

Public-Private Tensions: Anne Frank's Diary Reconsidered*

Yi-Ling Lin

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Tunghai University
E-mail: yll@thu.edu.tw

Abstract

My paper considers public-private tensions in relation to Anne Frank's diary. To escape Hitler's genocide of Jews during the Second World War, Anne Frank, her German Jewish family, and four other Jews hid in a secret annex in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. These eight were eventually arrested by the Nazis and sent to concentration camps, with Anne's father, Otto Frank, the sole survivor. After the war, he edited and published the diary Anne had kept while in hiding. An important historical document, the diary has received much scholarly attention. This paper takes new approaches to exploring the public-private tensions involved in the diary's editorial history and Anne's fugitive experience. I compare three versions of the diary,

© Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica
Received September 13, 2020; accepted September 23, 2020; last revised April 29, 2021

Proofreaders: Yi-Han Huang, Yu-Hsien Liao, Wen-Chi Chang
* The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for pointing out oversights in this article's original argument. The editorial team of *EurAmerica* meticulously edited and proofread this article, for which the author is also grateful.

focusing specifically on passages present in version A (Anne's original writing), absent in version B (her self-edited version), and reinstated in version C (Otto's edited version), i.e., Anne's de-emphasis of her adolescent development, which Otto considered essential elements of the narrative. I draw on Michel de Certeau's theory of everyday life for textual analysis to argue that public-private tensions are key to understanding the diary and offer new insights into it (inter)textually and theoretically.

Key Words: Anne Frank, Otto Frank, diary, version difference, everyday life

I. Introduction

To escape the Holocaust, Anneliese (Anne) Marie Frank, her German Jewish family, and four other Jews hid in a secret annex in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The eight were eventually arrested by the Gestapo and sent to concentration camps, with Anne's father, Otto Heinrich Frank, being the sole survivor. After the war, Otto edited and published his daughter's diary, kept mainly during their time in hiding, in Dutch in 1947, and in English in 1952. The diary was subsequently translated into many other languages and adapted for stage, screen, and television. An important historical document, the diary has attracted a wealth of scholarship. Taking new approaches, my paper examines public-private tensions involved in the diary's editorial history and Anne's fugitive experience. I compare three versions of the diary, focusing specifically on the passages present in version A (Anne's original writing), left out in version B (her self-edited version), and reinstated in version C (Otto's edited version), and draw on Michel de Certeau's theory of everyday life for the analysis. I argue that public-private tensions are key to understanding the diary. Anne and Otto had different understandings of what content was essential for the reading public. While Anne left out passages suggestive of her adolescent development, Otto considered such passages essential and reinstated them. Public-private tensions were also inherent in the family's fugitive experience, with secret practices of quasi-ordinary everyday life serving as survival tactics.

II. Historical Context of Anne Frank's Hiding and Writing

Born into a liberal Jewish family in Frankfurt am Main, Germany, on 12 June 1929, to Otto and Edith Frank, Anne was the family's second child. Her sister, Margot Betti Frank, was her senior by about three years. Otto was a businessman. After enrolling in the

University of Heidelberg for one semester, he went to New York to learn business practices. Although he soon returned to Germany following his father's death, he continued his business training in Düsseldorf and made several brief trips to New York prior to the outbreak of the First World War. During the war, he served in the German army and was promoted to lieutenant. In about 1923 or 1924, he joined his family's banking business in Frankfurt, which had suffered due to the war, a lack of foreign currency, inflation, and restrictive legislation. To save the family business, Otto went to Amsterdam where he founded a banking and foreign currency trading company. He chose Amsterdam as the Netherlands had been neutral during the war. However, the company went into liquidation in December 1924 and was dissolved in January 1929. This failure, the Great Depression, and the scandal that Otto's family bank had been involved in unlawful trade caused the bank to cease operation in January 1934. After the election of the Nazis in March 1933, hostility toward the Jews increased. Jewish city employees in Frankfurt were dismissed, and Jewish children were assigned to segregated seats at school. Sensing that the situation would probably worsen, Otto decided to relocate his wife and daughters to Amsterdam. Thanks to his business experience in the city, and with his brother-in-law's help, Otto set up the Amsterdam branch of Opekta, a pectin company based in Cologne, Germany, in September 1933. His wife and elder daughter joined him in Amsterdam in December 1933, with Anne joining them in March 1934.

Reestablished in Amsterdam, Otto tried various means to grow the business. He promoted the use of pectin in jelly making through advertising and demonstrations, and hired customer service, administrative, and sales staff. Recognizing that pectin sales were contingent on the fruit harvest season, Otto established a less seasonal company, Pectacon, in 1938 to sell herbs and spices. Although the Nazi threat grew more pronounced at the end of the '30s, Otto chose to stay on in Amsterdam, in the mistaken belief that the Nazis would respect Dutch neutrality. Germany occupied

the Netherlands in May 1940, following which Otto tried to emigrate without success.

The Nazis mistreated and marginalized the Jews in the Netherlands. Some were arrested, and a multitude of anti-Jewish decrees restricted the freedom of movement. Marked as outcasts, Jews were ordered to wear a yellow Star of David when in public, and Jewish pupils were transferred to segregated Jewish schools.¹

While Otto's business remained open, he had foreseen that the lives of the Jews in the Netherlands would become more difficult and planned to hide his family away in a back building on the premises of his business at 263 Prinsengracht, where he had squirreled away goods and necessities sufficient for months. When Margot received notice from the SS to report to a labor camp on 5 July 1942, the Franks decided to move in to their hiding place the very next day—ten days earlier than planned.² On 13 July, Hermann van Pels, his wife Auguste, and son Peter (Anne's senior by about three years) joined the Franks in hiding. Hermann was an herbal specialist and Otto's business partner. Four months later, on 16 November, the Franks and the van Pels were joined in hiding by Fritz Pfeffer, a dentist in Otto's circle of friends.

The eight people hid in the upper rear rooms in Otto's office building, which comprised a front house and a back annex. In the front house, the ground, first, second, and top floors were, respectively, the warehouse, company offices, the stockroom, and

¹ The first four paragraphs are based on Paape (2003d) and Gies & Gold (2009: 82-83). For Otto's family background, see also Pressler & Elias (2012: 57-124). For his employment experience in New York and his service in the German army, see Lee (2003: 9-20). For Otto's failed attempts to emigrate, see Adler (2013: 67-90). For a brief introduction to Anne's family, see Pressler (2019b). For a history about Jews in the Netherlands, see Hirschfeld (2019).

² For how the Franks left for the hiding place, see Gies & Gold (2009: 89-98) and Frank (2003: 226-231). The diary of Anne Frank is published in a number of editions and versions. In this paper, I use the revised critical edition in English, and my citations and quotations of the diary are based on version C (Otto Frank's edited version).

attic. In the back annex, the ground floor was the warehouse, and the first floor consisted of a private office, a kitchen, and water closet. The Franks and Pfeffer hid on the second floor of the back annex, with one room for Margot and her parents, and another room for Anne and Pfeffer. Margot and parents' room was used as the Franks' living room during the daytime. The bathroom on this floor was shared by all. The van Pels hid on the third floor of the back annex, with one large room used as living room, kitchen, and dining room, where they cooked, ate, and gathered to listen to news and music on the radio. The room was converted into the van Pels couple's bedroom at night. Another room on the third floor was Peter's with a staircase leading to the attic used for storage. To move from the front house to the back annex, one had to walk through the passage on the second floor that connected the two buildings. The hiding place, which Anne called "*het achterhuis*" (literally: the house behind) in her diary, is commonly referred to as the "Secret Annex" in English.³

The fugitives were aided by Otto's employees: Johannes Kleiman, Victor Kugler, Hermine (Miep) Gies, Elisabeth (Bep) Voskuil, and her father Johan Voskuil. Miep's husband, Jan A. Gies, a social worker and a good friend of the Frank family, also helped. These people provided food, necessities, and moral support.⁴

³ For Anne's description of the hiding place, see Frank (2003: 232-234). After the war, the hiding place was preserved and open to the public as a museum named Anne Frank House in 1960. For its establishment, see Anne Frank House (2000: 241-244) and Lee (1999: 230-231). In 1963, Otto established the Anne Frank Fonds, a charitable foundation, in Basel, Switzerland, to administer the rights to Anne's writings. For the work of the Anne Frank Fonds, see Müller (2013: 353-354) and Pressler & Elias (2012: 389-391). In 2012, the Anne Frank Fonds, with Anne's cousin Bernhard (Buddy) Elias as its president, collaborated with the Jewish Museum Frankfurt to establish its Frank Family Center, which houses materials related to the Frank family, including documents and objects (Müller, 2013: 345). For the interaction between the Anne Frank House and the Anne Frank Fonds, see Barnouw (2018: xi-xv, 97-98).

