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Abstract

Children’s literature usually consists of texts that are written by adults for a child readership. This situation results in children’s literature operating as an adult-constructed notion, based on assumptions about children and childhood. Due to children’s literature being a constructed notion, a space for adult manipulation of texts for children is thus created. Subsequently, texts written for children are often imbued with adult ideologies. This also occurs in the translation of children’s literature. In order to explore the influences of adult ideological agendas on the translation of children’s literature, this thesis examines the production of texts translated for children under state censorship during Franco's Spain (1939-1975), with a particular focus on the translations of Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1885). Through a comparative study of the distinct versions of the translations of the novel, produced across different stages of Franco's dictatorship, along with the censorship records, this study will uncover how certain issues of the novel have induced translation problems, due to the politico-ideological constraints that the receptor system imposed on the production of texts translated for children. At the same time, through a detailed examination of the translators’ solutions to the translation problems present in *Huckleberry Finn*, this study will also shed light on the dynamics of children’s literary system: despite the constraints imposed by the regime on texts translated for children, methods were designed so as to tackle and even to challenge the censorship constraints. Lastly, this study also highlights the way that theories developed in translation studies can enhance children’s literature studies and vice versa.
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Chapter 1  
Introduction

1.1 What is This Thesis about?
This thesis examines the censorship practices applied to translations of children's literature produced under Franco's dictatorship in Spain, with specific textual analysis dedicated to the Spanish translations of Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. In order to facilitate understanding of the objectives of the thesis, it is reasonable to structure the focus of the thesis into three main sections, namely, children's literature, translation and censorship.

1.1.1 Children's literature
The first objective of the thesis is to highlight the role of translations of children's literature as an important channel through which adult ideological concerns can be expressed and inscribed. 'What is children's literature?' is, perhaps, the usual starting question. The answer to this deceptively simple question, however, is not easily formulated and a satisfactory definition of children's literature can be extremely complex. To begin with, children's literature usually consists of texts written for children and read to children, but such texts are hardly ever created by children. Therefore, complexities with defining children's literature are first induced by the inevitable adult intervention in the very process of the creation of children's texts (Walsh 1976: 215, Marshall 1982: 7, Shavit 1986: 37, Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 2, Murray 1998: xvi, Thacker and Webb 2002: 3-4, Nodelman and Reimer 2003: 79, Grenby and Reynolds 2011: 3, Mickenberg and Valone 2011: 9, Hunt 2011: 42). Jill Paton Walsh contends that ‘the defining quality of children’s literature is to be sought not in children, nor in children’s writers, but in the peculiarities of the adult market’ (1976: 215). Likewise, Margaret R. Marshall also suggests that:

The children's book world [...] is a complex structure of the written world, the illustrated idea, the psychology, sociology and education of children and their aesthetic values and the even more complex attitudes and values of the adults who concern themselves with children and books (1982:7).
Similarly, according to Murray Knowles and Kirsten Malmkjaer: ‘children’s books are controlled by adults in that they can determine what children read and, in the main, produce what children read’ (1996: 2). Consequently, due to the excessive adult intervention in children’s literature, the process of the creation of texts for children necessarily involves an imbalanced power distribution between the adult authors, publishers, parents, educators and the child readers (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: xi-x, Murray 1998: xvi, Thacker and Webb 2002: 3-4). In general, adults possess ‘greater experience, strength, access to the media and to the essentials and luxuries of life’ that, without a doubt, make them ‘more powerful than children socially, economically and physically’ (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 43). As a result, it is adults that occupy the controlling position in children’s literature, while the child readers are usually confined to the position of the controlled, exerting no active power in deciding what to expect in texts written for them. In the meantime, Nodelman and Reimer argue that ‘children’s literature is a body of texts defined by its intended audience’ (2003:79). Nonetheless, even this ‘intended audience’, namely, children and the associated idea of childhood, are adult-constructed notions that vary historically and culturally (Marshall 1982: 7, Shavit 1986: xi, Dankert 1991: 21, Stephens 1992: 8, Castañeda 2002: 5, Nodelman and Reimer 2003: 9), which further complicate the matter of children’s literature.

Children are adults in the making; children are less experienced; children are innocent; children of today will be citizens of tomorrow, etcetera. Such generalized assumptions that adults make, based on their observations of children, are often circulated as if such assumptions are universal truths. However, when adults are studying and making observations about children, a paradox, as Nodelman points out, inevitably occurs. On the one hand, ‘we can claim objectivity for our observations only by being other than what we observe’ (1992: 30). In other words, in order to ensure the scientific quality of adult observations on children, adults have to posit themselves as inherently different from the object of their study, namely, children. On the other hand, ‘in being other, we have no choice but to interpret what we observe in terms of ourselves and own previously established assumptions’ (1992:30). Thus, adult
assumptions about children, based on adult observations, despite the claimed objectivity, inevitably involve a process of subjective interpretation. Subsequently, as Nodelman and Reimer suggest:

When people express any of the assumptions [about children], the phrase “children are” often really means “children should be” - a confusion of what the adults would like to be true with what actually is true (2003: 91).

As it turns out, the contemporary notions of children and childhood seem to be constructed, based mainly on two adult subjective interpretations of their observations on children. First, adults tend to view children as not yet fully developed human beings, and that children are generally believed to be weak and vulnerable, both physically and intellectually. Subsequently, bearing this conviction in mind, adults often identify in themselves a ‘natural’ responsibility for protecting children from potential sources of harm and danger. Secondly, adults see in children a ‘potentiality rather than an actuality’ (Castañeda 2002: 1). More specifically, the very notions of children and childhood inherently imply a sense of constant evolvement: childhood can be understood as a stage of both physical and mental transformation that children necessarily go through, so as to become grown-up human beings. During this transformative process, ‘[the child] is not yet fully formed, and so [she or he is] open to reformation’, in other words, ‘the child is not only in the making, but also [...] can be made’ (Castañeda 2002: 3). In the meantime, however, this transformative process is not guaranteed to be smooth and successful. As a result, adults identify in themselves a second ‘natural’ responsibility for ensuring a desirable outcome of the transformation of children, ‘desirable’ usually to be understood in the sense that children will eventually become both physically fit grown-ups and culturally accepted social members at the same time.

Children’s literature largely expresses the adult assumptions about children and demonstrates the adults’ obsession to protect and to transform children. In that sense, it can be said that all texts written for children are, to a lesser or greater extent, imbued with adult ideologies, aiming at teaching
knowledge on some occasions or promoting certain values and ideas amongst children on others. Stephens, in his study of language and ideology in children’s fiction, observes that ‘the discourses of children’s fictions are pervaded by ideological presuppositions, sometimes obtrusively and sometimes invisibly’, and he continues to point out that:

Children’s writers often take upon themselves the task of trying to mold audience attitudes into “desirable” forms, which can mean either an attempt to perpetuate certain values or to resist socially dominant values, which particular writers oppose (1992: 1-2, 3).

In a similar manner, Nodelman and Reimer also contend that:

Because writers assume that their own ideology is universal truth, texts always act as a subtle kind of propaganda and tend to manipulate unwary readers into an unconscious acceptance of their values. The representation always threatens to become a reader's reality (2003: 156).


In terms of the construction of national identity, Meek contends that:

If we agree that literature offers and encourages a continuing scrutiny of “who we think we are”, we have to emphasize the part that children’s literature plays in the development of children’s understanding of both belonging and differentiation (2001: x).

More specifically, as Judith Graham summarizes:
A country will retain those aspects of its history, which show it in a good light and conveniently rationalize the others. It will retrieve or perhaps invent myths that embody values and characteristics that it thinks laudable. In the effort to get everybody speaking the same language, and aware of the country’s great stories, it will educate its children in schools and through the media where it can more or less control the content and language of its instruction [...]. In a sense, the natural pull in any nation is towards homogenizing the nation—making everybody as like each other as possible so that in times of need, all would see the sense of pulling together against an enemy who was ‘not like us’ (2001: 105).

Furthermore, in terms of how children’s literature transmits messages on social issues such as gender and race, Pinsent affirms that:

No text can be written without the authors’ values being in some way significant in it. Even when writers are trying to be neutral, something not very frequent in the case of politically sensitive issues such as gender and race, their underlying assumptions will color what they consider to be impartiality (1997: 23).

Nevertheless, ideologies embedded in texts written for children are not necessarily harmful, and ‘a narrative without an ideology is unthinkable’ (Stephens 1992:8). Neither should the ensuing adults’ efforts to make it possible for children to live successfully in a community with others, as expressed through much of children’s literature, be completely rejected (Nodelman and Reimer 2003: 97). What has to be pointed out, though, is the necessity to alert children of the possible ways in which ideologies can be inscribed in texts written for them. In this way, the child readers, instead of being merely passive recipients of adults’ ideologies, can become active critical thinkers, thus able to choose to adopt or to reject certain ideas and values (Stephens 1992: 3, Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: xi, Pinsent 1997: 3, Hollindale 1988: 10, Nodelman and Reimer 2003: 23).
Given the importance of identifying ideologies informing children’s literature, how does one detect the ideological convictions embedded in a given text? Nodelman and Reimer suggest that readers ‘read against a text’, by ‘remain[ing] at some distance from [it] and allow themselves to think about how the views [the text] presents differ from their own’ (2003: 156). The most obvious way to do that is ‘to question its political and social assumptions’ (Nodelman and Reimer 2003:156). In this process, an examination of the language used in texts written for children is of great significance, since political and social assumptions are necessarily expressed through the language used in composing a text, as Hollindale contends that ‘ideology is inseparable from language’ (1988: 15). Also, there is a consensus that language plays a vital role in the acculturation of children: ‘It is through language that the subject and the world are represented in literature and through language that literature seeks to define the relationships between child and culture’ (Stephens 1992: 5); ‘It seems to us indisputable that the effects, whatever they might be, which literature might work on children, must be mediated largely through the language which constitutes the texts in question’ (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: ix); and, ‘language and culture are almost impossible to separate, since the values of any group are inevitably strongly associated with the way they speak about the values’ (Pinsent 1997: 109).

In order to locate ideologies embedded in the language used in children’s literature, Peter Hollindale distinguishes three levels at which authors of children’s books may express their own ideological convictions (1988: 10-17). At the first level, an author may express explicitly his social, political or moral beliefs, as well as ‘his wish to recommend them to children through the story’ (1988: 10). Ideologies at this level are obvious to detect, since the author intentionally aims to promote certain ideas or values amongst the readers. At the second level, an author’s ideological beliefs may be expressed implicitly, and are, therefore, difficult to uncover, since these can be the author’s unexamined assumptions, or, in Nodelman and Reimer’s words, ‘a text’s absences’, which are taken-for-granted ideas or assumptions (2003: 156). Lastly, the ideological convictions of a certain text also need to be understood within the broad socio-
cultural and historical context in which the work has been created. This should not be difficult to understand, since ‘a large part of any book is written not by its author but by the world its author lives in’ (Hollindale 1988: 15) As a consequence, literary works necessarily reflect the context in which the creation takes place.

Nevertheless, despite Hollindale and other scholars’ emphasis on language as a major medium through which ideologies can be inscribed in children’s literature, it is curious that the role that translations of children’s books play in the transmission of adult ideological concerns has rarely been examined, disregarding the fact that translations are precisely where language exchanges take place most actively. It can be said that the three levels identified by Hollindale, where ideologies can be located in texts written for children, can equally be applied to texts translated for children. In order to study the norms of writing for children, according to Shavit: ‘the discussion of translated text is even more fruitful than that of original text’, because ‘translational norms expose more clearly the constraints imposed on a text that enters the children’s system’ (Shavit 2006:26). At the same time, while scholars of children’s literature, on the one hand, have constantly lamented the marginalized status of studies on children’s literature in the academic field (Shavit 1986: ix, Dankert 1991: 21, Alderson 1991: 34, Short 1995: 1-2, Knowles and Malmkjær 1996: viii, Thacker and Webb 2002: 2, Nodelman and Reimer 2003: xiv, Grenby 2008: 8-9, Clark 2011: 295-296), on the other hand, it is observed that the current research activities conducted on children’s literature have limited themselves largely to works produced in an Anglo-Saxon cultural background. The result is a rather limited research scope. Therefore, in order to deepen our understanding of how ideologies work within the language used in children’s literature, as well as to enrich the research possibilities of the children’s literature sector, the role of translation must be explored.

1.1.2 Translation Studies

The second objective of this thesis is to demonstrate that studies of children’s literature in translation need to be approached with a target-text-oriented
method, since translations of texts for children are largely mediated through the
target-culture system. In literary translation, the source-text-oriented focus is
usually preoccupied with notions such as accuracy, adequacy, equivalence,
faithfulness and originality, which all seem to confirm a necessary supremacy of
the source text, without considering the potential target-culture influences in the
shaping of the target text. As will soon be explained, such a focus is incompatible
with the study of children’s literature in translation.

To begin with, Eugene Nida’s translation theory can be identified as
precisely source-text oriented. Nida and Taber propose a notion of ‘dynamic
equivalence’ (1969:24), which Nida later renames as ‘functional adequacy’
(1993: 123). According to Nida and Taber, a dynamic equivalence in translation
is to be defined in terms of ‘the degree to which the receptors of the message in
the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the
receptors in the source language’ (1969: 24). In striving for dynamic equivalence
in translation, Nida criticizes the notion of ‘formal correspondence’, that is, ‘a
comparison of corresponding lexical meanings, grammatical classes and
rhetorical devices’ between the source text and the target text, since, for Nida,
‘what is important is the extent to which receptors correctly understand and
appreciate the translated text’ (1993:116). Nida’s repetitive emphasis on the
importance of readers’ responses to a translated text can be easily understood,
as soon as one becomes aware of Nida’s particular concern with Bible
translation:

A translation of the Bible must not only provide information
which people can understand but must present the message in
such a way that people can feel its relevance (the expressive
element in communication) and can then respond to it in action
(the imperative function) (Nida and Taber 1969: 24).

It must be pointed out that the aims of Bible translation, as Nida and Taber
suggest here, surprisingly, share a common trait with writings for children: both
the Bible (and its translation) and children’s literature (and its translation) are
burdened with a philosophy of education, in the sense of persuasion and
motivation. Nevertheless, Nida’s translation theory cannot be applied to the translation of children’s literature, after all. Although the priority given to dynamic equivalence over formal correspondence takes the target readers’ needs into consideration, it is based inherently on Nida’s upholding of the supremacy status of the Bible. For Nida, ‘God is the only truth’ is a value to be shared universally, which does, or should not vary culturally. Eventually, the considerations of the target readers’ needs that dynamic equivalence promises are not so much preoccupied with the target readers’ cultural specificities, as with an eagerness of converting the target readers to Christianity. Translations of children’s literature, however, do require conciliations of the cultural factors, as, before anything else, notions of ‘what is essentially good for children’ are necessarily dependent on the sociocultural and historical contexts, in which the translations are conducted. In this sense, dynamic equivalence fails to account for this process of cultural conciliation in the translation of children’s literature.

Critiques of Nida’s dynamic equivalence have also come from Sándor Hervey et al., and Lawrence Venuti. Hervey et al. criticize Nida’s notion based on three points (1995: 14-15), the first of which is outlined below:

The requirement that the TT should affect its recipients in the same way as the ST does (or did) its original audience raises the difficult problem of how any one particular recipient responds to a text, and of the extent to which texts have constant interpretations even for the same person on two different occasions (14).

In other words, for Hervey et al., Nida’s notion of dynamic equivalence may first run a risk of substituting one particular recipient’s response to a text, at one particular occasion, for a generalized, universal readers’ response that is also stable, free from temporal and spatial constraints. Secondly, ‘if good translation is defined in terms of “equivalence”, this is not an objective equivalence’, but a mere imagined equivalence by the translator, since it is unrealistic that the equivalence theory ‘can cope not only with ST and SL audience but also with the impact of a TT on its TL audience’ (14). Thirdly and most fundamentally, the
equivalence theory ignores the fact that ‘TL speakers are inevitably culture-bound’, and subsequently, ‘the notion of cross-cultural “sameness” of psychological effect is a hopeless ideal’ (14-15). To replace the equivalence theory, Hervey et al. propose a theory of ‘translation loss’ (1995: 16-17), which is, nonetheless, again source-text oriented. The notion of translation loss is based on a pessimistic presupposition that the target text will never be the same as the source text, that is, ‘a TT will always lack certain culturally relevant features that are present in the ST’ (16). Upon acknowledging this, the translator can then ‘concentrate on the realistic aim of reducing translation loss, rather than on the unrealistic one of seeking the definitive translation of the ST’ (16). This approach, compared to Nida’s dynamic equivalence, does allow considerations of the shaping effects that cultural constraints may have on translations. Nonetheless, an evaluative component is added at the same time. In the theory of translation loss, cultural factors, instead of being examined as objective conditions under which translations are produced, are perceived as potential sources of hindrance for the target text to achieve sameness as that of the source text. Again, it has to be reiterated that production of texts for children, including translations, are based upon adult assumptions over children and childhood, which are indeed culturally and historically specific. Any evaluative judgment made on the cultural system in which a translation is produced, thus, cannot avoid a sense of arbitrariness.

Venuti’s critique of Nida, on the other hand, is mainly directed towards Nida’s translational ethics such as ‘the best translation does not sound like a translation’, and ‘the translator must strive for equivalence rather than identity’ (Nida and Taber 1969:12), ideas necessarily engendered from the notion of dynamic equivalence. Venuti classifies Nida’s theory as ‘fluent translation’, or ‘domesticating translation’, which ‘in fact links the translator to the missionary’ (2008: 16-17). For Venuti, ‘translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text with a text that is intelligible to the translating-language reader’ (2008: 14). Nida’s domesticating translation theory, instead, ignores the cultural specificities involved in the translation process by ‘imposing the English-language valorization of transparency on every
foreign culture, masking a basic disjunction between the foreign and translated texts’ (2008: 16). As an alternative, Venuti proposes a theory of ‘foreignizing translation’:

Foreignizing translation signifies the differences of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the translating language. In its effort to do right abroad, this translation practice must do wrong at home, deviating enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience in the receiving culture, for instance, or using a marginal discourse to translate it (2008: 15-16).

In short, Venuti’s idea can be summarized as ‘translations have to sound like translations’, as opposed to Nida’s equivalence theory. However, it should be noted that, although Venuti’s theory significantly challenges the previous source-text-oriented translational focus, the foreignizing translation theory is not constructed based on considerations of target readers, but on the interests of the translators. In fact, Venuti’s critique to Nida is conducted out of his conviction that Nida’s fluent translation practices are largely responsible for the current marginalized, or invisible status of translators, particularly translators working in English-speaking countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States (2008: 1-20). Subsequently, Venuti’s foreignizing translation is mainly offered as a resistant practice to that of domesticating translation, so that, by introducing disruptions into the cultural codes of the target system, the role of translators can eventually be made visible. As it turns out, Venuti’s definition of the target system is made in a rather narrow sense, mainly focusing on British and American cultures, hence a lack of universal applicability of his theory. Furthermore, by proposing the staging of an unfamiliar reading experience, Venuti largely undermines the role of target readers. As a result, when it comes to translations of children’s literature, the practicality of foreignizing translation immediately becomes questionable, since children’s literature is basically a genre defined by its intended readership. In addition, ‘on the whole, children’s literature is a conservative medium’, subject to constraints of ‘clergy, teachers, parents and writers’ (Murray 1998: xvi), and also, translators. In this regard, the
foreignizing translation theory that Venuti proposes is not likely to be applied to translation practices of this particular genre, due to the subversiveness underlying such a translation strategy.

As demonstrated above, studies of children’s literature in translation cannot be conducted under the guidance of a source-text-oriented approach, since the weight placed on the originality of the source text unavoidably leads to evaluation of the target text as necessarily inferior to the source text, disregarding the fact that children’s literature and its translation are both context-dependant. Neither could studies of children’s literature in translation be conducted through a translator-oriented approach, as in Venuti’s foreignizing translation theory. Domesticating or foreignizing, as Hatim and Mason correctly point out, seem to represent two mutually exclusive alternatives from which a translator makes an initial and free choice (1997: 11), without considering that translators’ decisions are constrained, before anything else, by the ‘social context’ in which they act (146). Therefore, studies of children’s literature in translation must be conducted through a target-text-oriented approach. For that purpose, Itmar Even-Zohar’s poly-system theory is found to be of particular relevance (Even-Zohar 1990a), along with other theories developed based on the notion of poly-system that include Zohar Shavit’s interpretation of the translation of children’s literature as a function of its position in the literary polysystem (Shavit 1981), Gideon Toury’s descriptive translation theory (Toury 1981 and 1985) and André Lefevere’s ‘patronage’ theory (Lefevere 1992). These theories will be explored in detail under the section of Theoretical Framework of the thesis (See page 27-34).

Similar to scholars of children’s literature, scholars of translation studies have also constantly lamented the marginalized status of translation studies, especially when considering literary translation (Hermans 1985: 7, Even-Zohar 1990a: 13, Bassnett and Lefevere 1998: 1, Baker 2006: 14 and Venuti 2008: 1). At the same time, however, attention given to children’s literature in translation studies is scarce. In this regard, one cannot deny the relevance of extending the research scope of translation studies to cover the translation of children’s literature, so as to lead to an improvement of the overall academic profile of the

1.1.3 Franco’s Spain and Censorship of Children’s Literature

Franco’s Spain was built upon the ashes of a three-year bloody civil war, from which the Nationalists emerged as the victors over the defeated republicans. At the same time, Franco’s regime ‘proved to be one of the most intolerant, regressive, anti-democratic and centralist dictatorships that the western world has ever known’ (Newton 1983: 102). Evidence of the regime’s intolerance came from its ruthless purging of its enemies, those branded republicans, maintaining ‘the discriminatory division of Spanish society into victors and vanquished for many, many years’ (Payne 1987: 635). In order to build the Spain of the twentieth century, it was, however, the Spain of the sixteenth and the seventeenth century, when Spain was thought to be most spiritual, Catholic, imperial and authentic, that Franco’s regime looked upon as a model, hence the backward side of the regime. In the words of Alun Kenwood, ‘the future the Nationalists envisaged was, in fact, the past’ (1993: 36). The regime was also anti-democratic. This was precisely due to the regime’s dictatorial nature. As Payne asserts, ‘Franco’s complete victory in 1939 gave him greater power than any previous ruler of Spain’ (1987: 231). He further contends that ‘the new [Francoist] government was in its own formal theory a more direct personal dictatorship than those of Soviet Union, Italy, and Germany’ (1987: 234). Lastly, the regime was highly centralist, in that it strived for national unity and a cultural homogeneity, which was largely expressed through its vehement

Despite its intolerant and repressive nature, Franco’s regime lasted for a long time, spanning a period of nearly forty years in contemporary Spanish history, from 1939 till 1975. The regime’s longevity has to be explained by its sustaining ideologies, known as ‘Franquismo’, or Francoism, which acted as an umbrella term, as it did not refer to any single coherent political philosophy. Payne points out that ‘Franco never defined in theory a clear-cut formal ideology comparable to any of the major political theologies of the twentieth century’ (1987: 623). Instead, Francoism was a term that housed the interests of various different groups within the regime, as well as their ensuing ideologies. These groups, including the Catholic Church, the Spanish Falange, militants, Carlists and other traditional forces, were markedly different by nature but who, nevertheless, came to unite out of their common distaste for the Spanish Second Republic. Eventually, these groups became the ideological families that sustained Franco’s regime. Indeed, for Boyd, ‘holding the disparate “families” of interests in balance would prove to be the greatest political talent of Francisco Franco’ (1997: 233). Also, in the meantime, one of the peculiarities of Franco’s regime, as Payne points out, was that ‘he shared some of the key ideas of each of the major political families of the regime while rejecting the full ensemble of ideas of any one of them’ (1987: 623). Consequently, ideologies that combined to constitute Francoism were not necessarily compatible with one another, and the discourse of Francoism was strewn with controversies, hence a constant necessity for the regime to legitimize itself. According to Cisquella et al.: ‘el

---
2 The military forces that fought on the Nationalist side during the Civil War, for more details, see Payne, S. (1987), The Franco Regime 1936-1975, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, pp.87-106.
4 For example, the so-called Traditionalists, heirs of the old Carlist movement, see Ross, C. (2004), Spain: Modern History for Modern Language 1912-2004, 2nd ed., London: Arnold, p. 84.
Régimen [...] se quedó sin ideología definida. Por eso, quizá, tuvo que luchar contra todas’ (2002: 21). Censorship was thus imposed as an effective way for the regime to legitimize itself, by silencing the unwanted voices.

Censorship of Children’s Literature

The third objective of the thesis is to study the impacts of state censorship on translations of children's literature, produced under Franco’s Spain. Before anything else, the fact that censorship practices were conducted on a state level necessarily implies an established legal framework, within which the censorship activities were supported and regulated during the Francoist epoch. Such a legal framework provides an obvious methodological convenience, for the purpose of this study, as it allows for textual analysis to be performed in line with support of legal evidences, which can facilitate the discovery of the rules governing the production of translated texts for children during this period.

The Censorship Legislation

There was no censorship legislation specifically regulating publications for children until 1955, when Reglamento sobre publicaciones infantiles y juveniles (See Appendix 2) was introduced by the Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones Infantiles, a censorship department dependent on Dirección General de Prensa y Propaganda, under Ministerio de Informaciones y Turismo. Prior to the introduction of this legislation, censorship practices were all conducted in accordance to the 1938 Press Law (See Appendix I), through which a compulsory prior censorship, consulta previa, was applied to all publications to be circulated in Spain. In terms of publication content, the 1938 Press Law reiterated the prohibition of publications related to pornography, socialism and communism, as was established previously in Orden de 23 de diciembre de 1936, a war-time censorship law introduced in the Nationalist zone. However, the 1938 Press Law did not specify any particular requirements for publications that were aimed at young readers. In regard to translations of foreign works, the 1938

---


Press law attributed the lowest priority to publications of this type, due to both an economic reason, a severe domestic shortage of paper supply that Spain faced during the immediate post-War years, and an ideological reason, a concern for the ‘índole doctrinal’ of the imported texts (Article 2). Considering the socio-political instabilities in which Spain was submerged at that particular time, translations of foreign works disseminating alien ideas were likely to be viewed as potential sources of threat to the newly born Francoist regime.

The introduction of the 1955 *Reglamento* can be first understood as a response to the social transformations that Franco’s Spain started to experience during the 1950s. With the end of ostracism, Spain started to establish more connections with other European countries. The ensuing amelioration of the economic situation necessarily induced increasing domestic demands for consumer goods, hence more production of books for children and the need to regulate publications of this type. At the same time, the establishment of a specific censorship law on publications for children also reflected the regime’s position on children and children’s literature. As early as 1936, *Orden de 23 de diciembre de 1936* clearly stated that:

La inteligencia dócil de la juventud y la ignorancia de las masas fueron el medio propicio donde se desarrolló el cultivo de las ideas revolucionarias y la triste experiencia de este momento histórico (Dávila 1936: 471).

From this statement, it can be seen that the regime saw children and the masses as both intellectually vulnerable, hence more prone to be influenced or manipulated by potentially ‘bad ideas’. In this sense, the 1955 *Reglamento*

---

8 Due to the time expansion of Franco’s dictatorship, scholars tend to divide Franco’s Spain into different stages. In general, despite the different criteria used and the drawing of different time division lines, scholars seem to agree on an earlier stage of Franco’s dictatorship that is underdeveloped, more repressive and centralist, and a later stage of the regime, which is more open and economically developed and, thus, allows for social and cultural transformations. See, for example, Payne 1987, pp.231-265 then pp.463-393, Graham and Labanyi 1995, p. 257, Boyd 1997, pp.232-234 then pp. 283-284, Callahan 2000, pp.343, 381, 412, 500, and Ross 2004, pp.99-102 then pp.117-119.

9 Due to its close connections with Germany and Italy during World War II, Spain suffered from an isolation by the international world during the immediate post-War years, hence a period of ostracism.
reiterated the regime’s desire to discipline, protect and orientate children through regulations of children’s literature.

Based on the Reglamento, it was required that all types of publications for children, except for textbooks, be submitted to the censorship department for a consulta previa, before approval for publication could be granted. Upon submission of the material to be considered, publishers were required to specify details such as name and address of the publishing company, name and address of the general manager of the publishing company, name and address of the person in charge of the publication of the submitted material, and a publication plan of the submitted material, detailing the title of the material, gender and age group of the target readership, physical appearance of the material, material content and financial sources in support of the publication (Article 6). Based on the gender of the target readers, the Reglamento classified books for young readers into five categories that were: books for boys, books for girls, books for boys and girls, books for adolescent boys and books for adolescent girls (Article 4). In terms of content, the Reglamento specified a long list of items considered as taboos, to be avoided in publications for children (Article 14-19). In short, attacks on Catholic religion, its principles and representatives, attacks on Catholic-based moral codes, attacks on authority, and issues that contravened the principles of national unity and patriotism were all considered inappropriate topics that would not be allowed in books for children. Good quality children’s literature, instead, were expected to ‘acentuar el debido respeto a los principios religiosos, morales y políticos que fundamentan el Estado español’ (Salgado 1955: 4509). Translations of imported children’s literature were also checked against the same set of criteria as the domestic works (Article 21). Failure to comply with the requirements of the Reglamento would result in rejection of the material submitted for publication.

The 1955 Reglamento was, later, replaced by the 1967 Estatuto de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles, also known as Decreto 195/1967 (See Appendix III). The introduction of this statute was made in compliance with the

---

10 Examination and revision of textbooks was placed under the control of Ministerio de Educación Nacional.
1966 new Press Law, elaborated by Manuel Fraga Iribarne, then Minister of the Ministerio de Informaciones y Turismo. The elaboration of the new Press Law can be understood as another internal adjustment of the regime, in response to the further social changes that Spain experienced during the 1960s: rapid economic growth, flourishing consumerism and, at the same time, growing tensions within the regime (Amodia 1983: 2, Payne 1987: 622, Graham and Labanyi 1995: 257, Boyd 1997: 283-284, Ross 2004: 117-119). The 1966 Press Law, replacing the 1938 Press Law, abolished the previous compulsory consulta previa, hence a gesture of the regime towards more tolerance of freedom of expression. Nonetheless, such tolerance did not extend to publications for children, as, according to the 1967 Estatuto, compulsory prior censorship would still apply to children’s literature. Two identical copies of a publication for children still needed to be deposited at the Ministry for censorship reading, before approval could be granted to the publisher (Article 27). The censorship reading process of each work could take up to thirty working days from the date of deposit (Article 30). Also, the Estatuto classified three categories of literature for young readers. This time, the classification was based on the age groups of the target readership: works for readers under fourteen years of age were considered as children’s literature; works for readers above fourteen but under eighteen were considered as juvenile literature; works for readers under eighteen years of age were considered as literature for child and juvenile readers (literatura infantil y juvenil) (Article 5). In terms of content, the Estatuto specified almost the same list of taboo topics as the previous 1955 Reglamento, with adjustments made only to topics related to religion. Specifically, while the Reglamento condemned only attacks on Catholic religion, the Estatuto condemned attacks on any religion (Item C under Article 9). Once again, the new Estatuto stressed the importance for children’s literature to ‘acentuar el respeto a los valores religiosos, morales, políticos y sociales que inspiran la vida española’ (Article 8). Translations of imported children’s literature, according to the Estatuto, were to be evaluated against the same set of criteria as domestic works, same establishment as that in the previous Reglamento. For the current study of censorship on translations of children’s literature during Franco’s Spain, the 1955 Reglamento and the 1967
Estatuto will be used as the main legal sources from which references will be drawn.

The Censors

The censors were those who were employed by the regime and placed in charge of the censorship reading activities, under the guidance of the corresponding censorship legislation created by the regime. Labanyi observes that ‘the practical work of censorship was mostly farmed out to freelancers’ (1995: 209). However, it should be pointed out that ‘freelancers’ does not mean that this job position would be given to anyone who wished to work as a censor. In order to be qualified for the position, candidates were required to sit an exam, in which they would be tested against their knowledge over four broad topics, namely, administrative law (Derecho Administrativo), political law (Derecho Político), doctrines of the Movement (Doctrina del Movimiento)\(^\text{11}\) and legislation related to the sector of press and propaganda (Legislación de Prensa y Propaganda) (Tovar 1941: 2431). In spite of the creation of this examination program, the selection process was not conducted without bias. ‘Ex-combatientes o mutilados o ex-cautivos, o personas económicamente dependientes de las víctimas de la guerra’ were largely given preferences over those without such backgrounds, to the extent that the former could be exempt from the above-mentioned examination and attend related training courses instead (Lorente 1941: 2098-2099). Furthermore, candidates with no sound track record of fighting for the Nationalist front would be given no more than twenty percent of the total available positions (Lorente 1941: 2099). At the same time, it is also worth noticing that, in the regime’s selection for its censors, no specification was ever made in regard to the education background of the candidates, possibly due to the regime's unwillingness to recognize accreditations issued by the former Republican government. It can thus be seen that, for the regime, in its selection of censors, a candidate’s absolute loyalty to the regime and readiness to defend its principles obviously had more weight over his or her professional qualification.

\(^{11}\) The Movement refers to the sole legal party under Franco’s regime: Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista.
In terms of the selection of censors of children’s literature, the regime was even more skeptical. Besides a readiness to defend the regime’s principles and ideologies:

El nombramiento de encargados de la consulta previa de las publicaciones infantiles recaerá en persona de reconocida capacitación, en orden a la psicología, la educación y la literatura para niños y adolescentes (Salgado 1955: 843, Article 34).

The high threshold that the regime established for the selection of censors of publications for children also reflects the particular attention that the regime gave to children. Once selected, the censor’s main task would be to review works submitted by publishers and determine which of the submitted works were suitable for publication. In general, there were three possible outcomes for each censorship reading: approval for publication, provided that the submitted work fully met the requirements of the corresponding censorship legislation; conditional approval, if the work did not fully meet the given requirements and certain modifications needed to be made before a final approval could be granted; and rejection, that is, the work submitted was not considered suitable for publication as children’s literature. It should be noted that, although censorship legislation was created to be the principles to guide the censors in making their decisions, in practice, the censors were often given the freedom to make their own interpretations of such principles, hence an unavoidable arbitrariness underlying the censorship practices, as will be seen later in the thesis.

Besides the listed taboo topics and the strict selection of censors of children’s literature, the regime also recruited book inspectors, who were to visit bookshops and public libraries, every now and then, inspecting children’s books and denouncing any misdeed found in the process (Salgado 1955: 844, Article 37). At the same time, apart from the book inspectors:

Toda persona mayor de edad y cabeza de familia podrá dirigirse a la Dirección General de Prensa o a la de Información según sea...
la competente por la materia, denunciando las infracciones que observe en las publicaciones infantiles o que su contenido no se ajuste a los principios generales que informan esta Orden (Salgado 1955: 844, Article 44).

In this way, publications for young readers were placed under constant monitoring even after they were published. Once an infringement was detected, the publisher would either be given a fine, or their business would be suspended or their license cancelled, depending on the degree of severity of the offence (Salgado 1955: 51-57, Article 51-57; Iribarne 1966: 3315, Article 69).

