Faculteit Geesteswetenschappen
Versie september 2014

VERKLARING KENNISNEMING REGELS M.B.T. PLAGIAAT

Fraude en plagiaat
Wetenschappelijke integriteit vormt de basis van het academisch bedrijf. De Universiteit Utrecht vat iedere vorm van wetenschappelijke misleiding daarom op als een zeer ernstig vergrijp. De Universiteit Utrecht verwacht dat elke student de normen en waarden inzake wetenschappelijke integriteit kent en in acht neemt.

De belangrijkste vormen van misleiding die deze integriteit aantasten zijn fraude en plagiaat. Plagiaat is het overnemen van andermans werk zonder behoorlijke verwijzing en is een vorm van fraude. Hieronder volgt nadere uitleg wat er onder fraude en plagiaat wordt verstaan en een aantal concrete voorbeelden daarvan. Let wel: dit is geen uitputtende lijst!

Bij constatering van fraude of plagiaat kan de examencommissie van de opleiding sancties opleggen. De sterkste sanctie die de examencommissie kan opleggen is het indienen van een verzoek aan het College van Bestuur om een student van de opleiding te laten verwijderen.

Plagiaat
Plagiaat is het overnemen van stukken, gedachten, redeneringen van anderen en deze laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Je moet altijd nauwkeurig aangeven aan wie ideeën en inzichten zijn ontleend, en voortdurend bedacht zijn op het verschil tussen citeren, parafraseren en plagiëren. Niet alleen bij het gebruik van gedrukte bronnen, maar zeker ook bij het gebruik van informatie die van het internet wordt gehaald, dien je zorgvuldig te werk te gaan bij het vermelden van de informatiebronnen.

De volgende zaken worden in elk geval als plagiaat aangemerkt:
- het knippen en plakken van tekst van digitale bronnen zoals encyclopedieën of digitale tijdschriften zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het knippen en plakken van teksten van het internet zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het overnemen van gedrukt materiaal zoals boeken, tijdschriften of encyclopedieën zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het opnemen van een vertaling van bovengenoemde teksten zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het parafraseren van bovengenoemde teksten zonder (deugdelijke) verwijzing: parafrasen moeten als zodanig gemarkeerd zijn (door de tekst uitdrukkelijk te verbinden met de oorspronkelijke auteur in tekst of noot), zodat niet de indruk wordt gewekt dat het gaat om eigen gedachtengoed van de student;
- het overnemen van beeld-, geluids- of testmateriaal van anderen zonder verwijzing en zodoende laten doorgaan voor eigen werk;
- het zonder bronvermelding opnieuw inleveren van eerder door de student gemaakt eigen werk en dit laten doorgaan voor in het kader van de cursus vervaardigd oorspronkelijk werk, tenzij dit in de cursus of door de docent uitdrukkelijk is toegestaan;
- het overnemen van werk van andere studenten en dit laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Indien dit gebeurt met toestemming van de andere student is de laatste medeplichtig aan plagiaat;
- ook wanneer in een gezamenlijk werkstuk door een van de auteurs plagiaat wordt gepleegd, zijn de andere auteurs medeplichtig aan plagiaat, indien zij hadden kunnen of moeten weten dat de ander plagiaat pleegde;
- het indienen van werkstukken die verworven zijn van een commerciële instelling (zoals een internetsite met uittreksels of papers) of die al dan niet tegen betaling door iemand anders zijn geschreven.

De plagiaatregels gelden ook voor concepten van papers of (hoofdstukken van) scripties die voor feedback aan een docent worden toegezonden, voorzover de mogelijkheid voor het insturen van concepten en het krijgen van feedback in de cursushandleiding of scriptieregeling is vermeld.

Universiteit Utrecht

In de Onderwijs- en Examenregeling (artikel 5.15) is vastgelegd wat de formele gang van zaken is als er een vermoeden van fraude/plagiaat is, en welke sancties er opgelegd kunnen worden.

Onwetendheid is geen excuus. Je bent verantwoordelijk voor je eigen gedrag. De Universiteit Utrecht gaat ervan uit dat je weet wat fraude en plagiaat zijn. Van haar kant zorgt de Universiteit Utrecht ervoor dat je zo vroeg mogelijk in je opleiding de principes van wetenschapsbeoefening bijgebracht krijgt en op de hoogte wordt gebracht van wat de instelling als fraude en plagiaat beschouwt, zodat je weet aan welke normen je je moeten houden.

Hierbij verklaar ik bovenstaande tekst gelezen en begrepen te hebben.
Naam: Ella van den Broeck Studentnummer: 5485347
Datum en handtekening: 5 juli 2018 EB

Dit formulier lever je bij je begeleider in als je start met je bacheloreindwerkstuk of je master scriptie.

Het niet indienen of ondertekenen van het formulier betekent overigens niet dat er geen sancties kunnen worden genomen als blijkt dat er sprake is van plagiaat in het werkstuk.

Didacticism in the Translation of Children's Literature

A Case Study of Charles Kingsley's *The Water Babies* and Its Dutch Translations and Adaptations

Name Student: Ella van den Broeck

Student Number: 5485347

MA Thesis Vertalen (Letterkunde), Utrecht University (20 EC)

Date: 5 July 2018

Words: 21,912

Supervisor: Onno Kosters

Second Reader: Lette Vos

Abstract

Through a close reading and comparative analysis of a number of passages from Charles Kingsley's *The Water Babies* and all its translations and adaptations published in the Netherlands, this paper explores the extent to which the Dutch target texts retain, adapt or omit the overt and passive didacticism concerning evolutionary theory, class and British supremacy. While child images are usually employed to explain a decrease in overt and to some extent passive didacticism in children's literature and translations of children's literature during the twentieth century, *The Water Babies* and its translations and adaptations demonstrate that not all didactic topics are treated in this same manner. While didacticism concerning evolutionary theory and British supremacy tends to disappear, Kingsley's teachings about class are still present in the latest Dutch adaptation. Similarly, the treatment of didacticism concerning British supremacy is inconsistent, as prejudices against the Irish are for example omitted and adapted from the first translation onwards, whereas stereotypes of African-Americans are retained in the first TT. This shows that sociohistorical developments are a factor inherent to the translation of didacticism in children's literature, as much as or perhaps even more so than child image.

Key words: *children's literature*; *translation*; *didacticism*; *Charles Kingsley*; *evolution*; *class*; *imperialism*.

Illustration title page: Professor Huxley and Professor Owen study a water baby ("Things").

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

Chapter 1: Victorian Children's Literature, Didacticism and Translation 10

1.1: The Development of Victorian Children's Literature 10

1.2: Charles Kingsley within the Framework of Victorian Children's Literature 14

1.3: Didacticism in Children's Literature during the Twentieth Century 18

1.4: Victorian Children's Literature in Translation 20

Chapter 2: Teaching Morality though Evolutionary Theory 23

Chapter 3: Teaching Victorian Attitudes and Ideals Regarding Class 43

Chapter 4: Teaching British Supremacy and Prejudices 64

Conclusion 85

Works Cited 89

Appendices 97

Appendix 1: The Undeniable Existence of Water Babies 97

Appendix 2: The Great Hippopotamus Test 103

Appendix 3: Trout and Salmon 105

Appendix 4: Turnip Children 106

Appendix 5: I Must Be Clean 107

Appendix 6: Vendale 109

Introduction

Ever since the study of children's literature emerged towards the end of the nineteenth century, critics have commented on the role of didacticism in children's books. While at first it was the norm for children's books to contain overt moral preaching (Hunt, *Understanding* 5; Sarland 41), attitudes towards didacticism took a negative turn during the twentieth century (Lesnik-Oberstein 21). While this does not necessarily mean that children's literature no longer contained any didactic elements, didacticism clearly lost its popularity during the latest century, which reflects a changing attitude towards the place of children within society: "Children's literature, including translated text, tells us whether children are regarded as innocent or sinful in any given historical period or location, what rights or duties they have, and how they are socially or intellectually educated" (Lathey, *Translation* 6). Didacticism in children's literature has thus traditionally been connected to the child image, meaning the views of childhood and the status of children during certain time periods as defined by adults through children's books (Nodelman 30). According to Perry Nodelman, the contemporary child image paints children as innocent and creative, and turns against the religious or moral aspects of children's literature, assuming that children respond rather to the imaginative passages (31); consequently, modern children's books have grown to be less explicitly didactic. While didacticism in children's literature has been a rather popular topic within literary studies (Darton; Hunt; Knowles and Malmkjær; Lesnik-Oberstein; Nodelman; Rigby; Sarland; Wu, Mallan and McGillis), only a few critics within translation studies have discussed the subject. Gillian Lathey, for example, has done research on the connection between the translator's preface and a translation's didacticism and view of the child reader ("Translator Revealed" 1). Emer O'Sullivan has also discussed didacticism in children's literature in a case study on the reception of *Pinocchio* in Germany and in the United States, connecting the manner in which moralising passages are translated to the differences between

target audiences over time (139-44). While both studies suggest that overt moralisation has largely disappeared in more recent translations, they mainly connect this to the child image and fail to address the possibility of a relation between different types of didactic messages and the level of didacticism in translations of children's books. While O'Sullivan for example compares the reception of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in Germany to the reception history of *Pinocchio* and states that both novels have known a tradition of "translations solely for children" that were, "above all", "moralizing in tone", followed by a depletion of the didactic messages due to mass marketing (142), he does not examine the possibility that the similarity in publication history is due to similarities in the subjects of the didactic messages of the novels. Furthermore, only Lathey appears to have focused on specific didactic techniques employed in translations (cf. *Translation*; "Translator of"; "Translator Revealed"), such as the use of overt versus passive didacticism.

Charles Kingsley's *The Water Babies* (1863, henceforth *TWB*) lends itself particularly well for an analysis of didacticism in translation, as the novel's author attempted to teach his audience lessons on a wide range of subjects. Moreover, the novel employs both the overt and the passive form of didacticism in abundance, which will be elaborated on in Chapter 1. This novel is nowadays relatively unknown in the Netherlands and has lost the interest of its original British audience. It contains a wide variety of Victorian moral and social viewpoints and shares its format with Dickensian *Bildungsromane*, even if it supports rather than critiques societal norms. At the start of the novel, chimney sweep Tom and his cruel boss Mr. Grimes travel to Sir John's Harthover House. While on the job, Tom accidentally ends up in one of the rooms, where he encounters a girl, Ellie, who is asleep in bed. She wakes and is startled by his appearance, and Tom subsequently flees because he is accused of theft. Tom falls ill and ultimately drowns in a river, after which he is turned into a so-called water baby: a tiny amphibious child that lives in the water. He finds teachers and torturers in various

creatures and fairies, such as Mrs. Bedonebyasyoudid and Mrs. Doasyouwouldbedoneby, and is eventually joined by Ellie, who dies after an accident and teaches him to be a good boy. Towards the end of the story, Tom has to fulfil the duty of travelling to the Other-end-of-Nowhere and finding Mr. Grimes. Mr. Grimes, who is in the afterlife forced to work as a chimney sweep as well, finally shows remorse for his cruel behaviour during his lifetime and is freed from his punishment. Tom eventually returns to Ellie as an adult, and they live together for the rest of their lives.

During the Victorian Age, *TWB* enjoyed great popularity due to its “didactic approach” and “fatalistic view of humanity”, which coincided with the attitudes of the educated Victorian middle class towards society (Cheshire vii). *TWB* functioned as “a story of moral criticism, warning and guidance directed at children, so that they developed into responsible adult citizens” (vi). While the novel therefore has a wide didactic focus, its most notable subject matters are evolution, class and British supremacy.

First of all, *TWB* was partly written in support of Darwin’s evolutionary theory. While this was rather controversial, as Kingsley was a priest for the Church of England, his views of evolution differed somewhat from those of Darwin. Kingsley was focused on reconciling evolutionary theory with religion, and saw evolution as “a force for good or bad, depending on the path one chooses to take” (Cheshire vii), meaning that if one behaves according to Christian doctrine, it leads to happiness and redemption. Kingsley’s novel thereby provides a highly Christian and erroneous view of Darwin’s theories. Furthermore, *TWB* teaches certain ideas about class, focusing in particular on the working class. This book follows a working-class boy’s journey towards success. As Kingsley reportedly felt for the fate of young chimney sweeps (cf. Holt), some parts of his novel are fairly progressive, as it demonstrates compassion towards the poor and especially towards children. On the other hand, Kingsley “seems to have had a genuine belief that the working class should have been told how and

what to think, thereby adjusting their behaviour for the greater good of Victorian society" (Cheshire vi). This is in line with the Victorian view that the lower classes were to blame for their own conditions, as "[s]elf-education, self-discipline and religious observance were seen as the holy trinity to achieving success in life" (vii). Finally, Kingsley's novel also attempts to teach its readers about British supremacy, which is one of the elements that dates *TWB* immensely. The novel provides a clear hierarchical structure with Great Britain at the top, and other countries and races are presented as being inferior. As a result of this, the book contains prejudices towards Americans, Jews, African-Americans, Native Americans, Catholics and particularly the Irish.

Due to its moralistic message, which encourages children to act kindly and responsibly towards others, the novel was also a favourite during the 1920s, when Britain was recovering from World War I (Cheshire vii). While the novel lost its popularity over the course of the twentieth century due to its dated views of society and its period-typical racism and has consequently become ostracised in its status as a classic, it is still reprinted and read, mainly for and by adult readers. Even though it is no longer very much read by children in its original form, its characters have passed into cultural folklore and the novel is still a topic of research, focusing on for example religion (cf. Gilliver; Riga), science, nature and ecocriticism (cf. Neill; Rauch) and its didactic qualities (cf. Neill; Riga). It appears that there are, however, no studies that comment on its reception outside of Great Britain. Similarly, there is no research on the translations of *TWB* in the Netherlands. In Dutch society, the book never reached the status of a classic at all, contrary to other Victorian children's books such as *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, and none of its translations or adaptations have been reprinted after 1982. Apart from analysing *TWB*, which is the source text (henceforth ST), this research will focus on the following target texts (henceforth TTs), all published in the Netherlands:

- *De Waterkindertjes: Een sprookje voor een landkind* (1905), translated by Martha van

Eeden-Van Vloten. This is the first Dutch translation of *TWB*, and while the cover states that Van Vloten adapted the novel, this remains the most complete Dutch translation of the novel. The target audience is unspecified, although the translator mentions that she has omitted references from the novel that were specifically aimed at English readers (5). This edition has been reprinted in 1941 and 1974 and will henceforth be referred to as TT1.

- *The Water-Babies* (1911), annotated by Willem van Doorn. While this is not a Dutch text, it is included in this research, as it is tailored to a Dutch audience; this adaptation is aimed at "boys and girls from thirteen to fifteen years old" and meant "for the use of Dutch Junior Classes" (Van Doorn 3), to teach them to read English. This text has been reprinted for a third edition in 1930 and will henceforth be referred to as TT2.
- *De Waterkinderen* (ca. 1918). This is an adaptation clearly aimed at a child audience, since it is marketed as "goed en goedkoop kinderboek" for "ons jonge volkje", and mentions its illustrations as one of its main features to attract children (58). This text has been reprinted in 1930 and will henceforth be referred to as TT3.
- *De Waterkinderen* (1982), translated by André Abeling. Rather than a direct translation of Kingsley's *TWB*, this text is a translation of Ines de Hosson's 1980 adaptation *The Water-Babies*. This research includes both texts. De Hosson's text does not refer explicitly to its target audience, although the large illustrations and lettering imply a younger audience. This text will be referred to as TT4a. Abeling's translation does mention its target audience on the cover, namely "lezers vanaf acht jaar", and is thus clearly aimed at a child audience. This text will be referred to as TT4b.

The list above includes all Dutch translations and adaptations of *TWB*, and an English adaptation of the novel published in the Netherlands for a Dutch audience. The inclusion of this text in addition to all Dutch translations and adaptations will help to provide an overview

of the development of *TWB* in the Netherlands that is as complete as possible. Important to note is that *TWB* itself enjoys a dual audience of adult and child readers; while the book's address implies that it is a tale for children, as it is 'a story for land babies' and it is dedicated to Kingsley's five-year-old son Grenville, the novel was initially published in *Macmillan's Magazine*, which was aimed at adults. As the TTs each have a more specific audience, this may also be a factor in the amount of didacticism that the translations and adaptations contain.

This investigation will explore the extent to which the themes of evolution, class and British supremacy are taught in Kingsley's novel; to which extent the same, mostly controversial didactic elements are found in its translations and adaptations published in the Netherlands; and how this reflects sociohistorical developments in the Netherlands during the twentieth century, taking into account a shift in target audiences and child images but not limited to these external factors. A close reading and comparative analysis of a number of passages from *TWB* and all of its translations and adaptations published in the Netherlands will be employed to answer the following research question: to what extent are overt and passive didacticism concerning evolutionary theory, class and British supremacy retained, adapted or omitted from translations and adaptations of *TWB* published in the Netherlands? The first chapter will provide a short overview of the development of didactic and nonsense literature within the Victorian Age, as *TWB* can be seen as part of both traditions within children's literature. This chapter will also discuss the development of didacticism itself, its different forms and didacticism in translation. The second, third and fourth chapter will examine to what extent didactic elements regarding evolution, class and British supremacy respectively are retained, adapted or omitted in translations and adaptations of *TWB*. In the concluding chapter, the implications of the analysis of the case study, limitations of the research and suggestions for future studies will be given.

Chapter 1: Victorian Children's Literature, Didacticism and Translation

This chapter gives a brief overview of the development of children's literature in the Victorian Age and some characteristics of Victorian children's books. Subsequently, Charles Kingsley's *TWB* is positioned within this framework. To provide context for the decisions made in the translations and adaptations of Kingsley's work within a Dutch, twentieth-century context, an overview of general attitudes towards didacticism within the field of literary criticism and a method to identify ideological levels is given, as well as short discussion of the translations of similar Victorian works, such as those of Lewis Carroll.

1.1: The Development of Victorian Children's Literature

The development of a literature for children occurred relatively recently, since the concept of childhood was only recognised in Great Britain after the sixteenth century. Before the seventeenth century, children were treated as small adults and married early (Ariès 37-47), and without the idea that children were a separate part of society, there was no need for literature aimed at children. Before 1800, only five percent of the child population in Europe could read at all (Zipes 45). These children read adult books such as the Bible, fairy tales and *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1648). From the seventeenth century onwards, however, British society began to acknowledge the importance of the education of children, inspired by philosophers such as John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Children were now targeted as a specific literary audience (Hunt, *Children's* 15), which led to books that promoted "an overt form of direct preaching" (Hunt, *Understanding* 5; Sarland 41). In these books, children were taught morality, usually through an intrusive narrator explicitly instructing the audience on how to behave in certain contexts, as exemplified by Isaac Watts's *Divine and Moral Songs* (cf. 2). While children's literature was initially mainly aimed at the upper class, the audience of children's books became more diverse during the nineteenth century. With the rise of

industrialism, people became concerned with the welfare of children and especially the poor (Bratton 14). While teaching children was traditionally seen as the parents' responsibility, the nineteenth century saw calls for education for all children, also those of the lower classes (14). This was not without its motives and was mostly instigated by the Evangelical Revival that had been ongoing since the 1780s (14-5). Many overtly evangelical works were written specifically for the use in Sunday schools as a means to teach the Victorian ideal of self-improvement (19), such as the works of Mary Martha Sherwood. The focus on education, however, demonstrates that *children's literature* is a rather deceptive term: as adults started to experience a sense of responsibility for the formation of the next generation of sensible adults, they have traditionally written, bought and read children's books, using their own social and ethical frameworks. While children's books are therefore certainly meant to be consumed by children, children's literature is firmly based in the shifting child images created by adults. As a result, children's books also have a dual audience (Alvstad 24) of both children and adults.

It is, however, a misconception to think that all early children's literature is rigidly didactic and simply not entertaining, as a branch of Victorian children's literature completely different from what had been published up until then appeared during the second half of the nineteenth century, namely nonsense literature. While nonsense writing existed in the form of children's rhymes, literary nonsense has no direct ancestry before the Victorian Age (Lecercle 5), even though connections have been made with the works of Shakespeare and Chaucer. Literary nonsense is a form of writing, prose or verse, which emphasises the subversion of logical and rational structures. While it was for a long time not seen as literature at all (Ede 3), it has been defined as both a literary genre (Lecercle 3) or a subgenre (Shortsleeve 27). Some characteristics of literary nonsense are the use of imaginary creatures (32) and dark and violent themes (27). As Edward Gorey, a twentieth-century author of nonsense verses described, "[i]f you're doing nonsense it has to be rather awful, because there'd be no point.

I'm trying to think if there is sunny nonsense. Sunny, funny nonsense for children-oh, how boring, boring, boring" (Schiff 89). The underlying idea is that nonsense confronts children with darker themes about society without the risk of damaging them, since the child is detached from the writing due to its nonsensical qualities (Shortsleeve 33). Through such techniques, nonsense writing allows children to explore views of society through imagination, instead of offering a clear-cut lesson about how to behave, which early Victorian children's literature tended to do. Literary nonsense therefore tends to contain parodies of didacticism, and emerged as a response to the growing call for education and especially to the institutionalisation of education (Lecercle 4), as described above. Nonsense naturally resists any form of educational purpose through the "non-transparency of language" (3). While on the one hand the development of this type of literature played into the need for children's books, as they form an entertaining tool to teach children to read, it simultaneously formed a criticism of the unimaginative forms of education employed in British schools and in most cases the staunch Christian morality and manners that were taught. This does not mean that literary nonsense is without meaning or that all uses of nonsense are devoid of didacticism. According to Jean-Jacques Lecercle, "[n]onsense texts are reflexive texts" (2), structured by what is at heart a juxtaposition between an "over-structuring and destructuring, subversion and support" (3). While nonsense is thus most famous for its entertaining qualities and its subversion of the rules, such existing rules must be acknowledged before they can be properly turned inside out.

The most famous examples of nonsense literature are perhaps Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1865) and *Alice Through the Looking Glass* (1871), which on the one hand demonstrate a certain reverence for language and most notably stress politeness, whereas on the other hand its rules are turned upside down through Carroll's imaginative creation of for example the Jabberwocky. F. J. Harvey Darton would even go as far as to

claim that Carroll “changed the whole cast of children’s literature” (qtd. in Susina 10). According to Darton, the development of children’s literature could be divided into two parts: didactic literature meant for instruction and education before Carroll’s *Alice* books were published, and literature that was meant purely for pleasure after Carroll (10). This, however, is too simplistic a view of children’s literature and especially of nonsense literature. While Carroll’s work has been characterised as anti-didactic, as it subverts and satirises conventional didacticism (Mulderig 320), some critics have argued that the book nevertheless possesses some educational properties (Rother 89; Susina 10), and Carroll adapted *Alice* into *The Nursery Alice* in 1890 to “clarify its moral message” (Kibbee 317).

Nonsense writing then, despite being very different from conventional children’s literature before the 1850s, is not necessarily devoid of didactic elements, even if such qualities may be left more implicit than in the works of earlier writers. Even more importantly, Carroll was not the first author to employ nonsense in writing for children. Nonsense literature was in fact popularised by Edward Lear earlier in the nineteenth century. In 1846, he published his *Book of Nonsense*, which contains 109 limericks, accompanied by his own, rather simplistic[1] and absurdist drawings, such as the following:

> There was an Old Man of Whitehaven.
>
> Who danced a quadrille with a raven;
>
> But they said, “It’s absurd
>
> To encourage this bird!”
>
> So they smashed that Old Man of Whitehaven. (56)

Both in its imagery and its direct content, Lear’s poem provides a short, absurd and rather aggressive tale, that appears to be devoid of any educational purpose. Rather than a portrayal

[1] This simplicity is an intentional and striking art style choice, as Lear was an accomplished painter and illustrated some of Tennyson’s poems.

of meaningless violence, Lear's works have been seen as a celebration of the eccentric individual: tolerance is preferred "over the punitive insistence in chap-books and other current children's literature upon discipline and conformity, an attitude that [Lear] allocates to the unspecified 'they' who in many of his verses persecute his anomalous protagonists" (Brown 15). In this verse, for example, the aggression of the unnamed masses is countered by the image of a happy man, dancing with a bird; through the influence of the illustration, Lear may have intended for his child audience to condemn the violent actions in this poem. While Lear's work is thus not explicitly didactic, it could still be viewed as containing elements of teaching.

