

The Struggles of Translating Henry Miller in Franco's Spain (1939-1975) The Different Versions of *Black Spring* (1936)

Sofía Monzón Rodríguez
University of Alberta

Received: 29/04/2020

Accepted: 30/06/2020

Abstract

In this article I analyze the translations of Henry Miller's novel, *Black Spring* (1938), in Spain throughout Francoism. A quick analysis of these two translations —both carried out during the last stage of the regime, the former under the title *Primavera negra*, translated by Jordi Arbonès in 1970, and the latter, *Primavera negra* as well, translated by Carlos Bauer in 1970 and published in 1978— serves to shed light on the effects of not only the institutional censorship that was established by the regime, but also the repercussions of self-censorship performed by the translators.

Key Words

Literary translation, Censorship, Francoism, Henry Miller, *Primavera negra*.



Introduction

What if “to get laid” merely reads as “to kiss” in a different text edition, or “real *pricks*, real *cunts*” translates as “*everything* real” in another language? What happens when a target audience is only exposed to literary translations subjected to cuts, deletions, and alterations at the linguistic, cultural, pragmatic, and even paratextual level? To what extent can the image of a foreign author and his/her works be either praised or equally damaged, due to factors taking place in said target culture? The phrases in quotation marks are two original passages from Henry Miller's *Black Spring* (1936) and an equivalent of what the

translations into Spanish and Catalan being issued in Spain looked like in the late 1960s-1970s. But where is the crudeness in “kissing” when the narrator truly uttered “let’s fuck”? How much is lost in translation and, what is more, is it a deliberate loss? To explain such controversial translation strategies it is mandatory to understand the historical and political panorama that the receiving country underwent in the mid-twentieth century.

In Spain, during almost 40 years of dictatorship, the Francoist regime (1939-1975) established a severe censorship system in order to control every literary publication. When publishers wanted to translate and circulate Henry Miller’s books, for example, they were quite aware of how subversive his oeuvre was. Yet still, they tried to get some of his works published. Most of the time, however, those translations resulted in utterly manipulated versions, like the above-mentioned references. Akin to Miller, many other recognized and at that time contemporary authors, such as D. H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway, Simone de Beauvoir, and Samuel Beckett, suffered a similar fate. Hence, what happened in the process of issuing the translations? The obvious answer is, of course, censorship and all its possible ramifications.

Censorship as a pervasive force is present in many cultures and times, and it often serves as a function to preserve existing power structures. Notable examples of literary censorship in our recent history are clearly visible in Franco’s Spain, Mussolini’s Italy, Hitler’s Germany, and Portugal under Salazar. Under Franco, the main topics subjected to censorship were sexual morality, political subversion, and religion. Literary passages that contained subject matter considered inappropriate or threatening to the regime were censored or outright rejected for publication, in an effort to both preserve the canon and maintain internal stability. In light of this, many literary works were suppressed and only issued in Spain following the downfall of the Francoist regime, while many of the translations that succeeded in passing the censorship filter to be published during Franco’s reign were severely bowdlerized or self-censored. The archives of the General Administration in Madrid contain a plethora of censored files yet to be examined, which necessitates the further study of censorship and translation in Franco’s time. According to Jordi Cornellà-Detrell, analysis of censorship under Franco is a growing field of study that seeks to gain insight into the effects that centralized government control over publishing practices has had on the circulation and dissemination of literature in Spain (2013: 129).

Censorship and Translation

Generally speaking, the study of the effects of censorship on literature and translation gives us an insight into particular historical contexts and, by extension, into their culture and ideology. Literary products and their consequent rewritings (i.e. translations or adaptations) are seen as a reflection of the context and culture in which they were produced, and thus they represent an oasis of information regarding the period. The field of Translation Studies has been responsible for addressing the matter of censorship and (or in) translation since the formation of the Manipulation School by Theo Hermans and André Lefevere in 1990. Theo Hermans, André Lefevere, and Susan Bassnett are the translation scholars who first considered the role of ideology and patronage in the translation system, and who furthered Itamar Even-Zohar's famous polysystem theory (1990). Susan Bassnett claims that polysystem theory was viewed as a seminal theoretical framework used by scholars seeking to rethink "traditional literary history through a lens that puts translation into sharp focus, and it also emphasised the ideological dimensions of translation" (Bassnett, 2011: 70).

