



Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA
Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

The Translation of the Linguistic Variation in *Dracula*

Elena Diez Antón

Tutor: Idoia Pozo Otegi

4º Grado en Estudios Ingleses

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I intend to analyze how the linguistic variation present in the speech of three characters in the novel *Dracula*, by Bram Stoker, has been translated into Spanish. For this purpose, I will study some linguistic theories about the linguistic variation and translation, and I will survey real examples extracted from the original novel so as to study how they have been translated into Spanish, analyzing also the translated extracts in terms of translation techniques, and drawing conclusions from the results obtained.

Keywords: Linguistic variation, translation, *Dracula*, markers, context clues, translation procedures

En este trabajo, pretendo analizar cómo la variación lingüística presente en el habla de tres personajes de la novela *Drácula*, de Bram Stoker, ha sido traducida al español. Con este propósito, profundizaré en teorías lingüísticas sobre la variación y la traducción, y examinaré ejemplos reales extraídos de la novela original para estudiar cómo han sido traducidos al español, analizando asimismo los extractos traducidos en términos de técnicas de traducción, y extrayendo conclusiones con los resultados obtenidos.

Palabras clave: Variación lingüística, traducción, *Drácula*, marcadores, pistas de contextualización, procedimientos de traducción

Index

1. Introduction	6
2. Justification	7
3. Theoretic Base.....	8
3.1 The Linguistic Variation	8
3.1.1 Markers	12
3.1.2 Context Clues	14
3. 2 Considerations about the Translation.....	15
3. 3. Translation Techniques	17
4. Analysis	19
4.1 Mr. Swales.....	20
4. 2. Abraham Van Helsing.....	27
4. 3. Quincey P. Morris	32
5. Conclusion.....	38
6. Bibliography.....	41

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, I will deal with the linguistic variation and the problems it poses for a translator when it comes to transferring it into the translated language. As we are going to see below, I will study the different types of variants that can exist in a language and how should the translator work with them in order to achieve a successful outcome. However, I am only going to center in the linguistic variation linked to the writing of novels, and more specifically, in the renowned work by the Irish author Bram Stoker (1847-1912) titled *Dracula* (or *Dracula, the Undead* in some versions), which was first published in 1897. It is my intention to survey Bram Stoker's style in this work, as *Dracula* is a novel written in epistolary form in which many characters and, therefore, many voices intervene. The characters come from many different parts of the world and have very different biographical backgrounds, thus constituting a very good sample for the study of the linguistic variation and how it has been translated into Spanish. Nonetheless, this is only possible thanks to the mastery achieved by Bram Stoker when it comes to the representation of different types of speech, since the author took a special care in the portrayal of the variety of accents, dialects, idioms and literary mannerisms that appear throughout the novel, which pose a number of problems related to the linguistic variation for its translation into Spanish. The problems derived from the linguistic variation and how they have been dealt with are going to be the focus of this paper.

I have organized this essay in various sections. The first is this general introduction to the matter in question, in which I am writing about the topic. The second is the justification of this essay. In the third part, I will deal with the theoretic base of the linguistic variation, context clues and markers in translation, plus some considerations. The fourth part is the core of the paper: the analysis in which I will describe what are the issues resulted from the linguistic variation in *Dracula* and how they have been solved by the translator. I will do it by means of including some exemplary excerpts from both the original novel and the translation, and explanations about the methodology used to sort out these problems. However, due to the limited space allowed for this essay, I could only analyze the linguistic

variation of three characters: Mr. Swales, Abraham Van Helsing, and Quincey P. Morris, surveying three of each one's utterances. Finally, I will sum up the conclusions drawn from the analysis, and the last two sections will consist of the bibliography and the appendixes.

2. JUSTIFICATION

It is common knowledge that each person has a different way of speaking, that each one has a certain manner for saying the same thing, due to a variety of reasons. These different forms of expressing oneself in oral speech have also been reflected in the written tradition, especially in literature. In order to make their works credible, writers have to pay special attention to the way in which the different characters think and speak. Therefore, they have to make an effort so that their characters express themselves in different and distinguishable forms, so as to provide them with richness and naturalness. However, this is not an easy task, because no matter how hardly you try it, it is really difficult to think with a different voice than yours (which is needed to create different types of voices for the characters) and, more importantly for this essay, writers and translators have to be very aware of the most relevant thing in order to articulate singular speeches: the linguistic variation. As we are going to see below, the linguistic variation is the linguistic feature that makes each person's utterances particular. There are many kinds of linguistic variations and they are the reason why each person sounds different.

I have decided to survey the translation of the linguistic variation in *Dracula*, because there are not many researches carried out tackling this topic, and, normally, they are only theoretical approaches. As very few of them deal with the translation of the linguistic variation in particular works, I believe that it is necessary a study like this, relating the theoretical basis to the practical translation of a real piece of literature.

As the linguistic variation implies some problems for the translator, the objectives of this paper include the following:

1. To define what the linguistic variation is and why it is so important in translation.
2. To describe the different translation techniques.
3. To find the context clues used in different characters' speech, according to their situation, and how they have been translated (if translated).
4. To find the markers used in different characters' speech and how they have been translated (if translated).
5. To draw a pattern for the translation of the linguistic variation in the characters of *Dracula* chosen (if possible).
6. To demonstrate that the linguistic variation is a very important aspect to take into account when translating a literary piece of work.
7. To show that, in a novel in which so many characters with differentiated voices intervene, the translation should reflect the linguistic variation (although not always focusing on the same elements as in the original text).
8. To give way to further researches about the translation of the linguistic variation in *Dracula*, and more generally in other literary writings.

3. THEORETIC BASE

3.1 The Linguistic Variation

To begin with, it is important to clarify what the linguistic variation is. I would say that the linguistic variation is the set of linguistic and extra-linguistic circumstances that makes each person's speech different. Historically, the study of the linguistic variation started with the School of Prague in the early 90s and it has been a matter of research for linguists, translators and sociolinguists up until the present day. This is due to the fact that there is no clear consensus between experts as to how to define the linguistic variation, since each author created a new conception, adding characteristics or removing the ones that he or she did not consider suitable for his or her investigations. This is the reason why there are two main lines for the study of the linguistic variation (Mayoral 1999: 21): one that places its focus on the linguistic system (followed by authors such as Saussure (1916), Catford

(1965) and Coseriu (1973)); and another that concentrates on the lexical meaning (defended by Mounin (1963), Kerbrat Orecchioni (1977), and Larson (1984)). Finally, these two points of view reunite in the figure of Nida (1969, 1964).

However, as Mayoral says (1999: 13), the concept of the linguistic variation has been accepted by most linguists, but very few have been concerned with its definition. According to the Centro Virtual Cervantes (*Variación Lingüística*), the linguistic variation is the use of the language conditioned by geographic, socio-cultural, contextual or historic factors. This means that the way in which the speakers of a language use it is not uniform, because its usage depends on the personal circumstances of the speaker, and the time and type of communication in which he is involved. This originates different kinds of linguistic variation: the functional variant, the socio-cultural variant, the geographic variant, and the historic variant (*Variación Lingüística: Centro Virtual Cervantes*).

To put it another way, the variation is the result of stating almost the same meaning but using different ways to convey it, which creates a variety of texts with a very close significance. It has also been defined by Halliday (1978: 74) as the process by which there is a movement between variants and the speaker changes of variant under certain sociolinguistic conditions. This means that the speaker can change of linguistic variant depending on the situation. Therefore, the linguistic variation comprises aspects such as: the individuality of the speaker, the difference of connotation, the social background, the situational background, the ideology, the style, the register, and the dialect, among many others (Mayoral: 1999, 13). As a result, there have been many classifications of the linguistic variation made.

