

Free Indirect Discourse in *Mrs. Dalloway*:

An Analysis of the Translation Strategies and Interpretive Possibilities in Three
Dutch Translations

MA Thesis Translation Studies (“Master Vertalen”) Utrecht University

Faculty of Humanities

English Department

Sjoerd Hendrik (Erik) Groot (3709744)

Supervisor: dr. Cees Koster

Second Reader: dr. Onno Kusters

August 2014

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Interpreting <i>Mrs. Dalloway</i>	9
3. Theory	15
3.1 Point of View / Focalization	15
3.2 Direct Discourse, Indirect Discourse and Free Indirect Discourse	17
3.3 Free Indirect Discourse in <i>Mrs. Dalloway</i>	24
3.4 Translation Problems in Free Indirect Discourse	31
4. Method	34
5. Corpus	38
6. Analysis	45
6.1 Syntax	45
6.2 Semantics	56
6.3 Punctuation	61
7. Conclusion	68
7.1 Summary of Results	68
7.2 Answer to Research Question	71
7.3 Reflection	73
8. Bibliography	75
9. Appendices	79
9.1 Source text	79
9.2 Translation [1]	80
9.3 Translation [2]	82
9.4 Translation [3]	84

1. Introduction

This thesis will explore the stylistic device free indirect discourse (FID) and what effect different translation strategies of FID have on the target text. The research material will be Virginia Woolf's novel *Mrs. Dalloway* and its three translations into Dutch. The purpose of this investigation is to describe and compare the different translation strategies used to translate FID in order to get a closer look at what effects different translation strategies can have on the interpretive possibilities that the target text offers.

The reason I chose FID as my subject of research is that the translation of FID can have a great impact on the target text. When I read Jane Austen's *Emma* in translation, it was by far the duller book I had ever read. I did not see what all the fuss was about and why the novel belonged to the world's greatest novels. By comparing the original and the translation, it became clear that the translator may not have been aware of the ambiguity caused by FID, thus obliterating Austen's "two main weapons", as Reichman Lemon puts it, her "individual wit and insight", and her "power of mimicking, of entering into another's being, of momentarily becoming another character" (1979, 95). These two abilities combined allowed Austen to mock her characters in such a subtle way that it almost seems as if the characters are mocking themselves.

The reason that *Mrs. Dalloway* is used as the corpus for this study is that Virginia Woolf is one of the best-known modernist writers who adopted this style of writing. She “rejects the artificial structures of Victorian fiction and writes aptly for the Modernist era[:] language awry, cultural cohesion lost, perception fragmented and multiplied” (Goldman in Langeroodi 2014). The strength of the novel, which revolves around just a single day in the life of Clarissa Dalloway, is FID, because it “allow[s] [Woolf] to present the most complex human relationships and the shifts in human consciousness that occur in only seconds” (Jones 1997, 70). Much of the speech and thought of the narrator and of almost every character are rendered in FID (with two characters in particular, on which I will elaborate later), which causes ambiguity to dominate certain parts of the story, leaving the reader with multiple possible interpretations of the story. FID is one of the most important features of the novel and certain translation choices can radically alter the effect that FID has in translations of the novel, thus making it an interesting subject for research.

FID as a narrative mode is a popular research subject in the field of narratology. This literary technique, identified by Charles Bally in 1912 as *style indirect libre* and used by many modernistic writers, offers a whole new way of rendering a character’s words and thoughts. As a mix of Direct discourse (DD) and Indirect discourse (ID), FID is in a “sort of halfway house position, not claiming to be the reproduction of the original speech, but at the same time being more than a mere indirect rendering of that original” (Leech and Short 2007, 57). Much research has dealt with questions like ‘how exactly is FID created?’, ‘What effect does FID have on

a text?' and matters like determining the boundaries of DD, FID and ID. However, research into FID and its translation has been relatively scarce.

In their book *Style in Fiction*, Geoffrey Leech and Mick Short give three categories that are important in FID: grammar, semantics and graphology. Most studies of FID in translation limit themselves only to the first category, grammar. The reason for this is that FID requires a third person reference and the past tense in English, elements that in some languages present major translation problems. For example, in her study of a Finnish translation of D.H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*, Tarja Rouhiainen finds that the required third person reference poses a translation problem because in Finnish only one word exists for both 'he' and 'she' (*hän*). As Rouhiainen observes: "Ambiguities and grammatical oddities often arise if the English pronouns are indeed replaced by *hän*" (2000, 110). Another example of where grammar causes translation problems in FID comes from French. Poncharal tells us that French uses the *passé simple* (simple past) for past tense narration, but that the *imparfait* (imperfect) is used to render FID while English uses the simple past for both past tense narration and FID (Poncharal in Bosseaux 2007, 61). Many of these studies thus only focus on the inadequacy of the target language that poses translation problems in FID. Because English and Dutch have for the greatest part the same way and means of creating FID, there are no major grammatical shortcomings to overcome as a translator. Nonetheless, the other aspects of FID mentioned by Leech and Short semantics and graphology, are also interesting research subjects. Although there is not that much research into these other aspect of FID in translation, a related

category, point of view in translation, has been covered by various studies (Levenston & Sonnenschein 1986; Bosseaux 2004, 2007, 2008; Taivalkoski-Shilov 2010). All of these studies include, but are not restricted to, FID. Even though these studies include research into FID, in this thesis I want to focus exclusively on FID and the translation strategies used to translate it. Because point of view and focalization, for example, are always intimately connected with FID, these elements will also be dealt with.

FID is used heavily in *Mrs. Dalloway* and this creates much ambiguity in the novel. Often it is not exactly clear through whom the reader experiences the story, the character, or the narrator. FID has a strong function in *Mrs. Dalloway*. It may be used to let the reader form his own interpretation of the novel. This is established by “an overlap of the character’s and the narrator’s voice. [...] What is sensed is a fusion of voices which result in a combination of perspectives. [...] The resulting polyphonic effect is so vivid that it can hardly be renounced” (Faini 2012, 40).

Translators have to take into account that this literary device is very important for the experience of the reader and that certain translation choices can alter the effects that FID has on the text. However, because FID creates ambiguity, it is possible that translators interpret the text differently, resulting in a possible change of perspective in the translation. In this thesis, the different translation strategies used by translators to translate FID in *Mrs. Dalloway* into Dutch will be analyzed and compared to each other to see what effect these strategies have on the interpretive possibilities of the target text. My research question is as follows:

Which translation strategies are used to translate free indirect discourse in the Dutch translations of Mrs. Dalloway and what consequences do these have for the interpretation of the target texts?

To answer this research question, different sub-questions will be answered first to help provide a more thorough investigation. The first sub-question is *'What is FID and what kind of translation problems can arise from it?'* This will help to establish a proper definition of FID before looking at possible translation problems. The second sub-question, *'Which translation strategies are used to translate FID in Mrs. Dalloway?'* will look at the three translations and analyze them in terms of translation strategies used for the translation of FID. After that, the third sub-question, *'How do the translations differ from each other and from the source text in terms of focalization?'* will give a detailed analysis of the comparison of the three translations and the source text in terms of focalization.

To analyze the three translations, Holmes' so-called 'repertory method' will be used, where a list of features will be established beforehand by which the source text and target texts will be compared and analyzed (1988, 89). The analysis will provide an elaborate account of the translation strategies used by the translator to translate FID and the effect that it has on the target text. After that the different translations will be compared with each other and with the source text to answer the main research question.

First, a general analysis of *Mrs. Dalloway* and the interpretive possibilities in the source text will be given. After that, a more theoretical chapter will deal with FID, its use, its effect and an analysis of FID in *Mrs. Dalloway*. I will also devote a part of this chapter to terms like 'focalization' and 'point of view', because many different researchers use the same terms with slightly different meanings. That part of the chapter will give an overview of these different uses and make clear how these terms are used in this thesis. After the theory, the corpus for the research will be discussed and explained, accompanied by a stylistic analysis of the passages used for the research. This is followed by a detailed description of the research method. After this it is time for the actual research. The chosen passages will be compared on the basis of the units of comparison that were established. After discussing the results of this analysis I will conclude with summing up the most important discoveries and by answering the main research question. Lastly I will comment shortly on this research and possible ideas for further research into this subject.

2. Interpreting *Mrs. Dalloway*

At first, *Mrs. Dalloway* can be seen as a typical example of 'one day in the life of...'.

We follow Clarissa Dalloway during the day when she prepares for the party she is organizing that evening. In spite of the plot being very uneventful, the story is far from dull. We hear Clarissa reminiscing about her past (she is 52 on the day she is organizing a party) and wondering how her life may have panned out had she done things differently. For example, she thinks about how her life would have been if she had married the more adventurous Peter Walsh instead of choosing safety and money as she did by marrying Richard Dalloway.

Apart from witnessing Clarissa's day, we witness the final day of Clarissa's 'double', Septimus Warren Smith, a World War I veteran suffering from shell shock, who spends the day with his wife, Rezia Warren Smith. "This doubling is achieved through shared reflections on objects, events and hours in that single day [and] stylistically [...] by the degree to which the entire narrative is shared by the story of each character" (Miller 2006, 172). Even though the point of view of almost every character in the book is shared. Clarissa and Septimus stand out as being the central characters in the story. It could be said that the story thus revolves around Clarissa and Peter, and Septimus and Rezia. Even though they are witnessing the same event at the same place (the car in Bond Street), see each other from a distance at Regent's Park and reflect upon each other (especially Clarissa, who suddenly feels very

connected to Septimus when she hears about his suicide), they never actually meet throughout the story.

The whole story includes the points of view of a multitude of characters, even of the most minor characters. In *Mrs. Dalloway*, Woolf “has learned to subordinate [...] moral issues by submerging and displacing them in a multitude of points of view” (Transue 1986, 92). Moreover, not only moral issues, but also nearly every other issue can be seen from more than one character’s point of view, and “[a]s the scale of measuring the plot becomes more detailed, including ostensibly trivial matters, there is a potential for issues of importance to emerge inclusively and the ‘summary’ ceases to be a mere summary but rather approaches interpretation” (Hoff 2014). It is thus the case that every reader of *Mrs. Dalloway*, rather than summarizing the novel, gives an interpretation of it and it will come as no surprise that many of these interpretations differ greatly. Hoff goes even further by saying that “[t]he complexity of such a text as *Mrs. Dalloway* that fosters a multiplicity of interpretations suggests, of course, a textual labyrinth. Its ambiguity is confusing and its circles are repetitious in which elaborate chaos is transformed into pattern” (2009, 244). In his essay “Misreading *Mrs. Dalloway*”, Bell collects different interpretations from various essays to show that “after all these years, the issue of Clarissa Dalloway remains ambiguous” (2006, 94). He goes on to say that “[t]here is so much reported thinking going on in the heads of so many characters – with virtually no guidance from the impartial narrator as to what *we* should be thinking – that Clarissa Dalloway hardly seems to be a protagonist but instead is a unifying device around

which other characters' thoughts cohere" (2006, 94 [emphasis Bell]). Studies show that the interpretation among readers differs greatly. For example, a study conducted by Sopčák and Kuiken, where participants were asked to read certain passages twice and then give their opinion of what they found "striking or evocative" (2012), found that readers fell into five different reader profiles: (1) Interpreting Death and Injustice, (2) Compassion for Victims of Injustice, (3) Existentialist Echoes, (4) Existential Resignation, and (5) Existential Affirmation.

Because the events in the novel are seen from multiple perspectives, the reader has a choice which characters he believes. For example, certain readers may find character X more reliable than character Y because of the way the other characters think about character X. By presenting the events from multiple characters' points of view, the reader is forced, as it were, to make a recollection himself of the event and situations and form his own opinion.

Another way in which FID leaves room for the reader to form his own recollection and opinion about events or issues is not by presenting them in multiple points of view, but leaving the character it concerns out of the event and presenting it only through another character. An example of this can be seen in the scene where Doris Kilman is praying in Westminster Abby and we hear not Doris, but an impartial character, a Mr. Fletcher, who describes what Doris Kilman is doing:

"But Mr. Fletcher had to go. He had to pass her, and being himself neat as a new pin, could not help being a little distressed by the poor lady's disorder;

her hair down; her parcel on the floor. She did not at once let him pass. But, as he stood gazing about him, at the white marbles, grey window panes, and accumulated treasures (for he was extremely proud of the Abbey), her largeness, robustness, and power as she sat there shifting her knees from time to time (it was so rough the approach to her God—so tough her desires) impressed him” (134).

A second good example is when Peter Walsh speculates about Clarissa writing a letter to him:

“To get that letter to him by six o’clock she must have sat down and written it directly he left her; stamped it; sent somebody to the post. It was, as people say, very like her. She was upset by his visit. She had felt a great deal; had for a moment, when she kissed his hand, regretted, envied him even, remembered possibly (for he saw her look it) something he had said—how they would change the world if she married him perhaps; whereas, it was this; it was middle age; it was mediocrity; then forced herself with her indomitable vitality to put all that aside, there being in her a thread of life which for toughness, endurance, power to overcome obstacles and carry her triumphantly through he had never known the like of. Yes; but there would come a reaction directly he left the room. She would be frightfully sorry for him; she would think what in the world she could do to give him pleasure

(short always of the one thing), and he could see her with the tears running down her cheeks going to her writing-table and dashing of that one line which he was to find greeting him. . . . "Heavenly to see you!" And she meant it" (155-156).

These passages describe the situation precisely but the reliability of the account seems to be questionable. As Bell stated above, the narrator does not give us clues as to who and what we should believe, and thus it is hard to say how we should interpret the portrayal of Doris Kilman by Mr. Fletcher for example, or what we should believe of Peter's speculation of how Clarissa wrote the letter to him. Because of the FID, these passages "cannot be thoroughly or even partially described to either the narrator or to the character" (Faini 2012, 40). There is certainly no *one* way to interpret all this and different interpretations make for different portrayals of the characters. That in turn can influence which characters the reader thinks are reliable and how he further interprets the novel.