With the censorship legislation established as principles; censors installed as arbiters for the ‘correctness’ of works for young readers and inspectors instated as monitors; and punishment methods created for those breaching the principles, censorship of literature for child and juvenile readers was enshrined within the regime’s legal system. In this way, literature for young readers was placed under the tight control of Franco’s regime. As mentioned previously, translations of imported children’s literature produced during Franco’s dictatorship were evaluated and censored according to the same set of criteria as domestic children’s literature. During this process, ideologies inscribed in the foreign works would inevitably confront the ideologies supported by the domestic system. As a result, an examination of translated texts will reveal more clearly the norms and constraints for writing for children in Franco’s Spain, along with the regime’s assumptions and positions on children and childhood.

1.1.4 Why Adventures of Huckleberry Finn?

The reasons that this thesis chooses to focus on translations of Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (Twain and Moser 1985) are threefold. First, for the purpose of investigating the censorial constraints imposed on translations of children’s literature produced during Franco’s Spain, a qualitative research method, focusing on different translations of a single work, produced across different stages of the regime, proved to be more efficient than a quantitative research, studying translations of multiple works. Due to the longevity of the regime and
the vast number of works translated from different languages into Spanish during this period, a comprehensive quantitative research will inevitably involve an exhaustive data collection process, as well as collaborations of scholars from different disciplines including foreign-language studies, translation studies, children’s literature studies and history studies. Without close multi-disciplinary collaborations, the outcomes of a quantitative research are likely to be incomplete and partial. For instance, in her research on censorship of children’s literature, translated from English, during Franco’s Spain, Marisa Fernández-López chose to focus largely on works translated during the first fifteen years of the dictatorship, because, ‘el control, se suponía, había sido férreo’ (2008: 21). In the meantime, Fernández-López’s investigation placed less emphasis on works produced at the latter stage of the regime, and her reason is outlined below:

El cambio introducido por la ley Fraga, aunque en la práctica como tal ley no afectó a la LIJ, coincidió con el incremento en la edición de LIJ en España y supuso un menor celo censor (21).

Here, an obvious problem arose: Fernández-López misinterpreted the increasing production of works for children in the 1960s, after the new Press Law, as the necessary consequence of a loosened censorship grip on children’s literature, without taking into consideration the socio-economic circumstances of the Spain of the 1960s and 70s. In other words, Fernández-López failed to see that the increasing production of literary works for children might be more related to the economic boom of that period, rather than a reduced censors’ vigilance on children’s literature. In this respect, Fernández-López’s study, while offering valuable insights into the situation, nevertheless, failed to provide a comprehensive view of the censorship of translated children’s literature produced under Franco’s regime, due to a flaw in methodology. In contrast, this thesis chooses to focus specifically on translations of Huckleberry Finn and the related censorial treatment on the translated texts produced at different stages of the regime, without forming any presumptive elaboration about the context of the production. In this way, through a comparative study of the different translations of the same text, a more objective and comprehensive
understanding may be achieved regarding the contextual constraints imposed on the translations at different stages of Franco’s regime.

The second reason for the selection of *Huckleberry Finn* is the novel’s controversial themes, which, as observed in the translations, posed certain confrontations with the regime’s assumptions about ‘good’ children’s literature, and suffered from censorship. The novel recounts, in first person, the story of a boy called Huckleberry Finn, who, in his effort to avoid being ‘sivilized’ by Widow Douglas and being abused by his own alcoholic father, decides to escape. During the escape, Huck comes across a runaway black slave, Jim, whom he soon identifies as a friend and decides to rescue. In the end, having traveled together along the Mississippi and gone through a series of exciting adventures, Huck manages to free Jim from slavery and the story reaches its happy ending. In the US, ever since its publication, the novel has attracted constant criticisms that largely focus on ‘Clemen’s’s use of irony and satire, his attacks on conventional religiosity, and his romanticizing of escape from “sivilization”’ (Murray 1998: 130), and much more recently, Twain’s ambiguous stance over racism in the novel. From a target-text-oriented perspective, although the reception of *Huckleberry Finn* in the source system has little interest with its reception in the target system, Mark Twain’s contemptuous attitudes towards authority and conventional social norms, as expressed through the voice of his boy hero, Huckleberry Finn, in the narrative also clash with the Francoist regime’s fundamental ideologies, its position on children, and its assumptions on ‘good’ children’s literature. Such confrontations were clearly manifested in the censorial documents produced on the translations of this novel. In general, it was observed that the major censorship activities conducted on *Huckleberry Finn* involved Twain’s use of religious satire and the protagonist’s subversive behaviors, which tended to be interpreted as infringements to the moral codes encouraged by the regime. In this regard, an examination of the censorship constraints imposed on the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* can provide an

\[12\] Mark Twain’s real name: Samuel Langhorne Clemens.

insightful understanding of how translations of children’s literature, in general, were mediated through the censorship mechanism during Franco’s Spain.

The third reason for the selection of *Huckleberry Finn* is its ambiguous status as children’s literature, which is closely related to the previous reason. In comparison with *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, the first story of the series, Mark Twain’s abundant use of satire and incorporation of controversial themes in *Huckleberry Finn* largely render the status of the story questionable: whether it is a story written for children, or rather, for adults. Pinsent, for example, argues that:

The author’s employment of irony presents problems to the younger reader, and, I suspect, is misunderstood even by older readers unfamiliar with the novel form. One of the irritants to many people is Twain’s use of the word “nigger”, though it is difficult to see how avoidance of it could have been allied with authenticity (1997: 48).

Subsequently, she contends that the novel ‘does not seem [...] to be very appropriate for readers below sixteen’ (1997: 48). Here, it can be seen that Pinsent’s objection to *Huckleberry Finn* as children’s literature is based on her assumption that children may not be able to understand the satire embedded in the story, especially the ironical elements, created based on the history of American Civil War (1861-1865), slavery and Emancipation. However, as Nodelman and Reimer correctly point out, ‘common assumptions and general theories of childhood [...] are generalizations, and generalizations rarely apply in all cases’ (2003: 90). If Pinsent’s major argument for setting the age sixteen is that readers, by this age, will have accumulated sufficient knowledge on American history, and therefore, can finally start to appreciate Twain’s irony in *Huckleberry Finn*, then she certainly fails to consider readers of the translations of the novel, namely, readers who, even by the age of sixteen, are still alien to the American culture and history. In this regard, instead of a ‘wholesale’ understanding, it is perhaps more reasonable to speak of *levels of understanding*, in defining the status of *Huckleberry Finn*. Using Shavit’s definition, *Huckleberry
"Finn can be termed as an ‘ambivalent text’ (1986: 65). According to Shavit, ambivalent texts are:

Texts read by adults that at the same time are considered classics in children’s literature— that is, texts which formally belong to one system (the children’s) and still are read by the reading public of another system (the adult), yet their system attribution is based on the criterion of audience age (children versus adults) (65).

As a distinguishing feature of such ambivalent texts, there is a ‘co-existence of at least two different models in the same text’ (1980: 77-78). As Shavit further explains:

While one of the models is conventional, more established and thus addresses the child-reader, the other, addressing the adult reader, is less established, more sophisticated, and sometimes based on the deformation of the more established model (1980: 78).

Based on Shavit’s explanation, it thus becomes clear that Pinsent’s concern of children not being able to understand Huckleberry Finn is largely a result of mismatch between child readers and the sophisticated model addressing adult readers embedded in the text. At the same time, Pinsent ignores the fact that children, though unlikely to fully understand Huckleberry Finn at its satirical level, can still enjoy the novel as an adventure story at its conventional level. Such confusion, as will soon be demonstrated, was also present among the Spanish censors. As a result of this confusion, different censorship activities were undertaken, depending on censors’ interpretation of Huckleberry Finn as a novel written for children or for adults. In this sense, it can be said that the very ambiguous status of Huckleberry Finn proved to be a methodological advantage in revealing the regime’s different positions on texts produced for children and those produced for adults through comparison of the different versions of its translations.
1.2 What is This Thesis NOT about?

First, it is not the intention of the thesis to examine the linguistic or stylistic ‘equivalence’ between the translated texts and the source text, as such a notion of ‘equivalence’ will inevitably lead to a source-text-oriented focus. Instead, it is the target system and the way that the target system shaped the translations that the current study examines. Therefore, in the following chapters, where comparisons between the source text and the target texts are established, the corresponding censors’ comments will also be provided alongside, in support of the textual analysis. Hence, the focus of the comparison is not on an evaluation of how close the target texts matched the source text, but rather, on a description of what was deleted or modified in the target texts, due to the censorship constraints in the target system.

Secondly, it is not the aim of the thesis to enter any debate in regard to the controversial aspects of the source text in the source system, especially in terms of the racial theme of Adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Mark Twain’s position on racism in Huckleberry Finn has induced some on-going academic debates, and is the major reason that has caused censorship of the work in the US since the civil rights movement.\(^{14}\) While some see Huckleberry Finn as a work tinged with racist ideology (Lester 1995: 340-347, Peaches 1995: 359-382, Briden 1995: 383-406, Brenner 1995: 451-468), others find the novel to possess great anti-slavery and anti-racist merits (Kaplan 1995: 348-358, Fishkin 1995: 407-450, Phelan 1995: 469-479). However, whether or not this text is racist is not the concern of this study. Rather, the thesis examines how the racial theme of Huckleberry Finn, so controversial in the source system, was treated in the translations in the target system. The ultimate aim is to demonstrate that whether or not a particular theme of a text is controversial is dependent on the context into which the text is introduced, hence the necessity to analyze translations of children’s literature based on a target-text-oriented approach.

Lastly, it is beyond the scope of the thesis to explore the self-censorship activities inflicted on the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* during Franco’s Spain. Both Fernández-López and Cisquella *et al.* identified a level of self-censorship conducted on children’s literature, which existed parallel to the official state censorship under Franco’s regime (Fernández-López 2008: 20, Cisquella *et al.* 2002: 168). The self-censorship activities consisted in the conscious efforts that book authors, translators and publishers took in enhancing the chance for their works to being approved by the official censors for publication through ‘la eliminación o modificación de los elementos causantes del problema’ (Fernández-López 2008: 20). In the current study, although traces of self-censorship activities were also discerned in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, it was, however, difficult to establish contact with the translators or publishers of the various versions of the novel, hence it was impossible to gain an insight of the translators or the publishers’ self-censorship decisions. Therefore, it is beyond the research scope of this thesis to provide an in-depth account of the self-censorship activities inflicted on the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*. This study will focus, instead, on influences of the official state censorship activities on the production of the translated texts, with the support of the relevant censorship legislation, as well as the censorial documents generated during the process of *consulta previa*.

### 1.3 Theoretical Framework

One of the objectives of the thesis, as stated earlier (See page 7-8), is to demonstrate that translations of children’s literature need to be approached with a target-text-oriented focus. In order to achieve this aim, Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory is found to be of particular relevance, together with theories inspired by the notion of polysystem, such as those proposed by scholars such as Zohar Shavit, Gideon Toury, André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. These theories together will form the basic theoretical framework of this study.

Even-Zohar contends that sign-governed human patterns of communication, namely, semiotic phenomena, such as culture, language, literature and society, ‘could more adequately be understood and studied if
regarded as systems rather than conglomerates of disparate elements’, since the notion of system ‘would make it possible not only to account adequately for “known” phenomena, but also to discover altogether “unknown” ones’ (1990a: 9-10). At the same time, Even-Zohar refutes the idea of understanding a ’system’ as a static entity, as such an understanding inevitably eliminates the possibility of accounting for changes and variations of the function, and the rules governing the function of the elements involved in the system (10). Instead, he proposes an understanding of a ‘system’ as a dynamic notion, a polysystem, that is:

A multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent (11).

In addition to interdependency, the systems enclosed within a polysystem also exist in a hierarchical order: there are always systems occupying the center of the polysystem, and systems occupying the peripheries. The dynamism of a polysystem consists, precisely, in the constant struggles between the peripheral systems and the central, dominant systems (14). Due to its dynamic characteristic and complex structuredness, a great advantage that the polysystem theory provides to studies of children’s literature and studies of translation is that ‘the polysystem hypothesis involves a rejection of value judgements as criteria for an a priori selection of the objects of study’ (13). In other words, within a polysystem theoretical framework, translations are not considered as less authentic than the source texts, nor children’s literature necessarily inferior to literature for adults. The polysystem theory, therefore, offers a solution to the currently marginalized status of studies of children’s literature and its translations.

In terms of the specific position of translated literature within the literary polysystem, Even-Zohar conceives of translated literature ‘not only as an integral system within any literary system, but as a most active system within it’ (1990b: 46). The activeness of translated literature implies its instability, and, according to Even-Zohar, such instability is mostly related to a paradox within
the system of translated literature: while translation may introduce new ideas, items, and characteristics into a literature, under certain circumstances, it can also be turned into a conservative force to preserve traditional taste (48-49). Even-Zohar’s observation proved to be highly relevant for the current study of translations of children’s literature under Franco’s regime. While translations of imported children’s literature were supposed to insert new elements into the Spanish literary polysystem, nevertheless, with the regime’s imposition of the censorship mechanism, the new elements were often filtered out, due to their incompatibility with the official orthodox views on texts for children. For example, translations of Huckleberry Finn were supposed to introduce new ideas on religion and conventional social norms, however, as a result of the official censorship, translations of the religious and moral themes of the novel tended to suffer from significant modifications or deletions. Consequently, under Franco’s Spain, translations of imported literature for children had to largely comply with the domestic standards, and were thus deprived of their innovatory potential, and eventually turned into preservations of the domestic ideologies. In the meantime, due to the dynamic characteristic inherent in the polysystem, hence the constant struggle between the peripheries and the center dominance, translations of children’s literature during Franco’s Spain, though suppressed by the regime’s censorship mechanism and temporarily assigned to a peripheral, conservative position, were, nevertheless, also in a course of challenging the dominant discourse imposed by the regime. This was confirmed by the various methods that publishers of translations of Huckleberry Finn employed to ‘trick’ the censors in order to secure the publications of the works, as will be further explored in the following chapter (See page 53-63).

Inspired by Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, Zohar Shavit proposes that ‘the behaviour of translations of children’s literature is determined by the position of children’s literature in the literary polysystem’ (1981: 171). In broad terms, Shavit observes a tendency for translated children’s literature to attach to existing textual models in the target literature, a tendency for deletions to occur in translations of children’s literature, a low level of textual complexity and a tendency for translations of children’s literature to become ‘a didactic
instrument for an unequivocal system of values, or for a certain ideology' (172-179). Such characteristics, according to Shavit, are closely related to two principles on which translation for children is usually based: first, texts should be adjusted in order to make them appropriate and useful to the child, in accordance with what society thinks is 'good for the child', and secondly, plot, characterization and language should be adjusted to the child's level of comprehension and his or her reading abilities (171-172). In other words, translators of children's literature are encouraged to modify or even to manipulate the translated texts so that the ultimate translations conform to the target system constraints on children's literature, hence seeing translations of children's literature as primarily products of the target literary polysystem.

A typical target-text-oriented approach on translation is Gideon Toury's theory of descriptive translation study, also inspired by Even-Zohar's polysystem theory. Toury's theory is derived from his criticism towards the source-text-oriented approach on translation studies. For Toury, the source-text-oriented translation theories:

Concern themselves mainly with potential translation, or even with translatability, rather than with actual translation, hence with the act of translating which actually proceeds from ST, rather than with translations as actual textual-linguistic products (instances of performance), which belong first and foremost to the system of texts written in TL (in spite of the undeniable relationships obtaining between them and SL text) (1981: 9-10, italics in original).

Furthermore, Toury contends that the notion of equivalence, from a target-text-oriented point of view:

[I]s not a postulated requirement, but rather an empirical fact [...] Thus, the actual relationships between target text and source text may or may not reflect the postulated (near) interchangeability; on the other hand, they always stand for a factual replacement of source text by target text (13).
Hence, when applying Toury's theory, translations are considered as of equal status as the source texts, not necessarily less 'authentic' or even inferior to the original. In *A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies*, Toury proposes that 'any research into translation [...] should start from the hypothesis that *translations are facts of one system only*: the target system' (1985: 19). Based on this, Toury attempts to establish a target-system-oriented research corpus. Within this corpus, researchers of translation studies will first examine the acceptability of the target text in the target system, disregarding the source text at this initial stage. Then, the target text will be mapped with the corresponding source text in the source system, in the process of which the translator's decisions in the target text are identified as solutions to potential translation problems induced by the source text. After the target text has been mapped, researchers will pair the textual elements of the target text with the corresponding textual elements of the source text and describe the relationships between them. Finally, the observed relationships are to be related to the overall concept of the translation under study (21-22).

Nevertheless, the corpus of descriptive translation studies that Toury attempts to establish is not without limitation. Toury specifies that within the corpus of descriptive translation studies, ‘translational problems are always reconstructed rather than given’, and that ‘they are constructed through target-source comparison rather than on the basis of the source text alone’ (1985: 28). Based on this, Toury correctly points out the often misleading research method to regard, as translation problems, only those source phenomena that appear ‘problematic [...] from the intrinsic point of view of the source text’, as such a practice ‘is likely to induce one to rest content with a simple enumeration of the “sins” committed against the original text’ (26). Nonetheless, what seems problematic is Toury's next assertion that:

> Since the subject matter of descriptive translation studies consists, by definition, of actual instances of performance which belong in defined sets of socio-cultural circumstances, it is valid to examine only those facts of the source text which can be
shown actually to have posed translation problems in those particular circumstances’ (25).

Here, the problem with Toury’s assumption is that he takes the target system constraints, the ‘defined sets of socio-cultural circumstances’, as granted conditions for the creation of the target text, without realizing that the target system constraints themselves may also be potential subjects to study at the same time. Furthermore, the focus on only the facts of the source text that have caused translation problems in the target text, as he proposes, can, sometimes, even hinder one from gaining an insight on the target system in which the target text is shaped. For instance, hardly any of the examined Spanish translations of Huckleberry Finn produced during Franco’s Spain demonstrated that the racial theme of the source text presented a translation problem. Neither did any examined censorship legislation or censors’ record confirm that racism should be an issue in translations of children’s literature. Following Toury’s suggestion, one may be tempted to conclude that the racial theme in Huckleberry Finn does not need to be examined and that racism was impertinent to the target system. However, it is only after an indepth examination of the target system itself, namely, Franco’s Spain, that one can realize that, far from being irrelevant, racism was actually institutionalized within that very system. Hence, the importance not to take the target system as granted ‘facts’, but rather, as a subject for critical study as well.

The shortcoming with Toury’s studies can be largely resolved by Lefevere’s theory on patronage. Lefevere and Bassnett define translation as ‘a rewriting of an original text’ (1992: vii). All rewritings, as they contend, ‘reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and, as such, manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way’ (vii). Such a characteristic of rewritings is mostly related to the necessary connections between the literary system and other subsystems, ‘which, together, make up a society, a culture’ (Lefevere 1992: 15). Lefevere identifies ‘a double control factor’ that ensures connections between the literary system and other subsystems of which a society is comprised. According to Lefevere, the first control factor ‘belongs squarely within the literary system’ and consists of so-called ‘professionals’, such as critics,
reviewers, teachers, writers and translators, who act in accordance to the parameters set out by the second control factor, ‘the patronage’, which acts outside the literary system, and ‘is understood to mean something like the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literature’ (1992: 14-15). The importance of patronage, as Lefevere highlights, is that:

Acceptance of patronage implies that writers and rewriters work within the parameters set by their patrons and that they should be willing and able to legitimize both the status and the power of those patrons as attested most forcibly (18).

The patrons can be either single persons in power, or groups of persons, such as religious bodies or political parties, and the patrons ‘operate by means of institutions set up to regulate, if not the writing of literature, at least its distribution’, via three elements of the patronage (15-16). The first element is an ideological component, which restricts both the selection and the development of the subject matter of each literary work (16). In the case of Franco’s Spain, both the 1955 Reglamento and the 1967 Estatuto clearly established that publications for child and juvenile readers should pay their due respect to the political, religious and traditional aspects of the Spanish nation, hence an ideological framework within which literary works for children were regulated. The second element is an economic component, as ‘the patron sees to it that writers and rewriters are able to make a living, by giving them a pension or appointing them to some office’ (16). Conversely, as the censorship legislation of Franco’s Spain made clear, those who breached the regulations set up by the Francoist regime were also to suffer from economic losses (Salgado 1955: 844, Article 50-57; Iribarne 1967: 1966, Article 38-45). Lastly, the third element of the patronage is status, in a sense that ‘acceptance of patronage implies integration into a certain support group and its lifestyle’ (16). In Franco’s Spain, this was manifested through the various book prizes established to acknowledge those works written for children that best complied with the regulations set up by the patronage, and to grant them a status of canonicity (Salgado 1955: 844, Article 45-49; Iribarne 1967: 1967, Article 46-48). Subsequently, with the
interplay of the regulatory elements of the patronage, the ‘professionals’ within the literary system will, on the one hand, ‘rewrite works of literature’ until such works are deemed acceptable to the dominant ideologies of a certain time and place, while, on the other hand, ‘repress certain works of literature’ that contravene the dominant ideologies (14). In Franco’s Spain, with its exertion of the censorship mechanism, the functioning of the double-control factor, as identified by Lefevere, was thus rendered even more visible. In this regard, in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the translators’ decisions in their making of the target texts, during the Francoist epoch, the role of the patronage, namely, the target system constraints cannot be underestimated.

1.4 Data Collection

The examination of the Spanish translations of *Huckleberry Finn* conducted in the current study, in general, followed the discovery procedures suggested by Toury (Toury 1985: 19-22). As the first step of the data collection process, distinct versions of the target texts were consulted, as shown in the following table:

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huck Finn- Continuación de las aventuras de Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>F. Elías</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Ediciones Náusica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn: el camarada de Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>Amando Lázaro Ros</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventuras de Tom Sawyer, aventuras de Huckleberry Finn</td>
<td>Elvira Vázquez Gamboa</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Editorial Éxito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huck Finn, el negro y Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>Simón Santainés</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Editorial Mateu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventuras de Huck Finn</td>
<td>María Teresa Monguíó</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Editorial Juventud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this stage, through comparison of the different versions of the translations, it was observed that some of the target texts were more explicitly directed towards younger readers, with insertions of illustrations, comic strips and the use of bigger print letters. Examples were translations by María Teresa Monguíó, Bárbara Viu Raluy, María Sommer and José Félix. In comparison, other versions were more appealing to older readers. Having compared the target texts, the next step was to examine the acceptability of the translations in the target system. Nevertheless, the fact that the target texts were published, distributed and, in some cases, reprinted had, to a large degree, already confirmed the acceptability of the translations within the patronage system of Franco’s Spain. Therefore, the major focus here was not whether or not the target texts were acceptable in the target system, but rather what made the translations acceptable. In order to examine this, censors’ files that were created during the consulta previa of the translations of Huckleberry Finn were also consulted.
The censors’ records, currently located in Alcalá de Henares,\textsuperscript{15} consisted of single files (los expedientes), each assigned with a file number (número de expediente) and each recorded the details of a consulta previa conducted on a specific work submitted by the publisher. In general, each expediente contained:

- An index card, which included information such as the file number, the book title, the book author or translator (in cases of a translated work), the publisher or importer (in cases of an imported work), the date of submission, the censor’s identification number,\textsuperscript{16} and the outcome of the consulta previa;

- An application form, filled out by the publisher, in which the publisher was required to specify details such as the name of the publishing company, its address, the book title, the author’s name or the translator’s name in case of a translation, total page number, paper size, total number of copies to be published, the expected readership of the work and if the work submitted belonged to a certain collection of works; and

- an evaluation form, filled out by the censor. On the first page of the form, details such as the book title, author name, and total page number etcetera, were again listed. The second page included a list of questions regarding the work examined, the answers to which were intended to guide the censor through the evaluation process of the submitted work. The questions listed were: ¿Ataca al Dogma? ¿A la Moral? ¿A la Iglesia y sus Ministros? ¿Al Régimen y a sus instituciones? ¿A las personas que colaboran o han colaborado con el Régimen? If the answer to any of the questions was ‘yes’, the censor was also required to specify the page number where the offense was detected. At the end of the page, the censor was asked to leave any additional comment regarding the examined work. Then, the outcome of the censorial evaluation was listed on the next page of the form. After this, a declaration form, signed and dated by the publisher after obtaining the approval for publication, in which the publisher was to specify the book title and author name of the work and declare that the book to be published, in terms of its contents, would, under no circumstances, deviate from the copies submitted for the consulta previa. In cases of rejection,

\textsuperscript{15} The censors’ records are currently located at Archivo General de Administración del Estado in Alcalá de Henares, not far from Madrid.

\textsuperscript{16} Through the research, it is found that the censors all remain anonymous in the records, and are known only by their assigned identification numbers, e.g. Lector Núm. 22, Lector Núm. 10 etcetera.
this declaration form did not need to be signed. If only a conditional approval was granted to a submission, **textual evidences** were included, hence a copy of the work submitted by the publisher, in which the censor highlighted those parts of the text where she or he had detected a problem. In addition, separate sheet(s) might also be attached, in which the censor would indicate the pages, specify the problems and sometimes, even offer suggestions for modifications.

Among the total thirty-five censors’ files on *Huckleberry Finn* examined at the archive, seven files were related to the importations of this work from overseas, either Argentina or the US.\(^{17}\) Based on the records, all of the seven publishers’ requests for importation of *Huckleberry Finn* were approved by the censors with no delay. It was unknown whether the work imported from overseas were written in the source language, English, or were Spanish translations, since this information was not specified. Nonetheless, it was observed that the publishers’ requests for importation only counted a few hundred copies each. It was thus reasonable to assume that, from the censors’ viewpoint, this small, limited scope of distribution of the imported work, be it translated or not, had dispossessed it of any threatening potential to provoke a mass interest among the domestic readers, hence the relevant unimportance of the importations. Besides the imported versions, three censors’ files were related to abridged versions of *Huckleberry Finn*, with the ultimate work counting only twenty or thirty pages, including comic strips, which could hardly be qualified as translations. Therefore, the current study will neither consider the imported versions nor the abridged versions of *Huckleberry Finn*. Subsequently, as shown in Table 2 below, the censors’ files that could be matched with the target texts\(^{18}\) consulted in the previous stage included:


\(^{18}\) It should be noted that not all censorial files could be traced for the translations consulted; neither could all translations be traced for the censorial files examined.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Número de Expediente</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huck Finn-Continuación de las aventuras de Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>F. Elías</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>7206-43</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Ediciones Náusica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn: el camarada de Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>Amando Lázaro Ros</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2297-1949</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Aguilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>456-61</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3053-67</td>
<td>Initially rejected, then approved</td>
<td>Ramón Sopena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huck Finn, el negro y Tom Sawyer</td>
<td>Simón Santainés</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>6156-52</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mateu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn</td>
<td>María Teresa Monguí</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>501-57</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6326-68</td>
<td>Conditional Approval</td>
<td>Juventud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3791-76</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn</td>
<td>Bárbara Viu Raluy</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3266-59</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Bruguera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>5847-67</td>
<td>Conditional Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6902-70</td>
<td>Conditional Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2115-1972</td>
<td>Conditional Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5238-74</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn</td>
<td>Guillermo López Hipkiss</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2545-72</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huck Finn-clásicos de la juventud</td>
<td>José Félix</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>12559-75</td>
<td>Conditional Approval</td>
<td>Edival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>8832-67</td>
<td>Conditional Approval</td>
<td>Selecciones del Reader’s Digest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among these records, the submission made by Selecciones del Reader’s Digest, file number 8832-67, is worth particular mention. Unlike other submissions, in which the Spanish translations of Huckleberry Finn were assessed during the
*consulta previa*, based on the textual evidences, it appeared that it was the source text that was submitted by the publisher. Accordingly, the censor evaluated the source text and advised that a number of changes be undertaken in the ultimate translation, hence a direct censorial filtering of the source-text contents:

Esta versión sólo podría autorizarse en edición para adultos. Sin embargo, al traducir podrían introducirse las correcciones necesarias para lograr una adaptación autorizable para jóvenes, en función del Estatuto. Para ello sería necesario reconsiderar la versión en castellano.

Unfortunately, the eventual translated text, based on the censor’s advices, could not be located, and it was thus impossible to verify if the censor’s suggestions were duly followed. Nonetheless, the direct censorial reading records on the source text could still serve as evidences of the criteria that were used by the censor to determine whether or not the textual contents were acceptable in the target system. At this point of examining the process in which the translations were made, or decided acceptable within the target system, through comparison of the censors’ records, it was uncovered that censors’ decisions were often contradictory and arbitrary, accompanied by an obvious confusion regarding the readership of *Huckleberry Finn*.

Having examined the acceptability of the target texts in the target system, following Toury, the last step of the study consisted of a mapping of the various translations of *Huckleberry Finn* with the source text, together with an identification of the translation problems and the related causes. Findings obtained through this process will occupy the space of the following chapters of this thesis. Through the comparative study of the target texts and the source text, along with censors’ records, it was found that Mark Twain’s use of religious satire and his mockeries of the religion-based moral standards, as expressed through the rebellious behaviors of his protagonist *Huck Finn* in the story, were the two major issues that induced translation problems, causing censors’ objections. Chapter two will explore the different censorial treatment of Twain’s use of religious satire in the translations, as a consequence of the censors’
confusion regarding the status of the novel and the double standards that were applied by censors in assessing texts for children and those for adults. Chapter three will address the translations of the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn* and the related censorial interventions that the target texts incurred. Here, in order to understand the constraints imposed on the translations by the target system, *Huckleberry Finn* will be contrasted with various textbooks for school children under the regime. In this way, clues will be offered as to the degree that Huck Finn diverted from the ideal child image that was desired and promoted by the regime. Unlike the former two chapters that explore the censored issues in the translations, chapter four, instead, will explore why racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn* failed to induce any censorial intervention in the translations, with the aim of gaining a deeper understanding about the target system itself, in which the translations were produced. Alluding once again to the scholars' consensus, no (translated) text is ever created in a historical vacuum, hence the goal of understanding the norms for writing or translating for children cannot be achieved without an understanding of the system that generates the writings. It is in the light of this very conviction that the current study will set out to unravel the constraints and dynamics within which translations of children's literature were situated during Franco's Spain.
Chapter 2  Translations of Religious Issues in *Huckleberry Finn*

*El alma española es naturalmente católica.*

(Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 8)

**Introduction**

Through comparison of the target texts and the source text, along with the examination of the censors’ files, it was observed that, in the production of the Spanish translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, a major translation problem was caused by the religious theme incorporated in the novel. This is manifested through the censors’ explicit objections to Mark Twain’s use of religious satire in the narrative and the episodes involving religion being subsequently modified or suppressed in the Spanish translations. Therefore, the current chapter will first explore why the religious issues in *Huckleberry Finn* presented a major translation problem in the target system, namely, Franco’s Spain. At the same time, it was also uncovered that the religious issues in the novel seemed to present a more acute translation problem when the target readers concerned children or juvenile readers than when the target readers concerned adults. In general, the more that children or juvenile readers were perceived as the target readers of *Huckleberry Finn*, the more censorship, modifications, and deletions tended to apply to the translations. In fact, it appears that all the censored versions of *Huckleberry Finn* were evaluated as literature for young readers. On the contrary, when adults were perceived as the target readers instead, more tolerance was demonstrated towards the religious theme in the translations, hence some clear double standards applied in the censorship process. Accordingly, this chapter will also provide a detailed account of how such double standards were manifested in the censors’ documents and how the censors’ use of the double standards affected the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*. Lastly, the chapter will attempt to explore the possible reasons for the censors and the translators’ use of double standards in their treatment of the religious theme in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, as well as to illustrate the repercussions, engendered from this use of double standards, on the production of children’s literature in general during Franco’s Spain.
2.1 Mark Twain’s Use of Religious Satire as a Translation Problem

In examining the records of the censored versions of *Huckleberry Finn*, included in Table 2 (See page 38), it was noticed that the censors unanimously expressed their disapproval regarding the religious satire in the translations. Guillermo López Hipkiss’s translation, submitted by *Editorial Molino* in 1972 was denied approval for publication, and the argument presented by the censor, identified as *Lector Núm.22*, reads:

> Traducción íntegra de la obra original, cuya acerba crítica de la sociedad norteamericana de la época acumula en tono de chacota las ideas más destructivas sobre la religión, la moral, la justicia e incluso la muerte (Expediente Núm. 2545-72).

In a similar manner, *Lector Núm. 30*’s objection to José Félix’s translation, submitted by *Edival* in 1975, reads:

> A través de esta novela, M. Twain vierte, no con poco ingeniosidad, sus críticas, a veces de una ironía cruel, no sólo ya contra la mentalidad social de su época, sino contra cuanto por tratarse de creencias religiosas (Expediente Núm. 12559-75).

Eventually, not without reluctance, the censor granted Félix’s translation a conditional approval, instructing that modifications be done accordingly before the work could be published for young readers. While these two censors’ negative comments were directed towards the general presentation of religion in the novel, other censors’ objections tended to be more associated with some particular use of religious satire in the texts, such as ‘chirigota sobre el rey Salomón’, ‘dos tunantes aprovechan una ceremonia religiosa para hacer su agusto’ (Expediente Núm. 6326-68), ‘idea sobre la oración que […] resulta negativa’ (Expediente Núm. 3053-67), ‘ironía sobre la Providencia’, and ‘ataque burlesco a ministros de la religión’ (Expediente Núm. 5847-67).

In accordance with André Lefevere’s patronage theory, the reason that Mark Twain’s use of religious satire in *Huckleberry Finn* presented a problem in the Spanish translations needs to be explored in the target system, namely,
Franco's Spain. Within Franco's regime, the Spanish Catholic Church was found to be the institution, or the 'patron', who exerted a most powerful role on the presentation of religion-related issues in children's literature, hence the translations of the religious theme in *Huckleberry Finn*. The Church's influence was determined, before anything else, by its position in Franco's regime, namely, as a politico-ideological *familia* of the regime.

2.1.1 The Catholic Church as a Politico-Ideological *familia* of Franco's Regime

The close relationship between the Spanish Catholic Church and Franco's dictatorship was largely prompted and shaped by the contemporary socio-historical milieu of the Spanish society. Long before the eruption of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939), under the Second Republic (1931-1936), not only were the financial privileges that the Church enjoyed under Primo de Rivera's dictatorship (1923-1930) significantly reduced, but so were its overall status and influence. The Constitution of the Second Republic of 1931, on the one hand, established that 'El Estado, las regiones, las provincias y los Municipios, no mantendrán económicamente a las iglesias [...] Los bienes de las Ordenes religiosas podrán ser nacionalizados' (Congress of the Second Republic of Spain 1931: 6, Article 26). On the other hand, it also confirmed the secular nature of the Spanish state (Article 27). Later, *Ley de Confesiones y Congregaciones Religiosas* introduced in 1933 imposed some additional restrictions on the Church and its related activities that further damaged its interests: the Church congregations were not allowed to have any political characteristics; the State was entitled to limit the maximum amount of financial income that the Church would obtain through its activities, and also, the Church was to abstain from school education (Congress of the Second Republic of Spain 1933: 1-4, Article 2, 3, 19, 30). Seeing its legal and financial privileges significantly undermined by the Republican legislation and deeply concerned with an imminent cultural change towards secularization, the Church started to identify the Republican government with irreligion and immorality, viewing it with increasing apprehensions and hostility. William Callahan contends that 'if Spain's modern history proved anything, it showed that any attempt to alter Church's privileges provoked resistance' (2000: 274). Then, the Church saw in the military revolt of
July 17, 1936, which triggered a three-year Civil War, a chance to ‘alter the rules of a game long regarded as prejudicial to its interests’, as well as ‘an unexpected opportunity to stack the deck in the Church’s favor by creating the conditions necessary for [...] the re-Christianization of the nation’ (Callahan 2000: 344). Moreover, after the eruption of the Civil War, the violence and crimes committed against the Church in the Republican zone, such as the church burnings and the murderings of nuns and priests, further hardened the Church’s determination to join the Nationalists’ cause (Ruiz 2001: 147-202).