1.2: Charles Kingsley within the Framework of Victorian Children's Literature

Lear and Carroll never approached the heavy explicit didacticism employed by Kingsley in *TWB*. Kingsley's novel is unique in the sense that it combines religious, moral and to some extent scientific didacticism with passages of literary nonsense, since the latter is commonly viewed as a response to or parody of the former. As Kingsley was a priest of the Church of England, it is perhaps not surprising that to a large extent his writing follows the tradition of the Evangelical Movement, in the sense that his book attempts to teach children Christian morality and is rooted in Victorian thinking about race and class. Like much of the religious literature of mid-nineteenth century, *TWB* focuses on hard work, supports British imperialism (Gilliver 218-9) and subscribes to the Victorian ideal of self-improvement. At the end of the novel, the narrator recommends the child audience to "learn [their] lessons, and thank God that [they] have plenty of cold water to wash in; and wash in it too, like a true Englishman" (Kingsley 228). Through becoming clean (55) and doing "the thing he did not like" (226), Tom evolves from a chimney sweep into a water baby, and from a water baby into a gentleman. Similar *Bildung* plotlines were commonly found in Victorian children's literature,

especially within the movement of "muscular Christianity" (Hall 7), of which Kingsley was the foremost advocate. The term was coined by T. C. Sandars in a review of Kingsley's *Two Years Ago* (1857), and represents a religious view that puts the male body at its centre (7). Donald E. Hall defines it as follows: "[A]n association between physical strength, religious certainty, and the ability to shape and control the world around oneself" (7). The male body as it is portrayed in Kingsley's works thus becomes a metaphor for "social, national, and religious bodies", while his writing simultaneously "attempts to enforce a particular construction of those bodies" (8). In *TWB*, this means that as Tom's bodily strength grows, since he is no longer "dirty […], tired, or hungry, or beaten" (Kingsley 56), his moral strength slowly starts to improve, until he has been transformed into "a great man of science" (226). While Norman Vance connects muscular Christianity with Christian manliness and the rise of public schools, as manliness was for Kingsley and other writers at the time synonymous with physical and moral strength (2), Walter Houghton asserts that the movement of muscular Christianity mainly originated from the anxieties of Victorian, middle-class men in a rapidly changing world with regard to science and social views; Kingsley's writing was then part of an attempt to control a world that would not be controlled (216). This may be accurate to some extent: according to some critics, Kingsley had a "genuine belief that the working class should have been told how to behave and what to think, thereby adjusting their behaviour for the greater good of Victorian society, [and] lacked sympathy, because he himself had never been poor" (Cheshire vi). It has, however, also been argued that Kingsley subverted the ideals of the middle-class lifestyle of his contemporaries (Padley 58).

This view is related to the scientific aspect of Kingsley's didacticism. Apart from teaching Christian morality, Kingsley appears to have written *TWB* in support of Charles Darwin's *On the Origins of Species* (1859). He received a copy of the book in advance and read it with great enthusiasm, as it confirmed his own view that the form of animals and

plants was not permanent (Cheshire v). As one of the first defenders of evolutionary theory within the church, Kingsley did adapt Darwin's view of evolution to conform to his own religious ideas. In particular, Kingsley supported the Lamarckian inheritance hypothesis that Darwin refuted, which suggested that evolution worked through "nature selecting the most suitable, or fittest, individuals from a range of subtly different variations on a theme" instead of supporting the idea that developmental changes could take place during a creature's lifetime and be passed on to the following generation (v). Kingsley also advocated the popular theory of recapitulation, which posed that within its lifetime the individual becomes part of an evolutionary process through the child's development into an adult (Straley 586-7). According to William Forbush, the child continues a more abstract form of "evolution, in which he has already repeated the history of the animal world, by repeating the history of his own race-life from savagery unto civilization" (9). This theory was also used to justify imperialism (Straley 589): unlike the people of the countries they conquer, the British have evolved to reach a higher form of civilisation and are therefore better able to govern those countries. Kingsley simultaneously attempted to reconcile the idea of recapitulation with Christianity, as *TWB* appears to add morality into the equation of biological recapitulation (Neill 168). As a result, Kingsley employed *TWB* to teach children not only about Christian morality in itself, but particularly about Christian morality in the framework of Victorian contemporary scientific advancements. Kingsley used empiricism against the people who advocate it by asserting that water babies exists, which cannot be disproven, because "no one has a right to say that no water babies exist, till they have seen no water babies existing: which is quite a different thing, mind, from not seeing water babies; and a thing which nobody ever did, or perhaps ever will do" (Kingsley 45), and parodied well-known Victorian scientists such as Thomas Huxley and Richard Owen (46).

While such passages might not be seen as particularly relevant in a didactic novel for

children, it is important to keep in mind that *TWB* has always enjoyed a dual audience. The novel was first serialised in *Macmillan's Magazine* from August 1862 to March 1863, and consequently published in its entirety in 1863. While Kingsley dedicated the book to his five-year-old son, Grenville, and mentions in the title that his intended audience is the *land baby*, children were definitely not his sole audience (Padley 53), as *Macmillan's Magazine* was aimed chiefly at white middle- to upper-class men (58), and especially Kingsley's views of contemporary scientific discussions like the Great Hippocampus Question might have been aimed more at adults than at children.

Apart from being unique for its treatises on evolution, *TWB* also differs from most Victorian didactic writing in its form: Kingsley's novel is imaginative, fantastical and contains many nonsense passages, especially in the form of lists. Like Carroll's Alice, Tom falls down into a fantasy world in which he encounters all sorts of imaginary creatures and people, both kind and unkind. While nonsense passages resist interpretation and are therefore seen as the antithesis of didacticism, this is not necessarily true for Kingsley's nonsense. In *TWB*, nonsense tends to be in line with the ideas and prejudices that the novel teaches. For example, when "the ills which flesh is heir to" are listed in the context of a story about Pandora's Box, this includes "Measles, Monks, Scarlatina, Idols, Famines, Quacks, Unpaid bills, Tight stays, Hopping-coughs, Popes, Wars, Peacemongers, Potatoes, Bad wine, Despots, Demagogues" (Kingsley 187-8), of which "Popes" and "Potatoes" (188) betray prejudice against Catholicism and the Irish. Similarly, a passage on the aforementioned Great Hippocampus Question, parodied as "the great hippopotamus test" and reflecting both Owen and Huxley's opinions on the matter (101), still aims to teach children that discovering "a hippopotamus major […] in one single ape's brain" does not necessarily mean that there is no longer any difference between men and beasts (101) and that it is honourable to confess your own mistakes (105). While the works of Lear and Carroll thus seem to be an attempt to defy

didacticism through their nonsense, Kingsley clearly combined didactic methods typical of the Victorian Age and imagery of muscular Christianity with nonsense writing to support his message of religious morality, class, imperialism, and in certain instances, prejudice.

1.3: Didacticism in Children's Literature during the Twentieth Century

While there appears to be no research into the translation of Victorian didacticism in particular, it seems likely that the didactic messages rooted in Victorian ideology as portrayed in *TWB* have shifted over time, since attitudes towards science, religion, class, imperialism and race changed during the twentieth century, as will be discussed in the analyses in later chapters. Moreover, the attitude towards didacticism, or at least explicit forms of didacticism, changed drastically during the twentieth century. While nonsense writing during the nineteenth century already constituted a form of resistance towards the prominence of moral teaching in children's literature, most writers supported the idea of didacticism. The earliest criticism of didacticism was made in 1844 by Elizabeth Rigby,[2] who argued that reading books that were of a less moral nature was not a threat to the well-being of children (21). She did, however, not directly oppose the use of didacticism in children's fiction, and it was only after the turn of the century that didacticism started to attract a negative connotation that was more widely recognised. Darton, for example, staunchly opposed didacticism in children's literature. In 1932, he proposed that children's literature should entertain children, rather than to teach them to be good or behave morally, or even merely keep them quiet (Darton 1). According to Darton, didactic elements in children's literature were at best dull to children, but at worst coercive or intrusive (Lesnik-Oberstein 21). It must be noted that this does not necessarily mean that children's books no longer contained didactic elements, or that Darton

[2] With this article in *The Quarterly Review*, a prominent political and literary journal, Rigby was in fact also the first critic to publish a literary article on children's books (Hunt, *Children's* 18).

opposed the educational aspects of children's books entirely. Darton's argument rather demonstrates that there is a shift in the focus of children's literature during the first half of the twentieth century, perhaps instigated by writers such as Carroll: while in the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth century the only object of children's literature was to teach children the skill of reading and moral, religious conduct, the function of entertainment began to overshadow the didactic purpose of children's books. Explicit didacticism nevertheless certainly lost its popularity during the twentieth century.

From the 1970s onwards Peter Hollindale and Charles Sarland started to define the moral or didactic role in children's books as an ideological role. While it is unclear whether he considers this ideological role to be didactic, as Hollindale does not employ the term, he still refers to ideological elements as teaching (11), which is central to didacticism. Children's literature contains three different levels of ideology: the overt level, the passive level, and the level of unintended influence. The first, overt level is defined as "explicit social, political and moral beliefs" (Hollindale 10). On the overt level, didacticism is deliberately embedded in the story (11). While Hollindale argues that this level can be easily detected (11), he fails to elaborate on a specific methodology. Sarland further clarifies that this level embodies "overt, often proselytising didacticism" (47). An example of this type of didacticism in *TWB* is the intrusive narrator that provides moral commentary on the plot. The second level uses "literary organization rather than explicitly didactic guidelines" to teach the audience (Hollindale 11). On this level, the novel transfers the ideology it attempts to teach in a more covert manner (11). This has also been defined as the passive level (Sarland 47). On this level character voices or other elements of the narrative are used to convey views of the world without "overt distancing" (47), meaning that on the passive level didactic teaching and the story itself are much more intertwined than on the overt level. Passive didacticism in *TWB* can be found in

for example the plotline[3] or in character descriptions, but particularly in the nonsense passages, which function as analogies. It is possible that during the twentieth century, didacticism slowly shifted to the passive level. Hollindale's third level stresses the sociohistorical context underlying the story (14) and is defined as the unintended influence of the time and place in which the author wrote the story (15). Because this level to some extent conflates with the second level and is not as well-defined as the first two levels, the third level will be not be used in this paper.

1.4: Victorian Children's Literature in Translation

While no research has been done into the translations of Kingsley's works, Dutch or otherwise, there have been broader studies focusing on the translation of children's literature. Even though in 2006 Eithne O'Connoll argued that, just like children's literature itself, translated children's literature in the West enjoys a lower status when compared to literature for adults (19), this may no longer be completely accurate, as research into the translation of children's literature forms a burgeoning subdiscipline within translation studies. In general, translators of children's books possess more freedom with regard to how they handle the source material and are "permitted to manipulate the text in various ways by changing, enlarging, or abridging it or by deleting or adding to it" (Shavit 26), as the norms for the translation of children's fiction differ somewhat from the norms of adult fiction due to the focus on the audience. While such freedom is granted, translations of children's literature cannot violate the following two principles: "[A]n adjustment of the text to make it appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society regards (at a certain point in time) as educationally 'good for the child'; and an adjustment of plot, characterization, and language to prevailing society's perceptions of the child's ability to read and comprehend"

[3] Notable examples of this are *Bildung* and poetic justice. Both plotlines are used in *TWB*.

(26). Historically, the focus was on the first principle, as didactic children's fiction was used as a tool to educate children during the nineteenth century; however, more contemporary translations tend to emphasise the second principle and advocate comprehensibility for the intended target audience (26). The choices made in translations of children's books then depend on the time period in which the translation was made, its intended function and the age of the child audience.

While there is no research on the translations of *TWB* in any culture, many studies on translations of Victorian children's literature focus on Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, which might lend itself well to comparison to *TWB* due to some of the similarities between the books that have previously been mentioned. According to Douglas Kibbee, the translator of *Alice* must first and foremost choose whether the eponymous character in translation is English, or adopts the nationality of the TT (316); a similar choice should be made by the translators of *TWB*'s Tom. Unlike Shavit, Kibbee questions the translator's right to make these changes, since the novel is also read by adults (317). This may, however, not necessarily be or have been the intention of the translators, and is perhaps a given loss when translating nineteenth-century children's literature in a different cultural context. The first Dutch translations of *Alice* are characterised by omission. The first translation, published in 1875, omits poems and the novel's last few chapters (Van den Berg 45). The next two translators, Eleonora Mann (1887) and R. ten Raa (1889), both skipped several poems, and especially Mann failed to grasp the meaning of Carroll's linguistic jokes (46). M. C. van Oven-van Doorn is the only translator who attempted to parody Dutch poems, with alternating success, as she aimed her translation at young children (48), and even in her text many of the jokes are lost.

While later translations of *Alice* lose the tendency to omit large passages, there is a tendency towards naturalisation. In for example the translations of C. Reedijk and Alfred

Kossmann (1947) and Eelke de Jong (1981), Shakespeare is translated as “dichters” (Reedijk and Kossmann 29) and “gewichtige mensen” (De Jong 36) respectively. A story about William the Conqueror is even nationalised as the “Munster vrede” (Reedijk and Kossmann 27) and “Waterloo” (De Jong 33). As British sociohistorical context is apparently deemed incomprehensible, this leads to the supposition that both translations target a young audience. Even if the translators may not necessarily have intended to solely target a child audience, the translation history of *Alice* demonstrates that when translating children’s literature, children’s knowledge of sociohistorical events tends to be taken into account to a larger extent than that of adults. It is likely that the translations of *TWB*, which similarly focuses on historical or mythological events, will follow this trend; therefore, elements of the novel may be naturalised or nationalised, either by small or large omissions or the inclusion of Dutch history. As *TWB*’s didactic messages are in many instances connected to a particular historical context, it is therefore likely that its didacticism becomes more implicit in Dutch translations, or disappears altogether.

Chapter 2: Teaching Morality though Evolutionary Theory

This chapter focuses on the manner in which didactic elements related to evolution and religion from *TWB* are portrayed in its translations and adaptations published in the Netherlands. One of Kingsley's main objectives in writing this book seems to have been to reconcile evolutionary theory, science and religion. As a member of the Anglican Church, Kingsley had a great appreciation for the natural world and had no issue with translating Darwin's views to a more Christian evolutionary ideology, as described in Chapter 1. Kingsley was renowned for his support of evolutionary theory, and was even alluded to as a clerical supporter in the second edition of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*: "A celebrated author and divine has written to me that he has gradually learned to see that it is just as noble a conception of the Deity to believe that He created a few original forms capable of self-development into other needful forms, as to believe that He required a fresh act of creation to supply the voids caused by the action of his laws" (388). These ideas are reflected in *TWB*, and Tess Cosslett argues that the passages in which Kingsley relates scientific theory are aimed at an adult audience (93). These passages, however, are just as much meant for the future generation, and are dealt with in an imaginative way to make them as understandable as possible, for which purpose the novel employs nonsense passages. As described in Chapter 1, Kingsley's views of evolution are outdated and some of the didactic passages provided in this chapter are closely related to historical events; therefore, it is likely the novel's didacticism becomes more implicit in later translations through omission and naturalisation, even if the subject of didacticism evolves to be less controversial throughout the twentieth century.

Already early on in *TWB* Kingsley's views of evolution seep into the story, although not always necessarily in the most scientific context. The first example of a passage in which Kingsley's ideas are exemplified is in the second chapter, when Tom drowns and the intrusive narrator explains that "[i]t was merely that the fairies took him" (Kingsley 38). The narrator

then continues to convince the reader that there are no good reasons to believe that fairies do not exist:

> Some people think there are no fairies. Cousin Cramchild tells little folks so in his Conversations. Well, perhaps there are none – in Boston, U.S., where he was raised. There are only a clumsy lot of spirits there, who can't make people hear without thumping on the table: but they get their living thereby, and I suppose that is all they want. And Aunt Agitate, in her Arguments on political economy, says there are none. Well, perhaps there are none – in her political economy. But it is a wide world, my little man – and thank heaven for it, for else, between crinolines and theories, some of us would get squashed – and plenty of room in it for fairies, without people seeing them; unless, of course, they look in the right place. The most wonderful and the strangest things in the world, you know, are just the things which no one can see. There is life in you; and it is the life in you which makes you grow, and move, and think: and yet you can't see it. And there is steam in a steam-engine; and that is what makes it move: and yet you can't see it; and so there may be fairies in the world, and they may be just what makes the world go round to the old tune of
>
> *C'est l'amour, l'amour, l'amour*
>
> *Qui fait la monde à la ronde*:
>
> and yet no one may be able to see them except those whose hearts are going round to that same tune. At all events, we will make believe that there are fairies in the world. It will not be the last time by many a one that we shall have to make believe. And yet, after all, there is no need for that. There must be fairies; for this is a fairy tale: and how can one have a fairy tale if there are no fairies? (39)

First of all, this passage has some nonsense aspects to it regarding the logic and the use of song; while the French citation appears to have been an existing phrase at the time (*Spirit*

325), the article “la” for “monde” (Kingsley 39) is incorrect, which adds to the imaginative spirit of the passage. In its content, the passage uses empirical science against scientists, by claiming that creatures can exist even if you cannot see them, the implication being that you just have not seen them *yet* or have not looked in the right places. While this passage is of course a parody and it is unlikely that Kingsley truly believed in the existence of fairies, his reasoning here can be extended to Christian thinking: as long as scientists fail to prove that God does not exist, they cannot claim to know the truth. To some extent, this can also be seen as a criticism of scientists who fail to reconcile their scientific views with the ideology of Christianity, as their views are so limited that they fail to believe in fairies and fairy tales. The narrator thanks God that the world is large enough for fairies to exist in them, for otherwise people would get squashed “between crinolines and theories” (39), a reproach towards the unimaginative aspects of science and the adult world. Similarly, *TWB* criticises Victorian educationalists. Even though Cousin Cramchild and Aunt Agitate have not truly existed, they are representative of the “purely factual educationalists” of the Victorian Age (Cosslett 94). While Kingsley himself wrote in the tradition of overt didacticism, as also becomes clear from this passage in which the reader is directly addressed, and thus focused on teaching children, he clearly attempted to create a story that was more than simple didactic lessons, since he accused Cousin Cramchild and Aunt Agitate of lacking imagination. Through such references, he clearly tried to teach the child reader to embrace imagination, which is further stimulated by the use of literary nonsense in combination with didacticism.

Even in TT1, however, some of Kingsley’s message is already omitted, as shown by the following passage:

> Sommige mensen denken, dat er geen feeën zijn en een heeleboel bewijzen het in boeken. Maar dit is een ruime wereld, mijn jongen, en er is plaats genoeg voor feeën, zonder dat de menschen ze zien, behalve natuurlijk wanneer zij op de goede plaats

> kijken. De vreemdste en verwonderlijkste dingen, dat weet je wel, zijn juist de dingen die men niet kan zien.
>
> Er is leven in je, en dat leven doet je groeien en bewegen en denken, en toch kun je het niet zien. En er is stoom in een locomotief en die stoom doet hem voortgaan, en toch kun je den stoom niet zien. En zoo kunnen er feeën zijn en misschien doen die juist de wereld draaien op het oude deuntje:
>
> ‘C’est l’amour, l’amour, l’amour
>
> Qui fait la monde à la ronde,’
>
> en toch is niemand in staat ze te zien, behalve misschien degenen wier harten kloppen met datzelfde oude deuntje meê. In ieder geval wij zullen doen of er feeën zijn. Het zal ook in lang de laatste keer nog niet zijn, dat wij iets zullen voorstellen of het er is. En ’t is toch eigenlijk niet eens noodig. Er moeten feeën zijn, want dit is een sprookje. En hoe kan er nu een sprookje zijn als er geen feeën bestaan? (Van Vloten 54-5)

While most of the content of the passage has been retained, some of Kingsley’s more specific commentary has been deleted. The references to Cousin Cramchild and Aunt Agitate have been generalised into “een heeleboel [menschen]” (54), which is not a fully necessary shift, as Kingsley made these figures up. Similarly, the sentence “and thank heaven for it, for else, between crinolines and theories, some of us would get squashed” (Kingsley 39) is deleted in its entirety. While the general idea then remains, namely that you should not rule out the possibility of the existence of beings you cannot perceive, Kingsley’s more specific pedagogic message about allowing imagination to be a part of science and of children’s books is somewhat diminished due to the deletion of the longer passage on education and the reference to science and adult society with “crinolines and theories” (39). These deletions may have been caused by Van Vloten’s general translation strategy. As she describes in the preface, she has “stukken uitgelaten die [ze] meende dat door een al te barok uitspinnen, aan den vorm en

de letterkundige waarde schade deden" (5). This suggests that omission is a common strategy used by this translator, or perhaps even in this time period, as Van Vloten seems to equalise Kingsley's more elaborate passages, perhaps specifically referring to the ones leaning towards nonsense, with damaging the literary quality of the novel. A more subtle shift in this passage is that the reference to religion with "thank heaven" (Kingsley 39) is omitted. While this may only affect the passage on a microstructural level, more of such deletion would have the macrostructural effect that Kingsley's religious message is lost.

TT2 shows omissions similar to those in TT1, except in this adaptation the poem is omitted as well:

> Some people think that there are no fairies. But it is a wide world and plenty of room in it for fairies, without people seeing then; unless, of course, they look in the right place. The most wonderful and the strangest things in the world, are just the things which no one can see. There is life in you; and it is the life in which makes you grow, and move, and think; and yet you can't see it. And there is steam in a steam engine; and that is what makes it move, and yet you can't see it. And so there may be fairies in the world, and yet no one may be able to see them. At all events, we will make believe that there are fairies in the world. It will not be the last a time that we shall have to make believe. (Van Doorn 26)

This shows that, while this passage still maintains that children should not necessarily disbelieve in what they cannot see, the stimulation of the imagination falls away, as the poetic sentence most reminiscent of nonsense writing is omitted. It is vital that the aim of this adaptation, meant for use in schools, is kept in mind. The preface for example describes the book's purpose as follows: "Of late years it has been urged again and again by educationalists whose words carry weigh, that whoever wishes to learn a foreign language both quickly and well should take to reading books in that language as soon as he can" (Van Doorn 3). It is thus

particularly notable that in this adaptation the mention of educationalists arguing the opposite is omitted.

TT3's approach is rather similar to that of TT1, even if the passage is shortened to some extent:

> Sommige menschen meenen, dat er geen feeën zijn. Welnu, misschien zijn ze er niet. Maar de wereld is groot, mijn jongen, en er is ruimte genoeg voor feeën, zonder dat de menschen ze zien, behalve natuurlijk, wanneer ze op de goede plaats kijken. De wonderlijkste en krachtigste dingen in de wereld zijn die, welke niemand kan zien. Er is leven in je, en het leven doet je groeien, bewegen en denken, maar niemand kan het zien. Er is stoom in een machine, en deze beweegt de raderen, en toch kun je den stoom niet zien. Zoo zijn er wellicht ook feeën, die de wereld laten wentelen op de wijze van het oude liedje:
>
> 'De liefde draait het al in 't rond,'
>
> terwijl toch niemand in staat is haar te zien, uitgezonderd zij, wier hart zich op dezelfde wijze beweegt.
>
> In elk geval zullen wij doen gelooven, dat er feeën zijn, en het zal niet de laatste maal zijn, dat wij zullen trachten meenigen tot zeker geloof te brengen. (*Waterkinderen* 26-7)

The deletion of details can be explained by this adaptation's aim: it is a work meant for children of a young age range and is specifically marketed as a shorter adaptation on the title page. In the last sentence, however, there is a shift in meaning specific to this adaptation, as TT3 seems to imply through "zullen wij doen gelooven" (27) that the narrator and the reader will convince other people of the existence of fairies throughout the story. Even though this does not necessarily make sense narratively, the child reader is actively implored to help the narrator in distributing his lesson, which once again focuses some more on imagination.

Unlike TT2, TT3 includes the poem again, through which the imaginative aspect also returns to some extent. Contrarily, this passage also includes the sentence "[w]elnu, misschien zijn ze er niet" (26) to provide a contrary perspective to that of the narrator, whereas TT1 and TT2 omit this. This diminishes the imaginative effect, as the narrator admits that "[s]ommige menschen" (26) may as well be right.

In TT4a, the passage has been reduced to a single sentence: "Some people think there are no fairies, but there must be fairies; for this is a fairy-tale: and how can one have a fairy-tale if there are no fairies?" (De Hosson 40). The translation of this in TT4b is: "Sommige mensen denken dat er geen feeën bestaan, maar ze bestaan natuurlijk wel; want dit is een sprookje, en sprookjes zonder feeën bestaan toch niet?" (Abeling 39-40). While on the one hand this shows that the relevance of the passage in general might have diminished for audiences during the 1980s in both Great Britain and the Netherlands, the focus is also different from TT1, TT2 and TT3. Whereas in TT1, TT2 and TT3 the imaginative part was deleted to some extent, Kingsley's narrative trick with regard to the possible existence of fairies, which can be explained as a more creative approach to science and nature, has been omitted in TT4; only the idea of the existence of fairies remains, and the emphasis on imagination becomes stronger than Kingsley's message about science. This demonstrates that in general translations of *TWB* might have become less focused on scientific aspects and rather enlarge or maintain the imaginative aspects of Kingsley's writing for a more modern audience. Furthermore, the overtly didactic passage has throughout the different adaptations and translations been shortened into a single sentence that is passively didactic at best, which may reflect the changed attitude towards overt, proselytising didacticism during the twentieth century.

