

‘Ziezo zusje, nu wordt er gewerkt of ik mep je dood!’

The Idiolect of Etty Hillesum in English and Swedish Translation



MA-Thesis Translation Studies

(Master Literair Vertalen)

Utrecht University

Faculty of Humanities

English Department

Mijke van Leersum (5513014)

Supervisor: Lette Vos, MA

Second Reader: Prof. dr. Klaas A.D. Smelik

July 2018

Abstract

This master thesis sets out to uncover the intricacies of translating a diary, by studying the idiolect in the diary of Etty Hillesum (1914-1943) and in two of its translations, to determine whether Hillesum's persona is portrayed differently in the translations. For this thesis two translations are used: the English one, translated by Arnold J. Pomerans (1983) and the Swedish one, by Brita Dahlman (1983). Chapter one provides a short introduction of Hillesum's life. Chapter two contextualizes this thesis by placing it in two fields of discourse, beside translation studies, namely life writing and Holocaust literature. This chapter will focus on the history and functions of diary writing and the role of the diary of Anne Frank in the aforementioned fields of discourse. In chapter three, a distinction is made between Hillesum's persona in the source culture and target cultures, based on the reception of the diary in said cultures. This chapter will be divided into three parts: first, the publication history of the diary will be discussed. Second, a study of the reception in the source culture will help to form an image of Hillesum's 'original' persona. Third, a study of the reception in the target culture will show how Hillesum's work is read in American and Swedish culture. This will help to establish Hillesum's persona in the two cultures and suggests approaches the translators might have taken, based on their target culture. Chapter four is concerned with the stylistic theory that will function as the framework for the analysis. In this chapter, theory on 'idiolect' and 'register' will be presented. Furthermore, several possible translation problems that might arise based on Hillesum's linguistic habits, are discussed. Chapter five will be the practical part of the thesis, where the theory presented in chapter four will be applied to the source text and its translations. The analysis will be sub-divided into several speech elements, namely 1) inner dialogue; particularly Hillesum's use of diminutives, imperatives and expletives, 2) graphological deviation; particularly Hillesum's implementation of emphasis by using accents and her use of punctuation to interrupt the flow of writing and 3) different

terms of endearment that Hillesum addresses herself with. In every category, the function of Hillesum's linguistic habits will be explained, followed by examples, translations and an analysis of said examples. Chapter six will offer conclusions, based on the analysis and the main question will be answered. This chapter will show how the translation choices made by the translators, have affected Hillesum's persona. Chapter seven will contain some final notes on the phenomena discussed in this thesis, such as the elusiveness of idiolect, how a translator can approach this and the difficulties of studying a personal document. Finally, ideas for further research will be suggested.

Contents

Abstract.....	2
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	6
1.1 Research question, corpus and approach.....	6
Chapter 2: Hillesum in context.....	10
2.1 History and functions of diary writing.....	10
2.2 Anne Frank and Etty Hillesum.....	11
2.3 Languages in this thesis.....	14
Chapter 3: Diary, translations and reception.....	15
3.1 The diary.....	15
3.2 The translations and its translators.....	16
3.3 Hillesum's persona.....	17
3.4 Reception in the source culture.....	18
3.5 Reception in the target cultures.....	21
Chapter 4: Stylistic Framework.....	26
4.1 Idiolect.....	26
4.2 Register.....	27
4.3 Stylistic translation problems.....	28
4.3.1 The spontaneous quality of diary writing.....	28
4.3.2 Inner dialogue.....	30
4.3.3 Graphological deviation.....	31
Chapter 5: Analysis.....	35
5.1 Inner Dialogue.....	35

5.1.1 Diminutive	35
5.1.2 Imperative	37
5.1.3 Expletives.....	39
Name-calling.....	39
Threats and reprimands.....	41
Negative qualities.....	42
5.2 Graphological deviation.....	44
5.2.1 Accents.....	44
5.2.2 Punctuation 1	46
5.2.3 Punctuation 2	48
5.3 Terms of endearment	50
5.4 Summary	51
Chapter 6: Conclusions.....	52
6.1 Pomerans.....	52
6.2 Dahlman.....	54
6.3 Translating idiolect and diary	55
Chapter 7: Further research and final notes	57
Works Cited	59

Chapter 1: Introduction

‘Vooruit dan maar!’, reads the opening line of the diary of Etty Hillesum (1914-1943). In the midst of the Second World War, the twenty-seven-year-old Jewish woman began keeping a diary in a plain college-lined notebook. Hillesum started the diary to try and get a grip on her physical and emotional breakdowns, probably on recommendation of Julius Spier (Costa, *Anne* 177; Smelik *Short* 27). Spier, by Etty often referred to as ‘S.’, was her therapist and would grow to be a dear friend and lover. The diary would soon become Hillesum’s lifeline, something to turn to whenever she felt like she was losing touch with herself. In the diary, she writes about her emotions, her spirituality, womanhood, her relationship with Spier, the increasing threat of Nazism and many other topics close to her heart. She kept a diary from March 1941 until October 1943. After she was deported to camp Westerbork¹, she continued to write letters. In October of 1943, news arrived via a letter, sent by a friend of Hillesum’s, that she and her family had been sent to Auschwitz (Hillesum, 209-212). On the 30th of November 1943, it was reported by the Red Cross that she had died in the concentration camp, at the age of 29 (Smelik, *Short* 29).

Ever since its publication in 1981, the diary has drawn attention from people all over the world. It has been praised for Hillesum’s unique style, philosophical contemplations and her hopeful, often witty, outlook on life during such a dark time in history. The diary has been translated into many different languages and new editions are still being published today.

1.1 Research question, corpus and approach

Hillesum’s diary has been a widely used source in several academic fields of discourse. Due to the literary, mystical, philosophical, historical, theological, psychological and therapeutic

¹ A transit camp in Drenthe, the Netherlands

elements in the diary, they have been studied and discussed by a variety of scholars (Gaarlandt X). Many critics have also touched upon the unique use of language in the diaries and its overall effect. Hillesum's language has been widely studied in the source culture, in essays, book chapters and even entire anthologies dedicated to Hillesum's idiom².

However, there has been significantly less literature on the translations of the diary. Apart from a handful of written accounts based on personal experience by translators themselves³, the diary's translations have hardly been studied in an academic setting, which creates a gap in the literature. This thesis will attempt to generate more insight into the translations of Hillesum's work by analysing two of the translated diaries: the English and the Swedish. Furthermore, in the field of translation studies, little has been written on translating idiolect in non-fiction. Therefore, this thesis aims to provide more insight into translating idiolect in personal documents and aims to show how translation choices can affect a person's idiolect and persona.

This aim of this thesis is to answer the main question: How have the translators of Hillesum's diary into English and Swedish dealt with translating Hillesum's idiolect and how have their translation choices affected her persona?

In order to answer the main question, there are two related questions that will be answered throughout this thesis. The first one is: What makes up Hillesum's persona? This question will help to define what a persona is and what Hillesum's consists of. After all, in

² E.g. Costa, Denise de, & Ton Jorna. *Van aandacht en adem tot ziel en zin: Honderd woorden uit het levensbeschouwend idioom van Etty Hillesum*. Utrecht: Kwadraat, 1999. Print.

Clement, Marja. "'Hineinhorchen' en schrijven: De taal van Etty Hillesum." In: *Etty Hillesum weer thuis in Middelburg* (Etty Hillesum Studies, 7). Edited by Klaas A.D. Smelik, et al. Antwerpen-Apeldoorn: Garant, 2015, 15-36. Print.

³ E.g. Noble, Philippe. "Het dubbele filter: De dagboeken en brieven van Etty Hillesum in Franse vertaling." In: Brandt, Ria van den and Smelik, Klaas A.D, ed. *Etty Hillesum in facetten*. Budel: DAMON, 2003, 93 -111. Print.

Van Oord, Gerrit. "Italiaans enthousiasme: Het dagboek van Etty Hillesum in Italië" In: Brandt and Smelik, 111-129. Print.

Passanti, Chiara. "Bij het vertalen van 'Het verstoorde leven'." In: Gaarlandt, Jan Geurt, ed. 'Men zou een pleister op vele wonden willen zijn': reacties op de dagboeken en brieven van Etty Hillesum. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Balans, 1989, 156-159. Print.

order to establish how the translation choices have affected the persona, there must be an initial image of the persona. This will be discussed in chapter two and chapter three, which focus on the function of diary writing, the difference between a personal document and a document intended for publication, and the diary's reception in the source culture and several target cultures. These chapters will help to gain a better understanding of how a persona is created, how it differs from the historical figure and how Hillesum's persona differs across cultures.

The second question is: What is an idiolect and how can it be studied? Once the persona is established, looking at the idiolect will help to illustrate how a person's characteristics can be found in their speech patterns. This will be discussed in chapter four and demonstrated in chapter five. Chapter four focuses on idiolect and register, where they appear most clearly and what purpose they serve within the diary. In chapter five, the theory offered in chapter four will then be applied to passages of her diary. These will be analysed to uncover what types of difficulties the translators encountered, how they have dealt with them and what effect this has had on the diary as a whole. The English and Swedish translations of the diary will function as a tool of comparison. Looking at these translations will help to crystalize the persona presented in the translations so that this can be compared to the persona from the source text.

The English translation was chosen because there is a great interest in Hillesum, both the person and her writing, in the United States (Brandt 10). Upon publication it was featured on the front page of the *New York Times* and many scholars have written papers and books on Hillesum (Gaarlandt X). The translator of the English edition was also responsible for the British and Canadian editions. In the analysis, an edition published in the United States is used.

The Swedish translation was chosen because there is significantly less interest in Hillesum in Swedish culture. Possible reasons for this will be explored in chapter three. Furthermore, the research will become more in-depth by using two translations, as they can be compared to the original and contrasted against one another.

This thesis is structured as follows: chapter two will outline the main functions of diary writing and touches upon the diary of Anne Frank, and how it relates to Hillesum's diary. Chapter three will construct Hillesum's 'original' persona based on the reception in the source and target culture. Chapter four elaborates on linguistic variation, particularly idiolect, register and graphological deviation in written narrative dialogue and inner dialogue. This chapter also introduces several possible translation problems based on Hillesum's idiolect. Chapter five will provide examples of Hillesum's unique linguistic variations, which will then be compared to their English and Swedish translations. In chapter six, conclusions will be drawn and the main question will be answered. Chapter seven offers final remarks and suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2: Hillesum in context

First, it is important to understand how Hillesum's diary is placed within the tradition of diary writing as it will help to contextualize this research. Secondly, a note on Anne Frank is necessary, as her diary is a much more common source in the fields of diary writing and Holocaust literature. Therefore, an explanation will be given on why Hillesum's diary was chosen for this thesis. Finally, there will be a general note on the different languages used in this thesis.

2.1 History and functions of diary writing

What sets diary writing apart from other autobiographical writing, such as memoirs or biographies, is its unique sense of unpredictability. This unpredictability is credited to the fact that the diarist has a 'lack of foreknowledge about outcomes of the plot of his life' (Smith & Watson 266). This brings a certain spontaneity to the act of writing because the content of the diary is driven by the events of the day. Furthermore, diary keeping is a private matter: diaries are rarely written with future publication in mind. However, this has not always been the case: the contents and functions of a diary have changed throughout history. In the eighteenth century, female diarists often wrote as 'family and community historians', keeping a detailed record of births, marriages, visits, travels, and other goings-on in the community (Culley 4). These records were intended for publication or at least preservation, so that they could be read by others. This is in contrast with the 'modern diarist whose principal subject is the self', who emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (ibid.). Hillesum can be considered the latter. The type of diary Hillesum kept is the product of a significant shift in history from journal writing to diary writing. The fact that Hillesum wrote with herself as the main subject can be seen in the diary itself. On the first page of her diary she describes the act of writing as '[..] het geremde gemoed prijs geven aan een onnozel stuk lijntjespapier' (1).

