

Evolutionary Translation

Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in Translation

Roy Lisman, 0423564
Palembangstraat 4
3531 EG, Utrecht
Master thesis
Begeleider: Cees Koster
6 January 2012
24,426 Words

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1. Introduction.....	4
2. The Writer and His Work.....	10
Charles Darwin	10
Youth and Education	10
Voyage of the Beagle.....	14
Origin of Species, Initial Reactions	16
3. Textual analysis	19
Analysis of Origin of Species.....	19
Text Type and Modality.....	20
Intended Audience	23
General Style	25
Conclusion	28
4. Editions of <i>Origin of Species</i>	31
Comparison between 1 st , 2 nd and 6 th Editions of Origin of Species.....	31
5. Examination of the Translators and Translations.....	41
T.C. Winkler – Translations of 2 nd (1869) and 6 th edition (1883).....	41
Translator and Context.....	41
Translation.....	47
Modality	49
Jargon and Intended Audience.....	53
Conclusion about the 1860 Translation	57
Translation of the 6 th edition.....	59
Conclusion about the 1880 Translation	61
Ludo Hellemans – Translation of 1 st Edition (2000)	63

Translator and Context.....	63
Translation.....	67
Modality	67
Jargon and Intended Audience.....	70
Conclusion about this Translation.....	75
6. Conclusion	77
7. WORKS CITED	85

1. Introduction

When Charles Darwin first wrote *Origin of Species* (lesser known by its full title *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* – for the duration of the thesis the first-mentioned shortened title will be used for reference), he could never have fully anticipated just how influential this work would become. It can be said that since its publication, it has entered the general consciousness of humanity. However, this carries some interesting consequences of its own; when people mention ‘Darwin’, the immediate connection the populace tends to make is a collection of four words: ‘Survival of the fittest’. It is interesting to note that this sentence had actually *not* been coined by Darwin himself and in fact was not present at all in the first edition of *Origin of Species*.

In fact, ‘survival of the fittest’ was a term originally coined by the economist Robert Spencer in regards to something else entirely (Stanford, 1), while Darwin had only used the term ‘natural selection’ in regards to the principle initially. The term ‘survival of the fittest’ would not appear in *Origin of Species* until the 5th edition that appeared no less than 13 years after the publication of the original. It has become so well-known that it has been ingrained into the general consciousness, but few people are actually aware of the true source of the term.

‘Survival of the fittest’ has also undergone another form of ‘evolution’, and this evolution is what inspired this thesis. With the years, the term ‘survival of the fittest’ as Darwin used it, went from meaning ‘fits well (e.g. is well-adapted to its surroundings)’ to ‘the strong survive’. So the term went from a more general meaning to referring to physical fitness alone, and has become arguably the most well-known fragment of Darwin’s work. This evolution of meaning can even be seen in Dutch, where it is nowadays frequently translated using the term ‘de sterksten overleven’ instead of ‘de best aangepasten overleven’ – a search

of the former on Google will result in literally thousands of hits. Sometimes even articles written by people who know better use the famous sentence (or a variation on it) in the title only to correctly describe the principle correctly in the article itself (Evoluтиetheorie.be, 1). If one of the most pivotal sentences in the work changes by that much even without a change in language, what does that mean for translations of the whole work? Has the way *Origin of Species* been translated evolved over the more than one hundred years since the original publication, and how? This certainly appears to be a thesis-worthy subject to examine.

Naturally, it is important to keep in mind that the translations were not the only things that have likely undergone change over the years; and in this case *Origin of Species* itself underwent quite a few changes of its own under Darwin's own hands. According to his contemporaries, Darwin was known as being almost obsessively perfectionist, and would revise his book numerous times (Leeuwenburgh, 47). In these revisions, Darwin would respond to critics (both positive and negative), include recent developments, and even change the importance he attributed to natural selection in evolution (Foursenses.net, 4 - 9). Because of this, it is subject to much debate which version should be regarded as the 'definitive' one. Should the first be given that honour, since that was written without outside influence, or the second, which was a 'corrected' version of the first? Perhaps the third edition, where Darwin expounds more extensively on historical antecedents to his theory and position, and gives his first extensive response to critics? The fourth then, once again with relatively minor changes, including the historical sketch? Even the fifth can lay claim to this position; it is changed extensively, downplays the importance of natural selection, and where natural selection gains its more famous synonymous term 'survival of the fittest' Or should it be the 6th and final edition; the one with all the corrections, emendations and responses Darwin himself had apparently deemed necessary? This element of *Origin of Species* (one of many, in fact) is expansive enough that it could warrant a thesis by itself and it is thus impossible to fully

explore this within the scope of this thesis. It must be considered, however, that these later editions may have inspired the translators of later years in some way, perhaps taking Darwin's changes into consideration if they are familiar with them. In order to ensure both a proper reading, and that a change is not incorrectly attributed to a peculiar choice by the translator, it will be verified which translation was based on what edition and subsequently the edition used for the translation will be compared to its predecessor.

Another element that needs to be considered about *Origin of Species* is its reception. When first published, Darwin's report was highly controversial for its message that animals can evolve over time from one form to another, as well as the suggestion that mankind evolved from primates. In the still highly religious society of the late 1800's (including the Netherlands), this was a heretical idea to many. No so much today, but now there is another element that might influence the translation: Darwin's theory has a much different standing today and is regarded as a revolutionary work that was largely correct despite having some errors and somewhat incorrect conclusions. Could this influence a translation when the translator knows some elements are wrong? Conversely – can the translator add too much 'certainty' to certain passages where Darwin only theorises, because nowadays his evolutionary theory is much more widely regarded to be partially true, at least?

These are the questions that this thesis will be based on, and they lead to the following research question:

How have the Dutch translations of *Origin of Species* changed throughout the years, and does this relate to their reception in their respective times?

However, this question has the significant problem of simply still being much too broad. Therefore, it becomes important to narrow it down to the elements that made *Origin of Species* what it is. What elements are especially notable about it, yet are subject to change? In order to discover this, this thesis will first go to the source: Charles Darwin himself, his life,

and his experiences that eventually led up to him writing *Origin of Species*. Following that, the controversy surrounding his work will be explored to gain a better understanding of the context. Finally, an analysis of his writing style will be made so as to have a foundation to base the refined research question on, and to aid the comparison between the translations. The reception of and reaction to his work in the Netherlands will also be included in this section of the thesis.

Taking all of these elements into consideration, the following refined research question emerged:

How have the Dutch translations of *Origin of Species* changed throughout the years in the areas of modality, jargon and intended audience, and does this relate to their reception in their respective times?

With the research question properly narrowed down (the method of how this refined research question was reached will be elaborated upon in chapters 2 and 3) the question will be researched by comparing three translations of *Origin of Species*: the translation *Het ontstaan der soorten van dieren en planten door middel van de natuurkeus, of het bewaard blijven van bevoorregte rassen in de strijd des levens* written by T.C. Winkler in 1860 – the very first Dutch translation, which was based on the second edition. The next translation was published in 1883, also by T.C. Winkler, and carried the same title. Based on the 6th and final edition, it was published after the peak and subsiding controversy and debate concerning Darwin and his theories. The last translation that will be discussed, titled *Over het ontstaan van soorten door middel van natuurlijke selectie, of het behoud van bevoordeelde rassen in de strijd om het leven*, was published during the ‘Darwinjaar’ in 2000 by Ludo Hellemans. It is noticeable that there is a significant gap between the second and third translations. There had been other publications in those years, but these were actually revisions of Winkler’s original

edition instead of proper, new translations (Falger, 7). The lack of an actual updated translation until the year 2000 quite possibly stems from the flow of the controversy surrounding the work. 1860 marked the initial book release but also showed a lack of interest by the public (in fact, the first printing was planned to be a thousand copies but was scaled back to only 600 due to lack of success (Leeuwenburgh 138 – 139)), the 1883 publication being released after the controversies had mostly ended but with their influence and Darwin's defence against them still tangible, and finally after a relative lull of more than 100 years, the translation from the year 2000 that was released in commemoration of the 'Darwinjaar'. After the peak in the late 1800's, the discussion on the subject had died down significantly, with no new arguments being brought to the table (Leeuwenburgh, 8), and the release of new translations slowed similarly. There have been other translations and versions, of course, for example the 'abridged edition' by Leakey, but as this thesis focuses on translations of the original *Origin of Species* by Darwin himself this version is of little use.

Third, problems related to translating *Origin of Species* specifically will be discussed; how are the sentences structured, what is the target audience (and how does that differ with today's readership)? The reason for this within the research question is to gain further insight into what elements are likely to be subject to change over the years.

Finally, fragments from the chapter on 'natural selection' will be used for an in-depth analysis of the problems appearing in this section. The reason for choosing to focus on this particular segment of the translation is because natural selection is considered the crucial point of *Origin of Species*; the element of theory that the rest of the theory either springs forth from or leads up to. Also, consider what comes to mind when someone mentions Darwin; one of the first things people think about in such cases (if not evolutionary theory as a whole), is natural selection. The other sections on variety, domestication and hybrids are much less well-known. The translation of these fragments from the three translations mentioned above will be

compared. This comparison will be done per translation, and each case will be given context by including notes on their reception as well as notes or forewords by their respective translators, the choices the translators made to translate certain elements, what the target audience seems to be, and naturally compare them to the original. It is also in this segment that the chosen fragments will be compared to how they appeared in the appropriate editions (for example, Winkler's translation was based on the second edition released in 1860), and taking into account other elements that may have influenced the translation (for example, the translation was also released in 1860 – barely six months after the original; quite a feat for a book of 503 pages).

Based on the findings in these segments, it will then be concluded what manner of change the translations have undergone, and if there is correlation with the circumstances in which the translations were written.

2. The Writer and His Work

Charles Darwin

While this thesis is meant to be focussed on translation of *Origin of Species* (or rather, how they have changed over the years), it is still important to describe the historical context of the book and its writer. This seems especially true here, with Darwin being as famous and controversial as his writings. Awareness of Darwin's world view and how this may have developed helps to put his words into perspective and aid in the analysis of his work before moving on to the translation. That said, this segment will not be an exhaustive discourse on Darwin's life, and will instead focus mostly on events and segments of his life that could be seen as formative, events that could quite possibly have planted the seeds for *Origin of Species* and subsequently allow these to bloom.

Youth and Education

Charles Robert Darwin was born on February 12th of 1809, in the town of Shrewsbury, England. Science had been part of his life from the start, having been born as the son of a wealthy society doctor, and having Erasmus Darwin as a grandfather, who was one of the key thinkers of Midlands Enlightenment, as well as a member of the Lunar Society of Birmingham. His relationship with his mother was distant, due to her being often ill, and her time otherwise being taken up by social duties. As such, when Charles lost his mother at the age of 8 in 1817, in his own words he remembered "hardly anything about her except her death-bed, her black velvet gown, and her curiously constructed work-table" (Darwin 1958, 22).

His fascination with natural history also started at a young age, being present even as he went to day school. An avid collector of everything from plants to shells to minerals, he described it thusly: "[t]he passion for collecting which leads a man to be a systematic naturalist, a virtuoso, or a miser, was very strong in me" (Darwin 1958, 14) – so it is evident

that even at this young age, he was already developing in the direction in which he would years later write his revolutionary paper.

Later in his life, he would attend the University of Edinburgh to obtain medical qualifications, but he would never finish it. As he states in his own biography:

The instruction at Edinburgh was altogether by Lectures, and these were intolerably dull [...] to my mind there are no advantages and many disadvantages in lectures compared with reading. Dr. Munro made his lectures on human anatomy as dull, as he was himself, and the subject disgusted me. (Darwin 1958, 46-47)

Darwin's dislike of anatomy would also spread to having to attend surgeries (which, in the early 1800's, were still being performed without anaesthetic) for his education, something he described as "having distressed [him] a great deal, and I still have vivid pictures before me of some of them" (Darwin 1958, 47). Despite his dislike for crucial elements in his education, Charles would regret not persevering and learning dissection. This is not very surprising considering where his research would take him. His words in his autobiography leave little to the imagination about his dissatisfaction on his perceived lack of drive: "It has proved one of the greatest evils in my life that I was not urged to practice dissection, for I should soon have got over my disgust; and the practice would have been invaluable for all my future work. This has been an irremediable evil, as well as my incapacity to draw." (Darwin 1958, 47)

Charles would, however, learn taxidermy from former slave John Edmonstone, who also told him stories about the rainforest in the South American Guiana - likely another element of his life planting the seeds that would later sprout into *Origin of Species*. In his autobiography, the passage where Darwin describes Edmonstone also shows something to be wary of when analysing the text later; Darwin describes Edmonstone as a "negro", but despite the term being very racially charged nowadays, Darwin does not use it maliciously here and further tells us that Edmonstone was "a very pleasant and intelligent man" (Darwin 1958, 51).

Darwin's actual idea for evolution most likely came from the book *Zoönomia*, written by his grandfather Erasmus, which proposed basic ideas of evolution through acquired traits like hereditary illness (Leeuwenburgh, 28). These ideas would only be strengthened in the following years, when Darwin became a student of Robert Edmond Grant, a Lamarckian anatomist. As Lamarckism follows the school of thought that organisms are able to pass on traits to their offspring, it is not surprising that Darwin was drawn into it considering his previous experiences¹. It is also in this period that Darwin first experienced the controversy radical thought could stir up. On 27th of March in 1827, the radically inclined psychiatrist William Browne suggested that consciousness and mind were simply a result of brain activity as opposed to being related to souls or spiritual entities during a meeting where Darwin himself had held his first presentation. This proclamation naturally sparked a massive debate, and led to the mention of this 'heretical' idea being erased from the minutes (Walmsley, 750). The fact that Darwin knew what he might stir up can be seen within the pages of *Origin of Species* as well – Darwin often comes across as noticeably careful and non-committal, and the incident mentioned here, taking place during Darwin's first presentation no less, makes it extremely likely that this is quite intentional to avoid a similar incident happening to him. As such, this is quite important to keep in mind when reading and analysing *Origin of Species* for translation.

Eventually, Darwin's dislike for medicine led him to leave the university later in 1827 without a degree. Shortly after, Darwin would follow his father's advice and enrol at the Christ's College at the University of Cambridge in 1828 to study to become a parson in the Anglican Church (Leeuwenburgh, 33). This choice is not as odd as it may seem at first

¹ Since Darwin and Lamarck's theories sound very similar, it seemed apt to describe the difference here; in Lamarckism this 'evolution' is a linear process where the most advanced species are simply the oldest around and as such have changed through adaptation to their environment. In Darwin's theory, species can actually undergo changes over time significant enough to actually change the species instead of just minor adaptations and changes to a basic form. As such, the ape-human connection wasn't an issue in Lamarck's theory as they were different 'struts' on the evolutionary ladder – close, but utterly unrelated (Leeuwenburgh, 30-32).

glance; many clergymen of the time were in fact naturalists, enjoying and in fact regarding the ‘exploration of the wonders of God’s creation’ as a duty. Darwin was however still very uncertain about this course of his life – being especially unsure if he could declare genuine belief of the dogmas, something that would continue throughout his life; though a letter written in 1879 notes that Darwin at that time considered himself agnostic – believing in God but not in dogma as such (“Darwin to John Fordyce”). Once his studies started, he found his old hobby of collection to come in handy when he started to (competitively) collect beetles as part of extramural activities.