A similar development is exemplified by the passage on water babies in this same chapter. In this passage, the narrator advocates the possible existence of water babies, starting

from the statement "[b]ut there are no such things as water babies" (45), which is positioned in the story to appear as the logical argument of the reader. The passage contains a number of arguments in favour of the existence of water babies (for the full passage and its translations, see Appendix 1), starting with a similar reasoning as in the fairy passage: "And no one has a right to say that no water babies exist, till they have seen no water babies existing; which is quite a different thing, mind, from not seeing water babies; and a thing which nobody ever did, or perhaps ever will do" (Kingsley 45). The imagined reader subsequently poses that somebody like Professor Huxley or Owen would have caught a water baby and that such a creature is "contrary to nature" (45). The narrator then goes to great lengths to discredit that statement, backed by scientific evidence. First of all, he describes that scientists such as "Sir Roderick Murchison, or Professor Huxley, or Mr. Darwin, or Professor Faraday, or Mr. Grove" do not know everything, and would therefore never claim that a creature "cannot exist"; the reader should not listen to Cousin Cramchild or Aunt Agitate (46). The second argument involves an elephant, which people would have seen as "contrary to nature" and an "impossible monster" if they had never seen it (47-8). A similar argument revolves around "flying dragon[s]" or "pterodactyls" of which "a German lately discovered [that they] had feathers", which to the narrator seems "contrary to nature" even though it is true (48). Then, in a celebration of nature, the narrator describes that if "[t]here are land babies – then why not water babies? Are there not water-rats, water-flies, water-crickets, water-crabs, [etc.]. Do not even you know that a green drake, and an alder-fly, and a dragon-fly, live under water till they change their skins, just as Tom changed his? And if a water animal can continuously change into a land animal, why should not a land animal sometimes change into a water animal?" (49). To explain the strange transformation, the narrator proposes a scientific analogy with "the transformation of Syllis, or the Distomas, or the common jellyfish, of which M. Quatrefages says excellently well – 'who would not claim that a miracle had come to pass, if

he saw a reptile come out of the egg dropped by the hen in his poultry yard, and the reptile give birth at once to an indefinite number of fishes and birds. Yet the history of the jellyfish is quite as wonderful as that would be" (49-50). With this sentence, the narrator steers the argument into what is rather a discussion of evolutionary theory, as in the next paragraph he explains that it is untrue that "things cannot degrade" and that "these transformations only take place in the lower animals" (50). According to the narrator, human beings are part of this evolutionary process: "Does not each of us, coming into this world, go through a transformation just as wonderful as that of a sea-egg, or a butterfly? And does not reason and analogy, as well as Scripture, tell us that that transformation is not the last?" (51). The narrator here proposes that evolution takes place throughout a single human's lifetime, which exemplifies Kingsley's support for the theory of recapitulation (cf. Straley) and connects it to Christianity, as it is further claimed that gaining a new heavenly body as predicted in the Bible (1 Cor. 15:49)[4] is the final transformation. While this passage could to some extent be seen as literary nonsense due the subject of water babies, it has a clear pedagogical goal, as questions supposedly asked by the reader are answered in detail by an intrusive narrator, which is an overt attempt to guide the reader into believing evolutionary theory as the narrator explains it. Similarly to the fairy passage, the narrator attempts to downplay the overt didacticism by ending his story with "[a]m I in earnest? Oh dear no. Don't you know that this is a fairy tale, all fun and pretence; and that you are not to believe one word of it, even if it is true?" (Kingsley 51). It is unlikely that these throwaway sentences are fully able to undermine the previous seven pages of didacticism, and moreover, due to the last part of the sentence it already undermines its own message.

TT1, as the only full translation, retains most of the passage. While the names of the scientists have been naturalised as "beroemde professoren" (Van Vloten 62) and Cousin

[4] "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Cramchild has been translated as “neef Wijsneus” (65), the only major shift is that the passage about the jellyfish and the degradation of species has been omitted. As it is unlikely that these paragraphs were omitted for their length, since these are in fact two of the shortest paragraphs in the passage and the translation does not seem concerned with the length of this passage otherwise, it appears that the paragraphs were deleted for their clear connection to evolutionary theory, as the jellyfish paragraph hints at the development of a species and the degradation paragraph deals with the theory of recapitulation. Still, however, the paragraph about the “gedaantewisselingen” of humans is retained, relating the following: “En zegt onze Rede ons niet dat diè veranderingen niet de laatsten zijn, die wij zullen ondergaan?” (65). While it is possible that the capitalisation of “Rede” (65) points to a reconciliation of God with reason, it also appears that the connection with Christianity is made somewhat more implicit as “Scipture” (Kingsley 51) is omitted.

TT2 has, however, heavily reduced this passage: “‘But there are no such things as water-babies.’ How do you know? Have you been there to see? And if you had been there to see, and had seen none, that would not prove that there were none. And if a water animal can change into a land animal, why should not a land animal sometimes change into a water animal?” (Van Doorn 31-2). Unlike TT1, this passage omits any specific reference to evolution and religion and solely focuses on the imaginative existence of water babies. As this was a book meant for teaching, commonly used in schools (Immink-Cost Budde 293), it is possible that evolutionary theory was somewhat too controversial to appear in this edition. TT3 has omitted many elements as well, even if it is to a lesser extent than in TT2:

> Maar zulke dingen als waterkinderen zijn er toch niet. Hoe weet je dat? Heb je goed rondgekeken? En als je rondgekeken hebt en geen enkel waterkind hebt gezien, dan bewijst dat niet, dat ze er niet zijn.
>
> Wel, wel, geen waterkinderen! Wijze menschen hebben van oudsher gezegd, dat elk

> ding op aarde zijn evenbeeld in het water heeft, en je zult zien dat dit, al mag het niet heelemaal waar zijn, toch minstens zoo waar is als menig andere leer, die je vaak zult moeten aannemen. Er zijn landkinderen, — waarom dan geen waterkinderen?
> En waar wij voortdurend kunnen waarnemen, dat waterdieren veranderen in landdieren, waarom zou dan een landdier niet eens in een waterdier kunnen veranderen? (*Waterkinderen* 32)

While the general ideas of the passage are retained, in the sense that the idea that a land baby can transform into a water baby remains, the specific evolutionary imagery is lost in its entirety in this TT as well. While this may be related to the fact that TT3 is an adaptation, it is also possible that specific ideas about the existence and evolution of dinosaurs and jellyfish were deemed unsuitable for the younger audience of 'Jongens en Meisjes' that this book is clearly aimed at, as it deletes any reference to the transformation of animals. Like TT2, this adaptation also loses all reference to religion in this passage, even if it retains hints at the transformation of human beings. The didactic purpose of the passage is therefore changed in TT3; while the initial goal was related to the reconciliation of evolution and religion, the passage is now, like the first passage, more about stimulating imagination with regard to the possible existence of water babies. This passage nevertheless still uses the method of overt didacticism.

TT4a and TT4b contain more elaborate takes on the passage than TT2 and TT3. The passage in TT4a starts as follows: "How do you know? Have you been there to see? And if you had been there to see, and had seen none, that would not prove that there were none" and then includes the list of creatures that live on land and have their double in the water (De Hosson 44). This is translated as: "Hoe weet je dat? Ben je soms komen kijken? En al was je komen kijken en had je ze niet gezien, dan wilde dat nog niet zeggen dat ze niet bestonden", also followed by a list (Abeling 44). Even though the list in the translation is slightly shorter

and mentions different creatures, for example "waterzwijn' (44) but not "water crickets" (De Hosson 44), TT4 also contains the passage in which the narrator explains that if water animals can change into land animals, land animals can change into water animals. While it seems like the versions of *TWB* from the 1980s may contain more of the evolutional message, it is more likely that the list was left in for entertaining purposes, as the more scientifically charged passages, for example the paragraphs about the jellyfish, are still omitted. Lists were a prominent aspect of literary nonsense (Swifty 13), and as such, this part of the passage may have been retained to fuel the readers' imagination. This demonstrates again that over time the adaptations and translations have become less focused on the scientific and evolutionary aspect, even if the last adaptation contains more of that, and mostly emphasise the imaginative aspect of the existence of water babies. Still, as with the first passage, the overt form of didacticism, in which the reader supposedly asks a question and the intrusive narrator directly addresses the reader, is retained in all TTs, even if it is diminished.

Another, somewhat less overtly didactic passage deals with the Great Hippocampus Question and is one of the passages in the book most directly related to Victorian evolutionary theory. This term, actually only coined after Kingsley wrote about it in *TWB*, signifies a debate on evolutionary theory between Thomas Henry Huxley and Richard Owen, both respected leading figures of Victorian science. While Huxley was a supporter of Darwin, Owen did not accept nor deny evolution. Nevertheless, he was convinced that the evolutionary theories that Darwin presented were false, and instead argued for the unconvincing theory of "the continuous operation of the ordained becoming of living things" (Owen). In his review of *On the Origin of Species*, he not only declared Darwin's ideas wrong, but also praised his own theory (Owen). Their debate on human heritage began in 1860, when Owen argued that "the brain of the gorilla was more different from that of man than from that of the lowest primate particularly because only man had a posterior lobe, a

posterior horn, and a hippocampus minor", whereas Huxley "denied altogether that the difference between the brain of the gorilla and man was so great" (Gross 407-8). The following arguments, presented at conventions and in their respective papers, lasted for about ten years and tarnished Owen's reputation beyond repair. While Kingsley tended to lean towards Darwin's side of the argument, he wrote this passage to express the ridiculous heights that the discussion reached, exclaiming the following afterwards: "What an advantage it is to be men of the world!" (Kingsley 102). The narrator introduces a character called "Professor Ptthmllnsprts" or Putthemallinspirits (98), who first like Huxley declares "that apes had hippopotamus majors in their brains just as men have" (100), but then like Owen argues that "[i]f you have a hippopotamus major in your brain, you are no ape" (101), parodying the argument about the hippocampus in a somewhat confusing nonsense passage (see Appendix 2 for the full passage and its translations). While this passage does not necessarily teach the reader a certain view of evolution, it does attempt to portray that, despite Kingsley's support for scientific efforts, one should not get lost in theorising and lose all one's imagination, as the professor later also claims that water babies cannot exist (103) and his theories are called "strange" (100). This is one of *TWB*'s most striking examples of a combination of literary nonsense and didacticism. Even in TT1, however, this passage is completely omitted except for references to the personal relationship between the unnamed Huxley and Owen, cursing at each other (Van Vloten 117), perhaps due to its lack of relevance for a Dutch audience. Only TT4 still contains references to the discussion, with "[s]o he gave her a succinct compendium of his famous paper at the British Association, in a form suited for the youthful mind" (De Hosson 77) and "[h]ij gaf haar daarom een beknopt uittreksel van zijn vermaarde voordracht voor de Koninklijke Academie, in voor kinderen begrijpelijke taal" (Abeling 77). Due to the frequent omission of this passage, some element of didacticism and literary nonsense is deleted from the translations and adaptations, but this is perhaps also an understandable

decision with regard to the target audience. While the ST was clearly also aimed at adults, all TTs except TT1 explicitly seem to focus on a child audience.

Apart from the overtly didactic passages, *TWB* also contains passive didacticism related to evolutionary theory as Kingsley proposed it, mostly through passages that can be identified as literary nonsense, as they parody existing theories on evolution or draw comparisons between the evolution of real and imaginary creatures, presented as historical truths. In *TWB*, many of the nonsense passages related to science function as didactic passages, in part meant to teach the reader the consequences of immoral behaviour, as will be shown by the next few examples. One of such passages is the degradation of salmon into trout:

> A great many years ago they [trout] were like us [salmon]; but they were so lazy, and cowardly, and greedy, that instead of going down to the sea every year to see the world and grow strong and fat, they chose to stay and poke about in the little streams and eat worms and grubs: and they are very properly punished for it; for they have grown ugly and brown and spotted and small; and are actually so degraded in their tastes, that they will eat our children. (Kingsley 82-3)

Like the previous passage, this also plays into the idea that creatures can degrade within their lifetime according to their behaviour, thus bringing the theory of recapitulation into practice in the world of *TWB*, instead of merely having the narrator describe it. This passage also demonstrates that Kingsley appears to have considered evolutionary degradation as driven by immoral or undutiful behaviour, and as such his didactic passages about evolution equally form a warning to readers to behave morally, lest you transform into an animal. Unlike the overtly didactic passages, this passage is mostly retained in all translations. In TT1, the passage is translated as follows:

> Jaren geleden waren zij precies als wij, maar zij waren zóó luî, zóó laf en zóó gulzig,

> dat in plaats van ieder jaar naar zee te gaan om de wereld te zien en sterk en vet te worden, zij liever bleven waar zij waren, en rondscharrelden in kleine stroompjes, en wormen en larven aten; maar zij zijn er behoorlijk voor gestraft; want zij zijn leelijk geworden en bruin, en gevlekt en klein; en ze zijn zelfs zóó in hun smaak achteruit gegaan, dat ze feitelijk onze kinderen eten. (Van Vloten 98)

There are some microstructural shifts in this passage, as for example "properly" (Kingsley 83) is translated as "behoorlijk" (Van Vloten 98), while the meaning 'accordingly' may have been more implied by the meaning of the passage; however, overall the passage retains the idea that trout are salmon that have degraded. TT2 and TT4 retain the passage to a large extent as well (see Appendix 3 for the translations of the passage in TT2 and TT4), and only in TT3 the meaning shifts on a macrostructural level, as the following translation is provided:

> Mijn vriend, wij noemen ze niet eens, als wij het kunnen laten, want ze zijn nog een beetje familie van ons, maar doen ons geslacht geen eer aan. Jaren geleden waren ze ons gelijk, maar zij waren zóó lui en laf en gulzig, dat zij, in plaats van elk jaar naar de zee te gaan om de wereld te bezien en sterk en vet te worden, hier verkozen te blijven, en in de kleine riviertjes omwroetten, en wormen en larven aten. Maar ze zijn er flink voor gestraft, want nu *blijven* ze leelijk, bruin, gevlekt en klein, en hun smaak is zoo bedorven, dat ze zelfs gaarne onze kinderen eten. (*Waterkinderen* 50, my emphasis)

While this passage seems largely similar to the other TTs, the shift from "grown" (Kingsley 83) to the italicised "blijven" (*Waterkinderen* 50) indicates that in TT3 the trout simply remain trout because they fail to do their duties, instead of degrading from salmon to trout because of that same reason. While the same evolutionary idea of adapting to one's environment still lays behind this passage, Kingsley's specific theory of recapitulation is not portrayed here. While it is possible that the author of TT3 did not want to teach its young audience the same message and instead complied more with Darwin's original theory, it is of

course also possible that s/he failed to recognise the didactic significance of the passage. It is, however, important to note that unlike the overt didacticism of the first two passages, the passive evolutionary didacticism is retained in all TTs, despite some minor changes.

While the evolution of animals in a passively didactic passage is thus retained, there are also passages in which human beings are degraded into creatures or, in fact, plants. As part of Tom's travels, he encounters different types of creatures and odd lands, amongst which a place where all children have been pressed to study continuously and take examinations. As a result of this, they are turned into turnips: "They can't play now, if they tried. Don't you see how their legs have turned to roots and grown into the ground, by never taking any exercise, but sapping and moping always in the same place" (Kingsley 207-8; for the full passage and its translations, see Appendix 4). This might be viewed as a nonsense passage, especially because the effect of this evolution is far more unlikely than the previously described evolutions from beast into beast or man into beast, to the extent that it forms a parody of Kingsley's own views. As with the passages on fairies and water babies, this contains a clear judgement of the educational views of the Victorians, and promotes that children should not merely be asked to study their lessons and rather be given time to play as well, and discover through experience and imagination. Only TT1, however, includes this passage at all (Van Vloten 217-8). It is entirely possible that this passage is omitted simply due to its length; in TT3, for example, two entire chapters are conflated and much of Tom's travels are lost. The choice to omit this particular part of Tom's journey, especially in the more elaborate TT4, may also indicate that the idea of possible evolutionary degradation of human beings or Kingsley's critique of staunch educationalists have lost their relevance for more modern audiences. A consequence of such omissions is, however, that in this passage *TWB*'s didactic value is lost, as well as the literary nonsense which is applied for the purpose of Kingsley's teaching.

The story of the Doasyoulikes has received a treatment similar to the passage above. As Tom proclaims that he does not like to travel to the world's end to seek out Mr. Grimes, as is his duty, the fairy Mrs. Bedonebyasyoudid tells "[t]he History of the great and famous nation of the Doasyoulikes, who came away from the country of Hardwork, because they wanted to play the Jews'-harp all day long" (Kingsley 156). The fairy explains to Tom and Ellie that these people skirted their duties and failed to act at the signs of a volcano eruption. As a result, most of them died and the others slowly evolved into apes, before the last one died, unable to speak (159-61). While *TWB* tends to focus on the theory of recapitulation, it becomes clear that this theory is not only applied to individuals, as for example with Tom's transformation into a water baby or the story of the trout, which did not concern *all* salmon. Rather, this story seems to address the possibility that an entire people is degraded into extinction because of a collective lack of moral improvement, which is linked to industriousness. This allows for an interpretation in which some peoples have the right to rule over others due to their moral superiority, as will be discussed in Chapter 3. Due to the names used in this passage, such as Doasyoulikes, but also "the land of Readymade" and the "Happygolucky Mountains" (156), this is clearly literary nonsense employed to teach children morality through the threat of evolutionary degradation, as with the passage of the salmon. Like the passage of the turnips, however, this passage is only translated in TT1 as the story of the "Doewatjewilts" (cf. Van Vloten 165), the only omission being a comment about the Irish which will be discussed in Chapter 3 as well. This shows that once again an imaginative nonsense passage containing covert didacticism about the degradation of human beings is deleted in later translations.

While all of the parables and analogies are to some extent presented as historical, the most striking of such stories is the passage in which the creation of St. Brendan, the island on which the fairies and the water babies live, is explained. In this story, the Irish degrade into

gorillas:

> Did you never hear of the blessed St. Brandan, how he preached to the wild Irish on the wild wild Kerry coast; he and five other hermits, till they were weary, and longed to rest? For the wild Irish would not listen to them, or come to confession and to mass, but liked better to brew potheen, and dance the pater o'pee, and knock each other over the head with shillelaghs, and shoot each other from behind turf-dykes, and steal each other's cattle, and burn each other's homes; till St. Brandan and his friends were weary of them, for they would not learn to be peaceable Christians at all. […] But the people who would not hear him were changed into gorillas, and gorillas they are until this day. (Kingsley 125)

While this story starts out with the intrusive narrator addressing the audience as if he is going to relate a historical tale, as St. Brandan as an Irish saint is a real historical figure, the story itself forms a part of passive didacticism and teaches that people who do not heed the Scripture degrade into apes. Unlike in some of the previous passages, the reason for degradation here depends heavily on religion as the highest form of morality and to some extent proposes that only Christianity can save humans from being degraded into lesser beings, and thus exemplifies the manner in which Kingsley attempted to reconcile evolutionary theory and religion. As seen in the passage with the Doasyoulikes, *TWB* tends to place the blame for a people's misfortunes entirely on their supposed lack of moral or dutiful behaviour, as it does here with the Irish due to their lack of religious belief.

Even in TT1, this passage has already been reduced to some extent, as demonstrated by the following translation:

> Heb jelui wel gehoord van Sint Brandaan? Hoe hij preekte voor de wilde Ieren op de woeste Iersche kust? Hij en vijf andere kluizenaars, tot ze moe waren en naar rust verlangden. Want de wilde Ieren wilden niet naar hen luisteren, maar ze dansten liever

> hun woeste dansen, en dronken zich dronken, en schoten op elkaar en stalen elkaar's vee en verbrandden elkaar's tuinen; tot Sint Brandaan en zijn vrienden er eindelijk genoeg van kregen en weggingen […] Maar de menschen, die niet naar hen wilden luisteren, werden in gorilla's veranderd, en gorilla's zijn ze nog' (Van Vloten 131)

There are some small shifts in this translation, as for example the "wild wild Kerry coast" (Kingsley 125) only is now only "woest" (Van Vloten 131), the mention of not going to mass and confession is deleted, specific references to Ireland such as "turf-dykes" (Kingsley 125) are omitted and the Irish no longer burn each other's homes, but instead each other's gardens. Such simple changes, however, imply that the translator was uncomfortable with some of the narrator's accusations towards the Irish or did not consider them suitable for a Dutch audience in 1905, and therefore made the passage somewhat more implicit. The main didactic message behind this passage is, however, retained, as the Irish still transform into gorillas when they fail to listen to St. Brandan. As the Netherlands was during this time period still deeply defined by religious structures (De Rooy 115), it seems unsurprising that this type of thinking is retained in TT1.

In TT2, the passage is omitted in its entirety and none of St. Brandan's preaching remains, possibly because evolutionary teaching was still deemed too controversial to be taught in schools. TT3 retains some of this story, but the degradation of the Irish is omitted and the passage is shortened to "[h]eb je wel eens van den zaligen St. Brandaan gehoord? Hij predikte voor de wilde Ieren op de woeste kust van Kerry, hij met vijf andere kluizenaars, tot zij moede waren en naar rust verlangden. Want de wilde Ieren wilden niet naar hen luisteren" (*Waterkinderen* 66). The evolutionary aspect is deleted from this passage, as it is in TT4b's "[h]eb je nog nooit van Sinte Brandaan gehoord, die bij de Ieren predikte, aan de woeste Kerry-kust? Dat deed hij met vijf andere monniken, tot ze moe werden en aan rust toe waren" (Abeling 84). While it is possible that, like in other passages, this deletion shows that there is

a diminished interest in teaching evolutionary theory in children's books, it is also possible that this omission, especially regarding the simian comparison, is related to the discrimination against the Irish in this passage, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.

This analysis thus demonstrates that especially TT1 appears to retain *TWB*'s didacticism, which can perhaps be explained by the fact that it was published at the start of the twentieth century, when overt didacticism had not yet lost its popularity. Nevertheless, some of the clearest overt references to Kingsley's view of the theory of recapitulation are omitted from this translation, as well as to an increasing extent in the subsequent publications. Especially TT2 seems averse to references to evolution, likely because this edition was used in schools, where such theories remained highly controversial in education until the second half of the twentieth century (Ridley, n.p.). With regard to overt didacticism, a focus on science is slowly replaced by a focus on the imaginary through the retained literary nonsense. Paradoxically, the passages of passive didacticism that rely heavily on nonsense writing, such as the passage about the turnips and the Doasyoulikes, are omitted later translations. Except for TT1, all translations and adaptations fail to include the passages that deal with evolutionary degradation of human beings at all, possibly because Kingsley's views of these evolutionary processes were disproven (Cheshire v) or because they became seen as politically incorrect with regard to the Irish and African-Americans. This demonstrates that while the focus of overt didacticism is adapted to suit a more modern audience, the omission of nonsense passages leads to the deletion of large elements of the passive didacticism related to evolution in *TWB*.

Chapter 3: Teaching Victorian Attitudes and Ideals Regarding Class

This chapter deals with the different attitudes towards class difference in *TWB* and the manner in which this develops through the Dutch twentieth-century translations and adaptations, with emphasis on views of the working class. As pointed out in Chapter 1, Kingsley was a member of the clergy and therefore a more privileged member of society. His views of the working class as they are presented in *TWB* seem somewhat conflicting for a middle-class man. On the one hand, the novel has been viewed as a tract against child labour (cf. Holt) through the manner in which Tom's tasks and the cruelty of Mr. Grimes are portrayed, as it is stated that Tom "had been sadly overworked in the land-world" (Kingsley 57). Kingsley was part of a Christian socialist movement that attempted to reconcile socialism with Protestant Christianity (Judd 179) and thus to some extent certainly felt compassion for the less fortunate classes. On the other hand, Kingsley subscribed to the ideal of self-improvement upheld in Victorian society (Bratton 19). According to the Victorian middle and upper classes, "the working class only had themselves to blame for their predicament. Self-education, self-discipline and religious observance were seen as the holy trinity to achieving success in life" (Cheshire vii). In line with Kingsley's scientific ideology, which links moral degradation to physical, evolutionary degradation, *TWB* emits that the idea individuals or groups of people are responsible for their own fate, as Tom is responsible for his own mistakes in the novel. While Kingsley thus criticises some aspects of Victorian society in *TWB*, he simultaneously denies that society as a whole, or the upper classes, are partly responsible for the dreadful circumstances of the poor, and places the blame with the working classes themselves, as he also for example faulted the Doasyoulikes for their own extinction due to laziness and the Irish for their transformation into gorillas due to their lack of religious belief.