She sets out to lay bare her most inner feelings, which is an indication of the self-inquiring function of the diary.

Unlike journals, diaries are often not meant for publication. The same goes for Hillesum's diary, although she did express the desire to become an author someday. However, the 'someday'-part is crucial since throughout the diary it is apparent that she feels she has not yet achieved her desired capability for writing: 'Ik haat een opeenhoping van woorden. Men kan eigenlijk met zo weinig woorden zeggen de paar grote dingen, waar het om gaat in het leven. Als ik ooit zal schrijven – wat eigenlijk? – dan zou ik enkele woorden willen penselen tegen een woordeloze achtergrond' (96). Later on, she decides that once the war is over, she wants to write about everything that happened, to become the 'kroniekschrijfster' of her time (157). She even felt it was her duty in life: 'Maar als ik één echte plicht heb in het leven, in deze tijd, in dit stadium van mijn leven, dan is het: schrijven, noteren, vasthouden' (184). Those lines reveal what her diary meant to her: it was a personal document, which she used to keep track of her own life. It was not until she realized that she might not survive the war, that she gave the notebooks to a friend and instructed her that, should she be deported, the friend was to give them to Klaas Smelik, the only writer Hillesum knew, so that he could have them published (Smelik, *Gedenken* 23). It can be argued that this proves that Hillesum might have had the intention to publish her diary after all. However, fragments from the diary show that this intention did not exist yet at the time of writing and therefore the diary should be considered as a personal document.

2.2 Anne Frank and Etty Hillesum

When mentioning a woman who was young, Dutch, Jewish and kept a diary during the Second World War, Hillesum may not be the first person to come to mind. Anne Frank (1929-1945) kept a diary from 1941 until 1944. She also wrote stories and kept a book with 'beautiful sentences' (Costa, *Anne* 48). Frank was much younger than Hillesum, starting her

diary at thirteen years old, whereas Hillesum was twenty-seven when she first started to write. Despite this age difference, there are several similarities between the two women that go beyond the obvious. For example, both kept a diary to further develop themselves and they wrote regularly, with dedication and intensity (ibid. 15). For both of them, keeping a diary was a form of escapism, a safe place into which they could withdraw themselves from the horrors around them (idem).

A significant difference between Frank and Hillesum is that Frank edited her diary and knew it would be published. This makes Hillesum a more suitable subject for this thesis, as it studies Hillesum's idiolect and persona, two phenomena which appear most clearly in uninhibited spontaneous writing; therefore Hillesum's diary is a rich source for this thesis. Another important difference is that Frank personified her diary. She constructed an 'addressee' or an 'implied reader', whom she often referred to as 'Kitty' (Smith and Watson 89). Costa describes how Frank regards the diary 'als een bezielde persoon, tot wie zij zich al schrijvend richt' (*Anne* 49). This 'person', according to Costa, was in fact a string of fictional characters, taken from a popular book series for young girls that Frank was reading at the time (*Anne* 56). However, Kitty was her favourite character to write to, a fact Frank admitted herself in the diaries (ibid., *Anne* 58). By introducing these fictional characters, she created a world in which she interacted with them. She considered these fictional readers to be sympathetic friends whom she spoke to in confidence (Smith and Watson 89). In contrast, Hillesum does not at any point introduce a third person, real nor fictional. She writes in the first person, and occasionally in the second person, whenever she refers to herself.

Hillesum did not write to an addressee but perhaps she wrote, as is often the case with diaries, to another version of herself (ibid., 88). This is underlined by responses to the diary from people who knew Hillesum when she was alive. Some of them appeared to be surprised

upon discovering Hillesum's rich inner spiritual life. Klaas Smelik Junior, whose father and half-sister knew Hillesum well, writes:

[...] [V]erderop lezend in de dagboeken stel ik tot mijn verbazing vast dat Etty Hillesum een bijzonder gelovige vrouw is geweest. Daarover had ik nog nooit eerder gehoord: ik had uit de verhalen van mijn vader en halfzus de indruk gekregen dat Etty een zeer linkse studente was, die een vrij leven leidde zonder God of gebod. Nu blijkt zij een spirituele denkster te zijn die in een voortdurende dialoog met God stond, toen zij haar dagboeken schreef. (*Gedenken* 27)

As mentioned earlier, unlike Hillesum, Frank knew that her work would most likely be published. Frank therefore rewrote parts of her diary once she realised that it could and, according to herself, should be published (Lefevere 379). She 'auto-edited' on two levels: the literary and the personal (ibid., 379). This means she changed the language to produce a text that was more stylistically refined, removed passages she thought were embarrassing, and added value judgements in hindsight. Hillesum did not at any point edit what she wrote. This is an important distinction between the two. Lefevere writes: 'Op het moment dat Anne Frank met het oog op publicatie besloot te herschrijven wat Anne Frank had geschreven, splitste de persoon Anne Frank zich op in een persoon en een schrijfster, en begon de schrijfster wat de persoon had geschreven te herschrijven in een meer literaire stijl' (388). He argues that the author Anne Frank and the girl Anne Frank should be seen as two different people.

In Hillesum's case, the fact that she did not intent to publish would mean that the person who wrote the diary is not an author but only a person. However, it would be too reductive to conclude that the 'historical' or 'real' Hillesum did not differ from the version of herself she presented in the diaries at all. Therefore, for the purpose of this thesis, the term

‘persona’ is used. Hillesum may not have been or considered herself an author but that does not mean she was the same person inside the diary and outside of it.

2.3 Languages in this thesis

Four languages will feature in this thesis: Dutch, English, Swedish and German⁴. The latter will appear in some of the diary entries used in this thesis, because Hillesum wrote in German frequently. In fact, Hillesum’s diary is filled with German words and phrases. She uses German in nearly all of her descriptions of interactions with Julius Spier, who himself was German, and often uses German words to describe emotions or abstract ideas. In hindsight, some might think it strange that Hillesum, who was Jewish, would write so much in the language of the Germans. However, at that point German was the language of culture and philosophy and had not yet been ‘contaminated’ by Nazism. Moreover, Julius Spier was a close friend of Hillesum’s and much of the diary is about their relationship. She was also his secretary, patient and friend and so she spent most of her days in his company. Given the fact that Hillesum spent a large part of her days speaking German, it is unsurprising that German words appear in her diary as well.

Neither of the translators have adhered to her use of German and have instead chosen to translate the German into their own respective languages. There are a few cases where the German has been maintained. For example, when Hillesum explicitly mentions how she cannot find a Dutch equivalent for a German word. This is a highly remarkable choice made by the translators and it has had a significant impact on the diary. However, the focus of this thesis is Hillesum’s idiolect and this information will therefore not be included or discussed further in this thesis.

⁴ Out of the four languages in this thesis, only Swedish will be translated. It is assumed that readers are accustomed with Dutch, English and German.

Chapter 3: Diary, translations and reception

In this chapter the publication history of the diary and its translations will be discussed. A brief discussion on the reception in the source and target cultures will follow, in order to answer the question: What makes up Hillesum's persona?

3.1 The diary

After Klaas Smelik Senior received the collection of notebooks in which Hillesum kept her diary, he spent years trying to find someone willing to publish them, to no avail (Smelik, *Gedenken* 24). The notebooks remained in the custody of the Smelik family for years. Until 1979, when Klaas Smelik Junior introduced Hillesum's writings to Jan Geurt Gaarlandt, after which he took an interest in them and decided to publish a selection of her writings (ibid., 26). In 1981 his publishing house, De Haan, released *Het Verstoorde Leven: Dagboek van Eddy Hillesum*.

This edition consists of a selection from the notebooks and a couple of the letters sent from Westerbork. At that point, there were still countless diary entries and letters that remained unpublished. In the fifth edition of the diary, Gaarlandt urged anyone who had any letters or pictures of Hillesum to send them to him for the following reason: he was compiling a complete unabridged edition of her writings (Gaarlandt, X). In 1986, Uitgeverij Balans (previously De Haan), published the unabridged edition called *Eddy: De nagelaten geschriften van Eddy Hillesum 1941-43*. The book was edited by Klaas Smelik, who remained active in the distribution of and research on Hillesum's work long after the first diary was published⁵. This edition is regarded as the scientific and integral edition of the complete diary and all the letters Hillesum sent from camp Westerbork (Brandt 9). According to Smelik, the purpose of this new release was to give as much information as possible in a concise manner while still

⁵ He is currently the head of the Eddy Hillesum Research Centre (EHOC), founded in 2006 ("Wat is").

preserving the readability of the text (Smelik, *Gedenken* 32). For this edition, additional footnotes were added, names were verified, and a small taskforce of researchers did a thorough re-reading of the notebooks, because Hillesum's scribbly handwriting had at times been misinterpreted (ibid., 30-31).

For this thesis, however, the first edition of the diary is used, even though it is only a selection of her writings and not the complete work. The reason for this is that at the moment of writing, a translation of the integral edition only exists in English, not in Swedish. Therefore, the translations used in this thesis are translations of the first publication, not the unabridged edition, as this edition was available in both languages. The letters from Westerbork will be excluded from the analysis. This thesis focuses on Hillesum's idiolect, which is most visible in her diary, where she writes without an addressee in mind.

3.2 The translations and its translators

The diary has been translated 33 times, in 19 countries and into 17 languages⁶, due to the fact that the US, UK and Canadian versions are all written in English. The English edition, *'Etty': A Diary, 1941-1943* was published in 1983 for the English-speaking market. In the same year, *An Interrupted Life: The Diaries of Etty Hillesum 1941-1943*, was released in America by Pantheon Books, a division of Random House.

The diary was translated into English by Arnold Pomerans (1920-2005), a British translator of Jewish origin. He translated from many languages but had a 'particular affinity' with the Dutch language ('Arnold'). He published around 200 titles in his career, including translations of the works of Hugo Claus, Sigmund Freud and Anne Frank. It is interesting to note that Pomerans is responsible for all available English translations of Hillesum's diary and letters, in the US, the UK as well as Canada.

⁶ Countries that have published *Het Verstoorde Leven*: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States ('Edities')

The Swedish edition, *Det Förstörda Livet: Dagböcker 1941-43 Etty Hillesum*, was also published in 1983, by Nordstedt & Söners. It was translated by Brita Dahlman (1911-1989). She translated approximately 20 titles, mostly from English and Dutch.

Little is known about which strategies either one of them might have adopted for the translation of Hillesum's work. However, in Pomerans' obituary published by the Independent, the following is said about his views of translation: 'Far from being a literal translator, he would frequently read a page of the original carefully, put the book down, and render the text into exquisite idiomatic English. He said that a translator's job was to recreate in the image of the original, and his versions were often held to have improved on their original text' ('Arnold'). This could mean that Pomerans may have strayed from the source text or taken stylistic liberties. The analysis will help to determine whether this approach is reflected in his translation.

3.3 Hillesum's persona

Before trying to determine whether Hillesum's persona has changed throughout the translations, it is important to first establish what her 'original' persona might look like. It has been mentioned before that diarists often write to a different version of themselves; a version that does not necessarily represent the complete person. A persona is therefore the version of a person that they choose to present to the reader. Since this document is autobiographical, the protagonist, narrator, and author are all the same person. This does not mean that there is no distinct voice present in the diary. On the contrary, it is because of the natural and chronological development that is so characteristic for a diary that 'the diarist's voice takes on a recognizable narrative persona' (Culley 12). This chapter sets out to form an image of what makes up Hillesum's narrative persona.