⁴ Some other people also helped the fugitives indirectly. When the office staff purchased a large quantity of bread and vegetables, the baker and the greengrocer

Helping with the office work and peeling potatoes were the fugitives' communal duties. To pass time, they listened to the radio, exercised, read, and studied. Take Anne for example. Under her father's tutelage, she read biographies and historical books and studied French, English, German, Dutch shorthand, geometry, algebra, history, geography, the history of art, mythology, biology, Biblical history, and Dutch literature. Victimized by the Nazis, Hermann forbid the fugitives to speak German, read German books (scientific and classical works excluded), and listen to German radio stations (classical music excluded) (Frank, 2003: 333-334, 409-412, 415).⁵

Aiming to be a journalist and writer, Anne also spent much time keeping a diary and writing stories in Dutch in the Secret Annex.⁶ She treated her diary as an imaginary close friend named Kitty, to whom most of the diary letters were addressed.⁷ The diary allowed her to express thoughts and feelings and sustained her as an emotional outlet on difficult hiding days. Anne also detailed the wartime situation and the fugitives' lives in her diary. Anne's writing came to a halt when the Nazi police raided the Secret Annex and arrested all eight on 4 August 1944. They were sent to concentration

suspected the food was for people in hiding but made no inquiries. See Schnabel (2014: 93-118).

⁵ For Anne's reading interest, hobby, and studies, see Frank (2003: 296-297, 611, 641-642, 666-667, 711). For a discussion about Anne's reading, see Iskander (2000). For others' reading and educational interests, see Frank (2003: 673).

⁶ For Anne's writing ambitions and the stories she wrote, see Frank (2003: 608-610).

⁷ Although Anne had many friends, she did not think she had a close friend with whom to share her secrets and concerns. In her diary entry of 20 June 1942, she wrote, "I want this diary itself to be my friend, and I shall call my friend Kitty" (Frank, 2003: 201-202). According to Arnold J. Pomerans's footnote (as cited in Frank, 2003: 243), Mirjam Pressler, the German translator of Anne's diary, has pointed out that Kitty's name comes from the character Kitty Franken in a series of Cissy van Marxveldt's Dutch novels for young girls named after the heroine Joop ter Heul. In the series, van Marxveldt describes a club founded by Joop ter Heul and her girlfriends, including Kitty Franken, and presents their schooldays, marriage, and motherhood. Anne mentioned Joop ter Heul in her diary entry of 16 October 1942.

camps. Only Otto survived.⁸

III. Publication of the Diary

After Otto returned to Amsterdam in June 1945, he sought information about his daughters. He knew his wife was dead, but still had hope for his daughters. When their deaths were confirmed in late July or early August, Miep handed over to Otto Anne's writings.⁹ Persuaded by his friends that Anne's diary would be "a

⁸ Hermann died in Auschwitz, Poland, on 6 September 1944; Pfeffer, in Neuengamme concentration camp in Germany on 20 November 1944; Mrs. Frank, in Auschwitz-Birkenau on 6 January 1945; Margot and Anne, in Bergen-Belsen in Germany in February or March 1945 probably because of typhus; Mrs. van Pels, in Germany or Czechoslovakia between 9 April and 8 May 1945; and Peter van Pels, in Mauhausen concentration camp in Austria on 5 May 1945. A prisoner in Auschwitz, Otto was liberated by the Russian armies on 27 January 1945. After a long journey, he reached Amsterdam on 3 June. When the Nazi police raided the Annex, Kleiman and Kugler were also arrested. Kleiman's gastric hemorrhage made him unfit for work. Through the intervention of the Netherlands Red Cross, he was released on 18 September 1944. As for Kugler, he was taken to do trench work but he took advantage of a moment of confusion and escaped. He returned to his home around April 1945. After Otto returned to Amsterdam, he continued his business with Kleiman, Kugler, and Jan until 1955. Miep and Bep had resigned in 1947 for family reasons. Otto had moved to Basel, where his mother and sister lived, as early as 1952, but he returned to Amsterdam every year for a few days until 1955. In 1953, Otto married Elfriede Geiringer-Markovits. She and her daughter Eva Schloss survived the concentration camps and met Otto on the train that took them from Auschwitz. For the Nazi raid on the Annex, see Paape (2003a) and Schnabel (2014: 127-142). Some assume that the fugitives were betrayed, see Barnouw (2018: 11-15) and Paape (2003b). For what happened to the fugitives and their helpers after the Nazi raid and the end of the war, see de Bruyn & van Wijk (2018: 80-112), Gies & Gold (2009: 191-246), Lee (2003: 118-314), Lindwer (1992: 9-204), Paape (2003c), Schnabel (2014: 143-182), and Shapiro & Kardonne (2008: 51-112). For a summary of Anne's life, see Pressler (2019a).

⁹ Miep and Bep saved Anne's writings from the Annex after the Nazi raid and planned to return them to Anne upon her return. Anne kept her writings in a briefcase. The raid commander emptied the contents onto the floor and used the briefcase to carry away money and jewelry he took from the Franks (Paape, 2003a: 22). After finding Anne's writings, Miep placed them in her office desk drawer for

meaningful document about humanity” (as cited in Lee, 2003: 210), Otto edited the diary and had it published in Dutch in 1947, and in English in 1952.

In 1980, Anne’s diary and other writings were bequeathed to the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation in accordance with Otto’s will (Barnouw & van der Stroom, 2003: ix). To dispel doubts about the authenticity of Anne’s diary (which arose in the 1950s and became widespread in the 1970s) and to facilitate research, the Institute published in English the critical edition of the diary in 1989 and its revised edition in 2003. The critical edition provides forensic reports to authenticate the diary, historically contextualizes the family’s hiding and the diary’s publication, and faithfully presents three versions (A, B, and C) of the diary in parallel sections.¹⁰

Anne’s writings in fact include two incomplete diary versions and some stories.¹¹ The first diary version, called version A in the critical edition, is Anne’s original writing in a red-checked autograph album and two exercise books. Version A covers the periods from 12 June 1942 to 5 December 1942, and from 22

safekeeping. After the raid, the Nazi instructed the moving company of Abraham Puls to clear the Annex. For how Miep and Bep saved Anne’s writings, see de Bruyn & van Wijk (2018: 87-89), Gies & Gold (2009: 198), Paape (2003a: 24-25), and van der Stroom (2003a: 62).

¹⁰ For the diary’s authenticity, see Barnouw (2003b). The main components of the critical edition and its revised edition are the same. Therefore, I use the more concise term “the critical edition” in my discussions but actually use “the revised critical edition” for citations and quotations. The additional components in the revised critical edition include the passages the Frank family had previously declined to publish, the pages of Anne’s diary found in 1998, a report on their authenticity, the stories Anne wrote while in hiding, and a chapter titled “Anne Frank and Academia.” For the diary pages found in 1998, see Barnouw (2018: 90-93) and Lejeune (2009: 259-264). In 1991, *The Diary of a Young Girl: The Definitive Edition* was published. It enlarges version C with extra passages from version A and B and is called by some version D of Anne’s diary. For scholarly comments on the definitive edition, see Barnouw (2018: 30-31), Lejeune (2009: 258-259), and Nussbaum (2000: 29).

¹¹ This and the following two paragraphs are based on van der Stroom (2003a; 2003c: 188). For the stories and other items saved, see van der Stroom (2003b).