Dutch culture has not been defined by class in the same way as Great Britain. While class difference certainly exists, Dutch history is rather characterised by the process of

pillarisation, or "verzuiling", which started at the end of the nineteenth century (De Rooy 131). A pillar consisted of people of different social-economic backgrounds, but with the same religion or ideology. The Netherlands was divided in Protestants, Catholics, socialists and liberals. Debates related to social issues such as the right to vote and start schools with a certain ideological background were fought between these different pillars, rather than between different classes.[5] As in Great Britain, however, socialism developed in the Netherlands during the second half of the nineteenth century, with the foundation of the Sociaal-Democratische Bond (SDB) in 1881 and the dissenting Sociaal-Democratische Arbeiderspartij (SDAP) led by Pieter Jelles Troelstra in 1894 (120-1). From the start of the twentieth century, political equality increased, even though this did not mean that all class distinctions and conflicts from the nineteenth century disappeared; as groups of people who were previously denied a voice started to organise, political discussions were sharper than ever before (134). Inequalities regarding for example the right to vote nevertheless disappeared during the twentieth century, and in 1937 the term "klassenstrijd" itself disappeared from the SDAP's programme (183). Only after the Second World War, however, the Netherlands transformed into a welfare state, instigating laws such as the Algemene Bijstandswet in 1965 (229). As class distinction itself diminished and was not as prominent as in Great Britain to begin with, attitudes particular to the Victorian Age have evolved or perhaps never been present in Dutch society, which is likely to show in the Dutch translations in the form of changed, diminished or deleted didactic passages.

Class differences in *TWB* are mainly presented through character descriptions and interactions, which means that for the largest part didacticism around class is passive rather than overt. This means that the narrator will often not provide explicit commentary on what

[5] Pillarisation has been characterised as a vertical division within society, whereas class difference is a horizontal division. The horizontal division is still present within the pillars, but has never been as prominent a part of Dutch society as in British society.

the reader is supposed to think about the working class and the upper class, but will employ specific imagery and use the narrator or character voices in an attempt to control the reader's opinion of particular Victorian ideas about the self-improvement of the working class and of various characters as an extension of their class. Even though the didacticism with respect to class is thus not as overt as the teaching of evolutionary ideas, this does not mean that attempts to control the reader are any less evident, as will be shown by examples throughout this chapter. The root of didacticism regarding class differences lies in the manner in which the characters are first introduced at the start of the novel, as in general through both overt and passive didacticism a negative view is given of the working classes and a positive view of the middle and upper classes. Tom, for example, is presented by the narrator as uneducated, as "[h]e could not read nor write, and did not care to do either; and he never washed himself. […] He never heard of God or of Christ" (Kingsley 1). This passage is found in all translations (Abeling 9, Van Doorn 5, De Hosson 9, Van Vloten 7; *Waterkinderen* 3), and to some extent paints a picture of Tom as an unclean, savage creature. This is emphasised later in the chapter, when Tom accidentally finds his way into the room of Ellie, an upper class girl. While "[s]he cannot be dirty", he is upset when he sees a "little black ape" when he looks into the mirror himself (Kingsley 17). While this representation also has some implications for Tom's possible ethnicity, as he is in illustrations sometimes represented as an African-American child (Judd 186), which will be discussed in Chapter 4, here it functions to dehumanise the working class through passively didactic imagery. After he escapes from the house, the narrator also compares him to a "small black gorilla" (Kingsley 20). While Tom is physically dirty in all TTs (Abeling 23; Van Doorn 14; De Hosson 23; *Waterkinderen* 13), TT1 is the only translation in which the animalistic comparisons are retained and Tom is called a "kleine, zwarte aap" (Van Vloten 30) and a "kleine zwarte gorilla" (33). The passive didacticism regarding the negative representation of Tom as a working class child is therefore

somewhat diminished in later translations.

In contrast to this representation, Sir John as an upper class man is presented as a "jolly, honest, sensible squire" (Kingsley 4), which is translated as "zóó joviaal, verstandig landheer" (Van Vloten 13), "zulk een opgeruimde, eerlijke, verstandige landheer" (*Waterkinderen* 13) and "vrolijkste, eerlijkste, verstandigste landheer" (Abeling 11) in TT1, TT3 and TT4b respectively, and is retained in TT2 (Van Doorn 8) and TT4a (De Hosson 11). Instead of omitting this, like the negative imagery around Tom, the positive imagery regarding a member of the upper class is emphasised in later translations, as "vrolijkste, eerlijkste, verstandigste" (Abeling 11) forms even stronger imagery than "jolly, honest, sensible" (Kingsley 4) due to the superlative form. While this imagery works as passive didacticism, since the reader is still to some extent free to disagree with the narrator, the first chapter contains more overtly controlling imagery regarding Sir John, as the narrator also provides the following statement after describing Sir John's house: "From which you may collect (if you have wit enough), that Sir John was a very sound-headed, sound-hearted squire, and just the man to keep the countryside in order, and show good sports with his hounds" (14). Even though the narrator appears to allow the reader some freedom of interpretation due to the verb "may", the comment "if you have wit enough" (14) exemplifies a clear attempt to control the reader's opinion of Sir John and portray the narrator's description as the truth. TT1 retains this sentence in a similar manner: "En daaruit kun je opmaken (als je slim genoeg bent) dat Sir John een landedelman was, die een gezond hoofd en een gezond hart met zich mee droeg, en de rechte persoon was om zijn bezitting in orde te houden en een aardig jachtvertoon met zijn honden te maken" (Van Vloten 26). As in the ST, TT1 attempts to steer the reader's interpretation into a certain direction through an overtly controlling sentence. TT2 and TT3, however, completely omit this sentence. While it is possible that this omission is caused by socio-political developments during the first half of the twentieth century, this

cannot be concluded from a single example, especially since the description of Sir John as a jolly squire is retained. It is then possible that this sentence was simply deleted in these adaptations because it is somewhat repetitive. Unlike TT2 and TT3, TT4 retains the sentence to some extent. The controlling "if you have wit enough" (Kingsley 14) is, however, deleted in TT4, and the sentence introduces the narrator's opinion with "[f]rom which you may collect […]" (De Hosson 20), which allows for a freer interpretation than is possible from the ST. The translation of this sentence in TT4a is: "Waaruit je wel kunt afleiden dat Sir John het hart en het hoofd op de juiste plaats had, en precies de juiste man was om die landstreek te besturen en goede sier te maken met zijn honden" (Abeling 20). This is somewhat more controlling than TT4a due to the addition of "wel" (20), even if it does not reach the level of didactic control of the ST. This demonstrates that the didactic imagery around both working class Tom and upper class Sir John loses some of its strength in the translations, but does not entirely disappear. This is to be expected, as without the distinction itself the novel would lose most of its plot structure, since *TWB* revolves around Tom's transformation from a working class pauper into a gentleman.

Another aspect through which *TWB* asserts class distinction is the relationship between Tom and Ellie. During their first meeting, Tom finds out how dirty he is in contrast to her cleanness and whiteness, and when she screams, he runs away from her (Kingsley 17). At this point in the novel, they could not be more physically apart from each other. When they meet again in the world of the water babies after Ellie dies, however, their relationship starts to develop, as Mrs. Doasyouwouldbedoneby asks Ellie to become Tom's "schoolmistress" and "teach him to be good" (148). There is of course some sense of class difference in this aspect of the plot, as it is automatically assumed that the clean, upper class girl is morally superior to the working class boy and therefore gains a position in which she has power over him, even after death and seemingly without any effort on her part, as she is not necessarily

excited to teach him (148). As this is retained in all TTs, since it is an important part of the novel's plot, it is perhaps more interesting to inspect the manner in which Tom and Ellie's relationship develops from this point onwards, as Tom appears to fall in love with the girl. After Tom realises that Ellie is the "very little white lady" he has encountered before, "he jump[s] at her, and long[s] to hug and kiss her; but [does] not, remembering that she [is] a lady born" (149). As Tom's thoughts are here presented without commentary, this passage is employed as passive didacticism to provide the reader with an example of adhering to class distinctions. Most of the translators retain this particular aspect of class distinction, and TT1 even emphasises it: "[H]ij sprong naar haar toe en woû haar pakken en een zoen geven; maar hij deed het niet, want hij bedacht, dat zij een dametje was en hij maar een arm jongetje" (Van Vloten 159). In this translation, the difference between Tom and Ellie becomes even larger, as Tom describes that in comparison to her high status he is only a poor boy, which he does not think in the ST. TT3 does not emphasise class distinction in this manner, and only describes Ellie's status: "Hij sprong op haar toe en wilde haar omarmen en kussen, maar hij deed het niet, want het kwam hem in den zin, dat zij een voornaam juffertje was" (*Waterkinderen* 82). TT2 is the only TT that completely omits this passage, whereas TT4a retains it in its entirety (De Hosson 103). There is, however, a notable difference between TT4a and TT4b. TT4a copies the ST exactly, mentioning that Tom wishes to both hug and kiss Ellie, whereas TT4b omits the desire to kiss: "En hij rende naar haar toe en wilde haar omhelzen, maar hij deed het niet, want hij bedacht dat zij een deftig meisje was" (Abeling 103). It is possible that the author of this translation felt that it was indecent to have a child feel romantic desire, and that he rather wished to express a friendship between the two children.

Tom's desire, however, is repeated later in the novel, when he is about to leave to find Mr. Grimes: "Tom longed very much again to kiss her; but he thought it would not be respectful, considering she was a lady born" (Kingsley 164). TT1 does not place additional

emphasis on Tom's desire here, and translates the sentence as "Tom had haar weer heel graag een zoen gegeven; maar hij dacht nog altijd, dat het niet eerbiedig genoeg zou zijn, omdat zij een dametje was" (Van Vloten 174). Both TT2 and TT3 omit the sentence (Van Doorn 72; *Waterkinderen* 88). While the reason for omission is unclear, it is possible that, like the author of TT4b, the authors of these TTs felt uncomfortable with portraying romantic desire in children, especially since both TTs are aimed at younger children. It is also possible that they wished to delete this explicit expression of class difference due to socio-political developments in the 1910s, as the lower classes were slowly gaining political equality to the upper classes (De Rooy 134). Similar to the previous example, TT4a retains the passage (De Hosson 110) and TT4b exchanges the desire to kiss for a desire to embrace: "Tom voelde weer een grote behoefte om haar te omhelzen, maar dat leek hem niet gepast, want ze was een deftig meisje" (Abeling 110). Unlike TT2 and TT3, TT4b thus retains the didactic message about class difference without portraying the explicit possibility of romantic feelings between the characters.

The idea of class difference between Tom and Ellie is emphasised at the end of the novel, when the children do not marry, even though they do supposedly spend the rest of their lives together: "'And of course Tom married Ellie?' My dear child, what a silly notion! Don't you know that no one ever marries in a fairy tale, under the rank of a prince or a princess" (Kingsley 226). Even though the narrator does not overtly admit that the two children are not even allowed to be married in death due to class difference, this can be inferred from Tom's previous admissions about Ellie's higher status and the narrator's rather ridiculous reason for not allowing the children to marry. This may, however, also function as criticism of the genre of fairy tales: romantic love can only exist between members of the aristocracy and is not available to members of the lower classes. This passage is retained by all TTs (Abeling 142; De Hosson 142, Van Vloten 237; *Waterkinderen* 116), except for TT2, which omits it in its

entirety. TT2 thus contains no reference to the influence of class difference on the possibility of a romantic relationship at all. On the one hand, this means that Kingsley's passively didactic teaching on class disappears from this adaptation. On the other hand, TT2 lacks the courage to twist the message and allow the children to marry after all.

TWB not only uses imagery to assert ideas about class when the narrator describes human beings, but also when he describes the animals that Tom encounters as a water baby. This particular type of didacticism is perhaps even more passive, as the animals represent human society, even though this is never specifically stated. As this type of didacticism is so implicit, this perhaps serves to provide the author with more freedom to criticise society. Especially the passage in which Tom encounters salmon is interesting in this regard, as both positive and negative aspects of the higher classes are portrayed. In the following passage, "gentlemen" are portrayed positively in comparison to men of lower classes: "You must know that this was the salmon's wife. For salmon, like other true gentlemen, always choose their lady, and are true to her, and take care of her, and work for her, and fight for her, as every true gentleman ought; and are not like vulgar chub and roach and pike, who have no high feelings, and take no care of their wives" (Kingsley 81). Salmon are thus seen as noble, whereas other fish, representing the lower classes, are portrayed as vulgar. In TT1, this passage is translated as follows: "Ge moet weten, dat het de zalm zijn vrouw was. Want als gentleman, kiest de zalm voor zijn eigen vrouw, en is trouw aan haar, en werkt voor haar, en vecht voor haar, zooals het de plicht is van een gentleman; en daarin verschilt hij veel van die ruwe gasten, de voorn en de karper en de snoek, die geen hoogere gevoelens hebben en geen zorg dragen voor hun vrouwen" (Van Vloten 96). In this translation, both the positive view of the upper class and the negative view of the working class are retained. In TT2, however, the negativity about the fishes that represent the working class is deleted, and in addition the positivity about the upper classes is more implicit as well: "You must know that this was the salmon's wife. For a

salmon is a gentleman and always takes care of his wife" (Van Doorn 41). In TT3, the negative aspect about the working class is deleted as well: "Je moet weten, dat de mooie zalm de vrouw was van den grooten. Want de zalmen, zooals echte heeren betaamt, kiezen steeds een eigen vrouw, die ze liefhebben en waaraan ze trouw zijn. Zij dragen zorg voor haar, werken voor haar en vechten voor haar, zooals echte heeren dat behooren te doen" (*Waterkinderen* 48). While the praise about the upper class is thus retained, the class distinction is less emphasised in TT3 than in the ST. While the first three translations diminish class distinction, TT4 offers the complete passage again: "Je moet weten dat ze het vrouwtje van de zalm was; want als echte heren kiezen zalmen hun echtgenote en houden van haar, en zijn haar trouw, en zorgen voor haar, en werken voor haar en vechten voor haar, zooals heren ook behoren te doen; ze zijn niet zoals die ordinaire karpers en voorns en snoeken, die geen hoogstaande gevoelens kennen en zich niet om hun vrouw bekommeren" (Abeling 63). While it is possible that the adaptation and translation from the 1980s still contain some emphasis on class difference, it is also possible that this description of class difference is retained even though more negative commentary about Tom has been deleted because in this passage human beings are not the subject.

In the passage about the salmon the narrator also overtly provides more negative commentary on the behaviour of salmon. After the description of the degradation of salmon into trout, as discussed in Chapter 2, the lady salmon tells Tom that she once knew a trout who tried to propose to a salmon, and the gentleman trout says that "[i]f [he] saw such a thing happen, [he] should consider it [his] duty to put them both to death upon the spot" (Kingsley 83). The narrator judges this behaviour through the following comment: "For you must know, no enemies are so bitter against each other as those who are of the same race; and a salmon looks on a trout, as some great folks look on some little folks, as something just too much like himself to be tolerated" (83). *TWB* here employs passive didacticism to comment on the

behaviour of the upper classes towards the lower classes regarding marriage and their general opinion of each other. TT1 is the only TT in which this passage is translated: "Want ge moet weten, dat er geen verbitterder vijanden zijn dan die van één ras; en dat een zalm neêrziet op een forel, als sommige grooten neêrzien op sommige kleinen, omdat zij juist genoeg op hen lijken om niet geduld te kunnen worden" (Van Vloten 98-9). The other translations thus omit this specific commentary on class, and therefore delete one of the most explicitly negative comments on the upper class found in *TWB*. While TT4 demonstrates that didacticism regarding class difference is in all cases omitted or made more implicit in more recent translations and adaptations, the examples about the salmon demonstrate that the didacticism that is retained tends to be positive about the upper class.

Kingsley's teaching about class is, however, not limited to attitudes towards the working class versus the upper class. Another prominent viewpoint portrayed in *TWB* focuses on the idea of the self-improvement of the working class, as described in the first paragraph of this chapter. Passively didactic teaching regarding this subject is exemplified by Tom's journey of self-improvement, which is supposed to set an example to the readers. Throughout the story, Tom is punished when he makes mistakes, even if they are based on a lack of knowledge, and rewarded when he does good. *TWB* emphasises the idea that this is a personal journey, and that he cannot always receive help in his own self-betterment. For example, when Tom taunts other creatures and ends up friendless, the fairies are not allowed to help, because "Tom had to learn his lesson for himself by sound and sharp experience, as many other foolish person has to do, though there be many a kind heart yearning over them all the while, and longing to teach them what they can only teach themselves" (Kingsley 61). This message is retained in TT1: "Tom moest zijn les allèèn leeren door eigen ondervinding, zooals heel veel dwaze en domme menschen dat ook moesten, al zijn er goede harten die er verdriet van hebben en ze zouden willen onderwijzen wat zij zelf moeten leren" (Van Vloten

76). This translation emphasises Tom's foolishness due to the repetitive "dwaze en dome" (76), and therefore depreciates the working class even further. TT2 and TT3, however, completely omit this passage, and evidently do not share the idea that self-improvement is a fully individual and personal affair. While TT4 includes the passage, it omits the second half of the sentence: "Tom had to learn his lesson for himself by sound and sharp experience" (De Hosson 50), translated as "Tom moest het zelf leren, door schande en schade" (Abeling 50). While some negative commentary about the working class is deleted, as a consequence the passage makes less sense in itself, since the reason that Tom has to teach himself is not mentioned.

As a result of Tom's unkindness, "he went on sulky and alone, as he deserved to be" (Kingsley 62) and "learned such a lesson that day" (64). Through these comments, the approach of allowing people to teach themselves is shown to be effective. TT1 describes the consequences of Tom's actions as "[h]ij ging verder en voelde zich eenzaam en uit zijn humeur, en dat verdiende hij" (Van Vloten 77) and describes "dat de lessen van dien dag Tom veel geleerd hadden" (80). TT2, however, once again omits the passage in its entirety. Unlike TT1, TT3 only notes that Tom has learned rather than also showing his punishment: "Tom had dien dag zulk een goede les gehad, dat hij gedurende langen tijd geen dieren meer plaagde" (*Waterkinderen* 41). As the punishment is omitted from this adaptation, the message itself becomes less effective as the result of a failure to improve is not included in TT3. TT4, on the other hand, fails to include the fact that Tom learns a lesson, only describing that "Tom weer verder [ging], helemaal alleen, en dat was zijn verdiende loon" (Abeling 50). TT4 therefore unlike TT3 emphasises the punishment, but fails to include its effect, which causes the didactic effect of the passage to decrease.

As with the teaching regarding attitudes towards class, the ideal of self-improvement of the working class is also taught through animals. On his journey to Mr. Grimes, Tom

encounters the last of the Gairfowl, who is described as a "lady" (Kingsley 168). When she asks Tom if he can fly and he answers that he cannot, she says the following:

> Then I shall have great pleasure in talking to you, my dear. It is quite refreshing nowadays to see anything without wings. They must all have wings, forsooth, now, every new upstart sort of bird, and fly. *What can they want with flying, and raising themselves above their proper station in life?* In the days of my ancestors no birds ever thought of having wings, and did very well without; and now they all laugh at me because I keep to the good old fashion. Why, the very marrocks and dovekies have got wings, the vulgar creatures, and poor little ones enough they are; and my own cousins too, the razor-bills, who are gentlefolk born, and ought to know better than to ape their inferiors. (168, my emphasis)

This passage, which is to some extent also connected to evolutionary development, describes that the Gairfowl opposes self-improvement, which she describes as "raising oneself above their proper station" (168), as italicised. It is interesting that she is described as a lady, as this passage then implies that also the higher classes are supposed to improve themselves, and not just the lower classes. While that sentence is retained by TT1, translated as "[w]aarom willen zij dat toch? Waarom moeten zij zich verheffen boven de plaats die hun in 't leven werd aangewezen?" (Van Vloten 180), TT2 and TT3 omit that particular comment and therefore delete the reference to class in the story of the Gairfowl. TT4a does include the comment (De Hosson 115); however, in TT4b the meaning shifts somewhat, as is demonstrated by the following quotation: "Wat moeten ze met al dat gevlieg, in plaats van een fatsoenlijke levenswandel?" (Abeling 115). While this is clearly an attempt to form a pun with "gevlieg" versus "levens*wandel*" (115, my emphasis), as a result the reference to class disappears and the text loses some of its didactic message.

In this passively didactic passage the result of the refusal of the Gairfowl to improve is

described as well:

> [O]ne day, when I was quite a young girl, the land rocked, and the sea boiled, and the sky grew dark, and all the air was filled with smoke and dust, and down tumbled the old Gairfowlskerry into the sea. The dovekies and marrocks, of course, all flew away; but we were too proud to do that. Some of us were dashed to pieces, and some drowned; and those who were left got away to Eldey, and the dovekies tell me they are all dead now, and that another Gairfowlskerry has risen out of the sea close to the old one, but that it is such a poor flat place that it is not safe to live on: and so here I am left alone. (169-70)

This passage demonstrates that the Gairfowl's lack of improvement has led to this Gairfowl being the last of her kind, after a volcano eruption killed most of the others, who could not fly away. Soon, all the Gairfowl will be extinct: "And soon I shall be gone, my little dear, and nobody will miss me; and then the poor stone will be left all alone" (171). While TT1 and TT4 retain this passage (Abeling 116; De Hosson 116; Van Vloten 182), TT2 omits it in its entirety, thereby erasing some of the passively didactic teaching regarding the stimulation to improve oneself. TT3 shows perhaps the most interesting approach, as the story of the Gairfowl is retained, but multiple changes have been brought to the parable. While the volcano eruption is still described in this adaptation, and the lady tells Tom that "[s]ommigen van ons werden verpletterd, anderen verdronken, en zoo ben ik alleen overgebleven" (*Waterkinderen* 90), this adaptation loses the implication that it is the Gairfowl's own fault that they are going extinct, as the reference to wings as the reason for their death is omitted. As such, both TT2 and TT3 lose some of *TWB*'s passively didactic message regarding the self-improvement of the higher classes.

The idea of self-improvement is also connected to imagery focusing on water. Apart from the use of comparisons to animals, a prominent form of imagery that is used to

portray the lower and upper classes in *TWB* is dirtiness versus cleanliness. One of the terms used by the Victorians to describe the working class was "the great unwashed", associated with filth and contagion (Walkowitz 4), while cleanliness was associated with the upper classes and a sign of status. During the nineteenth century, cleanliness found its way into didactic texts as a "marker […] of moral worth" (Atkinson 237). In *TWB*, the Victorian ideal of the self-improvement of the working class (cf. Bratton 19) is closely linked to the theme of cleanliness and morality. The novel focuses on the idea that the working class should clean themselves physically, spiritually and morally to improve themselves and their own circumstances, which is usually accompanied by imagery of washing, water and bathing. It is not without reason that Tom's death occurs through drowning and that he turns into a water baby. Already in the first chapter, a passage is included in which the characters are encouraged to clean themselves. After Mr. Grimes "began dipping his head into the spring" on the road to Harthover House, he explains to Tom that "[t]wasn't for cleanliness […], but for coolness" and forbids the boy to wash himself (Kingsley 8-9). The Irishwoman who joined them on the road then warns both of them that "[t]hose that wish to be clean, clean they will be; and those that wish to be foul, foul they will be. Remember" (10). This exemplifies the idea of self-improvement through cleanliness; the Irishwoman, who is later in the novel revealed to be multiple fairies,[6] asserts that if you want to be physically and morally clean, you can achieve it. The initial meeting between Mr. Grimes and Tom and the Irishwoman is only included in TT1 and TT4, translated as respectively "[z]ij die wenschen rein te zijn, zúllen rein zijn, maar wie vuil wil zijn, zál vuil zijn. Bedenk dàt" (Van Vloten 21) and "[w]ie schoon wil zijn, die zal ook schoon zijn; en wie vuil wil zijn, die zal ook vuil zijn. Onthoud dat" (Abeling 16). It is notable that in TT1 and TT4b different words for 'clean' are used,

[6] At the end of the novel, it becomes clear that she is an earthly manifestation of Mrs. Bedonebyasyoudid, Mrs. Doasyouwouldbedoneby and Mother Carey.

namely “rein” (Van Vloten 21), which can be associated with both physical and spiritual cleanliness, and “schoon” (Abeling 16), which can be associated with both physical cleanliness and beauty. The former then relates more closely to the double meaning that *TWB* attempts to convey. The reasons for the omission of the Irishwoman in the first chapter of TT2 and TT3 is unclear, as the theme of cleanliness is not completely omitted from these TTs and this passage is referred back to at the end of both translations. It is, however, possible that the authors of TT2 and TT3 were uncomfortable with bringing a character or a fairy from the world of the water babies into the ‘real’ world and suggesting that not all of Tom’s journey was imaginary; this is particularly likely for TT2, as this novel was used to teach school children. It is also possible that the authors of these translations wished to diminish the emphasis on class in *TWB* due to socio-political developments during the time period in which they were written.