Culture and ideology impact literary translation. André Lefevere went further and, in *Translation, Rewriting & the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992), he stated that translations are forms of rewriting that depend on various factors, such as political institutions or ideology. For that reason: "[a]ll rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way" (Lefevere, 1992: vii). According to Lefevere's classification, censorship and self-censorship take place when rewritings are controlled by patronage and the institutions in power, producing a mode of writing that is obviously motivated by ideological factors. This form of rewriting occurs when the source text contains subversive passages that can provoke undesirable conclusions to be drawn by the target culture, since these may be opposed to the institution's ideological standards. Furthermore, self-censorship corresponds to the type of rewriting that professionals within the literary system exercise by acting, on their own initiative, to pre-emptively censor a work based on their own moral and ideological standards. Translators can also develop their own strategies to work under the constraints of institutional censorship, avoiding, for instance, the direct use of sexual language or political references, and working their ways around taboo or unwelcome words. In this case, the translator rewrites the text under their own discretion, normally taking into consideration the culture's

imposed ideology. For that reason, a translation is perceived “to no small extent [as an] indicative of the ideology dominant at a certain time in a certain society” (Lefevere, 1992: 41).

Lefevere’s ground-breaking theories pertaining to censorship and literary manipulation set the basis for further research in Translation Studies, in fact, they opened a new subfield, that of “manipulation and translation,” or the Manipulation School. Later scholars such as Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko (2002), Francesca Billiani (2007), and Michaela Wolf (2007) have contributed to and furthered Lefevere’s position. Questions related to manipulation and the phenomenology of censorship are also being discussed with a “Bordieuan” sociological perspective. They have analyzed the implications that power exerts over translation to conceive the idea of structural censorship as a set of ideological characteristics native to the translator’s cultural context. Under this logic Francesca Billiani, for instance, points out that “both censorship and translation establish a power structure that sustains and shapes their respective, often intertwined operational modes (Sammells 1992; Saunders 1992)” (Billiani, 2007: 4).

Additionally, Anthony Pym reflects on how the descriptive approaches of the discipline are required to undertake an ethical or humanizing turn that allows researchers to go beyond mere enunciative contributions. “Failing any of those human dimensions [those of the translator and other agents], in the absence of even a hint of humanistic ethical concern, the actual ideological message coming from catalogue annotations and abstract two-force systematic studies” does not help us understand the ethical issues involved in the process of translating (Pym, 2009: 30).¹ A similar notion has been outlined by Jeremy Munday, for whom the scope of descriptive translation studies in isolation “is inevitably limited if they do not seek to combine analysis of the translated product with an investigation of the translation process” (Munday, 2013: 132).

In that vein, there are scholars who foresee the emergence of another shift in Translation Studies, that of the “critical turn.” This approach has “prompted researchers to investigate the cultural and sociological impact of translations on their culture” (Billiani, 2007: 6), by working with primary sources, for instance archival materials in order to build “the context of the genesis and evolution of

¹ In fact, there is a common feeling that “[m]ost scholars use historical research as a means of exploring general translation-related phenomena or elaborating on translation theories that apply not only to history but also to contemporary translations (studies on translation norms or the translator’s visibility are two prominent examples” (Tahir, 2013: 133).

a translation. This is evidenced by Translation Studies articles that have been published after 2010” (Stredová, 2019: 502). Among the proponents of this type of descriptive research that aims to further Toury’s descriptive models—combining historical and sociological approaches and employing archival research methods—, Jeremy Munday (“The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-Making” 2013, and “Using Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns” 2014); and Cristina Gómez (“Translation Choices as Sites of State Power” 2018) are two of the scholars advocating for an approach that not only intends to build a “history of translation” in general, but also a history of the translators and the translations.

