gates of heaven shut; for who shall open them to us again? We go on for all time abhorred by all: a blot on the face of God’s sunshine; an arrow in the side of Him who died for man. But we are face to face with duty; and in such case must we shrink? For me, I say, no; but then I am old, and life, with his sunshine, with his fair places, his song of birds, his music and his love, lie far behind. You others are young. Some have seen sorrow, but there are fair days yet in store. What say you?” (Klinger / Stoker 2008:336)

Throughout the novel, ever since Seward asked him for help, it appears that he has known, or at least suspected, that a vampire was causing the “strange” events with which the characters are confronted. Yet, as late as in chapter 18 (of 27), he chooses to let the hunting group know *what* they are after. He claims often before that he fears he might not be believed. But has Lucy’s change not already been proof enough for his theory? Already at this point, the others would have believed him about the nature of the creature that had caused Lucy’s transformation. Instead, he chooses to leave the others ignorant of his suspicions (or ideas) for as long as is possible for him. But this is not the only ambiguous factor about Van Helsing.

There are also some uncertainties concerning Van Helsing’s nationality: despite him “being” Dutch, he makes German exclamations when shocked. Dutch and German are related languages, and they are fairly close in their vocabulary, but nevertheless, one would expect the Dutch character to retreat to his *native* tongue when in circumstances of being utterly shocked, instead of using a language which can at best be regarded as a secondary language. Apart from that, his English is relatively poor as well. When Seward sends for him, he does so because he is convinced that Van Helsing is the only one who has enough knowledge to help, and also otherwise, Van Helsing is presented as a man who, during his long life, has spent all his time studying, learning something apart from the standard ways and collecting knowledge. However, he does not seem to have wasted any time in refining his knowledge of foreign languages. He manages well to make himself understood and obviously does not have any problems in understanding, either – yet, for a man as sophisticated as him, his poor English skills are rather peculiar. This becomes especially striking when compared to his great antagonist, the Count. The Count, being of

Transylvanian origin, clearly comes from a place further away from England than Van Helsing. Besides, Romanian is – concerning the number of speakers, a “larger” language than Dutch. The Count has therefore less pressing reasons for refining his knowledge of English (if he has any reasons for learning the language in the first place) than Van Helsing. And yet, the Count’s English is, according to the few occasions he is quoted, much better than Van Helsing’s. Van Helsing’s – admittedly small, but obviously still noticeable – mistakes are mercilessly copied to journal entries, even the varieties (he does not do the same mistake every time) are noted down, whereas the Count is being quoted in the best and most correct English. On the one hand, this might be interpreted as a sign of affection – only persons who are regarded as close to someone, are being “honoured” by a very detailed description, where even small imperfections are regarded as a pleasant aspect rather than a real remedy. Then, quoting the Count in “perfect” English would simply mean that none of the members of the hunting party wants to be bothered with capturing every detail about him. Apart from that, language imperfection is a very *human* remedy, so it would be inconsequent to attribute a supernatural and uncanny creature with something as personable as a human imperfection. On the other hand, however, it is not very nice to point out a person’s language imperfections repeatedly. The others’ pointing out Van Helsing’s mistakes in English then becomes a rather arrogant act, suggesting an “us here – him there”-attitude. And what does this tell us about both figures, the Count and Van Helsing? First of all, we are presented with a protagonist (Van Helsing) versus his antagonist (the Count), where the antagonist is marked by clear features. The Count is *indisputably* evil, his plan is simple and malevolent, he is egoistic and reckless. This character is rather one-dimensional as well, for neither Stoker nor any of the other characters (nor the reader, perhaps?) want to dwell on the question of a “why?” – the Count is evil and is to be defeated. This is his sole “purpose” within the novel. Van Helsing, on the other side, cannot be characterised so easily. Yes, he is the one to lead the vampire hunters, so that places him on the side of the protagonist, making him one of those to defeat evil. But he is too ambiguous to be described as “one-dimensional”, and can we be really sure that he is “nothing but good”? His scheming and lying for so long does not exactly make him a trustworthy character. And even Stoker himself created the Van Helsing-persona so inconclusive that it is very hard to establish any trust in Van Helsing. A Dutchman making German exclamations, a man of science trained in occultism – all these details make the whole character Van Helsing rather questionable and obscure.

