

Jane Austen through Francoist customs: What censorship files can tell about the publishing world of the First Francoism (1936-1959)¹

Isis Herrero López
Independent Scholar

Abstract

The present paper analyses the daily reality of the publishing world during the First Francoism (1936-1959), just after the Dictatorship's censorship board was established. To do so, I focus on the censorship files of Jane Austen, an author who did not represent any danger for the Francoist ideology. The examination of Austen's publication history during the period is carried out in relation to the ideological stances of the censors and the translation agents dealing with the translations of her novels: I analyse the image that these agents constructed of Austen both during the translation and the censorship process. I also study the strategies used by the translators and editors when submitting Austen's books to the censorship board in order to understand her constant success in being approved for publication. By means of this analysis, I emphasize the complexity of the Francoist censorship: in addition to being composed of multiple layers of private and public agencies and ideologies, the censorship is also described as a systematised apparatus characterised by its bureaucratic course of action. In addition, the importance of self-censorship is highlighted as an active measure taken by authors/translators and editors, and performed in different forms even in Austen's translated novels.

Keywords

Censorship and self-censorship, literary translation, First Francoism, Jane Austen

¹ Acknowledgements: The research for this article has been carried out within the project "Traducción y censura en la representación de género" (FFI2012-39012-C04-04), funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation. I would like to thank the members of the research project "Voices in Translation: Rewriting Literary Texts in a Scandinavian Context", based in the University of Oslo, for their reflections on the translation agents, and Sami Lakomäki for his revisions and comments.

1. Introduction

Even before the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) was over, the Francoist leaders began to establish their own legislation over the territory conquered in the fighting. Among those laws passed during wartime, several established a strong control over press and publishing houses and instituted a censorship board to examine publications before their release. The present paper deals with the daily reality of the publishing industry during the First Francoism, a period of extreme distress between 1936, when the Civil War began, and 1959, when liberal and capitalist attitudes and laws were incorporated into the national market and editing world. The study of the censorship files, as a reflection of the pressure imposed by the censorship agents on editors and authors/translators, is fundamental for understanding the translation and the publication processes during such a troublesome period of Spanish history.

The study of the censorship files of the First Francoism presented here emphasizes two main issues: the importance of the self-censorship that authors, translators and editors performed in order to pass the censorship inspection, and the tangible regularity and the inconstant purgative dimension of the censorship process itself, a vision frequently ignored when talking of dictatorial regimes. To do so, I focus the analysis on the censorship files about Jane Austen, an author who was not considered to represent a threat to the Regime in political terms: her lack of connections with the ideologies of the period (communist, Falangist, national-Catholic, republican, socialist, etc.) made her novels easily acceptable in the new cultural panorama of this period. The censorship files on Austen writings, seemingly, include very little information because they show neither any refusal for publication nor a single demand for modifications. The absence of censoring evidence in Austen's files, however, does not imply that her works were not censored at any stage of the publication process, and highlights the necessity of revising our conceptions about the Francoist censorship.

Thus, the close examination of the censorship files on Jane Austen during the First Francoism will provide an interesting insight into the censorship reality of the early Dictatorship. The information that will be highlighted by this analysis will be related to three extratextual issues of these publications: the censorship process itself alongside the role of the censors' ideologies in authorizing Austen, the image of Jane Austen as an author in Francoist Spain, and the strategies adopted by the translators and editors before submitting their editions to the censorship board. Before describing the censorship files in relation to these three issues, I will briefly explain the general conditions of censorship under which the Jane Austen's files were produced, commenting on the legal framework of the censorship board as well as other influential socio-cultural circumstances.

2. Conditions of censorship in the First Francoism

Still with the Civil War continuing, the Francoist leaders took the first legislative measure in relation to the publishing industry: the suppression of any publication containing pornography or a dissolving ideology (socialist, communist, libertarian, etc.). The Orden del 23 de diciembre de 1936, in addition, made it compulsory to deliver these kinds of books to the civil authorities for their destruction (Andrés de Blas, 2006). Private libraries were confiscated in many cases and public libraries were purged, sometimes even burned publicly (Abellán, 1984, p. 161). Alongside this regulation, censorship was mentioned in different public announcements from the very first moment of the Francoist rebellion, as well as enforced by both sides of the Civil War.

Yet, it was not until 1938 that the first regular government of Franco sat down to write the Ley de Prensa de 22 de abril de 1938, the founding document of the censorship process that all potential publications had to undergo prior to their distribution in the market (Beneyto Pérez, 1987, p. 28). This measure, taken during the unfolding of the military confrontation, was clearly connected with the republican ideology: in order to cut the republican propaganda and its own vision of events, Francoists had to monitor all publications. This law was focused on newspapers and magazines, so an additional piece of legislation was written to cover all kinds of non-regular publications: the Orden de 29 de abril de 1938 enforced for books and other non-periodic publications the same compulsory examination at the censorship board than that for newspapers. This Orden, in addition, prohibited altogether the selling of books produced abroad, in Spanish or any other language, without explicit authorisation from the censorship administration. Both regulations were extremely powerful, although they were remarkably condensed in their length (less than 3000 words together) and details (general, inexact limitations and restrictions) (Montejo Gurruchaga, 2013, p. 25). These two pieces of legislation were enforced until 1966, when the Ley de Prensa e Imprenta del 18 de marzo de 1966, substituted it, although without many drastic changes to the censorship process and apparatus (p. 29).