The second way in which these passages can be confusing to figure out is the amount of narratorial intrusion in the text. For example, in the second passage, where Peter puts together the story of Clarissa writing the letters, the focalization could be either only from Peter, who just lets his imagination run wild and leaves the reader with pieces that can be unreliable, or the narrator is involved in this passage

and she¹ tells the reader exactly what happened in Peter's idiolect. As Roy Pascal argues, "Even though the authorial mode is preserved throughout, the narrator, [...]when reporting the words or thought of a character[...] places himself [...]directly into the experiential field of the character, and adopts the latter's perspective" (Pascal in Jones 1997, 71).

This kind of ambiguity is precisely what makes determining the narration of a passage so hard and what gives rise to the multiple possible interpretations of the novel.

¹ For the sake of clarity I will refer to the narrator with 'she' in this thesis. This does not mean that I automatically refer to Virginia Woolf, even though the narrator and Woolf can often be seen as one

3. Narrative Theory

3.1 Point of View/Focalization

In their book *Point of View, Perspective and Focalization*, Hühn et al. present a collection of essays dealing with different terms like focalization, point of view and perspective, and how they are used by different researchers (Hühn et al. 2009).

Bosseaux gives us a fairly simple definition of the concept of point of view: “In a world of fiction, a novelist creates a fictional world that is presented from a particular angle, refracted through the values and views of a character or narrator” (2007, 15). Lorente writes that “the dichotomy between point of view and focalization sanctions the existence of two major traditions – Anglo-American studies on ‘point of view’ [...] and Genette’s narratological category of ‘focalization’[...]” (1996, 64).

In 1972, Gerard Genette introduced the term ‘focalization’ because he was of the opinion that the term ‘point of view’ implied only the visual sense of a particular character of narrator, when the other senses are just as important in the study of narration to determine from what angle the events are presented to the reader. Along with the term ‘focalization’ he offers two key questions: “who speaks?” and “who sees?” (Levenson and Sonnenschein 1986, 49). The first question, “who speaks?”, is the more simple one of the two. It is always the narrator who speaks, except in situations where direct speech is employed. Levenson and Sonnenschein make the point that in fact the narrator is always the one who speaks, even in direct discourse,

but for the “interests of greater theoretical clarity” they ignore that (Ibid., 49). The second question, “who sees”, is a more complex one. First of all, the question “who sees?” is an abbreviated version and still implies only the visual sense. The full form of the question is “qui est le personnage dont le point de vue oriente la perspective narrative?” (Ibid., 49). We can see here that focalization is not just about the visual sense, but rather the perspective of the character or narrator. Levenson and Sonnenschein then offer us a comprehensive list of what exactly this ‘point of view’ entails. First of all, it has to do with a character’s perception, which includes all the senses (hearing, feeling, smelling, tasting and seeing). Secondly, what is perceived “by any of the forms of cognition: thought imagined, wished, hoped decided, inferred [...]” (Ibid., 50). As a third category they include “everything that is undergone actively or passively” (Ibid., 50). Even though Genette has caused a dichotomy between point of view and focalization, Genette tells us that his term ‘focalization’ was never more than a “reformulation” to systemize and organize the concept (1990, 65). However, Bosseaux demonstrates that not everyone treats these terms (focalization and point of view) as equals. She writes that point of view can be divided into two categories, “focalization” and “mind style”, where focalization deals with the question of “whose eyes and whose mind witness and report the fictional world” and mind style, which concerns “the individuality of the mind that does the focalizing” (2007, 5). So where Genette only tried to reformulate the concept

²“Who is the character whose viewpoint directs the narrative perspective?” [Translation mine]

of point of view, Bosseaux sees focalization only as a part of it instead of as a reformulation.

Thus, it is very important to define beforehand which terms are used and how those terms are defined to avoid confusion. In this thesis I will stick to the term **focalization** as introduced by Genette. Both the terms **narrator** and **focalizer** are used in this thesis, where the narrator is the one who speaks and the focalizer is the one who not only sees, but also perceives and undergoes, whether it be passively or actively. The term **point of view** (POV) will be used as a synonym for focalization. For example, 'The focalization is done through Jane', 'Jane is the focalizer' and 'we see it from Jane's POV' all refer to the same concept, namely Genette's concept of focalization. When quotes are used where the terms defined above appear in a way that may cause confusion, I will elaborate on this and explain if necessary.

3.2 Direct Discourse, Indirect Discourse and Free Indirect Discourse

Point of view is one of the most important factors in determining FID. In FID, the thought or speech of a character is "woven into the narrative fabric" (Miller 2006, 173), so that it becomes hard to tell whether the reader is presented with the narrator's POV, the character's POV, or the thoughts or speech of someone else about that character. FID is often hard to identify and more information about how this discourse mode works can help to identify it more easily. It is thus important to first determine how FID is established and how it differs from discourse modes such as DD and ID. When it is clear what elements determine the 'free' part of FID, it

becomes much easier to identify FID in texts, although there are also other ‘tricks’ to help identify FID, which will be dealt with later in this chapter. FID is generally defined in opposition to both DD and ID (Leech and Short 2007; Bosseaux 2007; Verhagen 2012, among many others). In order to fully understand FID, it can be useful to first take a quick look at DD and ID.

According to Leech and Short, when one uses DD to report someone’s words or thoughts, “one quotes” the words or thoughts used by someone, in opposition to ID, where one reports the words or thoughts “in one’s own words” (2007, 255). To clarify, look at these sentences below.

(1) He said, “I’ll come back here to see you again tomorrow.” (Direct Discourse)³

(2) He said that he would return there to see her the following day. (Indirect Discourse)

As we can see here, the “he” character in (1) is directly quoted by the narrator. Those words are the exact words the character spoke and the narrator is only seen by the reporting clause at the end of the sentence. This is in contrast with (2), where the narrator is the one who retells what the character has said. Notice that in ID, the complementizer ‘that’ is used, which makes the second part of the sentence

³ The following example sentences (1-5) taken from Leech and Short’s *Style in Fiction*

subordinate. ‘That’ also introduces a ‘retelling’ because the actual words of the character cannot be used after ‘that’, as in (3).

(3) *⁴He said that I’ll come back here to see you again tomorrow.

All the features of DD and ID are shown below in a table, which is taken from Verhagen’s (2012) article “Construal and Stylistics”.

	DD	ID
<i>tense</i>	present	past
<i>person</i>	1st, 2nd	3rd
<i>deictic pro/adv</i>	proximal	distal
<i>subordinator</i>	absent	optional

Table 1: Features of Direct Discourse and Indirect Discourse in English

As can be seen, the most basic features are that DD is always reported in the present while ID is reported in the past tense. Also, ID most often is written in first person POV (“I’ll come back...”), but second person POV is also an option, although you barely see that in novels. This is contrary to ID, where the third person POV is used (“He said that...”).

Another category is deixis and has to do with the representation of the environment in which the characters and narrator are situated. Bosseaux tells us that

⁴ The asterisk (*) is a symbol used in linguistics used to denote grammatically incorrect sentences.

“deixis [essentially deals] with relations in space and time and it is always seen from an individual’s perspective; for this reason it is also known as spatio-temporal point of view” (2007, 28). Because the deictic center is always seen from an individual point of view, there can be only one deictic center and it can be that of one of the characters or that of the narrator. According to where they are situated in the story, the deictic center is established. For example, as can be seen in the table above, the deixis in DD is always proximal, meaning that the deictic center is very close to the character⁵.

When looking at (1) again, one word in particular stands out: “here”. This shows that the character is speaking the words at the exact place that “here” refers to. The deictic center is the character himself. If he would be at another place, he would have used a more distant deictic word, like ‘I’ll come back *there*’. Other examples of proximal and distant deixis are ‘now/then’, ‘this/that’, etc. In ID, the deixis is always distant, because the narrator only retells what the character has said. The narrator is not at the actual location where the speech or thought act takes place. Consequently, as can be seen in (2), the word “there” is used instead of “here”. This shows that the spatio-temporal point of view lies with the narrator instead of the character. Another distinction between (1) and (2) is “tomorrow” and “the following day”, which is deixis that has to do with time. “The following day” denotes that the narrator is retelling, after the character has spoken. If the narrator also used ‘tomorrow’, the

⁵ For the sake of clarity I will not discuss the second person POV because that is hardly ever used in novels and is not present in *Mrs. Dalloway*.

tomorrow from the narrator would be a different point in time than the tomorrow of the character because the narrator retells the story at a later point in time.

The last category has to do with subordination. In DD there is no subordinator, only the quoted words of the character and the reporting clause from the narrator. In ID however, a subordinator is optional. In (2), the complementizer “that” is present, but when looking at (4) in comparison with (2), it can be seen that the complementizer “that” is optional. Both sentences are grammatically correct and are interchangeable.

(4) He said he would return there to see her the following day.

FID lies somewhere in between DD and ID. According to Pascal, FID is a “dual voice”, it “bears a double intonation, that of the character and that of the narrator, [...] it is, in fact, a dual voice” (Pascal 1977, 18). Although FID takes features from both DD and ID, it is still called ‘indirect’. Van Gunsteren writes that “it is *indirect* because it implies that both narrator and character are involved” (1990, 211 [emphasis Van Gunsteren]). Indeed, in ID it is the narrator that rephrases the character’s words or thoughts, while in DD the narrator is not involved and we only hear the character.⁶ Table 2, again from Verhagen (2012), shows the features that FID has in comparison to DD and ID.

⁶ Although technically speaking, the narrator is involved by quoting the character’s words and adding the reporting phrase (e.g. ‘he said’), I will ignore this for the sake of the greater point. The narrator

	DD	ID	FID
<i>tense</i>	present	past	past
<i>person</i>	1st, 2nd	3rd	3rd
<i>deictic pro/adv</i>	proximal	distal	proximal
<i>subordinator</i>	absent	optional	absent

Table 2: Features of Direct Discourse, Indirect Discourse and Free Indirect Discourse in English

FID takes on the past tense and third person POV from ID, while the deictic center remains in the character as in DD. Also, no subordinators are used in FID, keeping the main clause syntax. However, these features are not the only ones that make up FID. Huang notes that “FID has the tense and pronouns [of ID], without the *verbum dicendi* like ‘she said’, yet has the character’s deixis and lexis” (2011, 127 [emphasis Huang]). Thus, the reporting clause is absent in FID and apart from the character’s deixis, the character’s lexis is also adopted in the rendering. However, Leech and Short note that “the *most typical* manifestation is one where [...] the reporting clause is omitted”, thus saying that a reporting clause can exist within FID, but that it is rarely used (2007, 260 [emphasis mine]). If the sentences shown in (1) and (2) would be written in FID, a sentence like (5) would occur.

(5) He would return here to see her again tomorrow. (Free Indirect Discourse)

here serves as a mere ‘vehicle’ for transporting the character’s words or thoughts. Without the narrator, they would not be heard at all.

This FID rendering of sentences (1) and (2) shows almost every aspect of FID. Firstly, the past tense is used, together with the third person references. The deictic center lies in the character, as can be seen by words like “tomorrow”. The sentence shows simple main clause syntax and no reporting clause is used. The only aspect of FID that is missing in this sentence is the personal lexis of the character, but that will be dealt with in a later part of this chapter, when the focus lies on FID in *Mrs. Dalloway*.

Even though FID is sometimes hard to pinpoint in a text, there are ways to help identify FID. These clues are called “indices” by Bally and they can be both external and internal (Bally in Bosseaux 2007, 66). External indices are authorial material that introduces the FID in the text, and internal indices are indicators of FID from within the text. For example, syntax can be a good indicator of FID. As Bosseaux notes: “Strictly speaking, combinations of past tense verbs and present adverbs, as in ‘she was miserable now’, are ungrammatical, but in narrative discourse they are conventionally read as [...] the ‘dual voice’” (2007, 66). She adds that certain verbs and adverbs like *might, doubt, could, would, should, must, surely, certainly, perhaps, besides, doubtless*, etc. are indicators of FID because they “denote inward debate and uncertainty” (Ibid., 66). Rouhiainen expands this list of syntactical markers with more ‘indices’, like inverted questions, exclamatory or incomplete sentences, colloquial constructions, repetitions, hesitations, and false starts (2000, 115). Apart from syntactical indicators, there are also lexical indicators that can help identify FID. According to London, “lexical markers of FID may be said to comprise all such expressions that cannot plausibly be attributed to the narrator” (London in

Rouhiainen 2000, 115). What this means is that a sentence can be written in the tense and person agreement of ID, while still maintaining the character's idiom. This results in a sentence where both the narrator and the character can be heard. The narrator is speaking, but she takes on the language of the character. Bosseaux elaborates on this by saying that "[s]ome words will be either neutral or characteristic of the narrator; some will be suggestive of the character's idiolect or sociolect" (2007, 66). This mixture thus results in the 'dual voice' discussed earlier. These 'indices' are not the only way to identify FID in a text. A method of identifying FID is to change the third-person references to first-person references and the past tense to the present tense. If the sentence is still grammatically correct, chances are great it is FID. Take for example sentence (5). Changing the tense and person agreement will result in (6), a perfectly grammatical sentence.

(6) I will return here to see you again tomorrow.

3.3 Free Indirect Discourse in *Mrs. Dalloway*

In *Mrs. Dalloway*, Woolf was in search of a new narrative strategy. She recognized that "neither dialogue nor narrator summary" would suffice for presenting the complex human consciousness (Jones 1997, 70). As Woolf herself wrote, she "would have devised a method, clear and composed as ever, but deeper and more suggestive, for conveying not only what people say, but what they leave unsaid; not only what they are, but what life is" (1925, 59). In her diary, Woolf calls this literary

technique "tunneling", on which she wrote the following: "I shall say a good deal about the hours and my discovery: how I dig out beautiful caves behind my characters: I think that gives exactly what I want; humanity, humour, depth. The idea is that the caves shall connect and each comes to daylight at the present moment" (Woolf 1953, 60).