Additionally, the contrast in language skills between the Count and Van Helsing

might highlight the Count's apparent superiority to the human vampire hunters, at least until his eventual defeat. Then, concerning the novel as a whole, the small imperfection of language skills is – although worth mentioning – small compared to the “victory of good above evil” which the conception of Van Helsing represents (after all, he *is* the leader of the vampire hunters, imperfect English or not), at least compared to the alternative being the Count winning.

Van Helsing is “walking on thin ice” in several respects with his speech: not only does he inform the hunting party about the true nature of their enemy rather late, he also begins his speech – which is intended to get the group to hunt the Count down *all together* – with negative elements. He tells the group about the Count's true nature, about his strengths, and about the severe consequences which await them all should they fail in destroying the Count. Until here, no word about the vampire's weaknesses, or even the slightest chance of the vampire hunters to succeed in their task, is uttered. Van Helsing only appeals to the others' moral conscience, reminding them that hunting down the Count already *is* their task, although they neither knew what they are facing until now, nor knew that the task is in fact theirs. We know that he is successful with his speech, yet it seems somewhat strange that this is the case. Apart from moral responsibility, he gives the group no reason to either trust him or cooperate with him. He left the group ignorant about the Count's true nature for too long, and he *could* have saved Lucy's life, had he told the truth earlier. In other words, the vampire hunters have every reason to distrust him. And still, they follow him. Obviously Van Helsing must either be a more charismatic person than the others “admit” in their journals. In this case, however, “charismatic” would be synonymous with “manipulating”, since there is no objective explanation for the others willingness to follow him without even asking for any further explanations, not even on how to eventually destroy the vampire.

Apart from that, Van Helsing is contradicting his own statements: in earlier chapters, when dealing with the un-dead Lucy, he refuses to give any explanations, claiming that he fears he might not be believed, especially by Holmwood. This makes it clear that he most definitely *suspected* Lucy's being a vampire. And now he claims that “had he only even so much as guessed what is going on”, he could have saved her. He *did* at least guess the reason much earlier – and as it turns out, his guess was right! – and yet, he is not “able” (?) to save Lucy's life. The contradiction is obvious. What is, however, not obvious, is the reason for this behaviour. What benefits does Van Helsing have from waiting for too long? None other than finally being the only one in the vampire hunting

group who knows about the danger the group is about to face. This knowledge makes him the leader – especially the exclusiveness of this knowledge. As long as he keeps his knowledge to himself, he is *needed*. As long as it is him and none other than him, who knows how to defeat a vampire, the group is depending on him. While Van Helsing can direct the other members as he wishes – or “thinks best” – he is still important and needed, despite his age or other weaknesses. Does thus his behaviour ground in the anxiety of an old man who fears to be of no more use to those around him? In that case, his behaviour, all obvious and pathetic (pathetic because of his obvious boasting concerning his wide knowledge), would at least be explainable and make Van Helsing a vulnerable human being despite his apparent arrogant and reckless behaviour. It would also make his actions and motives understandable.

Let us have a look at the translations – as before, I present both the Norwegian and the German translation together, before I examine them.