At the beginning of its enforcement, the 1938 Order created a series of complications for both editors and the censorship apparatus. It produced problems at customs, where imported books piled up, forcing the government to relax their control on certain types of books by the end of June 1938: the books selected to skip censorship were those of technical or liturgical content; novels, historical books and educational publications still had to be examined before publication (Gutiérrez Lanza, 1997, p. 289). The overwhelming quantity of non-periodic publications to be revised, those under analysis here, also generated administrative delays, so in July 1939 a new Orden implemented the creation of a separated section of censorship within the National Service of Propaganda, with independent subsections for books, theatre plays, cinema scripts, musical compositions, or texts dealing with patriotic topics (Montejo Gurruchaga, 2013, p. 26).

As the years went by, the censorship apparatus became more and more regularised (see Beneyto Pérez, 1987). At the beginning, it was sufficient to send two copies of a book to be published alongside a formal petition to the censorship board. Later, the galley proofs, the cover artwork, the introduction and similar extratextual materials were also sent for inspection. In the early 1940s, a standard form was created for the censors containing direct questions about the ideological and political stances of the books. By 1947, the form included few new items such as space for preceding records on the same book. After its examination by the reader-censors¹ (the lowest level of the censorship board), a positive or negative report was issued for a quick check by the head of section (middle level), who made the actual decision. The general director of the censorship service (highest level) would only get involved in the examinations when a discrepancy had arisen between the two lower levels of the board. The resulting report was sent to the editors, either for them to fulfil the changes demanded and resubmit the book for inspection, or simply to inform that the publication was allowed.

The decisions of the censorship board also changed throughout time. In the post-Civil War period, the reports most frequently indicated three types of decisions: approved, approved

¹ The members of the lowest level of the censorship staff were called “readers”. In the present paper, I called them “reader-censors” to avoid confusion between them and the reading audience.

with modifications or deletions (always specified), or denied (Montejo Gurruchaga, 2013, p. 39). Already in 1945, there were new categories for the approved books as a way of controlling the market and the diffusion of the regime's ideology. In the Orden de 1 de junio de 1945, the following classification was established: tolerated books, which could only be included in the publishing houses' indexes and which were banned from having any kind of marketing; authorised books, which were granted marketing but only one copy of the book was to be exhibited in places such as shop windows; and advisable readings, which were to be highlighted by editors and booksellers with special exhibition places and marketing techniques (Grecco, 2014, p. 373).

However, the most important characteristic of this legislation was its lack of precision. Beneyto Pérez (1987, p. 33), who worked in the censorship board and collaborated in the creation of its legislation, points out that his proposal of establishing a specific list of criteria was disregarded and never came into effect.² The only measure taken was the production of a standard form with direct questions, commented on in the section below. This did not help much because the actual criteria applied by the reader-censors and the heads of sections ranged from linguistic particularities (from the selection of one synonym and no other, to the usage of improper language) to ideological stances (moral, political, religious, etc.) (Abellán, 1980, pp. 88-89, p. 91).

In addition, the censorship apparatus grew so big that its responsibilities needed to be assigned to the provincial delegations and their own censors. As Gutiérrez Lanza (1997, p. 287) points out, "the high number of civil servants and the geographical distance that separated them immensely complicated the application of uniform criteria throughout the national territory".³ The imprecision of the legislation, of course, meant significant problems for authors/translators and editors, who, in many cases, self-censored their texts beforehand before submitting them for inspection. At the same time, this imprecision was the greatest success of the censorship legislation (Ruiz Bautista, 2005, p. 280): authors and editors could not know for sure which specific elements would be problematic in their texts or which level of ideological correctness would be applied. Since the censorship staff, from reader-censors to the general director, had their own personal views determining their opinions and influencing decision-making, what one day was approved, even applauded, the next day or under different eyes could be considered subversive and prohibitive (Santamaría López, 2000, p. 210).

The Civil War and the Francoist victory brought about something other than censorship, though: the country was immersed in a deep crisis, not only economic, but also social and personal. This meant a whole new panorama of limiting circumstances that affected the editorial world during the First Francoism, both in direct and indirect ways. First of all, editors' publishing decisions were severely constrained by restrictions in the use of paper and the taxes assigned to it. Secondly, the general scarcity due to the unsuccessful policy of economic self-sufficiency chosen by the Francoist government imposed rationing and a great disparity between prices and salaries (see Molinero & Ysàs, 1985, as cited in Ginard i Ferón, 2002,

² His proposal included, among other particularities, an objective evaluation of each book independently of the ideological reputation of the authors, without directly approving the writings of authors known for their support of the Regime or denying publications of those writers who were known for their disaffection towards the Francoist movement (Beneyto Pérez, 1987, p. 38-40).

³ "El elevado número de funcionarios y la distancia geográfica que les separaba dificultaba enormemente la aplicación de criterios uniformes a lo largo del territorio nacional" (Gutiérrez Lanza, 1997, p. 287). All translations into English are mine.

p. 1110): the average buyer could not afford expensive publications or any book at all when the basic necessities were not fully covered. An extensive part of the country, in addition, was still illiterate at the beginning of the Dictatorship (Cazorla Sánchez, 2010, p. 90), making it difficult for certain kinds of publications to be successful. Furthermore, the cultural life accessible to poorer and richer social classes presented clear distinctions, even in relation to literary publications (see Ruiz Bautista, 2004). Finally, ideology permeated all aspects of life, including the selection for translation and publication of books ranging from comics and dime novels to classic authors and children's readings.