Censorship in Franco's Spain (1936-1976)

Institutional censorship, patronage, and translator’s self-manipulation harshly manipulated exogenous works in Spain, with the purpose of maintaining a controlled literary system due to moral, religious, and political inclinations. The Francoist regime imposed an authoritarian ideology that led to new challenges in the literary field, with a censorship system being instituted in 1937—only a year after the Civil War started—, and the infamous Press Law that set the criteria for books to be bowdlerized and censored being promulgated in 1938.

Eduardo Ruiz Bautista (2008) distinguishes between three stages within the Francoist dictatorship when focusing on censorship and editorial issues: Francoism I (1936-1945), Francoism II (1945-1966) and Francoism III (1966-1976). In general, the criteria for a text to be banned was: “Any kind of immoral concept or Marxist propaganda, anything which implies a disrespect for the dignity of our glorious army, any attack against the unity of our mother country, a disrespect for the Catholic religion or, in short, anything opposed to the meaning and goals of our Glorious National Crusade” (Pegenaute, 1999: 87). In the midst of the Spanish Civil War, the first official board was established in 1937, in order to deal with cultural production: *Delegación de Estado para Prensa y Propaganda*. This organism had a normative nature and offered a paradigm of what publishing houses might or might not distribute; a type of censorship known as compulsory and preventive, since the books were examined prior to publication. First, the publishers had to send the book they wanted to issue to the *Delegación*. Once there, the censors wrote a report analyzing the content of the book. The resolution was then attached to that

report and, ultimately, it was sent to the publishing house together with the final decision.

The initial reception of Henry Miller's works took place during Francoism III, a period during which the regime began to embrace liberalism and attempted to offer a modernized image of the nation in terms of policy, economy, and culture. The ultimate need for flexibility was reflected on the censorship system through the establishment of a new law, *Ley de prensa e imprenta* [Printing and Press Law], passed on the 18th of March 1966 by Minister Manuel Fraga. The new law introduced significant reforms regarding certain rights, e.g. "freedom of expression by means of forms" (Press Law, art. 1). Furthermore, the previously compulsory requirement of "prior permission" was rebranded as "voluntary consultation." It meant that the publishers had to voluntarily apply for permission to publish a book, although the dynamics were practically the same: censors examined the book in question and estimated whether the book could be published or not. Finally, in the late 1970s, the Francoist censorship system experienced a process of enfeeblement due to changes in Spanish society, which had been repressed for more than thirty years. In 1975, Franco's death brought the end of the dictatorship, although it was not until the proclamation of the Spanish Constitution in 1978 that the censorship system was formally dismantled.²

From Black Spring to the different Primavera(s) Negra(s)

Considering that the vast demand for exogenous literature to be imported in Spain during its last stage demanded a high degree of self-censorship, a good example of censorship and self-censorship in translated literature can be drawn from the Catalan and Spanish translations of the novel *Black Spring* (1938) by Henry Miller.³ A quick analysis of these two translations —both carried out during the last stage of the regime, the former under the title *Primavera negra*, translated by Jordi Arbonès in 1970, and the latter, *Primavera negra* as well, translated by Carlos Bauer in 1970 and published in 1978— serves to shed

² Nevertheless, the censorship board kept storing files until 1983 (Lázaro, 2004), although to my knowledge, all the reports that I have encountered in the files at the archive that date after 1975 were approved.

³ The following data have been extracted from my unpublished Master Thesis at Auburn University: "Tras la pista de la censura franquista: traducción, edición y censura en *Primavera negra* de Henry Miller" (2018).

light on the effects of not only the institutional censorship that was established by the regime, but also the repercussions of self-censorship performed by the translators.

Overall, the system enforced a strong normative manipulation, “institutional censorship” in Lefevere’s terms (1992), and some translators carried out self-translation strategies to get published, as occurred in the case of the Catalan rendering of *Black Spring*, a quasi-autobiographical novel related to the series *The Tropics: Tropic of Cancer* (1934) and *Tropic of Capricorn* (1939), and which was indeed banned in many countries due to its crude tone, sexual references, obscenity. The Archivo General de la Administración in Madrid stores 8 censorship files regarding Miller’s novel, all of them dating from 1967-1981, and which constitute the different requests the publishing houses applied for in order to obtain permission to publish the translations. On one hand, the Catalan version was approved and published in 1970, after being edited and resubmitted with the “necessary” amendments that the censors pointed out, although the first requests already showed the traces of a manipulated intervention by the translator. On the other hand, the Spanish version was not allowed for publication during the regime, since translator and publisher did not perform any self-censorship, which rendered the sexual allusions as they were narrated in Miller’s text in terms of tone and register. It was not published until 1978, after the regime was officially over.