Following Hudson (1980: 23-5) variations can apply to languages, dialects and registers, since the author comes to the conclusion that there is no real distinction between the three of them. Therefore, not only all the languages spoken by a person could be defined as a great variant, but also one peculiar element spoken only by a person or by a reduced group of people (family, village) can be considered a variant (Hudson, 1980: 24).

The linguistic variation can be categorized by the particular characteristics of a concrete speaker, this is, the user; or by the situation in which language is used, namely the context of use. On the one hand, the former categorization includes the geographic variants, or dialects; the different cultural levels of the language community; and according to the age, gender, religion, or occupation of the speaker, the variants related to jargons, argot, and special languages. On the other hand, the latter categorization refers to the linguistic register, or functional variants (*Variación Lingüística*: Centro Virtual Cervantes). These functional variants are directly conditioned by the context of use, and they depend on the means of communication (oral, written), the topic, the participants and the communicative intention. According to Halliday (1978), there are three contextual criteria:

1. The field, which determines the degree of specialization of a text.
2. The mode, or means of communication.
3. The tone of the speakers:
 - The interpersonal tone, which dictates the degree of formality, the courtesy and the subjectivity of a text.
 - The functional tone, related to the intention of the text.

Some specific types of variation relevant to this paper, as appear in Mayoral (1999), are described below:

- **The idiolect:** It is considered by some authors (like Halliday) as the personal style, and it is very related to the register, within the variant of use. However, other linguists (like Catford) believe that it is more related to the idiosyncrasy of a particular person, to his or her personal identity, and not to his or her peculiar way of speaking (personal dialect). As a result, the idiolect has been defined as being linked to the use, which is voluntary, or as being linked to the user, which is involuntary. It is claimed to be the only category useful for the characterization of the linguistic variation by authors like Mayoral (1999, 102).
- **The topic, the profession, the gender, the type of text and the communicative situation:** Mayoral (1999, 103) says that it is easy to define the variation related to the features of a person (profession, gender), but it is more complicated to

determine the variation connected to the context. To establish the kind of context, specialized or non-specialized, this author prefers to depart from the communication of specialized information, which leads to the description of the interlocutors (specialist to specialist, specialist to non-specialist, specialist to user, etc), the proper vehicles for that sort of communicative situation (specialized magazine, brochure, report, etc), the more suitable genres for the vehicles proposed (scientific article, abstract, essay, etc), and the format. All of these features will determine the terminology and phraseology, which characterize professional languages (Mayoral: 1999, 103). Therefore, the topic is which allows for the definition of the rest of contextual variations.

- **Standard language, social and/or economic class and educational level:** Mayoral (1999, 105) claims that there is no actual standard language, since what may be considered standard by some speakers is not considered standard by others and vice versa. Thus, the standard is more related to the appropriateness in a certain communicative situation and the requirements for the effectiveness of the transmission of information. As to the economic, educational and social class variations in language, Mayoral (1999, 104) states that they cannot be separated from one another, because normally one conditions the others, and consequently, they will manifest in a similar linguistic level.
- **Attitude, formality, argot and taboo:** These are not independent variants and they are usually determined by the communicative situation. It is assumed that there is a scale of formality, but the limits from one degree to the next are very diffused, since utterances that may be considered lofty or elevated in a situation may not be considered as such in other contexts. It is the same for the argot, the attitude and the taboo. Besides, these features can be used to characterize other linguistic variations: a dialect, a sociolect, uneducated language, relaxed speech, etc (Mayoral 1999: 106).
- **Geographic dialects:** Dialects are also used to describe language varieties spoken by specific social groups, professionals, religious confessions, etc. These geographic dialects can be of equal, minor or even superior importance than the

language variety considered as standard, and their prestige does not always depend on their geographic diffusion (Mayoral: 1999, 107).

- **Gender:** Violeta Demonte (1982: 216) lists the reasons why scholars have studied gender: to survey the nature and the ways of woman's speech, the differences with man's speech, how language reflects the role of women in society, the issue of sexism in language, and the question of the possibility of the elimination of the discriminatory uses of the language. Even though it is true that there is a clear difference between the linguistic elements used by women and men in some languages (for instance, in Japanese), the outcomes of the different studies carried out about the linguistic variation of the gender in English and Spanish have never been conclusive, since they are usually little objective and biased by clichés and stereotypes.
- **The use and the user:** The linguistic variants I have mentioned above.

It is also important to remark that the linguistic variation has been studied in terms of indexes, distinctive features, context clues and markers. The last two features are especially important for this essay, as they are going to be the basis that will allow me to analyze the original texts and the translations extracted from *Dracula*.

3.1.1. Markers

According to Muriel Saville Troike's theory about code markers (1989), markers are based on the idea of the School of Prague that, in communication, the most neutral and normal forms are considered to be unmarked, and the particular and peculiar forms resulted from a linguistic variant are marked. This reflects the concept that the speakers of a language know what is natural and unnatural in their language in different contexts. Therefore, marked forms are the ones that stand out and that do not follow the norm, and they usually belong to a regional dialect, register, or social category (Mayoral: 1999, 37). These marked forms serve to provide users with a range of variable features that can differentiate one linguistic variation from another, and they include (Saville Troike: 1989 [1982]: 72):

- Social markers, related to the social and educative status, the occupation and the geographic origin.
- Physical markers, which highlight aspects such as age, gender and physical condition
- Psychological markers, which characterize traits of personality and affective conditions.

Saville Troike (1989 [1982]:74-106) also specifies the type of variations associated with: the scenery in which they are used, their purpose, their region, the ethnic group, the class, condition and social roles, the age, the gender, the personality states (psychologically and socially conditioned), and the non-native variants (patterns used by the speakers of a second language, *linguas francas*, and official languages used when there are no native speakers).

For Catford (1965: 86) markers are the specific linguistic traits that serve as formal criteria for a certain variation. Moreover, they can appear in any language level, such as the phonetic, the grammatical or the lexical ones. However, following Mayoral (1999, 166), there are no unmarked elements in communication, since these values can only be applied by the user of a language, and thus, they are completely subjective. This is explained by the fact that one speaker expects to find some specific features in a certain sort of text, but the characteristics he expects to find vary according to the linguistic situation and to the speaker. Therefore, even though every element in the linguistic communication is marked, the receiver only realizes it when the variation provides him with new information (Mayoral: 1999, 165).

Klaus R. Scherer and Howard Giles (1979) define markers "as being concerned with the relationship between speech and social variables", and they comprise them in the next categorization:

- Phonetic and linguistic markers
- Markers of situation
- Age markers

- Sex markers
- Personality markers
- Social class markers
- Ethnicity markers

3. 1. 2 Context Clues

Context clues are the elements of the statement that permit the receiver to assign the sociolinguistic parameters of a context in a specific communicative event (Mayoral: 1999, 153). They help the receiver to picture a mental idea about the communicative event in its whole width: the linguistic variation, the temporal and spatial setting of the communication, the identity of the participants... They are especially useful when dealing with published texts, since they provide the reader with extra-information about the time and place of publication, the publishing house, the author, the content, etc.

Apart from this, context clues also origin feelings in the readers, which makes each reading and interpretation of a determined text completely different and subjective depending on the person who is reading it, fact to bear in mind when it comes to the translation of texts. Following Mayoral (1999, 154), it is also important to know that there are two kinds of context clues:

- Non-codified or non-conventionalized context clues, which rely on explanative or elaborate linguistic uses. These elaborate uses are based on the explicit meaning.
- Codified or conventionalized context clues, which rely on symptomatic or constrained linguistic uses. These constrained uses are based on the inexplicit meaning, which assumes the existence of some shared knowledge between the writer and the receiver of the text.