3. On the censorship process and politics

The censorship process did not evolve much throughout the Francoist dictatorship. However, the files did change, especially during the First Francoism, a fact that offers a complementary approach to the study of the proceedings and actions of censors as individuals and as a whole body of civil servants for the Regime.

In the early 1940s, a standard fill-in form was adopted, one that compiled information about the application (date, book title, author's name, publishing house's name, number of pages, and print run) as well as about the examination process (the assigned reader-censor's number, the reader-censor's report, the level of threat the book posed for the Regime, the required modifications and other observations). One of the pages of the form included a space under the decision section in order to register any possible appeal against a negative decision, detailing the reasons given for the appeal and the new decision, which became the definitive decision. Even when each submission for publication was checked and examined, sometimes, some or simply all of the pages were left blank.

The introduction of these fill-in forms highlights the divergence between how the high levels of the government envisioned the duties of the censorship board and the actual everyday work of the reader-censors and heads of section. The direct questions listed in the files show how unstable the Francoist ideology and the government were at the beginning of the Dictatorship: the questions –to be answered yes or no– dealt with the possible attacks by the books on morality, on the institutions of or the individuals collaborating with the Regime, or on the Church.⁴ The hidden fears of the government become explicit through these questions: the fact that the censorship form emphasized the possibility of being under attack indicates that the Regime feared it had fewer supporters than those indicated in official reports. However, the censorship process was not really a detailed procedure for evaluating the books and their actual potentiality as subversive material; rather, it was a filter to separate those writings that were visibly dangerous from those that could (and did) contain implicit messages against the Francoist vision of the world.

The files on Jane Austen, particularly, emphasize the fact that the censorship process was a filter rather than a detailed procedure of examination by means of the actual time used for

⁴ By 1944, the questions included in the evaluation form were: "Does it [the book] attack the [Catholic] Dogma or the Moral?" ("¿Ataca al Dogma o la Moral?"), "The institutions of the Regimen?" ("¿A las instituciones del Régimen?"), "Does it have literary or documentary value?" ("¿Tiene valor literario o documental?"). By 1947, the questions have been slightly changed, separating religion and politics: "Does it attack the Dogma?" ("¿Ataca al Dogma?"), "The Church?" ("¿A la Iglesia?"), "Its Ministers?" ("¿A sus Ministros?"), "The moral?" ("¿A la moral?"), "The Regime and its institutions?" ("¿Al Régimen y a sus instituciones?"), "The people who collaborate or have collaborated with the Regime?" ("¿A las personas que colaboran o han colaborado con el Régimen?"). This last version of the question section included space to indicate on which pages the book attacked any of the aforementioned people or institutions.

the reception, examination and answering of the applications. Time was scarce and censorship reader-censors could not spend a lot of time on each of the potential publications to be evaluated. Thus, the great majority of Austen's applications were resolved within a month of their arrival at the censorship board. Such quick turnarounds suggest that, at least at the beginning of the Dictatorship, careful evaluations may have not been the rule, as the firing of all reader-censors in February 1942 also indicates (Ruiz Bautista, 2005, p. 285). At the same time, though, it shows that censors learnt to put their efforts into evaluating those books and authors that were considered dangerous instead of focusing on Austen and similar writers. In this way, instead of having a single drastically severe censorship, as is commonly thought, there were two parallel processes depending on the threatening potentiality of specific books and authors.

The regularity of, at least, part of the censorship can also be found in Austen's files due to the additional material the censorship files contain. In addition to the standard evaluation document, all books that underwent examination had their own index card with the most basic information (book title, author, publishing house, file number, etc.). It is not uncommon to find the application forms the editors sent alongside two copies of the book for examination. These documents, in addition, present overwritings in blue or red pencil about the administrative process (i.e. the dates when the book was sent to the reader-censor and when the decision was made) besides official stamps and signatures of the different heads of section or of department. By 1943, these application forms had also been systematized as fill-in forms, although they still contained the same information but without the elaborate address formulas of the Spanish administration. Last but not least, it is also possible to find files which include some of the materials sent by the publishing houses: galley proofs, copies of the covers and their artwork, prefaces (which were also checked) or extra applications for a change of title, new printings or simply a translation.

All these additional documents can be found among Austen's files and they underline the commonness and redundancy of the censorship bureaucracy. The creation and usage of standard forms indicates the desire of the Regime to be systematic and integrate its administrative apparatus into the everyday lives of Spaniards. This was especially relevant at the beginning of the Dictatorship, when the Regime officials wanted to produce an image of Francoism as a strict, all-controlling power over the actions of its citizens and publishers. However, in time, what was a potentially problematic obstacle would be perceived as a mere formality. With its unvaried processing of books, the more repetitive the censorship process became the better the strengthening of the Dictatorship and its ideology. The case of Jane Austen's files, actually, gives a clear example of how censorship was easily integrated into the everyday lives of the publishing houses: on only one occasion (of the 38 times her novels were submitted for examination during the First Francoism) did the editor take the trouble to ask first for permission to translate *Emma*, sending the galley proofs later, presenting the cover design after that, and submitting the preface in a fourth delivery (AGA 21/07465-4775), instead of sending a single package with all the documents together.⁵

⁵ Censorship files are cited here with the acronym AGA (Archivo General de la Administración), a number of seven digits indicating the box where the file is stored, and a second number of three or four digits indicating the number of the file itself.

