

**Univerzita Karlova v Praze**

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav translatologie

Translatologie

Mgr. Jaroslav Špirk

**Ideology, Censorship, Indirect Translations and  
Non-Translation:  
Czech Literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal**

**Ideologie, cenzura, nepřímé překlady a  
nepřekládání: Česká literatura v Portugalsku  
ve 20. století**

Dizertační práce

vedoucí práce – Prof. PhDr. Jana Králová, CSc.

2011

### PROHLÁŠENÍ O PŮVODNOSTI PRÁCE

Prohlašuji, že jsem dizertační práci napsal samostatně s využitím pouze uvedených a řádně citovaných pramenů a literatury a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 30. srpna 2011

---

(podpis)

### DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I, Jaroslav Špírk, hereby declare that this doctoral thesis and the work presented in it is entirely my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own research. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is always clearly acknowledged. Neither this thesis as a whole nor any part hereof has been previously submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution.

Prague, 30 August 2011

---

(signature)

## **Dedication**

I dedicate the present doctoral thesis to

Anton Popovič (1933-1984),

who has taught me most.

## I. Abstrakt

Dizertační práce se zabývá knižními překlady české a slovenské literatury do portugalštiny v Portugalsku ve 20. století.

Úvod zdůvodňuje volbu tématu, ukazuje jeho relevanci a nastiňuje strukturu práce. Stanovuje též hlavní otázku výzkumu, *Jak byla česká literatura zastoupena na portugalském knižním trhu ve 20. století?*, a formuluje hypotézu: *Překlady české literatury v Portugalsku 20. století vykazovaly nějakou tendenci, systém.*

První kapitola se pokouší operacionalizovat sedm obecně translatologických témat: 1. ideologie, 2. cenzura, 3. nepřímé překlady, 4. nepřekládání, 5. kánon a světová literatura, 6. paratexty, 7. „středně velké“ kultury.

Druhá kapitola vymezuje předmět zkoumání, obecně představuje hlavní typy použitých zdrojů a materiálů a definuje metodologii. Jako hlavní oblast zájmu stanovuje překlady *české beletrie do evropské portugalštiny* publikované v Portugalsku ve 20. století v knižní podobě. Obšírněji probírá stěžejní práce J. Levého a A. Popoviče, z nichž vyvozuje metodologii vhodnou pro analýzu nalezeného materiálu.

Třetí kapitola poskytuje obecně historický, politický a kulturní kontext práce. Soustředí se především na kulturní vztahy Československa a Portugalska ve 20. století a poprvé české odborné veřejnosti přináší informace o fungování cenzury v Portugalsku během *Nového státu* (1926-74).

Čtvrtá kapitola se zaměřuje na českou literaturu v portugalských překladech, ale též na fenomén *nepřekládání* v důsledku cenzury. Představuje a analyzuje zprávy portugalských cenzorů o knihách českých autorů či jinak se týkajících Československa, zjišťuje příčiny zákazů a povolení jednotlivých knih a zkoumá jejich dopad na recepci české literatury v Portugalsku. Kapitulu uzavírá translatologická analýza vybraných pasáží z portugalského překladu románu *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války* od J. Haška s přihlédnutím k jeho zprostředkujícímu textu, francouzskému překladu J. Hořejšího.

Závěr shrnuje zjištěné výsledky, odpovídá na základní otázky výzkumu, rozebírá, do jaké míry byla původní hypotéza výzkumu potvrzena, nabízí alternativní vysvětlení, probírá okrajové případy a nastiňuje směry dalšího možného výzkumu.

Ústředními tématy práce jsou: a) vliv *politických ideologií* na překládání a *nepřekládání*, zvláště pak v důsledku působení *cenzury*; b) fenomén *nepřímých překladů* a obecněji *nepřímé recepce* výchozí literatury a jejího *kánonu*; c) vztahy mezi dvěma středně velkými evropskými kulturami na poli (nejen) literárního překladu.

Klíčová slova: ideologie, cenzura, nepřímé překlady, nepřekládání, kánon, světová literatura, středně velké kultury, Portugalsko, Československo, 20. století

## II. Abstract

The present doctoral thesis investigates book translations of Czech and Slovak literature into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal.

The Introduction gives reasons for choosing the topic, argues for its relevance and outlines the structure of the thesis. It defines the main research question, ‘What was the presence of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal?’, and formulates the hypothesis to be tested: ‘The translations of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup> century Portugal exhibited a tendency, a pattern.’

Chapter 1 attempts to operationalise seven theoretical issues pertinent to Translation Studies in general: (1) ideology, (2) censorship, (3) indirect translations, (4) non-translation, (5) canon and world literature, (6) paratexts, and (7) medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures.

Chapter 2 delineates the research subject, discusses the most important types of sources and materials used and presents the methodology. The principal research subject is defined as translations of *Czech fiction* into *European Portuguese* published in *book form* in Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Seminal works by J. Levý and A. Popovič are introduced, discussing the methodology most apposite to analysing the material found.

Chapter 3 provides a general historical, political and cultural background for the topic of thesis. It focuses on the cultural relations between Czechoslovakia and Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The institution and methods of the Portuguese censorship during the *New State* (1926-74) are presented to the Czech scholarly public for the first time.

Chapter 4 deals with Portuguese translations of Czech literature and the phenomenon of *non-translation* due to censorship. It presents and analyses the censorship files regarding books by Czech authors or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia, reveals the underlying reasons for banning or authorising the books and examines the repercussions for the reception of Czech literature in Portugal. The chapter is concluded with a micro-textual contrastive analysis of selected excerpts from J. Hašek’s novel *The Good Soldier Švejk*, including the *mediating* French translation by J. Hořejší.

The Conclusion synthesises the results, answers the main research questions, discusses to what extent the original hypothesis has been confirmed, offers alternative explanations, discusses borderline cases and gives suggestions for follow-up research.

The key issues of the thesis are: (a) the impact of *political ideologies* on translation and *non-translation*, especially due to *censorship*; (b) the phenomenon of *indirect translations* in particular and *indirect reception* of the source literature and its *canon* in general; and (c) relations between two European medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures as seen through the prism of translations of (not only) literature.

Key words: ideology, censorship, indirect translations, non-translation, canon, world literature, medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures, Portugal, Czechoslovakia, 20<sup>th</sup> century

### III. Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the assistance, advice and support of many people. I owe my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. PhDr. Jana Králová, CSc., who has helped to shape my thinking about translation for many years, guided me throughout my doctoral studies and offered me all the support I have needed.

I should also like to express my heartfelt thanks to my Portuguese consultants, Prof.<sup>a</sup> Doutora Teresa Maria Menano Seruya, professora catedrática, and Prof. Doutor João Ferreira Duarte, professor catedrático. Their erudition, patience and advice have been of supreme importance for this thesis, especially during my research in Lisbon.

I am also deeply indebted to Mr Robert Russell, who has shown much patience and a meticulous attention to detail when proofreading and editing my thesis. He has done his utmost to bring this thesis up to the standards of English academic discourse. Of course, any and all remaining faults, errors of judgment or interpretation, oversights and infelicities are entirely and solely my own responsibility.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the *Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation* in Portugal, which generously supported my research for the present thesis for a period of ten months between June 2007 and March 2008.

Thanks are also due to many other people who have helped me in various ways throughout my research and the writing process, in particular Prof. Alexandra Assis Rosa, Prof. Harish Trivedi, Prof. Michaela Wolf, Paulo Tremoceiro of the Portuguese National Archives, Janete Filipa Santas Noites Maximiano, Annegret Bolle, Rita Bueno Maia, Sara Ramos Pinto, Ana Teresa Marques dos Santos, Eva Švarcová, Kateřina Štěpánková, and Hanna Pięta.

Last but not least, I am indebted to my family, Edita Růžičková and those closest to me for always keeping me on the right track, for making me never lose the sight of the finishing line and for inspiring and motivating me throughout the work on this dissertation.

## IV. Table of Contents

I. Abstrakt .....	4
II. Abstract .....	5
III. Acknowledgements.....	6
IV. Table of Contents.....	7
V. Figures and Tables .....	9
VI. Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	10
VII. Introduction .....	12
VIII. Chapter 1: Conceptual Research.....	18
1.1 Ideology .....	18
1.1.1 Definition .....	19
1.1.2 Review of Literature .....	23
1.1.3 Conclusion .....	35
1.2 Censorship .....	36
1.2.1 Definition .....	36
1.2.2 Review of Literature .....	37
1.2.3 Conclusion .....	43
1.3 Indirect Translations .....	44
1.3.1 Definition .....	45
1.3.2 Review of Literature .....	51
1.3.3 Conclusion .....	58
1.4 Non-translation .....	60
1.4.1 Definition .....	60
1.4.2 Review of Literature .....	61
1.4.3 Conclusion .....	67
1.5 The Canon and World Literature .....	68
1.5.1 Definition .....	68
1.5.2 Review of Literature .....	71
1.5.3 Conclusion .....	82
1.6 Paratexts.....	84
1.6.1 Definition .....	84
1.6.2 Review of Literature .....	87
1.6.3 Conclusion .....	92
1.7 Medium-Sized Lingua- and Socio-Cultures .....	94
1.7.1 Language and Translation.....	94
1.7.2 A Case for Medium-Sized LSCs .....	96
1.7.3 Ideology and Central Europe .....	98
IX. Chapter 2: Material and Methodology.....	101
2.1 Introduction.....	101
2.2 Material .....	102
2.3 Methodology .....	109
2.3.1 Levý .....	110
2.3.2 Popovič .....	119
2.3.4 Syncretism .....	132
2.4 Conclusion .....	136
X. Chapter 3: Historical and Political Context .....	138
3.1 Czechoslovakia .....	138

3.2 Portugal .....	155
3.2.1 Introduction .....	155
3.2.2 Portugal in the 20 <sup>th</sup> Century .....	155
3.2.3 Censorship in Portugal .....	176
3.3 Czech-Portuguese Relations .....	191
3.4 Conclusion .....	196
XI. Chapter 4: Czech Literature in Portugal .....	198
4.1 Non-Translation .....	198
4.1.1 List of Censored Books .....	198
4.1.2 Analysis of the Censorship Files .....	208
4.1.3 Censorship Files Concerning the Portuguese Translations .....	212
4.2 The Translations .....	215
4.2.1 Books of Fiction Translated into Portuguese .....	215
4.2.2 Special Cases .....	227
4.2.3 Non-Fiction .....	233
4.2.4 Analysis and Statistics .....	241
4.3 Micro-textual Contrastive Analysis .....	247
4.3.1 Choice of Text .....	247
4.3.2 The Author: Jaroslav Hašek .....	248
4.3.3 The Original: <i>The Good Soldier Švejk</i> in Czech .....	249
4.3.4 The Translations and the Mediating Text .....	252
4.3.5 The Portuguese Translation .....	257
4.3.6 Conclusion .....	279
XII. Conclusion .....	281
XIII. Shrnutí .....	290
XIV. Resumo .....	294
XV. Sources and Bibliography .....	299
XVI. Appendix .....	322



## V. Figures and Tables

### List of Figures

Contents of Part One of *The Art of Translation* by J. Levý (1963/1998: 393-394), subchapter 2.3.1, p. 111-112

Model of the Individual Parts of an Integral Study of Translation by Reference to its Theoretical Disciplines and Translators' Activities by A. Popovič (1975: 20), subchapter 2.3.2, p. 120-121

Model for the Investigation of Translation History by A. Popovič (1975: 36-37), subchapter 2.3.2, p. 122

Typology of Shifts of Expression in Translation by A. Popovič (1975: 130), subchapter 2.3.2, p. 129-130

Main Chapters of *Original/Translation: Interpretation Terminology* (Popovič et al. 1983), subchapter 2.3.2, p. 131

### List of Tables

Official Names of Czechoslovakia, subchapter 3.1.12, p. 154

Czechoslovak (1918-1992) and Czech (1993-2013) Presidents, subchapter 3.1.12, p. 154

Prime Ministers of the Czech Republic (1993-2010), subchapter 3.1.12, p. 154

Presidents of the Portuguese Republic (1910-2011), subchapter 3.2.2.6, p. 175

Prime Ministers of Portugal (1932-2011), subchapter 3.2.2.6, p. 175

Representation of Original Languages of Censored Books in Proportion to Translations, Fiction and Provenance, subchapter 4.1.1, p. 205

Books Banned and Authorised by the Censorship Boards in Lisbon and Oporto, by Year, subchapter 4.1.1, p. 207

Books Originally Written in Czech or Slovak and Translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, by Genre, subchapter 4.2.4, p. 241

Source-Text Languages for Portuguese Translations of Books Written in Czech or Slovak, subchapter 4.2.4, p. 242

Years of Publication of Czech and Slovak Books of Fiction Correlated with their Place of Publication, subchapter 4.2.4, p. 244

## VI. Abbreviations and Acronyms

- ANP – *Acção Nacional Popular*, People’s National Action;  
 BNP – *Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal*, Portuguese National Library;  
 CDS – *Centro Democrático Social*, Social Democratic Centre;  
 CM – *Câmara Municipal*, City Council (city government);  
 CPLP – *Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa*, Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries;  
 cs. – in Czech;  
 ČSLA – *Československá lidová armáda*, Czechoslovak People’s Army;  
 ČSSD – *Česká strana sociálně demokratická*, the Czech Social Democratic Party;  
 de. – in German;  
 DGI – *Direcção-Geral da Informação*, Directorate-General of Information;  
 DGS – *Direcção-Geral de Segurança*, Directorate-General for Security;  
 DGSCI – *Direcção-Geral dos Serviços de Censura à Imprensa*, Directorate-General of the Press Censorship Services;  
 DSC – *Direcção dos Serviços de Censura*, Directorate of Censorship Services;  
 DSI – *Direcção dos Serviços de Informação*, Directorate of Information Services;  
 en. – in English;  
 es. – in Spanish;  
 FFUK – *Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy*, Faculty of Philosophy and Arts of Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic;  
 FLUL – *Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa*, Faculty of Letters of the University of Lisbon;  
 fr. – in French;  
 GNEL – *Grémio Nacional de Editores e Livreiros*, National Trade Union of Publishers and Booksellers;  
 GNR – *Guarda Nacional Republicana*, roughly: military police;  
 IANTT – *Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais – Torre do Tombo*, National Archives in Lisbon;  
 KSČ – *Komunistická strana Československa*, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia;  
 KSČM – *Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy*, the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia;  
 LSC – *lingua-&socio-culture*, i.e. culture *sensu lato*, a whole society sharing similar forms and manifestations of communication in the broadest socio-semiotic sense of the word, especially when contradistinguished from ‘culture’ *sensu stricto* (literature and arts);  
 LX – Lisbon;  
 M.º Ultramar – *Ministério do Ultramar*, Overseas Ministry (earlier: of Colonies);  
 MFA – *Movimento das Forças Armadas*, Movement of the Armed Forces;  
 MSLSCs – medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures, cf. LSC;  
 NATO – the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation;  
 NK Klementinum – *Česká národní knihovna*, the Czech National Library;  
 ODS – *Občanská demokratická strana*, the Civic Democratic Party;  
 OP – Oporto;  
 PCP – *Partido Comunista Português*, the Portuguese Communist Party;  
 PIDE – *Polícia Internacional e de Defesa do Estado*, International and State Defence Police;

- Pol. Jud.<sup>a</sup> – *Polícia Judiciária*, Judicial Police;
- PORBASE – *Base Nacional de Dados Bibliográficos*, The Portuguese National Bibliographic Database;
- PS – *Partido Socialista*, Socialist Party;
- PSD – *Partido Social Democrata*, Social Democratic Party;
- PSP – *Polícia de Segurança Pública*, Public Security Police;
- PVDE – *Polícia de Vigilância e Defesa do Estado*, State Defence and Surveillance Police;
- pt. – in Portuguese;
- SC – source culture;
- SEIT – *Secretaria de Estado da Informação e Turismo*, State Secretariat for Information and Tourism;
- sk. – in Slovak;
- SL – source language;
- SNB – *Sbor národní bezpečnosti*, National Security Forces, the police in Czechoslovakia;
- SNI – *Secretariado Nacional da Informação, Cultura Popular e Turismo*, National Secretariat for Information, Popular Culture and Tourism;
- SPN – *Secretariado da Propaganda Nacional*, National Propaganda Secretariat;
- ST – source text;
- StB – *Státní bezpečnost*, State Security, the ‘secret’ police in Czechoslovakia;
- Tradbases – *Bibliografia Portuguesa de Estudos de Tradução*, The Portuguese Bibliography of Translation Studies;
- TL – target language;
- TT – target text;
- TC – target culture;
- UN – *União Nacional*, National Union;
- WLD – ‘Western liberal democracies’, market-driven democracies in Western Europe and North America after 1945, e.g. the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, or France; this concept is placed between inverted commas, as it is rather simplifying in nature (and strictly speaking, not quite neutral, either); in this thesis, it is used in particular in contradistinction to the ‘fascist’ regimes on the Iberian peninsula and to the ‘communist’ (socialist) regimes in Central and Eastern Europe;
- WWI – the First World War, also the Great War;
- WWII – the Second World War.

## VII. Introduction

The present thesis deals with the destiny of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. Thus, it does not *only* investigate what has been translated and how (an overwhelming majority being indirect, i.e. mediated, translations), but also what has *not* been translated (due to censorship), attempting to account for the invisible, yet fundamental phenomenon of *non-translation*, the motivations behind it and its repercussions. As a result, the issues examined here are novel in several ways.

First, the thesis makes a case for medium-sized European lingua- and socio-cultures<sup>1</sup>. Most research in Translation Studies (hereafter TS) has hitherto concentrated on the reception of the ‘major’ cultures in the smaller ones, thereby raising questions of colonialism, superiority and suchlike. These are doubtless fundamental issues – but the field of TS is not exhausted by them. To quote Woods (2006: 185):

Translation Studies has tended to focus on case studies of major world languages: English (in the anglocentric and ex-colonial world), French (in the francophone world), German, Spanish, Italian, Arabic, Chinese and, to some extent, Russian. Case studies such as that of Kundera suggest that there needs to be an analysis of translations from so-called ‘minority languages’, and certainly one of the areas that has been ignored is ex-Eastern Europe: Central Europe and the Balkans, for instance.

At the same time, this approach is believed to be emblematic of the literary translation relations obtaining between other medium-sized European LSCs, as evidenced, for instance, by Jón Karl Helgason (1999, especially Part III, Chapters 4 and 5, pp. 83-116, dealing with the reception of *Njáls Saga* in the Danish and Norwegian literary systems). Other examples include Fabienne Frédérique Monique Lusseau’s unpublished thesis on the translations of Belgian francophone literature in Portugal (1996), Hanna Pięta’s paper on the translations of Polish literature into Portuguese (2010), or Alejandro Hermida de Blas and Patricia Gonzalo de Jesús’ joint paper on the translation of Czech and Slovak literature in Spain (2007).

While it may be argued that Portuguese, with its more than 170 million native speakers around the world, is not a medium-sized language, but the seventh most widespread mother tongue in the world (according to *L’Atlas du Monde diplomatique*, 2003), Portugal as a country does not occupy such a leading position in the European context. Much like the Czech Republic today (and Czechoslovakia before 1993), its place in Europe is one on the periphery, albeit for different reasons. The comparable status of Portugal and the Czech Republic, alongside Belgium, for example, is also reflected in the number of seats they hold in different institutions and bodies of the European Union today. Of course, the comparison ought not to go too far and the (very) different reasons

---

<sup>1</sup> LSC vs. culture: When speaking about ‘culture’ in the broadest sense, including the society as a whole, lingua- and socio-culture, or LSC, is used. This is ‘culture’ defined as a set of customs and beliefs, way of life and social organisation of a particular country or group (among many other definitions). When speaking about ‘culture’ in the narrower sense, consisting of art, music, literature, theatre, cinema etc., ‘culture’ is used. Where unambiguous, ‘culture’ is used as a hypernym. For the purposes of this thesis, Liechtenstein, Andorra or San Marino are considered to be ‘small’ within the European context. Countries like Portugal, the Czech Republic or Belgium (all with a population of about 10 million inhabitants) are called ‘medium-sized’ for want of a more concise term.

for this situation must always be viewed in their proper (and often unique) historical, political and cultural context. Chapter 3 deals with these issues in more detail (cf. also subchapter 1.7.1).

Second, this thesis proposes to view literature as one system not only in the polysystem of culture and other arts, but in the macro-system of the whole lingua- and socio-culture in the given country (and, not infrequently, the broader geopolitical region, such as the Iberian Peninsula or Central Europe).

In opposition to such approaches as Russian Formalism, early structuralism or Anglo-American New Criticism in literary theory, and in contradistinction to the linguistic approaches to translation (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958, G. Mounin 1963, the Leipzig School, J. C. Catford 1965, W. Koller 1979, *inter alii*), this thesis is an instance of, and conforms to, those strands and movements in Translation Studies that take into account the ideological aspects of translation and its social embedding.

When investigating culture (in both senses), we are dealing with sociosemiotic phenomena. Consequently, the theoretical and methodological edifice of the thesis is derived from such works as Jiří Levý (1957, 1963, 1971), Anton Popovič (1975, 1983), Dionýz Ďurišin (1985, 1995), Itamar Even-Zohar (1990, 2004), Gideon Toury (1995, 1998), André Lefevere (1985, 1992) and others.

The subject matter is inextricably interwoven with issues of power (patronage), ideology and politics as well as, more specifically, the impact of censorship upon literature and the translation of literature. While not forgoing *intra-textual* aspects of translation altogether (see subchapter 4.3), the relations of the (Portuguese) literary system with its political, historical and social environment occupy the foreground of the present approach.

Since ‘cultural ideology is inscribed in the text in its content or form in their interaction with the pragmatic dimension of the author/translator and receiver’ (Jettmarová, in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 41), *ideology* – as the prism through which literature is (intended) to be *received* – is also analysed in the presentation of the translations of Czech literature to the Portuguese readership in the form of their paratexts and the book series in which they appeared.

As a result, the *text-immanent* approach of subchapter 4.3 is only one of the vantage points from which the Portuguese translations of the works of Czech literature are observed. It is incorporated in the whole, above all, in order to ‘avoid losing the central object of translation studies, i.e. translation, for the sake of studying its external context’ (Jettmarová 2008: 43, *ibid.*) altogether.

However, when investigating the Portuguese translations of Czech literature, the *micro-textual contrastive analysis* of the original and the translation proves inadequate to capture the complexity and intricacies of the Czech-Portuguese literary relations. Reliance on this type of case study alone yielded too few – and hardly new – results (cf. subchapter 4.3). To quote Even-Zohar (1990: 53):

Thousands of works dealing with a large number of particular cases have been produced, but unfortunately these hardly accumulate to generate generalized knowledge which could transcend the details with which they are preoccupied.

A more integral and less ahistorical approach appeared more appropriate. The cultural, historical and political environment of the target (Portuguese) LSC as well as that of the source (Czechoslovak, and later Czech) LSC are described in considerable detail in order to contextualise our study and to correlate relevant facts, data and phenomena. Woods (2006: xi) sums up this argument as follows:

Rather than dwelling on inadequacies of translators or translations, I focus on how translations are manipulated on a variety of levels because of ideological assumptions or preconceived notions, especially, in this case, of European writing. Work on norms, cultural translation and post-colonial translation in Translation Studies informs these arguments, but I also want to stress the need in the field for further research beyond text-to-text comparisons, particularly via lesser-used languages within and beyond Europe.

Despite dwelling on interliterary relations extensively, this thesis cannot be said to be grounded in literary studies or comparative literature, although several brief detours do take us there when appropriate (especially as regards D. Ďurišin's contribution to the study of translation). Both the theoretical underpinnings and the methodological groundwork stem from, and are deeply embedded in, Translation Studies. It is only when defining certain terms, such as the canon or 'world literature', that recourse is had to other disciplines. Since Translation Studies is an interdisciplinary field straddling the humanities and the social sciences, sharing terms is only natural and should not be frowned upon.

Third, and more to the point, the issues examined here are intrinsic to Translation Studies and pertinent primarily to it. *Censorship* has been recognised to have particular relevance to Translation Studies by several scholars, cf. Billiani (2007), Seruya & Lin Moniz (2008), Thomson-Wohlgemuth (2009), and Chuilleanáin, Cuilleanáin & Parris (2009).

In translating from Czech into Portuguese, the use of a source text different from the (Czech) original (i.e. *indirect translation*) was the rule rather than the exception. The significance of this phenomenon was identified by Levý and Popovič as early as the 1960s and the 1970s respectively. Toury dedicates a whole chapter to it (1995: 129-146). All three of these scholars account for indirect (second-hand, mediated) translations from a theoretical standpoint. Case studies such as M. Ringmar (2007), O. Vimr (2006) or H. Kittel (1991) make it clear that the practice is far from being consigned to history's inscrutable vices.

The phenomenon of *non-translation*, accounted for most meticulously by J. F. Duarte (2000), is inextricably linked with the *choice of texts for translation*, dealt with explicitly by several translation scholars, such as Levý (1963), Popovič (1975), Even-Zohar (1990), Lefevere (1992) and Toury (1995), to name just those few who are most relevant to this thesis.

Considering all of the above arguments, it is our firm conviction that the thesis is of interest not only, nor even primarily, to Czech literature scholars ('bohemists') or those studying Portuguese cultural history in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, but first and foremost to translation scholars at large. This is one of the reasons why the decision has been taken to write and defend this thesis in the English language.

Moreover, writing this thesis in English represents a deliberate and conscious break with the tradition of ‘splendid isolation’ of Czech and Slovak scholarly endeavours. Jeremiads regarding the scarcity of publications by Czech and Slovak literary and translation scholars in western languages abound wherever we look (cf. Doležel 2000, Jettmarová 2005, Králová 2006, Vajdová 2009<sup>2</sup>). To quote from the latest joint enterprise of Králová, Jettmarová et al. (2008: 9), published in English:

The handful of publications by Czech and Slovak scholars available in English or other languages with a wide readership in the western world are the source of certain misrepresentations circulating as memes in our discipline.

Indeed, the (partially differing) Czech and Slovak strands of structuralism, the Prague Linguistic Circle and Czech structuralist aesthetics (Mukařovský, Vodička, *inter alii*) in linguistics and literary studies, as well as the work of Jiří Levý, Anton Popovič and the Nitra School in Translation Studies contributed to the furtherance of their respective disciplines by propounding many concepts and models which were not only groundbreaking in their time, but are still strikingly topical and ready-to-use today.

Ironic as it may seem, Translation Studies itself has suffered its share from language barriers, in other words, from the phenomenon of *non-translation*. By not translating our theoretical and methodological works into more widely used languages, we waive our claim to inventions and, by extension, to the importance of our work.

Whether we like it or not, Czech and Slovak are not only small, peripheral languages as such; their knowledge and use was also curbed by the oppressive weight of the Iron Curtain for almost half a century. Contacts between Czechoslovak scholars and their colleagues in the West were extremely difficult and limited to very few occasions (and individuals). The *political* situation in post-WWII Europe thus affected Translation Studies itself, so that becoming a truly trans- and multinational discipline, thereby doing justice to its name and nature, remained only wishful thinking. And so the issues examined in this thesis have come full circle.

Owing to subjective limitations, the **sources and bibliography** used in this thesis are confined to English, Portuguese, Czech, Slovak, German, and – to a lesser extent – French and Spanish. Last but not least, writing this thesis in English is also justified by pragmatic considerations. Not only is English the *lingua franca* of our globalised times (and of doctoral research in particular), no matter how much we might approve or oppose this trend, but it has also been the language on which both cooperating universities, Charles University in Prague and the University of Lisbon, could most readily agree. As most of the research for this thesis was done in Lisbon, while the principal supervision of this project came from the Institute of Translation and Interpreting Studies in Prague, English was the first and obvious choice in the mutual

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Hermans (1999: 11): ‘[...] a Czechoslovak group including Jiří Levý, Anton Popovič and František Miko. [...] Levý died in 1969 [sic!], aged 41, Popovič in 1984, and the Czechoslovak group eventually fell silent.’ Apart from the wrong date – Jiří Levý died in 1967, not having turned 41 yet; Popovič had not turned 51 when he died in 1984 – why did the Czechoslovak group fall silent (i.e. in Western languages)? The reasons were, of course, political. Many scholars, not only but most importantly in Prague and in Nitra, continued and built on Levý’s and Popovič’s legacy. Cf. also Králová and Jettmarová (2008: 9), offering the example of Valero Garcés (1995: 5), who ‘refers to Levý as a member of the Leipzig School in the former East Germany’, probably, but not less erroneously, due to the 1969 German translation of Levý’s 1963 work (cf. Bibliography).

effort to understand each other, establish new research and scholarly partnerships, and put the bitter legacy of the Iron Curtain behind us.

Materials used for the present thesis include the following categories:

- i. **archival sources**, especially the Portuguese censorship files (censors' reports) concerning Czech literature (for more see Bibliography);
- ii. **library sources**, primarily works of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese (mostly impossible to obtain on the Portuguese book market today – over 90 % of the corpus);
- iii. **media sources**, in particular daily newspapers, literary magazines and academic periodicals;
- iv. **interviews** and personal communications;
- v. **reference works** concerning authors and translators;
- vi. other **secondary works**, especially academic works in Translation Studies.

Portuguese materials were collected in Lisbon between October 2006 and May 2008, while other sources have been gathered in the course of the entire research project (October 2006 to December 2010).

The subject matter of this thesis has been approached with the following central **research question** in mind: *What was the presence of Czech literature on the book market in Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century? In other words, what was the impression the Portuguese reader (without a knowledge of other languages) could gain of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal?*

The **hypothesis** proposed here suggests that *the reception of Czech literature in Portugal, substantialised in the translations into Portuguese, followed a pattern – in one way or another filling a void in the target culture (cf. Toury 1995: 27 et passim). In other words, Portuguese translations of Czech literature are hypothesised to exhibit some kind of a structure, a tendency, or a goal in their transposition into the target system.*

**Chapter 1** opens with a review and discussion of the existing theoretical literature regarding the concepts most pertinent to this thesis. As such have been identified: (1) **ideology**, including the (not entirely synonymic) concepts of power and politics; (2) **censorship**, subsuming expurgation and bowdlerisation, as a typical and yet specific instance of ideology; (3) **indirect translations**, also called mediated translations, as a hypernym for second-, third-, fourth-hand etc. translations (Toury's *preliminary norm: directness of translation*); (4) the phenomenon of **non-translation** as the reverse side of the 'choice of texts to be translated' (Toury's *preliminary norm: translation policy*); (5) **paratexts**, including the book series in which the translations appeared, as the (semiotically) pragmatic presentation of the translations to the target readership; (6) the **canon** and 'world literature' – which is where recourse is had to comparative literature (D. Ďurišin), while still taking account of Even-Zohar (2004); and (7) **relations between medium-sized lingua- and sociocultures** (as opposed to relations between 'major' vs. 'minor' LSCs on the one hand, and between two 'major' LSCs on the other). The last concept is linked with the first one, thereby closing the circle.



**Chapter 2** comprises a series of methodological discussions, constituting a necessary framework for Chapter 4. It introduces the three most important works of J. Levý (1957, 1963, 1971) as the main theoretical underpinnings for A. Popovič (1975, 1983), whose methodological contributions to Translation Studies are treated in considerable detail. In an attempt at syncretism embracing various approaches, including Toury (1995, 1998) and Even-Zohar (1990, 2004), a methodology applicable to our corpus is derived from the work of these translation scholars.

Chapters 1 and 2 are thus conceived as the theoretical and methodological background for the thesis as a whole.

**Chapter 3** presents the general historical and cultural context of the investigated topic. The history of Czechoslovakia (1918-1993, followed by the split into the Czech and Slovak Republics, 1993-2001) and the history of Portugal (1910-2001) are discussed (a) in relation to the cultural development in each country, focusing especially on the issue of censorship and other instruments of cultural oppression, and (b) in relation to each other, including a subchapter on mutual relations between the two countries and nations (LSCs) historically, politically and culturally. The institution and workings of Portuguese censorship are discussed in some detail.

**Chapter 4** is dedicated to Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. Subchapter 4.1 presents a list of books written by Czech authors or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia that were submitted to the Portuguese censorship. These are analysed in detail, statistical correlations are established, and the resulting *non-translation* is discussed.

Subchapter 4.2 presents the corpus of the translations of Czech literary works into European Portuguese. Aiming to uncover a pattern in their transposition into Portuguese culture (referred to above), the translations are ordered chronologically (according to their date of publication), geographically (place of publication), by genre (fiction, non-fiction, propaganda) and according to the languages of the mediating texts via which the Portuguese translations were made.

Subchapter 4.3 consists of a *micro-textual contrastive analysis* of the Czech original and the mediated Portuguese translation of a Czech canonical novel, *The Good Soldier Švejk* by Jaroslav Hašek, including the mediating French translation. The methodology used here is based on Popovič (1975, 1983). Particular emphasis is placed on the attempt to uncover whether, and if applicable to what degree, the ‘translational methods’ (Popovič 1975), i.e. ‘translation strategies’ (Toury 1995), betray signs of censorship or manipulation.

The **Conclusion** synthesises the results obtained and discusses their implications. It offers answers to the research questions and examines the hypothesis put forward in this Introduction, discussing borderline cases, providing alternative explanations and offering suggestions for further research.

The Conclusion is followed by a summary in Czech and Portuguese, a list of sources and bibliography, and an appendix consisting of copies of the Portuguese censorship files concerning Czech literature.

## VIII. Chapter 1: Conceptual Research

As indicated in the Introduction, the following seven concepts have been identified as the most important theoretical issues for the data and material treated in the present thesis. Concurrently, they constitute the theoretical underpinnings, including a comprehensive (albeit not exhaustive) review of literature under each subchapter. Here we shall broadly define these concepts and state their relevance for Translation Studies in general; Czech and Portuguese data will be used only to support this general argumentation. Specific contexts, relations, data and phenomena are the subject matter of the following chapters.

### 1.1 Ideology

‘When I use a word,’ Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, ‘it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less.’

‘The question is,’ said Alice, ‘whether you *can* make words mean so many different things.’

‘The question is,’ said Humpty Dumpty, ‘which is to be master – that’s all.’

(Lewis Carroll: Alice in Wonderland)

Taking into account the far-reaching implications of modern hermeneutics (e.g. Gadamer 1960) and deconstruction (e.g. Derrida 1967) for epistemology (but cf. already Kant’s *noumenon* in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1781 and 1787), the ultimate Truth regarding the world and ourselves (whence we came, whither we go and what the sense of our ephemeral terrestrial life might be) appears to be unknowable to the human mind, at least in its entirety. As a result, we live by metaphors, stories (*Grands Récits*, J.-F. Lyotard) and ideologies (all of which are intrinsically sociosemiotic, i.e. cultural phenomena). Ideologies are particularly appealing, since they function as smokescreens, narrowing reality and shining light on just one segment of it, thereby making ‘true knowledge’ seem less impossible to grasp.

More to the point, ideologies can be used efficiently to manipulate groups – whether they initially seem rather innocent (e.g. religious ideologies) or betray dangerous features from the very outset (e.g. Nazism). Of course, in reality the two extremes are never so clear-cut, ‘innocent’ and ‘dangerous’ being themselves axiological concepts. However, human reality is not constructed (primarily) by the ‘reality out there’ (things-in-themselves), but by the value- and hence ideology-laden ‘social reality’ (in which, for instance, ‘kitsch’ is a concept with an actual intension and extension).

Ideologies help us to find our way in the labyrinthine, entropic universe (of discourse) we live in. However, as indicated above, they are never devoid of the axiological dimension. Thus, they do not merely simplify things cognitively (epistemologically); they also simplify things ethically (axiologically).

It is, nonetheless, the goal of all scholarly endeavour to expose such ideologies for what they are and to look behind them – in the steadfast hope that we may uncover and *know* (cognise) at least part of the world around (and within) us.

### 1.1.1 Definition

As is the case with many general and abstract notions in the social sciences and the humanities, there are various definitions and theories of *ideology*<sup>3</sup>. In fact, entire monographs have been devoted to defining it and tracing its historical development (cf. T. Eagleton 1991, D. Hawkes 1996, T. A. van Dijk 1998, M. Freedon 2003), usually mentioning Antoine Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) as the coiner of the term in 1796 (in his conception, as a *neutral* science of ideas). While cognisant of the contributions to the issue of Marx and Engels, Karl Mannheim, Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser and others, it is not our intention here to revisit the entire debate regarding ideology in general. What we are concerned with here are political (especially totalitarian) ideologies as they relate to (i) **translation** of literature in general (particularly as regards censorship, see subchapter 1.2), (ii) **Portugal** and **Czechoslovakia**<sup>4</sup> in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Chapter 3), and (iii) **Translation Studies**.

T. A. van Dijk and M. Freedon are particularly helpful in that they are both concerned with ideology and language, although Freedon takes a more general view, while Van Dijk's multidisciplinary approach is geared towards investigating discourse (and more specifically, racism in discourse).

Van Dijk<sup>5</sup> (p. 7) traces the Marxist pedigree of the definitions of ideology, asserting that 'ideologies were forms of "false consciousness", that is, popular but misguided beliefs inculcated by the ruling class in order to legitimate the status quo, and to conceal the real socioeconomic conditions of the workers.' This is not only significant in general, as it reveals the intrinsically political nature underlying ideologies (at least as the term is mostly understood today, contrary to Destutt de Tracy's coinage), but also in particular, as the Marxist (-Leninist) offshoot of ideology is what we encounter in Czechoslovakia in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Regarding the interrelationship of ideology and *power*, Van Dijk (35) is worth quoting at some length:

Since ideologies indirectly control social practices in general, and discourse in particular, the obvious further social function of ideologies is that they enable or facilitate joint action, interaction and cooperation of ingroup members, as well as interactions with outgroup members. These would be the social micro-level functions of ideologies.

---

<sup>3</sup> Power, hegemony, the 'influence of politics in/on culture' etc. (albeit obviously not quite synonymic), are all subsumed here under the superordinate term of "ideology". Of course, this is a practical simplification, but it seems tenable in the light of the present subject matter. This thesis does not aim to define all of these terms unequivocally and exhaustively (provided it is possible at all, given their overlapping and intersections). This definitional task is taken to fall within the purview of other scholarly disciplines, such as (political) philosophy and political science (as well as e.g. sociology and anthropology, from different perspectives). Where appropriate, however, power and politics are expanded on insofar as they pertain to the subject matter here.

<sup>4</sup> As the reader is well aware of the fact that Czechoslovakia came into being in 1918 and split into the Czech and the Slovak Republics in 1993, the term 'Czechoslovakia' shall henceforth be used as a hypernym, unless ambiguous. Chapter 2 deals with the political and legal entities of the (now) two countries as well as their multifarious appellations throughout the twentieth century in due detail.

<sup>5</sup> Teun A. van Dijk. *s.d.* Cf.

<http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-01-31).

At the macro-level of description, ideologies are most commonly described in terms of group relations, such as those of *power* and *dominance*. Indeed, ideologies were traditionally often defined in terms of the legitimization of dominance, namely by the ruling class, or by various elite groups or organizations.

In other words, ideologies are the beginning and end, the source and the goal, of *group* practices, and thus geared towards the reproduction of the group and its power (or the challenge towards the power of other groups).

The distinction between the social micro-level and the macro-level of description is very useful in that it allows operationalising an initially fuzzy concept. The third paragraph then draws attention to the inextricable link between ideology and (political) power. As for ‘power’ (i.e. political power), Van Dijk asserts (36):

Power needs a 'power base', such as scarce social resources, such as force, money, real estate, knowledge, information or status. One of the important social resources of much contemporary power is the access to public discourse. Who controls public discourse, indirectly controls the minds (including the ideologies) of people, and therefore also their social practices. We shall often encounter this relation between social power, discourse, the mind and control. In a more critical approach to power, we are especially interested in power abuse or dominance, and how ideologies may be used to legitimate such dominance.

Interestingly, Van Dijk (37) also speculates under which conditions there would be no need for ideologies; in other words, he offers a definition for a (hypothetical) non-ideological environment: ‘if there is no conflict of goals or interests, no struggle, no competition over scarce resources, nor over symbolic resources, then ideologies have no point.’

This implies, of course, that ideologies are, indeed, *group* affairs within one and the same culture (although they may function across cultures, albeit in modified forms, e.g. fascism, communism etc.), and that they are geared towards power and dominance. Conversely, if one lingua- and socio-culture (LSC) equalled one ideology, there would be no need for (the concept of) ideology and it would suffice to employ the term ‘culture’ (in the broader sense of the word, i.e. LSC). This is one of the reasons why the ideological turn and the cultural turn in Translation Studies, while doubtless overlapping, should be treated as distinct.

Freeden’s (2003: 32) definition of a political ideology is as follows:

A political ideology is a set of ideas, beliefs, opinions, and values that

- (1) exhibit a recurring pattern
- (2) are held by significant groups
- (3) compete over providing and controlling plans for public policy
- (4) do so with the aim of justifying, contesting or changing the social and political arrangements and processes of a political community.

Freeden (33) goes on to explain that ‘while an ideology and a party sharing the same name are never identical, they are mutually supportive’. Apart from the obvious claim that ideology as a theoretical concept of political philosophy is (and, by definition, must be) different from its application or implementation in practice, this qualification is particularly germane to Portugal and Czechoslovakia, since neither can be described as the ‘prototype’ of the ideology whose name it bore. Czechoslovakia’s ‘communism’, especially if compared with the exacerbated situation in the Soviet Union, is as dubious

a term as Portugal's 'fascism' (not only, but particularly when compared with Mussolini's Italy)<sup>6</sup>.

Freedon (*ibid.*) elaborates by saying that 'ideologies may, as Althusser claimed, be carried by conscious individuals, but they are, as Mannheim realized, social products'. While the Portuguese 'fascism' had one evident and absolutist leader (Salazar)<sup>7</sup>, the Czechoslovak 'communism' lacked a strong indigenous personality that could be invoked throughout the Party's rule.

Despite the relatively 'softer' features exhibited by Portuguese 'fascism' (as compared with Mussolini's Italy) and Czechoslovak 'communism' (as compared with Stalin's USSR), it would be difficult to classify the two regimes as authoritarian, rather than totalitarian. Juan J. Linz (2000/1975)<sup>8</sup> defines the differences between the two thus:

#### Authoritarian Regimes

- Role of ideology is weak
- Goal is to depoliticize and de-mobilize society
- Small degree of pluralism is allowed
- Political parties, if they exist, are devoid of ideology and may not play an important role in the regime
- Regime does not exercise total control over society; masses have some political power
- Terror and propaganda may be used, but not to the same extent as in totalitarian regimes

#### Totalitarian Regimes

- Goals of the regime are social revolution, aiming to transform human nature
- Ideology plays a strong role, provides legitimacy
- Strategy to achieve these goals is to subject society to terror
- Regime has a high level of organization and total control over society
- Key holders of power are the leader, secret police, and party
- Emphasis on mass mobilization
- Regime exercises total control over society

According to these definitions, the Portuguese *Estado Novo* was arguably less totalitarian and more authoritarian than Communist Czechoslovakia<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> The specific situation of translation(s) in fascist countries is particularly well investigated in Rundle & Sturge (2010: 12): 'Griffin (1991: 121) uses the term "para-fascist" to describe the Spanish and Portuguese regimes, both of which he considers to be examples of "abortive", not fully realized, fascist systems. Payne (1995: 266) uses the term "semi-fascist" in reference to Spain, but describes Salazar's *Estado Novo* as a form of "authoritarian corporatism" or "authoritarian corporative liberalism" (1995: 313), by which he would seem to imply that Spain was more fascist than Portugal'.

<sup>7</sup> The rule of Marcello Caetano as Portugal's Prime Minister from 1968 to 1974 was only an agonal prolongation of the regime installed and built up by Salazar (see Chapter 3).

<sup>8</sup> Juan J. Linz: *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (2000, originally published in 1975), quoted in Natasha M. Ezrow & Erica Frantz: *Dictators & Dictatorships: Understanding Authoritarian Regimes and Their Leaders* (2011: 5).

<sup>9</sup> 'Communist Czechoslovakia' is an ancillary term covering the period from the Communist *coup d'état* in February 1948 to the Velvet Revolution in November 1989. The country changed its name from 'The Czechoslovak Republic' to the 'Czechoslovak Socialist Republic' in 1960 by a new constitution. The ideological justification for this 'motivational move' was that the Czechoslovak society had already reached the stage of socialism, while true communism was the ultimate goal to be strived for. This was not quite usual. Apart from the 'model', the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), most countries of the 'Eastern bloc' were *people's (democratic)* republics.

Paul C. Sondrol, investigating Latin American dictatorships<sup>10</sup>, structures the differences between totalitarianism and authoritarianism as follows:

	<b>Totalitarianism</b>	<b>Authoritarianism</b>
<b>Charisma</b>	High	Low
<b>Role conception</b>	Leader as function	Leader as individual
<b>Ends of power</b>	Public	Private
<b>Corruption</b>	Low	High
<b>Official ideology</b>	Yes	No
<b>Limited pluralism</b>	No	Yes
<b>Legitimacy</b>	Yes	No

This nomenclature, probably due to its Latin American provenance, appears more ambiguous when applied to the situation in Portugal (1926-74) and Czechoslovakia (1948-89). In this classification, the Portuguese as well as the Czechoslovak regimes appear rather totalitarian, with the former slanted slightly more towards authoritarianism.

Ezrow & Frantz (2011: 5) emphasise the current trend in political science to look beyond totalitarianism:

In response to the literature on totalitarianism, other scholars have moved away from an emphasis on ideology. Rather than being central to the typology, ideology is instead one of the many factors that distinguish dictatorships from one another. Institutions – and how entrenched they are in society – are also key.

So, while the ideology of Communist Czechoslovakia appears to have been more pronounced and elaborated (backed by the political philosophy of Marxism-Leninism), the ideology of the Portuguese *Estado Novo* (backed by none less than the Catholic Church) appears to have been more veiled and less tangible (and probably intentionally so).

Be that as it may, M. Philpotts (in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 244), designating the later Portuguese regime as ‘post-fascist’ by analogy with ‘post-Stalinist’ socialist dictatorships, emphasises that ‘the Iberian dictatorships seem to be much more readily comparable in this respect with the post-1953 Soviet-style dictatorships of the Eastern Bloc than with Nazi Germany.’

To conclude, however, we should note one fundamental discrepancy between the two political systems. Despite its overt ideological inspiration from Mussolini’s Italy, the Portuguese *Estado Novo* was an indigenous political system, developed by a Portuguese economist-turned-dictator. Portugal had had a proud history of global discovery, its borders having remained the same for more than eight centuries - ever since the *Reconquista* (c.1140) - with only a sexagenary intermezzo during the personal union with Spain (1580-1640). Portugal had conquered and colonised all continents with the exception of the Antarctica. Despite its peripheral role in Europe, Portugal had been an empire and a dominant world power, vying for supremacy with other superpowers of the time (cf. the 1494 *Treaty of Tordesillas* between Portugal and Spain, dividing up the then known non-European ‘world’).

---

<sup>10</sup> Sondrol, Paul C. (1991) ‘Totalitarian and Authoritarian Dictators: A Comparison of Fidel Castro and Alfredo Stroessner’, in *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 23, pp. 599-620.

Czechoslovakia, having only just emerged from three centuries of oppression by the Habsburgs (1618-1918), enjoyed a brief twenty years of independence and democracy (1918-38) before once again coming under the imperialist yoke. Again, it was imposed by the germanophone peoples to the West and South, this time in the form of Hitler's Reich and the 'Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia' (1938-45). Within three years of the defeat of Nazism, it was the turn of 'the Slav brothers' in the East to assume the imperialist role as Stalin's Soviet Union, arguably less atrociously, but all the more lastingly, dismantled our fragile democracy (1948-89). Czechoslovakia could, as a result, be seen as a (not only ideologically, but also militarily, at least from 1969 on) 'colonised' country. Indeed, the metaphor of a 'Soviet satellite' implies orbiting around a 'sun', but this was the sun of Icarus, searing and baleful.

The differences between the two regimes arising from these very different geo- and socio-political conditions were far-reaching and must be taken into consideration when analysing the history of the two countries in the 20th century.

### 1.1.2 Review of Literature

While fully recognising the import of the 'cultural turn' (cf. Bassnett & Lefevere 1990) and of the 'sociological turn' (e.g. Hatim & Mason 1990)<sup>11</sup> in Translation Studies, it is the 'power turn' (cf. Tymoczko & Gentzler 2002) or the 'ideological turn' that we are concerned with here.

Even in Translation Studies, essays, proceedings from various conferences, anthologies and monographs on the issue of ideology abound, most of them dating from after 1990. The following 'review of literature' is thus inevitably a selection based on the relevance to the subject matter of this thesis, the most important being (chronologically) R. Álvarez & M. Carmen-África Vidal (1996), L. von Flotow (2000, *TTR*, vol. XIII, n.º 1), M. Tymoczko & E. Gentzler (2002), M. Calzada Pérez (2003), S. Cunico & J. Munday (2007, *The Translator*, vol. 13, n.º 2).

Although other important works have been written on the subject, e.g. L. Venuti's *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology* (1992), J. Munday's *Style and Ideology in Translation: Latin American Writing in English* (2007), M. Tymoczko's *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation* (1999) and her *Translation, Resistance, Activism* (2010), they were disregarded here as being insufficiently relevant to the (geographical and temporal) areas and topics under discussion. Considering the vast and ever growing amount of literature on translation and ideology (power, manipulation and suchlike), an exhaustive investigation of this issue alone would lead us too far afield.

---

<sup>11</sup> This is not to imply that the 'sociological turn' would be of no interest to the issue at hand. In fact, the original (admittedly maximalist) intention of this investigation was to include a sociological dimension to the present study. However, data on the Portuguese translators from Czech were impossible to come by, and the correspondence with those publishers whose trade survived the Carnation Revolution in 1974 and still exists has proved all but fruitless. For more on the material, see Chapter 3.

A good introduction to the matter in hand is offered by Matthew Wing-Kwong Leung (in Duarte & Rosa & Seruya 2006: 130), who begins his overview of the issue of ideology in Translation Studies with the following words:

Instead of focusing on the translator's painstaking attempt to replace one linguistic unit in the source language with another so-called 'equivalent' linguistic unit in the target language, the cultural turn has re-orientated the effort of the translator to consider the influence of the wider context of culture on the translation enterprise, from the micro-level of daily routine greeting between two acquaintances to the macro-level of wholesale transplant, or domestication, of a culture's beliefs and discourse practices.

Leung (129) goes on to specify that 'the latter [i.e. the ideological turn] is not just an offshoot of the former [i.e. the cultural turn]' and draws yet another distinction between 'the power turn' (Gentzler & Tymoczko 2002) and 'the ideological turn'. He exemplifies: '[...] environmentalism has its power institution, but it may not be quite appropriate to view the relationship between human beings and nature as essentially a "power" one' (138-139).

As for 'culture', Leung (138) admits: 'The term "culture" can be said to be an encompassing one. If it forms a set, then ideology can be a sub-set within it – the ideology is highlighted, but cultural matters will also be in the background.'

After discussing the input from Bassnett and Lefevere (1990), Lefevere (1992), Calzada Pérez (2003), Chang (1998), Cheung (2002), Godard (1990), von Flotow (1997) Massardier-Kenney (1997), van Dijk (2002), Gentzler & Tymoczko (2002), Leung proposes *critical discourse analysis* as the appropriate tool to analyse ideology in language.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), derived from Halliday's functional grammar<sup>12</sup>, aims in Leung's words (139) to reveal 'how language can be used to manipulate readers' responses, resulting in uncritical acceptance of the explicitly stated or implicitly hidden ideology of discourse'.

Summing up, Leung (142) suggests: 'The result is that for the latter [i.e. Translation Studies], after the linguistic turn and the cultural turn, intensive micro linguistic analysis is back in another guise, and at the macro content level the important issue stays more focused at the ideology.'

Only indirectly related to the subject matter of this thesis is the issue of ideology in the discipline of Translation Studies, as examined, for instance, by Cheung (2002) and Calzada Pérez (2003, 2007), and briefly discussed also by Fawcett (see below), although this issue will be touched upon when dealing with Translation Studies in Czechoslovakia before 1989<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> See e.g. N. Fairclough 1992 and his later publications. In Translation Studies, see also H. Olk 2002 (in *The Translator*, vol. 8, n.º 1, pp. 101-116).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Špírk (in Seruya – Moniz 2008: 223ff.).



Siri Nergaard (2007: 35)<sup>14</sup>, in a volume on the manipulation and rewriting of mediaeval literature, reminds us of crucial statements linking translation with ideology (and power):

Key concepts here are statements like ‘no translation is innocent’, ‘translation does not take place in a vacuum’, ‘there is nothing that can be called objectivity in translation’, and ‘translations are inevitably partial’, where the manipulating ‘force’ was recognized to be less linguistic and more cultural or institutional.

She emphasises the importance of the concept of *manipulation*, ‘because it is strictly connected to that of power: power to manipulate for certain purposes, power to select, power to achieve desired effects’ (*ibid.*).

At a more textual level, she maintains that ‘shifts in translation cannot only be explained as mistakes or subjective interpretations, but as shifts that are *culturally* and *socially* determined by the discourses of the age and, therefore, in any case information about the relation between the source- and the target-cultures’ (*ibid.*).

At a rather philosophical level, Nergaard (28) asserts that ‘power, in a foucaultian sense, is instead connected to the concept of knowledge, where power produces knowledge, but not in the sense of a cause producing an effect.’ By producing knowledge (semiosis), then, translation underpins, undermines or surrenders to ideology.

Gentzler (2002: 216) chimes in: ‘Translation does not simply offer a window onto some unified, exotic Other; it participates in its very construction.’ This recurrent theme shall be discussed in more detail below (see particularly ‘non-translation’ and ‘canon’).

In a special issue of *The Translator* devoted to translation and ideology (vol. 13, n.º 2, 2007), Yau Wai-Ping (321) suggests that ‘we should reject universalist assumptions and focus instead on the social embedding of texts’. The term ‘universalist assumptions’ is, of course, a clear pointer to the work of Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury. Wai-Ping (322) enumerates four weaknesses of the paradigm based on norms and polysystems developed by Even-Zohar and Toury. To quote the most relevant to our purposes:

Third, as Gentzler (1993/2001: 121) has observed, Even-Zohar’s analysis accords little attention to ‘extraliterary’ factors and rarely ‘relates texts to the “real conditions” of their production, only to hypothetical structural models and abstract generalizations.’

As shown conclusively by Jettmarová (2005: 104)<sup>15</sup>, ‘Holmes and Popovič do have the social aspect in their paradigms, i.e. social agency embedded in its historical environment,’ as evidenced specifically by Popovič’s praxeology and sociology of translation (100)<sup>16</sup>. This is one of the reasons why the methodology here is based on Popovič rather than Even-Zohar (see Chapter 2).

---

<sup>14</sup> Nergaard, S. (2007), ‘Translation and power: recent theoretical updates’, in Buzzoni, M. & Bampi, M. (eds.), *The Garden of Crossing Paths: The Manipulation and Rewriting of Medieval Texts*, Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina, 2005, rev. ed. 2007, pp. 33-43.

<sup>15</sup> In ‘East Meets West: On Social Agency in Translation Studies Paradigms’, in *New Trends in Translation Studies: In Honour of Kinga Klauďy*. Edited by Krisztina Károly and Ágota Fóris. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 95-105.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also Špirk (2009a: 16-17, *Target 21:1*).

Wai-Ping (324) goes on to stress that ‘the emphasis on literary institutions as being empowered by and embedded in other social institutions urges the researcher to situate translations in their social and ideological contexts.’ Before eventually embarking on a case study, Wai-Ping (326) concludes the expository part of his article with words that might also be applied to the present thesis: ‘This approach is relational, contextualist and sensitive to the institutional embedding of texts.’

In the same issue of *The Translator*, Jeremy Munday (2007: 195) suggests that in Translation Studies, ideology has primarily been linked to manipulation and power relations. His article focuses on the ideology of the individual translator:

The main interest is in how ideology in its many facets is conveyed and presented textually in translation and how analysis drawn from within monolingual traditions (such as critical discourse analysis and the tools of systemic-functional analysis) may not always be the most appropriate to detect and classify the shifts that take place.

The point here is that approaches such as those of P. Simpson (*Language, Ideology and Point of View*, 1993), Fowler et al. (*Language as Control*, 1979) or Fowler (*Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, 1991), proposed for analysis by Leung (see above), while instrumental in conducting a *discourse analysis*, may not be quite satisfactory in and for Translation Studies, since ‘the vast majority of work from a critical linguistics and critical discourse perspective has been performed monolingually, primarily on English texts’ (Munday 2007: 198-199).

When discussing ideology and translation (studies), *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies* (2003) edited by M. Calzada Pérez springs to mind as one of the pioneering collections on this issue. Perhaps surprisingly, the most relevant part of the book to the issues and spatiotemporal areas discussed in this thesis is the Introduction.

After reviewing many definitions of ideology, much along the lines presented here, M. Calzada Pérez (2003: 5) settles on a definition of ideology which is ‘not limited to political spheres’. Of course, such a broad approach allows Calzada Pérez to bring a variety of very divergent studies under one roof. More fruitfully for our approach, the collection enables us to stake out the territory to be investigated in this thesis.

Of the potentially most relevant articles in the collection, C. Schäffner’s study, ‘Third Ways and New Centres: Ideological Unity or Difference?’, employs critical discourse analysis (among other approaches) to investigate political manifestos. Political ideology is present, but not in literature (fiction, *belles lettres*).

K. Harvey’s “‘Events’ and ‘Horizons’: Reading Ideology in the ‘Bindings’ of Translations”, while helpful for a study of paratexts, is concerned with three gay fictional texts translated from American English into French in the late 1970s. The ideology investigated in this paper is clearly not political *sensu stricto*.

Finally, Tymoczko’s ‘Ideology and the Position of the Translator – In What Sense is a Translator “In Between”?’ goes well beyond the issues explored in this thesis, reviewing ‘phylogenetic, physical, ontogenetic and functional reasons for the acceptance of the “in between” discourse’ and refuting them ‘with the help of a very varied multidisciplinary theoretical framework that draws on literary criticism,

linguistics, politics, philosophy, systems theory, mathematics, anthropology, ethnography and descriptive translation studies' (Calzada Pérez 2003: 20, 181ff.).

Returning to the Introduction, we note that Calzada Pérez (2003: 2) identifies critical discourse analysis as a very heterogeneous field, consisting of at least six main strands, all of them using slightly different tools and methodologies for their work. More constructively, she offers a viable distinction both between culture and ideology and between society and ideology in order to prevent confusion among scholars (Calzada Pérez 5-6):

[While ideology] consists of 'the set of ideas, values and beliefs that govern a community by virtue of being regarded as the norm' (Calzada Pérez 1997: 35), culture is commonly taken to be 'an integrated system of learned behavior patterns that are characteristic of the members of any given society' (Khol 1984: 17).

Ideology, as is understood here, not only affects 'societies'. It permeates (identity) groups of the most varied nature, which would not always relate to the conventional meaning of 'society'.

As stated above, such definitions of ideology appear too broad for our purposes. Indeed, Calzada Pérez (7) does not shy away from subsuming 'feminists, functionalists, descriptive and polysystemic scholars, sociolinguistic researchers, postcolonial exegetes, corpus studies propounders, critical linguistic theorists, gay and lesbian academics, semioticians, contrastive linguists' and others under her definition of ideology.

In a different article, Calzada Pérez (2007: 243, in the aforementioned issue of *The Translator*) examines 'the role of translation studies in mediating the hegemonic ideology of the New Consumerism, of which advertising is a pivotal mouthpiece'. This is a very interesting paper, as it exposes ideology in a (post-) modern liberal democracy, which is far from usual and underscores the relevance of studying ideology in translation (studies) in general.

However, since she 'seek[s] to raise awareness, principally among translation scholars themselves, with respect to their potential role in exposing and contesting some of the *ethically negative* aspects of advertising today' (emphasis added), arguing that 'translation studies will also benefit from participating in this programme of resistance' (*ibid.*), she is adopting an activist, engaged stance with an ethical (axiological) dimension, which must be contradistinguished from our approach.

In a similar vein, Maria Tymoczko (2000: 23)<sup>17</sup> calls for using translation for geopolitical agendas. While very different from our approach here, it is worth dissecting, precisely to demonstrate the differences.

Drawing on a case study of the translation of Irish literature into English over the last century, Tymoczko (*ibid.*) delineates her material in the following way: 'It is, therefore, not simply the translation of narratives that is at issue here, but the translation of any central documents, including laws, annals or other historical materials.'

More interestingly for our purposes, having enumerated more than ten translation scholars studying engagement in translation, she (24) claims that the 'harnessing of translation for political and ideological purposes is not original to these critics and

---

<sup>17</sup> Tymoczko, M. 'Translation and Political Engagement: Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts', in *The Translator*, 2000, vol. 6, n.º 1, pp. 23-47.

theoreticians, nor is it original to the present age.’ These theoreticians include, *inter alii*, Vieira (1994), Godard (1990), Bassnett (1992, 1993), Simon (1994, 1996) Niranjana (1992) and Spivak (1992).

Tymoczko (29) argues that ‘the translation movement was central to the Irish cultural revival, and from the Irish revival grew the political and military struggle that won freedom from England’. The establishment of the Irish Republic in 1919 almost coincides with the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. As for the Czech National Revival (roughly from the 1870s to the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) under the Habsburg Monarchy, translation was equally instrumental in raising awareness in the Bohemian and Moravian populace and in bringing about a political change (Levý 1996/1957: 66-145)<sup>18</sup>. A study comparing the pivotal role of translation in these two national (and cultural) revivals, doubtless very interesting, still awaits its author.

Tymoczko (31) concurs with Genzler (2001/1993: 121) regarding the usefulness of the polysystems approach developed by Even-Zohar, but elaborates:

Many of the points about power and translation made by recent theorists were anticipated by Even-Zohar in both his 1978 and his 1990 publications formulating a polysystems approach to translation, but Even-Zohar’s framework is difficult to use if one is interested in power and political engagement, because he masks issues related to both with his rather sanitized vocabulary. It is difficult to tease out the geopolitical implications of centre and periphery, cultural prestige and so forth in his presentation of the issues (cf. Lambert 1995, Robinson 1997b: 31, 39). Although Even-Zohar acknowledges that there are power differentials between cultures, the cases he considers are of a different order of magnitude from the power differentials that colonized countries struggle with or that exist in contemporary geopolitical contexts. Moreover, some of his theoretical language – ‘high’ vs. ‘low’, for example – is today distasteful, offensive and unacceptable.

Tymoczko (33ff.) is also highly critical of Venuti (1992, 1995, 1998a, 1998b):

Although Venuti has developed an impressive number of terms ostensibly useful for analysing aspects of translation related to engagement, power and politics, he does not carefully define any of them. [...]

A further problem we can point to in Venuti’s work is that his style of argument is very informal, indeed even at times lax (cf. Pym 1996). [...]

I would suggest that Venuti’s shifting terminology in conjunction with his loose style of argument makes it difficult to use his concepts or to extend his arguments. [...]

Ironically, what I am suggesting is that Venuti uses the methods of descriptive studies of translation, but ultimately his approach is a normative one, and a highly rigid and autocratic approach to norms at that, making ultimate appeal to his own view of politics rather than to the methods or contexts of translation. [...]

Venuti has been criticized for not offering a theory that is transitive, that can be applied to translation in smaller countries that are at a disadvantage in hierarchies of economic and cultural prestige and power.

Conversely, Tymoczko herself cannot be accused of being only critical and destructive. She does put forward what she calls suggestions for ‘using translation as a means of political engagement’ (42). To quote the two that are most relevant to the present discussion:

- Texts must be chosen for translation with political goals in view, and, if need be, there must be a *willingness to manipulate the texts in translation*, so as to adapt and subordinate the

<sup>18</sup> See also Bassnett in Álvarez & Vidal (1996: 13).

texts to political aims and agendas. The intent to transmit the texts closely, in and for themselves, must in many cases – perhaps even most – be abandoned. [...] (emphasis added)

- Translators should be ingenious and varied in their approach to translation. No single translation approach or strategy is likely to suffice – whether it is literal or free, ‘domesticating’ or ‘foreignizing’. Instead, as the Irish translations show, multiple strategies should be deployed and maximum tactical flexibility maintained, so as to respond to the immediate cultural context most effectively. It may even be desirable, as in the Irish case, to have multiple and complementary representations of the same set of texts. Trying to prescribe a single translation strategy is like trying to prescribe a single strategy for effective guerrilla warfare. What is required instead is a certain opportunistic vitality that seizes upon immediate short term gains as the long-term goal remains in view.

It should now be clear why we have quoted so extensively from Tymoczko’s article: at the risk of appearing normative, we wish to argue that her argument stretches the point too far. A translation theory that justifies, to such an extent, the ideological manipulation of texts runs precisely counter to the intentions of this thesis.

Of course, one might argue, the *Skopos* theory harbours a potential to the same effect. Even functionalist approaches, of which the *Skopos* theory could be seen as one branch (albeit rather an extreme one), when applied sweepingly and without a corrective, may be accused of justifying the same manipulative procedures.

Our point here is merely that we are addressing the reverse side of ideology: the extent to which political power, i.e. official ideology, state institutions and, by extension, publishers and translators themselves in a defensive move of (self-)censorship, can have a bearing on translated literature under an unpropitious regime.

The special issue of *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* (2000, vol. 13, n.º 1, pp. 9-208), dedicated to ideology and translation and edited by Luise von Flotow, has equally limited relevance to the issues examined here. Again, ideology is used *sensu lato* to include gender (K. Littau’s article) and gay issues (K. Harvey), and the areas under scrutiny are relatively remote from ours either spatially, i.e. lying outside Europe, (J. M. Green, H. Amit-Kochavi, J. J. Zaro) or temporally (G. L. Moyal), or by exploring very specific circumstances (Z. Stahuljak, the 1991-92 war in Croatia).

Instead, the collection is conspicuous for the ground-breaking article on *non-translation* by J. Ferreira Duarte (95-112), which is analysed in more detail below (see subchapter 1.4).

The remaining article of the aforementioned collection (the first one, in fact) is by L. von Flotow herself. In her entertaining and insightful paper, she discusses ideology as it pertains to religious politics, women’s suffrage and the politics of environmentalism. However, she makes two important comments *en route*:

Korsak does not impose a politics of environmentalism on the text, she simply ‘sees’ differently, still basing her decisions on etymologies and patterns of repetition. (17)

In translation, the translator’s ‘positionality’ is undeniable. The translator writes from a specific moment, from within a specific culture and usually sub-culture, and often in dialogue with the social and political culture of the moment. Inevitably, there is an ideological slant on the text. (18)

Although she also includes a discussion of vocables and locutions, von Flotow always sees to it that the texts (and translators) themselves are embedded in their cultural and

political contexts, thereby making it possible to discern and present the ideology behind each discursive (dynamic) event.

S. Petrilli (1992: 259)<sup>19</sup> seeks to ‘shed light upon the close relation between ideology theory and translation theory viewed semiotically’. Aligning herself with Bakhtin (*inter alii*), she describes language as pliant, inscrutable, vague, imprecise, ambiguous, connotative, polysemantic and plastic (elastic), ‘all of which determine[s] the very possibility of communicative interaction’ (241).

Drawing primarily on V. Welby, A. Ponzio, C. S. Peirce, L. Wittgenstein (both ‘early’ and ‘late’), F. Rossi-Landi, M. Bakhtin, C. Morris and others, she makes two crucial points in relation to the issues that concern us here:

The verbal sign is an ideological sign *par excellence*, says Bakhtin. As an ideological phenomenon it refracts historico-social reality. The verbal sign has an ideological function, an ideological materiality. It refracts ideologically the social reality in which it is produced and used. Insofar as it is ideological, the verbal sign may be characterized as a historico-social event. (252)

For Welby the term ‘significance’ indicates the maximum expression value of a sign as it is enhanced through ongoing translative-interpretative processes; *the sign viewed not solely as a cognitive entity but in its axiological dimension as well*, in its relation to values. (254) (emphasis added)

While initially dwelling too extensively on language rather than translation (discussing Sapir and Whorf and translatability, for instance), she throws into sharp relief the complex interplay of language, significance, semiosis, translation and ideology.

Similarly to von Flotow (2000), Tymoczko & Gentzler (2002), Calzada Pérez (2003) and Cunico & Munday (2007), the collection edited by R. Álvarez & M. Carmen-África Vidal (1996) is most pertinent to our study in its Introduction, entitled ‘Translating: A Political Act’, in which they characterize their approach as editors thus (1):

From the eagerness to consider translation as a science or the obsession to give a definitive, prescriptive and sole version of a text, we have moved on to a descriptive outlook which likewise, whether we like it or not, is political.

[...] the study and practice of translation is inevitably an exploration of power relationships within textual practice that reflect power structures within the wider cultural context.

In addition, in a vein similar to Petrilli (1992, see above), they make an epistemological (noetic) claim:

Contemporary studies on translation are aware of the need to examine in depth the relationship between production of knowledge in a given culture and its transmission, relocation, and reinterpretation in the target culture. This obviously has to do with the production and ostentation of power and with the strategies used by this power in order to represent the other culture. Translation is *culture bound*. It makes us ponder, as Edward Said would put it, how knowledge that is non-dominative and non-coercive can be produced in a setting that is deeply inscribed with the politics, the considerations, the positions and the strategies of power. (2)

[...] an account of the accumulation of knowledge by one people about another is most unlikely to be the record of a progressive revelation of objective truth, achieved through the disinterested quest of learning for its own sake. (*ibid.*)

---

<sup>19</sup> Petrilli 1992 (in *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 5, n° 1, 1992, pp. 233-264).

Translation is an excellent vehicle for conveying the typically Foucaultian binary essence of the opposition power/knowledge: power is intimately related to knowledge, information, and especially to the manner in which that information is conveyed and the way of articulating a wider range of discursive elements in the TT which behave according to extremely subtle strategies. (5-6)

And finally, the need for a context transcending linguistic (intra-textual) boundaries is reiterated (3-4):

The importance of the cultural milieu of each language is such that it could be argued that its significance cannot be found at a linguistic level (neither SL nor TL) but rather on a third level: in the cultural space that emerges from the clash (although, ideally, intersection) between the two cultures; a cultural space that is usually as complex as it is conflicting. Translation is ‘an integral part of the reading experience’.

In our view these quotations provide a good summary of the discussion to date regarding the relations between ideology, power and translation (studies). Last but not least, it is important to inquire into the issue of ideology and translation from the point of view of its ‘canonicity’ in the study, theory and (self-) perception of translation. In other words, to what extent this issue has become part and parcel of investigation in our discipline, as reflected in four influential encyclopaedias (dictionaries).

Shuttleworth & Cowie’s *Dictionary of Translation Studies* (1997, reprinted 1999), since it purports to define terms developed by translation scholars or derived from their work, does not (understandably) have an entry for ‘ideology’ or ‘power’. However, Lefevere’s terms pertaining most closely to the issue at hand, such as ‘manipulation’, ‘patronage’, ‘rewriting’ or the older ‘refraction’ (*s.v.*) are all included.

By contrast, the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998/2001), edited by M. Baker, assisted by K. Malmkjær, dedicates a whole article to the issue of ideology and translation, authored by P. Fawcett (106-111).

Peter Fawcett’s essay takes a rather critical view of claims regarding the ubiquity of ideologies and exhorts the reader to scrutinise the hidden agenda behind them (and espoused and promoted by their exponents), in line with the motto ‘we have true knowledge, they have ideologies’ (T. A. van Dijk 2000: 7).

In his pragmatic, down-to-earth approach, Fawcett resorts to Nord (1991:36), extending her general questions about a text to be translated to include ‘a power orientation’ (107):

What gets translated (what is valued and what is excluded)?  
 Who does the translation (who controls the production of translation)?  
 Who is translated for (who is given access to foreign materials and who denied)?  
 How is the material translated (what is omitted, added, altered, to control the message)?

Fawcett (110) concludes his essay by arguing that translation, when under ideological constraints, adopts basically domesticating procedures:

Ironically enough, translation [...] reverts to a ‘gesture of closure which consists in reducing the unknown to the known’ (Rocher 1993: 1993: 12; translated), a mode of translation which, as Berman (1985c: 48) puts it, ‘brings everything back to its own culture, to its norms and values, and considers what is situated outside the latter – the Foreign – as negative or just about good enough to be annexed, adapted, to increase the richness of that culture’ (translated), a strategy

which receives justification from the POLYSYSTEM approach to translation as ‘whatever the target culture calls translation’.

This (repeated) imputation would require a more thorough analysis, but it should be said straight away that Toury’s approach is methodological (in being empirical and descriptive) rather than axiological (defending, prescriptively or normatively, the target culture’s approach to translation). Indeed, it is both Even-Zohar’s (1990) and Toury’s (1995) claim throughout that translation is perceived as a peripheral phenomenon by both the receiving culture in general and (its) literary studies in particular.

As for German Translation Studies (‘translatology’), the two primary reference books (encyclopaedias) include R. Stolze’s *Übersetzungstheorien: Eine Einführung* (originally 1994; 2008 in its 5<sup>th</sup> edition) and the title by M. Snell-Hornby, H. G. Hönig, P. Kußmaul and P. A. Schmitt (eds.) entitled *Handbuch Translation* (first edition 1999; second 2003).

Snell-Hornby, Hönig, Kußmaul & Schmitt (2003) fail to include ‘ideology’, ‘power’ and ‘politics’ (Ideologie, Macht, Politik) both in the main text and in their otherwise very comprehensive Index (Register, 417-430). All we find (in Chapter 25) is a discussion of the ‘Manipulation School’ under the heading ‘Descriptive Translation Studies’ (96-100).

In such a context, and although the two schools are doubtless ideationally related, (the) manipulation (school) is accorded precious little attention (96). Instead, the focus is on criticism of the polysystems theory and descriptive translation studies (DTS), e.g. by A. P. Frank (in Roger, Fokkema & de Graat 1990: 85-98) and M. Bakker (in Delabastita & Hermans 1995: 141-162). A. Lefevere (1992) is mentioned only in passing for distinguishing the three categories of *poetics, ideology and patronage*, which he claims are of relevance primarily to literary translation (98). ‘Language, on the other hand – so goes his provocative thesis – is the least important factor in translation: what is actually at stake is the acceptability and control in the poetological and ideological sense or, precisely, the exercise of power.’<sup>20</sup> Most of all, the author takes issue with ‘the lack, at the methodological level, of an operable module for a comparative micro-analysis of the ST and the TT’<sup>21</sup>. It may thus come as a surprise that the article is written by T. Hermans (London) and translated by K. Kaindl (Vienna).

The third edition of Stolze’s *Übersetzungstheorien: Eine Einführung* (2001) can be said to exhibit the same features as the above book, discussing Holmes’ empirical approach (Der empirische Ansatz, pp. 165-167) and Toury’s Descriptive Translation Studies (168-173), mentioning only Holmes (1988) and Toury (1995). Lefevere (1992) is referred to in The Role of Literary Translation (Die Rolle der literarischen Übersetzung,

---

<sup>20</sup> The original reads as follows: ‘Sprache hingegen – so seine provokante These – sei in der Übersetzung der unwichtigste Faktor: worauf es tatsächlich ankomme, seien die Akzeptabilität und die Kontrolle im poetologischen und ideologischen Sinn oder eben die Ausübung der Macht.’ (Snell-Hornby et al. 2003: 98). Unless otherwise indicated, all translations into English are by J.Š.

<sup>21</sup> ‘Auf methodologischer Ebene stellt das Fehlen eines operablen Moduls zur komparativen Mikroanalyse von ZT und AT weiterhin einen Schwachpunkt dar’ (Snell-Hornby et al. 2003: 99).



149-151), together with Hermans (1985), Levý (1969) and Popovič (1970)<sup>22</sup>, Even-Zohar (1990) and SFB Göttingen<sup>23</sup>.

However, in the fifth (2008) edition of her book<sup>24</sup>, R. Stolze includes a whole new chapter dedicated to Translation and Ideology (Übersetzen und Ideologie, 195-205). Perhaps nothing else from the material presented so far shows so clearly how the issue of translation and ideology is gaining in ‘canonicity’ (centrality) in Translation Studies.

Stolze (2008: 195) attributes the endeavour to inquire into the correlations of translation and ideology to the outcome of postmodern movements (since the 1990s) and summarises the key questions posed by the ‘ideological turn’ as: What gets translated at all? For what purpose did this take place? And what constraints come into play here?<sup>25</sup>

She says (*ibid.*) that the matter in hand is ‘translation as a process of power’ (quoting M. Wolf’s article in Snell-Hornby & Jettmarová & Kaindl 1997: 123-133). ‘Such power relations are reflected, above all, in extra-linguistic aspects, such as a discriminatory publishing policy, text choice and payment for the translation performances’<sup>26</sup>.

For Stolze (198), herself a hermeneuticist (cf. Stolze 2003), the ‘apodeictically proffered argument of manipulation obscures, to a certain extent, the fact that translators could, by all means, communicate the sense of an original and that the factually observed “manipulations”, which can also stem from simple inability, should not be elevated to a theory of translation by logical inversion of the argument’<sup>27</sup>.

In her interpretation (*ibid.*), ‘the polysystem of a culture gets mistaken for the handling of the text by the understanding translator, who is, by no means, merely the representative of a “culture” and subject to its striving for power’<sup>28</sup>.

Finally, discussing Tymoczko and ‘political ethics by means of translation’, Stolze (2008: 205) concludes that the question remains unresolved as to ‘whether the ideological expansion of a translator’s opinion leads to the disintegration of power

---

<sup>22</sup> Levý 1969 (i.e. the German translation of Levý 1963) and Popovič 1970 (in the well-known volume with J. S. Holmes and F. de Haan) are so reduced that Stolze’s interpretation of both cannot be but a very gross distortion of their work.

<sup>23</sup> SFB Göttingen (Sonderforschungsbereich, i.e. special research centre) or Göttinger Beiträge zur internationalen Übersetzungsforschung (Göttingen Contributions to International Translation Research), in English see e.g. H. Kittel & A. P. Frank (eds.) 1991 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt), hereafter ‘the Göttingen project’.

<sup>24</sup> Unfortunately, we have no recourse to the 4<sup>th</sup> edition from 2005, which bears the epithet ‘überarbeitete Auflage’ (revised edition), whereas the 5<sup>th</sup> edition from 2008 is ‘überarbeitet und erweitert’ (revised and enlarged).

<sup>25</sup> ‘Was wird überhaupt übersetzt, zu welchem Zweck geschah dies, und was für Zwänge wurden hier wirksam’ (Stolze 2008: 195).

<sup>26</sup> ‘Solche Machtverhältnisse kommen v.a. in außersprachlichen Aspekten wie einer diskriminierenden Verlagspolitik, Textauswahl und Bezahlung für Übersetzungsleistungen zum Tragen’ (*ibid.*).

<sup>27</sup> ‘Das apodiktisch vorgebrachte Argument der Manipulation verdunkelt nämlich etwas die Tatsache, dass Übersetzer durchaus auch den Sinn eines Originals mitteilen könnten, und dass faktisch beobachtete „Manipulationen“, die auch schlichtem Unvermögen entspringen können, nicht einfach im logischen Umkehrschluss zur Theorie des Übersetzens erhoben werden sollten.’ (Stolze 2008: 198).

<sup>28</sup> ‘Dabei wird aber das Polysystem einer Kultur mit dem Textumgang des verstehenden Übersetzers verwechselt, welcher keineswegs bloß der Repräsentant einer „Kultur“ ist und deren Machtstreben unterliegt’ (*ibid.*).

relations or whether the translator's attempt to make the foreign text available as authentically as possible for the target area would not be more conducive here'<sup>29</sup>.

Germanophone Translation Studies, however, does not omit to study ideology in relation to translation. The monumental 12-year Göttingen project (launched in 1985) mentioned above is an example *par excellence*, complemented by such collections as S. Messner & M. Wolf (2001), M. Wolf (2006) and monographs by G. Thomson-Wohlgemuth (2009).

Theoretically, Vermeer's *Skopos*-Theory (originally 1978; 1984 with K. Reiß) and J. Holz-Mänttari's *Translatorisches Handeln* (1984) both allow for expansion, making it possible to study ideology in translation within their paradigms.

Lastly, although not available for this thesis, one monumental work of international cooperation in TS ought not to pass unnoticed: *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction: An international Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Kittel & Frank & Greiner & Hermans & Koller & Lambert & Paul 2004)<sup>30</sup>, which is, in all probability, the most comprehensive encyclopaedia of Translation Studies to date. Its very first volume (out of the planned three) begins with a section of articles headed 'Anthropological foundations, cultural contexts and forms of translation', section XI is entitled 'Translation and cultural studies: Foundations and concepts', section XII 'Literary and cultural translation studies: Style', etc. Volume 2 begins with Section XVI 'Translation within and between cultures: Conditions, contexts, and consequences' and the list of culturally (and ideologically) relevant topics goes on. Volume 3 (in preparation) is to dedicate a whole section to 'Translation and cultural history in the Iberian Peninsula' and (at least) one article on 'Culture and Translation in the Czech Republic' (Slovakia is strangely missing from the plan).

We may conveniently round off this section with a word of advice from M. Wolf (1997: 131)<sup>31</sup> in her paper on translation as a process of power:

As far as the specific question of asymmetrical power relations in translating between cultures is concerned, a new concept of translation is necessary which needs to create a new awareness of the relationship between 'strong' and 'weak' languages. Discourses in different cultures are not autarchic but develop within social fields of power and privilege. In order to detect these asymmetries, analyses of the economic and political processes in the source and target society could be increasingly employed for translation between cultures, which would subsequently reveal the constraints in the production and the reproduction of texts.

---

<sup>29</sup> 'Die Frage bleibt daher ungelöst, ob die ideologische Ausbreitung der Meinung eines Translators zum Abbau von Machtverhältnissen führt, oder ob nicht vielmehr der Versuch desselben, den fremdartigen Texten möglichst authentisch im Zielbereich Gehör zu verschaffen, hier förderlich wäre' (Stolze 2008: 205).

<sup>30</sup> *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung / An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies / Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*, edited by Kittel, Harald & Frank, Armin Paul & Greiner, Norbert & Hermans, Theo & Koller, Werner & Lambert, José & Paul, Fritz, together with House, Juliane & Schultze, Brigitte. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. Volume 1 (2004): ISBN 978-3110137088, Volume 2 (2007): ISBN 978-3110171457, Volume 3 (in preparation). The articles are written in English, German and French.

<sup>31</sup> In M. Snell-Hornby & Z. Jettmarová & K. Kaindl (eds.), *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress – Prague 1995*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

### 1.1.3 Conclusion

The foregoing analysis implies that translation can be (i) the victim of an ideology, (ii) the means or vehicle of an ideology, as well as (iii) a means to resist or subvert an ideology. Although all three of these phenomena do occur in the investigated countries and time, as they usually do in totalitarian societies, they are very distinct from one another and must be kept apart (wherever possible).

The first instance views translation as a victim, subject to societal, ideological and, by extension, political forces (power). In the second instance, whether under coercion or voluntarily (even proactively or purposefully), translation is wielded as an instrument of power. In the third situation, translation is again deployed as a weapon, this time on the opposite side of the barricade. Consequently, translations can, and do, combat one another. As tips of ideological icebergs, as textual manifestos of competing ideologies, different translations vie for the attention of the public (i.e. voters) and hence carry political clout. Translations can, therefore, be both victimised and deployed as arsenal, but intrinsically and immanently they are always (at least potentially) ideological.

The above disquisition implies yet another thing, crucial to this thesis. In the words of Venuti (1998: 29): ‘insisting on a value-free methodology will only blind the researcher to “the wider cultural impact that translation research might have”’. No translation can be absolutely transparent and ultimately impartial (objective); but nor can any research into translation(s), i.e. research in translation studies, as highlighted and reiterated by several of the scholars above.

In addition, criticism of polysystems theory and descriptive translation studies has been expressed from various standpoints (e.g. T. Niranjana 1992 from a postcolonial angle; A. Berman 1995 from a hermeneutical viewpoint; E. Gentzler 1993 and M. Bakker 1995 from a deconstructivist perspective), calling into question, if not actually excluding, the very possibility of a value-free (i.e. non-ideological) descriptive method (and by extension, research in general, see also above, beginning with Kant).

It is for all of the above reasons that this thesis does not purport to be entirely value-free, nor to use a clinically descriptive method. This may be particularly evident in the discussion revolving around the canon (an intrinsically normative category) of Czech literature and its rendering into Portuguese, above all in comparison with its rendering into other European languages.

Consequently, although this thesis is essentially and substantially empirical (first and foremost in its methodological approach), it nonetheless reserves the right to occasionally express a judgment.

## 1.2 Censorship

*War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength.*  
George Orwell: Nineteen Eighty-Four

What translation has in common with censorship is that both operate on the basis of the “what’s possible” principle, and it must be noted that linguistic barriers can be as high as those erected by the state. Joseph Brodsky (1987: 47-48, quoted in Woods 2006: 27).

[Kundera] depicts, with some humour, an anthropomorphised pencil blithely crossing out any semicolons in the manuscript and replacing them with periods [...]. The pencil has a great deal of affinity with the censor’s pencil because the changes are made in ignorance of the novel’s meaning expressed in its syntactical structure. (Woods 2006: 36).

Censorship is a much less fuzzy concept than ideology and therefore requires less discussion as a general category. Rather, the emphasis must be on how censorship affects translation<sup>32</sup>.

### 1.2.1 Definition

The *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (7<sup>th</sup> edition, 2005, *s.v.*) defines censorship as a procedure ‘to examine books, films, movies, etc. and remove parts which are considered to be offensive, immoral or a political threat’. Two English terms are partially synonymic with censorship: *expurgation*, i.e. ‘to remove or leave out parts of a piece of writing or a conversation when printing or reporting it, because you think those parts could offend people’ (etymologically in the sense of ‘purge of impurities’), and *bowdlerisation*, ‘to remove the parts of a book, play, etc. that you think are likely to shock or offend people’ (‘named after Dr Thomas Bowdler, who in 1818 produced a version of Shakespeare from which he had taken out all the material which he considered not suitable for family use’).

According to the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 1972, *s.v.*), ‘censor’ is first attested in 1533 in the sense of an ‘official whose duty it is to inspect books, journals, plays, etc., *before publication*, to secure that they shall contain nothing immoral, heretical, or offensive or injurious to the State’ (emphasis added). ‘Preventive censorship’ (see below) thus seems to have been the primary mode of censorial practices.

Both in dictatorships and in ‘Western liberal democracies’ (for want of a better term), censorship is, however, rarely recognised openly as such. Instead of calling a spade a spade, *meta-censorship* is the more common procedure. In other words, information about the existence of censorship is censored and removed texts or phrases are not marked. If acknowledged at all, attenuating labels ranging from ‘offensive’ or ‘harmful to the public’ to ‘emendations’, ‘purification’ or ‘prior examination’ are frequently used to cover up the actual forces at work. In Portugal, censors were called ‘readers’ (Seruya, in Wolf 2006: 323). It therefore requires an alert eye and the utmost vigilance to read

---

<sup>32</sup> For the issue of censorship in Translation Studies as a discipline and censorship in Czechoslovakia, see e.g. Špirk (in Seruya – Moniz 2008: 223-228).

between the lines, as one of the aims of censorship is to remain invisible – that is, to appear not to exist.

Needless to say, all of this is done in the name of the ‘common good’. Such practices have a long tradition in the Modern Age, both in the West and elsewhere, from the Committee for Public Safety and Committee of General Security during the French Revolution to the debate on the degree of freedom (of speech, information and the press) vs. ‘homeland security’ in the U.S.A. under the administration of George W. Bush.

Typically, the introduction of censorship is justified as an inevitable measure to ‘protect’ the public or ‘defend’ society or the nation (the word ‘nation’ is particularly efficient in mustering public support due to its invariably positive overtones) against an ‘excess of liberty’ that threatens to undermine shared values such as ‘truth, justice, and morality’. Censorship thus needs to be recognised as the most palpable demonstration of ideology, indeed as its very quintessence.

### 1.2.2 Review of Literature

Censorship was discovered by Translation Studies later than ideology as a relevant phenomenon in need of closer scrutiny, most probably in the wake of the ‘power’ turn.

Collections of articles most pertinent to this thesis include (chronologically) *Censorship and Translation in the Western World* (*TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 15, n.º 2, 2002, edited by D. Merkle), F. Billiani’s *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Context and Diverse Media* (2007), T. Seruya & M. Lin Moniz’ *Translation and Censorship in Different Times and Landscapes* (2008), and E. Ní Chuilleanáin, C. Ó Cuilleánáin & D. Parris’ *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference* (2009).

Other collections and monographs that examine the issue of censorship in some detail (though disregarded here on account of their insufficient spatiotemporal relevance to our thesis) are e.g. K. Sturge’s *‘The Alien Within:’ Translation into German during the Nazi Regime* (2004), D. Merkle, C. O’Sullivan, L. van Doorslaer & M. Wolf’s *The Power of the Pen: Translation & Censorship in Nineteenth-century Europe* (2010) and C. Rundle’s *A Poisonous Importation: Publishing Translations in Fascist Italy* (2010)<sup>33</sup>.

Like ideology, censorship is becoming a central (‘canonical’) issue to Translation Studies. Analogically to the new chapter on translation and ideology in Stolze (2008), the new version of M. Baker’s *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2008, together with G. Saldanha, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2011) finds space for a new entry on Censorship (pp. 28-31) by F. Billiani, while the earlier editions (1998, 2001) only touched on it indirectly under the heading ‘Publishing Strategies’ (2001: 190-194, in particular p. 193).

Billiani (in Baker & Saldanha 2008: 28) defines censorship as ‘a coercive and forceful act that blocks, manipulates and controls cross-cultural interaction in various ways [...]’

<sup>33</sup> The Ph.D. thesis (2001) on which Rundle 2010 is based is downloadable from [http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/3092/1/WRAP\\_THESIS\\_Rundle\\_2001.pdf](http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/3092/1/WRAP_THESIS_Rundle_2001.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-02-05).

expressed through repressive cultural, aesthetic, linguistic and economic practices'. She goes on to specify:

In contrasting fashions, both censorship and translation influence the visibility and invisibility, as well as the accessibility and inaccessibility, of the cultural capital enjoyed or produced by a given text or body of texts.

Linking research in Translation Studies with the work of M. Foucault (1975) on knowledge, power and repression and P. Bourdieu's notion of the *habitus* (here: 'dynamics of tastes'), Billiani (28-29) continues:

[...] in its consideration of transnational dynamics of tastes, Bourdieu's definition of structural censorship allows us to view the phenomenology of translation and censorship in terms of both its national specificity and a repertoire of universal themes (for instance sexuality, religion and ideology) shared by different communities at different times of their history (Bourdieu 1982: 168-73). In this respect, censorship has to be seen not as an institutional set of rules, or even as an overtly repressive means of controlling public opinion and discourses, but rather as a set of unwritten rules, shaped both by current *habitus* and by the symbolic capital a text enjoys in a certain field (*ibid.*: 172-3).

[...] the relationship between censorship and translation can challenge current assumptions on the notion of accessibility of culture, both in overtly repressive contexts and in seemingly neutral cultural scenarios (Billiani 2007a, see also the General Censorship Resources website for a wide range of examples of censorial operations).

Subsequently, Billiani makes a distinction between institutional (that is official or state) censorship and individual (or self-) censorship. As it is impossible, in the scope of this thesis, to obtain sufficient reliable data about translators' self-censoring procedures, the analyses here can be based only on available translations in the public domain. Consequently, what we are most interested in here is *political* censorship<sup>34</sup>.

This, of course, does not mean that self-censorship should be underestimated. On the contrary, Billiani herself (2008: 30) admits that 'translations were rarely sequestered, because the publishers themselves pre-empted censorship by guaranteeing their acceptability (Rundle 2000, Van Steen 2007)'. As did the translators, we might add.

Although it is almost impossible to trace vestiges of self-censorship *ex post*<sup>35</sup>, there can be no doubt that its workings have been at least as significant as those of 'institutional censorship'. Indeed, since authors, translators and publishers have a natural professional interest in getting published or publishing, they strive to overcome or circumvent all barriers along the way.

---

<sup>34</sup> Other authors use such terms as official, institutional, state, government, structural or systemic censorship, all of which are implied by and subsumed in our use of 'political censorship'.

<sup>35</sup> This is of paramount methodological importance. It is nigh on impossible to provide any conclusive explanations for the shifts discovered by means of a micro-textual comparative analysis of the original and the translation. They may have been caused by any agent in the complex and protracted act of getting a translation published (see also 'indirect translations' below). Left only with the *products* (i.e. translations), with no means to fall back on the *process(es) of translating*, we are left in an almost complete darkness as to the reasons for the actual textual shifts. It follows that investigating the shifts in the translations leads merely to uncovering facts which cannot be accounted for. As a consequence, we must broaden our perspective by undertaking a much more multi-layered analysis to come up with plausible explanations for any shifts in the target texts.

D. Merkle (2002: 9-18, in *TTR*, vol. 15, n.º 2) prefaces the collection of articles with another fundamental distinction, namely between preventive and reactive censorship<sup>36</sup>. This is how she defines censorship (9):

Censorship refers broadly to the suppression of information in the form of self-censorship, boycotting or official state censorship before the utterance occurs (preventive or prior censorship) or to punishment for having disseminated a message (post-censorship, negative or repressive censorship). In its narrower legalistic sense, it means prevention by official government act of the circulation of messages already produced, or a system of direct official constraints on publication. The term is applied to both original texts and translations, although the distinction between the two is rarely made in the literature.

Keeping these two methods apart is vital, as it makes it possible to capture the intricacies of multifarious censorial modes in Portugal. While the press was restricted by preventive censorship, books were subject to reactive censorship (see Chapter 3). The two, of course, apply very different methods. While the former is mostly textual (possibly even entailing negotiations with the authorities), the latter is more violent, often resulting in confiscation or sequestration, inflicting serious financial losses on the publishers or even forcing them into bankruptcy (and thereby depriving translators of a source of work).

Merkle (9-10) also emphasises the pervasiveness of censorship, differing across cultures not in absolute terms but in degree:

Even the freest of nations seem to find some form(s) of censorship necessary; as such censorship is not limited to oppressive autocracies as Michaela Wolf asserts in her study on the blockage of Italian alterity in the late Austro-Hungarian Empire. The articles on censorship and translation brought together in this issue confirm that censorship, more specifically translation phenomena found in censoring societies, are not the exclusive purview of explicitly autocratic regimes, a position upheld by Raquel Merino and Rosa Rabadán in their article ‘Censored Translations in Franco’s Spain: The TRACE Project – Theatre and Fiction (English-Spanish).’

Indeed, when speaking about censorship on the Iberian Peninsula<sup>37</sup>, it would be reprehensible not to mention the TRACE project (*TRAducciones CEnsuradas*, censored translations in Spain from 1936 to 1975, in some cases up to 1983), a joint enterprise of the University of León and the University of the Basque Country (primarily R. Rabadán and R. Merino Álvarez), launched around the year 1997<sup>38</sup>. Since then, the TRACE project has been sprouting so many roots and branches that it may soon be comparable to the Göttingen project.

In its extreme forms, censorship may result in a blanket ban on translations from a certain language (the well-known example being English as the language of the enemy

---

<sup>36</sup> Epithets used by other authors are *pre-emptive*, *prior*, *pre-publication* versus *repressive*, *negative*, *punitive*, *post-publication*. Since censorship is always repressive (*ergo* negative, punitive), preference is given here to ‘preventive’ vs. ‘reactive’ censorship or to the more accurate, albeit less handy, ‘pre-publication’ and ‘post-publication’ censorship.

<sup>37</sup> Czech, Slovak as well as several Slavic and Finno-Ugric languages (and sometimes German) use ‘the Pyrenean Peninsula’, a geographical rather than an (ancient) political term.

<sup>38</sup> See <http://www.ehu.es/trace/home-eng.html> and [http://trace.unileon.es/TRACE/trace\\_en.htm](http://trace.unileon.es/TRACE/trace_en.htm) (retrieved on 2011-02-14).

under the Third Reich, cf. Philpotts in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 239 or Sturge 1999:121<sup>39</sup>) or entire genres (e.g. detective stories, cf. Billiani in Baker & Saldanha 2008: 30).

In any case, censorship as the institutional (government) justification for *non-translation* (see below) shapes the image of a country and its people (culture) in a very significant way. In (post-) modern ‘Western liberal democracies’, this function is partly attributable to the power of the market (‘What isn’t likely to sell doesn’t get published’). For instance, the image Czech readers in the 1990s could have obtained of Iceland was one of a country producing nothing but detective stories (the only genre translated from Modern Icelandic into Czech in the 1990s), while their image of South Korea could have been one of a bastion of Zen Buddhism (the theme uniting all translations from Korean into Czech in the same period). These images are, of course, spectacularly wrong – whether they are the result of a political or an economic (market-driven) censorship.

Another form of censorship is one which fails to include standard copyright data (e.g. in a book). The author’s or the translator’s names are omitted or changed (as pseudonyms or simply misspelled to obstruct their identification), the original title of the book is wrong, misspelled or deliberately confused with the source text’s title (as in the case of second-hand translations, where the original is not equal to the source text used for the target translation) etc. The converse may also be the case: the target culture translator’s name is highlighted in order to identify him/her and to make him/her more readily accountable for ‘what he/she has done’, while the author’s name may be of inferior importance to the perception of the target culture. In our material we encounter all of these varying modes of censorship and manipulation.

Censorial practices applied to the cinema may even result in totally opposite approaches employed to the same end. António Ferro (then in charge of the *Secretariado Nacional de Informação*, see Chapter 3) forbade the dubbing of foreign movies by Act No. 2027 of 1948, not for aesthetic reasons, but simply because dialogue could thus be left untranslated or purposely mistranslated (Santos 2007: 133). In Czechoslovakia, the opposite procedure was adopted, but for the very same reasons. Perhaps surprisingly, dubbing was also the prevalent mode of censoring films in Spain (cf. C. Gutiérrez Lanza<sup>40</sup>).

Most ironically of all, these two opposing practices continue in both countries to this day. In today’s Portugal, films are predominantly subtitled both in the cinema and on television, as are sometimes even children’s cartoons. In the Czech Republic, films in the cinema are now mostly subtitled (except for children’s films; only a handful of cinemas in Prague offer subtitled children’s films for small audiences often drawn largely from the expatriate community), whereas films on television are almost exclusively dubbed (with the exception of some late-night ‘specials’ for real cineastes<sup>41</sup>).

---

<sup>39</sup> ‘Once the war began, however, the position of translated literature changed: all imports from enemy countries were banned, with a special guide issued to librarians and booksellers separating language group from nationality for this purpose (which English-language authors were British, which Irish or American, and which “exceptionally” permitted).’ In <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers1999/Sturge%201999.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-02-16).

<sup>40</sup> See <http://www3.vives.org/pdf/setam/Gutierre.PDF> (*s.d.*, retrieved on 2011-02-17).

<sup>41</sup> Of course, this is slowly changing with the advent of digital television, where it is possible to select the language of both the sound and the subtitles (as is the case with DVDs already). But this reflects the technological advancement of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which is not the issue of this thesis.



The stricter approach towards dramatic works and motion pictures as compared with books in general is understandable, as the staging of theatre plays and especially the screening of films are public (or semi-public) events, while reading may be regarded as a rather private form of entertainment.

All of the above, of course, is not to say that censorship is applied in the same manner and to the same extent in (relatively) ‘free’ societies as it is in dictatorial regimes. They differ not only in the methods employed, but also in the topics targeted. While obscenity, advocacy of violence, incitement to a breach of fundamental and/or constitutional rights (e.g. racism, chauvinism, unfair treatment of women, children, minorities, etc.) and perhaps propagation of religious extremism may be the focal point of censorship in a democracy, a dictatorship is primarily concerned with sedition, the threat of insurrection, or the spread of any potentially subversive ideas.

It is precisely in the range of topics most avidly monitored by the censors that dictatorships differ both from democracies and from each other. In Franco’s Spain, for instance, Roman Catholicism was the only officially recognised religion and ‘members of the pro-Franco political party, the *Falange*, and the most fundamentalist members of the clergy became willing censors’ (Merino & Rabadán 2002: 126). By contrast, religion of any hue was seen as a threat in socialist (communist) countries (cf. N. Kocijančič Pokorn in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 175, 183 *et passim*, G. Thomson-Wohlgemuth in Pym & Shlesinger & Jettmarová 2006: 62, or R. Dimitriu in Wolf 2006: 59). Poland, however, retained certain autonomy within this socialist anti-clericalism, as testified to by E. Skibińska (in Wolf 2006: 140)<sup>42</sup>: ‘En effet, les autorités polonaises, quoique prônant l’athéisme, ne peuvent ignorer que la religion catholique est une composante essentielle de l’identité nationale [...]’.

As regards the relative emphasis placed on translated as opposed to ‘indigenous’ literature as potential targets of censorship, different milieus call for diverging approaches. While in Nazi Germany, censorship focussed first and foremost on translations, highlighting the importance and high quality of original German writing (cf. Sturge 1999: 1 *et passim*), the converse was true in Romania (Dimitriu, in Wolf 2006: 59):

As for the decision-making factors regarding what gets translated, many of the editors-in-chief were also respected intellectuals who refused to engage with the regime from close quarters (e.g., by refusing to become part of the *nomenklatura*) and preferred to work in ‘less visible’ places, such as publishing houses – see Şora, quoted above. In this way, they [i.e. editors-in-chief] could help the process of silent, but tenaciously structured, symbolic resistance to the dominant social practices. Add to this the fact that official censorship did not, erroneously of course, perceive translated works as being dangerous for the stability of the system, while ‘original’ literature was intrinsically not trusted. The symbolic power of translation was “mis-recognised” largely because the censors underestimated the symbolic power of (translated) works.

Perhaps surprisingly, economic considerations played a part in the book market not only in the ‘fascistic’ or ‘corporatist’ dictatorships (which did not resort to nationalisation), but also in the socialist (communist) countries. G. Thomson-Wohlgemuth explains:

---

<sup>42</sup> ‘In fact, Polish authorities, although proclaiming atheism, cannot ignore the fact that Catholicism is an essential component of national identity’ (translation by J.Š., here and throughout, unless indicated otherwise).

The GDR was constantly short of foreign currency, since its own currency was not convertible outside the Eastern Bloc countries. (56)

As a consequence of this economic dilemma, many older classical titles found their way onto the market because the author's rights had expired and in several cases so had the translator's rights, making these books cheaper to produce. (57)

Paper was scarce and had therefore to be distributed according to priority and urgency of publications. Here so-called "proportions" played a significant role. These were the ratios between literature from the capitalist west and literature stemming from the GDR, the USSR and the other socialist countries. Another key parameter regarding the "right proportion" of book production was the distinction between literature for which license fees had to be paid (i.e. contemporary literature) and "other" literature (i.e. cultural heritage). (58)

All this resulted in a literary landscape dominated by the dinosaurs (safe, harmless 'good old classics', often subsidised, formidably translated, beautifully illustrated and in de luxe editions), with very few contemporary western authors: 'Translations from the west mostly had only one print run, as further runs were deemed too expensive and unnecessary. Classical titles could have as many as 15 print runs or even more' (Thomson-Wohlgemuth 2006: 58).

Thomson-Wohlgemuth rightly points to the didactic purpose of literary production with which the authorities invested the publishing houses:

Literature was to be produced which involved itself actively in the process of educating and cultivating the general public. Publishers not only had the function of a business enterprise, but were also a pedagogical institution [...] (58)

The main requirements [for a book to be selected for translation] were the educational effect of the book, the way the reader would benefit from it, and its contribution to the construction of a socialist society. (59)

This trace of the political ideology of Marxism-Leninism is also reflected in Popovič's concept of 'literary education' (see Chapter 2), which is in turn closely related to the normative concept of the 'canon' (subchapter 1.5.2.1).

While in Portugal censors were military officials (cf. Seruya in Wolf 2006: 323, J. Cardoso Gomes 2006), in socialist countries the procedure was strikingly different, as G. Thomson-Wohlgemuth (2006: 60) reminds us:

Evaluators were chosen for their reputation and the likelihood that they would provide a favorable assessment. The content of their commentaries, although important, should not be misunderstood as literary discussions. Rather, they constituted a political move by the publisher.

Finally, Rundle & Sturge (2010: 6-10) name four phenomena relevant to the study of translations and common to all of the four fascist regimes they investigate (the Nazi regime in Germany, Mussolini's fascism in Italy, Franco's 'semi-fascist' Spain and Salazar's 'corporatist' Portugal), viz. publishing history, censorship, renewal and expansion, and finally racism. As to the issue of censorship, they have the following to say (6-7):

As recent work on translation and censorship has shown, translated works are magnets for censorship, since they make manipulation possible at several stages, from the selection for publication to the precise wording of the translated texts.

[...] the processes and rationales of fascist censorship of translation are an important theme in the research collected in this volume, at the very least because they cast light on the specific mechanics of political intervention in culture during the periods concerned, and in a more far-reaching respect because they hint at the ideological complexities that often underpinned such intervention.

And more specifically regarding Portugal, Rundle & Sturge (*ibid.*) elaborate:

Portugal maintained a tight control on all forms of mass communication, but adopted a relatively pragmatic attitude towards the censorship of books, which were never monitored systematically. Like Italy, Salazar's regime was prepared to allow the cultural elite a degree of freedom it would not allow the masses, as long as this freedom did not develop into a potentially dangerous political activism.

One final remark should be added regarding the specificity of investigating translations under the Portuguese *Estado Novo*, not only when viewed through the lens of censorship: Portugal 'was the one country where the translation market was not dominated by English as a source language. Instead, the hegemony of French gave way to Spanish as the main source language' (Rundle & Sturge 2010: 6). The hegemony of French is also evident in the second-hand translations from Czech into Portuguese, made more often than not via French, at least during the *Estado Novo* (see Chapter 4).