Norwegian translation:

“Vampyrer er vesener som virkelig finnes, flere av oss har sett vitnesbyrd for deres eksistens. Og om vi ikke hadde hatt våre egne tragiske opplevelser å støtte oss til som bevis, så kan overleveringer og beretninger fra fortiden tjene som beviser gode nok for fornuftige mennesker. Jeg innrømmer at jeg i begynnelsen stillet meg litt skeptisk. Hadde det ikke vært fordi jeg gjennom mange år hadde trent meg opp til aldri å være forutinntatt, ville jeg ikke trodd det før det tidspunkt kom da selve kjensgjerningen tordnet mot meg: 'Se! Se her! Jeg har bevis, jeg har bevis!' Akk ja! Hadde jeg visst fra først av det jeg nå vet – nei, hadde jeg bare glettet det – da kunne et liv som var dyrbart for alle oss som var glad i henne, ha vært reddet. Men det er allerede skjedd, og nå må vi arbeide for at andre arme sjeler ikke skal gå til grunne, så lenge vi kan redde dem. En *nosferatu* dør nemlig ikke slik som bien etter at den har stukket en gang med sin brodd. Han er sterkere, og fordi han er sterkere, har han enda større evne til å gjøre det onde. Denne vampyren som nå er iblant oss, er rent fysisk sterkere enn tyve vanlige menn. Han er mer slu enn noe dødelig menneske, for hans sluhet har utviklet seg gjennom mange århundrer. Dessuten kan han gjøre bruk av nekromanti, som er hans ord for evnen til å mane frem de døde, og alle døde som han kommer nær, må lyde ham. Et udyr er han, og verre enn et udyr: han er en forherdet djevel, helt uten hjerte. Innen visse begrensninger kan han vise seg hvor han vil og når han vil og i en hvilken som helst av de skikkelser han har. Så langt hans makt rekker, kan han bestemme over naturkreftenene: storm, tåke og tordenvær. Alle laverestående skapninger må lyde ham: rotten og uglen og flaggermusen – og møllen og reven og ulven. Han kan bli både stor og liten, og til tider kan han forsvinne så ingen vet noe om ham. Hvordan skal vi da begynne vår kamp for å ødelegge ham? Hvordan skal vi kunne finne ut hvor han er, og når vi så har funnet ut det, hvordan skal vi kunne tilintetgjøre ham? Det blir ikke lett, mine venner, det er en forferdelig oppgave vi har påtatt oss, og den kan trekke med seg følger som vil få selv den tapreste til å skjelve. For hvis vi taper i denne kampen, da må jo nødvendigvis han vinne, og hvordan skal det så gå med oss? Livet betyr ikke noe, jeg er ikke redd ham av den grunn. Men å tape her, det gjelder mer enn liv og død. Vi kommer til å bli som han – uten hjerte og samvittighet, vesener som raner

sjeler og legemet til dem vi har vært mest glad i. For oss ville himmelens port da være stengt for bestandig, for hvem skulle da åpne den for oss igjen? Vi må eksistere videre i evig tid, hatet av alle – som en skamplott på det solskinn som Gud skapte, og som en spydodd i siden på Ham som døde for menneskenes skyld. Men vi står her overfor en plikt, og kan vi da vike tilbake? For mitt eget vedkommende sier jeg nei. Men jeg er gammel, og for meg er livet med sitt solskinn og sine vakre steder, med fuglesang og musikk og kjærlighet, noe som jeg har lagt bak meg. Dere andre er unge. Noen av dere har opplevd sorg, men dere har gode dager i vente. Hva svarer dere?” (Stoker / Carling 1974:246–7)

German translation:

”Es gibt Wesen, die man Vampyre nennt; einige unter uns haben handgreifliche Beweise dafür, daß sie existieren. Selbst wenn wir nicht unsere eigenen traurigen Erfahrungen hätten machen müssen, so würden immerhin die Berichte und Lehren unserer Vorfahren für vernünftig Denkende Beweis genug bilden. Ich gebe zu, daß ich anfangs der Sache skeptisch gegenüberstand. Wäre ich nicht schon durch die Übung langer Jahre darauf geschult, meine Augen offen zu halten, ich hätte nicht eher daran geglaubt, als bis mir die Tatsachen zugerufen hätten ’Sieh, sieh! Ich beweise es!’ Leider! Hätte ich gleich zu Anfang das gewußt, was ich heute weiß – selbst wenn ich es nur hätte ahnen können – ein kostbares Leben hätte erhalten bleiben können. Aber das ist nun vorbei; unsere Aufgabe ist es nun, so zu wirken, daß nicht auch andere Seelen zu Grunde gehen, so lange sie noch zu retten sind. Der ’Nosferatu’ stirbt nicht wie die Biene, wenn sie einmal gestochen hat. Er wird dadurch nur noch stärker, und je stärker er wird, desto mehr Kraft hat er, wieder Böses zu tun. Dieser Vampyr, der unter uns weilt, vereinigt in sich die Kraft von zwanzig Männern; er ist schlauer als die Sterblichen, denn seine Schlaueit wächst im Laufe der Zeiten. Er besitzt die Gabe der Nekromantie, d.h., wie ja schon aus der Etymologie der [*sic!*] Wortes ersichtlich, die Sehergabe als Toter und unbedingte Macht über alles Tote, in dessen Nähe er kommt. Er ist grausam, mehr als grausam, er ist ein Teufel an Gefühllosigkeit, und ein Herz besitzt er nicht. Er kann, mit gewissen Einschränkungen, erscheinen, wann und wo und in welcher Gestalt er will; er kann innerhalb seines Machtbereiches den Elementen gebieten: dem Sturm, dem Nebel, dem Donner. Er hat auch Macht über geringere Dinge, über Ratten, Fledermäuse, Fliegen, Füchse und Wölfe. Er kann sich größer und kleiner, er kann sich zeitweilig unsichtbar machen und ungesehen kommen und gehen. Wie wollen wir also vorgehen, um ihn zu vernichten? Wie bringen wir heraus, wo er ist, und wenn wir das gefunden haben, wie können wir ihn unschädlich machen? Meine Freunde, das ist nicht einfach; es ist ein schreckliches Unternehmen, das wir da vorhaben, und kann Folgen haben, die auch den Tapfersten erzittern lassen. Denn wenn unser Plan mißlingt, ist er Sieger; wie werden wir dann enden? Das Leben bedeutet nichts; ich klammere mich nicht daran. Aber wenn wir unterliegen, handelt es sich um mehr als Leben und Tod. Wir werden dann so wie er; wir werden von da an gräßliche Nachtgespenster ohne Herz und Gewissen, die die Leiber und Seelen derer zu vernichten trachten, die sie vorher am meisten geliebt haben. Uns sind dann auf ewig die Pforten des Himmels verschlossen, denn wer sollte sie uns wieder öffnen? Wir werden für immer das Abscheu aller sein; ein Schandfleck in Gottes reinem Angesicht; ein Pfeil in der Seite dessen, der für die Menschen gestorben ist. Aber wir stehen unserer Pflicht Auge in Auge gegenüber. Dürfen wir in diesem Falle noch zögern? Ich für meine Person sage nein! Denn ich

bin alt, und das Leben liegt weit hinter mir mit seinem Sonnenschein, seinen *[sic!]* Vogelgesang, seiner Musik, seinen Lieben. Ihr aber seid jung. Einige von euch haben wohl das Leid kennen gelernt, aber sie haben noch Aussicht auf schöne Tage. Was sagen Sie dazu?“ (Stoker / Widtmann 2009:309–11, my comments in italics)

The first language-related difference that catches the eye is the difference between the explanations of the word *necromancy*: in both the original and the German translation, the word is explained by its etymology, but in the Norwegian translation, it suddenly becomes something very obscure, as if it is only the vampire (or any un-dead creature) who uses it. Another difference in language lies in Van Helsing appeal to accept the “duty” that lies before the vampire hunters: in the original, as well as in the Norwegian translation, he states that he himself cannot hesitate to accept the duty, even if it might cost his life. However, he makes it clear that in this case, he can only speak for himself, since he is old. That is what the word “but” in “But I am old [...]” indicates. In the German translation, he starts the other way around: he must accept the duty for he is old, *but* the others are young, and thus might have a more difficult decision to make.