It should be noted that reading and interpreting a work is highly subjective, so therefore the answer to the main question will not be a simple case of stating whether her

persona has changed in the translations or not. Instead, the analysis will help to determine whether the choices made by the translators may have affected the established persona in any consistent or significant way.

3.4 Reception in the source culture

The reception of Hillesum's diary will help to establish how Hillesum was perceived by those who read and studied her work. Consequently, an image of Hillesum's persona will emerge. Fortunately, the reception of the diary has been well-documented. In 1989, Geurt Gaarlandt published a book called *'Ik zou een pleister op vele wonden willen zijn': Reacties op de dagboeken en brieven van Etty Hillesum* in which he gathered responses to the diary, both from the Netherlands and abroad. These responses range from personal accounts of what Hillesum meant to people personally, to how her writing can be regarded in a theological, philosophical or feminist framework. Later, in 2003, Brandt and Smelik edited and published the book *Etty Hillesum in Facetten* in which eight authors discuss different aspects of the diary's reception. For the purposes of this thesis, only responses regarding the stylistic and literary qualities of her diary will be selected, to define her uniqueness as an author.

A passage from the diary will be used to illustrate and contextualize the commentary of the critics. Hillesum wrote with great attention to detail, finding valuable lessons or philosophical musings in seemingly mundane situations. This shows in the following passage, where she describes how she felt as she watched her mother eating a bowl of soup at a dinner party:

Er was in die gulzigheid iets of ze bang was in het leven iets te kort te zullen komen.

Iets verschrikkelijks zieligs was er in haar en tegelijk iets dierlijks afstotelijks. Zo zag ik het. In werkelijkheid was ze een vrouw in een blauwe kanten japon die soep at.

Maar wanneer ik zou kunnen begrijpen, wàt ik allemaal in haar voelde, toen ik haar

daar zo gadesloeg, dan zou ik veel van m'n moeder begrijpen. Die angst om in het leven iets te kort te komen en door die angst kom je eigenlijk alles te kort. Kom je aan het werkelijke niet toe. (Hillesum 54)

Minco considers this passage to be an example of Hillesum at her best, writing with precision and a keen sense of detail (4). In the diary, Hillesum continues by applying her newfound knowledge to herself: 'Psychologisch zou je misschien deze formule op kunnen stellen – moet je de onnozele leek horen: ik heb een oppositie tegen m'n moeder, die is nog steeds niet in elkaar gezakt, en daarom doe ik die dingen, die ik in haar verafschuw, precies zo' (54-5). This sentence shows two aspects of Hillesum's writing style. First, her tendency to write about matters close to her heart. Fens writes: 'Het dagboek is een poging van de schrijfster over zichzelf tot helderheid te komen; het is dus zeer reflexief; uiterlijke gebeurtenissen worden slechts beschreven met het oogmerk van persoonlijke duiding: ze worden op hun persoonlijke betekenis doorlicht' (8). The second aspect is her signature sense of humour and self-awareness. Kleef-Hillesum writes: 'Naast haar diepste gedachten, waarbij ze ook de depressies niet verdoezelt, beschrijft Etty gevoelig en vol humor de dagelijkse gebeurtenissen. De goede dingen – muziek, samen gezellig eten, bloemen op haar schrijftafel – komen steeds weer boven ondanks alle verdriet om wat joden niet meer mogen [...]' (20). Others also touch upon this sense of humour she manages to keep throughout her diary, even in dire situations: '[...] [A]l gauw weet ze de lezer te bekoren door haar eerlijkheid, haar intelligentie, haar spontaniteit, haar humor' writes Heldring (22). He refers to a confrontation between Hillesum and a Gestapo officer:

Toen ik voor zijn lessenaar verscheen met S. brulde hij me opeens aan: Was finden Sie lächerlich hier. Ik had graag gezegd: Außer Ihnen, finde ich nichts lächerlich hier,

maar uit diplomatieke overwegingen leek het me beter dat achterwege te laten. Sie lachen ja fortwährend, brulde hij verder. En ik heel onschuldig: davon bin ich mir gar nicht bewußt, das ist mein gewöhnliches Gesicht. [...] Ik had misschien verontwaardigd of bang moeten zijn, maar het belangrijke van die ochtend lijkt me daarin te liggen, dat ik een oprecht medelijden met die jongen had, dat ik hem het liefst gevraagd had: heb je zo'n ongelukkige jeugd gehad of heeft je meisje je bedrogen? [...] Ik had het liefst direct met een psychologische behandeling begonnen (82).

Hillesum's distant and amused attitude towards the officer, combined with the coy reply she gave him, is a testament to the woman she was: someone who was unphased by tense situations and most importantly, wrote about her experiences in a lively, humorous manner. The passage above paints such a vivid picture by combining direct speech combined with the vocal verb 'brulde' and the addition 'heel onschuldig' (idem). Her use of style and language makes the story come to life. Even Karel van het Reve, who once wrote a highly critical review in which he refers to her diary as a 'bakvissendagboek'⁷, notes that her quality of writing improves throughout the years. 'Al in 1941 merk je dat ze eigenlijk zou willen schrijven, maar echt goed schrijven doet ze pas in 1942 en 1943, als de broeierige 'S.'-uitspraken en het *Stundenbuch* van Rilke, hoewel nog steeds ter sprake komend, plaats maken voor eenvoudig en helder proza' (42-43). For Hillesum, that was the highest goal she hoped to achieve as a writer: 'Misschien geeft God me nog eens die paar eenvoudige woorden? Ook kleurige en hartstochtelijke en ook ernstige woorden. Maar bovenal: eenvoudige' (172).

Based on this selection of responses, several characteristics of Hillesum's persona arise. It can be concluded that she was a highly reflective author. She had a keen eye for

⁷ 'Bakvis' was a common curse word at the time, used to mock immature girls

observation and described events with honesty and humour alike and her writing style was clear, simple, intelligent, honest and spontaneous.

3.5 Reception in the target cultures

Both translations were published in 1983, relatively shortly after the original publishing date in 1981. In the American field of discourse on Hillesum, critics have stated that the English translation is faulty, incomplete, or too interpretative (Costa, *Fel* 7; Groot 129; Des Pres 73). This raises the question of whether the American readers have gotten a complete and honest image of Hillesum. In one case, the characterisation was deliberately altered. In some of the early American publications, the cigarette Hillesum held in her hand was photoshopped out of the cover picture (Costa, *Fel* 78). This change could have had a great effect on how people perceive Hillesum's persona. Costa comments on this: 'Etty Hillesum ontwikkelde zich misschien in de loop der tijd tot een 'bijna heilige', maar ze had ook haar wereldse, 'onheilige' kanten. Juist deze oppositie, deze innerlijke tegenstrijd typeerde haar [...]' (*Fel* 79). Moreover, it was noted by Groot that Hillesum was almost exclusively placed in the field of discourse of gender studies and Holocaust literature (129). Many American scholars took an interest in her identity, both as a Jew and as a woman, and how her spirituality could be interpreted (or even implemented) as a universally religious discourse (ibid.). In terms of persona, it can be argued that the American critics were less interested in how she wrote and more interested in what her writing could mean. The result of this is that Hillesum was placed in contexts much larger than the diary itself and consequently Hillesum's persona became larger than life as well. Groot offers an explanation:

Niet gehinderd door historische details en Nederlandstalig bronnenmateriaal (zoals de volledige editie) wordt in de Amerikaanse receptie vaak grootser en meeslepender gedacht over de figuur van Etty Hillesum dan in Nederland en dat levert soms

gewaagde, maar ook relevante waarnemingen op omtrent Hillesums identiteit als joods en vrouw enerzijds en haar spiritualiteit als universeel religieus discours anderzijds. (148-49)

She postulated that the publication of the unabridged version might result in a renewed interest for Hillesum work (130). Unfortunately, this did not happen. ‘The unabridged 2002 text edition did not generate additional interest in the Dutch context of Hillesum’s mental universe’, writes Hans Krabbendam in his essay on Hillesum’s reception in the American culture. Krabbendam also notes that after 2002, Hillesum was mostly studied in the field of psychology. ‘There exists a definite trend to read Hillesum’s work in psychological terms’, he writes (386). Jewish-American literary scholar Rachel Feldhay Brenner points out that American critics may have wanted Hillesum’s work to be more sensational. Here paraphrased by Krabbendam:

Their preconceived model of such a diary consisted of an explicit record of the cruelties done to Jews written by someone who had a deep awareness of her/his Jewish religious and cultural identity. [...] The absence of a conscious Jewish identity, her inner struggle, and her criticism of the Jewish elite, who [Brenner] said, stood empty-handed without the protection of the external signs of their status, were arguments for some representatives of Holocaust Studies in America to cast Etty Hillesum aside as irrelevant. (387)

This statement shows that Hillesum’s persona in American culture is highly context-dependent. This makes it more difficult to establish a persona that is consistent and reliable. However, the American reception does show that the function of the diary is different in the

target culture because Hillesum needs to fulfil certain roles: a Jew, a woman, a hero. The analysis will show whether these roles actually emerge in the translation.

When the diary was published in the Netherlands, it sold around 200,000 copies and it was immediately translated into a number of languages (Goldman 85). However, when it was published in Sweden, it was not as successful. Anita Goldman, author of *Guds älskarinnor: om hängivna kvinnor i en livrädd värld*⁸ writes on the reception, or lack thereof, in Sweden:

Anledningarna till att publiceringen av Etty Hillesums dagbok passerade så obemärkt i Sverige är säkert flera. I det allmänna medvetandet om Förintelsen existerade det redan en dagboksskrivande judinna från Amsterdam och kanske upplevdes det som att man inte behövde »en till». Anne Franks dagböcker är också lättare att ta till sig, skrivna som de är av en ung oskuldsfull flicka, utan pretentioner på att presentera en världsbild som utmanar den etablerade synen på gott och ont.⁹ (85)

Goldman also points out that the Holocaust is framed somewhat differently in Swedish culture since the country was neutral during the war (idem). She even describes the interest in the war as 'knappast akut', translating to 'hardly pressing' (idem). Furthermore, she points out how Hillesum's diary, and especially her spirituality, would most likely have been considered strange by the Swedish people in that time: 'Dessutom tror jag att Ettys särskilda slag av intensiva andlighet kändes främmande i en nation som bekänner sig till en sval postlutheransk sekularism'¹⁰ (86). This affects Hillesum's Swedish persona. Her ideas were

⁸ God's Lovers: On Devoted Women in a Terrified World

⁹ There are definitely several reasons for why the publication of Etty Hillesum's diary went by unnoticed in Sweden. In the public knowledge on the Holocaust, a Jewish woman from Amsterdam who wrote diaries existed already, and maybe that is why people felt they did not need 'another one'. The diaries of Anne Frank are also easier to take in, seeing as they are written by a young innocent girl, without trying to present a worldview that challenges the established view on good and evil.