December 1943 to 1 August 1944. The second diary version, called version B in the critical edition, is Anne's rewriting of version A on loose sheets of paper. Version B covers the period from 20 June 1942 to 29 March 1944. The 28 March 1944 radio address by Gerrit Bolkestein, the Dutch Minister of Education, on the historical significance of commoners' documents motivated Anne to rewrite her diary for future publication. In only a few months, she rewrote her original diary entries covering about two years. She drew up a list of pseudonyms for the fugitives and their helpers. In addition, she expanded, shortened, removed, and combined some entries.¹²

After Otto decided to publish his daughter's diary, he used version B as his major guide. He typed out a copy based on version B, leaving out some passages he considered less interesting or offensive to other fugitives. He further supplemented this typescript with some "essential" (as cited in van der Stroom, 2003a: 63) passages in version A and four sketches related to the time spent hiding away from Anne's stories. To combine passages from different sources, Otto had to cut out the typed passages he wanted to use and then pasted them together. Except only very occasional alterations, Otto copied Anne's manuscripts with great accuracy. He had his typescript read and amended by others. Albert Cauvern, a radio dramatist and the husband of Otto's former secretary, Isa Cauvern, mainly corrected typing errors, lapses in idiom, grammar, and punctuation. Others amplified and deleted some sentences. Isa Cauvern then retyped the amended typescript, which was then further amended by the Dutch

¹² Anne prepared the pseudonym list but did not have an opportunity to use it; she still used real names in version B. Examples from the pseudonym list: Anne Frank became Anne Robin; v. Pels, v. Daan; Pfeffer, Dussel; Kleiman, Koophuis; Kugler, Kraler; and Bep, Elly. In version C, Otto used real names for the Franks and pseudonyms for others and his companies. Some pseudonyms used in version C differ from those in Anne's plan. For Anne's original list of name changes, see Anne Frank Fonds (2019: 7). For the pseudonyms used in version C and their corresponding real names, see Enzer & Solotaroff-Enzer (2000: xvii-xviii). In this paper, I use real names. Although Anne rewrote in diary form, the genre of her publication project is actually unclear (Lejeune, 2009: 242). She mentioned "romance" but also suggested "eyewitness account."

publisher, Contact. The publisher changed word choices, revised sentences, shorten the length to fit a book series, and deleted “indecorous” (van der Stroom, 2003a: 69) passages about Anne’s sexual development so as not to “offend Dutch Puritan or Catholic susceptibilities” (as cited in van der Stroom, 2003a: 74). Contact published the Dutch edition of Anne’s diary, *Het Achterhuis*, in 1947.

The English edition of Anne’s diary, titled *The Diary of a Young Girl*, was published in 1952 in London by Vallentine, Mitchell, & Co. and in New York by Doubleday. B. M. Mooyaart-Doubleday translated from Dutch into English *Het Achterhuis* and the passages Contact omitted, which Otto requested be included in the English edition. Obviously, Otto expected to have a more complete version of the diary published and had no scruples about publishing the passages related to his daughter’s sexual development. The critical edition calls the U.S. edition of *The Diary of a Young Girl* version C of Anne’s diary, which covers the period from 14 June 1942 to 1 August 1944. As version C originates from the typescript Otto prepared for publication, I call version C Otto’s edited version of the diary in this paper.¹³

1942		1943		1944			
14 June						version C	
20 June						version B	
12 June	5 Dec.		22 Dec.		29 Mar.	1 Aug.	version A

Source: adapted from van der Stroom (2003a: 61).

Figure 1 Periods Covered in Anne Frank’s Diary

¹³ For a diagrammatic comparison of the periods covered in version A, B, and C, see Figure 1.

IV. Literature Review and Research Method

The critical edition's presentation of three diary versions in parallel sections has inspired version comparisons. For example, Lauren Nussbaum argues that Anne's self-edited version B should represent the diary. In her rewrite, Anne showed great literary skill in improving the structure and content. She omitted passages about her sexual development and her criticism of her mother, which is suggestive of her self-criticism and growth. In Nussbaum's view, Otto's reinstatement of those passages in his edited version C hints that he ignored his daughter's growth. Nussbaum concludes that Otto did not know "what to do with the more mature, objective, and autonomous young writer" and sought to "preserve the image of his beloved, tempestuous little Anne" (2000: 30).¹⁴

Some scholars concur with Nussbaum's arguments. Deborah E. Kaplan, Daniel Paul O'Donnell, and Francine Prose also think the literary quality of version B is superior to that of version A, with greater "emotional clarity by dramatizing" (Kaplan, 2018: 92), "more dialogue," "more suspense," improved "rhetorical effectiveness" (O'Donnell, 2011: 80-81), "more descriptive adjectives," more "complexity, animation, and humor" in conversations, and people becoming characters (Prose, 2010: 141-146). Like Nussbaum, Oren Baruch Stier similarly argues that perhaps Otto, who restored in version C Anne's earlier and more emotional passages, "simply didn't see his daughter as anything more than a child" (2015: 118).

Considering Anne edited the work with publication in mind, Sally Charnow points out the changes Anne made for her potential readers: she left out passages "inappropriate for public consumption" (2012: 301), such as those about her bodily changes, erotic desire, and sex, and provided more contextual information in

¹⁴ In 2019, version B was published in German as a stand-alone edition of Anne's diary titled *Liebe Kitty: Ihr Romanentwurf in Briefen* (*Dear Kitty: Your Draft for an Epistolary Novel*).

her rewrite. Paying attention to gender issues, Jane Fenoulhet and Berteke Waaldijk suggest that Anne had a feminist consciousness, for she discussed the problem of women's subjugation to men in her 13 June 1944 diary entry in version A, which was omitted in version C (Fenoulhet, 2007: 107-108; Waaldijk, 2000: 113).¹⁵

Philippe Lejeune's study is larger in scope than the analyses mentioned above. Lejeune divides the time frame of Anne's diary (12 June 1942 to 1 August 1944) into four periods based on the documents available: version A and B, version B alone, version A and B, and version A alone. For each period, Lejeune explores how Anne and Otto reworked the diary. Lejeune points out that in her rewrite, Anne demonstrated her maturity and "the artistry of a novelist" (2009: 247). She omitted more childish, impulsive, and private passages, such as those concerning her mother, her sexual development, and her love affairs. Furthermore, she revised diary entries with the writing principles similar to those of the epistolary novel: calibrating (similar length for entries), centering (one main subject for one letter), and pruning (avoiding repetitions) (251). In Lejeune's opinion, Anne's revisions erase "telling signs of time's passing" and make version B "homogeneous" (257). By contrast, the original diary version, which presents Anne's development from childishness to "extraordinary maturity," enables readers to see her "adolescent writing in all its freshness" (257). As for Otto, he reduced Anne's criticism of Pfeffer and put back into the text her relationship with Peter van Pels. In addition to his qualitative explorations, Lejeune compares the three diary versions quantitatively in terms of their line and entry numbers in each period. The statistics show that in the first and third periods, Anne herself omitted more passages than Otto did and that in the second and fourth periods, Otto kept more passages than he deleted. As a result, it is problematic to generalize Otto's role as a censor of the diary.

¹⁵ According to Barnouw (2003a: 104), the passage in which Anne discussed women's social position can be found in the typescript Otto prepared for publication.

Unlike the scholars discussed above, I compare the three diary versions in order to demystify what Otto meant by the “essential” passages he restored to version C. As mentioned before, when Otto prepared the diary for publication, he based his typescript mainly on version B but added some “essential” passages from version A. Otto’s editing approach implies that he and Anne had different views about the “essential” components of the diary. Thus, I seek to explore the passages that were nonessential to Anne but essential to Otto. For my purpose, I qualify my comparison in two aspects. First, I narrow down my comparison to the two periods covered by both version A and B: June 1942 to 5 December 1942, and 22 December 1943 to 29 March 1944. Only when both version A and B are available can Anne’s own editing be discerned. Therefore, I do not discuss the periods covered by either version A or B. Second, I explore the version difference only through one editing approach: the passages in version A that were left out by Anne in version B but reinstated by Otto in version C. I do not explore the passages about which Anne and Otto made the same editorial decisions (i.e., the passages in version A that both Anne and Otto kept or left out in versions B and C) and the passages in version A that were kept by Anne in version B but omitted by Otto in version C. A scrutiny of the passages within the scope of my research leads to the conclusion that public-private tensions affected how Anne and Otto edited the diary. Similar tensions were also inherent in their fugitive experience and can be interpreted from a new perspective, Michel de Certeau’s theory of everyday life.¹⁶

¹⁶ Anne’s diary and its stage and screen adaptations have been discussed in the fields of history, literature, education, and media and cultural studies. Many discussions concern Anne’s image in the American play by Albert Hackett and Frances Goodrich. A Pulitzer Prize winner, the play de-emphasizes Anne’s Jewish background and emphasizes her optimism about humanity despite her victimization. Otto considered universalizing his daughter’s experience to be “the most effective method of propagating understanding and tolerance” (Lee, 2003: 299). Gradually, Anne Frank has become “the symbol of universal victimization” (Brenner, 2010: 46). However, some regard as problematic the universal and

V. Textual Differences between Version A, B, and C

A close reading teases out two strands of passages that are present in version A, left out by Anne in version B, and reinstated by Otto in version C. The first strand provides readers with background information about Anne's writing and hiding context. The second strand, far larger than the first, presents features of Anne's adolescent development: physical changes, attention to self, heightened emotions, conflicts with her parents, and new role as a romantic partner. Compared with the first, the second strand is more personal and private and would affect Anne's image more. Hence, she and her father would most likely have different views about whether the second strand was essential for readers.