The narrator plays an important role in FID, even though she may be mostly invisible in a majority of FID passages. The difference between FID and both DD and ID is the extent to which the narrator is visible in the text. In DD, the narrator barely gets a word in (only contributing the reporting phrase) while in ID the narrator is very prominent. In FID, however, the narratorial presence lies somewhere in between. It can be hard to distinguish between the character's voice and the narrator's. As Hoff puts it: "The narrator [...] must almost always share the stage with the characters it seems, expressing their narrated focalizations, hardly getting a word in edgewise as conventional narrators usually can do. Still, narratorial intrusions occasionally come in the form of parentheses—sometimes occupying an entire paragraph, sometimes excavating only a part of the paragraph, sometimes merely claiming a small space in the middle of a sentence" (2009, 256). These narratorial intrusions occur frequently in passages of FID in *Mrs. Dalloway* and are used by the narrator to subtly comment on characters, events or situations. Because these comments occur in the middle of the thoughts or speech of characters, it can be hard sometimes to make a distinction between character and narrator. That is exactly

what makes these comments so subtle. The following sentence contains such a comment:

(7) "Evelyn was a good deal out of sorts, said Hugh, intimating by a kind of pout or swell of his very well-covered, manly, extremely handsome, perfectly up-holstered body (he was almost too well dressed always, but presumably had to be, with his little job at Court)[...]" (6).

This passage occurs in the beginning of the novel, when Clarissa goes out to buy flowers and runs into Hugh. The passage is surrounded by instances of FID and the reader mostly sees Clarissa's POV. Hugh is portrayed as nothing less than a handsome gentleman, until the parentheses. Especially the "little job at court" is quite condescending towards Hugh and makes the rest of the sentence (well-covered, manly, extremely handsome, etc.) seem ironic. When such a sentence is embedded in sentences that show Clarissa's POV, it is easily read as being Clarissa's thoughts. However, from the context it becomes clear that Clarissa is one of the few characters in the novel that actually likes Hugh and would never say a bad word about him. Consequently, the reader can presume that this comment belongs to the narrator, who is subtly commenting on this character. About the undermining of characters by the narrator, Hoff also mentions that "[t]he narrator's double perspective in free indirect discourse is responsible for exposing [...] the flaws of these personages" (2009, 245). So although the narrator may seem invisible most of

the time, she stays at the surface, ready to comment on anything at any given moment.

Not only does the narrator give comments through bracketed statements, she also comments on what she sees as the faults of society through the words of other characters. Take, for example, the scene where William Bradshaw orders Septimus to six months rest to treat his condition.

(8) "To his patients he gave three-quarters of an hour; and if in this exacting science [...] a doctor loses his sense of proportion, as a doctor he fails. Health we must have; and health is proportion; so that when a man comes into your room and says he is Christ (a common delusion), and has a message, as they mostly have, and threatens, as they often do, to kill himself, you invoke proportion; order rest in bed; rest in solitude; silence and rest; rest without friends, without books, without messages; six months' rest; until a man who went in weighing seven stone six comes out weighing twelve" (99).

Sir William Bradshaw is so sure of himself that he has no doubt about this treatment for Septimus' condition. On the one hand, this passage of FID can be interpreted from Bradshaw's POV, that would be the 'standard' reading of this passage. A doctor that does what he thinks is best to cure a patient. However, as the novel makes clear, Peter is suffering from shell-shock, a condition that cannot be cured by ordering six months rest in isolation. The other reading is thus that of the narrator as focalizer,

who, through Bradshaw's words, criticizes the medical world. As Marnie Langeroodi writes: "Woolf witnessed that her contemporaries failed to recognize shell shock as a serious mental condition, and uses Bradshaw as a vehicle through which to attack the medical community ill equipped to heal Septimus" (2014).

Another important function of FID in *Mrs. Dalloway* is what was already touched in this thesis, namely the multiple interpretations that are open to the reader. Because the POV of almost every character in the novel is expressed through FID, the reader not only sees what different characters think about each other without a clear narrative authority, the reader is also given a dual voice, that of the narrator and that of the character. According to Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop, "the function of this dualism is [...] that it makes it possible for an outside consciousness (the reader's) to follow, understand and interpret the minds of the characters which the author creates" (2002, 41). The difficult part of this dual voice is that it is sometimes hard to distinguish between character and narrator. This in turn has an effect on how the reader interprets a certain event or situation. Margaret Doody writes that "[o]ur judgment emerges slowly, under the quiet guidance of the author, and can be completely formed only when we understand a character's point of view" (Doody in Jones 1997, 77). Thus the reader essentially has to side with the character or the narrator to interpret the event or situation before he can form his judgment about the characters. As suggested before, many readers will interpret the events and situations differently and thus will form a different opinion about what he or she reads. This is in line with Doody's point: "The author makes us see the world as the

character sees it, and we must comprehend his view before rejecting or modifying it” (Ibid.). A clear example of this polyphonic effect can be seen in the sentence below:

(9) “She understood; she understood without his speaking; his Clarissa” (118).

This is the scene where Richard Dalloway comes home from the lunch with Lady Bruton and brings home flowers for Clarissa. He desperately wants to tell her that he loves her but for some reason, he does not say it. He hands her the flowers without saying that he loves her. Sentence (9) can be interpreted in two clear, but very different ways. First of all, the reader can interpret this to be the voice of the narrator who is only observing and describing what happens. The “his Clarissa” at the end of the sentence can in that case be interpreted as the narrator commenting on how naïve Richard actually is. On the other hand, the reader can interpret this to be the voice of Richard, who may so naïve to think that he does not have to say that he loves his wife and giving her flowers might be enough. Clearly, these two different interpretations make for different judgments about the characters. In the first interpretation (that of the narrator’s voice) the reader most likely has a much better impression of Richard than in the second interpretation.

Because in FID the narrator takes on the idiom of the character to create a polyphonic effect, the character language is also an important part in translation. The character’s imprint then comes from “the presence of [...] emphatic markers which are typical of orality, i.e. exclamations, questions” or any other emphatic marker that

is usually not expressed by a narrator (Faini 2012, 40). Take the following sentence from *Mrs. Dalloway*:

(10) “*Goodness knows* he didn’t want to go buying necklaces with Hugh” (113 [emphasis mine]).

In this sentence we see a clear sign of an emphatic marker, namely the “goodness knows”, which is a typical expression that can be ascribed to the character instead of the narrator. This kind of emotional expression is usually not used by narrators and it gives the reader a mix of a narratorial frame, with a single expression that can be ascribed to the character. Without it, the sentence would be more easily interpreted as the narrator’s voice but because of the expression, the reader ends up with this dual voice.

Basically, with this ambiguity that is inherent in FID it is up to the reader to choose sides in this novel. It requires close reading to pick up on all the clues that might point to either the character’s voice or the narrator’s. Apart from the narrator who gives subtle critique of characters and society, the most important function of FID in *Mrs. Dalloway* is the ability leave the interpretations of events and situations up to the reader, who, according to Jones, “are continually being asked to suspend [their] judgment of them until all the evidence is compiled” (1997, 79).

3.4 Translation Problems in Free Indirect Discourse

Verhagen (2012) has also made a table showing the features of the different discourse modes in Dutch, resulting in table 3 below.

	DD	ID	FID
<i>tense</i>	present	past	past
<i>person</i>	1st, 2nd	3rd	3 rd
<i>deictic pro/adv</i>	proximal	distal	proximal
<i>subordinator</i>	absent	present	absent

Table 3: Features of Direct Discourse, Indirect Discourse and Free Indirect Discourse in Dutch

As can be seen in the two tables, the features that make up FID are the same in both English and Dutch. Both languages use the past tense and third person to create FID. However, these syntactical features are not the only elements that can pose translation problems in FID. Apart from the fact that the means with which these syntactical features are created may differ between languages, there are various other elements that can cause translation problems. First of all, as Huang (2011) and Bosseaux (2007) noted above, in FID the lexis and idiom of the character is often used while maintaining the narratorial framework. These different voices of all the characters and the narrator have to be preserved in the translation in order to maintain the ambiguity of this dual voice. When a translator fails to maintain the character's language in a FID excerpt, chances are the translation will only show one voice, that of the narrator. Another way in which the ambiguity might get lost in translation is by explicitation. On the basis of the 'explicitation hypothesis', established by Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1986), it is possible that translations will be

more explicit than their source texts, which can cause the ambiguity in FID to be lost. Blum-Kulka states that translators may be more explicit in their translations due to the process of interpretation the translators go through. This results in the “*explicitation hypothesis*”, which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. It follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation” (Blum-Kulka 1986, 19).

Another element that can cause translation problems in FID is the use of punctuation. As Enrique Alcaras Varó puts it: “In *Mrs. Dalloway*, one feels that the absence of semantic rigour is a result of the desire to reflect the instantaneousness or simultaneousness of thoughts, ideas, concepts, sensations and feelings shown graphically by commas, [semi-colons,] dashes, brackets or relative pronouns” (216). These punctuation marks can be an important factor in determining whose viewpoint the passage in FID is, because the characters and narrator have their own way of speaking and thinking, and the use of punctuation thus differs for each one of them. Therefore, the ambiguity can also be lost in translation when the use of punctuation is changed. Because in *Mrs. Dalloway*, Virginia Woolf uses punctuation marks such as commas, dashes and semi-colons to a far greater extent than what is considered normal in Dutch, it can be said that the translator may be more drawn towards a translation that is perfectly idiomatic in Dutch than to stick closely to the source text. Toury (1995) identified these translation ‘choices’ and made a distinction between two translation norms: ‘adequacy’ and ‘acceptability’. In the former the

translator tries to stay as close to the source text as possible, where in the latter the translator focuses more on delivering an idiomatic translation, possibly at the cost of some of the stylistic features of the source text. Toury notes that it is these “norms that determine the (type and extent of) equivalence manifested by actual translations” (1995, 60). Because Woolf makes such heavy use of different punctuation marks, translators might be drawn towards acceptability to avoid ungrammaticality in the target text. Moreover, “analyses have shown that punctuation marks in [Woolf’s] novels tend to change in translation. According to Rachel May (1997) and Elena Minelli (2005), there is a tendency among translators, regardless of target language, to use punctuation marks with a stronger function than what is used in the source text” (May and Minelli in Pihl 2013, 282). Their research has shown that translators are faithful to punctuation marks with a clear function, such as full stops, but tend to change or delete punctuation marks within sentences.

Clearly, it is not only the syntactic features that may pose translation problems for FID in translation from English to Dutch, but also the more stylistic features that are part of it, like deixis, lexis, idiom, punctuation, etc.

4. Method

Holmes makes distinction between two kinds of research methods for carrying out comparative research: the 'distinctive feature method' and the 'repertory method'.

The former is a research method where the researcher "will derive [...] a list of distinctive features [from the texts] which strike him as significant and deserving of comparative analysis" (1994, 89). Thus, the researcher makes a selection of features while analyzing the texts, one for the source text and one for the target text. After that, both lists are compared to analyze the translation shifts. A second working method, which Holmes calls the 'repertory method', is one where the researcher circumvents the *ad hoc* selection of features and where the researcher "[determines] beforehand a required repertory of features always to be analyzed, regardless of what specific text is involved" (Ibid.).

Both of these methods have their pros and cons. The distinctive feature method is first of all the more complete of the two, because most of all the features of the texts will be included in the analysis. Of course there is a great chance that not *every* feature will be included since some of them may be overlooked by researchers. Furthermore, Holmes argues that "the fact remains that none of the disciplines concerned with the nature of texts had given us a generally accepted intersubjective method for determining distinctive features in a concrete text" (Ibid.). When the research goal is to describe the translation shifts in ST and TT as thoroughly as possible, the distinctive feature method may be useful. However, when the research

is set on a specific element of the text (FID in this case), the repertory method might be a better way to go.

The repertory method might prove to be more efficient due to the fact that only the necessary elements are analyzed. The drawback of this method is a minor one. According to Edoardo Crisafulli, the repertory method “might be a useful point of departure for the comparative study of source and target text [...] but it is simply not feasible to ascertain in advance what textual features are relevant to all literary texts” (Crisafulli in De Wilde 2010, 31). However, this point is directed towards the analysis of a complete text and all its elements. This problem mostly ceases to exist when the research subject is not the whole text, but a specific element of the text. When analyzing only FID, it becomes much more feasible to establish a ‘complete’ list of features to be analyzed because not every feature of the whole text has to be taken into account, only those that are relevant to FID and translation. The theoretical part of this thesis has already dealt with the translation problems of FID and how they manifest themselves in the novel. Most of the translation researchers would agree that those features are important when doing research of FID in translation. Therefore, those features would constitute a relatively complete list.

Another choice the translator has to make is whether to use a bottom-up strategy or a top-down strategy. According to Cees Koster, “[a] bottom-up method departs from the notion that one first has to compare texts on the level of component parts (microstructure), then make an analysis of the source text and target texts as a whole (macrostructure)”, while “a top-down method starts with the establishment of

a common core of source and target text after which the way the two texts' component parts relate to this core is compared" (2011, 24). Although Anthony Pym argues that "it should make no difference which end you start at: all roads lead to Rome, and there are always dialectics of loops and jumps between levels" (2009, 11⁷), the bottom-up method can "produce much doubt and even more data" (2009, 13⁸), since the researcher immediately starts at the microstructure and is presented with a great amount of data before analyzing the text as a whole.

A third choice is whether to start the analysis with the source text or the target text. There are many different opinions about this issue. Holmes even thinks that the source and target texts should be analyzed simultaneously (Toury 1995). Since this thesis deals with one source text and three target texts, and the source text has already partly been dealt with previous in this thesis, I prefer to first analyze the source text before comparing it to the three target texts. In this way it becomes easier to compare the three source texts to one another because a 'standard' is already established when the source text was analyzed.

Elements to be compared will range from broad to specific, starting with **syntax**. Syntax will be concerned specifically with the syntactical aspects of FID and deixis in the translations in comparison to the source text. As was already shown in the chapters above, syntax is an important part of FID. In English as well as in Dutch, FID has third person references and past tense, and no subordinators can be used.

⁷ I was only able to find a chapter of the book without page numbers. Therefore the link to the article is included in the bibliography. The page number thus does not correspond with the book, but only with the article to which the hyperlink in the bibliography directs.

⁸ Ibid.

Apart from that, the different kinds of verbs used will also be analyzed because, for example, verbs that denote uncertainty and inward debate are also markers of FID. Also, the spatial-temporal point of view is very important in FID. It is one of the essential elements that create ambiguity in the text. A certain sentence might seem to be rendered by the narrator, but when the deictic center lies within the character, it suddenly becomes hard to tell who is focalizing.