¹⁰ Furthermore, I believe that Etty's particular kind of intense spirituality felt alien in a country that considers itself to belong to a somewhat disengaged branch of post-Lutheran secularism

seen as alien by the Swedish public, which might have raised the threshold for people to connect with her writings. Based on what Goldman writes about the receiving culture, it is apparent that there are certain cultural norms at play here, which do not align with those in the source culture. This is a significant contrast with the source culture, where the diary was received with many positive responses. A possible explanation for this is that the diary might have been part of a larger ideological trend in the eighties: '[...] dit soort [positieve] reacties [zijn] een symptoom van een metaforiserings- of mythologiseringsproces ten aanzien van de tweede wereldoorlog. Sommige mensen vinden hun historische exempla van goed en kwaad, hun mythische schurken en heiligen in deze recente oorlogsgeschiedenis' (Schrijvers 90). This seems to mirror Goldman's idea that Hillesum's writing challenged the current ideas of good and evil. In the Netherlands, those same ideas were reaffirmed instead. It is important to remember that these cultural differences affect the translation process and raises questions about the role of the translator. According to Toury, acts of translation can be considered as acts with a cultural meaning behind them (321). The translator has a social function, because he or she applies cultural norms in order to create a product that is suitable for the target culture (idem). Toury defines two types of 'normsystemen', which are the driving force behind any translation:

- (1) een vertaling is een tekst in een bepaalde taal en heeft dus een plek, bezet een positie, in de aangewezen cultuur, of een onderdeel daarvan;
- (2) een vertaling vormt een representatie in die taal/cultuur van een al bestaande tekst in een andere taal, die onderdeel is van een andere cultuur en daarin een specifieke positie inneemt. (323)

In the Swedish translation, there is a discrepancy between the first and the second system: the target culture has different norms regarding the Second World War and consequently the book performs a different function in the target culture than in the source culture. The same can be said for the American translation and the function the diary has in its culture.

American critics appeared to be more interested in how Hillesum's writings could be placed in fields of discourse, and less interested in the stylistic subtleties in the diary. Instead, much like the Dutch audience, they want to read about the struggle, the heroism and the stories of good and evil. The Swedish culture, on the other hand, seems to be less interested in Holocaust literature in general. This is important to keep in mind when looking at the translations, because the translators might have been aware of the interest in Holocaust literature in their respective cultures and chose their strategies accordingly.

In summary, it appears as if Hillesum's persona consists of different qualities in these two cultures compared to the source culture. In the American culture, the content of her diary is more important than the style in which it was written. Hillesum's persona therefore needs to be easy to establish, in black-and-white terms, so that she can have a role in a myriad of discourses. In the Swedish culture, there seems to be a lack of a general reception and the value or purpose of Hillesum's work can therefore not be discerned as easily. As a result, Hillesum's persona in the Swedish culture seems to be a person who is strange, with a foreign outlook on life and religion. Both of these images are in contrast with the persona that emerged from the reception in the source culture. The target cultures seem less interested in her wit, spontaneity, honesty and intelligence: qualities that were highly appreciated in the source culture. The analysis will show whether and if so, how the translation choices have contributed to these versions of Hillesum's persona.

Chapter 4: Stylistic Framework

This chapter offers a stylistic framework for the analysis and aims to answer the question:

What is an idiolect and how can it be studied? First, the terms ‘idiolect’ and ‘register’ will be discussed and illustrated with examples from the diary. Then Hillesum’s idiosyncrasies will be broken down into three translation problems: the spontaneous quality of diary-writing, inner dialogue and graphological deviation.

4.1 Idiolect

The previous chapter showed that many Dutch critics found Hillesum’s way of writing remarkable. It is important to remember that the diary was never meant for publication, and therefore she wrote unguardedly, with honest observations and a distinct voice. According to Hahn, this spontaneous way of writing provides the reader with a sense of ‘authenticity’ and he argues that this is unequivocally intertwined with her use of language: ‘[D]eze authenticiteit wordt herkenbaar en voelbaar in haar heldere, onverwisselbare en onverminkte taal. Etty Hillesum schrijft in een taal die tegelijk rijk en eenvoudig, helder en genuanceerd, elastisch, flexibel en toch raak is’ (55). The adjectives ‘onverwisselbare’ (un-interchangeable) and ‘onverminkte’ (un-maimed) emphasize just how unique her style was (idem). This linguistic uniqueness can be referred to as an idiolect: a ‘term reserved for an individual’s special unique style’ which is composed of their own ‘linguistic mannerisms’ and ‘stylistic idiosyncrasies’ (Simpson 110). According to Leech and Short, idiolect can be considered a type of dialect: ‘A DIALECT is thus the particular set of linguistic features which a defined subset of the speech community shares; IDIOLECT refers, more specifically, to the linguistic ‘thumbprint’ of a particular person: to the features of speech that mark him off as one individual from another’ (134). Both dialect and idiolect are linguistic varieties that provide the reader with information about a character, and especially idiolect is often employed in novels to show a deviation from the author’s own standard norm of writing or conversing

(ibid., 136-7). However, as established before, Hillesum was not an author and consequentially idiolect did not have the same function or purpose for her. Instead, it has a function for those who read her work because her idiolect adds a unique dimension to the stories she tells. Hillesum used her distinct voice to narrate the events of her (inner) life and created a narrative full of details and colourful anecdotes. Leech and Short describe the effect of this approach as ‘verisimilitude’ or ‘to evoke reality by particularising’ (136). Hillesum may not have purposefully employed this tactic in order to write a stylistically interesting and unique story, but it is this authenticity that has drawn readers to her work time and again.

4.2 Register

In order to properly discuss the way language is used by a specific person, it is helpful to make a distinction between different aspects of speech. Beside the terms ‘dialect’ and ‘idiolect’, which help to distinguish between communal and individual language, another useful term in this discourse is ‘register’. Simpson writes:

Whereas a dialect is a linguistic variety that is defined according to the user of language – it tells you things about their social and regional background – a *register* on the other hand, is defined according to the *use* to which language is being put. In other words, a register shows, through a regular, fixed pattern of vocabulary and grammar, what a speaker or writer is doing with language at a given moment. (112)

To understand Hillesum’s language, it is key to find out how she uses it and in which context. According to Simpson, this can be assessed by defining the context according to a set of features, which he calls ‘field’, ‘tenor’ and ‘mode’ (112). He explains these terms as follows: ‘Field of discourse refers to the setting and purpose of the interaction, tenor to the relationship between the participants in interaction and mode to the medium of

communication (that is, whether it is spoken or written)’ (idem). For the diaries, the mode to the medium is the easiest to establish, namely written diary entries. The tenor relates to the participants in the conversation. However, in diary writing there is only one participant and therefore the relationship present in diary writing can best be described as a conversation with the self, especially in Hillesum’s case: textual evidence supports that she started the diary to embark on a journey of self-discovery and at times she even explicitly converses with herself. At first, this prospect of self-discovery hardly seemed exciting to her, as shown by the opening lines of her diary: ‘Vooruit dan maar! Dit wordt een pijnlijk en haast onoverkomelijk moment voor mij: het geremde gemoed prijs geven aan een onnozel stuk lijntjespapier’ (Hillesum 1). However, only three weeks later, she emphasizes how important it is to keep on writing: ‘Ik moet er voor zorgen, dat ik contact met dit schrift houd, d.w.z. met mezelf, anders gaat het niet goed met me; ik loop nog ieder ogenblik de kans helemaal weer verloren en verdwaald te raken [...]’ (ibid., 15). In this passage she clearly states the purpose that the diary serves for her, namely, to stay connected to herself. The setting, therefore, is autobiographical writing, or more specifically, diary writing. In conclusion, when examining Hillesum’s register, it is important to remember that she wrote in a diary, to herself, and the register can therefore be expected to be informal, intimate and highly personal. These conditions will help to examine whether Hillesum diverts from her usual register and if so, how the translators have dealt with that.

4.3 Stylistic translation problems

4.3.1 The spontaneous quality of diary writing

To further establish Hillesum’s register and idiolect, it is key to find which textual elements make up her ‘linguistic thumbprint’ and where these appear in the diary. In order to answer the main question, Hillesum’s idiolect will be studied by looking at two levels of her idiolect. The first level is inner dialogue and the second is graphological deviation. However, before

exploring these two levels, it is important to remember that the medium affects how the idiosyncratic elements manifest themselves in the work. It has been noted before that there is a spontaneous element to diary writing, and in the following passage, Noble elaborates on how this spontaneity affects the levels of style:

In het dagboek komen verschillende stilistische registers aan bod – Etty bekommert zich niet om eenheid op dat vlak. Haar vocabulaire, met zoveel aan filosofie of psychologie ontleende termen, heeft een wetenschappelijk tintje, maar in de – wat schaarsere – verhalende passages of in dialogen is haar taalgebruik gewoner, alledaagser, of soms ironisch studentikoos, wanneer de dagboekschrijfster zichzelf toespreekt. De syntaxis is los, toegespitst op directe bruikbaarheid, en in dit eerste schrift althans worden er zelden stilistische ingrepen toegepast die duiden op een behoefte aan sierlijkheid. Dit schrijven is geboren uit noodzaak. (101)

In this observation, both syntactic and semantic levels are discussed explicitly. Even though her diary is often praised for their stylistic value, the syntax is at times fragmented, hurried, or even incomplete. Noble illustrates this further on, with an example from the diaries:

‘Omdat ik zelf nog zo jong ben en vol onverwoestbare wil om me niet ten onder te laten krijgen en het gevoel dat ik er ook toe mee kan helpen ontstane leemtes op te vullen en daartoe ook de kracht voelende, kom je er nauwelijks toe je te realiseren, hoe verarmd, wij jongeren, achterblijven en hoe eenzaam we komen te staan’ (Hillesum 19). She had just learned of the death of one of her professors and in the rest of the diary entry she reflects on other professors and intellectuals of that time who passed away or had been captured since 1940 (Noble 105). It is evident that the sentence structure does not make sense. Several constructions are strung together in a nearly incoherent fashion. Even so, the emotion and

meaning of the words is vivid and palpable. Noble notes that this quote seems to be written in a great hurry and Hillesum seemed to put little thought into her wording or phrasing (idem). This kind of urgency in her writing is partially due to the medium but can also be contributed to Hillesum's temperament: she was often overcome with emotion and could write with a 'koortsige schrijftrant' (107). For the translators, it is therefore key to define the tone of the day. Due to the dynamic nature of diary writing, this can change with every diary entry. They can therefore not expect consistency in Hillesum's writing, but paradoxically, they are still burdened with the task of creating a cohesive narrative.

4.3.2 Inner dialogue

The first element of Hillesum's idiolect that is to be explored, is inner dialogue. It is here where her temperament is most visible, namely in the way she explicitly addresses herself. As noted by Noble, her way of writing was 'ironisch studentikoos' whenever she referred to, or even reprimanded, herself (101). Marja Clement, author of the chapter '*Hineinhorchen* and Writing: The Language Use of Etty Hillesum', notes that Hillesum had a habit of explicitly addressing herself and refers to it as 'inner dialogue', which is a 'common element in diary writing' (53). According to Clement, this inner dialogue is used in several ways to 'show a certain distance, self-awareness, and self-observation' (ibid.). This can be seen in the following passage:

En toen hij [Spier] om 9 uur opbelde: Haben Sie noch Lust zu kommen, toen ging ik met een vreugde en een zinnelijkheid en een overgave. *Maar je maakt jezelf maar wijs zusje*, dat er dan maar alleen dat zinnelijke is, het is niet zo, dat we meteen in elkaars armen stortten, we hebben eerst nog heel intensief gepraat over dat allemachtig interessante en gespleten object van 's middags. (Hillesum 45; emphasis added)

In this passage, Hillesum justifies her actions to herself, showing self-awareness and self-criticism. Whenever Hillesum explicitly addresses herself, this is often paired with a purpose: ‘Etty Hillesum admonishes herself, encourages herself, and sometimes is highly critical of herself, at times in jest, or inclined to coarseness’ (Clement 54). For the translators this means that they must first understand with which purpose Hillesum addresses herself, in order to choose language that fits that purpose.