In aligning itself to the side of the Nationalists, Catholicism contributed greatly to the construction of an ideological framework that informed the propaganda and justification of the Nationalist cause during the Civil War, and the eventual legitimization of the regime’s victory in Post-Civil-War Spain. These were largely realized through the many episcopal letters that the Church delivered since the beginning of the war, in support of the Nationalist side. Among these episcopal letters, two are worth particular mention. The first is *Las dos ciudades*, delivered by Enrique Pla y Deniel, then bishop of Salamanca, on 30 September of 1936. This episcopal letter can be understood as the Church’s official declaration to join the Nationalist cause. At the same time, it also provided the kind of legitimization of which the rebels were in desperate need, as, in the letter, for the first time since the beginning of the war, the military revolt against a legitimate, elected government was labelled as a cruzada; the revolt was now blessed and, therefore, justified. The other important episcopal letter is *Carta colectiva del episcopado español al mundo entero con motivo de la guerra de España*, signed jointly by over 30 bishops of the Spanish episcopate and delivered on July 1 of 1937. If *Las dos ciudades* had legitimized the Nationalist cause on a domestic level, then *Carta colectiva* definitely granted legitimization to the Nationalist cause on an international level. In this letter, the Church continued and further developed its discourse of the Spanish Civil War as a holy crusade. This time, the Church identified communism, associated with the popular front, not only as the cause of all the social ills that Spain was suffering at that historical moment, but also as a threat to all civilizations in the Christian world. The Spanish Civil War, thus, became ‘una carretera de velocidad entre el
bolchevismo y la civilización cristiana’, ‘una etapa nueva y tal vez decisiva en la lucha entablada entre la Revolución y el Orden’, and ‘una lucha internacional en un campo de batalla nacional’ (Gomá et al. 1937: 6). Subsequently, the Civil War was justified as a crusade, aimed not only to save the Spanish people, but also to defend the religious order of the whole Christian world against the threat of communism, hence a legitimization of the war on an international level. Besides their propagandistic activities, the Church’s backing of the Nationalist side also included political support, military volunteers and financial assistance that, in the end, it ‘became the most important single domestic pillar of the Nationalist movement’ (Payne 1987:198). The Church-Regime bond was thus formed and the Catholic Church’s position as an ideological familia of Franco’s dictatorship thus ascertained.

2.1.2 The Catholic Church’s Influences on Children’s Literature in Post-Civil-War Spain

In return for the remarkable contribution that the Church made to the ultimate victory of the Nationalists, the Catholic Church placed various demands on the Francoist regime, seeking state support in order to fulfill its mission of religious re-conquest in post-war Spain. The regime responded favorably to most of the Church’s demands. According to Callahan’s observation:

Within the history of modern Spanish Catholicism, there was no period in which the Church more successfully developed the institutional foundations that it believed necessary for its strategy of religious conquest than the Franco era (2000: 440).

In practice, the unquestionable privileged position of Catholic Church was clearly stated in Fuero de los españoles of 17 July 1945. Article 6 established that:

La profesión y práctica de la Religión Católica, que es la del Estado Español, gozará de la protección oficial […] No se permitirán otras ceremonias ni manifestaciones externas que las de la Religión Católica (Franco 1945: 358, Article 6).
Fuero de los españoles of 1945 thus confirmed the non-secular nature of Franco’s regime and guaranteed the unchallengeable status of the Spanish Catholic Church, to the extent that no other religions in Spain were permitted to hold any religious ceremonies or congregations in public.

In order to achieve its goal of religious re-conquest or ‘re-Catholicization’ of the nation in Post-Civil-War Spain, the Church saw an absolute church control in education as the key. Books for children, due to the usual pedagogic role attributed to writings of this genre, were thus placed under a particular vigilance of the Church during Franco’s Spain. The Church’s position on books for children was largely shaped by both its assumptions on books and its assumptions about children. On the one hand, the Church believed in the power of written words, in the notion that books can influence. In Rutas de orientación juvenil, Father Pablo Juvilla Camarasa stressed the importance of books by stating that:

El libro abre, ante el joven, horizontes desconocidos, le transporta, en alas del pensamiento, a un mundo superior, le inicia en los secretos de la ciencia y le brinda una copa rebosante de placer intelectual (1958: 153).

The importance of reading acknowledged, there, however, remained the necessity to distinguish the ‘good’ books from the ‘bad’ books. According to Father Camarasa, the bad books were those written ‘con el perverso fin de atacar las enseñanzas del evangelio, y los dogmas y verdades de nuestra sacrosanta Religión’ (155), and conversely, an example of the good books was the Santo evangelio. The Church’s views on children, on the other hand, largely consisted in its association of children with the concept of human original sin: ‘El corazón juvenil [está] naturalmente inclinado a la maldad’ (Camarasa 1958: 158). Based on its views on books and children, the Church first perceived the necessity for children to be kept away from the ‘bad’ books, as ‘un libro malo, va destilando un tóxico que se infiltra en el alma y emponzoña y corrompe el entendimiento’ (Camarasa 1958: 155). Among the bad books, Father Camarasa considered fiction, in particular, as a dangerous text type. Quoting the French theologian
Pierre Nicole, he affirmed that reading novels might produce thoughts that would eventually be ‘fuentes de nuestra perdición’ (156). At the same time, of equal importance for the Church was the necessity for children to access the ‘good’ books, such as the Santo evangelio, so that a Catholic religious spirit could be instilled among the young readers, and, in so doing, achieve redemption for children from their original sin. The Church, therefore, was to play an essential role in effectively regulating books for children, ensuring children’s access to the ‘good’ books, those in line with the Catholic doctrines, and the access to the ‘good’ books only.

The regime’s support addressing the particular concern of the Church to regulate publications for young readers was demonstrated in the series of censorship laws that it introduced across its different stages. El programa para el examen previo de aptitud de los funcionarios interinos de Prensa y Propaganda of 1941 established that, in order to be qualified as an official censor, one was required to possess a sound knowledge of the ‘fundamento y principios religiosos de las legislaciones españolas vigentes’ (Tovar 1941: 2431). Orden de 21 de enero de 1952 established the creation of La Junta Asesora de la Prensa Infantil, a specific censorship department responsible for publications for children, considering that ‘el caso de la prensa destinada a los niños [...] ha de ser motivo de un cuidado especial’ (Salgado 1952: 475). Later, by Decreto de 22 de junio de 1955, a representative from Comisión Episcopal de Ortodoxia y Moralidad was to be installed as a board member of the newly founded Junta Asesora de la Prensa Infantil, with the aim to ensure ‘la recta orientación religiosa, moral’ in publications for young readers (Salgado 1955: 4510, Article 8). Reglamento de las publicaciones infantiles y juveniles of the same year specified, in detail, the regulations in terms of religious issues in publications for child and juvenile readers. According to Article 14 of the Reglamento, censorship would apply to the following religion-related topics:

a) Errores más o menos velados, sobre las verdades de la fe y sobre los relatos de la Sagrada Escritura; b) Ataques a la Iglesia Católica, a sus Sacramentos, al Culto o a los Ministros, así como ridiculizarlos en cualquier forma; c) Éxitos que aparezcan como
consecuencia de invocaciones al diablo, descripción o elogio de sesiones espiritistas a no ser para descubrir la superchería; d) Narraciones o historietas que contengan ejemplos destacados de laicismo, descripciones tendenciosas de ceremonias o costumbres correspondientes a cultos de otras religiones o confesiones que puedan inducir a error o a escándalo (Salgado 1955: 842, Article 14).

The 1955 Reglamento continued to be in force until it was replaced by Estatuto de Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles of 1967. In comparison with the previous Reglamento, updates can be observed in the latter concerning regulations of religious contents in books for child and juvenile readers. Unlike the Reglamento, which condemned only those topics contravening the interests of Catholicism, the 1967 Estatuto, however, condemned all topics that might damage the interests of any religion. Subsequently, according to the Estatuto, censorship would apply to:

Exposición, admisión o estímulo del ateísmo o tratamiento o presentación de temas que puedan suponer o sugerir error, equivoco o menoscicio acerca de cualquier religión o confesión religiosa, su culto, sus ministros o sus fieles (Iribarne 1967: 1965, Article 9).

The regime's support of the interests of the Catholic Church in publications produced for young readers were thus overtly manifested in its censorship legislation. Through the imposition of these censorship laws, the Church's influential role in children's literature produced under Franco, was, therefore, strongly confirmed and reinforced.

As mentioned previously (See page 17-18), translations of imported works for children, according to the regime's censorship legislation, were to be measured against the same set of criteria as the domestic works. Subsequently, translations of religion-related topics incorporated in imported works were also to be evaluated in accordance to the domestic standards, ensuring a due respect for the Church's interests in the translations as works for child and juvenile
readers, in particular, were required to ‘acentuar el debido respeto a los principios religiosos, morales y políticos que fundamentan el Estado Español’ (Salgado 1955: 4509, Article 1). At the same time, compared to the domestic works, translations of imported texts tended to be associated with a notion of ‘otherness’ or ‘alienness’ that often caused the regime to manifest a more suspicious stance towards such texts. Based on the establishment of the 1938 Press Law, during the immediate post-war years, publications of foreign materials in Spain were generally subject to high restrictions, due to both an economic reason, namely, a general shortage of paper supply in Spain at that time, and an ideological reason, namely that foreign materials might contend values or ideas incompatible with those promoted by the regime (Súñer 1938: 7036, Article 2). Furthermore, in accordance to Orden de 22 de junio of 1938, all books or brochures of social and political characteristics published outside Spain and brought by tourists visiting the country would be taken at the Spanish border and sent to Servicio Nacional de Propaganda for advice on the admission of such materials into Spain (Súñer 1938: 4, Item A under Article 2). Only under certain circumstances would some German, Italian and Portuguese books, brochures and doctrinal materials be allowed entry into Spain, provided that such materials were published after 1932, 1923 and 1926 within each of the three countries respectively (Item B under Article 2). In terms of translations of imported children’s literature in particular, the 1955 Reglamento specified:

La Junta Asesora vigilará especialmente el contenido de las publicaciones extranjeras [...] La Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones Infantiles podrá proponer la denegación del permiso de importación o la prohibición de la circulación y venta de una publicación extranjera, cuando [...] su lectura pueda provocar en los niños o adolescentes riesgos de índole religiosa, moral o patriótica (Salgado 1955: 843, Article 21).

In addition to these, imported children’s literature works:
No podrán participar en los concursos establecidos para premiar las publicaciones nacionales, ni gozar de ninguna de las ventajas que puedan concederse a las mismas (Article 23).

As a result, compared to domestic works, translations of imported children’s literature works were confined to a secondary position and, in the meantime, often suffered from censorship suppressions and modifications.

In short, the Catholic Church’s wish to intervene in books produced for children, the regime’s manifest support to the Church’s wish, as well as the general hostility held by the regime itself towards foreign literature, together, accounted for Mark Twain’s use of religious satire in *Huckleberry Finn* being a major translation problem in the production of the Spanish translations. At the same time, the censorship of the religious issues in *Huckleberry Finn* largely reflected the role of children’s literature, produced under Franco’s dictatorship, as a vital medium, through which the regime aimed to transmit its ideologies and perpetuate its power among the younger generations in Post-Civil-War Spain. Craig suggests that:

Effectively indoctrinating the young was a particularly pressing political necessity in the context of post-Civil War Spain, since the adult population was already irremediably polarized into winners and losers. If the regime was to secure its perpetuation, the ‘New Race’ had to be ideologically homogenized (1997:9).

Hence, a constant necessity to lay a particular emphasis on publications for young readers, ensuring that such works would transmit the ‘correct’ values, beliefs and ideas as the regime wished. Such a stress on the ‘correctness’ in works produced for young readers, subsequently, led to censors’ use of double-standard criteria in censorship of works for children and works for adults.

2.2 The Double-Standard Criteria Applied to the Censorship of the Religion-Related Issues in the Translations of *Huckleberry Finn*

In the examination of the censors’ records, it was observed that all of the censored versions of *Huckleberry Finn* were evaluated either as children’s
literature or juvenile literature, in accordance with the specifications that the publishers made upon their submission of the texts. In contrast, none of the translations that were specified and evaluated as adult literature received any censorial suppression or modification. In addition, contrary to the censors’ harsh remarks on the versions of *Huckleberry Finn* produced for child and juvenile readers (See page 42), censors’ comments on the target texts aimed at an adult readership usually read:

Nada que oponer al presente relato del popular humorista americano, en el que se nos cuentan las aventuras de Huck Finn, llenas de incidentes extraordinarios y divertidas peripecias (Expediente Núm. 3266-59).

Or, ‘Admitido el depósito, puede publicarse’ (Expediente Núm 2044-67), or simply, ‘Puede ser autorizado’ (Expediente Núm 4363-53). Through comparing the censors’ comments, it was perceived that censors’ decisions were both arbitrary and controversial. In short, when the target readership concerned children and juvenile readers, the censors tended to dedicate more preoccupations over the educative values of the translated texts, raising objections against Mark Twain’s use of religious satire in particular. When adults were, instead, perceived as the primary audience, the censors tended to give more considerations to the literary values of *Huckleberry Finn*, viewing Twain’s use of satire as essential to the humorous quality of the novel. It thus becomes clear that, in the censorship of the religious theme in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, double-standard criteria were applied by the censors, depending on their perceptions of the target readership of the novel. Consequently, the findings obtained through examination of the censors’ records further confirmed the previous conviction that, in Franco’s Spain, children’s literature was laden with the burden of instructing the young of the religious values and moral standards sustained by the regime, with the ultimate goal to shape the new generations of post-Civil-War Spain into ‘model citizens’ of Franco’s dictatorship.
In order to further uncover the controversial and arbitrary nature of the censorship of children’s literature under Franco’s regime, in the following paragraphs, a comparative study of five distinct versions of the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* will be conducted, examining in detail the treatment of the religion-related novel theme in each translation, along with the corresponding censors’ records. The five Spanish versions of *Huckleberry Finn* to be studied are: *Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn (El camarada de Tom Sawyer)* (1967), translated by Amando Lázaro Ros and *Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn* (1975), translated by José Félix; *Huckleberry Finn* (1968), by María Teresa Monquió, and *Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn* (1967), by Bárbara Viu Raluy and finally, *Aventuras de Huckleberry Finn* (1969), translated by María Sommer. The five selected versions represent three broad types of the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, depending on the degree of closeness between the target text and the source text. Here, it should be noted that the word ‘closeness’ is used only for its *descriptive* quality, describing the extent to which the translations match with the source text, in terms of the intactness of the story plot, without adopting its *evaluative* quality, as this implies a necessary superiority of the source text with which this study does not agree. In the analysis, first, Amando Lázaro Ros’s translation will be studied along with that of José Félix, as these two versions represent the type of translations that match most closely with the source text, without any remarkable modifications or deletions inflicted on the target texts. Next, María Teresa Monquió’s translation will be examined along with that of Bárbara Viu Raluy. These latter two versions, in comparison with Ros and Félix’s translations, represent a second type of translations that match less closely with the source text, with observable deletions and modifications performed on certain story plot. Lastly, María Sommer’s translation will be analyzed by itself. Among the five translations under study, Sommer’s version is the only translation that was stamped ‘*Con licencia ecclesiástica*’ and did not experience any form of censorial intervention. At the same time, it is also a type of translation that least matches with the source text: a number of changes of the story plot occurred in this version that it could barely be rated as a translation. Through this arrangement, examining each translator’s decisions in dealing with the religious theme in *Huck Finn*, while taking into account the censorial
constraints, it is hoped that the following analysis will shed some light on the double-standard criteria applied by censors in their evaluation of works for children, as well as the impacts that such a use of double-standard censorship criteria has produced on the translation of children’s literature under Franco’s regime.

2.2.1 Amando Lázaro Ros’s and José Félix’s Translations of *Huckleberry Finn*

Lázaro Ros’s translation, prior to its rejection at Ministerio de Información y Turismo in 1967, had been submitted by the publisher Aguilar in 1949 and Ramón Sopena in 1961. Both these previous submissions were granted approval for publication without encountering any censor’s objections. This can first be explained by the fact that the publishers did not specify the submitted works as children’s literature, which had, to a certain degree, managed to loosen the censors’ alert and direct the censors’ attention to the literary merits of Twain’s work instead. In addition, the foreword, authored by Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles, which served as an introduction to Ros’s translation, manifested unmistakably a critical stance towards the author, Mark Twain, as well as the American society in which the novel was created:

> Todas las calidades que pueden encontrarse en las obras de Mark Twain derivan directamente del pueblo yanqui: escasas especulación ideológica; una risa tenaz, enraizada profundamente en el optimismo al considerar las obligaciones morales; afán de ridiculizar cuantas cosas parecen oponerse al victorioso avance de una democracia corriente; tendencia a despreciar por igual a los ociosos y a los idealistas; cierta fanfarria de seguridad en los propios sentimientos y las intenciones propias (5).

The criticism of the American society as a society lacking in ideological consistency and moral standards, along with the criticism of the American democratic political system, thus, further appeased the regime’s censors, who did not hesitate to grant approval to this translation, despite the translator’s undiscriminating representations of Twain’s use of religious satire in the
ultimate translation. In fact, when Ros's translation was rejected in 1967, part of the reason was precisely because the censor, *Lector Núm. 22*, who evaluated this work as children's literature, decided that ‘el prólogo no va dirigido, ni mucho menos, a lectores de corta edad’ (Expediente Núm 3053-67). Judging that young readers would not be able to comprehend the American context, in which Twain's ironies and satire of religion were created, nor develop a critical understanding of such ironies, *Lector Núm. 22*, therefore, highlighted the religion-related theme in the novel as an objectionable issue in the translation. Table 3 demonstrates the particular religious issues in Ros's translation that prompted the censor's apprehension, along with the corresponding source text for comparison:

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
<th>The Censor's Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She told me to pray every day, and whatever I asked for I would get it. But it warn’t so. I tried it. Once I got a fish-line, but no hooks. It warn’t any good to me without hooks. I tried for the hooks three or four times, but somehow I couldn’t make it work. By and by, one day, I asked Miss Watson to try for me, but she said I was a fool (16-17).</td>
<td>Me aconsejó que rezase todos los días, y que así se me concediera todo lo que yo pidiese. Pero esto no resultó como ella decía. Lo intenté. Una de las veces conseguí una caña de pescar, pero no conseguí los anzuelos. ¿De qué me servía la caña sin los anzuelos? Recé pidiendo anzuelos tres o cuatro veces, pero, yo no sé por qué, no marchaba aquello como era debido. Dejé pasar algún tiempo, y cierto día le supliqué a la Señorita Watson que rezase y pidiese los anzuelos para mí; pero ella me contestó que yo era un estúpido (26).</td>
<td>Burlas ya irónicas, ya sarcásticas, de la religión.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Well, Balum he tuck de money, en when he wuz in church he hear de preacher say dat whoever give to de po’ len’ to de Lord, en boun’ to git his money back a hund’d times. So Balum he tuck en give de ten cents to de po’, en laid low to see what wuz gwyne to come of it.” “Well, what did come of it, -Balaam recibió mi moneda, se fue a la iglesia, y oyó decir al predicador que todo aquel que da su dinero a los pobres es como si se lo prestase al Señor, que se lo devolvería a razón de ciento por uno. Balaam, que lo oyó, entregó los diez centavos a los pobres, y se sentó a ver lo que le producían.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim?&quot;</th>
<th>-¿Y qué le produjeron, Jim?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Nuffn’ never come of it. I couldn’ manage to k’leck dat money no way [...] Boun’ to git yo’ money back a hund’d times, de preacher says! Ef I could git de ten cents back, I’d call it squah, en be glad er de chanst“ (66).</td>
<td>-Absolutamente: nada. No hubo modo de que yo cobrase aquellos intereses; [...] ¡Y decía el predicador que el Señor pagaba ciento por uno! ¡Ya me conformaría yo con que me devolviesen los diez centavos! (68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| So I slid out and slipped off up the road, and there warn’t anybody at the church, except maybe a hog or two, for there warn’t any lock on the door and hogs likes a puncheon floor in summer-time because it’s cool. If you notice, most folks don’t go to church only when they’ve got to; but a hog is different (169). | Salí, pues, de casa a hurtadillas, y me alejé sin ser sentido carretera adelante; no había nadie en la iglesia; es decir, había uno o dos cerdos, porque la puerta no tenía cerradura y el cerdo gusta de tumbarse en verano en sitio fresco. Si bien se mira, la mayoría de la gente sólo va a la iglesia cuando no tiene más remedio que ir; pero los cerdos no obran así (141). |

| It warn’t no use to try and hide it from Him. Nor from me, neither [...] I was trying to make my mouth say I would do the right thing and the clean thing, and go and write to that nigger’s owner and tell where he was; but deep down in me I knowed it was a lie- and He knowed it. You can’t pray a lie- I found that out [...] I studied a minute, sort of holding my breath, and then says to myself: “All right, then, I’ll go to hell” (306-308). | Era inútil tratar de ocultar el hecho a Dios y también a mí [...] Esforzábame por hacer que mi boca dijese que yo obraría de una manera recta y limpia escribiendo a la propietaria del negro y contándole dónde se encontraba éste; pero en lo más profundo de mi corazón sabía yo que ésta era mentira, y Él también lo sabía. Lo que entonces descubrí fue que no se puede rezar mintiendo [...] Medité un momento, conteniendo la respiración, y, de pronto, me dije: << Bien, en este caso iré al infierno>> (258-260). |

| Idea sobre la oración, que siendo aparentemente ingenua, resulta negativa, o al menos, peligrosamente equívoca. |

The first three fragments above are typical examples of Twain’s use of satire in the narrative. The satirical effects are largely achieved through the characters’ ridiculing religious practices, such as praying and attending church congregations. Although the ironies are obviously directed against the American Protestant Church rather than the Spanish Catholic Church, the censor still found such story plot objectionable. The censor’s decision was understandable though,
considering that the submission was made in 1967, the same year in which Decree 195/1967 came into effect, replacing the 1955 *Reglamento* and starting to prohibit *whatever* derogatory description cast on *whatever* religion in works for children (See page 18). The last fragment is, instead, a presentation of *Huck*'s inner struggle, torn between his sense of right and wrong. Compared to the previous examples, the satirical tone in the last example is obviously undermined. However, despite it being pronounced as a child’s genuine uncertainty over the right choice to make, seeing that *Huck*'s final decision is to ‘go to hell’, the censor still decided that this is ‘dangerously wrong’. Comparing the target text with the source text, it can be seen that the translations match closely with the source text, without any observable changes done to the story plot. However, it was precisely this closeness to the source text that induced the censor’s rejection of this translation, considering that the translation would eventually reach a child or juvenile readership. In the end, as a solution, the publisher, upon seeing that the submission was denied for publication, responded immediately with a letter sent to the censorship department at the Ministry, arguing that:

Dado que este libro está incluido dentro de la colección-“Biblioteca Sopena”, de carácter meramente literario, rogamos no lo considere como obra de carácter juvenil o infantil, ya que está destinada para personas adultas (Expediente Núm 3053-67).

Having been assured that the target readership would not involve young readers, the censor then approved the publisher’s request one week later, without making any further comment. As it turned out, the solution adopted by the publisher *Editorial Ramón Sopena* seemed to be a common strategy shared among publishers, in order to obtain censors’ approval to publish their submitted works. For instance, upon filling an application form to make their submission, publishers would usually avoid specifying the translation of *Huckleberry Finn* as *literatura infantil* or *literatura juvenil*. Instead, they would place the submitted text under their claimed collections of *obras eternas* (Expediente Núm 2044-67), *maestros norteamericanos* (Expediente Núm 13615-
74), or *grandes novelas de la literatura* (Expediente Núm. 3879-50), thus convincing the censors that the translations were produced for an adult readership, based on the pure literary merits of Mark Twain's work. In most cases, the result would be a prompt grant of approval for publication, hence the censors' clear double standards applied to works for adults and works for children.

Unlike Ros's translation, José Félix's version, submitted by the publisher Edival in 1975, was specified as juvenile literature from the very beginning, included in the publisher’s collection of *Clásicos de la Juventud* (Expediente Núm 12559-75). The censor who evaluated this work, identified as *Lector Núm.* 30, obviously did not consider it an appropriate work for young readers, as he wrote:

> Esta novela de M. Twain- y otras del mismo autor— es uno de tantos ejemplos de obras que, escritas en un principio para adultos, fueron más tarde y poco a poco retrotayéndose a veces, indebidamente- a lectores juveniles e incluso infantiles.

It thus becomes clear that this censor not only disproved the idea of *Huckleberry Finn* being published as a book for young readers, but also was strongly against the idea of allowing young readers the access to *any* of Mark Twain's works, as in the censor's opinion, Twain's works should only be reserved for adult readers. The censor's comment again confirmed the regime's treatment of children's literature as an exclusive, separate sector that would require special attention. Nevertheless, despite his strong objection, the censor eventually granted *Edival* a conditional approval to publish Félix's translation as juvenile literature, on condition that the publisher fully suppress or modify the passages highlighted in red. In total, the censor's redline crossings were found on twenty-seven pages of the target text. Almost half of the highlighted issues concerned religion. In order not to provide an exhaustive account, Table 4 transcribes a few of the passages highlighted by the censor, along with the related source texts for comparison:
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After supper she got out her book and learned me about Moses and the Bulrushers; and I was in a sweat to find out all about him; but by and by she let it out that Moses had been dead a considerable long time; <strong>so then I didn't care no more about him; because I don't take no stock in dead people</strong> (4-5).</td>
<td>Después de cenar sacó un libro y me habló de Moisés y los juntos, y me entraban sudores para entenderla, pero poco a poco ella me hizo comprender que Moisés había muerto hacía muchísimo tiempo, <strong>de modo que dejé de interesarme por él, porque los muertos no me hacen mucha gracia</strong> (12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I slid out and slipped off up the road, and there warn't anybody at the church, except <strong>maybe a hog or two</strong>, for there warn't any lock on the door, and <strong>hogs likes a puncheon floor in summer-time</strong> because it's cool. If you notice, most folks don't go to church only when they've got to; but <strong>a hog</strong> is different (169).</td>
<td>Así que me escabullí de la casa y enfilé el camino. No había nadie en la iglesia, exceptuando <strong>uno o dos cerdos</strong>, porque la puerta no tenía cerradura y <strong>a los cerdos les gusta mucho el suelo de la iglesia</strong>, porque en verano está frío. Si se fijan, la mayoría de las personas van a la iglesia sólo cuando deben ir, pero <strong>un cerdo</strong> ya es diferente (80).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I reckoned he believed in the A-rabs and the elephants, but as for me I think different. It had all the marks of a <strong>Sunday school</strong> (22).</td>
<td>Supuse que él creía en los árabes y los elefantes, pero en cuanto a mí, opino de otro modo. Me pareció que aquello tenía todos los síntomas de una <strong>escuela dominical</strong> (20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While I was cooking supper the old man took a swig or two and got sort of warmed up, and went to <strong>ripping</strong> again (37).</td>
<td>Mientras yo hacía la cena, el viejo echó un par de tragos, se acaloró y empezó de nuevo a <strong>blasfemar</strong> (27).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the case of Ros’s translation, Félix’s undiscriminating representation of the satirical elements in the target text also prompted the censor’s apprehension. The censor’s objection in the first two cases above was understandable, as he crossed the sections in which obvious ironies on religion were detected, whereas, in the latter two cases, the censor’s decisions seemed less reasonable. Based on the context of the story, it was observed that neither of Mark Twain’s use of ‘Sunday school’, nor ‘ripping’ was aimed at creating any ridicule of religion in the source text. Instead, in the ‘Sunday school’ incident, it was Tom Sawyer’s insane imagination that the author wished to communicate, while ‘ripping’ led to the depiction of Huck’s father as a ‘good-for-nothing’ drunkard. Correspondingly, Félix's translation of ‘Sunday school’ as ‘escuela dominical’ and ‘ripping’ as ‘blasfemar’ in the target text, when circumscribed in the context of the story, did
not elicit any derogation of religion either. Therefore, it can be said that what the censor actually disapproved was the mere presence of words that might, potentially, deliver harmful connotations on religion, regardless of the context in which the vocabulary was applied. In the censorship of children’s literature, such censorial practice seemed to be common. For instance, in Editorial Litúrgica Española’s 1969 submission of Hansel y Gretel (Expediente Núm. 11902-69), the censor objected to all use of ‘bruja’ in the translation and suggested complete suppression of the term before the story could be approved for publication. In La Bella Durmienta (Expediente Núm. 11903-69), a work that was submitted by the same publisher on the same day as Hansel y Gretel, and even evaluated by the same censor, the use of ‘la mala hada’, in the translation, however, did not cause any objection. Also, in Molino’s 1955 submission of a translation of Grimm Brothers’ fairy tale, El Agua Milagrosa, the censor objected to all use of ‘milagrosa’ in the story and, subsequently, instructed that ‘deben sustituirse la palabra milagrosa por maravillosa. Son demasiados milagros’ (Expediente Núm. 941-55). Practices like these served as a good reflection of the arbitrary, inconsistent nature of the censorship activities conducted on children’s literature under the regime.

2.2.2 María Teresa Monguíó’s and Bárbara Viu Raluy’s Translations of Huckleberry Finn

Unlike the previous two analyzed translations, Monguíó and Raluy’s versions of Huckleberry Finn, both addressing children and juvenile readers, matched less closely with the source text, with a number of detectable modifications, or deletions of the story plot in the translations. Some of the changes were found to be the results of the translator or the publisher’s conscious self-censorship, in their effort to minimize the risk for the translations to be rejected at the consulta previa. For instance, in Monguíó’s translation, the title of chapter one was translated as ‘Capítulo Primero: La Viuda, Moisés y los presagios en la noche’ (5), whereas the name ‘Moisés’ was not mentioned anywhere in the rest of the chapter. All references to Moses were simply deleted in the translation. Also, in Raluy’s version, a number of Twain’s use of irony relating to religion disappeared, including the episode in which Huck comments that hogs prefer
going to church more than people do (Twain and Moser 1985: 169). In the examination of the related censors’ records, it was discovered that the above-mentioned deletions were not the direct consequences of the censors’ instructions, but were, rather, the translator or the publisher’s own decisions for self-censorship. Despite their efforts, the two submissions were each granted with conditional approval only and still encountered censors’ objections. Therefore, it can be said that these two translations suffered from a ‘double-censorship’.

Monguíó’s version, when submitted by Editorial Juventud in 1957, under its colección infantil, was approved promptly for publication by a censor, identified as Lector Núm. 12. The censor's feedback simply read: ‘Nada que oponer a esta edición infantil, aunque juzgamos que los lectores se aburrirán con la lectura de unos episodios más bien para público juvenil’ (Expediente Núm. 501-57). However, when Editorial Juventud re-submitted the same version in 1968 to apply for a reprint, this time as juvenile literature and evaluated by Lector Núm. 22 (Expediente Núm. 6326-68), the translation only received a conditional approval. As expected, Twain's satirical treatment of religion was again criticized, and the censor subsequently reached the conclusion that Huckleberry Finn was only appropriate for adult readers (Expediente Núm. 6326-68). The following table demonstrates in detail the censor's objections concerning the translation of religious issues:

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
<th>Censor’s Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yit dey say Sollermun de wises’ man dat ever live’, I doan’t take no stock in dat. Bekase why: would a wise man want to live in de mids’er sich a blimblamin’ all de time? No’ deed he wouldn’t. A wise man ‘ud take en buil’ a biler-factry; en den he could shut down de biler-factry when he want to res” (106).</td>
<td>-Diseng que Salomong era e hombre má sabio que ha estitido. Pero a mí no hay quieng me convensa. Un hombre sabio lo que haría é construí una fábrica e billete e Banco; y cuangdo quisiera deccansá, serraba la fábrica y eng pá (64).</td>
<td>Chirigota sobre el rey Salomón.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A-amén! Glory, glory</td>
<td>- ¡Amén! ¡Amén!</td>
<td>Dos tunantes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hallelujah!” [...] Folks got up, everywhere in the crowd, and worked their way, just by main strength, to the mourners’ bench [...] Well, the first I knewed, the king got agoing; and you could hear him over everybody; and next he went a-charging up on to the platform and the preacher he begged him to speak to the people, and he done it. He told them he was a pirate [...] he was going to start right off and work his way back to the Indian Ocean and put in the rest of his life trying to turn the pirates into the true path [...] And then he busted into tears, and so did everybody. Then somebody sings out, “Take up a collection for him, take up a collection!” (197-198)

precipitándose en masa hacia el Banco de las Lamentaciones. Pues bien: el rey fué el que llegó primero y su voz se oía por encima de todas las demás, y en un arranque le veo subirse a la plataforma y pedirle al predicador que le dejase hablar a la gente. Entonces explicó que era un pirata, y que ahora se había convertido y lo que ansiaba era convertir a sus compañeros [...] Y al decir esto rompió a llorar con gran sentimiento, y todo el mundo hizo lo mismo. De pronto, alguien gritó: <<¡Hagamos una colecta para este buen hombre!>> (97)

The first case, as outlined in Table 5, shows the censor’s disapproval of Jim’s pronounced negative opinion on King Solomon in the translation. In the second case, while the censor’s protest was seemingly directed against the two frauds cheating at a religious congregation, it was, perhaps, the depiction of the church followers, as simple-minded, emotional and easy-to-fool crowds in the narrative that truly caused the censor’s apprehension. Interestingly, this censor’s decision to suppress the above-mentioned passages, prior to the grant of a final approval, was reviewed and rejected by another censor, presumably a superior to Lector Núm. 22. As a counter-argument, the second censor, known by the name of Pedro Borges, explained that:

Tanto las conversaciones como las travesuras de los personajes [...] incurren en tales exageraciones que este mismo hecho les hace perder todo peligro de imitación (Expediente Núm. 6326-68).

It thus becomes clear that, for Borges, the major concern was whether or not the readers were likely to imitate the characters’ behaviors after reading the text.
From his point of view, the negative depictions of religion in the narrative were so exaggerated that the readers were unlikely to perceive these as realities, let alone to imitate them. Subsequently, Monquió’s translation was ‘AUTORIZABLE, íntegramente’ (Expediente 6326-68). Nevertheless, the fact that two opposite views could be established between the censors unmistakably revealed the inconsistent and contradictory nature of the censorship practices.