The following tables show several examples of how both versions were translated, demonstrating the omissions the Catalan translator carried out. First, the Catalan translation of the novel shows a text full of cuts, exposing that the translator had performed extreme self-censorship. For this reason, the Catalan version was approved by the censorship board, whereas the Spanish version—a rendering of the source text without any submissions or alterations regarding both content and tone—was submitted several times in the following years and repeatedly denied for publication. This reveals that the use of self-censorship played an extremely important role for the success of a book being published even during the last years of the regime. The selected passages pertain to a number of sexual references and have been divided into two groups: body parts and sex acts.

In relation to the instances that contain references to the body parts, some of the examples extracted from the original and the Catalan and Spanish translation are as follows:

	<i>Henry Miller (1963)</i>	<i>Jordi Arbonès (1970)</i>	<i>Carlos Bauer (1970; 1978)</i>
#1	“Before me always the image of the body , our triune god of penis and testicles ” (24).	“Davant meu sempre es dreça la imatge del cos ” (26). ø	“En mí siempre está la imagen del cuerpo , nuestro trinitario dios de pene y testículos ” (39).
#2	“Real pricks . Real cunts ” (51).	“ Tot autèntic” (46).	“ Pollas verdaderas. Coños verdaderos” (66).

Table 1: Passages contrasting Catalan and Spanish translations of body parts.

Historically, sexual content has been a taboo subject, challenging to be referred to and, in many cases, persecuted. In Western culture, there are infamous examples of institutions that have ensured that themes related to carnal love, sexuality, and descriptive references to intimate human relationships remain hidden. Since topics related to sex have generally been censored for moral and religious reasons (Chamizo, 2008: 37), both authors and rewriters face these hindrances marked by culture and society at a given time. Table 1 shows the omission strategy (ø) employed in the Catalan translation, where there is no trace of the words: “penis,” “testicles,” “pricks,” and “cunts.” Whereas such body parts are rendered in the Spanish translation. The Catalan translation of these passages is an example of the translator’s self-censorship. According to Santaemilia,

self-censorship is an individual ethical struggle between self and context. In all historical circumstances, translators tend to produce rewritings which are ‘acceptable’ from both social and personal perspectives. The translation of swearwords and sex-related language is a case in point, which very often depends on historical and political circumstances, and is also an area of personal struggle, of ethical/moral dissent, of religious/ideological controversies. (Santaemilia, 2008: 221)

In addition to omitting the body parts when they expose a certain sexual connotation, the translations also present other strategies in order to deal with the sexual content that would later be subject to deletion by the censors. The use of the standard, normalized, or clinically accepted term is a strategy that,

together with omission, appears to be very much used by the Catalan translator. Table 2 underlines a number of instances where Arbonès opts for an orthophemism, which “is typically more formal and more direct (or literal) than the corresponding euphemism” (Allan, 2006: 33). Examples of this are “sina,” “testicles,” and “vagina” in the Catalan translation, and only “busto” and “vagina” in the Spanish translation in the cases where the source texts keeps a more formal register (“bust” and “vagina” for instance).

	<i>Henry Miller (1963)</i>	<i>Jordi Arbonès (1970)</i>	<i>Carlos Bauer (1970; 1978)</i>
#1	“If we are stirred by a fat bust it is the fat bust of a whore” (10).	“Si ens commou la visió d’una sina grassa , és pel record de la sina grassa d’una meuca” (15).	“Si nos conmovemos por un opulento busto , es el opulento busto de una puta” (25).
#2	“I want a world where the vagina is represented by a crude, honest slit ” (50).	“Vull un món on la vagina sigui representada cruament per un tall honest” (45).	“Quiero un mundo en el que la vagina esté representada por un rudo y honesto tajo ” (65).
#3	“Some of them with balls as big as a lamb’s fry ” (97).	“Alguns, amb uns testicles enormes” (85).	“Algunos, con las pelotas tan grandes como las de un carnero” (116).