Inner dialogue in general may pose a translation problem because Hillesum employs it frequently and with several purposes that are not always easy to discern. As a translator, one has to be able to spot these patterns as well as implement them in a way that still appears natural.

4.3.3 Graphological deviation

The second element of Hillesum’s idiolect is graphological deviation. Idiolect is a linguistic phenomenon and it is therefore helpful to consider the different levels, namely the graphological, syntactic (grammatical and lexical) and semantic levels (Leech and Short 134). The graphological level is often where an idiolect can be detected most clearly (ibid., 135). Graphology is the ‘shape of language on the page’ and so any deviation from the norm will be easy to spot because the language is literally written differently (Simpson 5). In the diary, this appears most clearly when encountering abbreviations or unusual spelling, such as in the following passage:

En ik vraag niet meer honderd keer per dag aan Han: ‘Heb je me nog lief?’ *‘Vin je me nog erreg lief?’* en ‘Ik ben toch zeker het liefste van iedereen?’ Dat was ook weer eenzelfde soort vastklampen, een lichamelijk vastklampen aan de dingen, die niet

lichamelijk zijn. En nu leef en adem ik *a.h.w.* door *m'n* 'ziel', als ik dit in diskrediet geraakte woord tenminste mag gebruiken. (Hillesum 12-3; emphasis added)

The first graphological deviation shows a written representation of what she would have sounded like when speaking these words out loud. It is written semi-phonetically, which can help the reader to envision how she must have sounded, but it also implies a child-like, almost nagging way of speaking. This makes sense, given the fact that she is writing about her need to cling on to things or people, the way a child might cling on to their mother.

The next graphological deviation is her use of abbreviation. There are two abbreviations she uses frequently in the diaries. One is 'a.h.w.' (als het ware) and the other 'd.w.z.' (dat wil zeggen). This is a translation problem because the literal translations of these two phrases ('as it were' and 'that is to say') are not common abbreviations in English. The Swedish language has the phrase 'det vill säga', but no equivalent for 'als het ware'. A Swedish translator might therefore choose to maintain some of the abbreviations and omit others. This would only slightly alter Hillesum's linguistic habit. However, if a translator were to avoid using abbreviations altogether, they would risk erasing Hillesum's habit of using them.

The last graphological deviation is the way she writes 'm'n', which is a contraction of 'mijn'. Pronouncing 'mijn' as 'm'n' is common practice in spoken text, but a marked choice in written speech. Given the medium she is using to write, it is not too strange to use abbreviations or contractions for the sake of conciseness or simply to write faster. However, these deviations do show explicitly that this diary was not intended for publication.

There are several other graphological deviations that Hillesum uses frequently throughout the diaries. These are all cases where she uses standard punctuation in a non-standard way, which makes them marked graphological choices. These matters of

punctuation create a translation problem because of the frequency with which Hillesum employs them and because of their function. For example, in this following passage she uses quotation marks for emphasis: ‘Ik voel me zo ‘gewoon’, zo heel erg gewoon en prettig, zo zonder van die verschrikkelijk diepzinnige en kwellende gedachten en zware gevoelens, maar zo heel gewoon, maar toch vol leven en heel erg diep, maar een diepte, die ook al als iets ‘gewoons’ wordt aangevoeld’ (74). It is interesting to note that Hillesum writes the word ‘gewoon’ four times, twice with quotation marks and twice without. This suggests that when she did mark them, she intended for the word to stand out. This short passage alone illustrates the importance of punctuation in her work. Given the fact that she uses several types of punctuation for several different purposes, it becomes apparent why this is a translation problem. If, for example, the English translator were to use italics in every instance, the readability of the diary might suffer from it. Moreover, it is exactly that element, readability, which is often valued most in the process of translating a Dutch work into English:

Constraints with respect to readability, and more especially to matters of idiom and textual make-up (such as punctuation), play (or rather are assumed to) an important role in English prose translation. The target texts are expected to conform to standard ways of text editing and to ‘shift’ more or less towards familiar and accessible narrative. (Vanderauwa 115)

Evidently, the work in question is a diary and not prose literature. Therefore, the translators may have adopted a different approach to this problem.

To summarize, it has become clear that there are three different versions of Hillesum in the respective cultures. Based on these images, it can be expected that the American translation might focus more on the content than on the form. The Swedish translation might

include estranging elements for the target audience. Furthermore, it has been established that the idiolect of Hillesum is most present in her inner dialogue and graphological deviation.

These two categories will be the focal point of the analysis.

Chapter 5: Analysis

Ultimately, the aim of this thesis is to answer the question: how have the translators of Hillesum's diary into English and Swedish dealt with translating Hillesum's idiolect and how have their translation choices affected her persona?

In order to do so, the analysis will explore two speech patterns: inner dialogue and graphological deviation. In the first category, the focus will be on the use of diminutives, imperatives and expletives. In the second category, accents and punctuation marks will be examined. Finally, a final round-up will show which choices the translators have made in translating the names and terms Hillesum uses to address herself.

Final note: the categories are based on speech elements that were frequent enough to be considered representative for Hillesum's idiolect. The chosen examples are the ones that are most illustrative within their respective categories.

5.1 Inner Dialogue

Inner dialogue is most often used by Hillesum to reprimand or chastise herself. This can be seen in her use of the diminutives, imperatives and expletives. In each category the function of the speech pattern will be explained, followed by examples from the source text and an analysis of its translations.

5.1.1 Diminutive

Hillesum uses the diminutive to diminish the value of words that relate to herself, her work or her emotions. She does this by using a suffix or by using words that denote smallness, such as superlatives or adverbs of degree. As a result, her tone of voice is derogatory and reprimanding, which can be seen in the following examples:

1. Het kleinste, onbenulligste opstelletje, dat je neerschrijft is belangrijker dan die vloed van grootste ideeën waar je in zwelgt (6).

2. En niet denken, ik heb hier een hoofdpijntje en ben daar een beetje misselijk en nou gaat het niet zo goed. (5).
3. Maar laat je niets wijs maken, zusje, dat is je lichaam niet, het is je zieltje, je geteisterde zieltje, dat zo spookt (33).

The table below isolates all textual elements featuring a diminutive (phrase), along with their corresponding translations:

NL	EN	SE
Kleinste onbenulligste opstelletje	Smallest, most fatuous little essay (10)	Minstiga, torftigaste uppsats (16)
Een hoofdpijntje	Little headache (8)	Ont i huvudet (15)
Een beetje misselijk	A bit of nausea (idem)	Mår lite illa (idem)
Je zieltje	-	-
Je geteisterde zieltje	Your ravaged little soul (37)	Din lilla plågande själ (44)

-: Element was omitted

Pomerans adhered to Hillesum's use of the diminutive. Most notably, in the translation of sentence 2, where he mimicked the original 'ik heb hier een hoofdpijntje en ben daar een beetje misselijk' with 'no little headache here or a bit of nausea there'. This type of playful speech is instrumental in maintaining Hillesum's persona. However, he often chooses words from a higher register. For example, the words 'fatuous' and 'ravaged' have stronger negative connotations than their counterparts 'onbenullig' and 'geteisterde'. It has been stated that Hillesum's register has a more simple, intimate and personal range, so the words chosen by Pomerans deviate from that. Moreover, the function of the diminutive is to diminish, not to emphasize, so combining these words with diminutive phrases creates a discrepancy between the dismissive tone and the strong words, which can have a confusing effect on the reader.

Dahlman used the diminutive in most places. However, in sentence 2 she deviates from the original by writing: ‘Inte tänka. Jag har ont i huvudet och mår lite illa och kommer ingen vart¹¹’ (15). She has split up the sentences, which changes the meaning. It now appears as if Hillesum states that she does indeed have a headache. This change is most likely the result of misinterpretation. Even though Dahlman does not always adhere to the use of diminutive, she does capture the meaning of the sentences, through her use of words: particularly ‘torftigaste¹²’ and ‘plågade¹³’ have connotations that strongly resemble those of the source text. As a result, Hillesum’s voice is maintained through word choices.

Neither of the translators repeated the word ‘zieltje’. The most likely explanation for this is to maintain readability. However, another result of omitting the repetition is that an aspect of Hillesum’s idiolect disappears completely, namely, the repeating of words or phrases for emphasis. This aspect is not included in the analysis because it is not exclusively related to inner dialogue or graphological deviation. However, it is frequent enough in the diaries to be considered a habit and therefore the omission does have an impact on Hillesum’s idiolect in general.

5.1.2 Imperative

The imperative is used to create a sense of urgency. Hillesum often combines the imperatives with either an expletive, her own name, or other addressing terms. In doing so, she literally ‘calls’ herself to order:

1. Houd dat verdomd goed voor ogen (6).
2. Nou Etty, raap je nou eens op, ik bedoel: raff je zusammen (35).
3. Gekje! dat je bent. Laat af met die harsens! (52).

¹¹ Do not think. I have a headache and feel a little bit nauseous and I am not getting anywhere

¹² meagre or bland

¹³ tortured

4. Meisje, doe geen domme dingen. Leef niet in een paar dagen een héél leven op (187).

The translators do not always adhere to the use of the imperative. Pomerans even rephrased all sentences but one:

NL	EN	SE
Houd	(Never) forget (10)	Håll (16)
Raap (op)	-	-
Laat af	X	Sluta upp (63)
Doe (geen)	-	Inga dumheter (201)
Leef (niet)	-	-

-: Element omitted, X: Sentence omitted

Pomerans used only one imperative out of the five instances and instead used phrases like ‘you’re just going to have to’ and ‘I must’ (39, 221). Neither of these convey the same degree of urgency that the imperative would have. Moreover, in the translation of ‘Gekje! dat je bent. Laat af met die harsens!’ he omitted the sentence ‘Laat af met die harsens!’ altogether, keeping only the phrase ‘Fool that you are’ (56). This phrase lacks the diminutive that is present in ‘gekje’, which makes the expletive ‘fool’ sound less affectionate. He also omitted the expletive ‘verdomd’ in the first sentence. Instead, he wrote ‘Never forget that’ (10). As a result, the general tone is less explosive than the original. A possible effect of this can be that Hillesum’s persona becomes more even-tempered. This would be at odds with her fiery disposition, as shown in the source text material.

Dahlman follows the imperative in most cases. Furthermore, she once again compensates for losing grammatical phrases, by choosing her words wisely, which is demonstrated most clearly in the sentence ‘Du är tokig, Etty! Sluta upp med de där grubblerierna!¹⁴’. ‘Tokig’ means silly-crazy rather than insane-crazy, which makes this an

¹⁴ You are crazy, Etty! Stop it with those pondering thoughts

idiomatic translation for the word ‘Gekje’: Dahlman understood the function of the diminutive and picked a word for ‘crazy’ that was less strong. Furthermore, Dahlman did not follow the phrase ‘Laat af met die harsens!’ to the letter but instead distilled the meaning of the source text and wrote ‘Sluta upp med de där grubblerierna!’. This playful, not too literal approach helps to maintain Hillesum’s persona.

Unfortunately, Dahlman made another interpretative mistake. She translated the sentence ‘Leef niet in een paar dagen een héél leven op’ with ‘Inte för ett par veckors skull förstöra ett helt liv’, which translates to ‘Do not, for the sake of a few weeks, destroy a whole life’. Beside a change in meaning, the use of the word ‘förstöra’ is also marked because it is featured in the title of the book: *Det Förstörda Livet* (‘The Destroyed Life’). As a result, the reader might be misled into thinking that the title of the book was derived from Hillesum’s own words.