One possible reason for this may well be ecclesiastical (hence ideological, by implication). As reported by M. Goreti Monteiro (in Pym & Shlesinger & Jettmarová 2006: 68) discussing zero translations in the first Portuguese *Robinson Crusoe* in 1785 made in order to avoid the censorship of the Inquisition, she says:

The title page of the Portuguese book states that it was translated from the French. However, this information could have been false, as was often the case. One of the reasons for misrepresenting the source could be that a French origin might bring fewer problems than an English one, since the Portuguese church had never accepted the religious changes in England.

M. Goreti Monteiro (72) ends her article succinctly with the following coda (72): 'What Henrique Leitão learned was that he, as translator, had yet another problem, not to conquer, but to live with, if he wanted to survive: that to translate under the pressure of censorship means, at times, resorting to silence.'

### 1.2.3 Conclusion

Regarding the issue of censorship, it is of paramount importance to realise that it is not limited to dictatorships. In one form or another (e.g. the Lord Chamberlain's Office in the U.K. censoring theatre plays from 1737 to 1968, the Hays Code in the U.S.A. censoring films from 1934 to 1966), it has been a social reality and a recurring pattern throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Europe and elsewhere.

K. Sturge (in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 68) points out that some of these censorial processes 'do not differ in absolute terms from many other phases in translation history' and include many strategies which 'are in no way alien to a present-day translation market'.

M. Philpotts (in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 246) concurs: ‘Different not in absolute terms but in degree, discursive mechanisms of power are rendered visible in conditions of dictatorship where in democracy they can often remain hidden’.

Censorship in today’s ‘Western liberal democracies’ may take the form of (i) government subsidies (selecting some works to be supported, including academic research projects, over others), (ii) economic (market) censorship (what does not promise to be a commercial success is dismissed, irrespective of its non-economic value), (iii) ‘censorship proper’, regarding e.g. religious matters (U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Office for Film and Broadcasting or ‘Everybody Draw Mohammed Day’), pornography (the label ‘harmful to minors’) as well as political (e.g. ‘Viva Zapatero!’ in the RAIot show in 2003).

And of course, censorship has an established tradition with a long shadow in the West, from the banning of J. Joyce’s *Ulysses* in 1922 to the WikiLeaks affair in 2010, when U.S. federal staff were banned from reading WikiLeaks since it would ‘hamper their work’<sup>43</sup>.

However, inquiring into censorship in today’s ‘Western liberal democracies’ is not the aim of this thesis. The point of this subchapter has been, to quote Philpotts (2010: 245) again, that ‘the extreme asymmetry of power present in the exceptional circumstances of totalitarian dictatorship actually places a particular emphasis on cultural strategies which belong to the more symmetrical power relationships of market-led democracies’.

In conclusion we should mention the ‘Lisbon Group’, a group of scholars studying (among other things) the effects of censorship on translation in the Portuguese *Estado Novo*, whose scholarly endeavours are best represented by their latest joint publication *Traduzir em Portugal durante o Estado Novo* (2009, edited by T. Seruya, M. Lin Moniz and A. Assis Rosa).

### 1.3 Indirect Translations

One would like to think that [Murakami], himself a translator, would not readily approve of re-translation. If this declaration [on the DuMont website] does accurately convey Murakami’s intention, however, then by promoting the translation of the English version of his works into other languages, he himself comes to embody the English-language-centred cultural imperialism that we continue to deplore and resist. By taking American tastes as a model, what he is helping to bring about is nothing less than the globalization – indeed, the Hollywoodization – of his own works. The Japanese versions, in that case, are reduced to the status of mere regional editions.

(Irmela Hijiya-Kirschner, quoted in J. Rubin 2002/2005: 345)

In the second-half of the twentieth century, we would expect translations to have been made directly from the original into the recipient language, without being mediated through another language (culture). Presumably most European nations already had translators, philologists and literary scholars at their disposal capable of translating from any European language into their own. In the so-called ‘major’ cultures of Europe (say, the English, French, German or Russian) this must surely have been the case.

<sup>43</sup> See, for instance, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/dec/10/us-ban-staff-wikileaks-official> (retrieved on 2011-02-13).

These assumptions are not without foundation. As G. Toury (1995: 143) reminds us, ‘the concept of translation itself had been undergoing [changes] towards an ever-growing emphasis on adequacy, which inevitably involved a concomitant reduction of tolerance for indirect translation as a whole’. Not surprisingly, the phenomenon of indirect translations has not been accounted for by modern *linguistic* theories of translation (e.g. W. Koller 1979/2004 or J. C. Catford 1965). When investigating both the socio-cultural embedding of translations and the history of translatorial practices, the purely linguistic approach towards translation thus falls short of providing adequate tools.

One of the contributions an investigation into the mutual relations between ‘medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures’ (LSCs) of Europe via translation can make, however, consists precisely in drawing our attention to the possibly unexpected fact that some of these medium-sized LSCs in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Europe may not have had the requisite cultural élite able to render the works of other European literatures into their own without having to resort to cultural mediation. This is certainly the case of Portugal throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century (at least until 1989), which reflected Czech literature only indirectly (if, indeed, at all).

### 1.3.1 Definition

The phenomenon of ‘indirect translations’ is the first of the concepts discussed here belonging primarily and by definition to the discipline of Translation Studies. Despite its pervasiveness throughout history, little has been written about indirect translations from a theoretical point of view. Most publications deal with it in the form of case studies, contributing only inductively to our understanding of the phenomenon.

The designation ‘indirect translations’ seems more appropriate than other, competing terms<sup>44</sup> as an umbrella term, subsuming second-hand (secondary), third-hand (tertiary), fourth-hand (quaternary) etc. translations, i.e. translations not made directly with recourse to the original, but by means of a mediating text (MT).

In the realm of indirect translations, the ‘source text’ (ST) and the ‘target text’ (TT) do not correspond to the ‘original’ and the ‘translation’, respectively. As this metatextual process involves a mediating text (MT), the ‘source text’ (German: *Vorlage*, Swedish: *förlaga*, Czech: *předloha*) for the ‘end translation’ is the MT, not the original. The metatextual chain multiplies in the case of third-, fourth-hand etc. translations.

Not infrequently, however, even this scenario describes an idealised state of affairs. Both J. Levý and A. Popovič draw our attention to the possibility of an eclectic (‘compilative’) translation. Having analysed the translators’ own rationales behind their work (in *Czech Theories of Translation*, 1957/1996), Levý (in his *The Art of Translation*, 1963/1983/1998, here 1983: 203) specifies:

---

<sup>44</sup> E.g. mediated, intermediary translation, retranslation, meta-translation, secondary translation, relay translation, etc. See also Ringmar 2007: 2 (quoting from John Benjamins Translation Studies Bibliography).

Second-hand translating, however, was not always so simple. We must take into account that the translator often worked with several texts, that he used a foreign translation either as an aid to solve semantically or technically difficult details of the transposition, or that he additionally checked his translation, made according to a foreign version, against the original.<sup>45</sup>

In the terminological volume produced with his colleagues from Nitra, Popovič (1983: 224) accounts for this phenomenon systematically:

Compilative translation – a translation compiled from a number of other, already made translations of the original into the same target language. The translator's contact with the original is mediated by other translations of the text.<sup>46</sup>

In Popovič's definition, compilative translation is a (reprehensible) form of 'retranslation', but the concept is instrumental in accounting for both retranslations and indirect translations. Toury (1995: 134) concurs and elaborates:

What is likely to further complicate matters is the possible existence of *compilative* translations where several intermediate translations were used, into one language or several, alternately or together, or even a combination of the ultimate original and translation(s) thereof.

In her influential essay 'When is a Translation Not a Translation' (1998), S. Bassnett, discussing Thomas Mallory's *Morte d'Arthur*, explains:

Mallory claims authentic sources and yet deliberately blurs all traces that might lead us back to those sources. And we, as readers, collude with this, because it is a quintessential story-telling device. (30)

The question is, however, whether we may call this kind of text a translation, for although it presupposes an original somewhere else and claims to be a rendering of that original, the original is not a single text but a body of material in several languages. (*ibid.*)

Mallory's *Morte d'Arthur* cannot be described as a translation, in one respect, because there is no explicit source text, but neither can it be described as an original because there is in fact a body of source material upon which Mallory's version is based. (38).

Indeed, these 'authorial' (metatextual) procedures were very common in mediaeval European literature (and later as well, although they subsequently became less widespread). The fact of there being several (original?) source texts upon which a target text (not necessarily a 'translation in the traditional sense'<sup>47</sup>) is based is far from being restricted to old texts, nor even to literature, as J. Munday (in *The Translator*, vol. 13, n.º 2, 2007: 197) reminds us:

Yet I would argue it is not clear that translation is necessarily the most 'recognizable' form of rewriting. If anything, it might be termed 'misrecognized', since, in political contexts for example, it so often tends to pass unnoticed, absorbed into reports feeding on a variety of sources or in the co-existence of multiple versions of the same text on websites of all sorts of commercial,

<sup>45</sup> The original reads as follows: 'Překládání z druhé ruky nebylo ovšem vždy tak jednoduché. Musíme počítat s tím, že překladatel často pracoval s několika texty, že buď cizího překladu používal jako pomůcky pro řešení významově či technicky obtížných detailů převodu, anebo že si naopak převod pořízený podle cizí verze dodatečně zkontroloval podle originálu.' (Levý 1983: 203). See also the German version of Levý (1969: 162).

<sup>46</sup> In the original: 'Kompilačný preklad – preklad zostavený z niekoľkých iných, už hotových prekladov toho istého originálu do toho istého cieľového jazyka. Kontakt prekladateľa s originálom sprostredkujú iné preklady textu.' (Popovič et al. 1983: 224).

<sup>47</sup> A 'translation in the traditional sense' is defined first and foremost in terms of the 'equivalence' postulate. This approach is perhaps best exemplified by W. Koller 1979/2004 (*Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*, 2004, 7<sup>th</sup>, updated edition).

governmental and non-governmental organizations, where it may be unclear which is the source text and, indeed, whether it is possible to say that there is one source language at all.

Abstracting away from idealised scenarios, the convoluted metatextual concatenation between an/the original(s) and a/the translation(s) is in obvious need of a more thorough scrutiny.

We must differentiate consistently between four categories of texts: (1) originals (which may or may not be equivalent to the source texts), (2) source texts (originals, translations or any combination thereof), (3) translations (serving as both target and mediating texts), and (4) target texts (always harbouring, by their very existence, the possibility of becoming mediating texts for yet another metatextual chain).

All texts that came into being on the basis of another text, including (direct) translations, can be designated as **metatexts** (drawing on Popovič 1975, *passim*)<sup>48</sup>. A second-hand translation is thus a ‘secondary metatext’ in Popovič’s terminology (1976: 32), i.e. a ‘secondary, derived metatext, the “prototext” of which is not the original text, but a metatext (e.g. a second-hand translation)’.

**Original(s) = [0, x]; x ∈ R+**

(where x is any positive real number)

An original can be non-existent (0), then we speak of a *pseudotranslation* (which is a form of ‘falsity’ – since it is based on the receiver’s erroneous belief that s/he is reading a metatext<sup>49</sup>).

Apart from the ideal case where there is one, clearly identifiable original (1), there may also be other ‘originals’ (x):

1. The original itself may be a matter of dispute and divergence of opinions as to what constitutes its ‘invariant core’ objectively, or rather inter-subjectively (cf. the hermeneutical, poststructuralist, or deconstructivist contributions hereto), i.e. whether it is possible at all to arrive at an indisputable ‘invariant core’ on which everyone can agree, etc.
2. The author him/herself may have produced various differing ‘originals’ (deliberately or unintentionally – cf. Herberto Helder, Milan Kundera). Or there may be various differing originals due to the interference of various factors and/or agents other than the author (e.g. editors; Franz Kafka interpreted via Max Brod, Fernando Pessoa via his ‘excavator’ Richard Zenith, Jaroslav Hašek, etc.; see also M. Kundera’s *Testaments Betrayed*).
3. Furthermore, for EU documents, all linguistic versions in the official languages of the EU are seen as (legally) equivalent and all of them are deemed to be originals.

---

<sup>48</sup> Note that Popovič’s metatexts include ‘adaptations’, ‘versions’, intersemiotic translations (‘based on the book by...’), etc., so while being indispensable to Translation Studies, the term and concept of the metatext concurrently exceeds its scope.

<sup>49</sup> Popovič subsumes ‘pseudotranslations’ (originals based on no prototexts) and ‘pseudooriginals’ (concealed translations) under the hypernym ‘quasi-metatexts’. Quasi-metatexts make use of the recipients’ expectations (Popovič 1975: 278; Popovič et al. 1983: 132).

4. As indicated above, ‘original’ is not equivalent to ‘source text’. The translator may have drawn on several source texts:
- a. two or more editions of the text in the original language;
  - b. two or more versions of the text in languages other than the original;
  - c. any combinations thereof.

In other words: Can or should all editions of a literary work – even in the source language alone – be considered to constitute *the original* equally, i.e. in the same sense and with the same authenticity and authority? Certainly not (cf. Hašek’s *Švejk*, subchapter 4.3).

The original is an ideal, reduced not infrequently to translation scholars’ wishful thinking, but not always possible to find in a clear-cut form in reality. The dethronement of *the original* is thus no idiosyncrasy of the Skopos theory but must, in principle, always be allowed for and taken into account.

**Translation(s) = [0, x]; x ∈ R+**  
(where x is any positive real number)

A translation can be non-existent (0). If a translation is ‘conspicuous by its inexistence’, we may want to know why this is the case and look into the reasons behind it (see Chapter 1.4 on ‘non-translation’). Again, non-translation is a form of ‘falsity’ or ‘half-truth’, because it conceals from the target reader, incognisant of (the) other language(s), possibly important aspects of the world, thereby manipulating him/her.

Again, apart from the ideal case of one, clearly identifiable translation (1), there may in fact be several (x):

1. Two or more editions of the same translation into the same target language. In this case, the differences among the various editions may be caused by factors and/or agents other than the translator (e.g. editors).
2. Two or more translations of the text into the same target language – by the same translator or by different translators, i.e. what is also known as **re-translation**.<sup>50</sup>
3. Two or more translations of ‘one text’ into various languages – usually differing as such (by definition), but with the further complication that the translations into different languages may have been produced from different editions of the original, with or without the author’s interference.

Following Jakobson (1959), translated texts may be further subdivided into intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic:

1. **Intralingual translations** do not only comprise translations from older versions in the same language (temporal aspect) and translations from dialects, sociolects, etc.

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Levý’s rather normative comment: ‘Should the new reproduction be an act of art, the translation as a whole must be the work of a new translator, not a plagiarism from previous versions.’ In the original: ‘Má-li být nová reprodukce uměleckým činem, musí být překlad jako celek dílem nového překladatele, nikoli plagiátem z verzí předchozích.’ (Levý 1983: 105).



into the standard language (spatial aspect), but also **rewritings in terms of ideology** (ideological aspect).

2. **Interlingual translations** are, of course, subject to the same procedures, further complicated by the constraints of the target language (systemic aspect), the translator's disposition (subjective aspect), and translational as well as other norms (cultural and ideological aspect).
3. **Intersemiotic translations**, i.e. transpositions of a 'text' *sensu lato* from one semiotic system into another, whether entailing a language change or not, stand for a very broad concept of translation bordering on or going as far as adaptation.
4. This well-known triad can be complemented by what may be called '**inter-generic translations**', e.g. the translations of poetry as prose, or of theatre plays as poetry (see e.g. Duarte 2000: 99, 105 for such procedures in the Portuguese reception of Shakespeare). Depending on the definition of a 'semiotic system', 'inter-generic translations' may be subsumed under the category of 'intersemiotic translations', or they may form a category in their own right.
5. Popovič (1976: 20) and Ďurišin (1996: 55) also speak of **intraliterary translation**, which is not the same as intralingual. For instance, a Czech translation of a work written in German but belonging to 'Prague German literature' is a form of 'intraliterary translation', but it is an interlingual, not an intralingual translation<sup>51</sup>. The same would be true of Old Church Slavonic and Latin literary works produced in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown and belonging to this 'specific interliterary community' (see Ďurišin below, subchapter 1.5.2.2). This distinction has far-reaching implications for the hypothesis of 'extreme target-orientedness', which would obtain only if the object of Translation Studies could be reduced to the binary opposition of 'source-language culture' versus 'target-language culture'.

Consider, in this light, three borderline cases of interlingual transposition, 'sight translation', 'dubbing' and 'subtitling'. **Sight translation** (in Czech: *tumočení z listu*, i.e. 'off-sheet *interpreting*', *sic!*) and **dubbing** (in German: *Synchronisierung*, i.e. 'synchronisation', or sometimes even *Vertonung*, i.e. 'scoring' or 'sound recording'<sup>52</sup>) are both spoken (suggesting a form of interpreting), but the original is fixed and can, at least in principle, be resorted to repeatedly (suggesting a form of translation).

Finally, '**subtitling**' (or 'supertitling', the preferred form in live stage productions) also suggests a form of intersemiotic translation. If we disregard the actual translatorial procedure involved (the script or dialogue translated more or less in a standard manner, but with the further complication that it must be trimmed to fit the space and time

---

<sup>51</sup> An interesting object of study would be authors who, although writing in their mother tongue, chose to live (or spend a considerable portion of their life) abroad, such as José Saramago or Cees Nooteboom. Such authors are clearly 'bilateral', although their writing is 'monolingual'. The original's architextual status is at risk here, because it is often permeated through with literary, cultural and everyday-life references to, and influences of, the new/other country. Popovič (1976: 3) speaks of 'creolization of culture in translation'. Here, however, we are faced with 'creolization of culture in the original'.

<sup>52</sup> Derivatives are possible, too: *Nachvertonung*, 'post-recording'. The word *Vertonung* covers a variegated semantic field, including 'musical version' or 'score (scoring)' as a noun, and 'to set something to music', 'add tone, compose, score' as a verb (*vertonen*, Czech: *zhudebnit*).

available per utterance), the result certainly appears to be an intersemiotic translation, i.e. the transposition of spoken words into writing.<sup>53</sup>

J. Lambert (1995: 172) adds that ‘in multilingual South Africa, “simulcast” (simultaneous translation) has become quite common. Other variants are found in the USA (at the opera) and in South East Asia (subtitles in various positions on the screen).

For the sake of completeness, although it is rather unusual for literary works, we should add that there may be **more than one author** (as in the preparation of legal or technical documents, e.g. EU documents, building projects, minutes of meetings, etc.), and/or **more than one translator** (as, for instance, in cases where a translation must be completed by a tight deadline and the translation agency assigned with producing the translation decides to split the work among several of its employees).

### Other special cases

Adding to this already intricate picture, an entire set of texts can be non-existent in another culture (source, target or mediating). Then we speak of a gap, void or niche in the ‘other’ culture(s) (e.g. some types of poetry – such as the Russian *bylina* or the Japanese *haiku* – having no direct equivalent in other literatures)<sup>54</sup>.

Apart from a one-to-one relation, the set of texts in one language/culture, when compared with a set of texts in the other language/culture, can be disproportionate in all conceivable ways (1:0, 0:1, 1:x, x:1, x:x, where  $x \subset \mathbf{R}^+$ , cf. Leipziger Schule, W. Koller 1979/2004, set theory).

Moreover, there are other, special cases of translations relevant to Translation Studies:

1. **Pseudo-original** or concealed translation: a text pretending to be an original, but being in fact a translation; as a type of plagiarism, this is again a form of ‘falsity’, making use of the receivers’ expectations. Faced with this phenomenon, the researcher could attempt to establish the author/translator’s motives in making the text appear as if it were an original.<sup>55</sup>
2. Authorial translation or **self-translation** (e.g. M. Kundera’s *Jacques et son maître*, S. Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*, or Listopad’s *Tristão ou a traição dum intelectual*, see Chapter 4) may deviate from the ‘original’ more than if the text were translated

<sup>53</sup> When addressing the role of an interpreter in a film, a special effect is sometimes achieved by the semantic discrepancy between the sound and the subtitles (usually in the same language, however), suggesting two divergent ‘messages’ (and the potential unfaithfulness of the interpreter). E.g. For the *traduttore traditore* in Japan-occupied China, see *Yip Man* (2008), dir. Wilson Yip, Hong Kong: Mandarin Films, 106 min., particularly min. 60:30-61:30. The reasons for the misinterpreting (complete change of the utterance, in fact) are both subjective (fear of personal consequences for the interpreter) and political (the delicate situation of the Japanese occupation of China under WWII).

<sup>54</sup> Examining it under ‘Problems of the Semiotics of Translation’, Popovič (1971: 104, or 1975: 181) regards this issue as a temporary one (obviously, until the given genre is imported into the other lingua- and socio-culture – via translation).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Popovič: ‘A concealed translation comes into being when the author inserts certain passages of an original work which he translated into a new work, aiming to make functional and semantic use of these elements in his own new text.’ In original: ‘Utajený preklad – vzniká vtedy, keď autor vkladá do nového diela isté úryvky diela pôvodného, ktoré preložil, pričom chce funkčne a významovo využiť tieto prvky v novom vlastnom texte.’ (Popovič et al. 1983: 229).

by a ‘professional translator’<sup>56</sup>. A self-translation is thus not only a special case of translation (as it is modelled on a prototext), but also **a special kind of original** (as it is produced and authorised by the same person as the ‘original’).

3. Finally, **indirect translation** may be defined as a target text for which the source text was not the ‘original’ (the ‘manuscript’) written by the original author, but some other version(s) of the text (e.g. an unauthorised edition in the source language, a translation, intralingual, interlingual or otherwise, etc.).
  - a. In the narrow sense, it is a translation of a translation (second-hand translation) of the original text. That is, the source text for the indirect translation was another translation (original ≠ source text) (relay, pivot language).
  - b. In the broad sense, which reflects reality more appropriately, an indirect translation may be the result of various combinations of texts other than the original. To determine whether an indirect translation – although primarily using a source text which is not the original – becomes less indirect if the translator subsequently checks with the original poses a serious dilemma. Obviously, (in)directness is not a binary opposition, but rather a continuum, raising questions of the *degree* of (in)directness. (see Chapter 4 for such a case – Havel 1991 in *Círculo de Leitores*).

Indirect translations may be the result of there being no proper dictionary (Toury 1995: 146), no competent translators, or of a mere distance of cultures, as recognised by Popovič (1983: 230): ‘As a rule, second-hand translations are tied either to small, linguistically demanding literatures, or to ethnically and linguistically very remote literatures.’<sup>57</sup> And elsewhere (1976: 21), Popovič adds: ‘The communicative channel of a second-hand type as a rule leads through literatures that are either linguistically very close or favoured.’ (*sic!*)

These cases notwithstanding, indirect translations also, quite frequently, reflect power relationships, whether implicit or explicit – superiority and inferiority, centre and periphery, etc. (cf. Toury 1995: 129, 130, 140 *et passim*).

### 1.3.2 Review of Literature

Out of the four aforementioned encyclopaedias (Stolze 1994/2001/2008, Hornby et al. 1999/2003, Baker & Malmkjær 1998/2001, and Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997/1999), only the last and oldest includes an entry entitled and specifically defining ‘indirect translations’.

More precisely, the second edition of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Baker & Saldanha 2008) introduces new entries: ‘relay’ and ‘retranslation’.

<sup>56</sup> For these procedures, see e.g. Maria Alice Gonçalves Antunes (2009) *O respeito pelo original* (São Paulo: Annablume), discussing V. Nabokov, S. Beckett, M. Kundera and particularly João Ubaldo Ribeiro. For Kundera, see also and particularly M. Woods (2006).

<sup>57</sup> ‘Preklady z druhej ruky sú spravidla viazané jednak na malé, jazykovo náročné literatúry, jednak na literatúry etnicky a jazykovo veľmi vzdialené.’ (Popovič et al. 1983: 230).

The article on ‘retranslation’, however, discusses ‘the act of translating a work that has previously been translated into the same language, or the result of such an act, the retranslated text itself’ (233), while the term ‘relay’ is reserved mostly for interpreting. Nonetheless, James St André (in Baker & Saldanha 2008: 231) mentions ‘relay translations’ in passing:

Studies of relay in written translation have also been scarce. Two have appeared since the beginning of the twenty-first century: one discussing the relay translation of Ibsen into Chinese through English (He 2001), the other dealing with subtitling of films from Danish to Hebrew, again through English (Zilberdik 2004); see AUDIOVISUAL TRANSLATION. In line with the established idea that relay translation is at best a necessary evil, both articles focus on problems involved with relay translation and ways to reduce error.

The difficulty of translating from more distant languages, such as Chinese, Arabic or Sanskrit, makes the problems involved in translating from French or German appear trivial. This then allows a ‘we Europeans’ versus ‘you Others’ dichotomy, with Europeans sharing information about non-European peoples through relay translation (St André 2003a).

This observation, however, leaves much to be desired. The indirect mode is far from being restricted to a Europe-wide reception and information sharing about ‘non-European peoples’, not even in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. And indirect translations in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Europe were most certainly not trivial, precisely because they involved ideology, even – in the exacerbated case of Portuguese ‘fascism’ and Czechoslovak ‘communism’ – (in theory) antagonistic ideologies.

Toury, Shuttleworth & Cowie (1999: 76) go into greater depth, and are therefore worth quoting at some length:

**Indirect Translation 1** (or **Intermediate Translation**, or **Mediated Translation**, or **Retranslation**, or **Second-Hand Translation**) A term used to denote the procedure whereby a text is not translated directly from an original ST, but via an intermediate translation in another language. According to Toury (1980, 1995), such a procedure is of course NORM-governed, and *different literary SYSTEMS will tolerate it to varying extents*. For example, it is frequently encountered in weak POLYSYSTEMS which depend on other, stronger systems for literary models and precedents, particularly where the language of the dominant system is widely spoken; in stronger polysystems it can be seen in *the practice of established TL poets “translating” an ST (in an SL of which they have no knowledge) with the aid of a TL crib. Another situation in which indirect translation is turned to is where there is no suitable bilingual dictionary in existence*. TTs produced in this manner have a greater tendency towards ACCEPTABILITY, as *the original ST is frequently not even available to be consulted*, and the parameters of an ST which is a translation in its own right are less likely to be held to be inviolable. In spite of the fact that indirect translation is relatively widespread in some parts of the world, it is not a procedure which is generally approved of; the NAIROBI DECLARATION, for example states that recourse should be had to it “only where absolutely necessary” (Osers 1983: 182). (italics added, other emphasis in original)

Several important points are raised here. The Portuguese literary system seems to have tolerated indirect translations more than the Czech (see Chapters 3 and 4). In this context, the Portuguese *literary* system may be said to have been weakened by the Portuguese *political* system. While striving for political and economic independence, autarky and self-sufficiency, Salazarism resulted in cultural and literary ‘provincialisation’, impoverishment and marginalisation. Literary translations were thus, to a considerable degree, modelled on the literary landscape in France (and partly elsewhere, e.g. the U.S.A., the U.K. and Spain).

In communist Czechoslovakia, one example of the impact of politics on translation practices could be seen in what was known as ‘translator couples’: a philologist (translator), i.e. somebody who knew the language, and a poet (writer) working closely together, typically when translating poems. This phenomenon was defended theoretically by many literary critics of the time, but the real reason was that it was the practice in the U.S.S.R. (see e.g. Popovič’s praxeology in 1975: 239-240).

It is equally true of 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal that no bilingual dictionary (Czech-Portuguese) was available, nor were there any bilingual translators. This is, at least in part, both the cause and the effect of there being no institution (tertiary or otherwise) for Czech or Slovak culture, language or literature in Portugal to this day.<sup>58</sup>

Due to ideological constraints (difficulty of travelling abroad, resulting in smuggling books across borders when feasible; political censorship, etc.), it is only too true that the original text was indeed frequently not even available to be consulted.

Given its scope and importance in connecting cultures, it is rather surprising how little attention the issue of ‘indirect translation’ has received so far within Translation Studies. M. Ringmar, researching Finnish-Icelandic literary exchanges within a wider Scandinavian translational system<sup>59</sup>, points out that ‘none of the approximately 200 translation scholars in the EST directory lists ITr [i.e. indirect translation] among their fields of interest’ (2007: 2, footnote 1).

Ringmar also notes the neglect of this issue in most authoritative TS reference books:

ITr is not mentioned in e.g. Bassnett (1991), Baker (1992), Fawcett (1997), or Munday (2001); Ingo allots half a page (1991: 24), Levý mentions ITr in passing (1969: 161-2) and so does Prunč, who also remarks on the lack of research (2003: 41, footnote). Of two recent Translation Studies encyclopaedias, Baker (1998) and Classe (2000), only the latter contains an entry for “Indirect translation”. (2007: 2, footnote 2).

Drawing on Toury (1995, see below), Ringmar (2007: 5) says: ‘We can also expect ITr to occur when *acceptability* is the dominating translational norm in the target culture (or a part of it); when *adequacy* is the norm ITr tends to be hidden’ (emphasis in original).

One would be tempted to assume that *acceptability* would, of necessity, be the target culture’s norm in a dictatorship. This is only logical and abets censorial practices. Acceptability ‘safeguards’ a dictatorial regime against subversive forces from the

---

<sup>58</sup> In Czechoslovakia, the lexicographic situation was only a little brighter. The first *Portuguese-Czech* dictionary was published in 1975, the result of long years of the scholarly work of Z. Hampl, a prominent translator, philologist and university teacher of Portuguese. The first medium-sized *Czech-Portuguese* dictionary is from 1997 (S. Hamplová & J. Jindrová), followed in 1999 by a medium-sized *Portuguese-Czech and Czech-Portuguese Technical Dictionary* (J. Šupík). An updated, revised and enlarged medium-sized *Portuguese-Czech* dictionary finally came out in 2005 (J. Jindrová & A. Pasienska). With the exception of the first dictionary, appearing shortly after the Portuguese Carnation Revolution (*sic!*), the others all belong to the post-1989 ‘democratic present’. On the other hand, the presence and teaching of Portuguese in Czechoslovakia had a proud history to look back on (cf. Z. Hampejs, 1959, *Observação à divulgação do Português na Checoslováquia*, Lisboa: Separata do Boletim da Sociedade de Língua Portuguesa, número especial I).

<sup>59</sup> M. Ringmar (2007) ‘Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations’. *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*. MUS, Francis (ed.). <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers2006/RINGMAR.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-03-01).

outside better than adequacy. Indeed, one could reverse the argument and hypothesise that adequacy is a characteristic virtue of democratic political systems.

Leaving aside quibbles as to which regime was more harsh (the Portuguese ‘pseudo-fascism’ or the Czechoslovak ‘would-be communism’), the two literary systems exhibit contrasting attitudes towards these norms. At least in relation to translations from Czech and Slovak, the Portuguese literary system appears to have preferred acceptability, thereby allowing for indirect translations (almost exclusively).

The Czech literary system, on the other hand, both in general and in relation to translations from Portuguese into Czech, appears to have had a strong bias in favour of translational adequacy (see Conclusion).

Ringmar (2007: 6) also recognises that ‘the fact that ITr prevails today in spite of competence in a particular SL may be due to a publishers’ rationale, which gives priority to e.g. the quality of the TT, delivery on time and minimising costs’.

Indeed, this market-driven recourse to indirect translations occurs more frequently than one might suppose. Discussing translations from Japanese into German via English, J. Rubin (2005: 347) quotes H. Murakami:

Say I am writing a book, and 15 years later it shows up translated into Norwegian, I would be glad for that, of course, but I would be *really* pleased if it came out just two or three years after I wrote it, even if the translation were a little off. This is important. Of course, accuracy is important, but speed is another thing you can’t ignore.

Markets are volatile and so are readers’ tastes. If something (an author, a book, or an event) is in the limelight, the publishers, along with other cultural agents dependent on the market, must not lose time, as delays incur loss of earnings.

Nor is this textual practice limited to newcomers into a literary system. An author some of whose works have already been translated directly into a target system may, under certain conditions, be translated indirectly.<sup>60</sup>

Ringmar’s ‘tentative suggestion’ (2007: 6) that ‘ITr coincides with a low book-per-translator ratio’ is also true of the corpus of Portuguese translations of Czech literature. The only recurrent translator of Czech literature into Portuguese is another Czech living in Lisbon, the ‘court translator’ of Hrabal into Portuguese, L. Dismánová. In the case of all of the other literary works translated from Czech into Portuguese, whether directly or indirectly, the translator seems to have exhausted his/her resources in one solitary contribution.

Drawing on Gambier, Ringmar (2007: 7) conveniently relates the significance of indirect translations to censorship and ideology:

Furthermore, ITr may be used as a means to control the contents of the TT, e.g. for political or religious reasons. This aspect is likely to have played a role in the frequent use of Russian as a

---

<sup>60</sup> A small Portuguese publisher (Bizâncio) intended to translate a book by V. Havel (*Prosím stručně* [Be Brief Please]) via French at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (2007), although Havel’s translator into Portuguese is Czech and has lived in Lisbon since 1989. Anna de Almeida (2007-10-03, personal communication).

ML in the former Soviet Union (Eastern bloc), as Gambier (2003: 59) points out (in connection with translation into Estonian in Soviet times): “Russian being thus, effectively, a relay language and the language of censorship.”<sup>61</sup>

While the Czech literary system did not use Russian as a mediating language (ML) for Portuguese (or any other ML, for that matter), the Portuguese literary system used French (followed by German and English – in that order!). French, however, is not likely to have acted as a language of censorship. Since France was neither fascist nor communist, but largely free and democratic (with the exception of the years of the German occupation, 1940-44), French was the ‘mediating’ language in the most genuine sense, that is not only *de préférence*, but also *par excellence*.

Ringmar’s claim, however, is more general and thus unassailable (2007: 1): ‘ITr also highlights the power relations between cultures/languages, in so far that the mediating language is, as a rule, a dominant language, whereas the TL is dominated.’

Setting aside the various possible definitions of ‘dominant’ and ‘dominated’, French is certainly one of the large world languages, although its status is not the same everywhere. The French of France has an altogether different *cachet* to it than the French of Belgium<sup>62</sup>, for instance.

One of Ringmar’s main and repeated points (2007: 1, 7, 8) is that the ‘paratextual claims of direct translation cannot always be trusted and bibliographies tend to repeat these claims, whether true or not’, but he suggests a solution: ‘obvious traces of a mediating text [consist] in measurements and other culture-related phenomena, (transliterated) names etc.’ (2007: 8). Paratexts are discussed separately (see subchapter 1.6), while the issues revolving around the excavation of Portuguese texts are dealt with in Chapter 4.

Direct translations from Czech into Portuguese amount to a total of four books in the course of the entire 20<sup>th</sup> century, with all of them published in or after 1989. Ringmar (2007: 9) suggests: ‘At times when direct translations have become a realistic option, any unmediated translation is likely to state its directness explicitly.’

Once again, this is a matter of the *degree* of ‘explicitness’. The very first of these books, B. Hrabal’s *I Served the King of England* (*Eu que servi o rei de Inglaterra*, Porto 1989; translated by L. Dismánová and M. Gomes) appeared with a preface by Jorge Listopad, a well-known Czech poet and playwright living in Portugal (see Chapter 4).

The second of these books, a volume of three plays by V. Havel, *Audience, Unveiling, Protest* (*Audiência, Vernissage e Petição*, Lisbon 1990; translated by A. de Almeida and J. V. de Almeida) had a preface by Havel himself (though it was not written specifically for the Portuguese edition).

Apart from these two prefaces, none of the four books draws any particular attention to the fact that it is a direct translation from Czech (except, of course, in the colophon, i.e.

---

<sup>61</sup> The (former) Soviet Union and ‘the Eastern bloc’ must not, of course, be equated. While they coincide in the case of Estonia, Czechoslovakia, for instance, was part of ‘the Eastern bloc’, but not the U.S.S.R., whereas e.g. Tajikistan was part of the Soviet Union, but not ‘the Eastern bloc’, as that term was used to refer to the Eastern ‘half’ of Europe.

<sup>62</sup> For the investigation of Portuguese translations of francophone Belgian literature, see Lusseau 1996.

in the ‘cataloguing in publication’ data). On the other hand, none of these books is a new (i.e. second) translation of the Czech original into Portuguese, so none needs to be distinguished from a previous version.

Be that as it may, the failure to state their directness explicitly is symptomatic of the Portuguese literary system’s tolerance towards indirect translations, at least from Czech. As with non-translation (see below), what is missing (absent) is more significant than what is there (present).

Ringmar’s conclusion highlights again the inherent power forces at work (2007: 11-12):

If we assume, for good reasons it seems, that there is a correlation between dominating languages and ‘domesticating translation’ – witness the famous French ‘belles infidèles’ in the eighteenth century (for English today, cf. Venuti 1995: 17 and *passim*) – this will lead to a paradox: on the one hand, the MT is always a (or *the*) dominating language, whereas on the other hand a dominating language is a questionable choice as MT (if adequacy is still aimed at).

Of course, this is no hard and fast rule, but rather the most common of cases. During the Czech National Revival in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, for instance, indirect translations were often made via Polish (then a semi-peripheral language) (Levý 1957/1996: 78). The *ideological* justification of this procedure consisted in avoiding German as a mediating language and culture (with Czechs and Slovaks having been exposed to it incessantly under the Habsburg Monarchy for over three hundred years) and in presenting the Poles as the Slavic brothers of Czechs and Slovaks, fellow sufferers and fellow campaigners against German (linguistic) oppression.

From all of the above, it is probably safe to assume that Toury’s contribution to the issue of ‘indirect translation’ from a theoretical (systemic) point of view has been greatest to date (cf. Shuttleworth & Cowie 1999: 76). Toury (1995: 130) asserts:

As a culturally relevant phenomenon, second-hand translation forms much more than a mere *legitimate* object for research [...]. In fact, the claim should be even stronger. I would go so far as to argue that no *historically* oriented study of a culture where indirect translation was practiced with any regularity can afford to ignore this phenomenon and fail to examine what it stands for. (emphasis in original)

Indirect translations were extremely common in the Portuguese *Estado Novo*, not only from Czech (see e.g. Seruya 2004: 37), and French was the mediating culture of choice (see e.g. Rundle & Sturge 2010: 6). It is therefore a phenomenon that this thesis must address.

Toury (1995: 134), however, acknowledges the ‘inherent difficulty here, in terms of *corpus construction*’ (emphasis in original): ‘The more significant the role of intermediate translation, the more severe the problems involved in establishing the body of texts that should be taken into account.’

Perhaps one of the reasons why indirect translations are not a favourite academic topic consists precisely in the difficulty of establishing the appropriate body of texts. It is one of our key claims here that in studying indirect translations, **it is perfectly legitimate to do without the mediating texts**. It is a matter of delimiting one’s research territory, of *operationalisation*, of posing and attempting to answer researchable questions.



Including the *mediating texts* (MTs) would be likely to produce more (*micro-*) *textual* results. But that is expressly *not* the primary aim of this thesis. Rather, the research question examined here is: **‘What was the Portuguese reader’s impression of Czech literature, given that s/he did not read foreign languages?’**

The proviso is added for the reason recognised also by Toury (1995: 139): ‘introducing Shakespeare to Hebrew literature (rather than to the Hebrew reader, who grew increasingly adept at reading his works in translations into other languages)’, an observation which applied to the Portuguese cultural élite (especially in large cities) as well.

To reformulate the above research question, analysing **‘the presence of Czech literature translated into Portuguese on the Portuguese (book) market’** is a relevant issue (culturally, historically and for Translation Studies), **worthy of investigation in itself.**

The focus here is not on (micro-) textual shifts, translators’ inadequacies (e.g. loss of humorous allusions, cf. Štěpánková 2009), untranslatable culture-specific items (‘*realia*’), explicitations, stylistic attenuations and intensifications, etc. These procedures and their outcomes are doubtless interesting in themselves, but ‘unfortunately these hardly accumulate to generate generalized knowledge which could transcend the details with which they are preoccupied’ (Even-Zohar 1990: 53).

Geared towards ‘moving from observable phenomena to underlying factors’ (Toury 1995: 130) and ‘formulating and investigating repetitive patterns and regularities’ (Even-Zohar 2004: 54), it seems more useful to consider the corpus (see Chapter 4) as a whole and to seek differences and similarities (within the corpus and with related translations), rather than to focus on a particular case and investigate it exhaustively.

This theoretical rationale is further supported by the *inoperability* of an alternative approach. As Toury (1995: 134) remarks:

To begin with, one of the implications of the obscured borderline between ‘originals’ and ‘non-originals’ has been the fact that many translations, mediated as well as direct, still defy identification [...]. To compound the problem, some of the names given there are mistaken.

Indeed, the body of Portuguese translations of Czech literature, while not necessarily concealing the fact of being indirect translations<sup>63</sup>, constitute a very disorderly corpus. Under the ‘original title’ or ‘title of the original edition’ (pt. ‘*título original*’ or ‘*título da edição original*’), we find the title of the original Czech text in some books, and the title of the source (i.e. mediating) text in others. However, that is the extent of the information provided. Other data about the source text edition (apart from its title) are given extremely rarely, and almost always only after 1974, when Portugal extricated itself from the dictatorial yoke of the *Estado Novo* and embarked on its path to democracy.

---

<sup>63</sup> After all, there were no Portuguese translators able to translate from Czech directly. The fact that translations of Czech literature into the Portuguese language were made *at all* speaks in favour of the quality and significance of Czech literature in general, and its relevance for the Portuguese letters in particular.

In Toury's words (Toury 1995: 133), 'the *text* which had actually been translated was often not specified' (emphasis in original), thereby making it well-nigh impossible to locate it with any certainty.

One of the effects of these procedures was that 'translations which were in fact *fragmentary* were often presented as being complete' (Toury 1995: 133), as was the case of the Portuguese *Švejk* (see subchapter 4.3).

Under such circumstances, Toury (1995: 134) puts forward a recommendation:

In many cases, the only practicable way out would be to contextualize the individual figures involved in the act – translators, writers, editors, and the like: where they lived, what kind of education they had, which languages can be ruled out for such persons under such circumstances, how likely they were to encounter certain texts rather than others in their immediate vicinity, and so on. On the basis of information of this kind, texts which in all likelihood could *not* have been translated from the ultimate original would be tentatively marked as 'mediated translations'. The next step, establishing their immediate sources, will often be only *probabilistic*. (emphasis in original)

Unfortunately, under our circumstances, Toury's recommendation has proved *impracticable* – and not for lack of trying. The one-time Portuguese translators (see above, Ringmar's low book-per-translator ratio) of Czech literature could, for the most part, not even be identified, as they used pseudonyms and usually made their living in professions other than literary. The publishers ('editoras'), where they are not already extinct, are unable to provide any information (see 'corpus construction' in Chapter 2).

Should we see all of these difficulties and missing links in the concatenation of texts and data as invalidating our entire research project? Should we forgo completely the study of Portuguese translations of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal because much of the potentially relevant data is inaccessible? And should, as a consequence, the fate and fortunes of Czech literature in Portugal be utterly ignored?

### 1.3.3 Conclusion

Section V (Training and working conditions of translators), Article 14 (c) of the 'Translator's Charter' (approved by the Congress at Dubrovnik in 1963 and amended in Oslo on 9 July 1994) stipulates that 'as a general rule, a translation should be made from the original work, recourse being had to retranslation only where absolutely necessary'<sup>64</sup>.

This must be interpreted as reflecting a situation that needs to be addressed. Despite all prescriptive efforts (and contrary to much 'wishful thinking'), the discountenanced practice of indirect translations still persists – if not for political, it may be for economic reasons.

As with other cultural phenomena, indirect translations are only the tip of the iceberg. To expose the contours of the entire iceberg, a broader picture must be sketched out. Indirect translations are but one symptom of what could be designated as 'indirect

---

<sup>64</sup> Together with the Nairobi Declaration, it is downloadable from [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13089&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13089&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) (retrieved on 2011-02-20).

reception', i.e. reception through the lens of another culture. But like any lens, it distorts and misrepresents what it shows, appearances being doubly deceptive here.

In his article<sup>65</sup>, O. Vimr investigates the work of Hugo Kosterka (1867-1956), a Czech post-office bureaucrat and 'polyglot translating from a number of European languages including Portuguese, Spanish, French, English and Serbo-Croatian' (2006: 52) and the Scandinavian languages into Czech. Vimr's article begins in the time of the Czech National Revival (19<sup>th</sup> century), when the Lands of the Bohemian Crown were still part of the Habsburg Empire, and makes the following points:

German was commonly spoken and written side by side with Czech, resulting in (1) a reduced need of translation into Czech and (2) numerous second-hand translations using German as the most common and natural mediating language. (52)

German translations were available and read in Bohemia too. Kosterka's selection was based not on his personal knowledge of the Scandinavian literary context, but on his reading of the German translations and thus on the German reception. (53)

Czech readers would first learn about a particular book from its German translation and only then, in some cases, from the Czech translations, be it a first or second-hand translation. Although second-hand translations were very rare in the inter-war period, the prior knowledge of the German text made it necessary to translate and publish books bearing the expectation of the target-language reader in mind. (56)

Toury (1995: 133) concurs: 'a translation tended to be selected for translation into Hebrew precisely as any other text would; namely, on the basis of its position in the *mediating* system, with no regard for the position of its own original in the source literature' (emphasis in original). And elsewhere (135):

Whatever material was picked for transference therefore had to pass the test of proven recognition in and by the German culture. [...] To be sure, even in those rare cases where a text was translated from the non-German original, it was often the position of its *German* translation(s) in German culture which was crucial at least for its selection for translation.

With some hyperbole, we could say that the underlying cause of 'indirect reception' is a kind of 'envy' related to an 'inferiority complex' of (usually) 'smaller' or weaker LSCs, i.e. the fear of being inferior to other literary systems if 'we' do not have what 'the other' (neighbouring, stronger) literary systems do. Compare Even-Zohar's observation (1997: 378-9)<sup>66</sup>: 'In such cases, the simple principle of "why don't we have what our neighbor has already got" is set in motion.' As such, it is a form of self-imposed 'colonisation': the receiving (weaker) LSC models itself, to a certain extent at least, on the dominant culture – not only on the cultural plane, but more often than not on other planes as well (political, economic, etc.)<sup>67</sup>.

<sup>65</sup> O. Vimr (2006) 'When the Iron Curtain Falls: Scandinavian-Czech Translation 1890-1950', *RiLUnE*, n.º 4, 2006, pp. 51-62.

<sup>66</sup> EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. 1997. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer." *Target*, 9 (2), 1997, pp. 373-381. Electronically available from: [http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers/papers/rep\\_trns.htm](http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers/papers/rep_trns.htm) (retrieved on 2011-04-09).

<sup>67</sup> The example most easily springing to mind is the influence of 'Hollywood' on worldwide film-making. It may, of course, be only an indirect influence, which the film-maker (or the entire film industry of a country, e.g. France, *nota bene* only to a certain extent) may choose to ridicule, challenge or even ignore. But its presence, and even more conspicuously so when it is being opposed or denied, is indisputable nonetheless. The worldwide influence of the U.S.A., stronger in some places, weaker in others, is the best example of a kind of influence which is far from being restricted to the cultural (film-making) domain (cf. the quote about Murakami at the beginning of this subchapter).

Indirect reception is, in fact, closely related to the concept of ‘world literature’ (and the canon). This concept (see subchapter 1.5) is by no means universal and is far from enjoying a worldwide consensus. Its most intrinsic paradox consists in the fact that different nations have different definitions of what ‘world literature’ *is* and what it contains (i.e. the intension and extension of the term). If anything, it is a form of ‘inter-subjective compromise’.

Consequently, if different nations have rather different conceptions of ‘world literature’, then ‘borrowing’ another culture’s models may prove more problematic than attempting to create one’s own (see also Ringmar 2007: 12, quotation above).

Indirect translations, as the epitome of indirect reception, are thus an exacerbated form of ‘what gets lost in translation’. Not because of a translator’s incompetence (subjective factor), but in principle and inevitably, encompassing the target culture’s concept of translation as such (cultural factor).

## 1.4 Non-translation

There can only be nothing if there is no one to contemplate it.  
Thales, quoted in F. Close (2009: 5)<sup>68</sup>

### 1.4.1 Definition

Venturing into this *terra incognita* may seem rather foolhardy, but that makes it all the more thrilling. Non-translation, the reverse side of the ‘choice of texts to be translated’ (Toury’s *preliminary norm: translation policy*, 1995: 58), is, nevertheless, part and parcel of the cultural context of translation, as inseparable from its more familiar opposite as the far side of the Moon. Let us begin by asking what ‘non-translation’ is *not*.

Abstracting away from value judgments, ‘**translation by omission**’ (TBO) is a working procedure (*modus operandi*) on the micro- or macro-stylistic level whereby a portion of a text is left out. The reasons for omission can be various (down to such basic factors as a translator’s inattentiveness). The person responsible for the omission may be the translator, but also a copy editor, proof-reader, publisher, censor, etc.

On the other hand, ‘**zero translation**’ is a procedure whereby a translator decides to keep an original portion of a text unchanged (untranslated) in the target text. In Newmark’s (1988) translation procedures, this technique is called ‘transference’ (e.g. ‘baccalauréat’) at word level. Vinay & Darbelnet (1958) speak of ‘emprunt’ or loan-words (e.g. know-how, soundtrack) – again only at word level (cf. *Bye-bye, Lehrstück*).

The term ‘non-translation’ has also been used in the sense of ‘original work’, be it in the source or in the target culture (Pym 1998: 79ff. *et passim*). ‘Non-translation’ in that sense is a countable noun pointing to existing texts that have not been translated

---

<sup>68</sup> F. Close (2009) *Nothing: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: OUP.

(originals = non-translations). *Non-translation* in the present thesis (courtesy of J. F. Duarte 2000, see below) is an uncountable noun and points to the non-existence of source-culture texts in the target culture (in translation).

Only if a whole text (short story, novel, play, etc.) is not translated do we speak of ‘**non-translation**’ proper. If a source text is *conspicuous by its absence* in the target culture (in a ‘niche’ it would otherwise be likely to fill), we should inquire into the reasons behind its ‘non-translation’.

When discussing the concept of non-translation, its potentially axiological dimension must be acknowledged. Asking what is *not* translated from a given language (or culture) leads inevitably to the question: ‘Out of what set of texts?’. In at least one sense, then, the term is closely related to that of ‘the canon’ (see subchapter 1.5). The target-oriented approach suggests, in fact, that ‘the canon of the source culture’ may be entirely irrelevant to the target culture in question. Still, instead of dismissing the matter outright because of its potentially axiological dimension, we should first submit it to more detailed scrutiny.

Hypothesising that the canon of Czech literature was of *no relevance* to Portugal, we can pose the following research questions: What were the likely reasons behind this fact if at the same time it can be argued that the canon of Czech literature had at least *some relevance* in other cultures (e.g. German, French, or English)? If the receiving culture chooses to translate some texts while disregarding others, what are its motives for translating what it does, *and what are the likely reasons behind not translating what it does not?*

In Toury’s words (1995: 59), ‘what one is after is (more or less cogent) *explanatory hypotheses*, not necessarily “true-to-life” accounts, which one can never be sure of anyway’ (emphasis in original).

## 1.4.2 Review of Literature

The phenomenon of *non-translation*, accounted for most meticulously by J. Ferreira Duarte (2000)<sup>69</sup>, has been dealt with tangentially or directly by several translation scholars, who either bring its circumstances to light or provide illuminating examples. The following is not an exhaustive list, but again a judicious selection of the most relevant contributions to the subject matter with respect to our ends.

Most of the scholars quoted below acknowledge the implicit relationship of ideology (power, politics) and non-translation. By affecting translations (in effect, *the translation industry* as a subsystem of culture, here: literature), ideology ‘produces’ non-translation as its concomitant.

With regard to rewriting as a tool of ideology, R. Álvarez & M. Carmen-África Vidal (in *eidem*: 5) look still at the seamy side of the phenomenon, highlighting the fact that agents other than the translator may be behind the decision on what gets translated:

---

<sup>69</sup> DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2000. ‘The Politics of Non-Translation: A Case Study in Anglo-Portuguese Relations’. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 13, n° 1, 2000, pp. 95-112. <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2000/v13/n1/037395ar.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-03-04).

[T]he importance of knowing what is being rewritten and how it is rewritten stands out (**what is translated; what is included in literary anthologies; what is taught in the history of literature**), insofar as the idea that the non-professional reader of a given culture will form will be that provided **by literary critics, translators and compilers**. (emphasis added)

This formulation, drawing obviously as it does on Lefevere (1992, *passim*), reminds us yet again that Translation Studies encompasses far more than the interaction between languages (albeit as *paroles*), or the source (and mediating) and target texts. Even if we add the dimension of agency, in the person of the translator, the potential of Translation Studies is still far from exhausted. Instead, a much broader context is a *conditio sine qua non* if we wish to make a plausible and cogent study of the sociosemiotic phenomena in our field of enquiry.

The ideological dimension of non-translation is reiterated by several authors. While not using the term ‘non-translation’ explicitly, L. Venuti (1998: 67) is specific enough, linking the phenomenon with the establishment of ‘target culture canons of the source culture’:

Translation wields enormous power in constructing representations of foreign cultures. **The selection of foreign texts and the development of translation strategies can establish peculiarly domestic canons for foreign literatures**, canons that conform to domestic aesthetic values and therefore reveal exclusions and admissions, centres and peripheries that deviate from those current in the foreign language. [...] Translation [...] inevitably domesticates foreign texts, inscribing them with linguistic and cultural values that are intelligible to specific domestic constituencies. **This process of inscription [...] is initiated by the very choice of a foreign text to translate, always an exclusion of other foreign texts and literatures**, which answers to particular domestic interests. (emphasis added)

Compare, in this context, the above observation on the ‘peculiar canon’ of translations from Icelandic and Korean into Czech in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century (subchapter 1.2). A case in point is the translation of Czech literature into English depicted by M. Woods (2000: 166):

The paucity of translation of Czech writers into English has effected a narrow conception of Czech literature, one limited to within the parameters of ‘the four major writers it has produced since the Second World War’ – Havel, Kundera, Klíma and Škvorecký (Curtis, 1991: 18). The fallacy that these are the only major Czech writers since World War II and that only Kafka and *The Good Soldier Švejk* (1921-2) are what came before is perpetuated by the lack of translation. The four mentioned above are the only widely translated Czech authors currently in print in British editions (there is a wider publication history of Czech literature in the United States); **the availability of translations, rather than the quality of Czech post-war prose, is the creating factor in the canon as seen by British eyes**. (emphasis added)

O. Vimr (2006: 60), speaking of translations from Scandinavian languages into Czech and considering their position in Czechoslovakia in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, comments along analogous lines: ‘The strict Nordic attitude and their criticism of the regime installed in Czechoslovakia stopped the translation and publication of Scandinavian literature in Czech.’ And elsewhere (Vimr 2009: 146):

**The selection criteria were defined politically** on a supranational level. [...] **Aesthetic qualities being irrelevant**, the literary work was supposed to express a positive attitude to work and to the situation of the time. [...] A negative remark concerning the Soviet Union made by the author of the original or by important persons of the cultural and/or political life in the source-

text country **rendered the author and/or a group of authors untranslatable into Czech, no matter what the literary work was actually about.** (emphasis added)<sup>70</sup>

L. van Doorslaer, in his article ‘Source-nation- or Source-language-based Censorship? The (Non-)translation of Serial Stories in Flemish Newspapers (1844-1899) (in D. Merkle et al. 2010: 73)<sup>71</sup>, explicitly uses the term ‘non-translation’, linking it with political ideology:

Decisions on the translation or **non-translation** of literary texts seem to be taken in line with the **political or ideological predilection** of the newspaper. Consequently these choices can be seen as an act that “blocks, manipulates and controls the establishment of cross-cultural communication” (Billiani 2006: 3) through pre-textual, prior censorship or “**cultural blockage**” (Greenblatt’s model used in Wolf 2002: 47-48, bold emphasis added).

As a consequence, when exploring the impact of ideology on translated literature, **to examine only what *has* been translated is certain to result in a highly distorted picture of the area under investigation.**

Toury and Sturge offer illustrative examples. Apart from the above quote (Sturge 1999: 121 on the blanket ban on translations from English in the *Third Reich* after the onset of the war, see subchapter 1.2), K. Sturge (1999: 120) adds another nuance to the phenomenon of non-translation, widening its scope to include the very unavailability of books (here: translations): ‘Control was thus largely invisible to the reading public because it worked via the (non)availability of books for sale and in libraries.’

The atrocity of Nazi crimes effected yet another instance of non-translation, this time in the opposite direction, i.e. *from German*, described by Toury (1995: 144): ‘Between the 1930s and the 1960s translation of German literature came to a virtual standstill, as an unofficial censorial reaction to the horrors of the Nazi regime.’

Finally, discussing indirect translations via German and Russian into Hebrew, Toury (1995: 138) reports ‘the failure to introduce Shakespeare’s writing into Hebrew literature in any significant way, in spite of the primary position that many of his translations enjoyed in the mediating systems – German, and later on Russian.’ For the intricate causes and effects of this instance of non-translation, see Toury (1995: 138-9).

Including ‘objects that are epistemologically identifiable as being empirically absent’ (2000: 111), what J. Ferreira Duarte’s ‘case study shows first and foremost is that not only translated *texts* are constrained by recipient agendas ideological or other; domestication may result in a highly symptomatic *absence of texts*’ (106).

Discussing Toury’s target-orientedness, Duarte (2000: 96) reminds us that a true epistemological break in the discipline makes it possible to uncover new objects of knowledge ‘that simply were not available as long as it was assumed that the co-

---

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Špírk (in Seruya – Moniz 2008: 221): ‘Heinrich Böll came out publicly against the invasion, as he was – by coincidence – lodged directly on the Wenceslas Square in the centre of Prague in August 1968 when Soviet tanks entered Prague to stay for more than two decades. Böll entitled his report symptomatically: “Der Panzer zielte auf Kafka” [The tank aimed at Kafka]. Evidently, after the publication of that report, Böll’s name automatically entered the black list of forbidden authors.’

<sup>71</sup> D. Merkle, C. O’Sullivan, L. van Doorslaer & M. Wolf (eds.). 2010. *The Power of the Pen: Translation & Censorship in Nineteenth-century Europe*. Wien, Berlin: LIT. ISBN 978-3643501769.

presence of two comparable texts (languages) was the Alpha and Omega of the study of translation.’

Doing justice to this claim, Duarte proposes a typology on non-translation categories, ‘in its different guises both textual and cultural’ (*ibid.*). He distinguishes seven categories, which all deserve closer scrutiny.

1. **Omission**, or what Toury (1995: 82) calls ‘zero replacement’ (see above, TBO): ‘the legitimacy of which as a translation solution was often neglected due to the prescriptive attitude once common among scholars’ (Duarte 2000: 96).

One might add that where omission is indeed legitimate, the *linguistic* approach alone, while it may identify this procedure, can hardly explain the reasons behind it.

2. **Repetition** (or what has been called ‘zero translation’ above – obviously, the terminology here still has some teething problems), i.e. borrowings and loanwords ‘carried over unchanged’ into the target text(s).

Although both of these procedures concern rather lower-order units, Duarte (2000: 97) point to the fact that there is an entire ‘history of non-translated transfers from central, prestigious languages into peripheral languages owing to cultural, economic or political ascendancy’ (for an example, see *ibid.*)

3. **Language closeness**, ‘the structural proximity of two languages works, at least in part, as an otherwise unexpected obstacle to translation’ (*ibid.*), Duarte’s example is the Portuguese reception of literatures in Spanish.
4. **Bilingualism**, drawing on J. Lambert (1995: 105), Duarte mentions the bi- (multi-) lingual situation in Belgium.

The situation of Czech and Slovak seems *prima facie* to belong to ‘language closeness’. However, with the benefit of hindsight (Czechs and Slovaks have lived apart since 1993), Duarte’s fourth category must be considered as well if we are to describe the ‘Czechoslovak’ situation appropriately.

To refute the common ‘West European’ (in fact, non-Slavic) fallacy, Czech and Slovak (both West Slavic languages) are languages arguably as distinct from each other as Portuguese and Spanish (both Western Romance languages), or German and Dutch (both West Germanic languages). The reason they have grown closer than the other pairs is primarily political.

On the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918, Slovakia-to-be would have been apportioned to Hungary, as it geographically formed part of Transleithania. By an agreement between Czech and Slovak politicians, these two northernmost Slavic nations of the Habsburg Empire (cf. the South Slavic peoples, e.g. the Slovenes and the Croatians) decided to create a shared state in order to wield greater political leverage in the negotiations with the powers victorious in the First World War concerning the future parcelling out of (Central) Europe.



As a result of coexisting in one state for three-quarters of a century – a century that saw an unprecedented proliferation of the mass media – the two languages necessarily grew closer. Instead of celebrating the ‘diamond wedding anniversary’ together, the peaceful divorce of Czechs and Slovaks brought forth a new generation grappling with the intricacies of the other language, now obliged to learn it like any other (linguistically related) foreign language – ontogenetically, as it were, without the extant, but disappearing phylogenetic advantage. (This tendency is stronger in the Czech Republic where, among other differences, there are fewer TV programmes in Slovak than *vice versa*).

The above implies that the Czech-Slovak political situation resulted in (temporary) bilingualism, while the close structural similarity of the two languages remains, of course, beyond doubt.

5. Duarte’s next category is **cultural distance**, i.e. a situation in which ‘a highly canonical text or series of texts fail over a more or less lengthy period of time to be admitted into some target system for no other reason than cultural remoteness, which may stem from hostility or indifference and may lead to a dearth of experts able to tackle the translation’ (Duarte 2000: 98).

Alongside Duarte’s example, the rather surprising fact of a very late translation of the *Qur’an* into Portuguese (1978), considering the Arabic heritage on the Iberian Peninsula, the case of Georgian, as reported in *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (P. France, 2000: 200), seems representative of this category as well: ‘Very little Georgian literature has been translated into English, even though Georgian (first recorded in 430 CE) is one of the world’s oldest and richest literary languages, and has scores of medieval texts and many modern poets and prose writers whose importance and aesthetic merits are comparable with the best of the major European cultures.’ Again, political reasons played their part in this almost total ignorance of Georgian culture and literature in the West (*ibid.*)

6. **Institutionalised censorship**: ‘There is no shortage of historical evidence that points to the fact that non-translation is one of the many cultural consequences of the political institution of censorship, which, as we all know, is set up to prevent circulation of material that is felt to threaten official ideology.’ (*ibid.*)

It is questionable here in which category Luso-Czech relations belong. At first, historically, *cultural distance* is certain to have been the decisive factor. The Portuguese have long looked across the Atlantic Ocean, away from Europe, becoming as a consequence a major colonising power. The Czechs were preoccupied with their own Central European issues, whether religious (the Hussite wars, 1420-34, and their repercussions until the Battle of White Mountain in 1620 and beyond), or political (implied in their geographical position between the German-speaking peoples and the Russians). Despite an epoch-making meeting between Czech diplomats dispatched by the Bohemian Hussite king George of Kunštát and Poděbrady and the Portuguese king Afonso V, called ‘the African’, in 1466 (cf. Klíma 2007: 498-9), contacts between the two cultures were few and far between.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, which is the subject matter of this thesis, however, the situation changed, supplanting Duarte’s fifth category by his sixth. By adopting fascist models,

Portugal ideologically opposed Czechoslovakia, first as a democratic country, and subsequently after the Communist *coup d'état* of February 1948, with only very brief spells in between (see Chapter 3 for more details). Previous cultural distance was thus compounded by institutionalised censorship in Portugal, resulting in flagrant non-translation, as exemplified by the censorship files (see Chapter 4).

7. Finally, Duarte's last category is **ideological embargo**, wherein non-translation 'results from the clash of a community's system of values and some shattering political event'.

Apart from Toury's example of the 'unofficial censorial reaction to the horrors of the Nazi regime' by the Hebrew society (1995: 144, see above), an analogous reaction to Hitler's annexation of the Czech state and its renaming as the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (1939-45) could be witnessed in the first post-war years in Czechoslovakia.

Literature in German (Hrala 2002: 179-184) suffered from a different fact – in the official historiography, the Soviet army liberated Czechoslovakia from the German invaders (at least in 1945)<sup>72</sup>. Consequently, German was looked down on as the language of the invaders, of Hitler, of the Nazis. Paradoxically, these discriminatory practices were also applied on German-writing authors of Jewish descent, who had been the very victims of the foregoing period. Thus, the so-called "Prague German authors", F. Kafka, M. Brod, E. E. Kisch, F. Werfel and others, were excluded from the Ministry of Culture's publishing programs. (Špirk, in Seruya – Moniz 2008: 220)

In his case study, discussing the flagrant non-translation of Shakespeare into Portuguese from 1890 to 1899 following 'the British Ultimatum', Duarte (2000: 101-102) repeatedly emphasises the need to broaden our perspective beyond the texts if we are to plausibly account for various instances of non-translation:

In other words, in order to be able to account for this *prima facie* unexpected lack of Shakespeare translations, **we must temporarily leave the literary system and look at the broader arena of the social formation, in particular at the political events** that took place in 1890 and rocked Portuguese society to its foundations with long-lasting effects. (emphasis added)

And elsewhere (100-101) and even more explicitly, when discussing Portuguese translations of Shakespeare made by King Luis<sup>73</sup>:

Now, **if one looks for reasons why this happened, one will surely not find them in the target texts and their supposed fidelity**, although they were translated from the English originals and were not self-styled "imitations" or "adaptations" like so many before. Their importance lies rather with the translator himself, whose royal status sufficed to turn a translation fact into a political fact. (emphasis added)

Duarte's case study is by no means unique in the history of translations. Discussing French translations of Wagner's libretti, Pym (1998: 80-81) points out:

<sup>72</sup> In reality, West Bohemia (with its capital Pilsen) was liberated by the U. S. American army. Besides, the word 'liberated' in this context has been questioned many a time. For instance, Czechoslovakia was offered by the U.S.A., but hindered by the U.S.S.R., to implement the Marshall Plan in 1947.

<sup>73</sup> Dom Luis I ('King Luis or Lewis', 1838-1889), who ruled between 1861 and 1889 and whose cognomen was the Popular or the Good (*O Popular, O Bom* – by Eça de Queirós), translated Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in 1877, *The Merchant of Venice* (as *O Mercador de Veneza*) in 1879, *Richard III* (as *Ricardo III*) in 1880, and *Othello* (as *Otelo*) in 1885. (*Grande enciclopédia portuguesa e brasileira*, 1935-60, vol. 15, p. 578)

In fact, the first translations came relatively hot on the heels of the first German editions. But then a war got in the way in 1870-71; France lost; Wagner celebrated the defeat in a farce (*Une Capitulation*); the French were not amused, and no translation of Wagner was published in Paris between 1869 and 1879.

Here again, only the broad picture, and not the texts alone, can furnish a plausible explanation for the underlying reasons for non-translation.

### 1.4.3 Conclusion

The influence of politics (ideology) on the translation and *non-translation* of Czech literature into Portuguese is more than evident. As discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, the translations cluster quite conspicuously around the years of 1968 and 1989, following the events of the Prague Spring and the Velvet Revolution respectively – both *source-culture* events! – leaving vast lacunae before, after and in between.

Compare also Woods' comment on the translation of Czech literature into English (2006: 182): 'The only golden age of translation into English for Czech writers was the late 1960s and early 1970s, following the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.'

Surprisingly, perhaps, the Portuguese Carnation Revolution of 1974 appears to have opened no 'niches' (Toury's 'slots') for the reception of Czech literature. This is all the more surprising as Portugal, after 48 years of far-right dictatorship, was standing at a crossroads, pondering, for some time, whether to follow the example of the 'liberal' (i.e. again rather right-wing) Western democracies or the 'socialist' (left-wing) countries of Central and Eastern Europe – though naturally without the oppressive Soviet hammer and sickle.

Still more surprisingly, it was now (1978-88) Czechoslovakia that started to produce agitprops in the form of political pamphlets eulogising the contemporary communist regime, and destined quite clearly both for Portugal and its (former) colonies, especially Angola (see Chapter 3) – clear testimonies to the fact that the target culture does not always and exclusively pursue only its own aims, as if it existed in a vacuum of 'splendid isolation', but rather seems to inspect very closely what is happening around it (here: in the other culture) in order to seize potential opportunities.

The point here is that the idea of 'non-translation' is not necessarily linked to that of the 'canon', which would thereby render it axiological by nature. There is another relevant vantage point from which this subject can be considered, as illuminated by R. Merino & R. Rabadán (2002: 129-130):

The censorship records also give access to materials whose publication was not authorized, texts that were never published in Spain (*expediente 2790-68*; H. Robins). **These 'non-existent' texts reveal as much about the motives and criteria underlying the decisions of the Censorship Boards as the systematic comparison of TTs and STs**, particularly because they offer the possibility of checking the manuscript to identify topics and/or words that evaluators found unacceptable.' (emphasis added)

And indeed, as many as 23 books of Czech authorship (not only fiction) were banned in Portugal, almost half the number of the books translated (see Chapter 4). With such a

two-forked corpus, it seems to run counter to good academic practice to black out what might be inconvenient.

At the risk of appearing provocative, let us conclude this subchapter with J. Ferreira Duarte's laconic observation (2000: 106): 'Apparently, one does not even need a target text to do Translation Studies.'

## 1.5 The Canon and World Literature

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.  
**John 1:1 (King James Version)**

In the beginning was the word, and the word was at God, and God was the word.  
**John 1:1 (Wycliffe New Testament)**

In the beginning [before all time] was the Word (Christ), and the Word was with God, and the Word was  
 God Himself.  
**John 1:1 (Amplified Bible)<sup>74</sup>**

The first words translated using the new Glagolitic alphabet were: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (Delisle & Woodsworth 1995: 15, discussing the impact of Cyril's invention of the Glagolitic alphabet on Old Slavonic in the late 9<sup>th</sup> century)

Studies in literary translation employ both 'the canon' and 'world literature' as a matter of course. Few, however, go out of their way to define these terms adequately. In order to redress this imbalance, this subchapter takes a brief detour into the realm of literary studies, and more specifically, comparative literature. It will become clear that translations are instrumental not only in influencing the canon, but not infrequently in establishing it. Thus, although the definitions are partially borrowed from literary studies, the concept is central to Translation Studies as well.

### 1.5.1 Definition

In the wake of all the post-isms that permeate current literary theory (poststructuralism, postmodernism, postcolonialism, postcommunism, post-Marxism as well as gender studies, etc.), **what constitutes the canon** (of any literature) **has become a controversial issue**. Despite the risks that examining the issue of the canon involves (consisting first and foremost in its intrinsically normative nature, thereby inviting challenges to any one definition), its existence is indubitable, as testified to precisely by its normative effects upon the 'behaviour' of various agents and institutions in the literary system (publishers, designers of school textbooks, compilers of anthologies etc.). Nonetheless, we should point out that it is in no way our aim or intention to attempt to redefine the canon of *Czech* literature (cf. Chapter 4). Rather, we wish to discuss the 'canon' as a concept of literary studies pervasive also in studies on translations of literature and set it in relation to the concept of 'world literature'.

Even when intent on avoiding value judgments, we need a **frame of reference**. If texts were *not* translated, it begs the question of *out of what corpus* of texts? One answer may

<sup>74</sup> Quoted according to <http://bible.com/> (retrieved on 2011-03-21).

be: ‘out of texts that were considered for translation and subsequently disregarded’ (e.g. due to censorship). The investigation could then turn to the underlying causes of why these texts were disregarded? Provided the data is available, as is indeed the case in extant censorship files, the target culture’s approach toward translations may be understood more fully.

Another plausible answer may be: ‘out of texts that might have been expected to be translated’. Texts belonging to the source culture’s ‘canon’, i.e. the centre of its literary system, can reasonably be expected to be liable to be translated. If that sounds too source-culture-oriented, we can look at other cultures (non-source and non-target) for an Ariadne’s thread. The argument is all the more substantiated as we are dealing with indirect translations, i.e. indirect *reception*.

If we proceed from this point of departure we quickly come up against the concept of ‘**world literature**’. Assuming that works of a particular (source) literature are considered to possess ‘exemplary literary value’ (UNESCO 1972: i)<sup>75</sup>, they will also be regarded as ‘worthy of being translated’ (*ibid.*). With Seruya’s concept of ‘*intercultural literature in Portugal*’<sup>76</sup> and with Āurišin’s concept of ‘*interliterary processes*’ (see below), the canon may also be seen as being interlinked with world literature.

The rationale behind the introduction of this term into our discussion is the need for a deeper analysis of non-translation and indirect translations as they present themselves in the Portuguese reception of Czech literature. The term itself suggests that works of world literature are predisposed, as it were, to be translated, as they represent cultural (literary) goods worth ‘possessing’. Any ‘major’ culture, as the Portuguese with its intercontinental intersections doubtless is, is likely to want to possess humanity’s literary treasures, as exemplified by what is considered to belong to ‘world literature’.

World literature and canon, though fraught with semantic and connotative vagueness, should not be circumvented as simply inconvenient, as they are in fact of profound importance to the issues under discussion here. Instead, we believe that looking at these concepts from different perspectives and inquiring into their nature will better illuminate the points of departure of the present thesis, while providing a convenient link between some of the notions developed thus far.

Gillespie (2005: 7)<sup>77</sup>, dealing with the effects of translations into English on the formation of the English literary canon in the period from 1660 to 1790, defines canon as follows:

The relevant sense of ‘canon’ is simply ‘books maintained by opinion to be illustrious’. This is close to Johnson’s 1755 dictionary definition of ‘classick’, *adj.*, as ‘of the first order or rank’, and the term ‘classic’ is also used here.

---

<sup>75</sup> *Tentative list of representative works of world literature (recommended for translation)*. 1972. Paris: UNESCO. 85 pages. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000012/001229EB.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-03-22).

<sup>76</sup> Cf. <http://www.translatedliteratureportugal.org/eng/index.htm> (retrieved on 2011-03-17).

<sup>77</sup> GILLESPIE, Stuart. 2005. ‘Translation and Canon-Formation’. In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English Volume 3: 1660-1790*. Gillespie, Stuart & Hopkins, David (eds.) ISBN 9780199246229. Pp. 7-20.

This definition of ‘canon’ is markedly close to what is generally understood by ‘world literature’ (see below). By way of the centre-periphery metaphor, Even-Zohar (2004: 48) maintains that ‘the center of the whole polysystem is identical with the most prestigious canonized repertoire’.

Obviously, not only the system of literature within the polysystem of culture, but also the canon as the ‘central’ subsystem of literature is hierarchical by definition. Taking English literature as an example, Shakespeare, Milton, Donne, or Joyce occupy a position rather different from, say, Thomas Dekker, James Shirley, or Ambrose Philips. This can already be seen in the fact that to identify the former group, the last names suffice. To identify the latter, the first names must be added for disambiguation.

Even with the useful metaphor of centre and periphery, the canon remains a fuzzy notion with no clear-cut boundaries. The picture is made doubly unclear, as Even-Zohar (2004: 44) reminds us, by the fact that ‘with a polysystem one must not think in terms of *one* center and *one* periphery’.

The category of the canon will thus always remain elusive to a certain extent. This is because it changes not only over time (extensional definition), but in principle – a feature inherent in its hierarchical structure (intensional definition).

Like Viktor Shklovskij, Even-Zohar (2004: 46-47) links the canon’s hierarchical structure with the power relations in a culture:

[...] “canonized” would mean those norms and works (i.e., both models and products) which are accepted as legitimate by the dominant groups within the literary institution. On the other hand, “non-canonized” would mean those norms and products which are rejected by these groups as illegitimate and whose products are often forgotten in the long run by the community (unless they change their status). In this view, **canonicity is therefore no inherent feature of any activity on any level, but the outcome of power relations within a system.** (emphasis added)

To give an example, T. Seruya (2001: 213-214), discussing the canonicity of Stefan Zweig in both Austrian (or germanophone) and Portuguese (or lusophone) literature, reports that Zweig’s position within the two literary systems was for long considered to be one belonging to ‘literatura secundária ou menor, paraliteratura, infraliteratura, subliteratura, literatura de consumo, literatura de massa, literatura popular, literatura marginal ou literatura “kitsch”’<sup>78</sup>.

Even-Zohar (2004: 49) further asserts that the hierarchy of the canon is projected onto, or imposed upon, the system by extraneous factors (agents):

But there is nothing in the repertoire itself that is capable of determining which section of it can be (or become) canonized or not, just as the distinctions between "standard," "high," "vulgar," or "slang" in language are not determined by the language repertoire itself, but by the language system – i.e., the aggregate of factors operating in society involved with the production and consumption of lingual behavior.

J. Lambert (1995: 171) provides an illustrative example:

---

<sup>78</sup> ‘secondary or lesser (minor) literature, para-literature, infra-literature, sub-literature, consumerist literature, literature for the masses, popular literature, marginal literature or “kitsch” literature’ (Seruya 2001: 213-214).

It would be hard to find a better illustration of a translation strategy with *explicit* political goals than the translation of the “Décrets de la politique française” into the dialects of France in 1790. The standard national language was established in the heart of the nation and soon claimed exclusive status so that, during the French Revolution, a particular translation policy was instituted to achieve *political* goals, i.e. to unite a feudal population for a new principle.

One final remark from Gillespie (2005: 16) on the nature of the canon: ‘Canons by definition are public and not private constructs, and writers have always been well aware of the three-way relationship between their own work, the canon to which they aspire, and the public.’

Popovič, though rarely mentioning the word ‘canon’ explicitly, defines what he calls the ‘literary level (niveau) of translation’ as ‘the degree to which the contemporary literary canon has been mastered and further developed by the translator’ (1976: 14). On the one hand, this definition is admittedly didactic, but on the other it does show that translators have a say in the establishment and reconfiguration of canons.

## 1.5.2 Review of Literature

### 1.5.2.1 The Canon

Lefevre (1992: 2) emphasises the importance of looking beyond texts at the broader socio-cultural context when delving into the reasons behind the *canonisation* of texts or their wholesale rejection:

It is my contention that the process resulting in the acceptance or rejection, canonization or non-canonization of literary works is dominated not by vague, but by very concrete factors that are relatively easy to discern as soon as one decides to look for them, that is as soon as one eschews interpretation as the core of literary studies and begins to address issues such as power, ideology, institution, and manipulation.

We are reminded of the point made by Venuti (1998: 67), quoted above (under non-translation). Writing from the perspective of mediaeval studies and semiotics, S. Nergaard (2007: 40) links the choice of texts to be translated (the obverse side of *non-translation*) with their position in the *canon* and with the *paratexts* surrounding them (see also next chapter):

Analyzing translators’ choices of *what* to translate, we probably need to connect their choices to the dialectic of power inside the social and political situation in which they work. Is the text they translate already known? Is it already part of the canon? Do the philologists agree on the interpretation of the text? Are some forms of interpretation marginalized by a dominant cultural form of power? Are the translators working for an institution or for a “general” editor? Is the translators’ work considered prestigious or is it competing with the interpretation offered by the philologists? How is the paratextual material that surrounds translations organized? These and many more questions of this kind could be asked, and the **answers one gets probably offer a deeper understanding about the translation than if one had been concentrating on the comparison between the source text and target text focusing on the linguistic differences.** (bold emphasis added)

This ‘visit’ from mediaeval studies fits particularly well into our chapter on the canon. The classics – both ancient and mediaeval – have always been part of the canon,

sometimes even more so than the vernaculars, although their role within the canon was subject to constant re-evaluation, as demonstrated by Gillespie (2005: 7, 9):

The sway of the Latin and Greek literary heritage was so powerful in this period that English works rarely seemed “classics” unless their relation to it was a broadly imitative one, and the national literary canon can very easily be said to have embraced such writers as Cicero (known familiarly as “Tully”) or Horace. (7)

The only permanent thing about their place in the canon, it would seem, is the requirement to re-examine and reassess it; and in this process, translations can have, and can be shown to have had, a major role. (9)

The subjection of the canon not only to historical changes, but more precisely and more specifically to political and hence ideological changes, emerges from the joint article of M. Vrinat-Nikolov and K. Tchilingirova (2006: 26-27)<sup>79</sup>:

Ce que nous appelons le canon dans tous les domaines de la création artistique est un ensemble de règles, d'exigences et de tendances imposé avec l'avènement du régime communiste. [...] Ainsi, sur les lettres bulgares de cette période règne une esthétique politique qui très vite bipolarise la littérature en glorieuse ou décadente, en officielle ou interdite. Dans le dynamisme du processus littéraire, le modèle de création est dicté par la littérature soviétique. (26)

[...] Pendant la période stalinienne on fait souvent rééditer des traductions déjà existantes. Ce qui importe c'est de représenter les classiques, mais sous l'angle de l'idéologie en vigueur. (27)<sup>80</sup>

From a different, and more contemporary point of view, compare J. Lambert's (1991: 137)<sup>81</sup> comment:

[...] non-canonized literature is treated selectively. What is almost invariably excluded is: literature in “foreign languages”, translated literature (which, in some cultures and for certain types of readers, accounts for more than eighty percent of their reading matter), special types of traditional but isolated literature (dialect literature, literature of the provinces), oral traditions, other non-written literature (film, television, chanson), “literary life” in the sense of Eikhenbaum, and “readers’ literature”. As a matter of course, standard language and written language are recognized as norms; “new”, “original” literature is not excluded either; but the well-established literature of mass consumption (*vide* Agatha Christie, Kongsalik) is regarded as marginal. (Isn't it paradoxical that literature for the masses is marginal?)

The extreme relativity of the canon and of national literature is rooted in the history of these concepts. P. Löser (2001: 45)<sup>82</sup>, discussing cultures in translation and arguing in favour of an international literary history, calls to mind that nationhood and nationality are historical constructs:

<sup>79</sup> VRINAT-NIKOLOV Marie, TCHILINGIROVA Krassimira. 2006. ‘Création et diversification du canon littéraire bulgare (XIX<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles): entre tradition nationale et innovation par la traduction’. In *RiLUnE*, n.° 4, 2006, pp. 19-35.

<sup>80</sup> ‘What we call the canon in all domains of artistic creation is an aggregate of rules, requirements and tendencies imposed after the arrival of the communist regime. [...] Thus, Bulgarian literature is ruled over by political aesthetics that very quickly bipolarises literature into glorious and decadent, into official and banned. In the dynamism of the literary process, the model of creation is dictated by Soviet literature. [...] The Stalinist period has existing translations often reedited. What matters is to represent the classics, but from the angle of the ideology in power.’ (Vrinat-Nikolov & Tchilingirova 2006: 26-27).

<sup>81</sup> LAMBERT, José. 1991. ‘In Quest of Literary World Maps’. In *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*. KITTEL, Harald & FRANK, Armin Paul (eds.). Berlin: Erich Schmidt. ISBN 3503030158. Pp. 133-143.

<sup>82</sup> LÖSER, Philipp. 2001. ‘International Literary History: Cultures in Translation’. In *Histórias Literárias Comparadas*. Lisboa: Ed. Colibri / Centro de Literatura e Cultura Portuguesa e Brasileira, U.C.P., 2001, pp. 45-56.



Nationalism, as Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson and other historians of the processes of nation-building have observed, precedes the rise of a nation, and all emphatic claims to radical distinctness in language, character and culture are clearly functional in the construction rather than descriptive in the analysis of a nation. (see also Löser's footnote, *ibid.*)

S. Bassnett (in Bassnett & Lefevere 1998: 38) point to the historicity of the original, essential not only for Translation Studies but also for national literature:

Indeed, as has been so often demonstrated, the concept of the original is a product of Enlightenment thinking. It is a modern invention, belonging to a materialist age, and carries with it all kinds of commercial implications about translation, originality and textual ownership.

J. Lambert makes the same claim for 'language' (1991: 135) and 'national literature' (138):

Looking more closely, we recognize that the maps show only standard languages characterized by a written tradition. This is what makes our language maps so interesting in terms of ideology. They are based on a familiar tradition according to which a language needs to be well institutionalized in order to be recognized as such. [...] We are like those maps: In referring to "the languages", we refer to *canonized* languages. (135)

The paradigm of national literature is a paradigm of the nineteenth century, and this is precisely why it is based on historical revisionism. What cannot be accounted for by this paradigm has either been forgotten, excluded, or marginalized. This is why nations with no language of their own (Switzerland, Luxembourg, Belgium, etc.) are pushed into the literary periphery. Wherever political and linguistic borderlines do not coincide – and they never do – the principle of national literatures does not work. The maps of European literatures, past and present, look like a piece of Swiss cheese. (138)<sup>83</sup>

Adding to Gillespie's arguments regarding the importance of translations for the constitution of a national literary canon, J. Lambert (1991: 140) points to yet another instance in which translations can influence, indeed *create*, the canon: '[...] it might happen that a literary work is not recognized as such in the culture in which it originated whereas it is ranked among the master works in some other or later culture (imported or deported literature)'

History is full of such examples. Compare M. Kundera's chapter entitled 'Die Weltliteratur' in *Le Rideau* (2005: 50-51)<sup>84</sup>:

Et pourtant, toujours sous-estimé par ses compatriotes, Rabelais n'a jamais été mieux compris que par un Russe : Bakhtine; Dostoïevski que par un Français : Gide; Ibsen que par un Irlandais : G. B. Shaw; James Joyce que par un Autrichien : Hermann Broch [...]. Si les livres de Witold Gombrowicz et de Danilo Kis avaient dépendu uniquement du jugement de ceux qui connaissaient le polonais et le serbo-croate, leur radicale nouveauté esthétique n'aurait jamais été découverte.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>83</sup> It is perhaps no coincidence that J. Lambert quotes D. Āurišin as one of his sources. Lambert mentions Āurišin's *An Introduction to Literary Comparatistics*, published in Bratislava, and according to Lambert (1991: 143), in 1985. According to V. Āejková (in Koška 2002: 113), however, this monograph was published in 1984.

<sup>84</sup> KUNDERA, Milan. 2005. *Le Rideau*. Paris: Gallimard (English in 2007 as *The Curtain*, New York: HarperCollins).

<sup>85</sup> 'And yet Rabelais, ever undervalued by his compatriots, was never better understood than by a Russian, Bakhtin; Dostoyevsky than by a Frenchman, Gide; Ibsen than by an Irishman, Shaw; Joyce than by an Austrian, Broch. [...] If the books of Witold Gombrowicz and Danilo Kiš had depended solely on the judgment of people who read Polish or Serbo-Croatian, their radical aesthetic newness would never have

It would seem that in the wake of the emancipation of various minorities (ethnic, linguistic, religious, etc.) and even long-time subjugated majorities (women), literary values are changing from a vertical stratification (the ‘high’ vs. ‘low’ notions of Even-Zohar criticised by Tymoczko above) to a more horizontal distribution. Compare the following two comments by J. Lambert (1995: 170, 175)<sup>86</sup>:

Advertizing, magazines and even book publishing now refer to cinema and TV rather than to the traditional canon. That the more traditional channels of communication are being absorbed by new ones indicates that we have entered a new era of canonization: we are experiencing more “horizontal” than “vertical” canonization. (170)

The distance between canon formation around 1800 and at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, even within the realm of literary values, can be tested by means of the simple observation that today fashionable *literary* genres use many labels and categories that are common to TV audiences (thriller, romance, soap opera, science fiction, comic strip, etc.). (175)

A. Lefevere (1996)<sup>87</sup>, discussing the role of translations and anthologies in the constitution of canons, links the issues of ideology, censorship, non-translation and anthologies (see ‘paratexts’, subchapter 1.6) with the canon. Anthologies tend to be conservative, in terms of poetics, ideology and even the choice of cultures on which they base their selection (Lefevere 1996: 148):

The anthologies under discussion here are not only fundamentally conservative in terms of poetics, that is in terms of how they define (good) drama; they are equally conservative in terms of ideology. Not only does Marxism never really make it beyond the fringes, and if then, only in a much watered-down version, thoughtfully packaged by means of introductions and notes, but Ibsen’s *Ghosts*, arguably not the least important of his plays, is never included at all, undoubtedly on account of its subject matter. [...] they also tend to be conservative in that they favour two national traditions, the English, because that is the most obvious one for the readership aimed at, and the French, partially because, of the other national traditions, the French was the one that established itself first on the English stage, and partially because of the American fascination with things French and the peculiar identification of “high culture” with whatever is (or can be made to sound) French.

The prevalence of English translations from French is also noted by Gillespie (2005: 8 *et passim*). When speaking about agendas (*skopoi*, in fact) as concomitants of any human activity, we must not lose sight of the people behind them (Lefevere 1996: 140):

[...] learned tomes have been written, and continue to be written about canons and canon formation, without touching once on what I propose to discuss in what follows: the hidden makers of what to many people does indeed become a living canon, and their agendas, hidden or otherwise.

Lefevere (1996: 141) seeks to answer the key question of ‘on what authority the anthologist shoulders the burden of selection’:

---

been discovered.’ (Kundera 2005: 50-51, *Le Rideau*; 2008: 36-37, *The Curtain*, translated by Linda Asher).

<sup>86</sup> LAMBERT, José. 1995. ‘Translation, or the Canonization of Otherness’. In *Literaturkanon – Medienereignis – Kultureller Text: Formen interkultureller Kommunikation und Übersetzung*. POLTERMANN, Andreas, et al. Berlin: Erich Schmidt. ISBN 3503037276. Pp. 160-178.

<sup>87</sup> LEFEVERE, André. ‘Translation and Canon Formation: Nine Decades of Drama in the United States’. In ÁLVAREZ, Román & VIDAL, M. Carmen-África 1996: 138-155.

That answer is likely to be that the authority in question is not conferred by any muse or other vaguely angelic and allegorical figure, but rather by publishers trying to tap into what they think is likely to be a lucrative market.

Constraints (here: poetological) are subject to change in the course of time (Lefevere 1996: 139):

The fact that Homer and Virgil are now routinely translated into verse again is as good an indication as any of the much more important fact that these constraints are by no means eternal and unchangeable; rather, they, too, are subject to changes in the socio-cultural environment on which translations and their originals are produced.

Such mundane matters as ‘the number of pages the publisher is willing to invest in any given anthology’ also matter. Lefevere (1996: 145) notes:

[...] B.H. Clark’s *World Drama*, in two volumes, was published as the drama anthology to end all drama anthologies, not least because its publisher had obviously decided to allow for more choice by almost doubling the number of plays usually included.

Indeed, here as elsewhere, ‘not right nor wrong, but beliefs and attitudes determine the nature of translated discourse’ Lambert (1995: 169). Lefevere’s observation (1996: 149) on the didactic aims pursued by the compilers of anthologies reminds us of Popovič’s concept of ‘literary education’ (1976: 26-28):

The fact that the great majority of these anthologies were designed to serve as textbooks for classroom teaching goes a long way towards explaining the fundamental and tenacious conservatism underlying the selections, both in terms of ideology (no ethically objectionable or potentially subversive subject matter) and poetics (no, or definitely not too many, experimental plays whose presence might disturb the tax payers [...]).

The word ‘selections’ should already alert us to the phenomenon of non-translation, which is always involved both in the (general) selection of texts for translation and in the *canonising* selection of (translated) texts for anthologies, since they are one of the primary sources of the canon (‘higher-order metatexts, so to speak).

When Venuti (1995: 43) speaks of the canon, he refers to the establishment of a specific translation strategy (Toury’s *operational norms*, 1995: 58ff.)<sup>88</sup>, i.e. the domesticating, fluent, transparent *norm*, under which translation into English is now expected (and indeed, enjoined) to be made:

The following genealogy aims to trace the rise of fluency as a canon of English-language translation, showing how it achieved canonical status, interrogating its exclusionary effects on the canon of foreign literatures in English, and reconsidering the cultural and social values it excludes at home.

Here, although used in a different context, the term ‘canon’ retains its quintessential meaning of *centrality* to a system. It gradually becomes apparent that the concept of canon covers not only *which texts* are translated (and which are not) and *which parts of texts* are translated (as a result of ideological censorship, poetological expurgation, or

---

<sup>88</sup> Compare, in this context, Popovič’s definition of ‘translator’s poetics’ (1976: 15): ‘The poetic idiolect, a system of the translator’s expressive [i.e. stylistic] peculiarities seen from the angle of the current literary canon or of the standardized translational method. The elements of this system are individual qualities characteristic of the translator’s creative attitude.’

otherwise), but also *how* they should be received, i.e. translated and read. The ‘instruction for reception’ (Popovič 1976: 28) is reflected in the paratexts as well as in the translation strategy (Venuti 1995: 61, 67):

Fluency can be seen as a discursive strategy ideally suited to domesticating translation, capable not only of executing the ethnocentric violence of domestication, but also of concealing this violence by producing the effect of transparency, the illusion that this is not a translation, but the foreign text, in fact, the living thoughts of the foreign author [...]. Transparency results in a concealment of the cultural and social conditions of the translation – the aesthetic, class, and national ideologies linked to [...] translation theory and practice. (61)

It is important not to view such instances of domestication as simply inaccurate translations. **Canons of accuracy and fidelity are always locally defined, specific to different cultural formations at different historical moments.** (67, emphasis added)

Adaptation is a concomitant of domestication, as Gillespie (2005: 9) notes most perspicuously: ‘A reader who expected Pope’s *Imitations of Horace* to explain the meaning of the Latin would be sadly misguided. Such translations aimed not to “copy”, but to set a new stamp on their objects.’

Bowdlerisation is another by-product of domestication, affecting both first-time or marginal authors (see e.g. Kuhlwezak 1990<sup>89</sup> for the translation into English of Kundera’s first novel, *The Joke*) and highly canonical authors (Venuti 1995: 72, 97):

The very labour of suppression and sublimation involved in Tytler’s theory can be glimpsed in his willingness to risk compromising the canonicity of classical texts, admitting that they must be edited to fit his chastening, bourgeois readings of them. (72)

Lamb saw no contradiction between professing liberalism as a Whig politician and censoring canonical literary texts. (97)

The canon is admittedly a value-laden term, not an objective fact subsisting outside human society. But like ‘kitsch’ and other anthropological concepts (see above), it reflects an inter-subjective, socio-semiotic reality. And as such, we cannot pretend it does not exist. Its *normative power*, stronger in some cultures, weaker in others, stronger in some periods, weaker in others, is undeniable.

The rest of this subchapter considers the concept of world literature.

### 1.5.2.2 World Literature

Instead of repeating the well-known and well-worn lineage of world literature since J. W. Goethe, reiterated in most European comparative literature textbooks<sup>90</sup>, we shall take this opportunity to introduce another outstanding Slovak personality, the late Dionýz Ďurišin (1929-97). After all, this is not a study in comparative literature. Indeed, a comparative study of Czech and Portuguese literatures and their mutual ‘influences’ could not be farther from the intentions of this thesis. This digression into comparative literature is meant (i) to inquire into the concept of ‘world literature’ from a lesser-

<sup>89</sup> KUHIWCZAK, Piotr. 1990. ‘Translation as appropriation: The case of Milan Kundera’s *The Joke*’. In *Translation, History, Culture*. BASSNETT, Susan & LEFEVERE, André (eds.). London: Cassell. Pp. 118-130.

<sup>90</sup> See e.g. CORBINEAU-HOFFMANN, Angelika. 2004. *Einführung in die Komparatistik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).

known and potentially more enriching tradition, (ii) to present the inspiring results of Ďurišin and his international colleagues' investigation into this notion.

As with Popovič, political and language barriers have ensured that the scholarly endeavours of Ďurišin and his colleagues have remained relatively unknown in the West. Apart from the original Slovak editions, Ďurišin's monographs from 1966 to 2000 (posthumously)<sup>91</sup> appeared in German (Berlin 1972), English (Bratislava 1974, 1984, 1989), Hungarian (Budapest 1977), Russian (Moscow 1979), French (Brno 1999) and other languages. Moreover, several of his Slovak monographs are supplemented with summaries, usually several pages long, in Russian (1985, 1988), German (1985) and particularly French (1991a, 1991b, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1996). Finally, many of his articles were published in foreign languages, in both Eastern Europe and the West<sup>92</sup>.

If Ďurišin is virtually unknown in the West and all but forgotten even closer to home, the reason does not seem to be a lack of publications in Western or 'major' languages. What the above, rather impressive list shows instead is that publishing in foreign languages is not enough. The academic adage 'publish or perish' is only a half-truth.

Instead, apart from *what* is published and *in what languages*, it also matters *where* it is published (i.e. how available the publication is to world-wide readership), *whether that readership ever hears about it*, i.e. the issue of 'publicity', and *how many copies are printed* (i.e. whether it is available for distribution). For instance, Ďurišin's summarising, highly illuminating and bilingual *Teória medziliterárneho procesu I / Théorie du processus interlittéraire I* (Bratislava 1996) had a print-run of only 250 copies.

As with Popovič's *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (Edmonton, Canada 1976), the translations of Ďurišin's publications, at least into English, suffer from lexical or pragmalinguistic deficiencies, as best exemplified by the easily downloadable 'Artistic Translation in the Interliterary Process' (TTR 1991)<sup>93</sup>. The text as a whole testifies to the fact that a merely 'lexical' translation of such highly abstract scholarly works is unsatisfactory, no matter how good the translator's command of 'general' English may be.

Both Popovič and Ďurišin came up with new and highly idiosyncratic terminologies. To make their texts comprehensible to a Western readership, much more is needed than a translation *sensu stricto*. Two illustrative examples: Czech and Slovak translation theories speak, more often than not, of 'artistic translation'. This strikes a rather unusual note in academic discourse in English. Yet since the term denotes nothing more than 'literary translation' (or 'translation of literary texts' if we want to respect Toury's distinction, 1995: 166ff.), why confuse the English reader, starting with the title itself?

In the same article, Ďurišin (1991: 114ff.) speaks of 'translation dioecism and polyoecism'. In English, the term dioecism refers primarily, if not exclusively, to sexual

---

<sup>91</sup> The last one being a trilingual, Italian-French-Slovak, collection of articles by authors from several countries, published in Italy as *Il Mediterraneo: Una rete interletteraria* (Roma 2000). For selected bibliography of D. Ďurišin, including this book, see Bibliography.

<sup>92</sup> These and subsequent biographical and bibliographical data are taken from Koška (ed.) 2002.

<sup>93</sup> In *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 4, n.° 1, 1991, pp. 113-127.  
<http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/1991/v4/n1/037085ar.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-03-19).

reproduction in fungi, animal and plant systems<sup>94</sup>. What Ďurišin means, however, is that the author (and often self-translator) can feel, or even be, *at home* in two or more cultures at the same time, as s/he may be bi-, multilingual, and even ‘bi- or even *multiliteral*’ (another term used by both Popovič and Ďurišin meaning ‘well-versed, or at home, in two or more literatures’, e.g. Chinghiz Aitmatov or S. Beckett). The metaphor with dioecism is hardly obvious to an English-speaking reader.

The implication of the above is self-evident. The ideal translator of these innovative scholars would have to be fully conversant with the foreign (here: English) academic discourse in the respective discipline. In other words, Popovič would have to be translated by a bilingual translation scholar and Ďurišin by a bilingual comparative literature scholar. This should come as no surprise. Philosophical treatises, for instance, are often translated by other philosophers or, *faute de mieux*, by university teachers of philosophy. One can hardly imagine entrusting a ‘high street’ translation agency with the translation of M. Heidegger’s *Sein und Zeit*.

However, it must be acknowledged that this was rarely feasible in former Czechoslovakia (or most other places on both sides of the Iron Curtain, for that matter). Scholar-translators with a perfect command of the academic discourse in the discipline in both languages (here: Slovak and English) were so few and far between as to be virtually non-existent – a situation exacerbated by the fact that the discipline of Translation Studies, both in Czechoslovakia and worldwide, was still in its infancy. At the risk of stating the obvious, the reasons for this state of affairs used to be primarily political. Yet it still persists, albeit for different reasons. One is linguistic – few English native-speaker translation scholars are likely to have an adequate command of Slovak. Another is commercial – even if such a highly specialised, bilingual translator-scholar could be found, had the time (most improbable) and agreed to take on such a sophisticated and time-consuming job, who would pay for it? And, related to that, would the book sell?

Putting these deliberations aside, the contribution of Dionýz Ďurišin to the discipline of comparative literature and, more specifically, to the concept of ‘world literature’ are presented here in order to counteract, however modestly, the ignorance and misunderstanding unjustly surrounding his work.

For Ďurišin (1996: 75)<sup>95</sup>, ‘**world literature**’ is the final category of literary studies (or literary theory)<sup>96</sup>:

<sup>94</sup> Cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, s.v.

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/164131/dioecism> (retrieved on 2011-03-19).

<sup>95</sup> ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz. 1996. *Teória medziliterárneho procesu I / Théorie du processus interlittéraire I* [Theory of Interliterary Process I]. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV. Note that there was no ‘Theory of Interliterary Process II’. This bilingual book is highly recommendable. The French translation by A. Anetová, M. Kováčová and J. Teplan seems rather credible, as J. Teplan and especially A. Anetová translated several other books by Ďurišin and his team, such as the hexalogy *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá / Communautés interlittéraires spécifiques 1-6* (Bratislava 1987-1993).

<sup>96</sup> Ďurišin speaks of ‘literary science’ (just like Popovič speaks of ‘translation science’). Rather than intending to elevate their respective disciplines to the level of natural (nomothetic) sciences, the use of the noun ‘science’ and the adjective ‘scientific’ (as in ‘literary-scientific’, see Ďurišin’s aforementioned article in English) follows the usage of the word in Slovak (and Czech, as in German *Wissenschaft*, cf. *Translationswissenschaft, vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*). On the other hand, it must be admitted that both Popovič and Ďurišin are firmly convinced of laying the foundations of a true (if not outright

[World literature] is not a static category, but a highly flexible, live and constitutive component of literature and literary life. It is a historical and therefore variable phenomenon: it changes from epoch to epoch, from literature to literature, from reader to reader. The historicity of world literature is precisely the aspect of it which allows us to write literary history, i.e. to apply historical principles to literary creation from virtually the entire world. The history of literature without the generalisation of the interliterary process therefore has only a partial character.<sup>97</sup>

According to Ďurišin, there are three approaches which can be regarded as three levels on the path to forming the concept of world literature (*ibid.*):

- (a) the additive conception, putting individual works and national literature on a par;
- (b) the choice of the best authors and works;
- (c) literary phenomena in their mutual relations and contexts.

The **additive** approach is the easiest and most unambiguous, but it is also ‘marked by a mechanical principle of its composition, positing no internally unifying system, and it does not conceive of the history of world literature as an integrated whole’ (*ibid.*)<sup>98</sup>. Ďurišin asserts that this conception, juxtaposing national literatures, is the most common in preparing compendia of world literature (77).

The second principle is recognised as highly axiological (and therefore much more easily contestable), as it reflects the ‘**world classics**’, the ‘**canon** of world literature’. This is relevant for *teaching literature in schools* (cf. Popovič’s ‘literary education’, 1976: 26-28, or Lefevere’s various forms of rewriting) as well as for the publishing, editorial and popularisation practice (cf. Popovič’s praxeology, 1976: 5).

Ďurišin (1996: 77) points to the socio-cultural bias inherent in this approach:

The interpretation of authors or works is often subject to changes depending on various relations which influence the evaluation of a literary phenomenon. These may be, for instance, the social conditions of the evaluation, the type of culture, etc., i.e. agents which could be subsumed under the term of social-literary conventions.<sup>99</sup>

It is the **third** conception of world literature that Ďurišin (1996: 78-79) puts forward as a subject falling within the scope of comparative literature. This is because

[t]his conception does not unify the previous two in a mechanical way, but absorbs some of their properties, gives them their final shape, integrates and synthesises them. [...] The conception of

positivist) ‘science’, including an ‘exact’ terminology (nomenclature), rigorous methodology and sound theory (searching, e.g., for potentially replicable phenomena).

<sup>97</sup> Ďurišin (1996: 76). The original reads as follows: ‘[svetová literatúra] nie je meravou kategóriou, ale nanajvýš pružnou, živou a konštitutívnou zložkou literatúry a literárneho života. Je historickým a preto premenlivým javom: mení sa od epochy k epoche, od literatúry k literatúre, od čitateľa k čitateľovi. Historickosť svetovej literatúry je tou jej kategóriou, ktorá nám umožňuje písanie dejín literatúry, t.j. aplikáciu dejinných princípov na literárnu tvorbu prakticky celého sveta. História literatúry bez zovšeobecnenia medziliterárneho procesu má preto iba čiastkový charakter.’

<sup>98</sup> ‘[...] je podstatne poznamenaná mechanickým princípom výstavby, ktorý nepredpokladá vnútorne zjednocujúci systém a dejiny svetovej literatúry nechápe ako jednotný celok.’ (Ďurišin 1996: 76).

<sup>99</sup> ‘Výklad autorov či diel totiž často podlieha zmenám v závislosti od rozličných väzieb, ovplyvňujúcich hodnotenie literárneho javu. Je to napríklad spoločenská podmienenosť hodnotenia, kultúrny typ a pod., teda činitele, ktoré by sme mohli zahrnúť pod pojem spoločensko-literárnej konvencie.’ (Ďurišin 1996: 77).

world literature from the viewpoint of literary history is not only more comprehensive, but also more perfect, and the degree of the relativity of its cognitive value is lower.<sup>100</sup>

Thus conceived, Ďurišín (1996: 79) acknowledges, ‘an exhaustive and forever fixed definition of world literature is practically impossible, because if it existed, it would be a closed, and therefore dead, system’ (*ibid.*).<sup>101</sup>

What literary facts, then, belong to world literature? Ďurišín’s (1976: 79) answer is ‘those that exhibit mutual relations and connections and are, therefore, in a certain manner, genetically and typologically mutually conditioned and systemically contextualised’.<sup>102</sup>

Ďurišín, however, does not stop at distinguishing ‘individual (i.e. national) literatures’ and ‘world literature’, as many of his predecessors had done. Between a narrowly conceived, monolingual, national literature and the final ‘unit’ of world literature, there is the vast expanse of ‘interliterariness’, i.e. mutual ‘supranational’ interliterary relations and processes. The discovery of a new scholarly territory calls for a new nomenclature. In the case of Ďurišín and his team, this meant coining more than a hundred terms<sup>103</sup>. As far as our aims here are concerned, only the following three will be discussed: ‘specific interliterary communities’, ‘standard interliterary communities’ and ‘interliterary centrisms’ as units of the interliterary process leading, in ascending order, up to world literature.

Interliterary relations reflect the relations pertaining between phenomena beyond the boundaries of an individual literature (Ďurišín 1996: 73). In the course of history, groups of individual literatures developed of which a specific, typologically different principle of mutual interrelations, or other forms of interrelations in literary history are characteristic (Ďurišín 1996: 74). These ‘**specific interliterary communities**’ are mostly multiethnic or multilingual national literatures, such as the Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Montenegrin and Macedonian literatures of former Yugoslavia, or the Castilian, Catalan, Galician and Basque literatures of Spain.