Once he finally managed to take his finals four years later, Darwin managed to pass after many ups and downs, but this failed to lift his spirits – his words about it being “I do not know why the degree should make one so miserable.” (“Life and Letters of Charles Darwin”, 2)

Stuck in Cambridge due to housing issues, Darwin resumed his old hobby of beetle collecting (having been forced to give it up for his studies prior), and eventually read *Natural Theology* by William Paley; a treatise on how God’s existence can be proven in the complexity and adaptability of living beings. Darwin would later write that he had never admired another book as much as Paley’s *Natural Theology*. However – this was also for a different reason than immediately apparent. In his notes, Darwin frequently referred to the ideas of David Hume – a natural philosopher who was known for being a major sceptic and decidedly anti-metaphysical. Paley based his theories on the principle of causality, where Hume put question marks on whether ‘causality’ was not simply human nature and thinking that created connections between instances that were not related. It is possible to detect patterns in nature, but impossible to say certain causes have the same effects at all times. In short; causality is not a trait of nature (Leeuwenburgh, 17). Since natural theology was almost entirely based on ‘finding God in the perfection of creation’ – something also called

‘argument from design’ – a theory such as Hume’s is devastating for it. Later in *Origin of Species*, Darwin rejects this ‘argument from design’ despite his admiration for Paley. All of this fuelled a desire to make a contribution to the field, and Darwin started to plan accordingly, focussing on planning journeys into the tropics.

This eventually led to an invitation to join in the voyage of a ship called ‘HMS Beagle’ and after initial resistance from his father, Darwin would join the voyage (Leeuwenburgh, 33).

Voyage of the Beagle

The voyage that started on 27th of December in 1831 was actually the ship’s second voyage around the globe. This voyage was planned to take three years, but wound up lasting almost five. During the voyage, Darwin spent most of his time (over half of it) on land, theorising, seeing sights and collecting samples (as mentioned before, due to quitting his initial education in Medicine at the University of Edinburgh, Darwin was only a novice in dissection and preferred to leave it to experts) and writing. During the journey, Darwin would send back journals to his family and friends, among them letters concerning the interesting geology he encountered on the journey. These proved to be the true start of Darwin’s career as a celebrity in scientific circles, when John Stevens Henslow – a friend and former mentor – also sent the letters and pamphlets Darwin had written to other naturalists and had in fact read them at a meeting of the Philosophical Society in Cambridge (Darwin 1958, 81-82).

Darwin would not start writing *Origin of Species* proper before returning to England, but many of his theories were fed by what he found during the journey. One of the clearest examples would be his discoveries in and around the Galapagos Archipelago, where he found species of mockingbirds and tortoises that, while different from island to island, had enough in common for Darwin to suspect a common ancestor (Leeuwenburgh, 39). Another instance that may have inspired his ideas concerning the idea of ‘domestication’ was the presence of

thee 'Fuegians' on the Beagle. The Fuegians were natives from the Yaghan people, living on the islands around Tierra del Fuego (in an area that is now part of modern Chile and Argentina). The Fuegians had been captured as hostages during the first voyage of the Beagle, and would now be returned to their native land to serve as missionaries. This idea was abandoned later when a quick course in 'civilisation' proved to not be permanent when re-introduced to their original habitat. The difference between the missionaries' 'savage' kin and their own (temporary) civility, in combination with the difference between the Fuegians, and between themselves and people like Isaac Newton, can be regarded as partially responsible for Darwin's ideas on domestication, the effects of the natural habitat and availability of food on natural selection, and that the gap between animals and humans was not as insurmountable as it was often thought that it was (Leeuwenburgh, 50). In his own words, Darwin stated the following in *Voyage of the Beagle*: "It was without exception the most curious and interesting spectacle I ever beheld: I could not have believed how wide was the difference between savage and civilised man: it is greater than between a wild and domesticated animal, inasmuch as in man there is a greater power of improvement." (Darwin 2003, 217)

Similar to his comments on Edmonstone, Darwin seems rather harsh here, even racist, but seen from the perspective of his time, he is merely making an observation that considering the general world-view at the time was no more than reasonable.

Although much of the groundwork in on *Origin of Species* (as well as his later work, *Descent of Man*) was done during his travels, Darwin was largely side-tracked by geological writing and other works, such as *Zoology of the Voyage of H.M.S. Beagle*, *The Structure and Distribution of Coral Reefs* and other works. This was combined with him suffering an illness that seemed to come and go, with such a strange combination of symptoms that it is still unknown what the disease was.

Darwin still worked on his theories whenever time and his health allowed it, using his notebooks *M* and *N* to expand on his ideas on transmutation, hereditary instinct and gradual change in species (Leeuwenburgh, 51). Regardless, from the start of him developing his theory to the actual publication of *Origin of Species*, it would take Darwin from 1836 until 1859 before he felt that *Origin of Species* could be released.

With that, it is the end of the exploration of Darwin's life in detail for this thesis; with the release of *Origin of Species*. Although true that he would write multiple editions, those are strongly influenced to the reactions to his original work, a subject that will be discussed in the next section.

Origin of Species, Initial Reactions

Having seen what controversy could cause after the incident with Browne, Darwin must have decided to take it slow. Upon reading *Origin of Species*, it quickly becomes clear that Darwin did *not* discuss the possibility of human evolution at length at all. In fact, it is not directly touched upon save for a small mention in his conclusions stating that "(l)ight will be thrown on the origin of man and his history" (Darwin 2003, 912). Regardless, the theory not only garnered massive interest, but also massive amounts of controversy over the sheer concept that humans were simply evolved animals instead of some creation above all the beasts of the Earth. However, Darwin himself preferred to not take a stand on truly controversial issues at all; instead choosing to simply state his findings and letting these speak for themselves. Perhaps paradoxically, this would actually cause more controversy and discussion than actually taking a stand would have, but this will be discussed later. On the subject of evolution where humans are concerned, Darwin would write *Descent of Man* in 1871 – and while this re-fuelled the controversy surrounding his earlier *Origin of Species*, this thesis will be limited to that specific work.

In England, the controversy started much sooner than it did in the Netherlands, despite Darwin's care to not dwell on the subject of human evolution. Opinions were quickly formed in the debate, where people supporting Darwin's theories were being named 'the monkeys' (Leeuwenburgh, 55-56). It would, however, take a while before the controversy would stir up in the Netherlands.

According to Leeuwenburgh in *Darwin in Domineesland*, most of the controversy surrounding Darwin appeared during first years after initial publication, spanning between the years 1859 until 1877 (8). It may seem odd to arrive at such a conclusion, as discussion of *Origin of Species* is, in a way, still quite currently debated or refuted on religious bases. However, Leeuwenburgh states that the controversy past 1877 consisted of arguing the same points over and over again, with nothing new being said (8). The choices for translations that will be analysed are also based on this perception: the first being the translation from 1860 when the controversy was in its starting phases, the second being the 1883 translation, which was the first new translated edition since the controversy, and finally the 2000 version being the most recent translation, published well after the original controversy. Essentially, three 'slices' of time where Darwin was viewed in various ways will each get their own analysis.

Most of the controversies and discussion came from distinct fronts that also changed over time, best described by the general philosophy that the particular front adhered to. In his book, Leeuwenburgh mentions the 'materialistic atheists' moving away from deism as a whole, the 'naturalistic theologians' who try to merge belief in God and natural science, and the 'social Darwinists' who consider Darwin's theories as a basis on how society should work- and those are just a few pieces of the full picture (9). However; while discussing these would give a more complete image of context; it is simply too much to discuss at length here. As Leeuwenburgh proves, you can write a book on this subject alone, and therefore the

plumbing of the depths of this history will be limited to those that relate to the context in which the translations should be seen.

On that note, this section of the thesis comes to an end as the general context of *Origin of Species* at the time of release has been sufficiently discussed. From here on, the thesis will move on to applying this context, in combination with general theory on translation, to gain an understanding of the original text and how it could be translated.

3. Textual analysis

Analysis of Origin of Species

To ensure a proper analysis is made of the translations, it is of course necessary to first fully understand Darwin and his writing style. Although chronologically the first translation of Darwin's work into the Dutch language uses the second edition, the first edition also comes into play for the most recent translation of the work. Further, the editions are also something of expansions on Darwin's works, originating at the first, making it the 'solid base' on which the others are based upon. As such, with an analysis of the first edition in-hand, the analyses of the other editions can be kept rather short and focussed on the actual changes that have occurred compared to their predecessor.

The analysis of the text, however, will not be exhaustively in-depth and will not delve into extensive translation theory; this is on purpose as this thesis will for the most part be about already-written translations, initially viewing these on their own merits without already having made a theory in advance on how the translation should be. Furthermore, translation had not yet been as developed in the past, lacking the regulation and theories of today. Therefore analysis of the original text with the knowledge on the subject that has since been accumulated, and using this to compare the first translations against would be an uneven comparison. Of course, a thesis concerning translation cannot be completely without translation theory, and it will still be used to create a framework to work within, helping to identify elements that can be considered sensitive to change in translation and noting these, so special attention can be paid to these when moving on to the actual translations. The refined research question has already revealed the element that this thesis will take into consideration, and this chapter will explain why the research question took its current form.

Before moving on to the particulars, it is important to build up a framework for this thesis that is based on existing translation-theory, and in this case the work of Christiane Nord

is relevant, particularly Nord's work on textual analysis and elements both inside and outside of the text itself.

In her theories, Nord discusses both source- and target text analysis, and refers to Hönig's scheme with three central questions; 'Who's speaking where - and why him?', 'what is he talking about – and why in this manner?' and 'what needs to be translated here?' (Nord, 236). The first question in this scheme can be easily answered; all throughout the text, it is Darwin speaking, with the 'why' here being answered by the fact that it is his theory, research and conclusions. As the following chapter will show, however, the rest of these questions are not quite as easily answered. The difficulties become apparent when we look at the more extensive list of questions put forward by Nord, based on the Lasswell-formula; Who? Says what? In what channel? To whom? With what effect? Nord then also adds the external textual elements of 'Where, when and with what purpose?' to this list (235). Again the 'Who? Says what? In what channel' elements are easily answered; Darwin (who has been extensively discussed in the previous chapter), and the message he is conveying is his theory on evolution, and he does this through the medium of a written book. From here on it becomes more specific – and difficult – as the next section will show.

Text Type and Modality

First, it helps for the analysis to be aware what kind of text *Origin of Species* exactly is (or in Nord's list, the purpose of the text) and this may not be as clear-cut as one would think upon first viewing. On first glance, the text is informative or descriptive, informing the reader of facts. However, while this may seem true to readers today, the time period in which it was written and its context also need to be taken into account. When *Origin of Species* was first released, Darwin did so out of a desire to also leave an impression on naturalism, to let people think what he thought about the development and evolution of species – a quite popular subject within the field. On this count, the text could also be easily regarded as something of

an argumentative text; *Origin* shows what Darwin himself thinks of evolution, demonstrating this with facts and his own ideas as well as thoughts about why he thinks other theories may or may not be correct. Of course, that also means that the text could easily be considered a persuasive text. Many people in the past certainly seem to have thought so; if one looks at the controversy it stirred up and in fact still does on some levels to this day - and it can certainly be argued that the text has some elements to it that lean towards persuasion, which will be further discussed below. But can a text with a subject like this be regarded as purely argumentative?

So then, what can be used to gain more insight into the type of the text? When we turn to Nord once more, she notes that the tone of a text, the manner in which the writer makes his statements (what is he talking about – why in this manner?), is an important element (236). Taking this into consideration, it is quite noticeable in *Origin* that Darwin often uses phrases like ‘seems to me’, ‘we shall see’ and other terms that seem to indicate at least some desire of wanting to persuade the reader that he is ‘right’ and to some degree believing that he is – but he is noticeably careful about it. That said, Darwin also often notes the possible imperfections of his work numerous times and that it is certainly possible to take the facts he found, and through theorising on them, they can lead to a different or even directly opposite conclusion. In fact, Darwin emphasises this in his introduction to the book: “For I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived.” (Darwin 2003, 538)

However, in combination with another comment in the same introduction, this also seems to nudge the text into the direction of persuasive: “This Abstract², which I now publish,

² According to both the Oxford online dictionary and the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, the noun ‘abstract’ always carries the meaning of a summary in some way, shape or form. In this case, a research article containing a summary about a broad subject. Essentially, a thesis.

must necessarily be imperfect. I cannot here give references and authorities for my several statements; and I must trust to the reader reposing some confidence in my accuracy.” (537)

While it works as a simple apology for the imperfections inherent in the work not being ‘finished’ as such, and a question to try and see the text on its own merits, the ‘bear with me’ request seems to fit more into a persuasive text than a strictly opinionated one. Due to the influence they have on a text as a whole, these elements become very important in translation as well. Fortunately, these notes of uncertainty that show repeatedly in the work have a specific name in linguistics; linguistic modality. Peter Collins offers the following explanation of the subject: “Modality embraces a range of semantic notions, including possibility, necessity, ability, obligation, permission, and hypotheticality. What they have in common is that they all involve some kind of non-factuality: a situation is represented not as a straightforward fact, as not being known.” (Collins, 12).

Modality can be present in many forms, varying from deontic modality (focussing on permissions, commitment and/or obligation with constructions such as ‘I must’ and ‘it is required’), to epistemic modality (indicating possibility or certainty by using ‘it may be’ or ‘I believe’), but also influencing the evidentiality (whether there exists evidence of a statement, and of which type) and many other modal categories (Collins, 22). Instead of discussing all of these different forms of modality here, these will be focussed on as they appear in the text.

As noted, modality in its several forms appears throughout the text – along with words like ‘seem’, ‘I believe’ or similar terms - clearly dividing the line between fact and theory or personal idea and observation. While this seems obvious, it is important to note that it is quite possible that these elements may become lost in translation; a translator might agree so wholeheartedly to the concept Darwin has put forth that this element of modality is not included because it did not register with the translator. It might even be a conscious choice because of a personal belief that Darwin was right, so being so overly careful isn’t necessary.

In turn, this might actually shift the nature of the text that it might appear as more informative than the original actually was (as in, that it may come across in translation that Darwin is not so much presenting a theory as that he is telling the reader how it works, and makes clear that it is how he believes it works and readily admits he may well be wrong). Retaining modality is certainly possible in Dutch; its function is highly similar to the point of sharing terminology, thus untranslatability should not be an issue in this case.

Intended Audience

Here we arrive at the ‘for who?’ part of Nord’s questions - The intended audience is a subject that will be referred to multiple times in this thesis because it seems to shift and change over time. Regarding the audience Darwin tried to reach with the original *Origin of Species*, there is little doubt: the intended audience were other naturalists and highly educated people of the time.

This becomes immediately obvious because of the use of references and jargon. This element is immediately revealed by the text being an ‘Abstract’ (using Darwin’s own words in his introduction). It is also rather obvious that Darwin tends to name-drop as he discusses his theories and sources. He mentions people like Geoffroy St. Hilaire, Dr. Prosper Lucas and Charles Lyell – French naturalist, French medical doctor and British lawyer and geologist respectively – in such a manner that he seems to assume the audience knows which people he is talking about. In the case of Darwin’s friends and contemporaries, this was likely – but to the public at large, certainly not to such a degree, or possibly not at all. Where jargon, that is to say, the use of a specific terminology that is defined within a specific activity, profession or group, is concerned, Darwin also tends to use words that will fly right over the head of the common audience of the period (or even now). For example: using the original Latin names of the species he is referring to without clarification, like mentioning the *Lepidosiren* when referring to the Lungfish (Darwin 2003, 640).

This element is also important to remain aware of during the translation process; due to the changes to society as a whole over the course of a century, the very nature of audiences shifted. Education has markedly improved compared to the 19th century, and while there are exceptions, the common audience of today can generally be regarded to be better educated than the common audience of the 19th century. In other words, this is where the ‘when?’ in Nord’s theory becomes relevant. The ‘where?’ also holds some relevance, concerning the difference in cultures at the time (as the excerpts from *Darwin in Domineesland* show). This element will be discussed in the ‘Translator and context’ sections later in this thesis.