Table 2: Passages contrasting Catalan and Spanish translations of body parts.

In *Black Spring*, like any other novel by Miller, there is no scarcity of openly explicit images that crudely refer to sexual intercourse. The following table shows some passages that refer to sex acts and the ways in which the translators captured such images.

	<i>Henry Miller (1963)</i>	<i>Jordi Arbonès (1970)</i>	<i>Carlos Bauer (1970; 1978)</i>
#1	“and she put my head down on her and she told me to kiss it ” (97).	“ø” (84-85).	“me hizo bajar la cabeza y me dijo que se lo besara ”(114-115).
#2	“I could stand her on her head and blow into it , I could back-scuttle her , I could drag her past the parson’s house, as they say, any goddam thing at all” (103).	“Li podia fer qualsevol cosa : ella simplement desvariejava de joia” (90). ø	“Podía ponerla patas arriba y soplarle dentro , darle por detrás, hacer la carretilla , como dicen, cualquier jodida cosa que se me ocurriera” (121).
#3	“They fling themselves on the bed and finish the job with their fingers ” (123).	“ø” (105).	“Se echan sobre la cama y terminan el trabajo con sus dedos ” (142-143).

Table 3: Passages contrasting translated Catalan and Spanish references to sex acts.

The Catalan translation of the examples shown in Table 3 are similar to those of Table 1, where the main strategy used in Arbonès’ rewriting is the omission of very sexual content that describes the sex act. Curiously enough, in the example 2, the translator, instead of omitting the passage, opts for a shortened version in which the sexual references are softened by wording the whole situation as “I could do anything to her.” Once again, the examples of the Spanish translation indicate that Bauer’s translation keeps the register and sexual tone conveyed in the source text.

The Struggles of Translating Henry Miller in Franco's Spain

	<i>Henry Miller (1963)</i>	<i>Jordi Arbonès (1970)</i>	<i>Carlos Bauer (1970; 1978)</i>
#1	“ jerking away for dear life” (7).	“ i trafeguejava a cor què vols” (12).	“ casándose como si le fuese en ello la vida” (21).
#2	“No more masturbating in the dark! . . . I don't want to watch young virgins masturbating in the privacy of their boudoirs” (50).	“Prou fer el solitari a les fosques! . . . No vull contemplar cap minyoneta mentre, secretament, fa coses lletges en el seu boudoir” (45).	“¡Basta de masturbarse en la oscuridad! . . . No quiero ver a las muchachas vírgenes masturbándose en el secreto de sus habitaciones” (65).
#3	“I raised her dress and slipped into her . And as I got it into her and began to work it around . . . And I said Yes with one hand working around in her crotch . . . She was so wet and juicy down there” (97).	“vaig arregussar-li les faldilles i la hi vaig penetrar a dins. I, mentre començava a treballar-la . . . I jo li vaig dir que sí, tot acariciant-la . . . Estava tan tova ” (84-85).	“le levanté el vestido y se la metí . Y, cuando ya la tenía toda dentro, y había empezado a trabajarla . . . Y yo le dije que sí, con una mano trabajándole la entrepierna . . . Ella estaba mojada y jugosa allí abajo” (114-115).

Table 4: Passages contrasting translated Catalan and Spanish references to sex acts.

Table 4 illustrates the cases in which the Catalan translation reveals new omissions when the original content is too sexually descriptive. Additionally, the Catalan translator makes use of several euphemisms, that is to say a term that “is typically more colloquial and figurative (or indirect) than the corresponding orthophemism” (Allan, 2006: 33). For instance, “trafeguejava,” “fer el solitari,” “fa coses lletges,” “treballar-la,” “acariciant-la,” “tan tova.” Such a softening of the source text in the Catalan translation reflects, thus, a total act of self-censorship by the Catalan translator. In Santaemilia's words: “[s]elf-censorship may include all the imaginable forms of elimination,

distortion, downgrading, misadjustment, infidelity, and so on” (Santaemilia, 2008: 223). On the contrary, the Spanish edition shows that the translator tries to maintain Miller’s register in the original novel, by using dysphemism such as: “cascándose la,” “se la metí,” “trabajándole la entrepierna.” Dysphemism, in Allan’s classification, corresponds to “a word or phrase with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum and/or to people addressed or overhearing the utterance... they are normally tabooed” (Allan and Burrige, 2006: 31).