Perhaps more illustrative is the example of Switzerland, whose literatures written in German, French and Italian belong to Swiss national literature and at the same time relate to, connect with and react to the literatures of Germany, France and Italy. A similar situation is observable in trilingual Belgium, with the Walloon and Flemish populations as well as the German minority, relating to France, the Netherlands and Germany respectively.

Ďurišín (1996: 74) describes these ‘specific interliterary communities’ as typologically inclined to belong to national literature as a unit of literary history, which, however,

<sup>100</sup> ‘Táto koncepcia však dve predchádzajúce nezjednocuje mechanicky, ale niektoré ich vlastnosti tvorivo absorbuje a dotvára, integruje a syntetizuje.’ [...] ‘Literárnohistorická koncepcia svetovej literatúry je takto nielen obsažnejšia, ale aj dokonalejšia a miera relatívosti jej poznávacej hodnoty menšia.’ (Ďurišín 1996: 78)

<sup>101</sup> ‘Vyčerpávajúca a navždy daná definícia svetovej literatúry fakticky nie je možná, pretože keby existovala, bola by uzavretým, a tým aj mŕtvym systémom.’ (Ďurišín 1996: 79).

<sup>102</sup> ‘Odpoveď znie: tie, ktoré vykazujú vzájomné vzťahy a súvislosti a sú teda istým spôsobom geneticky a typologicky navzájom podmienené a systémovo usúvzťažnené.’ (Ďurišín 1996: 79).

<sup>103</sup> Ďurišín (qtd. in Koška 2002: 13). See also *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá 6 / Communautés interlittéraires spécifiques 6* (Bratislava 1993).



does not mean that they fully identify with it. Research into this phenomenon is best reflected in the colossal six-volume project entitled *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá 1-6* [Specific Interliterary Communities 1-6] (Bratislava 1987-1993), in which Ďurišín brought together researchers from many countries.

‘**Standard interliterary communities**’, as an ancillary category between the individual (i.e. national literature) and the general (i.e. interliterariness or, by extrapolation, world literature), can be defined by ethnic factors (the communities of Slavic, Romance and Germanic literatures, for instance), geographic determinants (Central European, East European, West European, Nordic communities of national literatures), etc. (Ďurišín 1996: 74).

‘The administrative-political principle, and the ideational-artistic principle derived from it, allowed to distinguish, for instance, the community of former Soviet as well as socialist literatures, which in recent history formed a community of a specific type.’<sup>104</sup> Proceeding from other perspectives is also possible, e.g. the religious perspective (Muslim literatures), or the (post-) colonial perspective (e.g. Maghreb) (Ďurišín 1996: 75).

The designation ‘**interliterary centrism**’ is a working title. Its ‘etymology’ is derived from the fiercely criticised Eurocentrism, or rather West-Eurocentrism, or alternatively the broader, but still hegemonic, Euro-American centrism. Aiming to render his theory pluralistic and polycentric, Ďurišín (1996: 75) propounds the notion of *several* interliterary centrism, hypothesising a broad ‘supranational’ area corresponding to historical phenomena. The concept is intended to make it possible to classify certain literary regions according to characteristics of literary history and theoretical-methodological features, while concurrently renouncing a qualitative evaluation of the phenomena under scrutiny.

Examples from Europe include the interliterary centrism of the Balkan literatures, the interliterary centrism of Central European literatures (including Hungarian literature, which is non-Slavic), the interliterary centrism of Nordic literatures, and the interliterary centrism of Mediterranean literatures (including Greek, which is not a Romance language). As with the last mentioned, their intercontinental overlapping and relations are acknowledged, as demonstrated e.g. by the aforementioned trilingual 588-page *Il Mediterraneo: Una rete interletteraria* (Roma 2000) compiled in cooperation with Armando Gnisci.

By bridging the gap between national literatures and world literature, Ďurišín took a decisive step towards broadening the subject of comparative literature and historical poetics. When investigating these intermediary units, i.e. interliterary communities and centrism, Ďurišín emphasises both analogies and divergences. Phenomena contributing to the overall cohesion of an interliterary community exhibit a **convergent function**, the converse of which is the **divergent function**. Most often, however, interliterary

---

<sup>104</sup> ‘Administratívno-politický a z neho vyplývajúci ideovo-umelecký princíp dovoľoval rozlišovať napríklad spoločenstvo bývalých sovietskych, ako aj socialistických literatúr, ktoré v nedávnej minulosti tvorili spoločenstvo osobitného typu.’ (Ďurišín 1996: 74)

communities and centrisms display a **complementary function**, borrowing from and thereby enriching one another (Đurišin 1996: 18ff., 24).<sup>105</sup>

To sum up, Đurišin unequivocally rejects the concept of world literature as a mechanically additive sum or eclectic pantheon of the classics. Instead, world literature is the ultimate, but currently unattainable goal of comparative literature – the supreme phenomenon, a system of systems. Significantly, Đurišin conceives of world literature as a process, a historically variable phenomenon, both along the synchronic and the diachronic axes, by which literature in its entirety realises its purpose, its *raison d'être*, and its anthropological dimension (I. Pospíšil & M. Zelenka in Koška 2002: 77).

### 1.5.3 Conclusion

Taking John Dryden as the example *par excellence*, Gillespie (2005: 19) recognises three aspects in which translations are constitutive of canons:

Dryden's own translating activity has made him conceive differently of the literary canon, ancient as well as modern – of Chaucer's relation to Boccaccio, or Homer's to Virgil, or (another kind of example) of Chapman, earlier criticized by Dryden as a translator of Homer, but who in his 1700 Homeric excerpts proves a source of inspiration. Second, because Dryden's translations, in *Fables* and elsewhere, breathe life into earlier poets, they have a similar effect on other people's perceptions in turn, potentially leading to widespread reorientations in views of the poetic canon (Jabez Hughes, above, is but one early example). And finally, this greatest of English translators, "through his versions of Ovid, Homer, Chaucer, Lucretius, Juvenal, and Vergil, permanently changed the scope of English poetry itself" (Tomlinson 2003: 3). To take all these claims seriously is to entertain the notion that in this period the activity of translation is quite expressly the animating power in the English poetic tradition, and the decisive influence in canon-formation.

Indeed, the claim could be even stronger. To formulate it in a probabilistic law-like generalisation, in line with Toury's recommendation (1995: 265-267), it could be hypothesised that **'the more metatextual material exists on a literary work, the more canonical it is likely to be'**.

Plato and Kant are sometimes regarded as the two greatest philosophers of all time. The reason for such claims is not that, say, Aristotle or Heidegger came up with less interesting or less innovative ideas, concepts or systems. Rather, the reason seems to be that Plato and Kant have aroused so many stimulating discussions, that so many philosophers have drawn on them, have made their works their own points of departure, or have delimited their own philosophy in contradistinction to one of the two or both (indeed, agreement or opposition are secondary here). In other words, **Plato and Kant are so essential because their works have given rise to so many metatexts.**

A similar hypothesis appears likely to hold for literature. Shakespeare has been the icon of English literature because English drama (and European drama in general) is hardly conceivable today without him. Kafka wrote little and published even less himself, but a lifetime would hardly suffice to get through the countless tomes written about him and his work.

---

<sup>105</sup> Đurišin's complementary function is markedly close to Toury's reiterated 'filling a void' (cf. also Popovič's 'time in the text of translation', 1976: 18).

The above hypothesis lives up to established academic standards. It is verifiable, modifiable, and most importantly, refutable (falsifiable, K. Popper). Moreover, at the current level of our knowledge, it appears highly probable: 'Rewritings tend to play at least as important a part in the establishment of canonized works of literature as those works do themselves' (A. Lefevere in T. Hermans 1985: 231).

Canonicity is established and reinforced by anthologies and other forms of metatexts used as school and university textbooks. 'A canon becomes effective only when actively propagated through teaching.' (Lefevere 1985: 231, cf. also Lefevere 1996: 149, quoted above). Even-Zohar (2004: 47) concurs:

The tendency to view official culture as the only acceptable one in a given society has resulted in massive cultural compulsion affecting whole nations through a centralized educational machine and making it impossible even for students of culture to observe and appreciate the role of the dynamic tensions which operate within the culture for its efficient maintenance.

Developing his concept of 'literary education', Popovič (1976: 26-28) speaks of 'literary advertisement', 'tendentious transcription' (rewriting), as well as 'liquidational continuity (linking)', i.e. destructive procedures in metatextual communication (see also Popovič 1976: 34, 'destruction of text' and 'discarding of text').

To sum up, (i) the canon is a dynamic category varying throughout cultures and history; (ii) translations are instrumental in establishing and influencing canons; and (iii) other metatexts also appear to be of paramount importance for the establishment and reinforcement of canons.

Finally, the effects of politics upon literary processes and products, both in relation to the canon and to literature in general, should always be taken into account. Literature is dealt with and studied according to *geopolitical* criteria – whether it is divided into *national* literatures (corresponding to the political entities of states and countries), according to the *language* in which literary works are produced (with politically stratified centres and peripheries – see e.g. Lusseau 1996 for Belgian literature in French), or according to Đurišin's *interliterary communities* (e.g. Slavic, Central European, or even the literatures of the *socialist countries*).

Literature is treated according to political criteria not only spatially, but also temporally. With regard to Czech 20<sup>th</sup>-century literature, with which we are concerned here, textbooks, anthologies, encyclopaedias and other secondary sources tend, in their overwhelming majority, to divide it into the literature of the First Republic (1918-38), i.e. between the two world wars, the literature under the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (1939-45), followed by the two vicennia of 1948-68 (from the Communist *coup d'état* to the Prague Spring) and 1969-89 (from the beginning of the 'normalisation' until the Velvet Revolution).

In the case of 20<sup>th</sup>-century German literature, political criteria apply as well (literature of the Weimar Republic, the Third Reich, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany). The same can be said of Portuguese literature, and so on. And this makes perfect sense, precisely because the socio-cultural embedding of publishing, literary creation and meta-creation (particularly translation) is constitutive

for literature both figuratively (as one of its sources of inspiration) and practically (what can be published, in what form, with what content, under what conditions, etc.).

To conclude, attempts to eschew the concept of the *canon* in Translation Studies because it is inherently axiological (thus running counter to the researcher's supposedly purely descriptive methods) are revealed as insufficiently informed, or at best as wishful thinking. It is our contention here that if we can speak of literature, we can speak of the canon.

## 1.6 Paratexts

Alice was beginning to get very tired of sitting by her sister on the bank, and of having nothing to do: once or twice she had peeped into the book her sister was reading, but it had no pictures or conversations in it, 'and what is the use of a book,' thought Alice 'without pictures or conversation?'

**Lewis Carroll:** *Alice in Wonderland*

### 1.6.1 Definition

On the back cover (a paratext) of the English translation of *Seuils* by Gérard Genette (1997b)<sup>106</sup>, the term is defined as follows:

Paratexts are those liminal devices and conventions, both within and outside the book, that form part of the complex mediation between book, author, publisher, and reader: titles, forewords, epigraphs, and publisher's jacket copy are part of a book's private and public history.

Through their illocutionary function, paratexts are a means of controlling the reception of a book: 'Although we do not always know whether these productions are to be regarded as belonging to the text, in any case they surround it and extend it, precisely in order to *present it*' (Genette 1997b: 1, emphasis in original).

Paratexts reflect the publisher's (and the author's, to a lesser extent) intention to influence the readership from the very moment they lay eyes on the book – in a bookshop, a library, someone else's hands, etc. In a model 'Western liberal democracy', the publisher's primary intention may simply consist in selling the book, i.e. as many copies of it as possible. And, in the long-term, publishers want to make a good name for themselves in order to sell other books in the future.

In a 'model dictatorship', the paratextual accessories of a book are aimed at yet another agent in the literary process: **the censor**. Censorship, as described above, is a complex, multi-stage matter – all the more so if we are dealing with translations. Looking only at what happens in the target culture, we can expect the translator's self-censorship to be followed by the censorship of 'the editor or adaptor of the final version of the text of the translation', who, in Popovič's words (1975: 69-70), 'is the mediating factor between the prevailing language norms and the text of the translation, implementing the

---

<sup>106</sup> GENETTE, Gérard. 1997b. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 9780521424066 (Originally published in French as *Seuils* [Thresholds], Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1987).

directives which the publishing institution has adopted under the influence of readers' habits'.<sup>107</sup>

It is more than likely that 'readers' habits' can be interpreted as a euphemism here. In a dictatorship proper, 'readers' habits' are likely to be 'represented' by the ideology in power. Elsewhere, Popovič (1971: 96-98)<sup>108</sup> defines the editor's role as follows:

[...] in this sense, an editor can even be a "co-author", whether overt, declared or anonymous. The position of the editor [...] is, in principle, threefold:

1. the editor is in a position "independent" of the literary norm of the time, he tries to surpass it;
2. the editor identifies himself with the prevailing, dominant literary and language norm and is, in fact, its implementer;
3. the editor sensitively balances the translator's text against the normative requirements of the given literary epoch.

In a dictatorship then, even in a socialist (but especially in a corporatist) one, editors, as publishers' employees, will do their best to protect their employers from possible litigation, enforced closure, bankruptcy, or worse. The paratextual trappings of a book must therefore convey to the censor (as the implementer of the ideology in force) that there is no threat intended, no subversion of the ideology in power – all the more so if, within the text of the book itself, such an intention does indeed exist.

Paratexts are, of course, forms of rewriting (Lefevere) or metatexts (Popovič). As we have seen in the previous chapter, metatexts exert enormous influence upon the constitution, stratification and reconfiguration of canons, and hence of the literary system at large. That is one reason why 'translation can no longer be analysed in isolation, [...] it should be studied as part of a whole system of texts and the people who produce, support, propagate, oppose, censor them' (Lefevere in Hermans 1985: 237).

The matter is, however, more complicated. In a monograph entitled *Palimpsests* (1997a)<sup>109</sup>, G. Genette defines five types of **transtextuality**: *intertextuality*, *paratextuality*, *metatextuality*, *hypertextuality* and *architextuality*. *Transtextuality*, the subject of poetics, is 'all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts' (1997a: 1), or the superordinate category subsuming the other five.

Genette defines *intertextuality*, a term borrowed from Julia Kristeva, more restrictively than she does as 'a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts: that is to say, eidetically and typically as the actual presence of one text within another'

<sup>107</sup> '[...] redaktor, resp. upravovateľ definitívneho znenia textu prekladu.' 'Redaktor je totiž sprostredkujúcim faktorom medzi vládnucimi jazykovými normami a textom prekladu a vykonáva direktívy, ktoré si pod vplyvom čitateľských návykov osvojila vydavateľská inštitúcia.' (Popovič 1975: 69-70).

<sup>108</sup> '[...] v tomto zmysle môže byť redaktor aj „spoluautorom“, či už zjavným, ohláseným, alebo anonymným. Pozícia redaktora [...] je, v princípe, trojaká: 1. redaktor je „v nezávislej“ pozícii voči súvekej literárnej norme, usiluje sa ju predbehnúť; 2. redaktor sa stotožňuje s prevládajúcou, dominantnou literárnou a jazykovou normou a je vlastne jej vykonávateľom; 3. redaktor citlivo vyrovnáva prekladateľov text s normatívnymi požiadavkami príslušnej literárnej epochy' (Popovič 1971: 96-98)

<sup>109</sup> GENETTE, Gérard. 1997a. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. University of Nebraska Press. ISBN 9780803270299. (Originally published in French as *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1982).

(1997a: 1-2). It includes quoting, plagiarism, allusion, etc. An intertext may even be hypothetical.

Next comes what Genette calls *paratexts*: ‘a title, a subtitle, intertitles; prefaces, postfaces, notices, forewords, etc.; marginal, infrapaginal, terminal notes; epigraphs; illustrations; blurbs, book covers, dust jackets, and many other kinds of secondary signals, whether allographic or autographic’ (1997a: 3) – an extensional, denotative or inductive (and thus incomplete) definition.

The third type of textual transcendence is *metatextuality*, ‘the relationship most often labelled “commentary”’ (1997a: 4). ‘It unites a given text to another, of which it speaks without necessarily citing it (without summoning it), in fact sometimes even without naming it’ (*ibid.*). Genette’s example is Hegel’s *Phenomenology of the Mind*, evoking Diderot’s *Neveu de Rameau*. In Genette’s words, ‘this is the *critical* relationship par excellence’ (*ibid.*). Genette also notes: ‘I am not sure that the very fact and status of the metatextual relationship has yet been considered with all the attention they deserve’ (cf. Popovič below).

The fourth category is *hypertextuality*, the subject matter of *Palimpsests*, by which Genette means ‘any relationship uniting a text B (which [he] call[s] *hypertext*) to an earlier text A ([...] the *hypotext*), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary’ (1997a: 5). ‘[T]he hypertext is more frequently considered a “properly literary” work than is the metatext’ (*ibid.*). Genette’s examples are the *Aeneid* and *Ulysses* as two hypertexts of the *Odyssey* as their hypotext. Herein, a ‘transformative process’ or simply transformation is involved, rather than a ‘commenting procedure’, as in a metatext. Genette (1997a: 7) specifies further: ‘What I call hypertext, then, is any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call from now on *transformation*, or through indirect transformation, which I shall label *imitation*.’

Genette’s *hypertextuality* is thus of supreme relevance to Translation Studies. Imitations and adaptations (including such ‘disclaimers’ as ‘based on the novel by’), lambasted from prescriptive vantage points as ‘not translations proper’, though pervasive throughout the Middle Ages and in other times (cf. Bassnett in Bassnett & Lefevere 1998) and therefore of cardinal historical and cultural interest, certainly fall within this category.

The fifth and last type of transtextuality is *architextuality*, which is ‘of a purely taxonomic nature’. It ‘can be titular (as in *Poems*, *Essays*, *The Romance of the Rose*, etc.) or most often subtitled (as when the indication *A Novel*, or *A Story*, or *Poems* is appended to the title on the cover)’ (1997a: 4). Genre, however, ‘is only one aspect of the architext’ (*ibid.*), but ‘generic perception is known to guide and determine to a considerable degree the readers’ expectations, and thus their reception of the work’ (1997a: 5). Other architextual categories are various kinds of discourse, modes of utterance, etc. For more detailed specifications and more examples of all five categories, see Genette (1997a).

Genette’s taxonomy is generally not adhered to in the present thesis for the simple reason that competing nomenclatures, i.e. that of André Lefevere (forms of *refraction*, 1982, or *rewriting*, 1985 and later) and particularly that of Anton Popovič (1975 and

later) are more relevant to our approach here. Nevertheless, Genette's approach (in 1997a, or more precisely 1982 in French) illuminates the complexity of *transtextual* relationships. It constitutes a potentially enriching methodology for further investigation within Translation Studies and beyond. Only where Popovič's *metatextuality* (see below) appears too narrow is Genette's *transtextuality* used as a hypernym.

## 1.6.2 Review of Literature

Paratexts can be studied according five different features: 'a paratextual message's spatial, temporal, substantial, pragmatic, and functional characteristics' (1997b: 4). More specifically (*ibid.*):

[...] defining a paratextual element consists of determining its location (the question *where*); the date of its appearance and, if need be, its disappearance (*when?*); its mode of existence, verbal or other (*how?*); the characteristics of its situation of communication – its sender and addressee (*from whom? to whom?*); and the functions that its message aims to fulfil (*to do what?*).

The **spatial** criterion is of supreme significance, for the place *where* a paratext appears influences, quite substantially, its type and features. Genette (1997b: 4-5) distinguishes between peritexts and epitexts: *peritexts* are positioned around the text, within the same volume (thus being closely linked to book design and typography); *epitexts* are 'all those messages that, at least originally, are located outside the book, generally with the help of the media (interviews, conversations) or under cover of private communications (letters, diaries, and others)' (5). Peritexts and epitexts complement one another to jointly form the superordinate category of paratexts.

The **temporal** situation of a paratext (of lesser importance in the present thesis because of our corpus) may be *prior* ('prenatal'), i.e. before the publication of the primary text; *original*, appearing with the first edition of the primary text; *later* or *delayed* (appearing shortly or long after the first edition); '*anthumous*' (during the author's lifetime) and *posthumous* (Genette 1997b: 6). Paratexts, of course, have life spans (they can disappear from future editions), i.e. some are short-lived (being products of their time, space and culture), others become an integral part of the book (and its presentation).

The **substantial** (material) aspect concerns the distinction between verbal and non-verbal paratexts, but also includes iconic paratexts (illustrations), typographic design, or paratexts consisting 'not of an explicit message (verbal or other) but of a fact whose existence alone, provides some commentary on the text and influences how the text is received' (Genette 1997b: 7).

'The **pragmatic** status of a paratextual element is defined by the characteristics of its situation of communication: the nature of the sender and addressee, the sender's degree of authority and responsibility, the illocutionary force of the sender's message,' etc. (Genette 1997b: 8, emphasis added). Not infrequently, the sender is concealed. Even a foreword signed by the author (as in Balzac's *La Comédie humaine*) may stem from another agent – editor, publisher, colleague (e.g. another writer) and so on. 'The sender is defined by a putative attribution and an acceptance of responsibility' (*ibid.*).

The *illocutionary force* is important here. The paratext may convey a piece of *information*, make known an *intention* or an *interpretation* (by the author, publisher or

another agent), a *decision*, a *commitment*, a word of *advice*, a *command*, etc. ‘Some paratextual elements entail even the power logicians call *performative*’ (11), as in dedications or inscriptions. According to the sender, there are authorial, editorial, or allographic paratexts (i.e. written by others, a third party). According to the addressee, there are *public* paratexts (the general public, specific groups of readers), or *private* paratexts (addressed to private persons, whether known or unknown).

The illocutionary force brings us to the **functional** aspect of the paratext, ‘dedicated to the service of something other than itself that constitutes its *raison d’être*’ (Genette 1997b: 12). This ‘aesthetic or ideological investment’ that the author (or another agent) makes in a paratextual element is of crucial importance. ‘The functions of the paratext therefore constitute a highly empirical and highly diversified object that must be brought into focus inductively, genre by genre and often species by species’ (13).

L. Lerner (1988: 243)<sup>110</sup> adduces four main functions of paratexts: *information* (about the text, author, publisher and other literary and non-literary facts), *apology* (explaining or defending the existence of the text), *control* (of the reader’s reception), and *indecision* (whether or not to use paratexts and if so, which). Linking manipulation (control) with instructions for reception and literary education, Lerner (1988: 255) has the following to say:

The function of the frontier areas of the text – all of those discussed – is to exert pressure on the reader, in the act of constituting meaning. Supplying information, exerting (or diminishing) didactic control, apologizing (or boasting): all these are aspects of that pressure.

L. Müllerová, in her doctoral dissertation (2009)<sup>111</sup> on paratexts (which she calls ‘secondary book texts’), attempts a classification of the various and complex *functions* paratexts can display: identification and contact, information, persuasion, usefulness (2009: 14); transaction, promotion (22). Relations between the primary text and the paratexts cut both ways and can be determinative (qualifying), characterising, amplificatory (extending), receptive, semiotic (i.e. producing meaning), canonising or guiding (controlling) (2009: 10)<sup>112</sup>. In Müllerová’s words (2009: 12)<sup>113</sup>:

A broad spectrum of mediators of the metalinguistic communication participate in the process of paratextualisation. Their role and degree of importance in the process is variable, for it depends not only on the social, ideological and cultural environment, but also on tradition and on the agent’s ability to establish him/herself in the literary communication.

According to Müllerová, factors participating in the paratextualisation process include the book business, literary experience, ideology, the social context, marketing activities, shared experience, cultural institutions, educational institutions and the media (*ibid.*).

<sup>110</sup> LERNER, Laurence. 1988. *The Frontiers of Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell. ISBN 9780631149675.

<sup>111</sup> MÜLLEROVÁ, Lenka. 2009. *Reklamní aspekty sekundárních knižních textů v devadesátých letech 20. století* [Advertising Aspects of Secondary Book Texts in the 1990s]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita. Supervisor: Petr Poslední (see Bibliography).

<sup>112</sup> ‘Vzájemná interakce obou typů textů – primárního a sekundárního – působí obousměrně. Od textu k ne-textům je určující, charakterotvorná a rozšiřující, od ne-textů k primárnímu textu je receptivní, významotvorná, kanonizující, usměrňující.’ (Müllerová 2009: 10)

<sup>113</sup> ‘Na procesu paratextualizace se tedy podílí široké spektrum zprostředkovatelů metajazykového sdělování, jejichž role a míra důležitosti v procesu je proměnlivá, neboť je závislá nejen na společenském, ideologickém a kulturním prostředí, ale i na tradici a na vlastní schopnosti etablovat se v literární komunikaci.’ (Müllerová 2009: 12)



However, she does not elaborate (for instance, on the difference between ‘literary experience’ and ‘shared experience’).

Müllerová (2009: 13) defines paratextualisation as ‘the process of influencing [appealing to] the receiver of the text (a potential reader, buyer) by secondary book texts [i.e. paratexts] of the sender – here: publisher or author. These texts not only actively enter and participate in the communication process, they co-produce it even in the event of their absence in the book (the significance of empty space)’<sup>114</sup>.

As with non-translation, here again what is missing may be more important (here: in a book) than what is there, or at least just as important. ‘White spots’ could also be observed in the workings of censorship (e.g. in the Portuguese military dictatorships, the *Ditadura Militar* and *Ditadura Nacional*, 1926-33, see below), while *horror vacui* (kenophobia) was more characteristic of the Salazar regime. Müllerová (2009: 18) reiterates: ‘The absence (or change in the configuration) of one of the important peritexts then becomes an important factor of reception.’<sup>115</sup>

‘It is almost impossible to find out whether an authorial secondary book text [paratext] came into being spontaneously or at the suggestion of the publisher, and to what extent it is the author’s conviction or an extorted communication’ (Müllerová 2009: 20)<sup>116</sup>. In view of this problem, Müllerová decides to attribute such paratexts, unless signed, to the publisher, ‘in conformity with Genette’ (2009: 20, 70). Even when signed, there is no absolute certainty about the actual author (cf. the above example of Balzac).

The peritextual structure of a book published more than once (2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, n<sup>th</sup> edition) can consist in a wholly new ‘bundle’ of peritexts, a bundle completely identical with the previous (first) edition, or a ‘layered’ (mixed) bundle (Müllerová 2009: 206). The mutual relation of dominance/subsidiarity among the paratexts depends on literary and non-literary factors, in particular on the type of primary text they refer to, the readers’ awareness (knowledgeability), the intentions of the publication series, the author’s status (how ‘established’ s/he is in the literary landscape), as well as on previous paratextual practice and current trends (Müllerová 2009: 207).

A final note on the terminology used in the present thesis: the text *sensu stricto* shall be called ‘the **text**’ where unambiguous, or ‘the primary text’ (‘prototext’ in Popovič’s definition, 1976: 32).

Since epitexts + peritexts = paratexts (Genette 1997b: 5), ‘the **book**’ is the conjuncture of the primary text and the peritexts, i.e. the physical (material) whole.

---

<sup>114</sup> ‘Jde tedy o tzv. paratextualizaci, tj. procesu působení sekundárních knižních textů vysílače – zde nakladatele či autora na příjemce textu (potenciálního čtenáře, kupce). Tyto texty nejen do procesu aktivně vstupují a účastní se ho, ale spoluvytvářejí ho i v případě vlastní absence v knize (význam prázdného místa).’ (Müllerová 2009: 13)

<sup>115</sup> ‘Nepřítomnost (či změna uspořádání) některého z významných peritextů se pak stává významným recepčním činitelem.’ (Müllerová 2009: 18)

<sup>116</sup> ‘Je téměř nezjistitelné, zdali autorský sekundární knižní text vznikl spontánně nebo z popudu nakladatelství a do jaké míry je přesvědčením autora nebo vynuceným sdělením.’ (Müllerová 2009: 20, footnote no. 19).

The entire concatenation of the primary text(s)<sup>117</sup> and all paratexts surrounding it shall be designated as ‘**the text in all of its textual and paratextual forms in one culture**’.

The entire concatenation of the primary text(s), all paratexts surrounding it, and all metatexts (in Popovič’s sense, i.e. including translations) based on it (them) shall be termed ‘**the text in all of its textual, paratextual and metatextual forms**’.

The importance of studying paratexts by translation scholars is recognised by Chesterman, who in his article on the sociology of translation (in Duarte, Rosa & Seruya 2006: 14) looks at paratexts from the viewpoint of TS methodology:

But a translation system contains more than just translation events. It also contains statements about these events: **discourse on translation, including such texts as translation reviews, prefaces and other paratexts**, and also scholarly research on translation: all these feed into the system, reflecting it and affecting it. These additional elements show something about people’s perception of translation (at a given time and place). These perceptions are of course partly formed by translations themselves, but they also serve as expectations which affect the way translators think and work. In this sense, the translation system is self-reflective and self-developing.

In his paratextual analysis of *I Promessi Sposi*, L. Giannossa (2010: 1)<sup>118</sup> asserts that ‘[t]he study of paratexts [...] in translation is still in its infancy.’ ‘Paratexts are a neglected subject in translation studies. They constitute an alternative object of study and a different way of looking at translation.’ (2010: 2) More explicitly, in his conclusion, Giannossa (2010: 13) states:

When it comes to studying the translation product and process, most scholars focus on the verbal elements of the text, without paying attention to other **traces that the translator and other agents in the translation process left around and outside the text**. As previously mentioned, these traces can tell us a lot about translation strategies and processes and about **readers’ reception of the translation**, so a study of these paratextual elements can help fill in the gaps in translation history. (emphasis added)

Analysing a 19<sup>th</sup>-century Italian (Milanese) classic, Giannossa compares how the status of the work in the source culture (a text central to Italian literature) has been reflected in the target culture. Canonicity is closely related to paratextuality here: ‘The study of paratexts can also indicate whether the prestige a work has enjoyed in the source culture has been conveyed in the target culture [...]’ (2010: 4).

Drawing on E. Crisafulli (2004), Y. Shiyi (2006) and particularly Ş. Tahir Gürçağlar (2002), all of whom have contributed to the study of paratexts in Translation Studies, Giannossa analyses a total of sixteen books covering a span of almost one and a half centuries (2010: 2). The analysis of paratexts is one operational method for dealing with a large corpus of texts (books) that proves highly relevant for the present thesis.

---

<sup>117</sup> Indeed, there may be several primary texts, or *allotexts*, as becomes obvious from Popovič’s definition of *architext* (1976: 1): ‘The original text, an ideal construction thereof which serves as a basis for the meta-textual link. The notion of architext occurs especially in folklore theory. It may be used to illustrate the process of variation in folklore. The basic scheme of this link may be expressed as follows: architext – (prototext) – metatext – (prototext) – metatext, etc.’

<sup>118</sup> GIANNOSSA, Leonardo. 2009. ‘A Paratextual Analysis of *I Promessi Sposi*’. [http://www.uottawa.ca/associations/act-cats/Young\\_Researchers\\_archive/Giannossa\\_I\\_Promessi\\_Sposi.pdf](http://www.uottawa.ca/associations/act-cats/Young_Researchers_archive/Giannossa_I_Promessi_Sposi.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-04-02).

Lefevere et al., in a chapter entitled ‘The Reins of Power’ (in Delisle & Woodsworth 1995: 146), discussing fascist ideological vetting before the publication of Elio Vittorini’s *Americana* in the Italian literary system, offer an illuminating example of how paratexts may be important in circumventing censors:

Literary culture in Italy was a minority interest in the hands of an élite. [...] Minculpop [Ministero di Cultura Popolare] did not consider it a threat to the regime, and saw no need to oppose it. This seems to be the most plausible explanation of why a set of translated texts seized one year could be published the following year, without Vittorini’s “political” commentary. It is important to point out, in this context, that the actual translations remained the same throughout. **Minculpop did not object to the translations so much as to their ideological packaging.** An analogous fate had befallen Luther’s Bible in Germany four centuries earlier. His text was read in many Catholic German states, as well as in Protestant ones, although in editions from which his introduction and glosses had been removed and replaced with those of Catholic theologians. Significantly, though, Luther’s translation itself had remained virtually unchanged. (bold emphasis added)

Helgason (1999: 84) provides an example regarding the Danish reception of the Icelandic *Njáls Saga*:

The case of *Islændingenes færd* in Denmark is, in many respects, similar to that of the Italian *Americana*. As discussed in Chapter 1, the Icelandic family sagas were partially incorporated into the cultural and racial ideology of Nazi Germany. Hence, there was little chance that the German censor, operating through the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, would regard the reissuing of canonised Danish saga translations as a threat in itself. But **the ideological context, produced through new introduction, commentary and commercials, was a different matter**, in particular as the publishing house in question had already been apprehended for exploring the subversive powers of rewriting. (emphasis added)

Paratexts exhibit multifarious functions, not only ‘paraliterary’ (Genette’s *thresholds* or vestibules leading the reader into the text *per se*) and promotional (advertising), but also ideological. S. Sherry, in his study of prefaces and Canadian literary politics (in Bassnett & Lefevere 1990: 111), points to the double language a preface speaks: ‘Offering information, it also seeks protection from the outrages of power; advancing propitiatory disclaimers, it also propels the work towards new markets and audiences.’

G. Thomson-Wohlgemuth, in her study on translations viewed through the lens of East German censorship files (in Pym, Shlesinger & Jettmarová 2006: 61), sums up the role of forewords and afterwords in the former GDR:

They told the reader how to interpret certain passages or ideas; and were thus very sensitive. They also needed to be assessed by external evaluators, either together with the book or in a separate assessment by another evaluator. Like the assessment of the actual manuscript, afterwords laid emphasis on the “correct” ideological concepts. [...] If a book was regarded as ideologically dubious, a cleverly formulated afterword could act as a pass permit. [...] Afterwords had the function of a safeguard for the publisher against the censor, in which the publisher explained and justified the value of the book for the socialist market. However, they also served as a safeguard for the censor against the Party and its cultural functionaries, to whom the censors themselves were responsible.

Thomson-Wohlgemuth cites various concrete examples (*ibid.*). Her observation is of utmost importance, as it contextualises both the publisher’s and the censor’s roles, neither of whom operated in a vacuum, or more precisely: in a purely *literary* (apolitical) context.

Woods (2006: 84-85) recounts the fascinating procedures whereby Kundera manipulates some groups of readers via his ‘author’s notes’ (usually prefaces):

The prefaces function on several levels: firstly as a seal of authorial approval; secondly as explanations (though only partial) of the choice leading up to this approval; and, thirdly, as an exposition of Kundera’s critical analysis of his work [...]. However, Kundera in his author’s note to the 1993 Czech edition of *Immortality / Nesmrtelnost* was fully candid about rewriting his novels, locating this urge in the fact of the existence of diverse versions because of his physical situation. In the note, he claimed that there were often three originating versions to his novels: the manuscript, the Sixty-Eight Publishers version and the definitive French version. **Kundera has never made such a claim in his French- or English-language prefaces.** (emphasis added)

Besides pointing out the functions of the paratext (here: prefaces or author’s notes), which is of relevance to literature and literary studies in general, Woods also stresses the importance of studying paratexts in Translation Studies and by translation scholars. Indeed, paratexts may often be not only different in the case of the original and the translation (different publishers, different cultural background knowledge, different political and ideological situations, etc.), but highly disparate, as also attested to by Giannossa’s article (2010).

There are, of course, other approaches to studying paratexts – whether through specific case studies (Huber 1997<sup>119</sup>; Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002, Crisafulli 2004 and Y. Shiyi 2006 quoted by Giannossa 2010) or in the form of theoretical analyses (e.g. Lerner 1988). It is not our purpose, however, to list or enlist them all.

Instead, the study of paratexts offers a welcome opportunity to revisit Popovič’s Theory of Literary Metacommunication. Popovič’s systems of metatexts and of literary education, including such concepts as ‘instruction for reception’, are highly pertinent to paratexts, offering as they do a workable methodology for analysing the paratexts with which Portuguese translations of Czech literature have been cinctured.<sup>120</sup> Popovič’s conception is introduced in detail below (see Chapter 2).

### 1.6.3 Conclusion

Paratexts are one of the most direct and revealing sources for studying the *reception* of (translated) texts in a literary system. Paratexts, of course, include both epitexts and peritexts. But even in a corpus of texts which seems to be devoid of epitexts (whether these be impossible to locate or defy analysis for any other reason, thereby rendering their analysis non-operational)<sup>121</sup>, one can still study the *reception* of the (translated) texts through their peritexts<sup>122</sup>.

<sup>119</sup> HUBER, Alexander. 1997. *Paratexte in der englischen Erzählprosa des 18. Jahrhunderts*.

Magisterarbeit. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. Referent: Horst Zander.

<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~bodl0153/elzma.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-04-03). Huber’s is a thesis in Translation Studies, dedicated to meticulous analyses of paratexts surrounding H. Fielding’s *Tom Jones*, J. Swift’s *A Tale of a Tub*, and L. Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*.

<sup>120</sup> The idea to use Popovič for a study of paratexts was already suggested by Müllerová (2009: 23-32, 63, and elsewhere). Müllerová, however, is interested in literature in general (not in translations of literature), which is why she draws on other publications by Popovič than we do, and her approach and methodology are different from ours.

<sup>121</sup> For an instructive study of epitexts (book series in this case), see Seruya 2005. *Book series* are also taken into consideration in the empirical part (material) of the present thesis (cf. subchapter 4.3).

When dealing with a large corpus of texts, it is beyond the capacity of a single researcher to conduct micro-textual comparative analyses (text-linguistic contrastive analyses) of every single source and target text. It becomes even less feasible when we are dealing with indirect translations, since (ideally) we would have to take into account the mediating texts as well.

One way out of this conundrum is to choose a *representative sample* (or subset) and to draw conclusions from it about the entire set. Problems regarding the choice of a truly representative sample are well known from mathematics and sociology. Moreover, this *inductive* method often leads to highly inaccurate generalisations. It has been applied in subchapter 4.3, with full knowledge of its deficiencies, whereby sweeping statements regarding the entire corpus have been refrained from.

Another solution is to submit the *paratexts* surrounding the translations to scrutiny and observe how the target-culture reader is instructed to receive the texts (Popovič's 'instruction for reception', 1976: 28), and where applicable (paratexts by or about the translator(s) and/or their methods), *what methods, strategies or agendas the translator pursued* in producing the target-language text.

Neither solution is all-encompassing and fully satisfactory. After all, it could be objected (not without justice) that *paratexts* are only another type of sample. Moreover, certain paratexts may provide little information about the source text, the translator, translation strategies, or even the target text, and concentrate instead on seemingly unrelated matters (why the book fosters the intellectual growth of socialist youth, for instance). Paratexts are likely to tell us less about *operational norms* and more about *preliminary norms* (Toury 1995: 58).

Both types of norms, however, are part and parcel of the subject matter of Translation Studies and, faced with limited time and resources, we must make a choice. As a consequence, the *combination* of both 'solutions' is believed to bring us closer to understanding the target culture's approach (i) to translations of literature in general, (ii) to translations from Czech and Slovak.

---

According to Müllerová (2009: 73), a book series has two main functions: a signalling function towards the readers, and a stabilising function towards the publishing house ('Edice má dvojí hlavní funkci – signalizační směrem ven ke čtenářům a stabilizační směrem dovnitř do nakladatelství.')

<sup>122</sup> **Reception**, doubtless an integral part of studying literature both in Translation Studies and in literary studies (phenomenology, aesthetics of reception, late structuralism, post-structuralism, deconstruction, psychoanalysis, neo-Marxism, post-colonial theory, etc. – of course, to differing extents and using divergent methods), is studied in our corpus first and foremost by means of *peritexts* and *censorship files*. The reason for this rather unusual choice of texts for the investigation of the reception of Czech literature in Portugal, is the simple and acknowledged fact that no other sources have been found to achieve this task and *reception* appears so vital to studying (translations of) literature that ignoring it did not seem to be an option (cf. subchapter 4.3).

## 1.7 Medium-Sized Lingua- and Socio-Cultures

This subchapter on medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures (medium-sized LSCs or MSLSCs)<sup>123</sup> does not follow the structure of the preceding subchapters. Its purpose, by way of conclusion to this theoretical-terminological part of the present thesis, is to summarise the whole of Chapter 1 and restate the case for our methodological approach.

The above definitions of the key concepts of this thesis, i.e. ideology, censorship, indirect translations, non-translation, the canon, world literature, and paratexts, are an attempt to indicate how fruitful research into relations between (and among) medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures (LSCs) can be.

This is not to say, of course, that these concepts are unique to the study of medium-sized LSCs. Many of the empirical data and theoretical observations quoted in the reviews of literature stem from studies on ‘major’ cultures. Two ‘non-major’ cultures, however, can shed a different light upon these issues, show them from other angles, reveal new features of these phenomena, and render certain aspects more conspicuous (*indirect reception*, for instance).

### 1.7.1 Language and Translation

Portuguese has almost 200 million native speakers worldwide, Czech only rather over 10 million. Thus, one could expect more works of ‘world literature’ to be accessible in Portuguese than in Czech. Perhaps surprisingly, the picture is very different.

To illustrate this by way of an example of a lesser used language and lesser known literature, we may consult UNESCO’s *Index Translationum (IT)*, which is available on the Internet (the data in the electronic IT go back only to 1970)<sup>124</sup>. Here we discover that there are three translations into Icelandic of Portuguese literature (José Saramago, Lygia Bojunga Nunes, and Paulo Coelho – three times), but only one translation from Icelandic into Portuguese (published in Brazil)<sup>125</sup>. The *Index Translationum* lists 14 translations from Icelandic into Czech (one of the books was published twice, four are translated indirectly via German, *nota bene* in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and bear the catchline ‘Icelandic detective story’) and 25 from Czech into Icelandic (three indirect translations, Hašek’s *Švejk* in two editions, Kundera’s *Unbearable Lightness of Being* in three editions translated from Czech and one edition, the latest, translated indirectly from French!).

The above data, while by no means representative, point to the apparent disequilibrium in the directionality of translations. Provided that the *IT* data can be trusted, Icelandic

---

<sup>123</sup> In the European context, Liechtenstein, Andorra or San Marino can be considered ‘small’. Countries like Portugal, the Czech Republic or Belgium (all with a population of about 10 million inhabitants) are designated ‘medium-sized’ here. Granted, the term seems more appropriate as much for the sake of scholarly as for the sake of political correctness.

<sup>124</sup> <http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/> (retrieved on 2011-03-26)

<sup>125</sup> The translation into Brazilian Portuguese by Carlos Nogue of Guðbergur Bergsson’s *Svanurinn* (Icelandic in 1991, English translation by Bernard Scudder as *The Swan*) appeared in 2000 (Rio de Janeiro: Rocco).

seems to be ‘superior’ to both Czech and Portuguese as a language *into* which translations are made, while Czech is superior to Portuguese in this instance.<sup>126</sup>

Without quoting particular authors, the *Index Translationum* has included Czechoslovakia since its first publication in 1948, providing, oddly enough, separate data for Czech and Slovak only from 1951 to 1978. Portugal appears for the first time (and with very few data) as late as 1950, and is omitted from the years 1951, 1969, 1971-1975, 1978 and 1979. The number of books translated in Czechoslovakia is on average far greater than in Portugal (i.e. between 1948 and 1986). In other words, Czechoslovakia appears to have been far more open towards translations than Portugal.

As for Translation Studies, Portugal is not deemed worthy of mention in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2006), where the Czech and Slovak Tradition each receive a chapter of their own (alongside the Brazilian and Icelandic Tradition).

Except for languages which are spoken only in one country (such as Czech or Icelandic), a **distinction must also be drawn between the language and the country**. Belgian French literature is comparably less known and less translated than French literature of France (see Lusseau 1996, below).

European Portuguese has only 10 million speakers, making it one of the medium-sized languages in the European Union. Worldwide, the number of Portuguese speakers is twice as high as the number of German speakers. However, German-speaking countries are all rather affluent, whereas the same cannot be said of lusophone countries. Far more money is invested in Germany into the propagation of the language, translations, research and development than in Portugal (or Brazil), thus promoting German far beyond its actual size (it is said to be the second most widespread language on the Internet).<sup>127</sup>

To follow up on Lambert’s suggestion (1991, quoted above), the ideal Translation Studies Cartography would produce three kinds of world map. The first would show the percentage of translations versus original production (in relation to the total output of publications) per language (and per country). The second would indicate the provenance of translations (cf. also Venuti 1995: 12-17). The third map would then proceed to compare languages (countries) according to the number of publications translated into them. In other words, such maps would indicate in which language most of humanity’s literary heritage is available. It seems reasonable to hypothesise that the ranking of ‘world languages’, when viewed through the prism of translations made into them, would be likely to change.

Such ‘utopian’ cartography may be reminiscent of J. L. Borges’ *La Biblioteca de Babel*. As with Đurišin’s world literature, it is probably unattainable with the current level of

---

<sup>126</sup> There are, for instance, no translations from Icelandic into Korean or vice versa (according to the *IT*). The only two translations from Korean into Portuguese are (communist) political brochures (published in Lisbon in 1993 and 1994). There are, however, 52 entries for translations (including re-editions) from Portuguese into Korean, 15 from Korean into Czech and 29 from Czech into Korean. The point here is not to quote as many abstruse cross-cultural (non-) exchanges as possible, but to point to the imbalance in the directionality of translations.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. <http://www.botschaft-frankreich.de/spip.php?article696> (retrieved on 2011-08-27).



our knowledge. Still, the fact that we do not have such maps and that we are unlikely to produce any in the near future reveals much about our ‘received’ cognitive patterns.

### 1.7.2 A Case for Medium-Sized LSCs

Lefevere (1992b: 70)<sup>128</sup> notes pertinently: ‘It is in the treatment of texts that play a central role within a culture and in the way a central culture translates texts produced by cultures it considers peripheral, that the importance of such factors as ideology, poetics, and the Universe of Discourse is most obviously revealed.’

It could be assumed that if major (central, dominant) cultures often take considerable liberties with texts, even central texts (*Švejk* being arguably an instance of a text central to Czech literature), produced in minor (peripheral, dominated) cultures, then an investigation into the mutual relations between two medium-sized (‘minor’) cultures could bring us closer to ‘the truth’.

Alas, the data culled from the most diverse sources for this thesis suggests otherwise. Due to ‘indirect reception’, ‘borrowed’ ideologies, ‘received’ preconceptions and prejudices, and ultimately ‘non-translation’, further exacerbated by the impact of inimical censorship, the reception of a minor culture by another minor culture is likely to be misrepresented to an even greater extent.

The UNESCO’s *Fifty+ Books to Span the World: The UNESCO Literature Translations Program* (1974)<sup>129</sup> can serve as the prototypical example. The UNESCO Literature Translations Program (LTP), founded in the late 1940s, set out to make masterpieces of ‘world literature’ available in English and/or French. The authors of the document have the following to say on **indirect translations** (1974: 1):

[...] we have not found anyone of English or French mother-tongue to translate a single book from Assamese. [...] One of the novels translated into English from Malayalam as part of the Unesco Literature Translations Program [...] was subsequently translated on the basis of the English version into Dutch, French, Macedonian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Hungarian, and Spanish. There is no other way of achieving this and for the simple reason that in all likelihood there is not a single Serbo-Croatian or Macedonian who knows Malayalam. (emphasis in original)

Those 50+ books, constituting, as they do, a **canon of world literature** from one possible point of view, and moreover recommended for translation by this global and respected organisation, contain not a single book of Czech, Slovak or even Portuguese authorship, although Swiss Romansh, Armenian, Urdu, Icelandic and other non-major literatures are represented.

In her innovative and illuminating monograph entitled *Translating Milan Kundera*, M. Woods (2006: xi) points to the dearth of investigation into medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures:

<sup>128</sup> LEFEVERE, André (ed.). 1992b. *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London & New York: Routledge. When referring to Lefevere’s *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, ‘Lefevere 1992’ or ‘Lefevere 1992a’ is used. The reason for this simplification is that the latter book is quoted in this thesis far more often than the former.

<sup>129</sup> UNESCO. 1974. *Fifty+ Books to Span the World: The UNESCO Literature Translations Program*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0001/000115/011543eb.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-03-25).



Rather than dwelling on inadequacies of translators or translations, I focus on how translations are manipulated on a variety of levels because of ideological assumptions or preconceived notions, especially, in this case, of European writing. Work on norms, cultural translation and post-colonial translation in Translation Studies informs these arguments, but I also want to stress **the need in the field for further research beyond text-to-text comparisons, particularly via lesser-used languages within and beyond Europe**. (emphasis added) (cf. also Woods 2006: 185, quoted above)

Vimr (2009: 139, quoted above), investigating Czech and Scandinavian literary interrelations, concurs. ‘What has been given little attention yet, oddly enough, is the relation between two equally (or similarly) minor cultures and the peculiarities of their situation.’ More importantly, Vimr (2009: 148) elaborates:

Although literary translation between minor literatures might seem to provide translators with greater freedom and power concerning all levels of the translation process, since they are the exclusive experts on the source culture, literature as well as language, we have seen that this is very often not the case.

Specifically, this was ‘not the case’ under the communist regime in Czechoslovakia (1948-89). Vimr himself (2006: 52ff.) describes a different situation in the Czech context of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, only, understandably, to lament its demise with the outbreak of the Second World War and its repercussions. Thus, minor literatures *may* provide translators with greater freedom and ‘power’, but only under certain circumstances.

Furthermore, due to indirect reception, translators from minor literatures are *not* ‘the exclusive experts on the source culture’, although their expertise, being the result of a direct contact, is more exact and profound. However, such ‘academic’ arguments are naturally of little interest to those wielding power over the publishing industry or, wherever patronage is undifferentiated, the entire literary system (Lefevere 1985: 228).

There is little doubt that the constraints imposed on translators from major languages also apply to translators from minor languages, but it could be hypothesised that, while probably not different in absolute terms, these constraints may be different in degree. A major LSC is more likely to be felt as a threat both to a minor and to another major culture (cf. the blanket ban on translations from English into German under the Third Reich, quoted above).

The unpublished *mestrado* thesis<sup>130</sup> of Lusseau (1996)<sup>131</sup> dealing with translations of Belgian francophone literature in Portugal is very much akin to the present thesis. Lusseau’s conclusions are striking: although Wallonia speaks (and more importantly here: writes) in a major language, added to the fact that French was a primary source for both direct and indirect translations into Portuguese (not only under the *Estado Novo*),

---

<sup>130</sup> In the Portuguese pre-Bologna system of tertiary and quaternary education, the *mestrado* was a postgraduate research degree following the 10-semester *licenciatura*. It was designed to take two years and could be followed by the four-year *doutoramento*. Cross-cultural comparisons of systems of education are always inexact, but in the Anglo-Saxon academia a *mestrado* could be situated somewhere between an M.Phil. and a Ph.D.

<sup>131</sup> LUSSEAU, Fabienne Frédérique Monique. 1996. *La traduction au Portugal de la littérature francophone de Belgique: Étude d’un cas particulier d’échange culturel*. Unpublished Dissertation in Comparative Literature. Centre for Comparative Studies, University of Lisbon.

this particular literature seems almost to have been ostracised. With few exceptions and despite the directness of translations, the best known instance of Walloon culture in Portugal remained the comic strip *The Adventures of Tintin* (by Georges Rémi), rather than any work from its canon or ‘high literature’.

J. K. Helgason is another kindred spirit. In his monograph, entitled *The Rewriting of Njáls Saga: Translation, Politics and Icelandic Sagas* (1999), he examines the ‘forking paths’ of *Njáls Saga* (in English better known as *The Story of Burnt Njal*), a canonical text of (Old) Icelandic literature, in the various forms of its rewriting in the British and American, as well as in the Danish and Norwegian literary system and socio-cultural context. The chapter headings alone give an indication of the richness of this study comparing the destiny of the Saga in both major and ‘minor’ LSCs: Tourism and Teutonism, Abridgement and Immigration, Rewriting and Censorship, Language and Nationality, Patronage and Politics, etc.

Inquiring into the ‘hierarchy of constraints influencing the textual (re)production within a literary system’, Helgason (1999: 99) describes the appearance of a Danish translation of the Old Icelandic Saga in German-occupied Denmark in the times of Nazi censorship as follows:

The German censor constrained the publishing activities of the Danish publisher Arne Sørensen, just as the publishing agenda of Det tredje Standpunkts forlag [the Danish publisher] predetermined the promotional writings of Icelander Bjarni M. Gíslason, enclosed with the publication in question. As we have seen, the publications of Det tredje Standpunkts forlag, including *Islendingenes færd*, generally conformed to the constraints of the censor while concurrently, on a different (disguised) level, [it] challenged the German presence in Denmark during World War II. In the writings of Gíslason, one is moreover able to detect a third level of signification, reflecting the sensitive political ties between Iceland and Denmark.

The reception of a work of literature mediated through a third culture, which in this case was present not in the form of texts but the military, and further exacerbated by censorship and competing ideologies, takes us into areas far removed from the texts themselves. Helgason adds a further twist to the tale by drawing our attention to the Saga’s destiny in Norway (1999: 101):

The irony is that, while the Danish publication was in part a reaction to the German military occupation of Denmark, Sommerfelt’s 1871 translation defied a long-standing Danish influence on Norwegian culture and literature. More specifically, it was meant to supplant Petersen’s Danish translation of *Njáls saga* on the Norwegian bookmarket.

It is difficult to imagine a more relevant quote to make our point here than this ‘irony’. Investigating literary and cultural interrelations between and among medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures not only makes sense. It also provides us with a cornucopia of new data, new points of view and opportunities for new discoveries, thus enormously enriching the field of Translation Studies.

### 1.7.3 Ideology and Central Europe

Cultural historian Matthew Philpotts (in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 237, 244) argues in his study on the boundaries of dictatorship:

While generic fascism places emphasis on ideological commonalities among ultra-nationalist dictatorships (see Griffin 1991), a host of alternative categories focus attention on the organizational dynamics of regimes and open up comparison with ideologically divergent, socialist dictatorships. (237)

[...] the Iberian dictatorships seem to be much more readily comparable in this respect [i.e. translation activity] with the post-1953 Soviet-style dictatorships of the Eastern Bloc than with Nazi Germany. (244)

Indeed, similarities between Portuguese fascism and Czechoslovak communism are striking, for instance in the functioning of censorship. The two regimes did not implement identical strategies for dealing with subversive literature (translated or autochthonous), and yet analogies can easily be drawn as to their effects upon the literary systems (including its institutions, agents, self-censorship, etc.).

The distortion inherent in studying medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures through the lens of major cultures is succinctly summarised by P. Kuhiwczak (in Bassnett & Lefevere 1990: 119):

[...] a substantial part of the scholarship carried on under the umbrella of “cultural studies” is not devoted to enquiry, but to some kind of intervention on behalf of the supposedly weak, dispossessed and, in one way or another, appropriated. In most cases these are studies of the post-colonial attitudes of Europe and North America towards the Third World, from which one can learn a lot about the author’s guilt (especially if s/he lives and works in Western Europe and North America), and the author’s strong sense of justice: but very little about the problem itself – and next to nothing about its relation to similar problems in the past. (119)

Before embarking on a comparison of Portuguese fascism and Czechoslovak communism by studying translations of literature (Chapters 3 and 4), a few words regarding the term ‘Central Europe’ appear appropriate.

The medium-sized lingua- and socio-cultures of **Central Europe** have been subjected to many forms of appropriation – including, during the Second World War, physical violence on an unprecedented scale (from which Portugal was spared). Kuhiwczak (1990: 120) sums up the post-war political repercussions:

[...] in the centre of Europe, the African solution was applied: small peoples were shifted from east to west and from north to south, frontiers were arbitrarily redrawn, new ideological solutions were enthusiastically applied, and cities which already had two names were given a third. Europe seemed to be rationalized at last: the centre had fallen apart, and the East could finally meet the West. (120)

To include the Czechs (see particularly Kundera’s *Le Rideau*), Slovaks, Poles, Hungarians and Slovenes in Eastern Europe is not only ideology-laden Cold War rhetoric (passed on to new generations of West Europeans), but *historically wrong* (with the exception of the brief, although recent intermezzo of 1948-1989).

Despite linguistic affinities (save for Hungarian, a Finno-Ugrian language), the history of Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary and Slovenia had for centuries been connected more closely with Austria and Germany than with Russia, tying Central Europe decidedly closer to Western rather than Eastern Europe.

This is reflected in a shared alphabet (Latin, not Cyrillic) as well as in a shared religion: Central and Western Europe are either Catholic or Protestant, whereas Eastern Europe is

overwhelmingly Orthodox Catholic or Islamic. West European influences in Central Europe are omnipresent in literature, music, architecture and so forth.

Central Europe witnessed and co-developed the Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque architectural styles; it had its own Protestant reformation (Jan Hus or ‘John Huss’, himself inspired by John Wycliffe and inspiring Martin Luther in his turn); Central Europe contributed to humanism (e.g. Jan Ámos Komenský or ‘John Amos Comenius’); it participated in the Enlightenment (e.g. Bernard Bolzano), etc. – all events and developments that Eastern Europe (notably Russia) neither experienced nor contributed to.

The establishment of the Holy Roman Empire in 962 and the East-West Schism in 1054 influenced, indeed divided, Europe for centuries to come. The division of Europe by the victors of the Second World War lasted less than 45 years (two generations, sociologically speaking).

To quote Kundera’s *Le Rideau* one last time (2005: 58): ‘Les gens qui m’entouraient prêtaient une grande importance à la politique, mais connaissaient piètrement la géographie [...]’<sup>132</sup> – and *l’histoire*, we could add.

---

<sup>132</sup> ‘The people around me placed great importance on politics but knew almost nothing about geography [...]’ (Kundera 2005: 58, *Le Rideau*, Paris: Gallimard; 2008: 43, *The Curtain*, translated by Linda Asher).

## IX. Chapter 2: Material and Methodology

Courses on historical methodology are not worth the time that they take up. I shall never give one myself, and I have observed that many of my colleagues who do give such courses refrain from exemplifying their methods by writing anything.  
Samuel E. Morison

Every discourse, even a poetic or oracular sentence, carries with it a system of rules for producing analogous things and thus an outline of methodology.  
Jacques Derrida

### 2.1 Introduction

Unlike theory (or ‘conceptual research’, in the terminology of Williams & Chesterman 2002: 58), which may spiral off into philosophical deliberations, methodology cannot be considered in isolation from the body of the material to which it applies. The interdependence between theoretical assumptions, concepts and approaches on one hand, and supposedly objective ‘hard’ facts (data) on the other, is reflected in the philosophy of science (Okasha 2002: 130):

[...] scientific enquiry is invariably laden with value judgements. (This is analogous to the claim that all observation is theory laden [...]. [A]ny set of data can in principle be explained in more than one way. A scientist’s choice of theory will thus never be uniquely determined by his data.

Translation Studies is, of course, well aware of this: ‘Even what you take to be a fact or a piece of data depends on your initial theoretical assumptions about what would constitute a relevant fact in the first place’ (Williams & Chesterman 2002: 58). And elsewhere and more explicitly (op. cit., 60):

It is important to realize, however, that your selection and interpretation of concepts, metaphors and theories is not only determined by their empirical, objective applicability. It is also influenced to some extent by your subjective feelings, your personal ideologies and motives. Just as observation is never theory-free, so, too, theoretical concepts are seldom entirely value-free, entirely objective.

Thus, for reasons elucidated and elaborated below, the methodology for the present thesis is based, to an overwhelming extent, on Anton Popovič – primarily his *Teória umeleckého prekladu* [Theory of Literary Translation] (1975), occasionally quoting from his *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (1976), and in a few cases, from *Originál/preklad: Interpretáčná terminológia* [Original/Translation: Interpretation Terminology], published with his colleagues from Nitra, Slovakia, in 1983. It is a conscious and deliberate aim of the methodological part of this thesis to demonstrate not primarily the originality or topicality of Popovič’s theoretical and methodological thinking, but the usefulness and applicability of his concepts, models and methods.

## 2.2 Material

One way of avoiding the pitfall of viewing the data exclusively through the lens of one's own theory or methodology is to approach the research question *heuristically* (D'hulst 2001: 8)<sup>133</sup>, without imposing any limitations on the 'zero corpus' (Merino 2005: 3)<sup>134</sup>.

Our initial research question ('just one important question is usually enough for any project', Pym 1998: 20) was therefore as simple as possible: *What was translated from Czech into Portuguese?* The question appeared justifiable on both accounts adduced by Pym (1998: 15): 'First, it should not have been done before. Second, the people carrying out the research must have an interest in it.'

Moreover, the research question appeared to be potentially of some importance, not because there would be any 'disagreement about its answer' (Pym 1998: 23), but because it would provide new data (Williams & Chesterman 2002: 111).

Portugal and the Czech Republic (or Czechoslovakia prior to 1993), although their political representatives have been meeting in several international organisations of which both countries are members, know blissfully little about each other. There is no institute or department for Czech or Slovak studies in Portugal, and Portuguese is not taught at the Czech Institute for Translation and Interpreting Studies at Charles University in Prague.

Although Portuguese has been taught at several universities in the Czech Republic (and was in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Czechoslovakia), the subject has been a classical, philological one (i.e. language and literature), focusing rarely on translation, and if so, then only on the 'Portuguese into Czech' direction.

Before 1989, the only known Czech living in Portugal, František Listopad (known in Portugal as Jorge Listopad), a Czech poet and Portuguese playwright, did not translate any book by a Czech author into Portuguese (for Listopad, see subchapter 4.2.2.1). The result was a chasm in our unidirectional knowledge of Czech-Portuguese/Luso-Czech relations via translations – a chasm that seemed worth bridging.

Another criterion of significance for any research is whether the answer to the research question opens up 'a much wider question that others had failed to ask' (Pym 1998: 21). There are at least three areas in which even the initial question can claim significance:

- a) Little research seems to have been done (or at least, is available) in Translation Studies in Portugal and in the Czech Republic on relations between two (semi-)peripheral cultures. Translation Studies in both countries have instead focused on translation of literature from or into 'major' (dominant) languages.
- b) Little research seems to have been done (or at least, is available) on the flow of translations between 'communist regimes' and 'fascist regimes' in the

<sup>133</sup> D'HULST, Lieven. 2001. 'Towards a metahistoriography in translation research'. <http://www.soas.ac.uk/literatures/satranslations/Dhulst.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-04-17).

<sup>134</sup> MERINO, Raquel. 2005. 'From catalogue to corpus in DTS. Translations censored under Franco: the TRACE project.' [http://www.ehu.es/trace/publicaciones/2005aRMA\\_RCEI.pdf](http://www.ehu.es/trace/publicaciones/2005aRMA_RCEI.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-04-17).

second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (but see B. E. Cieszyńska 2007<sup>135</sup>, H. Pięta 2010<sup>136</sup>).

- c) Little research seems to have been done (or at least, is available) on non-translation, indirect translations, etc. (see previous chapter).

Typologically, the present research can be well accommodated within what Pym (1998: 5) calls ‘translation archaeology’:

*Translation archaeology* is a set of discourses concerned with answering all or part of the complex question “who translated what, how, where, when, for whom and with what effect?”. It can include anything from the compiling of catalogues to the carrying out of biographical research on translators. The term “archaeology” [...] simply denotes a fascinating field that often involves complex detective work, great self-sacrifice and very real service to other areas of translation history.

Aiming to establish a catalogue of translations from Czech into Portuguese, or ‘zero corpus’, the main guideline was to ‘approach maximum completeness so as to enable any particular piece of information to be found’ (Pym 1998: 42). The first step thus had to consist in ascertaining data availability. At the initial stage, data was gathered from:

- 1) UNESCO’s *Index Translationum* (both in book form – from 1948 to 1986, and in the electronic version<sup>137</sup> – from 1970 to 2010);
- 2) PORBASE, the Portuguese National Database of Bibliographic Data<sup>138</sup>;
- 3) BNL, the Portuguese National Library in Lisbon (Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa);
- 4) The authoritative five-volume bibliography of translations into Portuguese by A. A. Gonçalves Rodrigues (1999) entitled *A Tradução em Portugal* [Translation in Portugal].
- 5) Klementinum, the Czech National Library in Prague.

The *Index Translationum* (IT) comprises data on Brazil from 1948 on (with the exception of the years 1951 and 1968). In fact, data on Portugal in the IT only begin in 1950, and the years 1951, 1969, 1971 to 1975 and 1978-79 are all missing from the book version. Angola and Mozambique are mentioned in the book version separately from Portugal only in 1971 and 1979 (Angola) and 1983 (Mozambique). Neither in the book nor in the electronic version of the IT are any translations from Czech into Portuguese to be found in Angola, Mozambique or in any other lusophone country (apart from Portugal and Brazil).

On the other hand, rather surprisingly, the electronic version of the IT and the Czech National Library in Prague revealed a number of translations from Czech into

<sup>135</sup> CIESZYŃSKA, Beata E. 2007. *Iberian and Slavonic Cultures: Contact and Comparison*. Lisbon: CompaRes. ISBN 9789899544406. <http://www.iberian-slavonic.org/iberianandslavoniccultures.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-04-17).

<sup>136</sup> PIETA, Hanna. 2010. *Portuguese Translations of Polish Literature Published in Book Form: Some Methodological Issues*. <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers2010/Hanna%20PIETA,%20Portuguese%20Translations%20of%20Polish%20Literature.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-04-17).

<sup>137</sup> The electronic version of UNESCO’s *Index Translationum* is available at: <http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/> (retrieved on 2011-04-17).

<sup>138</sup> PORBASE (*Base Nacional de Dados Bibliográficos*): <http://www.porbase.org/pesquisa-porbase.html#1> (retrieved on 2011-04-17).

Portuguese made in Czechoslovakia: over 70 pamphlets of political propaganda published from 1978 to 1988 by Orbis (Prague), apparently destined not only for Portugal after the Carnation Revolution, but also for other lusophone countries, in particular Angola and Brazil.<sup>139</sup> Their existence was verified, and subsequently confirmed in the catalogue of the Czech National Library in Prague (the prime receiver of the Czech statutory ‘deposit copy’), although these brochures are not easily accessible.<sup>140</sup>

The **PORBASE** includes all books published in Portugal (and her former colonies) since the introduction in 1931 of the statutory ‘deposit copy’ (‘depósito legal’), i.e. the legal obligation on all Portuguese publishers to send a copy of every book they publish to the National Library in Lisbon (and several other libraries, e.g. in Coimbra, Porto, Braga, etc.). The information in the PORBASE was verified *de visu* in the BNL, with the aim of extending the data to be analysed, rendering it as accurate as possible, and correcting whatever mistakes were discovered either in the BNL Intranet or on the PORBASE website.

The authoritative five-volume reference work by António Augusto Gonçalves Rodrigues, *A Tradução em Portugal*, sets out to cover the period from 1495 to 1930 and describes itself as an ‘attempt at a detailed chronological list of translations printed in the Portuguese language excluding Brazil’. It is the *chef d’œuvre* of Portuguese translation bibliography, unsurpassed to this day.<sup>141</sup>

With regard to our four main sources, it proved impossible to obtain the complete data on Brazil in Lisbon, so it was decided to exclude this material from our corpus. As Pięta (2010: 10) observes about the lusophone publishing industry:

Although all these countries are known to exhibit linguistic, historical and political affinities, the literary and cultural exchange between them is rather scarce, especially when compared with Anglo-Portuguese or Franco-Portuguese relations. Accordingly, one can hardly speak of a homogeneous lusophone culture, let alone a coherent lusophone publishing industry.

---

<sup>139</sup> The dissolved Portuguese Empire, the oldest and longest-established colonial power of Europe, faced vast political changes after the Carnation Revolution in 1974. The Portuguese colonies in Africa all gained independence between 1974 and 1976. In the time of the Cold War, the U.S.S.R. and its satellites saw in the emerging regimes yet another possibility to spread its ideology. The victory of Angola’s MPLA (Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola]), supported by the Soviet Union and its allies, looked very promising. In fact, Portugal itself, between 1974 and 1976 (at least), was torn between democratic and communist forces, since it was predominantly the communists, the most persecuted group of all under Salazar’s regime, who stood behind the 1974 revolution. As for Brazil, following the military regime from 1964 to 1985 it became yet another country where communist ideas appeared likely to catch on.

<sup>140</sup> For the most part these brochures are deposited in the National Conservation Fund (Národní konzervační fond, NKF) of the Czech National Library. Access to books in the NKF is only granted exceptionally and involves an extended period of waiting. All requests to view (volumes cannot be taken home) must be well substantiated. Cf.

[http://www.nkp.cz/pages/page.php?page=sluz\\_konzervacni\\_fondy.htm](http://www.nkp.cz/pages/page.php?page=sluz_konzervacni_fondy.htm) (retrieved on 2011-04-19).

<sup>141</sup> This despite the efforts of Teresa Seruya and her team to garner institutional support for a continuation of this immensely useful reference work (at the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology, *Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia*). See also below (Chapter 4). The years 1930-55 have already been published online: <http://www.translatedliteratureportugal.org/> [retrieved on 2011-08-27].



Moreover, ‘the application of inclusive linguistic and territorial criteria would result in an excessively large and undifferentiated corpus’ (*ibid.*), which was not and could not be the aim of the present research.

Having established what has been translated from Czech into Portuguese, and being aware of the pervasive phenomenon of censorship throughout the Portuguese dictatorship (the *Estado Novo*, or New State), the next step was to find out what has *not* been translated due to censorship. The answers lay dormant in the National Archives of the Tower of the Tomb (*Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo*) in Lisbon. The Portuguese National Archives leave much to be desired in comparison with their counterpart in Alcalá de Henares (northeast of Madrid), the Spanish *Archivo General de la Administración*. They are certainly unlikely to yield the kind of data used in the TRACE project, as reported by Merino (2005: 5, 7):

The published text, the film as shown or distributed, was not any longer the only possible object of study, it was, on the contrary, the last trace of a chain of texts that started with the original, went through processes of translation and adaptation, with draft versions examined at different stages by authors, translators, censors, producers... The bureaucratic process that started with an application form to publish a book, perform a play, or show a film, left many detailed traces of all interventions, leading to the creation, so to speak, of a cultural product in the target culture. (5) Target texts, translations, are found in censorship archives in two main formats: scripts (typewritten interim versions of plays or books or translated film scripts), and published texts (already published versions of play that are submitted to be used for a specific stage production, or books printed elsewhere – f. e. in Argentina – that require a censorship importation permission to be sold in Spain). (7)

Instead, all we are left with in the Torre do Tombo are censorship records compiled by the Portuguese censors, including occasional references to Czech literature. All in all, over thirty censorship files pertaining to books originally written by Czech authors were found in the Portuguese National Archives (see Chapter 4). Few though such data are [Limited though such data is, it provides...], they provide valuable information about the intermediate texts (via which language what literary work was translated into Portuguese) and about the censorial procedures applied: (i) approved (in its entirety), (ii) approved with cuts, and (iii) prohibited.

A list of books banned in Portugal, including translations, is also provided by J. M. Mascarenhas (1996) and the *Comissão do Livro Negro sobre o Regime Fascista* (‘Committee of the Black Book on the Fascist Regime’, 1981), which complemented our list. These sources revealed that for some of the banned books there was no corresponding censorship file in the Portuguese National Archives.

A corpus being ‘much more than a reservoir of “examples”’ (Toury 1997: 73, in Merino & Rabadán 2002: 143), the next stage consisted in producing a corpus proper from the list (catalogue) of translations and non-translated texts discovered, ‘making availability the decisive criterion’ (Merino 2005: 7).

Toury (1998: 23) notes that if regularities ‘manifest themselves in rather low percentages’, the way out is to begin cutting away the fuzzy edges of one’s corpus:

In actual fact, what a researcher often starts out with is a rather arbitrary set rather than a proper corpus; a group of texts, or a number of lower-level phenomena, which may be both accidental, from a translational point of view, and highly heterogeneous (i.e. devoid of clear regular patterns). The way to go from here is to try and break the initial set into sub-groups on the basis

of one feature (variable) or another which will have emerged as significant (for that set) during the study itself. This procedure is bound to yield a substantial increase of homogeneity, reducing each sub-group's accidentality and gradually rendering it representative in terms of that particular variable; in other words, a proper corpus. Within such sub-groups, regularities are bound to increase, often considerably. If found to be too small now, any subgroup-turned-corpus could then be expanded; this time on the basis of the defining feature itself, and hence in a much more justified (and justifiable) fashion.

In order to arrive at a more homogeneous research corpus, i.e. 'a list of translations drawn up according to strictly controlled criteria' (Pym 1998: 42), **the decision has been taken to include only translations of *fiction* from Czech into Portuguese in book form published in Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.**

Using the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC), the *Index Translationum*, at least in its book version, makes a clear distinction between literature and other pieces of writing. Although all ten categories of the UDC (0-9) have been researched, our main focus was on number eight – language, linguistics and literature. Subsumed in this category are: General questions, including philology and rhetoric (800); Linguistics and languages (810); and, most importantly for us, Literature (820).

From a conceptual point of view, *fiction*, or literature *sensu stricto*, is rather difficult to pinpoint. The Encyclopædia Britannica defines fiction as 'literature created from the imagination, not *presented* as fact, though it may be based on a true story or situation' (*italics added*)<sup>142</sup>. Czech structuralism defined a 'poetic work' as 'a linguistic utterance whose aesthetic function is its dominant' (Grygar 1999: 43)<sup>143</sup>, among other, more complex approximations.

The Nitra School defined fiction (*belles lettres*) as 'the joint designation for prose works having an aesthetic or entertaining function. The term "fiction" serves to designate prose works with a fictitious (invented) content as compared with works of non-fiction or factual literature. The transition from fiction to non-fiction is seamless.' (Žilka 2006: 87)<sup>144</sup>.

Culler (1997/2000) takes a more nuanced approach:

To describe "literature" would be to analyse *a set of assumptions and interpretive operations* readers may bring to bear on such texts. (25)

Now literary narratives can be seen as members of a larger class of stories, "narrative display texts", utterance *whose relevance to listeners lies not in information they convey* but in their "tellability". (26)

[...] literature is not just a special kind of language, for many literary works don't flaunt their difference from other sorts of language; *they function in special ways because of the special attention they receive.* (28)

[...] the "literariness" of literature may lie in the tension of the interaction between the linguistic material and *readers' conventional expectations of what literature is.* (35)

To reflect on literariness is to keep before us, as resources for analysing these discourses, *reading practices elicited by literature:* the suspension of the demand for immediate

<sup>142</sup> <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/206037/fiction> (retrieved on 2011-04-18).

<sup>143</sup> '[...] básnické dílo je definováno jako jazykové sdělení, jehož estetická funkce je jeho dominantou.' (Grygar 1999: 43).

<sup>144</sup> 'Beletrie [...] spoločný názov pre prozaické diela, ktoré majú estetickú alebo zábavnú funkciu. B. slúži na označenie prozaických diel s fiktívnym (vymysleným) obsahom oproti dielam vecnej literatúry a literatúre faktu. Medzi b. a vecnou literatúrou je plynulý prechod.' (Žilka 2006: 87).

intelligibility, reflection on the implications of means of expression, and attention to how meaning is made and pleasure produced. (41) (*italics added throughout*)

Finally, Culler posits five aspects of the nature of literature: 1) literature as the ‘foregrounding’ of language; 2) literature as the integration of language; 3) literature as fiction (‘The literary work is a linguistic event which projects a fictional world [...]’ 2000: 30); 4) literature as aesthetic object; 5) literature as intertextual or self-reflexive construct.

Patterson (1995: 256, in Seruya 2009: 74) concurs in defining literature as follows:

[...] a piece of writing is “literature” not because it possesses certain characteristics that other pieces lack, but because its readers regard it – for a variety of reasons – *as* literature. (emphasis in original)

Basing her argument on Toury’s (1995: 32) definition of ‘assumed translations’, i.e. ‘all utterances which are presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on no matter what grounds’, Seruya suggests we speak of ‘assumed literature’. It is a useful enough concept for our purposes.

UNESCO’s revised *Recommendation concerning the International Standardization of Statistics on the Production and Distribution of Books, Newspapers and Periodicals* (1985)<sup>145</sup> defines a **book** as ‘a non-periodic publication of at least 49 pages exclusive of the cover pages, published in the country and made available to the public’. Although there are competing definitions of what a book is (cf. Pięta 2010: 16-17), UNESCO’s definition has served us well as a general guideline. For the purposes of our corpus, however, we must add the criterion, contained in the regulations of the *Associação Portuguesa de Editores e Livreiros* (Portuguese Association of Publishers and Booksellers), that the publication must have appeared in the statutory ‘deposit copy’ (in Pięta 2010: 16-17).

As Pięta’s article belongs in the same research group as the present thesis – the aforesaid ‘Lisbon Group’ initiated and supervised by T. Seruya focusing on translations into Portuguese primarily during the *Estado Novo* – Pięta’s proviso of ‘published in Portugal’ may be borrowed for our purposes:

[...] by Portuguese translation I mean any text originally published in a language other than Portuguese which was rendered into European Portuguese and was published in Portugal. Note that a publication is considered to be published in Portugal if the publisher has his registered office in the country, the place of printing or place of circulation here being irrelevant.

This admittedly excludes the potentially interesting issue of the agitprop pamphlets translated from Czech into Portuguese in Czechoslovakia, but they would have been excluded already under the first criterion, since they cannot properly be classified as ‘fiction’. An enquiry into these pamphlets might in itself be an interesting area of research, but must be deferred to another study.

---

<sup>145</sup> UNESCO. 1985. *Recommendation concerning the International Standardization of Statistics on the Production and Distribution of Books, Newspapers and Periodicals*. [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13146&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13146&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) (retrieved on 2011-04-18).

Applying this criterion, the research excluded stories, articles, poems or theatre plays not published in book form (leaflets, brochures, film scripts, theatre bills, poems or stories published outside a book, e.g. in a literary magazine, etc.). As the present research is a pioneer study with no predecessors to draw upon, book translations of Czech literature into Portuguese are to be regarded as a first (and, in a sense, representative) sample of how Czech literature came to be represented in Portugal, or how accessible it was to the ordinary Portuguese reader who did not read other languages.<sup>146</sup>

There is only one exception: Gonçalves Rodrigues (1999: 267, volume 5) mentions a story by ‘Jean’ (i.e. Jan) Neruda entitled ‘O Vampiro’ (The Vampire) that was supposedly translated into Portuguese as early as 1926, thus making it the very first literary work translated from Czech into Portuguese. Unfortunately, Gonçalves Rodrigues does not mention where the story appeared (anthology, collection, daily, weekly, monthly?) and attempts to trace it have so far proved fruitless. To be exact, this is the only mention of any Czech author having been translated into Portuguese in this standard reference book by Gonçalves Rodrigues, which makes it appear very likely that there were no translations from Czech into Portuguese from 1495 to 1926, and no book translations from Czech into Portuguese until at least 1930.

**Czech literature**, or more precisely, the literature of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown (that is, Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia) as well as the literature of Czechoslovakia (1918-1993) can be seen as a ‘special interliterary community’ according to Ďurišin (see subchapter 1.5.2.2). Literature produced in these Central European regions has been written in Czech, Slovak, German, Latin and Old Church Slavonic (as well as, to a much lesser extent, in other languages and dialects) – all of which we came across during our research.

Czech literature, however, is defined here as literature written in the Czech language, including all of its stylistic variants and strata. Therefore, works written by John Amos Comenius (Jan Ámos Komenský) in Latin, Milan Kundera in French (that is, after 1990, following *Immortality*), by Franz Kafka, Max Brod, Rainer Maria Rilke and others in German – in fact Prague (actually, Bohemian and Moravian) German Literature in its entirety – are not included in the present study.

This may seem paradoxical as the two most translated Czech-born authors worldwide (which also applies to the Portuguese language) have long been Franz Kafka and Milan Kundera.

Franz Kafka (1883-1924) is the most translated author of Czech origin worldwide – and this applies equally to translations into Portuguese. To speak of ‘Czech origin’, however, is a kind of political correctness. Kafka was a Jew writing in German who lived in Prague, an Austro-Hungarian town until 1918, alongside many other Prague, Bohemian and Moravian Jewish authors (such as Rainer Maria Rilke, Egon Erwin Kisch, Franz Werfel, Max Brod, Gustav Meyrink), most of whom wrote in German. His ‘Czechness’ is consequently rather tenuous. However, if we take his place of birth as our criterion,

---

<sup>146</sup> Of course, the mere existence of a translation of a Czech literary work into a different language (say, French, Spanish, Italian, English or German) did not mean it could be obtained in Salazar’s Portugal. Even books in languages other than Portuguese were monitored and confiscated by the P.I.D.E. (‘political police’).

Kafka might indeed be considered a ‘Czech’ author, although he did not write any of his literary works in Czech. On the other hand it could be hypothesised that **Kafka is the most translated ‘Czech’ author precisely because he wrote in German and is thus studied as part of German Studies**, whereas Kundera has not been studied as part of French Studies (quite apart from the simple fact that there are very few institutes of Czech Studies around the world). The IT lists 22 entries for Kafka in Portugal since 1982 and 115 in Brazil since 1979 (including re-editions).

Milan Kundera’s case is very complex and needs to be treated separately. Kundera wrote most of his books in Czech, but since 1990 he has been writing in French. His books have been translated in Portugal and in Brazil in various editions and reprints (the IT lists 21 entries for Kundera in Portugal and 27 in Brazil – in both countries since 1985). However, all the source texts for the Portuguese translations were French.

The same criterion was applied to John Amos Comenius (1592-1670, Czech: Jan Ámos Komenský, Portuguese: João Amós Coménio), whose works *Didáctica Magna: tratado da arte universal de ensinar tudo a todos* (a translation of his *Didactica magna*, 1633-38, included in volume I of *Opera didactica omnia*, 1657), and *Pampaedia* (part of *De rerum humanarum emendatione consultatio catholica*, written in the early 1640s) were translated into Portuguese from their Latin originals by Joaquim Ferreira Gomes, a professor of the University of Coimbra, in 1966 and 1971 respectively.

## 2.3 Methodology

Proceeding from the theoretical concepts identified as the most relevant for the present thesis (Chapter 1), various theoretical-methodological approaches could be taken into consideration, e.g. Gideon Toury (1995, 1998), Itamar Even-Zohar (1990, 2004), André Lefevere (1985, 1992a, 1992b, 1995), and possibly Anthony Pym (1998) or Jiří Levý (1963, 1971).

The rationale behind our decision to put Anton Popovič (primarily 1975, 1976, 1983) to actual methodological use is twofold. First, since Popovič’s theoretical and methodological concepts and models have rarely been applied to actual data, the present research aims to break with this almost ostentatious neglect of Popovič’s lifelong scholarly endeavours and theoretical brilliance and to demonstrate the usability and applicability of his contribution to Translation Studies. The first principal reason to employ ‘Popovič’ is thus in part subjective and in part ‘archaeological’ – not from the viewpoint of translations, but from the angle of Translation Studies: ‘older’ models ought not to be discarded (e.g. as simply outdated) unless they have been put to actual use and conclusively proved inappropriate.

Second, Popovič’s work epitomises the apex of pre-1989 Czechoslovak Translation Studies. Levý’s contribution is by no means diminished by deciding to employ Popovič’s methodology. Quite the contrary, Levý precedes Popovič both chronologically and theoretically and Popovič’s work is inconceivable without much of Levý’s inspirational input. However, Levý’s untimely death before he turned 41 precluded him from developing his concepts, models and methods further. Instead,

Popovič resumed Levý's work where it had been discontinued, complementing it by the contributions of F. Miko (see below), and developing it along his own lines.<sup>147</sup>

Moreover, and more importantly, Popovič appears to be strikingly apposite to the present research and to the data obtained. Despite his forbidding terminology, which is explained wherever unclear, his work covers all of the phenomena investigated here.

In other words, our opting for Popovič's methodology does not in itself imply any criticism of other scholars and their propositions. Indeed, where criticism is expressed it is voiced as explicitly as possible.

Before embarking on the introduction of Popovič's concepts, models and methods, one important observation must be made. The present thesis is not a study in the history of Translation Studies. It does not seek to answer the question of 'who said what first'. Toury (1998: 11) cogently circumscribes our approach:

Let's agree to refrain from going into the question of who was the first to say what. Due to our incomplete knowledge of the history of our own discipline, where the wheel has been and is still being re-invented time and again, such questions are bound to generate hot debates; which is not bad in itself, had it not been for the fact that such debates would inevitably lead us way off track.

Anyone interested in a more historical and contextual approach to the concepts as well as theoretical and methodological underpinnings of Czech and Slovak translation theories is referred to Jettmarová 2005 (in Károly & Fóris 2005: 95-105) and especially Králová, Jettmarová et al. (2008)<sup>148</sup>. A thorough discussion of these issues would go well beyond the intentions and scope of the present thesis.

### 2.3.1 Levý

Jiří Levý (1926-67) was one of Popovič's main inspirers and his primary precursor in Czechoslovak translation theory ('Translation Studies' is, of course, a later coinage). There is much to Levý that cannot be covered in the present thesis, as the aim here is not to delve into the history of (Czechoslovak) Translation Studies, or to present Levý *per se*.

However, a brief note on Levý is necessary if we are to understand Popovič's underpinnings. Levý made a name for himself with two fundamental publications during his lifetime. The first, entitled *Czech Theories of Translation: Development of Translation Theories and Methods in Czech Literature*, published originally in 1957 and republished in 1996, consists of two parts.

---

<sup>147</sup> Historically, this is not quite accurate. Popovič's first theoretical-empirical monograph (on Russian literature in Slovakia 1863-1875) appeared in 1961. By that time at the latest, Levý cannot be claimed to have been Popovič's sole inspirer, not even in the narrowly delimited field of Czechoslovak translation theory of the time. Thus, for some time, the two scholars worked side by side, drawing occasional inspiration from each other, but concurrently producing two distinct approaches (i.e. until Levý's death in 1967).

<sup>148</sup> Jettmarová's 2008 article is also downloadable from: JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana. 2008. 'Czech and Slovak Translation Theories: The Lesser-Known Tradition'. [http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Jettmarova\\_4%2002\\_08.pdf](http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Jettmarova_4%2002_08.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-04-21).

The first part analyses translation theories and methods in Czech literature from the Middle Ages to the 1930s, relating them to the context of Czech literature in general as well as to translation theories and methods in some other European countries (especially the United Kingdom, Germany, France and Russia). The second part consists of what Popovič calls ‘translators’ formulated poetics’, i.e. what particular translators said about their (specific) work(s) in various paratexts (peritexts as well as epitexts). *Czech Theories of Translation* is a groundbreaking study in that it focuses both on translators as people (agents) and on the theorisation of convergent norms in particular periods throughout the history of Czech literature.

The second monograph, entitled *The Art of Translation*, drew on the previous, overwhelmingly empirical study and was published for the first time in 1963 and republished in Czech in 1983 and in 1998. The German version (*Die literarische Übersetzung: Theorie einer Kunstgattung* [Literary Translation: Theory of a Genre]), translated by Walter Schamschula, appeared in 1969. Levý participated in the German translation, extended the original 1963 monograph to include additional examples more relevant to German and Western scholars. The second and third Czech versions were expanded by K. Hausenblas to incorporate some of these elaborations.<sup>149</sup>

The English translation of this key monograph of Czech Translation Studies is now in preparation (Jettmarová 2009)<sup>150</sup>. *The Art of Translation* is divided into two parts. The first concerns translation in general, the second the translation of verse. The contents of Part One are follows (Levý 1998: 393-394):

[I] State of theoretical reflections on translation issues

1. Overall situation
2. General and special theory
3. Linguistic methods
4. Methods of literary studies

[II] Translation process

A/ **Genesis of a literary work and a translation**

B/ **Three stages of the translator’s work**

1. Understanding the original
2. Interpreting the original
3. Re-stylising the original

[III] Aesthetic problems of translation

A/ **Creative reproduction**

1. Translation as a type of art
2. Double norm in translation
3. Duality of the translated work
4. Ambiguous relation to the original literature

B/ **The translator as a literary and language creator**

1. “Classical translation”
2. Translation tradition
3. Language creativity

C/ **Reproductive faithfulness**

<sup>149</sup> This is one instance of how a translation can retroactively influence the original, relegating clinical target-orientedness to the realm of mere theory. For similar procedures in literature, see e.g. Kundera (Woods 2006).

<sup>150</sup> JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana. 2009. ‘Explanatory Notes to/on Additional Chapter’. [http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Pym\\_Explanatory\\_Notes\\_Czech.pdf](http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Pym_Explanatory_Notes_Czech.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-04-23), p. 3.

1. Translator's working procedures
2. National and temporal specificity
3. The whole and the part

[IV] Two chapters in translation poetics

A/ **Literary style and "translationese"**

1. Selection of words
2. The relationship between the idea and the expression

B/ **Translating the book title**

[V] Translating theatre plays

1. Orality and comprehensibility
2. Stylisation of theatrical speech
3. Semantic contexts
4. Verbal acts
5. Dialogue and characters
6. Uneven stylisation principle

[VI] Translation as an issue in literary history

1. State of work in translation history
2. Translation analysis
3. Translation in national culture and in world literature

Part Two, dealing with the translation of verse systems, consists of five subsections: I. Original verse and translated verse; II. Translating from unrelated verse systems; III. Translating from related verse systems; IV. Comparative verse morphology; V. Unity of style and idea (Levý 1998: 395-396).

The contents of this 1963 monograph already reveal several key notions of Levý's theory and methodology: his concern for the *translator* (agent), his (historical and cultural) account of *norms*, his conception of translation as a *product* and translating as a *process*, his emphasis on empirical data in studying translation history, etc.

Moreover, Levý (1957, 1963) is highly readable. Only very few of his concepts, e.g. that of 'realistic translation' (see below), may sound odd to our ears today; in general Levý exhibits clarity of style, precision of thought and scientific rigour. Last but not least, his approach and concepts have in no way become obsolete.

For all his readability, however, eliciting an explicit methodology from Levý (1963) is far from easy. Rather than providing the translation *scholar* with a methodology *sensu stricto*, Levý offers methods for the *translator*, and by extension, for the translation *critic*. Thus, most of the time, Levý's own implicit (or *implied*) methodology must be observed and reflected upon, and thus 'extracted' by deduction or extrapolation.

To give but one example: Levý (1998: 114-118) holds that the philosophical tripartite distinction between 'the general', 'the particular' (or 'the specific'), and 'the unique' can be successfully applied to the three most common translatorial methods: (i) translation proper, (ii) substitution, and (iii) transcription, respectively.

'The specific', when applied to a text to be translated, means its heavy dependence on the linguistic material, on the historical period or on the national environment. The translator must choose between *translation proper* (resulting in 'exotisation') and *substitution* by domestic analogy ('domestication'). If there is no meaning, as in some proper nouns, transcription must be opted for.



For example, the name of the protagonist in A. Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, Willy Loman, or Winston Smith in G. Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, can either be 'transcribed' (i.e. either carried over unchanged, transliterated, or adapted to the target-language pronunciation/alphabet system, as in Švejk → Chvejk, Schwejk) or 'substituted' by domestic (i.e. target-language) names, for these names arguably carry meanings.<sup>151</sup>

This is helpful for the translator, and potentially for a translation critic, but a translation scholar can derive only partial satisfaction from it. With respect to methods employable in a translation analysis, Levý (1998: 53) says there are three main relations in the study of translations:

- a) between the language of the original and the language of the translations – here, results of *comparative* [or contrastive] *linguistics* are used;
- b) between the content and form in the original (discovering the aesthetic function of the foreign form) and in the translation (seeking an equivalent form for the Czech stylisation [formulation]) – here, methods of *literary studies*, *comparative stylistics* and *poetics* are employed;
- c) between the resultant value of the original work and the translation – here, methods of *literary criticism* are used. (italics added)

The last relation is closely linked with Levý's 'dual norm in translation' (1998: 88): 'the reproduction norm' (i.e. the requirement of faithfulness, fidelity) and 'the artistic norm' (the requirement of beauty). Levý (1998: 93) puts it succinctly:

[...] beauty and faithfulness are often set against each other, as if they were mutually exclusive. However, they exclude each other only if attractiveness is taken for beauty and literalism is understood as truthfulness.<sup>152</sup>

In general, Levý's method is to proceed by a most painstaking analysis of the texts. His notion of 'intellectualisation' may serve as an enlightening example. According to Levý (1998: 145-153), the translator operates under the constraints of his/her principal task: to interpret. As a result, the translator 'makes the text more logical, sketches it in (clarifies it), intellectualises it' (Levý 1998: 145).<sup>153</sup>

Levý (1998: 145-146) established three main types of intellectualisation: (1) making the text more logical, (2) explaining implied meanings, and (3) formally expressing syntactic relations.<sup>154</sup> Providing examples for each case, Levý (1998: 146-148) makes the following points:

(1) In a literary work, there is a 'tension' between the idea and its expression, i.e. how it is conveyed. Translators tend to make such expressions more logical.

(2) (Mis)led by the effort to convey the text to the domestic (target) reader, the translator often expatiates on ideas which are only implied in the text and left in the

<sup>151</sup> The examples are ours; they are not taken from Levý.

<sup>152</sup> '[...] krásy a věrnosti bývají často stavěny do protikladu, jako by se vylučovaly. Vylučují se však jen tehdy, rozumí-li se krásou líbivost a pravdivostí doslovnost.' (Levý 1998: 93)

<sup>153</sup> 'Překladaťel [...] text [...] zlogičťuje, dokresluje, intelektualizuje.' (Levý 1998: 145)

<sup>154</sup> 'a) zlogičťování textu, b) vykládání nedorěčeného, c) formální vyjadřování syntaktických vztahů' (Levý 1998: 145-146)

subtext (between the lines). These ‘loci of indeterminacy’ are as important for the composition of the work as meanings expressed explicitly.

(3) The translator tends to explain and expand contracted ideas even in the syntax. In a literary work, relations between ideas are often unexpressed. Translators often articulate these hidden relations in full and express them formally by using conjunctions, e.g. changing paratactic to hypotactic clauses.

These secondary psychological tendencies of the translational process, ‘intellectualisation’ and (stylistic) ‘levelling’ of the text, result in the attenuation of the aesthetic function of the expression, in favour of the communicative function (cf. Levý 1998: 151).

Having thoroughly examined Czech translation throughout history, Levý does not pass over indirect translations. While he explicitly spells out that a ‘second-hand translation’ may have been the result of a compilatory translation, and indeed adduces several such examples, Levý (1998: 200) insists: ‘If conclusions about the relations of the Czech version to the original are to be reliable, it must first be unequivocally established which was the actual source text for the translator.’<sup>155</sup>

The problem with this procedure is obvious: it excludes all translations for which the source text cannot be unequivocally established from the realm of Translation Studies. In other words, such texts cannot be studied, as ‘the scholar examining the translational procedures of the Czech [i.e. target] translator always runs the risk of describing the foreign translation [i.e. the mediating text] from which the Czech version was made’ (*ibid.*).<sup>156</sup>

To study such texts, we must invoke Toury’s target-orientedness (1995). In order to do so, the original research question must be reformulated to run approximately as follows: ‘*What was the Portuguese [i.e. target] reader’s impression of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal (provided that s/he did not read in languages other than Portuguese)?*’, or alternatively: ‘*What was the presence of Czech literature in Portuguese translation in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal?*’

Levý’s 1963 monograph is extremely helpful and enlightening in providing a plethora of particular examples from translations (mostly into or from Czech) from mediaeval to modern times. Possibly as much as one half of *The Art of Translation* consists of examples underpinning Levý’s claims. Levý’s frequent ‘prescriptiveness’ (*the translator should, a translation ought to, it is in/advisable to...*) is based on thoroughgoing analyses of historically changing and (inter-)subjectively conditioned norms. Compare Jettmarová’s observation (in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 40):

Holmes (1972, in Holmes 1988) saw the solution in the TS applied branch. In the 90s Chesterman (e.g. 1993, 1999) suggested a theory that would be built on the principle of *from-is-to-ought* to accommodate its axiological dimension. This is basically Levý’s design of his *Art of Translation*, a design of an original and coherent theory with an extension to the past and in particular to the contemporary “ought”.

<sup>155</sup> ‘Mají-li být závěry o poměru české verze k předloze spolehlivé, je třeba v první řadě naprosto bezpečně zjistit, jaký text byl vlastně překladateli předlohou.’ (Levý 1998: 200)

<sup>156</sup> ‘Badatel, který sleduje překladatelské pojetí českého tlumočnicka, je vždy v nebezpečí, že nakonec popíše cizí překlad, podle kterého byla česká verze pořízena.’ (Levý 1998: 200)

In so doing, Levý seeks to provide a theoretical and methodological basis for a ‘realistic’ translation (which has nothing to do with ‘realism’ as a historical style, but is his rather unusual name for an optimum, ideal translation).<sup>157</sup>

Indirect translation is not the only potential danger leading us to describe something that is not the result of the translator’s work. Censorship is another such risk. Levý seems to be aware of this (1998: 200)<sup>158</sup>:

The translator’s creative operations are more difficult to capture than the original author’s, because the translator’s traces are left only in the language material, usually in subtle shades of meaning – and it was precisely in the style that ‘revisers’ other than the translator, the editors of a periodical or the publisher, frequently interfered.

Yet Levý insists that a translation critic (or scholar) should proceed by meticulous analysis of the original and the translation: ‘an analysis of a translation must begin by close comparison of the translation and the original and an almost statistical accumulation of detailed deviations that we find’ (1998: 204).<sup>159</sup>

Besides being consistently ‘text-bound’, Levý – typically for a scholar of the ‘modernity’ (as opposed to our ‘postmodern’ times) – is also convinced that there is something *objective* about a literary work. Levý recognises that:

The same linguistic means [...] produce different functions, as they are components of different systems. (1998: 211)

In general, the more a text is linguistically and historically conditioned, the bigger the creative contribution of the translator in the work. (*ibid.*)

We cannot make do with the content/form opposition, because “a work in the narrow sense” is not merely content, but “formulated content”. (1998: 47)<sup>160</sup>

However, he fails to conclude from this that the *objectivity* of a literary work could be called into question. Instead, Levý, and Popovič in his wake, are convinced that there is an ‘invariant core’ (or simply, ‘the invariant’) in a literary work which must remain unaffected by the translation. R. van den Broeck (in Beylard-Ozeroff, Králová & Moser-Mercer 1998: 4), via a consideration of Derrida’s notion of deconstruction, arrives at the same conclusion (based on the 1969 German translation of Levý 1963):

One of the most precarious points in Levý’s treatment of interpretation is, it seems to me, his insistence on the preservation of what he calls “the objective validity” of the original work. His statements in this respect elude all comment: “*Vom Originalautor verlangen wir die richtige*

<sup>157</sup> Ideology seems to have played its part in this designation. After all, *socialist realism* was the order of the day.

<sup>158</sup> ‘Přitom tvůrčí postup překladatele je obtížnější postihnout než u původního autora, protože jeho stopy máme jen v jazykovém výrazu, obvykle v jemných významových odstínech – a právě do stylizace mnohdy zasahovala kromě překladatele i redakce časopisu či nakladatelství, nebo jiní upravovatelé.’ (Levý 1998: 200).

<sup>159</sup> ‘Proto analýza překladu musí začít jemným srovnáváním převodu s předlohou a takřka statistickým hromaděním detailních odchylek, které zjistíme.’ (Levý 1998: 204)

<sup>160</sup> ‘Stejně jazykové prostředky [...] mají [...] různou funkci, protože jsou složkami jiných systémů’ (Levý 1998: 311). ‘Obecně lze říci, že tvůrčí podíl překladatele na díle je tím větší, čím je text silněji jazykově a historicky podmíněn.’ (*ibid.*) ‘Nevystačíme zde s protikladem obsahu a formy, protože „dílo v užším slova smyslu“ není jen obsah, ale „zformovaný obsah“.’ (Levý 1998: 47)

*Interpretation der Wirklichkeit, vom Übersetzer die richtige Interpretation der Vorlage.*” (1998: 4)<sup>161</sup>

Van den Broeck also highlights a difference between Levý (1969) and Popovič (1968), deciding in favour of Popovič. Starting with Levý, he (1998: 9) says:

Shifts of conception are admissible only within the borderlines given by the real and potential tenor of the work, since there is neither a theoretical nor an artistic basis on which the insertion of heterogeneous elements which are inconsistent with the work’s objective idea could be justified (cf. Levý 1969: 52-53). Here again Levý’s approach is essentially *prescriptive*. “Polemic” translation, for example, does not figure on his map. Also the “stylistic rearrangement” of the text, which in the descriptive approach of Anton Popovič is accounted for by the shifts of expression resulting from the “tension between the structure of the original and the norm of the perceiving medium,” is narrowed down to rather strict boundaries (Popovič 1968: 228).<sup>162</sup>

Such an approach has, of course, far-reaching implications. Levý’s ‘statistical accumulation of detailed deviations’ with respect to the ‘objective idea’ of a literary work (i.e. when comparing the translation with the original) is the foundation for Popovič’s later ‘shifts of expression’ in a translation analysis (in English in 1970). For Levý, it means that he ventures into the realm of mathematics, which he begins applying to literary works (in his 1971 collection of essays).

Levý’s posthumously published 1971 collection of essays, entitled *Will Literary Studies Become an Exact Science?*, is firmly in the grip of the 1960s conviction that mathematics must be applied to the humanities if they are to be promoted to the status of ‘sciences’<sup>163</sup>. Three articles in this collection are of general importance to Translation Studies at large. The first, homonymous with the title of the collection, will be briefly summarised here. The second, entitled ‘The Process of Creation of a Work of Literature and Its Reception’, has recently been translated into English by Patrick Corness and is generally available (in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 47-88). The third, entitled ‘Will Translation Theory be of Use to Translators’, appeared in English in 1965<sup>164</sup>.

The main arguments of the volume as a whole are more or less summarised in the first study. Levý distinguished between *literary criticism*, an ‘art’, and *literary studies*, a ‘science’. The literary critic works with his/her interpretation, whereas the literary scholar aims to uncover ‘the truth’ (Levý 1971: 10).

Levý argues in favour of information theory, which offers exact methods to analyse an utterance and its transposition (1971: 11). An exact *structural* description is possible only if we know the inventory of elements in a process and their relations. We can therefore define the resulting structure, usually by mathematical methods (*ibid.*). A *functional* approach is preferable if we know the results of a process and an incomplete

<sup>161</sup> In fact, the quote is from Levý (1969: 47-48). ‘We demand the right interpretation of reality from the original author; we demand the right interpretation of the original from the translator.’ The second part of the sentence is strangely missing from the third edition in Czech (1998: 60-61).

<sup>162</sup> The reference is to Popovič’s earliest theoretical work, *Preklad a výraz* [Translation and Expression] (1968).

<sup>163</sup> This may be a result of the rise of cybernetics and machine translation since the 1950s. The United States and the Soviet Union, among other countries, invested heavily in machine translation.

<sup>164</sup> LEVÝ, Jirí. 1965. ‘Will Translation Theory be of Use to Translators’. In *Übersetzen: Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, edited by Rolf Italiaander, pp. 77-82.

inventory of the elements entering it, and their relations in the course of the process can only be inferred from the resulting functions (1971: 12).

Levý's use of mathematics in literature concerns three areas: information theory, game theory and stochastic processes (probability theory). *Information theory* views a literary work not as a static system, but as a configuration of elements materialising in time (1971: 14). Being a structuralist, Levý tended to refute the idea of a static *system*. Rather, he saw the literary work as a *dynamic structure*. It remains an open question, however, to what extent the methods of information theory can account for what actually takes place, and in what sense they are reductive.

The *creative process* in art is similar to a *game of chess*, i.e. a 'perfect-information game'. This is a questionable premise in Levý's approach – such relations might obtain, but only on the most basic lexical level. The higher in the hierarchy of systems/structures we go (linguistic → literary → cultural, to put it as simply as possible), the less likely we are to be dealing with a perfect information game. This is not to say, of course, that Levý is unaware of the problem. Rather, it is important to realise that the application of *game theory* will tell us precious little about higher-level issues, such as ideology, censorship and suchlike.

Regarding stochastic methods, Levý (1971: 15)<sup>165</sup> says:

The difficulty and originality of a choice in each "move" can be calculated [...]. The decisions are binary (yes – no), so to select among  $2^n$  elements,  $n$  choices are necessary. [...] Reception, too, is a Markov chain, i.e. a sequence of elements in which the probability of each of them depends on those preceding them, and on the system's memory.

As Levý later admits (1971: 74): 'For the sake of simplicity, the decisions are represented as binary, though the actual range of choice is from  $n - 1$  members.' (English translation in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 51). 'Binary decisions' are thus revealed as a simplification. In other words, the translator's decisions are conditioned as much by the language systems, the poetics of their time and culture, as they are determined by such higher-level factors as ideology, power, (self-)censorship, economic components, the translator's status, etc. (cf. Lefevre 1985: 226ff. *et passim*).

To put it bluntly, the problem with Polysystem Theory or the Manipulation School is precisely the opposite: they offer excellent methods for investigating higher-level phenomena, but at the expense of lower-level analytical tools. As T. Hermans says about DTS and the Manipulation School (in Snell-Hornby et al. 2003: 99): 'Auf methodologischer Ebene stellt das Fehlen eines operablen Moduls zur komparativen Mikroanalyse von ZT und AT weiterhin einen Schwachpunkt dar.'<sup>166</sup> Compare also Jettmarová's comment (in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 39):

---

<sup>165</sup> 'Obtížnost a původnost volby v každém „tahu“ je možno vyčíslit [...]. Rozhodnutí jsou binární (ano – ne), a tedy k výběru mezi  $2^n$  prvky je zapotřebí  $n$  voleb. [...] Také *recepce* má charakter markovovského řetězu, tj. sledu prvků, v němž pravděpodobnost každého z nich je závislá na těch, které předcházejí, a na paměti systému.' (Levý 1971: 15)

<sup>166</sup> 'At the methodological level, the lack of an operable module for a comparative micro-analysis of the ST and the TT continues to be a weakness.' (T. Hermans, translated by K. Kaindl, in Snell-Hornby, Hönl, Kußmaul & Schmitt 2003: 99).