Raluy’s translation of *Huckleberry Finn*, when submitted by *Bruguera* in 1959 as adult literature, did not encounter any censorship issues. However, when *Bruguera* resubmitted the work, soliciting to publish it as juvenile literature in 1967, the application was approved with ‘tachaduras’. The religious theme in the narrative was again targeted and highlighted for suppression, as indicated in the censor’s instructions:

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
<th>Censor’s Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes the widow would take me one side and talk about Providence in a way to make a body’s mouth water; but maybe next day Miss Watson would take hold and knock it all down again. <em>I judged I could see that there was two Providences</em> (17).</td>
<td>Muchas veces la viuda me llamaba y me hablaba de la Providencia de una manera como para que se le hiciera la boca agua a un chico. Pero luego, la señorita Watson me cogía por su cuenta al día siguiente y <em>echaba por tierra todo lo que la viuda me había dicho</em> (16).</td>
<td><strong>Ironía sobre la Providencia</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “Blame it, do you suppose there ain’t but one preacher to a church?” “Why, what do they want with more?” “What! — to preach before a king! I never see such a girl as you. They don’t have no less than seventeen.” “Seventeen! My land! Why, I wouldn’t set out such a string as that, not if I never got to glory. It must take’em a week.” [...] “Well, I don’t want to know no such foolishness as that.” [...] “Honest Injun, now, hain’t you been telling me a lot of lies?” (253-254) | - ¡Caramba! ¿Cree usted que no hay más que un predicador en cada Iglesia? *Tienen nada menos que diecisiete*.  
- Ni quiera saber semejante estupideces. Con franqueza, ¿No me estás diciendo una sarta de mentiras? (153) | **Ataque burlesco a ministros de la religión** |
In the first case outlined above, despite the translator's conscious removal of Huck's comment on the 'two Providences', the censor, again Lector Núm. 22, still found the resultant translation disrespectful. In the second case, comparing the target text with the source text, it was observed that the translator carefully shortened Huck's discourse, as Huck's references to the king were deleted, together with his other lies about life in England. However, Huck's exaggeration of having seventeen preachers installed at one church, information translated in the target text, was still detected by the censor as a ridicule of the church and, thus, required suppression. Upon receiving the censor's feedback, as a solution, the publisher made the changes as the censor had requested, depositing two updated copies of the translation at the Ministry and, thus, obtained a final approval for publication. Nevertheless, when the book was finally published, the publisher still used the previous, unmodified version, thus tricking the censors in doing this. The same method was applied in 1970 when Bruguera submitted Raluy's translation for a reprint (Expediente Núm. 6902-70). It was not until 1972, when the publisher applied again for another reprint of Raluy's version, that the censor eventually detected the trick and urged that the publisher modify the text as instructed (Expediente Núm. 2115-1972).

2.2.3 María Sommer’s Translation- Con licencia eclesiástica

In comparison with the previously examined versions, the study uncovered that those source text episodes, which caused censorship problems to the previous four translations, were completely deleted in Sommer’s version, with only two exceptions. The first was Huck and Jim's discussion over the wisdom of King Solomon, the translation of which induced Lector Núm. 22’s objection to Monguíó’s version (See page 60). In Sommer’s translation, although the reference to King Solomon did not disappeared completely, the episode was, nonetheless, significantly shortened and modified:

Nos pasamos todo el día siguiente en el bosque, hablando de nuestra aventura y yo le leía libros a Jim. Eran libros que hablaban sobre reyes franceses y también de la sabiduría de Salomón. Yo ya había oído hablar de él, pues la viuda Douglas
Compared to the corresponding source-text sections (Twain and Moser 1985: 105-108), it was observed that, in the target text, the translator reinterpreted the source text and summarized the story plot in her own words. In this process, on the one hand, as a result of the translator's self-censorship practice, the textual elements that the translator judged controversial were removed, such as Huck's descriptions of the life of kings, as well as Jim's argument on King Solomon. On the other hand, in the translator's acknowledgement of the authority of the religious institution, namely, the Catholic Church, story plot was even recreated in the target text. Here, Sommer's translation obviously attempted to assure the readers of King Solomon's sageness, while in the source text, Huck and Jim never reach an agreement over this matter and Jim even presents some sound arguments questioning the sageness of King Solomon.

The second episode concerning religion that was translated by Sommer, but with significant diversions from the source text, was Huck's pronouncement that he would ‘go to hell’ and rescue Jim out of slavery once again, the translation of which induced censorship to Ros's translation (See page 55). In Sommer’s version, this episode was translated as:

Pensé en ir a confesar que Jim ya tenía amo, pero rechacé esta idea, pues sabía cuán importante era para él su libertad y lo que habíamos luchado por ello en nuestro viaje. Se me ocurrieron mil disparates y por fin decidí que lo único que me quedaba por hacer era rescatar a Jim (168).

Similar to the translation of the previous episode, Huck’s reference to ‘hell’ was deleted and Huck’s torment and inner struggles over the right choice to make were simply dismissed as ‘mil disparates’. Moreover, in the source text, it is Huck's weighing of his friendship with Jim over his concern that he might commit a sin against God’s will by helping a runaway slave that eventually prompts his decision to go and rescue Jim (Twain and Moser: 306-308). Nevertheless, such story plot was completely modified and recreated in
Sommer’s translation, as, in the target text, it became Huck’s concern over Jim’s freedom that led him to help Jim. Through this reformulation, Huck’s final decision made at the expense of contravening God’s will, as Huck believes so in the source text, was, instead, adjusted in line with values of Christian humanism19 in the translation.

Through the comparative study of the five translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, the censors’ use of double-standard criteria in their censorship of publications for children and those for adult readers were clearly revealed. When the censors were assured of an adult readership of the target texts, translations of Mark Twain’s use of religious satire were largely tolerated, whereas, when the target readership concerned young readers, no equal toleration could be found. Instead, the religious theme of the novel, in the translations produced for child and juvenile readers, tended to suffer from heavy suppressions and modifications, due to the censors’ objections. At the same time, also revealed through this comparative study was the extent to which the Catholic Church exerted its control on children’s literature during Franco’s Spain. On the one hand, disrespect towards religion was definitely prohibited in children’s literature, which often caused the translators or publishers to either perform self-censorship, filtering out the problematic elements from the translations, or to design methods so as to bypass the censors. On the other hand, translators of children’s literature were encouraged to adjust and even to recreate religion-related contents of the imported material, in order to pay their tribute to the Church’s authority, and to comply with the patronage requirements in the domestic context. In this way, translations of imported texts for children under Franco, instead of introducing new elements and energy into the domestic literary polysystem, became, rather, ‘a conservative force to preserve traditional taste’ (Even-Zohar 1990b: 48).

---

19In broad terms, Christian humanism regards humanist principles such as universal human dignity and individual freedom and human happiness as essential and basic components of the teachings of Jesus. For more details on Christian humanism, see Drake-Brockman, T. (2012), *Christian Humanism: the Compassionate Theology of a Jew Called Jesus*, Sydney: Denis Jones, p. vi.
Conclusion

The current chapter first explored the reason that translations of the religious issues in *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* presented a major problem in the Spanish translations produced during Franco’s Spain. As uncovered through examination of the censors’ records, in the versions of *Huckleberry Finn* that suffered from censorial interventions, the censors coincided in their belief that Twain’s use of religious satire was an objectionable issue. Due to the censors’ objections, the religious theme of the novel largely suffered from modifications and suppressions in the translations. The censors’ decisions were made largely in accordance with the censorship legislation under the guidance of which censorship activities were conducted. An examination of the regime’s censorship legislation on publications for children, in its turn, revealed a strong emphasis that Franco’s regime placed on the promotion of religious values in books for children, in particular, those values endorsed by Catholicism. This clearly demonstrated the position withheld by the Catholic Church under Franco’s regime, namely, the Church’s position as an ideological *familia* of the regime, which was again shaped by the contemporary social and political circumstances in which Spain was entangled. The Catholic Church, as an ideological *familia* and the most important religious body in Franco’s dictatorship, was, therefore, bestowed with a kind of ‘patronage’ power, in Lefevere’s term (1992: 16), and was, thus, able to exert its control over the production of texts in the Spanish system. In post-Civil-War Spain, the Church, in its effort to re-establish a religious order, attributed considerable importance to children’s literature, due to the pedagogic role that books for children were expected to fulfill. In this regard, the stress on the religious values in children’s books as expressed in the censorship legislation could be understood as the regime’s explicit support to the Church’s cause. At the same time, the regime itself also detected a need to perpetuate its power among the younger generations, in the process of which the regime had to ensure that works for children would transmit values in accordance to ideologies sustained by the regime. Mark Twain’s use of religious satire in *Huckleberry Finn* was, therefore, largely incompatible with the non-secular state nature of Franco’s Spain and the prevalent values promoted under
Franco’s regime. As a result, representations of the religious theme of *Huckleberry Finn* were often rendered problematic in the translations and prone to attract censors’ disapproval.

The censors’ decisions were, however, found to be both inconsistent and arbitrary. The inconsistency of the censorship operations was, first, manifested through the observation that completely opposite censors’ conclusions could be established over a same translation, as in the case of Monguió’s version. Secondly, chronologically, translation might initially be approved for publication, but subject to censorship when resubmitted at a later stage, as in the cases of Ros, Monguió and Raluy’s translations. The inconsistency of the censors’ decisions largely reflected the censors’ confusion with the censorship legislation, which guided their censorship activities. Such a confusion, was, on the one hand, due to the fact that not all censors were professionally qualified for their job, as the regime, in its selection of censors, gave more considerations to the candidates’ political records and fidelity to the regime than to their professional qualifications (See page 19). On the other hand, the censors’ confusion also revealed the impracticability of the principles established in the censorship legislation. Although legislation such as the 1955 *Reglamento* and the 1967 *Estatuto* managed to establish the general principles by which censors were expected to abide during their censorship practices on works for children, there was, however, a lack of some accompanying guidelines to ensure the censors’ correct interpretations of such principles in practice. In other words, while the principles were established, a coherent code of conduct was missing. Furthermore, the feasibility of creating such a code of conduct was even questionable, considering the unpredictability of the rich, creative language use in literature. As a result, the established censorship principles were rather vague, and, very often, the censors were left to make their own interpretations of such principles, based merely on their personal convictions.

Besides inconsistency, the censors’ decisions were also found to be arbitrary. The arbitrariness was, first, demonstrated through the censors’ objections to use of isolated words in the translations, while ignoring the context in which the words were applied. At the same time, the arbitrariness of the
censors’ decisions was also manifested through the double-standard criteria that the censors applied to the translations of the religious theme in *Huckleberry Finn*. Due to the censors’ different treatment of the translations, depending on their judgement of the target readership of the novel, subsequently, it can be said that Twain’s use of irony in the novel posed a more acute translation problem when the target readership of the translations involved young readers than when the target readership involved adult readers. The censors’ arbitrary decisions first reflected the censors’ unwillingness to believe that young readers possessed the critical and analytical skills in processing knowledge acquired from reading books. As a result, the censors saw the necessity to insulate young readers against any information that they believed to be harmful or dangerous. This explained the censors’ decisions to eliminate isolated words in the studied translations, as well as the double-standard criteria that they adopted in censoring Mark Twain’s satirical treatment of religion in the translations under review, even though the ironies were largely directed against the American Protestant Church, instead of the Spanish Catholic Church. In addition, the censors’ arbitrary decisions also revealed the censors’ unwillingness to give young readers the opportunity to critique and to analyze new ideas. Since the very purpose of the establishment and practice of censorship was to serve the interests of the regime and perpetuate its power, this practice supported effective indoctrination of the younger generations by eradicating influences damaging to the regime. Consequently, by eliminating information deemed incompatible with the regime’s ideologies through the censorship practices, the regime denied young readers the chance to question its authority and legitimacy. Furthermore, the censors’ arbitrary decisions, again, reflected the vagueness and impracticability of the principles established in the censorship legislation. Because of the vagueness of the censorship principles, a space for negotiations was thus made possible. As demonstrated in the cases of *Editorial Ramón Sopena* and *Bruguera*, taking advantage of the vagueness of the censorship principles and the censors’ own confusion regarding the relevant legislation, the two publishers eventually managed to develop strategies to circumvent the efforts of the censors, and ensured the publication of their submitted works. The success
of such negotiations, then, confirmed the unsustainability of the censorship practices.

Apart from the inconsistency and arbitrariness within the censors’ decisions, in the examination of the censors’ records, it was also found that the censors’ criticisms of the religious issues in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* were hardly ever addressed to the target texts or the translators. Instead, the censors’ criticisms tended to address exclusively the source text and the source-text author, Mark Twain. Moreover, in the latter three analyzed translations of *Huckleberry Finn* in the comparative study, due to the translators’ self-censorship efforts, significant modifications and deletions of the source text’s plot occurred in the target texts. Such modifications often rendered the translations incongruous. Nevertheless, the censors, to a large degree, disregarded the incongruities and the low quality of the ultimate translations. It thus becomes clear that, in the censorship activities, the role of the translators, especially translators of children’s literature, by default, was largely confined to that of guardians of the ideologies of the regime, rather than that of translation professionals.

Besides Twain’s use of religious satire, as confirmed through the censors’ records, the moral theme in *Huckleberry Finn* also presented a translation problem in the Spanish versions of the novel produced during Franco’s Spain. The moral theme of the novel being a translation problem was, again, related to the Church’s patronage position in the target system, namely, the Catholic Church that was not only the most important religious body, but also the institution in charge of monitoring public morality in Franco’s Spain. At the same time, the translations of the moral theme in *Huckleberry Finn* were also influenced by the regime’s determination to form the ideal Spanish youth. In this regard, Huck Finn, Mark Twain’s boy hero in the novel, with his subversive behaviours and passions for freedom and adventure, largely contravened the ideal child image that the regime aimed to construct. The translations of the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn* will be addressed in detail in the following chapter.
Chapter 3  Translations of Moral Issues in *Huckleberry Finn*

*Las virtudes morales son las que tienen por objeto inmediato las buenas costumbres o moralidad de las acciones y mediante éstas a Dios.*

(García 1951: 166)

**Introduction**

Besides the religious issues, it was found that moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn* also presented a major translation problem in the target texts. Through examination of the censors’ records, it was observed that issues related to the moral theme of the novel attracted the censors’ repetitive objections during their assessments of the translations. Specifically, such issues included the main character, Huck Finn’s often subversive, disobedient behaviours, as well as his disrespectful attitudes towards authoritative figures. At the same time, inappropriate deeds committed by secondary characters also tended to attract censorial intervention, for example, Miss Sophia Grangerford’s elopement with Harney Shepherdson (Twain and Moser 1985: 168-173). It should be noted that the censorship intervention that affected the translations of the moral theme in the novel was, to a large extent, also related to the hegemony of the Catholic Church that saw it as its responsibility to maintain the moral order of the society in accordance to its Catholic religious principles. The current chapter will focus on the Spanish translations of the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn* and conduct an in-depth analysis of the translation problem induced by these issues.

In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the censorship intervention that occurred to the translations of the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, as a preliminary approach, it is essential to clarify questions such as ‘what is morality?’, ‘what can be counted as a moral decision?’, and further, ‘what can be considered as a good moral decision?’. These questions, though seemingly simple, are, indeed, difficult issues that philosophers have been trying to tackle throughout history. Roger Straughan classifies the different philosophical approaches to defining the nature of morality into two broad categories: those defining morality by its form and those defining morality by its content. The first
category is concerned with ‘the way in which moral judgments are made and moral conclusions reached’, while the second category subscribes to the idea that ‘moral issues and questions are accordingly those which deal with a particular subject matter, for example, the pursuit of justice’ (1988: 41). According to Straughan, moral philosophers who have contributed to the understanding of morality by its form include R.M. Hare, C.L. Stevenson and Jean-Paul Sartre (43-63), while philosophers such as G.J. Warnock and R.S. Peters are considered as supporters of defining morality by its content (87-99). However, despite the philosophers’ efforts, a universal agreement on a clear definition of morality has not yet been reached. Instead, as explained by Straughan, ‘there is as much dispute within each category as there is between them’ (41). In the midst of the discussions, the least controversial feature of morality that has been generally accepted, as Straughan proposes, is that ‘voluntary choice and independent judgment’ should be two essential prerequisites for a moral decision (36). In other words, in making a moral decision, one should be given alternative options and the freedom to choose without submitting to the dictates of any authority. Nevertheless, even this claim cannot be guaranteed a universal applicability, as, for example, what a ‘good moral decision’ meant in Franco’s Spain would certainly have very different implications from what Straughan proposes.

In Franco’s Spain, neither voluntary choice nor independent judgment was necessarily an essential component of a moral decision. On the contrary, these two criteria, in fact, even contravened the idea of a good moral decision during the dictatorship. According to Straughan, in order to be able to make moral decisions, ‘one must first be operating as a moral agent’ (30). Furthermore, forming moral agents is precisely the goal of moral education. Depending on the educator’s subscription of the content bias of morality or the form bias:

‘Moral education’ can be seen either as prescribing a certain version and pattern of moral goodness for children to adopt, or as introducing children to the complexities of a new and distinctive area of experience’ (32).
It will soon become clear that, of the two directions suggested by Straughan, moral education in Franco’s Spain, largely, if not completely, adopted the former, to the extent that moral education under Franco could be substituted for indoctrination.

As already mentioned in the previous chapter, school education was placed under full control of the Catholic Church in post-Civil-War Spain (See page 46). Due to its hegemony, the Catholic religious principles were conveniently incorporated into the moral codes of the newly established regime:

La Moral enseña y explica los preceptos de Jesucristo, esto es, lo que debemos obrar para agradar a Dios y conseguir el cielo [...] 
A Dios no se le puede agradar sino practicando actos buenos y evitando los malos. Acto bueno es el que está conforme con lo que Dios manda, y acto malo es el que es opuesto a lo que Dios quiere (Los Padres Escolapios 1940: 133).

Hence, under the Church education, a moral decision, far from being the outcome of independent judgment, should always conform to the dictates of God. Besides religious ethics, other values, in line with the ideologies sustained by the regime, were also promoted as essential towards children’s moral goodness. In Valores encarnados y defendidos por España a lo largo de su historia, a course book designed for students in the third year of the baccalaureate, the values that Franco’s regime was aiming to inculcate were neatly summarized as ‘las virtudes propias de la raza’, which included ‘la fe, la abnegación, la austeridad, la ejemplaridad, el heroismo, el espíritu de servicio y sacrificio’ (Sospedra 1954:28). Moreover, an absolute obedience was also an encouraged virtue:

Los españoles tenemos la obligación de acostumbrarnos a la Santa Obediencia. Nada de murmuraciones, de reservas, ni discusiones. [...] ¡A cumplir fielmente lo mandado! Ésta ha de ser nuestra consigna (Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 21).

Lastly, in order to achieve a moral goodness, it was a must that one possess a love for the patria, as well as a readiness to serve the patria and even to sacrifice for it:
Si España es pobre, todos somos pobres. Y si España es rico y feliz, todos somos ricos y felices [...]. España necesita que yo sea buen cristiano, que yo trabaje, que yo estudie, que yo quiera a todos los españoles como se quiere a los hermanos. Y si España necesita mi vida, mi vida tengo que darle (Serrano de Haro 1957: 77, 92).

In summary, it could be seen that the image of an ideal youth projected through moral education under Franco’s regime was a young person that was able to demonstrate a strong faith in Catholicism, someone who was hardworking, obedient, loyal to the patria, and who was willing to renounce personal interests for the benefit of the common good of the nation.

Through the investigation into the censorship of the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, it was found that the censored moral issues were precisely those whose presence, in one way or another, challenged or even threatened to disrupt the ideal child and youth image that Franco’s regime was endeavouring to construct through its moral education. The censored issues in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* to be analysed in the current chapter are classified as ‘moral issues’. However, it should be pointed out that the words ‘moral’ and ‘morality’ that will be used in the following paragraphs are not applied in the same sense as philosophers would have applied them, applications that have a far broader and more universal implication. Instead, the words ‘moral’ and ‘morality’ used in the current chapter have acquired a rather specific temporal and spatial dimension. That is, what is moral or immoral is only a question considered in relation to the specific socio-cultural context of Franco’s Spain. In the following sections, a detailed account of the censored moral issues in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* will be provided. These include: Huck Finn’s disobedient behaviours, his involvement in playing banditry games with Tom Sawyer, as well as in gun-shooting episodes during his adventures, his mockery on kings, and lastly, Miss Sophia’s elopement with Harney Shepherdson. Each issue to be analyzed will be measured contrapuntally against the relevant censorship legislation, as well as the corresponding moral axiom(s) that the regime intended to inculcate through its moral education, via use of textbooks or school reading materials. Through
the establishment of this comparison, this chapter will provide an in-depth account of how the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn* breached the moral codes promoted by Franco’s regime, and how the filtering mechanism of state censorship, in the assessment process of the translations, functioned to keep out the ideas that the regime deemed undesirable for its moral education.

### 3.1 Translations of the Moral Issues in *Huckleberry Finn* and the Censorship

#### 3.1.1 Disobedience Versus *La santa obediencia*

The son of an alcoholic father, a vagabond, dressed in rags, sleeping in the woods, not attending school or having a strong faith in God, in summary, Huckleberry Finn, Mark Twain’s boy hero, is far from a role model character. When Huck is first introduced into the scene in the first novel, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (Twain and Gerber 1980), Twain presents him in the following way:

> Shortly Tom came upon the juvenile pariah of the village, Huckleberry Finn, son of the town drunkard. Huckleberry was cordially hated and dreaded by all the mothers of the town, because he was idle and lawless and vulgar and bad (66).

Whatever these mothers’ feelings are towards Huckleberry Finn, the censors of Franco’s regime might have experienced similar ones, when reading translations of *Huckleberry Finn*. Among the many undesirable features of the protagonist, in particular, Huck’s defiance towards authority and discipline, often shown in the form of satire, was one of the issues that tended to induce censors’ disapproval.

Through the investigation into the censors’ records, it was found that the requests for publications of *Huckleberry Finn* submitted by the publishers *Selecciones del Readers’ Digest* in 1967 (Expediente Núm. 8832-67), *Editorial Juventud* in 1968 (Expediente 6326-68), and *Edival* in 1975 (Expediente Núm. 12559-75) all encountered censorship problems related to the protagonist’s disobedient behaviours in the narrative. As mentioned earlier (See page 38-39), the submission made by *Selecciones del Readers’ Digest* was distinguished from others, as it was an English version that the publisher submitted for the censor’s assessment, rather than a translated version. Nevertheless, the censor’s
evaluation of the source text, including the censor's highlighted passages that were deemed problematic in the text and the relevant instructions that she or he offered for modification can equally serve the comparative purpose of the current analysis. Table 7 below provides a clear demonstration of the censors' activities, concerning the protagonist's subversive behaviours, on the submissions made by the three above-mentioned publishers:

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Censors' actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Widow rung a bell for supper, and you had to come to time. When you got to the table you couldn't go right to eating, but you had to wait for the widow to tuck down her head and grumble a little over the victuals. [...] Well, i couldn't see no advantage in going where she was going, so i made up my mind i wouldn't try for it. But i never said so, because it would only make trouble, wouldn't do no good (1967:10).</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Selecciones del Readers' Digest</td>
<td>Comment: Descripción irónica de dos mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty soon i wanted to smoke, and asked the widow to let me. But she wouldn't. She said it was a mean practice and wasn't clean, and I must try to not do it anymore. That's just the way with some people. They get down on a thing when they don't know nothing about it. [...] Then she told me all about the bad place, and I said I wished I was there. She got mad, then, but I didn't mean no harm (5).</td>
<td>Pronto me entraron ganas para fumar y le pedí el permiso a la viuda para hacerlo, pero no quiso concedérmelo. Dijo que aquéllo era una costumbre sucia y repugnante, y que era necesario que la abandonase definitivamente. Así son algunas personas: le ponen el veto a una cosa que ni saben lo que es, pues nunca la han probado en su vida. [...] A continuación, le di por explicarme con pelos y señales cómo era el infierno y yo le dije que me gustaría estar allí. Miss Watson se puso furiosa; pero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I had been to school most all the time, and could spell, and read, and write just a little, and could say the multiplication table up to six times seven is thirty-five, and I don't reckon I could ever get any further than that if I was to live forever (22).

Casi todo ese tiempo lo había pasado en la escuela y ya sabía leer y hasta escribir una pizca, y sabía cantar la tabla de multiplicar hasta aquello de <<seis por siete treinta y cinco>>, y creo que jamás podría pasar de ahí aunque tuviese que vivir dos mil años (Monguió 1968: 19).

The widow Douglas, she took me for her son, and allowed she would civilize me; but it was rough living in the house all the time, considering how dismal regular and decent the widow was in all her ways (4).

La viuda Douglas me adoptó como si fuera hijo suyo y afirmó que me civilizaría, pero era duro vivir siempre en casa, teniendo en cuenta las costumbres tan regulares y decentes que tenía la viuda (Félix 1975:11).

She said it was wicked to say what I said; said she wouldn't say it for the whole world; she was going to live so as to go to the good place. Well, I couldn't see no advantage in going where she was going, so I made up my mind I wouldn't try for it. But I never said so, because it would only make trouble, and wouldn't do no good (5-6).

Dijo que era muy malo por decir aquello, que ella no lo diría por nada del mundo y que viviría como era debido para ir al cielo. Bueno, no encontré ninguna ventaja en ir a donde iba ella, de modo que decidí no imitarla, pero no lo dije, porque solamente—habría—buscado conflictos inútiles (Félix 1975: 12).

In the above table, one can see that all three censors identified Huck's questioning the authority of Widow Douglas and Miss Watson as objectionable. In the narrative, Widow Douglas and Miss Watson, who kindly offer a home to the vagabond Huck and teach him the good manners as well as the Christian values, play the role of Huck’s surrogate mothers and educators. From the censors’ comments, it can be seen that, while the censors evaluating the submissions made by Secciones del Reader's Digest and Edival objected to Huck’s disobedient and disrespectful attitudes towards two women characters in
general, the censor who evaluated Monguíó’s translation, obviously, placed more emphasis on the role of the two female characters as Huck’s educators, as the censor further pointed out that Huck’s behaviours at school were equally reproachable, namely, Huck’s singing out ‘six times seven is thirty-five’ might be seen as an insult to his math teacher’s intelligence.

The first step to understanding the censors’ decisions was to compare their actions with the relevant censorship legislation, by which the censors’ activities were guided and regulated. In the archival records, it was found that the three publishers all declared compliance with the 1967 Estatuto (Decree 195) upon submitting the works. Examining Decree 195, it was then observed that the censors’ objections to the above-demonstrated paragraphs were, mostly, related to Article 9, which prescribed a series of topics as inappropriate in publications for child and juvenile readers. Among these topics was highlighted:

[El] atentado a los valores que inspiran la tradición, la historia y la vida española o tergiversación de su sentido, así como a los de índole humana, patriótica, familiar y social en que se basa el orden de convivencia de los españoles (Iribarne 1967: 1965, Article 9).

In the text, Huck’s disobedience to authority figures represented by Widow Douglas, Miss Watson and his math teacher could thus be understood as violations of the family and social moral codes established in Franco’s Spain, particularly, in terms of the way that a child was expected to treat his or her educators at school and his or her mother at home. To further confirm this, evidences were obtained from research into school materials approved by the regime and included in its moral education program. It should be noted that, due to the influences of the Catholic Church, mixed-gender education was prohibited in Franco’s Spain. Hence, certain school materials were also created separately, based on the gender differences of the students.²⁰

²⁰ Some texts books are found to address exclusively a female readership, for example, Delegación Nacional de la Sección Femenina del Movimiento, (1974), Economía doméstica: quinto y sexto curso, 10th ed. Madrid: Almena; Werner, C. (1954), Convivencia social: formación familiar y social, primer curso, Madrid: Ediciones de la Sección Femenina de F.E.T y de las J.O.N.S; Torres, F. (1950)
In Convivencia social: formación familiar y social, a course book designed for first-year female students, it was affirmed that the correct way for a child to treat her teachers at school should be:

Cuando una profesora nos pregunta algo debemos contestarle con entera franqueza y no ver en la profesora la enemiga, sino la persona que nos quiere ayudar [...] No nos situemos frente a la profesora, como si estuviéramos en un campo de batalla [...] Y si por casualidad nos resulta antipática procuraremos vencernos y tratarla con respecto (Werner 1954: 7-8).

In order to assist the students in achieving a better understanding, the author circumscribed the above points into a short story of a little girl called María, who refused to answer the questions that the teacher asked her in class and, subsequently, received a low mark. The author, therefore, identified María as ‘una alumna atolondrada, testaruda e indisciplinada’ and suggested that her example should not be followed (7). However, María’s misdeed, compared to that of Huck, was of a far lesser degree, since the girl, at least, did not talk back and challenged the authority of her educator. Another course book, designed for male students, was Así quiero ser: el niño del nuevo estado. The textbook served as an encyclopedia, aiming to clarify a wide range of complex topics such as national values, social values, the way that capital was accumulated and consumed, the national administration system and the working force. Considering the difficulties that students might encounter in studying such complex issues, the authors managed to explain each issue within the length of one to two pages, using simple terms and metaphors. At the end of each topic, there was always a maxim or principle, pertinent to the explained topic, in bold letters and placed in a square, that all students were required to copy down in their exercisebook and memorize, as their homework. In the section about the school system, the school was compared to ‘una sociedad pequeña’:

El maestro tiene en ella la superior jerarquía; luego hay otros niños muy formales y aplicados a los cuales suele confiar cargos de responsabilidad; después están los demás, que tienen la obligación de obedecerlos. Como toda sociedad, la Escuela se mantiene por el orden, la disciplina y el trabajo (Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 117).

The explanation of the school as, primarily, a hierarchical organization thus justified the needs for students to respect this established order, obeying the educator who was at the top of this hierarchy, so that teaching at school could be conducted smoothly. At the end of this section, the attached maxim, to be copied and memorized by the students, read:

Hago promesa formal de ser un buen alumno de la Escuela a que asisto. Sé que si no aprendo lo que el señor Maestro me enseña, ya no lo aprenderé en ninguna parte (117).

It thus becomes clear that, in Franco’s Spain, demonstrating respect and obedience to the educator was a moral value to be inculcated among students from both gender groups.

In the domestic sphere, the role of the mother, according to Father Camarasa, should be that of the ‘queen’ of the family, and that ‘un hogar sin madre es un cielo sin sol, o un desierto sin oasis que suavice la aridez desoladora’ (1958: 187). Based on this idea, the way that a child was expected to treat his or her mother at home should follow three fundamental principles that were: ‘amor, obediencia y servicio’ (189). Of the three principles, the particular importance of obedience was highlighted in the following way:

Así como por la insubordinación y rebeldía de los súbditos se disuelven las sociedades, pueblos y naciones, así quedan destruidos también los hogares cristianos, por la soberbia y altanería de los hijos que se niegan a reconocer la autoridad de sus padres (193).
In this text, Father Camarasa drew a clear juxtaposition between the masses and the youth, in that, in his opinion, both groups should be placed under constant strict discipline without which the two groups might threaten to disrupt an established order: the social order in the former case and the domestic order in the latter. In fact, Father Camarasa's grouping the youth and the masses together largely coincided with the idea underlying Orden de 23 de diciembre de 1936 in which the youth and the masses were both blamed for having involved the country in the miseries of a bloody confrontation (See page 16). The reason that the masses and the youth were likened to each other and were both seen as needing to be controlled was that, according to the mentality of Franco's regime, both groups were of low intelligence and were, therefore, ignorant. Their ignorance, it was thought, made them easier to subdue and manipulate. Yet, at the same time, both groups were believed to possess dangerous powers that could potentially threaten the stability of the status quo, as the masses could unite and rebel against the status quo, while the youth had the power to shape the future status quo. Therefore, in order to stabilize an established order, it was deemed necessary to place both groups under control, through strict discipline. Following this mentality of the regime, Huckleberry Finn's subversive behaviours against his surrogate mothers, Widow Douglas and Miss Watson, might not only be seen as violations against the family moral codes established by the regime, but also as a negative instigation, possessing the danger of manipulating the young readers against their parents' authority in the domestic sphere.

3.1.2 Banditry, Feud Versus La unidad total entre los españoles

The second issue that triggered censors' alert over the 'moral-correctness' of Huckberry Finn was the protagonist's participation in playing banditry games, as well as his involvement in horrible shooting scenes during his journey down the Mississippi. Texts submitted by Bruguera (Expediente Núm. 5847-67), Selecciones del Readers' Digest (Expediente Núm. 8832-67), Editorial Juventud (Expediente Núm. 6326-68) and Edival (Expediente Núm. 12559-75) all encountered censors' objections, due to the translations of the above-mentioned episodes in the narrative, as demonstrated in Table 8 below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Censor’s actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Soon as I could get Buck down by the corn-cribs under the trees by ourselves, I says:  
  “Did you want to kill him, Buck?” […] “What did he do to you?”  
  “Him? He never done nothing to me.”  
  “Well, then, what did you want to kill him for?”  
  “Why nothing- only it’s on account of the feud” (165-166). | En cuando nos quedamos solos Buck y yo, le pregunté:  
  - ¿Querías matarle, Buck? ¿Qué te ha hecho?  
  - ¿El? Nunca me ha hecho nada.  
  - Pues, entonces, ¿Por qué querías matarle?  
  - Por nada..., es sólo por la vendetta (Raluy 1968:109). | Bruguera | The censor red-line crossed the conversation, as well as commented:  
  **Explicación de la “vendetta” en un tono de indolencia inadecuado y nocivo para jóvenes.** |
| The same second I see a young girl coming on the run, and two men with her. […] “O Lord, don’t shoot!” Bang! goes the first shot, and he staggers back clawing at the air-bang! goes the second one, and he tumbles backwards onto the ground, heavy and solid, with his arms spread out. That young girl screamed out, and comes rushing, and down she throws herself on her father, crying, and saying, “Oh, he’s killed him, he’s killed him!” (213) | Al mismo tiempo vi a una muchacha joven acercarse corriendo, con dos hombres,  
  - ¡Oh, Dios! ¡No dispare!  
  La muchacha soltó un grito, corrió y se dejó caer al lado de su padre, llorando y diciendo:  
  - ¡Oh! ¡Le ha matado! ¡Le ha matado! (Raluy 1968:125) | Not Applicable | The censor red-line crossed this section, as well as commented:  
  Un asesinato a sangre fría. |
| “Well,” says Buck, “a feud is this way. A man has a quarrel with another man, and kills him; then that other man’s brother kills him; then the other brothers, on both sides, goes for one another; then the cousins chip in- and by | Not Applicable | Selecciones del Readers’ Digest | Censor’s comment:  
  **Explicación de lo que es “una deuda de sangre”**. |
and by everybody's killed off, and there ain’t no more feud” (1967:82).

Then I covered up their faces, and got away as quick as I could. I cried a little when I was covering up Buck's face, for he was mighty good to me (1967:87).

Chapter XVIII
Col. Grangerford was a gentle man, you see. He was a gentleman all over; and so was his family [...] I cried a little when I was covering up Buck's face, for he was mighty good to me (161-176).

“Stuff! Stealing cattle and such things ain't robbery, it's burglary,” says Tom Sawyer, “We ain't burglars. That ain't no sort of style. We are highwaymen. We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.”

“Must we always kill the people?”

“Oh, certainly. It's best. Some authorities think different, but mostly it's considered best to kill them” (13-14).

When I got down out of the tree, I crept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and by everybody's killed off, and there ain't no more feud” (1967:82).</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then I covered up their faces, and got away as quick as I could. I cried a little when I was covering up Buck's face, for he was mighty good to me (1967:87).</td>
<td>Censor's comment: Consecuencias de la “deuda de sangre”: asesinato de todos los miembros varones de una familia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter XVIII Col. Grangerford was a gentle man, you see. He was a gentleman all over; and so was his family [...] I cried a little when I was covering up Buck's face, for he was mighty good to me (161-176).</td>
<td>Editorial Juventud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “Stuff! Stealing cattle and such things ain't robbery, it's burglary,” says Tom Sawyer, “We ain't burglars. That ain't no sort of style. We are highwaymen. We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.”