Furthermore, because *Origin of Species* is well-known today, to the point of being ingrained in general consciousness, what we see is that a potentially much broader public might want to read the text (in part if not entirely). While it was not the audience Darwin had in mind, today even someone with common education is likely able to understand Darwin’s writings to a degree. The finer details may be lost on them and full understanding will be hampered because theories or ideas important to the big picture are only touched upon by Darwin; simply by referring to the person who thought of it and assuming the reader will either know what or who he is talking about or to look it up. This can be regarded as something that cannot really be expected of a common reader who only has a passing interest in the subject, especially now that many of the works Darwin refers to are no longer readily available.

How can a translator deal with this? Remain loyal to the source-text, or expand for the benefit of the now-intended audience? If the translator wants to pander to the new and broadened audience, how can this be included? Using explanatory footnotes, in the text itself, or even re-writing it so it remains the same in spirit, but in words a general audience would understand? All of these are potentially viable options, and preference for one or the other

may vary from translator to translator and it is quite possible we will see significant differences where this element is concerned.

General Style

Darwin's writing style is a quite interesting case. Because of the nature of *Origin of Species*, much of the text consists of explanations, theories and facts, and can come off as rather scholarly and academic (which should come as no surprise as Darwin was university-educated). Because of this, calling the text poetic would be a significant misnomer for most of the material; it is direct in what it is saying, does not use many metaphors when these might muddle the issue instead of clarifying it, and instead focuses on describing fact, observation or theory.

Something that does become noticeable rather quickly is that Darwin occasionally writes run-on sentences that seem to consist of multiple smaller sentences that may as well have been separate. For example:

In animals it has a more marked effect; for instance, I find in the domestic duck that the bones of the wing weigh less and the bones of the leg more, in proportion to the whole skeleton, than do the same bones in the wild-duck; and I presume that this change may be safely attributed to the domestic duck flying much less, and walking more, than its wild parent. (Darwin 2003, 546)

Apart from once again seeing two verbs expressing instances of epistemic modality (I find, I presume), it seems as if Darwin wrote this almost as a train-of-thought with the semicolons indicating related independent clauses. The first semicolon is put before an introductory word that introduces what could be a whole sentence on its own. The second semicolon also starts a new sentence, connected to the previous one with the semicolon replacing where normally a comma could be placed, but as the previous sentence already contains commas of its own this would make the sentence difficult to break-up and read

(Fowler, 457-458). The content of the sentences is interesting as well. Darwin starts out with the idea that ‘habit’ can also influence the development of differences in species, and notes that the effect is more marked in animals. Then, he explains this thought in the same sentence (or one breath) by using the explanation of the domestic duck/wild duck difference, and then finalises the thought with his conclusion (which works as a confirmation of sorts of his initial idea). The middle part seems a kind of interjection – if removed the sentence could work with a minor adjustment, (‘[i]n animals it has a more marked effect; I presume that this change may be safely attributed to the domestic duck flying less, and walking more, than its wild parent’) although at a loss of clarification of just why ducks are used as an example here.

There are also other examples, but these seem to work slightly differently in relation to difficulties of getting certain species (both plant and animal) to breed in confinement:

I cannot here enter on the copious details which I have collected on this curious subject; but to show how singular the laws are which determine the reproduction of animals under confinement, I may just mention that carnivorous animals, even from the tropics, breed in this country pretty freely under confinement, with the exception of the plantigrades or bear family; whereas, carnivorous birds, with the rarest exceptions, hardly ever lay fertile eggs. (544)

It can be noted here that although it starts off similarly (idea/concept; explanation), the second semicolon seems to have a different use here – indicating a contrast, or rather clauses linked by the conjunctive adverb ‘whereas’ – instead of a conclusion like how it is used above. This is not as strange as it may seem, as all of these are proper uses of a semicolon in the English language as the Little, Brown Handbook indicates.

However, in the case of translation into Dutch, these sentences can cause significant difficulty; because of differences to Dutch grammar and sentence-building compared to English, longer sentences can become increasingly difficult to understand or grammar renders

it impossible to translate without splitting the sentence. For example, in Dutch verbs are often located at the back of the sentence (making the sentence too long makes it harder to understand what the verb is referring to and requires close and focussed reading, which can become tiresome if it occurs too often – especially in already quite heavy reading material such as *Origin of Species*). There are several ways of solving this (as there are with most other translation problems), and different translators might decide to walk different paths on their methods on how to solve this problem, for example by splitting the sentence, or changing the word-order so that words that are related to each other remain as close as grammar allows. A difficulty to make note of is to keep the ‘importance’ of the different clause the same. Changing this may make a potentially crucial point seem more like an aside or cause confusion for the reader that may be worse than the confusion of just retaining the run-on nature of the sentences.

Another element that is important to keep in mind here is the age of the text; language can (and often will) undergo significant changes in a century, causing some words to change meaning or vanish from use. The very obvious example in the form of the ‘survival of the fittest’ has already been mentioned, but there are other fragments where the age of the text is evident (‘let it be borne in mind’ for example, or words like ‘indomitable’, or ‘fleetest’ or using ‘illustration’ to say ‘example’). Fortunately the lack of ‘prose’ in the text limits the problems in this area; scientific jargon, while undergoing changes like everything else, it generally changes less than prosaic language or regular speech. ‘Pollen’ is still called pollen, ‘Organic’ still has the same meaning, and so on.

Interestingly, there are parts where Darwin goes a particularly prosaic route in his writings; these stand out all the more because he maintains a ‘scientific’ manner of writing almost entirely throughout. For example we find this at the end of his summary on natural selection:

As buds give rise by growth to fresh buds, and these, if vigorous, branch out and overtop on all sides any a feebler branch, so by generation I believe it has been with the great Tree of Life, which fills with its dead and broken branches the crust of the earth, and covers the surface with its ever branching and beautiful ramifications. (640, Darwin, 2003)

It becomes a question why Darwin would suddenly ‘liven up’ his writings with such prose. In this case, it seems to be a reason for emphasizing; as if he wants to give the subject a proper sending-off. It is also noticeable that Darwin, despite generally not using them, slips into an expansive metaphor here. Indeed, he ends *Origin of Species* in a similar manner, even re-using the tree imagery in the quote above once again. The chapter on ‘the struggle for existence’ ends on a similar prosaic note. Perhaps these parts do denote ‘closure’ of parts or subjects that Darwin held in higher regard than most of the others. Using a metaphor in these cases might be because these take place at the conclusion when he has already discussed the subject in detail and with examples and science. If this is true, it becomes important that this shift is retained in the translation, stepping away from the ‘cold and distant’ theory and facts to a more ‘flowery and descriptive’ prose, perhaps to make the reader turn the preceding theory around in his head with vivid imagery added to the mix.

Before moving on to the conclusion of this chapter, it is worth noting that although the general style is naturally an important element, it also becomes difficult to include as a separate parameter when discussing translation without it becoming seemingly superfluous; as the translations are discussed not only in regards to their main parameter but also to the text as a whole, spending a separate paragraph reiterating what has already been said is unnecessary.

Conclusion

Now that Darwin’s history, work and writing have been expanded upon, and with this text seen through the lens of Nord’s theory, it becomes clearer what inspired the refined

research question mentioned in the introduction. The list of questions Nord poses for analysis is the following: Who? Says what? In what channel? To whom? With what effect? Where? When? With what purpose?' Through answering all of these (Darwin, his theory on translation, written abstract, well-educated friends and contemporaries, combination of controversy and opening a new school of thought, England, latter half of the 19th century, informative with elements of persuasion), the following conclusions could be drawn:

First, it appears that modality plays a very important role in Darwin's work due to its intended effect. Furthermore, his experiences with what being hard-line and forward with your ideas can get you, it is very likely he is careful in his wording. Reading his works, it becomes obvious that it is a lesson he took to heart, making the use of careful wording and the presence of modality an important factor.

Second, there is the case of the intended audience; Darwin wrote his works mostly for the benefit of other scientists of the time, colleagues, friends, and so on. In fact, a significant factor in the controversy is the masses having to form their ideas on the basis of scraps tossed their way by people who may or may not have been against Darwin's ideas. Today, there is much more interest in his work, and for many an increased ability to understand it, owing to better education. How do translations deal with this element?

Third, and by extension of the above; the use of jargon. Darwin used many instances of jargon, such as referring to species by their Latinate name; something that makes sense when writing a text for a group of scientists, but people without an education or personal interest in the subject would have no clue what is being referred to. Even today this issue stands as someone without a study in relevant fields is unlikely to know the Latin name for a platypus. It is therefore an interesting element to note how the translators deal with this issue and how it reflects on the translation as a whole.

Now that the reasoning behind the research question is clear, we will now move on to the next section concerning Darwin's work before we continue with the translations; the changes that were introduced as *Origin of Species* evolved from one edition to the next.

4. Editions of *Origin of Species*

Comparison between 1st, 2nd and 6th Editions of Origin of Species.

Before starting to discuss the changes from one edition to the next, it is required to note that a full comparison of all the differences between the editions would be much too voluminous for the purposes of this thesis. Because of this, only a few choice segments will be used to illustrate the general nature of the changes before moving on to the first of the translations. If, while discussing the translation itself, a fragment is used that does not appear here, it will be commented upon if that particular fragment has undergone changes in the update from the 1st to 2nd, and later the 6th edition and what these changes are if they did occur. The reason for selecting these segments is rather simple; they show clear changes in the areas set up in the previous chapter on textual analysis. They are certainly not the only sentences showing changes, but they are among the most clearly changed fragments.

The first thing that is noticeable in the differences between the editions is that they are, for a significant part, quite small. This does, however, *not* mean that they are meaningless or insignificant. Admittedly, some of the alterations are quite telling of Darwin's previously stated perfectionism and consist of changes that do not meaningfully alter what is written, for example:

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
“[B]y the accumulation of variations profitable at that age” (604)	“[B]y the accumulation of profitable variations at that age” (86)	“[B]y the accumulation of variations profitable at that age” (67)

It is immediately quite clear that the words being shifted around does not cause a particular change in meaning, other than arguably making the sentence flow smoother. Of course, it seems that Darwin eventually decided that the original was the better of the two,

restoring the wording of the 1st edition. There are several more changes such as these, consisting of a slight change in word-order, changes in capitalisation or spelling to make this more correct, and basically changes that can readily be considered as corrections to make the text look ‘cleaner’ and properly set up.

Other changes are quite meaningful however, as can be seen by comparing the following:

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
“It may be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising” (603)	“It may metaphorically be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising” (84)	“It may metaphorically be said that natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinising” (65)

While it is only a single added word, it changes the charge and implication of the sentence; from something ‘real’ to something ‘metaphorical’. While it is true that the ‘may’ already implies a degree of uncertainty as it functions as a modal auxiliary verb (in this case indicating epistemic modality as it indicates a possibility, not a request for permission), adding ‘metaphorical’ emphasises it further. As the 6th edition does not show any changes compared to the second, it is likely that Darwin considered his wording of this sentence to be adequate for his needs even with his tendency towards perfectionism, which is perhaps quite telling in itself.

The change between the 1st and 2nd edition as shown above is indicative to an apparent theme of ‘toning down’ the certainty of the statements by adding or removing terms that have an influence on linguistic modality:

Compare the following:

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
“But in many cases, victory will depend not on general vigour, but on having special weapons, confined to the male sex.” (606)	“But in many cases, victory depends not on general vigour but on having special weapons, confined to the male sex.” (88)	“But in many cases victory depends not so much on general vigour, but on having special weapons, confined to the male sex.” (69)

In this sentence, ‘will’ is a modal verb; in this context it indicates a strong expectation, something that appears as being almost guaranteed to happen. By removing it, it seems as though the dependence (or independence) of victory on certain elements is downplayed. In short, ‘will depend’ implies much more certainty than ‘depends’ on itself would because of the influence of linguistic modality. In this case we actually see that this theme of ‘toning down’ is followed down to the 6th edition, where not only ‘will’ has been removed, but ‘so much’ has been added to the ‘not’ – modifying the modality on part of the sentence even further towards taking a less ‘powerful’ stance.

Another example:

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
“I have found by experiment that the fertility of clover greatly depends on bees visiting and moving parts of the corolla so as to push the pollen on to the stigmatic surface.” (611)	“I have found by experiment that the fertility of clover depends on bees visiting and moving parts of the corolla, so as to push the pollen on to the stigmatic surface.” (95)	“[A]s the fertility of this clover absolutely depends on bees visiting the flowers, if humble-bees were to become rare in any country, it might be a great advantage to the plant to have a shorter or more deeply divided

		corolla, so that the hive-bees should be enabled to suck its flowers.” (75)
--	--	---

In the second edition the adverb ‘greatly’ is removed. While not related to modality specifically, ‘greatly’ does indicate the intensity of how influential said element is. This indirectly influences the modality on the count of modality being an expression of the certainty of a statement (as mentioned earlier in this thesis). In his case the removal of the adverb ‘greatly’ reduces the statement from having a significant amount of certainty to one that is less so. The result is a more carefully stated sentence where we once again see Darwin downplaying his own statements by reducing their scope and influence through careful use of modality. When we look at the 6th edition, however, we see a very extensive change to the sentence, to the point that it arguably is no longer the same sentence. We can also see here that Darwin’s ‘toning down’ tendency is not completely consistent; not only has he removed the reference that he has found this through his own experimentation, but he has also merged the sentence with the sentence directly following it. There may be a specific reason for this, for example, it is known that Darwin was in contact with many of his peers, as well as consulting experts in their fields and it is quite likely that he has received confirmation about his theory in this case, and felt it was unnecessary to continue to specify this. It is possible that his sudden swing from reducing the expression of certainty attached to the statement in the 2nd edition to emphasising it by inserting ‘absolutely’ instead comes from this part of his theory being corroborated by peers in general, making him feel more secure in his writing.

From the examples above, it is quite interesting to note that Darwin seems to tone his statements down quite significantly, and does this almost (but by no means completely) consistently. That said, Darwin does not do this to the point of undermining his work anywhere, and instead appears as if he tries to moderate himself. This may be a response to

early reactions to his work; the scientific community, specifically from the philosophy of empirical positivism. Darwin was criticised for making statements that things worked like he said when there was no way he could be absolutely sure aside from mere observation. To name an example from the Netherlands, C.W. Opzoomer espoused that the human senses, not mind or intellect, was what theory should be based on (Leeuwenburgh, 63-64). It is quite possible that this was Darwin's way of compensating for the purely intellectual theorising and 'meeting in the middle' by suggesting a degree of uncertainty. Another possibility here is that Darwin was, in fact, true in his initial statement that he merely desired to share his theory with others without implying that he was specifically 'right' in any way or wanting to convince others of this.

Of course, modality and 'toning down' are not the only changes seen in the editions. Occasionally, elements show up in the text which seem to be clarifications to make sure that the reader understands the term. In the summary of the chapter on natural selection in the second edition, we find the following sentence:

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
<p>"This principle of preservation, I have called, for the sake of brevity, natural selection." (638)</p>	<p>"This principle of preservation, I have called, for the sake of brevity, natural selection; and it leads to the improvement of each creature in relation to its organic and inorganic conditions of life." (127)</p>	<p>"This principle of preservation, or the survival of the fittest, I have called natural selection. It leads to the improvement of each creature in relation to its organic and inorganic conditions of life; and consequently, in most cases, to what must be regarded as an advance in organisation." (102-103)</p>

As can be seen here, compared to the first edition, everything after ‘natural selection’ is an addition. Furthermore, where in the first edition this part is in the middle of a paragraph, Darwin choose to split the paragraph here, after the added sentence. This seems to be a measure to ‘guide’ the reader, trying to ensure he properly ‘gets’ the idea of natural selection by placing it at the very end of a paragraph and allowing them to mull it over before continuing on. In the 6th edition, it is interesting to note that we finally see ‘survival of the fittest’ rear its head in writing. Otherwise the sentence seems to have been mostly retained from its 2nd edition iteration although the idea is once again further expanded upon.