Final Notes

Throughout more than thirty years of dictatorship, the Francoist regime thoroughly persecuted and censored books on grounds of immorality, political ideologies and religion. Exogenous and also internal works were revised before being published by a severe censorship system, which efficiently stored all data regarding the publication or import of books. Thanks to this bureaucratic storage, I have been able to carry out the study of Henry Miller’s translations in Franco’s Spain (1939-1975), by principally dealing with the analysis of archival materials regarding the Spanish and Catalan editions of his novel, *Black Spring*, preserved at the General Archive of the Administration.

Hence, why are there different reports and verdicts issued by the censorship board? What can the translations into Catalan and Spanish relate about this outcome? In analyzing the repercussion of the censorship system upon the imported and translated literature, some scholars point out that the censors wrote rigorous reviews in a fairly quick fashion, a fact that underpins the use of various censorship filters. An example of this is underlined in Alberto Lázaro’s study of the H. G. Wells’ reception during Francoism (2004). According to his conclusions, Wells’ works were translated and reissued throughout the dictatorship, so *a priori*, the censorship system did not embody a major threat for most of Wells’ fantasy works. On the contrary though, eight of his novels and a number of essays containing critical and progressive passages against religion were particularly prohibited during the second stage of the regime — when the Catholic elite was ruling—, which shows that both genre and content mattered greatly when it came to censoring literature.

Nonetheless, there is also an array of less flattering comments with regards to the censors’ reports. For instance, both Abellán (1980) and Cisqueña (2002) have declared that censors often fell into contradictions and arbitrariness. This

is reflected along the readers' reports on the two rejected voluntary consultations of Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* that I have analyzed elsewhere (Monzón, 2020): there were two censors who first examined the book in 1968, while two more carried out the second consultation in 1972 —that is to say, during the last stage of the regime—. Both files contain four very different stances in their attempts to consider whether the novel might or might not be published under the codes of the regime. The final result was that Plath's novel was rejected. On the other hand, one collection of her poems was submitted for consultation and was approved without any amendments. In fact, some scholars have sustained that poetry compilations were normally arduous for the censors to read, a factor that once again made them fall into misunderstanding and arbitrariness. Another possible explanation for this genre discrepancy has to do with the fact that during the entire dictatorship poetry was an isolated genre, located in a marginal status in the editorial market, whereas novels were easily saleable. Therefore, the censorship board focused much more on them, for the general demand was bigger and the readership larger.

In this vein, some scholars are of the opinion that those reports sometimes seemed poor and inaccurate,⁴ a fact that possibly has to do with the readers themselves, since the censorship board was constituted by different kinds of citizens (writers, priests, civil servants...), therefore diverse judgements were submitted to the reports, creating those contradictions. Furthermore, “one basic criterion for the censors' final decision seemed to be the ‘reputation’ of an author or a publishing house, or even the kind of edition that was intended” (Pegenaute, 1999: 91). In regard to the ‘reputation’ of a certain author, the list is almost never-ending. For example, many at that time contemporary and well-known authors such as D. H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway, Albert Camus, or Samuel Beckett were censored. Being aware of this ‘reputation’ effect, Marisol Morales (2010) studied the case of Kate O'Brien's novels in Spain during the dictatorship, taking as a starting point the idea that the author was censored in her motherland —Ireland— on ground of immorality, and considering that she was forbidden from entering Spain until the end of the regime. In her study of the censorship files she found that, similarly to Ireland, the Spanish censorship board (particularly during Francoism I and II) banned O'Brien's *Mary Lavelle* and only approved the Spanish translation of *The Last of Summer* in 1943, after performing several amendments.