These two types of clues can be used simultaneously, as they are not restrictive. Also, it is important that, sometimes, codified clues can only be understood by those learned readers

who are familiar with the topic or text, while less educated readers may find them useless, since they cannot decipher their meaning. Besides, context clues have different degrees of codification, depending on clichés, which respond to the stereotyped social and behavioral parameters assigned by one person to a certain variation. In any case, Mayoral (1999: 157) states that context clues must be based in markers that are widely recognizable by the receivers so as to guarantee the correct communication of the linguistic variation.

According to Mayoral (1999: 157), we can find lexical, phonetic, orthographic and grammatical context clues in written texts. He also claims that their use must stick to the requirements of an effective communication and of the translation order. Furthermore, the parameters activated by the clues combine in the textual segments, but there is always one that is going to be predominant over the rest. Nevertheless, the correspondence in parameters is not necessary between the original text and the translated version (Mayoral: 1999, 162).

3. 2 Considerations about the Translation

Due to the features aforementioned, the linguistic variation, and specially, markers and context clues, present a range of problems for the translator who is going to transfer the meaning of the original text to the translated one. In addition, there exist some considerations that we have to take into account when it comes to the translation of a literary piece.

On the one hand, from the psychological point of view, some authors like Séguinot (1997: 104-5) claim that the translation is going to be determined by the competence of the translator, the familiarity with the topic, and the different interpretations of the translation order, which may lead to diverse outcomes.

Séguinot (1997: 104-5) also states the conditions that are going to determine the different options when it comes to the translation: the skills of the translator, the characteristics of the translation order, the purpose of the text, the translational philosophy of the translator, the entity that orders the translation and the pragmatics of the translation situation.

On the other hand, for some scholars like Nida (1975 [1972]: 182-3), translation is more related to linguistics, and he believes that one of the most difficult things that the translator has to do is to find an equivalence for the different stylistic levels in language, which are going to give a greater meaning to the text than the mere words. When dealing with geographic dialects, he advises to translate to the most culturally dominant dialect and to use the most widespread forms between the speakers. He is also for the translation to the "popular" (between technical and vulgar) forms of the language.

Therefore, we can argue that the psychological features of a translator as well as the linguistic aspects of the text are the two principal factors influencing the process of translation of a literary work. Besides, the idea introduced by the German functionalists (Reiss, 1984; Nord, 1997: 35) of the *skopos* or translation order is also determinant in the translating process, since it is likely that it alters the original purpose of a text, as the translated text must adequate to the requirements of the translation order. As a result, I would assume that the problem of untranslatability has not been solved yet.

In the same line, Mayoral (1999, 138) considers that the process of translating the linguistic variation has been barely observed by scholars, and their studies are unsatisfactory. However, looking more concretely to the translation of linguistic variants, markers and context clues are essential in the consignment of the linguistic variation in translation. Besides, idiolects (individual ways of speaking) are also considered useful tools in order to translate the linguistic variation (Mayoral: 1999, 101).

Regarding the translation of context clues, it is relevant to highlight that translators do not always perceive all the context clues in the original text, that the meaning they assign to them may slightly vary, and that they convey what they have understood following their own personal criteria and idiosyncrasy (Mayoral: 2005, 159). This means that some context clues may be lost in the translation, or they may have a different meaning or realization in the translated text. In addition, translators may decide to make some clues explicit in order for the readers to understand better a certain communicative situation in the original text that has no clear equivalence in the translated language, considering that it may cause some confusion if the clue is codified.

3. 3. Translation Techniques

In order for the translators to develop their work, they usually follow a number of translation procedures which help them when it comes to translating texts from one language to other. In this paper, the study of the translation strategies that the translator has used is going to be the basic element for the analysis of *Dracula's* translation. There have been many classifications made by experts, but the ones I have used in this paper are those explained by Peter Fawcett (1997) and Vázquez-Ayora (1977). According to the latter, there are two main types of translation techniques:

- Oblique translation procedures, which require indirect translation strategies, such as:
 - Transposition, which involves a change in the category of the words translated, whether grammatical or not, but preserving the essential meaning of the original. For instance: 'Interestingly' → 'Lo más interesante es que...'. It is used to avoid the excessive literality and to provide the translated versions with natural forms (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 268).
 - Modulation: usually involves a change in the point of view. According to Fawcett (1997: 37), it implies using a different signifier but keeping the same signified by means of metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche. For example: 'Wait a minute' → 'Espera un momento'. It is used to avoid

inexactitudes and lack of stylistic richness in the translation. It is basically 'an inversion of logic categories' (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 291).

- Equivalence, which involves the translation of idioms and fixed expressions from a source language to a target language. It entails the translation of a communicative situation conveyed in different ways (Fawcett 1997: 38). For example: 'It's raining cats and dogs' → 'Está lloviendo a cántaros'. It is used to avoid an excess of literality when translating moneme by moneme.
 - Adaptation, it is a kind of substitution that involves changing one cultural element of the source text which does not exist in the translated culture for another cultural element that does exist in the translated language (Fawcett 1997: 39). For instance: 'Comunidad autónoma' → 'County'. It is used to avoid cultural gaps between the source language and the translated language and to avoid confusing cultural calques (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 324).
 - Amplification, which consists in the adding of more monemes to the translated text, maintaining the same meaning (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 337). For example: 'Skycraper' → 'Un edificio de gran altura'. They are used in English-Spanish translations due to the reductive character of the English language and the expansive character of the Spanish one.
 - Explicitation: it is a kind of expansion that makes explicit in the translated language what was implicit in the original text (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 349). For instance: 'He signed' → 'Firmó el contrato'. It has an explanative function, in order to avoid obscurity in the translation.
 - Omission, which involves the elimination of monemes in the translated version, which is used to give more fluency to the translation (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 359). For example: 'He just wanted it' → 'Él lo quería.'
 - Compensation, which implies the act of compensating a loss of meaning that occurred in one segment of the text in another point of the text (Vázquez-Ayora 1977: 376). For instance: 'The beautiful blue room was hers. She loved it.' → 'La habitación azul era suya. Era bonita, y le encantó.'
- Direct translation procedures:

- Literal translation, which consists in a translation in which no changes are needed, except those required by the translated language grammar (Fawcett 1997: 36).
 - Calque: the form or meaning of the original word is imitated, but not in phonetic terms. Example: 'Sangre azul' → 'Blue blood'
 - Borrowing: imitates every aspect of a foreign word. Example: 'Golf' → 'Golf'

4. ANALYSIS

In this section I will develop an analysis of the linguistic variation in *Dracula* and how it has been translated into Spanish, according to the criteria exposed in the previous section. Therefore, my intention is to verify if the translator made use of certain determined linguistic strategies to transfer the linguistic variation into Spanish, if there are no specific methods, or if the linguistic variation has not been translated at all. Regarding this, I have chosen specific segments of speech said by three characters —Mr. Swales, Abraham Van Helsing and Quincey P. Morris— that may be relevant to the study of the translation of the linguistic variation, since they show different types of speech, depending principally on their origins and their occupation.

For this purpose, I have chosen the Spanish translation realized by Óscar Palmer Yáñez in 2007 for Valdemar Colección Gótica. Palmer Yáñez is a translator well-versed in Bram Stoker and *Dracula*, since he has made several translations in the last years of this work and some other works by the same author, apart from having studied Stoker's life quiet thoroughly.