For example, the recently debated neo-Marxist conceptual framework based on human agency as suggested by Bourdieu and his field model, however relevant it may be found in respect of the free market culture frame and contemporary western philosophy, has the disadvantage that it is neither methodologically nor theoretically worked out on hierarchically lower levels (especially in relation to the internal translation process and the product structure) for the pivotal focus on and analysis of our main object of study, as has been already pointed out elsewhere (e.g. Buzelin 2005, Chesterman 2006).

Finally, Levý (1971: 18) acknowledges that ‘the meaning of the concepts *selection* (mathematical) information, *semantic* information and *aesthetic* information has not yet been properly explained.’<sup>167</sup> Closely related to this is what Hrabák says in the afterword to the 1971 collection of Levý’s essays (Levý 1971: 455): ‘Information theory cannot be applied to literary studies in a mechanical way, since it is interested only in information quantity, not in its quality.’<sup>168</sup>

Levý is, of course, aware of this, which is why he repeatedly emphasises that our methodology must be complemented by, and extended to include, psycholinguistics, structural anthropology, semantics, and sociology (cf. 1971: 148, 119). While such issues as dynamic functions, historically variable norms and values, semiotics (including, of course, pragmatics), psycholinguistics (and cognitive issues) etc., are included in his *theory*; the *methods* Levý propounds and develops in detail (especially in the 1971 volume, which is more methodological than 1963) are rather of the lower-level, and thus incapable of explaining the phenomena under scrutiny in the present thesis satisfactorily. Again we should emphasize that our concern here is not the theory *per se*, but the *methodology* put forward by Levý. For a proper contextualisation of Levý’s and Popovič’s work, both historically and in relation to other theories, see e.g. Jettmarová (2008).

But let us be fair to Levý. He died at the age of 40. Had he lived longer, he would have witnessed the development of Translation Studies, literary theory and the humanities in general both in Czechoslovakia and in the West. He would have seen that the application of mathematical methods to literature, springing subconsciously, as it were, from the inferiority complex of the social sciences and the humanities vis-à-vis the natural sciences (Okasha 123-5), are now regarded as a cul-de-sac, or – as in sociology – an exact computation of inexact numbers.

Our claim here is not, of course, that a micro-textual analysis of the original and the translation should be dispensed with altogether. Quite the contrary: it is an important source of information and data. Rather, the claim here is that a text-immanent contrastive analysis of two texts is insufficient when dealing with such complex and convoluted issues as ideology, censorship, indirect translations and non-translation.

As Levý himself says elsewhere (1971: 120):

De Groot introduces two fundamental methods for the verification of the validity of interpretation:

- d) ‘testing the interpretation by extrapolation’ (de Groot 1965: 268-269), i.e. investigation to ascertain whether it also applies to other phenomena of the category C; where C is a

<sup>167</sup> ‘Není zcela dořešen smysl pojmů *selektivní* (matematická) informace, *sémantická* informace a *estetická* informace [...]’ (Levý 1971: 18).

<sup>168</sup> ‘Teorie informací se však nedá aplikovat na literární vědu mechanicky, už proto ne, že ji zajímá jen množství informace, ale nikoli její kvalita.’ (J. Hrabák in Levý 1971: 455).

closed set, it is possible to divide it into several parts, create an interpretation for one of them, then test it by applying it to the other parts of category C.

- e) applying ‘the principle of convergence’ (de Groot 1965: 266), i.e. demonstrating that sets of facts of various kinds, such as those relating to form or content and literary, biographical, and historical data etc. lead to the same interpretation.<sup>169</sup>

In particular, the second principle seems highly pertinent to our analysis. As Pym (1998: 23) says to much the same effect: ‘The question-and-answer process quickly blossoms into networks of interdependent hypotheses that, together, propose simultaneous explanations on several levels.’

In the final analysis, the present approach seems reconcilable with Levý’s, who himself admits:

Regarding the examination of the functions of translation as part of Czech literature, the treatment of translation by literary history will necessarily have to be complemented by – or will actually culminate in – establishing how translation has been received in Czech cultural life and what its position in the developmental process of Czech literary works (original and translated) has been. Genetic analysis has been preparatory work for such examination – of fundamental importance, to be sure. In short, what was the task translation performed in Czech literature, and how the choice of a work for translation and the selection of translational means have been conditioned by it. (1998: 217-218)

The most important and the closest interrelations between original and translated literature will nevertheless be in the overall cultural and political orientation of our literature, in which translations participated very significantly. (1998: 220)<sup>170</sup>

This observation quite obviously displays close affinities with Toury’s and Even-Zohar’s target-oriented / polysystemic approaches. Moreover, it anticipates future turns in Translation Studies: the ideological turn, the power turn, as well as (throughout Levý’s work) the sociological turn.

### 2.3.2 Popovič

Anton Popovič (1933-84) elevated Czechoslovak Translation Studies to a whole new level. Despite his forbidding terminology, which may deter many a student of Translation Studies, Popovič’s conception of translation as a process and as a product (text<sup>171</sup>), his consideration of the semiotic-communicational aspect in modelling the process of translation, the notion of translation as a metatext, the theory of equivalence

<sup>169</sup> The English is quoted according to Králová, Jettmarová et al. (2008: 82). Levý’s fundamental study ‘The Process of Creation of a Work of Literature and its Reception’, originally published posthumously in the 1971 collection of essays, was translated for this volume by Patrick Corness. The article by D. de Groot in Levý (1971: 119ff.) is ‘On the Foundation of Interpretative Statements’ (in *The Foundations of Statements and Decisions – Proceedings of the International Colloquium on the Methodology of Sciences*, 1965).

<sup>170</sup> ‘Pokud jde o zkoumání toho, jak překlad fungoval jako součást české literatury, bude nezbytným doplňkem literárněhistorického zpracování překladu – ba vlastně jeho vyvrcholením, k němuž genetický rozbor byl přípravnou prací, ovšem základní důležitosti – zjišťování, jaký byl ohlas překladu v českém kulturním životě a jaké bylo jeho místo ve vývojové řadě literárních děl českých (původních i přeložených), prostě jaký úkol plnil překlad v českém písemnictví a jak byl také tímto úkolem podmíněn výběr díla a volba překladatelských prostředků.’ (1998: 217-218) ‘Nejdůležitější a nejtěsnější souvztažnosti mezi původní a překladovou literaturou budou ovšem v celkové kulturní a politické orientaci našeho písemnictví, na niž se podílely překlady velmi významně.’ (1998: 220)

<sup>171</sup> ‘Influenced by Lotman, the Slovaks use the term *text* for the combination of form and meaning.’ (Jettmarová in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 19, footnote 8)

as a ‘dialectical’ equilibrium of shifts of expression while preserving the invariant (based on Miko’s system of expressions), and many more of his ideas remain inspiring to this day within and beyond the discipline of translation theory.<sup>172</sup>

One of Popovič’s greatest assets is that he puts forward *methods at various levels of abstraction*. This is, perhaps, the result of his attempt to lay the foundations of a new academic discipline, which he calls ‘translation theory’, but which goes well beyond mere theory. Rather, it is Translation Studies as we understand it today, since it encompasses all main branches of the structure of a discipline: theory, methodology, terminology, bibliography, historiography, and empirical research. Proceeding in what has been called the ‘zigzag’ method<sup>173</sup>, Popovič himself contributed to all branches of this new discipline both theoretically and empirically (for a select Popovič bibliography, including specifically empirical monographs, see Špirk 2009a).

This subchapter, however, is concerned primarily with Popovič’s contribution to the *methodology* of Translation Studies, and is further limited only to what is pertinent to the present approach. Regarding the methods offered by Popovič, we shall proceed hierarchically top-down. First, by way of introduction, Popovič’s conception of translation theory needs to be briefly outlined to provide a framework for his methods.

The first chapter of Popovič’s *chef d’œuvre* entitled *Teória umeleckého prekladu: Aspekty textu a literárnej metakomunikácie* [Theory of Literary Translation: Aspects of Text and Literary Metacommunication] (1975: 20)<sup>174</sup>, provides a model of the individual parts of an integral study of translation by reference to its theoretical disciplines (Roman numerals) and translator’s activities (letters):

- I. General Theory of Translation
  - a) Theory of Oral Translation
  - b) Theory of Written Forms of Translation
  - c) Theory of Machine Translation
- II. Special Theory of Translation
  - A. Theory of Scientific and Technical Translation
    - Theory of Individual Special Cases of Technical Translation:
      - i. Scientific Texts
      - ii. Technical Texts
  - B. Theory of Journalistic Translation
  - C. Theory of Literary Translation
    - i. Theory of Verse Translation
    - ii. Theory of Prose Translation
    - iii. Theory of Drama Translation
    - iv. Theory of Translation of the Bible and Sacral Texts
- III. Praxeology of Translation
  - a) Sociology of Translation
  - b) Editorial Practices of Translation
  - c) Methodology of Translation Criticism

<sup>172</sup> This subchapter is partly based on Špirk 2009a (in *Target* 21:1, pp. 3-29).

<sup>173</sup> ‘The Czechs and Slovaks used the so called zig-zag method (which can be traced back to W. von Humboldt) – a dialectical interaction between empirical results and formulation/extension of a theory.’ (Jettmarová in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 21, footnote 9)

<sup>174</sup> This monograph, translated in 1980 into Russian, Hungarian and Serbo-Croatian, has recently been translated into Italian (2006) as *L’arte della traduzione. Aspetti metodologici – La comunicazione traduttiva* (Milano: Editore Ulrico Hoepli). Strangely, the 2006 translation into Italian was made simultaneously from the Russian (politically ‘adapted’) version by Bruno Osimo and from the original Slovak by Daniela Laudani.



## IV. Translator Teaching

- a) Translator Training
- b) Translators' Aids

The affinities with Holmes' paradigm are striking. We know that 'Holmes and Popovič maintained close contacts at the turn of the 60's and 70's' (Jettmarová 2005: 95). One outcome of the fruitful cooperation between these two scholars was the publication *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation* (1970), containing the papers presented at the International Conference on Translation as an Art in Bratislava (29-30 May 1968). As Jettmarová (2005: 96) points out:

To what degree Popovič, a member of Holmes's Invisible College, was inspired by Holmes or vice versa will probably remain a matter of speculation. What is relevant at this point is that they both speak of translation sociology, and no one seems to have noticed.

What is significant in Popovič's 'map' of Translation Studies (horizontally structured, *sic!*, cf. Pym 1998: 3-4) is less the focus on text-typological (that is, genre) partial theories of translation, but Popovič's consideration of sociology, editorial practices and translation criticism as the axiological branch, subsumed under what he calls 'praxeology', i.e. theory of practice<sup>175</sup>. For affinities with Bourdieu's concept of 'social praxeology', or theory of practice, see Jettmarová 2005 (104, *et passim*).

In various monographs (1971, 1975, 1976, 1983)<sup>176</sup>, Popovič defines praxeology and sociology of translation as follows:

Praxeology of translation – a discipline whose object is the programming of translation practice using objective methods (statistics, sociology, information theory) and analysis of translation practice from the aspect of confronting the system of translation science and socio-cultural needs. At the same time, it represents the theory of social practice in translation. (Popovič 1975: 282)

Sociology of translation – exploration of the genesis and functioning of translation in the social context. This branch of sociology is interested in translation as a manifestation of social communication. It explores translation as a fact of social and cultural consciousness within the scope of institutions (publishing policy, cultural interrelations, etc.) and individuals. (Popovič 1971: 160, 1976: 17, 1983: 268)

Praxeology is thus designed to include (1975: 239-240):

1. the influence of cultural policies (the Party principle) on the translation programme (i.e. what is to be translated) and on translators' activities;
2. the analysis of the translation programme from the point of view of the book market;
3. specific functions of literary translation criticism;
4. the role of the editor in the translation process;
5. the history of translation institutions (organisations and magazines);
6. didactics of translation: teaching translators, school system for translators, translators' aids (dictionaries, stylistics manuals, measures against substandard translations, the issue of "translator couples" as a social and didactic problem), etc.

<sup>175</sup> 'Other terms used for praxeology are: social practice theory, social praxeology, practical theory, theory of practice, sociology of practice.' (in Jettmarová 2005: 100, footnote 2)

<sup>176</sup> 'Popovič 1971' refers to *Poetika umeleckého prekladu: proces a text* [Poetics of Literary Translation: Process and Text], the monograph theoretically and methodologically preceding and anticipating Popovič's *Theory of Literary Translation* (1975). 'Popovič 1983' is the aforementioned *Originál/preklad: interpretačná terminológia* [Original/Translation: Interpretation Terminology]. The English translation of 'praxeology' is borrowed from Jettmarová (2005: 100); 'sociology' is defined in Popovič (1976: 17).

Here *Translator teaching* (or didactics of translation) is incorporated into praxeology, although it was a separate category in the ‘model of the individual parts of an integral study of translation by reference to its theoretical disciplines and translator’s activities’ above. A similar relocation of didactics took place between the 1972 and 1977 paradigms of Holmes (cf. Jettmarová 2005: 98).

The methods of research for translation praxeology proposed by Popovič (1975: 240) are as follows:

- a) communicational aspects;
- b) information theory;
- c) sociometrics;
- d) literary sociology;
- e) teaching theory (didactics);
- f) theory of culture.

Popovič does not leave praxeology and sociology of translation in a theoretical vacuum. Since the theory of literary translation has both a synchronic and a diachronic axis, Popovič (1971: 139-140, 1975: 36-37, **1976: 4-5**)<sup>177</sup> proposes a ‘model for the investigation of translation history’:

- A. Preparatory works to translation history.
  - 1. Bibliographical list of translations.
    - Statistics of manuscript, journal and book-form translations and its evaluation according to the stratification of literary genres, authors, periods, literatures.
  - 2. Bibliography of translators – Dictionary of national translators.
    - Differentiation of translator activity:
      - a) writer and translator in one person
      - b) translator-specialist
- B. Praxeology of Translation. External conditions and cultural-social preconditions of translator activity.
- C. Development of translator methods.
  - 1. Translator programme.
  - 2. History of translator methods after [i.e. according to] particular periods.
    - a) Formulated poetics of translation.
    - b) Poetics of translation (process and text). Relation: original ↔ translation, translation ↔ translation.
- D. Role of translation in literary development.
  - 1. Translation in the context of original production.
    - a) Stylistic procedures of recipient literature in translation and vice versa.
    - b) Generic [i.e. genre] aspect of literature and translation
- E. Functions of translation in literary life.
  - 1. Translation as a fact of interliterary communication.
  - 2. Translation in the system of metaliterature – literary education.
  - 3. Translation in the contexts of literature, philosophy, culture etc.
- F. Typology of national translation in particular periods in comparison with other literatures.

This model has obvious methodological advantages. It is quite elaborate, and is both theoretically coherent and methodologically tangible; it takes into account individual translators as well as literary and cultural systems; it includes norms both at the textual (intra-textual) and extra-textual levels; it allows us to translation synchronically as well as diachronically, etc. Most importantly, it guides the researcher attempting to cover a

---

<sup>177</sup> Quotations from the 1976 work are taken from this English edition, i.e. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Although this booklet appeared in Canada, the English is sometimes imperfect. However, as these are direct quotes, they have not been altered. Where necessary, our comments are added in square brackets.

target-culture system of translations (of literature) along clearly defined methodological lines, indicating goals and orientations.

Looking at Portuguese Translation Studies through the lens of this model, we can point, for instance, to C. C. Pais' 1997 *Teoria diacrónica da tradução portuguesa: Antologia (Séc. XV-XX)*, falling within C.2 of Popovič's model, i.e. C. Development of Translator Methods, 2. History of translator methods by particular periods.

The five volumes of A. A. Gonçalves Rodrigues *A tradução em Portugal* (1999) would fall within A.1, i.e. A. Preparatory works to translation history, 1. Bibliographical list of translations. T. Seruya has only recently applied for a state grant to produce a dictionary of Portuguese translators, Popovič's A.2, i.e. A. Preparatory works to translation history, 2. Bibliography of translators – Dictionary of national translators, and so on.

When Popovič (1971: 28) designs a communicational model of the translation process, he employs the model developed by Levý<sup>178</sup>, but adapts it as follows:

Sender – Text<sub>1</sub> – Translator – Text<sub>2</sub> – Recipient

This communicational model can be divided into two chains, one of communication, the other of metacommunication:

Author<sub>O</sub> – Text<sub>O</sub> – Recipient<sub>O</sub>  
Translator – Text<sub>T</sub> – Recipient<sub>T</sub>,

where O stands for original and T for translation. The translation process is thus a confrontation of the systems of two senders, two texts (forms and contents) and two recipients. Popovič (1971: 30) terms this, in line with Soviet semiotics, the 'creolization' of two cultures, which also affects the combination of two structures on a social level. Popovič (1971: 33) points out:

It is the facts of the so-called translation sociology, or praxeology, which are symptomatic of this level. This leads to such questions as: What is the motivation for a translator's activity (earning money, hobby, individual attitude towards literature, ideological, cultural or political orientations etc.); what does the consumer demand; what is the influence of the publisher on the translation agenda of an individual, group, generation; what does the book market demand; what is the role of a translator as a social unit in the cultural and political contexts, and suchlike. These are questions of a sociological-genetic nature.<sup>179</sup>

Popovič also addresses the manipulation of translations on the part of the professional 'stakeholders' (parties involved), such as translators, literary critics, reciters, actors, academics, etc. He coins the term 'metacommunicational context of translation' (1971: 35) to refer to situations in which a text is the condition or the impulse for the genesis (creation) of another text, i.e. metatext. In this context, Popovič (1971: 36) also speaks

---

<sup>178</sup> Levý's communicational model of translation (1998: 44): **reality** – AUTHOR: choice and formulation – **original text** – TRANSLATOR: reading and translating – **translation** – READER: reading and interpreting.

<sup>179</sup> 'Pre túto rovínu sú príznačné fakty tzv. prekladateľskej sociológie, resp. praxeológie, smerujúce k výskumu otázok, ako napr. čo je motiváciou činnosti prekladateľa (zárobok, hobby, individuálny vzťah k literatúre, ideová a kultúrno-politická orientácia a pod.), čo si žiada konzument, aký vplyv má vydavateľ na prekladateľský program jednotlivca, skupín, generácií, čo si žiada knižný trh, ako vystupuje prekladateľ ako sociálna jednotka v kultúrno-politickom kontexte a pod. Sú to otázky sociologicko-genetickej povahy.' (Popovič 1971: 33).

of ‘metacreation’, a secondary or derived literary activity encompassing allusions, loan words, imitations, paraphrases, commonplaces, parodies, travesties, and many other cases of literary dependence or influence – all of which are, of course, metatexts.

The issue of manipulation of translations leads Popovič to take into account the wider communicational implications of the genesis of a translation. Popovič (1971: 96) speaks of the ‘editor, or adaptor of the text in its final version’. The editor is the mediating agent between the prevailing language norms and the text of the translation. He or she is the ‘implementer of the directives which the publishing institution has adopted under the influence of readers’ habits’. This is, of course, a careful formulation circumscribing as well as circumventing the official ideology and censorship. In this sense, an editor can even become a ‘co-author’, whether overt and declared or anonymous. The position of the editor is, in principle, threefold (Popovič 1971: 97-98):

- a) the editor is in a position “independent” of the literary and temporal norm, he<sup>180</sup> tries to surpass it;
- b) the editor identifies himself with the prevailing, predominant literary and language norm and is, in fact, its implementer;
- c) the editor sensitively balances the translator’s text and the normative requirements of the given literary epoch.

In 1983 (169-170), Popovič is even more explicit about the role of editors. As Jettmarová (2005: 101) comments:

[...] the publishers and their editors/revisers are concerned with the selection, analysis, assessment and approval of literary texts for distribution, all made on the basis of contemporary ideological, aesthetic, ethical and language norms; the determining/controlling principle being the management of culture and literature by the Party. By management he [i.e. Popovič] meant the controlled central planning in communist countries where the Communist Party was the supreme dictator of culture policy. The executive power was in the hands of the Ministry of Culture, controlling the planning and production in publishing houses, which in turn were considered to be “institutions for literary education”.

It should by now have become obvious that ideology (‘the Party principle’) and censorship (‘editorial practices’) can quite easily be examined using the above model and Popovič’s praxeology. Irrespective of whether or not information theory is used as a method, all of the above other methods suggested by Popovič offer a viable and highly appropriate ‘toolbox’ to study the external conditions and socio-cultural (pre-) conditions of translation activities.

Concerning the position of translations among other texts, Popovič (1975: 216ff.) develops a comprehensive theory of metacommunication, which includes the concept of metatexts. The criterion for his *typology of metacommunicative activities* is the relation between the metalinguistic and the creative component.

Popovič calls the source text a *prototext*, and the semantic core retained in the metatext is called the *intertextual invariant*. A ‘pseudo-translation’, having no prototext preceding it, is thus a *quasi-metatext*, building on the expectations readers have about a translation.

---

<sup>180</sup> In Popovič’s time, political correctness was an unknown concept in Czechoslovakia. Consequently, and in line with Slovak grammar, Popovič uses ‘he’ when speaking about the translator, editor, etc. For that reason, ‘he or she’, or ‘s/he’, is used here only when not directly quoting Popovič.

In the way they are linked with their prototexts, metatexts can be either *affirmative* (approving) or *controversial* (dissenting). The concept of affirmative metatext includes all modes of agreeing, i.e. non-polemical intertextual continuation (or linking), i.e. imitative, selective, reductive, complementary transformations (Popovič 1976: 32, 1983: 129). The controversial metatext is a metatext linked negatively (disapprovingly) or polemically with its prototext (*ibid.*).

The links between metatexts and their prototexts can be *apparent* (i.e. declared or acknowledged), as with a quotation, title, travesty, literary pamphlet, etc., or *concealed*, as with a paraphrase, plagiarism, pseudo-original, etc. Regarding the scope (extent) of linkage, metatexts can link with (relate to, draw on) their prototexts either *in part*, i.e. by ‘transferring’ only some elements or levels of the prototext (e.g. allusion, quotation, summary, paraphrase), or *in total*, i.e. by ‘transferring’ the entire prototext (e.g. translation, ‘tendentious transcription [rewriting]’, second-hand translations, ‘polemic translation’, travesty, etc.).

All relations obtaining between metatexts and their prototexts give rise to Popovič’s ‘Typology of Metatexts’ (1976: 31, cf. Appendix), which is both synoptic and lucid. For instance, **copyright**, or ‘editio purificata’, is a *controversial, apparent metatext* linked with its prototext only by *some elements or levels*. A **second-hand translation** is an *affirmative, concealed metatext* linked with its prototext *as a whole*; in fact, it is a secondary (derived) metatext.

The concept of metatexts is ingenious in that it also anticipates **non-translation**. Compare these three definitions (Popovič 1976):

Destruction of Text: The change of the original functions of structural elements of the prototext within the metatext; this change can take place through deformation of the original elements of the text or **the whole body of the text**. Formation of oppositions of meaning and expression between prototext and metatext can be realized by preserving the original elements though in a different context, and their destruction can be effected. (34, bold emphasis added)

Discarding of Text: **Blocking of intertextual continuity [linking] in view of [a] certain type of text**. This blocking takes place as a rule in creating a new developmental structure, and gradually assumes a normative character. (34, bold emphasis added)

Liquidational [destructive] Continuity (Linking): Controversial relation to the prototext exhibiting the omission, leaving out, crossing out the segments of a text or in **the omission of the text as a whole**. Liquidational continuity (linking) of one text with another is at the same time the expression of the interpretative standpoint and it can, consequently, serve as recipe directions [instructions for reception]. (28, bold emphasis added)

All three procedures/approaches describe something closer to censorship than to non-translation. However, non-translation as a *non-existent metatext* can easily be accommodated in Popovič’s typology of metatexts as a non-realised metatext, assuming the features of controversial and concealed metatexts – *controversial*, because the target culture disapproves of its transfer into the target literary system, for whatever reasons; and *concealed*, because its very existence (both in the source literary system, and possibly also in translation in other literary systems or ‘third-party systems’) is concealed from the target-culture recipients. Moreover, non-translation is linked with its prototext *as a whole*, since it is missing from the target literary system in its totality.

Like Mendeleev, who in his table of elements predicted the existence of elements that were unknown in his day, Popovič can be said to have predicted the existence of non-translation. Indeed, the slot in his typology of metatexts occupied by *controversial concealed metatexts linked with their prototexts as a whole* includes only one example, that of (concealed) parody (1975: 227, 1976: 31)<sup>181</sup>.

Last but not least, and quite obviously, **paratexts** can easily be studied within the purview of Popovič's metatexts, as attested to by Müllerová (2009: 26-32). Indeed, Genette's concept of paratexts to some extent overlaps with Popovič's metatexts. However, the two are not identical. For instance, Popovič's metatexts do not include illustrations, and more importantly, Genette's paratexts do not include translations.

As we have seen, Popovič's typology of metatexts offers an excellent tool for studying censorship, indirect translations, non-translation and paratexts. The only remaining fundamental phenomenon of relevance to the present study is that of the canon and world literature, which we have already discussed with reference to Ďurišin's conception of comparative literature.

Dionýz Ďurišin (1929-97) and Anton Popovič (1933-84) were contemporaries. They borrowed concepts from each other. In part, Ďurišin also deals with translation (e.g. 1995: 51-55; in French in the same volume 33-36), albeit not to the same extent as Popovič. Popovič, for his part, borrows Ďurišin's concepts of 'interliterary relations' (e.g. 1976: 33).

However, Popovič has his own way of dealing with the canon and world literature from a non-prescriptive, historical point of view. Here three concepts are crucial: 'literary tradition', 'literary education', and 'subject of literary comparative studies'. It is rare for Popovič to speak of 'the canon' explicitly, but compare these two definitions:

Translator's Poetics: The poetic idiolect, a system of the translator's expressive [i.e. stylistic] peculiarities seen from the angle of **the current literary canon** or of the standardized translational method. The elements of this system are individual qualities characteristic of the translator's creative attitude. (1976: 15, bold emphasis added)

Literary Level (niveau) of Translation: The degree to which **the contemporary literary canon** has been mastered and further developed by the translator. (1976: 14, bold emphasis added)

Both definitions highlight the *personal* role of the translator (agent). Both also emphasise the *historical* and *dynamic* nature of the ever-changing concept of the canon. In addition, the second definition accentuates the importance of *norms* and the translator's *active* role in forming and influencing them. Compare also Popovič's 'method of translation' (1976: 13):

Method of Translation: Depends upon the translator's individual relation to the existing tradition and to **the prevailing literary and aesthetic canon**, etc., and comprises the translator's work in all its aspects. (emphasis added)

---

<sup>181</sup> In 1983, Popovič adds 'contrafact' to *controversial concealed metatexts linked with their prototexts as a whole*. A 'contrafact' is a musical composition (usually in jazz) consisting of a new melody overlaid on a familiar harmonic structure (e.g. using a secular text in a religious composition or vice versa). In literature, L. Bernstein's *West Side Story* is considered a contrafact of W. Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, as it borrows substantial components of its form. This is very close to Genette's definition of hypertext (cf. also Popovič's architext, 1976: 1).

However, to overlook the concept of the canon (or ‘the classics’) in Popovič’s thinking would be not to see the wood for the trees. Consider his definition of ‘literary tradition’ (1983: 69-70)<sup>182</sup>:

Literary Tradition: a system of relations and attitudes to the literary past, presented as the choice of texts and textual procedures. The contemporary acquisition of the literary past in the area of literary creation, reception and literary education. The motivation for the choice of texts from the past is the result of the relation between art and reality, i.e. it results from the needs of the present [...]. Tradition is a hierarchical system of a number of intertextual and intersystemic relations (“high” literature, popular literature, folklore, other arts, etc.) [...]. The narrowing of the literary tradition down to an actual invariant core of values, models and prototypes leads to the creation of the literary “classics”.

Literary tradition is thus a non-axiological, historical concept, while ‘literary classics’ (i.e. the canon) is a value-laden reduction of literary tradition. The above concept of ‘literary tradition’ is a later one; it was preceded by ‘literary education’ (1976: 26):

Literary Education: The system of literary metacommunication, the function of which is to mediate (supply) information about the original work and offer (issue) instructions for its reception. Literary education is transmitted by specific texts. Genres of literary education are differentiated into mediating (summarizing, reproductive and liquidating [i.e. destructive]), recipes [i.e. instructions for reception] and advertisements. Not only [the] present actual [contemporary] aspect, i.e. [the] system of genres of the given period is included in the system of literary education but also tradition, i.e. the memory of the literary culture. Literary education from the point of view of reception represents a “state” of [the] tradition. It is a product of the literary process and at the same time also its further point of departure.

Popovič’s ‘literary education’ again yields a whole model (cf. 1976: 27), including censorship, anthologies, ‘tendentious transcription’ [i.e. ideological rewriting], ‘instruction for reception’, various metatexts (digests, annotations, titles, flaps, notices, announcements), institutions (literary museums), etc. Two key terms deserve closer attention here:

Instruction for reception: Influence on the receiver through the use of meta-communication system in favour of various codes. Recipe is applied as an instruction or persuading. Instruction system may be realized through literary criticism, history of literature and theory of literature, making use of specific genres. These components of literary science [literary studies], in addition to being [a] recipe, fulfil also the modelling cognitive activity. Literary advertisement represents a specific aspect of the recipe, directed at engaging the receiver for [in] literary metacommunication. (1976: 28)

Tendentious Transcription: Metatextual operation of literary education realized on the principle of reproductive relation to [the] prototext. Tendentious transcription is a maximally similar model of [the] proto-pattern, which can have various degrees, such as: document of prototext, transcription [rewriting], and [last but not] least adaptation of prototext. (*ibid.*)

---

<sup>182</sup> ‘Literárna tradícia – systém vzťahov a postojov k literárnej minulosti, prezentujúci sa výberom textov a textových postupov. Aktuálne osvojovanie literárnej minulosti v oblasti literárnej tvorby, príjmu a literárneho vzdelania. Motivácia výberu textov minulosti vyplýva zo vzťahu umenia ku skutočnosti, t. j. z potrieb prítomnosti [...]. Tradícia je hierarchicky usporiadaný systém viacerých línií medzitextových a medzisyntémových vzťahov („vysoká“ literatúra, populárna literatúra, folklór, iné druhy umení atď. [...]) Zúžovanie literárnej tradície na vlastné invariantné jadro hodnôt, vzorov a prototypov smeruje k vytváraniu „klasiky“. (Popovič et al. 1983: 69-70)

The ‘instruction for reception’ obviously covers many functions of (Genette’s) paratexts (here: metatexts of literary education). ‘Tendentious transcription’ is, of course, nothing other than Lefevere’s (ideological) *rewriting*. Indeed, the Slovak word ‘prepis’ is rendered into English as ‘rewriting’, rather than the Latinised ‘transcription’, which has a slightly different meaning in English (in Slovak also ‘transkripcia’).

The ‘Subject of Literary Comparative Studies’ [i.e. comparative literature] (Popovič 1976: 36) encompasses ‘intertextual and intratextual relations’ as follows:

- 1) an author’s text about another text (see Typology of Metatexts)
- 2) translation
- 3) texts of literary education (see Literary Education)
- 4) intertextual relations from a diachronic point of view – tradition as the paradigm and syntagm of intertextual linking (see Paradigmatic Aspects of Tradition)
- 5) intertextual relations in literary synthesis (National Literature → Literary Synthesis (e.g. Slavonic Literature, Literature of the Danube countries, Soviet Literature, Socialist Literature, “Classic” → World Literature)
- 6) relationships between literary texts and other texts of art (sculpture, painting, film, music, etc.) or folklore (intersemiotic translation – R. Jakobson – Conception of the Bloomington School of Comparative Studies)
- 7) intratextual relations (internal textual elements and levels) – anaphora, epiphora, metaphor, parallelism, rhyme, verse construction, etc. (according to Lotman’s device of repetition and Bakhtin’s conception of “author’s voice”.)
- 8) typological studies

Here, especially in point 5, Ďurišin’s influence is quite clear, although he is not named, unlike Jakobson, Lotman, Bakhtin and the Bloomington School.

It might seem that by presenting this array of definitions we are trying to tease the concepts of the canon and world literature out of Popovič’s work. In the context of Popovič’s elaborate *Theory of Literary Translation* (1975), studying the canon and world literature within Popovič’s theory and using Popovič’s methods makes perfect sense.

Finally, Popovič also offers an excellent methodological tool for studying the two texts themselves, i.e. the literary work (or ‘literary work of art’) and its translation. This is, of course, his famous concept of ‘shifts of expression’ in translation analysis (1970 in English).

The third and last Slovak scholar who needs to be introduced here is František Miko (1920-2010), Popovič’s colleague and member of the Nitra School in Slovakia. Miko developed a theory of style (expressions) that went well beyond the linguistic conception of style (as in stylistics) and also included semantics (Miko 1973: 290)<sup>183</sup>:

A stylistic model of a literary work represents an enlarged, methodically and theoretically deepened interpretation of the expressional conception of style. [...] The expressional style conception proceeds from the commutation of text’s function and its structure, as well as from the postulate of their parallel analysis. [...] The elementary differential elements of this process are expressional categories as the components of style. In paradigmatic dimension expressional categories create a system, in syntagmatic one individual styles are their result. [...] The style

<sup>183</sup> MIKO, František. 1973. *Od epiky k lyrike: Štylistické prierezy literatúrou* [From Fiction to Lyric Poetry: A Stylistic Section Through Literature]. Bratislava: Tatran. This monograph includes a summary in English.



includes functional differences not only in [at] language level but also in theme, it is an all embracing factor of the text.

This conception of style was taken over by Popovič from Miko's 1970 monograph *Text a štýl* [Text and Style] (cf. Popovič 1976: 9). Miko published his ideas in French in 1970, in the same proceedings of the 1968 international conference in Bratislava in which Popovič presented his concept 'shifts of expression' in translation analysis (General Editor: James S. Holmes). Miko (1970b: 62) summarises his conception of style as follows<sup>184</sup>:

Je me servirai, plus loin, des notions suivantes : l'expression, la propriété expressive, la catégorie de l'expression. Par la première notion j'entends l'expression au sens plus large du mot, englobant chaque manière de s'exprimer, c'est-à-dire tous les styles. [...] Le style lui-même, ainsi conçu, est une configuration dynamique de certaines propriétés de l'expression dans une manifestation verbale. [...] En accord avec Edmund Husserl nous distinguons le sujet, ou mieux la teneur thématique de l'énoncé d'une part et la sémantique des moyens linguistiques utilisés de l'autre, mais sans considérer, comme le fait John C. Catford, le sujet, qui fait pour nous partie du texte, comme un phénomène extralinguistique (respectivement comme transcendant le texte). Le sujet dépend de la langue et se constitue par elle.

Popovič (1970: 84), when adopting Miko's system and model of style (expressions), defines it as follows:

The system of qualities of expression has its own intrinsic order and hierarchic gradation. From the most general categories corresponding to the two basic qualities of language (operativity and iconicity, the ability to state and the ability to depict), the system moves through the mediating categories (sociativity, subjectivity, animativity, conceptuality) to specific qualities that do not permit further analysis (emotionality, pathos, convention, and the like). Every category following in sequence is at the same time a differentiation of its predecessor.

Based on this highly abstract system, Popovič considers the stylistic changes, or what he calls 'expressive [i.e. stylistic] shifts', in a translation. These he presents in an overview of 'the typology of shifts of expression in a translation' (1975: 130, 1976: 24, 1983: 204):<sup>185</sup>

#### STYLE OF WORK:

1. **Macro-stylistic level (thematic structure [or composition])**
  - a) **actualization** [modernization, 'thematic update'] → *Zeitbezug* [temporal reference]
  - b) **localization** [domestication] → *Ortsbezug* [spatial reference]
  - c) **adaptation** → *Sachbezug* [factual reference]
2. **Micro-stylistic level (linguistic structure [composition])**
  - a) **expressive emphasis** [stylistic intensification]
    - i. **expressive typization** [stylistic standardisation]
    - ii. **expressive individualization** [stylistic individualisation]
  - b) **expressive correspondence** [stylistic compensation]

<sup>184</sup> Henceforth, I shall use the following concepts: expression, expressional property, and the category of expression. By the first concept I understand expression in the broadest sense of the word, encompassing all manners of expressing oneself, i.e. all styles. [...] Thus conceived, style itself is a dynamic configuration of certain properties of expression in a verbal manifestation. [...] In accordance with Edmund Husserl, we distinguish the subject, or rather the thematic tenor of the utterance on one hand, and the semantics of the linguistic means employed on the other. Unlike John C. Catford, who regards the subject as an extra-linguistic phenomenon (or more precisely, as transcending the text), for us the subject forms part of the text. The subject depends on the language and is constituted by it.' (Miko 1970b: 62, translated by J.Š.)

<sup>185</sup> The English version is quoted according to Popovič's *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (1976: 24).

- i. **expressive substitution** [stylistic substitution]
- ii. **expressive inversion** [stylistic transformation]
- c) **expressive reduction** [stylistic attenuation]
  - i. **expressive nivelization** [stylistic levelling]
  - ii. **expressive loss** [stylistic loss]

This model for the study of linguistic and semantic (or stylistic and semiotic) differences between the original text and the resulting translation does not claim to cover every aspect of ‘shifts of expression’, but it does offer a practical start for a micro-textual contrastive analysis of the original and the translation.

In his earliest work on translation theory in general, *Preklad a výraz* [Translation and Expression], Popovič (1968: 41-42) explained the ‘shifts’ at the micro-stylistic level in detail:

- *stylistic levelling* (called ‘expressive nivelization’ in Popovič 1976: 24) – simplification of the expressional, i.e. stylistic, qualities of the original (model);
- *stylistic intensification* (‘expressive emphasis’) – exaggeration of the expressional qualities of the original;
- *stylistic transformation* (‘expressive inversion’) – change in the expressional values of the model (source);
- *stylistic substitution* (‘expressive substitution’) – replacement of the original expressional features by domestic ones (encompasses words, phrases and idiomatic expressions);
- *stylistic compensation* (‘expressive correspondence’) – compensating for untranslatable elements, often in another place, by stylistic means unique to the translation’s language;
- *stylistic standardisation* (‘expressive typization’) – translating by stylistic means typical of the translator’s language and literature;
- *stylistic individualisation* (‘expressive individualization’) – translating by stylistic means untypical of the translator’s language and literature.

From these ‘shifts of expression’, Popovič (1968: 43-44) derives the translator’s basic *stylistic attitude*, which in his view is also the ‘attitude’ which every new translation adopts towards its own (i.e. the target) literary system:

- i. *zero attitude* – does not enrich the literature of the translation [target literature]; a style sometimes called “translationese”.
- ii. *redundant attitude* – a style in which the individual style (i.e. poetics) of the translator influences the style of the translation more than the original work does (also called “adaptation”).
- iii. *discovery of a new style* – an attitude whereby the translator discovers a new style, i.e. the style of the original, new to the domestic tradition of the translation, a stylistic *calque*.

The stylistic shifts in a translation bear witness to the translator’s *interpretation effort* in the translation process. According to Popovič (1968: 46), the two extremes are:

1. “*under-interpretation*” – excessive emphasis on the micro-context; the translation is too literal, the translator tries to be “faithful”;
2. “*over-interpretation*” – the translation tends to be “free”; the translator substitutes conventions unknown to the readers of the translation by conventions that the readers are familiar with.

In later works, Popovič (1976: 16-17, 1983: 197-198) makes a further distinction between what he calls ‘constitutive (systemic) shifts’ (i.e. inevitable shifts at the level of *langue*) and ‘individual shifts’, i.e. subjective shifts on the translator’s part (at the level of *parole* or *performance*).

There are other kinds of shifts: generic (i.e. shifts in genre), negative, topical [thematic] (see 1976: 16-17) as well as rhythmic shifts, simplification vs. explicitation, 'exotisation' vs. domestication, 'historisation' vs. modernisation, and last but not least 'ideational explicitation' (or ideological shifts) (1983: 195-217).

Popovič's model of the shifts of expression provides an excellent tool for a contrastive analysis of the original and the translation, as it includes and concurrently transcends all linguistic levels and ventures into the realm of thematic structure (composition). Here and throughout, Popovič provides us with a perspicuous, highly developed, and ready-to-use model.

Proceeding hierarchically top-down (rather than bottom-up) has been a deliberate decision for the purposes of the present thesis. In fact, this approach has been retrospective, rather than chronological. Popovič's 'thinking about translation' started with the 'shifts of expression' in translation analysis, proceeded via metacommunication to the theory and typology of metatexts, and culminated in the literary education system of relations. The 1983 enlarged 'dictionary', entitled *Original/Translation: Interpretation Terminology*, written by Popovič in his declining years together with his colleagues from Nitra, is not strictly alphabetical, but has the following main chapters:

1. **Imagery of Literary Work**  
[including Popovič's last major concept, i.e. that of the 'semiotic modelling of the world's image in text']<sup>186</sup>
2. **The Original**
  - 2.1. Fundamental Concepts of Literary Communication
  - 2.2. Style [based, to a large extent, on Miko]
  - 2.3. Expressional [Stylistic] Modelling of Text (System of Categories of Expression)
3. **Intertextual Linking**
  - 3.1. Metatext as a Model of Intertextual Linking [including metacommunication in general]
  - 3.2. Literary Education [including editorship, 'tendentious transcription', etc.]
4. **The Translation**
  - 4.1. The Translator
  - 4.2. The Editor of the Translation
  - 4.3. The Translation
  - 4.4. The Style of Translation
  - 4.5. Shifts in Translation
  - 4.6. Types of Translation
  - 4.7. The Reader of the Translation
  - 4.8. The Diachronic Aspect of Translation
5. **Translation Studies** (including sociology and praxeology of translation)

However, Popovič is most decidedly not reducible to (difficult) definitions of concepts and models, as he has been presented here, since the subject and scope of the present thesis does not allow for a more exhaustive exposition of his *theory*. His dictionaries (1976 in English and 1983 in Slovak, in cooperation with his colleagues from the Nitra School) are only his main contributions to the *terminology* of his 'Translation Studies'. For a full understanding of Popovič's theory it is necessary to read his 1975 monograph *Theory of Literary Translation*, which is unfortunately not available in English.

---

<sup>186</sup> Indeed, one may regard the following as Popovič's greatest contributions: 1) his concept of shifts of expression in translation analysis, 2) his typology of metatexts, logically and consistently derived from the notion of metacommunication, including 'literary education', and 3) his semiotic modelling of the world's image in text. The last model concerns literary theory in general, not the theory of literary translation specifically. Unfortunately, the 'semiotic model of the world's image in text' has remained a mere torso since Popovič died in 1984.

To be sure, Popovič can be ‘accused’ of the same prescriptiveness and the same belief in objectivity as Levý, given their insistence of both on *the invariant* and their constant advocacy of exact methods. It could even be hypothesised that the belief in an objectively establishable invariant core of/in a text is a precondition for any further prescriptive elaborations. On the other hand, some postmodernist theories run the risk of coming close to the opposite extreme of what might be called ‘semantic anarchy’, which would make it impossible for Translation Studies ever to achieve the status of a ‘science’.

Yet perhaps this is not seen as the aim or ambition of our discipline today. Instead, if postmodernist (especially deconstructivist) theories are ever to be incorporated in our thinking about translation, we shall have to make do with description and explanation, basically adopting Pym’s stance (1998: 5), when he describes *historical criticism*: ‘Clearly, I would welcome rather than shun any critical minds brave enough to say where we should be going and how translations can help get us there.’ Pym himself, however, prefers to stay on the safe side and refrain from axiological imperatives.

What is most important here, however, is that **all of the phenomena identified as fundamental for the present study** and discussed above (Chapter 1), i.e. ideology, censorship, indirect translations, non-translation, canon & world literature, paratexts, and medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures, **can be studied using methods proposed by Popovič**. While other methodologies might be equally appropriate for the examination of these issues, Popovič’s concepts, models and methods offer a practical platform to underpin the present study both theoretically and methodologically.

### 2.3.4 Syncretism

In the final analysis, the methodology for the present thesis has turned out to be *syncretic*. This does not mean to say that Popovič’s methodology alone proved insufficient for the analysis of the two dictatorial regimes or how translations of literature operated in and between them.

Rather, as the present thesis is written in English, concepts and methods used by ‘Western’ Translation Studies are sometimes invoked to render Popovič’s terminology more comprehensible, making his approach, we hope, potentially more readily and widely applicable today.

In strictly methodological terms, this thesis owes much to Williams & Chesterman (2002). While rarely quoting from this ‘textbook’, both the overall conception and the methodology of the present thesis is, to a large extent, modelled on the ‘map’ proposed by Williams and Chesterman. In certain cases, especially as regards the methodology of studying censorship, many ideas have also been drawn from Merino (2005) and Merino & Rabadán (2002). Methodological approaches of a more theoretical nature are briefly discussed hereinafter.

Apart from the occasional mention (e.g. R. van den Broeck 1998<sup>187</sup>, J. Ferreira Duarte 2000b<sup>188</sup>, T. Hermans 1999, T. Seruya 2007 and 2009, etc.), only **Gideon Toury** (e.g. 1998) draws both on Levý and Popovič explicitly. Toury (particularly 1995) is referred to throughout the present thesis. Indeed, his *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* could serve as a kind of ‘reference methodology’ both for the material encountered and in order to test and evaluate Popovič’s methodology from a more recent, and certainly a more central, point of view within Translation Studies<sup>189</sup>.

Itamar Even-Zohar (1990, 2004), drawing heavily on Russian Formalism as well as Prague Structuralism (Mukařovský, Vodička, and others), is another kindred spirit. In a sense, Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory may be seen as a variant of (Prague) structuralism. It is imperative to realise that by Prague structuralism we mean not its *linguistic* branch (with its well-known contributions, e.g. to phonology), but its *aesthetic/semiotic* branch (primarily Mukařovský<sup>190</sup>). Compare Jettmarová’s comment (2009: 1)<sup>191</sup>: ‘if anything can be representative of Levý’s background then it is this Prague structural aesthetics/semiotics rather than only linguistics.’ The same holds true for Popovič, Levý’s follower.

More specifically, drawing on the Moscow-Tartu School of Semiotics (J. Lotman, B. Uspensky, V. V. Ivanov, V. Toporov, and others), as Even-Zohar does, entails making (indirect) use of the results achieved by Prague structuralists. As Grygar (1999: 22) explains, summarised in English by Jettmarová (2009: 4):

Mojmír Grygar (Czech structuralist who worked at the University of Amsterdam between 1969-1993) says that Russian semiotics in the 60s drew primarily on domestic formalist sources but was influenced by Czech structuralism, only that for ideological reasons this fact could not have been stated. Leading scholars in Tartu and Moscow (Lotman, Ivanov, Toporov, Uspenski) made use of Prague’s research results in linguistics and literature, theory of art and semiotics.

In his *Terminologický slovník českého strukturalismu: Obecné pojmy estetiky a teorie umění* [Terminological Dictionary of Czech Structuralism: General Concepts of Aesthetics and Art Theory], Grygar (1999: 66-67) refers to the Prague structuralists’ definition of ‘society as a structure of structures’<sup>192</sup>:

<sup>187</sup> BROECK, Raymond van den. 1998. ‘Translational Interpretation as Prerequisite for Creativity’. In *Translators’ Strategies and Creativity*. Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová & Barbara Moser-Mercer (eds.). Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

<sup>188</sup> DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2000b. ‘Uncrowning the Original: Carnivalised Translation’. *TRANS, revista de traductologia*, n.º 4. Universidad de Málaga: Departamento de Traducción e Interpretación, pp. 9-18.

<sup>189</sup> This ‘testing’ is a rather discreet *comparison*. This thesis aims neither to compare two theories and methodologies nor to test them.

<sup>190</sup> Translated also into Portuguese (rather untypically via Spanish) as *Escritos sobre estética e semiótica da arte* by Manuel Ruas in 1997 (Lisbon: Editorial Estampa).

<sup>191</sup> JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana. 2009. ‘Explanatory Notes to/on Additional Chapter’.

[http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Pym\\_Explanatory\\_Notes\\_Czech.pdf](http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Pym_Explanatory_Notes_Czech.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-04-29).

<sup>192</sup> ‘Vývojové řady dané dynamikou jednotlivých struktur proměňujících se v čase (např. struktury politické, ekonomické, ideologické, literární) neprobíhají vedle sebe beze vztahů, nýbrž tvoří *strukturu vyššího řádu*, v které jsou složkami, [...] tato struktura struktur má svoji hierarchii i svoji dominantu (řadu převládající). Ježto ovšem jde o *živou* strukturu, nikoli o nehybný systém, je i tato vrcholná výstavba, plná vnitřních *antinomií*, v stálém *pohybu a přeskupování*, jednotlivé složky se střídají v postavení dominant a žádná z nich není v popředí natrvalo.’ (Grygar 1999: 66-67)

The lines of development produced by the dynamism of individual structures changing in time (e.g. political, economic, ideological, literary structures) do not proceed side by side without interrelations, but form a *higher-order structure*, of which they are components [...]. This structure of structures has its own hierarchy and its dominant (prevailing line). However, since it is a *living* structure, not a motionless system, this superstructure, full of internal *antinomies*, is in constant *movement and regrouping*; the individual components take turns in occupying the dominant position and none of them remains in the forefront permanently.

This is very close to Even-Zohar's polysystem theory. Although Czech structuralists distinguished between the *living structure* and the *immobile system*, the affinities between the two approaches are striking. Moreover, Czech structuralism was decidedly not *eidological*<sup>193</sup> (text-immanent), i.e. reducing research in literary studies to the text itself. Compare two quotes from Grygar (1999: 71, 68)<sup>194</sup>:

[...] it is necessary to seek the explanation in what is *outside* literature, beginning with the influence of other literatures and ending with the communication (relations) with the most varied branches of human culture. (71)

If society's effort to influence art becomes dominant, the result is *controlled* art; on the other hand, if art's effort to influence society prevails, we tend to speak of *tendentious* art. (68)

As with Popovič, Czech structuralism would deserve a much more detailed treatise, but that is not the aim of the present thesis. Besides, it has been dealt with elsewhere (e.g. Doležel 2000)<sup>195</sup>.

Finally, Even-Zohar's 'repertoremes' (2004: 17) are highly reminiscent of, while admittedly not identical with, Levý's 'normemes' (1971: 105-106; English in Králová, Jettmarová et al. 2008: 73):

[...] the individual requirements are part of the aesthetic norm and in the course of the historical development of the norm they are either accepted or rejected. These normemes combine to create segmental norms (syntagms) that are components of a higher-order global, composite norm. [...] The syntax of normemes operates on various levels; not only do they create hierarchical complexes within the aesthetic norm of a particular art form, but they also form structural relationships with contemporary norms in other art forms (the definition instructions are as a rule very generalised, noetic in nature).

Apart from Pym's (1998: 151-152) and Tymoczko's (2000: 29) criticisms of Even-Zohar, it is arguable whether 'books' can indeed be regarded simply as goods. It seems neither plausible nor convincing to say that the status of literature within the polysystem (superstructure) of culture can be reduced to that of goods, even taking into account the distinction of 'material' versus 'semiotic' (or symbolic) goods (Bourdieu's *biens symboliques*). Our main objection in the argumentation of Even-Zohar (2004: 7), where he elaborates Bourdieu's concepts, is to such formulations as the following:

It really matters little, from the point of view of their respective function, whether the goods in discussion are lapis lazuli, a high palace, running water, a car, a computer, or a set of texts, a

<sup>193</sup> The adjective is derived from the Greek 'eidos'. For a possible explanation, see e.g. NOVAK, J. (s.d.) <http://www.eidos.uwaterloo.ca/pdfs/novak-eidos.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-04-29).

<sup>194</sup> '[...] je nutno hledat vysvětlení v tom, co je *mimo* literaturu, počínajíc vlivem jiných literatur a končíc stykem s nejrůznějšími odvětvími lidské kultury.' (Grygar 1999: 71) 'Nabude-li převahy snaha po vlivu společnosti na umění, vzniká umění *řízené*; převáží-li naopak záměr umění působit na společnost, mluvíme o umění *tendenčním*.' (Grygar 1999: 68)

<sup>195</sup> DOLEŽEL, Lubomír. 2000. 'Poststructuralism: A View from Charles Bridge'. In *Poetics Today*, Vol. 21, no. 4, winter 2000, pp. 633-652.

group of text producers ("poets," "writers"), a collection of pieces of music, a collection of paintings, sculptures, a theater, etc. Once a defined set of such goods acquires the condition of evaluability by mutual recognition, in an established market (or Stock Exchange), it is assigned a specific value. Goods which cannot be evaluated by such a market cannot have value, and therefore are not marked as "culture."

Speaking specifically of books, Müllerová (2009: 56)<sup>196</sup> observes:

The responsibility [of the book market] is not only at the authorial or thematic level (choice and production of the work of a particular author), but also at the ideological, censorial, cultural, educational as well as economic levels. [...] The three-dimensional character (material and price, purpose of use, manner of use), one-time purchase, varying lifetimes of books, their quite untypical character as goods – borrowing, legal protection, the producer's focus on the buyers, the non-vital consumption or the book as an object of mass production, are the main attributes of this specific product.

Indeed, literature pursues ends that are cultural, societal and economic, but also political, academic and charitable (Müllerová 2009: 43). To treat books, and literature by extrapolation, as 'goods' implies a reductionist approach that can have only limited practical application, even for the purposes of (academic) modelling. While not denying that Even-Zohar's ideas, inspired in this case by Bourdieu, certainly open up new avenues of research, they can hardly be seen as radically better than what the Prague structuralists, with Levý and Popovič as their heirs, came forward with. Jettmarová (2005: 95) asks pertinently: 'Have Even-Zohar and especially Toury overestimated their audience's familiarity with dynamic/functional structuralism in terms of leaving a number of concepts implicit and/or unelaborated?'

Reading Pym (1998) shows the truth of Toury's words: 'Due to our incomplete knowledge of the history of our own discipline, where the wheel has been and is still being re-invented time and again...' (1998: 11). One such example is Pym's diagram of interculture (1998: 177), which is virtually identical to that devised by Popovič (1975: 187). Popovič, however, speaks of 'creolization', or the 'overlapping of two linguistic structures in the translation, the penetration of the original language's structure into the language of translation' (1976: 4), which roughly corresponds to Levý's 'the resulting translation is a hybrid entity (the content derives from SLC, the language belongs to TLC)' (in Jettmarová 2008: 34). Elsewhere, Pym (1998: 10) laments:

Note that most of the texts just referred to deal with the history of translation *theory*; they are not particularly interested in the past of translating translators. [...] translation history cannot be based exclusively on what has been said about translation. Better historiography requires awareness of what translators have actually done. And the best historiography must surely come from relating the two, investigating the complex relationships between past theories and past practices.

The above quote reveals that Pym is unaware of the existence of Levý's *Czech Theories of Translation* (1957), which is a successful attempt at uniting both approaches as

---

<sup>196</sup> 'Zodpovědnost není pouze v rovině autorské či tematické (výběr a produkce tvorby konkrétního autora), ale i v rovině ideologické, cenzurní, kulturní, vzdělávací i ekonomické. [...] Třidimenzionální charakter (materiál a cena, účel použití, způsob použití), jednorázová koupě, rozličná životnost knihy, zcela netypický charakter zboží – půjčování, právní ochrana, orientace výrobce na zákazníky, životně nedůležitá spotřeba či kniha jako objekt masové produkce jsou hlavními atributy tohoto specifického výrobku.' (Müllerová 2009: 56).

propagated by Pym, i.e. what translators actually did, and what they (and others) said about translation.

Discussing Toury's descriptivism, Even-Zohar's systems theory, Holz-Mänttari's *Handlungstheorie* and Reiß and Vermeer's *Skopostheorie*, Pym (1998: 154-155) arrives at the conclusion that 'no one in this camp is particularly interested in things like socially determined individuals'. As has been amply shown above, Levý and Popovič are keenly interested in the translators themselves.

Finally, we cannot consider most of the issues discussed above (Chapter 1) without mentioning, however briefly, André Lefevere (1985, 1992a, 1992b, 1995). As with Levý's *The Art of Translation* (1963), however, the main 'problem' with Lefevere is that while he excels at theory he offers only an *implicit* methodology. As a consequence, many of his concepts, such as patronage (ideological and economic components as well as status), rewriting, 'universe of discourse', subversion, etc., are used throughout the present thesis, but *methodologically* speaking, preference has been given to Popovič for the reasons given above.

## 2.4 Conclusion

The aim of the foregoing has been (i) to trace the present research from its inception onward, i.e. to show how our original research question led both to the formulation of a hypothesis to be tested, and thence, to our final questions; and (ii) to substantiate our belief that Popovič's conceptual and methodological framework provides an apposite set of instruments to answer the research questions, test the hypothesis, and investigate the issue [subject?] of the present thesis.

The initial research question consisted simply in *What has been translated from Czech into Portuguese?* To render the 'list', or zero corpus, more homogeneous, the final research questions had to be formulated as follows: 1. *What works of Czech fiction were translated in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal in book form?* 2. *How was Czech literature represented in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal?* The second reformulation is important, as it covers the phenomenon of non-translation (as a result of censorship). The hypothesis to be tested has been formulated as follows: *There was a pattern or a tendency in how Czech literature was represented in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal.*

Out of the plethora of competing theories and methodologies in Translation Studies, the work of Anton Popovič has been selected to provide the theoretical edifice and, especially, the methodological framework of our study. There are several reasons for this decision. First, Popovič provides methodological tools and models at all levels of abstraction relevant to the present thesis. In other words, the methodology offered by Popovič makes it possible to study all relevant phenomena mentioned in the previous section, i.e. all those identified as 'key theoretical concepts' for the present thesis.

Second, Popovič is most explicit regarding the tools and methods he puts forward. His methodology is perspicuous and ready to use. Third, it may be interesting to demonstrate how Popovič's methodology works in practice, as it is insufficiently known and has rarely been applied to actual data. Finally, Popovič does not lag behind any contemporary theory, as he is interested in both norms and agents, dissects both



individual texts and overarching ideologies, considers both context and co-text including societal and psychological issues, provides exact definitions of his concepts, etc.

For instance, the phenomenon of **copyright** can be studied, using Popovič's methodology, either as a **product** – an *apparent* (or *concealed*) *controversial metatext*, linked with the prototext only by some elements or at certain levels; or as a **process** – employing Popovič's *praxeology*, and more specifically, 'editorial practices'.

All this is not to say that Popovič's approaches are perfect and should be adopted uncritically (see above). No theory, model or methodology can be. Rather, Popovič's *methodology* proves most appropriate to the issues under scrutiny here, and that, ultimately, is why it has been selected.

The present thesis exhibits a certain lack or deficiency at the sociological level of studying translation study. Indeed, the reader might be surprised by how little data s/he is supplied with as regards actual translators, editors, publishing houses, etc. At this point it must be stated emphatically that every effort has been made to find out more about the translators: who they were, what they did for a living, what other languages they translated from and/or into, and first and foremost, *why* they translated Czech literature into Portuguese. In fact, our attempts have included most questions suggested by Chesterman (in Duarte, Rosa & Seruya 2006: 20-21). Yet, these attempts have, almost without exception, proved fruitless (see Chapter 4).

Thus, Pym (1998), Chesterman (2006) and others (including Levý and Popovič) may wish for Translation Studies to become more sociological, more focused on the people involved, more translator-oriented (what has been termed 'the translator's turn' elsewhere, Robinson 1991); but if the relevant material proves impossible to find, a (predominantly) sociological approach must, unfortunately, remain wishful thinking. Therefore a more cultural, rather than sociological, approach had to be pursued, focusing on the issues discussed above (Chapter 1).

Finally, research must be *operable*, i.e. feasible. If it vastly exceeds a researcher's limited possibilities (spatial, temporal, pecuniary, or other), it begs the question of whether the subject matter of such research should not be forgone altogether, no matter how novel, interesting or relevant it might seem.

## X. Chapter 3: Historical and Political Context

Ours is essentially a tragic age, so we refuse to take it tragically. The cataclysm has happened, we are among the ruins, we start to build up new little habitats, to have new little hopes. It is rather hard work: there is now no smooth road into the future: but we go round, or scramble over the obstacles. We've got to live, no matter how many skies have fallen.

**D. H. Lawrence:** *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

The present thesis deals with the cultural and political relations between Portugal and Czechoslovakia in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These relations were intermittent, which is why the entire 20<sup>th</sup> century needs to be discussed to provide adequate background. As this is no historiographical thesis, however, the political-historical context of our topic is only outlined by way of a synopsis.

### 3.1 Czechoslovakia

By the turn of 1950s, translators had lost any chance to influence significantly what would be translated. Most of them had no chance to translate (and publish) at all. Based on what translators did, they had about four options: (1) conform to the new system (as a rule it was only a small number of young translators who did so), (2) discontinue their work, (3) emigrate (that is, discontinue their work), (4) die (that is, discontinue their work). (Vimr 2009: 148)

#### 3.1.1 Prior to the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

The Lands of the Bohemian Crown, including primarily Bohemia, Moravia, and the southern third of Silesia<sup>197</sup>, had been part of the Habsburg Monarchy from 1526 to 1918. In the predominantly German-speaking country, the Czech language became ever more marginalized (alongside other Slavic languages), resulting in its almost total disappearance from everyday public life, especially in towns, towards the end of the Enlightenment. This led to the Czech National Revival, beginning towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, which endeavoured, in its first stage, to resurrect the Czech language in order to save it from extinction, and, in its second stage, to win political sovereignty for the Czech nation. The original idea was to achieve sovereignty within the Austrian Empire, but following the *Ausgleich* (Compromise) of 1867, which granted political rights to Transleithania, thereby establishing the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it gradually became clear that political sovereignty for Slavic nations within the Empire could be achieved only outside the outdated monarchy.

---

<sup>197</sup> English, German and most other European languages distinguish between 'Bohemian' (pt. boémio) and 'Czech' (pt. checo). The Czech language does not. The language is Czech (čeština), the inhabitants are Czech (sg. Čech, pl. Češi). Bohemia (Čechy, pt. Boémia) is only the largest part of the Czech Republic (Česká republika), which today consists of Bohemia, Moravia and the southern third of Silesia. 'Země koruny české' is translated as 'The Lands of the Bohemian Crown' for two reasons. First, the word 'Czech' is a modern, not a historical term, while the Bohemian Crown dates back to 1198, when Přemysl Otakar I obtained the hereditary title of King. Second, the Přemyslid Dynasty, the first royal dynasty to rule over the Lands, came from and started their reign in Bohemia. **Bohemia** (Czech: Čechy, Portuguese: Boémia) was predominantly Protestant (Hussite Church, Unity of the Brethren); **Moravia** (cs. Morava, pt. Morávia) was overwhelmingly Catholic; **Silesia** (cs. Slezsko, pt. Silésia) Protestant (Lutheran).

On 28 June 1914, the archduke and crown prince Franz Ferdinand of Austria and Sophie, Duchess of Hohenberg, were assassinated in Sarajevo (today Bosnia-Herzegovina, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire), which triggered a chain of events leading to the outbreak of the First World War. After four years of war, Austria-Hungary broke up into several parts, giving rise to Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the State of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs, and the Second Polish Republic, which incorporated the region of Galicia<sup>198</sup>, where the Polish had a slight majority over the Ukrainians.

### 3.1.2 The First Republic (1918-38)

Modern Czechoslovakia was established in 1918, as a result of the post-WWI settlement. Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the first president of Czechoslovakia, engaged in a series of diplomatic negotiations towards the end of World War I, resulting in the acceptance of his (and his likeminded colleagues') ideas concerning the new country to arise from the ruins of the Austro-Hungarian Empire – Czechoslovakia.

The period between 1918 and 1938 is referred to as the First Czechoslovak Republic. Alongside the Czech Republic, it included Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia<sup>199</sup>, which was annexed to the new state in order to prevent a 'bolshevisation' of Central Europe (Bělina et al. 1992: 163). Masaryk, and the so-called 'Castle Group' or 'The Five' (in Czech, *Skupina Hradu* and *Pětka*), i.e. the five most influential political parties, ensured political stability throughout the 1920s. Despite serious problems with minorities, especially the Sudeten Germans<sup>200</sup> in Bohemia and Moravia, and Hungarians in Slovakia, the 1920s was a time of peace, democracy and political and financial stability.

Problems began in the 1930s, as the world struggled through the Great Depression (1929-34) only to be faced with the threat of fascism and Nazism. The *Sudetendeutsche Partei* (Sudeten German Party) became the strongest political party in Czechoslovakia in the 1935 elections, while the political environment in neighbouring states – J. Piłsudski's Poland, M. Horthy's<sup>201</sup> Hungary and E. Dollfuss's Austria – continued to aggravate the young country's internal political situation.

---

<sup>198</sup> There are two regions called Galicia in Europe. The 'Slavic' Galicia (cs. Halič, pt. Galícia) lies in Central-Eastern Europe, north of Slovakia, currently divided between Poland and Ukraine. The 'Romance' Galicia (cs. Galicie, pt. Galiza) is situated on the Iberian Peninsula, north of Portugal. The language is Galician, the capital is Santiago de Compostela.

<sup>199</sup> In English, it is also referred to as Subcarpathia or Ruthenia. In Czech, the official name was Podkarpatská Rus, unofficially Zakarpatská Ukrajina (pt. Ucrânia Subcarpática). The capital was Uzhgorod (Užhorod). Carpathian Ruthenia was predominantly Greek Orthodox. The language is Rusyn, an East Slavic language, sometimes treated as a dialect of Ukrainian.

<sup>200</sup> The Sudeten Germans were the German-speaking population living in Czechoslovakia after 1918, forming 23.4% of the total population of Czechoslovakia according to the 1921 census (3,123,000 out of 13,613,172). Following the collaboration of the majority of them with the Third Reich from 1939 to 1945, their property was confiscated and they were expelled from Czechoslovakia in 1945 in accord with the 'Beneš Decrees' – the decrees of the President of the Republic, issued in the Czech government's London exile during WWII. Their expulsion was subsequently legitimised by the Potsdam Conference.

<sup>201</sup> Miklós Horthy (1868-1957) died in Estoril, a seaside resort near Lisbon, Portugal.

Following Austria's *Anschluss* on 12 March 1938, the Munich Agreement, signed by Adolf Hitler, Neville Chamberlain, Benito Mussolini and Édouard Daladier on 30 September 1938 (without any Czech representatives having been invited), deprived Bohemia and Moravia of more than one third of its territory as all regions with more than 50% of German population were annexed to Nazi Germany.

Édouard Daladier thus breached the bilateral treaty signed between France and Czechoslovakia in 1924, obliging either country to defend the other in case of an attack by an external party. Neville Chamberlain justified his decision with these infamous words:<sup>202</sup>

How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is, that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here, because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing... However much we may sympathise with a small nation confronted by a big and powerful neighbour, we cannot in all circumstances undertake to involve the whole British Empire in war simply on her account. If we have to fight, it must be on larger issues than that. I am myself a man of peace to the depths of my soul; armed conflict between nations is a nightmare to me... War is a fearful thing, and we must be very clear before we embark on it, that it is really the great issues that are at stake.

Chamberlain's words go a long way to explain why this moment in the history of Czechoslovakia is also termed the Munich Betrayal (of Czechoslovakia by France and the United Kingdom). The Second World War began several months later, on 1 September 1939, proving Chamberlain naïve on all counts.

### 3.1.3 The Second Republic (1938-1939)

Following the Munich Pact, the entire Czech population was forcibly expelled from the previously heterogeneous Sudetenland. President Edvard Beneš, installed in 1935, resigned on 5 October 1938 and fled to London to establish a Czechoslovak government-in-exile. Beneš was succeeded as President by Emil Hácha, a lawyer and the co-translator (together with his brother) of Jerome K. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat*. On 2 November 1938, under the Vienna Award, the southern third of Slovakia and Ruthenia were ceded to Hungary.

The Second Republic lasted only from 30 September 1938 to 15 March 1939, when German military units crossed the German-Czechoslovak border and occupied Czechoslovakia, establishing the *Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren* (Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia). Slovakia, led by the priest Jozef Tiso<sup>203</sup> (1887-1947), declared an independent and sovereign Slovak state, a satellite state of Nazi Germany.

---

<sup>202</sup> See e.g. <http://www.historyguide.org/europe/munich.html> [retrieved on 2011-08-27].

<sup>203</sup> *Clerical fascism* (or clerofascism) designates the involvement of the (Catholic) Church in fascist dictatorial regimes. Aside from Tiso's Slovakia, it has been used to refer to Portugal under Salazar and Brazil under Getúlio Vargas.

### 3.1.4 Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren (1939-45)

Formally, Emil Hácha remained president of the amputated Czech state (until 4 May 1945), but actual power fell into the hands of the Reichsprotektor ('imperial protector'), the representative of the Third Reich who held the reins in the new protectorate: Konstantin von Neurath (21 March 1939 – 24 August 1943), who was later represented first by Deputy Protector Reinhard Heydrich (29 September 1941 – 4 June 1942), then by Kurt Daluege (5 June 1942 – 24 August 1943); and finally Wilhelm Frick (24 August 1943 – 4 May 1945).

On 28 October 1939, on the 21<sup>st</sup> anniversary of the founding of Czechoslovakia, mass anti-Nazi demonstrations took place. The Nazi rulers crushed the uprising with extreme brutality. Václav Sedláček, a labourer, was shot to death, and Jan Opletal, a 24-year-old medical student at Charles University, was shot in the abdomen and died a few days later. His funeral gave rise to further spontaneous mass demonstrations.

On 17 November 1939, Konstantin von Neurath closed down all Czech universities, had nine Czech university students executed, and sent over 1200 Czech students to concentration camps. Still, Hitler considered von Neurath too lenient and installed Reinhard Heydrich as Deputy Protector of Bohemia and Moravia in his stead.

The acting Protector imposed martial law and launched massive arrests to crush all resistance. On 27 May 1942 British-trained paratroopers Jan Kubiš (Czech) and Jozef Gabčík (Slovak) succeeded in assassinating Reinhard Heydrich (in fact he died a few days later). While this act of bravery raised Czechoslovakia's credit abroad, it became a pretext for further Nazi terror in what was termed the 'Heydrichiade', organised by Karl Hermann Frank and Kurt Daluege.

In reprisal for the assassination, they obliterated and levelled the town of Lidice near Kladno on 10 June and the town of Ležáky near Chrudim on 24 June 1942, resulting in the deaths of 339 men, women and children in Lidice and 54 in Ležáky. These events effectively put an end to organised Czech resistance until almost the end of WWII.

Initially, the Slovak State (*Slovenský štát*) underwent a different development. The state organisation followed the example of corporatist fascist regimes in Mussolini's Italy and Salazar's Portugal (Bělina et al. 1992: 210). The Slovak Assembly was practically replaced by the State Council under the President, Jozef Tiso. Political and social life was soon dominated by Hlinka's Slovak People's Party (HSLŠ), whose members occupied all key posts in the state administration. The totalitarian regime rested primarily on the Catholic clergy and HSLŠ's organisations, such as the Hlinka Guard, Hlinka Youth etc. Czechs living in Slovakia lost their jobs and were expelled from the country. However, towards the end of the Second World War, resistance activities both in the Protectorate and in Slovakia began to coincide.

Exiled President Edvard Beneš, having lost faith in the Western powers after the betrayal of Munich, concluded a treaty on friendship, mutual aid and post-war cooperation between Czechoslovakia and the USSR in Moscow on 12 December 1943. Czechoslovakia was the first 'smaller' (medium-sized) country to conclude such a treaty with the USSR. Beneš promised Stalin he would cede Ruthenia to the USSR if the majority of its inhabitants expressed their wish to become part of the USSR in a

referendum. In return, Stalin agreed to support Beneš' aim of restoring Czechoslovakia to its pre-WWII borders (except Ruthenia).

On 1 May 1945, a spontaneous uprising against the occupiers broke out in the Czech lands. On 5 May 1945 it spread to Prague. On 6 May 1945, D. D. Eisenhower's military units entered Pilsen<sup>204</sup>, liberating almost the entire Western third of the Protectorate. The Soviet Army had at that point not yet reached the capital, so Eisenhower offered to advance. But Stalin had of his own political agenda and told him to hold back. Thus it was not until 9 May 1945, after tough battles had been raging on the barricades for four days, that the Red Army finally liberated Prague.

### 3.1.5 WWII Aftermath (1945-1948)

In March 1945, negotiations between the two Czechoslovak exile resistance centres were held in Moscow. The agreement they reached, which found expression in the Košice government programme<sup>205</sup>, included a ban on all right-wing parties from the First Republic. Although leftist sympathies were dominant throughout Europe (Communists participated in the governments of France and Italy, and even the popular Winston Churchill had to bow to the victory of the Labour Party in July 1945), this 'move' was unprecedented.

The Czech Communist Party (KSČ) and the Slovak Communist Party (KSS) occupied all power-wielding posts in the new government. Until a new legislature could be elected the country was governed by Presidential decree, a situation that changed the organisation of the country profoundly. Over 3000 companies, representing almost two thirds of the then industrial potential of the country and including mines, the food industry, banks and private insurance companies, were nationalised. Meanwhile the country's political representatives agreed to expel all non-Slavic minorities.

Germans, representing almost 30% of the population of Czech lands, and Hungarians (Magyars), representing over 17% of the Slovak population, were stripped of their citizenship<sup>206</sup>, thereby losing their right to legal protection, and their property was confiscated. The so-called 'wild expulsion'<sup>207</sup> broke out immediately after the end of the war and continued till August 1945. The Potsdam Conference approved of the expulsions, but only under the supervision of an independent international committee. The 'organised expulsion' began in January 1946, resulting in the displacement of 2,256,000 Germans (Bělina et al. 1992: 253). The rest of the German population was to be dispersed from the border areas into the interior. By 1950, according to official statistics, only 1.8% of the former German population was left in the Czech lands (*ibid.*).

The Potsdam Conference did not approve the expulsion of Hungarians according to the German model. The Czechoslovak government therefore had to negotiate with Hungary

---

<sup>204</sup> Pilsen (cs. Plzeň) is the capital of West Bohemia and the second largest city of Bohemia after Prague. It is known world-wide for its beer – Pilsner Urquell.

<sup>205</sup> Declared on 5 April 1945 in Košice, the capital of East Slovakia.

<sup>206</sup> Central European countries distinguish between 'nationality', which is obtained by birth and cannot be taken away (say, Czech, German, Roma), and 'state citizenship' (such as Czechoslovakia, France, Portugal), which can change in the course of one's life.

<sup>207</sup> Displacement, de. wilde Vertreibung, cs. divoký odsun, pt. deportação selvagem.

about an ‘exchange’ of citizens. Thus, over 10% of the ethnic Hungarian population was still in Slovakia in 1950.

Czech Communists set about redistributing the vacant land in the border areas before the national elections in May 1946, thereby increasing the popularity of their party. In the elections of 26 May 1946, the Communist Party won 38.12% of the vote in the entire country, becoming the strongest party. Although the Slovak Democratic Party gained 62% in Slovakia (the Slovak Communist Party reached only 30.37% in Slovakia), the distribution of power in Czechoslovakia was unequivocal.

When the U.S. Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, offered aid to all European countries as part of the U. S. ‘European Recovery Program’ in his address at Harvard University in June 1947, the U.S.S.R. refused it almost immediately. The Czechoslovak government intended to accept the aid, but sent a delegation to Moscow to be on the safe side. Stalin made it very clear to Prime Minister Klement Gottwald that accepting the Marshall Plan would amount to an act inimical to the U.S.S.R., thus challenging the Czechoslovak-Soviet alliance.

The proverbial ‘Iron Curtain’ fell with an oppressive thud in June 1947, locking Czechoslovakia firmly inside the sphere of Soviet influence. For a thousand years Czechs had coexisted or competed with Germans, Austrians and other Central European nations. Now Central Europe ceased to exist and Czechoslovakia became part of Eastern Europe against its will and in defiance of millennia of historical, political and cultural affinities, affiliations and alliances.

### **3.1.6 Communist Czechoslovakia (1948-1968)**

In protest at political intrigues in the Ministry of the Interior, non-communist ministers in the post-war government resigned. On 25 February 1948, the ageing and ailing President Beneš accepted the Communists’ demands to appoint a purely communist government. Ever since, ‘February’ (in Czech: ‘únor’) has been a byword for political treachery on the Czechoslovak political scene.

New elections to the Parliament took place on 20 May 1948. Anti-communist canvassing was proscribed and punished. None the less, the results were not good enough for the Communist Party, who rigged them to produce a result of 89.2% for the joint ballot of the ‘National Front’ – the conglomerate of all leftist parties under the umbrella of the Communist Party. Beneš resigned as President on 7 June 1948 to be replaced, a week later, by Klement Gottwald, leader of the Communist Party and previously Prime Minister, a post in which he was succeeded by Antonín Zápotocký, Prime Minister from 1948 to 1953 and the second communist president after Gottwald’s death, from 1953 to 1957. The Communist *coup d’état* was complete.

Purges and trials followed. The purges focused on the ‘internal enemy’, i.e. the enemy within the Communist Party, for instance on Communists who had fought ‘on the wrong side of the barricade’ in the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39. The trials targeted members of the Czech and Slovak resistance in the West as well as Jews and the Catholic Church. In 1956, 433 clergymen were still in prison (Bělina et al. 1992: 269).

The most visible expression of disagreement with the Communist regime was emigration. Between 1948 and 1951, more than 25,000 Czechoslovak citizens left the country illegally (Bělina et al. 1992: 270), including such prominent personalities as the journalists Ferdinand Peroutka and Pavel Tigrid and the philosopher Erazim Kohák.

The enforced ‘collectivisation’ of agriculture and massive nationalisation resulted in the fact that by the end of 1958 over 95% of industrial workers were employed in the state sector. The economy was subject to central planning and ‘five-year plans’. Industry was restructured, with priority given to heavy engineering and, in particular, the manufacture of munitions, with which Czechoslovakia supplied the entire Eastern Bloc. In 1949, cooperation within the countries in the Soviet sphere of influence culminated in the creation of Comecon, or the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance<sup>208</sup>.

The death of Stalin on 5 March 1953 was followed by that of Klement Gottwald on 14 March. Gottwald was replaced by Zápotocký, Stalin by Nikita Khrushchev. Although Khrushchev initially appeared to be a less hard-line leader and had withdrawn Soviet military units from Austria in 1955, he crushed the Hungarian uprising the following year with brutal force.

On 30 May 1953 a drastic monetary reform, depriving most people of their savings, took place in Czechoslovakia, causing a wave of anti-government protests, especially in Pilsen, the capital of Western Bohemia, where around twenty thousand protesters were dispersed by the army and People’s Militias<sup>209</sup>.

In February 1956, at the 10<sup>th</sup> congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R (CPUSSR), Khrushchev criticised the cult of personality of Stalin, denounced several aspects of Stalinist politics and disclosed a number of facts about his crimes. At the end of April, at the second congress of the Association of Czechoslovak Writers<sup>210</sup>, several authors called for the abolition of censorship and the poet Jaroslav Seifert<sup>211</sup> spoke out in defence of all imprisoned writers. However, Czech Stalinists refused to change course and declared that the debate about the 10<sup>th</sup> congress of the CPUSSR was now closed.

In October 1964, Leonid Brezhnev replaced Nikita Khrushchev as the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, politically the most influential post in the country. He remained in this post until his death in 1982, starting a period of gerontocracy that lasted until the appointment of Mikhail Gorbachev in March 1985 at the age of 54.

Czechoslovakia adopted a new, socialist constitution in 1960, destroying the remnants of Slovak autonomy and changing the name of the country to ‘Czechoslovak Socialist

---

<sup>208</sup> Comecon (cs. RVHP, Rada vzájemné hospodářské pomoci, pt. Conselho para Assistência Económica Mútua, CAEM) was joined by the People’s Republic of Mozambique in 1985 (observer status) and by Angola in 1986 (observer status).

<sup>209</sup> Also known as ‘the armed fist of the working class’; a militia organisation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia from 1948 to 1989.

<sup>210</sup> In Czech: Svaz československých spisovatelů (1948-89), the official body for all professional writers, controlled by the Communist Party.

<sup>211</sup> Jaroslav Seifert (1901-86), a Czech poet, was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1984. In the years 1968-70 he was Chairman of the Czechoslovak Writers’ Association. He was one of the first signatories of Charter 77 (see below), as a result of which he had to withdraw from public life.



Republic' (or ČSSR). When the third Five-Year Plan (1961-65) virtually collapsed in its second year of existence, it became clear that the economy had to be restructured. Although the need for radical economic reform had been discussed as early as 1964, real changes were introduced only three years later when a group of economic reformers led by Ota Šik challenged the conservative and incompetent policies of A. Novotný.

### 3.1.7 The Prague Spring (1968-1969)

The 'revival' process in the KSČ and society at large thus began much earlier than January 1968, so we should perhaps avoid the misleading term 'Prague Spring', which reduces Czechoslovak attempts at reform to a few months.

At the beginning of June 1967, at the fifth congress of the Czechoslovak Association of Youth (ČSM)<sup>212</sup>, a plurality of organisations for the young was demanded. Towards the end of the same month, at the fourth congress of the Association of Czechoslovak Writers, several authors openly challenged the moral right of the KSČ to play the leading part in society. In his opening address to the Fourth Czechoslovak Writers' Congress in 1967, Milan Kundera openly criticised censorship and other repressive tactics used against Czechoslovakian writers.

In January 1968, at the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, A. Novotný was voted out of office as First Secretary of the KSČ and forced to make do with the politically insignificant post of the President of the Republic. Alexandr Dubček, a Slovak communist reformist, was appointed First Secretary of the KSČ. In March, Antonín Novotný resigned as President and was replaced by Ludvík Svoboda. The new president promptly appointed a new government headed by Oldřich Černík. In April 1968, the Central Committee adopted an Action Programme of the KSČ and gave the green light to economic reforms along free market lines. Censorship was practically paralysed, with a proliferation of newspaper articles about the crimes of the KSČ.

In June 1968, a Warsaw Pact<sup>213</sup> military training exercise on Czechoslovak territory was viewed with some apprehension by politicians and the public alike. And not without reason: the Soviet leadership was using it to prepare an armed invasion of Czechoslovakia.

On 27 June 1968, several newspapers published Ludvík Vaculík's manifesto entitled 'Two Thousand Words' calling upon the people of Czechoslovakia to hold their party accountable to standards of transparency. The text declared that the reform process must be continued irrespective of the interests of the KSČ, and if necessary, even against its interests.

---

<sup>212</sup> ČSM, Czechoslovak Association of Youth (cs. Československý svaz mládeže), was directly controlled by the Czechoslovak Communist Party (KSČ). It existed from 1949 to 1968. Later, it was re-established as the Socialist Association of Youth (SSM). In 1970, SSM founded an organisation for young children called 'Pionýr' ('Pioneer'), which existed until 1990, when it became ideologically independent.

<sup>213</sup> The Warsaw Pact (cs. Varšavská smlouva, pt. Pacto de Varsóvia), founded in 1955 in Warsaw and dissolved in 1991 in Prague by Václav Havel, was the Soviet Bloc's military response to West Germany's integration into the NATO in May 1955.

In the night from 20 to 21 August 1968, Czechoslovakia was occupied by the armies of the Warsaw Pact (with the exception of Romania) – a force of around 750,000 soldiers and 6000 tanks. Senior politicians and KSC members (Dubček, Černík and others) were abducted to the U.S.S.R and forced to sign the ‘Moscow Protocol’, obliging them to yield to the dictate of the Brezhnev Doctrine.

The democratic world was taken by surprise. Diplomatic notes denouncing the invasion were issued, but no real action was taken. The Munich syndrome reappeared in a new form.

Most foreign troops, with the exception of Soviet military units, left Czechoslovakia by the end of 1968. Soviet troops were to stay ‘temporarily’, but remained in the country until 1990. By the end of November 1968 the pro-Brezhnev faction in the Czechoslovak Communist Party had consolidated its power. As a consequence, all economic and political reforms came to a halt.

Following these events emigration surged to previously undreamt-of levels. By the end of 1969, 70% of émigrés were below the age of 35 and 38% were tertiary- and secondary-educated people (Bělina et al. 1992: 288). It is estimated that around 70,000 people emigrated immediately.

In October 1968 a new constitutional act transformed the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic into a federation. As of 1 January 1969, the Czech Socialist Republic (ČSR) and the Slovak Socialist Republic (SSR) came into existence. The Federal Assembly, the legislative body of the country, consisted of the Chamber of the People (200 deputies for 4 years) and the Chamber of the Nations (150 deputies – 75 from the ČSR and 75 from Slovakia). The Assembly existed until 31 December 1992, when the two republics split. In addition to the Federal Assembly there were two independent parliaments – the Czech National Council and the Slovak National Council.

At negotiations in Kiev in December 1968, Brezhnev insisted on purges in the KSC and the entire society, threatening a renewed use of force. There was a new wave of protests, culminating in the self-immolation of Jan Palach<sup>214</sup>, an act hitherto unimaginable in Europe that shocked the world.

Old tendencies resurfaced: central control of the economy, restrictions on entrepreneurial activities and, generally, increased state intervention. Soviet and East German demands for a greater involvement of the Czechoslovak economy in the Comecon led to a situation in which Czechoslovakia once again paid a high price for its economic integration in the socialist bloc.

The reform movement suffered a mortal blow in the so-called ‘ice-hockey week’ in March 1969, when the Czechoslovak team beat the U.S.S.R. in the world championship in Stockholm. The spontaneous celebrations in Prague had clearly political overtones, openly declaring ordinary people’s dissatisfaction with the ongoing occupation of the

---

<sup>214</sup> Jan Palach (1948-69) was a student of history and political economy at the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy of Charles University in Prague (the square where the main building of this faculty are situated is now named in his honour). His funeral turned into a major protest against the occupation, and a month later (on 25 February 1969) another student, Jan Zajíc, burned himself to death in the same place, followed in April of the same year by Evžen Plocek in Jihlava.

country. Popular disillusionment reached a point where only one thing could hold it in check: repression.

### 3.1.8 Normalisation (1970-1989)

The Soviets chose Gustáv Husák, a prominent Slovak politician, to be the new leader of the Party, and hence *de facto* of the country. Purges in the Party and throughout society came in several waves and ended in spring 1971. Almost 30,000 people lost their jobs and were banned from practising their professions. The purges concerned primarily the army (ČSLA)<sup>215</sup>, the police (SNB)<sup>216</sup>, the Academy of Sciences, universities, cultural institutions, and the media.

In August 1969, one year after the occupation, mass demonstrations were again brutally suppressed by the SNB, ČSLA and People's Militias. Many Czech and Slovak citizens were wounded, some mortally, by their own security forces.

In May 1970, a new treaty between the U.S.S.R. and the ČSSR on mutual aid and cooperation (including a secret annexe about the privileges of the Soviet troops stationed in Czechoslovakia) was signed in Prague, leaving Czechoslovakia in the unequivocal position of a Soviet vassal.

In autumn 1970, a document entitled 'Lessons from the Crisis Development in the Party and Society after the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress of the KSČ'<sup>217</sup> justified the Soviet invasion and the following period of 'normalisation' ideologically.

Hundreds of thousands of former communists and non-communist opponents were watched and shadowed, and their relatives threatened. Many were prevented from studying or practising their professions. Others had to withdraw from public life, had their salaries were capped, and were banned from publishing their opinions and subjected to regular interrogation.

Except in the case of Party functionaries, permission to travel abroad was rarely granted – yet another reason for the massive illegal emigration after August 1968, which has been estimated at between 700,000 and 800,000 (Bělina et al. 1992: 306).

Acting on Moscow's instructions, Czechoslovak embassies, consulates and legations became agencies of international terrorism. Czechoslovak weapons (e.g. Semtex, a plastic explosive invented in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s) were supplied to the Irish Republican Army; Palestine terrorists received training in Czechoslovakia<sup>218</sup>; Czech advisors helped Libya to prepare its aggression against Chad, etc.

---

<sup>215</sup> The army was called ČSLA (cs. Československá lidová armáda, en. Czechoslovak People's Army) from 1954 to 1990.

<sup>216</sup> The 'police', called the SNB (cs. Sbor národní bezpečnosti, en. National Security Forces), had two branches, the VB (cs. Veřejná bezpečnost, en. Public Security) - the usual police force, and the StB (cs. Státní bezpečnost, en. State Security) - aiming to eliminate the 'internal' as well as the 'external' enemy.

<sup>217</sup> In Czech: Poučení z krizového vývoje ve straně a společnosti od XIII. sjezdu KSČ.

<sup>218</sup> Despite Czechoslovakia's historical ties with Israel.

When Angola's UNITA<sup>219</sup> took the town of Alto Catumbela on 12 March 1983, they destroyed the local paper mill and transformer station. During this operation UNITA kidnapped a group of Czechoslovak engineers and their families who had worked here. The 66 captives included 28 men, 17 women and 21 children. They were obliged to set off on a 1320 kilometre march, during which one of the men died. Subsequently, they were transported in trucks to Jambe in the south of the country. The first group, consisting of the women, children and 7 men, returned on 1 July 1983. The second, made up of the remaining 20 men, did not return until 23 June 1984, after a year of internment in the bush.

Censorship and political oppression in the media prosecuted all allusions to politics, émigrés, dissidents, eroticism, and last but not least, anything having to do with the Church or religion. This encouraged the appearance of samizdat<sup>220</sup>, and there was an increased demand for books and magazines from Poland, where censorship was far less draconian.

In 1977, a civic initiative called 'Charter 77' criticised the regime for breaching human and civil rights and called for a democratic and open debate on a legal basis. A document of the same name, signed in January 1977, specifically demanded that the Czechoslovak regime fulfil its obligations arising from the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which had been signed by 35 countries, including Czechoslovakia and Portugal, on 1 August 1975 in Helsinki. Disseminating the text of the document was considered a criminal offence. Among the founding members of Charter 77 were playwright Václav Havel, philosopher Jan Patočka, and writers Pavel Kohout and Ludvík Vaculík.

Jan Patočka<sup>221</sup>, a septuagenarian at the time, never recovered from the physical and psychological exhaustion he suffered during his many hours of interrogation by the StB (State Security). He had been one of the first spokespersons of Charter 77, albeit only for a few months.

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev became Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and adopted a policy of *perestroika*, or 'restructuring' of the Soviet economy. He also advocated 'openness' (*glasnost*) in the discussion of economic, social and – to some extent – political questions. Gorbachev's rise to power meant a breath of warm wind from the East. Ultimately, it made possible the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia and the gradual dissolution of the Eastern Bloc.

In August 1988, during demonstrations marking the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Soviet invasion, special units of the secret police, a part of the People's Militias and other

---

<sup>219</sup> UNITA (pt. União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola, en. National Union for the Total Independence of Angola), founded in 1966 by Jonas Savimbi, received military aid from the United States and South Africa, while its principal opponent, the MPLA (pt. Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola, Partido de Trabalho, en. Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, Labour Party) was supported by the Soviet Union and its allies.

<sup>220</sup> *Samizdat* (Russian for 'self-published') was the clandestine copying and distributing of government-suppressed literature or other media in the countries of the Eastern Bloc.

<sup>221</sup> Jan Patočka (1907-77), initially Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger's student, is regarded as the most important Czech phenomenologist. His works include *The Natural World as a Philosophical Problem* (1936), *Negative Platonism* (posthumously in 1990) and *Heretical Essays in the Philosophy of History* (1975 in samizdat).

bodies of the repressive apparatus inflicted serious harm on the demonstrators. Similar scenes were repeated at the beginning of 1989 during ‘Palach week’, and again on 1 May and 21 August of the same year.

On 29 June 1989, Charter 77 published a manifesto entitled ‘A Few Sentences’ (*Několik vět*), demanding freedom and democracy. Before long the petition had been signed by thousands of people (12,000 by the end of July). The reaction of the regime was little short of hysterical.

On 30 September 1989, thousands of East Germans started gathering at the embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Prague. By 4 October their numbers had reached 11,000, and the Czechoslovak authorities had no choice but to allow them to travel to Bavaria in special buses and trains. This East German exodus via Prague significantly accelerated developments in Czechoslovakia.

The repressive response of the Communist regime culminated on the 17 November 1989, the day that marked the start of what came to be called the ‘Velvet Revolution’.

### 3.1.9 The Velvet Revolution (1989-90)

On 17 November, a duly announced student demonstration commemorating J. Opletal’s death was brutally attacked by the police on the Národní Avenue. The public reacted almost immediately with mass demonstrations and general strikes across the country, resulting in a virtual *coup d’état*.

On 19 November, Občanské forum (OF, the Civic Forum) was established. This was a broad platform of all civic activists striving for the restoration of political pluralism and opposed to the totalitarian communist regime. It was soon followed by the Slovak ‘Verejnost’ proti násiliu’ (VPN, The Public against Violence).

On 3 December, Obec spisovatelů (The Society of Czech Writers) was founded, bringing together over 400 Czech playwrights, writers, poets and critics. Václav Havel was elected Chairman. On 8 December, President Gustáv Husák granted amnesty to all political prisoners. Two days later he resigned as President.

On 29 December 1989, Václav Havel, playwright<sup>222</sup> and political dissident, was elected the 10<sup>th</sup> president of Czechoslovakia, putting an end to 41 years of communist rule and Soviet oppression.

On 2 January 1990, President Havel’s first trip abroad took him to the German Democratic Republic (DDR) and to the Federal Republic of Germany (BRD). On 14 February 1990, Pope John Paul II appointed five new Czechoslovak bishops and for the first time in over half a century all 13 dioceses in the country were occupied.

---

<sup>222</sup> Václav Havel (b. 1936) is a playwright usually located within the tradition of the Theatre of the Absurd. His best-known plays include *The Garden Party* (1963, cs. Zahradní slavnost), *The Increased Difficulty of Concentration* (1968, cs. Ztížená možnost soustředění), *Unveiling* (1975, cs. Vernisáž), *Audience* (1975, cs. Audience), *Largo Desolato* (1984), and now *Leaving* (2007, cs. Odcházení).

On 26 February 1990, the ČSSR and the USSR signed an agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of Czechoslovakia. 73,500 soldiers and officers had been stationed there.

The so-called ‘Hyphen War’ over the official name of Czechoslovakia went on until mid-March. The federal assembly changed the name of the country to ‘Czecho-slovak Federal Republic’ on 29 March, but the Slovaks disliked both the lower-case ‘s’ in the compound and the order of ‘Czech(o)’ and ‘Slovak’. On 20 April 1990, the federal assembly changed the name again, this time to ‘Czech and Slovak Federal Republic’ (ČSFR)<sup>223</sup>.

On 7 May 1990, the European Communities and the ČSFR signed an Agreement on Trade and Commercial and Economic Cooperation. Soon afterwards, the ČSFR, Hungary and Poland signed an agreement with the European Free Trade Organisation (EFTA)<sup>224</sup> on the improvement of mutual trade. On 21 February 1991, the ČSFR became a full member of the Council of Europe.

On 8-9 June 1990, the first free elections to the Federal Assembly and both National Councils took place, with 22 political parties and movements competing. The turnout was 96.79%. The OF (Civic Forum) won in the Czech Republic, the VPN won in the Slovak Republic. The KSČM (Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia), founded on 31 March 1990 as a leftist socialist party professing democratic socialism, came second.

### **3.1.10 From Czechoslovakia to the Czech Republic (1989-1993)**

On 5 July 1990, Václav Havel was elected President of the ČSFR. On 20 September, the ČSFR was accepted as a member of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), part of the World Bank Group (WBG).

Very early after the restoration of democracy, negotiations on the future organisation of the federation began. On 5 November 1990, the three prime ministers (federal, Czech and Slovak) agreed on the ‘competence bill’, whereby the government of the federation (ČSFR) was to be responsible only for the defence, currency and foreign policy.

On 15 February 1991, a summit of the highest representatives of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary took place in Visegrád, Hungary, where they agreed on coordinated further steps leading to their accession into the European Communities and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. This was the beginning of the ‘Visegrád Group’ (now also called the Visegrád Four or V4).

---

<sup>223</sup> In Czech ‘Česko-slovenská federativní republika’, then ‘Česká a Slovenská federativní republika’.

<sup>224</sup> This economic organisation was founded in 1960. At the time, the United Kingdom, prevented from entry into the EU by France, assumed the leading role in the new organisation. Portugal was one of the founding countries, but left for the EC in 1986. There were 7 founding countries; the highest number of member states was 9 (in 1970); the only remaining member states today are Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, out of which the first three are also members of the European Economic Area (EEA), founded in 1994. The Swiss declined to participate in the EEA in a referendum.

On 1 March 1991, official military contacts between the NATO and the ČSFR were agreed upon. On 16 December, the Treaty of Accession of Czechoslovakia to the European Union was signed.

On 27 June 1997, the last soldier of the Soviet army left Czechoslovakia. On 1 July 1991, the protocol on the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact was signed in Prague.

In the autumn of 1991, privatisation of state-owned property began in the form of a 'coupon privatisation'. In the first wave, citizens could buy (by means of coupons) the shares of 1491 companies, valued at 277.84 billion Czechoslovak crowns (Čapka 1999: 841).

On 5-6 June 1992, parliamentary elections were held. A coalition led by the Civic Democratic Party (ODS) won over 33% of the vote. President Havel mandated Václav Klaus, the leader of the ODS, to begin coalition negotiations with the strongest Slovak party, HZDS (*Hnutie za demokratické Slovensko*), the Movement for Democratic Slovakia, led by Vladimír Mečiar. Jan Stráský (ODS) became the federal Prime Minister, Václav Klaus (ODS) the Czech Prime Minister and Vladimír Mečiar his Slovak counterpart.

On 20 July 1992, as the political crisis pushed the country towards dissolution, Václav Havel resigned as Czechoslovak President, and the country remained without a president until its demise. In accordance with the constitution, Federal Prime Minister Stráský assumed the duties of the President.

On 23 July 1992, the leadership of the ODS and the HZDS agreed on the dissolution of the Czechoslovak federation, which the federal government approved on 27 October 1992.

### 3.1.11 The Czech Republic (1993-2010)

The land area of the Czech Republic is 78,866 square kilometres. Portugal occupies 92,072 km<sup>2</sup>, including Madeira and the Azores. In the EU, Austria is closest in terms of area to the two countries, with 83,870 square kilometres.<sup>225</sup>

The population of the Czech Republic is 10,381,130, whereas that of Portugal is 10,627,250. Belgium is closest population-wise to the two countries, with 10,666,866 inhabitants (2009)<sup>226</sup>.

The two biggest post-Velvet Revolution political parties are the right-wing conservative Civic Democratic Party (Občanská demokratická strana or ODS, led from 1991 to 2002 by Václav Klaus), and the centre-left Czech Social Democratic Party (Česká strana sociálně demokratická or ČSSD, led from 1993 to 2001 by Miloš Zeman). The only other political party represented in the Czech Parliament continuously from 1993 until

<sup>225</sup> EUROSTAT. <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/guip/countryAction.do> (retrieved on 2011-05-15).

<sup>226</sup> EUROSTAT. <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&language=en&pcode=tps00001&tableSelection=1&footnotes=yes&labeling=labels&plugin=1> (retrieved on 2011-05-15).

2011 has been the Communists (Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy or KSČM, the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia).

The Czech Republic is a parliamentary republic. The bicameral Parliament of the Czech Republic consists of the Chamber of Deputies (200 deputies elected for four years under the proportional representation system) and the Senate (81 senators elected for 6 years; one third of the senators are elected under the two-round plurality voting system every two years).

On 26 January 1993, Václav Havel was elected the first Czech President. On 14-15 May 1993, a world pilgrimage took place in Nepomuk, a town in the district of Pilsen, commemorating the six hundredth anniversary of the martyrdom of Saint John of Nepomuk<sup>227</sup>.

On 30 June 1993, the Czech Republic became a member of the Council of Europe and on 29 October it was elected a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. Czechoslovakia had been one of the founding countries of the United Nations in October 1945, while Portugal joined the UN in December 1955.

On 4 February 1994, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Hungary and Poland signed the Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA). The CEFTA became defunct when these countries joined the EU in May 2004.

From 6 to 12 November 1994, the 61<sup>st</sup> world congress of International PEN was held in Prague, bringing together 520 writers, poets, playwrights and translators. Jiří Gruša (\*1938), a Czech writer, translator and diplomat, was the President of International PEN from 2004 to 2009.

On 31 May and 1 June 1996, the first parliamentary elections in the Czech Republic took place. The Civic Democratic Party (ODS), led by Václav Klaus, won and Klaus became Prime Minister on 2 July. Following an affair in the ODS involving anonymous sponsors and a scandal concerning a secret bank account of this party in Switzerland, the government resigned on 30 November 1997. It was replaced by a caretaker government led by Josef Tošovský, formerly (and afterwards) Governor of the Czech National Bank.

On 20 January, the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate of the Parliament of the Czech Republic jointly re-elected Václav Havel President of the Czech Republic.

The Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD), led by Miloš Zeman, won the early elections of 19-20 June 1998. Zeman formed a minority ('one-colour') government, but had the support of the opposition ODS, which created a stable political environment. However, the 'opposition agreement' was heavily criticised by politicians from other parties and the public.

On 12 March 1999, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland became members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). Portugal had been a founding member

---

<sup>227</sup> Saint John of Nepomuk (1345-93, cs. Jan Nepomucký, pt. São João Nepomuceno). His statues can be found on the Charles Bridge in Prague and in the Carmo Convent (pt. Convento do Carmo) in the centre of Lisbon.



since 4 April 1949 (see below). Slovakia became a member of NATO on 29 March 2004.

In the 2002 elections the ČSSD, this time led by Vladimír Špidla, won again. However, due to a series of affairs, the government saw a constant change of leadership: Vladimír Špidla was replaced in 2005 by the youngest Prime Minister in history, Stanislav Gross (b. 1969), who was in turn replaced by Jiří Paroubek in 2006.

On 1 May 2004, the Czech Republic joined the European Union, together with nine other countries (Malta, Cyprus, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Slovenia), two of which have already adopted the euro (Slovenia in 2007 and Slovakia in 2009). The Czech Republic has 22 seats in the European Parliament, the same number as Belgium, Greece, Hungary and Portugal (Slovakia has 13).

In the first Barroso<sup>228</sup> Commission (2004-2009), Vladimír Špidla (ČSSD) served as European Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Štefan Füle (ČSSD), formerly Minister for European Affairs in Fischer's administration (preceded by Alexandr Vondra in Topolánek's administration), is the incumbent European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy (due to serve until 2014) in the second Barroso Commission.

The 2006 elections ended in a stalemate. Although the ODS, this time led by Mirek Topolánek, won, it proved extremely difficult to form a government (the 200-seat Chamber of Deputies had exactly 100 left-of-centre and 100 right-of-centre elected deputies). After lengthy negotiations, Topolánek formed a coalition government together with the KDU-ČSL (Christian Democrats) and the Green Party, who had first entered Parliament in 2006.

In the first half of 2009, the Czech Republic assumed the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, headed by Mirek Topolánek. After the government's initial successes, the opposition ČSSD (led by Jiří Paroubek) proposed a motion of no-confidence during the Czech EU Presidency, bringing the government down. This seriously damaged the credit of the Czech Republic as a stable country capable of leading the EU, albeit for a mere six months. President Václav Klaus appointed Jan Fischer, until then President of the Czech Statistical Office (ČSÚ), to head a caretaker government until the next elections. Fischer thus became the 8<sup>th</sup> Prime Minister of the Czech Republic.

The Civic Democratic Party (ODS) won the parliamentary elections in June 2010, with Petr Nečas becoming Prime Minister.

---

<sup>228</sup> José Manuel Durão Barroso (b. 1956, PSD) served as the Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs (1992-95), then Prime Minister of Portugal from 2002 to 2004, when he assumed the post of the President of the European Commission.

### 3.1.12 Tables

**Table 1: Official Names of Czechoslovakia**

1918-20	Republic of Czechoslovakia (RČS)
1920-38	Czechoslovak Republic (ČSR)
1938-39	Czecho-Slovak Republic
1939-45	two independent countries: Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia; Slovak State
1945-60	Czechoslovak Republic (ČSR)
1960-90	Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (ČSSR)
1990-92	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic
As of 1 January 1993 – two independent countries: Czech Republic; Slovak Republic	

**Table 2: Czechoslovak (1918-1992) and Czech (1993-2013) Presidents**

1918-35	Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (non-partisan)
1935-48	Edvard Beneš <sup>229</sup>
1948-53	Klement Gottwald (KSC)
1953-57	Antonín Zápotocký (KSC)
1957-68	Antonín Novotný (KSC)
1968-75	Ludvík Svoboda (KSC)
1975-89	Gustáv Husák (KSC)
1989-92	Václav Havel (Civic Forum / non-partisan)
<b>1993-2003</b>	Václav Havel (non-partisan)
<b>2003-</b>	Václav Klaus (ODS, due to serve until 2013)

**Table 3: Prime Ministers of the Czech Republic (1993-2010)**

1993-97	Václav Klaus	ODS
1997-98	Josef Tošovský	Independent (caretaker government)
1998-2002	Miloš Zeman	ČSSD
2002-04	Vladimír Špidla	ČSSD
2004-05	Stanislav Gross	ČSSD
2005-06	Jiří Paroubek	ČSSD
2006-09	Mirek Topolánek	ODS
2009-10	Jan Fischer	Independent (caretaker government)
2010-	Petr Nečas	ODS

**Key:**

ČSSD – *Česká strana sociálně demokratická*, the Czech Social Democratic Party;  
 KSC – *Komunistická strana Československa*, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia;  
 ODS – *Občanská demokratická strana*, the Civic Democratic Party.

<sup>229</sup> Emil Hácha was President of the Second Republic (1938-39) and President *de iure* of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (1939-45). Josef Tiso was President of the Slovak State (1939-45). Edvard Beneš was President in the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile during WWII (1939-45).