“Must we always kill the people?”

“Oh, certainly. It's best. Some authorities think different, but mostly it's considered best to kill them” (13-14). | Censor's comment: Págs: 79 a 85: venganza que ocasiona varias muertes entre ellas la de un niño |

When I got down out of the tree, I crept

| Censor's comment: Este lector estima que debieran atenderse en su totalidad las enmiendas sugeridas, | Censor's comment: Este lector estima que debieran atenderse en su totalidad las enmiendas sugeridas, |

---

Staff: Robar ganado y cosas por el etilo no es robar — dijo Tom Sawyer— Nosotros no somos ladrones— Eso no va con nosotros. Somos salteadores de caminos— Detendremos diligencias y carruajes en el camino, con antifaces, y mataremos a la gente y les quitaremos los relojes y el dinero.

—¿Siempre hemos de matar gente?

—¡Oh, pues claro! Es mejor. ______ algunas autoridades opinan lo contrario, pero ______la mayoría ______ considera mejor matarlos— (Félix 1975: 16).
along down the riverbank a piece, and found the two bodies laying in the edge of the water, and tugged at them till I got them ashore; then I covered up their faces, and got away as quick as I could. I cried a little when I was covering up Buck's face, for he was mighty good to me (176).

“O Lord, don't shoot” Bang! goes the first shot, and he staggers back clawing at the air-bang! goes the second one, and he tumbles backwards onto the ground, heavy and solid, with his arms spread out. That young girl screamed out, and comes rushing, and down she throws herself on her father, crying, and saying, "Oh, he's killed him, he's killed him!" (213)

From the above comparison, it was observed that the censored paragraphs in the four versions of *Huckleberry Finn* coincided in presenting realistic depictions of crime scenes such as shootings, slaughtering and death, although in Tom Sawyer's case, the armed robberies and killings were only imaginative instead of real happenings. The censors' objections to the listed paragraphs were, again, based on requirements under Article 9 of *Estatuto de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles* of 1967:

En el contenido de las publicaciones infantiles y juveniles habrá de evitarse cuando suponga o pueda suponer: a) Exaltación o apología de hechos o conductas inmorales o que puedan ser
constitutivos de delito, o presentación de los mismos en forma tal que pueda causar perturbación en la formación del lector y sin la debida consecuencia de reprobación, o que muestre o sugiera técnicas para su comisión [...]. d) Exaltación o alabanza de cualquier emulación o estímulo que pueda suscitar sentimientos de odio, envidia, rencor, desconfianza, insolidaridad, deseo de venganza, resentimientos, falsedad, injusticia o culto desproporcionado y ambicioso de la propia personalidad (Iribarne 1967: 1965, Article 9).

In the episode of Tom Sawyer’s banditry game, as censored in José Félix’s translation, not only did Tom Sawyer provide a detailed explanation of ‘robbery’, but, eventually, he was also elected the first captain of the gang and admired by Huckleberry Finn and the rest of the boys, which was an obvious violation of item A under Article 9. On the other hand, Buck’s explaining the meaning of ‘feud’ to Huck, as well as Buck’s death, due to the feud between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons, were censored episodes in all of the four submitted versions. The feud episode, as well as that of Colonel Sherburn shooting the town drunkard Boggs, in the presence of the latter’s daughter, inevitably, presented issues related to hatred and vengeance, which, in accordance with item D of Article 9, should not be allowed in publications for child and juvenile readers.

Besides the legislative requirements, fights and killings propelled by personal hatred, envy or resentfulness was, before anything else, considered as sins that contravened the religious principles of the Catholic Church. In La doctrina de nuestro Señor Jesucristo, it was affirmed that ‘Dios nos manda amar a nuestros prójimos como a nosotros mismos’ (García 1951: 167). Likewise, in Camino: libro de lectura comentada, the same point was confirmed in lesson one, Mis amores:

Amo a Dios por encima de todas las cosas [...]. También amo a mi prójimo. Mis prójimos son todos los hombres, porque todos somos hermanos, puesto que procedemos de Adán y Eva (Maíllo 1942: 9).
It thus becomes clear that, in Catholicism, a fraternal love for all human beings was established as a 'divine precept', considering that all humans are descendants of the same ancestry. Therefore, Huckleberry Finn's involvement in banditry games, as well as his presence at revenge-fueled shooting scenes, was, obviously, a source of moral corruption, if one views the banditry games and vengeful shooting scenes from a religious stance.

Apart from breaching religious principles, the bandit, feud and the gun shooting episodes in *Huckleberry Finn* also contravened an important value that Franco's regime aimed to instill among the young generations of post-Civil-War Spain, which was the unity of the nation. In history textbooks, the Spanish Civil War was often depicted as a war of 'brothers against brothers', caused by dissensions among different sectors of the Spanish society. Below is a passage, on the Second Republic and the eruption of the Civil War, extracted from *Yo soy español: el libro del primer grado de historia*:

En España había ya muchos socialistas y muchos masones y muy poco temor de Dios. Los socialistas excitaban a los pobres contra los ricos. Los masones querían que hubiera revolución. Y por no haber temor de Dios, había muy poca caridad y no se cumplían los mandamientos. Por eso vino la República. Y con la República, se perdió la paz: se quemaban las iglesias y los conventos y los españoles luchaban otra vez unos contra otros (Serrano de Haro 1957: 83).

As an important lesson learned from the miseries of the Civil War that unity among the Spanish people was the key to the nation's rising to power and glory, while internal dissensions among the people would only bring the nation's downfall:

Para ser fuerte y poderosa es preciso que [un país] esté unido que no malgaste inútilmente sus energías en querellas interiores [...]. Cuando la unidad ha sido un hecho, la grandeza, el Imperio y la gloria han sido consecuencias inmediatas, de la misma forma que, cuando la discordia ha dividido a los
españoles, España ha decaído vergonzosamente, llegando casi a desaparecer (Sospedra 1954: 20, 27).

In order to achieve this unity, as the first step, a fraternal bond among all Spanish people should be established: ‘Los españoles somos todos hermanos [...]. Como hermanos debemos querernos y sacrificarnos unos por otros’ (Serrano de Haro 1957: 82). The next step was the dilution of the individual identity in the forging of a collective identity, during the process of which each individual’s needs should succumb unconditionally to the needs of the Spanish nation:

Si yo para mí mismo soy todo, para el estado español no soy más que su servidor [...] Mi voluntad y mis actos deben enderezarse al bien común, pues solamente de ese modo serán útiles para mí y para los demás. Yo no puedo querer para mi algo que sea a costa de los demás: eso es individualismo. El individualismo es absorbente, egoísta y disgregador: todo lo contrario de lo que España necesita. España necesita que todos, altos y bajos, grandes y pequeños, unamos nuestras voluntades y sentimientos para querer lo que a ella convenga, y no lo que convenga a nuestros caprichos (Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 33).

Based on this mentality, the shootings and killings in Huckleberry Finn, propelled by personal hatred, were precisely manifestations of individual selfishness, which were condemned by the regime as ‘los grandes enemigos de la unidad de los pueblos’ (Sospedra 1954: 19). The third step that the regime took, in its effort to achieve national unity, was to create a general belief among the young generations that they, as a whole, bore the responsibility to ensure the nation’s eventual rising to power in the future:

Todos los españoles somos unos en el deber, y lo debemos ser no porque el deber se nos imponga, sino porque lo sintamos en el fondo de la conciencia; por el convencimiento de que sólo procediendo así, España tendrá la grandeza de un pueblo culto, civilizado y moderno (Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 14).
Also, in a similar manner, such a responsibility that the younger generations were expected to undertake was formulated in the following terms:

Soy heredero y continuador de gloria y hazañas de afanes y proyectos que debo proseguir o comenzar [...] Debo colaborar con mis compatriotas en la gran obra de elevar más cada vez el nombre gloriosa de España. Todos mis actos, todos mis anhelos irán encaminados a trabajar, luchar y, si es preciso, morir, por aumentar el prestigio, el honor y la gloria de mi Patria (Maíllo 1942: 12).

As a result, under Franco’s regime, each individual’s personal identity was, to a large degree, reduced to that of a mechanical part, tightly controlled by the state machinery system, functioning in service of the latter. Therefore, each individual’s personal decisions had to be made strictly in line with what the state would demand, to the point that even one’s emotional feelings were not intimate personal properties possessed by oneself any more. Instead, in the regime’s logic, one’s personal emotions could be predicated, standardized and even formulated by the state. For instance, in Convivencia social: formación familiar y social, one can find section titles that read “¿Cuándo se puede reír abiertamente?”, “¿Cuándo conviene sonreír?” and “¿Cuándo no conviene sonreír?” (Werner 1954: 61-62)

Moreover, in her study on school textbooks used in Franco’s Spain between 1940s and 1950s, Kira Mahamud Angulo observed that, under the Franco’s regime:

El amor se configura según los preceptos del Nuevo Estado. A quién o a qué amar, y cómo, viene dada a través de claras
instrucciones [...] que amar no es un asunto íntimo ni trivial, sino religioso, social, políticamente condicionado y a veces incluso controlado (Angulo 2007:5).

Angulo’s statement may also be applied to hatred. Up to this point, it can be said that the censorship of the bandit and the feud episodes in *Huckleberry Finn* was, to a large extent, due to the fact that uncontrolled personal emotions, hatred in particular, as the driving factors behind the realistic depictions of the killings and shootings in these episodes, were incompatible with the religious and nationalist logic of Franco’s Spain.

3.1.3 No Mo’ Kings Versus *Los reyes católicos*

In more than one occasion, conversations about kings take place between Huck and Jim during their river journey down the Mississippi. When *Huckleberry Finn* was translated into Spanish, the humourous and satirical effects achieved in these conversations, at the expense of making fun of kings, however, tended to cause censors’ apprehension. Through examination of the censors’ records, it was found that five submissions 21 of the novel encountered censorship interventions of this kind, which are listed in detail below in Table 9:

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Censor’s Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I read considerable to Jim about kings, and dukes, and earls and such, and how gaudy they dressed and how much style they put on, and called each other your majesty, and your grace, and your lordship, and so on, ‘stead of mister [...]”Dat’s good! But he’ll be pooty lonesome- dey ain’ no kings here, is dey, Huck?” “No.” “Den he cain’t git no</td>
<td>Me animé a leerle a Jim la mar de cosas que trataban de reyes, duques condes y gentes así; del lujo con que vestían y de las cortesias que gastaban, y que unos a otros se llamaban Majestad, Excelencia y Vuestra Señoría, en vez de llamarse Mister [...] – ¿Ah, Sí? ¡Qué bieng! Pero debe sentise mu solo, poque aquí no hay reye. ¿Veddá, Huck?</td>
<td>Editorial Juventud</td>
<td>Censor’s Comment: P64-65: chirigota sobre el rey Salomón y los reyes en general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

situation. What he gwyne to do?”
“Well, I don’t know. Some of them gets on the police, and some of them learns people how to talk French” (107-109).

| “But Huck, dese kings o’ourn is reglar rapscallions; dat’s jist what dey is; dey’s reglar rapscallions.” “Well, that’s what I’m a saying; all kings is mostly rapscallions, as fur as I can make out.” “Is dat so?” [...] What was the use to tell Jim these warn’t real kings and dukes? (226-228) |
| - No. - Pue, entonse, no podrá encontrá empleo. ¿A qué se debe dedicá? - Pues, no sé. Dicen que algunos ingresan en la policía y otros enseñan a la gente a hablar al francés (Monguió 1968: 64-65). |
| | | |

| “But Huck, dese kings o’ourn is reglar rapscallions; dat’s jist what dey is; dey’s reglar rapscallions.” “Well, that’s what I’m a saying; all kings is mostly rapscallions, as fur as I can make out.” “Is dat so?” [...] What was the use to tell Jim these warn’t real kings and dukes? (226-228) |
| - Pero, Huck, estos reyes nuestros son unos verdaderos maleantes; eso es lo que son: unos maleantes. - Eso es, precisamente, lo que estoy diciendo: la mayoría de los reyes son unos maleantes, según yo he sacado en consecuencia. -¿Ah, sí? [...] ¿Qué se sacaba con decirle a Jim que éstos no tenían nada de reyes, ni de duques auténticos? (Amando Lázaro Ros 1967: 192-193) |
| | | |

| “But Huck, dese kings o’ourn is reglar rapscallions; dat’s jist what dey is; dey’s reglar rapscallions.” “Well, that’s what I’m a saying; all kings is mostly rapscallions, as fur as I can make out.” [...] “All I say, is, kings is kings, and you got to make allowances” (226, 228). |
| - Pero, Huck, estos reyes nuestros son unos bribones de tomo y lomo. - Pues eso es lo que te estaba diciendo. Tú lees algo de ellos y ya verás [...] - Lo único que yo digo es que un rey es un rey y que hay que ser comprehensivo (Raluy 1967: 134). |
| | | |

| A harem’s a bo’d’n house, I reck’n. Mos’ likely dey has reckety times in de nursery (1967:62). |
| Not Applicable | Selecciones del Readers' Digest | The censor marked this sentence in red. |
“Well, that’s what I’m a saying; all kings is mostly rapscallions, as fur as I can make out.”

“Is dat so?” (226)

- Pues es lo que yo digo. Casi todos los reyes lo son.
- ¿Ah, sí? (Félix 1975: 118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edival</th>
<th>The censor marked this sentence in red.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Although Decree 195 did not establish explicitly that mockeries on kings be a prohibited theme in publications for children, Article 8, under the same decree, did stress the importance that publications for young readers should demonstrate a high respect for traditional Spanish values (Iribarne 1967:1965, Article 8). Further, item E under Article 9 reaffirmed that ‘[el] atentado a los valores que inspiran la tradición y la historia [española]’ be unacceptable in publications for child and juvenile readers (1965). Therefore, it can be seen that the censors’ decisions were largely made in line with the legislative requirements, since, in the above-listed paragraphs, Huck’s and Jim’s mockery and generalizing discussions over kings in general would have also placed the great Spanish kings and Spain’s history under attack, which was not permissible.

In Huck and Jim’s discussions, kings were either presented as laughing stocks or ‘rapscallions’. As a contrastive picture, in the history teachings under Franco’s regime, the great Spanish kings such as Ferdinand II, Isabella I, Charles I and Philip II were not only presented as great monarchs in Spain’s history, but also as representatives of the glorious imperial past of the nation. King Ferdinand II and Queen Isabella I, also known as the Catholic monarchs, were recognized as ‘los verdaderos forjadores de la total unidad española’ (Sospedra 1954: 24). More specifically, the Catholic monarchs, during their reign, managed to achieve:

a) la unidad política;
b) la unidad de las tierras de España;
c) la unidad entre los hombres;
d) la unidad religiosa, expulsando a los judíos;
e) la unidad de la lengua (24).
In summary, under the reign of the Catholic monarchs, ‘España consiguió su unidad espiritual, territorial y política’ (Escuela Española 1962: 192). This complete unity of Spain, according to the history textbooks, was precisely a guaranteeing factor of Spain’s subsequent rising to power during the reign of Charles I and Philip II, when ‘España era un imperio en el que no se ponía el sol’ (Escuela Española 1962: 193). However, it should be noted that the teachings of the great kings and their achievements were, by no means, teachings of Spain’s history per se. Rather, the teachings of the young generations of Spain’s glorious past, conducted under the regime, had a more far-reaching present political implication. On the one hand, by evoking the nation’s imperial past during the Golden Age, the regime aimed to inculcate a patriotic sentiment among the youth, as Antonio J. Onieva, in the preface of Escudo Imperial: libro escolar de lectura, clearly stated:

Con estas páginas, aspiramos a que los niños sientan el orgullo de su Hispanidad y adquieran la convicción de que el ser españoles y católicos es hoy una de las pocas cosas elevadas de la tierra, si no la primera (1952:4).

Hence, the younger generations were expected to take pride in their Spanish identity, bearing in mind the glories that Spain had achieved in the past. On the other hand, by contrasting the imperial past with the present decadence of Spain, Franco’s regime also aimed to instill a sense of mission among the younger generations, that they, as citizens of the new state, bore the responsibility of regaining the nation’s lost glories:

Yo quiero una España imperial, que me recuerde la de los Reyes Católicos, Fernando e Isabel; una España unida que se haga respetar de todo el mundo, por su potencia y por sus virtudes (Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 15).

Besides the two above-mentioned purposes, the teaching of history during Franco’s Spain was, above all, an important means of justifying the authority of Franco’s dictatorship. David Herzberger contends that, in Francoist historiography, ‘tradition forms part of the natural and divine order of things’
(2007:13). More specifically, according to Herzberger, the past was understood as a fixed, unchangeable entity, from which 'religion, ethics, heroic deeds, great men and a host of other narrated concepts and events' were extracted in order to form 'the founding sense of Spanishness under Franco' (13). In this process, the primary task of the historians was to 'reveal the pertinent meanings of the past', (13) so that the past could be put into service for the present:

the fixedness of the past as an anchor for the present ossifies
Spanishness into a précis of traditions and discourses that are
[...] appropriated in order to sustain the Regime's authority (14).

Eventually, for Herzberger, the main function of Francoist historiography was one of revelation. In this sense, instruction on the great Spanish kings, representing the nation's golden, imperial past, thus, became a process of passing on a carefully pre-selected history and tradition to the new generations, with the aims to justify and perpetuate the dictatorship of Franco. Taking this into consideration, the mockeries of kings in *Huckleberry Finn* were not only seen as a disruption of the image of an ideal youth under the regime, being that these mockeries came from a child, but also as an attack on the very foundation upon which Franco's regime was sustained.

3.1.4 “Miss Sophia's run off!” Versus *La mujer ideal*

During Huck's stay at the Grangerfords', Miss Sophia, the youngest daughter of Colonel Grangerford, elopes with young Harney Shepherdson, despite the long-standing feud between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons. In the Spanish versions of *Huckleberry Finn*, Ros's translation and Félix's translation22 both encountered censorship problems due to their translations of Miss Sophia's elopement:

---

22 Expediente Núm. 3053-67 and Expediente Núm. 12559-75.
In compliance with Decreto 195, a woman’s elopement with her lover, without consent from her parents and family, was, without a doubt, ‘[un] atentado a los valores que inspiran la tradición, la historia y la vida española’ (Iribarne 1967: 1965, Item E of Article 9). At the same time, elopement could also be considered as an issue that ‘por su fondo o por su forma, no pertenece al mundo de los menores’ (Item G of Article 9). In either case, elopement was not considered as an acceptable theme to be included in publications for child or juvenile readers. Moreover, Miss Sophia contravened the ideal image of womanhood cultivated under Franco’s regime. The ideal Spanish woman, according to Federico Torres, had to possess qualities such as ‘la honradez acrisolada, la ejemplar abnegación,
la dulzura en la palabra, el amor a los suyos, y como primera de todas las virtudes, la limpia y pura fe católica’ (1950: 88). Based on these qualities, one such ideal image of womanhood was represented by Isabella I, the Catholic queen. In *Escudo imperial: libro escolar de lectura*, Queen Isabella, as an example for all Spanish girls to follow, was presented in the following terms:

Esta reina tan linda [...] conocía los deberes caseros como una perfecta ama de su casa. Por nada del mundo declinaba su majestad de reina, pero en cambio, era humildísima cuando se trataba de los servicios de Dios [...]. Solía añadir con orgullo que su esposo el Rey Don Fernando no se había puesto nunca una camisa que ella no hubiera hilado y cosido [...]. Toda su vida vistió con gran modestia; ni consintió nunca lujos en su Corte (Antonio J. Onieva 1952: 40, 43).

In summary, the ideal Spanish woman constructed under Francoism had to be modest, religious, spiritual, passive, obedient and, perhaps most importantly, she had to be the ‘moral guardian of the family and home’ (Enders and Radcliff 1999:22). However, as the same authors point out:

While guardianship normally implies some sort of authority and action, [under Francoism] it translated to a mandate for passivity, for “not doing” rather than “doing”. That is, to protect the honor of the household, women were supposed to abstain from any dubious activities that could defile the family name (22).

Hence, the ideal Spanish woman was expected to demonstrate a capability of resisting temptations: ‘La bondad será, pues, no guíarse de un impulso generosa del corazón, sino hacer bien a cuantos nos rodean’ (Torres 1950: 108); and ‘No busques la tentación, la ocasión, el peligro, porque eres muy débil’ (Los Padres Escolapios 1940: 134). This resistance to temptations was tested, above all, through her self-restraint from sexual desires, namely, the preservation of her chastity. According to Mercedes Carbayo-Abengózar, under Francoism, ‘sexuality was administered through the institution of engagement. To hold back was the
highest proof of respect- it was the norm, the law' (2001:83). In *Huckleberry Finn*, Miss Sophia’s elopement with Harney Shepherdson was not only a manifestation of her spiritual weakness when confronted with temptation, but also could be seen as an open resistance to the patriarchal authority of her father, Colonel Grangerford, considering the inimical circumstances between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons. At the same time, running away with a man would inevitably place her chastity at risk. Therefore, Miss Sophia contravened the ideal image of womanhood cultivated under Franco’s Spain, and, in the meantime, might set up a negative example for the potential female juvenile readers of the story.

**Conclusion**

The current chapter has analysed the translations of the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, as well as the censorship interventions that occurred to the translations of such issues during Franco’s Spain. Huckleberry Finn’s disobedient behaviours, involvement in feudal killings and shootings, mockeries of kings, as well as Miss Sophia’s elopement in the narrative, were all considered as moral issues that tended to induce censors’ objections to the target texts. This was due to the fact that the incorporation of these issues in the translations, in one way or another, threatened to disrupt the ideal image of a Spanish youth constructed within the moral codes of Franco’s Spain. At the same time, the censorial treatment that the translations of these moral issues encountered was a clear manifestation of the filtering mechanism of the censorship activities conducted under Franco’s regime: any element deemed incompatible with the moral order established by the regime was to be eliminated through the censorship process.

Through the investigation, it was found that the censored versions were all translations to be published for a juvenile readership, which reaffirmed the notion that Franco’s regime was particularly vigilant in publications for young readers, and supported the notion that double-standard criteria were in use during the censorship activities (See page 51-63). Also, it was observed that the censorship activities on the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, as examined in the current chapter, nearly all took place after Decree 195 came into effect in 1967,
replacing the 1955 *Reglamento*. The findings obtained here clearly contravened Marisa Fernández-López’s observation that the regime’s censorship grip on children’s literature loosened in the later stages of the regime (See page 22). On the contrary, it can be seen that, despite the economic and social changes that Spain underwent during the 1960s, instead of adopting a more open and tolerant stance on literary works produced for young people, the regime, to certain extent, even raised its level of control over works for children, especially in terms of the moral values transmitted in such works. This was again related to the regime’s position on the younger generations. Authors of materials used for moral education during Franco’s Spain tended to stress the importance of childhood and adolescence as a crucial stage for one to acquire good moral values. For example, in *Cursos de Religión*, it was stated that ‘*en la niñez y juventud es cuando con menos trabajo se puede adquirir buenos hábitos*’ (Los Padres Escolapios 1940: 137). Likewise, in *Yo soy español*, the author affirmed in the preface that:

> El alma de estos niños tiene una plasticidad asombrosa para quedarse con la huella de los grandes ejemplos. Después, el contacto con las ásperas realidades de la vida los endurecerá con el hálito seco del escepticismo (Serrano de Haro 1957:6).

Taking these authors’ opinions into account, along with the censorship records on the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, it can be deduced that the regime’s view of its younger generations, who were considered as the future guarantors of the regime’s *status quo*, most likely, remained unaltered, regardless of the evolvement of the dictatorship itself.

> Arbitrariness and inconsistency, as pointed out in the previous chapter, were two underlying features of the censorship activities conducted during Franco’s Spain (See page 66-68). In the investigation on the censorship of the moral issues in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, it was found that the censors’ decisions again manifested a large degree of arbitrariness and inconsistency. Firstly, the same translation might not encounter any censorship issue in one submission, but might be censored in another submission. One example of this
was María Teresa Monguió’s translation. When this translation was submitted in 1957 as a book for children, it was approved for publication. However, when it was resubmitted in 1968 for a reprint, this time as a book for juvenile readers, it encountered various censorship problems. Secondly, different censors might demonstrate different interpretations over the same issue, as in the case of Huck’s undisciplined behaviours at Widow Douglas’ house. The censor evaluating Secciones del Reader’s Digest’s version interpreted Huck’s bad manners as disrespect to two ladies, while the censor assessing Editorial Juventud’s version interpreted this issue as an irony on education and the educators. Such arbitrariness and inconsistency with censors’ decisions reaffirmed the impracticability of the censorship legislation, based on which censors made their decisions. Besides the vagueness of the principles expressed in such legislation, (see page 68) it was found that the language that was used in the formulation of the censorship legislation was also responsible for the censors’ inconsistent, arbitrary decisions. For instance, in studying Article 9 of Decree 195, it was observed that the whole article was syntactically structured in subjunctive mood, with the use of phrases such as ‘habrá de evitarse cuando suponga o pueda suponer’, ‘conductas inmorales que puedan ser constitutivos de delito’, ‘argumentos que supongan’, ‘presentación de temas que puedan’, ‘estímulo que pueda’ and ‘asuntos que no pertenezcan’ (Iribarne 1967: 1965, Article 9). Based on explanations given by Real Academia Española in Nueva gramática de la Lengua española, the verbal mode, traditionally, ‘revela la actitud del hablante ante la información suministrada, es decir, su punto de vista sobre el contenido de lo que se presenta o se describe’ (2010: 473). In addition, the predicates that require the use of subjunctive mode are usually characterized as ‘NO ASERTIVOS’, because:

Más que informar de un estado de cosas lo presentan bajo el prisma de una evaluación, una emoción, una intención o una acción ejercida sobre algo o alguien (478).

Thus, it becomes clear that the censorship legislation, with its repetitive use of subjunctive mode, was, by itself, structured upon uncertainty. Such uncertainty within the censorship legislation itself, therefore, accounted for the non-
The previous chapter and the current chapter have examined the two issues that induced most of the censors’ objections towards the Spanish translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, namely, the religious theme and the moral theme of the novel. The following chapter will focus on the translations of racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, together with the corresponding censorship reactions. The questions to be examined are: how did the translators dealt with the racial references in *Huckleberry Finn*? What were the censors’ reactions towards the translations of such references? What were the censors’ motives upon making their decisions? These questions will be addressed in detail in chapter four.
Chapter 4  Translations of Racial Issues in *Huckleberry Finn*

Los españoles llevamos la misma sangre, y hablamos el mismo idioma, tenemos la misma Religión y la misma Historia y una sola cuna: la madre España. La madre España nos hace hermanos a todos los españoles.

(Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940: 48)

**Introduction**

The religious and moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, as examined in the previous two chapters, posed some significant translation problems in the Spanish translations of the novel and, subsequently, these issues were subject to the censors’ rigorous scrutiny during Franco’s dictatorship. However, racial issues, the main controversy surrounding this work in the US context, in contrast, seemed to be exempt from censorship constraints and caused little problem in the Spanish translations of *Huckleberry Finn*. Examining the censors’ records, it was found that only one reference relating to racial issues was produced. A censor, identified as *Lector Núm. 22*, when evaluating Amando Lázaro Ros’s translation submitted by Editorial Ramón Sopena in 1967 (Expediente Núm. 3053-67), objected to contents on page 45 in the translation in which Huck’s drunkard father vehemently complained about the government’s allowing black people the right to vote. *Lector Núm. 22’s* comment read: ‘Explosión racista a cargo de un borracho’. However, it was observed that the censor’s objection was rather random, instead of a coherent, recurrent decision. *Lector Núm. 22* was also identified as the censor who assessed the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* submitted by *Editorial Juventud* in 1968 (Expediente Núm. 6326-68), *Editorial Molino* in 1972 (Expediente 2545-72), *Editorial Bruguera* in 1967 (Expediente Núm. 5847-67), 1970 (Expediente Núm. 6902-70), 1972(Expediente Núm. 2115-72) and 1974 (Expediente Núm. 5238-74), and *Selecciones del Readers’ Digest* in 1967 (Expediente Núm. 8832-67). It was unknown, though, whether *Lector Núm. 22* had been the same person during all these years. However, if *Lector Núm. 22* had been the same person, then in none of the above-mentioned translations did she or he place any recurrent objection towards the same racial issue; if, on the other hand, the position of *Lector Núm. 22* had been occupied by different
censors, then the censor who had objected to the racial reference in Ros’s translation obviously failed to prompt any consensus from other colleague censors. In one way or the other, the findings obtained from the examination of the censors’ files seemed to confirm that the Spanish translators’ treatment of racial issues in Huckleberry Finn did not prompt a major concern in the state censorship operations conducted during Francoist Spain. Neither had there been any manifest double-standard criteria adopted by the censors in their censorial scrutiny of the racial theme in the translations of the novel, unlike the censorship of the religious issues and the moral issues.

In a systematic study of the Spanish translations of the twentieth-century popular novels for young people written in English, Fernández-López discovers a ‘peculiar phenomenon’:

Fragments of the source text that were purified of racist and xenophobic elements in subsequent English-language editions were published in Spanish in a translation that remained faithful to the original English version editions. This characteristic even extended to illustrations (2000: 30).

In her subsequent explanation, Fernández-López contends that this phenomenon is both due to a Spanish translation tradition that aims to maintain ‘fidelity to the first editions of texts’ (30) and a lack of ‘social consciousness that rejects discrimination against ethnic minorities […] until the 1990s’ (33). This explanation, however, can only partly account for the case of the translations of Huckleberry Finn. While it was immediately recognizable that the notions of ‘blackness’ and ‘whiteness’ will certainly expect a very different response among the Spanish readers from their US counterparts, due to the different poly-systems (See page 27-29) in which the concepts were applied, hence the unawareness or even indifference demonstrated by the Spanish censors, translators and readers towards certain racial elements that might be highly sensitive in the US context. Examining the Spanish translations of Huckleberry

---

23 In her study, Fernández-López examined works by authors such as Enid Blyton, Richmal Crompton and Roal Dahl. See, for more details, Fernández-López, M. (1996), Traducción y literatura juvenil: narrativa anglosajona contemporánea en España, León: Universidad de León.
Finn in detail, it was found that the translators, in their renderings of the racial issues in the narrative, all displayed the kind of fidelity to the source text as Fernández-López mentioned above, regardless of the target readers of the translations being children or adults. Nevertheless, besides fidelity, the translators’ resultant treatment of certain racial elements even manifested an enhanced xenophobic insinuation in the translated texts, in comparison with the source text. This, along with the censors’ general indifference over the treatment of racial issues in Huckleberry Finn, subsequently, led one to wonder if, besides the two reasons mentioned above by Fernández-López, there was even a conscious encouragement, on the institutional level, to cultivate a notion of racial unity while discouraging racial diversity during Franco’s Spain, through the practice of translation and state censorship. Therefore, unlike the previous two chapters that have purported to explore why religious and moral issues were censored in the translations of Huckleberry Finn, the current chapter will investigate, instead, why the translations of racial issues were exempt from censorship focus under Franco’s regime.

For methodological purposes, the translations of the racial references in Huckleberry Finn will be classified into two categories in the investigation. The first category will examine the translations of the use of racial epithets in the novel, and the second category will focus on the translations of racial remarks in the text, which lead to negative racial stereotyping or the demeaning of ethnic minorities. Through an investigation on these two categories of racial references in the translations, the current chapter will offer a comprehensive discussion of the Spanish translators’ treatment of racial issues in Huckleberry Finn. It will also uncover the norms and constraints that shaped the translators’ decisions, as well as shed some light on the presentations of racial theme in literary works for children during Franco’s Spain.

4.1 Translations of Racial Epithets in Huckleberry Finn

4.1.1 Translations of “Nigger”

In the US context, the most often quoted reason to condemn Huckleberry Finn as a racist book is Twain’s excessive use of racial epithets in the narrative, especially the use of ‘nigger’ in the story. The word ‘nigger’, in Collins English
Dictionary, is defined as an offensive term to refer to a black person (2006: 584), and in *The Concise Macquarie Dictionary*, ‘nigger’ is a derogatory term either to refer to a Negro or ‘a member of any dark-skinned race’ (1982: 842). When pronounced in the US context, for the Afro-American people, the epithet ‘nigger’, both demeaning and disrespectful, alludes to a long tragic history in which Afro-Americans were enslaved and subjugated to service to the white people. Since the Civil Rights movement in the 1950s in the US, the use of ‘nigger’ in *Huckleberry Finn* has triggered an ever-growing uneasiness among black parents who are afraid that their children will be embarrassed and depressed when reading this story at school or in public libraries. Such uneasiness, followed by a series of active protests and legal actions, subsequently, has led to the banning and removals of *Huckleberry Finn* from a number of public libraries and school reading programs. Educators, for their part, have equally found it awkward to teach *Huckleberry Finn* in class, especially when having students read the story aloud, due to the repetitive appearances of ‘nigger’ in the narrative. John H Wallace, a public school administrator, for example, points out that:

> The assignment and reading aloud of *Huckleberry Finn* in our classrooms is humiliating and insulting to black students. It contributes to their feelings of low self-esteem and to the white students’ disrespect for black people. It constitutes mental cruelty, harassment, and outright racial intimidation to force black students to sit in the classroom with their white peers and read *Huckleberry Finn*. The attitudes developed by the reading of such literature can lead to tensions, discontent, and even fighting (1992:17).

Subsequently, Wallace called for the exclusion of *Huckleberry Finn* from the school reading program and he even went as far as to produce his own sanitized

---

24 *Huckleberry Finn* was first banned in Concord Public Library in 1885. In 1957, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People demanded that the book be removed from high schools in New York City. Then, in 1988 Rockford public schools removed the book from their reading list due to it containing the word ‘nigger’. For the same reason, Huckleberry Finn was again challenged at Taylor County High School in 1994. For a comprehensive overview of the censorship history of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* in the US, see Sova, D. (1998), *Banned Books: Literature Banned on Social Grounds*, New York: Facts on File, pp. 3-5.
version, deleting all mentionings of ‘nigger’. The opponents,\textsuperscript{25} nevertheless, have held rather different views in the midst of this racial controversy surrounding \textit{Huckleberry Finn}. David Lionel Smith, for instance, suggests that Twain’s use of the racial epithet ‘nigger’, as well as his portrayals of the black protagonist, Jim, are indeed ‘accurate reflections of an irreducibly heterogeneous social reality’, and that ‘the mere exclusion of troubling material constitutes an evasion, not a solution of fundamental problems’ (2006:121-123). Eventually, Smith compared Wallace’s idea to ‘an educational philosophy that values comfort over understanding’ (122). For critics that support this story without changes to the text, Twain’s realistic depictions of Jim have managed to render the character more human, which, in so doing, aims to provoke readers’ empathy with Jim and with people of his race in general. Therefore, \textit{Huckleberry Finn} is, in fact, a great American literature work that condemns racism. Nevertheless, to interpret \textit{Huckleberry Finn} as a racist book or the opposite is to ‘align oneself politically with one faction or another’ (Smith 2006:123), which is indeed not the preoccupation of this study. In his descriptive translation study, Gideon Toury contends that:

Translating as a teleological activity \textit{par excellence} is to a large extent conditioned by the goals it is designed to serve, and these goals are set in, and by, the prospective receptor system(s). Consequently, translators operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating, and not in the interest of the source text, let alone the source culture (1985:19).