It goes without saying that changes like this will also affect the translation and underline the importance of matching the editions to the appropriate translations and comparing the editions for alterations that might be of influence; otherwise changes in the ‘spirit’ of the text might be wrongly attributed to the translator taking liberties.

Before proceeding to the translations, however, it seems apt to expand on the 6th edition slightly further here, as the examples already given do not do justice to the sheer number of changes in that edition compared to its predecessors. The significant change is readily evident from page count alone (for the moment taking the e-book as reference, the 6th edition has over 100 pages more). For example, Darwin added an entire chapter before the beginning of *Origin of Species* showing the works that inspired him in the past to write his own theory. The timeline is quite concise, with Darwin briefly mentioning each and further describing how he was inspired himself. This addition actually addresses one of the earlier points mentioned in this thesis concerning the manner in how Darwin tended to name-drop and give more context to people who are not as well-read in the subject. That said, it does not come across as a desire to change the intended audience (although it is certainly a small concession in that direction), but more as a manner in which to ensure people have the proper

context to see his theories (something likely inspired by people misinterpreting his words and attacking him on erroneous grounds).

We can also see that Darwin had changed his foreword as well. While Darwin maintains that his work is nearly finished, the time he estimates that it will take changes from two or three years to simply many. Of course, the initial estimation could simply not be maintained simply because it was both already nearly a decade since he originally wrote that, and Darwin actually took the time to respond to critics and adjust his theories when they made valid points, making an exact estimation of when he would be finished (further complicated by his failing health as noted in the section on Darwin himself) would not be possible.

Moving on past the foreword, the table of contents immediately shows that Darwin has added a number of entire new sub-chapters, and even an entirely new chapter where he discussed the objections to his theory in-depth. Even when we limit ourselves to the chapter on natural selection (or, now that it has finally gained its much more well-known moniker; survival of the fittest), we see entire paragraphs and sub-chapters that have been added since the 2nd edition. Apart from expanding, Darwin had also introduced many changes to the existing text; many of the sentences have changed dramatically with additions, being rewritten to change emphasis, or being removed entirely. As early as the first sentence do we see the now familiar, small changing of word-order and similar grammatical refinement, and some weakening ('too briefly' becoming 'briefly'). In the third sentence, we see a significant change of words – from 'effectually' to 'efficient'. The fourth sentence expands 'strange peculiarities' to 'slight variations and individual differences'. After the fifth sentence, we see that Darwin has added a multi-line segment, where he addresses the statements of Hooker and Asa Grey by admitting that man can only steer, not cause, the variability in "domestic productions" – an interesting comment where one can almost see the seeds being planted for the misinterpretation of 'survival of the fittest' in a similar manner) (Darwin 1872, 85). The

second paragraph we encounter in the 6th edition is wholly unfamiliar, an entirely new addition in which Darwin discusses how other writers had “misapprehended or objected to the term natural selection” (85), and expands on why he choose the term and how it should not be taken as literally as some people seemed to do.

As can be seen from the paragraph above, it will be difficult to discuss these changes exhaustively simply for the reason of the massive amount of changes that can be seen; it is almost as if we are reading an entirely new book that only contains fragments of the original text. Furthermore, the changes are not limited to the changes in modality, but in fact seem to rely more on words with outright different meanings, extensive additions or omissions of entire sentence fragments and so on. Regardless, a few choice examples of the changes that can be noted in the text will be displayed here, and compared to previous editions if possible. The focus will be on changed sentences, with new sentences discussed separately, and then this segment of the thesis will be concluded with a description the overall effect of these changes.

We can start with the following sentence:

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
“Can it, then, be thought improbable, seeing that variations useful to man have undoubtedly occurred, that other variations useful in some way to each being in the great and complex battle of life, should sometimes occur in the course of thousands of generations?” (600)	Identical to previous edition.	“Can it then be thought improbable, seeing that variations useful to man have undoubtedly occurred, that other variations useful in some way to each being in the great and complex battle of life, should occur in the course of many successive generations?” (85)

The first change we see here is a change in punctuation – the ‘then’ is more integrated in the sentence. The eye is no longer specifically drawn to it. The impact of it lessens, making the sentence appear somewhat more neutral (although not by much). It is also interesting to note that Darwin changed ‘thousands of generations’ to ‘many successive generations’ – on first glance this seems like a downgrade, but on the other hand Darwin avoids ‘putting a number to it’; in light of his defence against people misunderstanding natural selection and taking it too literally, one can wonder if this might have motivated this choice. But there is also something of an odd one out in this sentence; the removal of ‘sometimes’. It seems like it changes the sentence from ‘it might occur on occasion’ to ‘it will occur’, which goes against the neutralisation we see elsewhere. It has to be said that it does make the sentence flow better without being pre-emptively apologetic; the ‘sometimes’ can come across as Darwin perhaps being too careful in this case, reassuring readers that it won’t happen all the time and instantly – something that is already evident by indicating that it is a process over many generations and making him feel like it was redundant.

A bit further along the same page, we see a sentence that was expanded between the editions:

Darwin 2003 (1 st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2 nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6 th edition)
“Variations neither useful nor injurious would not be affected by natural selection, and would be left a fluctuating element, as perhaps we see in the species called polymorphic.” (601)	Identical to previous edition	“Variations neither useful nor injurious would not be affected by natural selection, and would be left either a fluctuating element, as perhaps we see in certain polymorphic species, or

		would ultimately become fixed, owing to the nature of the organism and the nature of the conditions.” (85)
--	--	--

What we see here is Darwin adding another option or outcome to his own theory. The sentence hasn't undergone many relevant changes otherwise (except a smoothing of its overall structure), but the addition of an entirely new outcome of the process is another example of Darwin showing awareness that his theory still wasn't perfect, as he has done as early as the foreword of the very first edition.

Moving on to the summary of the chapter, it makes sense that this has also been altered dramatically, but curiously we see some significant strengthening here – concisely indicated in the following table;

Darwin 2003 (1st edition)	Darwin 1860 (2nd edition)	Darwin 1872 (6th edition)
“If during the long course of ages and under varying conditions of life, organic beings vary at all in the several parts of their organisation, and I think this cannot be disputed [...]” (638)	Identical to previous edition	“If under changing conditions of life organic beings present individual differences in almost every part of their structure”(131)
“[...] [I]n the same manner as species and groups of species have tried to overmaster other species in the great battle for life.” (640)	Identical to previous edition	“[...] [I]n the same manner as species and groups of species have at all times overmastered other species in the great battle for life.” (131)

While this seems strange, what we see happening in the full context of the work is that Darwin seems to emphasize the effect, but downplays the role natural selection has in it. It is as if Darwin wants to remind everyone that, while he certainly stands squarely behind his own theory, that natural selection is only a small part of it, whose role he might have overstated. It is interesting to note, however, that Darwin does seem to be making more of a stand for his theory as opposed to him only wanting to suggest it initially; this is a choice that rather makes sense if it is considered that the controversy he had hoped to avoid by being somewhat non-committal and remaining neutral had irrevocably happened regardless. Since that had failed anyway, he may have simply not seen a reason to keep this up (which can also be a further explanation of the earlier mentioned ‘clover’ example on page 33 of this thesis). With so many changes to the tone and information in the original text, the translation will naturally be at least as different from its own original version, perhaps even more so.

Now that an ‘overview’ has been established of the kind of changes noticeable between the editions, as well as the nature of the changes, it is now time to discuss the circumstances and translator of this particular translation.

5. Examination of the Translators and Translations

T.C. Winkler – Translations of 2nd (1869) and 6th edition (1883)

Translator and Context

Tiberius Cornelis Winkler (1822-1897) was a Dutch anatomic pathologist, zoologist and natural historian from Haarlem. His involvement in the translations starts proper on the 26th of January in 1860, after the Dutch publisher A.C. Kruseman received the rights to publish a translation of the work. Kruseman had noticed the amount of discussion, rumour

and controversy *Origin of Species* had started overseas, and contacted Winkler to see if he was interested in translating Darwin's work. Once the rights were secured, Winkler dug into the translation with enthusiasm and finished it the same year (Leeuwenburgh, 138).

As noted above, Winkler was many things, but does that make him a suitable translator? Research into Winkler seems to show that, while also an author with numerous works to his name, translation was not something he did regularly. Unfortunately, the Dbnl³ does not list translations, and any and all references found refer back to Winkler's translations of *Origin of Species* or his later translation of *Descent of Man*. In his foreword, Winkler does not make any references to having translated before, making it seem likely that *Origin of Species* was both his first and last translation. This begs the question, however, why publisher Kruseman would choose Winkler as a translator. This may have simply been a choice based on convenience – at the time both lived in Haarlem, and it is likely the two knew each other through *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* – a magazine both had submitted works to (18, 20). It is not unthinkable that the two knew each other personally, and that Kruseman was aware of both Winkler's favouring of Darwin's work (more on that later), and that there was significant overlap in their areas of expertise.

This also gives rise to a question on how to approach the translation; translation theory was relatively young as a science, and Winkler did not have theories of Nord, Holmes and Toury to work with. In that case (as was briefly discussed earlier) – is it fair to judge his translation by these theories and standards? Keeping this in mind, the extensive use of these theories will be avoided to prevent judging this translation from a perspective that can be deemed unfair from the start.

Let us first start at the very beginning of the translation. Winkler helpfully provided us with an eight-page foreword to his translation, and he makes no attempt to hide his admiration

³ Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren, roughly translated: Digital Library for Dutch Language and Literature

for Darwin's work. He immediately opens by stating that *Origin of Species* is a "boek dat bestemd is om ene nog grotere beweging in de gemoederen der natuurkundigen te verwekken, dan eens door de Principles van Charley Lyell werd veroorzaakt" (Winkler 1860, 1)⁴. Not a single paragraph later, he also states that the opportunity to create the translation for the work was more than welcome, and Winkler even goes as far to state that "[w]aarlijk, geen verstandig man zal dan ook met minachting durven nederzien op de vruchten van zooveel studie en zooveel ijver, op de besluiten van zulke redeneringen, om op de uitkomsten van zulk een leven voor de zaak der wetenschap" (2) when he mentions how much time and effort Darwin had put into this Abstract. There is even a somewhat offhand mention that Darwin's theories would be a joy to read for people who seek the truth. While this admittedly does mean that the truth is in the book – Winkler's enthusiasm does seem to give it a subtext that leans in this direction.

That is not to say that Winkler was not realistic; immediately after the praise mentioned above, he admits that the book will be attacked from many sides – showing he was certainly aware of the controversy overseas, and the potential of brooding controversy in the Netherlands. But he also follows this up with a short summary of the general theory and natural selection (natuurkeus, as Winkler translates it), and after that, immediately jumps to Darwin's defence; stating that it is too easy to take Darwin's writings out of context and misunderstand him, making Darwin's writings seem more 'radical' than they actually were, and attacking him on the wrong grounds (Winkler 1860, 4-5). In a re-publication of the same translation in 1869, Winkler had also added an afterword of his own to his later translation of *Origin of Species* where he emphasises that, so far, he has seen nothing but praise towards the theory from several contemporaries (who, interestingly, are indeed all known for being in the pro-Darwin camp, whereas well-known critics of the time such as Reverend Sedgwick, one of

⁴ As Darwin is technically the writer of all of these works, for convenience I refer to the translator in these parenthetical references referring to the translations. This is to prevent confusion when there is only the publication year do differentiate between the numerous translations and originals.

Darwin's teachers, are not mentioned) (Winkler 1869, 260-261). Although Winkler makes very good points with sound arguments, it is quite notable that a translator would do this, especially considering the views of today on the subject. Interestingly, Winkler's argument of context fits this thesis as well; we must keep in mind that the principle of an 'invisible translator' is fairly recent, and for when this translation was written it was quite normal for a translator to be quite 'present' in the translation. That being said, Winkler being an apparent 'Darwin-fan' could easily influence the translation and it is something that should be kept in mind.

Unfortunately for Winkler and Kruseman, however, it would take a while before the Darwin discussion would hit the Netherlands in earnest, and the current edition was discontinued after only 212 copies sold (Leeuwenburgh, 138). That the discussion still had to truly start can also be seen in the foreword; Winkler states that Darwin's theory might 'remove some blemishes' from the bible that were based on ignorance (Winkler 1860, 8); this comment immediately confirms where in the developing discussion mentioned in *Darwin in Domineesland*. Darwin's theory and the biblical story of creation were still seen as separate entities at this point in the discussion, entities that might influence each other, but the concept of them actually excluding each other had not truly developed beyond some back-and-forth comments on a small scale. This juxtaposition would only become a full-scale debate a decade later in 1871 when a former student of Opzoomer, Allard Pierson, suggested that Darwin's theory should be seen as a 'law'. When Darwin published *Descent of Man* (where he discussed the topic of human evolution – something he purposefully avoided in *Origin of Species*) around the same time, it caused the idea that 'religion' and 'science' could be viewed separately and exclusively on their own respective merits to falter (Leeuwenburgh, 117).

A final element that requires awareness is rather obvious, but for the sake of comprehensiveness it will be mentioned again: it is necessary to keep in mind that the Dutch language of 1860 is different from what we have now, leading to changes in spelling, grammar and word-use, possibly introducing (or omitting) a subtext because the meaning or connotations of the word change. Fortunately the nature of the text is somewhat in our favour; as a scientific text it uses jargon and scientific terms, and as stated before, these are somewhat less sensitive to change than prose would be.

Moving on to the other translation Winkler has done concerning *Origin of Species* – the 6th edition - more than two decades later and thus subject to a much changed context. Much like Darwin, Winkler would also add to his foreword, although he helpfully separates the changes from the original. It shows that Winkler's appreciation of Darwin had not changed in the last 23 years. He also quips about having had a prophetic insight on the influence *Origin of Species* would have, but does not add much otherwise apart from acknowledging that Darwin had made numerous changes and additions to the book compared to the 2nd edition. It is rather odd to note, however, that Winkler gives a rather low estimate of the amount of changes, by mentioning 'about thirty additions, comments, changes, etc.' – while it is blatantly obvious from looking at the summary on natural selection alone that it is much more than that. It makes one wonder what Winkler considered a 'change' as such; where does he count a sentence as changed? As his foreword does not elaborate on this, it seems like his reasoning behind this has been lost to time.

The context of the Netherlands as a whole is an interesting case; this translation was written with the bulk of the controversies concerning Darwin's theory already in the past. But controversies in the past does not mean they do not leave marks; towards the end of the controversies, the tone became more bitter as Nihilists saw Darwin's *Origin of Species* as a confirmation of their beliefs. Additionally, Darwin's theory also started to receive some bad

press because of the rise of social Darwinism; the belief that we should model our own societies after Darwin's teachings of natural selection; if you can't keep up, you are unfit for the society and thus there is no need to help people that were unable to keep themselves afloat (Leeuwenburgh, 201 – 202).

A Catholic priest by the name of Klönne wrote a book called *Onze voorouders volgens de theorie van Darwin en het darwinisme van Winkler*, scathingly criticising both Darwin's theory and the unfair bias of Winkler – in particular, he accuses Winkler of trying to hide the doubts Darwin himself had in his own theory, and instead wanted to pretend they were perfect (Leeuwenburgh, 223-224). In light of what we have already seen of Winkler's translation in combination with his own words, one cannot help but wonder if Klönne may have had a point.