## 3.2 Portugal

Here the sea ends and the earth begins.  
 José Saramago: *The Year of the Death of Ricardo Reis* (translated by Giovanni Pontiero)<sup>230</sup>

### 3.2.1 Introduction

Portugal was the first and longest-lived European colonial power of the Modern Era. The history of Portugal, in particular in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, cannot be fully comprehended without the fundamental and pervasive issue of Portuguese colonies (renamed ‘overseas provinces’ in 1951, *Ultramar*), including, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe, Cabinda and São João Baptista de Ajudá (St. John the Baptist of Ouidah Fort) in Africa, alongside East Timor, Macau (bordering on the Chinese province of Guangdong) and Portuguese India (*Estado Português da Índia*, mainly Goa, Damão/Daman and Diu) in Asia.<sup>231</sup>

Yet, the present thesis makes no attempt to deal extensively with the issue of Portuguese colonies, as our focus is on Czech-Portuguese relations<sup>232</sup> under two mutually inimical regimes: the 48-year Portuguese dictatorship from 1926 to 1974, and the 41-year Czechoslovak ‘communist’ regime from 1948 to 1989. As Raby (1988: 15)<sup>233</sup> puts it: ‘When a regime lasts as long as this one, its values, practices and institutions become part of the national culture; and the values, practices and institutions of resistance become a part of that culture also.’

### 3.2.2 Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century

On the 1 February 1908, King Charles I (*Carlos*, 1889-1908) and his heir Luís Filipe, the Prince Royal, were assassinated by republican terrorists. The regicide (*regicídio*) caused such uproar that it was front-page news as far away as Prague (e.g. in *Národní listy*). Eighteen-year-old Manuel II (1908-1910) succeeded to the throne, only to be ousted two years later by the republican revolution, which began on 4 October 1910.<sup>234</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> For a different perspective on the history of Portugal and an entertaining read, see J. Saramago’s *Journey to Portugal: In Pursuit of Portugal’s History and Culture* (1990, Portuguese as *Viagem a Portugal* in 1981).

<sup>231</sup> When it is said that the Portuguese Empire spanned four continents, this is meant to include Portugal in Europe and Brazil in South America. Brazil, however, was the first colony to gain independence from Portugal as early as 1822.

<sup>232</sup> Henceforth, ‘Czech-Portuguese relations’ shall be used in particular to describe relations in the direction from Czech into Portuguese, i.e. the unidirectional Czech → Portuguese relations. The present thesis does not deal (primarily) with the opposite direction. Moreover, the term ‘Luso-Czech’ (Lusophone → Czech) is avoided wherever ambiguous, as it might be misunderstood to include all Portuguese-speaking countries worldwide.

<sup>233</sup> RABY, D. L. 1988. *Fascism and Resistance in Portugal: Communists, liberals and military dissidents in the opposition to Salazar, 1941-1974*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press. ISBN 0719025141.

<sup>234</sup> Large parts of this subchapter are based on the prominent Czech historian of lusophone countries Jan Klíma (2005, 2007a, 2007b).

### 3.2.2.1 The First Republic (1910-26)

The Portuguese Republic was proclaimed on 5 October 1910. Teófilo Braga, a university professor, became the first Prime Minister. Portugal was given a new flag (red-and-green), a new anthem (*A Portuguesa* by Alfredo Keil), and a new currency (the *escudo*, divided into 100 *centavos*). When the King fled to the United Kingdom, the British government was quick to assure Portuguese republicans that Manuel II had been received ‘as a private person’ (Klíma 2007b: 432).

Afonso Costa, minister of justice in the first republican government, later Prime Minister (1913-14, 1915-16, 1917), and eventually president of the League of Nations (Birmingham 2007: 155), introduced a series of anti-religious measures, including ‘curtailment of religious privilege, the banning of clerical dress outside of churches, the second dissolution of the monasteries, the separation of church and state, the acceptance of divorce and a modest recognition of the rights of women and children’ (*ibid.*, 153). In response, the Vatican broke off diplomatic relations with Portugal.

In 1911, Portugal had 5,950,056 inhabitants (Lisbon: 435,359), of which 80 % worked in agriculture and only 19 % lived in towns. 75.1 % of the population were illiterate (Klíma 2007a: 332-333). By 1920 that figure had only fallen to 70.5 % (*ibid.*, 351). By 1930, 67.8 per cent of the 6,360,347 inhabitants of Portugal were still illiterate (*ibid.*, 370).

Only the outbreak of the First World War in 1914 saved the Portuguese colonies in Africa from being divided among the more aggressive colonial powers, notably the United Kingdom and Germany. Not long after Germany declared war on Portugal in 1916, Sidónio Pais overthrew Afonso Costa’s government and set up yet another dictatorship (1917-18).

In 1917, three shepherd children reported three consecutive apparitions of the Virgin Mary at Fátima, north of Lisbon. As a result of their testimonies, the place became a major Catholic cult site and pilgrimage destination. The apparitions were recognised as a miracle by the papal court in 1930 (*ibid.*, 344).<sup>235</sup>

From May 1918 onwards, a statutory copy (*depósito legal*) of every book published in Portugal had to be submitted to the National Library (Klíma 2007a: 346). Later this requirement was extended to include the libraries of Oporto and Coimbra.

In 1921, the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP, *Partido Comunista Português*) was founded. Officially dissolved in 1926, it had by 1928 only 50 members in Lisbon and 20 in Oporto (Klíma 2007a: 368). Nevertheless, ‘the PCP was the only party to maintain a permanent and effective clandestine apparatus, and this was an important factor in its hegemonic rôle within the resistance for most of our period [1941-74]’ (Raby 1988: 8).

Despite the initial promise of democracy and pluralism, the First Republic was marked by permanent political disequilibrium, popular uprisings, fear and chaos. Between 1910 and 1926, Portugal saw 8 presidents, 44 Prime Ministers, 24 massive uprisings and 158

---

<sup>235</sup> ‘Politically, Fátima was even used for anti-communist purposes, since one of the Virgin’s messages had referred to Russia’s “salvation” and “conversion”.’ (Costa Pinto 1991: 249)

general strikes (Klíma 2007b: 470). During the First World War the economy collapsed and failed to recover in the few years before the onset of the Great Depression. There was a clear need for strong and purposeful leadership.

On 28 May 1926, General Gomes da Costa took up the challenge and launched a military *coup d'état*. His 'march on Lisbon' from the northern city of Braga met with no resistance. The last government of the First Republic fell.

### 3.2.2.2 The Military and National Dictatorship (1926-33)

The *coup* of 28 May 1926 set up a dictatorship, thus ensuring stability, but it soon became apparent that the military triumvirate, consisting of José Mendes Cabeçadas, Gomes da Costa and Frago Carmona, lacked a viable political programme. Moreover, the desperate economic situation called for an immediate and comprehensive solution.

António de Oliveira Salazar, professor of economics at the Law Faculty of Coimbra University, who had made his name during the First Republic as an outspoken critic of the government's economic policies, was called upon in June 1926 to serve as finance minister. Salazar agreed, but resigned shortly afterwards as a result of infighting within the military government.

In June 1926, Mendes Cabeçadas was overthrown after little more than a fortnight and replaced in the premiership by Gomes da Costa, who proclaimed himself head of state until the next election. Less than a month later, however, Gomes da Costa was deposed and the reins were taken up by António Óscar de Frago Carmona, who was elected president in March 1928. The election of Óscar Carmona as head of state is sometimes considered to mark the end of the Military Dictatorship (*ditadura militar*, 1926-28) and the beginning of the National Dictatorship (*ditadura nacional*, 1928-33).

On 27 April 1928 Salazar finally accepted the post of finance minister in the fourth post-*coup* government of José Vicente de Freitas on condition, however, that all ministries cooperate with his. In August 1929, Manuel Gonçalves Cerejeira (1888-1977), with whom Salazar had shared lodgings in their student days and who had for a time led the Academic Centre of Christian Democracy (CADC, *Centro Académico de Democracia Cristã*), became the cardinal-patriarch of Lisbon. Salazar had won an influential ally.

Between 1928 and 1933, Salazar unleashed a legislative whirlwind in order to achieve a balanced budget. In 1930, a dispute between Salazar and Cunha Leal (1888-1970), the then governor of *Banco de Angola*, toppled the government. In the subsequent government Salazar became minister for colonial affairs in addition to finance minister, and Cunha Leal was dismissed. In 1931, the government established the 'Supreme Council for National Economy' (*Conselho Superior de Economia Nacional*) to allow for more effective intervention in the country's economy.

Salazar summed up his nationalistic policy in the dictum: 'everything for the nation, nothing against the nation' (*tudo pela nação, nada contra a nação*). In July 1930, Salazar founded the 'National Union' (*União Nacional*), which was to become the only permitted 'state-Party' for forty years. In 1970, Marcello Caetano, Salazar's successor,

reorganized the National Union and renamed it ‘People’s National Action’ (ANP, *Acção Nacional Popular*).

Salazar’s policy, as formulated when inaugurating the National Union, consisted in fighting individualism, socialism and parliamentarianism, and in endorsing protectionism, corporatism and nationalism (*ibid.*). In late 1932, a ‘national political council’ began work on the new constitution. In it, Salazar enshrined his vision of a corporatist state – a vision not fully realized until 1956 (Klíma 2005: 193).

It was while drafting a new ‘political constitution’ in 1932 that Salazar abolished all parties, including the Catholic party for which he had been elected to the National Assembly (the parliament) in 1921.

On 5 July 1932, the eighth government since the 1926 *coup* was installed. This time, President Carmona appointed Salazar Prime Minister (*Presidente do Conselho de Ministros* or, more precisely, President of the Cabinet, i.e. the select group of the most important ministers). Salazar, aged 43, would remain in this post for thirty-six years.

In the same month, the last Portuguese king, Manuel II, died in exile, aged 42. Salazar orchestrated monumental state obsequies designed to bury all monarchist traditions along with the king. The requiem mass was celebrated by none other than Manuel Cerejeira.

In February 1933, António Joaquim Tavares Ferro (1895-1956), a Portuguese writer, journalist, head of the Propaganda Secretariat from 1933 to 1949 and creator of the *Política do Espírito* (see below), published his panegyric *Salazar, O Homem e a Obra*, translated into English as *Salazar: Portugal and Her Leader* (London: Faber, 1939). It came out in 125,000 copies, an extraordinary number given the high illiteracy rate in the country (Klíma 2007a: 376).

On 19 March 1933, a referendum on the new ‘political constitution’ (as opposed to the ‘military’ *status quo*) was held. Only heads of families could vote, and abstentions counted as ayes. Out of the 1,330,258 voters, 40.2 per cent abstained. As a result of this manipulation, the constitution was ‘approved’ by 99.5 % of the electorate (Klíma 2007a: 376).

The transitional military (and national) dictatorship ceased to exist and a ‘unitary and corporatist republic’, soon to be known as the ‘New State’ (*Estado Novo*), saw the light of day.

### 3.2.2.3 Salazarism

Intelligent without flexibility, religious without spirituality, ascetic without mysticism, this man is plainly the product of a blend of narrownesses: the sordidly peasant-like soul of a countryman from Santa Comba only grew in small-mindedness with a seminary education, with all the bookish inhumanity of Coimbra, with his rigid and burdensome specialization for his much desired destiny as professor of finance. He is a Catholic materialist (there are many of those), a born atheist who respects the Virgin.

So far, the sweeping and inexact epithet ‘fascist’, albeit in inverted commas, has been used for the sake of simplicity and in order to emphasise the inherent antagonism between the communist regime in Czechoslovakia (1948-89) and the staunchly anti-communist *Estado Novo* (1933-74). But from the viewpoint of political science this is not entirely correct.

Several historians and political scientists, both Portuguese and foreign, such as Stanley G. Payne (1995: 266, in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 12) or Roger Griffin (1991: 121, *ibid.*) refute the ‘accusation of fascism’ in respect to Salazar’s *Estado Novo*. The matter, however, is rather more complicated.

Initially at least, the Portuguese dictatorship certainly drew (some) inspiration from Italian fascism. For instance, Salazar used to raise his right arm in greeting (the ‘Roman salute’) until the end of the Second World War, although post-war developments forced him to discontinue the practice. In a press conference, Salazar described his regime as follows: ‘It is authoritarian like a fascist dictatorship and it rejects democratic principles in national and social issues. However, it differs from a fascist dictatorship in its methods.’ (in Klíma 2007a: 373)

Salazar established a one-party state (*União Nacional*), made use of an all-powerful ‘political police’ (PVDE/PIDE) that reported directly to him, set up a ‘concentration camp’ (*Tarrafal*), founded paramilitary organisations (*Legião Portuguesa*), youth organisations (*Mocidade Portuguesa*), propagandist institutions (SPN/SNI), etc.

Until late in the Second World War, the inspiration of Mussolini and, to a lesser extent, of Hitler, was perceptible in the Portuguese right-wing regime. When the Axis powers began to lose momentum in 1943/44, Salazar began to make cosmetic changes, such as reorganising and renaming the SPN/SNI, the PVDE/PIDE, etc. (see below)

After the war, Salazar spoke ever less of corporatism. By providing the USA with a military base on the Azores in 1948 and by joining NATO in 1949 as one of the founding members, Salazar’s one-man right-wing dictatorial regime was predestined to become and remain part of the anti-communist bloc. The Azorean stake was so high that ‘as a result of Western support not only to the foreign policy but also to the dictatorship itself, Salazar’s regime “seemed even to gain a certain political and ideological arrogance”’ (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 6). Salazar, however, had to make at least outward concessions, such as organising ‘free’ general elections (always rigged to produce the desired results). Birmingham (2008: 163-164) puts it succinctly:

The regime created by Salazar [...] was commonly described by its opponents as a fascist system of government. Such loose usage of the term ‘fascist’ fails to illuminate the specific nature of Portuguese government in the 1930s and its contrasts of substance and style with both the other dictatorships of the western Mediterranean [Mussolini’s Italy and Primo de Rivera the Elder’s Spain].

---

<sup>236</sup> Klíma (2005: 104, in Czech). For the English, see <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Salazar+and+the+New+State+in+the+writings+of+Fernando+Pessoa.-a0188159484> (retrieved on 2011-05-27). For an entertaining guide around Lisbon, see F. Pessoa’s *Lisbon: What the Tourist Should See*, written in English in 1925.

Rather, Salazar's New State was 'anti-communist, corporative, catholic, nationalist and ultraconservative' (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 6). It was also anti-democratic, anti-parliamentary, and anti-modern (reactionary): 'Salazar's vaunted ideology of ruralism and self-sufficient poverty was the antithesis of modernisation, and has to be seen as more purely reactionary, in a philosophical and not merely a political sense' (Raby 1988: 5).

This was also reflected in the three supreme values propagated by the regime: 'Deus, Pátria, Família'. *Deus* (God) stood for the Catholic religion and spiritual life; *Pátria* (Fatherland) represented Portugal's national heritage; and *Família* (family) was the key unit of a corporatist state.

Jacques Georgel (in Birmingham 2008: 164)<sup>237</sup> describes 'Salazarism' as follows:

The Portuguese regime should not be given a fascist label because it was totalitarian, police-run, corporative, anti-liberal, anti-democratic, anti-parliamentary, anti-collectivist, and disdainful of opponents whom it was willing to eliminate physically [...]. It was a fascism deprived of all the attributes of fascism; a kind of travesty governed pettily by a man of extraordinary power-lust who lived in solitude for forty years and felt ill if he had to meet a group. The man claimed to be chosen by destiny for an exceptional mission, a man of burning pride behind a façade of modesty, a man who wished to prove his genius through an entirely idiosyncratic concept of the happiness of his people, a man who, all told, brought his country and its people to ruin.

Also, the term *clerical fascism* (or 'clero-fascism') is out of place here. Although the cardinal-patriarch of Lisbon, Manuel Gonçalves Cerejeira, was his university friend, Salazar's hunger for power (not wealth) was such that he could not allow the Church to assume a role so important that it might threaten him. In Birmingham's words (2008: 166):

Salazar surprised the bishops by abolishing his own Catholic party along with all other political movements when in 1932 he crafted his dictatorial constitution. His parricidal bluntness even extended to the cardinal, his old flatmate, who was kept at arm's length to ensure political supremacy. When relations with the Vatican were restored by the concordat of 1940 the separation of church and state was formally preserved.

Indeed, as early as 1928 Salazar sent word to the Catholics via the newspaper *Novidades* [News]: 'Tell the Catholics that my sacrifice gives me the right to expect them to be the first among all Portuguese to make the sacrifices that I demand of them and the last to ask favours which I cannot grant them.'<sup>238</sup>

Neither did Salazar, himself a university teacher, embrace *anti-intellectualism*, a feature of other fascist regimes. On the contrary, he liked to promote university teachers to political positions, he liked to consult them on matters of state, and he certainly liked to surround himself with other highly educated individuals (e.g. Marcello Caetano). It would be wrong to say that the Portuguese intelligentsia thrived under Salazar. But there were certainly no sweeping purges and pogroms aimed specifically at intellectuals,

<sup>237</sup> GEORGEL, Jacques. 1981. *Le Salazarisme: Histoire et Bilan 1926-1974*. Paris: Cujas, p. 302, translated.

<sup>238</sup> 'Diga aos católicos que o meu sacrificio me dá o direito de esperar deles que sejam de entre todos os portugueses os primeiros a fazer os sacrificios que eu lhes peço e os últimos a pedir os favores que eu lhes não posso fazer.' See e.g. [http://www.oliveirasalazar.org/download/documentos/Biografia\\_27A44D66-60D3-48D2-82CE-0AF13C6ECF75.pdf](http://www.oliveirasalazar.org/download/documentos/Biografia_27A44D66-60D3-48D2-82CE-0AF13C6ECF75.pdf) (retrieved on 2011-05-31).



comparable with those in Nazi Germany or the communist Soviet Union. Salazar did persecute intellectuals, to be sure, but mainly and primarily when they expressed their dissent publicly or even went as far as to actively oppose him.

Most importantly, Salazar in no way embraced the fascist ideology regarding *war* as the only and supreme way of achieving national regeneration. Costa Pinto (1991: 4) and Raby concur that ‘the Salazar regime was not fascist because it was not mobilisational; [...] in fact, [Salazar] devoted considerable energy to political demobilisation, propagating an ideology of submission and depoliticisation’ (Raby 1988: 4).

Through clever manoeuvring and deal-mongering, Salazar spared Portugal from the most atrocious of all wars to date. All he wanted for himself and his people was to work in peace, a kind of ‘*ora et labora*’. Even the colonial wars, which overshadowed the last years of his rule, he regarded as something imposed on him from the outside. Salazar was, in Klíma’s words (2005), a ‘quiet dictator’.

Furthermore, ‘organized anti-Semitism did not exist’ (Seruya 2010: 118)<sup>239</sup>. As elaborated on by Rundle & Sturge (2010: 10): ‘such racialized policies were not favoured and the discourse on translation that emerges from the research is free from the heightened sense of threat that can be found in Italian Fascist and Nazi rhetoric on translation.’

Lastly, Salazar expressed his disagreement with fascist ideology early (from 1933 on) and explicitly. Salazar suppressed *all* opposition to his politics – communists (most of all), socialists, and even the blue-shirt-clad Portuguese fascists (*Movimento Nacional-Sindicalista*) led by Rolão Preto<sup>240</sup>. After sending a letter to President Carmona criticising the regime and requesting freedom of the press, Rolão Preto was first incarcerated and then forced to emigrate (Klíma 2007a: 379).

Consequently, if one term of political science can be used to describe Salazar’s regime, it is that of corporatism, or *authoritarian corporatism*, as Payne (1995: 313) puts it.<sup>241</sup>

### 3.2.2.4 The New State (1933-74)

<sup>239</sup> However, ‘information about the persecution of Jews by the Nazis was banned (for example Victor Gollanz’s *Let my People Go*, R2295/43).’ (Seruya 2010: 143)

<sup>240</sup> Francisco de Barcelos Rolão Preto (1893-1977) had been previously involved with ‘Portuguese Fundamentalism’ (*Integralismo Lusitano*), ‘a political and intellectual movement founded on the eve of World War I. The IL, the most obvious inspiration for which was Maurras’s Action Française, defined itself as an anti-liberal, monarchist, corporatist and traditionalist movement’ (Costa Pinto in Larsen, Sandberg & Speirs 1991: 238). ‘National Syndicalism [was] born during the Military Dictatorship [...] in “fascist opposition” to the rising authoritarian power’ (*ibid.*, 242). It was ‘formed in 1932 by Rolão Preto, one of the youngest IL leaders’ (*ibid.*). Throughout the brief spell of its existence, ‘National Syndicalism became more and more a fascist opposition to the new power and, after backing a split within the movement, Salazar dissolved it.’ (*ibid.*, 243). The *Integralismo Lusitano* (1914-32) and the *Movimento Nacional Sindicalista* (1932-34) were the two genuinely fascist movements Portugal experienced.

<sup>241</sup> For a good (fictional) read about the ‘atmosphere’ under the *Estado Novo*, see Antonio Tabucchi’s *Pereira Declares* (orig. *Sostiene Pereira*), and Pascal Mercier’s *Night Train to Lisbon* (orig. *Nachtzug nach Lissabon*), both also available in Czech and Portuguese.

It is a testimony to Salazar's political and strategic acumen that he was able to secure the approval of the 1933 Constitution in a national plebiscite, by an electorate of whom more than 65 per cent were illiterate or semi-literate. The 'relatively democratic' constitution could be used as a shield against criticism from abroad, while the referendum served as justification of the regime at home. The new constitution was, however, not without a rub, as explained by Figueiredo (1975: 128):

[...] the so-called National Assembly could only propose certain laws. It was the government which legislated by means of decree-orders or decree laws (corresponding to Acts), both having the force of Bills. The catch introduced in the constitution, therefore, was that despite all the guarantees so solemnly inscribed in the text of the constitution, the government had the power to promulgate decree-laws of an 'administrative character' which were outside effective judicial control.

On 29 August 1933, Decree No. 22992 established the '**political police**' *Polícia de Vigilância e Defesa do Estado* (PVDE, State Defence and Surveillance Police), replaced under Decree No. 35046 of 22 October 1945 by the *Polícia Internacional e de Defesa do Estado* (PIDE, International and State Defence Police), and under Decree No. 49401 of 24 November 1969 by the *Direcção-Geral de Segurança* (DGS, Directorate-General for Security). The 'political police' was dissolved only in 1974 by Decree No. 171/74. Birmingham (2008: 167-168) notes:

The political police was not a large force and never rose much above 2,000 fully enrolled staff though it probably had 10,000 part-time informers planted in every hamlet or institution. It was above law and the government and was answerable to Salazar alone until the day he suffered a stroke in 1968 when it was the police chief, and not the state president or the army commander, who sat at his bedside deciding how to fill the power vacuum.

The PIDE was 'known to interfere with correspondence; indeed, by law, the mail of all detainees was opened as part of the investigatory process' (Figueiredo 1975: 154). Moreover, the PIDE made ample use of 'the "180-day no-charge detention law" and the three-year "security measures" of internment, both renewable and consecutive' (*ibid.*, 139).

The PIDE operated several prisons – in Aljube (central Lisbon) and Caxias (outskirts of Lisbon area), Angra do Heroísmo (Azores) and the Fortress of Peniche (north of Lisbon) (Pimentel 2007: 34, 430-440). Moreover, the regime set up a concentration camp, known as 'the camp of slow death' (*campo da morte lenta*), in Tarrafal on Santiago in the Cape Verde Islands.

Tarrafal was established by Decree No. 26539 of 23 April 1936 and began operation in October of the same year, destined mainly for the political opposition from mainland Portugal. In 1945, Salazar granted an amnesty to political prisoners, including those detained there, but in 1947 the penal colony again saw its population increase. Tarrafal was finally closed for prisoners from Portugal in 1954, but reopened again in 1961 for prisoners from the colonies. More than 250 people served sentences in the prison camp, with 32 known to have died there (Pimentel 2007: 430-431).<sup>242</sup>

According to Raby (1988: 2, 15-16):

---

<sup>242</sup> Klíma (2007b: 529) speaks of 340 prisoners (32 dead).

The total number of deaths in Tarrafal was thirty-two, out of a probable 293 prisoners who served time there. [...] In anti-regime uprisings, by far the largest number of casualties occurred in the first such action, that of February 1927 in Oporto and Lisbon, which left 120 dead and 650 wounded. [...] There were several deaths in the insurrectionary strike of 18 January 1934 and the naval mutiny of August 1936, and a few in later revolts (three at Beja on 1 January 1962). Repression of demonstrations left a steady toll of deaths, but rarely going into double figures on any one occasion. (15-16)

The total number of those killed in the notorious Tarrafal prison camp in the Cape Verde islands, in gaol or police custody, in the repression of strikes, demonstrations and popular protests, and in armed uprisings against the dictatorship does not exceed 1,000 at the outside. (2)

The regime's crimes were thus in no way comparable with the atrocities committed by the Nazi or Soviet regimes. In many respects, it even seems to have been more lenient than the Czechoslovak communist regime. Yet, 'such a benevolent analysis of Salazarism [...] ignores the subtle and all-pervasive character of repression under the New State' (Raby 1988: 3). 'Repression was generalised and systematic, if controlled and selective in its more brutal forms (which tended to be applied mainly to Communists, anarchists, striking workers and rebellious peasants).' (*ibid.*, 6)

Under Salazar, the PIDE, the regime and big business could not have been linked more intimately (Figueiredo 1975: 145):

After the April 1975 *coup* [*sic!*] many documents were found showing that the PIDE was receiving subsidies directly from private companies, in exchange for information on staff applicants or control of attempted strikes. Many concerns employed PIDE agents, not only for detective work inside their offices and factories, but as a means to support the overall activities of the political police.

Despite the corporatist structure of the state, the role of big companies in the regime was far from negligible. Birmingham (2008: 179) notes: 'Ten great families owned 168 firms and controlled 53 per cent of the national wealth, while a mere 1 per cent of the Portuguese population was deemed to belong to the select few which the social order maintained in style.'

Contrary to his own words, 'Salazar did little to protect the interests of the poor peasant smallholders whose way of life he professed to admire, and much to benefit the big monopoly groups associated with names like Melo, Champalimaud, and Espírito Santo' (Raby 1988: 5).

Small wonder then that after the 1974 revolution, 'the most obvious target for expropriation in the interests of its workers and of society at large was the Melo business empire [...], the largest financial complex in the Iberian peninsula [which] held 10 per cent of all share capital in the whole of Portugal' (Birmingham 2008: 189-190).

Every dictatorship relies on 'the silent majority'. In the case of Portugal, 'partisans or supporters would often say, "those involved in PIDE persecution are mostly communists and the situation in communist countries is no better"' (Figueiredo 1975: 129). Needless to say, this platitude-cum-apology is simplistic and reductive.

On 25 September 1933, Decree No. 23054 established the *Secretariado da Propaganda Nacional* (SPN, National Propaganda Secretariat). It was replaced under Decree No. 33545 of 23 February 1944 by the *Secretariado Nacional da Informação, Cultura Popular e Turismo* (SNI, National Secretariat for Information, Popular Culture and

Tourism), which in 1968 was in turn transformed and renamed *Secretaria de Estado da Informação e Turismo* (SEIT, State Secretariat for Information and Tourism). Figueiredo (1975: 156) outlines the background:

The National Propaganda Office, modelled after the Nazi and Fascist patterns after exchange visits by officials of the countries concerned, catered for adults through such institutions as the FNAT (National Foundation for Joy in Work), the ‘people’s houses’ [*casas do povo*] and the ‘fishermen’s houses’ [*casas dos pescadores*], as well as the ‘houses of Portugal’ [*casas de Portugal*] which operated for a time in the colonies. The Propaganda Office was directly answerable to the Prime Minister’s office and had powers to supervise the output of the régime’s National Broadcasting Service and television, as well as to licence newspapers and radio stations, issue professional licence cards to Portuguese and foreign journalists, and control cinemas and theatres.

While the SPN had a staff of only seven in 1935, twelve from 1936 to 1940, and seventeen from 1941 to 1944, the SNI began with 128 in 1945, a figure that by 1956 had grown to 168 (Ó 1999: 57). António Ferro was the only director of the SPN (1933-45) and the first and most influential director of the SNI (1945-50). His cultural policy, termed by himself *Política do Espírito* (‘Politics of the Spirit’ or ‘intellectual policy’), ‘defended a nationalist art supported by the state, aiming at the improvement of the aesthetic taste of society and of the people and helping to create a favourable atmosphere for all artists’. However, ‘once Ferro’s efforts to attract writers and artists to the regime had failed, he was dismissed by Salazar himself in the early 1950s, with no public justification’ (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 4-5).

The tough years of 1933-49, especially the 1940s, have been called the ‘Iron Years’ (*anos de ferro*, Ó 1999), creating a nice *double entendre* with the SPN/SNI director’s last name. The 1950s have been nicknamed the ‘Lead Years’ (*anos de chumbo*), referring ‘to the apparent political calm after 1949, when the regime, through the outcome of that year’s presidential elections, achieved the establishment of “order in the streets” and “peace in the minds” after ruthless police action’ (Seruya 2010: 134-135). This period is in many ways reminiscent of the Czechoslovak ‘normalisation’, following the ruthless crushing of the Prague Spring.

On 28 January 1934, Salazar inaugurated the ‘School Vanguard Action’ (AEV, *Acção Escolar Vanguarda*), the first organisation aimed at re-educating the country’s youth in line with the regime’s propaganda. The *Organização Nacional Mocidade Portuguesa* [National Portuguese Youth Organisation] (1936-74) and *Mocidade Portuguesa Feminina* [Portuguese Young Women] (1937-74) soon followed.

The ‘National Foundation for Joy in Work’ (*Fundação Nacional para Alegria no Trabalho*), inspired by the Italian *Doppo Lavoro* and the German *Kraft durch Freude*, was created on 13 June 1935 to regiment people’s leisure pursuits. The ‘Portuguese Legion’ (*Legião Portuguesa*, 1936-74) was formed on 14 September 1936 as the people’s militia. Birmingham (2008: 169) explains its purpose:

The adult counterpart of the youth brigades was the Portuguese Legion which wore green shirts and was called upon to defend public order. [...] The Legion was not a fascist paramilitary movement, nor was it a single party like the ‘National Union’ which Salazar had built up around himself despite the abolition of political parties, but it gave the government the necessary muscle to deal with the 86 per cent of the population who were politically voiceless.

In brief, the regime's basic institutional pillars were erected from its very inception. These included the institution at the focus of our attention: 'the most relevant legislation concerning censorship was produced in the 1930s and 1940' (Seruya & Lin Moniz 2008: 7).

The first parliamentary election after six years, in December 1934, only reinforced previous trends. The only party permitted to put up candidates, the National Union, occupied all the seats in the National Assembly (*Assembleia Nacional*), which was shorn of all legislative initiative. General Carmona was re-elected president on 14 February 1935 and the course of the coming years was set.

The period from 1936 to 1945, so tumultuous for the rest of Europe, passed relatively uneventfully in Portugal.<sup>243</sup>

In the Spanish Civil War, Salazar's sympathies clearly lied with Franco's fascists (the *Falange*), but respecting his obligations to an age-old ally, the United Kingdom, Salazar pretended to pursue a policy of non-intervention. In fact, he supported Franco in various ways, the least discreet of which was arguably the recruitment of the *viriatos*, 'voluntary units' sent to fight for General Franco.

Ironically, the Spanish Civil War also affected Czech-Portuguese relations, when in August 1937 Salazar broke off diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia over a dispute regarding a failed import of weapons (see below).

In March 1939, Salazar signed a non-aggression and amity treaty with Franco's ambassador in Lisbon, although in the following month he refused to join Spain, Italy and Germany in the Anti-Comintern Pact, despite his own bitter anti-communism. Only when France was defeated in 1940 did Portugal and Spain conclude the Iberian Pact (*Pacto Ibérico*), reinforcing the previous treaty.

Portugal preserved its neutrality throughout the Second World War, becoming a gateway for those fleeing Europe for the United States (e.g. Czech Jewish actor Hugo Haas, Czech Jewish writer Egon Hostovský, etc.).<sup>244</sup>

In 1940, grandiose celebrations were held throughout Portugal to mark the double centenary (*Duplo Centenário*) of the establishment of the Portuguese state in 1140 and the restoration of independence from Spain after sixty years of union in 1640. Among the events was the monumental Exhibition of the Portuguese World (*Exposição do Mundo Português*), for which the 'Monument to the Discoveries' (*Monumento aos Descobrimentos*, popularly known as the *Padrão dos Descobrimentos*) was built on the estuary of the Tagus (*Tejo*) at Belém. The monument, however, was not built of durable materials and was replaced by a concrete replica in 1960, on the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the death of Henry the Navigator (*Infante D. Henrique, o Navegador*).

On 17 August 1943, Portugal granted the United Kingdom military access to the Azores. A secret agreement to the same effect was signed between Portugal and the United

---

<sup>243</sup> José Saramago's *The Year of the Death of Ricardo Reis* (*O ano da morte de Ricardo Reis*) provides a highly readable, fictional, description of the beginning of this period.

<sup>244</sup> For a fictional account, see E. M. Remarque's *The Night in Lisbon* (*Die Nacht von Lissabon*).

States on 28 November 1944 (officially in February 1948). Birmingham (2008: 179) sums up the repercussions:

America, after entering the Azores airbases on British coat-tails in 1943, had supported Portugal steadily, allowing the regime to survive the fall of the dictators in 1945, then bringing it into the NATO alliance, and most dramatically permitting it to retain its colonies after the Angolan rebellion of 1961.

The 'lease' of the Azores military bases anticipated Salazar's strategic veer away from the Axis powers and towards the soon-to-be-victorious Allies. Salazar set about adapting his regime to the likely outcome of the Second World War in order to accommodate the expectations of the winning powers.

The SPN and the PVDE were dissolved, and in their place emerged the SNI and the PIDE – although little had changed inside these institutions. Salazar formed a new government, strengthening conservative forces. Portugal stopped the export of tungsten to Germany, which had continued until 5 June 1944, much to the Allies' dismay. An electrification plan for the entire country was announced on 26 December 1944.

The end of the Second World War and parliamentary elections announced on 5 October 1945 that were to be 'as free as in England' aroused great expectations amongst the population. The opposition, however, was highly fragmented and sharply divided between pro-communist and pro-democratic forces. Its tactics throughout the *Estado Novo* are described by Raby (1988: 9-11):

[...] for several years the consensus of most opposition parties was to present candidates and take advantage of the propaganda opportunity offered by the official campaign periods, but to withdraw just before the ballot and denounce the electoral fraud. But in 1958 this changed, with General Delgado inaugurating an opposition policy of going "right to the polls" and denouncing fraud afterwards. [...] in the elections of 1945, 1949 and 1958 [...] the opposition was able to mobilise massive public support such as to seriously embarrass the regime. [...] The achievement of unity from 1943 to 1949 and once again after 1958 was thus a great advance, just as the clear split of the opposition along Cold War lines from 1949 to 1957 was a major setback.

Raby (1988: 6-7) divides the history of opposition and resistance to Salazar's regime into 'six distinct stages, reflecting changes in its structure, organisation and tactics, and in its symbiotic relationship with the regime':

- (1) 1926-31: the initial armed resistance and adjustment to clandestinity, coinciding with the consolidation of the regime;
- (2) 1931-41: division, retreat and dislocation, with increased repression and the rise of fascism throughout Europe;
- (3) 1941-49: the 'golden age' of anti-fascist unity, stimulated by the Second World War and the rise of resistance movements throughout Europe, and by the reorganisation of the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), which becomes the dominant force of the opposition;
- (4) 1949-57: Cold-War division and retreat, with the regime's recovery from the wartime and post-war crisis;
- (5) 1957-62: the high point of the domestic anti-fascist struggle, revealing the emergence of vigorous new tendencies within the resistance: military populism, the Catholic Left and intense civilian-military insurrectionary activity ('Guevarism');
- (6) 1962-74: the gradual restructuring of the opposition, determined by the failures of the previous phase, the neo-capitalist boom of the sixties, and (above all) the colonial wars in Africa – which would prove to be the decisive factor in the regime's final collapse.

In his book, Raby (1988: 7) concentrates on stages 3 to 5, for it was in this time that ‘domestic factors were paramount’. On the other hand, ‘from 1962 onwards the entire political panorama was transformed by the impact of the colonial wars’ (*ibid.*). As a concomitant, the late 1960s saw renewed general support for Salazar, the staunchest imaginable defender of the unity and integrity of the Portuguese multi-continental state.

Consequently, the election of 18 November 1945 brought about no changes. All 120 deputies nominated by the National Union duly took their seats in the National Assembly.

With the war ended and the political atmosphere very tense, Salazar announced an amnesty for ‘crimes against the country’s internal and external safety’ on 18 October 1945. In February 1946, 110 political prisoners returned from Tarrafal.

In the summer of 1948, General José Maria Mendes Ribeiro Norton de Matos (1867-1955) announced his candidacy for the country’s formally highest office in the direct election scheduled for the following year. In the words of Birmingham (2007: 168-169):

[...] the redoubtable Norton de Matos who had served as minister of war in 1916-17, had been the republic’s high commissioner in Angola and had served as grandmaster of the outlawed freemasons [...] was Salazar’s most tenacious political rival [...]. In 1948 Norton de Matos tried to stand for election as president but even under a tightly restricted franchise political liberties were a fraud and he abandoned the attempt.

A. Óscar de Fragoso Carmona, elevated to the rank of Marshal in 1947, was thus re-elected president in February 1948.

On 25 September 1948 the ‘industrial lobby’ persuaded a reluctant Salazar to accept the European Recovery Program (the Marshall Plan). This cooperation with the West in general, and with the United States in particular, was further extended when Portugal became one of the founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Figueiredo (1975: 131) notes: ‘Portuguese repressive legislation was in conflict with the régime’s own constitutional provisions, it is significant that most of the inquisitorial laws were passed after 1949 when Portugal had already joined NATO.’

In 1951, Marshal António Óscar de Fragoso Carmona, President of the Republic since 1926, died at the age of 81. Salazar refused to become president himself, so the National Union had to nominate another candidate – General Francisco Higinio Craveiro Lopes (1894-1964). The opposition’s candidate, Manuel Carlos Quintão Meireles (1880-1962), withdrew his candidacy in view of the lack of any guarantees of a democratic election process (Klíma 2007a: 407). Craveiro Lopes remained president until 1958.

On 29 December 1952, the government announced the first Development Plan (*Plano de Fomento*) for the years 1953-58. The ‘industrial lobby’ thus won over the ‘rural lobby’, represented by Salazar himself (Klíma 2007b: 527). The second Development Plan for 1959-64 was approved in August 1957.

On 20 July 1955, Calouste Sarkis Gulbenkian, originally a Turkish citizen of Armenian nationality and an oil tycoon, died and bequeathed Portugal his estate, which was to

become the ‘Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation’ (*Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian*), a prominent Portuguese cultural foundation, subsidising research, housing an art collection, supporting all kinds of cultural activities throughout the year, such as exhibitions, jazz festivals, etc.

On 14 December 1955, Portugal was finally admitted into the United Nations Organization (UNO), which it had been prevented from joining in 1946 by a Soviet veto based on the ‘fascist’ nature of the Portuguese regime. Birmingham (2008: 173) notes: ‘Portugal had been admitted to the United Nations in 1955 in spite of a poor democratic record because it was both white and anti-communist and could therefore be expected to vote with Washington’s Latin American client republics and Britain’s white Commonwealth.’

Acceding to the UNO was a victory for Salazar, yet it presaged disputes over the Portuguese reluctance to decolonise its ‘overseas provinces’, which were ‘deemed to be integral parts of Portugal and not colonies subject to international supervision’ (Birmingham 2008: 175).

The first Portuguese television station (RTP, *Radiotelevisão Portuguesa*) began broadcasting on 7 March 1957. In 1959, a huge statue of Christ, ‘the Sanctuary of Christ the King’ (*Cristo-Rei*), inspired by the ‘Christ the Redeemer’ (*Cristo Redentor*) statue in Rio de Janeiro, was unveiled by Cardinal Manuel Cerejeira on the southern bank of the Tagus, facing Lisbon. It was a thanksgiving gesture for sparing Portugal from the Second World War. ‘Salazar Bridge’, today the ‘25 of April Bridge’ (*Ponte 25 de Abril*, commemorating the Carnation Revolution), was opened on 6 August 1966.

The years 1957-58 saw another crisis in the dictatorship. Air force General Humberto da Silva Delgado (1906-65), one of the founders of the Portuguese airline TAP (*Transportes Aéreos Portugueses*) in 1945, accepted an offer from the democratic opposition to stand for election in the 1958 presidential vote. The regime nominated Rear Admiral and Navy Minister Américo de Deus Rodrigues Thomaz (also spelled Tomás, 1894-1987). Despite massive support for General Delgado, Américo Tomás was elected on 8 June 1958 and remained in office until the Carnation Revolution. As a reaction to the crisis, Salazar decided to abolish direct presidential elections henceforth.

In retaliation, the opposition tried to topple the regime time and again: in March 1959 (the so-called ‘Cathedral coup’, *Golpe da Sé*), in 1961 in Beja, etc. – always unsuccessfully. General Delgado, who was denied a visa by the British government in September 1963, accepted the invitation of Álvaro Cunhal, long-time secretary-general of the Portuguese Communist Party (1961-92), to meet in Prague. In early 1965, close to the Portuguese border in Spain, Delgado fell into a trap set for him by the PIDE. His dead body was found on 24 April 1965 near the village of Villanueva del Fresno (Klíma 2007a: 429).

In May 1965, the offices of the Portuguese Writers’ Society (SPA, *Sociedade Portuguesa de Autores*) were raided and trashed by the PIDE, following the SPA’s announcement that it planned to award the Camilo Castelo Branco Prize to José Luandino Vieira, who had been persecuted for his collaboration with Angola’s MPLA, for his novel *Luuanda*. The society was disbanded and abolished, and Luandino Vieira sent to Tarrafal again.



The only success notched up by the opposition was the escape of ten prominent communist prisoners, including Álvaro Cunhal, from the Fortress of Peniche on 3 August 1960. Salazar sacked the then director of the PIDE, Neves Graça, and replaced him with Homero de Matos. He in turn was succeeded two years later by Fernando da Silva Pais, who stayed in this post until the Carnation Revolution of 1974.

In the meantime, the regime continued to receive support from abroad. On 30 December 1959, Portugal acceded to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). On 21 November 1960, it became a member of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund. On 6 April 1962, Portugal joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

As indicated above, the 1960s witnessed heightened activity in Portugal's colonies, eventually sparking colonial wars. In 1961, Portugal lost its three minuscule enclaves on India's western coast. Despite their insignificance, the loss dealt a serious blow to the regime's reputation. Salazar became all the more determined to keep Portugal's African dependencies at any cost. In 1961, colonial war erupted in Angola. In 1963, Portuguese Guinea (now *Guinea-Bissau*) took up arms against the colonial administration, and the Angolan MPLA laid siege to Cabinda.

In 1962 the massive emigration that had followed the 1926 military *coup* saw a change in destination, with more emigrants now leaving for France than Brazil. Henceforth the number of Portuguese emigrating to Western Europe exceeded the number of Portuguese seeking asylum in the traditional countries like Brazil. By 1973, 1.5 million Portuguese were working abroad (Klíma 2007a: 444).

On 3 August 1968, Salazar fell off a chair at his seaside retreat in Estoril and suffered a brain haemorrhage. The accident incapacitated him and 'the management of Portugal and the empire passed from Salazar to Caetano with barely a hiccup' (Birmingham 2008: 182). Salazar died on 27 July 1970, unchallenged and victorious. He was buried in his native village of Vimieiro near the town of Santa Comba Dão. His gravestone bears the simple epitaph 'A. O. S.'

Marcello José das Neves Alves Caetano (1906-80), professor at the Faculty of Law and Rector of the University of Lisbon (1959-62), represented the 'modern' faction in the National Union. He had famously fallen out with the regime in the spring of 1962 when, after the prohibition of Students' Day, the ensuing unrest had been harshly repressed by the then education minister. Caetano had resigned from the post of Rector in protest. He had, nonetheless, been Salazar's disciple and 'dauphin' for a long time.

The 'spring', 'opening' or thaw of Marcello Caetano (*primavera / abertura marcelista*) proved to be a major disappointment, however. Even Caetano's very first speech in office was apologetic in tone: 'For a long period, the country grew accustomed to being governed by a man of genius, but from now on it must adapt itself to being governed by men like other men.'<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>245</sup> *Time Magazine*. 4 October 1968. 'Portugal: End of the Salazar Era'.  
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,838804,00.html> (retrieved on 2011-06-17).

Caetano announced a programme of ‘evolution in continuity’ (*evolução na continuidade*) and contented himself with renaming and reorganising the regime’s crucial institutions (see above for PIDE/DGS, SNI/SEIT and National Union/ANP; see below for prior censorship/prior examination). Instead of speaking about the New State, Caetano used the term ‘Social State’ (*Estado Social*).

Cardinal Manuel G. Cerejeira, Salazar’s long-time supporter, retired in May 1971, after 42 years in office. Between 1930 and 1973, the illiteracy rate dropped from 61.8 % to 26.6 %. The number of university students more than septupled, with almost 50,000 students in the academic year 1970/71 (Klíma 2007b: 565).

The parliamentary election of 26 October 1969 fell short of even the most modest expectations. The first-past-the-post voting system ensured victory for the National Union, which again won all 130 parliamentary seats. On 25 July 1972, Américo Tomás was re-elected president. This put an end to any residual illusions about ‘marcelist’ reforms. A more substantial change was needed. The well-known and well-worn situation was repeated in the parliamentary election of 28 October 1973. That was the last nail in the regime’s coffin.

On 21 August 1973, fifty-one junior officers formed what was known as the ‘Captains’ Movement’ (*Movimento dos Capitães*) in Bissau, renamed ‘Movement of the Armed Forces’ (MFA, *Movimento das Forças Armadas*) in Cascais (near Lisbon) on 5 March 1974. Throughout March and April, Major Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho prepared the takeover. At twenty minutes past midnight on 25 April, *Rádio Renascença*, a Catholic radio station, broadcast the song *Grândola Vila Morena* by Zeca (José) Afonso (1929-87), which was the signal for the Carnation Revolution to roll. In Birmingham’s concise words (2008: 184):

Before dawn on 25 April 1974 a radio station played a song about ‘the land of fraternity’ and columns of tanks rolled into Lisbon to be greeted with carnations by delirious crowds. President Tomás and his prime minister Caetano were quickly dispatched to Brazil and General Spínola became the improbable mascot of his Marxist juniors. For the next year and a half the April revolution unfolded dramatically before being arrested by a counter-coup and then replaced by a democratic regime under light military supervision.

### **3.2.2.5 From the Carnation Revolution to the *Fin de Millénaire***

The Carnation Revolution was a peaceful one. The regime put up only minimal resistance and the total death toll amounted to five. The people on the streets stuck carnations into the soldiers’ gun barrels as a token of solidarity and support, hence the revolution’s name – not unsuggestive, in this aspect, of the peaceful Velvet Revolution (which was, of course, no military revolution). At 8 p.m., the ‘National Salvation Junta’ (JSN, *Junta de Salvação Nacional*), headed by General António Spínola, took over and the *coup* was complete. Only the DGS resisted until the following morning when it too surrendered.

An amnesty was declared, censorship lifted, and exiled politicians, such as the socialist leader Mário Soares and the communist leader Álvaro Cunhal, returned home. New parties, like the ‘People’s Democratic Party’ (PPD, *Partido Popular Democrático*),

soon to become the right-of-centre ‘Social Democratic Party’ (PSD, *Partido Social Democrata*) started to emerge.

On 15 May 1974, the ‘monocled cavalry general’ (Birmingham 2008: 183) António Sebastião Ribeiro de Spínola became president. The government established diplomatic relations with the countries behind the Iron Curtain. After almost fifty years of right-wing dictatorship, the swing to the left was very powerful, especially among the ‘captains’.

A wave of nationalisation swept the country. ‘The communists were the first people to claim the revolution as their own. They, almost alone, had survived as a clandestine political force throughout the dictatorship.’ (Birmingham 2008: 185) ‘The communist vote,’ however, ‘fluctuated around [only] one-eighth of the electorate in two main regions of the country’ (*ibid.*, 186).

President Spínola disagreed with the avowedly left-wing reforms and tried to stop them, but ‘his experiment in right-wing populism failed and he resigned as president’ (Birmingham 2008: 189). General Francisco Costa Gomes (b. 1914) replaced Spínola as president and remained in office until 1976.

One year after the revolution, on 25 April 1975, the first free and democratic ‘elections for a constituent assembly to institutionalise the revolution and prepare a democratic constitution’ (*ibid.*) saw a very high turnout of 91.73 %. The Socialists (PS, *Partido Socialista*) won with 38 %, followed by the right-wing PPD (26.4 %) and the Communists (PCP, 12.5 %). ‘When the votes were counted they were surprised that the extreme left, like the Christian right, was almost eclipsed by democratic socialists of various persuasions. The most prominent victor was Mário Soares.’ (Birmingham 2008: 191)

However, ‘the socialist victory was not enough to gain a grip on a government dominated by the military and Soares soon resigned the seat he was offered in the cabinet as a token recognition of his political strength’ (*ibid.*). The so-called ‘hot summer’ (*verão quente*) of 1975 was rife with mass leftist demonstrations. Birmingham (2008: 191-192) summarizes the consequences:

In the end, however, it was not the politicians who put an end to the governing alliance between communist civilians and armed forces captains but a moderate faction within the army. The end of extremism came on 25 November 1975 when António Ramalho Eanes, soon to be a general and elected non-executive president of the republic, gained political ascendancy after a *coup d'état* that evicted the captains. Five months later, on the second anniversary of the April revolt, Mário Soares was elected to be the first democratic prime minister Portugal had for forty-nine years and eleven months.

This ‘counter-coup’, which quickly calmed an explosive situation and restored stability, ‘occurred, by coincidence or otherwise, a mere fortnight after the final winding up of the colonial empire’ (*ibid.*, 193). Instead of the originally intended gradual decolonisation, Portugal quickly withdrew from its colonies, leaving them in a state of chaos. Angola, the former ‘pearl of the empire’ (*pérola do império*), plunged into a series of civil wars. It was not until 1996 that the ‘Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries’ (CPLP, *Comunidade dos Países da Língua Portuguesa*) was founded, with a view to promoting friendship among the member countries.

The first elections for the 250-seat National Assembly were again won by the Socialists (107 seats), followed by the PPD (73). The Communists came only fourth (40 seats), behind the 'Social Democratic Centre' (CDS, *Centro Democrático Social*, 42 seats). 'Communist public esteem peaked at 15 per cent of the popular vote before dwindling away.' (Birmingham 2008: 193)

On 27 June 1976, General António dos Santos Ramalho Eanes was elected president in a direct presidential election. This last military president remained in office until 1986. In July of the same year, the first constitutional government, headed by the socialist Mário Soares, took up office. On 22 September 1976, Portugal joined the Council of Europe. The transition period was more or less over.

In many ways, the chaos of the early Third Portuguese Republic, as the post-1974 period is sometimes called, was highly reminiscent of the First Republic. While the office of president remained stable following the election of Ramalho Eanes, with all presidents being re-elected after their first five-year term, governments came and went. Between 1976 and 2011, Portugal has seen 19 constitutional governments (*governos constitucionais*).

Since 1981, however, that is from the 8<sup>th</sup> constitutional government onwards, governments have managed to survive for at least a year and a half, and since 1987, from the eleventh constitutional government onwards, headed by Aníbal Cavaco Silva, governments have usually lasted for four years.

On 22 November 1977, Portugal and Spain signed a new treaty, which replaced the old Iberian Pact from 1940. Birmingham (2008: 197-198) notes:

The greatest change, however, after three and a half centuries of fiercely proclaimed independence was the restoration of closer ties with Spain. It might have been expected that ties between Portugal and Spain would have been restored when both countries were ruled by dictators cautiously sympathetic to the fascist powers of the 1930s. This did not happen, although Salazar did help Franco to win the civil war and Franco did not look too closely when refugees sent from Lisbon to Madrid for exemplary punishment included a few smuggled Portuguese whom Salazar had found to be uncomfortably recalcitrant. Both dictators, however, were primarily nationalists.

Only after the downfall of the two regimes (1974 in Portugal, 1975 in Spain) could relations 'normalise' again: 'New Iberian free trade arrangements led Spain's trade with Portugal to exceed its trade with the former Spanish American empire while Portugal's trade with Spain began to exceed its dealings with Britain.' (Birmingham 2008: 198)

The shift to the political centre continued. By 1980, the sixth constitutional government, headed by Francisco de Sá Carneiro (PSD), was turning away from socialist reforms and nationalisation. Sá Carneiro died in a plane crash on 4 December 1980, whereupon his government resigned. It was Aníbal Cavaco Silva, leader of the Social Democrats (PSD) and Prime Minister from 1985 to 1995, who reversed the trend and launched large-scale denationalisation in 1986. 'Not only were banks and state industries denationalised but public service utilities, which had never before been in private hands, were sold off to an entrepreneurial élite which was once more restored to favour.' (Birmingham 2008: 199)

In 1982, Portugal had already become so estranged from the communist world that it expelled the Czechoslovak ambassador for interfering in Portugal's domestic affairs (see below). The revolutionary – and still rather socialist – constitution was revised in the same year. The president's military powers were limited and the influence of the military on politics reduced. It was, however, only when Portugal became a member of the European Communities (EC) on 1 January 1986 that the military's role all but disappeared:

Radical soldiers had virtually gone from politics and the majority of the Portuguese workforce had opted to join non-communist trade unions which accepted periodic belt-tightening with reasonable equanimity. The most prominent year of change in post-revolutionary Portugal was 1986. It marked the end of ten years of “probationary” democracy during which a conservative segment of the army's officer corps had kept a watching brief over the politicians. (Birmingham 2008: 199)

Portugal's entry into the EC, however, did not quite bring about the desired effects. Although ‘Brussels did not anticipate that Portugal would be a difficult country to swallow since the entire Portuguese domestic product amounted to only one per cent of Europe's total product, [...] Portugal was never able to match France in tapping into the huge bounty which the European Union spent on subsidising agriculture’ (Birmingham 2008: 200-201). Instead, ‘Portugal's farming industry declined steeply’ (*ibid.*) and ‘the average national wealth remained at half that of Ireland though low prices gave the Portuguese a somewhat less depressed purchasing power’ (*ibid.*, 202).

Portugal presided over the Council of the European Union in the first half of 1992 and 2000, and the second half of 2007. To house Portugal's first EU Presidency, the splendid ‘Belém Cultural Centre’ (*Centro Cultural de Belém*) was built. On 1 July 1985 the treaty on the accession of the Portuguese Republic to the European Communities was signed in the ancient Hieronymus Monastery (*Mosteiro dos Jerónimos*). It was here, too, that the Treaty of Lisbon was signed on 13 December 2007.

In 1998, José Saramago (1922-2010) was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. In the same year, Lisbon hosted the Expo 98 world trade fair, for which a new railway station, *Gare do Oriente*, and the hypermodern district of *Parque das Nações* (Park of the Nations) were built. The district is home to Europe's biggest Oceanarium (*Oceanário de Lisboa*).

The Czech Republic was one of the few countries which declined the invitation to participate in this world exhibition (Klíma 2007b: 606), which coincided with the opening of the new bridge, *Ponte Vasco da Gama*, across the Tagus which linked the city to its far-flung industrial suburbs in the east.

The two most prominent political personalities between 1976 and 2011 have been **Mário** Alberto Nobre Lopes **Soares**, Prime Minister (1976-78, 1983-85) and President of the Republic (1986-96), from the centre-left Socialist Party (PS, *Partido Socialista*); and **Aníbal Cavaco Silva**, Prime Minister (1985-95) and President of the Republic (2006-16)<sup>246</sup>, from the centre-right Social Democratic Party (PSD).<sup>247</sup>

<sup>246</sup> A. Cavaco Silva was re-elected president in 2011.

<sup>247</sup> Portugal may be the only country in Europe where the Social Democrats are a right-wing party, like the Czech Republic may be the only European country where the Greens are a right-wing party. Both ‘orientations’ are, however, easily explained by the two countries’ previous political legacies.

Mário Soares was ‘a persecuted democrat under the dictatorship, a flexible democratic socialist after the revolution of 1974 and a paternal president of the second republic from 1986 to 1996’ (Birmingham 2008: 190). He was the first civilian Portuguese president since 1926, and it was his personality, among other factors, that kept Portugal on the path to the European Communities, rather than into the arms of the communist world, when his government applied for membership in the EC on 28 March 1977.

Cavaco Silva, an ‘abrasive young economist’ (back in 1985), ‘had been trained in Britain in the Thatcher mould and his ascendancy marked out a new direction for Portugal’. In 1987 he ‘was able to win two more general elections, the first-ever prime minister of Portugal to be given a parliamentary majority’ (Birmingham 2008: 199).

In a certain way, the importance of Mário Soares and Cavaco Silva for Portuguese politics can be compared only with that of Václav Havel and Václav Klaus on the Czech political scene after 1989 (see above).

Mário Soares and Cavaco Silva are arguably followed, in order of importance, by José Manuel Durão Barroso (PSD)<sup>248</sup>, Minister of Foreign Affairs (1992-95), Prime Minister of Portugal (2002-04) and President of the European Commission (2004-2014); and Jorge Fernando Branco de Sampaio (PS), long-time President of the Portuguese Republic (1996-2006).

On 22 March 2011, as Portugal teetered on the brink of bankruptcy following the global recession of the late-2000s, the socialist government of José Sócrates, elected on 20 February 2005 and re-elected on 27 September 2009, resigned. The Social Democrats (PSD), led by Pedro Passos Coelho (Prime Minister designate since 15 June 2011), won the parliamentary election (*eleições legislativas*) of 5 June 2011 (38.65 %, 108 seats), followed by the Socialists (28.06 %, 74 seats in the 230-seat National Assembly).<sup>249</sup>

---

<sup>248</sup> Before 1976, Durão Barroso was a member of the Portuguese Workers’ Communist Party (*Partido Comunista dos Trabalhadores Portugueses*), a Maoist party.

<sup>249</sup> On 17 June 2011, the EU decided to provide financial aid to Portugal: 2011/344/EU: ‘Council Implementing Decision of 30 May 2011 on granting Union financial assistance to Portugal’ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:159:0088:0092:EN:PDF> (retrieved on 2011-06-24).

### 3.2.2.6 Tables

**Table 4: Presidents of the Portuguese Republic (1910-2011)**

1910-11, 1915	Joaquim <b>Teófilo</b> Fernandes <b>Braga</b>
1911-15	<b>Manuel José de Arriaga</b>
1915-17, 1925-26	<b>Bernardino</b> Luís <b>Machado</b> Guimarães
1918	<b>Sidónio</b> Bernardino Cardoso da Silva <b>Pais</b>
1918-19	João de <b>Canto e Castro</b> Silva Antunes
1919-23	<b>António José de Almeida</b>
1923-25	<b>Manuel Teixeira Gomes</b>
1926	José <b>Mendes Cabeçadas</b> (soldier); Manuel de Oliveira <b>Gomes da Costa</b> (soldier)
<b>1926-51</b>	António <b>Oscar</b> de Fragoso <b>Carmona</b>
<b>1951-58</b>	Francisco Higinio <b>Craveiro Lopes</b>
<b>1958-74</b>	<b>Américo</b> de Deus Rodrigues <b>Tomás</b> (Thomaz)
1974	<b>António</b> Sebastião Ribeiro de <b>Spínola</b>
1974-76	Francisco <b>Costa Gomes</b>
<b>1976-86</b>	António dos Santos <b>Ramalho Eanes</b> (last military president)
<b>1986-96</b>	<b>Mário</b> Alberto Nobre Lopes <b>Soares</b> (PS)
<b>1996-2006</b>	<b>Jorge</b> Fernando Branco de <b>Sampaio</b> (PS)
<b>2006-</b>	Aníbal António <b>Cavaco Silva</b> (PSD, due to serve until 2016)

**Table 5: Prime Ministers of Portugal from 1932 to 2011**

<b>1932-68</b>	António de <b>Oliveira Salazar</b>	UN
<b>1968-74</b>	<b>Marcello</b> (Marcelo) José das Neves Alves <b>Caetano</b>	ANP
1974	Adelino Hermitério da <b>Palma Carlos</b>	non-partisan
1974-75	<b>Vasco</b> dos Santos <b>Gonçalves</b>	soldier
1975-76	José Baptista <b>Pinheiro de Azevedo</b>	soldier
<b>1976-78, 1983-85</b>	<b>Mário</b> Alberto Nobre Lopes <b>Soares</b>	PS
1978	Alfredo Jorge <b>Nobre da Costa</b>	non-partisan
1978-79	Carlos Alberto da <b>Mota Pinto</b>	PSD
1979-80	<b>Maria de Lurdes</b> Ruivo da Silva Matos <b>Pintasilgo</b>	PS
1980	Francisco Manuel Lumbrales de <b>Sá Carneiro</b>	PSD
1980-81	Diogo Pinto de <b>Freitas do Amaral</b>	CDS
1981-83	Francisco <b>Pinto Balsemão</b>	PSD
<b>1985-95</b>	Aníbal António <b>Cavaco Silva</b>	PSD
1995-2002	<b>António</b> Manuel de Oliveira <b>Guterres</b>	PS
<b>2002-04</b>	José Manuel <b>Durão Barroso</b>	PSD
2004-05	Pedro Miguel de <b>Santana Lopes</b>	PSD
<b>2005-11</b>	<b>José Sócrates</b> Carvalho Pinto de Sousa	PS
2011-	<b>Pedro</b> Manuel Mamede <b>Passos Coelho</b>	PSD

Key:

ANP – *Acção Nacional Popular* (People’s National Action);  
 CDS – *Centro Democrático Social* (Social Democratic Centre);  
 PS – *Partido Socialista* (Socialist Party);  
 PSD – *Partido Social Democrata* (Social Democratic Party);  
 UN – *União Nacional* (National Union).

### 3.2.3 Censorship in Portugal

‘These ambiguities, redundancies and deficiencies remind us of those which doctor Franz Kuhn attributes to a certain Chinese encyclopaedia entitled ‘Celestial Empire of benevolent Knowledge’. In its remote pages it is written that the animals are divided into: (a) belonging to the emperor, (b) embalmed, (c) tame, (d) sucking pigs, (e) sirens, (f) fabulous, (g) stray dogs, (h) included in the present classification, (i) frenzied, (j) innumerable, (k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush, (l) et cetera, (m) having just broken the water pitcher, (n) that from a long way off look like flies.’

‘The Analytical Language of John Wilkins’ (*El idioma analítico de John Wilkins*)<sup>250</sup>  
by **Jorge Luis Borges** (1899-1986)

‘Portugal, where the introduction of the printing press coincided with the ecclesiastical monopoly of learning and the period of the Inquisition,’ (Figueiredo 1975: 147), ‘has experienced 420 years of censorship in the five centuries of its publishing history’ (A. Cardoso Pires 1972, in Figueiredo 1975: 148).

Pertinently, censorship, and its consequence non-translation, lies also at the root of Czech-Portuguese relations. Jan Hus (1369/70-1415, pt. *João Huss*), the Church reformer burnt at the stake as a heretic by the Council of Constance, was, in all likelihood, the first Czech to have been censored in Portugal, in around 1450 (Rodrigues 1980: 93).

#### 3.2.3.1 Legislation and Duration

As early as 1910, the Portuguese First Republic rescinded a previous regulation and a new Press Law introduced freedom of speech, allowing for criticism of the government. Before long, however, on 9 July 1912, new legislation permitted the impounding of ‘unsuitable’ publications (post-publication censorship).

When in 1916 Germany declared war on Portugal, Decree No. 2270 of 12 March 1916 provided for the confiscation of writings which could be considered prejudicial to the military forces (Rodrigues 1980: 64). A few days later, the Portuguese government instituted *prior* censorship on war matters. As the Portuguese government regarded censorship as anti-constitutional *per se*, it justified its re-introduction as an exceptional measure in time of war. The law therefore stipulated that the workings of censorship were to be made known to the public in the form of ‘white spaces’ (*espaços em branco*) occurring where the original text had been effaced. Under the old republic, censorship was thus an *apparent* controversial metatext (Popovič 1976: 31, 28).

Censorship was lifted again only after the First World War in 1918. Shortly after the military *coup d'état* of 28 May 1926, Gomes da Costa re-introduced *prior* censorship on the grounds of the ‘abnormal situation’ in the country (on 22 June 1926). The censorship board took up residence in the Lisbon Carmelite Barracks (*Quartel do Carmo*) of the GNR (*Guarda Nacional Republicana*, roughly ‘military police’).

Although it was expressly abolished by Decree No. 11839 of 5 July 1926 and Decree No. 12008 of 29 July 1926, the latter a fundamental document of Portuguese press

<sup>250</sup> Translation into English by Lilia Graciela Vázquez.

<http://www.alamut.com/subj/artiface/language/johnWilkins.html> (retrieved on 2011-05-28).



legislation, neither the Military Dictatorship (1926-28) nor the National Dictatorship (1928-33) were able to dispense with censorship (Rodrigues 1980: 66). From 1926 on, newspapers had a stamp in their header reading ‘checked by the censorship board’ (*visado pela comissão de censura*’, Rosas & Brito 1996: 140, Gomes 2006: 179).

On 22 September 1928, the *Direcção-Geral dos Serviços de Censura à Imprensa* (DGSCI, Directorate-General of Press Censorship Services) was established and artillery colonel Joaquim Augusto Prata Dias made Director-General. He was replaced by Lieutenant-Colonel João da Conceição Tomás Rodrigues in 1931, Major Álvaro Salvação Barreto in 1932 and Lieutenant-Colonel Armando das Neves Larcher in 1944 (Gomes 2006: 179-183).

The *Estado Novo* formally came into being when the new ‘political’ Constitution of 1933 was approved in a (controversial) referendum. On 11 April 1933, when the Constitution became effective, Decree No. 22469 reinstated censorship. Interestingly, Article 6 of the decree stipulated that censorial boards should not introduce changes in the censored texts, but limit themselves to eliminating the questionable passages only (Azevedo 1997: 61).

As early as 1933, a report by Álvaro Salvação Barreto of the DGSCI entitled *Leituras imorais – propaganda política e social contrária ao Estado Novo – sua repressão* (Immoral Readings – Political and Social Propaganda against the New State – its Repression), commissioned by Salazar himself, marked the beginning of the censorship of non-periodical publications, including books (Gomes 2006: 67ff., 181). Having Salazar’s full support, the report resulted in the establishment of a Department for Books (*Secção de Livros*) within the Lisbon Censorship Board, allowing for both prior (i.e. pre-publication) and repressive (post-publication) censorship.

In 1935, the DGSCI requested that the Post Office (C.T.T., *Administração-Geral dos Correios, Telégrafos e Telefones*) confiscate foreign newspapers and magazines prohibited from circulation in Portugal. Decree No. 26159 of 27 December 1935 renamed the DGSCI *Direcção dos Serviços de Censura* (DSC, Directorate for Censorship Services).

In 1936, Act No. 1941 established the National Education Board (*Junta Nacional de Educação*), of which the DSC came to form the first department – Moral and Civic Education (*Educação Moral e Cívica*). Here again, we are reminded of Popovič’s concept of ‘literary education’ (1976: 26-27).<sup>251</sup>

Decree No. 26589 of 14 May 1936, never published in the government’s official journal (*Diário do Governo*, Barreto & Mónica 1999: 276), provided for a most arbitrary mode of operation of the censorship boards. In Figueiredo’s words (1975: 152): ‘Any collection of censors’ decisions makes one feel as if one has entered the world of the absurd’ (cf. quote from Borges above). Article 33 proscribed the ‘white spaces’ known from the time of the First World War (Rodrigues 1980: 68), rendering censorship a *concealed* controversial metatext (Popovič 1976: 31).

---

<sup>251</sup> Seruya (2006: 318) refers to Toury’s concept of ‘culture planning’ propounded in his ‘A Tradução como Meio de Planificação e a Planificação da Tradução’ (in Seruya & Moniz, eds., 1999: 17-32).

A circular letter of 4 July 1939 on military issues strictly forbade any criticism of the armed forces, military officers and the Navy, or the publication of details of life in the barracks, military campaigns etc., especially should they be depicted in an anecdotal or picturesque manner (Azevedo 1997: 41). This later proved significant for censoring *Švejk* (see below). In 1965, another circular letter extended the suppression of such information to include the PIDE (Azevedo 1997: 45).

In 1940, Decree No. 30320 established the *Gabinete de Coordenação dos Serviços de Propaganda e Informação* (Coordination Office for Information and Propaganda Services), which incorporated the SPN, the Censorship Services and the *Comissão Administrativa da Emissora Nacional* (National Broadcasting Administration Board). The Censorship Board gradually began to lose its operational independence (Gomes 2006: 183).

Decree No. 33015 of 30 August 1943 extended the scope of Decree No. 26589 from 1936 to include the cooperation of book publishers (Gomes 2006: 183). In 1944, censorship became a body of propaganda and education, with the DSC having been integrated into the National Information Secretariat (SNI, *Secretariado Nacional de Informação*). Coutinho (1969, in Figueiredo 1975: 156) observes:

The relevance the present régime ascribes to censorship goes to the extreme of having given the Director of the Censorship Services an important role in the education of youth; according to the statute of the National Education Board, the Director of the Censorship Board, as a member of the civic and moral section of the Education Board, is empowered to examine the textbooks to be adopted in the teaching of moral and civic education, as well as family education.

Events leading to the end of WWII and the victory of the Allies, however, prompted the Portuguese opposition to demand freedom of expression again. Salazar relented and relaxed censorship on the eve of parliamentary elections (although never quite lifting it) in a manoeuvre aimed at legitimising the *Estado Novo* in the eyes of foreign observers. For a while the opposition was even allowed to field candidates, though as it turned out this was no more than a trap set by the regime to ensnare any lingering opponents, providing the PIDE with a welcome opportunity to update its dossiers (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 280).

In this way Salazar was able to maintain the illusion that censorship was a temporary, transitional measure until his demise. Caetano's rise to power in 1968 brought about the last changes to the institution of censorship. Act No. 5/71 of 5 November 1971, the first press law since 1926, pretended to dispense with 'prior censorship' (*censura prévia*) for appearance's sake, only to rename it 'prior examination' (*exame prévio*) (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 282). The stamp revealing censorial interference, which had previously been obligatory, was forbidden by Decree No. 150/72 of 5 May 1972. Apart from that, the 'spring' of Marcello Caetano changed little in the daily execution of censorship, as it did in most other areas (Azevedo 1997: 58).

Following the Carnation Revolution of 25 April 1974, freedom of the press was reinstated and guaranteed in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic of 1976.

### 3.2.3.2 Structure and Personnel

The territorial structure of the censorship apparatus hardly changed throughout the years. In principle, there were three main Censorship Boards (*comissões de censura*): in Oporto (Northern Zone), Coimbra (Central Zone) and Lisbon (Southern Zone), with Coimbra lagging far behind Lisbon and Oporto in activity and influence. The Northern Zone was further subdivided into 10 delegations (*delegações*), the Central Zone consisted of 6 delegations and the Southern Zone subsumed 13 delegations, a total of 29 delegations with the most important deployed in Beja, Évora, Aveira, Braga and Funchal (Madeira). This structure, established in 1933, also applied to the Department for Books (Gomes 2006: 48, 89).

Censorship officials were mostly reservists such as majors and colonels, innocuously called ‘readers’ (*leitores*). Civilians joined the Censorship Boards only in 1944 (Gomes 2006: 12), following the appointment of a new DSC director (Larcher replacing Barreto) when the DSC became part of the SNI. Seruya and Moniz (2008: 9-10), speaking of the 1950s, elaborate:

We cannot say that 100% of them were Army officers because some reports do not mention any rank or name. Only five can be considered as members of the permanent body of censors throughout the decade. Other members, however, had a regular activity for several years, while others had a reduced or occasional participation. In general terms, we can say that there was a regular group of about twenty censors.

Censorship Services reported to the Minister of War (1926-27), to the Minister of the Interior (1927-44), and later to Salazar himself.

The agents exerting most influence upon the workings of censorship were thus Salazar, major Álvaro Salvação Barreto, the long-time head of the DGSCI (1932-44) and architect of the censorship apparatus of the *Estado Novo*, and finally António Ferro, head of the Propaganda Secretariat SPN/SNI (1933-50). His interference in the censorial apparatus was all the more ironic as Ferro’s own theatre play *Mar Alto* (High Tide) had been banned by the censors under the First Republic (Klíma 2007a: 354). His ‘enthusiasm’, however, was soon curbed by Salazar himself lest Ferro accumulate too much power in his hands (Gomes 2006: 129).

Other agents played some part as well: the Catholic Church (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 283); the *Inspecção-Geral dos Espectáculos* (‘General Inspection of Performances’), established in 1933 and responsible for censoring theatres and cinemas (Gomes 2006: 54); various police bodies (GNR, PVDE/PIDE, PSP); the Post Office (C.T.T.) and the Customs Services,<sup>252</sup> which impounded books and other publications imported into the country; as well as the entire publishing industry (publishers, printing plants, news agencies, etc.) (Gomes 2006: 53).

To complete the system of censorship and control of news and opinion, Article 149 of the Penal Code provided for a sentence of between two to eight years for “attacks against the prestige of the country abroad”. [...] this law proved to be an effective form of exercising remote control over Portuguese abroad since, owing to family, social and professional connections, few of them were prepared to risk losing their passports or being prosecuted upon return to Portugal. (Figueiredo 1975: 157)

---

<sup>252</sup> The PSP was the ‘regular police’ (Seruya 2010: 129). The Customs Services joined the censorial apparatus in 1953 (Seruya 2010: 131).

### 3.2.3.3 Causes and Objectives

Article 3 of Decree No. 22469 of 11 April 1933 staked out the objectives of censorship as follows (Rodrigues 1980: 67, English in Figueiredo 1975: 149):

[...] to prevent the perversion of public opinion as a social force; it should be carried out in such a way as to defend public opinion from all factors that may misguide it against truth, justice, morality, efficient administration and the common good, and to prevent any attack on the basic principles of the organization of society.

Censorship had always been justified as an interim measure – first to restore order and calm after the ‘chaos’ of the First Republic, then because of the war raging in neighbouring Spain, subsequently because of the Second World War, and finally due to the wars in the colonies (from 1961 onwards), when it suited both Salazar and Caetano to tighten the straitjacket of censorship even further.

Other reasons adduced for the institution of censorship were to ‘calm the spirits’ (*acalmação dos espíritos*) (Gomes 2006: 40), to avoid ‘perturbing the minds’ (*perturbação dos espíritos*) (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 279), and to ‘prevent the press from being used as a political weapon against the implementation of its [the dictatorship’s] national reconstruction programme, against republican institutions and against the nation’s well-being’ (Azevedo 1997: 33)<sup>253</sup>. In Figueiredo’s words (1975: 151-152):

The overall aim of censorship was to present an image of a country with no national or local problems, functioning under the guidance of an infallible, wise and benevolent ruler. The public conscience was directed towards events taking place thousands of miles away, and preferably in the negative “communist world”.

In his discussions with António Ferro, Salazar had given three reasons for the existence of censorship: ‘the need to avoid “unjustified attacks” on the work of the Government; the interest in “moralizing” the Press as regards “personal attacks and verbal abuse”; and the objective to keep the debate doctrinal, especially in the political arena’ (in Azevedo 1997: 16).<sup>254</sup>

In his speech inaugurating the Propaganda Secretariat (SPN) in 1933, Salazar uttered these infamous words: ‘Politically there is only what the public knows to exist’.<sup>255</sup> This maxim was to be used both for what the public ought to know, the task of propaganda, and for what the public should *not* know, the task of censorship.

---

<sup>253</sup> ‘evitar que seja utilizada a Imprensa como arma política contra a realização do seu programa de reconstrução nacional, contra as instituições republicanas e contra o bem estar da Nação’ (Azevedo 1997: 33).

<sup>254</sup> ‘[...] três grandes argumentos para justificar a existência da Censura: a necessidade de se evitarem “ataques injustificados” à obra do Governo; o interesse em se “moralizar” a Imprensa, no âmbito dos “ataques pessoais e nos desmandos de linguagem”; e o objectivo de se manter o debate doutrinário, mesmo no terreno político [...]’ (Azevedo 1997: 16)

<sup>255</sup> ‘Politicamente só existe o que o público sabe que existe’ (English in Rosa, in Seruya, Moniz & Rosa: 2009: 136).

### 3.2.3.4 *Modus operandi*

The basic mode of censorial activities consisted in preventive (prior, pre-publication, *a priori*) censorship (*censura prévia*), the power of which was considerable (Gomes 2006: 14, 100). It was aimed primarily at the press, but also – albeit to a much lesser extent – at books (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 276).

Reactive (repressive, post-publication, *a posteriori*) censorship (*censura repressiva*) was perceptibly weaker (Gomes 2006: 100) and was primarily aimed at books and other non-periodical publications. Of course, this led to a bizarre situation:

[...] book confiscation was such a complex procedure that, years after a particular book was banned, the police could still be looking for copies in bookshops. Booksellers would, additionally, always find a way to hide and keep banned or suspect books for special clients, so that private libraries were likely to evade censorship to a significant extent. (Seruya 2010: 138)

*Prior* censorship was later extended to cover ‘cables and phone-calls sent by foreign news agents’, while *repressive* censorship applied to ‘news sent from abroad, or magazines and newspapers sent for distribution in Portugal’ (Figueiredo 1975: 151).

The rationale for maintaining both modes of censorship was twofold. First, it would have drastically increased the number of censors if they had been mandated to ‘read’ everything before publication. Second, the two-edged sword of preventive and repressive censorship had the advantage, at least for the regime, of constantly keeping publishers alert and on their guard.

The PIDE or any of its informers could denounce offending publishers, who would face fines, confiscation of books or the outright closure of their establishment, for a definite or indefinite period, potentially forcing them into bankruptcy (Azevedo 1997: 53). Incitement or propaganda against the *Estado Novo* or the Nation, i.e. accusations of ‘partisanship’ (*partidarismo*)<sup>256</sup>, directly contravening the Nation’s unity, or of (the negatively conceived) ‘internationalism’ (*internacionalismo*, cf. Azevedo 1999: 495) that jeopardized the Nation’s sovereignty and integrity, could incur penalties including ‘deportation to the colonies for periods up to twelve years, fines and jail sentences’ (Figueiredo 1975: 150).

In the case of *prior* censorship, ‘the statutory three copies of printers’ proofs were submitted to the censors’ (Figueiredo 1975: 152). The censors would then pass one of four judgements: ‘Censored or Deleted, Suspended (pending further decision), Authorized, or Authorized with Cuts’ (Rosas & Brito 1996: 140, English in Figueiredo 1975: 149).

Already in 1948, at the behest of António Ferro, Act No. 2027 forbade the dubbing of foreign films (Santos 2007: 133). This prohibition facilitated censors’ work, as subtitling, often deliberately deficient, could be falsified more easily. The SNI also relied on wide-spread illiteracy and a general lack of knowledge of foreign languages (*ibid.*).

---

<sup>256</sup> Cf. Popovič’s ‘party spirit’ (*stranickosť literatúry*, 1983: 37-38).

Unlike the press, books were subject to a selective form of censorship, both in the rather rare cases of preventive censorship and necessarily resulting from the overwhelming mode of repressive censorship applied to non-periodical publications in general. Thus, each case was judged separately and no author's works were forbidden in their totality (Gomes 2006: 70).

The juggernaut of pervasive censorship, both preventive and repressive, led writers to adopt certain strategies of 'writing between the lines'. Thus, words like *aurora* or *amanhecer* (dawn, daybreak) came to mean 'socialism', *primavera* (spring) became 'revolution', *camarada* (companion, comrade) stood for 'prisoner', *vampiro* (vampire) for 'policeman', and *papoila* (poppy) for 'people's victory' (Rodrigues 1980: 76), adding an unexpected poetic touch to covertly subversive texts. Summing up in the words of Leo Strauss (1988: 25, in Esteves 2005: 62):

Persecution, then, gives rise to a peculiar technique of writing, and therewith to a peculiar type of literature, in which the truth about all crucial things is presented exclusively between the lines. That literature is addressed, not to all readers, but to trustworthy and intelligent readers only.

### 3.2.3.5 Channels and Topics

Censorship in Portugal began as a means of supervising and 'blue-pencilling' the press and theatre plays in a still predominantly rural and half illiterate country. Over the years, the tentacles of censorship reached out to smother telephones, telegrams, the radio (fewer than 40,000 receivers towards the end of 1935 as compared with 1,516,000 in 1974) and later the television (32,000 sets in 1958 against 675,000 in 1974) (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 283).

Censorship did not affect the domestic press only. Foreign periodicals were banned from circulating in Portugal, films, theatre plays and other shows and performances were proscribed or mutilated, songs were removed from repertoires, as were radio broadcasts from abroad that criticized the regime. In the education system, school readers (*livros de leitura*) and textbooks about 'sensitive' subjects were the object of special censorial attention (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 276).

As for the topics subjected to censorship, Figueiredo (1975: 150) provides us with a general idea:

Here is a sample of what should *not* be published: attacks or criticism of the State, the government, its personalities and institutions; irreverent references to the authorities or public services; news that might cause alarm or public disquiet; writings which might offend creeds and religious practices; details of suicides and murders, as well as infanticides, when not followed by the news of the arrest of delinquents or their punishment by the courts; articles of local reports or advertisements concerning astrologers, witches or clairvoyants; issues that might prejudice diplomatic relations with foreign countries.

As might be inferred from the above, 'obscene publications or those that contain attacks upon Portuguese sovereignty or give offence to the government or its representatives or might provoke crime or incite rebellion or disorder' (Figueiredo 1975: 151) were similarly outlawed. These 'attacks' even included advocating 'the disintegration or separation of any component part of the "Portuguese Colonial Empire"' (*ibid.*).

Furthermore, epidemics, accidents, even natural disasters were sometimes played down or concealed from the public. A mere reference, without the slightest political overtones, to suicides, juvenile delinquency, crimes of passion, labour conflicts, slums, famine, bare feet, drug misuse, homosexuality, nudism, prostitution, abortion, alcoholism, mental illnesses, infant mortality, etc. tended to be expurgated or suppressed (Barreto & Mónica 1999: 275).

Interestingly, the censors did not always have the last word. Regarding domestic authors, several works e.g. by António Sérgio, Ferreira de Castro or Alves Redol were approved by the Director of the Censorship Services against the censors' judgments (Azevedo 1997: 73-79). Conversely, several titles by António Sérgio (again), Vergílio Ferreira, Urbano Tavares Rodrigues and Manuel da Fonseca were prohibited in contradiction to the censors' recommendations (Azevedo 1997: 80-83). Finally, certain books, such as *O Arcanjo Negro* (The Black Archangel) by Aquilino Ribeiro or *A Cabra Cega* (The Blind Goat) by José Régio were prohibited at first only to be authorised several years later, either in their entirety or with cuts, against the initial censors' verdicts (Azevedo 1997: 83-85). This also happened with *Švejk* (see below).

The regime's *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* included not only all communist propaganda, but many politically innocuous works, for instance those displaying too much 'realism'. In Seruya's words (2010: 136), 'Another stigmatizing judgement often applied to literature was "realism". Authors such as Niven Busch, D. H. Lawrence, Jean Genet and John Dos Passos<sup>257</sup> had some of their books banned because they described, in the censors' view, how things "really are".'<sup>258</sup>

Yet ironically, 'surrealism and its authors (Aragon, André Breton) were always firmly banned' (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 10) and topics 'such as Darwinism and the death penalty' were also considered undesirable (*ibid.*, 19). Figueiredo (1975: 155) adds nuance to the picture:

In addition to all books by Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Mao Tse-tung [Mao Zedong] and the better-known socialist authors, all, or some, of the books of Tolstoy, Gogol, Gorky, Zola, Bernanos, Malraux, Camus, Faulkner, Steinbeck, John Dos Passos and Bertrand Russell were "indexed". The "Index" was far more implacable towards Portuguese authors and at one stage more than sixty writers in Portugal had one or more books banned. (Figueiredo 1975: 155)

It is also interesting to note what was *not* likely to be censored under the *Estado Novo*: "[...] To write according to the regime's *canon*, the novelist had to pretend to be unaware of all the great anxieties of contemporary man and to write conventional novels, disconnected from his time, novels subject to so many restrictions that it would be tedious to enumerate them all here, all the more so since they are well known" (in Azevedo 1997: 12).<sup>259</sup>

---

<sup>257</sup> John Dos Passos as an American writer was censored in Portugal despite, or perhaps precisely because of, the Madeiran-Portuguese descent of his father.

<sup>258</sup> One plausible explanation for this may consist in the fact that the most important anti-regime literature was that of 'neo-realism, closely linked to the PCP' (Costa Pinto 1991: 248). 'Neo-realism aspired deeply and with conviction to socialist revolution and it was only out of fear of censorship that the movement adopted in Portugal the euphemistic name by which it is known,' (*ibid.*, 252). Links to 'socialist realism' propagated by and produced in communist countries are more than obvious.

<sup>259</sup> "[...] Para escrever conforme os cânones da censura, o romancista devia fingir ignorar todas as grandes inquietações do homem do nosso tempo e escrever uns romances convencionais, deslocados da

‘In 1947, the SNI published a list of what was to be regarded as the regime’s *canon*, “essential works” of Portuguese literature, in which no reference was made to contemporary writers’ (Seruya 2001: 220)<sup>260</sup>. This canon laid ‘emphasis on rural values and the cluster of values to be followed at all levels appeared in the concept of “regionalism”, the new key orientation for cultural policy’ (Seruya 2010: 120). This regime-imposed production of books was intended to bolster the *Plano de Educação Popular* (People’s Education Programme), which was still under way in 1970. In the intervening two decades, almost 80 occasional collaborators produced only 111 works (Seruya 2006: 322). Instead, from the 1940s on, the regime’s official nationalist ‘regionalism’ was constantly ‘undermined’ by large book series of foreign or mixed<sup>261</sup> literature published by various publishing houses (Seruya 2004: 39).

### 3.2.3.6 Foreign Literature and Translations

As Seruya (in Rundle & Sturge 2010: 131) says, ‘very little is known yet about the decisions to ban or approve foreign books, except for some lists of banned books (Azevedo 1999; *Comissão do Livro Negro* 1981) and an illustrated exhibition catalogue (*Livros Proibidos no Estado Novo* 2005 [Ferrão, Oliveira & Fonseca]).’

Moreover, ‘the percentage of literary works [i.e. fiction] among the foreign books submitted to the Censoring Commission is actually quite low. It is therefore important to discuss all foreign books when assessing the situation of translation censorship in the *Estado Novo*.’ (*ibid.*)

Regarding foreign books, censorship mainly focused on the following key topics (Ferrão, Oliveira & Fonseca 2005, *passim*):<sup>262</sup>

- **political controversy and political prisoners** (e.g. *A democracia* [La démocratie] by Georges Burdeau);
- **colonialism and conflicts abroad** (e.g. *Chora, terra bem amada* [Cry, the Beloved Country] by Alan Paton; *Le Portugal et la fin de l’ultra-colonialisme* [Portugal and the End of Ultra-Colonialism] by Perry Anderson; *Chant du fantoche lusitanien* [Gesang vom lusitanischen Popanz] by Peter Weiss);
- **political economy and land reform** (e.g. *A questão agrária* [Die Agrarfrage] by Karl Kautsky);
- **offences to religion** (e.g. *Le Diable et le Bon Dieu* and *L’Âge de raison* by Jean-Paul Sartre);
- **socialist ideology** (e.g. *Reforma ou revolução?* [Sozialreform oder Revolution] by Rosa Luxemburg; *Economia marxista* [An Essay on Marxian Economics] by Joan Robinson);

---

sua época, uns romances sujeitos a tantas restrições, que seria fastidioso enumerá-las todas aqui, tanto mais que elas são bem conhecidas.” (*Eleições Legislativas*, 1973: 30-38, in Azevedo 1997: 12)

<sup>260</sup> ‘Em 1947, o SNI mandaria imprimir uma lista que bem podemos considerar o cânone do regime, as produções “essenciais” da literatura portuguesa, na qual não há referência a escritores contemporâneos (J. de Castro Osório, *Ordenação Crítica dos Autores e Obras Essenciais da Literatura Portuguesa*, Lisboa, Ed. Inquérito, 1947).’ (Seruya 2001: 220)

<sup>261</sup> That is, including Portuguese authors.

<sup>262</sup> Original titles are given in square brackets. (Ferrão, Oliveira & Fonseca 2005, *passim*)



- **poverty and social disparities** (e.g. *Crónica dos pobres amantes* [Cronache di poveri amanti] by Vasco Pratolini);
- **emancipation of women, eroticism and sexuality** (e.g. *A nossa vida sexual* [Unser Geschlechtsleben] by Fritz Kahn, *Lolita* by Vladimir Nabokov).

The examples above, selected to include only books by foreign (i.e. non-Portuguese) authors, reveal that some books had already been translated and then either prevented from being published or subsequently sequestered (repressive censorship). Other books arrived in Portugal, either in their original version or in a translation (often into French), and were either impounded by the Post Office (C.T.T.), Customs Services, PIDE<sup>263</sup> or other agents of the censorial apparatus; or else they were submitted to the Censorship Services for evaluation, typically by a publisher intending to commission a translation into Portuguese and publish it.

The above topics on which most censorial effort was concentrated imply that foreign fiction did not constitute a large part of the censors' work unless, of course, the original author was known to be a 'communist', a term of very broad scope indeed. The translation of Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (*Os Irmãos Karamazoff*) was forbidden on 6 March 1946 for an indisputable and unassailable reason: 'As the translation of this novel implies its dissemination, I believe it is to be prohibited.' The censor's actual justification, however, was the following: 'Dostoevsky, apart from his mysticism and religious fervour, is known to have deformed the Russian people's minds in the preparation for bolshevism.' (Azevedo 1997: 202)<sup>264</sup>

Other 'communists', real, supposed or temporary, included Bertolt Brecht, whose *Théâtre Complet* (in French!), volumes I, II, III, VI, VII and IX, were all prohibited between 1955 and 1959 as 'anti-militaristic, social or communist propaganda' (Azevedo 1997: 203-204).<sup>265</sup>

Another victim was Simone de Beauvoir, 'comrade' and Sartre's 'companion', whose *Privilèges* and *Mémoires d'une Jeune Fille Rangée* were condemned as 'intrinsically immoral and openly communist' and prohibited in 1959 and 1960 respectively (Azevedo 1997: 209-210). Beauvoir's *Pyrrhus et Cinéas* was prohibited in 1960 as an 'apology of existentialism, hence communism' (*sic!*) (Azevedo 1997: 211), although by that time Sartre and Beauvoir had ceased to support communist ideas.<sup>266</sup>

Heart-stricken by the Soviet crushing of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, Sartre and Beauvoir regarded 'existentialism' as an attempt at finding a third way between Western capitalism and Soviet communism. Existentialism was hence *non-communism* by definition, which is why it was also heavily censored in Czechoslovakia (Janoušek et

<sup>263</sup> Baubeta (2009: 51) maintains: 'We know from scholarly sources that the PIDE raided Europa-América [a publishing house] in July 1965, seizing works by Remarque, Sartre and Tennessee Williams.'

<sup>264</sup> 'Não se ignora que Dostoiewsky apesar do seu misticismo e fervor religioso foi um dos reformadores da consciência do povo russo na preparação para o bolchevismo. [...] Como a tradução deste romance implica a sua divulgação, entendo ser o mesmo de proibir.' (Azevedo 1997: 202)

<sup>265</sup> For an accurate analysis of Brecht in the Censoring Commission see SERUYA, Teresa. 2009. "Bertolt Brecht e a Censura do Estado Novo", In *Jornadas sobre Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956)*. G. Bär, C. Rodrigues, E. da Silva (eds.). Lisboa: Universidade Aberta, 2009, DVD, 10pp.

<sup>266</sup> See SERUYA, Teresa. 2010. "O Poder 'Dissolvente' da Tradução: Simone de Beauvoir na censura portuguesa". In *Simone de Beauvoir. Olhares sobre a Mulher e o Feminino*. Isabel Capelo Gil, Manuel Cândido Pimentel (eds.). Lisboa: Nova Vega, pp. 213-237.

al. 2007b: 405), at least until the *détente* of the 1960s (Janoušek et al. 2008a: 24). French existentialism was, of course, atheistic, a feature which would in itself upset Portuguese censors.

As far as **translation** *per se* is concerned, it was not always welcomed by the regime. António Maria Pereira, long-time director of the ‘National Corporation of Publishers and Booksellers’ (GNEL, *Grémio Nacional dos Editores e Livreiros*), spoke in 1944 of the disagreeable fact that ‘the Portuguese publishing activity was nourished by translations’ (Seruya 2004: 39, 41).

As soon as 1943, this situation had led the association of publishers and booksellers to draft a ‘translation statute’ (*Estatuto de Traduções*), an administrative order regulating translations, which appeared in the GNEL’s monthly magazine *Livros de Portugal* (Books of Portugal). The *Estatuto* aimed “‘to avoid commercial competition” (Article 4) – commercial competition being contrary to the economic doctrine of a corporative state’ (Seruya 2010: 123). Among other things, the *Estatuto*

requires books in translation to include data on the original title and “if it is missing, the title of the French or English translation” (Articles 11). This indicates the common disrespect for original works, a habit dating back at least to the nineteenth century and one reflected in the tendency to “domesticate” foreign works as a method of translation. It also confirms which source languages were predominant. (Seruya 2010: 123)

The GNEL later admitted that the *Estatuto* ‘possessed no legal force, rather providing a “moral and economic orientation” (*Livros de Portugal*, 1945, No. 37)’ (Seruya 2006: 321)<sup>267</sup>. ‘Translations,’ however, continued to be ‘feared because they were “available to those belonging to the less learned classes, who might be exposed to harmful effects by reading them” (R4803/52)’ (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 18).

Seruya & Moniz (2008: 11-18) summarise the most common arguments for banning foreign literature in Portugal in the 1950s, which slightly differ from the key topics identified above. As such, there were:

- **Propaganda** (proselytism, apology), ‘attributed to a very large number of books, mainly of French origin and dealing with any topic concerning the USSR (in a few cases concerning China), regardless of its content: historical, biographical (Stalin<sup>268</sup>, Trotsky) or philosophical and doctrinal’, even Paul Éluard and Pablo Neruda (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 11);
- **Sexual morality, doctrine of social dissolution**, which ‘quantitatively speaking, is not only literature considered pornographic but also everything taken as offensive in the light of Christian morality, regarding marriage, homosexuality, adultery and divorce (but concerning women alone), sexual satisfaction, birth control’, e.g. Jean Claudio or Clément Vautel (*ibid.*, 11-12);
- **Realism** (‘a stigmatizing judgement, meaning, in this *corpus*, “how things really are”’), e.g. Guy de Maupassant’s *Le Plaisir* (*ibid.*, 13);
- **“Elites” or “the learned” vs. “the many”**, often allowed to ‘circulate’ in the original, but not to be translated, e.g. J. P. Sartre’s *Nekrassov* (*ibid.*, 14);

<sup>267</sup> ‘Allerdings wird später eingestanden, daß die Verordnung keinen juristischen Wert besitze, sondern bloß eine „moralische und wirtschaftliche Orientierung“ darstelle (*LP* 1945, Nr. 37).’ (Seruya 2006: 321)

<sup>268</sup> However, ‘[...] we know that at least seven translations of Stalin’s works were published in Portugal before the April Revolution of 1974.’ (Seruya 2010: 140)

- **Speculation**, there was a ‘dual manipulation of the concept, i.e., it [was] used either to ban or to approve’, e.g. Kierkegaard’s *The Banquet*, being ‘harmless’ speculation, was allowed, whereas *L’univers concentrationnaire* about Nazi concentration camps by David Rousset was banned as a ‘speculation of a communist theoretician’ (*ibid.*, 16);
- **Discomfort in relation to National Socialism (NS), democracy and war**, e.g. *A Small Village Called Lidice* by Zdena Trinka, drawing attention to the Nazi obliteration of the town of Lidice near Kladno (now Czech Republic) on 10 June 1942 (see above). Seruya and Moniz (2008: 16) suggest that ‘the reason for the ban was another type of fear, the “references to communistic propaganda, largely speaking about a world government of all nations” (R4867/53)’.

As a consequence of the military roots of the *Estado Novo* and the censors’ affiliation to the Army, ‘**pacifism, anti-militarism**’, and later even anti-colonialism (when the war of independence war broke out in Angola in 1961), were condemned as ‘Communist propaganda’ (Seruya 2010: 134, 136) and often given as reasons for banning a book. Such was the case of L. Aragon’s *L’enseigne de Gersaint*, the French translation of John Dos Passos’ *Terre élue (Chosen Country)* (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 17), but also of the first ban on *Švejk* (see below).

Summing up the effects of censorship in Portugal, Seruya & Moniz (2008: 20) write:

[I]t was forbidden to become familiar with more crude or unpleasant aspects of life (**realism**), to think and discuss about possible worlds (**speculation**), to let senses and instinct play their role (**sexual moral and social dissolution literature**), [and] to read about adverse regimes and ideologies (**propaganda**).

All of this resulted in a very large number of translations of **popular genres**: ‘genres such as detective and adventure stories, science fiction and the sentimental novel saw very high percentages of translations; in the case of science fiction, even 100 per cent for a long period’ (Seruya 2010: 139). Apart from the high probability of thus evading censorship, ‘a number of publishing houses opted for science fiction [...], because it was an economically viable proposition’ (Baubeta 2009: 51). Baubeta (2009: 39) goes as far as to claim that ‘irrespective of whether one talks in terms of “good” literature, none of the evidence I have seen to date suggests that the prevailing motivation for publishing translations was anything other than economic.’

Considering publishers’ strategies aimed at avoiding censorship, Seruya and Moniz (2008: 7) point out that ‘the title/topic and/or the cover of the book could be decisive’. Thus, ‘we know that the names of authors were sometimes disguised or faked by certain publishers – Francisco Lyon de Castro, for one’ (Baubeta 2009: 52). Baubeta hypothesises that ‘crime fiction did not generally draw the censors’ attention’, and she goes on (2009: 54):

As a popular genre, I suspect that it somehow escaped notice, was not perceived as a serious threat to the Portuguese establishment. The sheer volume of short stories and novels must have acted as a deterrent, if nothing else. [...] In any case, the fictions are mainly set in the Anglophone world and so do not have to be interpreted as a critical comment on Portuguese society, politics or class structures.

The above implies that *paratexts* played a crucial part in either attracting or deterring the censors’ attention. The decision by the Post Office, Customs Services, the PIDE or

occasionally even the regular police (PSP) whether or not to submit a particular book to the Censorship Board was, almost certainly, not based on a prior thorough reading of it. Rather, the author(s), the title (and subtitle), the outside and inside front and back cover matter – in short, the book's *peritexts* – were what mattered most.

Despite the fact that Karel Čapek's *War with the Newts* has been interpreted as clearly anti-Nazi, anti-fascist, and by extension anti-dictatorial, we may hypothesise that it repeatedly slipped through the censorial net precisely because it had been consistently presented as science fiction (see also below).

Since 'the decision to approve or ban a foreign book was a decision on whether it could be circulated, and hence in most cases on whether it would ever be translated' (Seruya 2010: 131), the Censorship Board's judgements often resulted in *non-translation*, despite the fact that foreign books intercepted by the Post Office, the Customs Services or the PIDE were often sent on to the addressee after careful assessment. 'A single reader or anyone included in the category of the "learned ones" wasn't regarded as a dissemination agent of the forbidden fruit.' (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 18)

The censors' approach thus points to a significant **social cleavage** in the Portuguese society between the 'élites' and the 'masses'. Due to the high illiteracy rate (49 % in 1940, but still 40.4 % ten years later (Seruya 2006: 320)<sup>269</sup>, 'the cultural gap between the "élites" or "the educated" and "the many" was acknowledged and supported by the authorities, who would sometimes (unwillingly) allow the circulation of a foreign book on the grounds that it was published in a foreign language.' (Seruya 2010: 133)

The resulting *non-translation* was thus an invisible, yet crucial, feature of Salazar's regime: 'The fact that books were not subjected to pre-publication censorship, as were the media, also signals their relative unimportance. For the Portuguese case, the strong presence of non-translated foreign books is important: these were only accessible to a minority, hence were not a major source of concern for the authorities.' (Seruya 2010: 140)

The impression conveyed so far suggests that Portugal 'was the one country where the translation market was not dominated by English as a source language. Instead, the hegemony of French gave way to Spanish.' (Rundle & Sturge 2010: 6) This, however, is only true if no distinction is made between 'high' (classical) and 'popular' literature. Portugal was 'a market pervaded by translations of Spanish pseudotranslations, written by Spanish authors using anglophone pseudonyms' (*ibid.*).

Historical and political reasons prompt Seruya (2009, 2010) and Seruya & Moniz (2008) to distinguish between British (GBR) and American (USA) anglophone cultures, given the 'ancient Anglo-Portuguese Alliance (dating from 1373)' and Salazar's foreign policy (Seruya 2010: 125).

The 'provisional, yet representative, results' are based on the 'data collected for the project *Intercultural literature in Portugal 1930-2000: A critical bibliography*, an ongoing bibliographical study within the Portuguese Catholic University's Centre for

---

<sup>269</sup> '[...] hohe Analphabetenrate – 49% im Jahre 1940, aber immer noch 40,4% zehn Jahre später (Ramos do Ó 1999: 134f.)' (Seruya in Wolf 2006: 320)

Communication and Culture Studies, in collaboration with the University of Lisbon's Centre for English Studies' (Seruya 2010: 124)<sup>270</sup>.

Regarding the number of books *translated* into Portuguese, the '**dominant source culture**' was France in the 1940s, and Spain in the 1950s and 1960s. As concerns the number of different authors translated into Portuguese, however, the 'dominant source culture' was the United Kingdom in all three decennia (Seruya 2009: 81-82, Seruya 2010: 125-126). Seruya (2010: 126) thus concludes:

If we look at the period as a whole, then, the dominant source culture for translation into Portuguese is Spain, at least after the 1940s. This result clearly questions the common perception of a French hegemony, a hegemony which in fact was mainly restricted to intellectuals, artists and the universities. It should be noted that the predominance of Spain arose from translations of popular literature, not the canonical authors, who, apart from Cervantes, were rarely translated until the 1980s (see Soler 1999).

Specifying the role of the Spanish classics, Seruya (2010: 128) goes on to explain: 'Spain leads in terms of the number of titles, but among nearly 4000 titles there are only five canonical authors: Calderón de la Barca, Cervantes, José Cela, Felix Cucurull and Alfonso Sastre share nine titles together.'

On the other hand, it could be hypothesised that the '**dominant mediating culture**', at least regarding fiction, was French. Not only is this true of the corpus of Czech literature in Portuguese translation (see below); the data from the abovementioned project itself<sup>271</sup> also suggest a strong tendency towards using the French polysystem as the preferred mediating culture.<sup>272</sup> This hypothesis is well grounded in what is generally true of literature under the *Estado Novo*. 'As is well-known, the source text of a translation may not always be the original source: French was very often used among us as a mediation language for Russian and German literature for example' (Seruya 2011: 7) (see also Seruya 2007: 107).

The last important set of comments deals with the **difficulties inherent in collating relevant data**. Speaking of the above project, Seruya (2011: 6) points to 'the publishers' deliberate habit not to record the publication date where they should. The feasible explanations for this omission which go far beyond mere carelessness are not at all flattering in terms of the publishers.'

From a *sociological* perspective, translation under the *Estado Novo* 'was not a regulated profession, [...] there were no professional translators, and [...] translating, while widespread, was not undertaken from artistic motivations but as a means of earning extra money' (Seruya 2010: 124). Regarding the translators, Seruya (*ibid.*) elaborates:

---

<sup>270</sup> The project begins in 1930 precisely because the aforementioned fundamental reference book by Gonçalves Rodrigues, *A Tradução em Portugal*, ends in that year. The project's website: <http://www.translatedliteratureportugal.org/index.htm> (retrieved on 2011-06-13).

<sup>271</sup> The project, *Intercultural literature in Portugal 1930-2000: A critical bibliography*, has so far covered only the period from 1930 to 1955 (Seruya 2011: 5). SERUYA, Teresa. 2011 (forthcoming). 'The Project of a Critical Bibliography of Translated Literature and its Relevance for Translation Studies in Portugal', in *Homenagem a João Ferreira Duarte* (Tribute to João Ferreira Duarte).

<sup>272</sup> The project's website (in English) produced 69 entries for French as the intermediate language, 4 entries for Spanish, and 2 entries for English, German and Italian each. These are, of course, only interim results, as the data on the website seem far from complete. The tendency, however, is unequivocal. <http://www.translatedliteratureportugal.org/index.htm> (retrieved on 2011-06-13)

The translators of literature in this period include anonymous people (this is the case for translators of Spanish and English titles in the field of adventure and sentimental novels), well-known writers and personalities (Aquilino Ribeiro, José Saramago, Maria Lamas, Fernanda Botelho, Urbano Tavares Rodrigues, poets like Vitorino Nemésio, Jorge de Sena, Alexandre O'Neill, Ruy Belo, Ramos Rosa; painters like Lima de Freitas and many others), or professionals from other areas, such as the sociologist [historian] Vasco Pulido Valente or the philosopher of culture Agostinho da Silva (see Pinho 2006).<sup>273</sup>

Elsewhere, Seruya (2011: 6) points to the fact that ‘the number of translators who have left not a single trace of themselves in the bio-bibliographical records available is staggering; anonymity and invisibility seems to be the overwhelming trait.’

Moreover, the research is seriously impeded by ‘the lack of organized archives at the National Archives in Torre do Tombo’ [*Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais – Torre do Tombo*, hereafter IANTT] (Seruya 2010: 131):

Considering the deficiencies of the documentation on the Censoring Commission’s work, the results of the present research can only be provisional. However, the corpus can be considered representative: the percentage of missing reports is not high – 22.4 per cent of the 10,011 reports written between 1934 and April 1974 – and the continuity of procedures and criteria across the four decades indicate that what is missing should not significantly change the conclusions. (*ibid.*)<sup>274</sup>

Moreover, a large number of books contain no date (Seruya 2005: 37)<sup>275</sup>, leaving the researcher with only an approximation of the decade in which they are likely to have originated. This is the case of *Aventuras do valente soldado Svejek* translated by Maria Alberta Miranda & José Carlos Rodrigues by the publishing house Vega in Lisbon sometime in the 1960s. However, the existence of this edition, recorded in the PORBASE<sup>276</sup>, could not be verified *de visu* in the National Library in Lisbon.