The theme of cleanliness develops further after Tom rans away from Harthover House. When he falls ill, he starts to dream during his sleep, and recalls the Irishwoman’s words:

> Instead of it he tossed and kicked about in the strangest way, and felt so hot all over that he longed to get into the river and cool himself; and then he fell half asleep, and dreamt that he heard the little white lady crying to him, “Oh, you’re so dirty; go and be washed”; and then he heard the Irishwoman saying, “Those that wish to be clean, clean they will be.” And then he heard the church bells ring so loud, close to him, too, that he was sure it must be Sunday, in spite of what the old dame had said; and he would go to church, and see what a church was like inside, for he had never been in one, poor little fellow, in all his life. But the people would never let him come in, all over soot and dirt like that. He must go to the river and wash first. And he said aloud again and again, though being half asleep he did not know it, “I must be clean, I must be clean.” (Kingsley 36)

While this does not appear to be a directly didactic passage, it portrays Tom as someone who, as a working class boy, needs to be cleaned and in line with the Victorian ideal *chooses* to clean himself, through which *TWB* sets an example to its readers of how the working class is supposed to behave and develop. When Tom steps into the river, falls asleep and dies, he transforms into a water baby, finally becoming clean and realising the ideal. In this passage, he refers back not only to the warning of the Irishwoman, but also to his encounter with Ellie at Harthover House, where he first saw himself in the mirror. Because the Irishwoman is omitted from TT2 and TT3, her warning is again omitted from the translation of this passage. While TT1 and TT4 once again offer rather complete translations (Abeling 38, De Hosson 38; Van Vloten 51-2; see Appendix 5 for all translations of this passage), TT2 and TT3 omit the repeated "I must be clean, I must be clean" (Kingsley 36), which results in the deletion of some of Tom's personal desire to become clean and, in line with the Irishwoman's warning, Tom's actual chance to be clean. The example that is set in this passage is therefore somewhat weakened in TT2 and TT3, which shows that once again in these two texts the emphasis on Victorian views of class is diminished.

Tom is, however, not the only character that attains physical and moral cleanliness. Towards the end of the novel, Tom goes on a quest to find Mr. Grimes and finds him working as a chimney sweep, as punishment for his actions during his lifetime. Mr. Grimes is guarded by a talking truncheon that, when Tom attempts to help Mr. Grimes, describes that Tom's former boss "has come to the place where everybody must help themselves; and he will find it out, I hope, before he is done with me" (Kingsley 217). This once again emphasises the idea of self-improvement, which is seen as a personal responsibility; if a person fails to achieve success in life, it is the inevitable consequence of their own immoral conduct (Cheshire vii). Mr. Grimes, however, becomes remorseful once he meets with Tom, and says: "I've made my bed, and I must lie on it. Foul I would be, and foul I am, as an Irishwoman said to me once;

and little I heeded it. It's all my own fault: but it's too late" (Kingsley 219). With this statement, Mr. Grimes's voice is used as a passively didactic tool to demonstrate the result of uncleanliness to the reader. TT1 retains this sentence as "ik heb mijn bed gemaakt en moet er op liggen. Vuil wou ik zijn, en vuil ben ik, zooals die Iersche vrouw gezegd heeft, en ik gaf er niet om. Het is alles mijn eigen schuld, maar het is te laat" (Van Vloten 228). Apart from the inaccurate translation of the idiom 'making one's bed', in the 1941 edition helpfully corrected to "opgemaakt" (Van Vloten 127), TT1 portrays a message similar to the ST and allows Mr. Grimes to portray his uncleanliness. TT2 omits the final sentence of this passage (Van Doorn 87), as does TT3: "Zooals ik mijn leven heb gemaakt, moet ik het dragen. Ik wilde vuil zijn, en nu ben ik vuil, zooals die Iersche vrouw mij eens heeft voorspeld" (*Waterkinderen* 110). Even though this passage still passively conveys the idea that Mr. Grimes was responsible for his own fate, the man himself does not explicitly state this in TT2 and TT3, which weakens the didactic message somewhat. In TT4a, the sentence is retained in its entirety (De Hosson 138), which leads to the following translation in TT4b: "Ik heb mijn bed opgemaakt, en nu moet ik er op liggen. Vuil wilde ik zijn, en vuil ben ik, zoals een Ierse vrouw me eens heeft gezegd; en ik heb me er weinig van aangetrokken. Het is allemaal mijn eigen schuld, maar nu is het te laat" (Abeling 138). Once again, the first translation and the most recent translation retain the full message, whereas the adaptations from the 1910s omit some of its aspects, presenting Mr. Grimes's responsibility in a more implicit manner.

Equally important to the consequence of Mr. Grimes's personal responsibility regarding his immoral behaviour is the effect of his newfound feelings of guilt: his tears "washed the soot off his face and off his clothes; and then they washed the mortar away from between the bricks; and the chimney crumbled down; and Grimes began to get out of it" (Kingsley 220). With this scene, *TWB*'s discourse on cleanliness comes full circle; in the true spirit of the Victorian ideal of self-improvement even someone as horrid as Mr. Grimes can

gain forgiveness and moral cleanliness, as long as he truly desires it and works for it. This passage therefore works on the passively didactic level as well. All translations include this particular passage. In TT1, this passage is translated as "zij waschten het roet van zijn gezicht en van zijn kleeren, en zij spoelden de kalk tusschen de steenen weg, en de schoorsteen viel in; Grimes begon er uit te kruipen" (Van Vloten 229). While the content of the translation appears to be rather faithful to the ST, it is notable that the repetition of "washed" (Kingsley 220) is not retained in TT1, as the translator instead opted to vary between "waschten" and "spoelden" (Van Vloten 229), likely for stylistic purposes. While this is of course a microstructural shift, a symbolically charged repetition is omitted as a result. This affects the effectiveness of this didactic passage, as repetition "improves retention" (Hintzman 47) and has therefore likely been included in this passage in an attempt to gain more control over the reader response. TT3 also fails to retain the repetition: "[Z]ij wischten het roet van zijn gezicht en van zijn kleeren, zij maakten de kalk tusschen zijn tenen los, zoodat de schoorsteen inelkaar zakte en Grimes er uit begon te kruipen" (*Waterkinderen* 110-1). Due to the use of the words "wischten" and "losmaken" (*Waterkinderen* 110), the connection with washing is also diminished. Both TT2 an TT4a, however, do include the repetition (Van Doorn 88; De Hosson 138), which leads to the following translation in TT4b: "[Z]e wasten het roet van zijn gezicht en van zijn kleren. En toen wasten ze de specie tussen de stenen vandaan, en de schoorsteen brokkelde af, en Gruis kroop eruit" (Abeling 138). In fact, the didactic effectiveness of this translation might even have increased in comparison to the other translations, as Mr. Grimes's name is translated with a Dutch equivalent, which emphasises the image of this man's initial dirty and immoral state. This again demonstrates that Kingsley's teachings on the self-improvement of the working class are retained in the most recent TTs.

Finally, overt didacticism is employed to teach the audience to clean themselves as

Tom and Mr. Grimes did. At the end of the novel, Kingsley has included a "Moral" (226) which explicitly describes certain interpretations of what the reader is supposed to have learned from this novel. At the end of this moral, the narrator implores the reader to clean themselves: "[L]earn your lessons, and thank God that you have plenty of cold water to wash in, and wash in it too, like a true Englishman. […] stick to work and cold water" (228). In this passage, emphasis is placed on both the ideal of cleanliness and the viewpoint that one of the ways to reach moral cleanliness is by doing one's duty, like Tom had to do his duty when he was sent to find Mr. Grimes, as described in Chapter 2. TT1 only omits the reference to God, but retains the message that the reader should wash: "Leer jij nu je lessen maar, en wees blij, dat je zooveel frisch water om je in te wasschen hebt als je maar wenschen kunt, en wasch je er in ook. […] als je maar vasthoudt aan koud water en hard werk" (Van Vloten 239). It is also notable that in TT1 'cold water' is placed before 'hard work', unlike in the ST. In this translation, cleanliness is therefore somewhat emphasised. In TT2, the novel's message is diminished, as the entire moral is summarised: "And now, what should we learn from this parable? A great many things, which you may find out for yourselves. Meanwhile, learn your lessons, and stick to hard work and cold water as long as you live" (Van Doorn 92). Even though some of the ST has been deleted, it should be noted that the author opted to include at least one reference to cleanliness while deleting a large portion of other overtly didactic messages, which demonstrates that in TT2 the relevance of the imagery around cleanliness is still recognised. TT3 retains the main message, but once again omits the repetition of "wasschen", instead opting for the verb "gebruiken": "Leer jij ondertusschen je lessen maar, en dank God, dat je overvloed van frisch water hebt om je te wasschen, en gebruik het ook. […] wanneer je maar vasthoudt aan hard werk en koud water" (*Waterkinderen* 118). Even though this is a small microstructural shift, the consequence on the macrostructural level is that the repetition in this adaptation decreases, which somewhat undermines *TWB*'s specific

stylistics used to convey its passively didactic message on self-improvement. While TT4 provides rather complete translations for all other commentary on cleanliness, the moral is omitted in its entirety. Because of the manner in which this translation has handled previous examples of idealised cleanliness, it is unlikely that the final portion of the novel is in TT4 omitted to delete the passage on cleanliness; rather, the moral itself could have been deleted because overt didacticism lost its popularity during the twentieth century, and would certainly not have been as common in the 1980s as it might have been in the 1860s.

Throughout this chapter it has been demonstrated that adaptations and translations of *TWB* all approach the portrayal of Kingsley's didactic messages related to attitudes towards the working and upper class and the possible self-improvement and social climbing of the working class differently. Whereas TT1 retains almost all of Kingsley's references to class, even emphasising some of the didactic passages regarding class distinction, TT2 and TT3 show a tendency to weaken or omit any teaching connected to class, whether negative of positive about class distinction. Especially TT2 contains hardly any of the analysed examples. As discussed before, it is possible that this is due to socio-political developments at the start of the twentieth century, as the working classes slowly started to gain more political rights and equality (De Rooy 134). It is also possible that because of pillarisation class became less prominent in the Dutch TTs after the 1910s. As class differences, however, did not fully disappear and discussions about class were fuelled by the newly politically active working class (135), it is unlikely that the omission of passages that teach class is caused by an actual disappearance of class difference in the Netherlands during the twentieth century. A more plausible reason for the omission of passive didacticism regarding class is perhaps the wish of the authors to delete such a politically charged debate from children's books, especially since TT2 was written for use in schools and TT3 was meant for small children. There is, however, a clearer reason for the disappearance of the idea of the self-improvement of the working class

from both TT2 and TT3. From around 1898, the Dutch government started to intervene in several aspects of public life that were previously left to the free market or private initiatives, such as education and child-rearing, unemployment, health care and alcohol abuse (133). In a society in which the government started to become more responsible for its people, the Victorian discourse that individuals were supposed to improve and educate themselves lost its relevance. The attitude towards didacticism in TT4 is perhaps most surprising. While some passages are made less explicit, and especially some of the more negative commentary about the working class is deleted, this TT certainly contains more of Kingsley's passively didactic messages about class than TT2 and TT3, even if class difference as *TWB* describes it had diminished by the 1970s with the development of the Dutch welfare state and a culture of equality, which was connected to a longing for a modern form of socialism (229). It is possible is that the imagery related to class distinction is purposefully included as a warning, as unemployment rose after the oil crises of 1973 and 1979, only starting to decrease again after 1982 (231-3). The government's failed attempts at intervention (231) may be a reason for the renewed call on personal responsibility. It is, however, in context of this translation also entirely possible that the didacticism about class distinction serves a more nostalgic purpose, reminding the reader of the extent to which the country has developed over the course of the century.

Chapter 4: Teaching British Supremacy and Prejudices

In this chapter, the manner in which *TWB* portrays the British and Great Britain as opposed to people of other nationalities or ethnicities is discussed. Kingsley's image of race is very much of the Victorian era, and is "hierarchical, with the British at the top, as they had achieved more than any other people" (Cheshire viii). Throughout the novel, British people and British landscapes are idealised, whereas people of other nationalities and ethnic descent are met with prejudices and stereotypes, such as the Irish, African-Americans, Americans, Native Americans and Jews, as exemplified by comparisons to animals. As discussed in Chapter 2, Kingsley employed the theory of recapitulation to advocate the idea that people degrade when they behave immorally, which he also applied to larger groups of people, such as the Irish. This chapter will show how evolutionary theory in *TWB* fuels the idea of British supremacy and imperialism: if the Irish degrade into gorillas whereas people such as Sir John and Ellie are portrayed as clean, idealised figures, it follows easily that the British are superior to the Irish.

It is likely that, as the translations of *TWB* transport the story from Great Britain to the Netherlands, some of the Victorian ideas about nationality and ethnicity have been omitted in the TTs, especially regarding the idealisation of the British, which is less relevant to Dutch readers. While it is likely that especially in the earlier translations some of the stereotypes about other nationalities and ethnicities are retained, as the Netherlands were equally involved in colonialism during the nineteenth century and adopted prejudiced attitudes towards colonial migrants, particularly during the Interbellum (Oostindie 17), the British stereotypes of for example the Irish may not have been as relevant to Dutch readers. Furthermore, it is probable that prejudices against Americans become less prevalent during the rise of capitalism in the twentieth century and especially after the American aid during and after the Second World War, as the Netherlands became increasingly dependent on the United States; due to the

Marshall plan the Netherlands received 1127 million dollars between 1948 and 1954 (De Rooy 185). The Second World War makes it equally unlikely that Jewish stereotypes have survived in the post-war adaptations and translations of *TWB*. Finally, stereotypes and prejudices towards African-Americans and other people of colour will likely diminish or perhaps completely disappear from the translations as a result of the Civil Rights Movement during the 1950s and the 1960s.

While *TWB* offers some criticism of British society and its treatment of the working class, as discussed in Chapter 3, it mainly provides positive images of brave and well-behaved British people and children and an idealised landscape. While didacticism around British supremacy appears both overtly and covertly in *TWB*, descriptions and comments on British characters provided by the narrator function to convince the reader of the greatness of the British Empire through passive didacticism. While one of the most passive forms of didacticism that the novel employs is perhaps landscape description, as it mainly serves the purpose of showing the reader the beauty of England, it can also be accompanied by overtly didactic comments, as demonstrated by the following example. After a description of the road to Vendale, "[a] quiet, rich, happy place; a narrow crack cut deep into the earth; so deep, and so out of the way, that the bad bogies can hardy find it out" (Kingsley 30), the narrator claims the following: "[A]nd then, whether you have found Vendale or not, you will have found such a country, and such a people, as ought to make you proud of being a British boy" (30). The use of the verb "ought" (30) forms a clear attempt to control the reader's opinion of the description. This passage, however, also demonstrates that the didactic message about British supremacy is aimed specifically at British readers, who are likely to agree with the narrator's observation, which makes it more challenging to translate this particular didactic message for Dutch readers. It is therefore remarkable that TT1 retains the address in this sentence: "[E]n of je dan Vendale hebt gevonden of niet, in ieder geval zul je wel zulk een streek en zulke

menschen hebben gezien, dat je er trotsch op bent *een Engelsche jongen* te zijn" (Van Vloten 42, my emphasis). While it may seem that this translation also retains the overt didacticism found in *TWB*, this is not the case; because the translation fails to address its own audience, the passage teaching British superiority becomes less effective. TT1 is, however, the only translation which retains any landscape description (see Appendix 6 for the ST and TT1), which may help to convey the message about the beauty of the British countryside nevertheless. Whereas TT2 and TT3 omit the passage in its entirety, not even mentioning Vendale itself, possibly because of its length or its lack of relevance for Dutch children, TT4 gives a brief summary: "A quiet, silent, rich, happy place; a narrow crack cut deep into the earth; so deep, and so out of the way, that the bad bogies can hardly find it out. The name of the place is Vendale" (De Hosson 32), translated as "[e]en kalm, stil, rijk, gelukkig oord: een smalle, diepe kloof in de aarde, zo diep en zo afgelegen, dat de boze machten het nauwelijks kunnen vinden. De naam van dat oord is Vendale" (Abeling 32). While in TT4 a positive image of Vendale is still given, the landscape description as well as the explicit reference to Great Britain have been omitted. It is notable that this is already the case in TT4a, the English ST for the Dutch translation TT4b; even for British readers, the overt message of British superiority was no longer considered relevant or appropriate, even if Kingsley's teaching is retained in a highly passive form. For the Dutch translations, this example shows that teaching about British superiority either disappears or is made more implicit.

The novel contains more overt didacticism regarding British superiority, for example when the narrator praises Thomas Bewick, a natural history author. Amongst other works, he published an illustrated version of *Aesop's Fables*, which became popular with children during the eighteenth and nineteenth century (Bennett et al. 970-1). As the narrator describes the salmon stream at Harthover, he mentions that the reader should "look at Bewick to see just what it was like, for he has drawn it a hundred times with the care and the love of a true north

countryman" (Kingsley 79). The narrator then describes that Sir John also appreciates Bewick: "[Y]ou ought, like all good boys, to know your Bewick. At least, so old Sir John used to say, and very sensibly he put it too, as he was wont to do: 'If they want to describe a finished young gentleman in France, I hear, they say of him, "Il sait son Rabelais." But if I want to describe one in England, I say, "He knows his Bewick." And I think that is the higher compliment'" (79). This passage simultaneously praises Sir John's good sense and Bewick's works as even superior to Rabelais's. Once again, the controlling verb "ought" is used to convey the idea that all "good boys" should read works by this particular author (79), and in a more passive manner Sir John's voice is used to pose that England is superior to France. In this passage, the address "like all good boys" (79) is employed, which shows that *TWB* is mostly directed to young boys, who were the main actors of British imperialism, as will be discussed later. This rather explicit comment about Bewick is, however, omitted from all TTs. While it is possible that the authors of the translations and adaptations considered this comment to be rather too overtly positive about Great Britain, it is perhaps more likely that the audience of the Dutch TTs, especially child audiences, would have been unfamiliar with the works of Bewick, which would have made this passage of didacticism unsuccessful either way.

An example of passive didacticism is character description, as demonstrated in particular by the manner in which the narrator portrays Sir John and Tom. Sir John, for example, is described as "a fine old English gentleman" (Kingsley 41). Even TT1, however, omits the reference to Englishness and translates this passage as "een flinke oude land-edelman" (Van Vloten 57). The shift from "fine" (Kingsley 41) to "flink" (Van Vloten 57) is equally notable, as the latter has a somewhat different, more neutral connotation. TT3 and TT4b also delete the Englishness, translating the phrase as "een ferme, oude edelman" (*Waterkinderen* 28) and "op en top een heer" (Abeling 42) respectively. Only TT2 and TT4a

retain the sentence as it is given in the ST (Van Doorn 28; De Hosson 42). While it is not surprising that TT4a still portrays Britishness, as this adaptation has a British audience, it is somewhat more remarkable that the comment is retained in TT2, since this adaptation was meant for Dutch school children. Addressing the Dutch readers or attempting to teach British superiority was, however, never the main aim of this TT, as its goal was rather to teach Dutch children to read English. As the adaptation is written in English, it is fathomable that this comment was included to retain the British textual world. Nevertheless, in most of the TTs the passive didacticism that provides a positive image of Britishness is omitted, or at least made more implicit. It is important to note that although the explicit mention of Sir John's Englishness has been deleted, it is still clear to the reader that Sir John is a British man due to the context of the novel, and particularly his name and title. As he is portrayed as positively as in the ST, some level of passive didacticism around British superiority still remains, especially when compared to the less positive or neutral portrayal of other nationalities and ethnicities, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

Whereas it has been demonstrated in Chapter 3 that there is a clear class distinction between Sir John and Tom, there does not appear to be any differentiation in their level of Britishness. While Tom's class is portrayed negatively in *TWB*, his Britishness is clearly shown to be one of his positive attributes, just as it is a positive aspect of Sir John's personality. When Tom is in the water, struggling against the tide without giving up, the narrator describes him as follows: "But Tom was always a brave, determined little English bulldog" (Kingsley 89). This sentence provides an image of the British as brave and determined. All TTs, however, omit the connection between bravery and Britishness. In TT1, this passage is translated as "Tom was een flinke, dappere kerel" (Van Vloten 105) and TT2 omits it in its entirety. TT4 even diminishes Tom's bravery somewhat, adapting the sentence to "[b]ut Tom was brave" (De Hosson 70), translated as "[m]aar Tom was dapper" (Abeling

70). TT3 perhaps comes closest to a portrayal of the ST's passively didactic description: "Maar Tom was altijd een flinke jongen geweest" (*Waterkinderen* 52). Even though this adaptation equally lacks a link between Britishness and bravery, it suggests that Tom has possessed this positive quality all his life, rather than developing it. This may imply that this quality is inherent to British boys. Nevertheless, this example shows that the passively didactic implications of the narrator's description of Tom have mostly disappeared from the Dutch TTs.

Another passage about Tom's Englishness has been treated in a similar manner. As Tom sets out for the Other-end-of-Nowhere, the narrator describes that he is not scared, because "[h]e was a brave English lad, whose business is to go out and see all the world" (Kingsley 181). This passage, however, not only conveys the idea of British bravery. It also borders on overt didacticism when the narrator claims that it is Tom's task as an English boy to travel and discover the world, which exemplifies Kingsley's support of British imperialism and sets an example for *TWB*'s child reader, or rather, its boy reader. As mentioned previously, this novel is aimed at young boys rather than girls. Within the British Empire, it is not seen as a woman's task discover the world, as is also portrayed in *TWB*: whereas Tom is given the duty to travel, Ellie is, as discussed in Chapter 3, given the position of a schoolmistress. The division between genders is nevertheless retained in all translations and adaptations. TT1, however, does omit both Tom's Englishness and the idea that seeing the world is his task: "[H]ij was een flinke jongen, die de wereld wou zien" (Van Vloten 193). In this translation, travelling the world is presented as a choice, rather than a duty, which weakens its connection to the Victorian idea that the British had the responsibility to rule over other races due to their superiority (Cheshire viii). The passage is deleted in its entirety from TT2 and TT3, which makes it surprising that the idea of duty returns in TT4, in which Tom is described as "a brave lad, whose business is to go out and see all the world" (De Hosson 124),

translated as "[h]ij was een dappere jongen, wiens taak het was om de wijde wereld te zien" (Abeling 124). Even though the explicit reference to Britishness has been omitted, the idea of the duties of British imperialists is retained. While it is unlikely that TTs from the 1980s wish to implore their readers to return to the age of imperialism, TT4 may convey either nostalgia for the past or a wish to portray the Victorian textual world accurately.[7]

Another example appears to convey the idea that only British people are meant to discover the world, which poses the imperialism of the British Empire as unique and natural, as the narrator relates the following:

> But I am proud to say that, though Tom had not been at Cambridge – for, if he had, he would have certainly been senior wrangler – he was such a little dogged, hard, gnarly, foursquare brick of an English boy, that he never turned his head round once all the way from Peacepool to the Other-end-of-Nowhere: but kept his eye on the dog, and let him pick out the scent, hot or cold, straight or crooked, set or dry, up hill or down dale; by which means he never made a single mistake, and saw all the wonderful and hitherto by-no-mortal-man-imagined things, which it is my duty to relate to you in the next chapter. (Kingsley 190)

The narrator here describes that because Tom is a strong British boy, he obeys the previously provided command to only "look ahead" (190) and does not make mistakes. As a result, he is allowed to explore new lands and people, such as "the island of the Golden Asses" (199), "Oldwivesfabledom" (212) and "Leaveheavenalone" (213). The intrusive narrator here controls the image that the reader has of Tom as an English boy through overt didacticism,

[7] A similar message about the duty of British imperialists is provided by the fairy Mrs. Bedonebyasyoudid, when she tells Tom that following: "Indeed, if you had not made up your mind to go on this journey, and see the world, like an Englishman, I am not sure but that you would have ended as an eft in a pond" (Kingsley 162). If Tom had failed to do his duty as an English imperialist, he would thus have degraded into an inferior species. Even if Tom's Britishness is once again deleted, this evolutionary twist to imperialism is retained in TT1 (Van Vloten 172) and TT4 (Abeling 108; De Hosson 108), whereas TT2 and TT3 completely omit this passage as well, thus consistently leaving out the idea of imperialist duty.

and through a more passive form of didacticism conveys the idea that only such a good English boy as Tom is meant to discover the world. TT1 again omits the explicit reference to Britishness, but retains most of the passage:

> Maar het doet mij genoegen te kunnen zeggen, dat Tom zoo'n flinke verstandige kerel was, dat hij niet éénmaal zijn hoofd omdraaide, den heelen weg van Vredemeer tot aan het Andere-Eind-van-Nergens; hij hield maar altijd het oog op het hondje, dat steeds zijn lucht volgde, recht of scheef, nat of droog, op of neêr; en zoo maakte hij nooit een vergissing, en zag de wonderbaarlijkste dingen, waarvan ik in het volgende hoofdstuk zal moeten vertellen. (Van Vloten 202)

The ability to explore other countries does not exclusively belong to the British in this text, even if Tom is still a British boy. Similarly, the positive description of Tom has been made more explicit, as two adjectives instead of four are now used to denote his superiority. The didacticism is thus already diminished in the first translation. TT2 deletes the positive adjectives in their entirety, summarising the passage in a single sentence: "And I am proud to say that Tom never turned his head round once all the way; but kept his eye on the dog, and let him pick out the scent, by which means he never made a single mistake" (Van Doorn 80). In this adaptation Tom's ability to keep his eyes on the road is not connected to either his Britishness or personal qualities. Additionally, the connection between his successful journey and the discoveries he makes in different lands is deleted. Kingsley's didactic message about the link between Britishness and imperialism is thus lost in TT2. It is worth noting that, in fact, most of Tom's journey has been omitted, as he immediately reaches Mr. Grimes in the chapter following this comment (*Waterkinderen* 81). This demonstrates that TT2 not only omits a specific note on British imperialism, but also deletes the passage of travel which exemplifies and idealises it, as during his journey Tom encounters other peoples and the narrator and Tom judge their behaviour and lifestyles as inferior, like true British conquerors.