The next element is **semantics**. This part has to do with style and the semantic implications of semantic choices by the translators. This can happen on lexical level as well as on stylistic level, for example word choices, semantic implications of those words and the language of the characters and the narrator. The lexis and idiom of the characters and narrator in the source text will be analyzed and compared with that of the translations. Also, the analysis will look at the use of pragmatic particles in the translations since this can have implications for whether the sentence can be interpreted as character language or narrator language.

Finally, the analysis will look at the **punctuation** in both source and target texts. Because Woolf makes excessive use of punctuation throughout her novel – and consequently also in FID –, this is an important element for the dual voice in FID. Because different characters may have different ways of speaking and thinking, the punctuation may be different. This can lead to the dual voice, where, for example, the reader stumbles upon a sentence that may be focalized by the narrator, but with the punctuation that is characteristic of a the rendition of a character's words and thoughts.

5. Corpus

The analysis will be executed on several passages from *Mrs. Dalloway*.

After a global analysis of the whole novel and its translations, four passages have been selected that represent the use and effects of FID in the novel the best. This is because this thesis does not allow for a full analysis of the whole novel. The example sentences and phrases and their translations used in the analysis are also selected to represent the translations in the most thorough way possible and to give the reader a general idea of the translation strategies used by the translators throughout the novel. The passages and their translations can be found in the appendix at the end of the thesis. In this chapter, the source text passages will be analyzed according to the three, often partly overlapping categories that have been established above, namely syntax, deixis, semantics and punctuation. I will try to discuss each category separately but when the clarity of the argument is at risk, different elements may be discussed together.

When looking at the syntax of the novel, the standard tense and person agreement can be seen in FID, namely third person and past tense. However, some variations can be observed within FID. Virginia Woolf makes excessive use of the continuous form in *Mrs. Dalloway*. One good example of this can be seen in the following sentence from the corpus:

“[...] feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen; looking at the flowers, at the trees with the smoke winding off them and the rooks rising, falling; standing, looking until Peter Walsh said [...]” (3).

In just a part of a sentence, the continuous form appears eight times. The sentence itself is written in FID and these continuous verbs appear in the middle of it. These verbs give the sentence a feel of immediacy. Because of this, even the surrounding past tense of FID feels like it is all happening now. As this verb form is not often used in Dutch, translators may have to come up with a different way to maintain that sense of immediacy. When looking at the length of sentences, for example, it can be observed that Clarissa is generally speaking or thinking in very long, drawn-out sentences, while Septimus often uses very compact short sentences to give the reader ‘chunks’ of information of what he is thinking. An example of this can be seen in the corpus:

“Holmes was coming upstairs. Holmes would burst open the door. Holmes would say "In a funk, eh?" Holmes would get him” (149).

Here we see Septimus right before he commits suicide. Septimus is suffering from shell shock, caused by the war. His doctor, Holmes, who is a terrible man in the eyes of Septimus and Rezia, wants to completely isolate him for six months to cure his

insanity. Thus, the short chunks of information come from the chaos in the mind of Septimus. Clarissa's sentences will be further discussed under punctuation since the punctuation is more relevant than the syntax when talking about a character's language in FID.

In FID sentences, the deictic center usually lies within the character while the narrative frame points towards the narrator (Bosseaux 2007, 32). That is one way in which the dual voice is created. When looking at the selected passages of *Mrs. Dalloway*, many deictic words can be found, for example "He would be back from India *one of these days*" (4 [emphasis mine]) or "she did not pity him, with *all this* going on" (186 [emphasis mine]). In the first sentence, past tense and the third person are used, which points towards a narrator focalizing this sentence. However, the word "these" indicates that the deictic center lies within the character. A narrator who is not a character in the story (as is the case in *Mrs. Dalloway*) would not be so close to the situation or event to use proximal deixis, but rather use distant deixis. The same goes for the second sentence. The overall structure of the sentence is a typical narratorial frame, but the proximal deixis ("this") points towards a focalizing character. If this sentence were fully focalized by the narrator, she would have used more distant deixis instead of proximal deixis. Thus, in these sentences we see traces from both the narrator and the character. Where the overall structure of the sentence points towards a narrator-focalizer, the deictic center of the sentence clearly lies within one of the characters. There are also cases in which the deictic center is hard to determine. This can be seen for example in the sentence "[...] and as for Peter Walsh,

he had never *to this day* forgiven her for liking him" (6 [emphasis mine]). Again, the third person narration and the past tense is that of the narrator, but in this sentence, the words "to this day" are ambiguous. They can be either from Clarissa or from the narrator. One interpretation is that where "to this day" would mean the day in the story, thus Clarissa's day, while the other interpretation would be the narrator's day, which is a while after Clarissa's day since the narrator is re-telling the story. Either way, Peter Walsh has not forgiven Clarissa for liking Hugh, but it does make a difference whether the reader interprets this sentence to be Clarissa's or the narrator's. Because the narrator (along with Peter and pretty much everyone else in the novel) is not particularly fond of Hugh (she comments on his actions and thoughts throughout the book), the interpretation that this sentence is the narrator's would mean that the reading of "to this day" seems more exaggerated and more intense than how Clarissa would have said it, since she does like Hugh. Thus, most of the deictic words in the novel seem to indicate either the character of the narrator, but there are also cases in which the deictic center is ambiguous.

When looking at the characters in *Mrs. Dalloway*, different use of language and style can be found. As was already noted earlier in this chapter, for example, the difference in sentence length between Clarissa and Septimus can be seen. It can also be noted that Clarissa is a more upbeat character than the rest. The use of language for Clarissa's character makes her seem happy, for example, by many references to nature: "fresh as if issued to children on a beach", "What a plunge!", "Like the flap of a wave", etc. (3). Clarissa almost always seems to be in good spirits. Even after she

heard about the suicide of Septimus, she tells us what an extraordinary night this is and goes back to her party to find her friends. Hugh, on the other hand, is a character that is somewhat pompous. He thinks he is more important than he actually is, which makes most characters dislike him. The narrator also has her own way of speaking by making remarks in the middle of sentences with the use of parentheses. Her tone can sometimes be condescending, especially when she makes a remark about Hugh, as was already shown. These characterizations and the language of the characters and narrator are important not only to the story but also for the ambiguity in FID. For example, the sentence “what a morning – fresh as if issued to children on a beach” (4), could be just the POV of the narrator, but because Clarissa is the one who makes excessive use of references to nature, we also hear Clarissa’s voice in this sentence.

The last category is that of punctuation. The different characters are characterized by the use of punctuation. For example, Clarissa often uses very long sentences with many punctuation marks, resulting in a “prolonged, sustained rhythmical movement, drawing breath again just when it seems about to stop, and continuing beyond a semi-colon [...] or the numbering or naming of a new section” (Miller 1983, 168). This use of punctuation gives the reader a feel of continuity. The thoughts are strung together into one ongoing sentence that could have easily been several separate sentences would it have been any other character. For example, consider the sentence

“The young man had killed himself; but she did not pity him; with the clock striking the hour, one, two, three, she did not pity him, with all this going on” (186).

We see here that in this relatively short sentence (for Clarissa) there are seven punctuation marks, excluding the full stop at the end, as that is only there to signal the end of the sentence. The first semi-colon could have easily been a full stop, just as the first comma. But by stringing all these parts together, the sentence gets a certain flow. We come closer to the brain of Clarissa and see how her thoughts follow each other up. She goes from here to there, in one string of thought. One of the best examples of these long thoughts in a drawn-out sentence is the following:

“How fresh, how calm, stiller than this of course, the air was in the early morning; like the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave; chill and sharp and yet (for a girl of eighteen as she then was) solemn, feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen; looking at the flowers, at the trees with the smoke winding off them and the rooks rising, falling; standing and looking until Peter Walsh said, ‘Musing among the vegetables?’” (3)

This sentence consists of nine commas and four semi-colons. The semi-colons are essential in these long sentences since they introduce a pause that is longer than that

of a comma, but shorter than a full stop. It is because of this that so many of Clarissa's thoughts can be presented in these single, long sentences. Since the overall structure of those sentences points towards the narrator as focalizer, Woolf's characteristic use of punctuation for Clarissa's character is necessary to maintain the ambiguity in these sentences.

6. Analysis

6.1 Syntax

Since English and Dutch both use the past tense and the third person POV to create FID, it can be expected that these features are mostly maintained in translation.

Indeed, this is the case in most of the more straightforward FID sentences. Take the following extract:

“He must have said it at breakfast one morning when she had gone out on to the terrace -- Peter Walsh. He would be back from India one of these days, June or July, she forgot which, for his letters were awfully dull” (3-4).

The syntactic features of FID in this sentence are that it is written in the past tense (“must have said”, “had gone out”, “would be back”, “forgot”, “were”) and that the third person POV is used. As can be seen in the three translations below, these features have been maintained in all three of the translations:

[1⁹] “Hij moest het op een morgen bij het ontbijt gezegd hebben toen ze naar buiten op het terras was gegaan – Peter Walsh. Hij zou dezer dagen, Juni of Juli, terugkomen, ze was vergeten wanneer, want zijn brieven waren verschrikkelijk vervelend” (5).

⁹ When referring to the translations, [1] refers to Nini brunt’s 1947 translation, [2] to her 1980 translation and [3] refers to Boukje Verheij’s 2013 translation.

[2] “Hij moest het op een morgen bij het ontbijt hebben gezegd, toen ze naar buiten, naar het terras was gegaan – Peter Walsh. Hij zou een dezer dagen uit India terugkomen, in juni of juli, ze was vergeten wanneer, want zijn brieven waren verschrikkelijk saai” (13).

[3] “Hij moest het op een ochtend tijdens het ontbijt hebben gezegd, toen ze het terras op was gelopen – Peter Walsh. Hij kwam een dezer dagen terug uit India, in juni of juli, dat wist ze niet meer, want zijn brieven waren ontzaglijk saai” (5).

The third person POV has been maintained in all translations, as could be expected. The verb tenses are also mostly maintained, with the exception of the phrase “he would be back from India one of these days”. Where Nini Brunt uses “zou terugkomen” in both translations [1] and [2], Boukje Verheij, in translation [3], chose to use the simple past verb “kwam”. This shift in tense does nothing to the structure of FID since both verbs are still past tense. However, when the deictic phrase “(een) dezer dagen” is included, a very clear difference can be seen in the effect between translations [1,2] and [3]. “would” and “zou” are both auxiliary verbs, that together with “one of these days” or “(een) dezer dagen” create ambiguity between past and present. Although the sentence is about something that happened in the past (the narrator narrating a past event), the sentence somehow feels like it can be in the

present (the character's thoughts at that precise moment in time). This is a very nuanced way of establishing the ambiguity in FID. When looking at translation [3], the contrast between the past ("kwam") and the present ("een dezer dagen") is more significant than it is in the source text or in translations [1] and [2]. Where this past-present feel is established in a nuanced way in [1] and [2], translation [3] makes the reader notice a very clear grammatical discrepancy in the sentence between past and present. Also, "would" is one of the verbs that indicate FID, since it expresses a certain amount of doubt (See Bosseaux as discussed in chapter 3, above). Through this verb, the reader can clearly hear Clarissa's voice and knows that she is not entirely certain when, and if Peter is coming back. The effect of this verb is maintained in translations [1] and [2], where "zou" is used as a translation for "would", both verbs that express doubt. However, translation [3] uses "kwam", a verb without any underlying doubt whatsoever. Suddenly, Clarissa's voice is less apparent and that of the narrator more prominent.

While most of these syntactical features are preserved in the translations, some differences can be noticed in the continuous form within FID sentences. As was explained in the previous chapter, using the continuous form within a larger frame of FID can cause a feel of immediacy and continuity, which contributes to the reader hearing the character's voice within a larger FID framework. Take the following sentence:

“Getting up rather unsteadily, hopping indeed from foot to foot, he considered Mrs. Filmer's nice clean bread knife with "Bread" carved on the handle” (149).

Here we can see that the main clause consists of the past tense and third person POV while the sentence begins with continuous forms such as “getting” and “hopping”. This causes the reader to feel that the actions are happening right at that moment, while the main clause portrays the sentence as a retelling of the event by the narrator. The continuous is thus an important part of the ambiguity in this sentence between the possible focalizing agent: the character and the narrator. The continuous adds to the feel of the present and to the character focalizing the actions and thoughts at the very moment that they are happening, in contrast with the narratorial frame of the main clause. All three translations deal with the continuous in a different way as can be seen here:

[1] “Onvast overeind komend, eigenlijk hinkend van de ene op de andere voet, bekeek hij Mrs. Filmer's mooi, schoon broodmes met „Brood” in het handvat gesneden” (169).

[2] “Hij stond wankelend op, eigenlijk hinkend van de ene voet op de andere en keek naar Mrs Filmers mooie schone broodmes met Brood in het handvat gesneden” (157).

[3] “Terwijl hij nogal wankel overeind kwam, huppend van de ene voet op de andere, overwoog hij even mevrouw Filmers mooie schone broodmes met ‘Brood’ in het handvat gekerfd” (139).

The continuous is a verb form that is used less in Dutch than in English. Much use of the continuous in Dutch can give the language an outdated feel because the continuous used to be more acceptable in Dutch than it is nowadays. According to Jack Hoeksema, this verb form could be used, but “with some lexical exceptions (e.g. hij was stervende ‘he was dying’ [...]), this is no longer possible” (2001). In translation [1], which dates back to 1947, it is noticeable that the continuous forms are mostly maintained. Because much use of the continuous can cause outdated language use, English to Dutch translations have had to come up with different ways to translate the continuous. For example, in her 1980 translation, Brunt uses the continuous form as an adverbial (“wankelend”) instead. This not only deals with the problem of the outdated Dutch, it also maintains an important element of the text, namely the feel that the actions are happening in the present. Although the language of translation [1] may seem outdated, it also maintains this effect because of the continuous form. Verheij uses a different strategy in translation [3] to translate the effect of the continuous. She inserts the word “terwijl”, a conjunction that denotes that something is happening *while* something else is happening (“terwijl”). While this does let the reader know that something is happening in that moment, “terwijl” feels

more like 'telling' than 'showing'. It is more a description of the situation than the continuous form in the source text, consequently making the narrator more prominent in the translation than in the source text. In the following phrase, both Brunt and Verheij use the continuous form, "hinkend" and "huppend", respectively. These are verbs that can still be used in the continuous form in Dutch without them feeling like outdated language. All three translations thus maintain the continuous form in that phrase and preserve the effect that the source text has.