4.1 Mr. Swales

Mr. Swales is an awkward old man who used to be a sailor and who lives in Whitby, a fishing little village in England. In the novel, Mina Harker says that he is very skeptical and that he has a scornful personality. Due to this fact and his past as Yorkshire sailor, he has a very peculiar way of expressing himself. We can perceive this already from his first appearance in chapter 6, when Mina asks him about some local legends:

*"I wouldn't fash masel' about them, miss. **Them** things **be** all wore out. **Mind**, I don't say that they never was, but I do say that they wasn't in my time. They **be** all very well for comers and trippers, an' the like, but not for a nice young lady like you. **Them** feet-folks from York and Leeds that **be** always eatin' cured herrin's and drinkin' tea an' lookin' out to buy cheap jet would creed aught. I wonder masel' who'd be bothered tellin' lies to them—even the newspapers, which is full of fool-talk (Dracula 2012: 89-90)."*

Firstly, I intend to classify the context clues I have found, and secondly I will further classify them according to markers.

Phonetic clues:

- Masel': probably a deviation of the word 'myself'
- An': dropping of the last 'd' in the word 'and'
- Eatin', herrin's, drinkin', lookin', tellin': dropping of the last 'g'

Grammatical clues:

- **Them** things **be** all **wore** out: Sentence full of grammatical mistakes. There is a confusion between the plural demonstrative article 'these' and the plural pronoun 'them'; the verbal tense (present subjunctive: be → present simple: are), and between the past tense and the past participle of the verb (wore → worn). In current standard English this whole sentence would read as '**These** things **are** all **worn** out'.
- ... they never **was**: Mistake in the person of the verb. The subject is plural, so the verb should be conjugated as 'were'.
- Verbal contractions: wouldn't, don't, wasn't, etc.

The previous grammatical errors and contractions occur many times throughout the whole extract, because they are marking Mr. Swales' characteristic speech.

Lexical clues:

- **Fash:** a verb used mainly in Northern England and Scotland which means 'to worry' or 'bother' about something. This is a codified clue.
- Things be **all** wore out: used in this context for emphasis more than anything.
- **Mind:** pet word used to call the attention of the receiver.
- But I **do** say...: it is used only for emphasis in this case. It has no real meaning here.
- They be **all** very...: as in the previous case, it is used mainly for emphasis.
- **Comers and trippers:** words used to talk about tourists and excursionists in a scornful manner.
- **An' the like:** a colloquial manner of saying 'and so forth'.
- **Feet-folks:** a disdainful way of referring to young rich people from the cities.
- **Jet:** in this case, Mr. Swales is making reference to the famous mourning stones (pieces of jewelry) made out of this material in Whitby in the Victorian era (Palmer Yáñez: 149, 2007). This is also a codified clue.
- **Creed aught:** this means 'to believe anything'. Creed as a verb comes from the noun of the same form which means 'credo' or 'belief', and aught is an archaic way of saying 'anything'.
- **Fool-talk:** a colloquial way of saying 'absurdity' or 'nonsense'.

Now, according to the markers, we can classify the clues as follows:

- Discursive markers: 'mind'
- Markers of origin: 'fash' → Northern England
- Markers of social class: 'masel', dropping of final consonant sounds, ungrammaticalities (subject-verb agreement, confusion of verbal tenses and of the

plural demonstrative article and the plural personal pronoun) → Low social class and low education.

- Markers of situation: 'miss', 'in my time', 'a nice young lady', 'an' the like', 'jet', 'aught', verbal contractions, informal vocabulary, dropping of final consonant sounds → These elements mark him as someone who is not young anymore and who is talking in a colloquial register to a young woman toward whom he shows some respect, in Whitby, in the Victorian era.
- Markers of personality: 'comers and trippers', 'feet-folks', 'creed', 'fool-talk' → Scornful and disdainful attitude.
- Markers of age: 'in my time' → This marks that he is not in the prime of his life anymore.
- Markers of social relationship: 'miss', 'lady' → Formal address in the public sphere.

Therefore, summarizing all the clues and markers retrieved in the excerpt, we can conclude that all these elements are characterizing the linguistic variation of an old man from Northern England, and more specifically from Whitby in the Victorian era (if we take into account the codified clue referring to the mourning stones), probably from a low social class, or who has a low education, who is presenting a disdainful attitude, and who is talking very colloquially to a young woman towards whom he feels some respect.

Looking now to the Spanish translation, I will thoroughly analyze the translation techniques employed by the translator in order to transfer Mr. Swales' linguistic variation into Spanish.

Here it is the translation by Óscar Palmer Yáñez:

—Yo en *su* lugar no haría *ni* caso, *señorita*. *Todo* eso está *completamente* pasao. *Oiga*, que no le digo que nunca existieran, pero *desde luego* no en *mis tiempos*. Esas cosas están bien para los turistas y *domingueros*, pero no para una *chica guapa* como *usted*. Esos *pisaverdes* de York y de Leeds que siempre están *jalando* arenques curados y bebiendo té y buscando *gangas* de azabache *es que se tragan* cualquier cosa. Yo mismo me pregunto *quién se molestará* en contarles esas *trolas*... ni siquiera los periódicos, y *eso que* están llenos de *bobadas* (Drácula 2007: 149).

First of all, speaking of the translation procedures followed by the translator in order to transfer Mr. Swales linguistic variation, we can see that in the case of the first context clue that we find in the original ('masel'), Palmer Yáñez has simply decided to omit it and amplify the sentence with 'en su lugar'. Thus, by losing this marker, the information that we get about Mr. Swales's social class in the original is lost in the translation. Secondly, to translate the verb 'fash about' Palmer Yáñez has used a transposition (from verb to verbal phrase) and has amplified it with the conjunction 'ni', all of which results in the expression 'no haría ni caso'. Then, the term 'miss' has been adapted into Spanish as 'señorita'.

Moving on to the next sentence, all the ungrammaticalities have been translated in correct grammatical Spanish, except for the verb 'wore out', which has been translated literally, but including a spelling mistake 'pasao', probably so as to compensate for the loss of the marker of social class in the previous sentence. Moreover, the lexical clue 'all' has been adapted as 'completamente', since they both serve to emphasize the meaning of the verb.

In the next sentence, the translator has adapted the pet word 'mind' by the discursive marker 'Oiga', and has also amplified the sentence by adding 'que' and 'le', making the whole segment sound more natural. Palmer Yáñez also decided to omit the verb 'say' in the following clause, most likely to avoid repetition, which is acceptable in English, but sounds very artificial in Spanish. However, he has maintained the emphasis by using the discursive marker 'desde luego', which is also an amplification. To end with this segment, the translator has omitted the subject and the verb, also to avoid repetition, and has translated the rest literally, since it seems proper Spanish, too.

The next linguistic clue we encounter is 'comers and trippers', which has been translated by Palmer Yáñez by means of an equivalent in Spanish: 'turistas y domingueros', maintaining the disdainful tone. In the next segment, we come across 'nice lady', which Palmer Yáñez has chosen to translate as 'chica guapa', which, in my opinion, is a modulation that the translator has used to keep the colloquial register of the whole excerpt, even though in this

case Mr. Swales is addressing Mina in a respectful manner. Besides, in this case there is a transposition in the position of the adjective. For my part, I think that this could have also been perfectly translated as 'bella dama' or 'linda señorita' so as to keep the respectful form of address. Nevertheless, this is compensated with the use of the courtesy form of address 'usted' at the end of the sentence, which, additionally, conditions the employment of the personal pronouns and the verbal agreement in all the extract.

Finally, we can see that the remaining lexical clues have been translated by means of adaptations into Spanish ('feet-folks' → 'pisaverdes', 'fool-talk' → 'bobadas'), but also by means of modulation (in some verbal times; 'eatin' → 'jalando'; 'lies' → 'trolas'), transpositions ('cheap jet' → 'gangas de azabache', plus explicitation in a footnote), modulations plus amplifications ('would creed aught' → 'es que se tragan cualquier cosa'), and amplifications ('which is full...' → 'y eso que están llenos...').