Also in the German translation, the mode of addressing the group changes within two sentences: “Ihr”, although also an old way of addressing one single person in a highly formal way, is in this case the addressing of the second person plural (*Du – Ihr*, as opposed to the formal *Sie – Sie*). In the next sentence, however, he asks the group suddenly in the accepted polite way “Was sagen *Sie* dazu?” – from an informal plural, the addressing has changed to a formal plural. This is rather inconsequent concerning translation – whichever degree of formality the translator sees fit to use in a text’s translation, he must in any case stay consequent. The same applies for writing errors. It is rather confusing that a *German* translator, and a *German* publisher both are ignorant about the difference between Genitive and Dative case *in German*. Especially given the fact that the actual translation dates back to 1926, being decades before the present spelling reform in Germany (which also concerns the correct use of cases, and has recently “loosened” a bit), this grammatical error should not have happened. Since the translation is dated to 1926, and has been re-used in the 2009 edition of the text used here, it is very hard to state whether these mistakes have been accidentally copied from the original translation, or whether they are “new” mistakes that happened during the copying (and, as the publisher claims, *correcting*) process. However, since the editors of the 2009 edition state at the end of the text that “[...] The punctuation was carefully adapted to today’s language use. Obvious writing or printing

errors *have been corrected.*” (Stoker / Widtmann 2009:495, my translation⁸ and italics), these indeed obvious writing errors I presented here should not have happened.

Almost the same applies for the Norwegian translation: some of the words used in the translation must be writing errors, since they cannot be regarded as even very old-fashioned Norwegian. The past tense of the Norwegian verb *å trene* is *trent* and not **trenet*. The same applies to the Norwegian verb *å stille* (*seg [...] til noe*); the correct past tenses of this verb are *stilte* and *ha stilt*, not **(ha) stillet*. The forms used by the translator are of such an old-fashioned nature that even native speakers of Norwegian will find them peculiar.

Since these peculiar, not to say archaic, verb forms only appear in the quoted excerpt, they cannot be regarded as the translator’s “version” of Van Helsing’s incorrect language use transferred to Norwegian. This leads to the conclusion that this peculiar language use in this specific text excerpt must be rather puzzling for a Norwegian native reader – this is neither particularly “old-fashioned” Norwegian, nor is it so consequently incorrect as to be identified as Van Helsing’s characteristically patois we know from the original text. What else is it, then?

One possible answer might be what Eco discusses in his chapter *Translating Rhythm* (Eco 2001:40–5). Provided that a certain congruency in rhythm is not exclusively applying to poetry, but also to prose, the use of the archaic verb forms in this context only might fulfill the purpose of maintaining the urgency and pathos of Van Helsing’s speech. Eco finishes his chapter with the following: “[...], we can discard a lot of puzzling definitions of translations that have recourse to similarity of meaning or to other circular arguments. Instead of speaking of equivalence of meaning, we can speak of *functional equivalence*: a good translation must generate the same effect aimed at by the original (cf. Mason 1998, Schäffner 1998). Obviously this means that translators have to make an interpretative hypothesis about the effect programmed by the original text. Many hypotheses can be made about the same text, so that the decision about the focus of the translation becomes *negotiable.*” (Eco 2001:44–5). Applying this statement to our case, we can assume that the seriousness of the situation in which Van Helsing makes his speech is of such a grave nature that it needs to be highlighted by an archaic use of language.