The continuous can be translated using many different strategies. When looking at the sentence "but she did not pity him; with the clock striking the hour, one, two, three, she did not pity him, with all this going on" (186) and its three translations below, it can be seen that yet another strategy is used to translate the effect of the continuous.

[1] "[...] maar ze had geen medelijden met hem, terwijl de klok sloeg, een, twee, drie, had ze geen medelijden met hem; terwijl dit alles door ging" (212).

[2] "[...] maar ze had geen medelijden met hem terwijl de klok sloeg, een, twee, drie, had ze geen medelijden met hem, terwijl dit allemaal doorging" (194).

[3] "[...] maar ze beklaagde hem niet; nu de klok het uur sloeg, een, twee, drie, beklaagde ze hem niet, met alles wat hier gaande was" (174).

It can be seen here that Brunt, in both translations [1] and [2], uses the word “terwijl” to cover the effects of the continuous. While “terwijl” does give the reader a sense of immediacy, of something happening at that moment, it also is a stronger signal that there is a narrator involved because it becomes more of a narratorial description. In the source text, the actions are just happening, with the narrator less involved than in translations [1] and [2]. In translation [3], Verheij makes use of a compensation strategy. She leaves the continuous out of the translation and resorts to deixis to create the same effect as in the source text. Where Brunt uses the word “terwijl” to create the continuous feel, Verheij uses deictic words, such as “nu” and “hier”. Both these words together duplicate exactly what the continuous does in the source text. It creates the voice of the character.

As explained above, a basic sentence that is written in the past tense and from a third person POV can be interpreted as a sentence that is focalized by the narrator, because past tense and third person narration are usually indicators that something is being retold by a narrator. Deixis can create ambiguity in these sentence when deictic words are included that refer to the present and to certain places, such as ‘now’, ‘here’, ‘this’, etc. When looking at such deictic words, the spatio-temporal POV is located in the character, not in the narrator. So in these sentences, the reader experiences two different events or situations. One is the part of the sentence that has the past tense and the third person POV, where the narrator seems to be retelling the

story, and the other comes from the deixis of the sentence, where the reader hears the character focalizing.

Most of these deictic words that occur in *Mrs. Dalloway* are not expected to pose major translation problems from English to Dutch. There are, however, some exceptions. First, take a look at the more basic deictic words. 'Now' is one of the deictic words that are used multiple times in the corpus. For example, one of the phrases is "which she could hear now" (3). In translation [1], Brunt uses the phrase "dat ze nu nog kon horen" (5). "Now" is translated with "nu" and preserves the same deictic effect. Both words indicate that something is happening at the moment where the character actually hears it. In Brunt's translation [2], she only substitutes "dat" for "wat", a small grammatical adjustment. The rest of the phrase is the same as translation [1] and maintains the deixis from the source text. In translation [3], something different can be seen. Verheij translates the phrase as "(ze hoorde het nóg)" (5). Apart from the added parentheses, which I will discuss under punctuation, note that no deictic words are included in the translation. Although the emphasis on the word "nog" may point towards the character focalizing the sentence, the narrator is the deictic center of this phrase, in opposition to the source text, where the character is the deictic center. The character's voice is thus weaker in translation [3] than it is in translations [1] and [2], as well as the source text, because the deictic word "now", which points to the character's POV, is not maintained in the translation.

Another example is the phrase “[b]ut it was too late now” (149). Again, the grammatical structure of the sentence points towards a narrator focalizer, but the word “now” indicates that the deictic center lies within the character. When looking at the translations, it can be seen that Brunt, in both translations [1] and [2], uses the same translation: “[m]aar het was nu te laat” (169; 157, respectively). Both the important elements of this phrase have been preserved in the translation, namely the past tense and the deictic word “now”. Translation [3] is again different from translations [1] and [2]. Verheij translated this phrase as “[m]aar het was al te laat” (139). The past tense is maintained in the translation, but where translations [1] and [2] use “nu”, translation [3] uses “al”. The deixis is missing from translation [3], as it was in the previous example. A possible explanation for this deviation may be that Verheij has tried to translate the text with a stronger focus on idiomatic phrases than on maintaining every little detail of the source text. When comparing only the target texts, it is indeed true that translation [3] (“maar het was al te laat”) is a more idiomatic phrase in Dutch than translations [1] and [2] (“maar het was nu te laat”). Although it might be the case that translation [3] is altogether more idiomatic, the fact remains that the character’s voice in these phrases is almost completely wiped out because there are no more deictic words that point towards the character focalizing the sentence.

Apart from the instances where deictic words are not maintained in the translation, there are also instances where they appear in the translation but they are

not present in the source text. Take the following sentence from the source text and its three translations:

“[...] feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen” (3).

[1] “[...] omdat zij voelde, terwijl ze daar aan het open raam stond, dat er dadelijk iets verschrikkelijks zou gebeuren” (5).

[2] “[...] omdat ze voelde, zoals ze daar stond aan de open deuren, dat er dadelijk iets verschrikkelijks zou gebeuren” (13).

[3] “[...] terwijl ze daar zo bij de open deur stond, had ze het gevoel dat er iets ontzaglijks stond te gebeuren” (5).

The deictic word “there” in the source text has been translated with “daar” in all three translations. The deixis in that phrase has thus been preserved by the translators. However, when looking at the last phrase in the example, note that Brunt, in both her translations, has opted for the word “dadelijk”, a deictic word that implies that we see this phrase from the character’s POV. “Was about to happen” is not a phrase that the reader has to interpret as being focalized by the character. On the contrary, since no deictic words point toward the character focalizing, the reader

may interpret this sentence as being focalized by the narrator. This is preserved in translation [3], where “stond te gebeuren” does not contain deixis that points towards the character as the deictic center. Thus, where the source text and translation [3] correspond in the use of deixis, translations [1] and [2] contain an extra deictic word, “dadelijk”, that implies that the character is focalizing the sentence.

Most other occurrences of deixis have been preserved in all three translations. For example, “tonight” is translated as “vanavond” in all translations, “this” with “dit”, “here” with “hier” etc. Although translating deixis does not seem to be a problem when looking at these simple one-syllable words with seemingly obvious translations in Dutch, this part of the chapter has shown that maintaining these words is very important for the ambiguity in FID. One single word can make the difference between an ambiguous sentence where the voice of both the narrator and character can be heard, and a sentence clearly belonging to the character or narrator.

Also, the translations show a difference in the use of the third person pronoun ‘she’. In Dutch, this can be translated with either ‘ze’ or ‘zij’. Translation [1] uses ‘zij’ in combination with ‘ze’, while translations [2] and [3] only use ‘ze’. When looking at translation [1], it seems that the choice of either ‘zij’ or ‘ze’ is done at random. A pattern for when these two pronouns are used is hard to find. It can be the case that the translator has used both these pronouns at random to increase the lexical variation in the translation. However, the choice to use both of these pronouns also has an effect on how the reader can interpret the translation. When looking at both ‘zij’ and ‘ze’, ‘zij’ seems to be a more distant pronoun than ‘ze’. Take for example the

following phrase from translation [1]: “Zij voelde zich precies zoals hij” (212). In FID, the intention is that the reader hears both the voices of the narrator and the character. In the cases where ‘zij’ is used as the translation for ‘she’, the narrator’s voice becomes more prominent. To explain this, compare the sentence with the same sentence, only with ‘ze’ instead of ‘zij’: ‘Ze voelde zich precies zoals hij’. In the first sentence, ‘zij’ feels like the narrator is pointing at the character. Interpreting this sentence as the character’s POV becomes very unrealistic because a woman would not refer to herself as ‘zij’, she would have used ‘ze’ to refer to herself. To illustrate this distinction more clearly, look at the following sentence from translation [1]: “Het was hun opvatting van tragedie; niet de zijne of van Rezia (want zij was bij hem)” (170). In this sentence, it is the narrator who comments on the situation by adding a phrase in parentheses. The narrator indicates that Rezia was “with him”. It is not Rezia herself the reader hears in that phrase, only the narrator. This is mostly because ‘zij’ is used in that phrase. Both ‘zij’ and ‘ze’ can essentially be used to refer to someone else, but ‘zij’ is clearer in that aspect. On the other hand, it seems like only ‘ze’ can be used to refer to oneself. Because in translation [1] Brunt has used ‘zij’ various times in FID sentences, only the narrator’s voice remains, because ‘zij’ strongly suggests that someone else is referring to Clarissa, instead of herself.

6.2 Semantics

The translator’s choice of words is an important part of how the reader of the translation will eventually interpret the text. Every word has its own denotation and

connotation and contributes to how the reader may interpret the text. In the translations, many differences can be noted in the translators' word choices and in the way that words are used in sentences.

First of all, in the translations, a clear difference can be seen in the use of pragmatic particles. According to Billick, pragmatic particles usually denote a shift in POV from narrator to character (2012, 322). Since the use of pragmatic particles is a clear indicator of colloquial language, it indicates the character's language instead of the narrator's. A clear example can be seen in the following passage and its translations:

"Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself.

For Lucy had her work cut out for her" (3).

[1] "Mrs. Dalloway zei dat ze zelf de bloemen zou kopen. Want Lucy had haar handen vol" (5).

[2] "Mrs Dalloway zei dat ze zelf de bloemen zou kopen.

Want Lucy has haar handen vol" (13).

[3] "Mevrouw Dalloway zei dat ze de bloemen zelf wel ging kopen.

Want Lucy kwam al handen te kort.

What can be observed here is that in the source text, as well as in translations [1] and [2], no pragmatic particles can be found. In translation [3], however, two pragmatic particles are added, “wel” and “al”. Consequently, what can be observed is a shift in focalization, from the narrator in the source text to the character in translation [3]. Because no pragmatic particles – or any other indicators that this might be character language – are present in the source text, there is no reason for the reader to interpret this as Clarissa’s POV. However, in translation [3], the pragmatic particles give the sentences a colloquial feel. As London already mentioned above, such use of language, that cannot plausibly be attributed to the narrator (London in Rouhiainen 2000, 115), is a clear indicator of FID. Consequently, note that in translation [3], the sentences are FID while in the source text and translation [1] and [2], they are clearly the narrator’s.

Overall, translation [3] contains much more pragmatic particles than the source text and translations [1] and [2]. The effect that this has is that in non-FID sentences, as the example above showed, suddenly the character’s voice is audible alongside the narrator’s voice and FID is created where in the source text it was not FID.

Another factor that determines the meaning of a word, phrase or sentence is the emphasis that is put on it. In the translations, it can be seen that certain words receive more emphasis than they have in the source text. Take for example the following sentence: “for his letters were awfully dull; it was his sayings one

remembered" (4). In the three translations, emphasis is put on different parts of the sentence.

[1] "want zijn brieven waren verschrikkelijk vervelend; wat hij zei bleef in je herinneringen" (5).

[2] "want zijn brieven waren verschrikkelijk saai; het was wat hij *zei* dat je je herinnerde" (13 [emphasis Brunt]).

[3] "want zijn brieven waren ontzaglijk saai. Wat je bijbleef waren zijn uitspraken" (5).

In the source text, no real emphasis is put anywhere in the sentence. The only slightly emphasized part is "his sayings" because of the construction of that phrase, starting with "it was". It was not his letters, it was not anything else, "it was his sayings". In translation [1], no real emphasis can be found, not even on "wat hij zei". The reader can even interpret this as a continuation of the preceding phrase, thus what he said in his letters was what one remembered. In the second translation, a very clear emphasis is put on "*zei*". Because this is such a strong emphasis, it has a certain amount of emotion to it, which, as Bosseaux (2004) stated earlier, is a sign of character language, not that of the narrator. What can be observed here is that consequently the character's voice is more evident than the narrator's voice and more

evident than the character's voice in the source text. Translation [3], on the other hand, has preserved the more nuanced emphasis. This can be obtained by structuring the sentence in certain ways to create a natural emphasis. In this case, Verheij has used the 'climax-principle' to slightly emphasize the word "uitspraken". According to this 'climax-principle', "In a sequence of interrelated tone units, the final position tends to be the major focus of information" (Leech & Short 2007, 179).

Another example of where emphasis can point the reader in a certain direction can be seen in the sentence "It was their idea of tragedy, not his or Rezia's (for she was with him)" (149). In the translations below, note that translation [2], in the same way as the earlier example above, has added a very clear emphasis on the word "*hun*".

[1] "Het was hun opvatting van tragedie, niet de zijne of van Rezia (want zij was bij hem)" (170).

[2] "Het was *hun* opvatting van tragedie, niet de zijne of die van Rezia (want zij zou hem helpen)" (157 [emphasis Brunt]).

[3] "Het was hun idee van een tragedie, niet dat van hem of van Rezia (want zij stond aan zijn kant)" (139).

In translation [2], the sentence contains more emotion than the source text or the other translations. Where the source text lingers between narrator and character as focalizer, translation [2] leans more towards the character because of the added emphasis. This can create a clear difference in interpretation between the source text and the translation. Because Septimus' language use is somewhat flat at the end of his life, the sudden emphasis and emotion in translation [2] would portray his character differently than in the source text. In translation [2], the reader can strongly feel the hatred of Septimus towards Holmes and Bradshaw and it seems like he commits suicide just to get back at them. Although the dislike of Septimus towards Holmes and Bradshaw is present in the source text, it is more prominent in the target text and the narrator's voice disappears from the translation. Translations [1] and [3] have preserved both the narrator's and the character's voice by not adding the emphasis.

6.3 Punctuation

To a great extent, punctuation determines the rhythm and the flow of the sentence. The same sentence may have a different feel to it when certain punctuation marks are changed, added or removed. One of the great features of *Mrs. Dalloway* is Woolf's use of punctuation to imitate the human mind and all its thoughts, in particular their interconnectedness. When looking at the overall use of punctuation in the passages from the corpus, several differences can be noted in the translations.