The Archivo General de la Administración (Central Spanish Administrative Archive) is placed in Alcalá de Henares and has a broad archival collection, most of them produced by the public offices of the Spanish administration.

Last but not least, the files on Jane Austen provide information about the reader-censors themselves and their more or less active participation in the banning and publication of books and authors. All reader-censors signed their documents; quite frequently their signatures are completely illegible, but on other occasions their names are recognisable and we can thus learn about their personal ideologies. As a general rule, the individual reader-censors followed the guidelines passed onto them from the higher levels of the censorship apparatus. However, the personal background of the censors influenced their attitudes towards the novels they examined, giving way to different levels of strictness and ideological preoccupation.

A particularly interesting contrast is that between Leonardo Panero (reader-censor number 1) and Enrique Conde, identified as reader-censor number 3 by Fernández López (2007, p. 41). The former was a poet of republican ideology who changed sides during the Civil War under family pressure and who, before the war, had pursued literary studies in England and France. His reflections on Austen's writings, commented on in the next section, focused mainly on the artistic value of the works under examination, without paying special attention to the socio-political issues in the books. Enrique Conde, for his part, had been a medical sub-lieutenant on the Francoist side and has come to be considered by scholars as "the 'great Inquisitor' of children's literature" (Vandaele, 2010, p. 110). His severity is present too in Austen's files: as I will comment later, his remarks on *Northanger Abbey*, for example, showed a very severe vision of the censorship process even when dealing with non-dangerous writers and books, helping to create the impression that censorship was indeed all about crossing out passages and cutting down pages.

4. On Jane Austen as an author

During the First Francoism, Jane Austen's works were sent to the censorship board a total of 38 times. On all occasions, the editors' applications for publication were approved, and the censors did not demand the translations to be changed. Jane Austen's files only seldom contained additional documents to the basic items (the application form by editors, the fill-in form for the reader-censor's report, and the index card), but there are some interesting cases in which galley proofs have been kept. Eight of the registry entries are labelled as importations, although most of them are edited by the South American offices of a Spanish publishing house (Espasa-Calpe, and Editorial Juventud).

The fact that all the 38 applications for publication concerning Jane Austen during the First Francoism were approved highlights how well Austen fitted, apparently at least, within the literary expectations and limitations of the new Regime. Pemartín, an important member of the Francoist Ministry of Education at the time, considered the English novel, especially that of the Victorian period, the most appropriate reading for Spaniards, for the works of Thackeray, the Brontë sisters, George Eliot or Thomas Hardy were, at their core, constructed around "the daily family life of the 'home', of the ancestral manor" (as cited in Pegenaute, 1999, p. 92). Evasion was the key element in the publications of the post-war period and publishing houses took advantage of this in "many translations of 'popular' literature . . . : thrillers, westerns, detective novels, love stories, works for children, etc." (p. 93).

Austen, as the predecessor of the Victorian novel, proved to match the criteria of homely and evasive plot, adding the gender correctness that the Francoist morality demanded. Because of it, Austen became a highly successful author in this period: her novels did not contradict the socio-political ideology of the Francoist Dictatorship or its particular beliefs in relation to women's roles and literature. The illusory simplicity of her works led them to be considered

novels about manners –or simply love stories– that blended morality and romanticism –exactly what the Regime was looking for to (re)educate women.

This aspect is highly relevant in order to understand, first of all, why editors would choose Austen’s works to be translated, as well as the decisions taken by the publishing houses –which I will comment on below. The Francoist Dictatorship was characterised by strong national-Catholicism and traditionalism, emphasizing, on the one hand, discipline and obedience, and, on the other hand, the social and cultural distinction of men and women. When publishing for women and children, the editors’ selections followed the limits established by the new ideology on women: literature had to be used for instructing these “beings susceptible of being trained by and for the service of the nation” (Huguet, 2013, p. 136).⁶ As a consequence, the readings for young women used plenty of fantasy to soften the hard reality of female adulthood as wives and mothers, and, inevitably, “all of them ended in the only admissible real situation: marriage” (p. 146).⁷

The censorship files on Austen’s novels, however, do not emphasise this educational aspect: the reader-censors seem to have only focused on the non-dangerous nature of Austen’s writings. Her novels were seen as mere stories for young girls with a happy married life at the end. In 1956, the reader-censor F (whose signature is illegible in AGA 21/11494-3565) describes *Pride and Prejudice* as a “classical romantic novel about the marrying process of two sisters, the two eldest of the five daughters of a married couple, with two handsome men, handsome and rich”.⁸ There is no mention of Lydia and Wickham’s immoral behaviour or of Austen’s narrative style or literary merit: by then, the only important feature of her writings was its complete detachment from any ideological stance and the fact that it reinforced the Regime’s aspirations for women (marriage and motherhood).