It is indeed a grave subject he is talking about, and the situation for the vampire hunters is not only urgent, but also highly dangerous. In order to maintain the solemn seriousness of

⁸ Original: „[...] Die Interpunktion wurde behutsam dem heutigen Gebrauch angepasst. Eindeutige Satz- und Druckfehler wurden stillschweigend korrigiert.“

Van Helsing's speech, the translator might have chosen those archaic verb forms precisely for the reason I just suggested. Both the occasion and Van Helsing's being a rather peculiar character might thus justify the translator's choice of words – and for this occasion only, in order to mark it as a particularly important turning point within the novel.

7 Conclusion

Both *Dracula's* structure as well as the fact that the novel is regarded as the basis of all modern vampire fiction, lead to specific problems concerning translations of the text. A translation of a Victorian text today needs special attention. Not only have the social and linguistical registers changed, but also the different registers within the text (a letter between friends vs. a ship's log entry, for example) are to be considered. This is difficult today because modern translators may well have the theoretical knowledge of the characteristic Victorian English, but due to language change throughout time this theoretical knowledge might be misleading. There is a danger of "overdoing" the specific linguistical registers and thus changing the text too much. A translator is always walking the line between being as close as possible to the source text (hereafter abbreviated as ST, as well as "source language" will be abbreviated as SL) and presenting a target text (hereafter abbreviated as TT, as well as "target language" will be abbreviated as TL) that is not only good to read, but also matches the cultural factors of the target language.

The first thing that strikes the reader of the original and the Norwegian or German translations, is the lack of socio- and dialects in the translation. When Mina talks to a local from Whitby, she not only writes down the conversation in her journal, she is also keeping the man's dialect when she quotes him. This does not happen in the Norwegian translation, and not in the German translation, either.

Suddenly, in both translations, the Whitby local is talking just like a London middle-class man. One might argue that it is difficult to pick the "right" dialect when translating a text. What guidelines are there? Is the translator supposed to use the same geographical features in the TL, as they were in the SL? Or what other guidelines does the translator have? Concerning sociolects, this question is easier to answer, since as good as every social class has their own sociolect. Here, it is easy to find an equivalent, by finding a TL-sociolect that matches the SL-sociolect (for example, the sociolect of the working class or similar). But concerning dialects, the problem is more challenging. But relatively easy or not, the Norwegian translator chose to ignore the dialects and sociolects in a large degree. Only the interview with the zookeeper, who speaks Cockney in the original text, shows some slight approaches to at least colloquial Norwegian. Yet still, even this approach is not strong enough to be regarded as equivalent to the original Cockney sociolect.

Of course, the disregarding of specific language aspects has consequences. First of all, a great deal of the characters' individuality and trustworthiness is getting lost. Van Helsing's ambiguity, for example: in Stoker's original, many questions arise concerning this character. Is he really a Dutchman? Then how come he makes German exclamations in the English text? How to explain his secrecy? Could he have saved Lucy after all? And if so, why did he not do it? Where did he gain his knowledge about supernatural beings such as vampires? The many ambiguous factors about Van Helsing are in both translations merely reduced to his enigmatic behaviour. The general obscurities about him, especially shown in his use of language, are no longer present in the translations. For what reason did the translators ignore (and even remove) the ambiguity of the entire character Van Helsing?

According to Newmark's statement that "[U]sually, the translator's intention is identical with that of the author of the SL text, [...]" (Newmark, 1988:12), the translator of the Norwegian version of *Dracula* clearly did not have the same intentions. My argumentation is that Stoker's intention was to create a realistic nature to his text by giving certain accents, dialects and sociolects to certain figures and thus shaping them more "likely to believe in". Since their dialects disappear in the translation, the translator removes this "additional feature of realism" from the text.

Newmark also states that "[...] the translator cannot afford the luxury of saying that something cannot be translated." (Newmark 1988:6). So, why did the translator choose to ignore the Whitby dialect, the Cockney, and why did he correct Van Helsing's and the small children's incorrect use of language?