	<i>Mrs. Dalloway</i>	Translation [1]	Translation [2]	Translation [3]
Full Stop	45	44	44	45
Comma	68	63	61	75
Semi-Colon	21	15	16	8
Colon	-	3	3	5
Hyphen	11	11	11	9
Exclamation Mark	7	6	7	7

Table 2.1 Punctuation marks in *Mrs. Dalloway* and translations

First of all, note that the punctuation marks with a strong function (full stop, exclamation mark) are maintained almost perfectly in the three translations. This is in line with the claim made by May and Minelli (in Pihl 2013) earlier in this thesis that translators who translate novels by Woolf are generally faithful to punctuation marks with a strong function. They also claim that the use of punctuation marks with a weaker function, such as commas, semi-colons, tend to change in translation. As the table above shows, there is a slight difference in the use of commas, where translations [1] and [2] use less commas than the source text while translation [3] uses more commas. The most notable difference may be use of semi-colons in the translations. All the translations contain relatively few semi-colons compared to the source text, but translation [3] stands out with the number of semi-colons that is not even half of the number that is used in the source text. Another interesting point is that all the translators have added colons to their translations, a punctuation mark that is not present in the source text passages. To find out what effects these changes

in punctuation have on FID and the interpretive possibilities of the text, some examples of sentences and their translations will be given below.

The most notable difference in punctuation is the use of the semi-colon. The following sentence and its translations show some interesting differences in the use of the semi-colon and the effect that it has on FID and the interpretive possibilities of the text:

“How fresh, how calm, stiller than this of course, the air was in the early morning; like the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave; chill and sharp and yet (for a girl of eighteen as she then was) solemn, feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen; looking at the flowers, at the trees with the smoke winding off them and the rooks rising, falling; standing and looking until Peter Walsh said, ‘Musing among the vegetables?’” (3)

[1] “Hoe Fris, hoe rustig, stiller dan hier, natuurlijk, was de lucht ‘s morgens vroeg; als het omslaan van een golf, de kus van een golf; kil en scherp en toch (voor een meisje van achttien zoals ze toen was) plechtig, omdat zij voelde, terwijl ze daar aan het open raam stond, dat er dadelijk iets verschrikkelijks zou gebeuren: kijkend naar de bloemen, naar de bomen waaruit de rook zich loswond en de kraaien stijgend, dalend, stil kijkend, totdat Peter Walsh zei: ,Peinzend tussen de groente?’” (5)

[2] "Hoe fris, hoe kalm, stiller dan dit natuurlijk, was de lucht in de vroege morgen; als het omslaan van een golf; de kus van een golf; koel en doordringend en toch (voor een meisje van achttien, wat ze toen was) plechtig omdat ze voelde, zoals ze daar stond aan de open deuren, dat er dadelijk iets verschrikkelijks zou gebeuren; terwijl ze stond te kijken naar de bloemen, naar de bomen waaruit de damp zich loswond en naar de kraaien, die stegen en daalden; en bleef kijken totdat Peter Walsh zei: 'Peinzend tussen de groente?'" (13)

[3] "Zo fris, zo kalm, stiller dan dit natuurlijk, was de lucht in de vroege ochtend: als het omslaan van een golf, de kus van een golf, koel en scherp en toch (voor een meisje van achttien dat ze toen nog was) plechtig, want terwijl ze daar zo bij de open deur stond, had ze het gevoel dat een iets ontzaglijks stond te gebeuren, en ze keek naar de bloemen, naar de bomen met de opkringelende rook erboven en de stijgende, dalende vlucht van de roeken, stond daar maar te kijken totdat Peter Walsh zei: 'Sta je te dromen tussen de groente?'" (5)

The point of these punctuation marks, especially the combination of commas and semi-colons, is that it imitates the thought process of the human mind. Through the rhythm that these punctuation marks establish, the reader is invited into the

consciousness of Clarissa and experiences everything she experiences, in precisely the same way. The commas give the sentence a certain flow. They guide the reader from one thought to another, with little intervention from the narrator. The semi-colons are used to emphasize certain thoughts. The reader takes a longer pause than with a comma and stays with that thought a little bit longer than with others. In this sentence, as well as in the rest of the novel, the semi-colons are often used after a reference is made to nature, a typical characteristic of Clarissa's character. Because of this use of punctuation, more emphasis is put on these references and Clarissa's voice becomes more prominent in the sentence. In translation [2], all the semi-colons are maintained in the same place as in the source text. The emphasis in the translation also lies on the references to nature and thus establishes the emphasis on Clarissa's voice. Translation [1] has left out several semi-colons but still manages to maintain most of the original emphasis. In the phrase "[...]was de lucht 's morgens vroeg; als het omslaan van een golf, de kus van een golf;", only two of the three original semi-colons are maintained. However, the two references to nature ('lucht' and 'golf') are succeeded by a semi-colon. The only difference is that in the source text, a semi-colon is placed after both 'wave's, while in the translation only one semi-colon is placed after 'golf'. Thus, the emphasis on the references to nature are maintained by placing semi-colons in those positions, only the emphasis is not as great as it is in the source text and in translation [2]. Translation [3], on the other hand, has eliminated all semi-colons in this sentence and replaced them all by commas, except for the semi-colon after "the air was in the early morning", which

was replaced by a colon in the translation. The effect of these commas is that the flow of the sentence is increased and the reader is not halted by semi-colons to take a second longer to experience certain thoughts. Because the references to nature are not highlighted in this translation, Clarissa's voice is less prominent than in the source text and in the other translations. A possible explanation of why so many semi-colons were left out of the translation may be that the translator has put more effort into making a grammatically correct Dutch translation that is easily readable instead of reproducing as much of the original elements from the source text as possible.

Another translation choice that stands out in translation [3] is that Verheij chose to add parentheses in a sentence where no parentheses are used in the source text. This can be seen in the following sentence:

“What a lark! What a plunge! For so it had always seemed to her, when, with a little squeak of the hinges, which she could hear now, she had burst open the French windows and plunged at Bourton into the open air” (5).

Boukje Verheij has translated this sentence as follows:

[3] “Wat een dag! Wat een duik! Want zo had ze het altijd ervaren als ze met een licht gepiep van de scharnieren (ze hoorde het nóg) de tuindeuren opengooide en op Bourton de buitenlucht in dook” (5).

From this sentence on, almost the entire passage is written in FID, with Clarissa's voice clearly audible. As was already discussed earlier, the narrator likes to have a certain amount of control by adding parenthesized comments throughout the novel. So whenever a phrase or sentence appears within parentheses, the reader can automatically assume that this is the narrator who is addressing the reader directly. In the source text, the reader can hear Clarissa's thoughts of how she can still hear the squeak of the hinges. Although the sentence is written in a form that looks like the narrator is telling the story, readers can assume that it is actually Clarissa whose POV they experience due to for example the punctuation, word choice and deixis. However, because the narrator is the only one in the novel who uses parentheses, the translation is suddenly only partly FID, where in the middle of the sentence, the narrator becomes clearly visible and claims the phrase that otherwise may have been Clarissa's.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Summary of Results

We have seen that the use of third person POV and the use of the past tense have been maintained in all translations. However, some verb forms important to FID ('would') have been changed in translation [3], making the narrator more apparent in those sentences. Translations [1] and [2] have maintained these FID verbs and consequently the same ambiguous effect between narrator and character. Another important element in the text, the continuous form within FID, is dealt with in different ways by the translators. Translation [1] is the most source text oriented translation in this aspect, maintaining most of the original forms. Although the language use may seem somewhat outdated, it does preserve the effect of the continuous in the same way as in the source text. Translation [2] deals with the source text in a similar way, but only preserving the continuous forms that are not outdated. The other instances are replaced by, for example, adverbials to describe the situations. Also, most of the original effect is maintained in the translation. Another strategy that all the translations use is to replace the continuous by 'terwijl', which creates a similar effect, but also signals that there is a narrator at work. Translation [3] also makes use of compensation, leaving out the continuous forms and replacing them by deictic words to maintain the character's voice in the same way as the original.

In the part about deixis we have seen that where translation [1] and [2] preserve most of the deictic words in the translations, translation [3] does not. The effect that this has on the translation is that in translation [3], the character's voice in FID sentence is less prominent than in translations [1], [2] and the source text. The main reason for this may be that Verheij was more target language oriented than the other translators and preferred idiomatic sentences to maintaining all the source text elements. We also saw that translations [1] and [2] have added certain deixis to the translation where in the source text no deixis was present. This causes the character's voice to become more prominent in sentences than in the original. This could also be compensation for other instances where the deixis could not be maintained but since this thesis does not allow for a full analysis of the novel that is hard to find out. Apart from the instances of deixis that have been discussed above, most of the deixis has been properly maintained in all translations.

The first thing that came to mind when analyzing the semantics, was the use of both 'zij' and 'ze' in translation [1]. Where translations [2] and [3] only use 'ze' as the third person pronoun, translation [1] seems to be using both 'zij' and 'ze' randomly throughout the translation. This certainly has an effect on how the reader interprets certain sentences. When 'zij' is used in FID sentences, where the 'she' is referring to the character herself, the sentence suddenly becomes a clearly narrated sentence with almost no trace of the character's POV, because 'zij' is almost always used to refer to another person, not to oneself. Translations [2] and [3] have only used 'ze' as translation for 'she' in FID sentences, thus preserving the character's

voice better than translation [1]. Because translation [1] is the oldest translation (1947) it may be the case that back then, 'zij' and 'ze' were used interchangeably, but nowadays this poses a serious problem when looking at the effect of FID. Another important element in FID is the use of emphasis. We saw that translation [2] in particular, has added several instances of clear emphasis by writing words italicized. The emphasis causes the sentence to be read with a certain amount of emotion that is not present in the source text, which makes the character's voice more prominent. Where translation [1] sometimes misses some of the emphasis created in the source text by the way in which the sentence is structured, translation [3] has managed to recreate this emphasis caused by the structure of the sentences.

The most important finding with regard to punctuation is that translation [3] has left out most of the original semi-colons and replaced them by commas. Because the semi-colon is an important stylistic feature in the novel for Clarissa's thoughts for example, Clarissa's voice is less prominent in translation [3] than in the other translations and the source text. Also, Verheij has added several parentheses in translation [3] where no parentheses were present in the source text. Because parentheses in *Mrs. Dalloway* are used by the narrator to comment on events and situations, a clear shift can be seen in translation [3] from FID to a sentence that is clearly the narrator's. Translation [2] has maintained most of the original punctuation, thereby also maintaining most of the original effect. Translation [1] also maintained most of the punctuation, but left out some of the semi-colons in places

where it was clear that the reader hears Clarissa's voice, thus only maintaining the most necessary punctuation.

Furthermore, we have seen that the explicitation hypothesis, created by Blum-Kulka in 1986, is not necessarily true. It was not the case that all three translations were made more explicit with regard to FID than the source text. On the contrary, there were instances where more ambiguity was found in the translations than in the source text.

7.2 Answer to research question

In the introduction the question was asked what translation strategies the translators had used to translate FID in *Mrs. Dalloway* and what effect those strategies had on the interpretive possibilities of the target texts. As we have seen, many different translation strategies have been used to tackle the problems of translating FID. However, in most cases it is not entirely clear whether something is a clear translation strategy or whether it is more or less a regular translation choice. Despite this, these translation shifts have a clear impact on how the target text can be interpreted.

In general, several things can be said about the translations and their interpretive possibilities. First of all, when looking at the extent to which the original stylistic elements were maintained in the translation, a clear pattern can be seen. Translation [1] maintains most of the stylistic elements from the source text, namely sentence structure, verb tenses, punctuation, etc. Translation [3] has maintained the

least of these elements, while translation [2] is somewhere in the middle. As we have seen in the analysis, many of these stylistic elements are very important in FID and its ambiguity between the narrator and character. The examples have shown that in general, translation [1] has maintained the FID, its ambiguity and its effect the best of the three translations. I have excluded the 'zij'/'ze' examples from this statement because I think that it is not so much a clear translation choice as these terms were nearly interchangeable at the time in which the translation was written. Thus, despite the fact that the language use may seem a little outdated to readers now, the main effect of FID in *Mrs. Dalloway*, namely that the reader is not given clear guidance of who to believe and has to determine himself how he interprets different characters, is best maintained in the first translation.

Translation [2] is somewhat similar to translation [1], only some minor differences in the translation may cause the reader to interpret this translation differently. First of all, translation [2] has best preserved the original punctuation of all the translations. Because the punctuation is such an important factor in the novel, as it can tell the reader who is actually speaking, the translation has preserved those effects to a great extent. However, some small translation shifts, like adding certain emphasis by placing words in italics, cause those sentences, and even the characters, to be interpreted differently. This can in turn change the way the reader looks at those characters and what the reader believes to be reliable information.

Translation [3] can be said to be the most idiomatic translation of the three. In this translation, the least amount of stylistic elements is maintained in the translation

and the focus lies more on producing grammatically correct and idiomatic Dutch sentences. Although the novel may be more easily accessible for more people, it does have consequences for the way FID works and how the reader can interpret the text. In general, it seems to be the case that in translation [3], that the character's voice in FID is often less apparent than in the source text, or even completely eliminated. This is caused by loss of the characteristic use of punctuation, adding parentheses in FID sentences, making syntactic constructions where the narrator is more prominent, loss of deixis, etc. Even though Verheij compensates some of the loss by adding many pragmatic particles to increase the character language, the narrator has a more prominent role in the translation. The strength of the source text is that the novel has no clear reliable POV from which everything is seen and the reader has to weight everything he reads and make his own interpretation of the novel. In translation [3], there is such a consistent POV: the narrator's. Because much of the ambiguity is lost, many sentences are suddenly clearly focalized by the narrator. This may cause the reader to take on the POV of the more consistent narrator, meaning that the reader is less likely to rely on the different characters to establish his own interpretation of the novel.

7.3 Reflection

This research has shown how important FID can be in a novel and how many different elements are crucial to maintain the ambiguity in translation. Loss of the ambiguity in translations can completely change the way readers interpret the novel.

In the case of *Mrs. Dalloway*, it could be seen that the more stylistic elements from the source text are preserved, the more of the effect of FID is maintained in the translation, even if that means that the translations is not always as idiomatic as possible. Some small translation shifts can radically alter the way in which certain passages are interpreted. Because all the translations showed different translations shifts, every one of them give the reader different interpretive possibilities.

All in all, after reading four different versions of *Mrs. Dalloway* several times and interpreting every version differently each time I read it, I would not be surprised if interpreting *Mrs. Dalloway* simply cannot be done and every translation of the novel ever published will tell the reader a different story.