Therefore, we can appreciate that the most recurrent context clues employed for the characterization of Mr. Swales' linguistic variation in Spanish are essentially lexical, with only one occurrence of phonetic clues, and very few grammatical ones, which demonstrates that his speech in Spanish is not so marked when it comes to the phonetic and grammatical spheres as when it comes to the lexical one.

To sum up, in order to transfer the linguistic variation spoken by Mr. Swales, it is clear that Palmer Yáñez decided to include many more discursive markers than in the original, since in Spanish they are commoner and they make the speech sound fluent and natural. Also, they mark his speech as colloquial. However, what is more important is that there are no markers of origin in the translation, so those codified clues in the original text have been lost in the Spanish version, probably because the translator could not think of a cultural equivalent for an English northern dialect, or maybe he considered that the Spanish readership would dislike it if he employed a Spanish northern dialect clearly distinguishable for that purpose. In addition, we can infer from this analysis that the element that Palmer Yáñez preferred to highlight as marked in Mr. Swales' speech is his informality and

casualness when speaking and his disdainful personality rather than his origins or the period when the communicative event is happening. Nevertheless, in order to supply this lack of period markers in the translated version, the translator provides readers with a footnote in which he explains what the '*gangas de azabache*' were, where they were sold and when.

We can find more examples of Mr. Swales particular linguistic variation in other interventions, which can exemplify the translation procedures employed in order to convey his peculiar speech.

*"Now look you here. You come here a stranger **an'** you see this **kirkgarth** (Dracula 2012: 92)."*

In this example, we can ascertain that his linguistic variation is sustained. However, in this case we come across the word 'kirkgarth', which does not exist in English as such, but it comes from the northern dialect he speaks, with the meaning of 'churchyard' (Palmer Yáñez: *Drácula*, 152, 2007). This problematic case has been solved by the translator as follows:

*"Por ejemplo, usted, que es forastera, viene aquí, a visitar el **camposanto**...(Drácula 2007: 152)"*

Here, we can appreciate that the translator, instead of using a word from any Spanish dialect to transmit the same meaning with an equivalent variant, has adapted it into a Spanish word that is perfectly understandable by any reader, although it is not the most frequent in use. Thus, he avoids the possible misunderstanding of the word, and keeps being coherent with his decision of not using any marker of origin (such as words from any Spanish dialect) in Mr. Swales speech. However, this causes that Palmer Yáñez had to add a footnote explaining that this character speaks a Yorkshire dialect in the original after Mina states that she could not understand Mr. Swales' dialect very well (which does not make sense in the translated version, since he speaks standard Spanish). Besides, we can see that in this short intervention, Palmer Yáñez has omitted some parts, amplified others,

and has removed the stop and replaced it by commas to make his speech sound more fluent and natural.

His following words (in chapter 9) are also quite problematic from a translator's perspective.

*"And you **consate** that all these **steans be aboon** folk that is happed here, **snod an' snog**?(Dracula 2012: 92)"*

In this segment, we find many difficult words that may make the translation task very complicated. First of all, we have the word 'consate', which seems to be a deviation of the word 'conceit', a phonetic context clue that reveals his low education. Secondly, the word 'steans', which comes from his northerner dialect and means 'stones' or 'tombstones' (Prestwick House 2006: 343), and the already mentioned confusion of verbal times. Thirdly, we encounter the seemingly awkward word 'aboon', which was a dialect word for the adjective or adverb 'above' (*Aboon* MerriamWebmaster.com). And finally, we have the idiomatic expression 'snod an' snog', which may mean 'neat' and 'tidy' and might be an equivalent of the idiom 'part and parcel', something inseparable from the whole (Prestwick House 2006: 343).

Palmer Yáñez dealt with these problems as you can see below.

*—¿Y **piensa** usted que todas esas **losas cubren** a gente que **disfruta cómodamente del sueño eterno**?(Dracula 2007: 152)*

In this case, the translation procedures preferred by the translator have been the adaptation ('consate' → 'piensa'; 'steans' → 'losas'), the transposition ('aboon' → 'cubren'), the amplification plus modulation plus omission ('that is happed here' → 'que disfruta cómodamente'), and the equivalence in the idiom ('snog an' snod' → 'sueño eterno'). As we can appreciate, especially in this last instance, Palmer Yáñez decided to make use of a less literal translation, probably due to the difficulty presented by these words and expressions, and he translated this segment more freely. By doing this, I believe that the text is less

cryptic and more understandable for the Spanish readership, although all the variants related to the origin and social class of Mr. Swales are lost.

4. 2. Abraham Van Helsing

Abraham Van Helsing is an old doctor from the Netherlands who tries to help the protagonists. His speech is pretty particular, because he is not a native English speaker, he uses the medical jargon and he constructs very complex and long sentences which are hard to understand. For instance, we can see this in chapter 9, in one of his letters to John Seward, the psychiatrist:

"Tell your friend that when that time you suck from my wound so swiftly the poison of the **gangrene** from **that** knife that our other friend, too nervous, let slip, you did more for him when he wants my **aids** and you call for them than all his great fortune could do. **But** it is pleasure added to do for him, your friend, it is to you that I come (*Dracula* 2012: 148-9)."

The linguistic variation in Van Helsing is hence characterized by:

Grammatical clues:

- Omission of the relative pronoun: 'when that time (**that**) you suck...'
- Use of the demonstrative pronoun 'that' instead of the indefinite article 'the' in 'that knife that our other friend...'
- Use of plural instead of singular in 'aids'
- Use of the wrong conjunction: 'but' instead of 'although', 'even though', etc.
- Omission of the indefinite article before 'pleasure' in 'But it is (**a**) pleasure added...'

Syntactical clues:

- Very long sentences.
- Many subordinated clauses.

- Unusual phrasings: '... you did more for him when he wants my aids and you call for them than all his great fortune could do.'

Lexical clues:

- Gangrene: medical term

The previous context clues are marking him as non-native English speaker, who is learned, since he is capable of building up syntactically complex sentences, who might be related to the medical field, and who has a great appreciation for the receiver of the letter, according to what he states. Additionally, he addresses him rather formally.

This segment has been translated into Spanish as follows:

"Dile a tu amigo que cuando aquella vez chupaste tan rápido de mi herida el veneno de la gangrena de aquel **bisturí** que nuestro otro amigo, demasiado nervioso, dejó escapar, hiciste más por él cuando necesita mi ayuda y tú llamas **para pedirla** de lo que podría hacer toda su fortuna. **Pues aunque** es un placer añadido ayudar **a un amigo**; es a ti a quien acudo (*Dracula* 2007: 223)."

Here, Palmer Yáñez's translation seems to be more understandable than the original due to the fact that in Spanish is commoner to find this type on long sentences with many subordinate clauses. Therefore, he did not have to apply great changes in his version. When analyzing the translation procedures that he used for this extract, we see that he decided to translate quite literally, all the syntactic constructions and the register being the same, even though he resorted to the amplification in some cases (swiftly → **tan** rápidamente; 'and you call for them' → 'y tú llamas **para pedirla**'; 'but it is pleasure added...' → '**Pues aunque** es un placer añadido...') for the sake of naturalness in Spanish. Besides, he omitted the apposition 'your friend' and linked it with the verb as a direct object, most likely to save space ('ayudar a un amigo'). It is also remarkable that as he is supposed to be a scholar very well educated, Van Helsing speaks proper standard Spanish, with no errors, unlike the original ('but' has been adapted more reasonably as '*aunque*'). Moreover, in this Spanish

excerpt there is a clear marker of his occupation when the translator adapted the word 'knife' as '*bisturi*', a technical term from the medical field that does not appear in the original. In my opinion, Plamer Yáñez used it rather than '*cuchillo*', the literal translation, or a similar word, to make it even more explicit that Van Helsing is a doctor who is speaking to another doctor. Summarizing it, we could say that Palmer Yáñez decided to highlight only the markers related to syntax and vocabulary, and he left out those dealing with grammar. Also, it seems to me that he preferred to highlight the markers that identify him as a highly educated person from the medical field than those related to his origin.