The first strand of passages Otto reinstated helps readers understand the context of Anne's writing and hiding. To begin with, Otto restored the passages dated 14 June 1942 in which Anne mentioned her birthday presents (Frank, 2003: 197-198).¹⁷ Possibly the nicest of all was a diary from her parents that was to become her good pal. The passages are crucial because they explain how Anne started keeping her diary.

In addition, Otto situated the historical context and related the diary author's education to the anti-Jewish milieu. He restored

optimistic image of Anne. For example, the American writer Meyer Levin firmly argues that Anne's Jewish identity is essential to the play adaptation. For the philosopher Hannah Arendt, the stage performance that generalizes Anne's experience to create audience identification with her is "cheap sentimentality at the expense of a great catastrophe" (as cited in Ozick, 1997: 86). For different approaches to Anne's diary, see Barnouw (2003a). For the American play's universal approach and Otto's view about it, see Lee (2003: 249-261, 298-304). For Levin's role in relation to the stage version of the diary, see Barnouw (2003c; 2018: 32-45). For the concerns that the universal and optimistic image of Anne would jeopardize the historical accuracy of the Holocaust, see Ozick (1997) and Rosenfeld (1991).

¹⁷ Subsequent parenthetical references to Anne's diary in the main text of this article will specify only page numbers.

Anne's listing of anti-Jewish decrees to the entry of 20 June 1942 (203), one of which required Jews to attend Jewish schools. Anne thus had to discontinue her Montessori education and transferred to the Jewish Secondary School (204). Moreover, Otto reinstated passages to demonstrate how Anne continued her studies under his tutelage after her formal education was interrupted. The sentence he reinserted into the entry of 3 October 1942 shows that Anne was working at French and reading *La Belle Nivernaise* (286). Also relevant are the restored passages dated 16 October 1942 (296-297). For French, Anne translated a chapter out of *La Belle Nivernaise*, made notes of the new words she learned from the book, and studied three pages of grammar. Not interested in math, she rejected doing math problems every day. She and Otto often needed to rely on Margot's help with math. Nonetheless, Anne was further on in shorthand than her sister and Peter. After reading Cissy van Marxveldt's *The Assault*, Anne considered it not as good as the writer's another work, *Joop ter Heul*.

Furthermore, Otto reinserted passages to detail the tensions between the fugitives. The passage he reinserted into the entry of 21 September 1942 presents Anne's complaint about the way Mrs. van Pels washed pans (259). The restored passage dated 1 October 1942 shows Anne's jealousy toward and protest against Mrs. van Pels's close interaction with her father (282).

Otto also reinstated passages to demonstrate that the fugitives and their helpers were on good terms. First, the restored passages dated 16 October 1942 reveal Anne's closeness to her sister (298). They occupied the same bed, chatting and talking about reading each other's diary, and Margot kept her future career plans to herself. The passages Otto reinserted into the entry of 28 October 1942 depict the morning after the Gies couple stayed overnight as guests in the Annex (309). Anne got up early, Jan left at eight-thirty for work, and Miep could conveniently go downstairs to the office after a cozy breakfast. Additionally, despite the difficult wartime conditions, the fugitives and their helpers still managed to express

their good will toward each other through Christmas gift giving. In the restored passage dated 22 December 1943, Pfeffer gave Mrs. Frank and Mrs. van Pels a lovely cake, and Anne gave Miep and Bep fondants made from the sugar she had saved from her porridge for at least two months (449). The restored entry of 27 December 1943 details the Christmas gifts the fugitives received from their helpers: a lovely cake with "Peace 1944" written on it, a pound of sweet biscuits of prewar quality, a bottle of yoghurt for each of the teenagers, and a beer for each of the grownups (454).

Besides, Otto restored passages to present the problems caused by hiding away. He reinstated the passage dated 29 October 1942 in which Anne mentioned their plan to light the fire for the first time and her hope that the chimney, which had not been swept for ages, would draw (311). Although the chimney smoke could lead to their betrayal, they could not help but run the risk to meet their living needs.

Hiding also affected Anne emotionally. To highlight that she was saddened by being a victim of racism, Otto reinserted her statements in the 24 December 1943 entry: "I sometimes ask myself, 'Would anyone, either Jew or non-Jew, understand this about me, that I am simply a young girl badly in need of some rollicking fun?' I don't know, and I couldn't talk about it to anyone, because then I know I should cry. Crying can bring such relief" (451-452). Otto further restored passages dated 29 December 1943 to show that Anne felt lonely and guilty. She thought about her deceased Granny (grandmother on mother's side), who was always faithful, good, and supportive. Not revealing her severe internal disease, Granny must have been lonely.¹⁸ Relating Granny to herself, Anne concluded, "A person can be lonely even if he is loved by many people, because he is still not the 'One and Only' to anyone" (455). Before going into

¹⁸ Granny passed away in January 1942. To illustrate Anne's affection for Granny, Otto reinstated a sentence in the diary entry dated 20 June 1942: ". . . no one will ever know how much she is present in my thoughts and how much I love her still" (Frank, 2003: 203).

hiding, Anne had felt lonely even with family or friends around her. The cloistered life in the Annex made her ponder more and become more sentimental. She considered her hiding away “selfish and cowardly” because her Jewish friend Hannah Goslar and other Jews might have suffered a misfortune (456). Their fate aroused her fear. Sometimes she wanted to scream out loud and cry. She prayed that God would save some of them.

The second strand of passages Otto reinserted concerns Anne’s adolescent development. Adolescence marks a transition into adulthood and packs a lot of development into a short period. Physically, adolescents become capable of reproducing. For girls, menstruation begins and breasts develop. The development of sexual characteristics increases adolescents’ interest in sex. Emotionally and socially, adolescents are preoccupied with themselves. Their brain development makes them spend much time thinking about themselves. They care much about their appearance and feelings. They may express their feelings in an intense way. Their heightened emotions result from the hormone changes that set off their physical development. Adolescents’ preoccupation with themselves, their heightened emotions, and their cognitive ability to question established values and authority may make them have conflicts with parents. Valuing their friends and peers, adolescents may develop romantic interests and relationships (McNeely & Blanchard, 2009: 1, 7, 14-15, 21, 27, 32-33).

Through Otto’s editing, Anne demonstrates the adolescent features mentioned in the preceding paragraph. He restored the passages of 5 January 1944 to show how his daughter reacted to her maturing body (462-463). Reading Sis Heyster’s article about blushing reminded Anne that she was like the pubertal girls in the article starting to think about “the wonders” happening to her body (462). She felt more embarrassed about her physical development than her shyer sister and never discussed it with anyone. She had had her period three times. Although she experienced discomfort during menstruation, she saw her period as “a sweet secret” and

looked forward to feeling that secret within her again (462). Realizing she was a person with individual ideas and thoughts, she sometimes had a strong desire to feel her own breasts and listen to the rhythm of her heart when lying in bed at night. Curious about the female body, Anne once kissed the girl sleeping with her and asked in vain to feel each other's breasts as a proof of friendship. Whenever Anne saw the "wonderful and exquisite" naked figure of a woman, such as that of Venus, she felt ecstatic (463). Sometimes she even burst into tears. She longed for a girl friend to talk to. Further, to suggest Anne's curiosity about sexual topics, Otto reinserted the passages dated 24 January 1944 in which she wondered how much Peter van Pels knew if his parents never talked to him about sex (484).

In addition, Otto reinstated passages to show Anne's attention to herself. For the diary entry of 16 October 1942, he restored passages suggestive of Anne's concern with her appearance. In response to Anne's question whether she was ugly, Margot said she was quite attractive with nice eyes (298). Moreover, Otto restored the passages dated 7 March 1944 to present Anne's reflections on her social image and on her true self. Before going into hiding, she had been popular at school for her jokes, pranks and cheerfulness. Everyone had liked to cycle with her and she had received positive attention (538). However, she now realized that back in 1942 she simply had used jokes and pranks to drive away her emptiness (539). As she confessed, she discovered her longing for a boy friend (not for a girl friend), her "inward happiness," and her "defensive armor of superficiality and gaiety" (540). She further made it clear that she longed for the dearness of Peter van Pels, which was still "embryonic and impressionable" but would come sometime (541).