⁴ “Spanish censors were usually learned people, sometimes their reports revealed flaws and often a lack of specific knowledge on certain writers and literatures” (Morales, 2010: 62).

Another good example to illustrate this matter is the author who has been the subject of this article: Henry Miller, whose most famous novels *Tropic of Cancer*, *Tropic of Capricorn*, *Black Spring* or *Sexus* were harshly censored and constantly rejected by the censorship board due to his own worldwide fame. One of the reports I found at the Archivo General de la Administración contained the times that the novel *Black Spring* had been submitted for approval during the 1960s-1970s, and even rejected prior to the establishment of ‘voluntary consultation’: “Esta novela de Miller está plenamente en la línea de sus otras novelas *Los Trópicos* tanto es así que el mismo autor afirma que aquí completa lo que no dijo en las otras novelas. Esta novela ha sido rechazada 8 o 10 veces en su importación” (File: 592-67).

Nevertheless, censorship on behalf of fame and reputation cannot be conceived as a general rule, since scholars who have studied the reception of James Joyce’s *Ulysses* (Lázaro, 2001; Sanz Gallego, 2013) demonstrate that, even though the novel had been attacked and remained banned in several countries due to its sexual content, it was approved and circulated in Spain since 1947. Why this novel was approved in the midst of the second and most severe censorial stage has to do with the fact that the translation was a rather self-censored edition imported from Argentina. The translator used slang and taboo language from an Argentine dialect, which possibly made the controversial nature of the reading more inaccessible to the censors.

Thus, as it has been shown with the previous examples from a number of authors who experienced the effects of the Spanish censorship system during its three different periods, the Francoist regime produced a complex, heterogeneous, and wholly inconsistent censoring apparatus. In this article, thanks to the analysis of two different translations of Henry Miller’s *Black Spring* into Catalan and Spanish that were issued in Spain through the last two decades of the dictatorship, I have offered an expository glance into the role of translators and publishers in conjunction with the censorship board that operated during the years of the Francoist regime. As it has been presented through the translated passages of Miller’s novel, professionals carried out rewritings that clearly affected the final literary products. Therefore, the Spanish readers, who were precisely the ultimate target of such a manipulation, were given censored books provided by the different practitioners who were forced to collaborate in that task of ideological rewriting in order that the texts better reflected the value system the regime was attempting to preserve during the dictatorship.

References

- Abellán, M.L. (1980) *Censura y creación literaria en España (1939-1976)*. Barcelona: Península.
- Allan, K. and Burrige, K. (2006) *Forbidden Words. Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Monash University, Victoria: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrés, G. (2012) *La batalla del libro en el primer franquismo: política del libro, censura y traducciones italianas*. Madrid: Huerga & Fierro.
- Bassnett, S. (2011) 'From Cultural Turn to Translational Turn: A Translational Journey.' *Literature, Geography, Translation*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 67-80.
- Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (1990) *Translation, History and Culture*. London, New York: Pinter.
- Billiani, F. (2007) *Modes of Censorship and Translation. National Contexts and Diverse Media*. Manchester, UK Kinderhook, NY: St. Jerome.
- Cisquella, G. and Ervity, J.L. and Sorolla, J.A. (2002) *La represión cultural en el franquismo: diez años de censura de libros durante la Ley de Prensa (1966-1976)*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Cornellà-Detrell, J. (2013) 'The Afterlife of Francoist Cultural Policies: Censorship and Translation in the Catalan and Spanish Literary Market.' *Hispanic Research Journal*, 14(2) pp. 129-143.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1990) 'The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem.' *Poetics Today*, 11(1) pp. 45-52.
- Gentzler, E. (2002) 'Translation, Poststructuralism, and Power.' In Tymoczko, M. and Gentzler, E. (eds.) *Translation and Power*. Amherst/Boston: University of Massachusetts Press. pp. 195-218.
- Gibbels, E. (2009) 'Translators, the Tacit Censors.' In Chuilleanáin, E., Cuilleánáin, C. and David, L. (eds.) *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- Gómez, C. (2006) '¿Traducción Tradición? El polisistema literario español durante la dictadura franquista: la censura.' *RiLUnE*, (4) pp. 37-49.
- (2018) 'Translation Choices as Sites of State Power: Gender and Habitus in Bestsellers in Franco's Spain.' In Baumgarten, S. and Cornellà-Detrell, J. (eds.) *Translation and Global Spaces*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Limited, pp. 109-24.
- Holmes, J. (1988). *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*. Translated Papers on Literary Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Lázaro, A. (2004) *H. G. Wells en España, estudio de los expedientes de censura (1939-1978)*. Madrid: Editorial Verbum.