Before this file, reader-censors had been more worried about the literary value of Austen’s works. In 11 files, the reader-censors included information on this aspect, summarized the contents of the novels or emphasised the positive aspects of these publications for promoting the approbation of the editors’ applications. The merit of her novels was acclaimed in five occasions: Leopoldo Panero wrote that her novels’ artistic value was substantial (AGA 21/07051-372; AGA 21/07465-4775) or high (AGA 21/07118-1586). Whenever he summarised the plots, Panero highlighted Austen’s ability to provide fine psychological descriptions of her characters (AGA 21/07118-1586; AGA 21/07465-4775). However, his comments grew shorter and shorter over time, ultimately, simply highlighting that the contents were not censurable at all (AGA 21/07576-516; AGA 21/07589-810).

Other reader-censors were not so positive about Austen’s talents as a writer, confirming that Austen was seen as an unimportant writer in the literary landscape of the First Francoism. Leopoldo D. de la Garza (reader-censor number 2) states that the literary value of *Persuasion* is simply good (AGA 21/07073-1760), whereas Dionisio Lorenzo Palagi (reader-censor number 8) claims *Pride and Prejudice* to be a “well-written novel” (AGA 21/07118-1553).⁹ Enrique Conde had a completely different opinion and rigorously qualified *Northanger Abbey* as “a romantic novel of insignificant plot” about the “small setbacks in the love of a young couple”

⁶ “Seres susceptibles de ser entrenados por y para el servicio de la nación” (Huguet, 2013, p. 136).

⁷ “Terminaban todos ellos en la única situación real admisible: el matrimonio” (Huguet, 2013, p. 146).

⁸ “Clasica [sic] novela rosa sobre el proceso matrimonial de dos hermanas, las dos mayores de las cinco hijas de un matrimonio, con dos apuestos hombres, apuestos y ricos” (AGA 21/11494-3565).

⁹ “Novela bien escrita” (AGA 21/07118-1553).

(AGA 21/07417-3255),¹⁰ even if, evidently, it fitted the expected development of romantic reading. All in all, the reader-censor determined that Austen's literary value was simply modest, although the publication could be authorised anyway.

All in all, these opinions and commentaries are more the exception than the rule during the First Francoism, at least in relation to Jane Austen. Already in 1944, the reader-censors began to resolve Austen's applications by means of referring to previous files on other editions of the same book. Austen was not the exception: the same thing was happening with Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (Pajares Infante, 2007, p. 60). At least 14 files use this method, even when the publishing houses and the translations were different. In some cases, the links between files are accumulative: for instance, two 1945 editions of *Pride and Prejudice* are connected to each other (AGA 21/07563-193 and AGA 21/07671-2813), with the former's approval depending on a file from 1944 (AGA 21/07546-6867) which, in turn, was approved on a 1943 file (AGA 21/07118-1553).

On only a couple of occasions were the authorisations based on previous publications justified further. In AGA 21/11662-1848, reader-censor F (with a different signature from reader-censor F in AGA 21/11494-3565) wanted to revalidate the authorization of *Persuasion* because of reading it again and finding it a "totally inoffensive novel".¹¹ Such was the perception of Austen by the censors that a second translation of *Mansfield Park* was accepted for publication in 1954 based on a previous reference, even when the former file could not be found (AGA 21/10900-6801): in fact, the censors misdated the year of the precedents (1952 instead of the correct 1942). Such a situation confirms the status acquired by Austen's novels as non-dangerous readings: this granted editors and translators, on the one hand, and censors, on the other, greater freedom than when dealing with other authors.

Austen's files and their comments about her as an author reveal that the repetitive, non-purgative nature of the censorship was real and commonplace during the First Francoism. Austen's novels had to undergo the censorship examination as did the rest of books published and banned during the era, standing as a clear example of the systematization of the censorship process. Censors, then, carried out their job more or less strictly, resolving the editors' applications in a variety of ways, sometimes dispatching the application with ease and rapidity. Thus, the censorship files on Austen emphasize the fact that not all the books were truncated or banned at the hands of the censors. Studying authors such as Austen, thus, is essential in order to understand the literary landscape of the period, the judgements that publication and censorship agents made about authors and novels, and the censorship strategies performed by translators, editors and censors. It is also necessary in order to demystify the image of the censorship files as "a sort of 'horror chamber'" full of prohibited books and manipulated texts (Andrés de Blas, 2007).¹²

5. On the translation and publication process

In addition to the details about the censorship process and the literary considerations on Austen, the censorship files also provide information about the work of the translators and the publishers before and after the submission to the censorship board. The fact that the censors

¹⁰ "Novela de tipo rosa de argumento intrascendente [sobre las] pequeñas contrariedades en los amores de una joven pareja" (AGA 21/07417-3255).

¹¹ "Novela totalmente inofensiva" (AGA 21/11662-1848).

¹² "Una suerte de 'cámara de los horrores'" (Andrés de Blas, 2007).

did not demand any modification or deletion in the translated texts of Austen indicates that the greatest part of the censoring in the Spanish versions was performed by the translators and the editors. This is highly relevant when constructing a more complex image of the Francoist censorship: focusing on the censors and their actions at the censorship board is not sufficient because there were, in fact, more literary agents changing the texts that were finally published during the Dictatorship.