We can further examine Van Helsing's speech in this excerpt (chapter 9), when he meets for the first time Lucy Westenra in order to treat her from her mysterious illness:

"My dear young miss, I have the so great pleasure because you are so much beloved. That is much, my dear, even were **that which** I do not see. They told me you were down in the spirit, and that you were of a ghastly pale. To them I say "**Pouf!**" (Dracula 2012: 150)"

Here, we can appreciate that his peculiar way of expressing himself is maintained, although the sentences are not so long and complex as the ones I have discussed above.

The possible problems that we can find in this excerpt when it comes to the translation are mainly the omission in 'I have the so great pleasure [**of meeting you**]', because it leaves the clause unfinished; and, more importantly, the confusion in the use of the relative pronouns and the personal pronoun in 'even were that which I do not see', probably due to his origins (non-native English speaker). Moreover, in this case, the phrasing is quite unusual, due to the lack of the expletive subject 'there', the omission of the conjunction 'if', and the absence of the third person singular masculine personal pronoun as subject. In proper Standard English this would read as: 'Even **if there** were **he who** I do not see'. As a result, we can infer that Van Helsing is good at using verbal tenses and modes (subjunctive in the first part of the clause), but he fails when it comes to syntax and the construction of sentences, which tend to be pretty awkward and confusing. Therefore, it could be stated that he is a learned man, using a formal register in his speech, who has not, however, completely mastered the English language yet, because it is not his mother tongue. Finally, another

interesting element that we come across in this extract is the onomatopoeia 'Pouf!', which is meant to reflect disdain.

This segment has been translated into Spanish as:

—Mi **querida señorita**, tengo el gran placer **de conocerla** porque es **usted** muy amada. Eso es mucho, querida, **incluso aunque** estuviera **aquí aquel al que** no veo. Me dijeron que estaba **usted** muy desanimada, que estaba terriblemente pálida. Y yo les digo: <<¡**Bah!**>> (*Drácula* 2007: 225).

The first of the problems aforementioned has been solved by the translator by means of amplification ('tengo el gran placer **de conocerla**'), making completely explicit the meaning. Otherwise, this sentence would sound strange in Spanish. Besides, Palmer Yáñez decided to deal with the second problem by also amplifying the sentence and adapting the conjunctions and the relative pronouns to their correct usage in Standard Spanish ('**incluso aunque** estuviera **aquí aquel al que** no veo'), leaving out the errors in the original, which were marking Van Helsing as a foreigner. Therefore, he has decided not to convey the markers of origin that could signal him as a non-native English speaker, most likely for the sake of the understanding in the Spanish version, as in Mr. Swales' case. Lastly, the final onomatopoeia has been translated by means of equivalence into the common expression of scorn 'bah', since in Spain we would never say anything like 'pouf' in a case like this, as that onomatopoeia, naturalized in Spanish, is usually assigned to the expression of fatigue or exhaustion. In addition, in this version, the translator has had to maintain a formal register, since Van Helsing is addressing a young lady whom he is meeting for the first time. Consequently, all the second person pronouns have been translated as 'usted', which also determines the verbal agreement and the use of the rest of the pronouns. Furthermore, Palmer Yáñez opted for the omission of the adjective 'young' in 'My dear **young** miss' (*Mi querida señorita*), which is a little redundant, because the Spanish word 'señorita' already portrays the idea of a young woman, and it is not necessary to state it again. Thus, he is avoiding repetition.

To finish off with Van Helsing's linguistic variation, let us focus on the next fragment:

"But I shall **precaution take**. I shall give [**her**] **hypodermic injection** of **morphia** (*Dracula* 2012: 167)."

In this case, we appreciate again Van Helsing's unusual phrasing in 'I shall precaution take', in which the direct object is placed before the verb, when in Standard English it should be the contrary: 'I shall **take precaution**'. Besides, he does not use the plural form of the noun, even though it would be the preferred form in that expression. This, once more, marks him as a non-native English speaker. In addition, I wanted to remark this passage, because it clearly signals Van Helsing as a doctor or, at least, as someone related to the medical field, as he makes use of some specialized terms that would not be used by a non-expert in medicine. Besides, it is relevant that the term 'morphia' is hardly used nowadays, since it is an archaic way to refer to 'morphine'. Lastly, in this excerpt we can also observe the omission of the indirect object '**her**' in the second sentence, which is very characteristic of Van Helsing's speech, since he usually omits subjects and objects, as we have already seen.

Palmer Yáñez translated this extract as:

—Debo **tomar precauciones**. **Le** daré una **inyección hipodérmica** de **morfina** (*Drácula* 2007: 246).

Here, the translator simply ignored Van Helsing's alteration of the syntactic order in the first sentence (SOV → SVO), using the plural form of the noun, which is a modulation ('precaution' → 'precauciones'), and translating the specialized medical terms by their correspondent equivalents in Spanish, by means of naturalization ('injection' → 'inyección'; 'hypodermic' → 'hipodérmica'; 'morphia' → 'morfina'). Moreover, the indirect object in the second sentence is made explicit in his version, which conforms to rules of the proper Standard Spanish ('I shall give' → '**Le** daré'). It is my opinion that he translated this segment like this, avoiding all of Van Helsing's syntactical and grammatical errors and elisions in order to facilitate the proper understanding of his speech by the Spanish readership. Thus, he keeps being coherent with the way he decided to convey his linguistic variation. However, Palmer Yáñez did translate all the medical terms he uses, and he even added some more in the translated version (see the first example: 'bisturí'), most likely

because he chose as Van Helsing's most important marking element his occupation as a doctor and an erudite, and not his origins in the Netherlands which condition his speech as a non-native English speaker in the original.

4. 3. Quincey P. Morris

Quincey P. Morris is a young American gentleman from Texas, who frequently speaks in American argot. In his first appearance (chapter 5), he is proposing to Lucy Westenra:

"**Miss Lucy**, I know I **ain't** good enough to regulate the **fixin's** of your little shoes, but I guess if you wait till you find a man that is you will go join **them** seven young women with the lamps when you **quit**. Won't you **just hitch up** alongside of me and let us go down the long road together, driving in double **harness**? (*Dracula* 2012: 82)

Here, we can see how Stoker tries to reproduce the Texan slang. In his speech, we can find the next context clues:

Phonetic clues:

- Dropping of the last 'g': Fixings

Grammatical clues:

- Ain't: Contraction of 'am not'
- Use of the personal pronoun 'them' instead of the indefinite article 'the'

Lexical clues:

- Quit: 'to stop doing something' (mainly used in the US)
- Hitch up: phrasal verb meaning literally 'to hook up', or figuratively 'to get married' (in the US)
- Fixings, hitch up, harness: terms related to the cowboy field

- Miss Lucy: Use of the respectful address form 'miss' with the first name of the addressee, instead of with the surname

In this case, Stoker is purposely marking him as an American southerner. Morris uses the characteristic contraction of the negative form of the verb 'to be' in '**ain't**', and a somewhat relaxed pronunciation (**fixin's**). Besides, we can find a typical Southern American honorific ('Miss + first name', which implies both respect and, at the same time, a touch of informality, which responds to the American cliché), alongside with the use of 'them' rather than 'the', which is considered nonstandard and also stereotypical of the American southerner linguistic variation. He is however well educated (no grammatical errors) and rather respectful with the woman he is addressing too, although he also uses some slang terms and expressions from Texas so as to make clear his origins. Moreover, his birthplace is also highlighted due to the metaphor he is developing about harnesses and fixings, which can make the reader evoke images of the typical American cowboys trying to catch cows, which could be considered a codified context clue.