An example of this is formed by “those poor heathens” of Oldwivesfabledom (Kingsley 212), who will be discussed later. Unlike TT2, TT3 again retains more of the passage: “Maar ik kan met trots verzekeren, dat Tom zoo’n kleine, volhardende, onverzettelijke knaap was, dat hij op den weg van Vredewater naar Over-Nergensland geen enkele maal zijn hoofd omwendde. Hij hield het oog op den hond gevestigd, die door zijn reuk geleid, steeds het rechte spoor volgde en geen enkele misslag beging” (*Waterkinderen* 102). This translation strategy is similar to that of TT1, as Tom’s Britishness has been omitted and the connection between his lack of mistakes and the discoveries he makes on his journey is also deleted. This demonstrates perhaps even more of a disconnect between Tom’s personal qualities and his successful journey in this adaptation, since there has been a shift from one to two sentences: as there is now a full stop between Tom’s personal qualities and his lack of mistakes, the connection between the two becomes less explicit, which diminishes the passively didactic message of the passage. TT4 most visibly retains the reference to imperialism, as from TT4a only the word “English” is omitted (De Hosson 128), which leads to the following translation in TT4b:

> Maar het doet mij deugd om te zeggen dat Tom zo’n bovenste beste brave jongen was dat hij de hele weg naar de Overkant-van-Nergens niet één keer omkeek; hij bleef naar de hond kijken en liet hem het spoor volgen, warm of koud, recht of krom, nat of droog, hoog of laag; en hij ging dan ook nergens fout, en zag al die wonderbaarlijke dingen waarvan geen sterveling een voorstelling heeft, en waarover ik in het volgende hoofdstuk zal vertellen. (Abeling 128)

While the connection between imperialism and Britishness is thus deleted, the idea of Tom’s personal goodness as a success factor that aids his exploration of the world is in this adaptation retained. This demonstrates that, as with the previous examples, TT2 and TT3 mostly tend to omit praise of the British and the idea of imperialist duty, while TT1 and

especially TT4 retain it in a more implicit form. When connecting this to the periods in which the translations were written, this shows that while especially in the 1910s didacticism regarding British imperialism and imperialism in general is omitted, in the earliest translation and the TTs from the 1980s, imperialist ideas survive in a more passive, implicit form. A possible reason for the omission of imperialist ideology during the 1910s is the First World War, which perhaps made it less attractive to advocate travelling and world discovery. The reason for the more explicit didacticism in TT4, as described before, remains somewhat unclear.

The didacticism related to British superiority is emphasised by the manner in which Kingsley portrays people of various nationalities and ethnic backgrounds, which represents period-typical prejudices. The Irish form one of the most negatively portrayed groups of people in *TWB*. For example, when Tom encounters a rather stubborn lobster, the narrator describes that "[i]t was something of a bull, that; but you must know that the lobster was an Irish lobster, and was hatched off Island Magee at the mouth of Belfast Lough" (Kingsley 119). This sentence, however, has been omitted by all translations and adaptations. Another negative comment about the Irish is given in the story about Prometheus and Epimetheus, in which Epimetheus is characterised as a "slow fellow" (187), who "like the Irishman, […] had sooner prophesy after the event" (186). As a result of his thoughtlessness, he exposes the world to all evils when he opens Pandora's box (187-8). This rather negative comparison of the Irish to Epimetheus functions as passive didacticism and is only retained by TT1: "[H]ij blufte in 't geheel niet, maar als een zekere Ier placht hij te zeggen dat hij het liefste voorspelde nà de feiten" (Van Vloten 199). A more specific negative comment is provided when Sir John's wife makes him "write to *The Times* to command the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being to put a tax on long words" (Kingsley 108). At Sir John's attempt to pass his Bill, however, "most of the Irish members, and (I am sorry to say) some of

the Scotch likewise, opposed it most strongly, on the ground that in a free country no man was bound either to understand himself or to let others understand him" (109). This comment first of all conveys the idea that the Irish are perceived in a negative light because the narrator is "sorry" (109) that the Scottish make the same decision as the Irish regarding this matter. Moreover, the Irish dialect is here negatively portrayed as not understandable, which functions as passive didacticism against the Irish. This passage has equally been omitted from all translations. While it is possible that these comments have been deleted from the translations because the Irish were perceived more positively in the Netherlands during the twentieth century, it must be noted that some didacticism has disappeared because the translators show a tendency to delete nonsense passages, especially as Van Vloten for example proclaims to delete passages that, as mentioned before, "een al te barok uitspinnen" (5). As especially the last example about the tax on long words can definitely be counted among such passages, the didacticism about the Irish dialect is lost as collateral damage rather than as a result of a conscious decision to omit negative commentary about the Irish. The deletion of the comparison to Epimetheus has a similar reason in TT2, TT3 and TT4. For the example about the Irish lobster, however, this explanation does not suffice, which shows that the translators clearly did make an effort to delete negative commentary about the Irish.

Apart from more general negative passages, *TWB* also contains views of the Irish that were more specifically informed by Kingsley's own ideas about and personal experience with Ireland, as well as by common stereotypes during the Victorian Age. In 1860, after the Great Famine of 1845-1852, Kingsley visited Ireland (Judd 194), and while he held a positive opinion of the "fishing and natural beauty" of the country, the state of its towns and its people evidently left a more negative impression (197). In one of his letters, he called Ireland "a land of ruins and of the dead" and speaks of "ruined cottages" and "human misery" (Kingsley, *Letters* 112). In *TWB* Kingsley therefore consistently represented the Irish as poor. While this

is not necessarily a prejudice, as the famine certainly left a long-term mark on Ireland (Lee 1), the novel appears to place great importance on teaching its audience this particular view of the Irish in comparison to the positive, idealised view of Great Britain. This has a negative influence on the image of the Irish, as poverty places people in a position of inferiority (Egbert 112). When the Irishwoman discussed in Chapter 2 is introduced, for example, she is described as "poor […], trudging along with a bundle at her back. She had a grey shawl over her head, and a crimson madder petticoat; so you may be sure she came from Galway. She had neither shoes nor stockings, and limped along as if she were tired and footsore" (Kingsley 6-7). Like Tom and Sir John respectively represent the working class and the upper class, this woman becomes the sole human representative of Ireland throughout the novel, and as such she becomes a representation of the Irish people as a whole. While this image is retained in TT1 (Van Vloten 15) and TT4 (Abeling 14; De Hosson 14), the Irishwoman has, as previously described, been omitted from the start of the novel by TT2 and TT3. Other imagery of the Irish has received a similar treatment, also in TT4.[8] It is not entirely clear why the Dutch translators have chosen to omit imagery that portrays the Irish as poor, as it is unlikely that the messages, when they are viewed as social commentary, had lost their relevance. During the 1910s, when TT2 and TT3 were published, poverty was still prevalent ("Poverty"), and the 1980s, when TT4a and TT4b were published, formed a period of major recession, even if this went hand in hand with welfare reform (cf. Kirby). It is therefore more likely that the imagery has been omitted because it came to be more closely related to negative stereotypes about the Irish.

While Kingsley's didacticism regarding the poverty of the Irish can still be interpreted as sympathetic, he also wrote that "it had to be done" (*Letters* 112) with respect to the famine.

[8] The description of an Irishman's coat "patched all over" (Kingsley 58) and the comment that "poor Paddies […] eat potatoes", which makes their jaws grow large and lips grow coarse (159), have not been retained in any of the translations.

Through this comment, Kingsley conveys "a commonplace Malthusian justification for the famine" (Judd 194): as the country's food supply was unable to sustain the Irish due to overpopulation, the famine was inevitable. English writers such as Henry Fawcett even explicitly place the blame for the famine on the Irish population, that "went on marrying with as much recklessness as if they were the first settlers in a new country, [when] [a]t length there came one of those unpropitious seasons […] the potato, the staple food of the people, was diseased, and it was soon found that there were more people in the country than could be fed" (104). The idea that the Irish people are responsible for their own circumstances, if not for the famine itself, is also portrayed in *TWB* when the narrator introduces Dennis, who tells made-up stories about snakes and salmon, speaks with an Irish accent and whose only characteristic defined by the narrator is his "handsome, sly, soft, sleepy, good-natured, untrustable, Irish grey eye" (Kingsley 76). The novel appears to portray him as a stage Irishman (cf. Welch and Stewart 534-5), as Dennis is an unreliable character that tells jokes and lies and serves no other purpose than entertaining the reader:

> So you must not trust Dennis, because he is in the habit of giving pleasant answers: but, instead of being angry with him, you must remember that he is a poor Paddy, and knows no better; so you must just burst out laughing; and then he will burst out laughing too; and slave for you, and trot about after you, and show you good sport if he can – for he is an affectionate fellow, and as fond of sport as you are – and if he can't, tell you fibs instead, a hundred an hour; and wonder all the while why poor ould Ireland does not prosper like England and Scotland, and some other places, where folk have taken up a ridiculous fancy that honesty is the best policy. (Kingsley 76)

While this passage comments on poverty in Ireland, as Dennis is called a "poor Paddy" (76), it moreover employs passive didacticism to portray the idea that the Irish are responsible for their own circumstances, because when Dennis wonders why Ireland does not prosper, the

narrator covertly conveys the idea that it is because they lie too much. This passage has, however, been omitted by all TTs, possibly due to the heavy negative stereotyping, but perhaps even more so because the narrator's humour would not have worked as well within a Dutch context, especially for children.

Finally, *TWB* draws a comparison between the Irish and apes as a form of passive didacticism. In one of his letters, Kingsley declared the following: "I am haunted by the human chimpanzees I saw along that hundred miles of horrible country […] [T]o see white chimpanzees is dreadful; if they were black, one would not feel it so much, but their skins, except where tanned by exposure, are as white as ours" (*Letters* 107). Whereas during the Victorian Age simian slurs were already in use against other groups of people, such as people of colour, the use of comparisons to apes for the Irish gained popularity during the Great Famine (107). The use of such comparisons is a form of passive didacticism, as they do not directly prescribe an opinion of a certain group of people to the reader, but attempt to influence the reader's views through imagery and character description. This particular image is employed in the passage about St. Brendan, who preached to the Irish on the "wild wild Kerry coast" (Kingsley 125). While this passage has already been discussed in Chapter 2, it is also of relevance to the manner in which the translations present the Irish as a group of people. As described earlier, TT1 tends to omits some aspects of the ST specific to Ireland, such as "turf-dykes" (125), but the Irish still turn into gorillas after they fail to take St. Brendan's preaching to heart (Van Vloten 131). As equally exemplified by all aforementioned examples, TT1 is thus the only translation that in some instances retains negative commentary about the Irish, even if it is greatly diminished. In TT2, however, the passage and simian comparison are omitted in their entirety. TT3 and TT4 shorten the passage heavily as well, and delete the comparison to gorillas, possibly also because this passage can be seen as a nonsense digression about the island. As previously demonstrated, however, these translation

strategies are in line with the manner in which these TTs deal with all passages that convey prejudice towards the Irish, and as a result *TWB*'s passive didacticism around the Irish has not survived in the Dutch context. As negative didactic messages about the Irish are omitted or weakened, it is demonstrated that prejudice towards the Irish was either not present in the Netherlands during the twentieth century or simply not as prominent as in Great Britain. At any rate, the Dutch translators did not see fit to include heavy stereotyping in their TTs. This may also have been due to the target audiences of the translations, since all translations except for TT1 are specifically aimed at children and teenagers, who might not have had enough knowledge about the sociohistorical situation in Ireland to appreciate Kingsley's humour. Another possible explanation is that the authors of the TTs wished to rid the text of explicit references to the Irish for the purpose of keeping the books free of any possible political debate, as for example TT3 was published two years after the Easter Rising of 1916, an Irish rebellion quashed with brutal force by the British military.

Apart from prejudices towards the Irish, *TWB* also contains negative imagery about people of colour, and in particular African-Americans. When Tom, for example, encounters a seal, the narrator describes that "[t]he seal put his head and shoulders out of water, and stared at him, looking exactly like a fat old greasy negro with a grey pate" (Kingsley 90). This sentence is an example of passive didacticism, as the description of an animal is used to convey a message about a certain people: 'negroes', as the novel calls African-Americans, are associated with fatness and dirtiness. This is relevant, since, as described in Chapter 3, cleanliness was a Victorian ideal and dirtiness was associated with inferiority. Moreover, African-Americans are in this instance dehumanised, as they are compared to animals. TT1 retains this sentence, translating it as "[d]e zeehond hield zijn kop en schouders boven water en staarde hem aan, precies een vette, oude neger met een grijzen kop" (Van Vloten 106), which shows that apparently this translator still deemed it acceptable to portray African-

Americans negatively in the Netherlands. TT2, however, deletes the reference to African-Americans: “[O]nce he passed a great black shining seal, who was coming in after the fish” (Van Doorn 45). It is notable that the author of this adaptation added the adjectives “black shining” (45) to the seal, which may still implicitly refer to African-Americans and dirtiness as opposed to cleanliness. Nevertheless, the explicit didacticism has disappeared from this passage. TT4 omits the reference to African-Americans entirely, translating “[t]he seal put his head and shoulders out of water, and stared at him” (De Hosson 70) as “[d]e zeehond stak zijn kop en schouders boven water uit en keek hem aan” (Abeling 70), and TT3 even deletes the entire meeting with the seal. This shows that the acceptability of prejudices towards African-Americans diminished during the twentieth century, as it came to be characterised as racism, a concept which developed during the early 1900s (“Racism”), and for example the term ‘negro’ became unacceptable.

While Kingsley was politically conservative and his attitude towards African-Americans as shown above can from a contemporary viewpoint be considered racist, he also opposed slavery (Judd 190). *TWB* references abolitionist ideology, for example when the last of the Doasyoulikes attempts to proclaim “[a]m I not a man and a brother?” (Kingsley 161). The novel also appears to draw a comparison between the plight of the African-American slaves and Tom’s position as a chimney sweep, as Tom is described with the use of simian comparisons, such as “little black ape” (17) and “small black gorilla” (20), which were commonly used not only to denote the Irish, but also people of colour (Bay 3). Moreover, in the earliest illustrations of *TWB*, Tom appears as a black boy, as exemplified below. As Tom is, however, allowed to grow throughout the novel, it is implied that Kingsley believed that African-Americans were also able to improve themselves. As he proposed that “‘freedom alone’ could ensure the necessary ‘moral progress of the black race’” (Judd 192), the comparison between Tom and the African-Americans is used as an implicit method of passive

Figure 1: Tom as an African slave, engraving by Edward Linley Sambourne from the 1889 edition of *TWB* (Judd 187).

didacticism[9] to oppose slavery and convey the idea that these slaves should be allowed to develop themselves. While it may seem as if this particular message in *TWB* undermines the ideas about British imperialism, Kingsley wished to implore the Americans to take Great Britain's example: even if Great Britain was not blameless regarding slave trade history,[10] the country dealt with the abolition of Caribbean slavery in a peaceful manner, whereas in the United States it was cause for a Civil War (Judd 191). This, once again, places Great Britain in a morally superior position over others. As demonstrated in Chapter 3, Tom's apishness is only represented in TT1, and the story of the Doasyoulikes has equally only been represented by the 1905 translation. It is likely that Kingsley's specific didacticism regarding slavery and the American Civil War became irrelevant to Dutch readers during the twentieth century, as the American Civil War ended in 1865 and the Netherlands abolished slavery in 1863.

[9] Kingsley's editor is the reason that the didactic message about African-American slaves and the American Civil War is provided in such an inexplicit manner, as he advised Kingsley to avoid overt discussion of the subject when his book was being prepared for manuscript (Judd 191).
[10] In fact, Kingsley's own family had profited from Great Britain's involvement in the Atlantic and Caribbean slave trade (Judd 192).

Due to Kingsley's opinion on the American Civil War, *TWB* also teaches a negative view of Americans, employing both the overt and passive form of didacticism. For example, when the narrator attempts to teach the audience that "[b]eing quite comfortable is a very good thing; but it does not make people good" (Kingsley 143), this is connected to a judgement of the entire population of the United States: "Indeed, it sometimes makes [people] naughty, as it has made the people in America" (143). While the novel does not go as far as to explicitly state that the reader should consider Americans immoral, the statement is presented as a fact and can probably be connected to the instigation of a war over slavery, and their treatment of the slaves in the first place. TT1 translates this sentence as follows: "Het goed hèbben, is iets heel prettigs, maar men wòrdt er niet goed van. Integendeel men wordt er wel eens minder goed door; dat is in Amerika gebeurd" (Van Vloten 149). Even though the overtly didactic message is mostly retained in this translation, the generalisation about American people that is made in the ST is weakened. Whereas the ST refers to "the people in America", TT1 does not refer to Americans at all, and only states that people in the United States became "naughty" (Kingsley 143). This may imply that not all American people shared the same fate and that only a few act immorally. TT3 retains the general moral message, but omits the teaching about Americans: "Een prettig leventje hebben is een goed ding, maar het maakt de menschen niet altijd goed" (*Waterkinderen* 76). Both TT2 and TT4 omit the entire sentence, which may show that the prejudice towards Americans diminished over the course of the twentieth century.

Passive didacticism is also used to convey negative ideas about Americans, mainly through comparisons to animals. Even though the narrator does not employ the simian comparison for Americans, the animalistic image is still rather brutal. After a couple of hoodies peck a crow to death, the narrator claims that "they are true republicans, these hoodies, who do every one just what he likes, and make other people do so too, so that, for

any freedom of speech, thought, or action, which is allowed among them, they might as well be American citizens of the new school" (Kingsley 175), which shows Americans to be unprincipled and can equally be linked back to the American slave trade. Unlike Kingsley's overt didactic message, this comparison has not been retained in any of the translations. A comparison between Americans and whales has received the same treatment. Tom encounters a couple of whales on his travels, who "butt each other with their ugly noses, day and night from year's end to year's end. And if they think that sport – why, so do their American cousins" (182). This sentence provides a negative view of American sports and uses the comparison to convey the idea that Americans are just as stupid as these whales. Moreover, the ST implies that Americans and whales are related to each other, which is interesting with respect to Kingsley's ideas about evolutionary theory. While it is possible that the narrator attempts to draw a physical comparison, it can also be interpreted that whales are degraded Americans, or the other way around. This passage has been translated as "daar stompen ze elkander met hun leelijke dikke neuzen jaar in jaar uit" (Van Vloten 194) in TT1, and "daar stoten ze elkaar met hun lelijke neuzen, dag en nacht, het hele jaar door" (Abeling 124) in TT4b. TT1 and TT4b neutralise the sentence in a similar manner, and TT2 and TT3 delete the passage altogether. It is possible that the authors of the Dutch translations and adaptations considered these particular didactic messages to be rather too negative, especially since during the course of the twentieth century the United States started to play an important role in the world due to the country's involvement in the First and Second World War and in the economic market (cf. De Rooy 185). Since Kingsley might have been commenting on the behaviour of the Americans during the American Civil War (Judd 189), it is all the more likely that the historical context for his didactic messages was lost during the twentieth century. It is, however, also within reason that these particular passages have been omitted in TT2 and TT3 due to the removal of nonsense passages, as these examples are part of Tom's

travels, in which he encounters many nonsense lands.

Finally, *TWB* also contains negative references to Native Americans and Jews. Tom travels to a land where “the folks were all heathens, and worshipped a howling ape”, who is later called “the Powwow man” (Kingsley 210). There he encounters a scared child, and the narrator comments the following: “Ah! don’t you wish that someone would go and convert those poor heathens, and teach them not to frighten their little children into fits?” (212). This justifies imperialist and evangelical actions to the reader. In TT1, there are already some notable shifts in this passage: the reference to heathens has been deleted and the Powwow man, a reference to a specific Native American ritual, has been translated as “Boeman” (Van Vloten 220). Similarly, he is no longer referred to as a “howling ape” (220). This shows that the prejudiced attitude that Kingsley portrayed in *TWB* was already deemed somewhat unacceptable in the Netherlands in the early 1900s. All other TTs omit this passage in its entirety, deleting the imperialist didacticism. *TWB* also contains some light stereotyping about Jews, as Epimetheus is for example “as rich as a Jew” (Kingsley 189), which plays into the common stereotype of Jews being avaricious (Amossy and Heidingsfeld 694) and thus enforces a prejudice. This sentence has, however, only been retained by TT1, as “zoo rijk als een Jood” (Van Vloten 201), and has been omitted in its entirety by TT2, TT3 and TT4. As with some of the passages about the Irish however, some omissions may have taken place as part of the tendency to delete nonsense passages, as for example the story of Epimetheus is related during Tom’s journey to the Other-end-of-Nowhere. This may be the reason that these particular pieces of didacticism are not present in TT2 and TT3.

This chapter demonstrates that Kingsley’s didacticism focused on teaching British imperialism, both overt and passive, has for the larger part disappeared from the Dutch translations and adaptations. Specific references to British superiority have been made more implicit in almost all cases and have also been subject to omission, especially in TT2 and

TT3. In TT1 and TT4, some references to British superiority do remain. The prejudices about people of other nationalities and ethnicities have also been deleted from the TTs in almost all cases, except for TT1. Only TT1 retains some of the negative didactic passages about the Irish, all of Kingsley's teaching regarding African-Americans and the American slave trade and a Jewish stereotype; however, most commentary on the Irish is still deleted, most negative passages on Americans have been omitted and the stereotypical portrayal of Native Americans has also been diminished. As already described above, it is likely that these prejudices and stereotypes slowly disappeared from Dutch society and were specific to the Victorian Age. It is also possible that they were deemed unsuitable or irrelevant for the target audiences, which were children for most of the translations except TT1, which is assumed to have targeted a dual audience. While the Dutch translations and adaptations of *TWB* may therefore show the development of a more positive attitude towards people of other nationalities and ethnicities, it is worth mentioning that the stereotypes and prejudices that are retained in TT1 have not been deleted from the reprinted editions of 1941 and 1974. While this may point to lax editing, it may also be an indication that the deletion of prejudice is mainly related to the young audiences of TT2, TT3 and TT4.

Conclusion

While critics have mainly credited the disappearance of more explicit, overt didacticism from both translated and untranslated children's literature during the twentieth century to shifting child images during that century, *TWB* and its translations and adaptations published in a Dutch context demonstrate that not all moral messages are influenced equally by the general tendency to delete more didactic passages. The development of the sociohistorical context has also proven to be a large factor regarding the extent to which didacticism is retained. First of all, the didacticism regarding evolutionary theory and Kingsley's attempt to reconcile science and religion are mostly retained in TT1, whereas TT2 omits most of the passages related to these subjects. TT3 and TT4 equally delete most of the content about evolution, particularly concerning the degradation of human beings into other creatures. In this case, not only the more overt passages are omitted, but in particular the nonsense passages that function as passive didacticism. This trend can therefore not be explained only by a tendency to make didactic teaching more implicit in translations during the twentieth century, and is caused rather by the specific message Kingsley set out to teach his audience, namely that the audience should behave well, since evolution is connected to moral and religious valour and can cause beings to upgrade but most importantly degrade into other species. TT2, for example, probably deletes most of the didacticism regarding evolutionary theory because it was too controversial to include in a book aimed at school children in 1911. While it is perhaps surprising that the first translation contains a didactic view that favours evolutionary theory whereas the more recent translations omit it, considering that evolutionary theory became less rather than more controversial over the course of time, this is nevertheless due to scientific developments during the twentieth century: as Kingsley's view of the theory of recapitulation was disproven, his didactic message in *TWB* became irrelevant to a more modern audience.

Furthermore, the manner in which the Dutch adaptations and translations have dealt with didacticism regarding class, such as the Victorian ideal of self-improvement and the idea that the working class is responsible for its own fate, also exemplifies that the extent to which teaching is retained in translations of children's literature is influenced by the sociohistorical context in which they were published. Once again, the didactic message is most clearly retained in TT1. In TT2 and TT3, however, both negative and positive teaching about class distinction is weakened or omitted, especially in TT2. As from a sociohistorical perspective it is improbable that this is related to a total disappearance of class difference, the idea that the lower classes should improve themselves is more likely deleted because around the turn of the twentieth century the Dutch government backed away from its liberalist policies of the nineteenth century and started to intervene in public life, which contradicts personal responsibility. When taking only the shifted child image into consideration, it is surprising that TT4 contains a stronger didactic message than TT2 and TT3. While class difference was not present as strongly in the Netherlands anymore around the time TT4 was published, namely in 1982, this adaptation was published shortly after the oil crises of the 1970s and therefore during a period in which wealth decreased. The appeal of personal responsibility, rather than relying on external factors such as the government, whose interventions failed, may have led to new appeal for the idea of self-improvement and commentary on class difference.