Last but not least, when perusing the censorship reports, which ‘indicate the publisher and the translator, it is not always clear whether they [the translations] have already been made or only commissioned’ (Seruya 2006: 324)<sup>277</sup>. This is particularly relevant when tracking down non-translated books of Czech authorship (see Chapter 4).

No study of translation under a dictatorship can be divorced from the *political* aspect: ‘Most American titles appear in the second half of the 1940s, showing an interesting

<sup>273</sup> **Alexandre O’Neill** (1924-86) translated Jan Otčenášek’s *Romeo, Julie a tma* (Romeo, Juliet and Darkness) as *Romeo, Julieta e as Trevas* in 1961 (Lisbon: Arcádia). **José Saramago** (1922-2010), the Nobel Laureate for Literature in 1998, translated, *inter alii*, Hans Hellmut Kirst’s trilogy *08/15* (Seruya & Moniz 2008: 17) and Colette’s *Chéri* (Seruya 2010: 143). **Lima de Freitas** (1927-98) was the first translator of Karel Čapek’s *Válka s mloky* (*War with the Newts*) as *A Guerra das Salamandras* in 1965 (Lisbon: Livros do Brasil).

<sup>274</sup> ‘The reports of the Censoring Commission concerning Portuguese and foreign books, [...] are kept in large cardboard boxes identified as “Caixas da Censura”. The reports are all numbered and signed by two censors, the author of the report and the decision-taker. They are not yet catalogued. [...] The numbering of the censors’ reports indicates report number and issuing year.’ (Seruya 2010: 143)

<sup>275</sup> ‘uma grande parte das obras não contém qualquer data’ (Seruya 2005: 37)

<sup>276</sup> Cf. <http://porbase.bnportugal.pt/#focus> (retrieved on 2011-06-14).

<sup>277</sup> ‘Bei Übersetzungen (mit Angabe von Verlag und Übersetzer/in auf der Karteikarte) ist nicht immer klar, ob diese bereits angefertigt worden waren oder ob es sich nur um entsprechende Auftragserteilungen handelte.’ (Seruya 2006: 324)

correspondence with the change of role played by the US within Portuguese foreign policy' (Seruya 2010: 127).

*Political* translation and re-translation from and (back) into Portuguese is another fascinating area of potential future research. As Seruya (2010: 121) indicates: 'It would also be interesting to consider the peculiar case of the translation of Salazar's speeches or of tourist brochures from Portuguese into European languages, where translation out of Portuguese was clearly a vital propaganda tool regarding the regime's image abroad.' In this context, the abovementioned 'agitprop pamphlets', translated from Czech into Portuguese in Czechoslovakia from 1978 to 1988 (Chapter 2), could provide a fruitful basis for comparison of the two regimes' propaganda apparatuses.

Translation (back) into Portuguese extended even to Salazar's own speeches and interviews (Figueiredo 1975: 154, 157):

With evident contempt for "local" newspapers, Salazar often gave interviews to sympathetic newspapers in the United States, France, Germany and Italy in the certainty that they would promptly be translated and reproduced in newspapers in Portugal and the empire, with added prestige. (154)

To make the most of their investment, articles published in the supplements [of newspapers such as the London *Financial Times*] would be used again in Portugal, and presented as translations of independent views. (157)

This seems highly pertinent to Translation Studies, being an instance of a *politically* used re-translation (or back-translation).

The irony of the two mutually inimical authoritarian regimes of Portugal and Czechoslovakia, which actually had more in common than meets the eye, is pithily expressed in the following words by António de Figueiredo (1975: 155):

[...] there could hardly be a more sadly ironic and thought-provoking sight than to read Portuguese newspapers, marked "Passed by the Censorship" or "Passed by the Board of Censors", with a front-page story about the persecution of intellectuals or the existence of censorship in the Soviet Union, Hungary or Czechoslovakia.

### 3.3 Czech-Portuguese Relations

The first translation of a work of fiction in book form from Czech into Portuguese dates back to **1943**, a time when the censorship of books was extended to include the mandatory cooperation of publishers (Decree No. 33015). By 1943, Czechoslovakia had been reduced to the Nazi Germany-controlled Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, having been forced to cede the Sudetenland in 1938, and Jozef Tiso's clerical-fascist (First) Slovak Republic (1939-45), a puppet state of the Third Reich, which in turn had lost territory to Miklós Horthy's Kingdom of Hungary (1920-46).

The last 20<sup>th</sup>-century translation of a work of fiction in book form from Czech into Portuguese dates from **1992**, a time when Portugal had already achieved political and economic stability, having been admitted into the European Union in 1986 while Czechoslovakia was still in existence. Surprisingly perhaps, the creation of two independent, albeit cooperating, Central European states, the Czech and the Slovak

Republics in 1993, did not bear any translational fruit in Czech-Portuguese literary relations.

The above implies that Czech-Portuguese cultural, literary and translational relations in the 20<sup>th</sup> century can be divided into the following five main periods:

**(1) 1901-20**, the period of no noteworthy contacts, especially on the Portuguese side.<sup>278</sup> Czech newspapers (e.g. *Národní listy*) commented on the assassination of both the Portuguese King and the Prince Royal in 1908 as well as on the establishment of the Portuguese Republic in 1910. An allusion to the assassination of 1908 can be found in *Švejk* (in the first chapter). Portuguese newspapers (e.g. *O Século*) reported on the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918 (Klíma 2007a: 510-511).<sup>279</sup>

**(2) 1920-37**, the period of the first diplomatic relations and the first instances of economic cooperation (Josef Sochor, Walter). A commercial treaty was signed in Lisbon on 11 December 1922.

Armando Luís Rodrigues published his *A Tcheco-Slovaquia: sua exemplar administração económica, financeira e industrial* [Czechoslovakia: her Exemplary Economic, Financial and Industrial Administration] in 1924 (Lisbon: Liv. Rodrigues, 84 pages).

The Czechoslovak Republic established a consulate in Lisbon (1924-27), then an embassy (1927-37), with Miloš Kobr (1922-25), Adolf Berka (1925-27), Vlastimil Kybal (1927-36) and Robert Flieder (1936-37) as ambassadors or *chargés d'affaires* residing in Madrid (Klimek & Kubů 1995: 101). On 23 November 1927, three documents facilitating mutual diplomatic relations were signed between Portugal and Czechoslovakia (Klíma 2007a: 512).

António Ferro, later to become the head of the Propaganda Secretariat, visited an international congress of literary critics in Prague in 1930.

In 1932 Fidelino de Figueiredo (1888-1967), a Portuguese literary historian and philosopher, published *Iniciação Boémia* [Bohemian Initiation], an account of his visit to Czechoslovakia in 1929 (Coimbra: Imp. da Universidade, 66 pages).

In 1936, the military historian Henrique de Campos Ferreira Lima (1882-1949) published a monograph on relations between Portugal and Czechoslovakia entitled *Relações entre Portugal e a Tchecoslovaquia* (Lisbon: H. C. F. Lima).

An incident concerning machine-guns ordered by the Portuguese from the munitions-works of Brno (*Zbrojovka Brno*), which were stopped by the Czechoslovak government (specifically by Kamil Krofta, the then Foreign Minister) lest the weapons be used by the fascists in the Spanish Civil War, brought Czech-Portuguese relations to a standstill.

<sup>278</sup> For the Czech view of Portugal, see Klíma (2007: 510-511).

<sup>279</sup> This subchapter is, in part, based on Klíma (2007): *Dějiny Portugalska* [History of Portugal] (Prague: Lidové noviny), especially on chapter 11 'Historie česko-portugalských vztahů' [History of Czech-Portuguese Relations], pp. 497-522, but substantially enlarged by our own investigations, in particular as regards translations.



**(3) 1938-1974**, a period of virtually no contacts, save a few economic links. From 1938/39 to 1945, Czechoslovakia, castrated and split asunder, fell under the sway of Nazi Germany. Portugal beat against the wind with Salazar steering his country to and fro in order to escape the tempest of war. Towards the end of the war, *Diário de Notícias*, a daily loyal to the regime, commented on the liberation of Czechoslovakia (Klíma 2007a: 515).

Already in the Košice government programme of 1945, a decidedly leftist orientation of the future Czechoslovak government was proclaimed, thereby forestalling any official contacts with Salazar's Portugal. Salazar missed no opportunity to excoriate communism under whatever guise it might come. The entry of Portugal into NATO was the last straw, setting the two political systems implacably against each other.

The Czechoslovak conversion to communism in 1948 was widely commented on by the Portuguese press. Moreover, the Portuguese newspaper *República* serialised the memoirs of Edvard Beneš (Klíma 2007a: 515). The time was far from ripe for the reestablishment of diplomatic relations. Nonetheless, the Czechoslovak State Bank and the *Banco de Portugal* signed two agreements, on cooperation and on terms of payment, in 1956.

Mutual relations were further aggravated by the education at the Czechoslovak 'University of 17 November' (*Univerzita 17. listopadu*, 1961-74), at the International Union of Students (established in 1946 in Prague) and at the 'Foreign Faculty of Antonín Zápotocký's Military Academy' (*Zahraniční fakulta Vojenské akademie Antonína Zápotockého*) of Portuguese communists and African (Angolan, Mozambican and Guinean) nationalist opposition activists, as well as by the broadcasting of Radio Prague in Portuguese.<sup>280</sup>

For the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP), Prague became the second most important exile centre for party meetings and congresses after Moscow (Klíma 2007a: 516). For instance, Álvaro Cunhal visited the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in April 1962.

In early 1964, Dobříš near Prague hosted the second conference of the Portuguese *Frente Popular de Libertação Nacional* (Popular Front for National Liberation), led by the (defeated) opposition candidate in the 1958 presidential election, General Humberto Delgado. Following surgery for a double hernia, Delgado had to stay in the State Sanatorium in Prague until April. Here he was visited, among others, by Mário Soares, leader of the Portuguese socialists. António de Figueiredo, an active opponent of Salazar's regime and a journalist for the BBC (External Services), the *Guardian* and several British and American newspapers and magazines, wrote of Delgado's time in Prague: 'Delgado had never been more secure and comfortable than during the months he spent in the State Sanatorium in Prague' (in Klíma 2007a: 518).

The second half of the 1960s, however, was again marked by discord. Due to some 'euro-communist' opinions in the PCP, the Czechoslovak Communist Party (KSČ) did not support their Portuguese comrades as ardently as before.

---

<sup>280</sup> For relations between Czechoslovakia and Sub-Saharan Africa, including lusophone countries, see Zidek & Sieber 2007, as well as Klíma 2003a (Angola), 2003b (East Timor), and 2006 (Guinea-Bissau). From 1961, the Military Academy trained the Angolan MPLA, the Mozambican FRELIMO as well as the Guinean-Cape Verdean PAIGC.

The Prague Spring resonated strongly with the Portuguese public, resulting in a number of publications dedicated to the issue: *Dossier Checoslováquia (O que nós queremos)* [Dossier Czechoslovakia: What We Want] by Alexandr Dubček et al. (Oporto: Tipografia do Carvalhido, 1968), *Checoslováquia na hora da democratização* [Czechoslovakia at the Hour of Democratization] again by Alexandr Dubček and others (Lisbon: Dom Quixote, 1968), and even *A Tentativa checa há dez anos...* [The Czech Attempt Ten Years Ago] (Lisbon: Arcádia, 1979).

Pavel Tigríd's *A Primavera de Praga* [Prague Spring] was translated from the French original (Lisbon: Início, 1969). The Slovak writer Ladislav Mňačko's *O sabor do poder (Ako chutí moc)*, translated into English as *The Taste of Power* was translated from German (Lisbon: Bertrand, 1968), and Mňačko's *A sétima noite (Siedma noc)*, translated into English as *The Seventh Night* was translated from French (Lisbon: Ibis, 1969).

In short, the political events in and around 1968 in Czechoslovakia had a positive impact on translatorial activities into Portuguese, as they had on translations into English: 'The only golden age of translation into English for Czech writers was the late 1960s and early 1970s, following the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968' (Woods 2006: 182).

**(4) 1974-89**, the period after the Portuguese Carnation Revolution and before the Czechoslovak Velvet Revolution. As Czechoslovakia had always criticised Salazar's colonial policy, the rapid decolonisation resulting from the Portuguese Revolution of 1974 contributed positively to mutual relations. The two countries exchanged diplomatic notes in Bonn as early as 27 June 1974, whereupon their ambassadors took up their duties – António Telo Moreira de Magalhães Colaço in Prague and Miloslav Hruza in Lisbon (from 1975 onward).

On 1 March 1975, Czechoslovakia and Portugal concluded a long-term commercial treaty. On 12 June 1976, a cultural treaty between the two countries was signed.<sup>281</sup> In 1975, Presidents Gustáv Husák and Costa Gomes met in Helsinki during the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Álvaro Cunhal made further visits to Czechoslovakia in 1976 and 1978. The Revolutionary Trade Union Movement (ROH) and the Portuguese *Intersindical* established contacts.

From 1977 onwards, however, the influence of communists in Portugal gradually declined, Portugal embarked on a path leading to the European Union, and many of the Portuguese communists adopted a less doctrinaire euro-communist stance. As a result, the euphoria ebbed away. In 1982, the Czechoslovak ambassador, Ján Janík, was branded *persona non grata* for ideological interference in Portugal's internal affairs and asked to leave Portugal within five days. Czechoslovakia returned the gesture and diplomatic contacts were again broken off.

---

<sup>281</sup> *Acordo Cultural entre a República Socialista da Checoslováquia e a República Portuguesa* (Decreto n.º 691/76), published in Portugal on 20 September 1976. <http://www.instituto-camoes.pt/acordos/republica-checa.html> (retrieved on 2011-05-30).

From 1978 to 1988, Czechoslovak diplomacy turned its attention back to Africa, although this time its foreign policy lagged far behind that of the Soviet and East Germany.<sup>282</sup>

In Portugal, on the other hand, Julius Fučík's 'communist classic', *Reportagem sob a Forca* (*Reportáž psaná na oprátce*, Czech in 1947, English as *Notes from the Gallows*) was translated by Maria Teresa Cardoso and published by the communist publishing house *Avante!* (Lisbon 1975). Czech philosopher Karel Kosík's *Dialéctica do Concreto* (*Dialektika konkrétního* [Dialectics of the Concrete], Czech in 1963) was translated from Italian (Lisbon: Dinalivro, 1977). Czech émigré chess grandmaster Luděk Pachman's handbook, *Fundamentos do xadrez: aberturas, meio jogo, finais* [Chess Basics: Openings, Middlegame, Endgame] was translated from German (Lisbon: Presença 1978, 1979, 1981). Jan Mukařovský's *Escritos sobre a estética e semiótica da arte* [Writings on the Aesthetics and Semiotics of Art] was translated from Spanish (Lisbon: Estampa, 1981), etc. In a way, these books were more present on the Portuguese market than Czech fiction, as all were reprinted and republished several times.

**(5) 1989-2001**, the period of a gradual meeting of the twain. The Czechoslovak Velvet Revolution was closely observed and welcome by the Portuguese press. The Portuguese President Mário Soares (1986-96) was the first head of state to visit, in December 1989, the first post-revolutionary Czechoslovak President, Václav Havel (1989-1992). Mário Soares also prefaced the Portuguese translation of Havel's non-fiction book *Interrogatório à distância: Entrevista com Karel Hvižd'ala (Dálkový výslech – Rozhovor s Karlem Hvižd'alou*, Czech in 1986; 'Long-Distance Interrogation – an Interview with Karel Hvižd'ala') published in 1990 (Lisbon: Inquérito). The translation was made by none other than Zita Seabra, a former communist who had left the PCP at the time of the Soviet *perestroika*. This was her only translation (probably from German).

Indeed, 1990 can be considered 'the year of Czech literature in Portugal', as a total of seven books by Czech authors were translated into Portuguese (three by Havel, two by Hrabal, and one by Škvorecký). As has been shown above, the publication of translations of books by Czech authors in Portugal markedly clusters around the Czechoslovak political events of 1968/69 (Prague Spring) and 1989/90 (Velvet Revolution).

After the translation into Portuguese of a book by Ivan Klíma and another book by Václav Havel in 1991, plus a third one by Bohumil Hrabal in 1992, translations of books by Czech authors in Portugal came to an end for the remainder of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The dissolution of Czechoslovakia into two sovereign countries in 1993 seemed to extinguish any further interest on the Portuguese side until the end of the century.

---

<sup>282</sup> The Portuguese colonies in Africa all gained independence from 1974 to 1976. In the time of the Cold War, the U.S.S.R. and its satellites saw, in the emerging regimes, another opportunity to spread Marxist-Leninism. The victory of Angola's MPLA (*Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola – Partido de Trabalho*, The People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola – Labour Party), supported by the Soviet Union and its allies, looked particularly promising. Czech-Angolan relations, however, froze after the kidnapping of 66 Czechoslovak citizens in 1983 (see the above subchapter on Czechoslovak history).

Mário Soares visited the Czech Republic again in November 1994, while Václav Klaus as Prime-Minister visited Portugal in July 1995. Václav Havel, the then Czech President, bought a house in the southernmost region of Portugal, Algarve.<sup>283</sup>

### 3.4 Conclusion

Chapter 3 has been an attempt to provide a historical and political context for the present study concerning the destiny of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. To this end, the history of Czechoslovakia in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has also proved of considerable importance.

The 20<sup>th</sup> century saw the trials and tribulations of a country in Central Europe which had not existed at the start of the century and no longer existed when it ended. Established in 1918, Czechoslovakia was torn apart in 1939, resurrected in 1945, hijacked just three years later by a dictatorial regime acting on instructions from Moscow, crushed again in 1968 following an attempt to free itself from the shackles of subordination, and finally breaking free in 1989. The eventual triumph, however, was short-lived.

Portuguese culture reflected most closely the following Czechoslovak events: (a) the obliteration of the town of Lidice by the Nazis in 1942, (b) the Prague Spring and its aftermath in 1968-69, and (c) the Velvet Revolution in 1989-90. The Communist *coup d'état* in 1948 had serious repercussions for relations between the two countries in the long term, rather than immediately. The disintegration of Czechoslovakia and the emergence of two new states in Europe triggered little reaction on the Portuguese cultural scene.

In Portugal, the 20<sup>th</sup> century began, metaphorically speaking, with the establishment of the first republic in 1910. In 1926, a military *coup* put an end to the 'old republic' and a military dictatorship ensued. Soon after that, António de Oliveira Salazar took up the reins of power to relinquish them only after a fatal accident in 1968.

In 1933 military rule formally ended with the coming into effect of the 'Political Constitution of the Portuguese Republic', drafted by a group of lawyers led by Salazar himself. Thus was promulgated the so-called *Estado Novo* (or 'New State'), which was to last 41 years until the Carnation Revolution of 25 April 1974.

Following almost two years of doubt and disorientation, Portugal finally settled on a course leading to pluralist democracy and its admission to the European Union in 1986. A period of growth, peace and democracy ensued, marred only by the recent economic downturn of the late-2000s.

Censorship restricted Portuguese cultural life for most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. An essential part of the Portuguese *New State*, censorship in its most virulent form took effect in 1933 and remained in place until 1974. It had two main modes: preventive, i.e. pre-publication, and repressive, i.e. post-publication. Preventive censorship focused

---

<sup>283</sup> The Czech academic yearbook dedicated to issues regarding Spain, Portugal and Latin America has for long been the *Ibero-Americana Pragensia*, founded along with the Centre for Ibero-American Studies in 1967, of which an issue in Portuguese appears approximately every ten years. Cf. <http://sias.ff.cuni.cz/en/welcome.php> (retrieved on 2011-05-30). See also Špirk 2009b.

primarily on the press and the media, whereas books in the overwhelming majority of cases were subjected to repressive censorship. The censors, mostly military officials, passed decisions as to the effect of banning a book, authorising it, or authorising it with cuts. The issues and areas most targeted by the Portuguese censors included dissenting political ideologies, anti-colonialism and anti-militarism, anti-clericalism and offences against religion, eroticism and sexuality.

Diplomatic relations between the Portuguese Republic and the Czechoslovak Republic were established in 1920, only to be severed seventeen years later, before they could reach maturity. The disagreement between Salazar and the Czechoslovak government centred around the exportation of weapons from Czechoslovakia to Portugal, which the Czechoslovak government suspended for fear they might be used by the Falangists in the Spanish Civil War.

Diplomatic relations were reinstated in 1974 after the Portuguese Carnation Revolution, but broken off again in 1982 over political differences. Only after the Velvet Revolution of 17 November 1989 could official relations be established again, this time in a cordial and benevolent political climate in both countries.

## XI. Chapter 4: Czech Literature in Portugal

La nation tchèque n'est pas née (plusieurs fois née) grâce à ses conquêtes militaires, mais toujours grâce à sa littérature. Et je ne parle pas de la littérature en tant qu'arme politique. Je parle de la littérature en tant que littérature. Milan Kundera (*Une rencontre*, 2009: 142, Paris: Gallimard)<sup>284</sup>

Chapter 4 is dedicated to Czech Literature in Portugal, both translated and non-translated, and forms the centrepiece of the present thesis. It consists of the following sections: censorship files (reports) concerning works either originally written in Czech or Slovak or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia reveal what was *not* translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal; a list of works originally written in Czech or Slovak or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia, divided into fiction, 'special cases' and non-fiction is followed by a thorough discussion and analysis. Chapter 4 concludes with a contrastive micro-textual analysis of the original of a Czech canonical novel and its *indirect* Portuguese translation, considering also the mediating text.

### 4.1 Non-Translation

Logically as well as chronologically, translation from Czech into Portuguese is preceded by *non-translation*, both in general (since the ban on the works of Jan Hus by the Portuguese Inquisition) and in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Research for this subchapter started with the authoritative publication *Livros proibidos no regime fascista* (1981, 'Books Banned by the Fascist Regime'). Research then continued at the *Biblioteca/Museu República e Resistência* ('Library/Museum of the Republic and Resistance') and finally in the National Archives in Lisbon (IANTT, *Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais – Torre do Tombo*, also 'National Cartulary'). It was there that the most valuable pieces of information were found, confirming and specifying previous data.

#### 4.1.1 List of Censored Books

The following is a chronological list of 33 books mentioned in the 32 available *censorship files* concerning books either originally written in Czech or Slovak or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia.<sup>285</sup>

1. ERDÉLY, Eugene (Evžen) V. *Prague Braves the Hangman*. London: The Czechoslovak (1942). English.  
Censorship File No.: 1939/1942 (**banned**)

<sup>284</sup> 'The Czech nation was born (several different times born) not because of its military conquests but because of its literature. And I don't mean literature as a political weapon. I mean literature as literature.' Kundera (*Encounter*, 2010: 121, London: Faber and Faber). Translated from the French by Linda Asher.

<sup>285</sup> Every effort has been made to find as much information as possible about these books by consulting UNESCO's *Index Translationum*, WorldCat ([www.worldcat.org](http://www.worldcat.org)), Czech Literature Abroad (<http://www.czechlit.cz/bibliografie/>), the Czech National Library and the Portuguese National Library (PORBASE). Where data are missing, it has been impossible to find them.

2. LECHNER, O. *As We Saw it in Prague: Twelve Discussions and a Letter, 1933 to 1939*. London: G. Allen & Unwin (1942, reprinted in 1943). English.  
Censorship File No.: 2292/1943 (**banned**)
  
3. *Two Years of German Oppression in Czechoslovakia*. London: Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Information (1941). English.  
Censorship File No.: 2296/1943 (**banned**)
  
4. NĚMEC, František. *From Social Welfare to Social Justice*. London: Lincolns-Prager (1943). English.  
Censorship File No.: 2322/1943 (**banned**), submitted by P.V.D.E.
  
5. HODŽA, Milan.<sup>286</sup> *Federation in Central Europe: Reflections and Reminiscences*. London, New York, Melbourne: Jarrold (1942). English.  
Censorship File No.: 2356/1943 (authorised)
  
6. HAŠEK, Jaroslav. *Die Abenteuer des braven Soldaten Schwejk* [The Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk]. Graz: Österreichischer Volksverlag (1947).<sup>287</sup> German.  
Translated by Grete Reiner.  
Censorship File No.: 4481/1950 (**banned**), submitted by C.T.T.
  
7. *Il piano economico quinquennale cecoslovacco* [The Czechoslovak Five-Year Economic Plan]. Prague: Ministero delle Informazioni e dell'Educazioni Popolare (s.d.). Italian. Translated by Giuseppe Avitabile.  
Censorship File No.: 4532/1951, Oporto (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E. (Oporto)
  
8. ŠTOLL, Ladislav. *Face à la réalité: discours sur l'art* [Facing Reality: Discourse on Art]. French subtitle: (*Face à la réalité: Les problèmes que pose la création artistique en Tchécoslovaquie: Discours du 10 avril 1948 au Congrès National de la Culture* [Facing Reality: Problems of Artistic Creation in Czechoslovakia: Discourse at the National Congress of Culture on 10 April 1948]). Prague: Orbis (1949). French. Revised by Alexis Louis Castan.  
Censorship File No.: 4533/1951, Oporto (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E. (Oporto)
  
9. *Czechoslovaquia* [Czechoslovakia]<sup>288</sup>. Prague: Orbis. Spanish.<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>286</sup> Milan Hodža (1878-1944) was a Slovak politician and the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia from 1935 to 1938.

<sup>287</sup> Of all available sources, only WorldCat mentions the publication of 'The Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk' (*Die Abenteuer des braven Soldaten Schwejk*) by the Österreichischer Volksverlag in Graz in 1947, specifically Volume 1 in the translation of Grete Reiner. The same publisher issued Volumes I and II of *Švejk* in Reiner's translation in 1951 (NK Klementinum), a year after the first volume in German had been banned by Portuguese censors. Hartmann (2009: 168) speaks of both volumes having been published in Graz in 1947, but fails to identify his source.

<sup>288</sup> In Spanish, 'Czechoslovakia' is *Checoslovaquia*. In modern European Portuguese, it is *Checoslováquia*; in Brazilian Portuguese *Tchecoslováquia*. The modern European Portuguese spelling seems to have stabilised only recently. Armando Luís Rodrigues (1924) used *Tcheco-Slovaquia*, Henrique de Campos Ferreira Lima (1936) used *Tcheco-slovaquia* (see above, subchapter 3.3). Since the censorship file spells CHECOSLOVAQUIA in capital letters, i.e. not necessarily respecting the acute accent (â), it could possibly be Portuguese. However, the only booklet in Portuguese appearing at Orbis before 1951 is *A Tchecoslováquia* (1935), i.e. in the (modern) Brazilian spelling. There is, moreover, no evidence that the book ever arrived in Portugal (PORBASE). The language of the above book is therefore most likely to be Spanish.

Censorship File No.: 4534/1951, Oporto (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E. (Oporto)

10. *La juventud checoslovaca* [Czechoslovak Youth]. Prague: Comité Central de la Juventud Checoslovaca (1947). Spanish.

Censorship File No.: 4535/1951, Oporto (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E. (Oporto)

11. MALÍK, Jan. *Puppetry in Czechoslovakia*. Prague: Orbis (1948). English. Translated by B. Doldreich.

Censorship File No.: 4559/1951, Oporto (authorised), submitted by P.I.D.E. (Oporto)

12. *Seguro nacional Checoslovaco: Contribución al sistema de seguridad social / Ley sobre el seguro nacional Checoslovaco con una introducción de Evžen Erban* [Czechoslovak National Insurance: Contribution to the System of Social Security / the Act on Czechoslovak National Insurance with an Introduction by Evžen Erban]. Prague: Orbis (1949). Spanish. Translated by Rosa Vilas.

Censorship File No.: 4571/1951, Oporto (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E. (Oporto)

13. FUČÍK, Julius. *Reportaje al pie del patibulo* [Report from under the Gallows]. Buenos Aires: Lautaro (1950, 1951). Spanish. Translated by Bárbara Vilches.

Censorship File No.: 4738/1952 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.

14. TRINKA, Zdena (Irma). *Uma pequena aldeia chamada Lidice*. Lisbon (s.n., 1947). Book series (*coleção*): Claridade. **Portuguese**. No translator mentioned. The English original: *A Little Village Called Lidice: Story of the Return of the Women and Children of Lidice* (Lidgerwood, North Dakota, USA: International Book Publishers, Western Office, 1947).

Censorship File No.: 4867/1953 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E., contains reference to ‘Censorship File No. 4233/1949’ (authorising the above book), but the latter is missing from the Portuguese National Archives.

15. GOTTWALD, Klement. *La Cecoslovacchia verso il socialismo* [Czechoslovakia towards Socialism]. Rome: Rinascita (1952). Italian. Translated by Bruno Meriggi.<sup>290</sup> First published in 1949 (Rome: U.E.S.I.S.A.) as *La Cecoslovacchia verso il socialismo: rapporto al IX congresso de Partito Comunista Cecoslovacco (Prague, 25 maggio 1949)* [Report to the 9th Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party (Prague, 25 May 1949)].

Censorship File No.: 4906/1953 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.

---

<sup>289</sup> Three booklets were produced by the Prague publishing house Orbis before 1951 with the simple title of ‘Czechoslovakia’ in Spanish. The first two (1930, 1933), prefaced by Karel Čapek, were ‘adapted’ and translated by Rudolf Jan Slabý, a prominent translator from and into Spanish. According to the Czech Translators’ Guild (see link below), the brochure was also published in Madrid in 1933. The last brochure (1947) contains no data about the author or translator, and is much shorter (39 pages as compared with the 96 pages of the previous two). All three publications are classified as ‘archive copies’ in the Czech National Library (NK Klementinum) and are hence unavailable. For R. J. Slabý, cf. <http://www.obecprekladatelů.cz/ftp/DUP/S/SlabyRudolfJan.htm> (retrieved on 2011-07-03).

<sup>290</sup> Bruno Meriggi (1927-70) was a prominent Italian translator from Slavic cultures (Czech, Polish, Slovene, etc.). He translated, among other works, Jaroslav Hašek’s *The Good Soldier Švejk* (*Il buon soldato Sc’èik*) and Karel Čapek’s *The War with the Newts* (*La Guerra delle salamandre*) into Italian. His theoretical works include *Le letterature ceca e slovacca con un profilo della letteratura serbo-lusaziana* [Czech and Slovak Literature, with a Profile of Sorbian (Wendish) Literature] (1968).



16. HOSTOVSKÝ, Egon. *O incendiário*. Lisbon: Portugália (1953). **Portuguese**. Translated by João Cabral do Nascimento.<sup>291</sup> The original (Czech) title: *Žhář* (1935, 'The Arsonist').  
Censorship File No.: 5088/1953 (authorised), submitted by P.I.D.E.
17. KOŽÍK, František. *Emile Zátpek*. Prague: Artia (1954). French.<sup>292</sup>  
Censorship File No.: 5505/1955 (**banned**)
18. OLBRACHT, Ivan. *Nikola Šuhaj, Robber*. Prague: Artia (1954). English. Translated by Roberta Finlayson-Samsour (Czech: *Nikola Šuhaj loupežník*, 1933).  
Censorship File No.: 5839/1957 (**banned**), submitted by C.T.T.
19. MAJEROVÁ, Marie. *The Siren*. Prague: Artia (1953). English. Translated by Iris Urwin (Czech: *Siréna*, 1935).  
Censorship File No.: 5840/1957 (**banned**), submitted by C.T.T.
20. KRÁL, Karel. *Checoslovaquia: país del trabajo y de la paz* [Czechoslovakia: Country of Work and Peace]. Edición ROH (Prague: Práce, 1953, 1954). Spanish.  
Censorship File No.: 5847/1957 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.
21. *Anthologie de la poésie tchèque* [Anthology of Czech Poetry]. Paris: Kra (1930). French. Compiled and translated by Hanuš Jelínek.<sup>293</sup>  
Censorship File No.: 6529/1960 (authorised), submitted by P.I.D.E.
22. FUČÍKOVÁ, Gusta. *Julius Fučík*. Prague: Orbis (1955). Language unknown.<sup>294</sup>  
Censorship File No.: 6762/1960 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.
23. PEROUTKA, Ferdinand. *Manifesto Democrático* [Democratic Manifesto]. Belo Horizonte (Brazil): Editora Italiana Limitada (1960). **Portuguese**. Translated by Neil R. da Silva.  
Censorship File No.: 6772/1960 (authorised), submitted by P.I.D.E.

---

<sup>291</sup> João Cabral do Nascimento (1897-1978) was a writer in his own right (influenced by symbolism) and a translator from English (e.g. D. H. Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*, Portuguese in 1943) and French (e.g. Anatole France's *Les Dieux ont soif*, 1970). Hostovský's *Žhář* (1935) was not translated into English until 1996 by Christopher Morris as *The Arsonist* (Prague: Twisted Spoon Press; Paris: UNESCO Publishing). The French translation by Michel-Léon Hirsch was published in 1947 as *L'incendiare* (Paris: Éditions Stock Delmain et Boutellau). Cabral do Nascimento must, consequently, have translated this particular book from the French.

<sup>292</sup> Here, the Czech original is disputable. It was either 'Emile Zátpek', adapted for the French by Arthur Hartmann & G. D. Zimmermann, 1954 (Prague: Artia & Genève: La Librairie Nouvelle); or 'Emile Zátpek en photographies', translated by Fernande Rosenbaum, 1954 (Prague: Artia). The former appears more likely as the file refers to the book simply as 'Emile Zátpek'.

<sup>293</sup> Hanuš Jelínek (1878-1944) was a Czech poet and translator who promoted Czech literature in France, among other works, by his *Histoire de la littérature tchèque* (1930, 1933, 1935), and by his translations of Jan Neruda, Karel Hynek Mácha, Karel Čapek (*R.U.R., Rossum's Universal Robots*, 1924), etc.

<sup>294</sup> The book appeared in this publishing house in the same year in English, German, French, Spanish, Italian and Russian. The file does not mention the language. Consequently, as we cannot be sure, the language of this book must be regarded as 'unknown'. It is, however, important to note that the language was not Portuguese.

24. VESELÝ, Jindřich.<sup>295</sup> *Prague 1948*. Paris: Éditions Sociales (1958). French subtitle: *Chronique des journées de Février 1948* [Chronicle of the Days of February 1948]. Czech (original) title: *Kronika únorových dní 1948* (Prague: SNPL, 1958). Censorship File No.: 7024/1962 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.
25. KAVKA, František. *Panorama della storia cecoslovacca* [Panorama of Czechoslovak History]. Prague: Orbis (1960). Italian. Translated by Jelka Šetlíková. Censorship File No.: 7857/1966 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.
26. KUŽEL, Dušan, BLAŽKOVÁ, Jaroslava, HRABAL, Bohumil, VYSKOČIL, Ivan, ŠKVORECKÝ, Josef, VONDRA, Vladimír, BALGHA, Peter.<sup>296</sup> *Sette racconti per i giorni feriali* [Seven Stories for Weekdays]. Prague: Orbis (1966). Italian. Translated by Luciano Antonetti and Giorgio Gandini. Censorship File No.: 7858/1966 (**banned**), submitted by P.I.D.E.
27. ČAPEK, Karel. *A guerra das salamandras* [War with the Newts]. Lisbon: Livros do Brasil (1965). **Portuguese**. Translated by Lima de Freitas. Censorship File No.: 8059/1967 (authorised); contains reference to Censorship File No. 7689/1966;
28. DUBČEK, Alexander, VACULÍK, Ludvík, TATU, Michel, et al.<sup>297</sup> *Checoslováquia na hora da democratização* [Czechoslovakia at the Moment of Democratisation]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote (1968). **Portuguese**. Translated by Augusto Fitas et al. Book series: *Cadernos Dom Quixote no. 8* [Don Quixote Notebooks]. Censorship File No.: 8321/1969 (authorised), submitted by P.I.D.E.
29. LÖBL (Loebl), Eugen. *Procès à Prague: Un survivant du procès Slánský parle* [Trial in Prague: A Survivor of the Slánský Trial Speaks]. Paris: Stock (1964). French. Original Slovak title: *Svedectvo o procese* [Testimony of a Trial]. Translated by Amber Bousoglou.<sup>298</sup> Censorship File No.: 8551/1969 (authorised), submitted by P.I.D.E.
30. DUBČEK, Alexander, CASTRO, Fidel, GARAUDY, Roger, et al.<sup>299</sup> *Dossier Checoslováquia (O que nós queremos)* [File Czechoslovakia (What We Want)]. Oporto: Isabel do Carmo (Tipografia do Carvalhido, 1968). **Portuguese**. Edited and translated by Isabel do Carmo.<sup>300</sup>

<sup>295</sup> Jindřich Veselý (1906-64) was the author of several communist propaganda publications.

<sup>296</sup> The stories in this book are truly Czechoslovak: Bohumil Hrabal, Ivan Vyskočil, Josef Škvorecký and Vladimír Vondra are Czech; Dušan Kužel, Jaroslava Blažková and Peter Balgha are Slovak.

<sup>297</sup> Ludvík Vaculík (\*1926) is a prominent Czech writer. Michel Tatu (\*1933) is a French journalist. Other authors are not provided. The source language for the translation is not known; nor are the translators – the book is likely to be a compilation from various sources.

<sup>298</sup> Amber Bousoglou was a French journalist. The book remained in Portugal and can now be consulted at the *Mário Soares Foundation (Fundação Mário Soares)* in Lisbon.

<sup>299</sup> The book is likely to be a compilation from various sources with several source languages. Fidel Castro's speech evaluating the events in Czechoslovakia after 1968 would be originally in Spanish. Two extracts from Roger Garaudy's (\*1913) *La liberté en sursis, Prague 1968* [Freedom Adjourned, Prague 1968] (Paris: Fayard, 1968) were originally written in French. The source language for the rest of the book is not clear – see the censorship file analysed below.

<sup>300</sup> Isabel do Carmo (\*1940) is an endocrinologist, who, for a time, led the *Partido Revolucionário do Proletariado* ('Revolutionary Party of the Proletariat', 1973-76), a communist party inspired by Che

Censorship File No.: 9020/1971 (**banned**), submitted by D.G.S. (probably Oporto)

31. HAŠEK, Jaroslav. *O valente soldado Chveik* [The ‘Brave’ Soldier Chveik]. Mem Martins: Europa-América (1971). **Portuguese**. Translated by Alexandre Cabral. Censorship File No.: 9100/1971 (authorised), submitted by the publisher (Europa-América)

32. KOCOUREK, Rostislav. *Lidice*. Prague: Orbis (1972). Language unknown (not Portuguese).<sup>301</sup> Censorship File No.: 8077/1973 (authorised), submitted by D.G.S.

33. VODINSKÝ, Stanislav. *Checoslováquia: Instrucción y Educación* [Czechoslovakia: Schooling and Education]. Prague: Orbis (1961 or 1963). Spanish. Translated by Santiago García. Censorship File No.: 8077/1973 (authorised), submitted by D.G.S.

There are several observations to be made concerning this list. First and foremost, it is a list of books apprehended, evaluated and, for the most part, banned under the *Estado Novo*. They are, only to a limited extent, representative of the awareness and reception of Czechoslovakia in Portugal. Books about Czechoslovakia published in European Portuguese in Portugal appeared long before 1942: cf. Armando Luís Rodrigues (1924), Fidelino de Figueiredo (1932), and Henrique de Campos Ferreira Lima (1936) above (Chapter 3).

The list is probably not quite complete. *Livros proibidos no regime fascista* (1981) mentions two more publications for which no censorship files could be found:

BRAIBANT, Guy. *La planification en Tchecoslovaquie: Le Plan biennal* [Planning in Czechoslovakia: The Two-Year Plan]. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin (1948). French. (**banned** in 1949)

*Konstitucio de Ĉeĥoslovaka Respubliko: Proklamita 9 junio 1948 sub la nr-o 150 en la kolekto de leĝoj kaj dekretoj de Ĉeĥoslovaka Respubliko* [Constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic: Promulgated on 9 June 1948 under No. 150 in the Collection of Laws of the Czechoslovak Republic]. Translated from Czech into Esperanto by Jaroslav Mařík. Prague: Instituto de Esperanto-Servo (1948). (**banned** in 1950)

The censorship files themselves (see Appendix) refer to two more publications authorised by the Portuguese censorship, but neither censorship file could be found in the National Cartulary:

---

Guevara, and published its journal *Revolução* (Revolution). She has translated books from French and English.

<sup>301</sup> The book appeared at Orbis in the same year (1972) in Czech, English, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Russian and Swedish. Since books no. 32 and 33 were jointly submitted to the censorship board by the D.G.S. (‘political police’) and treated in one and the same censorship file (8077/1973), Kocourek’s *Lidice* is likely to have arrived in Spanish (translated by Fernando Tinajero). The file, however, does not tell us. Consequently, as we cannot be sure, the language of this book must be treated as ‘unknown’. It is, however, important to note that the language was not Portuguese.

*Le Cercle de Prague: Mathesius, Jakobson, Mukařovský, Troubetzkoy, Havránek, Polivanov, Brik, Chklovski, Majakovski, Meyerhold, Tatline pour la Révolution* [The Prague Circle: Mathesius, Jakobson, Mukařovský, Trubetskoy, Havránek, Polivanov, Brik, Shklovsky, Mayakovsky, Meyerhold, Tatlin for the Revolution]. Paris: Seuil (1968). French. Presented by Jean Pierre Faye, translated by Léon Robel.<sup>302</sup>

Censorship File No.: 8597/1969 (authorised in 1969).

DAIX, Pierre. *Journal de Prague: Décembre 1967 – Septembre 1968* [Prague Journal: December 1967 – September 1968]. Paris: Julliard (1968). French. (authorised in 1969, according to file no. 8551/1969).

Moreover, Zdena Trinká's *Uma pequena aldeia chamada Lidice* seems to have been authorised in 1949 (file 4233) only to be banned in 1953 (file 4867). The earlier censorship file, however, is missing from the Portuguese National Archives. The booklet appears to have been published in Lisbon in 1947, but neither the publisher nor the translator are mentioned.<sup>303</sup>

More importantly, Karel Čapek's *A guerra das salamandras* [War with the Newts] appears to have been banned in 1966 (file 7689), but subsequently authorised in 1967 (file 8059). The earlier censorship file, however, is also missing from the Portuguese National Archives.

As a result, no fewer than 37 books translated from Czech, Slovak or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia appear to have been censored in Portugal. Although incomplete, the above list of censored books is nonetheless representative. The missing items are likely to be very few in number (cf. Seruya 2010: 131, quoted above).

Of the 33 books for which the censorship files were found, only 12 were authorised; the rest (63.63 %) were banned. Most files concern political propaganda or non-fiction, with only 8 (24.24 %) constituting fiction (6 novels, 1 collection of poems, 1 collection of stories). 29 books (87.87 %) are translations. The languages represented, correlated with the provenance of the books, are as follows:

1. English: 8 books; 4 translations; the originals are from London, the translations are all from Prague;
2. Portuguese: 7 books; 7 translations; 4 from Lisbon, 1 from Mem Martins (near Sintra, district of Great Lisbon), 1 from Oporto, and 1 from Belo Horizonte (Brazil);
3. Spanish: 6 books; 6 translations; 5 from Prague, 1 from Buenos Aires (Argentina);
4. French: 5 books; 5 translations; 3 from Paris, 2 from Prague;
5. Italian: 4 books; 4 translations; 3 from Prague, 1 from Rome;
6. German: 1 book; 1 translation; 1 from Graz (Austria);
7. No data: 2 books; 2 translations; 2 from Prague.

English leads in the number of titles (8), but is on a par with Italian as regards translations (4). As far as *translations* are concerned, Spanish (6) is closely followed by

<sup>302</sup> Jean-Pierre Faye (\*1925) is a French writer, poet and philosopher, Léon Robel is a French translator from Russian.

<sup>303</sup> Zdena Irma Trinká was born in Bohemia in 1888, but her family emigrated to the United States in 1893. The book was originally written in English.

French (5). If Kocourek's *Lidice* (1972) was indeed written in Spanish, the dominance of Spanish would be even clearer. The French books for which no censorship files could be located are all from Paris, but only one is likely to be a translation (*Le Cercle de Prague*, 1969) – possibly from various languages.

Overall, books arriving in Germanic languages (English and German) were authorised in 22.22 % of cases (2 out of 9), while those in Romance languages (Spanish, French and Italian), excluding Portuguese, were authorised in 20 % of cases (3 out of 12). In the case of *fiction*, however, books in Germanic languages (3) were always banned, while books in Romance languages had a 50 % chance of being authorised: the anthology of Czech poetry in French was authorised, the collection of Czech and Slovak stories in Italian was banned. Once submitted to the Portuguese censorship board, the book had the highest chances of being authorised if it had already been translated into Portuguese, both in general (5 out of 7 books, 71.43 %) and especially as regards *fiction* (3 out of 3, i.e. 100 %).

Regarding the books' provenance, it is perhaps surprising to note that as many as 16 books (48.48 %) found their way to Portugal (6 of them to Oporto) from Prague, followed by London (5) and Paris (4). It is equally interesting to realise that none of the Spanish translations was actually made in Spain, none of the books in English arrived from the United States of America, and the only book in German (*Švejk*) came from Austria.

**Table 6: Representation of Original Languages of Censored Books in Proportion to Translations, Fiction and Provenance**

	originals	translations	fiction	from Prague	from elsewhere
English	4	4	2	4	4
<b>Portuguese</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>
Spanish	0	6	0	5	1
French	0	5	1	2	3
Italian	0	4	1	3	1
German	0	1	1	0	1
No data	0	2	0	2	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>

Evaluating censorial activities throughout the *Estado Novo*, Seruya (2010: 139-140) arrives at a figure of 'about 3550 titles banned [...] out of a total of 10,011 reports issued by the Censoring Commission'. If these data are correct and complete, Czech literature and issues concerning Czechoslovakia, taken together, appear to have been particularly affected by the Portuguese censorship. While the overall average of authorised books was 64.54 %, only 36.36 % of books relating to Czechoslovakia were allowed to circulate in Portugal.

As regards *fiction*, the percentage is rather friendlier: 50 %. The anthology of Czech poetry in French and the three Czech novels in Portuguese (by Hašek, Hostovský and Čapek) were all authorised, whereas the collection of Czech and Slovak short stories in Italian, *Švejk* (Schwejk) in German, and Olbracht (*Nikola Šuhaj Robber*) and Majerová (*The Siren*) in English were all banned.

All of the above might seem to imply that while the Czechs and Slovaks were eager to present their country in English, German, French, Spanish and Italian, there were no translations from Czech into Portuguese made in Czechoslovakia. That is far from true.

As early as 1932, *O Sokol Tchecoslovaco* [The Czechoslovak Sokol], a booklet produced by the Czechoslovak Sports Association *Sokol* ('Falcon'), was published in Portuguese in Prague (no translator mentioned). *A Tchecoslováquia* [Czechoslovakia], prefaced by Karel Čapek, appeared at Orbis in 1935 (no translator mentioned).<sup>304</sup>

Propagandistic translations from Czech into Portuguese made in Czechoslovakia began in 1960 with *Checoslováquia em cifras* [Czechoslovakia in Numbers]. The real boom came in 1978 with *Lições da evolução da crise no partido e na sociedade depois do 13º Congresso do Partido Comunista da Checoslováquia* [Lessons from the Evolution of the Crisis in the Party and Society after the 13<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia].

The publication of agitprop pamphlets, amounting to more than 70 (15 in the 1960s, 11 in the 1970s, and over 50 in the 1980s), ended only in 1988 with *CAME: um novo tipo de relações económicas internacionais* [Comecon: a New Kind of International Economic Relations]. The overwhelming majority of these booklets appeared in the Prague publishing house Orbis.

The fact that this major translational effort in Czechoslovakia began only in 1978 and the fact that they seem never to have arrived in Portugal (PORBASE) confirm our assumption that they were destined not for Portugal, but for other Portuguese-speaking countries (notably in Africa).

What is perhaps most interesting about these books, which were tailor-made for the Czechoslovak Communist Party (KSC), is that in many instances they omit any information about the authors. In view of the practices applied by the KSC to Czech and Slovak translators, it comes as a surprise that the translators are hardly ever missing in these cases – an atypical transparency for that period. This appears to be of particular relevance to Translation Studies – the authors being, in these instances, less relevant (or were they?) than the translators.<sup>305</sup>

Returning to the above list of censorship files and looking at their dates, everything seems to indicate that the first book concerning Czechoslovakia was apprehended and banned by the Portuguese authorities in 1942, amid the oppressive atmosphere of the Second World War, and the last in 1971, three years before the Carnation Revolution, spanning almost 30 years of the Portuguese dictatorship.

The first five books appear to have been originally written in English. The first *translation* thus dates from 1950 and is none other than J. Hašek's *Švejk* in German (banned). The last *translation of fiction* is *Švejk* again, this time (1971) translated into Portuguese and authorised to circulate in Portugal in the Portuguese translation of

<sup>304</sup> *A Tchecoslováquia* is the Portuguese translation of the same publication translated into Spanish by R. J. Slabý in 1930 and reprinted in 1933 (see above).

<sup>305</sup> The actual historical situation suggests that the reasons may well have been political. The author of the book was often 'the Party', i.e. a Party-approved committee or group of authors. The translators' names were retained in order to make them more easily responsible.

Alexandre Cabral. *Švejk* is followed by only two more propagandistic publications, assessed together and authorised to circulate in 1973.

The Portuguese censors seem to have been most systematic in weeding out books concerning Czechoslovakia in 1951, when the Oporto mission/delegation banned 5 books out of 6 (83.33 %). Other bad years for the reception of Czechoslovakia-related books in Portugal were 1943 (3 out of 4 banned), 1953 and 1957 (3 out of 3 banned in each year). The most lenient years, on the other hand, were 1960 (2 out of 3 books authorised), 1969 and 1973 (2 out of 2 authorised in each year).

When a book concerning Czechoslovakia arrived at the censorship board in Oporto, it had a 14.29 % chance of being authorised (1 out of 7 books). In Lisbon, the chances were markedly higher: 34.62 % (9 out of 17 books).

Most censorship files contain no information about where the books were evaluated. Only files concerning books no. 7-16 (above) state explicitly: *Comissão do Porto* (Oporto Censorship Board). Isabel do Carmo's *Dossier Checoslováquia* (1968) is likely to have been evaluated in Oporto, but the file provides no information (see Appendix). From what we know, however, it seems that all remaining books were assessed in Lisbon. No book of Czech authorship or about Czechoslovakia seems to have been submitted to the third most important censorship board in Portugal, that of Coimbra.

**Table 7: Books Banned and Authorised by the Censorship Boards in Lisbon and Oporto, by Year**

Year	B in LX	A in LX	B in OP	A in OP
1942	1			
1943	3	1		
1950	1			
<b>1951</b>			<b>5</b>	1
1952	1			
1953	3			
1955	1			
1957	3			
1960	1	2		
1962	1			
1966	2			
1967		1		
1969		2		
1971		1	1	
1973		2		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>

Key: A – authorised, B – banned, LX – Lisbon, OP – Oporto

Regarding the *proveniência* (literally: ‘provenance’), i.e. the institutions which submitted the books to the censorship boards, the statistics are as follows:

- the ‘political police’ – 23 books, more specifically: PVDE – 1 book (Němec 1943), P.I.D.E. – 19 books, D.G.S. – 3 books;
- the post office (C.T.T.) – 3 books;
- the publisher – 1 book (Hašek's *Švejk*, Europa-América, 1971);
- no data – 6 books.

To conclude, it should be noted that the corpus of censorship files regarding Czechoslovakia exhibits no instance of a book ‘authorised with cuts’. Books coming from or concerning Czechoslovakia were clearly evaluated as either too pernicious (in most cases) or completely harmless (in 10 instances out of 33, i.e. 30.30 %).<sup>306</sup>

To give a complete picture, all of the 32 available censorship files are included in the Appendix. Below, we analyse a selection of the most relevant censorship files, paying special attention to the Portuguese translations. A separate subchapter (4.3) is devoted to Jaroslav Hašek’s *The Good Soldier Švejk*.

#### 4.1.2 Analysis of the Censorship Files

The first and the last censorship files are not representative of the corpus. The first three files contain no reference to the institution that submitted the books to the censorship board for evaluation. The last two books (32-33) are dealt with together in a file numbered 8077, which takes the form of a letter (see Appendix).

To introduce the layout and structure of the censorship files, Censorship File No. 4534, concerning book no. 9 in the above list, can serve as an example. It is typical in that it displays the fields used in most files as well as the censor’s negligence as to filling them in. The file contains the following fields:

1. *Despacho em* (dispatched on): 19 January 1951;
2. *Distribuído para leitura em* (submitted to the ‘reading’ on): 19 January 1951;
3. *Recebido em* (received on): ... (day) / ... (month) / 95... (not filled in),  
the number ‘95...’ stood for the year, i.e. 195x;
4. *Relatório N.º* (report number): 4534;
5. *Autor* (Author): ... (not filled in);
6. *Tradutor* (Translator): ... (not filled in);
7. *Editor* (Publisher): ... (not filled in);
8. *Proveniência* (‘Provenance’, i.e. which institution or individual submitted the book to the censorship board):  
*PIDE – Porto (pela Comissão do Porto)*, i.e. the ‘political police’ (P.I.D.E.) of Oporto (to the Oporto [Censorship] Board);
9. Title of the book (no designation of the field in Portuguese), underlined, in inverted commas and usually in capital letters: “*CHECOSLOVAQUIA*”;
10. Summary of the book and reasons for its ban or authorisation (no designation in Portuguese):  
‘It is a leaflet of tourist propaganda, but all impregnated with the spirit of the Russian revolution. To me it seems pernicious reading, unsuitable on this side of the “Iron Curtain”.’<sup>307</sup>

<sup>306</sup> This plethora of statistics is not autotelic. Despite the relatively small size of our corpus, the statistical data beg to be compared with the results of the other researchers of the Lisbon Group, and possibly with the data of other translation scholars investigating the impact of censorship upon translations.

<sup>307</sup> For the original Portuguese, see Appendix.



The censorship file is usually followed by the censor's name in capital letters and his handwritten signature.<sup>308</sup> In this case, it says only: *Comissão do Porto* (Oporto Censorship Board).

After the first censor's evaluation, another censor, usually his superior, would take the final decision, writing either *proibido* or *autorizado* (banned or authorised)<sup>309</sup>, and initial the report in his handwriting, sometimes adding comments.

Finally, the report would receive the censorship board's official stamp, carrying the following information: Line 1 – *Direcção dos Serviços de Censura* ('Censorship Services Directorate'), Line 2 – *PROIBIDO* (banned) or *AUTORIZADO* (authorised). Finally, the censorship report was filed and appropriate action taken.

In the case of the above censorship file, the decision of the second censor concurred with the first censor's recommendation: he wrote *proibido* and initialled the report, which was subsequently confirmed by the official stamp.

Sometimes, when the book was read by the Director, Sub-Director or Assistant Director (*Director Adjunto*), the 'argumentation' could be highly 'efficient'. To illustrate, let us look at file no. 4738 of 1952 concerning book no. 13 of the list above.

Dispatched on: 11 August 1952

Submitted to reading on: 11 August 1952

Received on: 11 August 1952

Report No.: 4783

Author: Julius Fucik (i.e. Julius Fučík)

Translator: *not filled in*

Publisher: Editorial Lautaro – Buenos Aires

Provenance: P.I.D.E.

Title of the book: *Reportaje al pie del patibulo* [literally: Report from under the Gallows, in English known as 'Notes from the Gallows']

Substantiation/argumentation:

'Anti-social.

Exaltation of a prisoner who suffers and goes unjustly to the gallows.

Banned.'

Read by: Sub-Director, José da Silva Dias, Cap.

In most cases, the censor's name is followed by his military rank. Here, Cap. stands for *Capitão* ('Captain'). Most censors were either Captains or Majors in the Portuguese Army (*Exército*).<sup>310</sup>

<sup>308</sup> Unlike Seruya and Moniz (2008: 7), we have decided not to suppress the censors' names. As invaluable pieces of documentary evidence, the censorship reports are attached as part of the Appendix of the present thesis.

<sup>309</sup> Being historical documents, the reports exhibit an older spelling of some words, e.g. *proibido* – today: *proibido* (banned), *éste* – today: *este* (this), *sôbre* – today: *sobre* (about), etc.

<sup>310</sup> Cf. CENTENO, João. 'Portuguese Army Ranks and their British Equivalents'. [http://www.napoleon-series.org/military/organization/c\\_portugueseranks.html](http://www.napoleon-series.org/military/organization/c_portugueseranks.html) (retrieved on 2011-07-09).

As the decision was taken by the Sub-Director, there was no second censor and only the official stamp was affixed to the file.

Even less verbose are the files read by the Assistant Director concerning two books of Czech fiction in English: Ivan Olbracht's (1882-1952) *Nikola Šuhaj, Robber* (Czech in 1933), a novel about an outlaw stealing from the rich and giving to the poor, and Marie Majerová's (1882-1967) *The Siren* (Czech in 1935), a family saga and social novel about striking miners in the town of Kladno.<sup>311</sup> The entire argumentation for their ban reads as follows: 'Read by the Assistant Director. Banned.' The same applies to file no. 5847 concerning book no. 20, 'Checoslovaquia' (Czechoslovakia), read by the Director himself.

The justification for banning E. V. Erdely's *Prague Braves the Hangman*, the first book about Czechoslovakia to be censored in Portugal, censorship report no. 1939 of 1942, reads as follows:

Work published by the Czechoslovaks of London. It relates the violence employed in Czechoslovakia under the German dominion, concentrating on the acts of terror carried out under [Reinhard] Heydrich. Czechia [*sic!*] is incorporated in the [Third] Reich, it is part of the German territory and has no autonomous government. Circulation unsuitable. On 21 September 1942.

The report is signed by an *adjunto*, which could be either the military rank of *caboadjunto* (literally 'attached corporal', approximately 'lance corporal'), a rank-and-file soldier, anxious not to trespass by authorising a book, or the *Director Adjunto* (Assistant Director), one of the censorship board's leading officers, who would have had little to fear by authorising the book. In any case, in the midst of the Second World War and given Portugal's position among the war-torn European countries, the ban was to be expected.

The Portuguese non-word 'A Checo', here roughly translated by the modern and inappropriate 'Czechia', refers to the fact that (i) Slovakia was a separate country then and Czechoslovakia did not exist, and (ii) the censor wanted to use a word covering both Bohemia and Moravia, a term which the Portuguese language lacks.<sup>312</sup>

Even when a book was read by a simple 'reader', in this case a Major, the wording could be quite concise. In the case of H. Jelínek's *Anthologie de la poésie tchèque*, censorship file no. 6529 of 1960, the substantiation reads: 'improper', which is confirmed by the official stamp reading: 'authorised'.

In the case of F. Kafka's *Panorama della storia cecoslovacca*, censorship file no. 7857 of 1960, the 'justification' is not much longer: 'Book of communist propaganda translated into Italian. I propose it be "banned from circulating in the Country"'.<sup>313</sup>

The same terse style is used in the second report concerning K. Čapek's *A Guerra das Salamandras*, censorship file no. 8059 of 1967: 'By virtue of a superior order, dispatch

<sup>311</sup> Both *Nikola Šuhaj* and *The Siren* were adapted for the screen in Czechoslovakia in 1947. Majerová's other best known novel is *Robinsonka* (*The Girl Robinson Crusoe*, see below).

<sup>312</sup> Cf. the Czech 'Česko' and the English 'Czechia', both late coinages and both sounding rather wrong. In French, *la Tchéquie* is more digestible. In German, the speaker can choose between the value- and history-laden *die Tschechei*, and the neutral and strongly recommended *Tschechien*.

registered on 1 February 1966 in Reading Report no. 7689 referring to the above book is hereby cancelled,' signed by the Director.

Unfortunately, as the former report is missing from the Portuguese National Archives, this is all the information available regarding the censorship of Lima de Freitas' translation into Portuguese of Čapek's *War with the Newts*. Since the field 'proveniência' is not filled in, the Director of the censorship board appears to have initiated this change of decision. All we can tell is that the later file implies that the book had been banned in an earlier report dated 1966.

Regarding Z. Trinka's *Uma pequena aldeia chamada Lidice*, censorship file no. 4867, repeatedly mentioned above, the 'reader' wrote:

The topic of this book is an outcry against Nazism, aimed at Germans and at the wholesale destruction of the Czech village of "Lidice" and the slaughter of all its inhabitants, for it was assumed that the assassin of a Gestapo chief [R. Heydrich] was hiding in this village.

The topic is similar to what is currently being discussed in the newspapers with reference to the trial of the war criminals who burnt and completely destroyed the French village of Oradour [Oradour-sur-Glane].

This book, however, apart from the condemnation of the Germans' course of action in 1942, ordering the destruction of "Lidice" and the slaughter of all its male inhabitants, also contains references to communist propaganda, speaking at length of a world government of all nations, for only thus would wars cease to exist and peace and happiness be established among all oppressed nations (see pages 80 and 81).

It is only for these last reasons that I hold that the book must not be authorised and disseminated.

The first censor's opinion was shared by the second and the official stamp confirmed the ban. The heading of the report bears the following words referring to a lost report: 'This book had been authorised in 1949. See file no. 4233.'

Censors' judgements could be as long as two pages. That is the case with the files on E. Löbl's *Procès à Prague*, E. Hostovský's *O incendiário*, *Dossier Checoslováquia*, J. Hašek's *O valente soldado Chveik* and the correspondence relating to the last two censored books. However, we shall concentrate only on those concerning Czech authors translated into Portuguese (see below).

As indicated above, the first censor's decision was not always final and could be overruled by the second censor or a higher instance. Such was the case of F. Kožík's *Emile Zátopek*, censorship file no. 5505 of 1950. The (first) censor wrote:

A book essentially about sports.

It recounts the effort and the willpower of the athlete Zátopek. It relates his actions in the various competitions in which he took part. Regarding his contact with world athletes, he offers his opinion about their behaviour and the atmosphere in training camps, etc.

Pages 78, 90, 111, 120, 123, 146, ~~473~~ [struck out] show how the aforementioned topics are presented by the author.

For all of the above, I am of the opinion that the book should circulate and that extracts of it should be published in specialised journals.

The second censor differed and the book was banned. The cases of E. Hostovský's *Incendiário* and of *Dossier Checoslováquia* are rather more complex and are dealt in detail below.

The last book *not* translated into Portuguese to be analysed here concerns the Italian translation of seven ‘weekday’ stories by Czech and Slovak authors, censorship file no. 7858. The censor’s argumentation appears rather strange:

This book is a collection of stories by seven Czech [*sic!*] authors translated into Italian. The common objective of this work is based on the propaganda of putting an end to the Cold War, which is not a censurable intention for our political conceptions. However, the sixth story by Vladimír Vondra is of condemnable impiety towards religious matters, which in itself is more than sufficient reason to propose that the book be banned from circulating in our Country.

Had the book been (about to be) published in a Portuguese printing office, it would have been eligible for being ‘authorised with cuts’. However, as this was a foreign publication, this censorial mode would probably not have been feasible.

To conclude this section, the first confidential letter of the preserved correspondence concerning the last two books, treated in censorship file no. 8077 of 1973, is quoted here. The rationale is twofold: first, it uses a format different from all of the previous reports; second, it shows the extreme formulism of such letters. The Director-General of the D.G.S. (*Direcção-Geral de Segurança*), the ‘political police’, approached the Director-General of the D.G.I. (*Direcção-Geral de Informação*), then in charge of censorship, on 9 April 1973 with the following words:

Re: Request for Information

I have the honour to solicit Your Excellency to deign to send notice to this Directorate-General to inform whether the books listed below, which are attached hereto, to be returned, are authorised to circulate in the Country:

“INSTRUCCIÓN Y EDUCACIÓN” – by Stanislav Vodinský and

“LIDICE” – by Rostislav Kocourek.

I avail myself of the opportunity to present to Your Excellency my best compliments.

To the Good of the Nation

Director-General, *signature*

In English, only the most formal diplomatic correspondence verges upon such formulations. Summarising, the Director-General of the D.G.I. responded to the effect that he ‘deem[ed] the intervention in the circulation of the books referred to hereinbefore unnecessary, for they [were] of no import to the current political situation’.

### 4.1.3 Censorship Files Concerning the Portuguese Translations

Being the main subject of the present thesis, the translations into Portuguese submitted to the censorship board deserve our closest attention and are discussed here in their entirety, apart from the censorship file concerning K. Čapek’s *A Guerra das Salamandras*, discussed above, and the files concerning J. Hašek’s *O valente soldado Chveik*, detailed below.

Regarding E. Hostovský’s *O incendiário* [The Arsonist], censorship file no. 5088 of 1953, the censor wrote:

The novel’s plot revolves around a 15-year-old boy whose sickly passion is aroused by a girl who feels repugnance for the immoral actions of her progenitors, making him believe that he must perform a glorious deed to win her admiration, especially since his physical qualities leave

much to be desired: to accomplish remarkable feats, to revolutionise the world, to be a bandit or an arsonist, like the one who is assumed to live in the location where the plot takes place.

To this effect, the boy takes advantage of the fact that an arsonist is suspected to live in the location, and to support this assumption, he announces future incendiary fires to be caused by the “Arsonist”, indicating the locations and the days when these fires are to be started, and believing that the atmosphere of terror which he thinks to have created through these announcements would be a homage to his beloved.

The fact, however, is used by three individuals for the attainment of their goals, confirming the issued announcements by:

- setting the house of an enemy on fire;
- setting their own shop on fire in order to receive the insurance payout;
- setting their own residence on fire in order to avert suspicion from themselves.

The book closes with the obligatory “happy end”, bringing an end to the incendiary fires and restoring peace and harmony in the family life of the hero of the book, at times threatened by the misunderstanding among its members, sheltering a sister of his who, for the reason mentioned above, had fled the house with a lover.

Considering the above, the story proves to contain no moral foundation, which renders its reading inappropriate for adolescents.

Neither the censor’s lengthy exposition nor his conclusion acted as a deterrent and the book was authorised to circulate in the Country – the Portuguese nationalist regime tended to capitalise words of particular importance to the political doctrine of the day.

The Brazilian translation of F. Peroutka’s *Manifesto Democrático* [*Democratic Manifesto*], censorship file no. 6772 of 1960, was authorised for very different reasons:

This work consists in a revision, point by point, of the communist ideology, intending to prove (proving it, in fact) that this ideology does not manage to live up to its promises or to accomplish its socialist objective, as promised and advertised. It is, rather, democracy that can achieve this goal.

Consequently, as it relates an acceptable idea, the book is valid and can or should circulate freely.

The censor’s impression was confirmed by the official stamp.

The first of the books co-authored by A. Dubček, *Checoslováquia na hora da democratização* [Czechoslovakia at the Moment of Democratisation], censorship file no. 8321 of 1969, was authorised based on a terse judgement: ‘The issue explored in this book does not raise objections, as it has been widely discussed in the press. I therefore propose that it be authorised to circulate in this edition.’

The second book containing a contribution by A. Dubček, but also a text by Fidel Castro, *Dossier Checoslováquia* [*Dossier Czechoslovakia*], censorship file no. 9020 of 1971, underwent a more complicated process of evaluation. The censor wrote:

1. Reference is made to the dispatch of the Director of the Censorship Services, dated 31 March 1971, which is hereby complied with.
2. If the intention was to bring to light what happened in Czechoslovakia in 1968, the person responsible for the publication of the book [Isabel do Carmo] did so by referring to communist documents only:
  - a. Roger Garaudy, two extracts of his book “La Liberté en Sursis” [Freedom Adjourned], not assessed by the Censorship, but we assume that the author harbours leftist tendencies, since 18 of his books have been banned and only 4 authorised;
  - b. The Information Bulletin of the Press Department of the Russian Embassy in Brazil;
  - c. A letter of communist parties from Eastern Europe to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia;

- d. A speech by Fidel Castro, assessing the development of events in Czechoslovakia, and starting from there, his partiality and intentions.
3. Will anyone appreciate the communist propaganda spread through such texts, intending to criticise the West, NATO and the detours made in the application of the doctrine of the Czechoslovak Communist Party under the leadership of Dubček?
4. Consequently, we issue the statement that such a book must be banned from circulating in Portugal. Your Excellency, however, will decide best.

In contradiction to the censor's opinion, the heading of the censorship file carries a handwritten comment reading 'authorised'. Curiously, however, there is no official stamp confirming either decision.<sup>313</sup>

Considering the regime's fear that books translated into Portuguese might enjoy wider circulation and be read by 'the uneducated many', it is striking that books concerning Czechoslovakia and/or by Czech authors tended to be authorised when in Portuguese, but banned if imported in another language. One explanation may consist in the large number of books from Prague, of which the overwhelming majority was indeed political propaganda.

Regarding J. Hašek's *The Good Soldier Švejk*, it first arrived in Portugal in the Austrian edition of 1947 (see above), consisting only of Volume I: *Behind the Lines*. Censorship file no. 4481 of 1950 banned this novel, translated into German by Grete Reiner, with the following argumentation:

The life story of a Czechoslovak [*sic!*] soldier who, having been conscripted into the army to fight in the war of 1914-1918, uses all defeatism to denigrate the military mission, debasing it at every opportunity with humorous passages and details, malingering, etc., etc.  
It fully conforms to the communist mysticism.  
There are three or four volumes, it seems, of this author and of this book series.  
Its circulation is to be banned.

The Portuguese censor recognised correctly that Švejk would be received more favourably by left-wing artists and intellectuals, especially in Germany (Hartmann 2009: 167 *et passim*), than by the right-wing press and politicians.

By 1971, times had changed perceptibly. Švejk had been translated into Portuguese (from the French) and the publisher, Europa-América, submitted the book to the censorship services to have it re-assessed. This time (censorship file no. 9100 of 1971), the censor wrote:

According to the registers of these Services, the German version of this book was banned from circulating in the Country in 1950, which was communicated to the then P.I.D.E. and to the G.N.E.L.  
Recently, the publishing house "Europa-América" placed the Portuguese translation of the book on the market as no. 8 of the series "Europa-América Pocket Books", now under evaluation.  
The publishing house in question mentions in passing that this book had already been published in Portuguese many years ago in an edition put on the market by the publishing house Portugália.  
The publishers' note reads "Chveik, an astute and malicious soldier, is the symbol of the negative attitude of Czech soldiers in relation to Austria during the First World War. But not only that. He embodies one of the profoundest and most enjoyable satires on militarism."  
This militarism, however, is understood to pertain to the historical epoch in which the work was written by a Czech author fighting under the Austrian flag.

<sup>313</sup> Since it lacks the official confirmation, the decision is assumed to have complied with the (first) censor's opinion and the book is treated as having been banned in our statistics (see above).

The negativism of the work is diluted with irony and the successive humorous situations in which the protagonist, the soldier Chveik, is placed.

Only one fleeting remark could offend the sensibility of some Portuguese readers. It can be found on page 11, in a brief allusion to the person of King Charles.

But even there, no pejorative intention can be detected.

In my opinion, nothing opposes the free circulation of the work.

This lengthy report is most helpful. First of all, it refers to the translation of *The Good Soldier Švejk* into Portuguese in 1961 (Lisbon: Portugália). Interestingly, this translation only arrived on the censor's desk after the publication of its *second* edition. The first edition seems to have passed unnoticed. Unfortunately no information about the print-runs of these editions is available, making it impossible to infer whether the first edition was intended to be sold openly or predominantly 'under the counter'.

Secondly, this censorship file clearly testifies to the change in the political atmosphere between 1950 and 1971. The world wars had receded into the past,<sup>314</sup> Salazar had died and the censors appear to have become less severe in their judgements. Not even the communist threat is mentioned. The humorous aspect of the book is accentuated rather than its undeniably outspoken and trenchant criticism of the army, militarism and war as such, in a move that safely relegates it to the realm of 'ancient', 'East' European history. The brief allusion to the Portuguese regicide of 1908 is made in order to exemplify the book's harmlessness.

The censor's words are reminiscent of the approach adopted by the publisher of Čapek's *War with the Newts* in Portuguese, who presented the book as 'pure' (or 'mere') science fiction – despite its strikingly obvious criticism of the political situation in Europe in the 1930s, and especially of Nazism.

## 4.2 The Translations

### 4.2.1 Books of Fiction Translated into Portuguese

The following is a chronological list of books of fiction originally written by Czech and Slovak authors, translated into European Portuguese and published in Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, usually via another mediating language (see below for further explanations). Where data is missing (e.g. from what language the Portuguese translation was made, dates of birth and/or death of the translators, etc.), none could be found in the sources consulted.

**1. BENEŠ (Bénès) Karl-Josef. 1943. *A vida doutra* [The Life of Another]. Lisbon: Minerva. Translated by Campos Lima.**

Czech original: *Uloupený život* [A Stolen Life], 1935 (Prague: Melantrich).

In trying to find out via which mediating language the Portuguese translation is likely to have been made, two sets of data were considered: 1) from what other languages the Portuguese translator translated (PORBASE); and 2) what other translations of the Czech original existed. Throughout the investigation, it has become clear that French,

---

<sup>314</sup> Although colonial wars were raging on, which makes the authorisation all the more interesting.

English, German, Spanish and Italian, in this order, are the most frequent, and indeed the only relevant, languages that need to be considered in establishing which mediating language was used for the Portuguese target text.

The Czech original of Beneš' novel was first published in 1935. Although its author may today be considered obscure, the book was twice adapted for the screen: in 1939 in the United Kingdom, and in 1946 in the United States:

*Stolen Life*. Dir. Paul Czinner. Released in the U.K. (London) on 18 January 1939, in Portugal on 16 February 1940 as *A vida de uma outra*. Script: K. J. Beneš (novel), Margaret Kennedy (adaptation). Orion Productions, UK, 1939.<sup>315</sup>

*A Stolen Life*. Dir. Curtis Bernhardt. Released in the United States on 6 July 1946, in Portugal on 3 June 1948 as *Uma vida roubada*. Script: Catherine Turney (screenplay), Margaret Buell Wilder (adaptation), K. J. Beneš (novel). B. D. Production & Warner Bros. Pictures, U.S.A., 1946.<sup>316</sup>

Before the Portuguese translation appeared in 1943, the novel had also been translated into French as *La vie d'une autre*, 1941 (Paris: Clermont).<sup>317</sup> Data on the second French edition from 1946 (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latine), obtained from the Czech National Library (hereafter NK Klementinum), identify the translators as Eugène and René Bestaux, assuming, that is, that these books were simply two different editions of the same translation.<sup>318</sup>

João Evangelista Campos Lima (1887-1956) translated both French (e.g. É. Zola's *Le travail*), and English authors (e.g. W. Thackeray's *The History of Henry Esmond*) (cf. PORBASE).

Only a careful textual comparison could reveal whether the English screenplay by Margaret Kennedy (1939) or the French translation of the novel (1941) were used by Campos Lima for the Portuguese translation. These texts, however, were not available for the present research.<sup>319</sup>

Karel Josef Beneš (1896-1969) wrote under the pseudonyms of Karel Beneš, Karel Beneš-Jizerský, K. Jizerský, and K. J. The French spelling of his name (Karl-Josef Bénès) greatly increases the probability that the Portuguese translation was made from French (there is no 'ě' in Czech, for instance, and Czech diacritics are missing entirely).

The example of this first book is already indicative of the greatest difficulty concerning the Portuguese translations of Czech literature, namely establishing the mediating text.

<sup>315</sup> The citation of films complies with the requirements of the MLA Style Manual (see bibliography). For more on this particular film, see <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0031979/> (retrieved on 2011-07-16).

<sup>316</sup> See <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0038984/> (retrieved on 2011-07-16).

<sup>317</sup> Cf. WorldCat:

[http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=au%3AKarel+Josef+Benes&fq=yr%3A1930..1955+%3E&se=yr&sd=asc&dblist=638&start=11&qt=page\\_number\\_link](http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=au%3AKarel+Josef+Benes&fq=yr%3A1930..1955+%3E&se=yr&sd=asc&dblist=638&start=11&qt=page_number_link) (retrieved on 2011-07-16).

<sup>318</sup> The novel was also translated into Portuguese in Brazil, but not until 1947 (Rio de Janeiro: Vecchi), i.e. after it had been translated in Portugal. The Brazilian version was translated from the French by Alfredo Ferreira as *Uma vida roubada* (NK Klementinum).

<sup>319</sup> A screenplay is of course a much abbreviated version of a novel, so it is highly unlikely that M. Kennedy's version was used by the Portuguese translator.



In the case of K. J. Beneš' *Stolen Life*, the mediating language could have been either French or English, but as there can be no certainty, it must be treated as 'unknown' or 'no data' (n.d.).

When trying to find *the mediating text*, there is a significant difference between translations from 'dominant' and translations from 'medium-sized' or 'small' languages. Works such as *Faust* or *Hamlet* have usually been translated several times by different translators into most (European) languages. Works translated from Czech – into any language, in fact – rarely enjoy such a luxury. In our corpus, Čapek's *War with the Newts* and Hašek's *The Good Soldier Švejk* are striking exceptions.

Conversely, most of our data support the hypothesis that once a translation from a non-dominant language has been made, it is likely to circulate for many decades. This in turn simplifies the search for the mediating texts.

**2. BENEŠ (Bénès) Karl-Josef. 1947. *A casa encantada* [Enchanted House]. Lisbon: Minerva. Translated by Alexandre Fonseca.**

Czech original: *Kouzelný dům* [The Magical House], 1939 (Prague: Melantrich).

Alexandre Fonseca (n.d.) appears to have translated primarily English authors.<sup>320</sup> Before 1947, however, Beneš's novel was translated only into French, by Eugène and René Bestaux, as *La maison enchantée*, 1942 (Paris: F. Sorlot). The Portuguese translation must therefore have been made from the French.

**3. BENEŠ (Bénès) Karl-Josef. 1953. *O violino marcado* [The Marked Violin]. Lisbon: Minerva. Translated by Maria Franco.**

Czech original: *Červená pečeť* [The Red Seal], 1940 (Prague: Melantrich).

Maria Franco (n.d.) translated both French (e.g. H. de Balzac, P. Mérimée) and English authors (e.g. M. Edginton, F. L. Barclay). Before 1953, Beneš's novel appeared only in French as *Le cachet rouge* [The Red Seal], 1948 (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latine), in a translation by Eugène and René Bestaux. The Portuguese translation must therefore have been made from the French. The change in the Portuguese title is untypical of our corpus, but Beneš's novel appeared in no other language bearing the title 'The Marked Violin'.<sup>321</sup>

**4. HOSTOVSKÝ, Egon. 1953. *O incendiário* [The Arsonist]. Lisbon: Portugália. Translated by João Cabral do Nascimento. Book series (*colecção*): *Romancistas Universais No. 9* [World Novelists].**

Czech original: *Žhář* [The Arsonist], 1935 (Prague: Melantrich).

Egon Hostovský (1908-1973), a Czech Jewish writer and a relative of Stefan Zweig, lived in exile for most of his adult life. Between 1940 and 1941, he spent several months in Portugal, having left Paris after its occupation by the Germans in June 1940.

<sup>320</sup> There are no data about the date of birth (or death) of Alexandre Fonseca in the PORBASE. He is the translator of only four books, three of which were originally written in English. However, that does not necessarily imply that Fonseca translated them from English.

<sup>321</sup> The German translation by Anna Wirthová was entitled *Das rote Siegel: Roman einer Geigenvirtuosin* [The Red Seal: Novel about a Violin Virtuoso]. However, it was published only after the Portuguese translation, in 1960 (Prague: Artia).

In 1941, he embarked on his journey to the United States of America to work at the Czechoslovak consulate in New York.

João Cabral do Nascimento (1897-1978) was a Portuguese poet and a writer in his own right, influenced by symbolism (Klíma 2007a: 455). He translated English (D. H. Lawrence, G. Eliot, T. Capote, O. Wilde, J. London, etc.) and French authors (F. Mauriac, A. Camus, P. Verlaine).<sup>322</sup>

Before the Portuguese translation, Hostovský's novel had come out only in French as *L'incendiaire*, 1947 (Paris: Editions Stock Delmain et Boutellau), translated by Michel-Leon Hirsch. The Portuguese translation must therefore have been made from the French.

**5. HOSTOVSKÝ, Egon. 1960. *A casa sem dono* [The House Without a Master]. Lisbon: Ulisseia. Translated by A. Silva Santos. Book series: *Série Literária No. 46* [Literary Series].**  
Czech original: *Dům bez pána*, 1937 (Prague: Melantrich).

A. Silva Santos (n.d.) appears to have translated nothing else (PORBASE). Before 1960, Hostovský's novel had been translated only into French by Fred Bérence as *La maison sans maître*, 1949 (Paris: Plon, reprinted in 1950). The Portuguese translation must therefore have been made from the French.

**6. HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1961. *O valente soldado Chveik* [The Brave Soldier Chveik]. Lisbon: Portugália. Translated by Alexandre Cabral. Reprinted in 1971 and 1988 by Europa-América. Book series: *Os romances universais no. 24* [World Novels] (1961); *Livros de Bolso no. 8* [Pocket Books] (1971); *Grandes Obras no. 8* [Great Works] (1988).**  
Czech original: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války, Díl první: V zázemí* [The Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk during the World War, Part 1: Behind the Lines], 1921 (Prague: Adolf Synek).

Jaroslav Hašek (1883-1923) is best remembered for the literary figure of Švejk (in English also spelled 'Schweik'), who appears both in his famous novel and in many of his short stories. In the Czech original, Hašek's novel consists of four volumes, but only the first volume was translated into European Portuguese.

PORBASE contains an entry for this book as early as 1950, including the same publishing data. This edition, however, could not be verified *de visu* and is therefore treated as 'non-existent'.

Alexandre Cabral was the pseudonym of José dos Santos Cabral (1917-96), a neo-realist<sup>323</sup> Portuguese writer of fiction, playwright, and a leading expert in the work of Camilo Castelo Branco (1825-90), a prominent Portuguese writer, to whom Cabral dedicated many studies and a dictionary. Cabral translated little, mainly French authors (e.g. C. Roy, A. France).

<sup>322</sup> Cf. CASTAGNA, Vanessa. 2009. *Voz de muitas vozes: Cabral do Nascimento, Tradutor*. Parede: Principia. ISBN 9789898131461.

<sup>323</sup> Neo-realism was the Portuguese 'euphemism' for 'social(ist) realism', adopted to avoid censorship and political persecution (cf. Costa Pinto 1991: 252, quoted above).

Careful textual analysis (Štěpánková 2009: 43-45) proved that Alexandre Cabral translated Švejk (Chvéik) from the French (see below).

**7. OTČENÁŠEK (Otchenachek), Jan. 1961. *Romeu, Julieta e as trevas* [Romeo, Juliet and Darkness]. Lisbon: Arcádia. Translated by Alexandre O'Neill. Reprinted in 1967. Book series: *Autores estrangeiros no. 16* [Foreign Authors]. Czech original: *Romeo, Julie a tma* [Romeo, Juliet and Darkness], 1958 (Prague: Československý spisovatel).**

Jan Otčenášek (1924-79) was a novelist writing under the influence of socialist realism and a screenwriter for various Czechoslovak films, some of which were based on his own novels, including *Romeo, Juliet and Darkness* (1959, dir. Jiří Weiss). Several of his novels deal with the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia.

Alexandre O'Neill (1924-86) was a prominent Portuguese surrealist poet and prose writer of Irish origin. He translated authors writing in French (G. Simenon, A. Jarry), Italian (Dante, C. Malaparte) and Spanish (P. Neruda).<sup>324</sup>

Otčenášek's novel was translated into dozens of languages. The French translation by François Kérel, a renowned French translator from Czech, appeared as *Roméo, Juliette et les ténèbres*, 1959 (Paris: Les Éditions françaises réunies).<sup>325</sup>

Translations into English, German, Italian, Spanish (via French), but also Russian, Estonian, and Hungarian all came out in 1960.<sup>326</sup> Romanian, Polish, Dutch, Sorbian (Wendish) and Lithuanian editions followed in 1961.

Given the spelling of Otčenášek's last name as *Otchenachek*, it is plausible to assume that Alexandre O'Neill translated the novella from the French. However, as there can be no certainty, the mediating language for the Portuguese translation must be treated as 'unknown'.

**8. ČAPEK, Karel. 1962. *A fábrica de absoluto* [The Factory of the Absolute]. Lisbon: Livros do Brasil. Translated from the French by M. Gomes dos Santos. Book series: *Miniatura no. 140* [Miniature]. Czech original: *Továrna na absolutno*, 1922 (Brno: Polygrafia).**

Karel Čapek (1890-1938) was one of the most influential Czech writers of the interwar years. Among his many other books, *The Absolute at Large* (*Továrna na absolutno*, 1922) and *War with the Newts* (*Válka s mloky*, 1936) are considered early science fiction.

<sup>324</sup> Pablo Neruda (1904-73) chose his literary *nom de plume* as a tribute to the Czech writer Jan Neruda (1834-91).

<sup>325</sup> Apart from Otčenášek's novels and several works by M. Kundera, François Kérel (\*1925) translated B. Hrabal's *Closely Watched Trains* as *Trains étroitement surveillés* in 1997 (Paris: Gallimard), as well as works by J. Škvorecký, V. Havel, K. Čapek and others.

<sup>326</sup> Italian translation by Ela Ripellino: *Romeo, Giulietta e le tenebre*, 1960 (Milano: Nuova Accademia Editrice, reprinted in 1964); Spanish by Alfredo Varela: *Romeo, Julieta y las tinieblas*, 1960 (Buenos Aires: Editorial Platina), translated via the French; German by Bruno Liehm: *Romeo, Julia und die Finsternis*, 1960 (Berlin: Verlag der Nation); English by Iris Urwin: *Romeo, Juliet and the Darkness*, 1960 (Prague: Artia).

Eng.º (engineer) M. Gomes dos Santos (n.d.) translated nothing else, but the publisher's peritext in the book says: 'Title of the original edition: *La fabrique d'absolu*, © Éditions Nagel, Paris, 1945', which is a translation from the Czech by Jean (Jan) and Jiřina Danès (Daneš). Since the colophon is complete (a highly unusual occurrence in Portuguese translations of Czech literature), the data is probably reliable.

**9. MAJEROVÁ, Marie. 1962. *Robinson de saias* [Robinson in a Skirt]. Lisbon: Portugália. Translated by Maria Helena da Costa Dias. Book series: *Biblioteca das raparigas no. 48* [Girls' Library].<sup>327</sup>  
Czech original: *Robinsonka* [Girl Robinson], 1940 (Prague: Melantrich).**

Marie Majerová, the pseudonym of Marie Bartošová (1882-1967), was a Czech novelist who wrote in the manner of socialist realism. Apart from Zdena Trinká (1888-1987), an American of Czech origin, Marie Majerová is the only Czech woman translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal.

Maria Helena da Costa Dias (\*1917) is a translator from French (e.g. Victor Hugo, G. de Maupassant, J. Le Goff) and Spanish (F. García de Cortázar). The publisher's peritext says that the translation was made from the French. It must therefore have been *Robinsonne*, 1959 (Prague: Artia), translated by Yvette Le Floc'h.

**10. ČAPEK, Karel. 1965. *A guerra das salamandras* [War with the Newts]. Lisbon: Livros do Brasil. Translated by Lima de Freitas. Book series: Argonauta no. 102 [Argonaut].  
Czech original: *Válka s mloky*, 1936 (Prague: František Borový).**

Lima de Freitas (1927-98) was a prominent Portuguese painter and book illustrator (e.g. of Luís Vaz de Camões' *The Lusíads*). He translated authors writing in French (e.g. A. Coyné, J. Decrest) and English (e.g. F. Gruber).

Careful contrastive analysis (see below) has revealed that Lima de Freitas' translation into Portuguese was made from the first English translation: *War with the Newts*, 1937 (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.), made by Marie and Robert Weatherall (with the assistance of W. Francis and G. Johnston).<sup>328</sup>

**11. MŇAČKO, Ladislav. 1968. *O sabor do poder* [The Taste of Power]. Lisbon: Bertrand. Translated from the German by Margarida Schimmelpfennig. Book series: *Autores universais* [World Authors].**

<sup>327</sup> Interestingly, this Portuguese translation was not found in PORBASE, but in the NK Klementinum. The publishing data are complete, raising little doubt about its existence. It is, however, strange that neither the Portuguese National Library nor any other Portuguese library contained in PORBASE should have a copy of the book, despite the statutory copy requirement. This novel by M. Majerová was also translated into Portuguese in Brazil by Humberto A. Schoenfeldt as *A pequena Robinson* [The Little (Girl) Robinson], 1960 (São Paulo: Brasilenise).

<sup>328</sup> The French translation by Claudia Ancelot appeared in 1964 as *La Guerre des salamandres* (Paris: Les éditeurs français réunis). *War with the Newts* was translated into English again in 1985 by Ewald Osers (London: Unwin Paperbacks & New York: Catbird Press). Interestingly, both English translations are still available and on sale (at least in Prague).

Slovak original: *Ako chutí moc*, 1967 (manuscript), 1968 (Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ); first published in German as *Wie die Macht schmeckt*, 1967 (Vienna: Fritz Molden), translated from the original Slovak manuscript by Erich Bertleff.

Ladislav Mňačko (1919-1994), although born in Moravia (today the Czech Republic), was a Slovak journalist and writer. The title of the original Slovak manuscript is *Ako chutí moc*, but the Portuguese translation strangely gives the Czech title (*Jak chutná moc*) as the ‘título original’.<sup>329</sup> Apart from the two novels translated into European Portuguese, Mňačko is also known for his earlier novel, *Smrt’ sa volá Engelchen* [Death is Called Engelchen], 1959 (Bratislava: Slovenské vydavateľstvo politickej literatúry).<sup>330</sup>

Margarida Schimmelpfennig (n.d.) is a sculptor, living in Sintra, Portugal. PORBASE claims this book is her only translation into Portuguese. The only other title by Margarida Schimmelpfennig available in the Portuguese National Library is *Gedichte* [Poems], 1950 (s.l., s.n.).

**12. MŇAČKO, Ladislav. 1969. *A sétima noite* [The Seventh Night]. Amadora (Lisbon): Íbis. Translated from the French by Fernando Figueiredo.**

Slovak original: *Siedma noc: Skúsenosti a obžaloba jedného komunistu* [The Seventh Night: Experience and Accusation of a Communist], 1968; first published in German as *Die siebente Nacht: Erkenntnis und Anklage eines Kommunisten*, 1968 (Vienna: Fritz Molden), translated by Adolf Maldess.

French: *La septième nuit: Les Russes occupent la Tchécoslovaquie: Un communiste juge et accuse* [The Seventh Night: The Russians occupy Czechoslovakia: A Communist Judges and Accuses], 1968 (Paris: Flammarion), translated from the Slovak by Joëlle Martin.

In the same year (1968), Mňačko’s novel was also translated into Italian, Finnish and Slovene (from the Czech).

Fernando Figueiredo (n.d.) translated one book by English authors (W. Brink and L. Harris’ *Black and White*), but authored the following two books: *O inglês na hotelaria: mesa* [English in the Hotel Industry: Table] and *O francês na hotelaria: cozinha* [French in the Hotel Industry: Cuisine], both published in 1976.

As the publisher’s peritext defines the ‘original title’ as *La septième nuit* (1968), it is more than likely that the Portuguese translation was made from the French.

**13. WEISS, Jan. 1971. *A casa dos mil andares* [The House of a Thousand Floors]. Lisbon: Estampa. Translated by Ernesto Sampaio from the French. Book series: *Livro B no. 4* [Book B]. Reprinted in 1987.**

<sup>329</sup> The Czech translation by Gustav Hajčik and Zdeněk Koňák was published in 1968 (Praha: Československý spisovatel), and reprinted again only in 1990 (*ibid.*).

<sup>330</sup> This novel was translated into Portuguese in Brazil by Eduardo Sucupira Filho as *Nos confins do mal* [In the Confines of Evil], 1964 (São Paulo: Brasiliense).

Czech original: *Dům o tisíci patrech* [The House of a Thousand Floors], written in 1929 (manuscript), published in 1958 (Prague: Československý spisovatel).<sup>331</sup>

French: *La maison aux mille étages*, 1967 (Paris: l'Inter; Verviers, Belgium: Gérard et Cie.), translated by Jan Svoboda and Charles Moisse; reprinted in 1970 (Lausanne, Berne, Paris: Rencontre).

Jan Weiss (1892-1972) was a Czech surrealist writer and one of the founders of Czech science fiction. *The House of Thousand Floors* is a psychological science-fiction novel depicting a soldier's nightmare.

Ernesto Sampaio (1935-2001) was a Portuguese poet, translator, journalist, actor and secondary-school teacher. He translated authors writing in French (A. Breton, Le Clézio, E. Ionesco), English (O. Wilde) and German (T. Bernhard, W. Benjamin, G. Büchner).

As the publisher's peritext defines the 'original title' as *La maison aux mille étages*, it is reasonable to assume that the Portuguese translation was made from the French.

**14. ČAPEK, Karel. 1979. *A guerra das salamandras* [War with the Newts]. Lisbon: Caminho. Translated from the French by Mário de Sousa. Book series: *Mamute no. 2* [Mammoth] (1979). Reprinted in 1985. Book series: *Ficção Científica no. 13* [Science Fiction] (1985).**

Czech original: *Válka s mloky*, 1936 (Prague: František Borový).

This translation counts as a new entry, as it was made by another translator and via another language. Mário de Sousa (n.d.) translated several Central and East European authors (Ferenc Karinthy, Arkady Strugatsky, Alexander A. Fadeyev, etc.), although it is unclear via which language(s) – PORBASE provides no information. The publisher's peritext for the Portuguese translation of this novel of Čapek's, however, identifies the source (i.e. mediating) text as the French translation by Claudia Ancelot: *La guerre des salamandres*, first published in 1960 (Paris: Les éditeurs français réunis) and reprinted in 1969, 1974 (both in Verviers, Belgium: Gérard et Cie.).

**15. HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1986. *Aventuras do valente soldado Svejk e outras histórias* [Adventures of the Valiant Soldier Svejk and Other Stories]. Lisbon: Vega. Translated from the French by Maria Alberta Miranda and José Carlos Rodrigues. Book series: *Provisórios & Definitivos* [Provisional and Definitive (plural)].<sup>332</sup>**

Czech originals: *Velitelem města Bugulmy* [The Commandant of Bugulma], written in 1921 (manuscript), published in 1966 (Prague: Československý spisovatel); *Dobry vojak Švejk před válkou a jiné podivné historky* [The Good Soldier Švejk Before the War and Other Strange Stories], 1912 (Prague: Hejda a Tuček); *Politické a sociální dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona* [The Political and Social

<sup>331</sup> According to Janoušek et al. (2008a: 511), the book was written as early as 1929 (manuscript?).

However, in the National Library (NK Klementinum), recipient of the legal deposit of every non-periodic publication published in Czechoslovakia, the 1958 edition is the earliest published version.

<sup>332</sup> PORBASE contains two references to this book. The first is dated '[196-?]', the second 1986. The earlier edition, however, is missing from the Portuguese National Library (BNP). Confirming our findings, Štěpánková regards the earlier edition as an error in the database (personal communication, dated 2009-03-14).

History of the Party of Moderate Progress Within the Bounds of the Law], written in 1911 (manuscript), published in 1963 (Prague: Československý spisovatel).<sup>333</sup>

As the Czech originals imply, this Portuguese translation of *Švejk* stories has little in common with Alexandre Cabral's translation above. Rather, it is a translation of stories from three books by Jaroslav Hašek, translated into Portuguese from French source texts, despite the misleading, i.e. original (Czech), spelling of Švejk's name. Štěpánková (2009: 41-42) proves conclusively that the Portuguese translation was made from French, but she fails to identify the French source text(s) for the Portuguese translation.

Maria Alberta Miranda (n.d.) appears to have translated nothing else (PORBASE). José Carlos Rodrigues (n.d.) translated authors writing in French (e.g. B. Vian, Y. Lavoine, G. Deleuze, G. Apollinaire) and English (e.g. R. Jastrow).

Until 1986, only the following books written originally by Jaroslav Hašek appeared in French translations:

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1963. *Le Brave soldat Chveik* [The Good Soldier Švejk]. Paris: Livre de poche. Translated from the Czech by Jindřich (Henry) Hořejší.

This entry, found only in the French National Library (BNF), is ambiguous. The Czech original is said to be *Dobrý voják Švejk před válkou a jiné podivné historky* [The Good Soldier Švejk Before the War and Other Strange Stories], but a note in the entry identifies the book as the translation of the first volume of the novel *The Good Soldier Švejk* (Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka).<sup>334</sup>

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1969. *L'École de l'humour* [The School of Humour]. Paris: l'Inter; Verviers (Belgium): Gérard et Cie. Translated from the Czech by Andrée Ossipovitch. Book series: Bibliothèque Marabout, Humour no. 332.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1979. *Aventures dans l'Armée rouge, octobre 1918: (suivi de) Histoires vraies et populaires* [Adventures in the Red Army, October 1918: (followed by) True and Popular Stories]. Paris: Les Formes du secret. Texts selected and translated from the Czech by Kitty Fantl et Rudolph Bénès.

It seems that Maria Alberta Miranda and José Carlos Rodrigues made their own selection of stories from one or more of these French translations and translated them into Portuguese. The Portuguese version provides no information about the source texts. Attempts to obtain any information from the publishers have been fruitless.<sup>335</sup>

**16. HRABAL, Bohumil. 1989. *Eu que servi o rei de Inglaterra. Oporto: Afrontamento. Translated from the Czech by Ludmila Dismánová and Mário Gomes.* Book series: *Colecção Fixões no. 21.* Preface by Jorge Listopad. Reprinted in 2008.**

<sup>333</sup> The English translations are taken from PARROTT, Cecil. 1982. *A Study of Švejk and the Short Stories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0521243521.

<sup>334</sup> See BNF: <http://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb33038830g/PUBLIC> (retrieved on 2011-08-09).

<sup>335</sup> As the French translations of works written by Jaroslav Hašek were unavailable for the present research, only a researcher investigating the French translations of *Švejk* could answer the question with any certainty, based on the information provided here.

Czech original: *Obsluhoval jsem anglického krále*, 1971 (manuscript), published in Germany in 1980 (Köln: Index).<sup>336</sup>

Bohumil Hrabal (1914-1997), one of the greatest and most original Czech post-WWII authors, is perhaps best known for his novels *Closely Watched Trains* (*Ostře sledované vlaky*, 1965), *I Served the King of England* (*Obsluhoval jsem anglického krále*, 1971),<sup>337</sup> and *Too Loud a Solitude* (*Příliš hlučná samota*, 1977).

Ludmila Dismánová (\*1949), born in Czechoslovakia, was a secondary-school teacher of French in Lisbon (she is now retired). Mário Gomes (\*1947), Dismánová's Portuguese husband, proofread and corrected the Portuguese. Their collaboration resulted in the first translation of a Czech author into European Portuguese directly from the Czech original. All Dismánová's translations of Hrabal were from the samizdat editions produced in Czechoslovakia.<sup>338</sup>

**17. HAVEL, Václav. 1990. *Audiência, Vernissage e Petição* [Audience, Unveiling, Protest]. Lisbon: Relógio d'água. Translated from the Czech by Anna de Almeida and José Vidal de Almeida.**

Czech originals: *Audience*, *Vernisáž* (both written in 1975), *Protest* (written in 1978), all three as a manuscript in 1979.

Václav Havel (\*1936), alongside his political career, is best known as a playwright inspired by the Theatre of the Absurd. He has also written poems and essays. The premiere of his first play, *The Garden Party* (*Zahradní slavnost*), took place in 1963. His most recent play, *Leaving* (*Odcházení*), appeared in 2006.

Anna de Almeida (née Němcová) emigrated to Portugal in the summer of 1989, a few months before the Velvet Revolution. She translated Havel's theatre plays directly from the Czech originals and José Vidal de Almeida, her Portuguese husband, proofread and corrected the Portuguese.

**18. HRABAL, Bohumil. 1990. *Comboios rigorosamente vigiados* [Closely Watched Trains]. Lisbon: Caminho. Translated by António Sabler. Book series: *Uma terra sem amos no. 46* [A Land without Masters].**

Czech original: *Ostře sledované vlaky*, 1965 (Prague: Československý spisovatel).

Jiří Menzel (\*1938) made a film based on this novel by H. Hrabal in 1966:

*Ostře sledované vlaky* [Closely Watched Trains]. Dir. Jiří Menzel. Released in Czechoslovakia on 18 November 1966 and first screened in Portugal on 30 July

<sup>336</sup> *Index*, based in Cologne (Köln), was a Czech exile publishing house founded in the 1970s by A. Müller and B. Utitz. It produced over 200 publications by authors who could not publish in Czechoslovakia. Perhaps the greatest difference between Portuguese and Czech literature in the 20<sup>th</sup> century is pinpointed by A. Costa Pinto (1991: 248): 'Throughout the long years of the Salazar regime, Portugal never knew a literature of exile.' Czech literature, on the other hand, must be seen as falling into three distinct publishing spheres: (1) official literature published in Czechoslovakia, (2) clandestine literature published in samizdat in Czechoslovakia, and (3) exile literature, published primarily in Europe and North America.

<sup>337</sup> This novel was also translated into Portuguese in Brazil by Maria Terezinha M. Cavallari as *Eu servi o rei de Inglaterra*, 1988 (São Paulo: Best Seller), reprinted in 1989 (São Paulo: Nova Cultura).

<sup>338</sup> Dismánová, L. Personal Communication (2011-08-02).



1973. Script: Bohumil Hrabal and Jiří Menzel. Film Studio Barrandov, Prague, Czechoslovakia, 1966.<sup>339</sup>

In 1968, this Czechoslovak film won The Academy Award (Oscar) for Best Foreign-Language Film. The novel was soon translated into many languages (Dutch in 1967, Italian in 1982, Danish in 1991, etc.).

António Sabler (n.d.) was a translator from French (e.g. Michel Grimaud), English (e.g. Anna Sewell, Stanisław Lem [*sic!*]) and Spanish (J. L. Borges). It is not clear via which language he made his translation into Portuguese and the publisher's peritext does not say.

By 1990, the novel was available in numerous languages. Considering Sabler's working languages, the following editions could have served as the source text for his Portuguese translations:

- *Closely Watched Trains*, 1968 (New York: Grove Press), reprinted in 1990 (Evanston: Northwestern University Press), translated by Edith Pargeter;
- *A Close Watch on the Trains*, 1968 (London: J. Cape), translated by Edith Pargeter;
- *Closely Observed Trains*, 1990 (Falmouth, UK: Sphere Books), translated by Edith Pargeter;
- *Trains étroitement surveillés*, 1984 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by François Kérel
- *Trenes rigurosamente vigiados*, 1988 (Barcelona: Península), translated by Fernando de Valenzuela

Given the U. S. Academy Award for the film and the fact that Sabler translated a Polish classic of science fiction (S. Lem) from English, (one of) the English translation(s) by Edith Pargeter would appear most likely, but as there can be no certainty, the mediating language for the Portuguese translation must be treated as 'unknown'.<sup>340</sup>

**19. HRABAL, Bohumil. 1990. *A terra onde o tempo parou* [The Place Where Time Stood Still]. Oporto: Afrontamento. Translated from the Czech by Ludmila Dismánová and Mário Gomes. Book series: *Colecção Fixões no. 28*.**

Czech original: *Městečko, kde se zastavil čas* [The Little Town Where Time Stood Still], written in 1978, published in 1989 (Toronto, Canada: Sixty-Eight Publishers) and in 1991 (Prague: Odeon).

Note that the Portuguese translation, directly from the Czech original, appeared in Portuguese before the novella was first officially published in Czechoslovakia. That was also the case with several books by Milan Kundera (see below).

**20. ŠKVORECKÝ, Josef. 1990. *O engenheiro das almas* [The Engineer of Souls]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated from the English by Maria Jorge de Freitas. Book series: *Ficção Universal no. 62* [World Fiction].**

<sup>339</sup> Cf. <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0060802/releaseinfo> (retrieved on 2011-07-22).

<sup>340</sup> Until, of course, the Portuguese translation is compared with the English, French and Spanish versions. As those texts were unavailable for the present research, this information was impossible to obtain.

Czech original: *Příběh inženýra lidských duší: entertainment na stará témata o životě, ženách, osudu, snění, dělnické třídě, fyzlech, lásce a smrti*, 1977 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers).

English translation: *The Engineer of Human Souls: An Entertainment on the Old Themes of Life, Women, Fate, Dreams, the Working Class, Secret Agents, Love and Death*, 1984 (Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys), translated by Paul Wilson, reprinted in 1985 (London: Chatto & Windus) and in 1986 (London: Pan).

Josef Škvorecký (\*1924) has been one of the leading figures of post-WWII Czech literature. He became famous after the publication of his first novel *Cowards (Zbabělci*, 1958). Besides his authorial work, he also translated U. S. American Literature into Czech (R. Bradbury, H. James, E. Hemingway, S. Lewis, R. Chandler, W. Styron, etc.). Together with his wife, Zdena Salivarová (\*1933), also a Czech writer, he founded a publishing house named *Sixty-Eight Publishers* in Toronto, Canada, in 1971, publishing Czech authors whose works could not appear in Czechoslovakia.

J. Hašek's *The Good Soldier Švejk* is a much longer work, but since only the first volume was translated into Portuguese, *The Engineer of Human Souls* is the longest novel by a Czech author available in European Portuguese.

Maria Jorge de Freitas (n.d.) is a Portuguese translator from English (H. Miller, W. Faulkner).

**21. KLÍMA, Ivan. 1991. *Amor e desencanto* [Love and Disenchantment]. Lisbon: Bertrand. Translated from the English by Ascensão Santos e Castro.**

Czech original: *Láska a smetí* [Love and Garbage], manuscript in 1986, published in samizdat in 1987, in exile in 1988 (Purley, U.K.: Rozmluvy), in Czechoslovakia in 1990 (Prague: Československý spisovatel).

English translation: *Love and Garbage*, 1990 (London: Chatto & Windus), translated by Ewald Osers, reprinted in 1991 (London: Penguin).

Ivan Klíma (born in 1931) spent three years in the concentration camp of Terezín during the German occupation. On his return from the University of Michigan, where he had been invited as a visiting professor from 1969 to 1970, Klíma's works were officially banned in Czechoslovakia. During the 'normalisation', he could publish only in samizdat or in exile and had to work as a manual labourer until the Velvet Revolution. The Portuguese title represents a noticeable distortion of the original, in both sense and style.