Palmer Yáñez translated this passage as follows:

—**Señorita Lucy**, sé que no soy **digno** de **atar** los **cordones** de sus zapatitos, pero si **pretende usted** esperar hasta encontrar a un hombre que lo sea, **acabará uniéndose** a las siete jóvenes **doncellas** con sus lámparas cuando **finalmente** renuncie. ¿No querrá **amarrarse a mí** para recorrer juntos el largo camino, **enjaezados** con un doble arnés? (*Drácula* 2007: 140)

In this version, the techniques employed by the translator in order to transmit Morris' linguistic variation are: adaptation ('Miss Lucy' → 'Señorita Lucy'; 'good enough' → 'digno'; 'regulate' → 'atar'; 'fixin's' → 'cordones'), transposition ('alongside of me **and** let us go down' → 'a mí **para** recorrer'), transposition + adaptation ('driving' → 'enjaezados'), omission ('I guess'; 'let us'), amplification ('if you wait till...' → 'si **pretende** usted esperar hasta...'; 'when you quit' → 'cuando **finalmente** renuncie', 'Won't you' → '¿No **querrá**...?'). As we can check, Palmer Yáñez has decided to leave out of the translation all the elements that were marking Morris' Texan dialect and his nonstandard features, ignoring his origins

once more in the Spanish version. Again, I believe he is following the idea that if he had to transfer Morris' markers of origin for another Spanish dialectical variant, the readership would not like it, since it would sound awkward. Nonetheless, he maintained the honorific address form he is using in English ('Miss Lucy' → 'Señorita Lucy'), probably, because it does not sound strange in Spanish, and it may be considered acceptable when it comes to the transmission of his little relaxed manners. Thus, the translator is remarking that he expresses differently than other English people would do, and characterizes his American manners, according to the Spanish stereotype of the American people, which, fortunately, is pretty similar to the English cliché about them. It is also relevant that as for the adaptations he used, some of them could be considered free translations, such as 'atar' for 'regulate' or 'enjaezados' for 'driving'. Especially striking is the case of the latter, since we cannot find a similar word in English anywhere in that clause. However, in my opinion, the result is very effective and literary. What is more, it evokes the image of two horses walking adorned together, the change does not affect very much the meaning of the sentence, and it enhances its literary style in Spanish (this has a much better sound than any other option, in my view). Apart from that, Yáñez has also kept the respectful form of address 'usted' in Spanish, since Morris is proposing to a young woman he met recently. This serves to mark the period of the novel as well, since it would not be used in a similar situation nowadays. One more feature of this translation is that Palmer Yáñez could not maintain the double meaning of the verb 'hitch up' ('to hook up' or to 'get married') in Spanish, so he decided to transmit its literal meaning rather than its secondary figurative one. Finally, it is remarkable that there are many amplifications and omissions in this segment, most likely for the benefit of the fluency and naturalness of the Spanish version. Otherwise, the translation would sound sharp and artificial.

In this other excerpt (chapter 5) we can see other typical features of Morris' speech and how they have been dealt with by the translator:

"Don't cry, my dear. If it's for me, I'm a **hard nut to crack**, and **I take it standing up**. If that other **fellow** doesn't know his happiness, **well**, he'd better look for it soon, or he'll have to deal with me (*Dracula* 2012: 84)."

Here, we can see that Morris is very prone to the use of idioms and fixed expressions, such as 'a hard nut to crack' or 'he'll have to deal with me', which may pose some problems for the translator. Looking now to the vocabulary he employs, it is relevant the appearance of the word 'fellow', which is quite colloquial. It is also remarkable that he makes use of a discursive marker, fact that makes his speech more direct and informal. In addition, he mainly uses contractions when speaking, which, altogether with the rest of the aforementioned characteristics, results in his speech sounding more casual and relaxed than that of the rest of the characters, facts that are supposed to reflect his origins as an American English speaker.

The Spanish version of this passage is:

—No llore, querida. Si es por mí, **soy duro de pelar** y **sé encajar los golpes**. Si ese otro **tipo** no sabe **dónde está** su felicidad... **bueno**, será mejor que empiece a buscarla pronto, o **tendrá que vérselas conmigo** (*Dracula* 2007: 141).

In this version, Palmer Yáñez principally resolved the translation problems derived from the idioms cited before by means of equivalence, this is, finding similar expressions used in Spanish with practically the same connotations. Therefore, 'I'm a nut hard to crack' becomes in Spanish 'soy duro de pelar', 'I take it standing up' turns into 'sé encajar los golpes', and 'he'll have to deal with me' is replaced by the fixed expression 'tendrá que vérselas conmigo'. Other translation feature that we find in the Spanish version but not in the original is the ellipsis (a modulation) after 'felicidad'. In my opinion, he could have opted for its inclusion in the translation in order to give that sentence a sense of doubt, because Morris does not know how (or does not want) to finish the sentence, and that is why he uses the discursive marker afterwards, which grants him enough time to think how to continue with it. Besides that, it is also noteworthy the use of an amplification in 'Si ese

otro tipo no sabe **dónde está** su felicidad'. In the original version, there is no subordinate clause inside the conditional clause, but in Spanish the sentence would have lacked meaning if Palmer Yáñez would have left it as in the English version. Consequently, he had to add something to make clear what the author meant.

The third instance by Quincy P. Morris that I am going to analyze is this passage from chapter 19, in which he doubts the supposed mental insanity of Mr. Renfield:

*"Say, Jack, if that man wasn't **attempting a bluff**, he is **about** the sanest lunatic **I ever saw**. I'm not sure, but I believe that he had some serious purpose, and if he had, **it was pretty rough on him** not to get the **chance** (Dracula 2012: 312)."*

Again, here we can appreciate Morris' characteristic colloquial speech due to his recurrent use of fixed expressions, discursive markers, contractions, and informal vocabulary (bluff, lunatic, get, chance); in general, all of which contribute to the realization of his particular speech as an American native English speaker. It is also remarkable that he did not use the present perfect verbal tense in 'I ever saw' (which would be the standard in England), following the stereotype that Americans use the past simple tense in all situations where present perfect is required.

Now, let us focus on the Spanish translation by Pálmer Yáñez:

—**Oye**, Jack, si ese hombre no estaba **intentando engañarnos**, **debe de ser** el lunático más cuerdo que **he visto en mi vida**. No estoy seguro, pero creo que tenía un propósito serio. Si así fuera, **tiene que haber sido** muy duro para él **que no le hayamos dado ninguna** oportunidad (Dracula 2007: 421).