8. Bibliography

- Alcaras Varó, Enrique. "An approach to the language of Mrs. Dalloway." *CAUCE* nr 6. Centre Virtual Cervantes.
- Bell, Vereen. 2006. "Misreading Mrs. Dalloway." *The Sewanee Review* 114.1. Print.
- Binnick, Robert I. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford University Press: New York. Print.
- Blum-Kalka, Shoshana. 1986. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation." In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Juliane House: Tübingen. Print.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2004. *Point of View in Translation: A Corpus-based study of French Translations of Virginia Woolf's To The Lighthouse*. *Across Language and Cultures*, 5.1, p. 107-122. Print.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2007. *How Does it Feel? Point of View in Translation: The Case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. p. 54-67.
- Bosseaux, Charlotte. 2008. "Translating Point of View: A Corpus-based Study." *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*, 35:1, p. 259-274. Print.
- Ciocoi-Pop, Dumitru. 2002. *Highlights of Modern British Literature*. Editura Universitatii: Sibiu, p. 37-46. Print.
- Faini, Paola. 2012. "The Challenge of Free Indirect Speech in *Mrs. Dalloway*". In *Translating Virginia Woolf*. Peter Lang: Bern. Print.
- Genette, Gérard. 1990. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Cornwell University Press: Cornwell. Print.
- Gunsteren, van Julia. 1990. *Katherine Mansfield and Literary Impressionism*. Rodopi B.V.: Amsterdam. Print.
- Hoeksema, Jack. *Verb Movement in Dutch Present-Participle Clauses*. Groningen: University of Groningen. Print.

- Hoff, Molly. 2009. *Virginia Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway: Invisible Presences*. Clemson University: Clemson. Web.
- Hoff, Molly. 2014. "Complexity: A Richly Organized Pattern in Mrs Dalloway." In *Blogging Mrs. Dalloway*. Web. n. pag.
- Holmes, S. James. 1994. *Translated!: Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Rodopi B.V.: Amsterdam. Print.
- Huang, Xiaocong. 2011. *Stylistic Approaches to Literary Translation: With Particular Reference to English-Chinese and Chinese-English Translation*. Thesis for Phd. University of Birmingham. Web.
- Hühn et al. 2009. *Point of View, Perspective, and Focalization: Modeling Mediation in Narrative*. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin. Print.
- Jones, Gloria G. 1997. "Free Indirect Style in Mrs. Dalloway." *Postscript* 14, p. 69-80. Print.
- Koster, Cees. 2011. "Comparative Approaches to Translation". In Gambier, Y & Doorslaer, van. L. *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 2*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam. p. 21-25. Print.
- Langeroodi, Marnie. 2014. *Narrative Voice in Mrs. Dalloway*.
<<http://marnielangeroodiblog.wordpress.com/2013/04/07/narrative-voice-in-mrs-dalloway>>
- Leech, Geoffrey and Short, Mick. 2007. *Style in Fiction. A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman. Print.
- Levenston, E.A & Sonnenschein, G. 1986. "The Translation of Point-of-view in Fictional Narrative". In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Juliane House: Tübingen. Print.
- Lorente, Joaquín Martínez. 1996. "Blurring Focalization: Psychological Expansions of Point of View and Modality". *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 9, p. 63-89. Print.
- Miller, J. Hillis. 1983. "Mr. Carmichael and Lily Briscoe: The Rhythm of Creativity in To the Lighthouse". In Robert Kiely *Modernism Reconsidered*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. 167-89. Print.

- Miller, Marlowe A. 2006. *Masterpieces of British Modernism*. Greenwood Press: Westport. Print.
- Pym, Anthony. 2009 "Descriptions: *The Intellectual Background*". In Pym, A. *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge: London. Web.
< http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/05_descriptions_1.pdf>
- Pascal, Roy. 1977. *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and Its Functioning in the Nineteenth Century Novel*. Manchester University Press: Manchester. Print.
- Pihl, A. 2013. "Voices and Perspectives: Translating the Ambiguity in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*." In: Eronen, Maria & Rodi-Risberg, Marinella (ed.), *Point of view as challenge*. Vaasa: Vakki Publications, p. 281-291. Web.
- Reichmann Lemos, Brunilda. 1979. "Language and Character in Jane Austen's *Emma*". *Letras* 28. Print.
- Rouhiainen, Tarja. 2000. "Free Indirect Discourse in the Translation into Finnish: The Case of D.H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*". *Target* 12.1. Print.
- Sopčák, P. & Kuiken, D. 2012. "Readers' Engagement with Virginia Woolf's *Mrs Dalloway*: From Knowing about Death to the Experience of Finitude." *Studies in Book Culture* 3.2. Web.
- Taivalkoski-Shilov, Kristiina. 2009. "When Two Become One: Reported Discourse Viewed through a Translatological Perspective." In Omid AZADIBOUGAR (ed.). *Translation Effects: Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2009*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. Web.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. "The Coupled Pair of Replacing + Replaced Segments". In *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam. p. 87-101. Print.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation". In *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, p. 53-69. Print.
- "terwijl". Van Dale 2014. Web. 7 Aug 2014.
- Transue, Pamela, J. 1986. *Virginia Woolf and the Politics of Style*. State University of New York Press: Albany. Print.

- Verhagen, Arie. 2012. *Construal and Stylistics: within a language, across contexts, across languages*. Leiden University Centre for Linguistics: Leiden. Web.
- Wilde, De. Judy. 2010. "The Analysis of Translated Literary Irony: Some Methodological Issues". *Linguistica Antverpiensia* vol. 9, Print. p. 25-44.
- Woolf, Leonard. 1953. *A Writer's Diary: Being Extracts of the Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Leonard Woolf: London. Print.
- Woolf, Virginia. 1925. *The Common Reader*. Hogarth Press: London. Print.
- Woolf, Virginia. 1925a. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Hogarth Press: London. Print
- Woolf, Virginia. 1947. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Vert. Nini Brunt. G.A. Van Oorschot: Amsterdam. Print.
- Woolf, Virginia. 1980. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Vert. Nini Brunt. De Bezige Bij: Amsterdam. Print.
- Woolf, Virginia. 2013. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Vert. Boukje Verheij. Athaneum – Polak & Van Genneep: Amsterdam. Print.

9. Appendices

9.1 Source Text

1925 – *Virginia Woolf*

“Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself.

For Lucy had her work cut out for her. The doors would be taken off their hinges; Rumpelmayer’s men were coming. And then, thought Clarissa Dalloway, what a morning – fresh as if issued to children on a beach.

What a lark! What a plunge! For so it had always seemed to her, when, with a little squeak of the hinges, which she could hear now, she had burst open the French windows and plunged at Bourton into the open air. How fresh, how calm, stiller than this of course, the air was in the early morning; like the flap of a wave; the kiss of a wave; chill and sharp and yet (for a girl of eighteen as she then was) solemn, feeling as she did, standing there at the open window, that something awful was about to happen; looking at the flowers, at the trees with the smoke winding off them and the rooks rising, falling; standing and looking until Peter Walsh said, “Musing among the vegetables?” – was that it? – “I prefer men to cauliflowers” – was that it? He must have said it at breakfast one morning when she had gone out on to the terrace -- Peter Walsh. He would be back from India one of these days, June or July, she forgot which, for his letters were awfully dull; it was his sayings one remembered; his eyes, his pocket-knife, his smile, his grumpiness and, when millions of things had utterly vanished -- how strange it was! -- a few sayings like this about cabbages (3-4)”.

“They had just come up—unfortunately—to see doctors. Other people came to see pictures; go to the opera; take their daughters out; the Whitbreads came "to see doctors." Times without number Clarissa had visited Evelyn Whitbread in a nursing home. Was Evelyn ill again? Evelyn was a good deal out of sorts, said Hugh, intimating by a kind of pout or swell of his very well-covered, manly, extremely handsome, perfectly up- holstered body (he was almost too well dressed always, but presumably had to be, with his little job at Court) that his wife had some internal ailment, nothing serious, which, as an old friend, Clarissa Dalloway would quite understand without requiring him to specify. Ah yes, she did of course; what a nuisance; and felt very sisterly and oddly conscious at the same time of her hat. Not the right hat for the early morning, was that it? For Hugh always made her feel, as he bustled on, raising his hat rather extravagantly and assuring her that she might be a girl of eighteen, and of course he was coming to her party tonight, Evelyn absolutely insisted, only a little late he might be after the party at the Palace to which he had to take one of Jim's boys,—she always felt a little skimpy beside Hugh; schoolgirlish; but attached to him, partly from having known him always, but she did think him a good sort in his own way, though Richard was nearly driven mad by him, and as for Peter Walsh, he had never to this day forgiven her for liking him (6)”.

“Holmes was coming upstairs. Holmes would burst open the door. Holmes would say “In a funk, eh?” Holmes would get him. But no; not Holmes; not Bradshaw. Getting up rather unsteadily, hopping indeed from foot to foot, he considered Mrs. Filmer’s nice clean bread knife with “Bread” carved on the handle. Ah, but one mustn’t spoil that. The gas fire? But it was too late now. Holmes was coming. Razors he might have got, but Rezia, who always did that sort of thing, had packed them. There remained only the window, the large Bloomsbury- lodging house window, the tiresome, the troublesome, and rather melodramatic business of opening the window and throwing himself out. It was their idea of tragedy, not his or Rezia’s (for she was with him). Holmes and Bradshaw like that sort of thing. (He sat on the sill.) But he would wait till the very last moment. He did not want to die. Life was good. The sun hot. Only human beings? Coming down the staircase opposite an old man stopped and stared at him. Holmes was at the door. “I’ll give it you!” he cried, and flung himself vigorously, violently down on to Mrs. Filmer’s area railings (149)”.

“The young man had killed himself; but she did not pity him; with the clock striking the hour, one, two, three, she did not pity him, with all this going on. There! the old lady had put out her light! the whole house was dark now with this going on, she repeated, and the words came to her, Fear no more the heat of the sun. She must go back to them. But what an extraordinary night! She felt somehow very like him—the young man who had killed himself. She felt glad that he had done it; thrown it away. The clock was striking. The leaden circles dissolved in the air. He made her feel the beauty; made her feel the fun. But she must go back. She must assemble. She must find Sally and Peter. And she came in from the little room (186)”.

9.2 Translation [1]

1947 – Nini Brunt

“Mrs. Dalloway zei dat ze zelf de bloemen zou kopen. Want Lucy had haar handen vol. De deuren zouden uit hun hengsels gelicht worden; de mannen van Rumpelmayer kwamen. En dan, dacht Clarissa Dalloway, wat een morgen – fris alsof hij aan kinderen op een strand werd geschonken.

Wat een genot! Wat een onderdompeling! Want zo was het haar altijd voorgekomen als zij, met een zacht gekras van de scharnieren, dat ze nu nog kon horen, de openslaande deuren had opengegooid en zich op Bourtown in de buitenlucht had gestort. Hoe Fris, hoe rustig, stiller dan hier, natuurlijk, was de lucht ‘s morgens vroeg; als het omslaan van een golf, de kus van een golf; kil en scherp en toch (voor een meisje van achttien zoals ze toen was) plechtig, omdat zij voelde, terwijl ze daar aan het open raam stond, dat er dadelijk iets verschrikkelijks zou gebeuren: kijkend naar de bloemen, naar de bomen waaruit de rook zich loswond en de kraaien stijgend, dalend, stil kijkend, totdat Peter Walsh zei: „Peinzend tussen de

groente?" – Was dat het? „Ik verkies mensen boven bloemkool" – Was dat het? Hij moest het op een morgen bij het ontbijt gezegd hebben toen ze naar buiten op het terras was gegaan – Peter Walsh. Hij zou dezer dagen, Juni of Juli, terugkomen, ze was vergeten wanneer, want zijn brieven waren verschrikkelijk vervelend; wat hij zei bleef in je herinneringen; zijn ogen, zijn zakmes, zijn glimlach, zijn brommerigheid en terwijl miljoenen dingen totaal verdwenen waren – hoe vreemd was dat – een paar gezegden zoals dit over de kool (5)".

"Zij waren – helaas – alleen maar gekomen om dokters te spreken. Andere mensen kwamen om schilderijen te zien, om naar de opera te gaan; hun dochters mee uit te nemen; de Whitbreads kwamen „om dokters te spreken". Talloze keren had Clarissa Evelyn Whitbread opgezocht in een ziekenverpleging. Was Evelyn weer ziek? Evelyn was helemaal niet goed, zei Hugh, die door een soort vooruitsteken of opzwellen van zijn zeer goed gespierd, mannelijk, buitengewoon aantrekkelijk, volmaakt bekleed lichaam (hij was bijna te goed gekleed maar moest dat waarschijnlijk zijn met zijn baantje aan het Hof) mededeelde dat zijn vrouw een of andere inwendige kwaal had, niets ernstigs, die Clarissa Dalloway, als oude vriendin wel zou begrijpen zonder dat het nodig was dat hij in bijzonderheden trad. O, ja, natuurlijk; hoe vervelend en ze voelde zich erg zusterlijk en tegelijk vreemd bewust van haar hoed. Niet de geschikte hoed voor vroeg in de morgen – was het dat? Want Hugh gaf haar altijd, met zijn zenuwachtige drukte, zijn hoed overdreven afnemend en haar verzekerend dat ze net een meisje van achttien leek, en natuurlijk kwam hij op haar partij vanavond, Evelyn stond er op, alleen kon hij misschien wat laat zijn, na de partij op het paleis waar hij met een van Jim's jongens heen moest – ze voelde zich altijd een beetje benepen naast Hugh; schoolmeisjesachtig; maar verknocht aan hem, gedeeltelijk omdat ze hem altijd gekend had, gedeeltelijk omdat ze hem in zijn genre een goede kerel vond, hoewel Richard bijna tot razernij werd gebracht door hem en Peter Walsh – hij had haar tot op de huidige dag niet vergeven dat ze op hem gesteld was (8-9)".