Therefore, what this section purports to investigate is, when the racial epithets used in \textit{Huckleberry Finn} were detached from the US context, hence the complete loss of the social and historical context in which the use of such terms provoked controversy, what were the Spanish translators’ solutions to present such terms in the target texts? Moreover, what kind of constraints imposed by the Spanish

receptor system of Franco’s Spain could be reflected based on the translators’ decisions?

In order to provide a more focused account of the Spanish translations of ‘nigger’, the following table only draws on the translations of the first reference to Jim in the narrative for comparison:

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Text</th>
<th>Target Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El negro</strong> de Miss Watson, un negro muy gordo, estaba sentado a la puerta de la cocina (F. Elías 1943: 9-10)</td>
<td>Miss Watson’s <strong>big nigger</strong>, named Jim, was setting in the kitchen door (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jim, el corpulento criado negro</strong> de Miss Watson, estaba sentado a la puerta de la cocina (María Teresa Monguiló 1957:9)</td>
<td>1957, Editorial Juventud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Un criado negro</strong>, muy grandote, de la señora Watson, llamado Jim, estaba acluecado en la puerta de la cocina (Lázaro Ros 1961:19)</td>
<td>1961, Editorial Ramón Sopena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jim, el negrazo</strong> de la Señorita Watson, estaba sentado a la puerta de la cocina (J. A. de Larrinaga 1966: 8-9)</td>
<td>1966, Editorial Planeta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above comparison, it was observed that most of the translators’ solution to translate ‘nigger’ was either ‘el negro’ or ‘el criado negro’, except De Larrinaga who translated the term as ‘el negrazo’, adding the suffix ‘-azo’ to the noun ‘negro’. Based on its definition in *Collins Spanish Dictionary*, ‘Negro’, as a noun, when referring to human beings, is a ‘black person, colored person, a Negro’ (2005: 685), though it is not specified whether the term possesses any derogatory connotative meaning when applied this way. However, ‘negro’ is also an adjective, as in the case of ‘el criado negro’. When used as an adjective, apart from indicating the black complexion and hair color of a person, ‘negro’ can also be explained as ‘filthy, black (Spanish equivalent: sucio); gloomy, upset (when
referring to the mood of a person); terrible, atrocious and illegal’ (685). In relation to the solution ‘negrazo’, on the one hand, it implied Jim’s physical appearance as a ‘big nigger’, on the other hand, based on explanations given by Real Academia Española, the suffix ‘-azo’, when attached to a noun, it tends to ‘denotar golpes o acciones bruscas, repentinias o sorpresivas, sea en sentido literal o en alguna de sus extensiones metafóricas’ (2010: 112). It thus became obvious that, the Spanish translations of ‘nigger’ also possessed some negative insinuations in the receptor system. However, it should be noted that a mere examination of the Spanish translations of ‘nigger’ was not sufficient to uncover the particular agenda to which the translators subscribed in dealing with the racial theme of the narrative, since a fidelity to the original and a lack of awareness of racial discrimination, two reasons as Fernández-López proposed, would suffice to account for the translators’ solutions presented above. Therefore, along with the translations of ‘nigger’, available extra-textual information, or ‘preliminary data’ (Lambert and Van Gorp 1985:52), including information contained in book blurbs, book titles and prologues of the ultimate published Spanish versions, was also examined, since Jim, the main black character was likely to be introduced for the first time in these sections of the book. Further, information contained in the above-mentioned sections would usually set the readers’ first impression with a story, as well as readers’ expectations of the ensuing reading experience. Consequently, by examining the way Jim was presented in blurbs, titles and prologues of the ultimate Spanish translations, a clearer view can be obtained on how Jim was eventually adapted into the receptor system.

The blurb featured on the back cover of the 1963 edition of Huckleberry Finn, translated by Lázaro Ros and published by Editorial Ramón Sopena read:

Mark Twain, gran fantasista, es el padre de Huckleberry Finn, el compañero infatigable de Tom Sawyer. Los dos muchachos, dueños de un tesoro, se convertirán en personajes respetables sin la intervención de Huck, el vagabundo, el cual volverá a lanzarse en pos de lo desconocido. Él y Finn, en su balsa, Mississippi abajo, viven multitud de divertidos lances, que
culminan al juntárselos los indeseables charlatanes, dedicados a explotar la candidez de los pueblos de la ribera. Tom Sawyer entra de nuevo en escena para impulsar un gran número de las más jocosas aventuras.

It was not difficult to observe that this summary of the story plot in *Huckleberry Finn*, very likely produced by the publisher, was rather imprecise. On the one hand, the character Jim was not even mentioned; on the other hand, this summary presented, instead, Huck and Tom as the two protagonists of the story. ‘Él y Finn, en su balsa, Missisipi abajo’ even gave the impression that it was Tom and Huck who travelled together along the Mississippi river, which is totally misleading, since it is Jim whom Huck takes on the river journey. In the prologue authored by the translator Lázaro Ros himself, the translator contended that:

Tom y Huck son una transposición a la vida de dos chicos de las orillas del Missisipi de los dos personajes centrales de la inmortal novela de Cervantes. (9)

Alluding to Cervantes’ *s Don Quijote*, Ros continued to expain that:

Tom Sawyer lo ve todo como en sus condenados libros de aventuras, y Huck lo ve todo con los ojos de la dura realidad de su vida; pero tiene ante él tal prestigio esa referencia a los libros que Tom Sawyer hace a cada momento, que al igual que Sancho, se identifica en ocasiones con su leído compañero, y se fuga de la realidad con él. Por eso afirmamos que las aventuras de Tom Sawyer y las de Huckleberry Finn se complementan y complementan el pensamiento de Mark Twain (10).

Ros’s only reference to Jim in his three-page-long prologue was found in the following paragraph:

Huck vive en este libro su propia vida y aventuras y hasta refleja en sí mismo un poco de la locura de Tom, proyectándose él en otro personaje que ya aparece en el primero de estos dos libros
de Mark Twain: el negro Jim, que adquiere extraordinario relieve (11).

Ros’s prologue equally confined Jim to an unimportant secondary position. Instead, Ros interpreted Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn, the two white boy heroes, as the true protagonists of the narrative, comparing them to the famous Spanish iconic Quijote and Sancho Panza. This allusion to iconic characters in Spanish national literature could be understood as the publisher’s and the translator’s strategy to appeal to the domestic readers by extracting ‘sameness’ out of the ‘foreignness’, thus familiarizing readers of the receptor system with the translated foreign text. Nevertheless, this attribution of a Spanish agenda to Huckleberry Finn regrettably rendered the black character, Jim, invisible and secondary. It should be noted that, in the source text, whether Twain’s portrayals of Jim are racist or antiracist, Jim is unquestionably a main character in the narrative, next to Huckleberry Finn: of the total forty-three chapters, Jim appears in thirty chapters, while Tom Sawyer, completely absent from Huck’s and Jim’s river journey, only appears in fifteen. Therefore, the translator’s rendering of Jim fell beyond the explicability of fidelity to the original or a simple lack of consciousness of racial matters. A conscious belittling of Jim’s role in Huckleberry Finn was also reflected in Simon Santainés’s translation of the book title, which read Huck Finn, el negro y Tom Sawyer. The three main characters in the narrative were all listed in the title. However, while the two white boys were unproblematically identified by their names, Jim, the black character, failed to have his name mentioned and, instead, was merely identified by the racial group to which he belonged. Consequently, the title of the translated text confirmed the unequal status between Jim and the two white boys: Huck and Tom were fully personified characters, while Jim, with his name discarded, was deprived of his personal identity, thus de-personified, and subjugated to stereotyping in the ensuing narrative.
4.1.2 Translations of ‘Injun’

Another racial epithet used in *Huckleberry Finn*, with nonetheless much less frequency, is ‘Injun’, an informal or dialect word for (American) Indian. Apart from its colloquial use in ‘honest injun’, an idiom meaning ‘genuinely, really’, which will not be considered here, only three references to ‘Injun’ could be traced in the narrative, which are outlined below:

Reference 1

I got an old tin lamp and an iron ring and went out in the woods and rubbed and rubbed till I sweat like an Injun (Twain and Moser 1985: 21).

Reference 2

Boggs comes a-tearing along on his horse, whooping and yelling like an Injun (210).

Reference 3

They swarmed up the street, towards Sherburn’s house a-whooping and yelling and raging like Injuns (215).

From its use, it can be perceived that the epithet ‘Injun’ has a rather limited textual function in the narrative, that is, ‘Injun’ is not associated with any particular character, nor does it contribute to the development of the story plot, but is merely used for descriptive purposes, meaning savage or rough. Due to its rather limited appearances and textual function in the narrative, it can be assumed that, in the target texts, the translators might, accordingly, attribute a limited attention to the translation of this term and opt for a most convenient strategy. The following table lists the translators’ different solutions of ‘Injun’ in the Spanish versions of *Huckleberry Finn*:

---
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Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Reference 1</th>
<th>Reference 2</th>
<th>Reference 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo López-Hipkiss, <em>Editorial Molino Argentina</em>, 1949</td>
<td>un piel roja (13)</td>
<td>un piel roja (64)</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Viu Raluy, <em>Bruguera</em>, 1967</td>
<td>un piel roja (18)</td>
<td>un piel roja (124)</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Sommer, <em>Bruguera</em>, 1970</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simón Santainés, <em>Editorial Mateu</em>, 1972</td>
<td>un piel roja (19)</td>
<td>un piel roja (135)</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Félix, <em>Edival</em>, 1975</td>
<td>un indio <em>injun</em> (20)</td>
<td>un indio <em>injun</em> (109)</td>
<td>Not translated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated in the above table, compared to the translations of 'nigger', the translators' solutions to 'Injun' seemed to be much more diversified. Due to the secondary textual function of the term, two translators, namely, Sommers and Monguíó, opted for the complete deletion of all references to 'Injun' in the target texts, while Lázaro Ros undertook the opposite strategy by borrowing this term directly from the source text, only italicizing it in the target text to signal its
foreign origin. Nevertheless, whether a complete deletion of 'Injun' or a complete borrowing, the target-text readers were prevented from either gaining awareness of the existence of 'Injuns' or gaining a knowledge of what an 'Injun' was. Other translators, nonetheless, chose to translate this term. It was observed that their translations of 'Injun' were more or less descriptive, thus rendering the meaning of this term explicit for the target-text readers to access. Four translators, namely, Raluy, López-Hipkiss, Santainés and De Larrinaga, coincided in translating 'Injun' as 'piel roja'. However, if Sommers's and Monquió's deletions of references to 'injun' merely erased the existence of 'Injuns' in the target texts, then the solution to translate 'Injun' as 'piel roja' obviously achieved an reinforced xenophobic emphasis, by alluding to the skin color of the American Indians. In Así quiero ser, el niño del nuevo Estado, in the chapter that explained about 'El Destino' (Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez 1940:16), a picture inserted featured two American Indians, both wearing the traditional headdress and on their knees, who were bowing towards a big cross in the center, in presence of a Catholic missionary on the left and a Spanish conquistador on the right. This picture clearly transmitted a strong ethnocentric message, that is, the American Indians, without the Catholic religion, were 'infieles' (17) and thus inferior, in desperate need of being rescued by the Spanish conquistadores who 'descubrieron nuevas tierras por el deseo de hacer cristianos' (16). In this regard, the translators’ decisions to translate 'Injun' as ‘piel roja’ seemed to conform to this ethnocentric agenda. In addition, the word ‘rojo’, by the time of the Spanish Civil War and the ensuing Franco's Dictatorship, had been widely applied to refer to communism or communists that were vehemently condemned by the regime. In this sense, ‘piel roja’ also acquired an increased degree of enmity in the target text than 'injun' in the source text.

4.2 Translations of Racial Remarks in Huckleberry Finn

Besides the racial epithets, there are also racial remarks in Huckleberry Finn that often lead to either the demeaning of the black characters in the narrative or a general racial stereotyping of black people. Furthermore, in the source text, it is found that while some of such racial remarks are pronounced by white characters, others are pronounced by black characters themselves. With the
racial comments articulated by white characters, it is observed that such comments vary between two poles: at worst, an affirmation of the inferiority of the black people and, at best, an attribution of a 'spiritual whiteness' to the 'good' black characters; 'good', defined from the perspective of the white people. Two examples are selected from the source text, which represent most clearly such variations as reflected in the racial remarks articulated by white characters in the narrative:

Example 1:

“It warn't the grounding- that didn't keep us back but a little. We blewed out a cylinder-head”

“Good gracious! Anybody hurt?”

“No'm. Killed a nigger.”

“Well, it's lucky; because sometimes people do get hurt” (317).

Example 2:

I knewed he was white inside, and I reckoned he'd say what he did say (390).

Example 1 is a conversation between Huck and Aunt Sally. In this conversation Aunt Sally questions about the reason for Huck's delayed arrival, to which Huck responds with a lie: an imagined cylinder-head-explosion incident during his steam-boat journey. However, it is Huck's answer to Aunt Sally's following question inquiring on if anyone gets injured during the explosion that is most controversial. From Huck's answer, 'No'm. Killed a nigger', the implication that can be drawn is that 'niggers' are excluded from the semantic considerations of 'anybody'. In addition, Aunt Sally's response to Huck's answer, 'Well it's lucky; because, sometimes, people do get hurt' further confirms the taken-for-granted de-humanization of the black people, since the implied meaning of her statement is that 'niggers' are not counted in the concept of 'people', and therefore, it is 'lucky' that a 'nigger' is killed instead of a white man. Example 2, nonetheless, is a positive remark that Huck articulates in the narrative, in which he confirms
Jim’s inner ‘whiteness’, upon seeing that the latter is willing to sacrifice his chance to achieve freedom in order to look after his injured white companion, hence a ‘spiritual whiteness’ bestowed on Jim for his unselfishness and service to the white people. Racial remarks articulated by black characters in the narrative, on the other hand, are far less frequent. Nevertheless, it is noticeable that these few remarks usually reflect the black characters’ passive acceptance of their own position, a low self-esteem and even a conscious contempt towards other members belonging to the same racial group as themselves, as manifested in the following cases:

Example 3:

So Tom says:

“What's the vittles for? Going to feed the dogs?”

The nigger kind of smiled around graduly over his face like when you heave a brickbat in a mud puddle, and he says:

“Yes, mars Sid, a dog. Cur’us dog, too. Does you want to go en look at’im?”

“Yes” (337).

Example 4:

“Spose a man was to come to you and say Polly-voo-franzy-what would you think?”

“I wouldn' think nuff'n; I'd take en bust him over de head. Dat is, ef he warn't white. I wouldn't 'low no nigger to call me dat' (109).

In Example 3, Tom Sawyer, in his investigation on the possible location where Jim is imprisoned, asks a black servant if he is going to feed a dog with the vittles. The black servant responds positively to Tom's question with a broad smile: 'yes, mars Sid, a dog. Cur’us dog, too'. As a matter of fact, this 'cur'us dog' refers to Jim. By happily accepting Tom's suggestion that vittles are food for dogs and further comparing Jim to a 'cur'us dog', the black servant not only demonstrates his own simple-mindedness but also his passive acknowledgement of the inferior
position to which the black people are confined. Likewise, in Example 4, Jim, without any knowledge of the French language, perceives ‘Polly-voo-franzy’ to be an insult and decides to ‘take en bust de head’ of whoever says this to him, on condition that this person is not white. Jim’s claim, ‘Dat is, ef he warn’t white, I wouldn’t ‘low no nigger to call me dat’, on the one hand, reveals his awareness of the unequal racial status between the white people and the black people; and on the other hand, implies Jim’s conscious contempt towards other black people that are the same as him.

The above-analyzed racial remarks, whether articulated by white characters or black characters in the narrative, have contributed to the racial controversy surrounding Huckleberry Finn in the US context (Lester 1995: 343, Henry 1995: 369, Brenner 1995: 451). In this section, the Spanish translations of these racial remarks will be investigated in detail. Through this investigation, along with the translations of the racial epithets examined in the previous section, it is hoped that a comprehensive view will be achieved over the Spanish translators’ general strategies in dealing with the racial references in Huckleberry Finn in the target system.

A detailed examination of the Spanish translations of the above-mentioned racial remarks revealed that the translators generally opted for conformance to the source text in the production of the translations. Fernández-López observes that:

> In the translation of children’s literature, the Spanish norm of fidelity to the original text is only displaced by another norm of greater force, such as the primacy of pedagogic and didactic considerations (2000:33).

Since conformance was upheld as the general strategy in the translators’ treatment of racial remarks in Huckleberry Finn, in order to uncover the ‘norm of greater force’ that guided the Spanish translators’ decisions in their treatment of racial remarks in Huckleberry Finn, the following analysis will focus exclusively on the ultimate target texts that have markedly diverted from ‘the Spanish norm of fidelity’, based on Fernández-López’s observation.
In Monguió’s 1957 translation of *Huckleberry Finn*, Example 1 was translated as:

- No fue el embarrancar lo que nos retrasó, pues en seguida nos remolcaron. Fue que estalló una caldera.
- ¡Santo Dios! ¿Hubo alguna desgracia?
- Sí, un negro muerto.
- ¡Vaya por Dios! (134)

Of all Spanish versions studied, Monguió’s translation of Example 1 was the only one that diverted markedly from the source text. The implication derived from the conversation between Huck and Aunt Sally in the source text, that black people are not considered as human beings was erased totally in the target text. Monguió’s decision to breach the fidelity norm seemed to echo Fernández-López’s observation in that the translator perceived it inappropriate to claim the death of some people as ‘better’ than the death of other people, because of their racial differences, and hence, a rectification was made for didactic purposes in the target text. Nonetheless, Monguió’s translation seemed to be a rare case in which the racial connotations of the source text were eliminated in the target text. Other translators’ decisions seemed to be more ambiguous, if not working towards the opposite direction. For instance, with the translations of Example 2, De Larrinaga and Santainés coincided in producing the following target text:

**Yo sabía que Jim tenía unos sentimientos muy nobles y esperaba que dijese lo que dijo** (De Larrinaga 1966: 288, Santainés 1972: 284).

Raluy and Hipkiss have produced almost the same translations as De Larrinaga and Santainés:

**Yo sabía que Jim tenía muy nobles sentimientos** y esperaba que dijese lo que dijo (Raluy 1959:242, Hipkiss 1949:118).

What these four translators had in common was that, in the target texts, they tended to efface the explicit linkage of Jim’s unselfishness and reliability to a ‘spiritual whiteness’ as in the source text. Nonetheless, it was unclear whether the translators’ decisions were based on an intention to reduce the racial
implications in the target text or, rather, on a need to explain explicitly what it really meant by being ‘white inside’, that is, one had to possess certain noble characteristics to be qualified for an inner whiteness. If the underlying norm that guided the translators’ decisions in their translations of Example 2 was ambiguous, then the following two translators’ renderings of Example 4, however, reflected unmistakably an increased degree of racist agenda:

Example 4a

- Suponte que un hombre se te acerca y te dice: ¿Palle vu fransua?... ¿Qué pensarias tú?
- No pensaría nada; me iría hace él y le abriría la cabeza...; eso, como es natural, si no se trataba de un hombre blanco. Yo no le permitiría a un negro que me llamase esas cosas (Lázaro Ros 1961: 105).

Example 4b

- Supón que un hombre se te acerca y te dice: ¿Parlé vu francé? ¿Qué pensaría que quiere decir?
- No pensaría nada; le contestaría a puñedazos. Y eso si no era blanco, porque supongo que solamente un negro podría llamarme una cosa así (Elías 1943: 99).

Comparing the source text with Ros’s translation, it was observed that the phrase ‘como es natural’ was absent from the source text. Hence, it was the translator’s own insertion in the target text. ‘Como es natural’ further described the superior status of the white people and the inferior status of the black people as natural, unquestionable facts, which Jim, in the source text, does not contend explicitly. As a result, the translator’s insertion of ‘como es natural’, to a large degree, attributed an increased racial connotation to the target text. Meanwhile, in Elías’s version, it was noticed that the meaning of Jim’s statement was completely modified. In the source text, ‘I wouldn’t ‘low no nigger to call me dat’ only implies Jim’s awareness of the same low status that he and other black people share, and that other black people do not have the right to abuse him, since the black people are of the same status. In Elía’s translation, Jim’s conviction that only someone black would be so bad as to insult him while a
noble white man would be very unlikely to perform such an action, nonetheless, acquired a strong, intentional depreciation and downgrade of his fellow black people and, at the same time, a praise of the white man's nobility, which the author Mark Twain does not communicate in the source text.

Through examination of the Spanish translations of the racial references in *Huckleberry Finn*, it was uncovered that, in general, the racial issues that had rendered the source text controversial in the source system remained, nonetheless, unmodified in the target system, without raising much controversy or concern at the state censorship level during Franco's Spain. However, at the same time, compared to the source text, the Spanish versions of *Huckleberry Finn* seemed to manifest an enhanced racist agenda, as demonstrated in the cases analyzed above. If Mark Twain’s stance on racial matters in *Huckleberry Finn* is still ambiguous, then the Spanish translations tended to communicate unmistakebly a racist ideology. Such a phenomenon fell beyond the explicable of a fidelity translation norm or a simple lack of awareness of discrimination against ethnic minorities in the Spanish system, as Fernández-López proposes. In their censorial assessment of the Spanish translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, the censors were manifestly more concerned with religion and moral-related issues in the translations than with the racial issues. Due to the censors’ lack of attention, little evidence was traced in the censors’ reading records that could account for this increased racist agenda observed in the Spanish versions. Therefore, in order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the translators’ and the censors’ treatment of the racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, an in-depth examination of the target system, hence Franco's Spain, in which the translations were produced thus becomes essential.

### 4.3 To Understand the Spanish Translators’ Decisions in the Receptor System: the Censorship Legislation during Franco’s Spain

The most direct references to be explored to account for the translators’ treatment of the racial elements in *Huckleberry Finn*, after the censors’ reading records, would be the various censorship laws introduced at various stages of the dictatorship because, with the introduction of these laws, the regime created
a legal framework through which translations of foreign works were censored in an organized, systematic manner, with the ultimate intention to ‘block, manipulate and control the establishment of cross-cultural communication’ (Billiani 2007: 3).

The regime’s special concerns over children’s literature were first reflected in the introduction of the 1955 Reglamento on the publications of literature for child and juvenile readers. The guidelines established in the Reglamento covered a wide range of topics concerning children’s literature, which, broadly, included religion and moral related issues, educational issues, political issues and literary issues. Under moral-related issues, the Reglamento contended that ‘las novelas o relatos policíacos y de aventuras en los que se exalte el odio, la agresividad y la venganza’ should be avoided in publications for young readers (Salgado 1955: 842, Item E under Article 15). Nevertheless, ‘el odio’, or the hatred referred to in this establishment, did not specify racial hatred in particular. Furthermore, under the section concerning political issues, it was stated that ‘las publicaciones infantiles se abstendrán de fomentar, directa o indirectamente sentimientos de odio, envidia, rancor o venganza entre las clases sociales’ (Salgado 1955: 843, Item B under Article 17). Again, it is noticeable that while the regime discouraged the class-related hatred to be represented in books written for children, race-related hatred was, nonetheless, not mentioned. In the later 1967 Estatuto de Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, the censorship legislation replacing the 1955 Reglamento, amongst the topics that were prohibited for inclusion in books written for child and juvenile readers, while ‘exaltación o alabanza de cualquier emulación o estímulo que pueda suscitar sentimientos de odio, envidia, rencor, desconfianza, insolidadad’, was reiterated (Iribarne 1967: 1965), no specific reference to racism was made.

Besides the censorship legislation regulating specifically publications for child and juvenile readers, it was observed that other censorship laws introduced by the regime, regulating publications in general, also failed to address racial issues. Chronologically, Orden de 23 de diciembre of 1936, first initiated the censorship practices on the Nationalists’ side by prohibiting:
la producción, el comercio y la circulación de libros, periódicos y folletos y toda clase de impresos y grabados pornográficos o de literatura socialista, comunista, libertaria, y, en general, disolventes’ (Dávila 1936: 471, Article 1).

As it can be seen, the censorship principles established in this order were more based on an ideological ground, rather than on a racial ground. This preoccupation with the ideological agenda of publications was also expressed in the Ley de Prensa of 1938. In regard to the publication of foreign works in general, the 1938 Press Law recommended ‘la adopción de medidas restrictivas’, due to both ‘razones de orden económico’: a general paper shortage in Spain during the immediate post-Civil-War years, and ‘razones por índole doctrinal’ (Súñer 1938: 7036, Article two). However, this legislation did not specify what this ‘índole doctrinal’ was exactly, nor could any explicit reference to racial matters be found in this legislation. The 1938 Press Law was later replaced by the new 1966 Press Law, which continued in use until the end of the dictatorship. In this latter legislation, although restrictions imposed on publications were not as strict as those established in the former legislation, a series of topics were still deemed as taboos:

Son limitaciones: el respeto a la Verdad y a la moral; el acatamiento a la Ley de Principios del Movimiento Nacional y demás Leyes Fundamentales; las exigencias de la defensa Nacional, de la seguridad del Estado y del mantenimiento del orden público interior y la paz exterior; el debido respeto a la Instituciones y a las personas en la crítica de la acción política y administrativa; la independencia de los Tribunales, y la salvaguardia de la intimidad y del honor personal y familiar. (Iribarne 1966: 3310, Article 2)

As it can be seen, neither were racial issues explicitly addressed in the 1966 Press Law.

Thus it becomes clear that, in the case of Huckleberry Finn, the Spanish censors’ general indifference towards the translators’ treatment of the racial
issues in the narrative was largely due to the fact that racism was hardly ever addressed, in the above-examined censorship laws, as an inappropriate topic that might contravene the ideological agenda of the regime or induce harm to the readers. As a result, the representations of the racial references in *Huckleberry Finn* in the Spanish versions managed to be absorbed into the receptor system unproblematically, through the filtering of the regime’s censorship mechanism. Nevertheless, the mere examination of the censorship legislation was not sufficient to account for the increased tendency of racism manifested in the Spanish translations of *Huckleberry Finn*. In order to understand this tendency, it was thus necessary to explore, on a deeper level, the reasons for the absence of references to racial issues in the regime’s censorship legislation, which was intrinsically associated with the receptor system, namely, the socio-historical circumstances in which the legislation was created.

4.4 To Understand the Spanish Translators’ Decisions in the Receptor System: the Socio-Political Factors

Franco was known for his pragmatism in the power stabilization of his dictatorial regime and before anything else, in the maintenance of his own, unquestionable position as a dictator. The Caudillo’s strategy of pragmatism was, to a large extent, reflected in his skillful and regular ‘balancing act between the various politico-ideological families of the regime’ (Payne 1999: 312). Among the ideological ‘families’, Falange Española (FE), the Spanish fascist party, was perhaps the political sector that was most relevance to the regime’s views and policies on racial issues.

Falange Española, founded by José Antonio Primo de Rivera in 1933, was largely inspired by and modelled on Italian fascism (Payne 1987: 52-56, Payne 1999: 96, 142 and 234). During the Civil War, by Decree number 255 of 20 April 1937, FE was merged with other Spanish rightist forces, broadly referred to as ‘los requetés’, which together would form the sole legal party of Franco’s regime, known by the name of Falange Española Tradicionalista y de las Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista, or FET y de las JONS in short, or simply as El Movimiento (Franco 1937: 1034, Article 1). FET y de las JONS was largely responsible for organizing social and propagandistic activities in Franco’s regime.
The elaboration of the 1938 Press Law was precisely a task assigned to Ramón Serrano Súñer, the dictator’s brother-in-law and, at the same time, the new national delegate of Press and Propaganda in the FET. According to Antonio Marquina Barrio’s observation, Serrano Suñer was ‘una personalidad clave en el surgimiento del nuevo estado español y su orientación hacia la ideología fascista’ (1989: 147). Due to the support that Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany had provided to Franco’s Nationalist front during the Civil War, the new regime developed and maintained amicable relations with these two countries of the Axis during the years of the Second World War, as Payne contends that:

Though Franco never fully adopted the entire core fascist revolutionary ideology, there is no question that he identified his regime politically with the fascist powers and considered himself not merely an associate but virtually an ally of the Axis (1999:326).

In terms of its racial policies, it is noticeable that, although with the Axis coming to power during the war, the most radical Falangists turned more and more Nazi-phile, within Falange Española in general, ‘there does not seem to have been a full appreciation of the character and extent of Nazi racism, either vis-à-vis the Jews or in general’ (Payne 1999:96). In practice, FE seemed to demonstrate more closeness to its Italian counterpart, in that:

FE was not particularly anti-Semitic, though it was not opposed to anti-Semitism either [...]. There was no criticism of Nazi policy, except to point out that in Spain the historic “Jewish problem” did not have to do with race but with religion (Payne 1999:96).

Payne’s observation thus provided at least some clue to account for the absence of the Francoist regime’s views on racism in its censorship legislation, namely, that the regime was not in full favor of the kind of racism as promoted in Hitler’s Germany, based on a biological determinism, using James Gregor’s words (Gregor 1969:259). But, at the same time, it was not explicitly against racism of this kind either. Therefore, it can be said that the regime had rather opted for a strategic indifference to racism, while diverting its focus on addressing religion and moral-related issues instead, which it believed to be more relevant to the
Spanish context.

With the defeat of the Axis power by the end of World War II, Franco’s regime promptly adjusted both its foreign and domestic policies, thus entering what Payne terms as an era of ‘defascistization’ (1999: 363). In this process, FET y de las JONS eventually lost its popularity. Nonetheless, it was never abolished during Franco’s dictatorship and the reason for this, once again, pointed to the dictator’s regular strategy of pragmatism, as ‘it (FET) was still indispensable as a means of propaganda, limited mobilization, and political and social support’ (Payne 1999: 417). Subsequently, leading figures of FET y de las JONS continued to occupy key positions in Franco’s government after World War II and youth organizations, in particular, under the administration of FET, even managed to expand during this period (Payne 1999: 405-417).

If, in the middle of the War, the regime’s position on racism could be understood as a strategic indifference, then, in the context of post-World-War-Two, the lack of demonstrations of the regime’s position with respect to racism may, on the one hand, be explained by the fact that there was simply no need for the regime to correct or adjust its policies on anything that it had never officially acknowledged. On the other hand, the regime’s position on racism was largely linked to the conscious efforts that it took in building a unified and homogenized Spanish identity. In the process of constructing this Spanish identity, the regime’s definition of ‘Spanish-ness’ was often made based on an exclusion of the ‘un-Spanish’, as Maria Fernández-Lamarque observes:

Franco’s government characterized itself by emphasizing the Spanish ‘race’ as a standard of value and pride. ‘Spanishness’ was based on one ethnicity only, which excluded any group that differed from the Francoist fundamentals of ‘true Spaniards’ (2014: 89).

Without a doubt, the ‘true Spaniards’, before anything else, were constructed in line with the regime’s political and ideological agenda. Therefore, racism in Spain, subsequently, acquires a cultural and political dimension, on top of the ethnic one. In practice, the republicans, or the ‘enemies’ that the Nationalists had fought during the Civil War, were the first ones to be excluded from the consideration of ‘true Spaniards’. After the Civil War, not only were the former republicans
persecuted and marginalized, but also they were even considered as racially inferior. In *Els nens perduts del franquisme*, a 2002 documentary based on a project investigating child abductions from republican parents conducted by Franco’s regime during and after the Civil War, Francisca Aguirre, a former child victim, recounts her experience when staying with other abducted children in an orphanage that was similar to a concentration camp:

Nos juntaron y nos explicaron claramente que éramos escoria, que éramos hijos de horribles rojos, asesinos, ateos, criminales, que no merecíamos nada y que estamos allí por puro...por pura caridad pública. 28

As it turns out, Francisca was not alone in her experience, as other victims of child abductions that were interviewed for this project also confirmed similar ones.29 According to this study, the major motivation for the regime to conduct organized child abductions was to separate the children from their republican parents so that they would not be ‘contaminated’ by the ideas held by their parents, thus eventually eliminating the ‘illness’ that had plagued the Spanish race.

Besides the republicans, in the regime’s efforts to cultivate a homogenized Spanish identity, representations of minority groups such as the Jews and the Moors were also subject to a conscious ‘ethno-cultural disappearance’ (David K. Herzberger 2007: 14), since homogeneity had to be achieved at the expense of wiping out signs of plurality. The racial ideals promoted by Franco’s regime were also clearly manifested in *Raza,*30 a 1942 film scripted by the dictator himself, under the pseudonym Jaime de Andrade. In the film, the qualities for the ideal Spaniards can mostly be found in two characters, namely, Pedro Churruca and his son José Churruca. The former is a ship captain and dies shorty after the story starts, participating in a suicide mission fighting

---


29 Other victims of child abduction that were interviewed for the making of this documentary include María Villanueva, Juana Doña, Carme Riera, Teresa Martín, Julia Manzanal, Petra Cuevas, Antonia Radas, Tomasa Cuevas, Trinidad Gallego and Carme Figuerola.

30 *Raza,* (1942), directed by Sáenz de Heredia, J. L.,[DVD], Barcelona and Madrid: Consejo de Hispanidad.
against the US navy in Cuba, which was still a Spanish colony at that time. The latter, José, joins the Nationalists during the Civil War and firmly defends the Nationalists’ cause. Both are heroic, determined fighters, firm in belief, willing to defend the honor of the patria and even die for it. In addition, both are white. In contrast, the republicans in the film are associated with moral corruption: ‘la relajación de costumbre’. Also, ‘la gente de color’, referring specifically to the Philippinos and the Cubans when Pedro recounts his experience overseas, are associated with ‘la rebeldía’, and ‘la invasión de la masonería’. Hence, the absolute superiority of the true Spaniards over those that do not belong to this category becomes obvious. Fernández-Lamarque contends that:

Children’s stories, as part of meaningful representations, function by making associations with the images they present and the reality that surrounds the reader (2014:88).

Therefore, it can be said that children’s stories created during Franco’s Spain could hardly be exempt from influences of the racial ideals promoted by the regime. This thus accounted for the Spanish translators’ tendencies in reducing the main black character Jim in Huckleberry Finn to a secondary, unimportant position in the translations of the novel, since the image of the black character obviously fell outside the range of racial ideals sustained by the regime.

The examination of the socio-political factors that shaped the regime’s positions on racial issues in this section has, in the end, proved fruitful to account for the absence of dealings on racism in the regime’s censorship legislation, as well as to understand the Spanish translators’ treatment of the racial issues in Huckleberry Finn, as analyzed in the previous sections. In its censorship legislation, the regime’s reluctance to demonstrate a clear attitude on the topic of racism was, on the one hand, linked to the fascist component embedded within the ideologies of the Francoist dictatorship, as well as to the pragmatic wartime strategies that the regime adopted, in order to maintain amicable relations with Nazi Germany. On the other hand, the regime was unwilling to address the issue of racism, because, whether in favor or against racism, the slightest manifestation of its position on this issue would be taken as an indirect confirmation of the racial plurality reality of the Spanish society, which would

---

31 This quote appears at around five minutes after the beginning of the film.
definitely controvert the regime's will to construct a homogenized Spanish identity. Cristina Sánchez-Conejero contends that 'racism must be considered as part of the social fabric of Spanish identity' (2007:4). In fact, in the process of constructing the Spanish identity, in the regime’s careful selection of some as 'true Spaniards' and the exclusion of others as heretics, racism was installed in the Spanish society in such a seamless, natural way that it was often difficult to be aware of its existence. The result, instead of the innocent 'lack of social consciousness' of racial discriminations, to which Fernández-López alludes, it is rather a 'cultivated unification of public prejudices against those who were excluded from Spanishness' (Herzberger 2007: 15).