Finally, ideology regarding British imperialism and the related prejudices towards people of other nationalities and ethnicities is handled in different manners by the translations and adaptations of *TWB*. Didactic messages that teach British superiority have almost completely disappeared from TT2 and TT3 and still subsist in TT1 and TT4. Only TT1 retains prejudices towards for example African-Americans. While negative teaching on the latter is still prominent in this translation, most of the didacticism around the Irish and Americans is

omitted in this TT as well. These deletions can certainly not be contributed to a changed child image, and are more likely due to the different sociohistorical and cultural context in which TT1 was published; prejudices towards the Irish were not prominent in the Netherlands, and Kingsley's negative commentary about the Americans was related to the Civil War, which ended years before TT1 was published. The translations and adaptations of *TWB* published in the Netherlands thus demonstrate that the extent to which the didactic messages of children's literature are retained in translation is not only connected to the development of child images in a certain culture, but also to other sociohistorical developments, dependent on the specific type and content of teaching. Furthermore, *TWB*'s translations show that the weakening of didacticism is not necessarily constant or consistent for all didactic messages of the novel and that didacticism can therefore also reappear over time during certain historical periods.

One of the main limitations of this paper is its relatively small scope. Only one novel has been examined and the most recent Dutch adaptation was published in 1982. While this fact is telling about the manner in which *TWB* and its didactic messages were received in the Netherlands, future research should include a broader range of children's novels and their translations and adaptations, as well as different didactic messages within those novels. Whereas this research focused on evolution, class and imperialism, topics such as traditional gender roles, manners and ecocriticism could also be subjects of future research. Furthermore, novels within different cultural contexts could be examined. While this research only focused on translations and adaptations in a Dutch context, future studies could focus on the development of didacticism in translation in different countries. There are, for example, six German translations of *TWB* published from 1880 to 1986 that could be examined, as well as more recent and modern British radio adaptations in 1998 and 2013. Finally, the didactic function and effect of the illustrations in different editions of the ST and TTs could also be examined; for *TWB*, for example, all TTs contain illustrations different from each other and

from the ST.

This paper has demonstrated that with respect to the translations and adaptations of *TWB* published in the Netherlands didacticism concerning evolutionary theory and British supremacy are more often omitted in the later TTs than passages that teach about class difference. Similarly, the first translation takes different approaches to negative didacticism regarding various ethnicities and nationalities. There is thus a differentiation between the manner in which translations approach various didactic messages and didacticism does not necessarily disappear or weaken over time. While there is still much research to be done on this subject, sociohistorical developments are shown to be a factor inherent to the translation of didacticism in children's literature, as much as or perhaps even more so than child image.

Works Cited

Primary Works

Abeling, André, trans. *De Waterkinderen*. By Ines de Hosson. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1982. Print.

Doorn, Willem van. *The Water-Babies*. By Charles Kingsley. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff, n.d. Print.

Hosson, Ines de, ed. *The Water-Babies*. By Charles Kingsley. Limpsfield: Dragon's World, 1980. Print.

Kingsley, Charles. *The Water Babies*. 1863. London: Harper Press, 2011. Print.

Vloten, Martha van, trans. *De Waterkindertjes: Een Sprookje voor een Landkind*. 1863. By Charles Kingsley. Amsterdam: G. Scheuders, 1905. Print.

---. *De Waterkindertjes: Een Sprookje voor een Landkind*. 1863. By Charles Kingsley. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: G. Scheuders, 1941. Print.

De waterkinderen: Een Sprookje voor een Landskind. ca. 1918. By Charles Kingsley. Leeuwarden: Hepke en van Veldema, 1930. Print.

Secondary Works

Alvstad, Cecilia. "Children's Literature and Translation." *Handbook of Translation Studies, Vol. 1*. 2010. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2013. 22-8. Web. 3 May 2018.

Amossy, Ruth, and Theresse Heidingsfeld. "Stereotypes and Representation in Fiction." *Poetics Today* 5.4 (1984): 689-700. Web. 8 Jun. 2018.

Ariès, Philippe. "Centuries of Childhood." *Toward a Sociology of Education*. Eds. John Beck, Chris Jenks, Nell Keddie and Michael F. D. Young. 1976. New Brunswick/New Jersey: Transaction, 1978. 37-47. Web. 15 May 2018.

Atkinson, Paul. "Review of Victoria Kelley's *Soap and Water: Cleanliness, Dirt and the*

Working Classes in Victorian and Edwardian Britain." *Labour History Review* 78.2 (2013): 237-8. Web. 9 May 2018.

Bay, Mia. *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People 1830-1925*. New York/Oxford: UP, 2000. Web. 8 Jun. 2018.

Bennett, Kate M., Richard Latto, Marco Bertamini, Ivana Bianchiô, and Sarah Minshull. "Does Left-Right Orientation Matter in the Perceived Expressiveness of Pictures? A Study of Bewick's Animals (1753-1828)." *Perception* 39 (2010): 970-81. Web. 5 Jun. 2018.

Berg, Judith van den. "Vertalers in Wonderland: Over de Nederlandse Vertalingen van *Alice*." *Literatuur zonder Leeftijd* 17 (2003): 44-55. Web. 20 Jan. 2018.

Bratton, J. S. *The Impact of Victorian Children's Fiction*. 1981. 3rd ed. London: Croom Helm, 2016. Web. 15 May 2018.

Brown, Daniel. *The Poetry of Victorian Scientists: Style, Science and Nonsense*. Cambridge: UP, 2013. Web. 16 May 2018.

Cheshire, Gerard. "Life and Times." *The Water Babies*. By Charles Kingsley. London: Harper Press, 2011. v-ix. Print.

Cosslett, Tess. *Talking Animals in British Children's Fiction: 1786-1914*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006. Web. 23 May 2018.

Darton, Frederick Joseph Harvey. *Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life*. 1932. Ed. B. Alderson. 3rd ed. Cambridge: UP, 1982. Print.

Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species*. 2nd ed. 1859. Oxford: UP, 1996. Print.

Ede, Lisa S. "The Nonsense Literature of Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll." *Ohio State University*. Ohio State University, 1975. Web. 16 May 2018.

Egbert, Marie-Luise. "Flann O'Brien's *The Poor Mouth* and Deconstruction of Stereotypes about Irish Poverty." *Narrating Poverty and Precarity in Britain*. Eds. Barbara Korte

and Frédéric Regard. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2014. 111-30. Web. 7 Jun. 2018.

Fawcett, Henry. *Pauperism: Its Causes and Remedies*. London: Macmillan, 1871. Web. 6 Jun. 2018.

Forbush, William. *The Boy Problem: A Study in Social Pedagogy*. 2nd ed. Boston: Pilgrim's P, 1901. Web. 17 May 2018.

Gilliver, John. "Religious Values and Children's Fiction." *Children's Literature in Education* 17.4 (1986): 215-25. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.

Gross, Charles G. "Hippocampus Minor and Man's Place in Nature: A Case Study in the Social Construction of Neuroanatomy." *Hippocampus* 3.4 (1993): 403-16. Web. 25 May 2018.

Hall, Donald E. *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age*. Cambridge: UP, 1994. Web. 15 May 2018.

Hintzman, Douglas L. "Repetition and Memory." *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 10 (1976): 47-91. Web. 30 May 2018.

Hollindale, Peter. "Ideology and the Children's Book." *Signal* 55 (1988): 3-22. Print.

Holt, Jenny. "'A Partisan Defence of Children?' Kingsley's *The Water Babies* Re-Contextualized." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 33.4 (2011): 354-70. Web. 31 May 2018.

Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind: 1830-1870*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1957. Web. 10 May 2018.

Hunt, Peter. *Criticism, Theory and Children's Literature*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991. Print.

---. "Introduction." *Children's Literature: The Development of Criticism*. Ed. Peter Hunt. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

---. "Introduction: The World of Children's Literature." *Understanding Children's Literature*.

Ed. Peter Hunt. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Immink-Cost Budde, G. B. “Kingsley’s Waterkindertjes.” *Droom en Daad* 2 (1924): 293-301. Web. 24 Apr. 2018.

Jong, Eelke de, trans. *Alice in Wonderland*. By Lewis Carroll. 1865. Amsterdam: Loeb, 1981. Print.

Judd, Catherine Nealy. “Charles Kingsley’s *The Water Babies*: Industrial England, the Irish Famine, and the American Civil War.” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 45.1 (2017): 179-204. Web. 15 Apr. 2018.

Kibbee, Douglas A. “When Children’s Literature Transcends Its Genre: Translating *Alice in Wonderland*.” *Meta* 48.1-2 (2003): 307-21. Web. 17 May 2018.

King James Bible. 1611. *King James Bible Online*. King James Bible Online, 2018. Web. 27 May 2018.

Kingsley, Charles. *Charles Kingsley: His Letters and Memories of His Life, Edited by His Wife. Volume 2*. Ed. Frances Eliza Grenfell Kingsley. London: Macmillan, 1894. Web. 6 Jun. 2018.

Kirby, Peadar. “Explaining Ireland’s Development: Economic Growth with Weakening Welfare.” *Poverty Reduction and Policy Regimes*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 1 Sept. 2008. Web. 5 Jun. 2018.

Knowles, Murray, and Kirsten Malmkjær. *Language and Control in Children’s Literature*. London: Routledge, 1996. Web. 18 May 2018.

Lathey, Gillian, ed. *The Translation of Children’s Literature: A Reader*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2006. Web. 3 Apr. 2018.

---. “The Translator of Literature for Children.” *Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Eds. Kristen Malmkjær and Kevin Windle. Oxford: UP, 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2018.

---. “The Translator Revealed: Didacticism, Cultural Mediation and Visions of the Child

Reader in Translators' Prefaces." *Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*. Eds. Jan van Coillie and Walter P. Verschueren. London/New York: Routledge, 2006. 1-18. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.

Lear, Edward. "Book of Nonsense." 1846. *Complete Nonsense*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1994. Print.

Lecercle, Jean-Jacques. *Philosophy of Nonsense: The Intuitions of Victorian Nonsense Literature*. 1994. London/New York: Routledge, 2002. Web. 10 May 2018.

Lee, Joseph John. *The Modernisation of Irish Society 1858-1918*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2008. Web. 8 Jun. 2018.

Lesnik-Oberstein, Karín. "Essentials: What is Children's Literature? What is Childhood?" *Understanding Children's Literature*. Ed. Peter Hunt. London: Routledge, 1999. 15-29. Print.

Mulderig, Gerald P. "Alice and Wonderland: Subversive Elements in the World of Victorian Children's Fiction." *Journal of Popular Culture* 11.2 (1977): 320-9. Web. 10 May 2018.

Neill, Anna. "Marvellous Plasticity and the Fortunes of Species in *The Water-Babies*." *Philosophy and Literature* 38.1 (2014): A162-77. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.

Nodelman, Perry. "The Other: Orientalism, Colonialism, and Children's Literature." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 17.1 (1992): 29-35. Web. 15 Jun. 2018.

O'Connell, Eithne. "Translating for Children." *The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader*. Ed. Gillian Lathey. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2006. 15-24. Web. 14 May 2018.

Oostindie, Gert. "Migration and Its Legacies in the Dutch Colonial World." *Dutch Colonialism, Migration and Cultural Heritage*. Leiden: KILVT Press, 2008. 1-22. Web. 8 Jun. 2018.

O'Sullivan, Emer. *Comparative Children's Literature*. London: Routledge, 2005. 130-51. Web. 12 Jun. 2018.

Owen, Richard. "Darwin *On the Origin of Species*." *Edinburgh Review* 111 (1860): 487-532. Web. 25 May 2018.

Padley, Jonathan. "Margin(alized) Demarcator: (Mis)reading *The Water Babies*." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 34.1 (2009): 51-64. Web. 10 May 2018.

"Poverty and Health." *Ireland in the Early 20th Century*. National Archives of Ireland, n.d. Web. 5 Jun. 2018.

"Racism." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford English Dictionary, n.d. Web. 8 Jun. 2018.

Rauch, Alan. "A World of Faith on a Foundation of Science: Science and Religion in British Children's Literature: 1761-1878." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 14.1 (1989): 13-9. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.

Reedijk, C., and Alfred Kossmann, trans. *De Avonturen van Alice in Wonderland en Spiegelland*. By Lewis Carroll, 1947. Rotterdam: Ad Donker, 1987. Print.

Ridley, Matt. *De Evolutie van Alles*. Trans. Wybrand Scheffer. Amsterdam: Atlas Contact, 2016. Ebook.

Riga, Frank P. "Religion in Children's Literature: Introduction." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 14.1 (1989): 4-5. Web. 4 Apr. 2018.

Rigby, Elizabeth. "Children's Books." 1844. *Children's Literature: The Development of Criticism*. Ed. Peter Hunt. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Rooy, Piet de. *Republiek van Rivaliteiten. Nederland sinds 1813*. 5th ed. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek, 2014. Print.

Rother, Carole. "Lewis Carroll's Lesson: Coping with Fears of Personal Destruction." *Pacific Coast Philology* 19.1/2 (1984): 89-94. Web. 15 May 2018.

Sarland, Charles. "The Impossibility of Innocence: Ideology, Politics, and Children's

Literature." *Understanding Children's Literature*. Ed. Peter Hunt. London: Routledge, 1999. 39-55. Print.

Schiff, Stephen. "Edward Gorey and the Tao of Nonsense." *New Yorker*. New Yorker, 9 Nov. 1992: 84-94. Web. 18 May 2018.

Shavit, Zohar. "Translation of Children's Literature." *The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader*. Ed. Gillian Lathey. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2006. 25-40. Web. 14 May 2018.

Spirit of the Metropolitan Conservative Press: Being a Selection of the Best Leading Articles from London Conservative Journals, during the Year 1839. With an Introductory Preface. Vol 2. London: James Walter and co., 1840. Web. 23 May 2018.

Straley, Jessica. "Of Beasts and Boys: Kingsley, Spencer, and the Theory of Recapitulation." *Victorian Studies* 49.4 (2007): 583-609. Web. 10 May 2018.

Susina, Jan. *The Place of Lewis Carroll in Children's Literature*. London/New York: Routledge, 2010. Web. 15 May 2018.

Swifty, Tom. *A Course in Nonsense: Your Pea-Green Guide to Nonsense Literature*. Rotterdam: Brave New Books, 2015. Print.

"Things You May Not Know about *The Water-Babies*." *Interesting Literature*. Interesting Literature, 9 Oct. 2018. Illustration. Web. 27 Jun. 2018.

Vance, Norman. *The Sinews of the Spirit: The Ideal of Christian Manliness in Victorian Literature and Religious Thought*. Cambridge: UP, 1985. Web. 10 May 2018.

Walkowitz, Judith R. *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State*. Cambridge: UP, 1980. Web. 30 May 2018.

Watts, Isaac. *Divine and Moral Songs*. 1715. Morgan: Soli Deo Gloria, 1988. Web. 15 May 2018.

Welch, Robert, and Bruce Stewart, eds. *The Oxford Companion to Irish Literature*. Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1996. Web. 8 Jun. 2018.

Wu, Yan, Kerry Mallan, and Roderick McGillis. "Introduction." *(Re)imagining the World: Children's Literature's Response to Changing Times*. Eds. Yan Wu, Kerry Mallan and Roderick McGillis. Heidelberg: Springer, 2013. xi-vii. Print.

Zipes, Jack. *Sticks and Stones: The Troublesome Success of Children's Literature from Slovenly Peter to Harry Potter*. London/New York: Routledge, 2001. Web. 1 May 2018.

Appendices

Appendix 1: The Undeniable Existence of Water Babies

ST (Kingsley (45-51)
"But there are no such things as water-babies."
How do you know that? Have you been there to see? And if you had been there to see, and had seen none, that would not prove that there were none. If Mr. Garth does not find a fox in Eversley Wood—as folks sometimes fear he never will—that does not prove that there are no such things as foxes. And as is Eversley Wood to all the woods in England, so are the waters we know to all the waters in the world. And no one has a right to say that no water-babies exist, till they have seen no water-babies existing; which is quite a different thing, mind, from not seeing water-babies; and a thing which nobody ever did, or perhaps ever will do.
"But surely if there were water-babies, somebody would have caught one at least?"
Well. How do you know that somebody has not?
"But they would have put it into spirits, or into the *Illustrated News*, or perhaps cut it into two halves, poor dear little thing, and sent one to Professor Owen, and one to Professor Huxley, to see what they would each say about it."
Ah, my dear little man! That does not follow at all, as you will see before the end of the story.
"But a water-baby is contrary to nature."
Well, but, my dear little man, you must learn to talk about such things, when you grow older, in a very different way from that. You must not talk about "ain't" and "can't" when you speak of this great wonderful world round you, of which the wisest man knows only the very smallest corner, and is, as the great Sir Isaac Newton said, only a child picking up pebbles on the shore of a boundless ocean.
You must not say that this cannot be, or that that is contrary to nature. You do not know what Nature is, or what she can do; and nobody knows; not even Sir Roderick Murchison, or Professor Owen, or Professor Sedgwick, or Professor Huxley, or Mr. Darwin, or Professor Faraday, or Mr. Grove, or any other of the great men whom good boys are taught to respect. They are very wise men; and you must listen respectfully to all they say: but even if they should say, which I am sure they never would, "That cannot exist. That is contrary to nature," you must wait a little, and see; for perhaps even they may be wrong. It is only children who read Aunt Agitate's Arguments, or Cousin Cramchild's Conversations; or lads who go to popular lectures, and see a man pointing at a few big ugly pictures on the wall, or making nasty smells with bottles and squirts, for an hour or two, and calling that anatomy or chemistry—who talk about "cannot exist," and "contrary to nature." Wise men are afraid to say that there is anything contrary to nature, except what is contrary to mathematical truth; for two and two cannot make five, and two straight lines cannot join twice, and a part cannot be as great as the whole, and so on (at least, so it seems at present): but the wiser men are, the less they talk about "cannot." That is a very rash, dangerous word, that "cannot"; and if people use it too often, the Queen of all the Fairies, who makes the clouds thunder and the fleas bite, and takes just as much trouble about one as about the other, is apt to astonish them suddenly by showing them, that though they say she cannot, yet she can, and what is more, will, whether they approve or not.
And therefore it is, that there are dozens and hundreds of things in the world which we should certainly have said were contrary to nature, if we did not see them going on under our eyes all day long. If people had never seen little seeds grow into great plants and trees, of quite different shape from themselves, and these trees again produce fresh seeds, to grow into fresh trees, they would have said, "The thing cannot be; it is contrary to nature." And they would have been quite as right in saying so, as in saying that most other things cannot be.

Or suppose again, that you had come, like M. Du Chaillu, a traveller from unknown parts; and that no human being had ever seen or heard of an elephant. And suppose that you described him to people, and said, "This is the shape, and plan, and anatomy of the beast, and of his feet, and of his trunk, and of his grinders, and of his tusks, though they are not tusks at all, but two fore teeth run mad; and this is the section of his skull, more like a mushroom than a reasonable skull of a reasonable or unreasonable beast; and so forth, and so forth; and though the beast (which I assure you I have seen and shot) is first cousin to the little hairy coney of Scripture, second cousin to a pig, and (I suspect) thirteenth or fourteenth cousin to a rabbit, yet he is the wisest of all beasts, and can do everything save read, write, and cast accounts." People would surely have said, "Nonsense; your elephant is contrary to nature;" and have thought you were telling stories—as the French thought of Le Vaillant when he came back to Paris and said that he had shot a giraffe; and as the king of the Cannibal Islands thought of the English sailor, when he said that in his country water turned to marble, and rain fell as feathers. They would tell you, the more they knew of science, "Your elephant is an impossible monster, contrary to the laws of comparative anatomy, as far as yet known." To which you would answer the less, the more you thought.
Did not learned men, too, hold, till within the last twenty-five years, that a flying dragon was an impossible monster? And do we not now know that there are hundreds of them found fossil up and down the world? People call them Pterodactyles: but that is only because they are ashamed to call them flying dragons, after denying so long that flying dragons could exist.
The truth is, that folks' fancy that such and such things cannot be, simply because they have not seen them, is worth no more than a savage's fancy that there cannot be such a thing as a locomotive, because he never saw one running wild in the forest. Wise men know that their business is to examine what is, and not to settle what is not. They know that there are elephants; they know that there have been flying dragons; and the wiser they are, the less inclined they will be to say positively that there are no water-babies.
No water-babies, indeed? Why, wise men of old said that everything on earth had its double in the water; and you may see that that is, if not quite true, still quite as true as most other theories which you are likely to hear for many a day. There are land-babies—then why not water-babies? *Are there not water-rats, water-flies, water-crickets, water-crabs, water-tortoises, water-scorpions, water-tigers and water-hogs, water-cats and water-dogs, sea-lions and sea-bears, sea-horses and sea-elephants, sea-mice and sea-urchins, sea-razors and sea-pens, sea-combs and sea-fans; and of plants, are there not water-grass, and water-crowfoot, water-milfoil, and so on, without end*?
"But all these things are only nicknames; the water things are not really akin to the land things."
That's not always true. They are, in millions of cases, not only of the same family, but actually the same individual creatures. Do not even you know that a green drake, and an alder-fly, and a dragon-fly, live under water till they change their skins, just as Tom changed his? And if a water animal can continually change into a land animal, why should not a land animal sometimes change into a water animal? Don't be put down by any of Cousin Cramchild's arguments, but stand up to him like a man, and answer him (quite respectfully, of course) thus:-
If Cousin Cramchild says, that if there are water-babies, they must grow into water-men, ask him how he knows that they do not? And then, how he knows that they must, any more than the Proteus of the Adelsberg caverns grows into a perfect newt.
If he says that it is too strange a transformation for a land-baby to turn into a water-baby, ask him if he ever heard of the transformation of Syllis, or the Distomas, or the common jelly-fish, of which M. Quatrefages says excellently well—"Who would not exclaim that a miracle had come to pass, if he saw a reptile come out of the egg dropped by the hen in his poultry-

yard, and the reptile give birth at once to an indefinite number of fishes and birds? Yet the history of the jelly-fish is quite as wonderful as that would be." Ask him if he knows about all this; and if he does not, tell him to go and look for himself; and advise him (very respectfully, of course) to settle no more what strange things cannot happen, till he has seen what strange things do happen every day.
If he says that things cannot degrade, that is, change downwards into lower forms, ask him, who told him that water-babies were lower than land-babies? But even if they were, does he know about the strange degradation of the common goose-barnacles, which one finds sticking on ships' bottoms; or the still stranger degradation of some cousins of theirs, of which one hardly likes to talk, so shocking and ugly it is?
And, lastly, if he says (as he most certainly will) that these transformations only take place in the lower animals, and not in the higher, say that that seems to little boys, and to some grown people, a very strange fancy. For if the changes of the lower animals are so wonderful, and so difficult to discover, why should not there be changes in the higher animals far more wonderful, and far more difficult to discover? And may not man, the crown and flower of all things, undergo some change as much more wonderful than all the rest, as the Great Exhibition is more wonderful than a rabbit-burrow? Let him answer that. And if he says (as he will) that not having seen such a change in his experience, he is not bound to believe it, ask him respectfully, where his microscope has been? Does not each of us, in coming into this world, go through a transformation just as wonderful as that of a sea-egg, or a butterfly? And do not reason and analogy, as well as Scripture, tell us that that transformation is not the last? And that, though what we shall be, we know not, yet we are here but as the crawling caterpillar, and shall be hereafter as the perfect fly. The old Greeks, heathens as they were, saw as much as that two thousand years ago; and I care very little for Cousin Cramchild, if he sees even less than they. And so forth, and so forth, till he is quite cross. And then tell him that if there are no water-babies, at least there ought to be; and that, at least, he cannot answer.
And meanwhile, my dear little man, till you know a great deal more about nature than Professor Owen and Professor Huxley put together, don't tell me about what cannot be, or fancy that anything is too wonderful to be true. "We are fearfully and wonderfully made," said old David; and so we are; and so is everything around us, down to the very deal table. Yes; much more fearfully and wonderfully made, already, is the table, as it stands now, nothing but a piece of dead deal wood, than if, as foxes say, and geese believe, spirits could make it dance, or talk to you by rapping on it.
Am I in earnest? Oh dear no! Don't you know that this is a fairy tale, and all fun and pretence; and that you are not to believe one word of it, even if it is true?"

TT1 (Van Vloten 61-6)
'Maar zoo iets als waterkinderen is er toch niet?'
Hoe weet je dat? Ben je ooit gaat kijken? En als je waart gaan kijken en je hadt er geen gezien, dat zou geen bewijs wezen dat er geen zijn? Niemand heeft het recht te zeggen dat er geen waterkinderen bestaan, die niet gezien heeft dat ze niet bestaan. En gezien te hebben dat iets niet bestaat, is heel iets anders dan iets niet gezien te hebben.
'Maar als er waterkinderen zijn moet iemand ze toch gevangen hebben!'
'En hoe weet je, dat dat niet gebeurd is?'
'Maar dan zouden ze hen toch op spiritus hebben gezet of in de illustraties afgebeeld, of aan een professor gezonden hebben, of misschien wel in twee helften aan twee verschillende professors hebben getoond, om te horen wat ieder er van zijn standpunt van zeggen zou.'
'Och, beste jongen, dat volgt er in 't geheel niet uit, zooals je uit dit verhaal zult merken.'
'Maar een waterkind is tegen de natuurwetten.'