Otto also restored the entire diary entry of 19 February 1944 to reveal Anne's heightened emotions (517-518). That quiet Saturday morning, Anne helped out upstairs and had only some fleeting words with Peter. At half past two in the afternoon, she went down to the private office where she sat at the desk, reading or

writing. Soon she felt a surge of emotions and fell into tears. She was “desperately unhappy” and wished Peter had come to comfort her (517). She went upstairs again at four o’clock in hopes of meeting Peter, but he had gone down to see the cat in the warehouse. Suddenly her tears returned. Hurrying to the lavatory, she cried and “felt very wretched” (518). She wished for Peter’s attention and company. Although she kept thinking that probably he did not like her or did not need anyone to confide in, she still felt hope and anticipation as the tears streamed down her cheeks.

Moreover, Otto reinstated passages to present Anne’s conflicts with her parents, especially with her mother. He reinserted into the entry of 3 October 1942 Anne’s description of a mother-daughter quarrel that resulted in both breaking into tears (286). Anne made it clear that she was much more fond of her father than her mother. Although Otto said Anne would get over the problems in her relationship with her mother, Anne did not believe him and had to make a particular effort to remain calm when with her mother. Otto expected Anne to help her mother when she was not well, but Anne was unwilling. In fact, there were times when Anne was very close to her mother, as suggested in the sentence Otto reinserted into the entry dated 16 October 1942: “Mummy, Margot, and I are as thick as thieves again” (298). While Anne was closer to her father, she still had complaints about him and Otto restored relevant passages to the 20 March 1944 diary entry. Therein, Anne noted that she deserved punishment for being indifferent to her mother and must try to be friendly to her, but also mentioned that while her father was trying not to treat her like a child, it made him “much too cool” (572).

Otto reinserted passages elucidating why mother and daughter clashed. The restored passages dated 24 December 1943 show that Anne did not think she had a real mother, a “Mumsie,” who understood her and took what she said seriously (452). Deciding to be the “Mumsie” for her children in the future, Anne noted that writing had saved her from a degree of despair. In the entry of 2 March 1944, her father reinstated similar messages. Anne grumbled

over her mother disregarding her opinions. When Bep felt discouraged, Mrs. Frank suggested that she “try to think of all the other people who are in trouble!” (527). Anne doubted the feasibility of the advice: “What is the good of thinking of misery when one is already miserable oneself?” (527). Ignoring Anne’s response, her mother simply asked her not to interfere in the conversation. Otto also ignored what Anne would say. Irritated by her parents, Anne dismissed adults as “stupid” for not allowing young people to have opinions (527). For Anne, young people were “much more sensitive” and “much more advanced” in their thoughts than any adult in the Annex would imagine (528). Her advice for people feeling melancholy was to go outside. The beauty in nature, sunshine, and freedom could help one find oneself and God, as the passages her father restored to the 7 March 1944 entry specify (542).¹⁹

The passages Otto reinstated in the entry of 5 January 1944 present Anne’s view of her mother in the wrong in her treatment of her daughters as friends (460). This was not an example Anne wished to follow, for she felt her mother did not show “great tact” toward her children at puberty (461). For instance, Anne recounted an unpleasant experience: when she was crying, she was laughed at by her mother and her sister.

The restored passages dated 12 January 1944 suggest that Anne expected more attention from her mother, who only looked at her sister (473). In order not to offend her mother, Anne would not tell her mother that her daughters were not what she imagined (473-474). Mrs. Frank was aware that Anne did not love her to the same degree as her sister, but was convinced that Anne would come around (474).²⁰ On the other hand, Anne’s mother also expected

¹⁹ The passages Otto reinstated in the entry of 23 February 1944 similarly elucidate the function of nature, where Anne encouraged Peter to find happiness (Frank, 2003: 521).

²⁰ In a passage Otto reinserted into the entry of 12 January 1944, Anne noted that thinking of Peter could save her from her conflicts with her mother (Frank, 2003: 476).

attention from Anne. As a sentence Otto reinserted into the entry of 2 March 1944 shows, Anne's mother felt jealousy when Anne talked to Mrs. van Pels more than to her (528).

To suggest that Anne's conflicts with parents were typical of adolescent development, Otto reinstated relevant passages about Peter and Margot. In the reinserted passages dated 2 March 1944, Anne had a long talk with Peter and concluded that they both did not always like his parents, who quarreled over politics, cigarettes, and all sorts of things. Anne offered to help Peter, who was shy and tended to keep things to himself, and suggested that he go to talk to her father (529). The restored passages dated 6 March 1944 show that Peter was as offended by his mother's ridicule as Anne was by her mother's laugh. Peter flushed and looked very embarrassed when his mother called him, "The thinker!" (534). Irritated by Mrs. van Pels's mockery, Anne noted, "Why can't these people keep their mouths shut?" (534). In the reinserted passages dated 17 March 1944, Anne mentioned that she and Margot were getting a little tired of their parents, and sick of all their remarks and questioning throughout the day (564). Anne and Margot wanted to decide a few things for themselves and to exercise some independence at times (564). They felt they did not have as much "confidence and harmony" in the Annex as they used to have at home (565). They were still treated as children, but actually they were, inwardly, much more mature than most girls their age. Anne wrote of knowing what she wanted, being able to tell right from wrong, and having her own "ideas and principles" (565). She felt "more of a person than a child" and "quite independent of anyone" (565). She also felt that she was able to "discuss things and argue better" than her mother (566).

Finally, Otto reinserted into the text many passages regarding Anne's romantic relationships. Before going into hiding, Anne had been developing romantic relationships, which had been topics of family conversations. In the restored entry of 15 June 1942, Anne described her birthday party, which many of her school friends, both boys and girls, attended. They watched a film and had a good time.

Mrs. Frank always wanted to know whom Anne would like to marry and did not know that the person she had in mind was Peter (Petel) Schiff (199).²¹ The restored passages dated 30 June 1942 present Anne's interaction with Helmuth (Hello) Silberberg, one of her admirers. More fond of Anne, Silberberg gave up his girlfriend, went out with Anne, and planned future dates (220-222). In the reinserted passages dated 3 July 1942, Silberberg told one of Anne's friends that he liked Anne. The Frank family discussed Silberberg and approved of him. Margot said he was "a decent lad," while Mrs. Frank praised him as "a good-looking boy, a well-behaved, nice boy" (223).

Otto also reinstated passages to show that after going into hiding, Anne entered into a romantic relationship with Peter van Pels, which developed in stages. First, Otto reinserted Anne's judgment of Peter to suggest her preoccupation with romance. Anne's comment on Peter, which Otto restored to the 25 September 1942 diary entry, reads: "I thought Peter rather awkward, but that it was probably shyness, as many boys who haven't had much to do with girls are like that" (265). The restored entry dated 25 December 1943 conveys a similar message. Anne recalled what her father said about the love of his youth and believed she would understand it better now (453). Anne's concern with love and her active personality possibly ignited her romance with Peter. Anne was more active than Peter, as shown in the restored passages of 16 October 1942. Anne played a trick on Peter, chased him off, and lay on his bed (298).

Second, Otto reinstated passages to demonstrate that when Anne was first attracted to Peter van Pels, she still clung to her

²¹ Anne described her relationship with Schiff in her diary entry dated 7 January 1944. She fell in love with him in the summer when she was about to go into the sixth form of the lower school, and he into the first form of the high school. Schiff eventually gave up Anne because he was convinced by someone that she was "a childish little imp" (Frank, 2003: 469). Their relationship ended before Anne went to the Jewish Secondary School.

memory of Schiff. In the reinserted passage of 6 January 1944, Anne described how she was attracted by Peter's helpless, uncertain, and manly look: "I noticed his shy manner and it made me feel very gentle; I couldn't refrain from meeting those dark eyes again and again" (465). However, Otto restored passages to suggest Schiff was still the person who captivated Anne's heart at the moment. In the same diary entry, Otto restored a sentence that speaks to Anne's vivid memory of Schiff: ". . . never before have I had such a clear picture of him in my mind" (467). To further present Anne's love for Schiff, Otto restored several passages to the 7 January 1944 diary entry in which Anne expressed hurt and unhappiness because Schiff had forgotten her completely. Even so, she still thought of him all the time and repeated to herself the whole day, "Oh, Petel, darling, darling Petel . . . !" (470). She wished it had been Schiff rather than Otto who had kissed her in the morning, and imagined she could still feel Schiff's eyes upon her and his cheek against hers (471). She asked how she would free herself of Schiff's image and whether someone would be "a miserable substitute" for him (471). She hyperbolically described her love for Schiff as such a great love that it would "leap out into the open and suddenly manifest itself in such a devastating way!" (471). She was sure that Schiff was the person she would like to marry and she understood fully the sexual longing that Otto thought she could not yet possibly understand (471).