**Conclusion**

Mark Twain's use of the racial epithets 'nigger' and 'Injun', as well as his incorporation of controversial racial remarks in the narrative have, to a large extent, problematized the reception of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* in the US context. However, in its Spanish translations produced under Franco's regime, such controversial issues managed to bypass the Francoist censorship filtering mechanism and were eventually admitted smoothly into the target-culture system. Moreover, unlike the double-standard criteria that the censors adopted in their censorship of the religious and moral issues in the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, as discussed in the previous two chapters, it was observed that, in regard to the racial theme of novel, the censors’ decisions did not seem to vary according to the perceived target readership of the translations. Instead, the above-mentioned racial issues were absorbed into the target Spanish system indiscriminately without causing any major concern among the censors. Such censors' manifest disinterest towards the racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn* was, before anything else, accounted for by the relevant censorship legislation elaborated by Franco’s regime, as such legislation provided the basic guidelines under which the censorship activities were conducted. Nevertheless, through an examination of the various censorship laws that were in use, it was found that hardly any of these laws addressed the issue of racism, nor alluded to the regime’s position on racial matters.

At this point, one may be misled into concluding that racism may simply
not be relevant to Franco’s Spain, as the regime did not even find it worthwhile to address this issue on its legislative level. Subsequently, racism being irrelevant to the Spanish society, in addition to the Spanish translators’ fidelity tradition, together may suffice to account for the racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn* being admitted unproblematically into the Spanish system. However, through a focalized comparison between the source text and the target texts, it was observed that the translated texts somehow coincided in transmitting a much more emphasized and explicit xenophobic agenda than the original source text, which was beyond the explicability of a simple fidelity translational norm, or racism being irrelevant to the Spanish society. Instead, a further in-depth examination of the socio-political circumstances in which the Francoist censorship legislation was elaborated led to revealing that, far from being irrelevant to the Spanish society, racism was actually incorporated, in such a seamless manner, into the social and cultural life of the Spanish people that it was often hard to be aware of its existence, hence the innocent ‘lack of social consciousness’ that Fernández-López perceives.

Racism, in Franco’s Spain, was not so much expressed through a biological determinism as it was through the regime’s cultivation of a unified, homogenized Spanish identity. Racism of the former kind, as in Hitler’s Germany, was broadly condemned after World War II, for its lethal mass liquidation practices, while racism in Franco’s Spain, due to its much milder practices and its often amalgam with the regime’s patriotic and Catholic religious ideals, managed to remain unnoticed by a post-War world that preoccupied itself in preparing to enter the Cold War. The Francoist regime’s forging of the Spanish identity was, without a doubt, a selective process, in which the ‘true Spaniards’ were selected and the ‘others’ were excluded, in line with the fundamental ideologies of Franco’s dictatorship. In parallel, the censorship mechanism under Franco’s regime equally functioned as a selective process, also conforming to the regime’s political and ideological agenda. The racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, which are so controversial in the source-culture system, however, when translated and absorbed into the target-culture system of Franco’s Spain, not only did not controvert, but also, to a certain extent, even amalgamated with the regime’s promotion of homogeneity. In this way, racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn*, were,
subsequently, unproblematically represented and further highlighted in the Spanish translations.
Final Conclusion

The current thesis has examined the Spanish translations of Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, (1885) produced under the vigilance of state censorship during Franco’s Spain. Chapter two and chapter three investigated the two themes of *Huckleberry Finn* that suffered from major censorship in the translations, specifically the religious theme and the moral theme of the novel. Chapter four, in its turn, explored the non-censorship of the racial theme of the novel in the translations. This investigation on the various target texts, produced and censored at different stages of Franco’s regime, first of all, uncovered the constraints or limitations imposed on the translation of children’s literature, or even on publications for children in general, during Franco’s dictatorship.

The constraints, first, consisted in that translations of children’s literature were more likely to suffer from censorial interventions than translations of texts for adults. As manifested through the censors’ records, more tolerance was demonstrated towards those translations of *Huckleberry Finn* with a perceived adult readership, while stricter censorship regulations tended to be imposed on the translations when children were the perceived target readers instead. Secondly, the censorship of the religious satire and the moral issues in *Huckleberry Finn* largely confirmed that translations of children’s literature were more expected to comply with the requirements set up by the ‘patrons’ in the target system, namely, the upholders of the dominant values and ideologies of Franco’s Spain: the Catholic Church and Franco’s regime itself. Thirdly, the regime’s censorship grip on children’s literature did not loosen as it evolved through the different stages of its existence, which was reflected in the censors’ records on *Huckleberry Finn* produced in the late sixties and early seventies.

These constraints imposed on translations of children’s literature during Franco’s Spain were mostly derived from the regime’s assumptions and interpretations of the notions of children and childhood. As the censorship legislation and the textbooks used under the regime together manifested, the regime, before anything else, saw children as the future of Spain, upon which
also laid the future of the regime itself. At the same time, the regime also perceived an inherent unpredictability in the new generations, which prompted the regime to intervene at the formative stage of the Spanish youth, in order that the younger generations would eventually develop into desired citizens of the state as the regime had envisaged. In regard to children’s literature, the regime undertook two major forms of intervention, as demonstrated through the current study. The first form of intervention, which was realized through the established censorship framework, was the elimination of ideas that the regime judged to be undesirable or harmful from texts written for children. This was largely based on the regime’s assumption that children required adult protection, so as to promote their growth into model citizens. The second form of intervention that the regime undertook was the cultivation of ideas and values among the young generations, in accordance with the regime’s fundamental ideologies, based on its assumption that children also required adults’ guidance and teaching, so as to be successfully socialized, acculturated and, in the specific case of Franco’s Spain, indoctrinated. The two forms of intervention shared a common underlying assumption of the regime, that is, children, compared to adults, were more likely to succumb to influences of ideas, whether good or bad, hence the necessity to regulate the sort of ideas to which children would be exposed. The harsh censorial treatment and constraints that were imposed on translations of children’s literature were precisely due to such texts, of foreign origins, containing potentially dangerous or harmful ideas that the regime feared would be beyond its control.

Nevertheless, as the current study uncovered, translated children’s literature under Franco’s regime, instead of being a passive receiver of the constraints that the target system imposed on it, in fact, responded actively and even challenged such constraints up to a certain degree, hence the inner dynamics of children’s literary system. Such dynamics first consisted in the broad and ambiguous scope of children’s literature, which could not be fully, unambiguously accommodated in the related censorship legislation during Franco’s Spain. As it turned out, in the 1955 Reglamento, children’s literature, excluding school course materials, was specified as:
Todas publicaciones que por su forma externa, su contenido y por el público a que van destinadas puedan considerarse principalmente apropiadas para niños y los adolescentes (Salgado 1955: 841, Article 1).

Furthermore, Article 2, 3 and 4 of the Reglamento attempted to explain more clearly what exactly were considered as works for child and juvenile readers, based on the three different criteria proposed in Article 1, namely, the external forms of the works, the contents and the target readers. Here, an obvious controversy arose between ‘todas publicaciones’ claimed in Article 1 and the limited number of cases considered in the actual explanations given in the ensuing articles. In other words, the Reglamento first failed to accomplish the sort of universal applicability that it alleged to achieve at the beginning. Secondly, in terms of contents, Article 3 established that:

Por su contenido, las publicaciones para niños y adolescentes podrán ser: a) Formativas, cuando persigan una finalidad predominantemente educativa o cultural; b) Recreativas, si se proponen fundamentalmente el entretenimiento, aunque con un trasfondo intelectual, moral y artístico (842, Article 3).

As it demonstrates, the Reglamento identified education and recreation as the two forms of works for child and juvenile readers. However, it is equally true to say that works directed at an adult readership may also fall into either, or both, of these two categories. Therefore, the demarcations made here in terms of the publication contents largely lacked specificity in addressing literature for child and juvenile readers. Thirdly, in regard to the target readers, Article 4 distinguished the readers of publications of the considered type into five categories, namely, boy readers, girl readers, boys and girls, adolescent boy readers and adolescent girl readers (842, Article 4). Such a method was, nonetheless, both arbitrary and pre-theoretical. On the one hand, it is unknown how a clear distinction between child readers and adolescent readers can be established, as the Reglamento did not specify the exact criteria by which the two groups were distinguished. On the other hand, it is also questionable how a
certain book or a topic can be associated exclusively with readers of a certain gender group, an issue that the *Reglamento* also failed to address.

The above-listed fundamental problems underlying the 1955 *Reglamento*, in terms of the definition of the scope of literature for young readers, continued to be unresolved in the later 1967 *Estatuto*, in which literature for child and juvenile readers was understood to be ‘publicaciones infantiles y juveniles las que por su carácter, objeto, contenido o presentación aparecen como principalmente destinadas a los niños y adolescentes’ (Iribarne 1967: 1964, Article 2). In comparison with the former *Reglamento*, an obvious difference with the *Estatuto* was that it renounced altogether its former ambition to provide a clear definition of the scope encompassed by the considered literature type. In the meantime, the *Estatuto* expressed an increased degree of uncertainty and ambiguity in terms of the definition of children’s literature: first, the use of the verb ‘aparecer’ unmistakably revealed the regime’s own confusion with the potential scope of the literature type in consideration; secondly, the *Estatuto*, on the one hand, attempted to define children’s literature based on its characteristics, objectives, contents and outlooks, but, on the other hand, did not provide any further explanation about what exactly were the characteristics, objectives, contents and outlooks that would distinguish children's literature from other literature types, thus leaving the term ‘children’s literature’ largely ambiguous. Another significant change introduced by *Estatuto* was that gender was replaced by age as the primary criterion to categorize the target readers. Although the setting of age fourteen established a criterion to separate child readers from adolescent readers, this, by itself, caused new uncertainties. Why should the age fourteen be used as the criterion, instead of age thirteen or fifteen? In practice, based on what arguments can one claim that a particular book is suitable for fourteen-year olds but not so for fifteen-year olds? Such uncertainties, instead of being addressed and clarified, were only responded to with an increased degree of arbitrariness in the 1967 *Estatuto*, as Article 3 made it clear that the censorship department would reserve the ultimate right to decide whether or not a work was children's literature.
In summary, the uncertainties and ambiguities as verbalized through an excessive use of subjunctive mood largely confirmed that the definitions of children's literature that the two censorship legislation attempted to establish were more located at the level of 'can be' or 'should be', rather than 'is'. In other words, the definitions provided were more suggestive and directive, focusing only on certain aspects of children's literature, based on the regime's arbitrary decisions, rather than definitive, fully embracing the broad scope of children's literature. However, in legislation that aims to regulate acts that, in practice, would constantly involve 'yes or no’ dilemmas, such as censorship, there is simply no room that can be afforded to accommodate uncertainties and ambiguities that would eventually induce uncertain, ambiguous and partial responses to practical situations. In this regard, it can be said that the incompatibility between the broad scope of children's literature and the selective, restrictive nature of the censorship legislation under the regime, and the ensuing uncertainties and ambiguities generated from this very incompatibility, were the fundamental reasons to explain the censors’ arbitrary, controversial decisions. At the same time, the uncertainties and ambiguities, embedded within the censorship legislation and manifested through the censors’ decisions, gave rise to opportunities for translators and publishers to negotiate with the censors and to discover methods to increase the chance to have their works approved for publication, as demonstrated in chapter two (See page 53-63).

In addition, the dynamics within the system of translated children's literature during Franco's Spain also consisted in precisely the kind of 'foreignness' and 'otherness' that such texts embodied in the target system. Through examination of the censors’ comments, an odd phenomenon that was uncovered was that, in many cases where the censors expressed objections to certain parts of the target texts, they tended to cast the blame on the source text, *Huckleberry Finn*, the author, Mark Twain and the source system, the American society, instead of blaming the translators or publishers for having introduced inappropriate elements into the translations. Such censors’ responses led to revealing a deep-rooted element of xenophobia within the Spanish society, a xenophobia that was further confirmed through examination of the translations.
of racial issues in *Huckleberry Finn*. In general, ‘us’, during Franco’s Spain, tended to be associated with spiritualism, heroism, patriotism, nobility, superiority, and ‘them’ with materialism, liberalism, individualism, immorality, and inferiority, and worst of all: ‘they do not understand our Spanish way’. Based on this, during their conduction of *consulta previa*, the censors tended to read and confirm, in the translations, the incompatibilities between ‘the foreign’ and ‘the Spanish’, while largely ignoring the agency that translators and the publishers may possess, in the process of generating the translations. This lack of attention, at the same time, offered translators and publishers opportunities for negotiation with the censors. With the translations of *Huckleberry Finn*, it was found that the translators or the publishers often used two strategies for such negotiation. First, a prologue that condemned the American society, Mark Twain or the story itself would be inserted so as to please the censors and to distract them from their task, as in the case of José Félix’s translation. Secondly, a second type of prologue might also be inserted, which attempted to establish connections between *Huckleberry Finn* and Spanish literature, often referring to *Don Quijote*, an iconic text, so as to show the censors the connections between the imported foreign text and the native Spanish text, as manifested in the case of F. Elías’s translation. The two methods of negotiation may also be used in combination, which was the case of Amando Lázaro Ros’s translation. Ironically, it was observed that such strategies proved to be particularly successful in guaranteeing the publication of the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* as literature for adults, without censorship, as, sometimes, the censors might judge that the prologue did not seem to be directed towards children or juvenile readers.\(^{32}\) However, without the censors being aware, while they denied the introduction of the translations of *Huckleberry Finn* into the children’s system, due to certain ‘bad’, ‘foreign’ ideas that the texts contained, they, in fact, allowed such ideas into the adult system that occupied a more central position in the target system.

Besides the constraints and dynamics of (translations of) children’s literature during Franco’s Spain, the current study has also outlined how the
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\(^{32}\)This is the case of *Editorial Ramón Sopena’s* 1967 submission of Amando Lázaro Ros’s translation, which was initially rejected. Later, the publisher had to send a letter to the censorship department, assuring the censors that the book is aimed only at an adult readership.
theories and methodologies of translation studies can be useful and beneficial for the future enlargement and development of children’s literature studies, and vice versa. The development history of translation studies confirms the nature of the field as interdisciplinary. From the earlier linguistic approaches of translation studies to the later functionalist approaches, to the recent so-called ‘cultural turn’ in translation studies, this development history reveals the many possible methodologies and the many possible perspectives, based on which critical inquiries into the field of translation studies can be conducted. At the same time, the different approaches in translation studies unavoidably add to the difficulty in defining the discipline of translation studies itself, as any definition of translation based on one single, isolated agenda tends to be partial and incomplete. In the meantime, ‘it is not possible to proceed with research when scholars do not define or delimit the object of study’ (Tymoczko 2007: 51). Facing this problem of definition, instead of aiming to establish some closed and clearly delineated boundaries of translation studies, Maria Tymoczko suggests that translation be seen as ‘a cross-cultural cluster concept’, with blurred boundaries, as she argues:

The blurred boundaries of translation ensure the flexibility needed to facilitate interchange, growth, learning and friendship as required by individuals, groups and cultures through time and space (106).

In other words, for Tymoczko, an advantage of the definition of translation as a cross-cultural concept is that such a definition can guarantee the openness of the discipline, an openness that can not only accommodate the different and changing conditions under which translation takes place, but also ensure the adaptability of translation to the varied human communication needs across time and space.

Tymoczko’s solution is found to be particularly beneficial for the studies of children’s literature, children and childhood in general. Until recently, there has been an astonishing lack of communication between scholars working in

---

different fields of children’s literature studies (Alderson 1991: 34, Short 1995: 2). A direct consequence of this is that scholars tend to assume that scopes of children’s literature are only enclosed within their own field of expertise, without realizing that each of their research fields only represent a small portion of the possibilities of children’s literature. This, to a large extent, contributes to the current ‘weakness’ or marginalized status of children’s literature that scholars tend to lament. Similar to the case of translation, the vitality of children’s literature is also characterised by its openness, as children’s literature is largely a constructed notion, based on adult assumptions of children and childhood. It can thus have no definite boundaries, since no one can decide where the subjectivities underlying an assumption should end, nor can it be denied that assumptions also vary between individuals, groups and cultures. In this regard, Tymoczko’s suggestion for blurred boundaries for an open concept is of particular relevance to be applied to the definition of children’s literature, which will eventually break the rigidity of single-discipline based interpretations of children’s literature and encourage, instead, collaborations involving as many disciplines as possible. In this way, blurred boundaries between children’s literature and that directed at other readerships can accommodate the dynamics and flexibility needed for the further development of the field.

At the same time, the development history of translation studies demonstrates a shift from the earlier focus on the ‘accuracy’ of the translated text that tend to emphasize the absoluteness and supremacy of the source text, to the current tendency that pays more and more attention to the systematic affiliations in which translations take place and are received. Tymoczko sees this shift as a move of the field of translation studies beyond its Eurocentric interests and presuppositions, towards a more globalized and post-positivist position of the field (2007: 15-49). Unfortunately, at present, such a globalized and post-positivist turn in studies of children’s literature is still in its embryonic stage. Current outstanding scholarships on children’s literature are largely produced in Western contexts. Works for children created in Anglo-Saxon cultural backgrounds still occupy a hegemonic position, to the extent that children’s literature and children’s literature written in English are widely used as
interchangeable terms. At academic institutions, the studies of children's literature are often affiliated under the department of English, if not the department of education. As a result, children's literature created in non-Western contexts is largely ignored. At the same time, the development of an open, comprehensive understanding of children's literature is remarkably hampered, with the current views based unquestioningly on Western presuppositions of children and childhood. Bassnett and Lefevere contend that:

Any study of literature that ignored works deemed to have no artistic merit was bound to be flawed and would result in a completely inadequate picture of textual production and reception (1998: 126).

In addition to Bassnett’s assertion, alluding to Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, a comprehensive view of Western-context based children’s literature can not be fully achieved without taking into consideration its relationship with children’s literature created in non-Western contexts, hence the obvious limitations of the current scholarship on children’s literature and the necessity for a globalized, post-positivist turn in children's literature studies. In this regard, inspirations can be sought within the development history of translation studies, in terms of the conditions, the possible theories and methods that can help to prompt such a shift in studies of children’s literature.

Lastly, translation, as Bassnett and Lefevere suggest, ‘is a primary method of imposing meaning while concealing the power relations that lie behind the production of that meaning’ (1998: 136). In recent years, the very process of the production of translations and the relationship between individual texts and the wider cultural system in which such texts are generated tend to attract more and more academic attention, as translation studies have become increasingly concerned with questions of power.34 For such purposes, studies on children's literature and the related research findings can also benefit and contribute to the enlargement of translation studies, as children’s literature is, by itself, a constructed notion based on unequal power relations. As demonstrated

in the current study, from the creation of the censorship legislation regarding children’s literature, to the ultimate grant of approval for publication of a certain work, in none of the stages concerning children’s literature were children the initiators for decision-making. Instead, adult ideologies and manipulations are inscribed throughout the whole processes of the creation of children’s literature. Subsequently, children’s literature can be understood as a microcosm of the power relations, between the dominant and the dominated, involved in text production. Moreover, likewise to Bassnett and Lefevere’s observation on translation, children’s literature is also a primary method of imposing meaning, but unlike translation, children’s literature does not always conceal the power relations underlying the imposed meanings, with adults assuming their taken-for-granted authority. Therefore, examinations of the relationship between production of individual translations and the wider cultural systems in which the translations are introduced, in particular, can benefit greatly from studies on texts for children, as texts entering the children’s system reveal more clearly the imposed ideological, manipulatory mechanisms. ‘Children’s literature is political’ (Berlinda 2008:5). To the dismay of those who insist on ‘leaving children alone’, due to their romantic perceptions of childhood, the truth is, in the contemporary world, children are never left alone.
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### Appendix I: Ley de prensa, 1938 (Non-Periodic Publications):

**MINISTERIO DE INDUSTRIA**

**Y COMERCIO**

**ORDEN**

Al minimizar la explotación de las minas de Asturias y procurar a la distribución del carbón a los distintos puertos de la España Nacional, se ha iniciado una elevación de los fletes, de esta mercancía, lo cual ha de ser mantenido hasta el próximo Movimiento Nacional. Y con el fin de regular los fletes máximos, de acuerdo con el presupuesto del Gobierno, de evitar el aumento indebido de los precios que regían el 18 de julio de 1936, y con las posibilidades de comercio marítimo, este Ministerio ha dispuesto lo siguiente:

- Los fletes máximos para el transporte de carbón de los tres puertos asturianos a los restantes de la España Nacional que registren desde la publicación de esta Orden serán los del cuadro que se inserta a continuación.

**Observaciones**

- Las condiciones de carga y descarga serán las siguientes:
- A — 125/125 laborables y reversibles
  - Pesetas 1 — por tonelada
- B — 200/200
  - 0.50
- C — 250/250
  - 0.75
- D — 300/300
  - 0.50
- E — 400/400
  - 0.60
- F — 500/500
  - 0.40
- G — 503/500
  - 0.30

**MINISTERIO DEL INTERIOR**

**ORDENES**

Atendiendo a la conmemoración del Día de Mayo, este Ministerio ha tenido a bien dispondar que el día de hoy se deje en el estado de inactividad a la censura en cuanto a libros, folletos y otros impresos, editados en España y declarados ilegales. Sin embargo, se prevé en la Orden de 25 de diciembre de 1936.

**Ramon Ferrando Suner**

La intervención que actualmente ejerce el Estado sobre la edición y venta de publicaciones no es una prevención, sino una medida que se toma para evitar actividades que puedan resultar perjudiciales para la seguridad de la nación. Es una medida que se debe tomar con suma cautela para evitar cualquier forma de censura excesiva y garantizar la libertad de expresión.
Ley de Prensa, 1938 (Non-Periodic Publications) Continues:

Artículo cuarto. Queda prohibida la venta y circulación, en territorio nacional, de libros, folletos y demás impresos, producidos en el Extranjero, cualesquiera que sean el idónimo en que estén escritos, sin la previa autorización de este Ministerio. Los editoros, libreros o concesionarios que pretendan vender en venta o circulación tales obras, deberán remitir dos ejemplares a la prensa de esta Capital. En la disposición anterior a las que actualmente se venden o circulan y que hayan tenido entrada en nuestro territorio con anterioridad a la fecha indicada, quedan sujetos a las penas previstas en la Orden de la Presidencia de la Junta Técnica de 23 de diciembre de 1936, publicada en su número, 136, en esta misma jornada.

Artículo quinto. Los libros, folletos y demás impresos que hayan tenido entrada en nuestro territorio con anterioridad a la fecha indicada, quedan sujetos a las disposiciones de la presente Orden, podrá ser sancionada con multa e incautación de los mismos.
II. O. del E.—Num. 33
2 febrero 1956
841

**MINISTERIO DE COMERCIO**

**ORDEN** de 25 de enero de 1956 por la que se conceden autorizaciones a don Manuel Casillas Rátchel para instalar un nuevo establecimiento de muebles en la ciudad de Aranda.

**Párrafo 1:** Visto el expediente impreso en el que se adjuntan las correspondientes observaciones de carácter técnico y administrativo expedidas por el Director General del Instituto de Artesanos, la autorización dada por el Ayuntamiento de Aranda de Duero, y la aprobación del proyecto presentado por el mencionado señor, se concede la licencia correspondiente con las condiciones que a continuación se indican.

**Párrafo 2:** Por el presente autorización se regirá por las normas del presente Reglamento.

**Párrafo 3:** Las licencias que, sin estar comprometidas con disposiciones previas a la autorización, están destinadas a alumnos o a Servicios de cualquiera institución, a que se les dediquen a fines de formación.

**Párrafo 4:** Las licencias para instalaciones de cualquiera clase aislada para alumnos y establecimiento de cualquier clase aislado, se verán obligadas a adquirir la autorización del Ministerio de Educación Nacional o del Ministerio de Educación de la Comunidad Autónoma, como corresponda.

**Párrafo 5:** Las licencias que, sin estar comprometidas con disposiciones previas a la autorización, están destinadas a alumnos o a Servicios de cualquiera institución, a que se les dediquen a fines de formación.
Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continúa:
B. O. del E.—Núm. 35
2 febrero 1986

Art. 16. Las denominaciones españolas de las publicaciones infantiles en cada uno de sus num-

meros, hasta el 25 por 100 de origen literario, literario o pautas de ilustración de procedencia extranjera.

Las correcciones de cualquier origen extranjero o adaptaciones de éste en las publicaciones infantiles, debe como pa-

ra la el nombre del país o el de la agencia proporcionados. La sombre de escritura, se

serán acreditadas consignado a lo establec-

do en el apartado primero del artículo 2 del

el presente Estatuto.

Cuanqo sus publicaciones reúnan el 10 por 100 en el párrafo primero de este artículo, serán consideradas como

españolas.

Art. 26. Las publicaciones extranjeras

Art. 27. La Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 28. Será Presidente de la Junta el Direc-

tivo General de Prensa, Vicepresidente el Di-

rector General de Información, y Secreta-

rio el Jefe de Sección de la Dirección General

nación de Prensa de la Junta Asesora de las Pa-

citados funcionarios, se reunirán, cada mes, hasta el

31 de cada mes, en el ayuntamiento del distrito de la capital, en la fecha señalada por el Director General de Prensa,

Art. 22. Las publicaciones extranjeras

Art. 21. Las publicaciones españolas

Art. 20. Para que una publicación en

tratada en párrafo anterior, se entenderá, según los términos a

169

Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continuos:

la Junta, que sea observada por las publica-

ciones infantiles y juveniles es imprescindible

Art. 22. La Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 20. Para informar y auxiliar a los

la Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 19. Para orientar las publicaciones

Art. 18. Para orientar las publicaciones

Art. 17. Atendiendo a los aspectos

Art. 16. Las denominaciones españo-

Art. 15. El Secretario de la Comisión Perma-

Art. 14. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 13. Las expediciones y gastos extranje-

Art. 12. Las publicaciones españolas

Art. 11. Las publicaciones extran-

Art. 10. Las publicaciones extran-

Art. 9. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 8. El Prensa, secretario de la Comisión

Art. 7. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 6. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 5. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 4. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 3. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 2. La Junta Asesora de las Publica-

Art. 1. La Junta Asesora de las Publica-

Art. 169

169

Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continuos:

la Junta, que sea observada por las publica-

ciones infantiles y juveniles es imprescindible

Art. 22. La Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 20. Para informar y auxiliar a los

la Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 19. Para orientar las publicaciones

Art. 18. Para orientar las publicaciones

Art. 17. Atendiendo a los aspectos

Art. 16. Las denominaciones españo-

Art. 15. El Secretario de la Comisión Perma-

Art. 14. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 13. Las expediciones y gastos extranje-

Art. 12. Las publicaciones españolas

Art. 11. Las publicaciones extran-

Art. 10. Las publicaciones extran-

Art. 9. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 8. El Prensa, secretario de la Comisión

Art. 7. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 6. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 5. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 4. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 3. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 2. La Junta Asesora de las Publica-

Art. 1. La Junta Asesora de las Publica-

Art. 169

169

Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continuos:

la Junta, que sea observada por las publica-

ciones infantiles y juveniles es imprescindible

Art. 22. La Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 20. Para informar y auxiliar a los

la Junta Asesora de las Publicaciones

Art. 19. Para orientar las publicaciones

Art. 18. Para orientar las publicaciones

Art. 17. Atendiendo a los aspectos

Art. 16. Las denominaciones españo-

Art. 15. El Secretario de la Comisión Perma-

Art. 14. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 13. Las expediciones y gastos extranje-

Art. 12. Las publicaciones españolas

Art. 11. Las publicaciones extran-

Art. 10. Las publicaciones extran-

Art. 9. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 8. El Prensa, secretario de la Comisión

Art. 7. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 6. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 5. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 4. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 3. La Junta Asesora de las Pa-

Art. 2. La Junta Asesora de las Publica-

Art. 1. La Junta Asesora de las Publica-

Art. 169

169

Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continuos:
Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continúa:

Art. 44. En cada caso la Dirección General corresponderá citarán en el

Art. 45. La producción e venta de una publicación infantil o de adolescentes no

Art. 46. La falta de inscripción de una

Art. 47. Los aranceles de originales no presentados a la consulta previa en el

Art. 48. Los aranceles de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles en las que se hicie

Art. 49. El incumplimiento de lo pre

Art. 50. La reincidencia en cualquiera de las faltas señaladas en esta Orden se

Art. 51. Las publicaciones infantiles extranjeras que no estén en el libre de

Art. 52. Los derechos de autor serán prohibidos en territorio español.

Art. 53. El incumplimiento de lo pre

Art. 54. La celebración de publica

Art. 55. Las publicaciones infantiles extranjeras que no estén en el

Art. 56. A fin de estimular a los aut

Art. 57. Los aranceles de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles en las que se hicie

Art. 58. La reincidencia en cualquiera de las faltas señaladas en esta Orden se
Reglamento de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continúa:
Appendix III: Estatuto de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles, 1967:

1964
13 febrero 1967
B. O. del E.—Núm. 37

MINISTERIO DE INFORMACION Y TURISMO

DECRETO 196/1967, de 13 de enero, por el que se aprueba el Estatuto de Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles.

A. Ley catorce mil novecientos sesenta y seis, de dieciocho de marzo, de Prensa e Imprenta, establece en su artículo cuádruplo de la impresión, edición y difusión de publicaciones que por su carácter, objeto, contenido o presentación aparecen como principalmente destinadas a los niños y adolescentes.

La importancia del desarrollo creciente de estos medios informativos y la transcendencia de su influjo en la formación de la infancia y la juventud en todos los aspectos que han venido a consagrarse en nuestros días como de los fenómenos de mayor interés sociológico y a delimitar una zona en que conduce de manera unánime la preocupación de las Obras, impone la conveniencia de dictar, en cumplimiento del aludido mandato legal y dentro de los principios que inspiran la orientación general en este terreno, las normas especiales necesarias para adecuar la ordenación jurídica de la materia el cumplimiento de los fines que exigen las especiales características del público lector a dichas publicaciones ven destinadas.

En su virtud, habiendo uso de la autorización contenida en el artículo quinto de la Ley catorce mil novecientos sesenta y seis, de dieciocho de marzo; a propuesta del Ministro de Información y Turismo; de conformidad con el dictamen del Consejo Nacional de Prensa; oído el Consejo de Estado, y previa del Consejo de Ministros en su reunión del día trece de enero de mil novecientos sesenta y siete.

DISPONGO:

Artículo primero.—Se aprueba el presente Estatuto de Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles que a continuación se inserta.

Artículo segundo.—Se aprueba el Decreto de veinticuatro de junio de mil novecientos cincuenta y cinco y el Orden ministerial de la misma fecha.

Así lo dispone por el presente Decreto, dado en Madrid a diecinueve de enero de mil novecientos sesenta y siete.

FRANCISCO FRANCO

EL MINISTRO DE INFORMACION Y TURISMO.

MANUEL FRAGA IBALBAIN.
Estatuto de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continue:

tenido al especial carácter del público sector a que en cada caso van dirigidas, cuidando especialmente de asegurar el respeto a lo espiritual, religioso, moral, político y social que implica la vida española.

Art. 9.° Para el debido cumplimiento de lo dispuesto en el artículo anterior, en el contenido de las publicaciones infantiles y juveniles habrá de evitarse cuando suponga o pueda suponer:

a) Exaltación o apología de hechos o conductas inmorales o que puedan ser constitutivos de delito, o presentación de las mismas en forma tal que pueda causar perturbación en la formación del lector y sin la debida consecuencia de reprochabilidad, o que muestran o sugieren técnicas para su comisión.

b) Presentación escrita o gráfica de estímulos o argumentos que supongan exaltación o justificación de comportamientos negativos, de defectos o vicios individuales o sociales, o en que se estipule el terror, la violencia, el sadismo, el erotismo, el aislamiento, la dementia, el alcoholismo, la bebida en demasia o la excesiva vagancia o que de alguna manera pueda originar perturbación o algún perjuicio físico o moral de los lectores.

c) Exposición, admisión o estímulo del asesinato o tratamiento de temas que puedan suponer o sugerir error, equívoco o no explicación acerca de cualquier religión o confesión religiosa, su culto, sus místicos o sus fechas, o presentación de escenas o argumentos que puedan implicar desvirtuación del resto del sentido religioso.

d) Exaltación o alabanza de cualquier sensación o estado que pueda producir sentimientos de odio, envidia, enemistad, descontento, exposición o publicación de conductas moralizantes, fatiga, enajenación, enemistad o desproporción mental o de la propia personalidad.

e) Atentado a los valores que inspiran la tradición, la historia y la vida española, generando de su sentido, así como a los de todo humano, patotico, familiar y social en que se basa el orden de convivencia de los españoles.

f) Traducción, imitación, invento de las publicaciones infantiles y juveniles para que destaquen las publicaciones y se dé debido respeto a lo que se establece en este artículo y en su secuencial.

g) Presentación de escenas que por su fondo o por su forma no pertenezcan al mundo de los niños.

h) Narraciones fantásticas imbuidas de superstición电缆

dudas que puedan conducir a sobreestimación del valor de la tensión frente a los valores espirituales.

i) Destierro en el uso correcto del idioma o deformación estética, cultural o educacional de los lectores.

CAPÍTULO III

DE LAS EMPRESAS

SECCIÓN 1.—DE LAS EMPRESAS PERIODÍSTICAS

Art. 10. Al solicitar la inscripción en el Registro de Empresas Periodísticas que se designe a la edición de las publicaciones a que se refiere el presente Estatuto habrá constar en la solicitud correspondiente, además de los datos exigidos en el artículo 70 de la Ley de Premsa e Imprenta, los que a continuación se expresan:

a) Expresión del carácter de la publicación o publicaciones que pretende editar y de la categoría a que corresponden dentro de las establecidas en el artículo 5.° de este Estatuto.

b) Descripción del contenido de la publicación o publicaciones de que se trate, acompañando una maqueta o proyecto de la misma.

Art. 11. Cualquiera de las modificaciones en las circunstancias de inscripción a que se refiere el artículo 3.° de la Ley de Premsa e Imprenta y que afecten a lo dispuesto en los apartados a) y b) del artículo 76 del mismo texto legal habrá de comunicarse previamente a la Dirección General de Premsa, y no podrán realizarse sin su previa autorización.

Art. 12. Además de en los casos determinados en el artículo 23 de la Ley de Premsa e Imprenta, y en lo que se refiere a lo establecido en este Estatuto y a las Empresas exentamente constituidas para la edición de las mismas, no procederán la primera y sus sucesivas inscripciones cuando, desde la inscripción en el Registro de Empresas, que hacen que el mismo Estatuto a que tienen asignadas la prensa infantil o juvenil y el mismo, en el momento de su publicación o publicaciones de que se trate no se ajusten a lo que en este Estatuto se establece.