In the case of Austen, this basic fact leads us to wonder about the first translation of *Mansfield Park*, which appeared in 1943. In its censorship file, AGA 21/07118-1553, there is no direct mention of any modification required before its publication, but 10 chapters (chapter XI to chapter XX) are omitted from the final version. It may be argued that those 10 chapters were, initially, included in the translation and eliminated only later by the editor since the application by the publishing house, Tartessos, included in the file, indicated that the book is 460 pages long, whereas the copies being sold had only 338 pages. The main reason for cutting the book down even after a positive answer from the censorship board seems to have been economic, for the final print run was very expensive (18 pesetas, according to the front flap of the book's dust jacket).¹³ This situation, though, is not surprising for there are testimonies like that from Borràs Betriu (as cited in Mengual Català, 2013), a translator working in the 1950s, who had to condense Tolstoy's *War and Peace* under the command of the head of the publishing house Juventud.

Although this self-censorship¹⁴ seems to be unrelated to ideological issues, it still had ideological consequences due to the contents of the eliminated chapters. Between chapter XI and chapter XX, the young characters of the book remain at home without the austere head of the family and decide to perform an improper theatre play: as such, this is not a defining section for the development of the plot, but it helps to show the characters' attitudes towards one another and towards marital and sexual issues. The image the book offers about its female characters, one of the foci of interest of the Francoist ideology, therefore, is not fully developed in the translation and the lessons included in the book through this episode and later events (i.e. adultery, elopements and divorce) are distorted, if not eliminated altogether. Even if the editing strategy of the translator/editor was aimed at reducing costs, the Francoist desire to protect women from indecorous readings may have influenced the decision.

As Rioja Berrocal highlights (2009), the imprecision of the censorship legislation meant that the literary agents created their own personal limits, with different degrees of permissiveness and strictness. Thus, another strategy of self-censorship was incorporated into the translation area: the phenomenon of copying. When inspecting the censorship files, it is possible to come across cases in which an editor submitted for approval not only a previous translation of a certain book, but the actual edition of another publishing house. The publishing house Dólar

¹³ For a comparison, in the 1940s, the daily salary of a laborer was between 9 and 15 pesetas (Arasa, 2008, p. 78). In 1943, the price of newspapers was only 25 cents. In the black market –the government had imposed food rationing and control–, for instance, a kilo of sugar was 20 pesetas in Cádiz, a liter of oil was 15 pesetas in Valencia, but 9 or 10 pesetas in Talavera de la Reina; in the latter village, a kilo of flour was 5 or 6 pesetas whereas a kilo of rice was 15 pesetas (Report by the General Management of Security, as cited in Arasa, 2008, p. 78).

¹⁴ Pegenaute (1999, p. 91) uses the term "internal censorship" to name the self-censorship produced by translators, and distinguishes two types of it: "one affecting preliminary [norms]", that is, the selection of texts; and "one [affecting] operational norms" which "implied deleting, for example, dirty words and passages which might . . . remotely offend public decency". It is obvious that translators and editors applied these two kinds of internal censorship on Austen's works, as it is explained in the main text. However, it is not possible in the present paper to discuss further Pegenaute's classification or nomenclature.

did such a thing on two occasions, in 1952 with *Pride and Prejudice* (AGA 21/09923-2722) and 1953 with *Northanger Abbey* (AGA 21/10479-5883). The source translation the editors used for their application on *Pride and Prejudice* was a version published in the magazine *Novelas y cuentos* in 1948: the text submitted for examination was a simple photocopy on which the headline with the information of the magazine has been crossed out in pencil. The version of *Northanger Abbey* Dólar sent to the censorship board seems to be an edition by Espasa-Calpe imported from Argentina; this time they stripped the book of its cover to hide its actual origin.

Why would editors admit openly that they were copying? On the one hand, editors were being quite clever when submitting a previously published translation: they were telling the censors that the text had been approved before, making it easier to pass the examination. It could, actually, bring about a publication or importation approval just by a reference to a previous file, as happened with the 1953 Dólar edition of *Northanger Abbey*, authorised on the 1952 Espasa-Calpe file (AGA 21/09805-814). On the other hand, the use of such a strategy by an editor may have been economically advantageous in two senses. Copying a previous translation, whether with or without permission from the translator and/or the former publishing house, meant saving money on the production of a new book: after the censorship examination, the printing went ahead very quickly. But it was also very beneficial because the editors knew how the previous rendition had done in the market, adapting the printing accordingly with bigger or smaller print runs.

Both cases, self-censorship and copying, added to the routine nature of the censoring process by relieving the burden of censoring from the censors' shoulders. The strategies for control that translators and editors displayed over their own production helped to make the books more acceptable, reducing the agency of censors, who could have little objection to the books they were examining. This situation, consequently, alters our vision of the Francoist censorship from an apparatus that truncated publications or denied them altogether, into one that, first, was more complex and discriminating and, second, was composed of multiple layers of agency, both institutional and private. Understanding that translators, editors and censors shared the vague classification of *non-dangerous* writers and books helps to describe in greater detail the daily reality of the publishing industry throughout its various processes of selection, translation, censoring and publication. Thus, it is possible to demystify the censorship board and its workers, redistribute the agencies among all the agents involved in publishing during the Dictatorship, and reevaluate the role of the censorship board in the years of the First Francoism.