5.1.3 Expletives

Expletives are frequent in Hillesum’s inner dialogue. In this analysis, the term ‘expletives’ is used to indicate all types of strong-worded language, threats and chastisements to the self. This feature of her speech can be broken down into three categories: name-calling, threats and reprimands and Hillesum exposing her own negative qualities. The latter is a less outspoken form of the expletive but is nonetheless a way in which Hillesum admonishes herself.

Name-calling

1. [...] je bent een slappeling en een onbenul wanneer je blijft zwelgen en nagenieten van al die innerlijke golven (7).
2. Ik moet toch dankbaar zijn dat ik alle tijd voor mezelf heb, laat ik hem toch in godsnaam gebruiken, kaffer die je bent. En nou is het uit met dat onnozele geklad (35).

3. Ik schurk en mispunt en gemakzuchtig loeder. O zo, die zit (62).

In these three lines, Hillesum employs six curse words, which have been isolated in this table:

NL	EN	SE
Slappeling	Weakling (10)	Kräk (17)
Onbenul	Nonentity (10)	Odugling (17)
Kaffer	Silly girl (39)	Slöfock (46)
Schurk	Wretched (66)	Skurk (74)
Mispunt	Good-for-nothing (66)	Missanpassat kräk (74)
Gemakzuchtig loeder	Indolent worm (66)	Lat slarva (74)

It has been mentioned before that Pomerans often favours more solemn words, whereas Dahlman manages to pin-point Hillesum's language through her choice of words. This table confirms that notion. It is only in the first example, that Pomerans choses a more favourable word, namely 'weakling'. Dahlman's 'kräk' ('freak'), fails to evoke a notion of weakness. However, in the other five cases, Dahlman's choices are more accurate and more desirable. In contrast, Pomeran's 'Nonentity' is too paradoxical and extreme (how can one be a nonentity?), 'silly girl' is too weak, 'wretched' is too old-fashioned and strong-worded, 'good-for-nothing' is too general and misses the sharpness of 'mispunt' and in the phrase 'indolent worm', the 'indolent' is too clinical and 'worm' is far more (gender)neutral than 'loeder'.

Dahlman's curse words are much closer to the source text. For example, she translates 'gemakzuchtig loeder' with 'lat slarva' ('lazy sloppy one'). It is interesting to note that 'slarva' is derived from 'att slarva': to be sloppy. Someone who *is* sloppy is called a 'slarver' and 'slarva', as used by Dahlman, is the female version of the word. Although 'loeder' is generally used to indicate that a person is mean and spiteful, not sloppy or lazy, there is an

important commonality between ‘slarva’ and ‘loeder’: both are curse words generally aimed at women. It is therefore a salient detail that Dahlman chose to use a more ‘female’ curse word. Dahlman’s choice of words is therefore, once again, a testimony to her attentiveness.

Threats and reprimands

Hillesum’s threats and reprimands are often directed towards her work ethic or her mood swings. These examples feature threats, chastisements and sarcasm:

1. Ziezo, zusje, nou wordt er gewerkt, of ik mep je dood (5).
2. Ik moet toch dankbaar zijn dat ik alle tijd voor mezelf heb, laat ik hem toch in godsnaam gebruiken, kaffer die je bent. En nou is het uit met dat onnozele geklad (35).
3. Al twee dagen alleen maar gewerkt en me niet verdiept in eigen stemmingen. Grote meid, hoor! (52).
4. En het is ook zo verdomd onnozel van je, in deze tijd, die alle krachten zo zeer vreet, je ongelukkig te voelen, omdat de spanning tussen jou en een man wat verslapt is (102).

This way of speaking is effective due to its under-the-belt approach: Hillesum strikes where it hurts. Textually, this can be isolated into speech fragments where she uses a threat, an expletive, or sarcasm:

NL	EN	SE
Of ik mep je dood!	Or God help you (8)	Annars går det dig illa (17)
Onnozele geklad	Scribbling (39)	Enfaldiga pratet (46)
Grote meid, hoor!	How adult of me! (57)	Duktig flicka! (64)
Verdomd onnozel	So stupid (142)	Förbaskat enfaldig (113)

Pomerans' translations present a different, less explosive, version of Hillesum: he weakens her harsh language, removes the expletives and as a result, Hillesum's tone of voice becomes more even-tempered. An interesting choice is the change from 'ik mep je dood' to 'God help you'. This is a marked decision, given the fact that Hillesum was a highly religious person. In the diary, she only mentions God in relation to praise or prayer, so to place him as the acting agent in a threat can be considered uncharacteristic. By omitting or adding words like this, Pomerans risks a loss of coherence in the text which can ultimately alter Hillesum's tone of voice.

Dahlman, like Pomerans, has made Hillesum less aggressive in the first example, by writing 'annars går det dig illa'¹⁵. The acting agent (Hillesum) has been removed altogether and therefore the sentence reads more like a bad omen than an explicit threat. In the other cases, Dahlman chose her words well. 'Enfaldig' means 'simple' or 'simple-minded' and has very similar connotations as 'onnozel' does. Moreover, 'duktig flicka' means 'good girl', with an emphasis on the studious qualities of a person. This fits with the context, where Hillesum 'compliments' herself on her work ethic. The effect of Dahlman's choices is that Hillesum's idiosyncrasies and their function, remain present in her threats and chastisements and therefore they appear very natural.

Negative qualities

The final way in which Hillesum uses strong language is by pointing out her own negative qualities. In the following examples she comments on her feelings of jealousy and the way she writes in her diary:

1. Etty, ik walg van je. Zo egocentrisch en zo klein (102).

¹⁵ Otherwise bad things will come to you

2. Weet je, waar ik bij jou misselijk van word, kind? Van die halve openhartigheid en die halve hoogdravendheid (103).

There are four flaws pointed out in these sentences. The translators have each interpreted these in different ways:

NL	EN	SE
Egocentrisch	Selfish (142)	Egocentrisk (112)
Klein	Mean (142)	Småskuren (112)
Halve openhartigheid	X	Halvdana öppen hjärtlighet (113)
Halve hoogdravendheid	X	Halvdana svulstighet (113)

X: Sentence was omitted

In the passage where these two examples are taken from, Pomerans omitted eight consecutive sentences, spread across two different diary entries. The sentences that he omitted were part of a longer inner dialogue where Hillesum admonished herself during the length of sixteen consecutive lines. This means that Pomerans omitted half of her inner dialogue. This is a big interference and affects the perception of Hillesum's persona greatly. Pomerans might have thought that the passage was too repetitive or wanted to improve readability. However, the passage is a clear example of Hillesum's tendency to get stuck in her emotions, a fact she herself points out frequently throughout the diaries. Therefore, Pomerans' decision to omit such a large part of an inner dialogue is detrimental to Hillesum's persona.

Dahlman's translations do not deviate much from the original, which once again shows her capability of capturing Hillesum's way of speaking. Especially her choice of 'småskuren', literally 'small-cut', is a clever solution to translate the word 'klein', used by

Hillesum to indicate pettiness, and retaining the image of smallness. Dahlman maintains Hillesum's persona and due to her word choices, the text reads much like the original.

5.2 Graphological deviation

Hillesum's writing is filled with graphological oddities and punctuation marks. Her graphological habits can be broken down into two categories: accents and punctuation marks.

5.2.1 Accents

The use of accents is a typical Dutch graphological convention, used to emphasize words. In English it is standard to use italics to achieve the same effect (Claes 74). The Swedish convention is to use double quotation marks, either standard ("...") or angular («...»). Italics are used, but not as often. These following examples show Hillesum's use of accents:

1. We moeten *zó* onafhankelijk worden van materiële en uiterlijke dingen, dat, onder wat voor omstandigheden dan ook, de geest kan doorgaan zijn weg te gaan en zijn werk verder kan doen. En *dáá*rom: geen chocola, maar karnemelk. *Jawèl!* (107-106).
2. Ik ben al in duizend concentratiekampen duizend doden gestorven, ik weet het *allemáál* en ben ook niet meer verontrust over nieuwe berichten. Op *één* of andere manier *wéét* ik het alles al. En *tòch* vind ik dit leven schoon en zinrijk (111).
3. En als God *míj* niet verder helpt, dan zal ik God wel helpen (135).

Pomerans and Dahlman often omit emphasizing words altogether; most likely because there is no equivalent of these particular type of accents in either English or Swedish. However, a similar effect can be achieved, particularly in English, by using italics. Remarkably, it is Dahlman who employed italics, even though it is not standard Swedish convention:

NL	EN	SE
<i>Zó</i>	So (145)	<i>Så</i> (116)

Dáárom	And so (146)	Och därför (idem)
Jawèl!	X	Just det! (idem)
Allemáál	Everything (150)	Hur det är (121)
Wéét ik het alles	I know it all (idem)	Vet jag redan allihop (idem)
Tòch	Yet (idem)	Ändå (idem)
Míj	Me (173)	<i>Mig</i> (146)

X: Sentence was omitted

Pomerans did not use any graphological markers to indicate emphasis. As a result, the cadence of the sentence changes. For example, in the following phrase: ‘En dáárom: geen chocola, maar karnemelk. Jawél!’, Hillesum created a rhythm by framing her ‘big decision’ of choosing buttermilk over hot chocolate between the accentuated words ‘dáárom’ and ‘Jawél!’, which causes the cadence of the language to rise, fall and rise again. Pomerans’ translation is: ‘And so: buttermilk instead of hot chocolate’ (146). He switches the order of the hot chocolate and the buttermilk and omits the exclamation at the end, which removes all rhythm from the sentence. The decision not to emphasize any words at all does therefore not just change the emphasis, it removes the cadence of (written) speech, which removes a part of Hillesum’s idiolect and thus alters her persona.

Dahlman uses two strategies to compensate for the loss of accents: adhering to the function of the emphasis or using italics. An example of the first strategy can be seen in her translation of ‘ Allemáál’ which, in the context of the original sentence, is used to express how Hillesum knows how it goes, how it is. Dahlman translates with ‘hur det är’, literally ‘how it is’, which makes the phrase more accentuated (and accurate) than the plain translation ‘allting’ (‘everything’) would have been. The second strategy, using italics, has a two-folded effect: it helps to accentuate words but also runs the risk of appearing strange to the reader. Italics are not used as commonly in the target culture as accents are in the source culture and

therefore using them frequently could confuse the reader, who may not understand the function.

5.2.2 Punctuation 1

There are times when Hillesum ‘interrupts’ her own flow of writing, to comment on the goings-on in the world outside of the text, to narrate actions as well as reflections. These interruptions provide an insight into what is happening in the ‘real world’ and they look like this:

1. En nu worden me de woorden van S. na mijn eerste bezoek aan hem duidelijk. ‘Was hier sitzt (en hij wees op z’n hoofd) muß da kommen’ (en hij wees op z’n hart) (13).
2. Ik wil de kroniekschrijfster worden van veel dingen uit deze tijd (beneden moord en brand, vader brult: ga dan, en smijt met deuren; ook dat moet verwerkt worden en nou huil ik – brul opeens, zó objectief ben ik dus nog niet; eigenlijk kan je hier in huis niet leven, enfin, vooruit maar weer); o ja, kroniekschrijfster, daar was ik gebleven (36).