"Holmes kwam de trap op. Holmes zou de deur opengooien. Holmes zou zeggen: „Bang hè?" Holmes zou hem te pakken krijgen. Maar neen; noch Holmes, noch Bradshaw. Onvast overeind komend, eigenlijk hinkend van de ene op de andere voet, bekeek hij Mrs. Filmer's mooi, schoon broodmes met „Brood" in het hadvat gesneden. Ach, dat moest je niet bederven. Het gas? Maar het was nu te laat. Holmes kwam. Hij zou de scheermesjes hebben kunnen nemen, maar Rezia, die dat soort van dingen altijd deed, had ze ingepakt. Er bleef alleen het raam over, het grote raam van een pension in Bloomsbury; het vermoede, lastige en nogal melodramatische werk om het raam open te doen en er uit te springen. Het was hun opvatting van tragedie; niet de zijne of van Rezia (want zij was bij hem). Holmes en Bradshaw hielden van zulke dingen. (Hij zat op de vensterbank). Maar hij zou tot het allerlaatste moment wachten. Hij wilde niet doodgaan. Het leven was goed. De zon warm. Alleen

menselijke wezens? Een oude man die de trap aan de overkant afkwam bleef stil staan en keek naar hem. Holmes was bij de deur.

„Ik zal 't je betaald zetten!” riep hij en stortte zich energiek, gewelddadig naar beneden op het hek van Mrs. Filmers souterrain (169-170)”.

“De jonge man had zelfmoord gepleegd; maar ze had geen medelijden met hem, terwijl de klok sloeg, een, twee, drie, had ze geen medelijden met hem; terwijl dit alles door ging. Daar! de oude dame had het licht uitgedaan! het hele huis was nu donker terwijl dit alles doorging, herhaalde ze en de woorden vielen haar in „Vrees de hitte der zon niet langer”. Zij moest naar hen terug gaan. Maar wat een buitengewone nacht! Zij voelde zich precies zoals hij – als de jonge man die zelfmoord had gepleegd. Ze voelde zich blij dat hij het gedaan had, het had weggegooid terwijl zij voortgingen met het leven. De klok sloeg. De loden cirkels losten op in de lucht. Maar ze moest terug gaan. Ze moest zich bij de anderen voegen. Ze moest Sally en Peter zoeken. En ze kwam binnen, uit de kleine kamer (212)”.

9.3 Translation [2]

1980 – Nini Brunt

“Mrs Dalloway zei dat ze zelf de bloemen zou kopen.

Want Lucy had haar handen vol. De deuren zouden uit hun hengsels gelicht worden; de mannen van Rumpelmayer kwamen. En bovendien, dacht Clarissa Dalloway, wat een morgen – puur alsof hij aan kinderen op een strand was geschonken.

Wat een feest! Wat een duik! Want zo had het haar altijd geleden, als ze, met een licht geknars van de scharnieren, wat ze nu nog kon horen, de glazen deuren had opengegooid en op Bourton in de openlucht was gedoken. Hoe fris, hoe kalm, stiller dan dit natuurlijk, was de lucht in de vroege morgen; als het omslaan van een golf; de kus van een golf; koel en doordringend en toch (voor een meisje van achttien, wat ze toen was) plechtig omdat ze voelde, zoals ze daar stond aan de open deuren, dat er dadelijk iets verschrikkelijks zou gebeuren; terwijl ze stond te kijken naar de bloemen, naar de bomen waaruit de damp zich loswond en naar de kraaien, die stegen en daalden; en bleef kijken totdat Peter Walsh zei: ‘Peinzend tussen de groente?’ – was het dat? ‘Ik verkies mensen boven bloemkool’ – was het dat? Hij moest het op een morgen bij het ontbijt hebben gezegd, toen ze naar buiten, naar het terras was gegaan – Peter Walsh. Hij zou een dezer dagen uit India terugkomen, in juni of juli, ze was vergeten wanneer, want zijn brieven waren verschrikkelijk saai; het was wat hij *zei* dat je je herinnerde; zijn ogen, zijn zakmes, zijn glimlach, zijn humeurigheid en, terwijl miljoenen dingen totaal verdwenen waren – wat was dat vreemd! – een paar zinnen, zoals die over kool (13)”.

“Ze waren – helaas – alleen maar gekomen om dokters te spreken. Andere mensen kwamen om schilderijen te zien; naar de opera te gaan; hun dochters mee uit te nemen; de Whitbreads kwamen om ‘dokters te spreken’. Talloze keren had Clarissa Evelyn Whitbread in een ziekenhuis opgezocht. Was Evelyn weer ziek? Evelyn was helemaal niet goed, zei Hugh, die door een soort vooruitsteken van zijn lippen of het opblazen van zijn zeer goed gespierd mannelijk buitengewoon aantrekkelijk, perfect gekleed lichaam (hij was altijd bijna te goed gekleed maar dat moest hij waarschijnlijk zijn met zijn onbelangrijke baantje aan het hof) liet doorschemeren dat zijn vrouw een of ander inwendige kwaal had, niets ernstigs, wat Clarissa Dalloway, als een oude vriendin, wel zou begrijpen, zonder dat hij genoodzaakt was in bijzonderheden te treden. O ja, natuurlijk, hoe vervelend; en ze had een erg zusterlijk gevoel en tegelijkertijd was ze zich eigenaardig bewust van haar goed. Niet de juiste hoed voor de vroege morgen – was het dat? Want Hugh gaf haar altijd het gevoel terwijl hij zich voorthaastte en op een overdreven manier zijn hoed afnam en haar verzekerde dat ze wel een meisje van achttien leek en natuurlijk kwam hij vanavond op haar feestje, Evelyn stond daarop, hij zou alleen misschien een beetje laat komen na het feest op het paleis, waar hij met een van de jongens van Jim heen moest – ze voelde zich altijd een beetje nietig naast Hugh; als een schoolmeisje; maar ook verknocht aan hem, gedeeltelijk omdat ze hem altijd had gekend, ze vond hem op zijn speciale manier een goede kerel, hoewel hij Richard bijna gek maakte, en wat Peter Walsh betrof, hij had haar tot op de huidige dag nooit vergeven dat ze op hem gesteld was (15-16)”.

“Holmes kwam de trap op. Holmes zou de deur opengooien. Holmes zou zeggen: ‘Bang hè?’

Holmes zou hem te pakken krijgen. Maar nee, noch Holmes, noch Bradshaw. Hij stond wankelend op, eigenlijk hinkend van de ene voet op de andere en keek naar Mrs Filmers mooie schone broodmes met *Brood* in het handvat gesneden. Ach, dat moest je niet bederven. De gashaard? Maar het was nu te laat. Holmes kwam. Hij zou misschien scheermesjes hebben kunnen nemen, maar Rezia die altijd dat soort van dingen deed, had ze ingepakt. Alleen het raam bleef over, het grote raam van een pension in Bloomsbury; het vermoeiende, lastige en nogal dramatische werk om het raam open te krijgen en eruit te springen. Het was *hun* opvatting van tragedie, niet de zijne of die van Rezia (want zij zou hem helpen). Holmes en Bradshaw hielden van zulke dingen. (Hij zat op de vensterbank). Maar hij zou tot het allerlaatste moment wachten. Hij wilde niet doodgaan. Het leven was goed. De zon was warm. Alleen de mensen? Een oude man, die de trap aan de overkant af kwam bleef staan en staaarde naar hem. Holmes was bij de deur. ‘Ik zal het je betaald zetten!’ riep hij en stortte zich met kracht en geweld naar beneden op het hek van Mrs Filmers souterrain (157)”.

“De jongeman had zelfmoord gepleegd maar ze had geen medelijden met hem terwijl de klok sloeg, een, twee, drie, had ze geen medelijden met hem, terwijl dit

allemaal doorging. Kijk! de oude dame had het licht uitgedaan! het hele huis was nu donker, terwijl dit allemaal doorging, herhaalde ze en de woorden schoten haar te binnen: *Fear no more the heat of the sun*. Ze moest naar hen teruggaan. Maar wat een buitengewone nacht! Ze voelde zich op de een of andere manier precies zoals hij – als de jongeman die zelfmoord had gepleegd. Ze was blij dat hij het had gedaan; het had weggegooid, terwijl zij voortgingen met leven. De klok sloeg. De loden cirkels losten op in de lucht. Maar ze moest teruggaan. Ze moest zich bij de anderen voegen. Ze moest Sally en Peter zoeken. En ze kwam binnen, uit de kleine kamer (194-195)“.

9.4 Translation [3]

2013 – *Boukje Verheij*

“Mevrouw Dalloway zei dat ze de bloemen zelf wel ging kopen.

Want Lucy kwam al handen te kort. De deuren zouden uit hun hengsels worden gelicht; de mannen van Rumpelmayer kwamen. Bovendien, dacht Clarissa Dalloway, wat een ochtend: fris als een traktatie aan kinderen op een strand.

Wat een dag! Wat een duik! Want zo had ze het altijd ervaren als ze met een licht gepiep van de scharnieren (ze hoorde het *nóg*) de tuindeuren opengooide en op Bourton de buitenlucht in dook. Zo fris, zo kalm, stiller dan dit natuurlijk, was de lucht in de vroege ochtend: als het omslaan van een golf, de kus van een golf, koel en scherp en toch (voor een meisje van achttien dat ze toen nog was) plechtig, want terwijl ze daar zo bij de open deur stond, had ze het gevoel dat er iets ontzaglijks stond te gebeuren, en ze keek naar de bloemen, naar de bomen met de opkringelende rook erboven en de stijgende, dalende vlucht van de roeken, stond daar maar te kijken totdat Peter Walsh zei: ‘Sta je te dromen tussen de groente?’ – was dat het? ‘Zelf prefereer ik mensen boven bloemkolen’ – was dat het? Hij moest het op een ochtend tijdens het ontbijt hebben gezegd, toen ze het terras op was gelopen – Peter Walsh. Hij kwam een dezer dagen terug uit India, in juni of juli, dat wist ze niet meer, want zijn brieven waren ontzaglijk saai. Wat je bijbleef waren zijn uitspraken; zijn ogen, zijn zakmes, zijn glimlach, zijn knorrigheid, en wanneer duizend-en-één-dingen volledig vervlogen waren – vreemd was dat toch! – een paar van dat soort uitspraken over kolen (5)“.

“Ze waren – helaas – alleen maar in de stad om bij dokters langs te gaan. Andere mensen kwamen om films te zien, om naar de opera te gaan, om hun dochters mee uit te nemen; de Whitbreads kwamen ‘om bij dokters langs te gaan’. Al talloze malen had Clarissa Evelyn Whitbread bezocht in een kliniek. Was Evelyn weer ziek? Evelyn was niet helemaal in orde, zei Hugh, en de manier waarop hij zijn lippen tuitte en zijn zeer goed gevulde, mannelijke, buitengewoon welgevormde, volmaakt gestoffeerde lijf (altijd ging hij bijna *té* goed gekleed, maar hij moest waarschijnlijk wel, met zijn baantje aan het hof) een tikje opblies, duidde erop dat zijn vrouw een of ander inwendige kwaal had, niets ernstigs, zoals Clarissa Dalloway, een oude

vriendin, wel zou begrijpen zonder dat hij in details hoefde te treden. O, ja, natuurlijk begreep ze het, wat vervelend, en ze voelde zich heel zusterlijk en was zich tegelijk merkwaardig bewust van haar hoedje. Niet het juiste hoedje voor de vroege ochtend, was dat het? Want Hugh gaf haar altijd het gevoel, terwijl hij zich voortspoedde, waarbij hij zijn hoed nogal overdreven lichtte en haar verzekerde dat ze een meisje van achttien kon zijn, en ja, natuurlijk kwam hij naar haar feestje vanavond, Evelyn stond erop, alleen was hij mogelijk wat later vanwege het feestje op het paleis waar hij met een van Jims jongens naartoe moest – ze voelde zich naast Hugh altijd een tikje schamel, een schoolmeisje, maar wel aan hem verknocht, voor een deel omdat ze hem al haar hele leven kende, maar toch vond ze hem op zijn manier een geschikte kerel, hoewel Richard zowat gek van hem werd, en wat Peter Walsh betrof, die had het haar tot op de dag van vandaag niet vergeven dat ze hem graag mocht (7-8)”.

“Holmes kwam naar boven. Holmes zou de deur opengooien. Holmes zou zeggen: ‘In de put, hè?’ Holmes zou hem te pakken krijgen. Maar nee; Holmes niet en Bradshaw niet. Terwijl hij nogal wankel overeind kwam, huppend van de ene voet op de andere, overwoog hij even mevrouw Filmers mooie schone broodmes met ‘Brood’ in het handvat gekerfd. Ach nee, dat was zonde. De gaskachel? Maar het was al te laat. Holmes kwam eraan. Hij zou de scheermesjes hebben gehad, ware het niet dat Rezia, die dat soort dingen altijd deed, ze had ingepakt. Er restte hem alleen nog het raam, het grote Bloomsburyraam, karakteristiek voor logementen; de onaangename, de ongemakkelijke en nogal melodramatische rampslomp van het raam openen en eruit springen. Het was hun idee van een tragedie, niet dat van hem of van Rezia (want zij stond aan zijn kant). Het was koren op de molen van Holmes en Bradshaw. (Hij zat in de vensterbank). Maar hij zou tot op het allerlaatste moment wachten. Hij wilde niet sterven. Het leven was goed. De zon warm. Maar mensen? Een oude man die aan de overkant de trap af kwam, stond stil en staarde naar hem. Holmes stond voor de deur. ‘Dan zullen jullie het krijgen, ook!’ riep hij, en wierp zich met kracht, met geweld op het spijlenhek van mevrouw Filmer (139)”.

“De jongeman had zelfmoord gepleegd; maar ze beklagde hem niet; nu de klok het uur sloeg, een, twee, drie, beklagde ze hem niet, met alles wat hier gaande was. Kijk! het oude vrouwtje had haar lamp uit gedaan! het hele huis was nu donker terwijl dit hier gaande was, herhaalde ze, en de volgende woorden kwamen in haar op: Vrees niet meer de verzengende zon. Ze moest terug naar de anderen. Maar wat een merkwaardige nacht! Ze voelde zich in zekere zin net als hij – de jongeman die zelfmoord had gepleegd. Ze was blij dat hij het had gedaan; het had weggegooid terwijl zij verder leefden. De klok sloeg. De loden kringen losten op in de lucht. Maar ze moest terug. Ze moest zich bij de anderen voegen. Ze moest Sally en Peter zoeken. En ze kwam het kamertje weer uit (174)”.