'Lieve jongen, als je ouder wordt moet je leeren over die dingen heel anders te spreken. Je moet nooit zeggen "kan niet" en "is niet" als je spreekt over deze groote, wonderbare wereld om je heên, van welke de wijste man pas het kleinste hoekje kent, en niet meer is, zooals de groote Isaac Newton zeide, dan een kind, dat steentjes zoekt op "de kust" van den grenzenloozen Oceaan.'
Je moet niet zeggen, dat iets niet zijn kan of tegen de natuurwetten is. Want je weet niet wat de Natuur is en wat zij kan doen; en niemand weet het, zelfs al de beroemde professoren niet, en al de groote mannen, voor wie he kinderen geleerd wordt respekt te hebben. Zij zijn heel wijs en je moet altijd eerbiedig luisteren naar wat zij zeggen, mar zelfs als zij zouden zeggen – hetgeen ik zeker weet dat zij nooit doen zouden. – "Dat kan niet bestaan; het is tegen de natuurwetten," dan moe je een beetje wachten en kijken, want zelfs zij kunnen zich vergissen. Wijze menschen zijn bang om te zeggen dat iets tegen de Natuur is, – behalve wat tegen de wiskundige waarheid is, want tweemaal twee kan geen vijf zijn, en twee rechte lijnen kunnen niet tweemaal samenkomen; en een deel kan niet zoo groot zijn als het geheel, en zoo meer (ten minste zoo schijnt het voor het oogenblik) – maar hoe wijzer menschen zijn, hoe minder zij praten over "kan niet". Het is een oppervlakkig en gevaarlijk woord dat "kan niet". En als menschen het te veel gebruiken, dan is de koningin van al de feeën, die de vlooien laat bijten en de wolken donderen, en precies evenveel zorg heeft voor het eerste als voor het tweede, – dan is die feeënkoningin in staat ze plotseling te verbazen, door ze te toonen, dat al zeggen zij dat ze het niet kán, ze het toch kán; en wat meer is, he zál doen, of ze het goed vinden of niet. En daarom is het, dat er dozijnen en honderden dingen zijn in de wereld, waarvan wij zeker zouden gezegd hebben, dat zij tegen de natuur waren, als wij ze niet alle dag voor onze oogen zagen gebeuren. Als de menschen nooit kleine zaadjes hadden zien opgroeien tot groote planten en boomen van een heel andere gedaante dan zij zelve, en deze boomen weêr nieuwe zaadjes voorbrengen, die ook weer boomen worden, dan zouden zij gezegd hebben: "Dat is tegen de Natuur!" en zij zouden daar net zooveel recht toe hebben als wanneer zij nu zeggen, dat een heeleboel dingen niet kunnen bestaan.
Of veronderstel eens dat je een reiziger waart en uit vreemde landen kwaamt, en dat niemand ooit van een olifant gehoord had. En verondersteld dan, dat je hem wilde beschrijven en zeide: "Zoo is de vorm en het beenderstelsel van het beest, zoo zijn zijn pooten en zoo zijn snuit, zoo zijn zijn kiezen en zoo zijn slagtanden; en dit is de doorsneê van zijn schedel, meer als een paddenstoel dan als een schedel, en zoo al voort; en hoewel het beest een achterneef is van het varken, en een heel verre bloedverwant van het konijntje, is hij toch de wijste van alle dieren, en kan alles, behalve lezen, schrijven en rekenen," dan zouden de menschen zeker gezegd hebben: "Loop heen, je olifant is tegen de natuur", en ze zouden gedacht hebben da je leugen vertelde, zooals de Franschen dachten van le Vaillaint, toen hij terug kwam in Parijs en vertelde, dat hij een giraffe geschoten had; en zooals de koning van de Kannibaaleilanden dacht van een Engelsch matroos, toen hij er van sprak, dat in zijn land water marmer werd en de regen als veêren uit de lucht viel. En hoe wetenschappelijker zij zouden zijn des te meer zouden zij zeggen: "Uw olifant is een onmogelijk monster, geheel tegen alle ontleedkundige wetten in." En hoe meer je dacht hoe minder je daarop antwoorden zou.
Het niet gelooven van de menschen in dingen die zij niet gezien hebben, is niet meer waard, dan het ongeloof van een wilde in een locomotief, omdat hij er nooit een door het bosch heeft zien hollen. Wijze menschen weten, dat het hun taak is de dingen te onderzoeken die er zijn en niet vast te stellen wat er niet is. En hoe wijzer ze zijn, des te minder zullen ze geneigd zijn om vol te houden, dat er geen waterkinderen zijn.
Geen waterkinderen! De wijzen van vroeger plachten te zeggen, dat alles wat op he land leefde zijn dubbelganger had in het water; en je zult zien dat dit, al is het nooit heelemaal waar, toch op zijn minst zoo waar is als een heele menigte stellingen die je in je leven nog hooren zult.

Er zijn landkinderen – waarom dan geen waterkinderen? Zijn er geen waterratten, watertorren, waterschildpadden, waterslakken, waterschorpioenen?
Zijn er ook geen zee-egels, zeeleeuwen, zeehonden, zeepaarden? En water planten betreft, is er geen zeegras, geen waterkers, waterviolier, wateraloë en nog eindeloos veel meer?
"Ja maar, dat zijn allemaal bijnamen, de waterdingen zijn niet wezenlijk verwant aan de landdingen!"
Dat is niet altijd waar. In heel veel gevallen, zijn ze niet alleen van dezelfde familie, maar wezenlijk geheel dezelfde individuen. Weet je niet, dat de muggen en glazenmakers in het water leven tot zij van gedaante verwisselen, net als Tom? En als een waterdier kan veranderen in een landdier, waarom zou dan een landdier niet eens in een waterdier kunnen veranderen?
En als nu je neef Wijsneus bij je komt en zegt dat het toch niet kan, dan moet je je flink houden en vragen waar zijn microscoop is, want dat hij daar de verwonderlijkste gedaanteverwisselingen door zal kunnen zijn. En als hij zegt, dat zulke gedaanteverwisselingen alleen bij de lagere dieren voorkomen, spreek hem dan eens van de verwonderlijke veranderingen die wij zelf ondergaan als wij geboren worden. En zegt onze Rede ons niet dat diè veranderingen niet de laatsten zijn, die wij zullen ondergaan? En dat wij hier op aarde niet meer zijn dan de kruipende rups, en hierna zullen worden tot de gevleugelde vlinder? De oude Grieken hadden dat al ingezien twee duizend jaar geleden en ik geef niet veel om je neef Wijsneus, als hij minder ziet dan zij.
Zóó moet je tegen hem spreken, tot hij kwaad wordt; en dan moe je zeggen, dat, als er geen waterkinderen zijn, ze er behoorden te wezen, en daar kan hij dan zeker niet op antwoorden. En intusschen, mijn beste jongen, spreek nooit tegen mij over wat er niet zijn kan of wat te wonderlijk is om waar te zijn, tot je een heeleboel meer weet dan al de beroemdste geleerden bij elkaár. "Wij zijn schrikkelijk en wonderlijk gemaakt!" zei de oude David; en dat zijn wij ook, en dat is alles om ons heen, tot een gewone houten tafel toe. En zelfs is die tafel, zooals hij daar staat, een eenvoudig stuk dood hout, al zoo wonderlijk mogelijk, en al kunnen er, zooals sommigen beweren, geen geesten door spreken en hem laten dansen en doen kloppen. Spreek ik in ernst? Wel neen! Weet je niet, dat dit een sprookje is, allemaal dwaasheid en verbeelding, en dat je er geen woord van hoeft te gelooven, ook niet als het waar is?

TT2 (Van Doorn 31-2)
"But there are no such things as water-babies." How do you know? Have you been there to see? And if you had been there to see, and has seen none, that would not prove that there were none. And if a water animal can change into a land animal, why should not a land animal sometimes change into a water animal?

*TT3 (*Waterkinderen *32)*
Maar zulke dingen als waterkinderen zijn er toch niet. Hoe weet je dat? Heb je goed rondgekeken? En als je rondgekeken hebt en geen enkel waterkind hebt gezien, dan bewijst dat niet, dat ze er niet zijn.
Wel, wel, geen waterkinderen! Wijze menschen hebben van oudsher gezegd, dat elk ding op aarde zijn evenbeeld in het water heeft, en je zult zien dat dit, al mag het niet heelemaal waar zijn, toch minstens zoo waar is als menig andere leer, die je vaak zult moeten aannemen. Er zijn landkinderen, — waarom dan geen waterkinderen?
En waar wij voortdurend kunnen waarnemen, dat waterdieren veranderen in landdieren, waarom zou dan een landdier niet eens in een waterdier kunnen veranderen?

TT4a (De Hosson 44-6)
"But there are no such things as water-babies."
How do you know that? Have you been there to see? And if you had been there to see, and had seen none, that would not prove that there were none.
No water-babies, indeed? Why, wise men of old said that everything on earth had its double in the water—then why not water-babies? Are there not water-rats, water-flies, water-crickets, water-crabs, water-tortoises, water-scorpions, water-tigers and water-hogs, water-cats and water-dogs, sea-lions and sea-bears, sea-horses and sea-elephants, sea-mice and sea-urchins, sea-razors and sea-pens, sea-combs and sea-fans; and of plants, are there not water-grass, and water-crowfoot, water-milfoil, and so on, without end?
"But all these things are only nicknames; the water things are not really akin to the land things."
That's not always true. They are, in millions of cases, not only of the same family, but actually the same individual creatures. Do not even you know that a green drake, and an alder-fly, and a dragon-fly, live under water till they change their skins, just as Tom changed his? And if a water animal can continually change into a land animal, why should not a land animal sometimes change into a water animal?

TT4b (Abeling 44)
'Maar waterkinderen bestaan helemaal niet.'
Hoe weet je dat? Ben je soms komen kijken? En al was je komen kijken en had je ze niet gezien, dan wilde dat nog niet zeggen dat ze niet bestonden. Geen waterkinderen dus? Wijze mannen hebben vroeger gezegd dat je alles wat je op de aarde vind, ook in het water kunt vinden; er zijn landkinderen – dus waarom geen waterkinderen? Zijn er dan geen waterratten, waterspinnen, watermuggen, watertorren, waterschildpadden, waterschorpioenen, waterbokken, waterzwijnen, waterhonden, zeekatten, zeeleeuwen, zeeberen, zeepaardjes, zeeolifanten, zeemuizen, zeesterren, zeeëgels, zeeprikken en zeeraspen; en bij de planten heb je toch watergras en waterlelies en waterranonkel enzovoort, noem maar op?
'Dat zijn allemaal maar namen; al die waterdingen zijn helemaal geen familie van de landdingen.'
Dat is niet altijd waar. In miljoenen gevallen zijn ze niet alleen van dezelfde familie, maar ook dezelfde wezens. Wist je dan niet dat de eendagsvlieg en e elzenvlieg en de libel onder water leven tot ze van huid veranderen, net zoals Tom van huid is veranderd? En als een waterdier in een landdier kan veranderen, waarom zou een landdier dan soms niet in een waterdier kunnen veranderen?

Appendix 2: The Great Hippopotamus Test

ST (Kingsley 100-3)

He held very strange theories about a good many things. He had even got up once at the British Association, and declared that apes had hippopotamus majors in their brains just as men have. Which was a shocking thing to say; for, if it were so, what would become of the faith, hope, and charity of immortal millions? You may think that there are other more important differences between you and an ape, such as being able to speak, and make machines, and know right from wrong, and say your prayers, and other little matters of that kind; but that is a child's fancy, my dear. Nothing is to be depended on but the great hippopotamus test. If you have a hippopotamus major in your brain, you are no ape, though you had four hands, no feet, and were more apish than the apes of all aperies. But if a hippopotamus major is ever discovered in one single ape's brain, nothing will save your great-great-great-great-great-great-great-great-great-great-great-greater-greatest-grandmother from having been an ape too. No, my dear little man; always remember that the one true, certain, final, and all-important difference between you and an ape is, that you have a hippopotamus major in your brain, and it has none; and that, therefore, to discover one in its brain will be a very wrong and dangerous thing, at which every one will be very much shocked, as we may suppose they were at the professor.—Though really, after all, it don't much matter; because—as Lord Dundreary and others would put it—nobody but men have hippopotamuses in their brains; so, if a hippopotamus was discovered in an ape's brain, why it would not be one, you know, but something else.

But the professor had gone, I am sorry to say, even further than that; for he had read at the British Association at Melbourne, Australia, in the year 1999, a paper which assured every one who found himself the better or wiser for the news, that there were not, never had been, and could not be, any rational or half-rational beings except men, anywhere, anywhen, or anyhow; that *nymphs, satyrs, fauns, inui, dwarfs, trolls, elves, gnomes, fairies, brownies, nixes, wills, kobolds, leprechaunes, cluricaunes, banshees, will-o'-the-wisps, follets, lutins, magots, goblins, afrits, marids, jinns, ghouls, peris, deevs, angels, archangels, imps, bogies*, or worse, were nothing at all, and pure bosh and wind. And he had to get up very early in the morning to prove that, and to eat his breakfast overnight; but he did it, at least to his own satisfaction. Whereon a certain great divine, and a very clever divine was he, called him a regular Sadducee; and probably he was quite right. Whereon the professor, in return, called him a regular Pharisee; and probably he was quite right too. But they did not quarrel in the least; for, when men are men of the world, hard words run off them like water off a duck's back. So the professor and the divine met at dinner that evening, and sat together on the sofa afterwards for an hour, and talked over the state of female labour on the antarctic continent (for nobody talks shop after his claret), and each vowed that the other was the best company he ever met in his life. What an advantage it is to be men of the world!

From all which you may guess that the professor was not the least of little Ellie's opinion. So he gave her a succinct compendium of his famous paper at the British Association, in a form suited for the youthful mind. But, as we have gone over his arguments against water-babies once already, which is once too often, we will not repeat them here.

TT1 (Van Vloten 117)

De professor was het volstrekt niet met Ellie eens; want hij had dikke boeken vol geschreven om te bewijzen, dat dingen als nimfen, satyrs, faunen, elfen, kobolden, kabouters, dwergen, spoken, dwaallichtjes, zeemeerminnen, engelen en aartsengelen niet bestonden, onmogelijk konden bestaan. En toen was er een ander gekomen en had gezegd, dat hij een materialist was, wat een erg scheld woord is; en toen had de professor ook een scheldwoord op "ist" gebruikt,

maar als zij elkaar zagen, waren zij toch goede vrienden, en praatten over heel andere dingen, en zoo hoort het ook.
Hij was het dus met Ellie in ’t geheel niet eens, en legde het haar heel duidelijk uit, zooals hij dacht:

TT2 (Van Doorn 47)
But the professor had not the least notion of admitting such things to be true.

TT3
-

TT4a (De Hosson 77)
So he gave her a succinct compendium of his famous paper at the British Association, in a form suited for the youthful mind, with all his arguments against water-babies.

TT4b (Abeling 77)
‘Hij gaf haar daarom een beknopt uittreksel van zijn vermaarde voordracht voor de Koninklijke Academie, in voor kinderen begrijpelijke taal, met al zijn argumenten tegen waterkinderen.

Appendix 3: Trout and Salmon

ST (Kingsley 82-3)
A great many years ago they [trout] were like us [salmon]; but they were so lazy, and cowardly, and greedy, that instead of going down to the sea every year to see the world and grow strong and fat, they chose to stay and poke about in the little streams and eat worms and grubs: and they are very properly punished for it; for they have grown ugly and brown and spotted and small; and are actually so degraded in their tasted, that they will eat our children.

TT2 (Van Doorn 42)
Many years ago they were just like us: but they were so lazy, and cowardly, and greedy, that instead of going down to the sea every year to see the world and grow strong and fat, they chose to stay and poke about in the little streams and eat worms and grubs: and they are very properly punished for it; for they have grown ugly and brown and spotted and small; and are actually so degraded in their tasted, that they will eat our children.

TT4a (De Hosson 64)
A great many years ago they were just like us: but they were so lazy, and cowardly, and greedy, that instead of going down to the sea every year to see the world and grow strong and fat, they chose to stay and poke about in the little streams and eat worms and grubs: and they are very properly punished for it; for they have grown ugly and brown and spotted and small; and are actually so degraded in their tasted, that they will eat our children.

TT4b (Abeling 64)
Jaren geleden waren ze net zoals wij; maar ze waren zo lui en laf en gulzig dat ze, in plaats van ieder jaar naar zee te gaan om de wereld te zien en dik en sterk te worden, gewoon bleven waar ze waren en in beekjes rondscharrelden en wormen en maden aten. En ze zijn er goed voor gestraft; want ze zijn lelijk en bruin en vlekkerig en klein geworden; en ze hebben zo'n slechte smaak gekregen dat ze zelfs onze kinderen eten.

Appendix 4: Turnip Children

ST (Kingsley 207-8)
there were as pretty little children once as you could wish to see, and might have been so still if they had only left to grow up like human beings, and then handed over to me; but their foolish fathers and mothers, instead of letting them pick flowers, and make dirt-pies, and get birds' nests, and dance round the gooseberry bush, as little children should, kept them always at lessons, working, working, working, learning weekday lessons all weekdays, and Sunday lessons all Sunday, and weekly examinations every Saturday, and monthly examinations every month, and yearly examinations every year, everything seven times over, as if once was not enough, and enough as good as a feast – till their brains grew big, and their bodies grew small, and they were all changed into turnips, with little but water inside; and still their foolish parents actually pick the leaves off them as fast as they grow, lest they should have anything green about them. […] They can't play now, if they tried. Don't you see how their legs have turned to roots and grown into the ground, by never taking any exercise, but sapping and moping always in the same place?

TT1 (Van Vloten 217-8)
het waren eens allerliefste kinderen, en dat zouden zij gebleven zijn, als men ze had laten opgroeien als menschen, en hen dan aan mij had overgelaten. Maar hun domme vaders en moeders, inplaats van hen bloemen te laten plukken en met zandvormpjes spelen, wat voor kinderen noodig is, lieten ze al maar werken, werken: weeklessen in de week en Zondagslessen 's Zondags, en examineeren wekelijke en maandelijks en jaarlijks; tot naarmate hun hersenen groeiden hun beenen krompen en zij allen in rapen veranderden, met enkel water van binnen. En hun ouders plukken nog alle blaadjes ook af, naarmate zij groeien, uit angst dat er iets groens aan hen blijven zal. […] zij kunnen niet meer spelen al wilden zij. Zie je niet hoe hun beenen tot wortels zijn geworden en in den grond gegroeid, door het altijd hangen en suffen op dezelfde plaats.

TT2
-

TT3
-

TT4
-

Appendix 5: I Must Be Clean

TT1 (Van Vloten 51-2)
Inplaats van slapen keerde hij zich om en om, en schudde heên en weêr op de zonderlingste manier en hij voelde zich zo heet en benauwd, dat hij verlangde in de rivier te gaan en zich af te koelen; en toen viel hij half in slaap en droomde, dat hij de witte jongejuffrouw hoorde roepen: ‘o, wat ben je vuil, ga je wasschen!’ en toen hoorde hij de Iersche vrouw zeggen: ‘Zij, die wenschen rein te zijn, zullen rein zijn!’ En toen hoorde hij de kerkklokken zóó hard luiden, en zóó dicht aan zijn oor, dat hij er zeker van was dat het Zondag moest zijn, al zei de oude vrouw ook van niet. En hij zou naar de kerk gaan, en zien hoe een kerk er uitzag van binnen, want hij was nooit van zijn leven in een kerk geweest, het arme ding! Maar zij zouden hem er nooit laten binnengaan, zoo vuil als hij was, voel met roet en stof. Hij moest eerst naar de rivier gaan om zich te wasschen. En hij zei aldoor halfluid, maar dat wist hij niet, omdat hij half in slaap was: ‘Ik moet schoon zijn, ik moet schoon zijn!

*TT2 (*Waterkinderen *22-3)*
In plaats daarvan wentelde en woelde en spartelde hij op de zonderlingste wijze in 't rond. Zijn geheele lichaam was zoo gloeiend, dat hij lust kreeg in de rivier te kruipen om zich te verkoelen. Toen dommelde hij een weinig in en droomde, dat het kleine, witte juffertje hem toeriep: ‘O, wat ben je vuil. Ga toch heen en wasch je.’ Daarbij hoorde hij de kerkklokken zoo luid en dichtbij weerklinken, dat het zeker Zondag moest wezen, wat de oude juffrouw ook mocht gezegd hebben. Hij wilde naar de kerk gaan om eens te zien, hoe die er van binnen uitziet, want hij was nog nooit in een kerk geweest, de arme jongen, nog nooit van zijn leven. Maar de menschen zouden hem er ook niet in willen hebben, zoo geheel met roet en vuil bedekt. Hij moest naar de rivier en zich eerst wasschen.

TT3 (Van Doorn 24)
he turned and tossed and kicked about in the strangest way, and felt so hot all over that he longed to get into the river and cool himself; and then he fell half asleep, and dreamt that he heard the little white lady crying to him, “Oh, you’re so dirty; go and be washed;” and then he heard the church bells ring so loud, *close* to him too, that he was sure it must be Sunday, in spite of what the old dame had said; and he would go to church and see what a church was like inside, for he had never been in one, poor little fellow, in all his life: but the people would never let him come in, all over soot and dirt like that. He must go to the river and wash first.

TT4a (De Hosson 38)
Instead of it he tossed and kicked about in the strangest way, and felt so hot all over that he longed to get into the river and cool himself; and then he fell half asleep, and dreamt that he heard the little white lady crying to him, “Oh, you’re so dirty; go and be washed”; and then he heard the Irishwoman saying, “Those that wish to be clean, clean they will be.” And then he heard the church bells ring so loud, close to him, too, that he was sure it must be Sunday, in spite of what the old dame had said; and he would go to church, and see what a church was like inside, for he had never been in one, poor little fellow, in all his life. But the people would never let him come in, all over soot and dirt like that. He must go to the river and wash first. And he said aloud again and again, though being half asleep he did not know it, “I must be clean, I must be clean.”

TT4b (Abeling 38)
Hij woelde en draaide en schopte in het rond, en had het zo warm dat hij het liefst naar de rivier was gegaan om af te koelen. Toen viel hij half in slaap en droomde dat het kleine witte meisje hem toeriep: ‘O, wat ben jij vuil, ga je eens wassen’; en toen droomde hij dat de Ierse

vrouw tegen hem zei: ‘Wie schoon wil zijn, zal ook schoon zijn.’ En toen hoorde hij de kerkklokken zo hard luiden, en zo dichtbij, dat hij zeker wist dat het zondag moest zijn, wat de oude vrouw ook zei. Hij wilde naar de kerk gaan en kijken hoe dier er van binnen uitzag, want hij was nog nooit in een kerk geweest. Maar ze zouden hem nooit binnenlaten, zo onder het roet en het vuil. Hij moest zich eerst in de rivier gaan wassen. En hij zei het hardop, keer op keer, hoewel hij half in slaap was: ‘Ik moet schoon zijn, ik moet schoon zijn.’

Appendix 6: Vendale

ST (Kingsley 29-30)
For the bottom of the valley was just one field broad, and on the other side ran the stream; and above it, grey crag, grey down, grey star, grey moor, walled up to heaven. A quiet, silent, rich, happy place; a narrow crack cut deep into the earth; so deep, and so out of the way, that the bad bogies can hardly find it out. The name of the place is Vendale; and if you want to see it for yourself, you must go up into the high Craven, and search from Bolland Forest north by Ingleborough, to the Nine Standards and Cross Fell; and if you have not found it, you must turn south, and search the Lake Mountains, down to Scawl Fell and the sea; and then if you have not found, you must go northward again by merry Carlisle, and search the Cheviots all across, from Annan Water to Berwick Law; and then, whether you have found Vendale or not, you will have found such a country, and such a people, as ought to make you proud of being a British boy.

TT1 (Van Vloten 42)
Want de bodem van het dal, was maar juist één veld breed, en aan den anderen kant stroomde de rivier en daarboven rezen grauwe rotsen, grauwe duinen, grauwe heivelden, boven elkander hemelhoog. Een stil, rustig, rijk, gelukkig oord; een nauwe spleet, diep in de aarde uitgesneden, zóó diep en zóó van de wereld af, dat de slechte duiveltjes het bosch niet kunnen vinden. De naam van die plaats is Vendale, en als je het zelf wilt gaan zien, dan moe je heel Engeland maar eens doorkruisen, van Zuid naar Noord en van Oost naar West, en of je dan Vendale hebt gevonden of niet, in ieder geval zul je wel zulk een streek en zulke menschen hebben gezien, dat je er trosch op bent een Engelsche jongen te zijn.