While the first example is very straight-forward, the second one is more intricate and complicated. This has resulted in some interesting choices by the translators:

EN	SE
“What’s in here [and he pointed to his head] must get down there [and he pointed to his heart].” (16)	Det som sitter i huvudet måste flytta ner i hjärtat (23)
I want to live to see the future, to become the chronicler of the things that are happening now (downstairs they are screaming blue murder, with Father yelling,	Jag vill bli den som skriver krönikan om mycket av det som händer just nu. (I bottenvåningen ryter pappa: ”För all del, ge dig i väg bara, och smäll ordentligt i

<p>“Go, then!” and slamming the door; that, too, must be absorbed, and now I am suddenly crying since I am not all that objective really and no one can breathe properly in this house; all right, make the best of it then); oh yes, a chronicler” (41).</p>	<p>dörrarna efter dig!” Också sådant måste tas med, och nu gråter jag plötsligt, så värst objektiv är jag alltså inte än. Egentligen kan man inte vara i det här huset. Men allright, fortsätt framåt.) Krönikeskriveri, ja, det var dit jag hade kommit (47).</p>
---	--

Pomerans uses square brackets in the first example, which is noteworthy, as these are most commonly used as an editing tool. This could confuse readers because it appears as if Pomerans added the phrases himself. In the second example, Pomerans follows the original and interrupts the main sentence with the bracketed one. However, within the brackets he has edited the text somewhat, for example by adding conjunctions, which makes the text run more smoothly. This removes the spontaneity to some degree, since it is not written in the same free flow as the source text, due to the added conjunctions ‘and’ and ‘since’, which make the text more explicit and explanatory.

Dahlman omits the brackets altogether and instead included the head (‘huvudet’) and the heart (‘hjärtat’) in the text itself, which removes the ‘action’ from the sentence.

Furthermore, in the second example she makes yet another interpretative mistake. She wrote ‘I bottenvåningen ryter pappa: ”För all del, ge dig i väg bara, och smäll ordentligt i dörrarna efter dig!¹⁶” and because of that Hillesum’s father is no longer the one slamming the doors. Moreover, she writes full sentences before and after the bracketed part, which makes the interruption appear less abrupt. As a result, Hillesum’s words are not portrayed truthfully, neither in content nor in form.

¹⁶ Downstairs father yells: ”By all means, just go already, and slam the door properly behind you!”

5.2.3 Punctuation 2

Sometimes the graphological interruptions serve a purpose of delivering commentary, most often on the sentence itself. This is a little form of meta (or auto)-commentary, which is characteristic to Hillesum's spontaneous writing flow:

NL

1. Het leven is inderdaad zwaar, een strijd van minuut tot minuut (nou niet overdrijven, schat!), maar die strijd is aantrekkelijk' (14)
2. 'Niet in eenvoudige en desnoods onbeholpen woorden neerschrijven, wat ik beleefd heb, want daarvoor is toch eigenlijk een dagboek, maar uit de simpelste belevissen wil ik het liefst direct aforismen en eeuwige wijsheden puren' (103).
3. 'M'n geest heeft alles van de laatste dagen – de geruchten zijn tot nu toe vernietigender dan de feiten, de feiten voor òns tenminste, in Polen schijnt de uitmoordpartij in volle gang – alles al verwerkt, maar m'n lichaam blijkbaar nog niet' (111).

NL	EN	SE
(nou niet overdrijven, schat!)	(don't overdo it now, Etty!) (18).	(överdriver du inte det där, flicka lilla?) (25)
, want daarvoor is toch eigenlijk een dagboek,	Not in the plain and necessarily clumsy words befitting a diary, no, [...] (143).	– det här är ju ändå bara en dagbok – (113).
– de geruchten zijn tot nu toe vernietigender dan de feiten, de feiten voor òns	So far the rumours have been infinitely worse than the reality, for us in Holland	– ryktena är hittills mera förintande än fakta,

tenminste, in Polen schijnt de uitmoordpartij in volle gang –	at least, since in Poland the killers seem to be in full cry (151).	åtminstone vad oss beträffar. (121).
---	---	---

Pomerans only uses punctuation marks in the first examples; in the other two he rewrites the sentence in order to avoid a graphological break. Perhaps this was done to improve readability, however, it also shifts the order of information. The function of the punctuation is to interrupt the main flow: the interjected clauses are literally put right in the middle of the sentence. This evokes a sense of urgency, demanding the attention of the reader while simultaneously signalling that these phrases are not part of the main narrative, due to the graphological breaks. By omitting these, the text runs the risk of becoming less dynamic. The dynamic style is characteristic to Hillesum's way of writing, so removing it alters her persona.

Dahlman has adhered to the use of graphological deviation, with slight moderations. In the first example, she changes the original warning 'nou niet overdrijven, schat!' into a rhetorical question: '[Ö]verdriver du inte det där, flicka lilla?'¹⁷. This slightly shifts the tone from warning to inquiring. However, this tone still fits Hillesum's character and so the change is not detrimental to her character. Furthermore, she makes the graphological deviation in the second example more pronounced, by placing the phrase 'det här är ju ändå bara en dagbok'¹⁸ between two long dashes. This separates the phrase from the main sentence and so the interjection and accompanying sense of urgency is maintained. In the third example, however, she only uses one long dash and then starts a new full sentence. As a result, the connection between the 'us' in Holland and the 'them' in Poland is less present.

¹⁷ Aren't you exaggerating that, little girl?

¹⁸ This here is, after all, only a diary.

Overall, the function of the speech pattern – namely to interject – is maintained in all the examples, and in doing so, Hillesum’s persona is unaltered.

5.3 Terms of endearment

In all the examples mentioned in the analysis, Hillesum has referred to herself with a name or term seven times. The names are shown here below in a table, with their corresponding translations:

NL	EN	SE
Zusje	Etty	Flicka lilla
Etty	Etty	Etty
Meisje	-	-
Zusje	My girl	Flicka lilla
Etty	Etty	Etty
Kind	-	Flicka lilla
Schat	Etty	Flicka lilla

-: *Element was omitted*

Hillesum uses five different variations: zusje, meisje, kind, schat and Etty. Each of these have slightly different connotations, but most of them share the common denominator of being feminine and affectionate. However, it should be noted that these ‘terms of endearment’ are often used by Hillesum to reprimand or chastise herself, as showed before, and are therefore not solely affectionate. In the translations, Pomerans and Dahlman only used two variations each: Pomerans used ‘Etty’ and ‘my girl’ and Dahlman used ‘Etty’ and ‘flicka lilla¹⁹’.

Pomerans only translated five of the seven terms, using ‘Etty’ four out of five times. This does not add much variation to the text. Moreover, in the examples shown, Hillesum

¹⁹ Little girl

does not use her own name unless she is angry with herself: the name has a function.

Therefore, the persistent use of 'Etty' eliminates a sense of nuance and disregards the original function of the term.

Dahlman used 'Etty' for 'Etty' and 'flicka lilla' for every other case, which also has a negative impact on the overall variation within the diary. However, the term 'flicka lilla' denotes femininity and affection but can also be used in a condescending way. Therefore, Dahlman's choice is a little more versatile than Pomerans' repetitive 'Etty'. Even so, Dahlman does not adhere to the different terms and therefore did not represent their different functions in the diary. This could lead to a repetitive read and cause readers to believe that Hillesum only ever referred to herself with one term, whereas she actually used many, even more than those mentioned in this analysis. Both Pomerans' and Dahlman's choice to not use the variation presented by the source material, has altered Hillesum's persona.

5.4 Summary

This analysis focused on inner dialogue, graphological deviation and terms of endearment. Two main translation problems arose: the uniqueness of Hillesum's speech and differences in conventions. The translators both had a different approach to these problems. Pomerans' main solution was to extract the meaning of Hillesum's writing and turn it into more standard, plain English. The effect of this has been that readability was maintained and the meaning has generally remained intact. However, this strategy also results in a lack of variety and a more one-dimensional character portrayal.

Dahlman's main solution was to adhere to Hillesum's idiosyncrasies where she could. As a result, many of her linguistic habits have been maintained. However, this strategy also has an estranging effect at times. Moreover, Dahlman made a significant number of interpretative mistakes, which ultimately affected the content of the diary.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

This chapter offers conclusions, based on the analysis. The translators will each be discussed individually, and the main question will be answered. Finally, some general conclusions will be drawn on translating idiolect and translating a diary, along with suggestions for further research.

6.1 Pomerans

Pomerans' translation choices have two main effects. Firstly, Hillesum's idiolect shows less coherence and secondly, there is less variety in her speech.

The lack of cohesion can be seen most clearly in the omittance of the imperative and accents. By not following Hillesum's use of the imperative, he makes her sound less resolute. Furthermore, he removes a linguistic habit from the diary altogether, which is detrimental to Hillesum's persona. In the source text, the imperative is a common denominator in many of Hillesum's reprimands. In Pomerans' translation, however, this commonality cannot be found, and so some cohesion within Hillesum's speech disappears. Furthermore, he has not used any strategies to compensate for the loss of nuance caused by the different conventions of accents and emphasis between the languages. The use of accents is a key element in Hillesum's speech and it is highly present throughout the diary. Omitting this removes yet another linguistic pattern, and so Pomerans misses an opportunity to maintain cohesion and variety in the diary again.

The lack of variety appears most clearly in his translations of the expletives and the terms of endearment. His use of weaker expletives *and* the omittance of eight lines of chastising inner dialogue, makes Hillesum sound less temperamental. Moreover, the words he chose for his expletives are often from a higher register than Hillesum's original words. An effect of this is that the appearance of the expletives remains unchanged but the function and connotations of the words change and often become uncharacteristic for Hillesum. As a

result, his choices erase a strong characteristic trait from the diary, namely, Hillesum's habit of calling herself to order.

It is worth mentioning that Pomerans does not make many interpretative mistakes, which shows his grasp of the content of the diary. However, he also does not take many liberties to compensate for speech elements that are lost, which shows his inability to grasp the form of the diary. According to his obituary, Pomerans was said to 'render the text into exquisite idiomatic English' and that 'a translator's job was to recreate in the image of the original' ('Arnold'). Perhaps that explains why the text often reads as if he distilled the message of the diary and then wrote it down in his own words, rather than Hillesum's. Throughout the diary, Pomerans has removed much of the consistency by taking Hillesum's language and shaping it into a more well-versed, even-tempered version. Instead, the source text shows that her language was often harsh, her grammar was flawed and her punctuation erratic. Pomerans' translation therefore almost reads as if he is narrating her life for her.

Ultimately, Pomerans' translation of the diary can best be compared to an electric car: it looks the same as a normal car, but it misses the rumbling sound of the engine, creating an uncanny feeling. He often sticks to the 'formula' of Hillesum's writing, using an expletive for an expletive and a diminutive for a diminutive. However, it is not always clear whether he understood the function of these speech patterns, or whether he even noticed the patterns at all. As a result, Hillesum's original persona is less present in the text and readers are instead presented with Pomerans' created version of Hillesum. 'His' Hillesum is more even-tempered, less explosive and hardly shows grammatical or graphological oddities. Perhaps this is related to the image that emerged from the American reception: a woman whose function was more important than her individual style. Pomerans' translation, which relies significantly more on content than on form, could have contributed to this image. In reality, Hillesum's nature is explosive, dynamic and sometimes erratic, which is exactly what makes

her so unique and therefore Pomerans' translation has negatively affected Hillesum's persona.

6.2 Dahlman

Dahlman's translation choices have had two effects: Hillesum's idiosyncrasies have been maintained, but the content of the diary has changed.