The only other translation by Ascensão Santos e Castro (n.d.) is of Nigel Tutt's *Europe on the Fiddle: the Common Market Scandal*, 1989 (Lisbon: Bertrand).

**22. HRABAL, Bohumil. 1992. *Uma solidão demasiado ruidosa* [Too Loud a Solitude]. Oporto: Afrontamento. Translated from the Czech by Ludmila Dismánová and Mário Gomes. Book series: *Colecção Fixões no. 36*.**

Czech original: *Příliš hlučná samota* [Too Loud a Solitude], 1977 (Prague: Česká expedice, an underground publishing house), 1980 (Köln: Index), 1989 (Prague: Odeon).

Hrabal's *Too Loud a Solitude* is the last book of fiction by a Czech (or Slovak) author translated into Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal.

The first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century saw only two new translations of Czech authors into European Portuguese: Listopad's *Chinatown with Rosa* in 2001 (see below), and a new translation of K. Čapek's *War with the Newts* in 2009 (Mem Martins: Europa-América), translated by Isabel Neves from the English.<sup>341</sup> Only one Slovak author appeared in Portugal in the first decade of the third millennium:

**KADLEČÍK, Ivan. 2004. *Rapsódias e miniaturas*. Lisbon: Cavalo de Ferro. Translated by Lumír Nahodil. Revised by César Charrua. Book series: Nova Europa: Eslováquia no. 10 [New Europe: Slovakia].<sup>342</sup>**  
Slovak original: *Rapsódie a miniatúry* [Rhapsodies and Miniatures], manuscript in 1981, published in 1988 (Köln: Index), 1992 (Brno: Atlantis).

Ivan Kadlečík (\*1938) is a Slovak prose writer and poet. His collection of essays *Rhapsodies and Miniatures* appeared in various versions and editions in 1981, 1987, 1988 (in samizdat), 1988 (Köln: Index), 1992 (Brno: Atlantis).

Lumír Nahodil is a Czech translator into Portuguese, living in Portugal. He has translated authors writing in German (J. Habermas, M. Heidegger, A. Gruen, D. Schwanitz, K. Wagenbach's *Kafkas Prag*) as well as English (A. Huxley) and French (D. Pennac, I. Marie).

## 4.2.2 Special Cases

### 4.2.2.1 Jorge Listopad

Jiří Synek (\*1921), writing in Czech under the pen-name of František Listopad and in Portuguese as Jorge (earlier Georges) Listopad is a Czech poet and prose writer and a Portuguese essayist, playwright, stage director and producer. Having been first dispatched as an editor of the daily *Mladá fronta* ('Young Front') to Paris in 1947, he decided to stay there after the February 1948 communist *coup d'état* in Czechoslovakia. In 1958, he moved to Portugal, where he first lived in Oporto before moving to Lisbon. Listopad writes poetry and short poetic fiction ('poetry in prose') in Czech, and essays and theatre plays in Portuguese, thus dividing his creative talents evenly between the two languages and cultures.

Although PORBASE lists thirteen publications by Jorge Listopad, none of them is a translation (*sensu stricto*):

1. *Bibliografia dos assuntos eslavos e da soviologia* [Bibliography of Slavic Issues and Soviet Studies], 1969 (Lisbon: Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Política Ultramarina);
2. *Secos e molhados* [The Dry and the Wet], 1967 (Lisbon: Numar);

<sup>341</sup> There are two translations of *War with the Newts* into English, the first by M. and R. Weatherall (1934) and the second by Ewald Osers (1985). While Lima de Freitas' translation (1965) is based on the former, Isabel Neves' translation (2009) uses the latter.

<sup>342</sup> PORBASE erroneously refers to the title of the books series as *Eslovénia* (Slovenia).

3. *Estreitamento progressivo: práticas e danos* [Progressive Narrowing: Practices and Injuries], 1983 (Lisbon: & Etc.);
4. *Primeiro testamento* [First Testament], 1985 (Lisbon: Rolim);
5. *Mar seco, gelado quente, são 21 de repente* [Dry Sea, Hot Ice, There are Suddenly 21], 1986 (Lisbon: O Jornal);
6. *Novos territórios* [New Territories], 1986 (Macau: Instituto cultural);
7. *Álbum de família* [Family Album], 1988 (Oporto: Afrontamento);
8. *Outubro-Oriente, October-Orient, Shi yue – dong fang*, 1992 (Oporto: Asa), a trilingual edition, English by Richard Zenith, Chinese by Wang (Zhang) Weimin;
9. *Biografia de cristal* [Crystal Biography], 1992 (Lisbon: Relógio d'Água);
10. *Meio conto* [Half-Story]<sup>343</sup>, 1993 (Oporto: Afrontamento);
11. *Fatum da dramaturgia portuguesa* [Fate of Portuguese Dramaturgy], 2000 (s.l.: s.n.), printed in Mafra (Elo);
12. *Todos p'ra mesa* [Everyone to the Table], 2006 (Oporto: Afrontamento), illustrated by Manuela Bacelar (see below);
13. *Prosa reunida* [Collected Prose], 2003 (Vila Nova de Famalicão: Quasi).

The only translation of a work by Listopad from Czech into Portuguese is the self-translation of his important essay 'Tristan or the Betrayal of an Intellectual':

1. **LISTOPAD, Georges F. 1960. *Tristão ou a Traição dum intelectual* [Tristan or the Betrayal of an Intellectual]. Oporto: Livraria Sousa & Almeida. Translated by G. F. Listopad from the Czech; revised by Eugénio de Andrade. Book series: *Origem no. 1* [Origin]. Reprinted in 1994 (Lisbon: Quetzal).**

Czech original: *Tristan čili zrada vzdělance*, 1954 (Vienna: Bohemica Viennensia).<sup>344</sup>

Eugénio de Andrade, the pseudonym of José Fontinhas (1923-2005), was a prominent Portuguese poet and prose writer.

Another work by Jorge Listopad was translated by Ludmila Dismánová and Aníbal Fernandes at the very dawn of the third millennium (and hence is not included in the statistics below):

- LISTOPAD, Jorge. 2001. *Em Chinatown com a Rosa*. Lisbon: Gótica. Translated from the Czech by Ludmila Dismánová and Aníbal Fernandes. Book series: *Cavalo de Tróia* [Trojan Horse].**

Czech original: *Chinatown s Rózou*, 2001 (Prague: Dauphin).

Aníbal Fernandes (\*1944) is a translator from French (L. F. Céline, B. Vian, F. Rabelais, J. Cocteau, P. Éluard), Spanish (J. L. Borges, F. de Quevedo y Villegas), and English (H. Miller, J. Conrad, O. Wilde, D. H. Lawrence).

---

<sup>343</sup> The Portuguese word 'conto' means 'story, tale' or 'one thousand escudos' (the former Portuguese currency). *Meio Conto* is therefore a *double entendre*, meaning either 'half a story' or 'five hundred escudos'.

<sup>344</sup> Although the Czech original was first published in Austria, and never in Czechoslovakia or the Czech Republic, the book was translated into German as late as 2010 by Eduard Schreiber as *Tristan oder der Verrat des Intellektuellen* (Berlin: Matthes & Seitz). *Bohemica Viennensia* was a publishing house in Vienna founded and managed by Karel Matal (Janoušek et al. 2007b: 131).

In an interview for Czech Radio on 31 July 2004, curiously available only in French,<sup>345</sup> Jorge Listopad said:

J'écris en portugais depuis trente ans, quarante ans, mais la poésie, je l'écris toujours en tchèque. J'ai été toujours d'une fidélité absolue à la langue tchèque poétique. Je n'essaie même pas d'écrire de la poésie en portugais. Je pense que la poésie est comme le lait maternel. Mais tout le reste, la fiction, les essais, je l'écris directement en portugais.<sup>346</sup>

Listopad does not hold translation, not even of literature, in high esteem, regarding it as a craft, rather than an art (*ibid.*):

Est-ce que vous traduisez la littérature et les auteurs tchèques en portugais?  
 “Non. J’ai essayé de faire des traductions, mais je n’aime pas traduire. Quand je traduis, j’écris une autre chose. Je crois que je ne suis pas doué. En plus, j’essaie de découvrir de nouvelles choses, et la traduction c’est une espèce de perfection technique qui ne m’intéresse pas tellement.”<sup>347</sup>

Jorge (František) Listopad has a place in a study of Czech-Portuguese cultural relations. From the viewpoint of Translation Studies, however, his case is rather marginal.<sup>348</sup> For our purposes here, his most interesting achievement is his staging of *O valente soldado Schweik* [The Good Soldier Švejk] in the Municipal Theatre of Almada (*Teatro Municipal de Almada*, 1995) (Klíma 2007a: 521).

#### 4.2.2.2 Milan Kundera

Apart from Václav Havel (\*1936), whose political career promoted his prominence beyond his literary achievements, Milan Kundera (\*1929) is arguably the best-known and most translated Czech author worldwide as well as in Portugal. He is so thanks solely to his literary achievements, notwithstanding the ban he put on all cinematic adaptations of his works and regardless of his unwillingness to be seen in public.

Kundera wrote most of his novels in Czech, but since 1990 has been writing only in French. His books have been translated in Portugal in various editions and reprints (the IT lists 21 entries for Kundera in Portugal since 1985). The year 1985 is no accident. It

<sup>345</sup> <http://www.radio.cz/fr/rubrique/literature/frantisek-listopad-lecrivain-entre-la-tchequie-et-le-portugal> (retrieved on 2011-07-23).

<sup>346</sup> “I have been writing in Portuguese for thirty, forty years, but as for poetry, I write always in Czech. I have always been absolutely faithful to the Czech poetic language. I don’t even try to write poetry in Portuguese. I think poetry is like mother’s milk. But all the rest – fiction, essays, I write directly in Portuguese.”

<sup>347</sup> “Do you translate Czech authors and literature into Portuguese? “No, I have tried to do translations, but I don’t like translating. When I am translating, I am writing a different thing. I think I don’t have the talent. What’s more, I try to discover new things and translation is a kind of technical perfection which does not interest me much.”

<sup>348</sup> Unless, of course, somebody undertook the potentially very interesting study of authors who, although continuing to write in their mother tongue, chose to live (or spend a considerable portion of their life) abroad, such as José Saramago and Cees Nootboom (cf. subchapter 1.3). The only question to be resolved then, however, would be whether, or in how far, such a study could be accommodated within Translation Studies.

was precisely a year earlier that Kundera's work gained international currency with his *Unbearable Lightness of Being*, which was to be filmed in 1988.<sup>349</sup>

Kundera's books were banned in Czechoslovakia after 1970. Careful attention must therefore be paid to the year of publication of his novels in Czechoslovakia or the Czech Republic. Some novels written in Czech, notably *Life is Elsewhere* and *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*, have not yet been published in the Czech Republic (as of 2010), although they have been available in many other languages for decades.

**1. KUNDERA, Milan. 1985. *A insustentável leveza do ser* [The Unbearable Lightness of Being]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated from the French by Joana Varela. Book series: *Ficção Universal no. 3* [World Fiction].**

Czech original: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*, written in 1982, published in 1985 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers), first published in the Czech Republic in 2006 (Brno: Atlantis).

French: *L'insoutenable légèreté de l'être*, 1984 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by François Kérel.

Joana Morais Varela (\*1952) is a Portuguese poet, teacher and translator from French (G. Deleuze, F. Guattari, M. Tournier, A. de Saint-Exupéry, etc.), English (J. Joyce), and German (S. Freud).<sup>350</sup>

**2. KUNDERA, Milan. 1985. *O livro do riso e do esquecimento* [The Book of Laughter and Forgetting]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated from the French by Teresa Coelho. Book series: *Ficção Universal no. 7* [World Fiction].**

Czech original: *Kniha smíchu a zapomnění*, written between 1975 and 1978, published in Czech in 1981 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers); as of 2010, it remains unpublished in the Czech Republic.

French: *Le livre du rire et de l'oubli*, 1979 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by François Kérel.

**Teresa Coelho** (1960-2009) translated authors writing in French (most notably M. Duras).

**3. KUNDERA, Milan. 1987. *A brincadeira* [The Joke]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated from the French by Helena Vaz da Silva. Book series: *Ficção universal no. 16* [World Fiction].**

Czech original: *Žert*, written in 1965, published in 1967 (Praha: Československý spisovatel).

French: *La Plaisanterie*, 1968 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by Darcel Aymonin, new edition in 1985 (*ibid.*), revised by Claude Courtot and Milan Kundera, definitive version in 1991 (*ibid.*).

---

<sup>349</sup> *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*. 1988. Dir. Philip Kaufman. Screenplay by Jean-Claude Carrière and Philip Kaufman. Starring Daniel Day-Lewis and Juliette Binoche. Released on 5 February 1988 in the U.S.A. and on 5 May 1988 in Portugal. The Saul Zaentz Company, U.S.A., 1988. <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0096332/> (retrieved on 2011-07-24). Kundera did not like the film and it was precisely because of the 'Hollywoodisation' of this novel that Kundera decided to impose a ban on all cinematic adaptations of his works.

<sup>350</sup> Her website: <http://joanavarela.blogspot.com/> (retrieved on 2011-07-24).

Helena Vaz da Silva (1939-2002)<sup>351</sup> translated authors writing in French (primarily M. Yourcenar).

**4. KUNDERA, Milan. 1988. *O livro dos amores risíveis* [The Book of Laughable Loves]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated from the French by Luísa Feijó, Maria João Delgado. Book series: *Ficção universal no. 32* [World Fiction].**

Czech originals: *Směšné Lásky* [Laughable Loves], three booklets written between 1958 and 1968 (*Směšné lásky* 1963, *Druhý sešit směšných lásek* 1965, *Třetí sešit směšných lásek* 1968 [Laughable Loves; The Second Notebook of Laughable Loves; The Third Notebook of Laughable Loves]), published together in 1970 (Praha: Československý spisovatel).

French: *Risibles amours*, jointly for the first time in 1968 (Paris: Gallimard), definitive edition in 1970 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by François Kérel.

Maria Luísa Queiroz de Castro Feijó (\*1944), translator and interpreter, translated authors writing in English (A. Bester, E. A. Poe, J. K. Jerome, A. Koestler, A. Christie) and French (A. Kourouma, G. Simenon, S. de Beauvoir).

Maria João Delgado (n.d.), translator and localisation professional, translated authors writing in English (J. M. Coetzee, A. Christie, S. Rushdie), but also French. Together, L. Feijó and M. J. Delgado translated *L'écriture ou la vie* [Writing or Living] by Jorge Semprún (1923-2011), G. Swift's *Last Orders* and *Waterland*, P. Roth's *American Pastoral*, M. Kundera's *The Art of the Novel*, etc.

**5. KUNDERA, Milan. 1989. *A valsa do adeus* [The Farewell Waltz]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated by Miguel Serras Pereira. Book series: *Ficção universal no. 44* [World Fiction].**

Czech original: *Valčík na rozloučenou*, written in 1972, published in 1979 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers), first edition in the Czech Republic in 1997 (Brno: Atlantis).

French: *La valse aux adieux*, 1976 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by François Kérel.

Miguel Serras Pereira (\*1949) is a Portuguese poet, essayist and translator.<sup>352</sup> He has translated authors writing in French (M. Proust, S. Beauvoir, G. Steiner, J. Derrida, M. Kundera), English (G. Orwell, V. Woolf), and Spanish (V. Llosa, G. G. Márquez, A. B. Casares, J. L. Borges). Since 1980, he has been publishing his own poetry. Between 1993 and 1997, and again from 2000 on, he taught at the ISLA (*Instituto Superior de Línguas e Administração*) in Santarém.

**6. KUNDERA, Milan. 1990. *A vida não é aqui* [Life Is Not Here]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated by Miguel Serras Pereira. Book series: *Ficção universal no. 61* [World Fiction].**

Czech original: *Život je jinde* [Life is Elsewhere], written in 1970, published in 1979 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers); as of 2010, it has yet to be published in the Czech Republic (*sic!*).

French: *La vie est ailleurs*, 1973 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by François Kérel.

<sup>351</sup> Cf. [http://cvc.instituto-camoes.pt/conhecer/bases-tematicas/index.php?Itemid=84&option=com\\_content&view=article&id=1412](http://cvc.instituto-camoes.pt/conhecer/bases-tematicas/index.php?Itemid=84&option=com_content&view=article&id=1412) (retrieved on 2011-07-24).

<sup>352</sup> Cf. <http://www.iplb.pt/sites/DGLB/Portugues/autores/Paginas/PesquisaAutores1.aspx?AutorId=10487> (retrieved on 2011-07-24).

**7. KUNDERA, Milan. 1990. *A imortalidade* [Immortality]. Lisbon: Dom Quixote. Translated by Miguel Serras Pereira. Book series: *Ficção universal no. 70* [World Fiction].**

Czech original: *Nesmrtelnost*, written in 1988, published in 1993 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers; Brno: Atlantis).

French: *L'immortalité*, 1990 (Paris: Gallimard), translated by Eva Bloch.

**8. KUNDERA, Milan. 1992. *Jacques e o seu amo: homenagem a Denis Diderot em três actos* [Jacques and His Master: Homage to Denis Diderot in Three Acts]. Oporto: Asa. Translated from the French by Teresa Curvelo. Book series: *Letras do mundo* [World Letters].**

Czech original: *Jakub a jeho pán* [Jacques and His Master], written in 1971, published in 1992 (Brno: Atlantis).

French: *Jacques et son maître: Hommage à Denis Diderot en trois actes*, 1981 (Paris: Gallimard). Translated into French by the author himself.

Teresa Curvelo (n.d.) is a Portuguese translator primarily from English (e.g. J. Blish, E. Cooper, P. K. Dick, C. Brown) and French (E. Bernheim, K. Mourad, S. Michaud, F. Lelord).

Kundera is a special, indeed a unique case in the corpus of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese in that his works have been translated in their entirety. More precisely: apart from his early poems and theatre plays, published in Czech in the 1950s and 1960s, which Kundera himself no longer considers part of his own *œuvre* and has never published again, all of Kundera's works, i.e. all those translated into or written in French, have also been translated into Portuguese. Those written originally in French, however, are not part of the present research.<sup>353</sup>

Kundera's case is highly pertinent not only to Czech literature studies, but also to Translation Studies in general, especially in that his literary creations tend to blur the boundary between originals and translations (Woods 2006: ix):

A bilingual author, Kundera lost his native-language readership (apart from a small exile readership) once his work was banned in Czechoslovakia in 1970. He wrote in Czech from then on, knowing that the large majority of readers would not be Czech speakers. In the mid 1980s he began writing in French and from the mid 1990s onwards his novels have been written in French. Also in the mid 1980s, Kundera revised all the French translations of the novels written in Czech and declared these, rather than the Czech versions, to be the definitive and authentic versions of the novels. The translations in other words became the originals. Later, to produce new Czech versions, he would use *three* "originals": the Czech manuscript, the first published Czech versions (in Toronto, Canada) and the French definitive translations. (*italics in original*)

<sup>353</sup> Before the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, there were four Portuguese translations of the French originals: *A arte do romance* [The Art of the Novel], 1988 (Lisbon: Dom Quixote), translated by Luísa Feijó and Maria João Delgado; *Os testamentos traídos* [Testaments Betrayed], 1994 (Oporto: Asa), translated by Miguel Serras Pereira; *A lentidão* [Slowness], 1995 (Oporto: Asa), translated by Miguel Serras Pereira; *A identidade* [Identity], 1998 (Oporto: Asa), translated by Pedro Tamen. The 21<sup>st</sup> century has seen three translations of Kundera's works: *A ignorância* [Ignorance], 2001 (Oporto: Asa), translated by Miguel Serras Pereira; *A cortina* [The Curtain], 2005 (Oporto: Asa), translated by Pedro Sousa Pires; and finally *Um encontro* [Encounter], 2011 (Lisbon: Dom Quixote), translated by Isabel St Aubyn.



Since, however, the Portuguese translations have all been made directly from the only authorised and ‘authentic’ French versions, the issue of Kundera’s Portuguese translations is much less interesting than that of his Czech originals and French (and English) translations (cf. Woods 2006).

Through the Portuguese looking-glass, however, even Kundera’s works have not been immune to a certain kind of distortion. What Kundera is very particular about in the translations he himself supervises (particularly into English and German) is the choice of translator. And once he settles on a translator, Kundera requires that he or she always translate his works into that language. Kundera’s Portuguese translators, however, have been many and various. In that sense, the medium size of Portugal and hence of European Portuguese resurfaces as a relevant issue even for such a ‘canonical’ author, an author whose oeuvre has been received in Portugal in its entirety.

### 4.2.3 Non-Fiction

Portuguese translations of non-fictional books written by Czech or Slovak authors or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia are not the main focus of the present thesis. However, translated non-fiction is not negligible, as it demonstrates in which areas and topics the Portuguese polysystem took an interest. Nor are the dates of publication irrelevant. They point to a tendency that applies to the translation of fiction as well: they cluster, even more conspicuously than does the fiction, around important political dates, especially 1968 and 1989, rather than 1974 and 1993. It is very important for current theoretical debates in Translation Studies to realise that despite all the indirectness of the Portuguese translations, it was *political* events in the source, more precisely: in the *original* (here: Czech) culture, that determined the reception of its literature, both fictional and non-fictional, and its translation (no matter via which mediating channel) into Portuguese. Politics, not just ‘power’ or ideology as abstract concepts, but politics *sensu stricto*, cannot be overlooked in investigating translations.

Last but not least, Portuguese translations of books of non-fiction by Czech authors tended to be reprinted more often than fictional works, exhibiting a more substantial presence in the Portuguese book market. A brief look at these works will therefore serve to provide a more complete framework for Czech-Portuguese literary relations.

#### 4.2.3.1 Political Non-Fiction

Politics is the most strongly represented area among the Portuguese translations of books written by Czech authors or concerning Czechoslovakia. Only books written originally and entirely in Czech are numbered and counted in the statistics below.

The list starts with a book of reports concerning Paul Thümmel (1902-45), an employee of the *Abwehr* [Defence], the German military intelligence during the Second World War, who worked as a spy for the Czech resistance movement:

1. AMORT, Čestmír & JEDLIČKA, Ivan M. 1968. *O espião A-54* [Spy A-54]. Lisbon: Bertrand. Translated from the French by Mário Varela Soares.

Czech original: *Tajemství vyzvědače A-54* [The Secret of Spy A-54], 1965 (Prague: Vydavatelství časopisů MNO).

French: *On l'appelait A.54* [They Called Him A.54], 1966 (Paris: Laffont), adapted and translated by Roger Gheysens.<sup>354</sup>

Apart from the two aforementioned Portuguese compilations dealing with the Prague Spring and including texts by Alexander Dubček (two publications in 1968) and Ludvík Vaculík (in one of these), P. Tigrid's *Le printemps de Prague* [The Prague Spring], was also translated into Portuguese:

**TIGRID, Pavel. 1969. *A primavera de Praga* [The Prague Spring]. Lisbon: Início. Translated from the French by Maria Odília Moreira, Orlando Neves and J. Correia Tavares. Book series: *Testemunhos no. 9* [Testimonies]. Original title: *Le printemps de Prague*, 1968 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil)**

Pavel Tigrid (1917-2003) was a Czech writer, journalist and politician, who spent the better part of his adulthood as an émigré. In 1956, he founded one of the most important Czech exile journals, *Svědectví* [Testimony]. After the Velvet Revolution, he was Minister of Culture (1994-96), before taking his own life in 2003. He wrote the above book of essays dealing with the Prague Spring in French, while he lived in Paris.

Ten years after the events, the Prague Spring was recalled again in another Portuguese compilation:

**CAVALCANTI, Pedro (ed.). 1979. *A tentativa checa há dez anos...* [The Czech Attempt Ten Years Ago]. Lisbon: Arcádia. Translated by Lemos de Azevedo, Francisco Agarez, Almeida Gonçalves and Teixeira Leite. Book series: *Alternativas Socialistas no. 10* [Socialist Alternatives].**

Being a translation from multiple sources and various languages, it cannot be regarded as a Portuguese translation of a Czech book. In as far as it concerns Czechoslovakia, however, it is included here to complete the picture.

Julius Fučík's *Notes from the Gallows*, a key book of Czechoslovak communist propaganda, was translated into Portuguese as early as 1975, only a year after the Carnation Revolution:

**2. FUČÍK, Julius. 1975. *Reportagem sob a força*. Lisbon: Avante. Translated by Maria Teresa Cardoso.**

The Portuguese translation appeared in three editions; the third edition, available in the Portuguese National Library (BNP), was published in 1985 in the book series *Resistência no. 5* [Resistance]. It contains no original title or title of the source text. The publishing house, *Avante!*, belongs to the Portuguese Communist Party.

Teresa Cardoso translated authors writing in French (e.g. C. Perrault, N. Ciravégna, P. Couderc). She even translated the Prague German author Gustav Meyrink's *Walpurgisnacht* [Walpurgis Night] from the French. The French version of Fučík's

<sup>354</sup> The book was translated into English, also from the French, as *The Canaris File* in 1970 (London: Allan Wingate) by Margaret E. Parker.

*Notes from the Gallows* is therefore most likely to have been the source text for the Portuguese translation: *Écrit sous la potence* [Written under the Noose], 1947 (Paris: Pierre Seghers), translated by Yvonne and Karel Marek. As there can be no certainty, however, the mediating language for the Portuguese translation is treated as ‘unknown’.

Julius Fučík (1903-1943) was a Communist journalist executed by the Nazis for his participation in the Czech anti-Nazi resistance. His *Notes from the Gallows* (in Czech: *Reportáž psaná na oprátce*, literally ‘Report Written under the Noose’) was first published in 1945 (Prague: Svoboda), albeit heavily censored by the Communist Party. The first unabridged edition appeared only after the Velvet Revolution in 1994 (Říčany: Orego), and in an enlarged and annotated edition in 1995 (Prague: Torst). The first facsimile edition of the manuscript appeared in 2008 (Prague: Ottovo nakladatelství). With more than 40 reprints between 1945 and 1985, it was one of the most ‘visible’ books of Czech communist propaganda. It has been translated into many languages.

The Velvet Revolution of 1989 was reflected by Portuguese translators and publishers most tangibly in the translation of three political books by Václav Havel:

**3. HAVEL, Václav. 1990. *Interrogatório à distância: Entrevista com Karel Hvižd’ala* [Long-Distance Examination – Interview with Karel Hvižd’ala]. Lisbon: Inquérito. Translated by Zita Seabra.** Preface by Mário Soares. Book series: *Estudos e documentos no. 241* [Studies and Documents].  
Czech original: *Dálkový výslech – Rozhovor s Karlem Hvižd’alou*, 1986 (Purley, U.K.: Rozmluvy)

Zita Seabra (\*1949) is a Portuguese publisher and politician. She started her political career as a communist, but left the PCP at the time of Gorbachev’s perestroika. She later joined the right-of-centre Social Democratic Party (PSD). Seabra is best known today as the director of the publishing house Alêtheia. She made her name writing a book of political reflections *O nome das coisas: reflexão em tempo de mudança* [The Name of Things: Reflection at a Time of Change], 1988 (Mem Martins: Europa-América), and lately her autobiography *Foi Assim* [Thus It Was], 2007 (Lisbon: Alêtheia).

Havel’s book, translated into English as *Disturbing the Peace: A Conversation with Karel Hvižd’ala*<sup>355</sup>, was Seabra’s only translation. By 1990, it was available in French (1987), German (1987) and several other languages (Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Hungarian, etc.). The Italian and English translations appeared only in 1990. As the publisher’s peritext does not tell us, it is not clear which mediating language Z. Seabra used, but either French or German would appear most likely.<sup>356</sup>

**4. HAVEL, Václav. 1990. *Ensaio políticos* [Political Essays]. Lisbon: Bertrand. Translated from the French by Margarida Gago da Câmara.** Preface by Adriano Moreira.

<sup>355</sup> HAVEL, Václav. 1990. *Disturbing the Peace: A Conversation with Karel Hvižd’ala*. London: Faber and Faber. Translated from the Czech by Paul Wilson.

<sup>356</sup> French: *Interrogatoire à distance: Entretien avec Karel Hvižd’ala*, 1987 (Revest: Éditions de l’Aube), translated by Jan Rubeš. German: *Fernverhör: Ein Gespräch mit Karel Hvižd’ala*, 1987 (Reinbek: Rowohlt), translated by Joachim Bruss.

French: *Essais politiques*, 1989 (Paris: Calmann-Lévy), reprinted in 1990, texts collected by Roger Errera<sup>357</sup> and Jan Vladislav (1923-2009); preface by Jan Vladislav.

Czech originals: various.<sup>358</sup>

Maria Alexandra (also Margarida) Gago da Câmara (\*1962) has written on Lisbon drama and baroque *azulejos*,<sup>359</sup> but she appears to have translated nothing else (PORBASE).

The third book on politics and the last by Václav Havel translated into Portuguese is his *Letters to Olga*. This book appeared at two different Lisbon publishers in the same year, and contained the following data:

**5a. HAVEL, Václav. 1991. *Cartas a Olga: Reflexões da prisão* [Letters to Olga: Reflections from Prison]. Lisbon: Livros do Brasil. Translated by Manuela Bacelar. ‘Original title’ (*Título original*): *Briefe an Olga*.**

**5b. HAVEL, Václav. 1991. *Cartas a Olga: Reflexões da prisão* [Letters to Olga: Reflections from Prison]. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores. Translated from the German by Aires Graça, ‘revision of the matrix by’ (*revisão de matriz por*) Manuela Bacelar. ‘Original title’ (*Título original*): *Dopisy Olze*.**

Czech original: *Dopisy Olze*, first published in 1985 (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers), published for the first time in Czechoslovakia as *Dopisy Olze (červen 1979 – září 1982)* [Letters to Olga (June 1979 – September 1982)], 1990 (Brno: Atlantis).

German: *Briefe an Olga: Identität und Existenz: Betrachtungen aus dem Gefängnis* [Letters to Olga: Identity and Existence: Reflections from Prison], 1984 (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt), translated by Joachim Bruss, German edition by Jiří Gruša (\*1938).<sup>360</sup>

Aires Graça (n.d.), a teacher at the Universidade de Lisboa and later Universidade Nova, now retired, is a Portuguese translator from German (e.g. G. Heym, H. von Kleist, E. Jelinek, B. Brecht). Manuela Bacelar is a Portuguese illustrator, who spent some time in Czechoslovakia before the Velvet Revolution at the *Vysoká škola uměleckoprůmyslová v Praze* (VŠUP, Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design in Prague).<sup>361</sup>

The version brought out by *Círculo de Leitores* is likely to be the Portuguese translation of the German translation, hence a second-hand translation. We know that ‘*título*

<sup>357</sup> For Roger Errera, cf. [http://rogererrera.fr/site%20anglais/parcours\\_anglais/parcours\\_anglais.html](http://rogererrera.fr/site%20anglais/parcours_anglais/parcours_anglais.html) (retrieved on 2011-07-30).

<sup>358</sup> The French collection of essays is most likely to have been based, to a large extent, on *Do různých stran: eseje a články z let 1983-89* [In Different Directions: Essays and Articles from 1983-89] (collected by Vilém Prečan), first published in 1989 (Scheinfeld, Germany: Československé středisko nezávislé literatury), reissued in 1990 (Prague: Lidové noviny).

<sup>359</sup> *Azulejos* are traditional Portuguese painted, tin-glazed, ceramic tiles used for decoration, found both in the interior and on the exterior of buildings.

<sup>360</sup> Jiří Gruša (\*1938) is an eminent Czech writer and translator from German (F. Kafka, F. Schiller, R. M. Rilke, etc.). He also served as Minister of Education (1997-98), Ambassador to Austria (1998-2004) and President of the International PEN (2003-09).

<sup>361</sup> Interview with František Listopad (2007-11-02).

*original*’ was used to describe both the title of the actual original (here: Czech) and the title of the source text, often a mediating translation (here: German). In the case of the *Círculo de Leitores* edition, then, that piece of information reveals little about the ‘directness of translation’ (Toury 1995: 58).

The version published by *Livros do Brasil* is more confusing. Manuela Bacelar is identified there as the translator, but the ‘*título original*’ is that of the German translation.

Thanks to her sojourn in Prague, Manuela Bacelar knew Czech, so she could ‘revise the matrix’, as indicated in the translation by A. Graça, published by *Círculo de Leitores*. Whether she was capable of making an entire translation of Havel’s *Letters to Olga*, not an easy text to comprehend and to convey, is unfortunately unknown. The probability of her translating from the German is even less likely.

The appearance of two Portuguese translations of the same book in the same year, both containing the name of Manuela Bacelar and a German ‘element’, is thus most surprising and unique in the corpus of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese.

#### 4.2.3.1 Non-Political Non-Fiction

Regarding non-fictional books of Czech authorship which have nothing to do with politics, the largest group concerns sports and games – from gymnastics to chess:

**6. KOS, Bohumil [et al]. 1978. *Ginástica: 1200 exercícios* [Gymnastics: 1200 Exercises]. Lisbon: Estampa. Translated from the German by Ana Falcão Bastos and Luís Leitão. Book series: *Desportos no. 2* [Sports].**

German: *Gymnastik: 1200 Übungen* [Gymnastics: 1200 Exercises], 1962 (Berlin: Sportverlag), translated from the Czech by Willi Franz.

Czech original: *Úvodní a přípravná cvičení* [Preliminary and Preparatory Exercises], 1956 (Praha: STN).

The first German edition mentions three authors: Bohumil Kos, Zdeněk Teplý and Rudolf Volráb. Later German editions identify Bohumil Kos as the main author of a team of co-authors. The Portuguese translation is therefore likely to have been made from one of the later German editions.

Three books by international chess grandmaster Luděk Pachman were translated into Portuguese from the German:

**PACHMAN, Luděk. 1978. *Fundamentos do xadrez: aberturas* [Chess Basics: Openings]. Lisbon: Presença. Translated from the German by Conceição Jardim and Eduardo Lúcio Nogueira. Book series: *Habitat no. 8*. Reprinted in 1981, 2003.**

German original: *Eröffnungspraxis im Schach*, 1976 (München: Heyne).

Czech: *Šachová zahájení v praxi*, 1991 (Frýdek-Místek: Pliska), translated by Milan Petras.

**PACHMAN, Luděk. 1979. *Fundamentos do xadrez: o meio jogo* [Chess Basics: Middlegame]. Lisbon: Presença. Translated from the German by Conceição Jardim and Eduardo Lúcio Nogueira. Book series: *Habitat no. 17*. Reprinted in 1988.**

German original: *Mittelspielpraxis im Schach*, 1977 (München: Heyne).

Czech: *Střední hra v šachové praxi*, 1991 (Frýdek-Místek: Pliska), translated by Milan Petras.

**PACHMAN, Luděk. 1981. *Fundamentos do xadrez: finais* [Chess Basics: Endgame]. Lisbon: Presença. Translated from the German by Conceição Jardim and Eduardo Lúcio Nogueira. Book series: *Habitat no. 29*. Reprinted in 1983.**

German original: *Endspielpraxis im Schach*, 1977 (München: Heyne).

Czech: *Šachové koncovky v praxi*, 1990 (Frýdek-Místek: Pliska), translated by Milan Petras.

Luděk Pachman (1924-2003) was a Czech grandmaster (from 1954), chess theoretician and political activist. First a Communist himself, he changed his political opinions after the events of the Prague Spring and emigrated to Germany in 1972. In 1976, he was stripped of his Czech citizenship (only a year after Kundera), so he then played for West Germany and became German chess master in 1978. Pachman also wrote books about his disillusionment with Marxism.

Although Pachman authored many books about chess while still in Czechoslovakia, the publications above were originally written in German and translated into Czech only after the Velvet Revolution. Since the Portuguese translations were all made from the German originals, these books are not counted in the statistics below.

Apart from politics and sport, other areas that yielded translations into European Portuguese were philosophy and psychology. Regarding the former, the Brazilian translation (from the Italian) of K. Kosík's *Dialectics of the Concrete* was reprinted in Lisbon in 1977:

**KOSÍK, Karel. 1977. *Dialéctica do concreto*. Lisbon: Dinalivro. Book series: *Perspectivas do homem no. 3* [Perspectives of Man].**

Brazilian translation from the Italian by Célia Neves and Aldérico Toríbio: *Dialética do concreto*, 1969 (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra), reprinted in 1976, 1986, 1995.

Italian: *Dialettica del concreto*, 1965 (Milan: Bompiani), reprinted in 1972, translated by Gianlorenzo Pacini.

Czech original: *Dialektika konkrétního: Studie o problematice člověka a světa* [Dialectics of the Concrete: Studies in Issues of Man and the World], 1963 (Prague, manuscript), published in 1964 (Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd).

Karel Kosík (1926-2003) was a Czech philosopher, historian and sociologist. Initially a Communist himself, he turned against the ideology like many other intellectuals after the suppression of the Prague Spring. He was expelled from the Communist Party in 1970 and until 1989 his books could only be published abroad.

Kosík's *Dialectics of the Concrete* was translated into many languages.<sup>362</sup> As the Portuguese edition adjusted the Brazilian spelling to the European Portuguese standard, it increases the indirectness of the translation beyond a simple second-hand translation.

However, as the translation itself is of Brazilian provenance, Kosík's book is not included in our statistics.

J. Toman's educational and self-teaching guide, supposedly translated into English as *How to develop all aspects of our personality*, is a mystery:

**TOMAN, Jiří. 1980. *Como desenvolver todos os aspectos da nossa personalidade. Oporto: Civilização. Translation from the English by Daniel Augusto Gonçalves.* Reprinted in 1986, 1993, 1994, 1995.**  
Czech original: *Jak zdokonalovat sám sebe* [How to Perfect Oneself], 1980 (Praha: Svoboda).

Jiří Toman (1913-88) was a Czech author, educational consultant and mental training adviser. Daniel Augusto Gonçalves (\*1921) was a Portuguese translator from English (J. Gardner, G. Greene, K. Amis, A. Christie, L. Durrell, J. London, etc.).

The Portuguese book claims to have been translated from the English, providing the title *How to develop all aspects of our personality*. The English translation, however, is impossible to locate. The identical date of publication of both the Czech original and the Portuguese translation are striking as well. The book is therefore not counted in the statistics below.

Finally, two eminent Czech literary theoreticians were translated into European Portuguese:

**7. MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1981. *Escritos sobre estética e semiótica da arte* [Works on the Aesthetics and Semiotics of Art]. Lisbon: Estampa. Translated from the Spanish by Manuel Ruas. Book series: *Imprensa universitária no. 20* [University Press]. Reprinted in 1990, 1993, 1997.**

Czech originals: various.

Spanish: *Escritos de estética y semiótica del arte*, 1977 (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili), translated by Anna Anthony-Višová, selection of texts, preface, notes and bibliography by Jordi Llovet.<sup>363</sup>

Jan Mukařovský (1891-1975), one of the co-founders of the Prague Linguistic Circle, was a renowned Czech structuralist, literary theoretician and aesthetician. He strongly influenced Jiří Levý and Anton Popovič. He was Rector of Charles University in Prague from 1948 to 1953.

Manuel Ruas (n.d.) made translations from English (E. Queen), Italian (B. Ciari), French (C. Lévi-Strauss) and Spanish (J. Ramírez Vázquez). The publisher's peritext clearly states that M. Ruas translated Mukařovský's book from the Spanish translation by A. Anthony-Višová.

<sup>362</sup> Cf. [http://volny.cz/enelen/kkosik/kk\\_bibl.html](http://volny.cz/enelen/kkosik/kk_bibl.html) (retrieved on 2011-07-30).

<sup>363</sup> Cf. <http://www.ellagoediciones.com/AUTORES/apoesia/jllovet.html> (retrieved on 2011-07-30).

**DOLEŽEL, Lubomír. 1990. *A poética ocidental: tradição e inovação*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian. Translated from the English by Vivina de Campos Figueiredo. Book series: *Manuais universitários* [University Manuals]. Preface by Carlos Reis (\*1950).**

English: *Occidental Poetics: Tradition and Progress*, 1990 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).

Lubomír Doležel (\*1922) is a Czech philologist and literary theoretician, strongly influenced by the Prague Linguistic Circle. He is one of the founders of the possible-world theory in the fictional universe. He has lectured at various North American universities since 1965 (primarily at the University of Michigan, 1965-68, and the University of Toronto, 1968-88).

Vivina de Campos Figueiredo (n.d.) also translated S. Bassnett's *Translation Studies* (*Estudos de Tradução*, 2003, Lisbon: Gulbenkian).<sup>364</sup>

Since Doležel wrote the above book in English, it is not counted in our statistics.

The last book written by Czech authors and translated into Portuguese straddles botany and medicine:

**VOLÁK, Jan. STODOLA, Jiří (illustrated by František Severa). 1990. *Plantas medicinais* [Medicinal Plants]. Lisbon: Inquérito. Translated from the French by Luís Serrão. No book series indicated.**

French: *Plantes médicinales*, 1984 (Paris: Gründ), reprinted in 1987.

Czech original: *Léčivé rostliny*, date and publisher unknown.

The book was originally written in Czech as '*Léčivé rostliny*', as indicated, for instance, in the Polish translation, available in the German National Library.<sup>365</sup> However, the Czech original is to be found neither in the Czech National Library (NK Klementinum) nor anywhere on the Internet. Strangely, the Slovak version, *Veľká kniha liečivých rastlín* [The Big Book of Medicinal Plants], from 1987 (Bratislava: Príroda), was translated by Ľ. Krajčovičová from the German: *Das große Buch der Heilpflanzen*, 1983 (Prague: Artia), translated by P. Zieschang.

The publisher's peritext indicates that the Portuguese translation was made from the French (*Plantes médicinales*, the translation mentioned above). Data from PORBASE seem to confirm this: Luís Serrão (n.d.) is a Portuguese translator primarily from French (M. Leblanc, Y. Duplessis, J. Gimpel) and English (J. Le Carré, A. C. Doyle, R. L. Stevenson, I. Murdoch), but also from Spanish (F. Arrabal).<sup>366</sup>

As the Czech original is conspicuously absent from all databases consulted, it could be hypothesised that a Czech manuscript may have been written only to be translated into foreign languages (e.g. at Prague's Artia, cf. the above translation into German from

<sup>364</sup> Cf. <http://www.confluencias.net/n3/figueiredo.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-08-27).

<sup>365</sup> Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. The Polish: <http://d-nb.info/1000658201> (no translator indicated); the German: <http://d-nb.info/204777550> (both retrieved on 2011-08-06).

<sup>366</sup> By 1990, there was also a Spanish translation of the book: *Plantas medicinales*, 1988 (Madrid: Susaeta, no translator indicated).



1983), and the book may indeed have never been published in Czech. In any case, scholarly caution prompts us not to count this book in our statistics.

#### 4.2.4 Analysis and Statistics

As stated in our Methodology (Chapter 2), only books written originally in Czech or Slovak, translated into European Portuguese and published in Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century are considered in the following statistics. Where ‘special cases’ are included, the total number is given in round brackets.

Excluding the ‘special cases’, only 20 books of fiction written originally in Czech were translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. Including Kundera (8) and Listopad (1), the total number is 29.

Non-fiction written originally and entirely in Czech amounts to only 7 books translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal.

Slovak was represented in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal by only two books, both works of fiction.

A further 11 non-fictional books, either written by Czech authors in other languages (e.g. P. Tigríd’s *Le printemps de Prague*) or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia (e.g. Cavalcanti’s *A tentativa checa há dez anos...*), were published in Portugal in the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Table 8: Books Originally Written in Czech or Slovak and Translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, by Genre**

GENRE	Czech	Slovak
Novels	19 (25)	2
Stories	(2)	0
Plays	1 (2)	0
Essays	(1)	0
Non-fiction	7	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>27 (37)</b>	<b>2</b>

The *genre* structure of the books of fiction tends clearly towards novels: 19, excluding the ‘special cases’; 25 in total. No Czech poetry was translated in book form and only one book of (three) theatre plays (written by V. Havel).

If we include the ‘special cases’, we can add Kundera’s play (*Jacques e o seu amo*), Kundera’s stories (*O livro dos amores risíveis*) and Listopad’s ‘poetic’ stories (*Em Chinatown com a Rosa*). Regarding essays, Listopad’s book (*Tristão ou a traição dum intelectual*) should not pass unnoticed, and three of Havel’s books, listed here under non-fiction (hence not counted in Figure 8), qualify as books of essays as well.

Regarding books written originally in Slovak, only two were translated into Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, both of them novels and both by L. Mňačko. The third book, dating already from the 21<sup>st</sup> century (2004), is the only book of poetry translated into

Portuguese in our corpus. In other words, no book of poetry written originally in Czech or Slovak was translated into Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal.

**Table 9: Source-Text Languages for Portuguese Translations of Books Written in Czech or Slovak**

	<b>CZ</b>	<b>FR</b>	<b>EN</b>	<b>DE</b>	<b>ES</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Czech fiction</b>	4 (5)	10 (18)	3	0	0	3	<b>20 (29)</b>
<b>Czech non-fiction</b>	0*	2	0	2*	1	2	<b>7</b>
<b>Slovak (fiction)</b>	0	1	0	1	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 (5)</b>	<b>13 (21)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>29 (38)</b>

Key: CZ – Czech, FR – French, EN – English, DE – German, ES – Spanish

\*Working on the assumption that Havel's *Letters to Olga* was translated from the German and only 'revised' by Manuela Bacelar, i.e. checked against the original Czech manuscript (see above).

Table 9 reveals a pattern of mediating languages very different from that found in the censorship files. French is clearly dominant for Czech fiction: 50 % (or 62.07 % including the 'special cases') of all books of fiction written originally in Czech were translated into European Portuguese via French.

The second most represented source language for the Portuguese translations is (the original) Czech, with 4 (5) books, i.e. 20 % (17.24 %) of our corpus, thanks to L. Dismánová's and A. de Almeida's translations (and Listopad's self-translation). Apart from Listopad's self-translation (1960), Czech was used as the ultimate source language for Portuguese translations only from 1989 to 1992.

For most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, or more specifically for most of the period in which books of Czech authorship were translated into European Portuguese (1943-92), *mediating* languages were used. Expressed in numbers, indirect translations form 80 % (82.76 %) of our corpus.

English comes third, with three books, i.e. 15 % (10.34 %) of our corpus. Apart from Lima de Freitas' translation of K. Čapek's *War with the Newts* (1965), it is also represented only in the last years of the period under investigation (1990-91).

German is the source language for the Portuguese translations of one Slovak book of fiction (L. Mňačko's *O sabor do poder*) and two books of Czech non-fiction (V. Havel's *Cartas a Olga* and B. Kos' *Ginástica: 1200 exercícios*). Were we to count L. Pachman's chess trilogy, assuming that his German-written books were, to a large extent, based on his previous publications in Czech, German would be represented as a mediating language even more convincingly. In other words, while German is not negligible *per se*, it is so in the case of Czech fiction.

The role of Spanish amounts to a standard error: only one book of non-fiction (Mukařovský's *Escritos sobre estética e semiótica da arte*) was translated into Portuguese via Spanish.

Less insignificant, however, is the number of books in the case of which only careful textual comparison of various mediating texts and the Portuguese translations would establish the ultimate source text for the Portuguese version: 15 % (10.34 %) of Czech books of fiction were translated via unknown mediating texts. These texts, however, are not ‘entirely unknown’. Given what we know about the translators and about translation practices in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, they will have been French, English, German, Spanish or Italian – in that order of probability. It is therefore unnecessary to consider *all* existing translations of a Czech work (e.g. Otčenášek’s *Romeo, Juliet and Darkness*) in order to establish the ultimate source text for the Portuguese translation.

Towards the close of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the tendency to translate Czech literature via other languages (primarily French and English) appears to have diminished, thanks first and foremost to the persistent efforts of Ludmila Dismánová. However, the trend towards direct translations proved unsustainable at the inception of the 21<sup>st</sup> century due to the desperate dearth of translators capable of translating from Czech into Portuguese.

While indirect translations may be reprehensible from a textual and academic point of view, they are a highly positive phenomenon from a cultural and literary perspective. On the one hand, they testify to the high quality and vitality of Czech literature; on the other, they prove the interest of the Portuguese polysystem in Czech literature. Seen in that light, indirect translations are doubtless inherently better than non-translation.

Mediating languages are not to be confused with provenance. One translation from Czech into French, later used for the Portuguese second-hand translation, originated in Prague (M. Majerová’s *Robinsonne*). For some books, we know the mediating language, but not the actual provenance of the source text for the Portuguese (indirect) translation. That is most notably the case of J. Weiss’ *La maison aux mille étages*, published in Belgium, France and Switzerland before it was translated into Portuguese, as well as of J. Škvorecký’s *The Engineer of Human Souls*, published both in Canada and in the United Kingdom before appearing in Lisbon.

Clearly, as the mediating language is sometimes not possible to determine, as in the case of J. Otčenášek’s *Romeu, Julieta e as trevas*, neither is the ultimate provenance of the source text for the Portuguese translation. The overall provenance of mediating (source) texts for the Portuguese translations of works of fiction written in Czech is as follows:

- 7 (15) books from Paris, i.e. 35 % (51.72 %); all French translations of Kundera’s works were originally published in Paris;
- 5 (6) books from Prague, i.e. 25 % (20.69 %); noting that Dismánová made all her translations of Hrabal from samizdat versions (produced in Czechoslovakia);
- 2 books from London, i.e. 10 % (6.90 %); possibly more if Škvorecký’s *The Engineer of Human Souls* arrived via London (not straight from Toronto);
- 6 books of unknown provenance, i.e. 30 % (20 %).

Czech non-fiction came from Paris (3 books), Berlin (*Gymnastik: 1200 Übungen*), Reinbek near Hamburg (*Briefe an Olga*) and Barcelona (*Escritos de estética y semiótica del arte*). Regarding the duo of Slovak books, one came to Portugal from Paris (*La septième nuit*), the other from Vienna (*Wie die Macht schmeckt*).

**Table 10: Years of Publication of Czech and Slovak Books of Fiction Correlated with their Place of Publication**

Years	CZ in LX	CZ in OP	SK in LX
1943	1		
1947	1		
1953	2		
1960	1	(1)	
1961	2		
1962	2		
1965	1		
1968			1
1969			1
1971	1		
1979	1		
1985	(2)		
1986	1		
1987	(1)		
1988	(1)		
1989	(1)	1	
<b>1990</b>	<b>3 (5)</b>	<b>1</b>	
1991	1		
1992		1 (2)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>17 (24)</b>	<b>3 (5)</b>	<b>2</b>

Key: CZ – Czech, SK – Slovak, LX – Lisbon, OP – Oporto

Translations of books of fiction written originally in Czech begin in 1943 and end in 1992. Two books (both by K. J. Beneš) were translated in the 1940s, two in the 1950s (one by Beneš, one by E. Hostovský), six in the 1960s (or seven if we count Listopad's self-translation), two in the 1980s (or seven if Kundera's novels are counted) and six in the 1990s (nine, including Kundera's works).

In other words, only the 1960s and the 1990s show heightened activity in the field of translation. The 1980s are dominated almost exclusively by the 'discovery' of Milan Kundera. This distribution is highly symptomatic.

The events of the Prague Spring and its suppression by the armies of the Warsaw Pact (1968-69) were followed by the Portuguese less in the form of translations *per se*, but in a rather different way. It is precisely to reveal such correlations that non-fiction has, after all, been included in this chapter.

Two of Mňačko's novels were translated into Portuguese in 1968 and 1969, only one year after their publication in the original Slovak. That is highly untypical of our corpus (see below) and very significant.

Following Salazar's death in 1968, the Portuguese regime went through a brief period of relaxation; but it survived the demise of its creator, and showed no signs of relinquishing power. Yet even in such an ambience, the Portuguese wrote, compiled and translated texts concerning the Czechoslovak attempt to bring about socialism with a human face.

*Checoslováquia na hora da democratização* (1968), *Dossier Checoslováquia (O que nós queremos)* (1968), Amort and Jedlička's *O espião A-54* (1968), and even P. Tigrid's *A primavera de Praga* (1969) all testify to the fact that the Prague Spring did not pass unnoticed in Portugal. Cavalcanti's *A tentativa checa há dez anos...* (1979), a decade later, confirms that the Prague Spring resonated strongly with the Portuguese public.

Translation from Czech or Slovak did not thrive in the turbulent years of 1974-76 in Portugal. Yet the Portuguese translation of Fučík's *Notes from the Gallows* (1975) is clearly a fruit of that time, characterised as it was by a strong swing to the political left.

Even at first sight, 1990 was 'the year of Czech literature in Portugal', with 4 (6) books translated into European Portuguese and published in Portugal in that year. None of the other years ever exceeded two translations.<sup>367</sup>

Needless to say the date is no accident. This surge of interest came immediately after the Velvet Revolution, which had been followed intently by the Portuguese media and public. 6 books of fiction, including two novels by M. Kundera, were accompanied by two volumes of essays by Václav Havel (*Interrogatório à distância* and *Ensaio políticos*). The total number is thus 8 books written originally and entirely in Czech, translated into European Portuguese and published in Portugal in the year 1990.

Despite, or perhaps precisely because of, the fact that the fall of communism and the related events of 1989-90 swept through *several* countries in Central and Eastern Europe, it was at that time that Czech literature was received most warmly in Portugal. The split of Czechoslovakia into two sovereign countries in 1993, however, prompted no reaction from the Portuguese polysystem.

The total number of 20 books of fiction written originally in Czech and translated into European Portuguese, spread evenly over the hundred years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, averages out at one book of Czech authorship being translated into Portuguese every five years. But this figure is misleading. Since the first book dates from 1943 and the last from 1992 (only 49 years), the actual time span between two books written by Czech authors and published in Portugal averaged 2.45 years. Including the 'special cases', the total number of books of fiction written originally in Czech and translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal was 29 (one book every 1.69 years).

If we contrast the dates of publication of the Czech books of fiction (originals) and the dates of publication of their Portuguese translations, while disregarding the mediating texts, the time-lag averages 18.5 years.<sup>368</sup> If the publication of Kundera's and Listopad's works written in Czech were taken into account, irrespective of the fact that some of their works have never been published in Czechoslovakia or the Czech Republic, the delay would be 15.14 years.

---

<sup>367</sup> By comparison, 1951 could be called 'the anti-year of Czech literature in Portugal' (see above, subchapter 4.1.1).

<sup>368</sup> The total number of years between the publication of the Czech originals and the Portuguese translations is 370 divided by 20 books of fiction. In the case of the book consisting of three stories written by J. Hašek and published in 1912, 1963 and 1966 respectively, the average date of their Czech publications was calculated as 1947. The dates when the Czech originals (manuscripts) were actually written (completed) are unknown for most of the works, so they cannot be statistically measured. The same is true of the mediating texts. As it is not always clear which was the ultimate source text for the Portuguese translations, the resulting figure would be equally inaccurate.

This is significant, particularly with regard to the swift translation into Portuguese of the two Slovak novels by L. Mňačko. The political circumstances of those years (1968-69) appear to offer the most plausible explanation.

In the corpus of Czech fiction translated into Portuguese, only Hrabal's *Little Town Where Time Stood Still*, written originally in 1978, but published in Czech as late as 1989, was translated with equal swiftness into Portuguese (in 1990). Other books in the Czech corpus translated into Portuguese with a minimum of delay include Otčenášek's *Romeo, Juliet and Darkness* (1958 in Czech, 1961 in Portuguese) and Klíma's *Love and Garbage* (see above).

As regards the 'special cases', Kundera's *Unbearable Lightness of Being* and *Jacques and His Master* appeared in Czech and in Portuguese in the same year. That claim, however, must be accompanied by a caveat: *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* appeared in Czech in 1985 in *Toronto*; it was published for the first time in the Czech Republic only in 2006. As a consequence, the overwhelming majority of Czech readers could not read Kundera's most famous novel until 21 years after it became accessible to Portuguese readers. The fact that Kundera is a 'special case' is particularly evident from the fact that his *Immortality* appeared in Portuguese three years before it was published in Czech (simultaneously in *Toronto* and *Brno*).

From a different point of view, the time-lag of 18.5 (15.14) years between the publication of the Czech originals and the Portuguese translations is short and reveals another characteristic of our corpus: no Czech or Slovak authors writing before the 20<sup>th</sup> century have been translated into European Portuguese, although Czech and Slovak literature, at least in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, is very rich and of high quality (e.g. Czechs: K. H. Mácha, B. Němcová,<sup>369</sup> J. Neruda, K. H. Borovský; Slovaks: Ľ. Štúr, J. Kollár, P. O. Hviezdoslav).

Excluding the 'special cases', only three books written originally in Czech and translated into European Portuguese came out in Oporto, all of them written by B. Hrabal and published by Afrontamento. In addition, Listopad's self-translation (1960) and Kundera's *Jacques and His Master* (1992) were published in Oporto. The remaining 17 (24) books were all published in Lisbon. No book of Czech authorship was published in Coimbra or elsewhere in Portugal.

Apart from M. Kundera, whose 'authorised' works were translated into Portuguese in their entirety (8 written in Czech), the most translated Czech author in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal was Bohumil Hrabal (4 books), thanks to the translational efforts of L. Dismánová.<sup>370</sup> If we include non-fiction, V. Havel also had four of his books translated into European Portuguese, one of them possibly twice (*Cartas a Olga*).

---

<sup>369</sup> From the few sources on Brazil available for the present research, we know that Božena Němcová's *Babička* [Grandmother] was translated into Portuguese in Brazil by Ruth Sylvia de Miranda Salles as *A avó: lembranças de uma vida de menina* [Grandmother: Memories of a Girl's Life], 1958 (Rio de Janeiro: O Cruzeiro), reprinted in 1969 (Rio de Janeiro: Edições de Ouro).

<sup>370</sup> Dismánová also translated Hrabal's *Něžný Barbar* [Tender Barbarian], published in 1973 at the clandestine publishing house Petlice (Prague) and in exile in 1981 (Köln: Index). The Portuguese publishing house Afrontamento has yet to publish it, however. (Dismánová, personal communication on 2011-08-02).

Today an almost forgotten author, K. J. Beneš is, nonetheless, the next most translated Czech author into European Portuguese, with three books published from 1943 to 1953. Indeed, he monopolizes the entire first decade of Portuguese translations of Czech fiction, ending only in 1953 with the translation of Hostovský's *The Arsonist*.

E. Hostovský, J. Hašek, K. Čapek and the Slovak writer L. Mňačko each had two books translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. Čapek occupies a special position in this quartet, as his *War with the Newts* was translated twice, by two different translators and from two different languages.

### 4.3 Micro-textual Contrastive Analysis

It should be emphasised that the present thesis aims at establishing, describing, analysing and contextualising the corpus of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal *as a whole*. In the following, the reader is advised not to expect a full-fledged micro-textual contrastive analysis of an entire Czech novel and its complete Portuguese translation, including a thorough analysis of the mediating text.

Instead, this subchapter is to be regarded merely as the treatment of a sample, at the same time unique and epitomising the corpus in its entirety, although not really representative, strictly speaking. The contrastive analysis below serves primarily to underpin the overall picture of Czech literature in Portugal. From a methodological point of view, it seeks to outline how Popovič's model can be used to describe, analyse and compare texts, especially when they are concatenated in a complex structure exceeding the traditional 'binary opposition' of one original against one translation.

#### 4.3.1 Choice of Text

As outlined throughout the present thesis, the decision has been taken to pay closer attention to a canonical novel of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese in Portugal in the 20<sup>th</sup> century: Jaroslav Hašek's *The Good Soldier Švejk*. There are several reasons for this decision.

Jaroslav Hašek's *The Good Soldier Švejk* is one of the most important novels of 20<sup>th</sup>-century Czech literature. As the First Czechoslovak Republic, roughly the time between the two world wars, abounded in literature of high quality, *Švejk* cannot actually be regarded as 'the most important' novel of that period. Moreover, for reasons elucidated below, Hašek's novel long vied for admission into the canon of Czech literature. However, few Czech literature scholars ('bohemists') would now disagree that *Švejk* has had a profound influence on Czech literature ever since its publication. Although its reception was fraught with misunderstandings, it has gradually gained a place in the pantheon of Czech literature (cf. Hartmann 2009: 178).

Furthermore, the translation of the novel into European Portuguese has been the subject of a *Mestrado* (roughly: Master's) thesis, written in 2009 by a Czech living in Portugal,

Kateřina Štěpánková.<sup>371</sup> Her approach differs from ours, as she looks for the transposition of humour and ‘realia’ (culturemes),<sup>372</sup> whereas our focus is on censorship-sensitive topics. Nonetheless, it is, to the best of our knowledge, the only thesis defended in Portugal to deal specifically and exclusively with Czech literature – and hence an invaluable metatext.<sup>373</sup>

The other Portuguese translation of a work by Jaroslav Hašek, with the confusingly similar title *Aventuras do valente soldado Švejk e outras histórias* (1986), is not investigated here for two reasons: (1) neither Štěpánková nor the author of this thesis were able to identify the French mediating texts – in any case, they were not available for the present research; (2) more importantly, the Portuguese translation dates from 1986, long after the end of the *Estado Novo*. An investigation of censorship-sensitive issues would therefore have produced no significant results.

### 4.3.2 The Author: Jaroslav Hašek

Jaroslav Hašek (1883, Prague – 1923, Lipnice) was both a Bohemian (that is, a Czech) and a bohemian. The highest education he ever received was from a secondary business school. On leaving school he set out on a tour of the Balkans. Later, he handed out anarchist leaflets among North-Bohemian mineworkers. Hašek never settled down, never kept a job for long. For most of his life he worked as a freelance journalist.<sup>374</sup>

A true bohemian, Hašek was most at home in the atmosphere of pre-war Prague pubs. He and his colleagues founded the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law (for which Hašek wrote the Political and Social History), whose aim was to lampoon the political state of affairs and ridicule the speeches of the politicians of the day.

Before the outbreak of the First World War, Hašek published a book with *Švejk* as the protagonist under the title *Dobrý voják Švejk a jiné podivné historky* [The Good Soldier Švejk and Other Strange Stories], 1912 (Prague: Hejda a Tuček). It was the first time that Hašek’s stories appeared in book form (Parrott 1982: 203).<sup>375</sup>

Soon after having been conscripted into the army, Hašek defected to Russia, first applying to join the Czechoslovak Legions and later entering the Red Army. It was this experience that gave rise to the series of stories entitled *Velitelem města Bugulmy* [The

---

<sup>371</sup> ŠTĚPÁNKOVÁ, Kateřina. 2009. *Rir em português: Estudo comparativo das traduções de Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války de Jaroslav Hašek* [Laughing in Portuguese: Comparative Study of the Translations of Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války by Jaroslav Hašek]. Supervisor: Prof. Doutor João Ferreira Duarte. Defended in 2009, Programme in Comparative Studies at the Faculty of Letters, University of Lisbon.

<sup>372</sup> For the definition of ‘realia’, see Shuttleworth & Cowie (1997/99: 139-140). For a discussion of ‘culturemes’, see Even-Zohar (2004: 17).

<sup>373</sup> The Portuguese translation of *Švejk* is also mentioned in the doctoral thesis of Maria Lin Moniz entitled *Das narrativas da Grande Guerra em traduções portuguesas* [Of Narratives of the Great War in Portuguese Translations], defended in 2005 at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Lisbon. This thesis, however, was not available for the present research.

<sup>374</sup> Most of the biographical data here are based on Balajka et al., vol. 2 (1997: 51-53).

<sup>375</sup> The German translation of these stories is characteristically called *Urschwejk* [Proto-Švejk].



Commandant of Bugulma], published in book form long after his death in 1966 (Prague: Československý spisovatel).

Hašek came back to Czechoslovakia in 1920 only to return to his former bohemian existence. It was then, between 1920 and 1923, that Hašek wrote *The Good Soldier Švejk*, his longest and best known literary work.

Apart from *Švejk*, Hašek wrote parodic poems (the first in 1903, his earliest works), satirical articles and stories. Mostly they were sold for quick cash to newspapers and magazines.

Hašek's life is a panoply of stories, incidents and experiences without equal. By turns anarchist, communist, rover, drunkard and literary genius, he is a natural and intriguing subject for biographical research (cf. Parrott 1982). However, such an inquiry would clearly transcend the realm of Translation Studies.

### 4.3.3 The Original: *The Good Soldier Švejk* in Czech

*Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války* [The (Fateful) Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk during the (First) World War] has an obvious protagonist, *Josef Švejk* (pronounced 'Shveik'), while other characters revolve around him, weaving in and out of the narrative in a kaleidoscope of events and stories.

It is difficult to pinpoint how the book originated. As mentioned above, Hašek created the personality of *Švejk* in a series of pre-WWI stories, a decade before he began writing the novel. Radko Pytlík (\*1928), a literary historian and editor who has investigated humour in Czech literature and particularly Hašek's *Švejk*, explains Hašek's way of writing:

Hašek never corrected or re-worked his works, never produced alternative versions. He wrote in haste, as if recklessly squandering his talent. With most of his short works, only the printed text in a magazine or book has been preserved. The authenticity of his texts is therefore questionable; interventions on the part of the printer or the editor, who conformed to the norms of the day, cannot be ruled out. The only exceptions are *The History of the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of the Law* and the first volume of *The Good Soldier Švejk*, of which the manuscripts have been preserved.<sup>376</sup>

The translators of *Švejk* have encountered the same difficulties. Cecil Parrot, the author of 'the first unabridged and unbowlerized version of *The Good Soldier Švejk* in English' (Parrott in Hašek 2000: xxi), explains:

The translator of *The Good Soldier Švejk* is faced with a number of problems at the very outset. First there is no authorized text of the work. Only the first and second editions were seen by the author during his lifetime, but there is no certainty that even these texts represent what he actually wrote or approved. Only a part of the manuscript has been preserved. The author, it appears, cared little about what he had written once he had sent it off to the printer. [...] Broadly

<sup>376</sup> 'Hašek své práce nikdy nekorigoval, nepřepočítával, nevytvářel varianty. Psal v chvatu, jako by marnotratně rozhazoval svůj talent. U většiny jeho drobných prací se zachoval pouze otištěný text časopisecký nebo knižní. Autentičnost jeho textů je proto sporná, nelze vyloučit zásahy tiskárny a korektora, kteří se většinou přizpůsobovali dobové normě. Výjimku tvoří *Dějiny strany mírného pokroku v mezích zákona* a první díl *Osudů*, od kterých se uchoval rukopis.' (Pytlík 1983: 405).

speaking there are two groups of texts – the texts published before the war, which were assumed to be what the author himself had written, and the texts published from the 1950s onwards which were revised in orthography, grammar and syntax. In making this translation I have drawn on both groups and have chosen whichever versions seemed clearer and more consistent. (Parrott in Hašek 2000: xx).

Rather than analysing the English translations, the aim here is to point to the intrinsic difficulties with the concept of *the original* in the case of Hašek's *Švejk*.<sup>377</sup>

The first publication of *The Good Soldier Švejk* in the Prague publishing house Adolf Synek (1920-23) was fraught with problems: 'It respects neither the author's intention nor his style, it seeks to correct his inconsistencies, to unify the pronunciation', etc. (Pytlík 1983: 405).<sup>378</sup>

In the course of the last years of his lifetime, Hašek wrote four volumes of *Švejk: Díl první: V zázemí* [Part I: Behind the Lines], published in 1920; *Díl druhý: Na frontě* [Part II: At the Front], 1922; *Díl třetí: Slavný výprask* [The Glorious Licking], 1922; and *Díl čtvrtý: Pokračování slavného výprasku* [The Glorious Licking Continued], 1923.<sup>379</sup> C. Parrot's translation of the fourth volume ends in these words:

This was the point reached by Jaroslav Hašek in dictating *The Good Soldier Švejk and his Fortunes in the World War*. He was already ill and death silenced him for ever on 3 January 1923. It prevented him from completing one of the most famous and widely-read novels published after the First World War. (Parrott in Hašek 2000: 752).

The publisher, Adolf Synek, however, had no intention of discontinuing the increasingly profitable *Švejk* series. He commissioned Karel Vaněk (1887-1933), a journalist and a well-known humorist, to complete the novel.

Vaněk finished Part IV and wrote two more sequels: *Švejk v ruském zajetí* [Švejk in Russian Captivity],<sup>380</sup> published in 1936; and *Švejk v revoluci* [Švejk in the Revolution], 1937. The resuscitation of Hašek's hero fuelled much debate, both on the quality of Vaněk's efforts and on the merits of the whole project.

Minds remain divided over these issues, but most literary critics seem to concur that Vaněk's continuation lacks Hašek's ingenuity and distorts his delicate style. Vaněk's sequels to Hašek's *Švejk* make more use of vulgarisms and substandard language, his *Švejk* is cruder and grosser. Vaněk is thus often blamed for the slow, even grudging reception of *Švejk* in Czech literature and culture (Pytlík 1983: 408ff.).

<sup>377</sup> To draw a perhaps unexpected parallel: whether the author is carefree about his work like Hašek or extremely sensitive about it like Kundera (see above), the sacred status of the one and only original is debatable. To put it even more provocatively: there is no need for modern Translation Studies to 'dethrone' the original. There is no shortage of cases in which the ultimate and unequivocal original either never existed or cannot be reconstructed (cf. Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, Herberto Helder's poems, etc.).

<sup>378</sup> 'Nerespektuje autorův záměr ani styl; snaží se opravovat jeho nedůslednosti, sjednocovat výslovnost [...]'. (Pytlík 1983: 405).

<sup>379</sup> Unless stated otherwise, the English is taken from the translation by Cecil Parrott (in Hašek 2000). Parrott originally produced his translation in 1973, 43 years after Paul Selver, and went on to write the aforementioned book dedicated to Hašek: *Jaroslav Hašek: A Study of Švejk and the Short Stories*, 1982 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), sometimes quoted here as well.

<sup>380</sup> Hašek himself wrote a series of stories entitled *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka v zajetí* [The Good Soldier Švejk in Captivity], published in book form in Kiev in 1917 (Parrott in Hašek 2000: xii).

In Czech minds, Hašek's *Švejk* is inseparable from the illustrations of Josef Lada (1887-1957), which not only accompanied most of the Czech editions of *The Good Soldier Švejk*, but gradually came to epitomise both the novel and its protagonist (Pytlík 1983: 427ff.). Although 'Hašek himself never saw any of the illustrations' (Parrott in Hašek 2000: xi), Lada's 'brilliant but farcical caricatures' (*ibid.*) have become so canonical as to be included even in some of the translations (e.g. P. Selver's and C. Parrott's English translations and Alfonsina Janès' Spanish).

Although Vaněk's sequels, in many respects, carried the style of Hašek's *Švejk* to extremes, Hašek was indeed a pioneer in introducing Czech substandard language into literature. He broke with literary traditions, wrote a completely new kind of novel, admitted the common man into literature, let him speak in his own vernacular and showed both his frailty and his potential – the ability to laugh, to be laughed at and to make others laugh.

Hašek's *Švejk* thus poses a formidable challenge for the translator. C. Parrott (in Hašek 2000: xx) laments the impossibility of reproducing this specific register (*langage*) in English:

*Švejk* and many of the other characters in the books use what is called 'obecná čeština' or *common Czech*<sup>381</sup>, which is not quite the same as *literary* or *book Czech*. The use of common Czech in Bohemia and Moravia is by no means confined to the uneducated. The Czechs are a democratic people and when they get together and let their hair down, whether they are educated or not, they speak a more or less common vernacular. This cannot be adequately rendered in English, since the only thinkable equivalent would be dialect or bad English. Either would be false and out of place in this context. We also have to remember that the action is taking place during the First World War in the Austro-Hungarian Empire among Czechs and it will create a wrong atmosphere if the language used in the English translation is associated with people and conditions of a very different kind. Much of the charm of *Švejk* lies in his use of common Czech.

That, however, is only one problem the translator is faced with. The novel abounds in 'a large number of German words and phrases, some of which are distorted by Czech mispronunciation,' but add 'a peculiar colour and humour to the language' (*ibid.*).

In other words, it is hardly possible to translate *Švejk* adequately. No translation can be termed 'adequate' when it is unable to retain at least the most typical features of the narrative. Any translation of *Švejk* is beset by the problem of 'the third language in translation', with each language presenting a different set of problems (see below).

Faced with the imminence of war, trying to outwit the 'medical experts', left at the mercy of the police, dealing with officers of an army which is not his, *Švejk* is in many aspects a relative of K. from Franz Kafka's *The Castle* (*Das Schloß*, written in Prague in 1922 and published posthumously by Max Brod in 1926).

C. Parrott (in Hašek 2000: xv) observed: 'Švejk is not necessarily a Czech figure. He might be any Central European and is in fact a "Mr Everyman", in the sense that he resembles any "little man" who gets caught up in the wheels of a big bureaucratic machine.'

---

<sup>381</sup> The coalescence of dialects (an 'inter-dialect') used in most of Bohemia (not Moravia), not considered standard Czech ('spisovná čeština').

Švejk, however, although not as resourceful as K., offers a much more optimistic and life-affirming perspective. Švejk always has an answer, always finds a way out of any predicament.

The reception of Hašek's novel, both in Czechoslovakia (cf. Pytlík 1982: 259-329) and in Germany (cf. Hartmann 2009: 149-177), is permeated with politics, which is highly relevant to issues discussed in the present thesis. However, the Czech and German reception of *Švejk* is clearly beyond the scope of a study focusing on Czech-Portuguese relations.

The point of the above has not been to digress into the realm of literary studies, but to show that the novel's translations are a prime candidate for investigation within Translation Studies. The Portuguese indirect translation provides added nuance to the research.

#### 4.3.4 The Translations and the Mediating Text

The mediating texts are not in the centre of our focus. Indeed, it might be possible – and sometimes even necessary – to disregard the mediating texts, as outlined above (subchapters 1.3.2 and 2.3.1). Asking a question like ‘What was the target-culture reader's impression of a source-culture text?’ may often be the only way for the researcher to study such texts within Translation Studies.

Whether certain shifts appeared in the first translation, i.e. from the original, or in the second-hand translation may be considered inconsequential for target-culture readers. Their impressions count and often substantially contribute to the fabric of mutual relations – especially between non-dominant cultures. It is a fact to be reckoned with and accounted for that second-hand translations *have* been made and *have* formed our impressions of more distant, or small(er), cultures.

Since in the case of this canonical novel, however, it has eventually proved possible to excavate the mediating text, a brief discussion of them follows.

Despite its long and winding road to acceptance, *Švejk* came to epitomise Czech literature in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The evolution of the novel's reception, both at home and abroad, was substantially influenced by the German translation.

Following the announcement of Hašek's death on 3 January 1923 (before Hašek turned 40), Max Brod<sup>382</sup> published a German translation of parts of the first chapter of Hašek's novel in a Prague German-language daily *Prager Tagblatt* on 5 January 1923 (Hartmann 2009: 55).<sup>383</sup>

---

<sup>382</sup> Max Brod (1884-1968) published Franz Kafka's works after Kafka's death and against his last will (see Kundera's *Testaments Betrayed*) and ‘discovered’ the modern Czech composer Leoš Janáček (1854-1928) for the German, and international, audience.

<sup>383</sup> HARTMANN, Zdeněk. 2009. *Hašekův „Švejk“ v němčině* [Hašek's Švejk in German]. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Supervised by: Doc. PhDr. Gabriela Veselá, CSc. Institute of Translation Studies and Interpreting, Faculty of Philosophy, Charles University in Prague.

The Czech publisher of *Švejk*, Adolf Synek, soon started looking for a suitable translator of the whole novel into German. Given the initial misgivings of Czech literary critics, the search was protracted until Synek found a Prague German-language translator who was willing to take up the challenge: Grete Reiner-Straschnow (1892-1944).<sup>384</sup>

Grete Reiner completed her German translation of the first (*Im Hinterlande*) and the second volumes (*An der Front*) in 1926, the remaining two volumes appeared in the following year.<sup>385</sup> Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine which Czech version served as the source text for Reiner's translation (Hartmann 2009: 62).

Reiner's translation of *Švejk* sparked a heated debate, especially for her use of 'Prague German'. Hartmann (2009: 61ff.) distinguishes between *Prager Deutsch*, the German of Prague intellectuals like Franz Kafka and the middle class, and what he calls *Kleinseitner Deutsch*,<sup>386</sup> which was associated with the lower classes and strongly interspersed with Czech loan words ('bohemisms').

In Reiner's translation, Hartmann (2009: 65ff.) points to the many 'Pragisms'; the loss of local colour in the transposition of German words used in the original and often distorted by Czech pronunciation; a 'levelling of expression' (Popovič 1975: 130) as regards the intensity of vulgarisms; and a large number of mistakes and oversights in proper names.

Nonetheless, in the English summary to his thesis, Hartmann's overall evaluation of Reiner's translation is not disapproving (2009: 191):

The German translation of *Švejk* by Grete Reiner preserves the three main elements of the novel's humour, viz. mixing the high and the low in content and form, drawing paradoxical associations, and progressing through digressions. Reiner's translation imitates the parallels, the complex and heavy-handed sentence structure with a great number of digressions, and the inconsistently colloquial style on the level of morphology. The method of stylistic imitation adopted by the translator, viz. the substitution of colloquial Czech by *Kleinseitner Deutsch* (that is German jargon with a fair share of Czech syntax and special vocabulary), may be (and has been) criticized, as it adds an accent-based aspect to the humour of the novel, which has been used in German theatre performance, motion pictures and on the radio.

Finally, Pytlík (1983: 307), Hartmann (2009: 164) and Štěpánková (2009: 35) all refer to the fact that Hašek's novel was 'burnt at the stake' during the Nazi burnings of 'un-German books' in Berlin on 10 May 1933, together with books by Lion Feuchtwanger, Thomas Mann, Stefan Zweig and many others, presaging an era of censorship and state control of all culture.

---

<sup>384</sup> She was born as Grete Stein. As a Prague Jew, Grete Reiner-Straschnow was deported to the concentration camp in Terezín (Theresienstadt) in 1942. In 1943 she was transported to and then killed in the Nazi extermination camp in Auschwitz-Birkenau ([Oświęcim](#)).

<sup>385</sup> Hartmann (2009: 193) quotes these as *Das glorreiche Debakel* and *Fortsetzung des glorreichen Debakels*. Newer editions, however, use *Der glorreiche Zusammenbruch* and *Fortsetzung des glorreichen Zusammenbruchs* (Berlin: Aufbau, 2008: 803-804).

<sup>386</sup> 'The German of Malá Strana'. Malá Strana, in English known as either *Lesser Quarter* or *Lesser Town*, is a historical Prague district on the left bank of the river Vltava (German: Moldau) below Prague Castle.

The German translation of *Švejk* was of fundamental importance – not only because it became the source text for the Spanish translation by Alfonsina Janès,<sup>387</sup> but primarily because it had a considerable impact on the reception of the novel in Czechoslovakia (Pytlík 1983: 259-288), as Hartmann (2009: 192) reminds us:

Grete Reiner's translation introduced *Švejk* to German-speaking audiences and even influenced the perception of the novel in Czech culture, which was then forced to react to the success of *Švejk* abroad. Until today, it remains the only translation of *Osudy* into German.

This disproves Toury's assumption that 'translation is as good as *initiated* by the target culture' (1995: 27) or that 'translations are facts of target cultures' (1995: 29). If we look at the sheer number of Czech names among the translators of Czech literature into foreign languages (by no means a rarity), we can successfully challenge the premise that translations originate in the target culture or that they are facts of the target culture only. Rather than Toury's starting-point, D. Ďurišin's 'specific interliterary communities' (see subchapter 1.5.2.2) appear more apt in accounting for these borderline cases. How rare or frequent they actually are, however, remains to be investigated by translation scholars.

Other translations of *Švejk* are not without interest either. *Švejk* has been one of the few fortunate books written by a Czech author to have enjoyed repeated translations into some languages.

The first English translation appeared soon after the publication of the original and the German translation. Paul Selver (1888-1970), who *inter alii* translated K. Čapek's *R.U.R.* (1923), completed his version of *Švejk* as early as 1930.<sup>388</sup> Selver's translation, entitled *The Good Soldier Schweik*, 'reduced the book to less than two-thirds' (Parrott in Hašek 2000: xxi). The *Epilogue to Part I* is missing, as is the entire *Part IV*.<sup>389</sup> The translation, however, appeared with Josef Lada's illustrations. As Parrott designates his translation 'the first unabridged and unbowlerized', it may be assumed that a study comparing the Czech original (which?) and the first English translation by P. Selver might discover even more serious shortcomings.

Cecil Parrott (1909-84) produced the second translation of *Švejk* into English, accompanied by the original illustrations by Josef Lada in 1973.<sup>390</sup> His translation offers

---

<sup>387</sup> In Spain, the first translation of Hašek's novel was made by Alfonsina Janès in 1980. Janès' translation in Spanish (Castilian), *Las aventuras del valeroso soldado Schwejk*, was made from the German translation by Grete Reiner and was accompanied by the illustrations of Josef Lada. This translation continues to be published to this date (2008, Barcelona: Destino). In 1995, Monika Zgustová translated Hašek's novel from Czech into Catalan as *Les Aventures del bon soldat Švejk* (Barcelona: Proa). In 2000, Monika Zgustová's translation appeared in Castilian at a Basque publisher (Hondarribia: Hiru; reprinted in 2008, Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg). The Basque translation, by Carlos Cid Abasolo, was made before Zgustová's Catalan and Castilian translation, in 1993-94 (cf. A. Hermida de Blas & P. Gonzalo de Jesús 2007: 203). See also <http://www.armiarma.com/unibertsala/hasek/> (Part I, including the author's epilogue), <http://www.armiarma.com/unibertsala/hasek2/> (Part II) (retrieved on 2011-08-10).

<sup>388</sup> It appears to have been published both in London (William Heinemann) and in New York (Frederick Ungar; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Co.).

<sup>389</sup> According to Hartmann (2009: 193), the first three parts of Hašek's novel appeared in 1923 (Prague: A. Synek). The complete novel, in four volumes, appeared only between 1926 and 1927. Had Selver been using the early version as his source text, he could have been aware of the 'distortion'. That, however, appears unlikely and is up to scholars dealing with the English translation of *Švejk* to investigate.

<sup>390</sup> Published simultaneously by William Heinemann in association with Penguin Books in London and by Thomas Y. Crowell in New York (1973).

an *Introduction by Cecil Parrott*, a Guide to the Pronunciation of Czech Names, maps and a note on the Austro-Hungarian Currency (Hašek 2000, London: Penguin Classics). In short, it is an edition that pays due tribute to the novel's significance.<sup>391</sup>

Lastly, there is a 'Chicago version' of *Švejk*, entitled *The Fateful Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk*, translated by Zdeněk 'Zenny' K. Sadlon and Emmett M. Joyce. Part I appeared in 2000 and the remaining three parts in 2009.<sup>392</sup>

Since both books authored by Jaroslav Hašek and translated into Portuguese were made via French translations, it is these French versions that deserve our closest attention. The following are the various French translations of Hašek's novel in book form.<sup>393</sup>

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1932. *Le Brave Soldat Chvéik* [Part I]. Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Française (later Gallimard). Translated from the Czech by Jindřich (Henry) Hořejší. Preface by Jean-Richard Bloch.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1932. *Nouvelles Aventures du Brave Soldat Chvéik* [Part II]. Paris: Gallimard. Translated from the Czech by Aranyossi.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1971. *Nouvelles Aventures du Brave Soldat Chvéik* [Part II, untitled]. Paris: Gallimard. Translated from the Czech by Claudia Ancelot.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1980. *Les Dernières Aventures du Soldat Chvéik* [Part III: *La glorieuse raclée* and Part IV: *Suite de la glorieuse raclée*]. Paris: Gallimard. Translated from the Czech by Claudia Ancelot.

However, the first publication of *Švejk* in France was a year older. On 23 February 1931, *L'Humanité*, a journal affiliated with the French Communist Party (PCF), announced the serial publication of Hašek's novel (Štěpánková 2009: 54). Jindřich Hořejší (1886-1941) was a Czech author known for his proletarian poetry and a translator from and into French.<sup>394</sup> According to Štěpánková (2009: 53-57), the choice of a Czech author to translate the novel into French had less to do with the stylistic challenges of the novel, but rather with the political views shared by Hořejší and *L'Humanité*.

Both Pytlík (1983: 426) and Štěpánková (2009: 9, 52-57) remind us that the French reception of *Švejk* was strongly influenced by the success of the German translation and the theatrical adaptations of *Švejk* in Germany (cf. Hartmann 2009: 158-177). From the first French publication to this day, the French translation of *Švejk* by Hořejší is accompanied by a *Présentation* entitled 'Ma première rencontre avec Chvéik' written by Jean-Richard Bloch.

This 'presentation' locates Bloch's first encounter with *Švejk* in Berlin in 1928, where Bloch saw Erwin Piscator's theatrical adaptation of *Švejk* at Piscator's *Theater am Nollendorferplatz*. Jean-Richard Bloch (1884-1947) was a French journalist and writer

<sup>391</sup> This is not to say, of course, that Parrott's translation is perfect and free of oversights. That, however, is up to scholars dealing with the English translation of *Švejk* to investigate.

<sup>392</sup> Published and available at <http://www.svejkcentral.com/> (retrieved on 2011-08-08).

<sup>393</sup> Apart from the Czech National Library and WorldCat, the electronic catalogue of the French National Library was consulted: <http://catalogue.bnf.fr> (retrieved on 2011-08-08).

<sup>394</sup> See <http://www.spisovatele.cz/jindrich-horejsi> (retrieved on 2011-08-09), cf. also NK Klementinum.

and a member of the French Communist Party (PCF), who co-edited the daily *Ce soir* with Luis Aragon (Štěpánková 2009: 52).

In this *Présentation*, Bloch ponders on the implications of Hašek's novel. He does mention Hašek and his *Les Aventures du brave soldat Chvéik pendant la Grande Guerre*, but his 'essay' serves primarily to expound his own views on the situation in Germany shortly before Hitler's seizure of power. The proletarian/socialist/communist slant is clearly noticeable in Bloch's words (cf. Bloch in Hašek 2007: 22-23 *et passim*).

Two things are significant here. First, the translation of *Švejk* was politically motivated: more specifically, it was leftist considerations that introduced *Švejk* to the French audience. Second, the reception of *Švejk* in France was, or at least began as, a second-hand reception via the German culture. The Portuguese translation, made through the mediation of the French translation, was hence a *third-hand reception* – not a rare occurrence in Salazarist Portugal.

For reasons unknown, Hořejší translated only the first part of Hašek's novel, excluding even the author's Epilogue to Part I (see below). Hořejší's translation was published in book form in April 1932. Several months later, Part II of the novel was translated into French by a translator of Hungarian origin, Aranyossi (Štěpánková 2009: 57-58).<sup>395</sup>

The novel appears to have been successful. Štěpánková (*ibid.*) counted 19 reprints in France until 1949. While Hořejší's translation continues to be published to this day, Aranyossi's translation of Part II of Hašek's novel appears to have been less successful, as there seems to have been the need to retranslate it in 1971 by Claudia Ancelot.

Claudia Ancelot (1925-97) was an eminent French translator from Czech and Slovak, who also translated Karel Čapek's *War with the Newts* in 1960 (Paris: les Éditeurs français réunis). It was Ancelot's translation that Mário de Sousa used as the source text for the second Portuguese translation of *War with the Newts* in 1979.<sup>396</sup>

Perhaps the last interesting piece of information about Hašek's novel in France is the fact that it was banned from circulation among French soldiers during the Algerian War of Independence (1954-62) (Štěpánková 2009: 58). In other words, *Švejk* was considered anti-militaristic enough to be subjected to censorship.

Since Alexandre Cabral's Portuguese translation was made from French and appeared in 1961, it is clear that Cabral could have access only to the first two volumes (Part I and II) of Hašek's novel. Although both French translations were reprinted several times, Cabral seems to have had access only to Part I of Hašek's novel in the translation by Jindřich (Henry) Hořejší.

<sup>395</sup> Our search for a translator named Aranyossi has unfortunately been fruitless.

<sup>396</sup> Another translator who translated both of the books investigated here was Bruno Meriggi (1927-70): *La guerra delle salamandre*, 1961 (Rome: Editori Riuniti); *Il buon soldato Sc`vèik*, 1988 (Milano: Feltrinelli). B. Meriggi also translated K. Gottwald's *La Cecoslovacchia verso il socialismo*, 1952 (Rome: Rinascita), banned by Portuguese censors in 1953 (file 4906). Meriggi remains the only translator of *War with the Newts* into Italian. *The Good Soldier Švejk* has a more complicated history in Italian – there seems to be at least one other Italian translation of the novel by Renato Poggioli (1907-63).



We should not forget, however, that the Portuguese censors already knew about the sequels to Part I of the novel as early as 1950 (see above, subchapter 4.1.3). Were they better informed than the translator? Did Cabral have no access to Aranyossi's translation of Part II of the novel? Did the Portuguese publisher, *Portugália*, decide against commissioning a translation of Part II? We shall probably never know. Whatever the truth, there can be no doubt that what we are dealing with here – even across a mediating polysystem – is an instance of non-translation.<sup>397</sup>

### 4.3.5 The Portuguese Translation

Since the main focus of the present thesis is on the workings of the Portuguese censorship, only those Portuguese translations that were made and published before the Carnation Revolution of 1974 are dealt with in detail. Since no book originally written in Czech appears to have been *officially* 'authorised with cuts' (see above), the analysis conducted below is aimed at discovering whether any cuts appeared in the Portuguese translations of the two canonical Czech novels nonetheless.

#### 4.3.5.1 Discussion with Štěpánková (2009)

As stated above, since the thesis dedicated to the Portuguese translations of Hašek's novel is written in Portuguese and unpublished, it is worth summarising here, albeit briefly. As with all other issues throughout this thesis, Štěpánková's findings are never taken at face value. They are always contextualised, made more accurate where necessary, elaborated on and followed by our own discussion.

(1) The Portuguese translation of the novel was made from the French translation by Jindřich Hořejší. Štěpánková (2009: 43-44, 63-107) proves that to be the case both of the Portuguese translation of Hašek's novel by A. Cabral (1961, 1971, 1988) and of the collection of stories written by Hašek and translated by M. A. Miranda & J. C. Rodrigues (1988).<sup>398</sup>

(2) The actual *text* of the three editions of Cabral's translation of Hašek's novel, published in 1961, 1971 and 1988 is identical in all three cases (Štěpánková 2009: 38-40, 43-44). It is the *paratexts* that differ in each edition. There is only one essential difference between the first publication by *Portugália* and the second and third editions by *Europa-América*: Švejk's name was changed from the Gallicised *Chvéik* to the 'Portuguese' *Chveik* (Štěpánková 2009: 67-68).

---

<sup>397</sup> Part I of Hašek's novel was also translated into Portuguese in Brazil by Dalton Boechat, as *Aventuras do Bravo Soldado Schweik*, 1967 (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira). The preface by J.-R. Bloch strongly suggests that this translation was made from the French. However, the title of the book 'Aventuras' and 'Schwek' appear to be taken from the German translation. The number of pages (240) suggests that only Part I of Hašek's novel was translated into Brazilian Portuguese. This edition, however, was not available for the present research. Cf. <http://www.traca.com.br/livro/8670/aventuras-do-bravo-soldado-schweik> (retrieved on 2011-08-10).

<sup>398</sup> In the latter case, the publisher (Vega) confirmed Štěpánková's assumption in an e-mail dated 23 March 2009 (Štěpánková 2009: 124).

(2.1) In 1961, the publishing house *Portugália* published Hašek's novel as part of its book series (*colecção*) *Os romances universais no. 24* [World Novels No. 24]. In 1971, *Europa-América* published it in *Livros de Bolso Europa-América no. 8* [Pocket Books Europa-América No. 8]. This publication acknowledges the cooperation of the two publishing houses.<sup>399</sup> In 1988, *Europa-América* reissued the novel as part of the book series *Grandes Obras no. 8* [Great Works]. For a more thorough discussion, see below.

(2.2) The *peritexts* in these three editions differ, however slightly. The '*título original*' for the 1961 edition is 'Osudy dobrého vojáka Svejka' [Adventures of the Good Soldier Svejka]. Since there is no 'Š' on the Portuguese keyboard, its replacement by 'S' can hardly be considered significant. What is not quite insignificant is the fact that the entire title in Czech is 'Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk **during the World War**'. Many Czech editions, however, display only the 'abbreviated' title on the book cover (e.g. Hašek 2004).

The 1971 edition contains no original title – neither in the book nor in PORBASE. In the 1988 edition, the '*título original*' provided is *Die Abenteuer des braven soldaten Shveik* (*sic!*). The actual title of the German translation, however, is *Die Abenteuer des braven Soldaten Schwejk*. Štěpánková's assumption (2009: 49) that the publisher used the German title of the book in order to conceal the novel's actual provenance, i.e. from a country behind the Iron Curtain and 'closely watched' by Portuguese censors, is therefore at variance with the chronology of the editions.

(2.3) Cabral's translation contains a footnote suggesting at least some direct contact with the original (Czech) culture of the novel: 'For the [foot]notes of this edition, the translator relied on the friendly cooperation of Prof. Zdeněk Hampejs.' (Hašek 1971: 23, 1988: 29)<sup>400</sup> Zdeněk Hampejs (1929-86) was, *inter alii*, the founder of Portuguese studies at Charles University in Prague.<sup>401</sup> There is, however, no other instance of any contact with Czechs, the Czech language or Czechoslovakia anywhere else in the three editions of Cabral's translation.

(2.4) The only longer *peritexts* accompanying the publication of Hašek's novel in European Portuguese were those on the books' covers. Štěpánková's observations are summarised below as part of our own analysis of these texts. It is significant that the author's Epilogue to Part I, the only authorial peritext in the Czech original, was translated neither into French nor into Portuguese (unlike Parrott's English translation, Reiner's German translation and Janès' Spanish translation).

(2.5) Apart from the book series in which Hašek's novel appeared, the only Portuguese *epitexts* are censorship files no. 4481/1950, which banned the importation of the Austrian version, and 9100/1971, which authorised Cabral's translation into European

<sup>399</sup> 'A inclusão desta obra em "Livros de Bolso Europa-América" foi possível mercê da colaboração da Portugália Editora' (the third unnumbered page of the 1971 edition).

<sup>400</sup> 'Para as notas desta edição, o tradutor contou com a colaboração amiga do Prof. Zdenek Hampejs.' Unfortunately, the first edition from 1961 was not available for the present research.

<sup>401</sup> Zdeněk Hampejs (1929-86), who also used the surname Hampl, is noted for at least two publications in Portuguese: *Camões em Boémia* [Camões in Bohemia] in 1956 and *Observação à divulgação do Português na Checoslováquia* [Notes on the Spread of Portuguese in Czechoslovakia], 1959 (Lisbon: Separata do Boletim da Sociedade de Língua Portuguesa, Número Especial 1, pp. 49-54).

Portuguese. Neither Štěpánková (2009: 109) nor the present author found any article or text dealing with the novel, whether written by a Portuguese or published in Portugal.<sup>402</sup>

(2.6) Although the announcement in *L'Humanité* (1931) of the first French translation of Hašek's novel contained three illustrations by Josef Lada, neither the French book versions nor any of the Portuguese versions were ever published with Lada's illustrations (Štěpánková 2009: 55).

(3) The transposition in 1961 of a book written in a country behind the Iron Curtain into the Portuguese polysystem was a political act on the part of both the translator, A. Cabral, and the (second) publisher (Štěpánková 2009: 45-47).

(3.1) The name of the translator, Alexandre Cabral (José dos Santos Cabral), is associated with several books suggesting an anti-Salazarist stance, such as *Um Português em Cuba* [A Portuguese in Cuba], 1969 (Lisbon: Dom Quixote), *José Martí e a revolução cubana* [José Martí and the Cuban Revolution], 1976 (Lisbon: Avante), *Memórias de um resistente* [Memories of a Dissident], 1980 (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte).

The publishing house *Avante!* [Forward!] is run by the Portuguese Communist Party (PCP). Cabral's name is associated with three books published at Avante (cf. PORBASE). As Štěpánková (2009: 45-46) argues, this is no coincidence. Opposing a right-wing regime, Cabral, like many intellectuals (not only) of his day, harboured leftist political opinions.

(3.2) *Europa-América* was established in 1945 by Francisco Lyon de Castro (1914-2004), a member of the Portuguese Communist Party and a known dissident under the *Estado Novo*.<sup>403</sup> Being 'a convinced anti-fascist', Lyon de Castro founded *Europa-América* in an attempt to 'change the political situation' (cf. Azevedo 1999: 526-544).<sup>404</sup>

(3.3) Štěpánková (2009: 47) therefore hypothesises that the Portuguese translation can be seen as a political act transgressing the barriers imposed by the regime and its censorship. Despite being a second-hand (and far from 'adequate') translation, it was a subversive move against the tyranny of Salazar's dictatorship. In that sense again, an indirect translation, this time clearly motivated by target-culture considerations, can be regarded as a better solution than non-translation.

(4) Clearly aware of the novel's 'subversive provenance', the publishers attempted to avoid a ban of the book by the censors.

(4.1) As evidenced below, *Portugália* left a lot of French traces on the book's cover, clearly showing that the book was favourably received in other cultures. By including

<sup>402</sup> For the list of journals consulted and other sources, see Bibliography.

<sup>403</sup> Cf. [http://www.infopedia.pt/\\$francisco-lyon-de-castro](http://www.infopedia.pt/$francisco-lyon-de-castro) (retrieved on 2011-08-10).

<sup>404</sup> Štěpánková does not mention the motivation of the *first* publisher. *Portugália Editora* was founded in 1942 by Agostinho Fernandes (1886-1972), a Portuguese businessman and art collector. From what we know, *Portugália* published several volumes of essays and theatre plays by B. Brecht in the 1950s and 1960s, all of which were banned (courtesy of J. F. Duarte). Unfortunately, it proved impossible to access more direct information from the publishers, as they have ignored both Štěpánková's and this author's repeated attempts at communication (Štěpánková 2009: 46).

the novel in a series entitled '*Os romances universais*', the publishers attempted to demonstrate beyond doubt that *Švejk* was (already) part of world literature.<sup>405</sup>

(4.2) As evidenced above, *Europa-América* wanted to be on the safe side, took the initiative and sent the book directly to the censors for review. The peritexts on the book cover suppressed allusions to French culture and played down the novel's anti-militarism, relegating it to a 'far-away country' and a distant past.

(4.3) Štěpánková (2009: 49) characterises Cabral's translation as an 'excessive domestication'. The novel's style was already played down in Hořejší's French translation. In the Portuguese second-hand translation, sub-standard language and vulgarisms are so rare as to suggest that the translator resorted to self-censorship.

(5) *O valente soldado Chveik* was never a success in Portugal. In her conclusion, Štěpánková (2009: 109-116) reiterates that the novel never elicited any interest among Portuguese critics, in the performing arts or in any other area of culture.

(5.1) Štěpánková attributes this lack of interest and success, so apparently at odds with the novel's reception in German-speaking countries (cf. Hartmann 2009: 149-177), to Cabral's translation. In Czech, the novel was experimental, innovative, even subversive in its use of language and in its ostentatious break with literary traditions. These features were suppressed in the Portuguese translation to such an extent as to make it appear somewhat conservative (Štěpánková 2009: 110). It was classified instead as a classical novel about the First World War (cf. also Moniz 2005), but hardly as a really humorous story transcending the age in which it was written. The publishers' attempt to avoid censorship led to a presentation of the novel that locates it in a 'universe of discourse' far away from its intended Portuguese readers, both spatially and temporally.

(5.2) Language was 'brought into line', standardised, made uniform. Misspelled German words were corrected, vulgarisms attenuated, puns left untranslated or misinterpreted. Instances of blasphemy and derision aimed at the Catholic Church were strongly suppressed or made unintelligible (Štěpánková 2009: 97-99).

(5.3) The domestication mentioned above was supplemented with an exotisation consisting in the retention of many German expressions and sentences in the original – usually translated outside the text in footnotes. Czechs of the time, however, understood German only too well. They had to use it in their dealings with the authorities; it was spoken in most large towns; it was the language of command – in short, it was the official language of the Habsburg Empire in which they had lived for over three centuries.

Even to a French reader, one might argue, German sounds familiar. Germany is France's biggest neighbour, German has been taught at French schools, Franco-German contacts, although admittedly not always bright and breezy, have been many and various.

---

<sup>405</sup> '*Os romances universais*' means more than merely 'World Novels'. The adjective 'universal' is, as in English, associated with 'universally accepted and recognised', hence part of (the canon of) world literature.

For a Portuguese reader, however, the distance is too great. Under the *Estado Novo*, even French, English and Spanish, languages closest to the Portuguese cultural sphere, were understood only by a fraction of those who could read. Hašek's use of German and Russian words and expressions, often misspelled to imitate Czech pronunciation, was a challenge Cabral was clearly unequal to.

(5.4) On the one hand, Cabral stuck closely to the French source text, clearly aware that the distance from the Czech original is enhanced by the mediating text. On the other hand, his 'standardisation and levelling of expressions' (Popovič 1976: 24) throughout the text resulted in a Portuguese text is of low quality, in parts even incomprehensible, that deterred rather than attracted Portuguese readers.

(5.5) In his French translation, Hořejší had a working-class readership in mind. His translation is domesticating in that he tried to translate as many 'culturemes' as possible so as not to make the French reader stumble over unknown peculiarities (Štěpánková 2009: 75-87). In Portugal, the audience Cabral had in mind was a handful of leftist-leaning intellectuals belonging to the metropolitan elite who opposed Salazar's regime. The necessity to understand, or ideally appreciate, German in order to enjoy Cabral's translation limited its potential readership even further.

Štěpánková (2009: 115) concludes: 'The French *Chvéik* is a buffoon, a clown who makes masses laugh at his apparent idiocy, the Portuguese *Svejk* [*Chveik*] is a soldier who consciously practises passive resistance with the intention of subverting the regime in power.'<sup>406</sup>

In her careful and detailed study, Štěpánková appears to have exhausted the topic, but her focus on the transposition of humour elements (cf. Štěpánková 2009: 96) and 'realia' (or culturemes) pays less attention to issues considered 'dangerous' by the Portuguese regime. Although it may be impossible to establish unequivocally whether such shifts and omissions, if found, are ultimately attributable to the translator, the editor or the censor, they still seem worth looking for. That is the approach we have decided to adopt in the contrastive micro-textual analysis below.

#### 4.3.5.2 The Paratexts

The first point to make about the translation of Hašek's novel, both into French and into Portuguese, is the *non-translation* of the only authorial peritext following the novel, *Epilogue to Part I*. The Epilogue, however, is crucial in order to understand Hašek's use of language and his own views on the novel. Quoting from Parrott's translation (Hašek 2000: 214-216):

As I finish the first part of the book *The Good Soldier Švejk and his Fortunes in the World War* ('Behind the Lines') I should like to announce that two further volumes will be published in quick succession: 'At the Front' and 'In Captivity'. And in these two further volumes the soldiers and civilian population will go on talking and acting as they do in real life. [...]

<sup>406</sup> '[...] enquanto o Chvéik francês é um bouffon, um palhaço, que faz rir as massas com a sua aparente idiotice, o Švejk português é um soldado que conscientemente pratica a resistência passiva com a finalidade de subverter o regime governante.' (Štěpánková 2009: 115).

Where it is necessary to use a strong expression which was actually said, I am not ashamed of reproducing it exactly as it was. I regard the use of polite circumlocutions or asterisks as the stupidest form of sham. The same words are used in parliament too. [...]

Years ago I read a criticism of a novelette, in which the critic was furious because the author had written: "He blew his nose and wiped it." He said that it went against everything beautiful and exalted which literature should give the nation. This is only a small illustration of what bloody fools are born under the sun. [...]

In using a few strong expressions in my book I have done nothing more than affirm *en passant* how people actually talk. [...]

Lots of people of the type of the late Bretschneider, who under old Austria was a member of the secret police, are still knocking about today in the Republic. They are extremely interested in what people are talking about.

I do not know whether I shall succeed in achieving my purpose with this book. The fact that I have already heard one man swear at another and say "You're as big an idiot as Švejk" does not prove that I have. But if the word "Švejk" becomes a new choice specimen in the already florid garland of abuse I must be content with this enrichment of the Czech language.<sup>407</sup>

The non-translation of this Epilogue, either into French or into Portuguese, raises several issues.

(1) The beginning of the author's peritext draws attention to further sequels of the novel. Not translating it, i.e. withholding this rather important piece of information from the readers, does not seem to be a mere coincidence. Rather, the publisher appears to have wanted to keep his options open and not commit himself to the publication of the sequels.

As we know, French readers saw the publication of the sequels. In Portugal, the political climate until 1974 was certainly not very receptive to books from behind the Iron Curtain. However, for a full quarter-century after the Carnation Revolution, 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portuguese readers waited in vain for the sequels to Part I of Hašek's novel.

(2) Hašek justified, in considerable detail, his use of language in the novel. He was well aware of the shocking effect his novel had on some readers and literary critics. The thrust of his argument was that his choice of language was conscious and intentional. In other words, Hašek *wanted* to use such language or, more precisely, to mix various stylistic registers in the narrative. In a translation aiming at 'adequacy', this could be considered one of the most important features to be retained (cf. also Parrott's Introduction to the English translation, Hašek 2000: xix-xxii).

---

<sup>407</sup> 'Ukončuje první díl knihy Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka (V zázemí), oznamuji, že budou nyní vycházet rychle za sebou dva díly: Na frontě a v zajetí. I v těch druhých dílech budou vojáci i obyvatelstvo mluvit a vystupovat, jak je tomu ve skutečnosti. [...] Je-li třeba užít nějakého silného výrazu, který skutečně padl, nerozpakují se podat jej právě tak, jak se to stalo. Opisovat nebo vytečkovat považují za nejpitomějši přetvářku. Slova těch užívá se i v parlamentech. [...] Před léty četl jsem kritiku jakési novely, ve které se kritik rozčiloval nad tím, že autor napsal: „Vysmrkal se a utřel si nos.“ Příčí se prý to všemu estetickému, vznešenému, co má dát národu literatura. Toť jen malá ukázka toho, jaká hovadí se rodí pod sluncem. [...] Užívá ve své knize několika silných výrazů, konstatoval jsem letmo, jak se skutečně mluví. [...] Lidí typu nebožtíka Bretschneidera, státního detektiva starého Rakouska, potlouká se i dnes velice mnoho v republice. Neobyčejně se zajímají o to, co kdo mluví. Nevím, podaří-li se mně dostihnout touto knihou, co jsem chtěl. Již okolnost, že slyšel jsem jednoho člověka nadávat druhému: „Ty jsi blbej jako Švejk,“ právě tomu nenasvědčuje. Stane-li se však slovo Švejk novou nadávkou v květnatém věnci spílání, musím se spokojit s tímto obohacením českého jazyka.' (Hašek 2004: 169-170).