- (2001) 'James Joyce's Encounters with Spanish Censorship, 1939-1966.' *In* F. Staley, T. (ed.) *Joyce Studies Annual*. Austin: University of Texas, pp. 38-54.
- Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting & the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- Linder, D. (2004) 'The Censorship of Sex: A Study of Raymond Chandler's *The Big Sleep* in Franco's Spain.' *TTR (traduction, terminologie, rédaction)*, 17(1) pp. 155-182.
- Lobejón, S. (2007) 'La censura en la traducción de la poesía en inglés (1936-1978).' *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación. La traducción del futuro: mediación lingüística y cultural en el siglo XXI*. Barcelona. pp. 241-250.
- Miller, H. (1963) *Black Spring*. New York: Grove Press.
- . (1946) *Printemps noir*. Translated by Rivert, P. Paris: Gallimard.
- . (1964) *Primavera negra*. Translated by Cantó, P. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Rueda.
- . (1970) *Primavera negra*. Translated by Arbonès, J. Barcelona: Aymà.
- . (1978) *Primavera negra*. Translated by Bauer, C. and Marcos, J. Madrid: Alfaguara-Bruguera.
- Monzón, S. (forthcoming 2020) 'Censoring Poetics through Translation: The Filtered Reception of Sylvia Plath in Franco's Spain.' *Translation Matters*, 2(2).
- Morales, M. (2010) 'Banned in Spain? Truths, Lies and Censorship in Kate O'Brien's Novels.' *Atlantis. Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies*, 32(1) pp. 57-72.
- Munday, J. (2013) 'The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-Making.' *Target*, 25(1) pp. 125-139.
- . (2014) 'Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns.' *The Translator*, 20(1) pp. 64-80.
- Chuilleanáin E, Cuilleanáin, C. and David L. (2009) *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*. Dublin: Four Courts Press.
- O'Leary, C. and Lázaro, A. (2011) *Censorship across borders: the reception of English literature in twentieth-century Europe*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Pegenaute, L. (1999) 'Censoring Translation and Translation as Censorship: Spain under Franco.' *Translation and the (Re) location of Meaning, Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminars in Translation Studies, 1994-96*. Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, pp. 83-96.
- Pym, A. (2009) 'Humanizing Translation History.' *Hermes*, 42, pp. 23-48.
- Rioja, M. (2010) 'English-Spanish Translations and Censorship in Spain 1962-1969.' *InTRAlínea*, 12.

- Ruiz Bautista, E. (2008) *Tiempo de censura: la represión editorial durante el franquismo*. Gijón: TREA.
- Santaemilia, J. (2008) 'The Translation of Sex-Related Language: The Danger(s) of Self-Censorship(s).' *Erudit*, 21(2) pp. 221-252.
- Sanz Gallego, G. (2013) 'Translating Taboo Language in Joyce's Ulysses: A Special Edition in Spanish for Franco and Perón.' *Atlantis*, 32(2) pp. 137-154.
- Seruya M, and Lin Moniz M. (2008) *Translation and Censorship in Different Times and Landscapes*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- Tymoczko, M. (2002) 'Ideology and the Position of the Translator. In What Sense is a Translator 'In Between?'' In Calzada M. (ed.) *Apropos of ideology: translation studies on ideology, ideologies in translation studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Pub, pp. 181-201.
- Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Rabadán, R. (2000) *Traducción y censura inglés-español, 1939-1985: estudio preliminar*. León: Universidad de León.
- Woods, M. (2012) *Censoring Translation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wolf, M. and Fukari A. (2007) *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. New York: John Benjamins Pub. Company.