Dahlman is not afraid to take risks. For example, her use of italics may appear strange to a Swedish audience, but it also draws the reader's attention, foregrounding the words or phrases Hillesum herself also foregrounds in the source text. This shows that Dahlman dares to take liberties in order to salvage some of the idiolect that may otherwise be lost due to the differences between languages and their respective conventions. Furthermore, much like Pomerans, Dahlman often improves readability by removing oddities from the language or making sentences more cohesive. However, she then compensates by adding playfulness to the text through her word choices. Especially when looking at the section on expletives, it shows that Dahlman used creativity and took liberties: she came up with words and phrases that sound like Hillesum. This adds a certain credibility to the text: it makes the reader feel that if Hillesum would have been Swedish, she might have written like this. Perhaps this explains the image that emerged from the reception: a strange woman. Dahlman's translation choices largely consisted of maintaining the oddities in Hillesum's speech. As a result, Dahlman did not make the text very accessible to the Swedish audience. She may have portrayed Hillesum more accurately, but this could also have confused readers unaccustomed to such strange use of language.

Unfortunately, Dahlman's translation, despite its many clever solutions, is also flawed. She often misinterprets the source text, ranging from easy mistakes to large shifts in the meaning of a sentence. Some of the mistakes have been pointed out in the analysis, but there are many more. This does not necessarily affect Hillesum's persona but does have an

impact on the diary as a whole. It presents readers with an unreliable version of the diary, which ultimately leads to a skewed image of Hillesum. Therefore, these mistakes cannot be disregarded, even if they do not have a direct impact on the idiolect.

In conclusion, Dahlman does not always stick to the ‘formula’ of Hillesum’s speech patterns but instead manages to capture Hillesum’s spirit through turn of phrase and word choices. To return to the car analogy used in the previous section: if Hillesum’s diary was a car, then Dahlman’s translation would be a similar car, but a different make and model. The roaring engine of Hillesum’s idiolect is present in this translation, but all the little shifts and changes on a sentence-level result in a larger shift in the diary as a whole. Hillesum’s character is still as explosive, creative and erratic as in the source text, but due to the interpretative mistakes Hillesum’s persona does change, simply because Dahlman makes her say and believe things that are not present in the source text. Therefore, Dahlman’s translation choices have altered Hillesum’s persona in a less negative way than Pomerans’ but altered it nonetheless.

6.3 Translating idiolect and diary

In this thesis, the central question has been: how have the translators of Hillesum’s diary into English and Swedish dealt with translating Hillesum’s idiolect and how have their translation choices affected her persona? The answer to the question is different for each of the translators. The English translation presents a version of Hillesum who is more even-tempered and takes on a less harsh tone to herself, as a direct result of Pomerans’ linguistic choices. The Swedish translation presents a version of a Hillesum who sounds very similar, due to Dahlman’s translation choices, but who says and believes different things, due to Dahlman’s interpretative mistakes.

These two personas that have arisen in the translations are each quite different from the persona established by the reception in the source culture. Hillesum’s style in the source

culture was described as clear, simple, intelligent, honest and spontaneous. However, the analysis has shown that the source text persona may also not have been completely accurate. In the passages that were discussed, Hillesum has been moody, foul, temperamental, witty, and many other things that have rarely mentioned in the reception of the source culture, as shown in chapter three. This shows that studying an idiolect can help to uncover more intricate aspects of a person and bring more depth to their character. Moreover, studying its translations can help to highlight which elements are present and which are missing from the text. This will help to identify which elements shape a persona the most and consequently, to construct a more precise image of which qualities are the most characteristic for the original source text persona.

Furthermore, this thesis has shown how one can study an idiolect: by isolating speech patterns and discerning their function. However, studying a translated idiolect is more complex: elemental differences between languages and their conventions can make it hard to discern whether a speech pattern has been adhered to or not. Moreover, sometimes linguistic habits are compensated for in a way that does not look like the original but *feels* like the original: a clear example of the *fingerspitzengefühl* that is often mentioned by those evaluating a translation. The next challenge is then to not lose sight of the content in the process. After all, *how* something is said will not matter if *what* is said gets lost in translation.

Chapter 7: Further research and final notes

This thesis aimed to uncover possible problems and difficulties translators will face when translating a diary. In doing so, it aimed to show how these difficulties can then be dealt with and how those choices affect the diary. Translating diaries is a field of research in translation studies that remains largely unexplored and so this thesis has hoped to contribute to filling a part of the gap in the literature by uncovering possible problems and difficulties translators will face when translating a diary. This thesis also has demonstrated how these difficulties have been dealt with and how those choices have affected the diary. Further research on translations of diaries will help to uncover more problems and, hopefully, offer more solutions.

By studying Hillesum's diary this thesis also hopes to have contributed to the field of research on Etty Hillesum. Despite the vast amount of existing research on Hillesum's life, her philosophies and her diary, little to no comparative research has previously been conducted into the diary's translations. This thesis has shown the benefits of comparing multiple translations in order to show different interpretations of Hillesum's diary and to reveal more layers in the original diary. It is worth mentioning again that for the purposes of this thesis only a selection of the diary was used. The unabridged edition of the English translation is available, so perhaps further research could focus on the same or similar speech elements, with a larger corpus. This could provide insight into whether the changes in the persona are only starker or are less present. Furthermore, reading the diary and its translations from a gender perspective could contribute greatly to the fields of gender studies, translation studies and Etty Hillesum studies. Moreover, this thesis has only scratched the surface of the richness of Hillesum's idiolect, so further research could help to find even more patterns and idiosyncratic habits in the diary.

Finally, idiolects remain an elusive phenomenon for research. It is unlikely that it will ever be discerned completely because in order to achieve that, the person whose idiolect is studied would a) have to be alive and b) have a keen awareness of their own idiosyncratic habits and c) have to be able to produce a practical and applicable guide on how to study and apply said idiolect. Therefore, when studying an idiolect, it is important to remember that one is essentially studying a person. Conducting research on a person will always be a partial and subjective task: ‘Wetenschap vertekent: een menselijk wezen is veel complexer dan een latere onderzoeker kan vastleggen en verklaren’ (Smelik, *Reacties* 219). Therefore, conducting a study on idiolect for now mainly relies on studying the source text carefully and looking out for idiosyncratic patterns in the text.

Diary writing is so personal that the linguistic thumbprint of the author is present on every page and therefore should be equally present in the translation: the form carries the content, perhaps more so than in any other kind of writing. Therefore, in order to translate an idiolect, one must be willing to learn more about its functions. To learn to squint one’s eyes and look at what jumps out from the page. To ask *how* a person is telling their story because the *how* is just as important as the *what*.

Works Cited

“Arnold J. Pomerans Obituary”. The Independent, Independent Digital News and Media, 2005. Web. 10 March 2018.

Brandt, Ria van den, and Klaas A.D. Smelik, editors. *Etty Hillesum in facetten*. Budel: Damon, 2003. Print.

Claes, Paul. *Gouden Vertaalregels*. Vantilt: Nijmegen, 2018. Print.

Clement, Marja. “*Hineinhorchen* and Writing: The Language Use of Etty Hillesum.” Smelik, Van Oord and Wiersma, pp. 51-81. Print.

Costa, Denise de. “Fel oranje en vuurrood: Hoe een Nederlands proefschrift over Etty Hillesum gekleurd werd door de Franse filosofie”. Brandt and Smelik, pp. 57-77. Print.

---. *Anne Frank & Etty Hillesum: Spiritualiteit, schrijverschap, seksualiteit*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Balans, 1996. Print.

Culley, Margot. Introduction. *A Day at a Time: Diary Literature of American Women from 1764 to the Present*, by Culley, New York: Feminist Press, 1985, pp. 3-29.

Dahlman, Brita, translator. *Det Förstörda Livet: Dagböcker 1941–43 Etty Hillesum*. Stockholm: Nordstedt & Söners, 1983. Print.

Des Pres, Terrence. “Eros, God en Auschwitz.” Gaarlandt, pp. 68-74. Print.

Edities en vertalingen. Etty Hillesum Onderzoekscentrum, 2018. Web. 4 March 2018.

Etty Hillesum. N.d. Photograph. *Det Förstörda Livet: Dagböcker 1941–43 Etty Hillesum*. Stockholm: Nordstedt & Söners, 1983. p.124. Print.

Fens, Kees. “Naar een woestijn van medemensen.” Gaarlandt, pp. 6-11. Print.

Gaarlandt, Jan Geurt, editor. *‘Men zou een pleister op vele wonden willen zijn’: reacties op de dagboeken en brieven van Etty Hillesum*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Balans, 1989.

Print.

Goldman, Anita. *Guds älskarinnor: om hängivna kvinnor i en livrädd värld*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 2006. Print.

Groot, Anouta de. “Aandacht voor identiteit, spiritualiteit en verbondenheid: Centrale thema’s in de Amerikaanse literatuur over Etty Hillesum.” Brandt and Smelik, pp. 129-153. Print.

Hahn, Karel J. “Richtsnoer voor menselijkheid.” Gaarlandt, pp. 54-67. Print.

Heldring, J.L. “De heilige van het Museumplein.” Gaarlandt, pp. 22-24. Print.

Hillesum, Etty. *Het verstoorde leven: dagboek van Etty Hillesum 1941–1943*. Haarlem: De Haan, 1981. Print.

Kleef-Hillesum, Suse van. “Een oorlogsdocument dat bevrijdt van angst.” Gaarlandt, pp. 19-22. Print.

Krabbendam, Hans. “America in the Shade: Etty Hillesum As Mediator Between the Cold War Perspectives on the Holocaust.” Smelik, Van Oord and Wiersma, pp. 379-395. Print.

Leech, Geoffrey N., and Mick Short. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007. Print.

Lefevere, André. “Over de constructie van verschillende Anne Franks.” Naaijken, Koster, Bloemen and Meijer, pp. 379-389. Print.

Minco, Marga. “De kroniekschrijfster van onze lotgevallen.” Gaarlandt, pp. 1-6. Print.

- Naaijkens, Ton, Cees Koster, Henri Bloemen and Caroline Meijer, editors. *Denken over Vertalen*. Vantilt: Nijmegen, 2010. Print.
- Noble, Phillipe. “De dagboeken en brieven van Etty Hillesum in Franse vertaling: het dubbele filter.” Brandt and Smelik, pp. 93-111. Print.
- Pomerans, Arnold J., translator. *An Interrupted Life: The Diaries of Etty Hillesum 1941–1943*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1983. Print.
- Reve, Karel van het. “Het korte leven van Etty.” Brandt and Smelik, pp. 41-44. Print.
- Schrijvers, P.H. “De dagboeken van Etty Hillesum en de brieven van Seneca.” Gaarlandt, pp. pp. 89-99. Print.
- Simpson, Paul. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D., Gerrit Van Oord and Jurjen Wiersma, editors. *Reading Etty Hillesum in Context: Writings, Life, and Influences of a Visionary Author*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018. Print.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. “A Short Biography of Etty Hillesum (1914–1943).” Smelik, Van Oord and Wiersma, pp. 23-33. Print.
- . “Gedenken is doen: Van een bundel cahiers tot een wereldwijde publicatie.” Brandt and Smelik, pp. 21-35. Print.
- . “Reacties op Etty Hillesum.” Gaarlandt, pp. 210-219. Print.
- Smith, Sidonie, and Julia Watson. *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, 2010. Print.
- Toury, Gideon. “De aard en de rol van normen in vertaling.” Naaijkens, Koster, Bloemen and Meijer, pp. 321-333. Print.

Vanderauwa, Ria. *Dutch Novels translated into English: The Transformation of a "Minority"*

Literature. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1985. Print.

Wat is het EHOC? Etty Hillesums Onderzoekcentrum. 2018. Web. 5 jul. 18.