Another interesting element that Klönne passes criticism on, and is actually occasionally still heard today, is that Darwin's theory of humankind evolving from primates was actually harmful to the youth of the time (Leeuwenburgh, 225). At the time the purely Christian upbringing was steadily disappearing from schools (already an eyesore to Klönne), but this was worsened by the possibility of Darwin's 'afschuwelijke leer der apen-afkomst' being taught in schools, even suggesting that education as it was developing was a kind of grand conspiracy against the faithful. Worse, with the younger generations thinking that they simply were a different type of animal, what would happen to the higher moral people that had always aspired to because of the belief that God made us in his image?

It is likely that bitter criticism and intentional polarisation such as this leaves marks even after the initial confrontations and debates. Even today we still see articles declaring Darwin's theory the work of the devil by suggesting that humankind was not created by God but rather evolved over millions of years, and thus driving people away from true faith (BijbelArchief, 37). While it is true that this kind of religious fanaticism is becoming

increasingly rarer, it must be said that at the time of this translation many more people shared these sentiments as the Catholic Church at the time still held significant power over the people.

What we also see, however, is Darwin being honoured as a hero of science towards the end of the 1870's. In fact, the 'hero worship' Darwin enjoyed was even formalised in the Netherlands by presenting Darwin with an album, decorated with silver, containing the 217 portraits of his 'fans', all naturalists, scientists, researchers and teachers (278-279). This is especially relevant if we keep Winkler's own 'hero worship' in mind; with it being formalised he could have seen this as an indication that he was indeed 'in the right camp' for the duration of the controversy, and that the pro-Darwin camp came out on top despite the controversies and rejection by the more religious elements of society.

We will now move on to the last of Winkler's Darwin translations, and see what, if any, effect the changes in time and society have had on his approach to translation.

Keeping the elements above in mind, the actual translations will now be subject to comparison.

Translation

As stated before, the focus will be on the translation of Chapter 4 of *Origin of Species* – natural selection, or 'Natuurkeus', as Winkler translates it. Considering the research question, this section has been split into smaller ones dealing with the elements of modality, intended audience and jargon.

Concerning how to proceed on these comparisons, it is useful to consult van Leuven-Zwart. She notes that the quality of a translation can be thought of as having two criteria; the quality of the translated Dutch text - often filed under creativity and recreative character⁵ in

⁵ Original Dutch term: Creativiteit en herscheppend karakter

jargon, and the manner in which the original text has been translated – the fidelity⁶ of the text (Van Leuven-Zwart, 301). However, she also comments that the actual judging the quality of a translation is something that is heavily subject to discussion; sometimes it seems that creativity is preferred, at other times it becomes secondary to closeness and remaining true to the original text (Van Leuven-Zwart, 302). Furthermore, she also comments on the difficulties of using terms like creativity and fidelity as a norm; they are both subject to extensive discussion, and change often due to a change in times, context, language and many other elements.

Van Leuven-Zwart suggests a method to still be able to judge a translation, a method consisting of two components; a comparative component and a descriptive component (303). The first component can be taken as random spot checks to see if the translation does not quite match up with the original text. Keeping this in mind, instead of random spot checks, there actually is something to focus on here; the elements of modality, intended audience and jargon.

After pinpointing choice segments, the thesis will move on to the descriptive component, where the nature of the changes is described in terms of ‘shifts⁷’ (Van Leuven, 303). In this context, changes at sentence-level will be called ‘micro-structural shifts⁸’, which will also be divided into certain categories that will be discussed as they are found in the comparison. Subsequently, micro-structural shifts can lead to ‘macro-structural shifts⁹’ – shifts that influence the entirety of the text. Van Leuven-Zwart uses a change in characterisation of characters as an example (304), but notes that this is an example, by that logic it can also include changes in how a subject is approached.

⁶ Original Dutch term: Getrouwheid.

⁷ Original Dutch term: Verschuivingen

⁸ Original Dutch term: Microstructurele verschuivingen

⁹ Original Dutch term: Macrostructurele verschuivingen

It is worth to note that van Leuven-Zwart mostly used this method of comparing translations to original texts on fiction, but it certainly has a place here; although there are no ‘characters’ in the text of *Origin of Species* in the traditional sense, there certainly are possibilities that changes in interpretation present themselves here.

With a method to use as a lens to view the translations through, we will now start with the first component of Winkler’s translation; Modality.

Modality

Immediately at the start of the chapter on natural selection, we find the following example:

Darwin 1860	Winkler 1860
<p>“How will the struggle for existence, discussed too briefly in the last chapter, act in regard to variation? Can the principle of selection, which we have seen is so potent in the hands of man, apply in nature? I think we shall see that it can act most effectually.”</p> <p>(80)</p>	<p>“Hoe kan de strijd voor het bestaan, dien wij al te kort in het vorige hoofdstuk moesten behandelen, invloed hebben op het ontstaan van veranderingen? Kan het beginsel van keus, zulk een krachtig middel in de hand des menschen, toepassing vinden in de natuur? Wij zullen zien, welk een krachtig middel ter verandering de keus ook hier is.”(91)</p>

An interesting choice we see here, is to leave ‘seen’ out of the translation entirely; ‘waarvan wij gezien hebben’ would also be a perfectly serviceable translation, but does it change the translation meaningfully? It can be argued that Darwin may have added the ‘seen’ for additional clarity, as what we see here is an effect that can actually be observed – something that might have been regarded as an important factor in the systematic empiricism that for example Opzoomer held in high regard (Leeuwenburgh, 63-64). In this example

stated by Darwin, it is certain that the effect is there, with the domesticated species as tangible proof. On this count, it seems that Winkler's translation works just as well; in both cases the sentence indicates a known fact. In van Leuven-Zwart's terms – there is a micro-structural shift in the removal of the word (syntactic-semantic shift), but at macro-level, it does not show much influence.

What does seem to undergo significant change in translation is the last sentence in this fragment. In this case, the translation almost seems to say as if it is an undoubted fact – something that Darwin does not do at all; for one, he uses 'I think' and thus indicated that it is something he considers to be so – in other words, he uses it to introduce an element of epistemic modality – but also leaves clear room for people to disagree, as it were. In Winkler's translation this is not the case; 'wij zullen zien' is quite powerful without the epistemic modality of 'ik denk' to moderate it. On its own, it can easily come across as if the writer is saying that his conclusion is correct, and that not seeing it is the reader's fault. The implication that it is a fact that is discussed here is further strengthened by omitting the 'can' in 'can be'. The 'can' here also has a function in linguistic modality; here it functions as a so-called 'modal auxiliary' that indicates dynamic modality – a type of modality indicating ability or disposition (in this case it is obviously used to indicate ability as opposed to willingness). Because of this, Darwin's original text carries the implication that selection has the potential to be effective and very influential, whereas in Winkler's translation, it comes across as more of a given than anything else because of the lack of this element of modality – an element that could have been included as easily as exchanging 'hier is' into 'hier kan zijn'.

On the subject of micro-structural shifts this change is decidedly stylistic – the 'careful' style of Darwin seems to be abandoned in this case. It is worth to note, however, that a single shift at micro-level does not mean a macro-level change, and thus that we require more of similar changes for it to truly register as a macro-structural shift (van Leuven, 304).

Overall, Winkler seems to have a slight tendency to ‘strengthen’ Darwin’s statements by changing the linguistic modality: in a discussion of a theory by Pierce on wolves in the Catskill mountains (Darwin 1860, 91), ‘I may add’ is translated to “ik moet toevoegen” (Winkler 1860, 103) instead of ‘hier kan ik’ or similar. The net result of this is that the text suddenly seems to become more ‘certain’ instead of careful theorising because modal verb ‘moeten’ carries much more inferred certainty. Another example from the summary of the chapter: “The affinities of all the beings of the same class have sometimes been represented by a great tree. I believe this simile largely speaks the truth” (Darwin 1860, 129). This is translated as; “De onderlinge verwantschappen aller wezens van de zelfde klasse zijn somtijds bij eenen boom vergeleken. Ik vind dat die vergelijking zeer goed is” (Winkler 1860, 148).

Although the modal verb ‘believe’ is mostly retained by translating it into ‘vind’, ‘largely speaks the truth’ is quite different in connotation than ‘zeer goed’; ‘zeer goed’ implies much more (if not nigh-total) correctness. Darwin is quite careful in his statement, indicating that the simile works for the most part, but not entirely. This notion is hardly present in Winkler’s translation, once again putting a much more ‘final’ certainty on Darwin’s words. While minor and not concerning a notable or crucial part of the theory, it once again showcases the mentioned tendency.

A final, telling example of changes in modality is found in a sentence from the sub-chapter on Sexual Selection:

Darwin 1860	Winkler 1860
“How low the law of battle descends, I know not” (88)	“Hoe laag de wet om te moeten vechten afdaalt langs de ladder der schepselen, weten wij niet” (100)

Winkler introduces a very blatant change here by translating this as “weten wij niet”, as well as expanding on the sentence significantly. While the expansion seems to be a measure to avoid begging the question of ‘descending what?’ or simply to avoid confusion, his translation of “I know not” makes the comment on ignorance much broader. Saying ‘I don’t know something’ is very different from saying ‘we don’t know something’, especially if the ‘we’ is not specified any further. What does he refer to here? Only between himself and Darwin, or naturalists as a whole? By changing one word, it is as if it places Darwin in a position of power, where he can speak for everyone who is interested in the subject, or who has done research in the area. This goes noticeably against Darwin’s style – he makes it exhaustively clear that what he is explaining are his own ideas, and specifically mentioning it when he uses other people’s theories. A suddenly blatant ‘we don’t know’ is in stark contrast to this. It is true that Darwin uses ‘we’ regularly, but mainly at points where he discusses something that can be regarded as common knowledge, segments already discussed earlier or readily visible observations; but this makes it even more notable that Darwin apparently specifically chose to use ‘I’ here, indicating that at this point he preferred to not speak for anyone but himself.

As can be inferred from the above, there is a significant amount of micro-structural shifts present here, many of which are of the same nature (stylistic). It can therefore be said that they are extremely likely to cause a macro-structural shift in the text. If we use the example of characters in a story that van Leuven-Zwart uses, and we see Darwin as the sole character, his characterisation changes from someone who is careful in his wording and makes it clear he is simply theorising, into someone who seems to almost know that he is right and only gives the occasional nod to the fact that his theory is far from certain of flawless.

And with this example as a close-off point for this segment, now Winkler approach to dealing with Darwin’s use of jargon will be discussed, and by extension, if this influences (or was influenced by) the intended audience.

Jargon and Intended Audience

One of the first instances of peculiar translation of jargon is the following;

Darwin 1860	Winkler 1860
<p>“We may conclude, from what we have seen of the intimate and complex manner in which the inhabitants of each country are bound together, that any change in the numerical proportions of some of the inhabitants, independently of the change of climate itself, would seriously affect many of the others.” (81)</p>	<p>“Wij mogen besluiten uit hetgeen wij gezien hebben van de innige en zamengestelde wijze waarop de bewoners van een gewest met elkander verbonden zijn, dat eene verandering in de betrekkelijke getalen der bewoners, onafhankelijk van de verandering des klimaats, velen dier schepselen op eene ernstige wijze zou treffen.” (92)</p>

While this sentence shows another example of Darwin modifying the modality by changing a modal adverb compared to the first edition (‘most seriously’ to simply ‘seriously’) to downplay the significance, we see something else Winkler’s translation also shows another peculiarity:

One of the first things that attracts attention here is the translation of ‘complex’ as ‘zamengestelde’ – a translation that seems strange to the modern reader. Today, complex would likely be retained in the translation as ‘samengesteld’, but does not quite carry the same weight today. Complex indicates not only a combination of parts, but also “not easy to understand; complicated or intricate” (Oxford, 1). ‘Samengesteld’, although indeed still a

possible translation of ‘complex’, is more regarded as a combination of elements, but complexity is not automatically a part of it. It is noticeable that Winkler does seem to consistently translate ‘complex’ as something else, so it seems likely that ‘complex’ had simply not yet entered the Dutch vocabulary yet – in which case the translation is perfectly adequate.

Winkler also does not seem to follow Darwin’s neutrality of the statement in another area; Darwin never specifies that he is speaking only about animals and only uses the word ‘inhabitant’. As the Oxford Dictionary shows, this word can refer to both animals *and* persons. While this might be a meaningless detail on first glance, if you keep in mind that Darwin did have his own ideas about human evolution but specifically chose to avoid going into more controversial elements such as this, one can wonder if this neutrality might be intentional; a slight hint that it might go beyond the animal-kingdom alone. Of course, this can never be certain so long after the fact, but it still seems as if Winkler could have maintained this neutrality by omitting the ‘dier’ from the translation and simply translating it with ‘schepselen’ – a direct translation without the syntactic-semantic shift. It is possible that Winkler wanted to clarify the statement to avoid too much controversy by the readers interpreting the comment that Darwin was implying it might apply to humans as well. It is entirely possible since at the time, giving your own interpretation to a translation in such a manner was something of an accepted practice – or at the very least not frowned upon. Considering Winkler’s foreword, from which we already know that he feels that people should not draw conclusions about humans based on extrapolation of Darwin’s theory, this possibility becomes more and more likely. In other words, we are seeing more shifts here of the syntactic-semantic category, that are arguably changing just what the text is actually saying or implying.

Another interesting change in the area of jargon occurs at the very end of the summary of this chapter on natural selection:

Darwin 1830	Winkler 1860
“[...] I believe it has been with the great Tree of Life, which fills with its dead and broken branches the crust of the earth, and covers the surface with its ever branching and beautiful ramifications.” (130)	“[...] [Z]oo is het ook het geval geweest met den grooten boom des levens, welke met zijne doode en afgebrokene taken de korst der aarde vervult, maar de oppervlakte bedekt met zijne heerlijke, altijd groene bladeren en kleurige bloemen.” (144)

Winkler once again translates loosely, but in this case it is actually rather appropriate; as Darwin closes the chapter while still discussing his extensive tree-metaphor, the fact that Winkler takes some creative freedoms here can be more easily defended than in other sections of the work as this leans much more strongly to prose than the rest of the text. Regarding the word-choice, there are much more direct translations available, but it does not help that ‘branching’ and ‘ramifications’ are generally translated with ‘vertakken’ and ‘vertakkingen’ respectively – making the sentence repetitive if this path is used. Credit where it is due, Winkler instead chooses to use the image of flowers and green leaves, evoking a similar sense of lasting fertility, similar to the original sentence. The shift in this case can be regarded as purely a pragmatic one – a shift to maintain the function of the fragment as a more prosaic segment.

We also see evidence of Winkler translating with a certain target audience in mind; for example, when Darwin gives specific examples in the form of the Latin names for certain species, he seems to translate some of these for the benefit of the reader; for example he

translates “Ornithorhynchus” (Darwin 1860, 130) to “vogelbekdier” (Winkler 1860, 144) – the direct translation of the animal’s much more well know name ‘platypus’. Another element pointing in the direction of simplification is the translation of book titles if these are quoted by Darwin. This seems a rather strange choice, but we must remember that when the translation was written, English was not as widely spoken in the Netherlands as it is presently. Today it can be expected that the average reader can understand enough English to comprehend a book title and form a picture of the general subject matter. In the late 19th century, however, it would likely have been as obscure as the Latin names for the animals were to the average reader. To an audience today, *Vestiges of Creation* would be enough, but it is likely that the translation into “Sporen der Schepping” (12) would have helped Winkler’s audience to arrive at a similar conclusion about the contents of the book. Similarly, we also see him explaining certain words through translation, for example translating “Isolation” (Darwin 1860, 104) with “de afgezonderdheid, de isolatie” (Winkler 1860, 117). If he had been translating purely for an audience of educated naturalists and biologists, it seems unlikely he would add an explicit explanation such as this. All these changes can be regarded as stylistic; shifting the text so that the words have the same meaning and function, ruling out syntactic-semantic and pragmatic shift – leaving stylistic shift, but are easier to understand for a broader audience.