Third, to demonstrate how Peter eventually replaced Schiff and became the person Anne longed for, Otto restored the entries dated 13, 16, 18, 27, 18, and 28 February 1944. In the entry of 13 February, Anne revealed a change in her life: Peter kept looking at her in an unusual way. Although she was pleased, she avoided looking at him too much so that she would not feel the "lovely feeling" too often (506). Otto noticed that Anne was not her usual self, but she could not tell him everything and would prefer to be left alone (506). The entries of 16, 18, and 27 February show the closer interaction between Anne and Peter. He stayed longer when coming down to see Margot's birthday presents (511). He helped Anne when she

went to the attic to get potatoes (512). She stayed in his room teaching him French and chatting on various topics (513). Her life became more pleasant, and he, who needed affection and had a strong inferiority complex, became more talkative (514, 516). Although she expected something to grow between them that could give them “confidence and friendship,” she denied that she was in love with Peter (516). Self-contradictorily, Anne also wrote that she dreamed about Peter all the time, and that as he similarly had conflicts with his mother, she hoped they would soon connect with each other (522). It was not until the entry of 28 February that Anne expressed certainty regarding her feelings for Peter. As she noted, Peter Schiff and Peter van Pels had “grown into one Peter, who is beloved and good, and for whom I long desperately” (523). Nonetheless, she was afraid that she was not courageous enough to enter into the relationship with Peter (523).

Fourth, in order to reveal Anne and Peter’s tacit recognition of each other as romantic partners, Otto reinstated the entries of 3, 4, 6, 16, and 19 March 1944. In these, Anne and Peter did not confess love to each other, but their interactions suggest they were in love. They were happy together. On a Saturday, they studied French and English together under Otto’s tutelage. When Otto read aloud from Dickens to them, Anne was “in the seventh heaven” because she was sitting very close to Peter (533). Thanks to him, Anne felt that Saturday was “the first Saturday for months and months” that was not “boring, dreary, and dull” (533). Anne and Peter looked forward to seeing each other, and Anne stated she lived “from one meeting to the next” (536). Similarly, Peter expected to see Anne again as soon as he bid her goodbye (533). They spoke at length on various topics when they met and found it easier to talk in semidarkness than in bright light (568). The shortcomings they saw in each other were no longer shortcomings. In 1942, Anne found Peter “awkward” and shy (265), while Peter found Anne “too talkative and unruly” (569). By 1944, Anne found Peter’s “clumsiness” attractive and was thrilled by his “small shy advance” (536), while Peter liked Anne’s chatter (531). Anne was glad that the van Pels had

a son and not a daughter; otherwise, her “conquest could never have been so difficult, so beautiful, so good” (536). Peter was also glad the Franks had children so that he could enjoy Anne’s company (570). Anne felt that whenever Peter looked at her, his eyes seemed to “laugh and wink,” and she would feel “a little light” going on inside her (570).

Last, to present the problems Anne and Peter faced in their relationship, Otto reinstated the entries dated 20, 22, and 28 March 1944.²² The first problem was that Margot was also fond of Peter and felt she would be “the odd one out” (571) because “two’s company and three’s a crowd” (598). To prevent Anne from reproaching herself, Margot wrote to Anne explaining that Peter was not her ideal choice. Although Margot felt sorry she hadn’t found someone to discuss her thoughts and feelings with, that person could not have been Peter, for she needed someone her “superior intellectually” (573). Believing Anne and Peter would gain by the friendship (573), Margot encouraged her sister to enjoy the companionship (576). In her letters responding to Margot, Anne explained she actually did not know how her relationship with Peter would develop, but she admired Margot’s goodness and encouraged her that her time might come sooner than she thought (578). Like Anne, Peter also invited Margot to join them in conversation, but, perhaps feeling insecure, Anne wondered whether Peter’s invitation was sincere (598). The second problem Anne had to deal with was her mother’s efforts to curtail the frequency of Anne and Peter’s visits (598). According to Mrs. Frank, Mrs. van Pels was jealous of the close interaction between Anne and Peter. Although Otto thought it unnecessary for Anne to mind Mrs. van Pels’s jealousy, her mother’s attitude made Anne feel she was “in a very difficult position” (599). Mrs. Frank was cross and probably jealous as well. She and Anne were at odds with each other and Otto tried to sidestep their “silent battle” (599). Not wanting to give up Peter,

²² Otto also restored a passage to the entry of 23 March 1944 in which Anne and Peter complimented each other on appearance (Frank, 2003: 585).

Anne asked when all the difficulties would be overcome (599).

As analyzed above, Otto reinstated two strands of passages. The first provides more information about Anne's writing and the context in which she wrote. The second strand highlights features of Anne's adolescent development as manifested in her physical changes, attention to self, heightened emotions, conflicts with her parents, and new role as a romantic partner. Publishing the first strand of passages should not embarrass Anne as it involves less private aspects of her life. The different historical circumstances in which Anne and Otto edited the diary maybe responsible, in part, for their differing editorial decisions concerning what to excise from the first strand of passages. Anne edited her diary while still in hiding with no knowledge about how her fugitive status would end, while Otto edited the diary after the war's end, having learned none of the others survived the concentration camps. Looking back on their time in hiding encouraged Otto to think differently about presenting details that would facilitate readers' understanding.

On the other hand, publishing the second strand of passages would possibly embarrass Anne. Some details Otto restored concerning her physical changes and her romance with Peter are of very private nature. Also, the presentation of Anne's heightened emotions and conflicts with parents could make her appear more emotional and childish than she would be comfortable with. Hence, Anne and Otto would likely diverge in their views about whether the second strand of passages was essential for readers to know. To avoid embarrassment and to construct a serious and mature image of herself, Anne left out elements of the second strand, which Otto liberally restored. After all, excluding passages about adolescent development would present the teen author unnaturally.

The reasons for Otto to restore the second strand may also be personal and social. As a father, Otto would see every developmental stage in his daughter's growth as significant. The fact that Anne's life ended in adolescence would make this period especially significant for her father. Moreover, the serious and mature image Anne would

like to create for herself may not adequately convey Otto's understanding of his daughter. While Otto reinstated passages to highlight Anne's adolescent identity, it does not follow that he ignored her more serious and mature thinking and treated her as nothing more than a child. Instead, Otto was very proud of Anne's talent. He described being impressed by the diary: "For me, it was a revelation. There . . . revealed a completely different Anne to the child that I had lost. I had no idea of the depth of her thoughts and feelings" (as cited in Lee, 2003: 202). He felt "she would have grown into a truly fine writer" had she lived (303). He considered her diary a great work that would survive generations (301) and "should be read as widely as possible, because it should work for people and for humanity" (217). As adolescence is a universal life stage, presenting Anne's adolescent development helps induce reader identification with her, which in turn would facilitate the cause against racism.

VI. Hiding and Michel de Certeau's Theory of Everyday Life

In addition to the editing history of Anne's diary, her fugitive status also involves public-private tensions, which can be interpreted through Michel de Certeau's theory of everyday life. De Certeau, a French Jesuit, historian, and ethnologist, radically shifts the focus of cultural studies from the producer and the product to the consumer in his book *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Clark, 1986: 706). Adopting a multi-disciplinary approach, de Certeau explores the means invented by ordinary people (the consumers) to "operate within and yet against a dominant culture" (the producers) (706). On this theme of resistance, de Certeau calls the art of the strong "strategy" and that of the weak "tactics." As he puts it, a strategy is "the calculation (or manipulation) of power relationships that becomes possible as soon as a subject with will and power . . . can be isolated. It postulates a *place* that can be delimited as its *own* and

serve as the base from which relations with an *exteriority* composed of targets or threats . . . can be managed” (de Certeau, 1984: 35-36). In other words, a strategy is “an effort to delimit one’s own place in a world bewitched by the invisible powers of the Other” (36). Political, economic, scientific, and military rationality have been built on this strategic model (xix, 36). By contrast, a tactic is “a calculated action determined by the absence of a proper locus. No delimitation of an exteriority, then, provides it with the condition necessary for autonomy. The space of a tactic is the space of the other” (37). Not having a place, a tactic relies on time. A tactic must seize the opportunities, “the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary powers,” to maneuver isolated actions within enemy territory (37). To “poach” the proprietary powers, a tactic has to be subtle, mobile, creative, ingenious, clandestine, and “guileful” in nature (36). De Certeau argues that to withstand power, a tactic is commonly employed in the everyday practices of consumers: their procedures of consumption and ways of operating and making do (29-30, 32, 39).