In this case, it is obvious that there have been some changes in the translation. Probably, the most remarkable alterations in the translation are the two great amplifications that occur in the last sentence. Where in the original only reads as 'it was pretty rough on him', in the Spanish version we find this amplification: '**tiene que haber sido muy duro para él**', which also comprises a modulation, since it involves a change of perspective: in the original, I

think that Morris sounds convinced, whereas in the translation the amplification implies a certain degree of doubt. In addition, continuing with this sentence, there is an amplification, a modulation and a transposition. While in the original we only have 'not to get the chance', in the Spanish version we read '**que no le hayamos dado ninguna** oportunidad', thus, an amplification ('que', 'le', 'ninguna' → this latter emphasizing the lack of opportunities). In the modulation I find a clear change of perspective, because the original gives the idea that it was Renfield who could not obtain the chance, while in the translation the idea conveyed is that they did not let him obtain it. Finally, a transposition changes the verb from an infinitive verbal tense (impersonal) to a present perfect subjunctive (first person plural). Besides, he translated the past tense in 'I ever saw' as 'que he visto', another transposition of verbal tense, since he used the Standard Spanish present perfect (once more, ignoring the markers of origin in the translation). Moreover, there is another transposition in the first sentence 'attempting **a bluff**', since he has changed the noun for a verb in the Spanish version, preserving the meaning → 'intentando engañarnos'. In addition, he has not resorted to the more literal translation 'tirarse un farol' in this case; maybe considering it too colloquial even for a Texan like Morris (we should not forget that he is a gentleman). Lastly, as for the discursive marker he used, I believe that the most literal option would have been 'dime', but then, the sentence would not have made sense, as Morris is not really asking anything to Jack Seward. Hence, the reason why he employed the less problematic 'oye', which also sounds very informal and compensates for the absence of markers of origin. All in all, it is my opinion that Palmer Yáñez made use of all these amplifications and transpositions in order for the translation to sound natural and fluent in Spanish, attempting to avoid all the awkward and strange options that would not be considered standard by the Spanish readership and, therefore, choosing the possibilities that would be most accepted and accessible for the Spanish audience. Therefore, it can be said that Palmer Yáñez transferred to the Spanish version only some of the lexical clues, leaving out all the grammatical and phonetic features that are marking his origins.

5. CONCLUSION

All the information analyzed in the previous section serves to draw some conclusions about the translation of the linguistic variation in the chosen characters of *Dracula*. Approaching each of them individually, we can claim that the marking elements and the main techniques to transfer the linguistic variants in each case are:

- In the case of Mr. Swales, the translator Palmer Yáñez opted for the omission of all the elements of his speech that mark him in terms of origin, hence, eliding all the context clues and markers of his Northern England dialect. He also left out the features signaling his low social class, such as grammatical mistakes, which have been translated as correct Standard Spanish. In my opinion, these markers were ignored by the translator, because they make sense in the English context, but they cannot be very well understood by a Spanish readership. Moreover, if he would have tried to replace his dialect by a Spanish one, it is likely that it would not have appealed the readers. As for the main translation techniques he used, he preferred the amplification, the adaptation and the modulation so as to achieve a natural speech in Spanish.
- When it comes to Van Helsing's speech, Palmer Yáñez also decided to keep out all the context clues that are marking him as a Dutch non-native English speaker, probably due to the same reasons stated above. Consequently, his characteristic and unusual phrasing in English, as for example, his recurrent elisions and change of the SVO pattern of the sentences, have been transferred into proper standard Spanish (SOV → SVO; no elisions). However, instead, the translator has placed more emphasis in the markers of his occupation as an erudite doctor, even to the extent of adding markers from the medical field that did not appear in the original text. Regarding the translation techniques more frequently used in his interventions, they are amplification, explicitation and adaptation, most likely to supply the information gaps caused by his constant omissions.

- As for the Texan Quincey P. Morris and his linguistic variation, the translator favored once again the omission of all the elements that are marking his Texan origins, although he preserves his colloquial and relaxed manners, which in Spain are also associated with the American way of speaking. Besides, the translation techniques more used in his interventions consist of amplification, adaptation and transposition, plus the use of equivalences for the many fixed and idiomatic expressions he uses, all employed for the sake of fluentness and naturalness in the Spanish version.

All in all, we can infer that, in his translation, Palmer Yáñez preferred to ignore all the elements that marked those characters in terms of origins and social class (especially in Mr. Swales case), and rather chose as marking elements their occupation or the tone of their speech (disdainful, colloquial, relaxed). Thus, the Spanish version is much more easier to understand, since the audience does not have to struggle to work out the meaning behind the characters' linguistic variations. Therefore, the translator did not replace their variants for any Spanish equivalent variant, as he probably thought that Spanish readers would not like it and, what is more important, it would lessen the opportunities for the general readership to understand the novel. Moreover, all the translation techniques employed, principally amplifications and adaptations, have been used according to their intended purposes (see section: 3. 2. 1 Translation Techniques), achieving a direct understanding of the characters' speeches and a great fluentness in the Spanish version. As a final remark, we can conclude that he preferred to translate all the non-standard features in the original by Standard Spanish in the translated version.

In my opinion, the way the translator dealt with the linguistic variation in the translation is the most adequate, as I believe that origin and social class markers existing in the English version would only make the translated version more difficult to approach by the Spanish audience, which could result in a failure in the selling market. However, I also think that the richness of the characterization for these characters is lost to some extent. Even so, I

consider his decision the most suitable for the translation of the linguistic variation in this novel.

Nonetheless, this is only a very shallow insight into the translation of the linguistic variation in *Dracula*, and I would recommend a deeper analysis, focusing on more characters and on more interventions, for further and more definitive results regarding the matter in question.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Penelope and Colin Fraser. "Speech as a Marker of Situation." *Social Markers in Speech*. Ed. H. Giles and K. Scherer. Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Catford, John C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Centro Virtual Cervantes. *Variación Lingüística*. n.d. Web. 17 May 2014.
- Demonte, Violeta. "Actas de las I Jornadas de Investigación Interdisciplinaria sobre la Mujer. Nuevas Perspectivas sobre la Mujer. Seminarios de Estudio sobre la Mujer." *Naturaleza y Estereotipo: la Polémica sobre un Lenguaje Femenino*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1982.
- Fawcett, Peter. *Translation and Language. Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.
- Giles, H. and K. R. Scherer, ed. *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood. *Language as a Social Semiotic: The social Interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.
- Hewson, Lance and Jacky Martin. *Redefining Translation: The Variational Approach*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Hudson, R. A. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 1980.
- Johnstone, Barbara and Judith Mattson Bean. "Self-expression and Linguistic Variation." *Language in Society* 26.2 (1997): 221-246.
- Kroch, Anthony and Cathy Small. "Grammatical Ideology and its Effect on Speech." *Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods* (1978): 45-55.
- Martín, Ricardo Muñoz. *Lingüística para traducir*. Barcelona: Teide, 1995a.
- Mayoral Asensio, Roberto. *La Traducción de la Variación Lingüística*. Soria: Uertere, 1999.
- Merriam Webmaster. *Aboon*. n.d. Web.
- Newmark, P. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International, 1988b.
- . *About Translation*. Clevedon Multilingual Matters, 1991.
- . *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall, 1988b.

- Nida, Eugene A. *Towards a science of translation, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.
- Nida, Eugene A. "Varieties of Language." *Language Structure and Translation: Essays by Eugene A. Nida*. Stanford: Stanford U. P., 1975 [1972].
- Nord, Christiane. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.
- Reiss, Katharina. *Adäquatheit und Äquivalenz. Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting*. Ed. Wills Wolfram and Gisela Thome. Tubinga, 1984.
- Séguinot, Candance. *Accounting for Variability in Translation*. Ed. DANKS et al. 1997.
- . *The Translation Process*. Toronto: H. G. Publications, 1989.
- Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. Croydon: Transatlantic Press Book, 2012.
- . *Dracula*. Ed. Lisa M. Miller and S. MacPherson. Clayton: Prestwick House: Literary Touchstone Classics, 2006.
- . *Drácula*. Trans. Óscar Palmer Yáñez. 3rd ed. Madrid: Valdemar, 2007.
- Troike, Muriel Saville. *The Ethnography of Communication: an introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989 [1982].
- Vázquez-Ayora, G. *Introducción a la Traductología*. Georgetown: Georgetown University, 1977.
- Vinay, J. P. and J. Dalbernet. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Trans. Juan C. Sager. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.