Art. 13. Las Empresas periodísticas para la edición de publicaciones periódicas infantiles y juveniles no podrán editar ninguna otra clase de publicaciones periódicas mientras estén inscritas con este objeto en el Registro correspondiente.

Art. 14. Salvo lo previsto en este capítulo, será de aplicación a las Empresas dedicadas o con descubierto a la edición de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles las disposiciones contenidas en el capítulo III y IV de la Ley de Premsa e Imprenta y en el Decreto 769/1986, de 31 de marzo, que regula la inscripción en el Registro de Empresas Periodísticas.

SECCIÓN 2.—DE LAS EMPRESAS AUTÓNOMAS

Art. 15. Las Empresas editoriales constituidas exclusivamente con el objeto de editar publicaciones infantiles y juveniles se ajustarán a la organización y régimen de inscripción a lo dispuesto en el capítulo VII de la Ley de Premsa e Imprenta y en el Decreto 769/1986, de 31 de marzo, que regula la inscripción en el Registro de Empresas Periodísticas.

CAPÍTULO IV

DE LOS DIRECTORES

Art. 16. Además de los requisitos exigidos con carácter general en el artículo 32 de la Ley de Premsa e Imprenta, los Directores de las publicaciones infantiles y juveniles habrán de estar en posesión del título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial. Se dispone que el mismo podrá ser exigido por la Comisión de Información y Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles, del acuerdo que tenga el título de Periodista Inscrito en el Registro Oficial.
Art. 24. Lo establecido en los dos artículos anteriores será de aplicación a los suplementos separados o separables, encartes, secciones, páginas o secciones que se dediquen a un público lector infantil o juvenil en cualquier clase de publicaciones periódicas o seriadas.

Art. 25. A los efectos de lo dispuesto en el artículo 22, la presentación de las textos literarios o gráficos se realizará en los servicios correspondientes del Ministerio de Información y Turismo, o de la Delegación del Departamento en la provincia en que la publicación se edite.

Art. 26. Cuando se trate de publicaciones periódicas, la presentación habrá de realizarse en ejemplar quadrapliado, firmado por el Director de la misma o por la persona en quien éste delegue, cuyo nombre y cargo o función en la publicación se comunicarán a la Dirección General de Prensa o a la Delegación Provincial correspondiente. En dichos ejemplares habrá de constar expresamente el día y número de la publicación en que habrá de insertarse los textos presentados.

Art. 27. En caso de publicaciones unitarias, la presentación se efectuará en ejemplar triplicado firmado por el editor, o por el autor cuando éste edite su propia obra, o por el traductor cuando el trabajo haya sido traducido, y por el impresor si no hubiera editor ni autor ni traductor que pretendiera publicarlo por cuenta propia.

Art. 28. Uno de los cuatro ejemplares presentados por la publicación periódica se devolverá en el momento de la entrega, y el otro, en el día y hora de entrega. Estos mismos datos se constatarán en los ejemplares que queden en poder de la Administración con el fin de que la persona que realiza materialmente la presentación.

Art. 29. Si se trata de publicación unitaria, la dependencia en que se haya efectuado la entrega facilitará a la persona que la realice un respaldo que acredite el acto y fecha de la presentación.

Art. 30. Por los servicios correspondientes se resolverá sobre la pertinencia o no de autorizar los textos presentados dentro de los siguientes plazos:

a) Si se trata de publicaciones periódicas:
   1. Ocho horas a partir del momento de la entrega, para las publicaciones diarias o de periodicidad inferior a la semanal.
   2. Veintiún horas a partir del momento de la entrega, para las restantes publicaciones periódicas.

b) Si se trata de publicaciones unitarias: treinta días hábiles por cada volumen, a partir del día de entrega del texto.

Art. 31. Transcurridos los plazos establecidos en el artículo anterior y sin que la Administración haya dado respuesta expresa, se entenderá autorizada la publicación presentada. En el caso de que esta autorización no se obtenga, se comunicará a la persona que realizó el envío, sin perjuicio de que se pueda insertar el texto presentado en el suplemento correspondiente.

Art. 32. La respuesta expresa, que es de aprobación podrá afectar a la totalidad o parte de los textos presentados, y la comunicación, mediante el envío de uno de los ejemplares que haya quedado en poder de la Administración, con las indicaciones pertinentes.

Art. 33. El silencio de la Administración sólo se producirá cuando el interesado no reciba una respuesta expresa, al personarse por el o por tercera persona en las dependencias correspondientes al expirar los plazos establecidos en el artículo 30, sin las indicadas dependencias deberán entregarse a las personas anteriormente autorizadas el proveedor justificante de su cumplimiento.

Art. 34. Antes de proceder a su difusión las publicaciones autorizadas a lo dispuesto en este Estatuto, habrá de realizar el preceptivo depósito de ejemplares, de conformidad con lo dispuesto en el artículo 22 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta, en los Decretos 792/1966 y 707/1966, de 31 de marzo.

Art. 35. El régimen de difusión de las publicaciones infantiles o juveniles editadas en el extranjero se regirá por lo dispuesto con carácter general en el artículo 23 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta, y en el Decreto 1247/1966, de 31 de mayo. En todo caso, las publicaciones de esta índole habrán de hacer constar en portada, o en forma destacada, la categoría a que corresponden dentro de las determinadas en el artículo quinto de este Estatuto, de la misma manera, que se establece en el artículo sexto del mismo Estatuto.

Art. 36. Sin perjuicio de las responsabilidades en que pueda incurrir el interesado, se obligará a la presentación de las publicaciones que se difundan sin haber cumplido los trámites de previa autorización, o infringiendo los términos de las autorizaciones concedidas, de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en este capítulo.

Art. 37. La Administración podrá ordenar la retirada de la exhibición pública de las publicaciones de cualquier clase expuestas en la vía pública o en comparadas que den directamente o indirectamente a la misma, o en el interior o exterior de establecimientos comerciales, cuando dicha exhibición atente gravemente por su cobertura, portadas, titulares o gráficos a los fines que en este Estatuto se persiguen, de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en los artículos octavo y noveno. El incumplimiento de la indicada Orden, con independencia de las responsabilidades en que se incurra, podrá dar lugar a la reposición de los ejemplares existentes en el lugar o horario de que se trate.

CAPITULO VI

De las infracciones y sanciones

Art. 38. La infracción de las normas de este Estatuto, sin perjuicio de la responsabilidad penal o civil en que pueda incurrirse, dará origen a responsabilidad administrativa.

Art. 39. La responsabilidad criminal será exigida ante los Tribunales de Justicia, de conformidad con lo establecido en la legislación penal, y por los tribunales que establezcan las leyes de procedimiento, de acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el artículo 66 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta.

Art. 40. Las infracciones a la responsabilidad civil, se otorgarán en el artículo 68 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta.

Art. 41. Se considerarán como infracciones administrativas muy graves, además de las establecidas en el artículo 67 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta, las que sean de aplicación a las publicaciones reguladas en este Estatuto.

a) La edición y difusión de publicaciones sin la previa inscripción en el correspondiente Registro.

b) La edición y difusión de publicaciones sin haber obtenido la autorización a que se refiere el artículo 11 de este Estatuto, y la edición de publicaciones de otro carácter por impresoras incrustadas con el exclusivo objeto de editar publicaciones infantiles y juveniles.

c) La omisión de la mención, de conformidad con lo dispuesto en los artículos 17 y 21 de este Estatuto, de los datos de inscripción de impresoras o publicaciones, cuando no concurran en ellos circunstancias por las que hubieran de considerarse como falsa muy grava.

d) La designación o actuación de Directores que no renúnen las condiciones establecidas en las normas de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta y en este Estatuto.

e) El incumplimiento de la orden de retirada de la exhibición pública de las publicaciones a que se refiere el artículo 37 de este Estatuto.

f) Las infracciones de carácter leve cuando se produzcan con reiteración.

Art. 43. Se considerarán como infracciones de carácter leve cualquier infracción de las disposiciones legales o reglamentarias de carácter general y que sean de aplicación, o de las contenidas en el presente Estatuto, que no estén comprendidas especialmente en los dos artículos anteriores.

Art. 44. Por razón de las infracciones a que se refieren los artículos anteriores podrán imponerse las sanciones determinadas en el artículo 69 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta.

Art. 45. La competencia para corregir las infracciones administrativas se dispersa en los jueces de paz, de acuerdo con las disposiciones de los artículos 70 y 71 de la Ley de Prensa e Imprenta.
Estatuto de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles continúa:
Appendix IV: Assessment Records of Amando Lázaro Ros's 1967 Translation:
EXPEDIENTE N° 3053-67

Presentada con fecha 15 ABR. 1967

instancia en solicitud de autorización para

imprimir la obra AVENTURAS DE HUCKLEBERRY, LAS

de la que es autor TWAIN, Mark

editada por Sopena

con un volumen de 352 páginas

y una tirada de 10,000 ejemplares

Madrid, de 15 ABR. 1967 de 196

El Jefe del Negociado de Registro,

El Jefe del Negociado de Circulación

y Ficheros.

PASE AL LECTOR don

Madrid. 17 ABR. 1967 de 196

EL Jefe de la Sección de Lectorado,
INFORME

¿Ataca al Dogma? Páginas
¿A la moral? Páginas
¿A la Iglesia o a sus Ministros? Páginas
¿Al Régimen y a sus instituciones? Páginas
¿A las personas que colaboran o han colaborado con el Régimen? Páginas
Los pasajes censurables ¿califican el contenido total de la obra?
Informe y otras observaciones.

La viuda de Douglas adopta a Huck para que deje de ser un vagabundo como su padre. El muchacho no se adapta a la civilización y huye por el río en una almadía que comparte con el negro Jim, fugitivo también de la vida de esclavitud. En sus correrías se les unen dos tipos indeseables, timadores de oficio, con los cuales viven azarosas aventuras hasta que logran zafarse de ellos.

- Burlas ya irónicas, ya sarcásticas, de la religión (Páginas 16, 17, 26, 27, 44, 57, 68, 140, 141, 165 a 167, 202, 278).
- Explosión racista a cargo de un borracho (Página 45).
- Chacota respecto a la muerte de dos personas (Págs. 131 a 134).
- Fuga de una pareja de enamorados (Págs. 144 a 147).
- Ataque a la autoridad representada en los reyes (Págs. 192, 193).
- Págs. 202 a 210: Capítulo que no deja nada en pie.
- Págs. 220 a 223: humor macabro irreprimido.
- Págs. 258 a 260: idea sobre la oración que, siendo aparentemente ingenua, resulta negativa o, al menos, peligrosamente equivocada.

El prólogo no va dirigido, ni mucho menos, a lectores de corta edad. La obra, como otras de este autor, es negativa de principio a fin para menores. Sólo suprimiendo o paliando notablemente las partes indicadas sería autorizable como obra juvenil.

De acuerdo y conforme con el dictamen anterior.

Madrid, 27 de abril de 1967
E. Lector.
En contestación a su instancia de 14 de abril de 1967, y previos los pertinentes informes del Lectorado de esta Sección, lamento comunicarle que no ha sido posible conceder la autorización de la obra LAS AVENTURAS DE HUCKLEBERRY.- Mark Twain, para edición infantil o juvenil.

Lo que traslado a Vd. para su conocimiento y efectos, indicándole que contra la presente resolución puede interponer recurso de revisión, dentro del plazo de quince días hábiles, a contar del siguiente de la presente notificación.

Dios guarde a Vd. muchos años.

Madrid, 5 de mayo de 1967

P. EL DIRECTOR GENERAL DE INFORMACION,

SR. D. RAMON SOPENA.- Barcelona.
ILMO. SR. DIRECTOR GENERAL DE INFORMACION

8/2/94/67

EDITORIAL RAMON SOPENA, S.A.:

Tiene el honor de exponer a Vd. en relación con la presentación de su libro, Avanturas de Huckleberry Finn (nº. 3053/67) - que ha sido denegado.

Dado que este libro está incluido dentro de la colección "Biblioteca Sopena", de carácter meramente literario, rogamos no lo considere como obra de carácter juvenil o infantil, ya que está destinada para personas adultas.

Gracias que esperamos alcanzar de Vd. cuya vida guarde Dios muchos años.

En Madrid 18 de Mayo de 1,967

[Signature]
Presentada con fecha 15 JUL. 1967 instanciada en solicitud de consulta juvenil o de la obra AVENTURAS DE HUCK FINN de la que es autor TWAIN, Mark editada por Bruguera con un volumen de 255 páginas y una tirada de 4.000 ejemplares Madrid, de 15 JUL. 1967 El Jefe del Negociado de Registro.

ANTECEDENTES:

PASE AL LECTOR don 22 Madrid, de 17 JUL. 1967 de 196 El Jefe de la Sección de Lectorado.
INFORME

¿Ataca al Dogma? Páginas
¿A la moral? Páginas
¿A la Iglesia o a sus Ministros? Páginas
¿Al Régimen y a sus instituciones? Páginas
¿A las personas que colaboran o han colaborado con el Régimen? Páginas
Los pasajes censurables ¿califican el contenido total de la obra?

Informe y otras observaciones:

Huck —compañero de Tom Sawyer— escapa en una balsa, río Mississippi abajo, junto a un negro fugitivo, con el que pasa por aventuras que sirven al autor para describir con su peculiar estilo la vida americana del medio Oeste. Es libro de gran valor literario, aunque de difícil lectura para personas sin una cultura amplia en lo que respecta a aquellos países y época.

- Es autorizable en coleción juvenil, salvo varios pasajes marcados en rojo, que deben suprimirse o paliarse:
  - Pág. 16: ironía sobre la Providencia.
  - Págs. 63 y 134: comentario satírico sobre los reyes, generalizando, y reticencia sobre los harénes.
  - Pág. 76: explicación de la "vendetta" en un tono de indignación inadecuado y nocivo para jóvenes.
  - Págs. 123, 125 y 127: grabado y textos sobre un asesinato a sangre fría.
  - Pág. 153: ataque burlesco a ministros de la religión.

Madrid, 25 de agosto de 1967

Comprobadas las fechas.

[Signatura]
En contestación a su instancia de 15 julio 1967, me complace comunicarle que la obra titulada "AVENTURAS DE HUCK FINN" de la que es autor Mark Twain podrá ser autorizada, previa presentación de las galeradas impresas, por las que pueda comprobarse la supresión de los pasajes señalados en las páginas 16, 85, 86, 88, 89, 134 y 153 del ejemplar original adjunto.

Dios guarde a Vd. muchos años.

Madrid, 16 de agosto de 1967

P. EL DIRECTOR GENERAL DE INFORMACION,

SR. D. EDITORIAL BRUGUERA S.A.- Madrid
Ilmo. Sr.

El que suscribe EDITORIAL MOLINO de Barcelona, con representante autorizado con domicilio en Madrid calle Valverde núm. 28, solicita la autorización que exige la Orden de 29 de abril de 1938, y disposiciones complementarias, para la edición siguiente:

Autor Mark Twain

Título "Las aventuras de Huckleberry Finn"

Editor Editorial Molino Domiciliado en Barcelona Calle Urgell núm. 244

Clase de Impreso, Libro o Folleto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religioso</th>
<th>Científico</th>
<th>Literario normale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carácter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documental</th>
<th>Artístico</th>
<th>Infantil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matiz político

ninguno

Volumen 396 páginas

Formato octavo marquilla

Tirada 12,000 ejemplares

Clase de papel alejado corriente

Barcelona, 6 de noviembre de 1945.

ILMO. SR. DELEGADO PROVINCIAL DE EDUCACION POPULAR
CAPITULO XIX

Aquella noche soñé en mil cosas dispares y sin sentido alguno, revolviéndome inquieto en mi lecho hasta que, al fin, el rojo disco del sol apuntó allá lejos, en el horizonte.

Entonces abrí los ojos, me desperezé... y vi a Jim.

El tipo andaba, no lejos de donde yo me hallaba, revolviendo algunos libros procedentes del naufragio.

Lo hacía lenta y perezosamente, como recreándose y complaciéndose en su labor. Tomaba un libro, contemplaba durante largo rato la cubierta, abría luego el ejemplar ceremonialmente, acariciaba las hojas y poco a poco, lo cerraba de nuevo. Y así con todos, como si ejecutara con ellos la ceremoniosidad de un rito antiguo y extraño.

—¡Qué! —le grité—. ¿Instruyéndote, eh?

—¡Huy, buena falta me haría, Huck! —replicó.

—Pues mira, aquí donde tú me ves —le dije—, todos esos libros los he leído ya...

—¡No me digas! Es para quedarse ciego, la verdad. ¡Todos, todos...?

—Como lo oyes, Jim; bueno, verás: no sólo los he leído, sino que incluso los he estudiado... Porque una cosa es leer y otra, muy distinta, leer y estudiar a la vez.

Al decir esto adopté un insustancial aire de erudición, hasta el punto de que el pobre Jim me lanzó una mirada de arriba a abajo como si en realidad le costara un tremendo esfuerzo creer en mis palabras.

—¿Y de qué tratan?

—Que él mismo le pregunté; pero me repuse rápidamente y le contesté:

—De todo un poco... Los hay de historia, los hay de geografía y los hay de numismática.
de cinco o seis familias casi todas del nombre de Shepherdson. Eran tan bien nacidas y de tanto tono como los Grangerford. Las dos familias usaban el mismo embarcadero y yo veía mucho de Shepherdson con sus hermosas cabezas.

Un día Buck y yo estábamos en el bosque y oimos ruido de cascos de caballo al cruzar la carretera. Buck dijo:

—¡Pronto! ¡Corre al bosque!

Lo hicimos y luego atisbamos por entre las hojas. No tardó en bajar por la carretera un joven magnífico y hábil Jimeno. Era el joven Harney Shepherdson, a quien yo ya había visto en otras ocasiones.

Si disparara la escopeta de Buck junto a mi oído y a Harney le voló el sombrero de la cabeza. Cogió su escopeta y se dirigió derechamente al sitio que estábamos escondidos, pero no esperamos.

Todos felicitaron a Buck al enterarse de lo ocurrido. La señorita Sofía, sin embargo, palideció, pero recibió el color al enterarse de que el hombre no estaba herido.

En cuanto nos quedamos solos Buck y yo, le pregunté:

—¿Qué casualidad, Buck? ¿Qué te ha hecho?

—¡Eh! No he hecho nada.

—Pues, entonces, ¿por qué le quieres matar?

Al domingo siguiente, todos fuimos a la iglesia. Los hombres llevaron las armas y Buck también, y las conservaron entre las rodillas, o las apoyaron en la pared al alcance de la mano. Los Shepherdson hicieron lo propio. El sermón fue bastante vulgar; algo acerca del amor fraternal y cosas por el estilo; pero todo el mundo dijo que había sido un buen sermón y todos lo discutieron camino de casa, y tuvieron mucho que decir acerca de la fe, de las buenas obras y de la Gracia.

Después de comer, todo el mundo dormitäba, Incluso Buck estaba echado sobre la hierba, dormido junto a su perro. Subí a nuestro cuarto dispuesto a descansar un sueño y acababa de llegar cuando la señorita Sofía me llamó en un susurro.

Con qué salió y marché carretera arriba. La iglesia estaba desierta. Cogí el libro y me dije: "Aquí pasa algo". Así que lo...
—Pero, Huck, estos reyes nuestros son unos bribones de tomo y lomo.
—Pues eso es lo que te estás diciendo. ¿Té les algo de ellos, y ya verás. Fijate en Enrique VIII: este nuestro resulta el superintendente de una escuela doméstica a su lado. Y fijate en Luis XIV, y en Jacobo II, y en Eduardo II, y en Ricardo III, y en cuarenta más, aparte de todas esas heptarquitas sajonas que tanto corrían por ahí en tiempos antiguos armando las de San Quintín.
—¡Caramba! ¡Habla que ver a Enrique VIII cuando estaba en pleno apogeo. Acostumbraba casarse con una mujer nueva cada día y cortarle la cabeza a la mañana siguiente. Y lo hacía con la misma indiferencia que si pidiera un par de huevos.
—No diré qué los nuestros sean corderillos, porque no lo son, sí profundizamos un poco; pero no son nada en comparación con ese carnicero. Lo único que yo digo es que un rey es un rey y que hay que ser comprensivo.
—De todas formas no siento la menor gana de tener más, Huck. Esto es todo lo que puedo soportar.
—De qué servía decíelo a Jim que aquellos no eran reyes ni duques de verdad? Nadie bueno hubiera adelantado con ello. Y además era tal como yo lo había dicho: no habla manera de distinguirlos de los verdaderos.
Cuando me desperté al rayar el día, encontrado a Jim sentado con la cabeza apoyada entre las piernas gimiendo. No hace caso ni le dejó saber que le vela. Ya sabía yo qué le pasaba.
Era en la muerta y en su hijo, y se sentía alcohado y sentía nostalgia. Hasta creo que quería a su familia como los blancos quieren a la suya. No parece natural ¿verdad?, pero era así.
Me las arreglé para ponerme a hablar con él de su mujer y sus hijos y, al poco rato, decía:
—Lo que me ha hecho sentirme tan mal esta vez es que, hace un rato, oí algo así como un golpe o portazo allá en la ribera, y me recordó la vez que traté tan mal a mi pequeña Elizabet. No tenía más que unos cuatro años y pilló la escarlata y pasó una temporada bastante mala; pero se puso bien y un día andaba por casa y le dije:
—Cierra esa puerta.
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—¡Caramba!... ¿Cree usted que no hay más que un predicador en cada iglesia? Tienen nada menos que dieciséis.
—Ni quiero saber semejantes estupideces. Con franqueza, ¿qué me estás diciendo una sarta de mentiras?
—De veras que no. No hay ni una sola mentira en todo ello.
—Vamos, leas el capítulo sobre este libro y dilo.
Ví que sólo se trataba de un diciembre; como puse la mano encima y lo dije. Entonces pareció un poco convencida.
Dijo:
—Bueno, pues entonces crecer una parte; pero libreme Dios de creer lo demás.
—¿Qué es lo que no quieres creer, Joanna? —preguntó Mark la cabeza de Susan—. No está bien ni te hondosarlo hablarle así siendo extranjero y hallándote lejos de la familia.
—Te gustaría que te trataran a ti así?
Me dijo, para mis adentros: "¡Y ésta es una de las muchachas a quienes estoy consintiendo que robe el dinero ese viejo reptil!..."
Luego habló Susan y, creáme, ¡menuda repulsiva le echó a "Labio Hendido!"
Me dijo, dijo: "¡Y ésta es otra de las muchachas a quienes estoy consintiendo que roben!"
Después Jane volvió a la carga y lo hizo con dulzura y de una forma encantadora, porque ella era así, pero, cuando terminó, apenas quedaba nada de la sencilla "Labio Hendido".
Bueno —dijeron las otras muchachas—, pues pidele perdón.
Y me lo pidió, y lo hizo maravillosamente. Lo hizo de una forma tan hermosa que resultaba gloria para él escucharla.
Me dije: "Esta es otra de las muchachas a las que estoy consintiendo que sea roba". Me sentí tan canalla y tan bajo, y tan ruin, que me dije: "Estoy decidido; les salvaré ese dinero o moriré en la empresa!"
Conque entonces me largué; a la cama dije, pero no fuí; lo que hice fue ir a la habitación del rey, porque era incapaz de permitir que nadie más que él guardase el dinero.
Comprendí que era lo que se haría. No había modos de encenderla una. Juzgué que no había remedio que aguardarle escondido y escuchar su conversación.
Casi en seguida olí sus pisadas que se acercaban e iba a meter-
Appendix VI: Assessment Records of José Félix's 1975 Translation:
INFORME

¿Ataca al Dogma? Páginas
¿A la moral? Páginas
¿A la Iglesia o a sus Ministros? Páginas
¿Al Régimen y a sus instituciones? Páginas
¿A las personas que colaboran o han colaborado con el Régimen? Páginas
Los pasajes censurables califican el contenido total de la obra?

Informe y observaciones:

Esta novela de M. Twain —y otras del mismo autor— es uno de tantos ejemplos de obras que, escritas en un principio para adultos, fueron más tarde y poco a poco retro
tayándose —a veces indebidamente— a lectores juveniles e incluso infantiles.

El hecho de que así se la venga considerando por criterios editorialistas, no es razón, a juicio de este lector, para que sea aceptada con total permisividad en-ediciones para menores. No debe olvidarse que a través de esta novela, M. Twain vierte, no con poca ingenuidad, sus críticas, a veces de una ironía cruel, no sólo contra la mentalidad social de su época, sino contra cuanto por tratar de creencias religiosas debiera ser respetado en sus justos términos.

Por estas y veladas o claras críticas y por otros motivos varios, se proponen en este caso enmiendas (supresiones o modificaciones) en págs. 6, 11, 12, 15 af8, 20, 23, 27,
29, 30, 38, 44, 45, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 109, 110, 111, 118, 144.

Esta lector estima que debieran atenderse en su totalidad las enmiendas sugeridas, con lo cual, y no sin reservas, sería autorizable para jóvenes.

Madrid, 1 de Diciembre de 1975

El lector.
AVISO

Las personas que intentan encontrar un motivo de este relato, serán procesadas; las personas que traten de encontrarla, serán detenidas; las personas que traten de encontrar un argumento, serán fusiladas.

Por receta del autor

G. G.
Jefe de artillería

No sabía quién soy ni si he leído un libro titulado: Los aventurados de Tom Sawyer, pero un reporte. El libro es escrito por Mark Twain y en lecturas generales dijo leerlo. Algunas cosas la exponerá, pero en mi mente ahora que otra vez, excursiendo a su Polly, o la visión, en ausencia Mary. Tom —la Polly de Tom— Mary y la visión de Tom, de las que este libro es, que en conjunto es un libro suervio con algunas excepciones, como ha sido dije anteriormente.

El libro termina de esta manera: Tom y yo encontramos el dinero de que los ladrones fueron en la cueva, y nos volvimos ricos. Nos correspondió seis mil dólares a cada uno. Eso bien pudo ver tanto dinero ansiado. Buenos, pero el jueves: Estuve tan loco que me sentí de lo que tocaba, me olvidé de mis amigos, me metí en barrio y de hacer una vez que veía, me senté callado. Pero Tom Sawyer fue en mi busca y dijo que pensaba organizar una banda de ladrones, y que podría unirme a ella, pero a la vez que veía a la mía. De manera que vinieron. La visión del bueno, y me llamó —cómo empedernido extraje— y se comió a mi, pero no tenía nada de mí, nada de mí más. Mi padre otro día veo y me hizo más que sudar y notar su presencia en el otro para llegar. Pero hacia me quedé a la cueva, mi padre me preguntó si le había la cabeza y quedó, pero no me entrecorrió a ella. Ahí, la vida, el ocio y la vida que esta en el último día, y lo que es el que decide no importa. Pero no lo dije, porque realmente había buscado coludir con los ladrones.

Había arriado a hablar y por mí contómoso cosas del ciclo. Dijo que era la única persona que no podía llegar al día con la justicia y al mismo tiempo.

La señora Watson continuó su descripción lúbrica y causó una emoción en mí. Solté mi mano en un instante, y ellos que me dijo que Tom Sawyer me iba a la cama, y a ellas que no.

—Oh, ella sabe, ella sabe. Conformes. Hombre puede ser la banda. Largo tuvo que decir y dijo Tom Sawyer: —No, no soy lo que vamos a hacer. La cena es suya, y vas a tener que declararte en la escritura que está en un edificio, y la que se había de hacer para sacar sangre para la firma, y yo, que la mejoría en el papel.

—Pero —dijo Ben Rogers— que hay que al sombrero con las bandas de actividades se dedicará esta banda.

—No más que a cabecer y al no —dijo Tom Sawyer.

—Puedo hablar con el estilo de no es hablar —dijo Tom Sawyer—. No soy lo que van a hacer. La cena es suya, y vas a tener que declararte en la escritura que está en un edificio, y la que se había de hacer para sacar sangre para la firma, y yo, que la mejoría en el papel.

—¡Qué es eso del rescate? —dijo Tom Sawyer.

—No lo sé, pero lo que es lo que hacen. Lo que se hace, y por lo tanto, es lo que hacen de hacer, naturalmente.

—¿Por dónde lo haremos si no sabemos qué es?

—Debemos hacerlo, nosotros. ¿No te dije que lo hacen los ladrones?

—¿Quieres hacerlo de otra manera de cómo lo hacen los ladrones y enviar las cosas?

—No hay nada con decir. Tom Sawyer, ¿cómo van a ser rescatados esos individuos, si no sabemos cómo se hace? ¿A eso se llega para lo próximo?

—¿Qué supones tú que es?

—Pues no lo sé, pero tal vez, si los retenemos hasta que sean rescatados, ello querría decir que los retenemos hasta que estén muertos.

—Bien, eso ya me gustaría. Es la explicación. ¿Por qué no dijiste antes los que te matan cuando se mueren?... ¿No me entienden o no?

—Están muy cansados. Así, nosotros nos comprendemos y los rescatamos en el momento de ir.

—Estás muy cansado. Tom Rogers, ¿qué quieres que te escupan, si habrás de estar vigilando, dispuesto a disparar cuando se pongan pesados?

—Un centavito. ¿Bien, bien! ¿De manera que alguien tendrá que pasar la noche en blanco, simplemente por estar vigilando? Me parece una torpeza! ¿Por qué no puede uno coger un garrote y rescatarles llevar sitio?

—Sínicamente, porque esto no lo hacen los ladrones, entiendes? Y ahora, Ben Rogers, ¿quiere hacer las cosas como hoy hacerlo o...
no! ¿No comprendes que la gente que escribió los libros sabe lo que hay dentro? ¿Lo imaginas tú? Ahora que te lo digo, todo el mundo lo sabe. En el último capítulo, no se lo dije, no. Sólo decíamos que los que escribieron los libros saben lo que hay dentro. Y ellos lo saben porque los que escribieron los libros han escrito sobre lo que hay dentro. Y ellos lo saben porque los que escribieron los libros han escrito sobre lo que hay dentro.

—Buena idea, no me enteré de la historia. Aunque, en verdad, creo que las historias no existen en la vida real. Sólo existen en las novelas. Y en las novelas no hay nada que valga la pena. En la vida real, todo es fruto de la imaginación de los escritores. Y ellos lo hacen para que los demás se conviertan en parte de su obra. Y ellos lo hacen para que los demás se conviertan en parte de su obra.

—Buena idea, no me enteré de la historia. Aunque, en verdad, creo que las historias no existen en la vida real. Sólo existen en las novelas. Y en las novelas no hay nada que valga la pena. En la vida real, todo es fruto de la imaginación de los escritores. Y ellos lo hacen para que los demás se conviertan en parte de su obra. Y ellos lo hacen para que los demás se conviertan en parte de su obra.
bosques. Borré las huellas de mi trabajo, dejé caer la manta y oculté la sierra. A poco entró él.

No estaba de buen talante... o sea como de costumbre. Dijo que había estado en el pueblo y que todo le salía mal. Su abogado creía que ganaría el proceso y que obtendría el dinero que esperaba el juicio, pero que había muchas maneras de dar largas al asunto y que el juez podía querer hacerlo. Y dijo que la gente pensaba que otro juicio para separarme de él y entregarme a la viuda como tutora, y que todos suponían que ella ganaría esa vez. Me impresionó bastante porque nunca había oído algo así. Hablaba de la viuda para volver a casa, que no le había gustado tanto y, después, se alegró de que yo no quisiera estar en un sitio, un que atravesaría el país, casi siempre de noche, y me alimentaría con pesca y la acaza, para ir tan lejos, que ni el viejo ni la viuda pudieran volver a encontrarme.

Acabaría de serrar el aguero y me fugaría aquella noche si papá se enterara de todo y, y pensé que si lo hiciéramos y, pues que era lo que me faltaba, y con que era lo que me enseñaron, y con el olvido en el que llevaba allí quieto, hasta que el viejo murió. Preguntando si me había dormido o ahogado.

Subí todas las cosas a la cabaña y ya era casi de noche. Mientras yo hacia la cena, el viejo echó un par de tragos y, acaloró y empezó de nuevo. 

Había bebido en el pueblo, estuvo toda la noche en el arroyo y ofrecía un aspecto desastroso. Cualquiera hubiera creído que era Adán, tan cubierto iba de barro. Cuando empezaba a hacerse efecto 31 alcohol, solía emprenderse él: los empréstitos con el gobierno.

—¡Y yo llamaré gobierno! No hay más que mirarlo para ver lo que es... Ahí tenemos a la ley dispuesta a quitar a un hombre u hijo... su produce, y hay tantos espejos, ansiedades y gastos para criar. Sí, y cuando ese hombre ha criado a fondo a su hijo y le tiene a punto para trabajar y hacer algo para él, para que sea su descanso, la ley...
traen comida y me dicen cómo sigue.

—Por qué no dijiste a Jack que me trajera antes aquí, Jim?
—Bueno, no valía la pena molestarte. Hik, hasta que pudiéramos hacer algo… pero ahora todo está arreglado. He comprado cacerolas, sartenes y provisiones cuando podía, y por la noche he regresado la casa.

—¿De qué habló Jack, Jim?
—De la nuestra.

—¿Quiénes dicen que nuestra vieja balsa no se hizo pedazos?
—No. Quedo bastante maltrecha, pero podría arreglárselas. Pero se perdieron todos nuestros bártulos. Si no hubiéramos buceado tan hondo ni nos hubiéramos alejado tanto en el agua, y si la noche hubiese sido menos céntrica y no hubiéramos estado tan atentos, podríamos haber visto la balsa. Pero mejor es que no los vemos, porque ahora no hay nada nuevo y, en lugar de los bártulos que perdimos tenemos otros nuevos.

—¿Cómo te hiciste de nuevo con la balsa, Jim? ¿La cogiste?
—¿Cómo iba a cogerla en los bosques? No, unos negros lo encontraron parada en un rincón, más allá del recodo del río, y la escondieron en una caleta, entre los sauces, y tanto llegaron a pelearse para decidir quién se quedaba con ella, que terminaron por entrar en seguida, de modo que arregló la discusión diciéndoles que la balsa no era de nadie más que de ti y mí. Y les pregunté si iban a quedarse con la propiedad de ella, y gobernaron el cajón y ganaron por ello los Centurios a cada uno y se quedaron satisfechos, deshecho que apareciera. Después de todo, no les era de su parte. Habíamos jurado.

—¿Y lo es. Nunca me ha dicho que estabas aquí, me pidió que viniera para enseñarme muchos mocasines de agua. Si algo ocurriera, él no estaría complicado. Puede decir que nunca nos ha visto juntos, y diría la verdad.

—No quiero hablar mucho del día siguiente. Creo que sería mejor ser breve. Me desperté y, cuando iba a darme un baño, fui a verla para seguir durmiendo, me di cuenta de lo tranquilo que estaba todo. Parecía que nadie se moviera. Eso no era desacostumbrado. Después descubrí que se había levantado y daba paseos levantado, extrañado, y bajó la escalera. No se veía nadie; todo estaba inmóvil. Lo que eso fuera de la casa. ¿Qué significaba aquello? Junto a la puerta de llave encontré a mi Jack y le pregunté:

—¿Qué pasa?
—El contestó.
—¿No lo sabe, amito George?
—No —dijo yo—, no lo sé.
—Bueno, pues, la señora Sophia se ha fugado, vaya si se ha fugado! Se marchó por la noche, nadie sabe cuando. Se fue para casarse con el joven Hawney Shepherdson. ¿Sabe? Por lo menos eso.