Although in the end unsuccessful, Anne and the other fugitives’ secret practices of quasi-ordinary everyday life involve ruses and tricks that are tactical in de Certeau’s sense. As mentioned before, having no power to resist the Nazis’ anti-Jewish policies, Otto decided to hide his family in the back building of his business premises, and Margot’s call-up notice for labor camp prompted him to move his family to the hiding place earlier than planned. He was cautious to keep his plan a secret from his daughters. Anne did not know the details of his plan until the very morning of their moving day (231). To avoid being seen carrying a suitcase, which would attract attention, Anne’s tactic was to wear as much clothing as possible. As she explained in her 8 July 1942 diary entry: “No Jew in our situation would have dreamed of going out with a suitcase full of clothing. I had on two vests, three pairs of pants, a dress, on top of that a skirt, jacket, summer coat, two pairs of stockings, lace-up shoes, woolly cap, scarf, and still more; I was nearly stifled . . .”

(229). To mislead people about their whereabouts, the Franks played a trick on their tenant. The Franks deliberately left their tenant a note on which was written an address in Maastricht, the Netherlands. Hermann van Pels further told the tenant a false story that Otto's officer friend stationed in Maastricht must have helped the Franks get into Belgium and then on to Switzerland. Hermann asked the tenant not to mention Maastricht but to tell people that the Franks had moved abroad. In this way, the misinformation was disseminated (240-241).

To pretend that no one lived in the back building, the fugitives resorted to means of camouflage. They kept most windows closed and covered them with curtains in the daytime and with blackout shades at night. They only opened the left window slightly during working hours to create a misimpression that people from the workplace were working there. Thus, their hiding place was always a bit stuffy. Without the shade of a large chestnut tree, the place would have been still hotter and stuffier (Gies & Gold, 2009: 114).²³ In her diary entry dated 31 May 1944, Anne noted Mrs. van Pels's remarks about the heat: "It's positively unbearable, this heat. The butter's melting, there's not a cool spot anywhere in the house, the bread's getting so dry, the milk's going sour, windows can't be opened, and we, wretched outcasts, sit here suffocating while other people enjoy their Whitsun holiday. . . . I can't wash the dishes in this heat" (685). For further camouflage, as Anne wrote on 21 August 1942, Kugler suggested a moveable bookcase be built in front of the door to the Annex in case the Nazis came to search for hidden bicycles, which Jews had been ordered to hand in. Johan, Otto's warehouse manager, helped build a bookcase that swung on hinges

²³ Anne mentioned "the poor blackout" in her 10 July 1942 diary entry (Frank, 2003: 236). The Franks made the curtains themselves. Anne noted on 11 July 1942, "We made curtains straight away on the first day. Really one can hardly call them curtains, they are just light, loose strips of material, all different shapes, quality, and pattern, which Daddy and I sewed together in a most unprofessional way" (237).

and could be opened like a door. Some books were placed on the bookcase to complete the disguise. Those not familiar with the building would not know there was an entrance behind the bookcase.

The fugitives followed a regular schedule so as not to raise suspicions from the warehouse workers. Otto had a small staff and only the warehouse workers did not know about the hiding plan. On weekdays, the fugitives woke at 7:30 a.m. The warehouse workers started working at 8:30 a.m.; the office staff, at 9 a.m. During the half hour between 8:30 and 9 a.m., the fugitives had to be especially careful to avoid making any sound, including that of a running faucet, flushing toilet, or footfalls. They breakfasted at 9 a.m. After the warehouse workers went home for lunch at 12:30 p.m., some of the helpers would visit the Annex at 12:45 p.m. They listened to the BBC radio news, lunched, and chatted with the fugitives until 1:45 p.m. People then went about their business. After the warehouse workers got off work and went home at 5:30 p.m., the hidiers were not restricted to the Annex but could move throughout the building.²⁴

Hiding in the Annex did not cut off Otto from his business as he had employed ruses to continue his work clandestinely. Before implementing his hiding plan, Otto had re-organized his two companies in order to comply with the Nazi decree to "Aryanize" Jewish businesses (which prohibited Jews from holding directorships). He had moved Opekta and Pectacon to 263 Prinsengracht and resigned his managing director's position at Opekta. Kleiman had taken over the position, but Otto actually

²⁴ For the fugitives' schedule and evening freedom, see Frank (2003: 333-334, 405-406, 419, 421-422). On 3 May 1944, Anne noted how the fugitives changed their lunch schedule and what they ate when food was scarce: "... we've changed over, and have lunch at half past eleven in the mornings, so we have to last out with one cupful of porridge; this saves us a meal. Vegetables are still very difficult to obtain: we had rotten boiled lettuce this afternoon. Ordinary lettuce, spinach and boiled lettuce, there's nothing else. With these we eat rotten potatoes, so it's a delicious combination!" (649).

continued to run the business as usual. For Pectacon, Otto had wound it up and transferred its entire stock and all the machinery to a new company, N.V. Handelsvereniging Gies & Co., set up at the same address. Kugler and Jan had assumed positions of Gies's managing director and director respectively. In reality, Pectacon's business continued in the name of Gies, and Otto remained in charge of the company, giving orders and making decisions (Gies & Gold, 2009: 82-83; Paape, 2003d: 10-15).

Otto's plan to continue running his business secretly was facilitated by the fact that his hideout was inside the business premises. He was able to discuss his business with Kleiman and Kugler when seeing them. However, Otto still had to think of ways to deal with the problems caused by his absence. For instance, on 1 April 1943, Anne mentioned that her father had adopted someone's suggestion to lie with one ear pressed against the floor and eavesdrop on an important business conference held downstairs in the private office:

. . . at half past ten yesterday morning Margot and Pim²⁵ (two ears are better than one!) took up their position on the floor. The talks were not finished in the morning, but by the afternoon Daddy was not in a fit state to continue the listening campaign. He was half paralyzed from remaining in so unusual and uncomfortable a position. I took his place at half past two, as soon as we heard voices in the passage. Margot kept me company. The talk at times was so long-winded and boring that quite suddenly I fell asleep on the cold hard linoleum floor. Margot did not dare to touch me for fear they might hear us, and talking was out of the question. I slept for a good half hour and then woke with a shock, having forgotten every word of the important discussions. Luckily Margot had paid more attention. (372-373)

²⁵ Otto was nicknamed Pim by Anne.

The fugitives also used tactics to deceive the outside world to continue their educations. In addition to the library books and reading materials their helpers provided, some fugitives, with Bep's assistance, learned from correspondence courses. As Anne mentioned on 1 October 1942, Bep ordered a correspondence course in shorthand for Margot, Peter, and herself (283). Also, on 17 November 1943, Anne noted Margot, writing in Bep's name, received her Latin assignments corrected by a teacher (440).

Sometimes the fugitives even resorted to self-deception to make life more bearable. As Anne wrote on 14 March 1944, she held a scented handkerchief over her mouth and against her nose when she had no other choice but to eat stale vegetables: "Our supper today consists of a hash made from kale which has been preserved in a barrel. Hence the precautionary measure with the handkerchief! It's incredible how kale can stink when it's a year old! The smell in the room is a mixture of bad plums, strong preservatives, and rotten eggs. Ugh! the mere thought of eating that muck makes me feel sick" (549-550).

The fugitives' secret practices of everyday life discussed above exemplify de Certeau's theory: when unable to confront the power of the strong, the weak will seek to outwit the strong as a form of resistance. In order to survive, the fugitives devised tactics to clandestinely create for themselves an in-between space where they could use the imposition of power to resume quasi-ordinary everyday lives in extraordinary times. Without leaving the Netherlands, where they had no choice but to stay, they sought to resist Nazi power by establishing within it "a degree of plurality and creativity" (de Certeau, 1984: 30).