Winkler’s translation also shows a jargon-related element that is not as much a change in translation, but more like a blatant error or research failure; Winkler does not differentiate between race and variety in his translation. In the earlier mentioned example of wolves in the Catskill Mountains, Darwin clearly refers to different varieties of wolves, whereas Winkler calls them races (rassen). Especially considering that this text is scientific and heavily built on ensuring all the differences in races, breeds, varieties and species are clear-cut, choosing to simplify and simply use the terms interchangeably muddles the issue and is, quite simply, wrong. In a later example we see how Winkler simply removes ‘sub-breeds’ from a sentence

(Winkler 1860, 125) about how horses might slowly change. All in all it almost seems as if Winkler simplified the theory (or at least the examples) by doing this. Perhaps he did it for the audience, so they did not have to juggle too many new terms. Perhaps he did it for himself to make the translation easier. It doesn't change, however, that it introduces a significant alteration in the text.

Conclusion about the 1860 Translation

Unfortunately, the changes do not seem to be limited to these elements alone, and Winkler's translation can be seen to noticeably veer away from the original text on numerous occasions.

What could be the reasoning behind these changes and additions? Perhaps Winkler disagreed with what was said, or in the case of the examples, perhaps he thought that the audience he intended the translation for would find the theory easier to understand with the examples he gave instead of the examples as Darwin presented them. Unfortunately the exact reasons are lost to time, and a sentence-by-sentence comparison of the entire work is, unfortunately, outside of the scope of this thesis.

All things considered, this translation is a remarkable case; calling it outright 'poor' would be too easy. Further, we must keep in mind that translation was differently regarded and not very regulated (if at all) in the late 19th century. It is interesting to note however, that Winkler seems, at times, to have tried to make it his own story in a way. In combination with his wanting to further Darwin's theory for the public (as can be deduced from his tendency to translate Darwin's statements into more confident claims as opposed to suggestions), it becomes clear that Winkler did not quite 'remove himself from the translation' as translators try to do today. There are many more examples to find in the discussed chapter, let alone spread across the entire book. The demonstrated changes in modality, the apparent shift in intended audience and the fumbling of the jargon hardly stand alone and almost consistently

appear in the translation. However, as there are two more translations to discuss in this manner, it is sadly impossible to dwell here too long.

It can be concluded that Winkler's text is well-done on first glance – it reads like the original text and Winkler seems to have a grasp of scientific theory. However, the fact that Winkler was something of a fan of Darwin (as is plainly visible in his both his fore- and afterword, and how he leaps to Darwin's defence in both cases) is extremely evident throughout his translation. While it cannot be said with certainty that Winkler seems to consider Darwin's theory as completely faultless and undoubtedly correct, his translation is much more final and decisive in its statement than the original text was in ways that cannot only be attributed to changes in connotation or language between then and now. Furthermore, it is impossible to ignore the blatant changes that are introduced without Winkler informing the reader of this; in a way he presents his own words as Darwin's and this is quite unfair no matter what the time-period is, and this also makes the translation quite unfaithful especially if considering we have only mostly seen a single chapter – how many changes would there be in the entire book?

Seen through the model suggested by van Leuven-Zwart, it seems as if Winkler had a tendency towards subjective interpretation. A subjective interpretation is when a translator allows his personal opinion guide his translation (Van Leuven-Zwart, 305), and it seems as if Winkler has certainly done this; his foreword shows a strong indication of his appreciation of Darwin's work and acceptance of his theories, and this personal view echoes through his translation. Furthermore, the changes shown also suggest what van Leuven-Zwart calls a structural translation method; a translator who lets himself be guided by the same conscious interpretation for every translation problem (306). As the examples show, the changes we see in modality and intended audience occur consistently enough to regard them as systematic, eventually leading to a significant macro-structural shift when the translation is compared to

the original text – shifts that are arguably to a point of moving the function of the text from mainly informative with a hint of persuasion to a text of which the persuasive nature seems much more pronounced.

Will these tendencies carry over to the next translation that will be discussed in this thesis? Responsible for that translation is, once again, Winkler – this time based on the 6th edition of the work, decades later and after the controversies had run their course. Will this have influenced Winkler to ease up on expositing his own ideas, made it even more pronounced, or will it have had no influence at all? Let us move to the next translation and, with that, decades closer to the present.

Translation of the 6th edition

For the discussion of this translation, let us begin with the same fragment that we used in analysing the 1860 translation:

Darwin 1872	Winkler 1880
<p>“How will the struggle for existence, briefly discussed in the last chapter, act in regard to variation? Can the principle of selection, which we have seen is so potent in the hands of man, apply under nature? I think we shall see that it can act most efficiently.” (80)</p>	<p>“Hoe kan de strijd voor het bestaan, dien wij al te kort in het vorige hoofdstuk moesten behandelen, invloed hebben op het ontstaan van veranderingen? Kan het beginsel van keus, zulk een krachtig middel in de hand des menschen, toepassing vinden in de natuur? Wij zullen zien, welk een krachtig middel ter verandering de keus ook hier is.” (66)</p>

It is immediately rather odd to note that Winkler completely glosses over the removal of ‘too’ and simply retains the same translation he used when he translated the second edition.

Unfortunately, this only makes the concerns that were commented on in that translation stand out even more; his translation makes the segment carry much more weight than it did in the original text. In fact, it becomes worryingly obvious that Winkler has not changed his translation at all to match Darwin's alterations in this segment. 'Krachtig' seems like a very strange translation for 'efficiently'. Let us delve into this further:

According to Oxforddictionaries.com, 'effectually' means that something is "successful in producing a desired or intended result." 'Efficiently' carries a slightly different meaning: "achieving maximum productivity with minimum wasted effort or expense", or something that simply works well – similar to the meaning of 'effectually'. The words are close together to the point that they can be regarded as almost synonym, but there are arguably differences and also, if the words mean exactly the same thing, why would Darwin want to change it? If we look at the exact meanings, 'Effectually' seems to be a more 'focussed' term, although that may also be caused by the fact that the word has fallen out of use today. It is also a very difficult question to answer if Darwin intended to strengthen or soften his statement by changing the word; depending on perspective either could be true. 'Effectually' could be regarded as having more driving force behind it in causing the process, where that meaning is less used in 'efficiently'. On the other hand, it can be argued that 'effectively' not only is a driving force, but also means that it is very good or the best at what it does. The question is further complicated by the fact that we may be looking at a difference that might be caused by the difference in time. There still remains a question, however, why Winkler did not acknowledge the changes in the sentence at all; did he feel that changing them would lead to a different interpretation in Dutch when the words in English are nearly synonyms? Did he simply not notice the change? Had 'efficient' not yet entered the Dutch vocabulary? It is impossible to tell the exact reason at this point, but from the current-day

perspective, it seems like an oversight to not introduce a change when there is obviously one in the source text.

Discussing any further material here would be of little use; upon comparing this translation to the translation Winkler provided for the 6th edition, it is obvious from the first line that Winkler once again simply re-used his translation of the second-edition translation despite the significant changes between editions as shown in chapter 4. Further discussing of Leuven's model here would similarly be of little use; it is readily evident that, in a sense, this is not a translation of the new material at all – so while there will naturally be shifts occurring due to this, they have less to do with translation choices and motivations, and more with simply not doing actual translation work.

Conclusion about the 1880 Translation

Apart from the rather obvious and immediate issue that Winkler has simply used his previous translation, we also see a revisit to Winkler's tendency to make Darwin's statement much more powerful even if we disregard that he had not changed his translation; At no point does Darwin say he considers something proven, he just notes that the diagram illustrates what he means. It appears as if Darwin takes more of a stand in the 6th edition by stating that natural selection and inheritance explain what the diagram shows. Winkler simply translates this that the diagram 'proves' that the stated theory is correct. Winkler also uses 'duidelijk verklaard' – whereas Darwin simply says that 'it is explained', not 'clearly explained', and in fact does not say this in either edition, making Darwin's statement seem much more final than it actually was.

Unfortunately, we see it show up again and again that Winkler simply seems to omit many of the changes Darwin introduced (even if these changes introduce a major change in the meaning of the sentence, like 'tried to overmaster' – 'will always overmaster' mentioned in chapter 5), which also explains the oddly low amount of changes Winkler mentions in his

foreword. In fact, it led a very strange discovery during the research on this translation: it seems as though Winkler barely did any work on this translation. There are entire paragraphs and even the sub-chapter “On the Degree to which Organisation tends to advance” (Darwin 1872, 97) being omitted entirely. Not simply because the header was left out – as happens in the case of the immediately preceding sub-chapter on “The Probable Effects of the Action of Natural Selection through Divergence of Character and Extinction, on the Descendants of a Common Ancestor” (Darwin 1872, 90), but simply being completely absent. It looks as if Winkler simply took his translation of the second edition, translated the new chapter present in the 6th edition, and inserted that into the translation. This does not seem proper for a translation; in essence the source text becomes misrepresented to people who have never read the original (either by choice or because they are unable to). Worse, it is well known that Darwin’s 6th edition has undergone a large amount of changes compared to the 2nd edition. If someone is aware of this but is not willing (or incapable) of reading the original, this causes a significant misrepresentation the work. As was mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, there is division on which version of *Origin of Species* is definitive, but that does not change that the 6th edition is a significant addition if only for it being the final edition Darwin would write as well as being the most recent one. As it is likely that someone who reads the translation is unable to read the original, and chooses to read this particular translation as it is (supposedly) based on the latest edition, they will likely never realise the problem – making this a rather insidious issue; essentially replacing the 6th edition with the 2nd and thus grossly misrepresenting it. Why Winkler choose to do this has been lost to time, but it is certainly strange that, in view of his apparent enthusiasm for Darwin’s work, he would skimp on his translation to such a degree.

Ludo Hellemans – Translation of 1st Edition (2000)

And now we have arrived at the most recent Dutch translation of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, a translation made in honour of the 'Darwinjaar' by Ludo Hellemans. In this case, there is no need to compare editions since this translation is once again based on the very first edition of the book. What we can do, however is look at the context and the translator.

Translator and Context

It is interesting to note the similarity between our first translator, T.C. Winkler, and L. Hellemans; first and foremost Hellemans is a biologist and science historian, not a translator. He has written numerous publications, many in the *Intermediar* magazine, about subjects that make him seem like a proper choice to translate Darwin's work; palaeontology, archaeology and evolutionary theory among others ("Ludo Hellemans"). And like Winkler, Hellemans also translated *Descent of Man* in addition to *Origin of Species*. Where translation is concerned, however, it seems as though his translations of *Origin of Species* and *Descent of Man* were the first (and seemingly only) translations he has worked on.

Let us first have a look at what Hellemans has to say in his foreword. It is interesting that Hellemans makes a number of observations that are rather similar to issues already noted in this thesis. He states that the initial idea was to use Winkler's translation as a basis, and then 'update' it to more modern Dutch. However, Hellemans observes that this would require such extensive rewrites that you might as well start anew (Darwin 2000, 8). He also notes that Winkler did not pay much attention to the subtleties of Darwin's word-use (something noted here as well), with apparently arbitrarily leaving segments out with no reason given. It is however odd that he does not make any mention of the problem observed in the 1883 translation being less of a translation and more of a rehash of the second edition with only the extra chapter added.

It is also interesting to see how Hellemans also gives a brief explanation on his views on how Darwin wrote *Origin of Species*. Word-use, the ideas that Darwin wanted to convey – even an explanation of the context he was working in (Hellemans 2000, 11-12). It seems as though Hellemans has at the very least some knowledge of translation theory despite his background as a biologist and science historian. This is even more telling when keeping in mind that he has not done any prior translations.

Hellemans also treats us with reasoning for choosing the 1st edition as a basis for this translation that goes beyond simply an anniversary edition. Hellemans notes that it shows Darwin's 'struggle with language' in an attempt to explain an almost entirely new concept to a (for the time) broad audience of learned people. He notes how Darwin uses direct and clear terms (he describes them as 'industrial and economical' – possibly related to Darwin's family having many economists and bankers among their number) to describe the idea as unambiguous as he could (Hellemans 2000, 12). It can indeed be argued that Darwin's refinements to the texts, as we have seen in the comparisons of the editions weakened this; we have noticed a tendency for Darwin to 'weaken' his statements slightly through careful choice of words, and in that respect, going back to the source for the newest translation is certainly a defensible choice, especially considering how scholars of Darwin's work cannot agree on which edition should be considered the definitive one for a variety of reasons.

While *Darwin in Domineesland* clearly indicates that the discussion on Darwin has long since died down – the controversy remains. Hellemans himself also makes note of this, and interestingly, makes note of some elements discussed in this thesis; the idea that Darwin's theory has been rendered obsolete since. Hellemans completely discards this notion (Hellemans 2000, 9) and the one before by stating that Darwin's work can still be considered taboo to a degree; school-curriculum only gives it passing mention and the work is increasingly played off as a charming theory, weakening it in Hellemans' eyes.

Something that is rather odd to note, though, is that Hellemans seems to show a bias towards Darwin having set out to remove faith and the supernatural from the world, when this is not true in Darwin's own words as mentioned before. While this is a very common perception of Darwin's intentions nowadays, in truth he set out to make his theory based solely on elements that could be considered tangible proof. It is true, however, that the theory removed humans from its originally iron-clad position above other animals, especially after *Descent of Man* (Hellemans 2000, 10). It is important to keep this bias of Hellemans in mind, however; as it might influence his translation.

Hellemans also notes another contextual element that we need to keep in mind, and that has been dwelt on before: Darwin's work being much more a part of public consciousness than it was 200 years ago. Congresses, exhibitions and museums are dedicated to both the man and his writings, which expands the potential audience for this translation.

With this translation as recent as it is, there is also more contemporary coverage of the subject that can be found, which will now be briefly discussed.

The general reception of the translation seems positive. One review starts off with praise on Darwin's work, emphasizing how, like the bible, it has become a work that almost everyone has at least heard about (Venhuizen, 1). Then, the reviewer describes Hellemans' translation of the work as one that is 'straight-laced, and despite its comprehensiveness not that expanded'¹⁰. It is noted that it is boring, however, mentioning the large blocks of text and the extensive, run-on sentences (Venhuizen, 6). While this is not very positive, it is appropriate to note that one could argue that this describes Darwin's work for a sizeable majority of the planet. Darwin had not written his theory to entertain, but to explain and give his idea to the world for who wanted to hear it. As Hellemans set out to provide a faithful

¹⁰ Original tekst: De vertaling van Hellemans is een versie zonder opsmuk. Daardoor is het boek ondanks zijn volledigheid niet al te zeer uit de kluiten gewassen, maar oogt de inhoud oersaai. De lange lappen tekst, Darwins uitvoerige zinnen, zijn weinig uitnodigend.

translation, it is only fitting that he has not tried to make it more bite-sized for the common public.

Another review also confirms that Hellemans made a point of staying close to the original text of the work (Nijland, 1). An oddity in this review, however, is that the translation from 1883 was attributed to H. Hartogh Heys van Zouteveen (6), while the actual translation itself unambiguously states that it is by Winkler's hand, has his name on the cover, and is certainly in Winkler's style. What the review confirms, however, is that Winkler's translation is far from perfect, and would with the standards of today be regarded as rather poor. The review at least partially confirms my findings about omissions in this version (although there is no mention about the second edition of the translation being a simple copy-paste job).

This review also reveals something about the production of this translation: Hellemans was assisted by a linguist. On occasion, Darwin's sentences are extremely long; something that is increasingly difficult to maintain in Dutch because of the specifics of the language. Another interesting point that this review reveals is that the translation is close to the original to a degree that it maintains oddities that could arguably be called errors; if Darwin formulated a certain element rather oddly, Hellemans (aided by the linguist) would try to find some way to convey that in the Dutch language. If a term proved to be untranslatable, the original English was maintained.