It appears that in both translations, Stoker's attempts to "give more life" to the characters have been ignored. Of course, these changes are minor compared to the novel's plot – the story that is being told has the same beginning, the same tension and the same ending in both translations as in the original. And still, isn't it exactly the single character's details, their ambiguity, remedies and "personal" way of expressing themselves which makes a novel worth reading? By removing these elements, the story is not altered, but the characters lack "trustworthiness". What makes *Dracula* clearly Bram Stoker's novel about a group of English people fighting a Romanian vampire count is the novel's characters and their personality. One could say that both translations merely re-tell a vampire story, not *the* specific one by Bram Stoker.

So, what is it the translations are doing here? Do they bring the text closer to the reader, or do they encourage the reader to get closer to the text? As far as I can see it, both translations attempt to lead the reader to the text. Both translations maintain an "old-

fashioned” style of language which is close to the Victorian English original. In both cases, not only the style of language, but also the shifting ideals on gender (such as on what is a “good” woman) are consequently maintained: Van Helsing attributes Mina as to having “a man’s brain”, and he means that as a compliment to Mina’s abilities and way of thinking; Harker “speaks for Mina and himself” when he decides to continue being a member of the vampire hunting party. And yet, the translations are only *attempts* to reproduce Stoker’s novel. Many aspects of the novel’s conception are missing, due to the lacking regard for apparently small linguistic aspects which turn out to be not so small nevertheless.

Given the fact that the most recent edition of the German translation is a re-print of a translation made in 1926, as well as the *only existing* Norwegian translation being from 1974, it is probably about time for re-doing Heinz Widtmann’s and Bjørn Carling’s work and produce new German and Norwegian translations respectively. As I mentioned in the introduction, it took almost sixty years to acknowledge the *original’s* relevance for Victorian Gothic literature. The present lack of “depth” in the translations puts the (translated!) text back into the realm of triviality, which is a fate that *Dracula* certainly does not deserve. If Stoker’s vampire count is to continue to haunt both Norwegian and German readers, as well as Norwegian and German *scholars*, new translations are necessary for both readers today and in the future.

Bibliography

- Andersson, Lars and Peter Trudgill: *Bad Language*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1990.
- Auerbach, Erich: *Mimesis: Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur*, zweite Auflage, Francke Verlag, Bern, 1959.
- Chambers, J.K. and Peter Trudgill: *Dialectology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, 1980.
- Eco, Umberto: *Experiences in Translation*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 2001.
- Hard, Robin: *The Routledge Handbook of Greek Mythology*, Routledge, London, 2008.
- Kittler, Friedrich: *Draculas Vermächtnis: Technische Schriften*, Reclam Verlag Leipzig, 1993.
- Kittler, Friedrich: *Grammophone, Film, Typewriter*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1999.
- Kittler, Friedrich: *Mediefilosofi*, oversatt og med etterord av Knut Ove Eliassen, Cappelenens populære skrifter, Cappelen akademisk forlag, Oslo, 2009.
- Maunder, Andrew: *Bram Stoker*, Northcote, Tavistock, 2006.
- Newmark, Peter: *A Textbook Of Translation*, Prentice Hall, New York, 1988.
- Punter, David and Glennis Byron: *The Gothic*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2004.
- Rabassa, Gregory: *If This Be Treason: Translation And Its Possibilities*, in: William Frawley (editor): *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives*, University of Delaware Press, Newark, 1984, pp. 21 – 29.
- St John Butler, Lance: *Registering The Difference: Reading literature through register*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1999.
- Stoker, Bram / Bjørn Carling (translator): *Dracula*, Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, Oslo, 1974.
- Stoker, Bram / Leslie S. Klinger (editor): *The New Annotated Dracula*, W.W. Norton & Company Ltd., London, New York, 2008.
- Stoker, Bram / Heinz Widtmann (translator): *Dracula: Ein Vampyr-Roman*, S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 2008.
- Wardhaugh, Robert: *An Introduction To Sociolinguistics*, 2nd edition, Blackwell, Oxford, 1992.