VII. Conclusion

My paper relates public-private tensions to Anne Frank's diary in two respects. First, a comparison of the three diary versions shows that Anne and Otto had different perceptions of the essential

components of the diary. In her rewrite, Anne left out passages regarding her adolescent development. They were reinstated by Otto in his editing. The different editorial approaches suggest that Anne and Otto intended to create different public images of the diary's author. Anne de-emphasized her adolescent identity and expected readers to treat her as a more mature and serious writer. By contrast, Otto highlighted his daughter's adolescence in order to commemorate her as a young victim and induce reader identification with her. Second, an interpretation of the diary through Michel de Certeau's theory of everyday life sheds light on Anne's fugitive experience. Unable to change the Nazis' genocidal policies, the Franks, the van Pels, and Pfeffer sought to tactically outwit the Nazis in order to continue their lives in hiding. De Certeau (1984: xx) suggests that the use of intelligence in everyday struggles entails pleasures. Indeed, Anne mentioned that the fugitives made fun of their hiding from time to time. However, what abounds in the diary are not pleasures but fears: fears of air raids, of burglar break-ins, and of discovery by the Nazis.²⁶

²⁶ The fugitives' greatest fear was to be discovered by the Nazis. On 26 May 1944, Anne described the complex feelings: ". . . one day we laugh and see the funny side of the situation, but the next we are afraid, fear, suspense, and despair staring from our faces" (Frank, 2003: 682). The suspense in fact never lifted (682). Anne asked how much longer the fugitives would have to bear the "almost unbearable, ever increasing pressure" (682). The news that their greengrocer had been picked up for having two Jews in his house made the fugitives "more nervous" and "quieter over everything" (683). Worrying the same misfortune would happen to the Annex, Anne wrote, "If one day we too should . . . no, I mustn't write it, but I can't put the question out of my mind today. On the contrary, all the fear I've already been through seems to face me again in all its frightfulness" (683). Air raids and burglar break-ins exacerbated the fugitives' emotional stress. For Anne's depictions about air raids and anti-aircraft shooting, see pp. 360, 395-397, 400. For Anne's statements about burglar break-ins, see pp. 367-370, 391-392, 524-526, 613-623.

References

- Adler, J. (2013). *For the sake of the children: The letters between Otto Frank and Nathan Straus Jr.* Straus Historical Society.
- Anne Frank Fonds. (2019). Foreword. In *Anne Frank: The collected works* (pp. 5-8). Bloomsbury Continuum.
- Anne Frank House. (2000). *Anne Frank House: A museum with a story*.
- Barnouw, D. (2003a). Anne Frank and academia. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 103-108). Doubleday.
- Barnouw, D. (2003b). Attacks on the authenticity of the diary. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 84-102). Doubleday.
- Barnouw, D. (2003c). The play. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 78-83). Doubleday.
- Barnouw, D. (2018). *The phenomenon of Anne Frank* (J. K. Ringold, Trans.). Indiana University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt21215t3>
- Barnouw, D., & van der Stroom, G. (2003). Introduction to the revised critical edition. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (p. ix). Doubleday.
- Brenner, R. F. (2010). Writing herself against history: Anne Frank's self-portrait as a young artist. In H. Bloom (Ed.), *Anne Frank's the diary of Anne Frank* (pp. 45-74). Bloom's Literary Criticism.
- Charnow, S. (2012). Critical thinking: Scholars reread the diary. In B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett & J. Shandler (Eds.), *Anne Frank unbound: Media, imagination, memory* (pp. 291-308). Indiana University Press.
- Clark, P. P. (1986). Review of *the practice of everyday life*. *Journal of Modern History*, 58, 3: 705-707. <https://doi.org/10.1086/243048>

- de Bruyn, J., & van Wijk, J. (2018). *Anne Frank, the untold story: The hidden truth about Elli Vossen, the youngest helper of the secret annex* (T. Stoop, Trans.). Bep Voskuijl Producties.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). University of California Press.
- Enzer, H. A., & Solotaroff-Enzer, S. (2000). Major identifications. In H. A. Enzer & S. Solotaroff-Enzer (Eds.), *Anne Frank: Reflections on her life and legacy* (pp. xvii-xviii). University of Illinois Press.
- Fenoulhet, J. (2007). Self-development as resistance: Anne Frank and ETTY Hillesum. In *Making the personal political: Dutch women writers 1919-1970* (pp. 97-122). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351194990-5>
- Frank, A. (2003). The diaries of Anne Frank. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 195-721). Doubleday.
- Gies, M., & Gold, A. L. (2009). *Anne Frank remembered: The story of the woman who helped to hide the Frank family*. Simon & Shuster Paperbacks.
- Hirschfeld, G. (2019). The contemporary historical context. In *Anne Frank: The collected works* (pp. 465-476). Bloomsbury Continuum.
- Iskander, S. P. (2000). Anne Frank's reading: A retrospective. In H. A. Enzer & S. Solotaroff-Enzer (Eds.), *Anne Frank: Reflections on her life and legacy* (pp. 100-109). University of Illinois Press.
- Kaplan, D. E. (2018). Anne Frank, reviser. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 18, 1: 87-107. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-4216962>
- Lee, C. A. (1999). *Roses from the earth: The biography of Anne Frank*. Viking.
- Lee, C. A. (2003). *The hidden life of Otto Frank*. Perennial.
- Lejeune, P. (2009). How Anne Frank rewrote the diary of Anne Frank. In J. D. Popkin & J. Rak (Eds.), *On diary* (pp. 237-266).

- University of Hawaii Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824863784-018>
- Lindwer, W. (1992). *The last seven months of Anne Frank* (A. Meersschaert, Trans.). Anchor Books.
- McNeely, C., & Blanchard, J. (2009). *The teen years explained: A guide to healthy adolescent development*. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.
- Müller, M. (2013). *Anne Frank: The biography* (R. Kimber & R. Kimber, Trans.). Metropolitan Books.
- Nussbaum, L. (2000). Anne Frank. In H. A. Enzer & S. Solotaroff-Enzer (Eds.), *Anne Frank: Reflections on her life and legacy* (pp. 21-31). University of Illinois Press.
- O'Donnell, D. P. (2011). "I certainly have the subjects in my mind": The diary of Anne Frank as bildungsroman. *Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies*, 32, 2: 49-88. <https://doi.org/10133/3613>
- Ozick, C. (1997). Who owns Anne Frank? *The New Yorker*, October 6: 76-87.
- Paape, H. (2003a). The arrest. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 21-27). Doubleday.
- Paape, H. (2003b). The betrayal. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 28-48). Doubleday.
- Paape, H. (2003c). Imprisonment and deportation. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 49-58). Doubleday.
- Paape, H. (2003d). ". . . Originally from Frankfurt-am-Main." In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 1-20). Doubleday.
- Pressler, M. (2019a). Anne Frank's life. In *Anne Frank: The collected works* (pp. 445-454). Bloomsbury Continuum.
- Pressler, M. (2019b). The history of Anne Frank's family. In *Anne Frank: The collected works* (pp. 455-464). Bloomsbury Continuum.

- Pressler, M., & Elias, G. (2012). *Anne Frank's family: The extraordinary story of where she came from based on more than 6,000 newly discovered letters, documents, and photos* (D. Searls, Trans.). Anchor Books.
- Prose, F. (2010). *Anne Frank: The book, the life, the afterlife*. Harper Perennial.
- Rosenfeld, A. H. (1991). Popularization and memory: The case of Anne Frank. In P. Hayes (Ed.), *Lessons and legacies: The meaning of the Holocaust in a changing world* (pp. 243-278). Northwestern University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv43vtdn.18>
- Schnabel, E. (2014). *The footsteps of Anne Frank* (R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). Southbank.
- Shapiro, E., & Kardonne, R. (2008). *Victor Kugler: The man who hid Anne Frank*. Gefen Publishing House.
- Stier, O. B. (2015). *Holocaust icons: Symbolizing the Shoah in history and memory*. Rutgers University Press. <https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813574059>
- van der Stroom, G. (2003a). The diaries, *het achterhuis* and the translations. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 59-77). Doubleday.
- van der Stroom, G. (2003b). Introduction. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 727-733). Doubleday.
- van der Stroom, G. (2003c). On the presentation of the text. In D. Barnouw & G. van der Stroom (Eds.), *The diary of Anne Frank: The revised critical edition* (pp. 188-192). Doubleday.
- Waaldijk, B. (2000). Reading Anne Frank as a woman. In H. A. Enzer & S. Solotaroff-Enzer (Eds.), *Anne Frank: Reflections on her life and legacy* (pp. 110-120). University of Illinois Press.

公私的張力： 重探安妮·法蘭克的日記

林宜玲

東海大學外國語文學系
E-mail: yll@thu.edu.tw

摘 要

作為重要史料，安妮·法蘭克於二戰躲避納粹大屠殺期間撰寫，並於戰後由其父親奧圖·法蘭克編輯出版的日記，已有許多學術討論，本論文以新的角度探討公私張力的互相拉扯如何展現在日記編輯過程及安妮·法蘭克的藏匿經驗。關於前者，本論文比較日記的A、B、C三個版本，關於後者，本論文以德賽托的日常生活理論分析。本論文主張公私張力為了解安妮·法蘭克日記的關鍵，日記三版本的差異主要在於作者青少年發展的段落，安妮·法蘭克不欲彰顯——但奧圖·法蘭克卻強調——日記作者的青少年身分。為求生，藏匿者只能與納粹鬥智，想出維持日常生活運作的生存戰術。

關鍵詞：安妮·法蘭克、奧圖·法蘭克、日記、版本差異、日常生活