Keeping all this in mind, it is now time for the final translation of this thesis: *Over het ontstaan van soorten door middel van natuurlijke selectie, of het behoud van bevoordeelde rassen in de strijd om het leven*, from the year 2000.

Translation

Modality

Let us move to the first sentence for an immediate example:

Darwin 2003	Hellemans 2000
<p>“How will the struggle for existence, briefly discussed in the last chapter, act in regard to variation? Can the principle of selection, which we have seen is so potent in the hands of man, apply under nature? I think we shall see that it can act most efficiently.” (600)</p>	<p>“Hoe zal de strijd om het bestaan, die wij in het vorige hoofdstuk te kort hebben moeten behandelen, inwerken op het ontstaan van variaties? Kan het principe van selectie, waarvan wij hebben gezien dat het zo’n krachtig middel is in de handen van de mens, ook in de natuur van toepassing zijn? Ik geloof dat we zullen zien dat het zeer effectief kan werken.” (80)</p>

What we immediately see here is that Hellemans does indeed stay much closer to the original text than Winkler had in his translations. The translation seems almost word-for-word save where grammar would disallow it. We also do not see the subtle changes Winkler introduced (for example entirely omitting the ‘I think’ opening the last sentence of the fragment and thus removing an element of epistemic modality, or omitting the additional uncertainty that ‘can act’ infused the sentence with) that made Darwin’s comment seem much more convinced and certain as if he was extolling fact instead of theory. Based on van Leuven’s model, it is hard to pinpoint actual shifts here. There are some stylistic-syntactic changes (as can be seen in the first sentence, including ‘wij’ in the sentence), but these change little apart from readability in Dutch – an element that van Leuven-Zwart mentions can actually benefit a translation (310).

Another example of Hellemans admirably maintaining Darwin’s rather neutral tone is in the following segment:

Darwin 2003	Hellemans 2000
<p>“We may conclude, from what we have seen of the intimate and complex manner in which the inhabitants of each country are bound together, that any change in the numerical proportions of some of the inhabitants, independently of the change of climate itself, would seriously affect many of the others.” (601)</p>	<p>“Op grond van hetgeen wij gezien hebben van de innige en complexe wijze waarop de bewoners van een streek met elkaar verbonden zijn, mogen wij concluderen dat iedere verandering in de numerieke verhoudingen tussen sommige van de inwoners, onafhankelijk van de klimaatsverandering zelf, veel andere bewoners aanzienlijk zou beïnvloeden.” (82)</p>

In his translations, Winkler translated ‘would seriously affect’ with ‘op ernstige wijze zou treffen’. Hellemans on the other hand, translates this as ‘aanzienlijk zou beïnvloeden’ – which is much less ‘negative’ in its connotations. ‘Ernstig’ is a word in Dutch that is almost exclusively used to denote the severity of negative effects, whereas ‘seriously’ can certainly also have that meaning, but it can also simply mean that something is important or that the effect of something is quite extensive. Hellemans catches this difference and uses an atypical but fitting translation for ‘serious’ that carries the same connotation of a ‘noticeable, but not necessarily negative, effect.’ In short, it is another syntactic-semantic shift, but one that actually brings the translation closer to the source text than the more direct, reflexive translation would.

At another point that has been discussed earlier in Winkler's translation, when Darwin mentions Pierce's theory on wolves in the Catskill-mountains:

Darwin 2003	Hellemans 2000
<p>"I may add, that, according to Mr. Pierce, there are two varieties of the wolf inhabiting the Catskill Mountains in the United States, one with a light greyhound-like form, which pursues deer, and the other more bulky, with shorter legs, which more frequently attacks the shepherd's flocks." (609)</p>	<p>"Ik zou hier willen toevoegen dat er volgens dhr. Pierce twee variëteiten wolven leven in de Catskill-bergen in de Verenigde Staten: een met een lichte, windhondachtige vorm, die herten achterna zit, en de andere meer gedrongen van lijf, met kortere poten, die veel vaker de kuddes van de herders aanvalt." (92)</p>

It is interesting to note that Hellemans does retain the modality where Winkler did not. Hellemans translates 'I may add' as '[i]k zou willen toevoegen' – a very close translation that does retain the modality of the original English sentence in the Dutch translation by including 'zou willen'; properly indicating the mood and minimising micro-structural shifts (and by extension, macro-structural shifts).

Similarly, when Hellemans translated Darwin's musings near the end of the chapter:

Darwin 2003	Hellemans 2000
<p>"The affinities of all beings of the same class have sometimes been represented by a great tree. I believe this simile largely speaks the truth." (639)</p>	<p>"De affiniteiten tussen alle wezens van dezelfde klasse worden soms weergegeven met een grote boom. Ik geloof dat deze vergelijking in hoge mate waar is." (130)</p>

Hellemans once again chooses to retain the modality translating it and keeping the specifics of especially the second sentence. We see the epistemic modality represented by “[i]k geloof”, as well as retaining a similar level of certainty through using “hoge mate” (as opposed to Winkler’s more powerful “zeer goed” (Winkler 1860, 148) mentioned in his section). Once again, there is little present where actual shifts are concerned, except once again simple stylistic-syntactic shifts to ensure the translation is in proper Dutch writing and easy to read (for example by translating ‘of all beings’ with ‘tussen alle wezens’ – although ‘van alle wezens’ would have been more direct, ‘tussen’ gives us a better read).

Based on these examples, it becomes clear that Hellemans went out of his way to retain this element of modality. Has he done the same for the other elements that this thesis explores, however?

Jargon and Intended Audience

The first readily obvious change compared to the other translations is how ‘natural selection’ is translated. Hellemans translates it with “natuurlijke selectie”, proudly displayed on the title page (Hellemans 2000, title), a much more direct translation than ‘natuurkeus’ was. That said, this is more likely a sign of the times; the Dutch language has acquired an increasing amount of English loanwords or words that in some other manner originate from English. That said, there seems to be a slight change in connotation between ‘selectie’ and ‘keuze’: according to the *Van Dale*, ‘keuze’ means “de daad v.h. kiezen [...] voorkeur”.

On the other hand, ‘selectie’ is described thusly: “het uitkiezen (naar geschiktheid)”

If we take this into account, it seems as though the term ‘selectie’ is in a sense more deliberate, as it were. ‘Keuze’ can mean that there is a choice, a possibility of selection or favouring something over the other. ‘Selection’ is narrower, where things are *actively* chosen or have already been chosen based on adequacy. It certainly seems that ‘selectie’ would be a better term despite that it can be argued that it indicated consciousness of choice instead of a

natural process, and time has in fact favoured this translation as ‘natuurlijke selectie’ is the accepted translation of the principle in Dutch today.

The next fragment already appeared in the ‘modality’ section of Hellemans’ translation, but it shows some elements that are important enough to revisit it: “Op grond van hetgeen wij gezien hebben van de innige en complexe wijze waarop de bewoners van een streek met elkaar verbonden zijn, mogen wij concluderen dat iedere verandering in de numerieke verhoudingen tussen sommige van de inwoners, [...]” (Hellemans 2000, 81)

Here we also see Hellemans’ preference for staying as close to the original text as he can. The largest change we see here is that the word order has been changed to make the sentence flow more smoothly in Dutch. It is also notable that Hellemans retains the rather neutral ‘inhabitants’ of the original text; he simply calls them ‘bewoners’ or ‘inwoners’ which is a direct translation of the term. It is interesting to note, however, that ‘inwoners’ of itself is quite rarely used to indicate animals. When speaking of the ‘inhabitants of a country’ most people will at first assume that you are talking about the people of a country, not the animals. That said, the English Cambridge dictionary does indeed specifically denote that ‘inhabitant’ covers both people and animals.

In other words, the translation, although using the most direct translation available of ‘inhabitant’, does show a slight change in meaning here. However, as the context of the full text makes it clear that this is about animals and not so much people. We also see that Hellemans uses a slightly non-standard translation of ‘country’ – translating it as ‘streek’ instead of the more direct translation of ‘land’. It is quite possible that this was a choice to prevent that readers assume that Darwin was talking about people as well; ‘streek’ can mean any area of land without being specific, where ‘land’ in this context implies people (as countries are areas defined by borders that have been put in place by people).

Overall, we once again see some remarkable examples of Hellemans staying true to his word in wanting to represent Darwin’s work in translation while remaining as close as he can to the source material. Winkler changing “I may add” on page 91 into “ik moet toevoegen” was already commented on, and Hellemans translates this into “ik zou hier willen toevoegen”; this is again much closer to Darwin’s more neutral tone through the chapter, and *Origin of Species* as a whole. In addition, this fragment also showed Winkler’s lack of attention to the difference between ‘variety’ and ‘species’ – while Hellemans does take this into account and makes sure that he translates this as “variëteit” instead of “ras” like Winkler had chosen to do.

We find yet another example of this in the summary of the chapter:

Darwin 1860	Hellemans 2000
“The affinities of all the beings of the same class have sometimes been represented by a great tree. I believe this simile largely speaks the truth.” (129)	“De affiniteiten tussen alle wezens van dezelfde klasse worden soms weergegeven met een grote boom. Ik geloof dat deze vergelijking in hoge mate waar is.” (127)

Again, the translation is about as literal as one can get; Hellemans even chose to retain the ‘great’ in the sentence even though omission in this case would only be a minor change, and not a change that really influences a reading of the work. Further, ‘in hoge mate’ does indeed indicate that, while close, is not entirely correct, unlike Winkler’s take on the same sentence in an earlier chapter.

Hellemans also does an admirable job to maintain sentences even if they are unusually long, like the sentence Darwin uses to close the subject of natural selection:

Darwin 1860	Hellemans 2000
<p>“As buds give rise by growth to fresh buds, and these, if vigorous, branch out and overtop on all sides many a feebler branch, so by generation I believe it has been with the great Tree of Life, which fills with its dead and broken branches the crust of the earth, and covers the surface with its ever branching and beautiful ramifications.” (130)</p>	<p>“Zoals uitlopers door uit te groeien nieuwe uitlopers doen ontstaan, en deze zich, als ze krachtig zijn, uitspreiden en langs alle kanten gaan uitsteken boven menige zwakkere tak, zo geloof ik is het door generaties heen gegaan met de grote Boom des Levens, die met zijn dode en afgebroken takken de aardkorst opvult en het oppervlak bedekt met zijn zich steeds afsplitsende, mooie vertakkingen.” (127)</p>

Hellemans has apparently chosen to maintain the long, run-on nature of the sentence much like Winkler had. Unfortunately this does not serve to make the sentence easier to read, and it could even be considered awkward with the strange commas. To be expected, Hellemans remains close to the original text in this segment as well, unlike Winkler who had chosen to go a more ‘poetic’ route for this fragment in an apparent attempt to keep the sentence aesthetically pleasing. It is noticeable that he does play around with Dutch grammar slightly – in the last segment of the sentence he chooses to leave the verb ‘bedek’ mostly in place, instead of moving it to the end of the sentence where it would usually be placed (‘en het oppervlak met zich steeds afsplitsende, mooie vertakkingen bedekt’), although this choice does make the sentence much easier to read. The usual difference of Winkler’s strengthening and Hellemans’ maintained neutrality is present even here as Hellemans maintains the ‘I believe’ comment where Winkler had not, thus retaining a similar level of modality as well.

We also see that Hellemans makes no effort to make the text more understandable to the general public by, for example, choosing to maintain the Latin names for the species that Darwin mentioned, and offering no further explanation; *Ornithorhynchus* of the original text (640) is maintained instead of offering the reader a hand by indicating that this is the platypus (Hellemans 2000, 127). Again, this is very true to form for Darwin's original work; Darwin assumed his readers would know which animal he meant, or that they would look it up themselves if they did not. Again, this heavily implies the tendency to remain as close as possible to the remaining text regardless of target audience, thus minimising any shifts. In fact, it can be argued that the 'audience' here has barely been considered at all, and that faithfulness to the text has taken precedence over everything else.

On occasion, we do indeed see elements that Hellemans has apparently chosen to leave untranslated. For example, at one point it is mentioned that Downing is an "excellent tuinbouwkundige" (Hellemans 2000, 85) – while 'excellent' is actually a term that can also be used in Dutch, it is very rarely done so (most people would likely choose to translate the term with 'uitstekend'). Another interesting choice in the same vein is seen when natural selection in plants is discussed – Hellemans keeps the yard as a measuring unit (Hellemans 2000, 98) instead of converting it to the usual metres used in the Netherlands for measurement of distance. Using the term "extinctie" (Hellemans 2000, 110) instead of translating it with the term 'uitsterving', which is the term that is used much more often in Dutch, is yet another example of this. In combination with the foreword and what we have already seen so far, these seem to be choices to once again ensure that he remains as close to the source text as he can, to the point of using terms that could arguably be regarded loanwords even if there are terms available that are part of the more general vocabulary. Further, it can be argued that using these simpler terms are a form of simplification compared to the scientific (or as Hellemans called it, 'economical') terms Darwin tended to use. It is noticeable that there is a

difference in translation between the concept of extinction, and it actually happening (in the latter case Hellemans does indeed translate it with ‘uitsterven’), which also strengthens the perception that Hellemans made this particular choice to maintain jargon and terminology. All that said, and contrary to what the foreword may lead the reader to believe, maintaining the English words in their entirety is a rarity on the whole of a text, and it indeed seems to go hand-in-hand with maintaining the terminology as closely as possible.

Conclusion about this Translation

As with the other translations, there is much more that could be spoken about in the chapter on natural selection alone, but that sadly goes beyond the scope of this thesis. It can be said that the reviews about the translations are adequate at covering the contents of the work. Hellemans does indeed do a remarkable job of remaining close to the translation, attempting to always choose wording close to Darwin’s own, occasionally to the point of causing the sentences to become somewhat awkward in Dutch (although still correct and understandable).

What we also see is that Hellemans is careful to not give Darwin’s words extra weight – quite different from Winkler’s approach. It seems that Hellemans was able to ‘remove’ himself from the translation to a much greater degree than Winkler; from his foreword it becomes evident that he holds Darwin’s work in high regard (much like Winkler), yet he maintains Darwin’s style of careful suggestion, examples and ideas, as well as keeping in mind that Darwin was not entirely sure about some of his theories and observations.

According to van Leuven-Zwart’s model, Hellemans’ translation does have something in common with Winkler’s – the structural translation method; the change here is that Hellemans seems to stay as close as he can to an objective interpretation. As van Leuven-Zwart states, an objective interpretation is based on the characteristics and properties of the original text (305). The result is a translation that is remarkably close to the original thanks to

careful choice in micro-structural shifts that have little effect on the macro-structure of the whole. It can certainly be said that the fidelity of Hellemans' translation is extremely high in regards to modality, intended audience and jargon, and in fact, on the whole.

Now that last of the translations that this thesis is going to discuss has been treated, it is now time to reflect on the findings, and attempt to draw conclusions from them.

6. Conclusion

To begin, the main question of this thesis will be reiterated: How have the Dutch translations of *Origin of Species* changed throughout the years in the areas of modality, jargon and intended audience, and does this relate to their reception in their respective times?

It did not come as much of a surprise that the research demonstrated that the manner in which Darwin's work was translated has indeed changed over the years. Despite that this expectation proved correct, the exact nature of the changes that added up over the years turned out to be quite unexpected.