A last note must be mentioned in relation to the role of the agents involved in the translation and publication processes: the selective treatment of Austen's books. The files on Jane Austen, cross-checked with the available printed versions of her translated works, show that the censorship board was not the only obstacle to having a translation published. The 38 applications for publications referred to Austen's six major novels, leaving aside not only her incomplete works, but also *Lady Susan*, an epistolary novel about a selfish, immodest heroine. The formal aspect of these minor works of Austen, as well as their contents, made them an impossible choice during the First Francoism and throughout the Dictatorship. Among the translations submitted to the censorship board, we can also find cases of unpublished books and delays after the examination: the copied translation of *Pride and Prejudice* by Dólar, mentioned above, seems never to have been published, whereas the Dédalo version of *Sense and Sensibility* had to wait 16 years after its approval in 1949 (AGA 21/08611-432) to be printed as an issue of the magazine *Novelas y cuentos*. The censorship files on Austen, in addition,

show the preferences of the editors for certain texts, namely *Pride and Prejudice* and *Northanger Abbey*: between the two, they added up to 27 of the 38 applications, whereas *Emma* was considered for publication only once during the First Francoism and it was not until 1971 that it was rereleased in a new translation.

6. Conclusions

The review carried out here has revealed a new vision of the censorship board and process. It has highlighted the importance of seeing the Francoist censorship as a complex apparatus composed of both private and public layers of agents as well as of social and personal ideologies and predispositions. Such a picture of the censorship, particularly during the First Francoism, had a strong effect on the daily reality of the editorial world whose agents (editors, authors/translators) had to adapt themselves and their work to the expectations and conditions of the new Regime. However, the censorship board and process was one predominantly characterized by regularity and commonness throughout the various steps toward book publication, without great inconsistencies or extreme restrictions.

The stability of the censorship board and process was undoubtedly linked to an accommodating imposition of its rules and procedures. Austen and her books, as an example of a non-dangerous authorship, passed the censorship examination within a month from their arrival at the board, proving that the process was characterised more by its bureaucratic course of action than by its purgative control of the publications. The review of Austen's files also reveals that the routine of the whole process got so ingrained into the publishers' minds that only seldom was special care put into the applications (see the case of *Emma*, AGA 21/07465-4775, mentioned above). Thus, the censorship board should be seen as a regular, institutionalised apparatus and process in which, from time to time, strict suppressions and bans were implemented.

An important part of the review of Austen's files has led to the interesting, though brief, study of the censors involved in the process of examination. It is obvious that censors worked under the legislation passed by the government, but, at the same time, had some margin for their own personal interpretations and agencies. Present as their ideologies may be in the censorship files by means of their comments, the censors contributed to the atmosphere of normality of the board and process. At least in relation to Austen, they never deviated from the routine of it all, further settling the presence of the censorship in the First Francoism and later on, and implementing the process according to the general legislation and ideology of the period. They too were, then, actors in the systematization of the censorship.

This systematization, in turn, was a powerful measure by the Dictatorship, especially as it indirectly forced the editors and authors/translators to collaborate in the censoring beforehand. Self-censorship, in different forms, became the usual mode of ensuring publication and was enforced by authors/translators and editors alike. Austen's files show that this side of censorship ranged from the selection of authors and books, to the textual changes of Austen's novels and to the reprinting of translations or the production of new ones. In addition, other concerns of and constraints on the editors were reflected in the interrelation between the files and the socio-political context in which they were produced: the restrictions and taxes on paper affected the length of books, the commercial circumstances made certain edition formats more desirable, and the multiple limitations of the different publishing houses restrained certain texts for a while or forever.

Reviews of censorship files, such as the one offered here, demands further investigation into the censorship process both during the First Francoism and throughout the whole Dictatorship. Carrying out more studies on Austen's files and similar ones about non-dangerous authors and books will be very helpful in producing a broader landscape of the individual agency of censors, as well as studies about the active involvement of editors and authors/translators in the censoring process. Furthermore, this kind of research will help in rectifying our present vision of the censorship as a purgative apparatus, amplifying it to reflect the multiple layers of ideology, interests and actions that were, in fact, working at the same time.