First there is Darwin himself, or more importantly, the changes he had introduced to his work over the years. By comparing the first and second editions, and then the second and 6th editions especially, it became extremely evident that Darwin had introduced many changes in *Origin of Species*. First and foremost, it was possible to notice a tendency towards lessening the 'strength' of his own claims, initially through linguistic modality and later even by replacing certain word with other words carrying different connotations. We have seen incidents where 'will' became 'could', 'is' became 'I believe there is', and many other similar changes that demonstrated how Darwin emphasized how his work was theory and not certainty. It also became evident how much attention Darwin paid to the small details – changing sentences around to improve their flow even though their contents were still the same. This, along with comments by his contemporaries that Darwin was a perfectionist (47), gives a strong indication that the words were extensively considered before Darwin used them, and were likely to be very closely defined. Especially the latter is of importance here; it must be borne in mind that Darwin was attempting to explain a new concept, and in such cases it is especially important to have defined terms to prevent both confusion, or broader application than what was intended. Put differently; Darwin had to use jargon extensively to

explain his ideas and theories to a specific intended audience as clearly as possible despite the threading of new ground.

Secondly, and in extension of the above, there is the analysis of *Origin of Species* as a work using Nord's theory to determine the most important segments. While the text is clearly scientific in nature and certainly not a work of prose or poetry exploring the beauty of the language, the exact text-type is hard to accurately put down due to some conflicting elements and claims; Darwin intended the work simply to add a theory to the field he held in high regard, but on the other hand his text contained some rather strong elements of a text that was written to persuade other that he was right instead of just being purely informative. However, especially when taking the earlier mentioned changes in modality that were introduced into account, it becomes cleared that being informative was indeed Darwin's intention; he indicates strongly that he is stating something he believes is correct, but not hammering on this and thus implying it should be taken as a gospel truth.

What audience the work was intended for (also regarded an important element by Nord) was an element also clearly present in Darwin's work. His intended audience consisted of well-read fellow naturalists and scientists of the time, something made evident by the use of jargon and Latin names for animals that would be confusing or outright unfamiliar to the average reader. In combination with Darwin's earlier mentioned reluctance to take a stand (especially on more controversial subjects such as human descent) this is actually also one of the elements that is likely to have been a strong influence on the controversy his work caused; for a significant part, the controversy also stemmed from people only knowing *Origin of Species* through hearsay, hearsay that may have been coloured by the perception of someone who disagreed with Darwin, and having the work be further weighed down with statements such as 'God does not exist' whereas Darwin had never said as such.

Third, analysis of fragments of the translation taken from the chapter on natural selection, and using the model suggested by Kitty van Leuven-Zwart, indeed indicated significant change over time. Surprisingly, the change was of a different sort than was anticipated. The reception of Darwin's work seems to certainly have had an effect; the initial translation was made specifically because of the storm of controversy that erupted over it in England, and the publisher Kruseman intended to catch this wave when it, in his eyes, would inevitably cross the channel to Europe and the Netherlands. He hired T.C. Winkler for this translation; a biologist living in the same city as him and moving in the same circles, thus making it likely they knew each other. Winkler was revealed to be a fan of Darwin's work, and eagerly accepted the assignment.

Before continuing it is important to note that one of the first elements in regarding translations of this age are the changes in the Dutch language from then compared to now; words regarded as archaic and unwieldy now likely did not seem so back then, and furthermore words may have changed meaning – but even with this element in mind we see many changes that cannot be explained away with this.

Winkler's translation is an interesting case; it would be unfair to judge it by the standards held by translators today, but yet it is difficult to call the translation unambiguously good, particularly if the large amount of micro-structural shifts (according to the van Leuven-Zwart model) is taken into account. Where Darwin was a perfectionist who likely poured over which words to use, Winkler seemed content to play 'fast and loose' with this. This unfortunately resulted in the loss of Darwin's carefulness in his wording because a word with different modal properties was used, or sometimes these elements were even ignored outright; causing a much different reading – or in the words of van Leuven-Zwart; a shift in the macro-structure. Much of Darwin's careful theorising and asking for people to think about his theory is somewhat marred by, for example, translating modal verbs such as 'I may add' into 'ik

moet toevoegen' – making it seem as if Darwin is asserting a dominance he never does in his own works. While this may seem relatively minor, it is important to keep in mind that many Dutch people of the time would not be able to read the English original, causing the Dutch translation to be their sole exposure to Darwin's theory. To these people, what they are reading are Darwin's words instead of Winkler's interpretation of them. This is especially blatant when Winkler starts to omit segments and add his own.

In the area of jargon, the translation was also rather uneven and in some cases even arguably wrong, a poignant example is to completely drop the distinction between 'race' and 'variety'. We also see what appears to be concessions for the benefit of a broader audience by, for example, changing the Latin names into more commonly known names for the animals they are referring to. It is possible that the earlier mentioned 'race-variety' translation issue also stems from this; simplifying it to make it more accessible. Furthermore, in combination with much of the controversy being that Darwin was much too strong in his statements (which was already exaggerated by hearsay), it might give readers a much different picture than they may have had otherwise, and arguably changes the text from informative to trying strongly to convince others. All things considered at this point, Winkler's translation leaves much to be desired, even allowing for the more lax (or almost non-existent) principles of the then-still fledgling science of translation.

However, in Winkler's translation of the 6th edition, there is something that can be regarded as inexcusable even when looking at it from the perspective of the time: Darwin's 6th edition was notable for just how much had been changed compared to the earlier editions, and not just in the manner that was mentioned earlier for the second edition. Segments were removed or shuffled about, sentences or paragraphs were added expanding on certain theories Darwin had done more research on (or was given by interested parties). What Winkler's second translation shows of this is almost nothing at all. The added chapter detailing Darwin's

retorts to reactions on his theory is present, but almost nothing of the other changes remains. In fact, even the iconic term ‘survival of the fittest’ had simply not been included in the translation. What happened here? The most likely answer is that Winkler deemed his original translation still good enough (not too large a leap considering he had already introduced several changes of his own in that translation) and only translated the additional chapter.

It is interesting to note that the foreword is also exactly the same in both editions, save for half a page of extension explaining how he had added new material and how Winkler ‘had prophetic gifts’ in predicting the impact of the theory. In modern terms, it almost feels like a ‘cash-in’; the initial printing of the translation was a disappointment, and though it picked up later, this translation was published long after the true controversy had run its course. So then a new printing was released afterwards with less effort than was put in the former, in an attempt to catch some profits from the receding wave.

Ludo Hellemans’ translation around the turn of the millennium is a different animal than Winkler’s in both time and content. Released to honour the ‘Darwinjaar’ celebrating the 150th anniversary of the release of *Origin of Species* it is evident that the context certainly had a hand in the release of this new edition. Using the original first edition as a basis, Hellemans produces a translation that remains extremely close to its source to the point of almost putting it on a pedestal in worship as a holy scripture. Elements of modality are admirably maintained, and there are no concessions to a broader audience like those clearly seen in Winkler’s translation, no footnotes clearing elements up – the text is simply an as direct as possible translation to the point of on occasion using English words if there isn’t a Dutch word that is its exact equivalent down to implied meaning in addition to the primary meaning. There are some shifts present according to van Leuven-Zwart’s model, but these are all on micro-structural level. On macro-structural level there is hardly any shift to be seen. It is here

that the development in the area of translation becomes much more evident. However, it is a development that is rather unlike what was expected at the outset.

The introduction mused on the possibility that translations of Darwin's work have changed with the times, especially because of what was theory then, is now quite widely accepted as fairly correct and to a degree common knowledge (as Hellemans also states in his foreword). It was then theorised if this might have caused a change in how certain words would be interpreted in translations, reflecting the acceptance of Darwin's theories. Quite surprisingly, the development actually wound up being quite the opposite of what was expected; the most recent translation proved to be the most loyal to its source text, modality, jargon and audience and all, whereas the contemporary translations of the time are much looser. Surprisingly, the controversy surrounding the work appears to not have had a highly profound effect on either of the Winkler translations; Winkler indicates being a fan in his foreword and agrees with (most of) Darwin's words, leading to the translation gaining in certainty that it lacked in the source text. His second translation almost seems like an afterthought where he simply re-used his first translation and inserting the new chapter. That said, perhaps the controversy was exactly the reason why Winkler appears to take a stand in Darwin's name – jumping on the barricades for him as it were by changing Darwin's text. With no controversy, there would have been less reason to become defensive and attempt to 'improve' the text.

An element that appears to be much more important than was anticipated was the development of translation as a science. Naturally, translation has been in existence for centuries, but the more extensive methodology and 'rules' would only be truly set after Winkler made his translation. Winkler was likely unaware of the principle of removing yourself from the translation as a translator - as stated he changes elements intentionally and omits others. For a translator today such an act would be unthinkable unless it can be

motivated with more than ‘in my opinion that works better’. Further, it can also be theorised that it was also a significant element that Winkler would not (or could not) be extensively reviewed. Today’s translations (especially concerning works such as Darwin’s), often find themselves under heavy scrutiny (as the reviews and articles in the sources show, and of course the influence of articles by for example Nord and van Leuven-Zwart as they were used in this thesis) and errors will more than likely be harshly judged. Looking back on the entirety, it very much seems as if this initially omitted element is in fact a primary influence on how the translators would treat the translation, leading to the development being the exact inverse of what the initial expectation was.

With all that, the initial question of how the Dutch translations of *Origin of Species* have changed throughout the years in the areas of modality, jargon and intended audience, and does this relate to their reception in their respective times can finally be answered.

The answer is that the translations have indeed changed significantly between then and now; they changed from being significantly different with the translator adding original material, to remaining close to the original text they were based in letter, spirit and modality. The context of controversies and reception did have an effect due to the translator who lived during the years of controversy being firmly set in the ‘pro-Darwin’ camp at the time, this being especially evident in the first translation. Today, with Darwin’s theory having long since been accepted as likely correct, and in combination with the science of translation having evolved as it has, it is likely that there is much less a need to convince people that your favourite naturalist was right and more of a need to ensure people reading a translation getting the same experience from it as reading the original.

Interestingly, this also means that the issue that opened this thesis, the change of meaning of the term ‘survival of the fittest’ has less to do with how it was translated and more to do with a combination of misinterpretation from people who were only vaguely familiar

with *Origin of Species*, and the change that the English and Dutch languages has undergone over the years. It is unfortunate that the most recent translation of Darwin had been based on the first edition and as such has no mention of ‘survival of the fittest’ at all, but on the other hand we can extrapolate from Hellemans translation that, if ‘survival of the fittest’ had been used in this edition, it is quite unlikely Hellemans would have made the error to translate it as simply ‘de sterkste overleven’, considering his nigh-unfailing loyalty and fidelity to the source text.

In a curious way, it seems as if Darwin might have been proud to see this development because it resulted in people of a different language finally being able to read his words as intended. And, of course to see confirmation that ‘survival of the fittest’ works for translations as well; with Darwin’s carefully chosen words ‘fitting’ so well that they even survived passing the test of time and the language-barrier besides.

7. WORKS CITED

- “Abstract.” Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. 2008. Merriam-Webster Online. 6 January 2012. <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/abstract>>
- Collins, Peter. Modals and Quasi-modals in English. New York: Edition Rodopi B.V. 2009
- “Complex.” Oxford Dictionaries. 2011. Oxford University Press. 5 January 2012. <<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/complex?q=complex>>
- Darwin, Charles. The Origin of Species and the Voyage of the Beagle. London: Everyman’s Library, 2003
- . The Origin of species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. 2nd ed. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1860
- . Het ontstaan der soorten van dieren en planten door midden van natuurkeus. Trans T.C. Winkler Haarlem: A.C. Kruseman, 1860
- . Het ontstaan der soorten van dieren en planten door midden van natuurkeus. Trans T.C. Winkler. Utrecht: J.G. Broese, 1869
- . The Origin of species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. 6th ed. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1872
- . Het ontstaan der soorten van dieren en planten door midden van natuurkeus. 2nd Ed. Trans T.C. Winkler. Utrecht: J.G. Broese, 1883
- . Over het ontstaan van soorten door middel van natuurlijke selectie, of behoud van bevooroordeelde rassen in de strijd om het leven. Trans L. Hellemans. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Nieuwezijds, 2000
- . The Autobiography of Charles Darwin. Ed. Barlow, N. London: Collins: 1958
- “Darwin to John Fordyce”. Darwin Correspondence Database. 2011. University of Cambridge. 6 January 2012. <<http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/entry-12041>>
- Fowler, H Ramsey. The Little, Brown Handbook. 10th ed. United States: Pearson Education, Inc. 2007
- “Effectually.” Oxford Dictionaries. 2011. Oxford University Press. 5 January 2012. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/effectual?q=effectually#effectual__5>
- “Efficiently.” Oxford Dictionaries. 2011. Oxford University Press. 5 January 2012. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/efficient?q=efficiently#efficient__4>
- Falger, V.S.E. “149 jaar ‘Origin of Species’ in vertaling.” Boekenpost. Vol. 17, Iss. 104 (2009). 7-9.
- “Herbert Spencer.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 27 February 2002. Stanford University. 6 January 2012. <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spencer/>>
- “Inhabitant”. Oxford Dictionaries. 2011. Oxford University Press. 5 January 2012. <<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/inhabitant?q=inhabitant>>
- “Keuze”. Van Dale. 2011. Vandale.nl. 6 January 2012.

<<http://www.vandale.nl/vandale/zoekService.do?selectedDictionary=nn&selectedDictionaryName=Nederlands&searchQuery=keuze>>

Leeuwenburgh, Bart. Darwin in Domineesland. Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2009

Van Leuven-Zwart, Kitty. “Een goede vertaling, wat is dat?” Trans. van Rinsum, Cornelia, et al. Denken over Vertalen. Ed. Ton Naaijken, Cees Koster, Henri Bloemen en Caroline Meijer. Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2004. 301 - 311

“Ludo Hellemans”. De Bib, het leven van A tot Z. 2009. Bibliotheek.be. 25 September 2001. <<http://zoeken.bibliotheek.be/authors/Hellemans,%20Ludo>>

Nijland, R. “Dicht bij de oorsprong der soorten”. De Volkskrant. 25 November 2000. Volkskrant.nl. 6 January 2012. <<http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2844/Archief/archief/article/detail/568224/2000/11/25/Dicht-bij-de-oorsprong-der-soorten.dhtml>>

Nord, Christiane. “Tekstanalyse en de moeilijkheidsgraad van een vertaling”. Trans. van Rinsum, Cornelia, et al. Denken over Vertalen. Ed. Ton Naaijken, Cees Koster, Henri Bloemen en Caroline Meijer. Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2004. 235-242

“Schepping of evolutie?” Bijbelarchief. 2011. Bijbelaktueel.nl. 6 January 2012.

“Selectie”. Van Dale. 2011. Vandale.nl. 6 January 2012. <<http://www.vandale.nl/vandale/zoekService.do?selectedDictionary=nn&selectedDictionaryName=Nederlands&searchQuery=selectie>>

“The Editions of the Origin of Species”. FourSenses.net. 9 June 2009. FourSenses.net. 6 January 2012 <<http://en.foursenses.net/editionsorigin>>

“The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin – Day 58 of 188”. Turtle Reader. 25 September 2011. <<http://www.turtlereader.com/authors/charles-darwin/the-life-and-letters-of-charles-darwin-day-58-of-188/>>

Vaderlandse Letteroefeningen. Vol 1967. Utrecht: L.E. Bosch en zoon. 1867. 18 - 20

Venhuizen, Gemma. “Precisie, eenvoud of omvang? Darwins meesterwerk, geëvolueerd in drie edities.” Athaneum Boekhandel. 11 December 2009. Athaneum.nl. 6 January 2012. <<http://www.athanaeum.nl/recensies/darwin-ontstaan-van-soorten>>

Walmsley, T. “Psychiatry in descent: Darwin and the Brownes”. Psychiatric Bulletin. Volume 17 (1993). 748-751

“Wie is de sterkste die overleeft?” Evolutietheorie.be. 2008. Universiteit Gent. 6 January 2012. <<http://www.evolutietheorie.ugent.be/node/100>>