7. Bibliography

- Abellán, M.L. (1980). *Censura y creación literaria en España (1939-1976)*. Barcelona: Península.
- Abellán, M. L. (1984). Literatura, censura y moral en el primer franquismo. *Revista de sociología*, 21, 153-172.
- Andrés de Blas, J. (2006). La guerra civil española y el mundo del libro: censura y represión cultural (1936-1937). *Represura*, 1. www.represura.es/represura_1_junio_2006_articulo2.html
- Andrés de Blas, J. (2007). La Delegación de Estado para Prensa y Propaganda, y la censura de libros. *Represura*, 2. www.represura.es/represura_2_enero_2007_articulo3.html
- Arasa, D. (2008). *Historias curiosas del Franquismo*. Barcelona: Ediciones Robinbooks.
- Beneyto Pérez, J. (1987). La censura literaria en los primeros años del Franquismo. Las normas y los hombres. *Diálogos Hispánicos de Ámsterdam*, 5, 169-180.
- Cazorla Sánchez, A. (2010). *Fear and progress: Ordinary lives in Franco's Spain, 1939-1975*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fernández López, M. (2007). Comportamientos censores en la literatura infantil y juvenil traducida del inglés en la época franquista: establecimiento de un corpus textual. In R. Merino Álvarez (Ed.), *Traducción y censura en España (1939-1985): Estudios sobre corpus TRACE: cine, narrativa, teatro* (pp. 19-48). Leioa: Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco.
- Ginard i Ferón, D. (2002). Las condiciones de vida durante el primer Franquismo. El caso de las Islas Baleares. *Hispania*, 62(212), 1099-1128.
- Grecco, G.L. (2014). El control del libro durante el Primer Franquismo. *Diálogos*, 18(1), 361-380.
- Gutiérrez Lanza, M. C. (1997). Leyes y criterios de censura en la España franquista: Traducción y recepción de textos literarios. In R. Martín-Gaitero & M. A. Vega (Eds.), *La palabra vertida: investigaciones en torno a la traducción. Actas de los VI Encuentros Complutenses en torno a la Traducción* (pp. 283-290). Madrid: Editorial Complutense.
- Huguet, M. (2013). Memoria del primer Franquismo: mujeres, niños y cuentos de infancia. In A. Cagnolati (Ed.), *Tessere trame, narrare storie: Le donne e la letteratura per l'infanzia* (pp. 123-150). Roma: Aracne.
- Mengual Catalá, J. (2013). Hacer libros sin papel en los años cuarenta [Blog post]. <https://negritasy cursivas.wordpress.com/2013/08/30/hacer-libros-sin-papel-en-los-anos-cuarenta/>
- Montejo Gurruchaga, L. (2013). *Discurso de autora. Género y censura en la narrativa española de posguerra*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.
- Pajares Infante, E. (2007). Traducción y censura: Cumbres borrascosas en la dictadura franquista. In R. Merino Álvarez (Ed.), *Traducción y censura en España (1939-1985): Estudios sobre corpus TRACE: cine, narrativa, teatro* (pp. 49-80). Leioa: Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco.
- Pegenaute, L. (1999). Censoring translation and translation as censorship: Spain under Franco. In J. Vandaele (Ed.), *Translation and the (re)location of meaning: Selected papers of the CETRA chair seminars in translation studies, 1994-1996* (pp. 83-96). Universiteit Katholieke Leuven.
- Rioja Berrocal, M. (2009). La traducción inglés-español de textos narrativos censurados (1962-1969). *Represura* 6. www.represura.ces/represura_6_marzo_2009_articulo5.html.
- Ruiz Bautista, E. (2004). En pos del "buen lector": censura editorial y clases populares durante el Primer Franquismo (1939-1945). *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma. Serie V, Hª Contemporánea*, 16, 231-251.
- Ruiz Bautista, E. (2005). *Los señores del libro: propagandistas, censores y bibliotecarios*. Gijón: Ediciones Trea.
- Santamaría López, J.M. (2000). La traducción de obras narrativas en la España franquista: panorama preliminar. In R. Rabadán (Ed.), *Traducción y censura inglés-español: 1939-1985. Estudio preliminar* (pp. 207-225). Universidad de León.

Vandaele, J. (2010). It was what it wasn't: Translation and Francoism. In C. Rundle & K. Sturge (Eds.), *Translation under fascism* (pp. 84-116). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Archivo General de la Administración Files

AGA 21/07051-372 – File on the 1943 Tartessos edition of *Mansfield Park*.
 AGA 21/07073-1760 – File on the 1943 importation of *Persuasion* by Juventud.
 AGA 21/07118-1553 – File on the 1943 Arimany edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.
 AGA 21/07118-1586 – File on the 1943 importation of *Sense and Sensibility* by Hyma.
 AGA 21/07417-3255 – File on the 1945 Selecciones Literarias y Científicas edition of *Northanger Abbey*.
 AGA 21/07465-4775 – File on the 1945 Arimany edition of *Emma*.
 AGA 21/07546-6867 – File on the 1944 Reguera edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.
 AGA 21/07563-193 – File on the 1945 Juventud edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.
 AGA 21/07576-516 – File on the 1945 Alejo Climent edition of *Northanger Abbey*.
 AGA 21/07589-810 – File on the 1945 Bruguera edition of *Persuasion*.
 AGA 21/07671-2813 – File on the 1945 Bruguera edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.
 AGA 21/08611-432 – File on the 1965 Dédalo edition of *Sense and Sensibility*.
 AGA 21/09923-2722 – File on the 1952 application by Dólar about *Pride and Prejudice*.
 AGA 21/09805-814 – File on the 1952 importation of *Northanger Abbey* by Espasa-Calpe.
 AGA 21/10479-5883 – File on the 1953 Dólar edition of *Northanger Abbey*.
 AGA 21/10900-6801 – File on the 1954 Arimany edition of *Mansfield Park*.
 AGA 21/11494-3565 – File on the 1956 Juventud edition of *Pride and Prejudice*.
 AGA 21/11662-1848 – File on the 1958 Juventud edition of *Persuasion*.



Isis Herrero López
 Independent scholar
herreroisis@hotmail.com

Biography: Isis Herrero López got her doctorate in Translation Studies at Universidad de Salamanca in 2013 with a dissertation about the translation into Spanish of Native American literature. For two years, she worked at Universidad de Cantabria, where she has begun to research translation and censorship during the Francoist Dictatorship. Her articles have been published in *Persuasions* and *Meta*, and she is currently co-editing a volume for *Vita Traductiva*.