(3) There is an explicit mention of the secret police. Moreover, Hašek's exact words are ambiguous as to whether it ceased to exist with the demise of 'old Austria' or whether such 'practices' continued to be employed under the new (Czechoslovak) republic.

Let us now focus on the peritexts surrounding the Portuguese editions of Hašek's novel before the end of the *Estado Novo*. In 1961, the only longer peritext accompanying *O valente soldado Chvéik* appeared on the book's cover. It reads as follows:

The Good Soldier Chvéik, who for the first time presents himself to the public of our country, is a masterpiece of world literature, only comparable with Don Quixote by Cervantes or Gargantua and Pantagruel by Rabelais. It is one of the most profound **satires on militarism**. The cunning soldier Chvéik, spiritual brother of Sancho Panza, has become, according to **Marc Vey**, one of the characters of world literature; and **François Kérel** affirmed: In his malicious ingeniousness, Chvéik is a kind of "**Monsieur-tout-le-monde**" ['the man in the street'] [...]. **Translated into all literary languages** [...], the Good Soldier Chvéik is a common heritage of all nations today, a profound and eternally fresh work whose interest and vigour are inexhaustible. By publishing it in our country, Portugália is certain to provide a great service to the Portuguese culture.<sup>408</sup> (bold emphasis added)

(1) Here again, what is missing may be more important than what is said. There is no reference to the Czech origin of the author or the novel, nor even to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The provenance of the story appears to have been camouflaged.

(2) Although the novel's anti-militarism had been a sufficient reason for the censors to ban the Austrian version in 1950, *Portugália* did not attempt to conceal it. Highlighting it on the book's cover, however, is rather unexpected, as it would be easily detected by any agent of the censorship apparatus scanning shop windows. Surprisingly, as we already know, that did not happen.

(3) Not only was Švejk's name kept in the Gallicised version, but the personalities invoked to evaluate the book were two specialists in Czech literature residing in France, and hence utterly unknown to the Portuguese public (cf. Štěpánková 2009: 39). Instead of translating the French expression 'Monsieur tout-le-monde' (e.g. by *Zé Ninguém*), the publisher maintained it. Two plausible reasons suggest themselves: first, the publisher made every effort to disguise the novel's provenance; second, the publisher was addressing an intellectual elite who knew French. Both reasons concur with our other findings.

(4) The novel is explicitly said to rank among the greatest books of world literature. Portuguese literary culture, on the other hand, is described as lagging behind other nations. It is the publisher who redressed the imbalance by finally having Hašek's novel translated into Portuguese. This is the publisher's main argument for the supposedly 'long-awaited' translation and his primary marketing strategy. He uses the *inferiority*

---

<sup>408</sup> 'O valente soldado Chvéik, que pela primeira vez se apresenta ao público do nosso país, é uma obra-prima da literatura universal, só comparável ao Dom Quixote, de Cervantes, ou ao Gargântua e Pantagruel, de Rabelais. Trata-se de uma das mais profundas sátiras ao militarismo. O manhoso soldado Chvéik, irmão espiritual de Sancho Pança, tornou-se, como escreveu Marc Vey, um dos tipos de literatura universal; e François Kérel afirmou: Na sua ingenuidade maliciosa, Chvéik é um espécie de "Monsieur-tout-le-monde" [...]. Traduzido em todas as línguas cultas [...], o Valente Soldado Chvéik é hoje património comum de todos os povos, uma obra profunda e eternamente fresca, cujo interesse e vigor são inesgotáveis. Ao lançá-lo entre nós, a Portugália está certa de prestar um grande serviço à cultura portuguesa.' (Štěpánková 2009: 38).

*complex, vis-à-vis other cultures, of the Portuguese intellectuals of the time to sell his book ('translated into all [other] literary languages').*

In 1971, *Europa-América* advertised Hašek's novel on the back cover of the book in these words:

Jaroslav Hašek was born in Prague (Czechoslovakia) in 1883 and died in Lipnice in 1923. He had a disorderly youth at the end of which he was called upon to fight under the Austrian flag. Assigned to health services, he devoted himself to a **conscious and regular anti-Austrian sabotage**. [...] Later, it seems, he engaged in intense activity in organisations of **the extreme left**. [...] His masterpiece is undoubtedly *The Good Soldier Chveik*, which made him famous both in his country and abroad. Chveik, an astute and malicious soldier, is the **symbol of the negative attitude of Czech soldiers towards Austria during the First World War**. But more than that, he embodies one of the most profound and agreeable **satires on militarism**. [...] Hašek's caricature of the **Austrian** military bureaucracy is a protest against **the war and the imperial eagle** [in the Habsburg coat of arms]. This work, acclaimed by all criticism, adapted for the cinema and several times for the theatre (once by Bertolt Brecht), is a common heritage of all nations today. Its publication in "Livros de Bolso Europa-América" was only possible thanks to the cooperation of Portugália Editora.<sup>409</sup>

(1) The origins of the author, the novel and the plot are explicitly acknowledged. This time, however, it is presented as something confined to Czech soldiers fighting under the Austrian flag, hence something remote both in space and in time. In other words, it is relegated to the realm of the insignificant, inconsequential, innocuous. Such a strategy is, of course, double-edged. It deflects the attention of the censors, but it hardly attracts the attention of the readers.

(2) The anti-militarism of the novel is admitted, in more or less the same words as in the previous edition, as is Hašek's involvement in left-wing 'organisations'. With the peritext admitting that Hašek's novel was more than just a parable of the Czech struggle against the Habsburg's imperial eagle, it comes as no surprise that the publisher sent the text to the censorship board to have it officially approved. Clearly, without the censors' stamp, the book cover could have appeared too provocative.

(3) As the publisher's peritext differs in content, and is longer than the text published by *Portugália* ten years earlier, its focus appears to have shifted from emphasising the novel's position among the masterpieces of world literature to the localised and historicised interpretation.

The peritext accompanying the 1988 edition, published long after the end of the *Estado Novo*, is much shorter and only briefly summarises the main points of the previous

<sup>409</sup> 'Jaroslav Hasek nasceu em Praga (Checoslováquia), em 1883, e faleceu em Lipnice, em 1923. Teve uma juventude desordenada, no fim da qual foi chamado a combater sob a bandeira austríaca. Destinado aos serviços de saúde, dedicou-se a uma consciente e regular sabotagem antiaustríaca. [...] Parece que, em seguida, desenvolveu uma intensa actividade em organizações de extrema esquerda. [...] A sua obra principal é, sem dúvida, *O Valente Soldado Chveik*, que o tornou famoso na sua pátria e no estrangeiro. Chveik, soldado astuto e malicioso, é o símbolo da posição negativa dos soldados checos em relação à Áustria durante a primeira guerra mundial. Mas não só isso, pois ele encarna uma das mais profundas e saborosas sátiras ao militarismo. [...] A caricatura que Hasek traça da burocracia militar austríaca corresponde a um protesto contra a guerra e a águia imperial. Esta obra, recebida com aplausos por toda a crítica, adaptada ao cinema e várias vezes ao teatro (uma delas por Bertolt Brecht), é hoje património comum de todos os povos. O seu lançamento em "Livros de Bolso Europa-América" só foi possível graças à colaboração da Portugália Editora.' (back cover of the 1971 book edition by Europa-América)



edition: ‘It is a classic of world literature’, ‘It is a symbol of the negative attitude of Czech soldiers towards Austria’, etc.<sup>410</sup>

Finally, it is worth taking a closer look at the book series in which *Chvéik/Chveik* appeared. *Portugália’s Os romances universais* was a series launched shortly after the establishment of the publishing house in 1942 (probably in 1943) and appears to have continued until 1970.<sup>411</sup> Publications preceding Cabral’s translation of *The Good Soldier Švejk* included *inter alia*:

- George Eliot’s *The Mill on the Floss*, D. H. Lawrence’s *Sons and Lovers*, H. G. Wells’ *Kipps* – all three translated by João Cabral do Nascimento, the translator of Egon Hostovský’s *The Arsonist*;
- Sigrid Undset’s *Kristin Lavransdatter*,<sup>412</sup> translated by Maria Franco, who also translated K. J. Beneš’ *The Red Seal*;
- F. M. Dostoyevsky’s *Crime and Punishment*, translated by João Cabral do Nascimento and Maria Franco;
- and several other, mostly English (C. Brontë, C. Dickens, O. Wilde), American (W. Faulkner, J. Dos Passos), French (A. Gide, Choderlos de Laclos), and Russian (D. S. Merezhkovsky) authors.

The list clearly implies a selection of classics, which was perpetuated even after the publication of Cabral’s *Chvéik* with authors such as A. Moravia, H. James, Stendhal, T. Hardy, A. Tolstoy, E. Brontë, etc.

*The Good Soldier Švejk*, in Czech an innovative, subversive and controversial novel, thus entered the Portuguese system alongside long-time classics. While it could be argued that Hašek’s novel *had* gained canonical status by 1961, its Portuguese translation was, from the very beginning, associated with classical authors, some of whom had been long dead. The novel’s innovative potential was thus lost not (only) in translation, but already in the mere act of publishing it in the above series. Even before peeking inside the book the Portuguese reader was misled by the blurb.

As the title implies, *Europa-América’s Livros de bolso* [Pocket Books] was an extensive book series with a very large number of publications and various subseries.<sup>413</sup> On the first page of Cabral’s *Chveik*, there is a list of books that preceded it:

1. *Esteiros* [River Branches], a neo-realist novel by Soeiro Pereira Gomes (1909-49), a Portuguese writer and a communist;
2. *O músico cego* [The Blind Musician] by Vladimir Korolenko (1853-1921), a Ukrainian-Russian writer;

<sup>410</sup> ‘É um clássico da literatura mundial’, ‘É um símbolo da posição negativa dos soldados checos em relação à Áustria’ (Štěpánková 2009: 40).

<sup>411</sup> The data contained in PORBASE are extremely disorderly. This search was limited to ‘words from publisher’ (*palavras em editor*): **Portugália**, words from title of book series (*palavras em título de coleção*): **Os romances universais**, and sorted by publication date (*ordenar por ano de publicação*). Cf. <http://porbase.bnportugal.pt/> (retrieved on 2011-08-11).

<sup>412</sup> Sigrid Undset (1882-1949) was a Norwegian novelist. She was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1928. She was born in Denmark, but her family moved to Norway when she was two years old.

<sup>413</sup> PORBASE lists 1743 entries (retrieved on 2011-08-11). Many of these publications, however, contain incomplete (or wrong) data.

3. *Frei Luís de Sousa* [Friar Luís de Sousa] by Almeida Garrett (1799-1854), a Portuguese romantic writer;
4. *A Oeste nada de Novo* [All Quiet on the Western Front] by Erich Maria Remarque (1898-1970)
5. *A Missão* [The Mission] by Ferreira de Castro (1898-1974), a Portuguese writer and opponent of Salazar's regime;
6. *Mar Morto* [Sea of Death] by Jorge Amado (1912-2001), a Brazilian writer and a communist;
7. *A Um Deus Desconhecido* [To a God Unknown] by John Steinbeck (1902-68).

Hašek's *O valente soldado Chveik*, no. 8 of the series, was directly followed by a book of short stories by Nikolai Gogol (1809-52).

The list hardly requires any comment. Suffice it to say that this time *Švejk* was placed among communists, left-wing sympathisers and authors from behind the Iron Curtain. Some of these authors were doubtless classics, already in 1971, but the political slant of the beginnings of the *Livros de Bolso* series is self-evident.

To conclude, it appears particularly relevant that the only *epitexts* concerning Hašek's novel, i.e. both in the Austrian (non-translated) version and in Cabral's translation (in its second edition), are the censorship files from 1950 (4481) and 1971 (9100). Other than that, only the book series provides an 'epitextual' context for Hašek's *Švejk* in Portugal.<sup>414</sup>

Regarding the *peritexts*, they are rather few and brief, and display a deliberate effort to avoid censorship. The authorial epitext following the novel, Hašek's *Epilogue to Part I*, was in all likelihood not translated simply because the Portuguese translation was made from the French edition, which does not contain it. Its absence is, nonetheless, significant for the reception of the novel by the Portuguese readership.

### 4.3.5.3 Analysis of Selected Passages

Selected passages of *Švejk* are presented in the following order: the Czech original (Hašek), the French first-hand translation (Hořejší) and the Portuguese second-hand translation (Cabral). Our aim is to compare the Czech original and the Portuguese 'end result'. Where these two texts diverge, the relevant passages are compared and discussed.

The French text serves only to reveal whether the 'shifts' occurred already in the translation from Czech into French, or whether they were in fact introduced by the Portuguese translator. Being only a 'reference value', the French excerpts are left untranslated, unless vital for the discussion.

Since this thesis is written in English and Parrott's translation often illuminates the subject more clearly to non-Czech speakers, our excerpts are followed by Parrott's

---

<sup>414</sup> This is an area of study which Baubeta termed 'Descriptive Anthology Studies' (Baubeta in Seruya & Moniz & Rosa 2009: 37, 41-42).

translation from 1973. Of all three translators, Parrott is generally closest to Hašek's original text.

Before embarking on our analysis, an important, critical comment must be made: throughout our comparisons, we work on the assumption that the texts of the translations had not changed in the various editions. We know for certain that the text of Cabral's Portuguese translation from 1961 was identical with the 1971 edition. Regarding all other languages, however, that is no more than a more or less plausible hypothesis. Most importantly, doubts have been raised as to the authenticity of the Czech original (Pytlík 1983: 405-408). For the French and English translations, it is the task of translation scholars comparing various editions in those languages to confirm or refute this hypothesis.

### (I) Introduction

Hašek's novel is introduced by a brief authorial peritext entitled *Úvod* [Introduction], *Avant-propos* in Hořejší's translation and *Prefácio* [Preface] in Portuguese.

Hašek (1921/2004)	Hořejší (1932/2007)	Cabral (1961/1971)
<p><b>Veliká</b> doba žádá velké lidi. [...] Dnes můžete potkat v pražských ulicích <b>ošumělého</b> muže, který sám ani neví, co znamená v historii nové, <b>velké</b> doby. [...] A tento tichý, skromný, <b>ošumělý</b> muž jest opravdu ten starý <b>dobrý voják Švejk</b>, hrdinný a statečný, který kdysi <b>za Rakouska</b> byl v ústech všech občanů českého království a jehož sláva nezapadne ani <b>v republice</b>. Mám velice rád toho <b>dobrého vojáka Švejka</b> [...] On nezapálil <b>chrám bohyně v Efesu</b>, jako to udělal ten hlupák Herostrates, aby se dostal do novin a do <b>školních čítanek</b>. A to stačí.</p>	<p>Une <b>grande</b> époque exige de grands hommes. [...] Dans les rues de Prague vous pouvez rencontrer aujourd'hui un homme <b>en débrillé</b>, qui ignore quel rôle important il a joué dans l'histoire de cette <b>grande</b> époque nouvelle. [...] Et cet homme, taciturne e <b>mal vêtu</b>, n'est autre que l'ancien « <b>brave soldat Chvéik</b> », guerrier héroïque et vaillant, dont, <b>sous l'Autriche</b>, tous les citoyens du royaume de Bohême avaient <b>sans cesse</b> le nom à la bouche et dont la gloire, <b>n'en doutons pas</b>, ne pâlera point non plus <b>dans la nouvelle République tchécoslovaque</b>. J'aime beaucoup ce <b>brave soldat Chvéik</b> [...] Il n'a pas, à l'instar de ce sot d'Erostrate, mis le feu au <b>temple de Diane</b> pour avoir son nom dans les journaux et dans les <b>livres de lecture du premier âge</b>. Et c'est déjà bien beau, <b>je crois</b> !</p>	<p>Uma <b>grande</b> época exige grandes homens. [...] Podem encontrar hoje, nas ruas de Praga, um homem <b>mal enjorcado</b>, que ignora a importância do papel que representou na história deste <b>magnífica</b> época nova. [...] Ora esse homem, taciturno e <b>mal vestido</b>, é nem mais nem menos que o antigo «<b>valente soldado Chveik</b>», guerreiro heróico e intrépido de quem, durante o <b>domínio austríaco</b>, todos os cidadãos do reino da Boémia traziam o nome <b>perpétuamente</b> na boca e cuja glória, <b>não tenhamos dúvidas</b>, também não empalidecerá <b>na nova República Checoslovaca</b>. Eu gosto bastante desse <b>valente soldado Chveik</b> [...] Ele não seguiu o exemplo do pateta do Eróstrato, que lançou fogo ao <b>templo de Diana</b> para ter o nome nos jornais e nos <b>livros de leitura da primeira classe</b>. <b>Na minha opinião</b>, isso já é muito bom!</p>

Let us first look at the English translation by Cecil Parrott (1973/2000):

**Great times** call for great men. [...] Today you can meet in the streets of Prague a **shabbily dressed** man who is not even himself aware of his significance in the history of the **great new era**. [...] And this quiet, unassuming, **shabbily dressed** man is indeed that heroic and valiant **good old soldier Švejk**. **In Austrian times** his name was once on the lips of all the citizens of the **Kingdom of Bohemia**, and **in the Republic** his glory will not fade either. I am very fond of

the **good soldier Švejk** [...] Unlike that stupid fellow Herostrates he did not set fire to the temple of **the Goddess in Ephesus** just to get himself into the newspapers and **school books**. And that is enough. (bold emphasis added)

There are several observations to be made from the very first page of the book:

(1) Synonymic parallelisms: ‘loss of expression’ or ‘expressional [i.e. stylistic] loss’ (in Popovič’s phrase).<sup>415</sup>

Hašek uses ‘**veliká doba**’ [great time(s), great epoch, great era] twice in this very short Introduction. Hořejší maintains ‘grande époque’ in both cases. Parrott slightly reformulates from ‘great times’ to ‘great era’. Cabral changes ‘grande época’ to ‘**magnífica época**’ (magnificent era).

Hašek describes Švejk as ‘**ošumělý**’, roughly: dowdy, mangy, shoddy, but also shabby or shabbily dressed, implying ‘unrespectable’. Hořejší breaks this parallelism, using ‘en débraillé’ and ‘mal větu’. Parrott maintains ‘shabbily dressed’ in both cases. Cabral, unaware of the parallelism, uses ‘**mal enjorcado**’, a regionalism for ‘carelessly dressed’, and ‘**mal vestido**’ [badly dressed].

Much more importantly, Švejk is described twice as ‘**dobrý voják Švejk**’, rendered by Parrott correctly as ‘good soldier Švejk’. Although the parallelism is maintained by Hořejší, he changes it to ‘brave soldat Chvéik’. While ‘*un homme brave*’ is a brave, valiant person, ‘*un brave homme*’ is an honest, good person. Cabral disambiguates and translates as ‘**valente soldado Chveik**’, a *valiant* soldier Chveik, which Švejk certainly is not, and Hašek intended no irony in the title.<sup>416</sup>

(2) ‘Expressional [i.e. stylistic] individualisation’ (emphasising the unique) and ‘localisation’.

In 1920/21, Hašek wrote ‘**za Rakouska**’ [under Austria] and ‘**v republice**’ [in the republic] – the dividing date between the two being 1918. Parrott translated ‘in Austrian times’ and ‘in the Republic’ (capital R), being neither completely faithful to the original nor too explicit. Hořejší resorted to an explication: ‘sous l’Autriche’ and ‘dans la nouvelle République tchécoslovaque’. Cabral added his own interpretation: ‘**durante o domínio austríaco**’ (under the Austrian dominion) and ‘**na nova República Checoslovaca**’ (in the new Czechoslovak Republic).

(3) ‘Expressional individualisation’ and ‘loss of expression’.

Hašek wrote ‘**chrám bohyně v Efesu**’, rendered by Parrott correctly as ‘temple of the Goddess in Ephesus’. Hořejší specified with ‘temple de Diane’ and Cabral followed with ‘**templo de Diana**’. Hořejší, and Cabral in his wake, ‘intensified’, specified the

<sup>415</sup> Unless stated otherwise, all ‘subheadings’ of our contrastive analysis refer to Popovič’s ‘Typology of Expressional Changes in Translation’, better known as ‘shifts of expression’, described in detail in subchapter 2.3.2 of the present thesis (Popovič 1971: 82; 1975: 130; **1976: 24**; 1983: 195-217, 204). For an enlightening and insightful discussion of the distortion of Kafka’s style in translation, see ‘Une phrase’ (English: ‘A Sentence’), the fourth essay in M. Kundera’s *Les testaments trahis* (1993, English: *Testaments Betrayed*, translated by Linda Asher).

<sup>416</sup> In German, *der brave Soldat Schwejk* is as ambiguous as the French: ‘ein braves Kind’ is ‘a good (behaving) child’, while ‘ein braver Soldat’ (obsolete) is ‘a brave soldier’.

expression, made it more ‘individual’ by rendering it as ‘the Temple of Diana’. In both cases, the ancient Greek city of Ephesus, near present-day Selçuk in Turkey, was omitted.

Moreover, Diana is the Roman (Latin) name for Artemis, the Hellenic goddess of the hunt, wilderness, virginity, etc. In Romance cultures, the Roman name is more common, but the correct title of the temple, as it was a Greek temple, is ‘The Temple of Artemis’. It might well have been this duplicity in the deity’s name that led Hašek to avoid using it. In being more specific, Hořejší and Cabral may have changed the author’s intention.

(4) ‘Expressional individualisation’ and ‘over-interpretation’.

Hašek wrote ‘**školní čítanky**’, which is literally ‘school reading books’. Since school books are usually called ‘textbooks’ or ‘study books’ (učebnice) in the higher forms (grades) at school, the expression does imply primary (elementary) school. Parrott rendered the expression neutrally as ‘school books’. Hořejší translated by ‘livres de lecture du premier âge’. Cabral intensified the expression even further by making it ‘livros de leitura **da primeira classe**’ (reading books of the first form).

(5) Additions, ‘expressional individualisation’ or ‘individual shifts’.

To Hořejší, it seemed insufficient that Švejk’s name was once on the lips of all the citizens of the Kingdom of Bohemia, so he added ‘sans cesse’. Cabral followed with ‘**perpétuamente**’ (all the time).

Emphasising Hašek’s ‘expression’ again, Hořejší adds ‘n’en doutons pas’. Cabral, unaware of the original text, renders it as ‘**não tenhamos dúvidas**’ (literally: let us have no doubts).

## **(II) Beginning**

The beginning of the story differs so greatly in the three versions as to make readers believe they are dealing with three different books:

Hašek (1921/2004)	Hořejší (1932/2007)	Cabral (1961/1971)
„ <b>Tak nám zabili Ferdinanda,</b> “ řekla <b>posluhovačka</b> panu Švejkovi, který opustiv před léty vojenskou službu, když byl definitivně prohlášen <b>vojenskou lékařskou komisí</b> za <b>blba</b> , živil se prodejem <b>psů, ošklivých nečistokrevných oblud</b> , kterým <b>padělal rodokmeny</b> . Kromě tohoto zaměstnání byl stížen revmatismem a mazal si právě kolena <b>opodeldokem</b> . „Kerýho Ferdinanda, paní Müllerová?“	« <b>C’est du propre ! m’sieur le patron</b> », <b>prononça la logeuse</b> de M. Chvéik qui, après avoir été déclaré « <b>complètement idiot</b> » par la <b>commission médicale</b> , avait renoncé au service militaire et vivait maintenant en vendant des chiens bâtards, <b>monstres immondes</b> , pour lesquels il <b>fabriquait des pedigrees de circonstance</b> . <b>Dans ses loisirs</b> , il soignait aussi ses rhumatismes, et, <b>au moment où la logeuse l’interpella</b> , il était justement en train de se frictionner les genoux au <b>baume d’opodeldoch</b> . « <b>Quoi</b>	– <b>É abominável, patrão!</b> – <b>exclamou a hospedeira</b> do Sr. Chveik, que, depois de ser considerado « <b>inteiramente idiota</b> » pela junta médica, renunciara ao serviço militar e viva presentemente da venda de <b>rafeiros, monstros imundos</b> para os quais <b>fabricava pedigrees de circunstância</b> . Tratava também, <b>nas horas de ócio</b> , do seu reumatismo; <b>precisamente, no momento em que a hospedeira lhe falara</b> , estava prestes a frictionar os joelhos com <b>bálsamo de opodeldoque</b> . –

	<p><b>donc? fit-il. – Eh bien, notre Ferdinand... il n’y en a plus !</b>  – De quel Ferdinand parlez-vous, m’ame Muller ?  questionna Chvéik tout en continuant sa friction.</p>	<p><b>De que está a falar? – perguntou ele. – De que havia de ser, do nosso Fernando... já não existe! –</b>  A que Fernando se refere, Sr.<sup>a</sup> Muller? – interrogou Chveik, continuando sempre a fricção.</p>
--	--	--

Again, let us first look at Parrott’s translation:

“And so they’ve killed our Ferdinand,”<sup>1</sup> said the **charwoman** to Mr Švejk, who had left military service years before, after having been finally certified by an **army medical board** as an **imbecile**, and now lived by selling dogs – ugly, **mongrel** monstrosities whose pedigrees he **forged**. Apart from this occupation he suffered from rheumatism and was at this very moment rubbing his knees with **Elliman’s embrocation**. “Which Ferdinand, Mrs Müller?” he asked, going on with the massaging.

**Footnote 1: The Archduke Franz Ferdinand, nephew of the Austrian Emperor, Franz Joseph, was assassinated with his wife in Sarajevo by the Serbian nationalist, Gavrilo Princip, in 1914.**

Clearly, the beginning of the novel is a daunting challenge. The translators add and omit, intensify and attenuate, invert and transform, offering a harvest of ‘shifts of expression’ on the very first page.

(1) ‘Loss of expression’, ‘expressional inversion’ (transformation) and additions.

The reference to the death of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in the first sentence is maintained by Parrott, but accompanied by a rather lengthy and encyclopaedic explanation in the footnote. Thus, in English, the novel in fact begins with the footnote – a clear instance of ‘exotisation’ at the macro-stylistic level.

Hořejší begins the novel in his own way: ‘C’est du propre!’ (roughly: ‘That’s something!’ or ‘What news!’). Cabral is not in tow and creatively interprets: ‘**É abominável!**’ (literally: ‘It is abominable!’), roughly: ‘Isn’t it awful!’).

These beginnings lead the two translators to continue the dialogue between Švejk and Mrs Müller in a manner strikingly different from the original. In other words, Hořejší and Cabral introduce rather significant additions on the very first page of the novel:

Hořejší: ‘Quoi donc? fit-il. – Eh bien, notre Ferdinand... il n’y en a plus!’

Cabral: ‘**De que está a falar? – perguntou ele. – De que havia de ser, do nosso Fernando... já não existe!**’ [‘What are you talking about?’ he asked. ‘What indeed! About our Fernando... he is no more!’].

(2) ‘Expressional intensification’ – additions.

(2.1) In Hašek’s words, Švejk was declared by a ‘committee of army doctors’ to be a ‘**blb**’: an idiot, imbecile, numbskull, etc. Hořejší has Chvéik declared ‘complètement idiot’ by a ‘commission médicale’. Cabral is faithful to Hořejší and the Portuguese Chveik is ‘considered’ ‘**inteiramente idiota**’ (a complete idiot) by a ‘**junta médica**’ (medical commission).

(2.2) Hašek's sophisticated syllepsis at sentence level, clearly employed to produce a comical effect, is maintained by Parrott, but broken down by Hořejší's two additions 'dans ses loisirs' and 'au moment où la logeuse l'interpella'. Cabral had little choice but to follow with '**nas horas de ócio**' (in the leisure hours) and '**precisamente no momento em que a hospedeira lhe falara**' (precisely at the moment in which the landlady was speaking to him). Such prolixity destroys any comical intention.

(3) 'Inadequate translation', 'individual shifts', 'negative shifts', 'stylistic levelling'.

In the Czech original, Švejk is speaking with his '**posluhovačka**', a charwoman, a home help, a daily 'servant' (cf. Reiner's 'Bedienerin zu Herrn Schwejk'). Incomprehensibly, Hořejší, whose mother tongue was Czech, changed it to 'la logeuse', which Cabral rendered by its Portuguese equivalent '**hospedeira**' [landlady].

Moreover the Portuguese 'hospedeira' cried out (**exclamou**), whereas the French 'logeuse' uttered ('prononça') and the Czech 'posluhovačka' said (**řekla**).

The Czech Švejk sells dogs that are ugly, currish monsters, i.e. not thoroughbreds, and he forges their pedigrees. The French Chvéik sells bastard dogs, repulsive (disgusting) monsters, whose *occasional* pedigrees he *fabricates*. The Portuguese Chveik again sells dogs that are not thoroughbreds ('**rafeiros**', not cães), dirty (unclean) monsters, whose *occasional* pedigrees he *fabricates*.

'Opodeldoc' is not one of Czech 'realia', but a kind of liniment (embrocation) invented by Paracelsus (1493-1541) and used against rheumatism and gout. As this ointment had fallen out of use, Hořejší and Cabral added 'the balm of opodeldoc'. Parrott was the only translator to substitute the expression with 'Elliman's embrocation'.

The remaining part of our analysis focuses on censorship-sensitive topics, such as anti-militarism, blasphemy, anti-religious passages, allusions to sex, and finally mentions of censorship in the novel itself. The excerpts have been carefully selected to be either representative or otherwise significant. Each excerpt is complemented by a brief discussion.

### **(III) Censorship 1**

In censorship file no. 9100 from 1971, the Portuguese censor wrote: 'Only one fleeting remark could offend the sensibility of some Portuguese readers. It can be found on page 11, in a brief allusion to the personality of King Charles. But even there, no pejorative intention can be detected.' Let us compare this locus in three translations:

Hašek (1921/2004: 13)	Hořejší (1932/2007: 32)	Cabral (1961/1971: 11)
Jestli se pamatujou, jak tenkrát v Portugalsku <b>si postřileli</b> toho svýho krále. <b>Byl taky takovej tlustej. To víte, že král nebude přece hubenej.</b>	<b>On l'a bien vu au Portugal.</b> Vous vous rappelez cette histoire du roi <b>troué de balles?</b> <b>Celui-là était aussi dans le genre de l'archiduc, gros comme tout.</b>	<b>Teve-se a prova em Portugal.</b> A <b>senhora</b> lembra-se dessa história do rei <b>varado de balas?</b> <b>Era também do género do arquiduque, corpulento como tudo.</b>

Parrott (1973/2000: 6): ‘You may remember the time they shot that king of theirs in Portugal? He was a fat chap too. After all, you wouldn’t expect a king to be thin, would you?’

(1) ‘Constitutive (systemic) shift’.

Speaking with Mrs Müller, Švejk is using an (obsolete) form of polite address. Since English lacks this distinction, it cannot be rendered adequately. The French Chvéik uses ‘vous’ to indicate that Mrs Müller and he are on formal, last-name, terms. In Portuguese, arguably the richest of the European languages regarding various levels of formal address, Cabral used ‘a senhora’, an adequate rendering for the social status and kind of relationship between Mrs Müller and Švejk.

(2) Addition or ‘individual shift’.

Hořejší added a whole new sentence with no equivalent in the original: ‘On l’a bien vu au Portugal.’ Cabral is even more specific: ‘**Teve-se a prova em Portugal**’ [literally: ‘It was proved in Portugal’].

(3) ‘Inadequate translation’, ‘individual shifts’, ‘negative shifts’, ‘stylistic levelling’.

Hašek wrote literally: ‘The king was kind of fat, too. You know, a king won’t be thin.’ Cabral, following Hořejší, translated: ‘He was also the archduke type, really corpulent.’ That is a peculiar collocation: not ‘really fat’ (**gordo como tudo**), but ‘really corpulent’. And the Portuguese king, in Cabral’s translation, was not ‘shot (dead)’, but ‘struck down with bullets’ (**varado de balas**), which of course he got through the French ‘riddled with bullets’ (*troué de balles*).

#### **(IV) Censorship 2**

In Hašek’s novel, censorship is explicitly mentioned on two occasions.

Hašek (1921/2004: 67)	Hořejší (1932/2007: 146-147)	Cabral (1961/1971: 74-75)
<p><b>Vojenská cenzura</b> dopravovala <b>sem</b> autory korespondence mezi frontou a těmi, které doma zanechali v zoufalství. <b>Sem</b> vodili <b>četníci</b> i staré výměnkáře, kteří <b>posílali psaní na frontu</b>, a <b>vojenský soud</b> házel jim na krk za jejich slova útěchy, líčení bídy domácí po dvanácti letech.</p>	<p><b>A côté d’elle</b> [la prison], <b>le service de la censure militaire</b> livrait <b>à cette prison</b> les auteurs de lettres écrites du front à leurs familles, dont les membres <b>subissaient à leur tour le sort de leurs correspondants. La prison de la place de Prague</b> voyait aussi passer de vieux campagnards qui <b>s’étaient permis, en écrivant à leurs fils</b>, de leur dire leurs misères et de plaindre celles des soldats; <b>le conseil de guerre</b> les condamnait <b>tous</b> invariablement à des peines de douze ans <b>de forteresse</b>.</p>	<p><b>Paralelamente, o serviço de censura militar</b> entregava <b>a esta prisão</b> os autores de cartas escritas na frente às <b>respectivas famílias, cujos membros por seu turno sofriram a sorte dos correspondentes. A cadeia da cidade de Praga</b> viu também passar velhos camponeses que se atreveram, ao escrever aos filhos, a contar-lhes as suas misérias e a lastimar as dos soldados; <b>o conselho de guerra</b> condenava-os invariavelmente a penas de doze anos <b>de fortaleza</b>.</p>

Parrott (1973/2000: 80):



The **military censorship** consigned **here** the writers of letters exchanged between the men at the front and the despairing ones they had left behind at home. The gendarmes even brought **here poor** old peasant pensioners who had **written letters to the front**, and the **court-martial** juggled them for twelve years as a punishment for their words of consolation and their descriptions of the misery at home.

Apart from several inadequate renderings, e.g. ‘**vojenský soud**’ (court-martial) as ‘conseil de guerre’ and ‘**vojenská cenzura**’ as ‘service de la censure militaire’, the most striking feature of Hořejší’s translation is its creativity. He reinvents the novel, adapting it – not necessarily to a French reality or culture, but rather as he sees fit. He ‘intellectualises’ Hašek’s unique idiolect by making the text more logical, explaining implied meanings, formally expressing syntactic relations, etc.<sup>417</sup>

Unfamiliar with the Czech original, Cabral has little choice but to trust Hořejší, who was after all a Czech. However, since every translation, even an indirect one, entails certain ‘shifts of expression’, Cabral is sometimes unwittingly closer to the Czech original, e.g. when he reduces ‘à côté d’elle’ to ‘**paralelamente**’ (in parallel) or, more importantly, when he leaves out Hořejší’s addition ‘tous’.

Hašek’s ‘**sem**’ (here, hither) becomes ‘à cette prison’ and ‘**a esta prisão**’ (to this prison) in one instance, and ‘la prison de la place de Prague’ and ‘**a cadeia da cidade de Praga**’ (the prison of the city of Prague) in the other.

‘Those who were left at home in despair’ turn out to be ‘their **respective** families whose members, **for their part**, suffered the fate of the correspondents’ (‘**as respectivas famílias, cujos membros por seu turno sofriram a sorte dos correspondentes**’). To be just to Hořejší, it was Cabral who added the word ‘respectivas’.

According to Hašek, the ‘retired peasants’, who were brought *here* by ‘the gendarmes’, ‘sent letters to the front’. In French and Portuguese, the gendarmes disappear, the retired peasants *dare* (venture) to write, and they write to their *sons*. For that they are imprisoned in a *fortress*.

### **(V) Censorship 3**

Censorship is not only mentioned, but shown in Part I of Hašek’s novel: more specifically, its mode ‘authorised with cuts’:

Hašek (1921/2004: 99)	Hořejší (1932/2007: 216)	Cabral (1961/1971: 110)
Švejk vzal do ruky tu <b>domáci</b> relikvii a četl: „Milá <b>Aninko!</b> Máme se zde velice dobře, všichni jsme zdraví. Sousedka vedle na posteli má skvrnitý [...] a také jsou zde černé [...]. Jinak je vše v pořádku. Jídla máme dost a sbíráme bramborové [...] na polívku. [...] <b>Tak myslím</b> , že je už pozdě a že už je ten pejsek taky na pravdě [...].“ A přes celý ten	Chvéik prit entre ses mains cette <b>touchante</b> relique et lut : « Ma chère <b>Anne</b> , tout va très bien ici, surtout rapport à la santé. La voisine du lit d’à côté est <b>toute rouge de...</b> et nous avons ici aussi <b>la petite...</b> A part ça, tout va au mieux. Le manger est <b>très abondant</b> et nous ramassons des... de pommes de terre pour en faire de la <b>bonne</b> soupe. [...] <b>Par conséquent, je crois</b> qu’il	Chveik tomou nas mãos a <b>enternecedora</b> relíquia e leu: «Minha querida <b>Ana</b> , por aqui tudo vai bem, sobre tudo em relação à saúde. A vizinha da cama do lado está <b>muito encarniçada por causa da...</b> também cá temos a... De resto, tudo vai pelo melhor. A comida é <b>muito abundante</b> e nós apanhamos algumas... de batata para fazer uma sopa <b>rica</b> . [...]

<sup>417</sup> For a thorough discussion of ‘intellectualisation’, see Levý 1963/1998: 145-146.

listek <b>růžové</b> razítko: <i>Zensuriert K. k.</i> <i>Konzentrationslager Steinhof.</i>	doit être aujourd’hui... la même chose. » La carte était <b>sabrée par les lettres rouges de l’estampille</b> : <i>Zensuriert! K. u. k. Konzentrationslager, Steinhof.</i>	<b>Por consequência, é de acreditar que</b> nesta altura deve estar... também.» A carta estava <b>emporcilhada com as letras vermelhas do carimbo</b> : <i>Zensuriert! K. u. k. Konzentrationslager, Steinhof.</i>
--	--	--

Parrott (1973/2000: 122):

Švejk took this **precious** household relic and read: “Dear **Aninka**, We are enjoying ourselves very much here. We are all well. The woman in the next bed to me has **spotted** — and also there are here people with **small** —. Otherwise everything is in order. We have plenty to eat and collect **potato** — for soup. [...] So I suppose it’s already too late and the little dog is also resting with —.” And across the whole letter there was a **pink stamp in German**: “Censored, Imperial and Royal Concentration Camp, Steinhof.”

(1) It can, of course, be questioned whether it was the author who blacked out the missing words and whether the translators had any influence on the insertion of the suspension points and the dashes. However, our research question is ‘What was the Portuguese readers’ impression of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal if they did not read in foreign languages?’ The end-product is therefore the main ‘evidence’ in our analysis.

However, blacking the words out is a much more conspicuous way of drawing the readers’ attention to the workings of censorship than using suspension points. Moreover, the ‘censored’ words are superfluous for the understanding of the text: ‘**skvrnitý...**’ is clearly ‘skvrnitý tyfus’ (spotted fever), ‘**černé...**’ in the context must be ‘černé neštovice’ (smallpox), ‘**bramborové...**’ is most likely ‘bramborové slupky’ (potato peelings), and ‘**na pravdě...**’ can only be complemented by ‘na pravdě boží’, a euphemism for ‘dead’ (roughly: ‘resting in peace’ or ‘meeting his maker’), since the talk is of a puppy.

Hašek’s playful parody of censorship is not laboured, however, and does not disrupt the fluency of the text. Parrott maintained this feature and translated accordingly (see above). The French and especially the Portuguese text are much less comprehensible, hence an ‘expressional intensification’, in Popovič’s nomenclature.

In 1921, when Hašek wrote the Czech original, the German stamp would be understood by all Czech readers. After all, the Austro-Hungarian Empire had ceased to exist only three years earlier. In French, where many German sentences, poems and inscriptions are translated in the translator’s footnotes, these German words are left untranslated. Cabral offers no explanation of the meaning of the stamp to those Portuguese readers who do not understand German, either.

In other words, the intervention of the censor is rendered less conspicuous both in the (democratic) French and in the (Salazarist) Portuguese context in two ways: (i) suspension points serve a variety of functions and they are used more generously in Romance languages than in English; and (ii) the German text is left untranslated.

Parrott, or his publisher, opted for long dashes ('em dashes'), not commonly used in English texts, and *translated* the abbreviated *Kaiserliches und königliches Konzentrationslager Steinhof*.

(2) 'Individual, negative shifts'.

None of the translators maintained Hašek's poetics of simplicity. Hašek took a 'household relic', neither a precious nor a touching one (touchante, **enternecedora**). The same is true of the soup. The potatoes are for a soup, neither a good ('bonne') nor a rich ('rica') soup.

The neighbour is not 'all red from' (toute rouge de) or 'very furious because of' (**encarniçada por causa da**) – she simply *has* spotted (fever). Cabral did not infer that 'petite...' stood for 'petite vérole' (smallpox) and left it out completely.

In Czech, the people in the concentration camp are 'very well' and they have 'enough food'. In the English concentration camp, people are 'enjoying themselves very much' – perhaps a slight overstatement. In the French and Portuguese concentration camps, they have food in abundance.

Across the entire card there was a 'pink stamp'. Parrott added 'in German' and translated. Hořejší changed to a 'the red letters of the stamp' and Cabral followed suit (**letras vermelhas do carimbo**).

(4) Non-translated 'constitutive shift'.

Had Cabral been translating from the Czech, he would have known that 'Aninko' was a diminutive form of address (vocative) and could have conveyed it more closely (e.g. by 'Aninhas' or 'Anita'). English and French could use 'Annie'.

## **(VI) Anti-Militarism**

Hašek's anti-militarism, albeit pervasive, is mostly subdued, expressed indirectly either in the characters' behaviour or in the authorial narrator's deliberations on war, the army, the Church and their mutual relations. In one instance, however, the authorial narrator is very explicit:

Hašek (1921/2004: 67)	Hořejší (1932/2007: 145)	Cabral (1961/1971: 74)
<b>Posledním</b> útočištěm lidí, kteří nechtěli jít do války, <b>byl</b> garnizón. Znal jsem jednoho <b>suplenta</b> , který nechtěl střílet jako <b>matematik</b> u artilerie, a kvůli tomu ukradl hodinky jednomu nadporučíkovi, aby <b>se dostal</b> na garnizón. Učinil tak s plnou rozvahou. <b>Válka mu neimponovala a neokouzlovala ho</b> . Střílet do nepřítele a zabíjet na druhé straně šrapnely a granáty <b>stejně takové nešťastné</b>	La prison de la place de Prague <b>formait le suprême</b> refuge de ceux qui ne voulaient pas aller à la guerre. J'ai connu un <b>agregé en mathématiques</b> , qui, répugnant au service de l'artillerie, décida de voler la montre d'un <b>Oberleutnant</b> pour pouvoir <b>se caser</b> dans la prison de la place. Il avait agi ainsi après mûre réflexion. <b>La guerre ne lui disait rien</b> . Expédier les obus et tuer des <b>agregés en</b>	A prisão da cidade de Praga <b>representava o supremo</b> refúgio para aqueles que não queriam partir para a guerra. Conheci um <b>professor formado em Matemática</b> que, repugnando-lhe o serviço de artilharia, decidiu [ <i>sic!</i> ] roubar o relógio de um <b>oberleutnant</b> para poder <b>malhar com os ossos</b> na cadeia. Agira assim, após madura reflexão. <b>A guerra</b>

<p><b>suplenty matematiky</b> považoval za <b>blbost</b>. „Nechci <b>být nenáviděn pro své násilnictví</b>“, řekl si a ukradl <b>s klidem</b> hodinky.</p>	<p><b>mathématiques</b> de l'autre côté du front, il considérait cela comme <b>parfaitement idiot</b>. « Je ne veux pas <b>me conduire comme un brutal</b> », s'était-il dit et il avait <b>froidement</b> volé la montre.</p>	<p><b>não o entusiasmava</b>. Expedir granadas e matar <b>professores formados em Matemática</b> do outro lado da frente considerava ele uma coisa <b>perfeitamente idiota</b>. – Não quero <b>comportar-me como uma fera</b> – monologara ele e, <b>friamente</b>, roubara o relógio.</p>
--	--	--

Parrott (1973/2000: 79):

For people who did not want to go to the front the last refuge was the garrison gaol. I once knew a **probationary teacher who was a mathematician** and did not want to serve in the artillery and shoot people. So he stole a lieutenant's watch to **get himself into** the garrison gaol. He did this deliberately. **War neither impressed nor enchanted him**. Shooting at the enemy and killing with shrapnel and shells equally unhappy probationary teachers of mathematics serving on the other side seemed to him **sheer idiocy**. "I don't want to be hated for my brutality," he said to himself, and **calmly** stole the watch.

(1) 'Standardisation (typization) of expression'.

The garrison gaol *was* the *last* refuge. It neither formed (*formait*) nor represented (*representava*) anything, let alone a *supreme* refuge. The 'suplent matematik', an apposition or hendiadys, was a 'supply (substitute) teacher-mathematician', neither an *agrégé*<sup>418</sup> nor a 'professor with a degree (educated) in mathematics' (*professor formado em matemática*).

This teacher stole a lieutenant's watch quite dispassionately, unperturbed by the misdemeanour, not 'cold-bloodedly' or 'coldly' (*froidement, friamente*). And he stole it from a person whose rank is written in the original Czech: 'nadporučík' (lieutenant). Why Hořejší introduced this forced 'exotisation' is unclear, and Cabral's knowledge of German was obviously minimal, since he made many mistakes, albeit consistent, transcribing it.

(2) 'Loss of expression'.

The teacher's counterparts are described as 'equally unhappy supply teacher-mathematicians'. The state of their minds got somehow lost in the French and Portuguese translations.

(3) 'Expressional levelling'.

Most importantly, however, Hašek's key phrase in this paragraph 'Válka mu neimponovala a neokouzlovala ho,' was conveyed accurately only by Parrott as 'War neither impressed nor enchanted him'. Hořejší's attenuated rendition, a clear instance of 'expressional levelling' was: 'War did not appeal to him.' Surprisingly, Cabral slightly

<sup>418</sup> A teacher holding the *agrégation*, i.e. an advanced teaching diploma. Cf. the definition in *Le Petit Larousse Compact*: *Agrégé(e)*: personne reçue à l'agrégation et pouvant de ce fait exercer les fonctions de professeur titulaire en lycée ainsi que dans certaines disciplines de l'enseignement supérieur (droit, sciences économiques, médecine, pharmacie). *Agrégation*: Concours auquel se présentent en France les candidats au titre d'agrégé; ce titre. *Passer l'agrégation. Agrégation d'anglais, de philosophie* (1999: 47).

improved it to ‘War did not enthuse (enchant) him.’ Neither version, however, respected the parallelism.

Hašek and Parrott’s supply teacher-mathematician does not want to be hated for his brutality. Cabral’s *professor formado em matemática*, following the French *agrégé*, ‘does not want to behave like a wild beast (cruel person)’.

(4) ‘Expressional intensification – individualisation’.

The teacher saw war as a ‘blbost’, a stupidity. Parrott translated by ‘sheer idiocy’, Hořejší by ‘parfaitement idiot’ and Cabral in his wake by ‘**perfeitamente idiota**’ (perfectly idiotic).

### (VII) Anti-Clericalism

While clearly ridiculing the army and opposing war with all its dehumanising effects, Hašek was most merciless when it came to the Church.

Hašek (1921/2004: 101-102)	Hořejší (1932/2007: 219-221)	Cabral (1961/1971: 112-113)
Přípravy k usmrcování <b>lidí</b> děly se vždy <b>jménem božím</b> či <b>vůbec nějaké domnělé vyšší bytosti</b> , kterou si <b>lidstvo</b> vymyslílo a stvořilo ve své obrazotvornosti. [...] <b>Než</b> svatá inkvizice <b>upálila své oběti</b> , sloužila přitom nejslavnější bohoslužby, velkou mši svatou se zpěvy. [...] <b>Veliká jatka světové války</b> neobešla se bez požehnání kněžského. <b>Polní kuráti</b> všech armád modlili se a sloužili polní mše za vítězství <b>té strany</b> , či chleba jedli.	C’est toujours <b>au nom d’une divinité bienfaisante</b> , sorti de l’imagination des <b>hommes</b> , que se prépare le massacre de la <b>pauvre humanité</b> . [...] Aux temps de la Sainte Inquisition, <b>avant de mettre le feu au bûcher</b> , on célébrait le service divin le plus solennel, la grande messe chantée. [...] Et les abattoirs de la <b>Grande Guerre</b> n’ont pu fonctionner non plus sans la bénédiction des prêtres. Les <b>aumôniers</b> de toutes les armées chantèrent la messe pour la victoire <b>des maîtres</b> dont ils mangeaient le pain.	É sempre <b>em nome de uma divindade benfeitora</b> , saída da imaginação dos <b>homens</b> , que se prepara o massacre da <b>pobre humanidade</b> . [...] Nos tempos da Santa Inquisição, <b>antes de lançar fogo à pilha de madeira</b> , celebrava-se o serviço divino mais solene, a grande missa cantada. [...] E os matadouros da <b>Grande Guerra</b> também não puderam funcionar sem a bênção dos padres. Os <b>capelães</b> de todos os exércitos cantaram a missa para a vitória <b>dos senhores</b> , que lhes davam o pão a comer.

Parrott (1973/2000: 125-126):

Preparations for the slaughter of mankind have always been made **in the name of God or some supposed higher being** which **men** have devised and created in their own imagination. [...] Before the Holy Inquisition **burnt its victims**, it performed the most solemn religious service – a High Mass with singing. [...] The **great shambles** of the world war did not take place without the blessing of priests. **Chaplains** of all armies prayed and celebrated drumhead masses for victory for **the side** whose bread they ate.

(1) ‘Loss of expression’, omission.

Hašek’s atheism is evident from the very first sentence: ‘in the name of God or some supposed higher being’. It was, however, Hořejší, who reduced it to ‘au nom d’une divinité bienfaisante’, not only leaving out God, but making the deity ‘benevolent’. Cabral, following in his footsteps, translated by ‘in the name of a beneficent divinity’ (**em nome de uma divindade benfeitora**).

According to Hašek, the ‘holy inquisition’ (not capitalised!) ‘burned its victims’. In the attenuated version by Hořejší, the Holy Inquisition ‘set fire to the stake’. Cabral went even further and translated by ‘set fire to the pile of wood’ (**lançar fogo à pilha de madeira**).

Hašek’s ‘world war’ became ‘the Great War’ both in French and in Portuguese. The ‘side’ on which the priests were or to which they gave their blessings became ‘the masters’ in French (les maîtres) and in Portuguese (‘**os senhores**’).

(2) ‘Individual, negative shifts’, additions.

‘**Lidstvo**’ (humanity) becomes ‘*poor* humanity’ both in French (pauvre humanité) and in Portuguese (**pobre humanidade**).

(3) ‘Substitution of Expression’.

‘**Polní kuráti**’ (plural), the exact equivalent to the German ‘Feldkurat’ (pl. Feldkuraten), is this time rendered by Hořejší and Cabral as ‘chaplains’ (aumôniers, **capelães**). It is a mystery, however, why in other instances Hořejší translated ‘polní kurát’ (singular) as *Feldkurat* (e.g. 193-218), to which Cabral adhered: *feldkurat* (e.g. 99-111).

### (VIII) Allusions to Sex

In the Czech original of Part I of Hašek’s novel, any mention of sex or eroticism is carefully toned down and remains a mere allusion. The implied meaning is clear nonetheless.

Hašek (1921/2004: 146)	Hořejší (1932/2007: 315)	Cabral (1961/1971: 162)
<p>Odhrujíc <b>jemnou látku</b>, která <b>halila a skrývala všechno</b>, řekla přísně: „Sundejte si boty a kalhoty. <b>Ukažte...</b>“ Tak se stalo, že dobrý voják Švejk mohl hlásit <b>nadporučíkovi</b>, když se ten vrátil z kasáren: „Poslušně hlásím, pane <b>obrlajtnant</b>, že jsem vyplnil všechna přání milostivé paní a obsloužil ji <b>poctivě</b> dle vašeho rozkazu.“ „Děkuji vám, Švejk,“ řekl <b>nadporučík</b>, „měla těch přání moc?“ „Asi šest,“ odpověděl Švejk, „ted’ spí jako zabitá <b>od tý jízdy</b>. Udělal jsem jí všechno, co jsem jí viděl na očích.“</p>	<p>Rejetant l’<b>aérien tissu</b> qui <b>volait et projetait ses charmes</b>, elle commanda d’un ton sévère : « Otez vos souliers et votre pantalon ! <b>Venez...</b> » C’est ainsi que le brave soldat Chvéik put annoncer au <b>lieutenant</b>, à son retour de la caserne : « Je vous déclare avec obéissance, <b>mon lieutenant</b>, que, selon votre ordre, j’ai servi <b>exactement</b> madame et que j’ai satisfait tous ses désirs. – Je vous remercie, Chvéik. Est-ce qu’elle a eu beaucoup de désirs ? – Six environ, <b>mon lieutenant</b>, répondit Chvéik. Madame dort à poings fermés, <b>le trajet</b> l’aura fatiguée. <b>Rassurez-vous, mon lieutenant</b>, j’ai fait tout ce qu’elle a voulu, <b>sans même qu’elle ait eu besoin de me le demander.</b> »</p>	<p>Deitando fora o <b>aéreo tecido</b> que <b>velava e revelava os seus encantos</b>, ordenou num tom severo: – Tire os sapatos e as calças! <b>Venha...</b> Foi assim que o valente soldado Chveik pôde anunciar ao <b>oficial</b>, de volta do quartel: – Declaro com obediência, <b>meu tenente</b>, que, de acordo com a vossa ordem, servi <b>adestradamente</b> a senhora e satisfiz-lhe todos os desejos. – Agradeço-lhe, Chveik. Ela teve muitos desejos? – Aproximadamente seis, <b>meu tenente</b> – respondeu Chveik. – A senhora dorme como um prego, o <b>trajecto</b> deve tê-la fatigado. <b>Tranquilize-se, meu tenente</b>, fiz-lhe tudo o que ela quis, <b>sem que tivesse mesmo necessidade de mo pedir.</b></p>

Parrott (1973/2000: 183)

Pulling aside the delicate material which **veiled and concealed everything**, she said severely: “Take off your boots and trousers! Come on!...” And so it happened that the good soldier Švejk could report to the **lieutenant** when he returned from the barracks: “Humbly report, **sir**, I’ve fulfilled all the lady’s wishes and served her **decently** according to your orders.” “Thank you, Švejk,” replied the **lieutenant**. “And did she have lots of wishes?” “About six,” answered Švejk. “And now she is sleeping as though quite exhausted by **the ride**. I *did* obey her slightest whim, **sir**.”

(1) ‘Individual, negative shifts’, ‘losses of expression’.

In the original Czech, the delicate material ‘veiled and concealed everything’ – another instance of Hašek’s use of hendiadys. Hořejší enhanced the erotic imagery: ‘the airy material veiled and projected her charms’. In Cabral’s translation, even more paradoxically, ‘the air material veiled and revealed her charms’.

In Hašek, the lady said ‘**ukážte**’ (‘show me’, or let’s have a look’). All translators rendered the invitation by ‘Come (on)’, with Parrott adding an exclamation mark.

In Hašek’s text, lieutenant Lukáš is referred to three times. The authorial narrator calls him ‘**nadporučík**’ (lieutenant) in Czech. In Švejk’s direct speech, Hašek uses ‘**obrlajtnant**’, i.e. the German *Oberleutnant* distorted by Czech mispronunciation. Hořejší redundantly repeated the address ‘mon lieutenant’ in Švejk’s final reply. Cabral changed the first reference to Lukáš from his exact rank to a mere ‘officer’ (**official**). This seemingly harmless use of a hypernym, however, blatantly contravenes Hašek’s style. Lukáš is always referred to as either ‘nadporučík’ or ‘obrlajtnant’.

Švejk served the lady ‘faithfully’ (**pocitivě**). Chvéik served her ‘precisely’ (exactement). Chveik, for his part, served her ‘skilfully’ (**adestradamente**).

Thereupon, the lady slept like a log, tired from the ‘**jízda**’, a *double entendre* which Parrott congenially conveyed as ‘exhausted by the **ride**’. Hořejší destroyed the pun: the French Katy was tired from ‘the journey’ (le trajet). Cabral followed suit (**o trajecto**).

(2) ‘Expressional intensification’, individual, negative shifts.

The last sentence in Czech translates literally as ‘I did everything (to her) I saw in her eyes.’ Hořejší invents: ‘Rest assured, lieutenant, I did everything she wanted without her having even to ask me for it.’ Cabral rendered by: ‘Calm down, lieutenant, I did everything (to her) she wanted without her even needing to ask me for it’.

#### 4.3.6 Conclusion

The list of shifts introduced in Hašek’s novel by the translators could easily be extended. The main point, however, has been to demonstrate what impression the novel made on Portuguese readers. Without wishing to make value judgements, let us say it was rather different from the impression gained by French readers, and fundamentally different from the novel’s impact on its original Czech readership.

All the excerpts quoted above reveal how much longer Hořejší's (and necessarily Cabral's) translations are as compared with the Czech original – and also Parrott's translation, which is usually the most faithful. The reason for these extensions is not the economical nature of the Czech language or Hašek's style, but Hořejší's urge to 'interpret'.

The number of individual negative shifts, losses of expressions (omissions) and additions overwhelming. However, the majority of the changes, in comparison with the original, were introduced by Hořejší. Indeed, taking into consideration that he was producing a second-hand translation, Cabral appears to have been relatively faithful to Hořejší.

Respecting Hašek's style may run counter to the conventional poetics of the two Romance languages. However, Hašek's novel is anything but conventional and any translation intent on being 'adequate' would have to respect Hašek's idiosyncratic and at times even peculiar style. This does not appear to have been Hořejší's intention.

Although all of the above 'shifts of expression' occur at the 'micro-stylistic level', *cumulatively* they have a considerable impact on the 'macro-stylistic structure' (Popovič 1976: 24). Style begins at the micro-stylistic (linguistic) level, but recurrent patterns, parallelisms, toned-down expressions, ambiguities, and all turns of phrase defying unequivocal interpretation – in short, all tropes and figures of speech used by the author – produce, when taken together, a combined effect in the macro-stylistic composition of the novel. An individual 'shift' may at first appear to cause little 'damage' to the style of the work as a whole, but the *accumulation* of these shifts progressively distorts the author's idiolect, and the end product may be a 'gross' adaptation. A second-hand translation is necessarily an exacerbated case, leading to a 'doubly shifted reception' of the novel on the part of the end (target) audience.

Overall, the Portuguese translation (1) appears to adhere rather close to the mediating text; (2) does not seem to have been subjected to any form of formal censorship. The main ideas, albeit in a 'shifted' form, are there. Hašek's novel does not appear to have been 'authorised with cuts'.

Ironic as it may sound, Cabral was a much more faithful translator than Hořejší in the translation of Hašek's *Švejk*. The only rub was that Cabral did not translate Hašek, but Hořejší, who, in his turn, (mis)interpreted and 'reinvented' Hašek as he saw fit.

Perhaps a hypothesis could be suggested based on the above findings: 'If a translator uses a mediating text and is aware of it, he or she tends to be more faithful and to translate more adequately'. Of course, such a hypothesis must be tested further, and there are other factors at work that may be less easy to grasp. For instance, some target cultures have a greater tendency towards 'adequacy' than others, and some periods are more favourable to 'adequacy' than others. However, testing such hypotheses and drawing conclusions accordingly could be done only on the basis of many studies from different times and various cultures.



## XII. Conclusion

### 5.1 Synthesis of Foregoing Findings

The present thesis has been a first attempt to chart the history of Czech-Portuguese cultural relations through the prism of translations of literature. More specifically, the prime focus has been on Czech literature translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. Such research appeared worthwhile for two reasons: (1) it has not been done before, and (2) it seemed likely to offer a new perspective on Translation Studies.

(1) In Portugal, there is no department for Czech studies and Portuguese Translation Studies has not concentrated on Czech literature as a research subject. In the Czech Republic, neither the departments for Czech studies nor the departments for Portuguese and lusophone studies have yet explored ‘the other side of the coin’, i.e. Czech literature in Portugal. Neither has Czech Translation Studies integrated Portuguese-language cultures among its research topics. Finally, no institution, including the embassies, Czech centres or the *Instituto Camões*, has yet initiated or supported any similar research. While Portuguese culture and literature is studied both in the Czech Republic and in Slovakia, they have no counterpart in Portugal.

(2) Translation Studies, both in Portugal and in the Czech Republic, has devoted its attention to translations from, and to a lesser extent into, ‘major’, dominant languages, in particular English, French, German, Spanish and Russian. Examining translational relations between two medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures therefore seemed a potentially interesting line of research.

Indeed, several topics have been identified as highly relevant to the literary relations between two medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures viewed through the lens of translations, most conspicuously and importantly (1) *indirect translations* and (2) the phenomenon of *non-translation*.

(1) *Indirect translations* in our corpus do not include clear-cut cases of third- or fourth-hand translations. However, on one occasion, a Portuguese publisher decided to take a Brazilian translation made from an Italian translation of a Czech original, adapt its language to European Portuguese standards and publish it. More relevantly, the overwhelming majority of Czech literature was translated into European Portuguese via *mediating* texts, in most cases French.

In our investigation of indirect translations, it has proved impossible in several cases to establish the actual source text for a given Portuguese translation. Heeding Levý’s recommendation that the translator’s source text must always be unequivocally established (1963/1998: 200) would have resulted in ignoring all such translations.

However, since the target texts do exist and have produced effects on target-culture readers, these texts and their reception in the target culture still appear worth

investigating, even if there is a missing link in the chain (cf. Toury 1998: 24, quoted above).

(2) *Non-translation*, as a result of pervasive *ensorship*, affected the reception of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, more specifically from 1926 to 1974, to a considerable extent. Portuguese censors banned over 60 per cent of all books originally written in Czech or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia.

Regarding Czech literature, the Portuguese censors seem to have tended to adopt an all-or-nothing approach: approve or ban. The third working method of the Portuguese censorship, labelled ‘authorised with cuts’, has not been applied to any book of Czech authorship throughout the Salazarist regime.

In order to test these results on a sample, a Czech *canonical* novel, containing several passages which the Portuguese censors could find problematic or offensive to the regime’s *ideology*, was analysed in detail. The contrastive micro-textual analysis of the Portuguese translation of J. Hašek’s *Good Soldier Švejk* revealed no instance of *cuts* made by official censorship.

In comparison with the Czech original, most changes originated in the *French* translation of Hašek’s novel. Since the French translation served as the source text for the Portuguese target text, these changes necessarily found expression in the Portuguese ‘end product’. Shifts introduced by A. Cabral, the Portuguese translator, were much fewer in number. In some instances, however, they could be interpreted as the translator’s ‘active’ self-censorship (e.g. Cabral’s use of German, 1961/1971: 110).

In conducting the contrastive analysis, A. Popovič’s ‘Typology of Expressive Changes in Translation’, better known as ‘shifts of expression’, was used as our main methodological instrument. Popovič’s model proved to be a ready-to-use and effective tool for the comparison of a primary text (*prototext*) and its metatexts.

The modern TS terminology using ‘source text’ as equivalent to ‘original’, and ‘target text’ as equivalent to ‘translation’, has proved to be inadequate. When dealing with indirect translations, the source text is by no means the original, and there are several translations involved in the metatextual process. The traditional terms, as used by Levý and Popovič, thus cannot be substituted by the modern ones.

*Ideology and politics* exerted a decisive effect on the reception of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal both during the Portuguese *New State* and after the Carnation Revolution. 1951 saw the highest number of books concerning Czechoslovakia banned by the Portuguese censors: 6 books. 1990, on the other hand, can be regarded as ‘the year of Czech literature in Portugal’, with a total of 6 books of fiction translated.

Books, either originally written in Czech (or Slovak) or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia, cluster quite conspicuously around the years 1968-69 and 1989-90. The reception of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal thus appears to have been stimulated and strongly determined by the *source-culture political* events of the Prague Spring and the Velvet Revolution.

On the other hand, neither the end of the Portuguese dictatorship in 1974 nor the dissolution of Czechoslovakia into two autonomous countries in 1993 produced any significant effects on the translational activities of the Portuguese literary polysystem as far as Czech literature was concerned.

Since it was *source-culture political* events that motivated translations in the target culture, Toury's claim that 'translations are facts of target cultures' (1995: 29) might be seen as potentially limiting the domain of Translation Studies.

Moreover, the Czech communist regime, i.e. the controlling power of the *source* culture, produced scores of translations of agitprop brochures into Portuguese, i.e. the *target* language. These translations were initiated in the *source* culture and had virtually nil effect on Portuguese culture.

Thus Toury's statement that 'translation activities and their products not only can, but do cause changes in the *target* culture' (1995: 27) does not apply to this particular situation. The propaganda booklets translated from Czech into Portuguese were not part of the target system at all. If anything, they were part of the source system, or occupied a place somewhere in between (cf. Pym's 'interculture', 1998: 177ff.).

Another assertion of Toury's, 'translation [being] as good as *initiated* by the target culture' (1995: 27), is contradicted by the translation of Hašek's *Švejk* into German. It was initiated by the *source* culture, the Czech publisher Adolf Synek, who also published the Czech originals. It was only as a result of the novel's success in Germany, i.e. the *target* culture, that Hašek's *Švejk* eventually embarked on its slow and tortuous path to canonisation in its *source* culture. Ďurišin's concept of 'specific interliterary communities' appears better fitted to account for these borderline cases than Toury's target-oriented approach.

When studying the effects of *ideology* upon translations, it is crucial to include all available *paratexts* in the analysis, i.e. both epitexts and peritexts. The peritexts in the books translated not only point to the publisher's strategies for getting their products past the censors, but may also reveal why these publishers refrained from having other books translated (e.g. the sequels to Part I of Hašek's novel). Epitexts include not only book reviews, if available, but also censorship files which illuminate the ideological agenda behind a ban or an authorisation – that is, the constraints imposed by the censors and the rules which the cultural market either abided by or fell foul of.

Regarding fiction, by far the most translated Czech author into Portuguese is M. Kundera (8 novels), followed by B. Hrabal (4 novels) and K. J. Beneš (3 novels). If non-fiction were included, Václav Havel (4 books) would rank third. This quartet is followed by K. Čapek, J. Hašek, E. Hostovský and L. Mňačko (the only Slovak writer translated into European Portuguese in the 20<sup>th</sup> century), each of whom had two books translated.

The five remaining authors had only one book translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal. Despite current debates on redefining 'the canon' – whether culture-specific or universal – the canon of *Czech* literature, i.e. the classics, however we define it, can hardly be said to be 'adequately' represented in European Portuguese. In comparison with major European languages, primarily German, Russian, English and

French, Czech literature translated into European Portuguese cannot be regarded as anything but ‘under-represented’.

This appears to have been the result of (1) the relative distance and scarcity of direct contacts between Portugal and Czechoslovakia before and during the 20<sup>th</sup> century; (2) two mutually inimical political regimes, which hampered cultural relations between the two countries for most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; and (3) the high illiteracy rate and the concomitant low level of competence in foreign languages in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, which itself was one of the results of the dictatorship in power (although the roots of this situation go back several centuries).

## 5.2 Research Questions and Hypotheses

Concurring with Toury (1998: 24) that the *mediating* texts, whether established or not, are of little relevance to the ‘people-in-the-culture, producers and consumers alike’, we have formulated our main research question as follows: *What was the presence of Czech literature on the Portuguese book market in the 20<sup>th</sup> century?* In other words: *What was Portuguese readers’ impression of Czech literature in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, provided that they did not read in languages other than Portuguese?*

Having delved into ‘the presence of Czech literature on the Portuguese book market’ as deeply as practicably possible, we can draw the following conclusions:

(1) *Non-translation* preceded any translations of Czech literature. In 1942, the first book concerning Czechoslovakia was banned by the Portuguese censorship. Only a year later, when a total of four books concerning Czechoslovakia had already been banned, did the first translation appear. After 1992, there were no further translations of Czech literature or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

(2) As regards *fiction*, it was barely present on the Portuguese book market in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Apart from Jorge (František) Listopad and Milan Kundera, only 20 books of fiction were actually translated into European Portuguese in the course of the entire century, with very few reprints.

(3) If *translations of books* written originally in Czech by Listopad and Kundera are added, the total number of books of fiction was 29. If we included Slovak (2 books) and all non-fiction either written by Czech authors (7 books) or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia (9 books), the grand total was 47 books. That is, in the span of 49 years, only 47 books, i.e. less than a book per year was translated into European Portuguese.

(4) Despite numerous and repeated efforts throughout our research (2006-11), we were unable to locate a single study, article or book review dealing with Czech literature in any Portuguese newspaper, journal or periodical. Extensive and continual correspondence with the publishers, if still in business, and translators, if identifiable and alive, has borne no fruits. In 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, the only *epitexts* concerning Czech literature were the censorship files.

(5) Concerning *censorship*, no less than 37 books translated from Czech, Slovak or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia have been censored in Portugal. Of the 33 books

for which the censorship files could be identified, only 12 were authorised; the rest were banned. Despite the fact that the Portuguese censorship ended more than a quarter of a century before the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, censorship appears to have had a long-lasting effect on the (non-)reception of Czech literature in Portugal. Only the fall of communism throughout Central and Eastern Europe in 1989-90 elicited a noteworthy response from the Portuguese book market.

(6) Finally, regarding the hypothetical Portuguese reader who sought out Czech literature but read only in Portuguese, his or her ‘impression’ of Czech literature would have been highly distorted. Not only did many authors and works considered *canonical* by most Czech literature scholars remain entirely unknown to the Portuguese readership, but even those works which actually *were* translated were, in their overwhelming majority, mediated through a third culture – and a dominant one at that. As demonstrated in the translation of Hašek’s *Švejk*, translating indirectly via a *dominant* mediating culture may result in an increased number of ‘expressive shifts’.

Moreover, the presence of censorship compelled the publishers to adopt ‘evasive’ strategies even in their *peritexts* in order to deflect the censors’ attention and avoid a ban of the book. The resulting peritexts could thus arouse only modest expectations in the average Portuguese reader.

(7) The hypothesis we put forward at the beginning of our research was that *the reception of Czech literature in Portugal*, as substantiated in the translations into Portuguese, *followed a pattern*. In other words, *Portuguese translations of Czech literature have been hypothesised to exhibit some kind of a structure, a tendency, or a goal in their transposition into the target system*.

Our hypothesis has been confirmed only in part. To account for the corpus as a whole, other explanations would have to be proposed, assuming, that is, that the entire corpus of Czech literature is not merely a random or accidental collection.

On the one hand, it is a fact that translations of Czech literature into European Portuguese *increased* during, or immediately following, major political events in Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, this does not explain how Czech literature came to be translated into Portuguese in the first place.

K. J. Beneš was not only the first Czech author translated into European Portuguese, but also the only one for the entire first decade (1943-53), with a total of three books, a very high number for any Czech author in Portugal (except for Kundera). Given Beneš’ less than canonical position in Czech literature, the impression is indeed that the first translations were the result of random events or coincidences.

Another possible explanation, which would account for the appearance of the first books as well as for books published outside the politically ‘charged’ years, has been offered by Baubeta (2009: 39): ‘Irrespective of whether one talks in terms of “good” literature, none of the evidence I have seen to date suggests that the prevailing motivation for publishing translations was anything other than economic.’

This assertion does not necessarily exclude the translation of canonical works or of ‘high literature’. It merely identifies the publishers’ primary motivation for

commissioning a translation. Since the first book in our corpus had been made into a film in the United Kingdom before the translation into Portuguese appeared, Baubeta's assumption seems quite plausible.

Most works of fiction originally written in Czech were not only subjected to *indirect translation*. They were *perceived and received* through the prism of other, dominant, cultures. With very few exceptions, the corpus of Czech literature translated into European Portuguese thus testifies to a deeper underlying phenomenon, that of *indirect reception*.

### 5.3 Suggestions for Follow-up Research

Our data gave rise to other hypotheses. Testing them on suitable material may be a potential starting point for future studies. They are ordered from the most general, pertinent to Translation Studies as a whole, to the most particular, concerning the Portuguese and the Czech cultures specifically.

(1) 'The more paratextual and *metatextual* material there is, the more canonical the literary work it concerns is likely to be.' As explained above (subchapter 1.5.3), there may be exceptions to this 'tendency', but overall, it seems a likely and certainly a testable hypothesis.

(2) 'Once a translation from a non-dominant language has been made, it is likely to circulate for many decades.' Testing this hypothesis would entail weighing the number of first translations and their reprints against the number of retranslations within an operable corpus.

(3) Regarding censorship, 'certain genres attract less attention than others'. This may be true of 20<sup>th</sup>-century Czechoslovakia, Portugal and other countries, but in each case to a different degree and concerning different genres. Our data implies that the Portuguese censors paid less attention to science fiction and other popular genres than they did to 'classical novels', and especially 'political literature' *sensu lato*.

(4) 'The dominant *mediating* culture for translations into Portuguese, at least regarding fiction, was French.' The fact that most translations into Portuguese *in general* were made from Spanish in the 1950s and 1960s (Seruya 2010: 126) does not contradict this hypothesis, as it concerns only *indirect* translations into Portuguese, primarily of *fiction*.

This hypothesis would have to be tested on Portuguese translations from languages other than the five most dominant: Spanish, French, English, German and Italian, e.g. on Polish, Hungarian, Norwegian, Finnish, etc.

(5) 'If a translator uses a *mediating* text and is aware of producing an *indirect* translation, he or she tends to translate more faithfully.' This hypothesis might be difficult to prove conclusively due to the sheer number of texts and metatexts it would involve. However, using statistical inference, a set of representative samples from various corpuses could provide at least some preliminary answers as to the *probability* of this hypothesis.

As this is only a pioneering study, it begs more questions than it answers.

(1) Widening the scope of research, future studies could concentrate on Portuguese translations of Czech literature *not* published *in book form*. If found, they would include short stories, poems, essays and other publications which appeared in Portuguese newspapers, magazines, specialised journals, etc. In particular, theatre plays originally written in Czech and staged in Portugal, e.g. Listopad's *Švejk* (Almada 1995), would doubtless deserve closer attention.

(2) From a historical point of view, it is not entirely accurate to limit 'Czech' and 'Czechoslovak' literature before and in the 20<sup>th</sup> century to literary works written in Czech and Slovak. Literature in Bohemia, Moravia and Slovakia has been written also in Latin, in German, and – to a much lesser extent – in other languages. There is no 'scientific' reason why the Portuguese translations of literature in Czech could not be put into perspective within a larger corpus including Portuguese translations of literature in other languages produced in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown.

If we accept and apply the concept of Central Europe, translations into Portuguese from other Central European literatures, such as Hungarian (cf. Seruya 2009: 81ff.), may yield further insights.

(3) Closer attention could also be devoted to *non-fiction*, not only in book form. This could reveal more about Czech-Portuguese relations beyond literature, including the visual and performing arts, culture in general, diplomatic, scientific, technological and any other conceivable forms of cooperation between these two relatively distant, non-dominant countries of Europe.

(4) From a more general perspective, the present thesis does not deal with *Czech* and *Slovak* translations of *Portuguese* literature. The Czech Literary Translators' Guild offers a list of translations from Portuguese into Czech after 1945.<sup>419</sup> The Camões Institute in Slovakia provides a list of Czech and Slovak translations of works by Portuguese authors.<sup>420</sup> Both lists include authors from lusophone countries other than Portugal, most importantly Brazil.

For the most part these translations were made directly from the Portuguese originals. However, we know little about the influence of *Czechoslovak censorship* on these translations and on the *non-translation* of other Portuguese and lusophone authors.

These issues could give rise to a series of potential follow-up studies, focusing on the 'destiny' of Portuguese and other lusophone literatures in Czechoslovakia before and throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

(5) The central topic of the present thesis, Czech literature translated into European Portuguese in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Portugal, might be better contextualised if viewed from various broader perspectives.

---

<sup>419</sup> Cf. [http://www.obecprekladatel.cz/\\_ftp/DUP/ZZPREKLADY/totalportugalstina.htm](http://www.obecprekladatel.cz/_ftp/DUP/ZZPREKLADY/totalportugalstina.htm) (retrieved on 2011-08-17).

<sup>420</sup> Cf. <http://www.portugal.sk/kultura/literatura/lista.html> (retrieved on 2011-08-17).

First, other Central European literatures translated into European Portuguese in the 20<sup>th</sup> century appear worth investigating. A doctoral thesis on Polish literature in Portuguese translation is already being written.<sup>421</sup> To assess the total impact of Portuguese censorship on the country's literature and culture, non-dominant literatures cannot be overlooked. Central and Eastern European literatures may be more interesting in this context than, say, Scandinavian literatures, because the former have been targeted by Portuguese censorship more consistently. Such studies could provide more insight into the relations between two (or more) *medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures*, both (or all) subjected to *censorship*.

What makes such potential studies even more interesting is that the *ideologies* behind the regimes were purportedly antagonistic in theory, but very similar in their methods. Communist and fascist (or corporatist) censorship, however, focused on issues which were similar in part, but very dissimilar in their hierarchy.

Further relevant contextualisation would entail studies dealing with Czech and Slovak literature in Spain under Francoist censorship. The issues involved in such studies are likely to intersect with those treated in the present thesis. The ensemble of these studies would offer a more complete picture of the '(fateful) adventures' of Czech and Slovak literature on the Iberian Peninsula. Here again, the destiny of other Central and Eastern European literatures under the Iberian dictatorships would certainly produce interesting results.

Last but not least, the place of Czech literature in European Portuguese could be compared with its place in Brazilian Portuguese and in other European languages, in order to properly contextualise its presence and representation. The results of such studies would offer a new perspective on Portuguese culture as *a culture of translations*.

The influence of translations upon various European literatures and cultures is a very intriguing question. While some European cultures may be dominant in other fields, we are likely to find that other, quite different cultures can be seen as 'translational superpowers'.

## 5.4 Assessing the Thesis and Adding a Coda

Not everything we set out to investigate at the beginning of our research could be done, unequivocally proven or established beyond doubt. Czech literature in Portuguese translation appeared to harbour potentially interesting issues, and the present thesis hopes to have demonstrated the relevance of the chosen topic to Translation Studies in general.

---

<sup>421</sup> Hanna Pięta's doctoral thesis on Polish literature in Portuguese translation, currently under preparation, raises high expectations as to potential intersections with the issues examined in the present thesis. The thesis is supervised by Prof. Teresa Seruya and Prof. João de Almeida Flor. Pięta is an affiliated member of the University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies and an external researcher of the Centre for Communication and Cultural Studies at the Catholic University of Portugal. Cf. <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers2010/Hanna%20PIETA,%20Portuguese%20Translations%20of%20Polish%20Literature.pdf> (retrieved on 2011-08-17).



Having no predecessors to draw upon, the present thesis is, needless to say, only a primer. The investigation of Czech literature in Portuguese translation cannot be regarded as final and complete. Much remains to be discovered, many issues need exploring more thoroughly, further contextualisation is desirable.

Had it been possible to acquire more data on the actual *translators* under the Salazarist regime, the thesis might well have turned out to be more *sociological*. Had the *mediating texts* between the Czech originals and the Portuguese translations been more unequivocally identifiable and easier to come by, *micro-textual contrastive analyses* might have received more space and attention here. Had it been possible to excavate more target-culture *secondary metatexts*, such as reviews and evaluations of the Portuguese translations in Portuguese journals, the result might have been a more *reception-oriented study*, etc.

Given the central focus of the present thesis, however, its ultimate goal has been to make a first contribution to our understanding and knowledge of the mechanisms underlying literary relations between two medium-sized lingua- & socio-cultures in Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> century seen through the prism of translations. We believe that this shift of perception has opened up new perspectives.

To conclude, let us quote from G. Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, written at the end of the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, when only two books of Czech authorship had been translated into European Portuguese. Although borrowed from fiction, Orwell's words seem particularly relevant to the topics treated in the present thesis:

When Oldspeak had once and for all been superseded, the last link with the past would have been severed. History had already been *rewritten*, but fragments of the literature of the past survived here and there, *imperfectly censored*, and so long as one retained one's knowledge of Oldspeak it was possible to read them. In the future such fragments, even if they chanced to survive, would be unintelligible and *untranslatable*. It was impossible to translate any passage of Oldspeak into Newspeak unless it either referred to some technical process or some very simple everyday action, or was already orthodox (goodthinking would be the Newspeak expression) in tendency. In practice this meant that no book written before approximately 1960 could be translated as a whole. Pre-revolutionary literature could only be subjected to *ideological translation* – that is, alteration in sense as well as language. (italics added)

Let us hope that ideologies, dictatorships and censorship will never again damage the relations between two countries as severely as they did those of Portugal and Czechoslovakia. Born out of affinities for both countries, this thesis has been a sincere attempt to undo at least part of that damage.

### XIII. Shrnutí

Dizertační práce se zabývá překlady české a slovenské literatury do portugalštiny v Portugalsku ve 20. století. Sleduje obecně relevantní fenomény translologie na konkrétním historickém materiálu *knižních* překladů literatury.

Nejprve je identifikováno sedm hlavních teoretických pojmů a témat, které jsou klíčové pro tuto práci a příznačné pro vztahy mezi Portugalskem a Československem ve 20. století na poli literárních překladů.

1. *Ideologie* je zde definována jako ideologie *politická*, ovlivňující tyto vztahy obecně a překládanou literaturu konkrétně. Znepřátelené ideologie obou diktatur, portugalské extrémně pravicové (1926-74) a československé socialisticko-komunistické (1948-89), měly zásadní dopad na ustavení a fungování cenzury a i tím na *recepti* druhé kultury.

2. *Cenzura* má dvě základní podoby, preventivní a represivní. U překladů knih se v portugalské diktatuře výrazněji projevovala forma druhá. Velmi problematické je empiricky dokazovat vliv autocenzury, avšak ani tuto „metodu práce“, ať již na straně autora, překladatele či vydavatele, není vhodné opomíjet při vyvozování obecnějších závěrů.

3. *Nepřímé překlady* je nadřazený pojem pro překlady z druhé, třetí, čtvrté atd. ruky. Pokud v daném korpusu nepřímé překlady převládají nad přímými, máme co do činění s fenoménem systémovým: *nepřímou receptí*. U nepřímých překladů pojem „výchozí text“ neodpovídá originálu a „cílový text“ je jen jedním ze zúčastněných překladů. Tyto moderní pojmy tak nejsou exaktnější než pojmy tradiční, jak je užívali i Levý a Popovič.

4. *Nepřekládání* zahrnuje jak části textů (např. některé paratexty), tak celé knihy, v extrémním případě i celé jazyky a kultury. Pro tento výzkum se jako nejdůležitější příčiny nepřekládání ukázaly být (relativní) „kulturní vzdálenost“, „institucionalizovaná cenzura“ a „ideologické embargo“ (srov. Duarte 2000). V průběhu celého výzkumu se ale především ukázalo jako velmi přínosné položit si vždy otázku: Co chybí? Tedy nejen srovnávat originál a překlad.

5. *Kánon a světová literatura* jsou dva inherentně normativní pojmy. Jejich existence a vliv, např. v „literárním vzdělání“ (Popovič), jsou ale nepopiratelné. Kánon je možno nazírat jako centrum literárního dění dané kultury. Zdá se, že kanonická díla obklopuje větší množství paratextů a metatextů než díla nekanonická. Kánon se však mění s časem a podléhá i tendencím ideologickým (srov. Even-Zohar 1990, Lefevre 1992, 1996).

Světovou literaturou se rozumí buď souhrn veškerého písemnictví v duchu Goethova odkazu nebo soubor kánonů národních literatur, tedy axiologický pojem. Jak ukazují práce D. Ďurišiny (1985, 1995), světovou literaturu je však možné definovat i vědecky, jakožto nejvyšší kategorii srovnávací literární vědy. Ďurišinovy mezistupně vedoucí od literatury národní ke světové, „standardní literární společenství“, „osobitá literární společenství“ a „meziliterární centrizmy“, se i v této práci ukázaly jako velmi přínosné.

6. *Paratexty* patří k nejzajímavějším dokumentům o recepti překladů výchozí literatury v cílové kultuře. U přeložených knih svědčí o politice nakladatele, včetně jeho pokusu vyhnout se zákazu knihy cenzurou. Paratexty (G. Genette) se částečně překrývají s Popovičovými *metatexty*. Paratexty ale například zahrnují i ilustrace

v knize a naopak nezahrnují překlad samotný, kdežto Popovičova typologii metatextů se od překladu odvíjí a ilustrace nezmiňuje.

7. Všech šest výše uvedených témat se projevuje při zkoumání vzájemných vztahů mezi „středně velkými“, nedominantními evropskými kulturami. Kulturou se zde myslí pospolitě žijící společenství lidí s podobnými formami a projevy komunikace v nejširším sociosémiotickém smyslu slova. Zkoumání vztahů mezi dvěma menšími evropskými kulturami umožňuje jasněji vystihnout translatologická témata, která by při zkoumání vztahů mezi dvěma „velkými“ kulturami či mezi kulturou velkou a menší mohla zůstat skryta nebo být přehlížena jako statistické chyby.

Celá práce vede širokou diskuzi s množstvím translatologických přístupů, např. J. Levý (1957, 1963, 1971), A. Popovič (1975, 1976, 1983), I. Even-Zohar (1990, 2004), G. Toury (1995, 1998), A. Lefevere (1985, 1992) aj. Jako nejpřínosnější pro zvolené téma se ukázala být metodologie, s kterou přišel A. Popovič.

Popovičovo „metatextové navazování“ obecně (1975: 215-238; 1983: 125-160) a „typologie realizace metatextových vztahů“ konkrétně (1975: 227; 1983: 126) postihují, na rozdíl od jiných translatologických prací, všechny výše uvedené pojmy a témata. Jeho koncept „literárního vzdělání“ a zvláště pak „výzkumný model k dějinám překladu“ (1975: 36) zasazují námi vytyčená témata do odpovídajícího kulturního kontextu. Popovič hovoří o *ideologickém postoji překladatele, funkci překladu v literárním vzdělání, literární tradici, překladatelském programu, stranickosti literatury, redaktorovi překladu, společenském oběhu překladu, tendenčním přepisu, recepčním návodu, likvidačním a redukcujícím navazování, sociologii a praxeologii překladu* (1975, 1983) – konceptech, které s tématy této práce nemohou souviset úžeji.

Pro translatologickou analýzu konkrétního díla, Haškova *Osudů dobrého vojáka Švejka* a jeho nepřímého překladu do portugalštiny, jsme jako hlavní metodologický nástroj použili Popovičovu „typologii výrazových změn v překladu“ konkrétně (Popovič 1975: 130; 1983: 204) a jeho „posuny v překladu“ obecně (1975: 113-131; 1983: 195-217). Ukázalo se, že tento model je nejen stále aktuální, ale především použitelný a výstižný.

Hlavní otázka výzkumu byla formulována takto: *Jak byla česká literatura zastoupena na portugalském knižním trhu ve 20. století? Řečeno jinak: Jaký byl dojem portugalského čtenáře z české literatury v Portugalsku 20. století, pokud četl pouze portugalsky?*

Vzhledem k tomu, že téma předkládané práce nebylo dosud zpracováno, je možné formulovat tyto, pouze *předběžné* výsledky:

1. *Nepřekládání* předcházelo logicky i chronologicky překladům české literatury do portugalštiny. Již díla Jana Husa byla v polovině 15. století zakázána portugalskou inkvizicí (Rodrigues 1980: 93) a nikdy nebyla přeložena. Ve dvacátém století pak první zákaz knihy týkající se Československa přišel v roce 1942. Když byl o rok později pořízen první portugalský překlad knihy napsané původně v češtině (přes zprostředkující překlad), byly už na seznamu zakázaných knih tři publikace týkající se Československa.

2. Co se týče *beletrie* původně napsané v češtině, její zastoupení na portugalském knižním trhu bylo téměř zanedbatelné. Celkově bylo v průběhu celého 20. století přeloženo jen dvacet beletristických knih od českých autorů, konkrétně mezi lety 1943 a 1992. Od rozpadu Československa do konce století už nevyšla žádná.

Pokud bychom připočetli tzv. „speciální případy“, tj. *překlady* knih Františka (Jorge) Listopada a překlady *česky* psaných knih Milana Kundery, došli bychom na 29 beletristických knih. Přidáme-li 2 romány slovenského autora Ladislava Mňačka, nebeletristickou literaturu buď původně napsanou v češtině (7 knih) nebo jinak se týkající Československa (9 knih), jedná se celkově o 47 knih. To znamená, že v rozmezí 49 let (1943-92) nevyšla ani jedna kniha o Československu ročně. Počet druhých a výjimečně třetích vydání již jednou přeložených literárních děl byl zanedbatelný.

3. Přes opakované pokusy v průběhu celého výzkumu (2006-11) nebyla nalezena jediná recenze, studie či článek v portugalských novinách, časopisech či odborných periodických týkající se české literatury. Ani korespondence s nakladatelstvími a vydavateli, pokud stále ještě existují, a s překladateli, pokud je bylo možné identifikovat a pokud ještě žijí, neodhalila žádné *epitexty* týkající se knih českých autorů v překladu do evropské portugalštiny kromě zpráv cenzorů, které prozrazují mnoho o ideologii *Nového státu* i o recepci české literatury v Portugalsku.

4. Minimálně 37 knih českých autorů nebo jinak se týkajících Československa bylo předloženo portugalské cenzuře. Z 33 knih, pro něž bylo možné nalézt cenzurní zprávy (viz příloha), byl u 12 povolen jejich oběh, zbytek byl zakázán (tj. přes 60 %). Vzhledem k tomu, že většina těchto knih byly překlady z češtiny do jiných jazyků než portugalštiny, počet *nepřeložených* knih tak byl ještě vyšší.

5. Konečně, co se týká hypotetického portugalského čtenáře, který měl specifický zájem o českou literaturu, ale četl pouze v portugalštině, jeho „dojem“ z české literatury byl velmi zkreslený.

Nejenže mnoho *kanonických* českých děl nikdy nebylo přeloženo do evropské portugalštiny, ale i ty překlady, které se portugalskému čtenáři dostaly do rukou, byly pořízeny přes zprostředkující verzi, nejčastěji francouzskou. Jak ukazuje i stručná translatická analýza portugalského překladu Haškova románu, u překladů z druhé ruky a recepce třetích literatur přes *dominantní* zprostředkující kulturu vůbec, vzrůstá množství a závažnost „výrazových posunů“ geometrickou řadou.

6. Vliv *cenzury* měl i *nepřímé* dopady na recepci české literatury v Portugalsku 20. století. Portugalští vydavatelé vybavovali české knihy v portugalském překladu jen velmi malým množstvím *peritextů* a ty se snažili formulovat tak, aby nepřilákaly pozornost cenzorů a nezpůsobily zákaz knihy. Tyto doprovodné texty portugalských překladů českých knih jsou tak stručné, nevýrazné a nepřitahovaly ani pozornost portugalských *čtenářů*.

7. Politická ideologie portugalské diktatury měla dopad na kulturní život Portugalska mj. izolováním Portugalska od zbytku Evropy, s tím související nízkou znalostí cizích jazyků, a konečně cenzurou literatury, tisku i veškerých ostatních médií. To vše se projevilo na *(ne)recepci* české literatury v Portugalsku.

V souvislosti s hlavní otázkou výzkumu byla formulována tato hypotéza, že *překlady české literatury v Portugalsku 20. století* vykazovaly nějakou *tendenci, systém*, tedy že *korpus portugalských překladů české literatury není jen sbírka náhodných jevů*.

Česká beletrie byla ve větší míře, tj. více než 1 kniha ročně, překládána do portugalštiny vlastně pouze v roce 1990. Připočteme-li však k tomu nebeletristickou literaturu napsanou původně v češtině či slovenštině nebo o Československu, pak byla výrazně produktivní léta 1968-69 a 1989-90.

Byly to tak právě události Pražského jara a Sametové revoluce, které zvýšily i v Portugalsku zájem o českou tematiku obecně i o českou beletrii konkrétně. Vše tedy nasvědčuje tomu, že recepci české literatury v *cílové* kultuře podměnily události v kultuře *výchozí*.

Konkrétní historická data sice objasňují příčiny *nárůstu* zájmu o českou literaturu v Portugalsku, ale nevysvětlují samotných *vznik* prvních překladů děl české literatury do evropské portugalštiny, ani důvod překládání z české literatury v dobách mezi výše uvedenými politickými událostmi. Původní hypotéza se tak naplnila jen částečně. Nejpřijatelnějším alternativním vysvětlením se zdá být ekonomická motivace portugalských vydavatelů.

Ústředními tématy práce jsou: a) vliv *politických ideologií* na překládání a *nepřekládání*, zvláště pak v důsledku působení *cenzury*; b) fenomén *nepřímých překladů* a obecněji *nepřímé recepce* výchozí literatury a jejího *kánonu*; c) vztahy mezi dvěma menšími, nedominantními evropskými kulturami na poli (nejen) literárního překladu.

## XIV. Resumo

A presente tese de doutoramento explora as traduções das literaturas checa e eslovaca para o português europeu em Portugal durante o século XX. Indaga fenómenos de relevância geral para os Estudos de Tradução no material histórico concreto das traduções de literatura publicadas em *livro*.

Começa por identificar sete temas e conceitos teóricos mais pertinentes para este trabalho e característicos das relações entre Portugal e a Checoslováquia no século XX, no âmbito das traduções literárias.

(1) Para os fins da presente pesquisa, *ideologia* é definida como a ideologia *política*, influenciando aquelas relações em geral e a literatura traduzida em particular. As ideologias opostas das duas ditaduras, a da extrema-direita do Estado Novo (1926-74) e a socialista-comunista da Checoslováquia (1948-89), resultaram no estabelecimento e funcionamento da censura, assim se reflectindo também na *recepção* da outra cultura.

(2) A *censura* institucionalizada tem duas formas básicas, a preventiva e a repressiva. No que diz respeito às traduções de livros na ditadura de Salazar/Caetano, o segundo modo foi mais significativo. Embora seja muito problemático provar a influência da autocensura empiricamente, quer por parte do autor, do tradutor ou da editora, este “método de trabalho” não se pode ignorar ao tirar conclusões mais gerais.

(3) *As traduções indirectas* são um hiperónimo para as traduções em segunda, terceira, quarta, etc. mão. Quando as traduções indirectas predominam num corpus concreto, encontramos um fenómeno mais sistemático, a *recepção indirecta*. No caso das traduções indirectas o “texto de partida” não é igual ao “original” verdadeiro, e o “texto de chegada” é só uma das traduções envolvidas no processo. Por isso, os conceitos modernos, o “texto de chegada” e o “texto de partida”, não são mais exactos do que os tradicionais, o “original” e a “tradução”, tais como foram empregues já por Levý e Popovič.

(4) A *não-tradução*, ou a inexistência de traduções, estende-se das partes de textos (e.g. alguns paratextos) aos livros completos, e no caso extremo até às línguas e culturas inteiras. No presente trabalho revelaram-se como as causas mais importantes da não-tradução a (relativa) “distância cultural”, a “censura institucionalizada” e o “embargo ideológico” (cf. Duarte 2000). A pesquisa veio confirmar a relevância da pergunta acerca do que não foi traduzido. Dito de outra maneira: não apenas comparar o original e a tradução.

(5) O *cânone* e a *literatura universal* são dois conceitos inerentemente normativos. Mas a existência e influência deles, e.g. na “educação literária” (Popovič 1975, 1976, 1983), são irrefutáveis. O cânone pode ser visto como o centro das actividades literárias numa cultura. Pode-se supor que as obras canónicas sejam acompanhadas de mais paratextos e metatextos do que as obras não-canónicas. No entanto, o cânone varia no tempo e é sujeito às tendências ideológicas (cf. Even-Zohar 1990, 2004; Lefevere 1992, 1996).

A literatura universal pode ser definida como o conjunto de todas as obras escritas no sentido de Goethe ou como a colecção dos cânones das literaturas nacionais, um conceito axiológico. Como demonstram as obras de D. Ďurišin (1985, 1995), a literatura universal pode ser definida também de uma maneira não prescritiva, como a última categoria da literatura comparada. Os graus intermédios de Ďurišin entre a literatura nacional e a literatura universal, “as comunidades literárias padrão”, “as comunidades literárias específicas” e “os centrismos interliterários”, revelaram-se também no presente trabalho como conceitos eminentemente relevantes.

(6) Os *paratextos* figuram entre os documentos mais interessantes sobre a recepção das traduções da literatura de origem na literatura alvo. Os livros traduzidos dão testemunho da política da editora e da sua estratégia comercial. Os paratextos (G. Genette) coincidem com a categoria dos *metatextos* de A. Popovič, mas só até certo ponto. Os paratextos incluem as ilustrações, mas não a tradução, enquanto que a tradução é um dos metatextos mais fundamentais na tipologia de Popovič e as ilustrações não são mencionadas.

(7) Todos os seis temas acima mencionados manifestam-se na investigação das relações mútuas entre as *culturas europeias de dimensão média*, não dominantes. Uma cultura pode ser definida como uma comunidade colectiva com formas e manifestações de comunicação semelhantes no sentido sócio-semiótico. Examinar as relações entre duas culturas europeias médias possibilita tocar em temas relevantes para os Estudos de Tradução em geral, tornando-os mais tangíveis. Esses temas poderiam ser considerados como meros erros estatísticos na investigação das relações entre culturas dominantes ou entre uma cultura menor e uma maior.

A tese entra em diálogo com várias abordagens nos Estudos de Tradução, e.g. J. Levý (1957, 1963, 1971), A. Popovič (1975, 1976, 1983), I. Even-Zohar (1990, 2004), G. Toury (1995, 1998), A. Lefevere (1985, 1992), etc. No entanto, a metodologia proposta por A. Popovič revelou-se como a mais apropriada para o nosso tema.

A “continuação metatextual” de Popovič em geral (1975: 215-238; 1983: 125-160) e a “tipologia da realização das relações metatextuais” em particular (1975: 227; 1983: 126) tomam em consideração todos os conceitos e temas acima referidos. O seu conceito da “educação literária” e especialmente o seu “modelo de pesquisa da história da tradução” (1975: 36) contextualizam os temas aqui identificados no quadro cultural adequado.

Popovič trata também da *atitude ideológica do tradutor, da função da tradução na educação literária, da tradição literária, do programa de tradução (selecção de textos para traduzir), do partidarismo da literatura, do revisor da tradução, da circulação da tradução na sociedade, da transcrição (reescrita) tendenciosa, das instruções para a recepção, da continuação metatextual “liquidacional” e redutiva, da sociologia e praxeologia da tradução* (1975, 1983) – conceitos que não poderiam estar mais intimamente relacionados com o nosso tema.

Para a análise textual contrastiva do original do romance *O valente soldado Chveik* escrito por J. Hašek e da tradução indirecta para português utilizámos como ferramenta metodológica principal a “tipologia das mudanças (shifts) de expressão (i.e. estilísticas) na tradução” em particular (Popovič 1975: 130; 1983: 204) e as suas “mudanças na

tradução” em geral (1975: 113-131; 1983: 195-217). Esse modelo revelou-se não só sempre actual, como sobretudo produtivo e apropriado.

A questão principal da presente pesquisa pode formular-se da seguinte maneira: *Como estava representada a literatura checa no mercado português do livro no século XX?* Ou por outras palavras: Que percepção tiveram os leitores portugueses da literatura checa no Portugal do século XX, se apenas a leram na tradução portuguesa?

Considerando a novidade absoluta do tema do presente trabalho, é possível formular apenas os seguintes resultados *preliminares*:

(1) A *não-tradução* antecedeu as traduções da literatura checa para o português europeu lógica e cronologicamente. Já as obras de João Huss (Jan Hus) foram proibidas pela Inquisição portuguesa em meados do século XV (Rodrigues 1980: 93) e nunca foram traduzidas. No século XX, o primeiro livro relativo à Checoslováquia foi proibido no ano de 1942. Quando, um ano mais tarde, a primeira tradução portuguesa de um livro originalmente escrito em checo foi autorizada (através de uma tradução intermediária), a lista das obras proibidas relativas à Checoslováquia já continha três publicações.

(2) No que diz respeito à *ficção* originalmente escrita em checo, a representação dela no mercado português do livro foi insignificante. Em suma, no decorrer do século XX foram traduzidas apenas 20 livros de ficção escritos por autores checos, mais especificamente entre os anos de 1943 e 1992. Da desintegração da Checoslováquia até ao fim do século não apareceu mais nenhuma tradução.

Adicionando os “casos especiais”, i.e. as *traduções* dos livros de Jorge Listopad e as traduções dos livros escritos em *checo* por Milan Kundera, a soma total seria 29 livros de ficção. Se se incluírem os dois romances do escritor eslovaco Ladislav Mňačko, as obras de não-ficção escritas originalmente em checo (7 livros) ou de outra maneira referente à Checoslováquia (9 livros), formam um total global de 47 livros. Isto significa que no intervalo de 49 anos (1943-92) não foi publicado nem um livro inteiro relativo à Checoslováquia por ano. O número das reimpressões e reedições das obras literárias já traduzidas foi insignificante.

(3) Apesar das tentativas repetidas durante toda a pesquisa (2006-11), não foi encontrada nenhuma recensão, nenhum estudo ou artigo nos jornais, nas revistas ou nos periódicos especializados portugueses no que diz respeito à literatura checa. Nem a correspondência com as editoras, quando ainda existam, nem com os tradutores, na medida em que foi possível identificá-los e se ainda estão vivos, revelaram qualquer *epitexto* relativo aos livros de autoria checa na tradução para o português europeu – apesar dos relatórios da censura, que, note-se, revelam muito sobre a ideologia do *Estado Novo* e sobre a recepção da literatura checa em Portugal.

(4) Pelo menos 37 livros de autoria checa ou de outra maneira referentes à Checoslováquia foram submetidos à censura portuguesa. Dos 33 livros para os quais foi possível encontrar os relatórios da censura (vide anexo), no caso de 12 livros foi autorizada a sua circulação, o resto foi proibido (i.e. mais de 60 %).



(5) Finalmente, em relação aos leitores portugueses hipotéticos que procuraram a literatura checa, mas a leram somente em português, a “impressão” deles sobre a literatura checa foi muito deformada.

Muitas obras checas *canónicas* nunca foram traduzidas para o português europeu. Além disso, as traduções que os leitores portugueses leram, foram feitas através de uma versão intermediária, quase sempre francesa. Como demonstrou a análise textual contrastiva de excertos seleccionados da tradução portuguesa do romance de J. Hašek, nas traduções indirectas e na recepção de outras literaturas através de uma cultura intermediária *dominante* em geral, o número e a gravidade das “mudanças de expressão” multiplicam-se.

(6) A *censura* teve também impactos *indirectos* na recepção da literatura checa em Portugal no século XX. As editoras portuguesas publicaram os livros checos na tradução portuguesa com poucos *peritextos* e tentaram formulá-los de maneira tal que desviassem a atenção dos censores e evitassem a proibição do livro. Esses textos acompanhando os livros checos na tradução portuguesa foram consequentemente breves, tímidos e não chamaram a atenção dos *leitores* portugueses.

(7) A ideologia política da ditadura portuguesa moldou a vida cultural de Portugal, entre outras coisas, no isolamento de Portugal do resto da Europa, incluindo o baixo nível de conhecimento de línguas estrangeiras e, finalmente, na censura da literatura, da imprensa e dos outros media. Tudo isto se manifestou na *(não-)recepção* da literatura checa em Portugal.

Em relação à questão principal da pesquisa foi formulada a hipótese de *as traduções portuguesas da literatura checa em Portugal no século XX exibirem uma tendência, um padrão, uma matriz*, ou dito de outra maneira, de *o corpus das traduções portuguesas da literatura checa não ser apenas uma colectânea de fenómenos coincidentes*.

A ficção checa foi traduzida para o português europeu em maior grau, i.e. mais de um livro por ano, só no ano de 1990. Incluindo, porém, a literatura não-ficcional escrita em checo, em eslovaco ou sobre a Checoslováquia, os anos significativamente prolíficos foram os anos de 1968-69 e 1989-90.

Foram então os acontecimentos do Verão de Praga e da Revolução de Veludo que intensificaram o interesse, em Portugal, pelos temas checos em geral e pela ficção checa em particular. Tudo isso parece confirmar a suposição de que a recepção da literatura checa na cultura *alvo* foi condicionada pelos acontecimentos na cultura *de origem*.

Os dados históricos concretos esclarecem as causas do *acrécimo* do interesse pela literatura checa em Portugal, mas não explicam a *emergência* das primeiras traduções das obras da literatura checa para o português europeu, nem as razões para traduzir a literatura checa nos períodos temporais entre os acontecimentos políticos mencionados acima. A nossa hipótese original revelou-se inadequada. A explicação alternativa mais plausível parece ter sido a motivação económica das editoras portuguesas.

Os temas centrais da presente tese são: (a) o impacto das *ideologias políticas* na tradução e na não-tradução, particularmente devido à *censura*; (b) o fenómeno das *traduções indirectas* e mais geralmente da *recepção indirecta* da literatura de origem e

do seu *cânone*; (c) as relações entre duas culturas europeias médias, não dominantes, através da tradução (não só) literária.

## XV. Sources and Bibliography

### 1. Archival Sources and Institutions Consulted

*Instituto dos Arquivos Nacionais, Torre do Tombo*, Alameda da Universidade, 1649-010 Lisbon, URL: [www.ianntt.pt](http://www.ianntt.pt) [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

*Biblioteca da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa*, Alameda da Universidade, 1600-214 Lisbon, URL: [www.fl.ul.pt](http://www.fl.ul.pt) [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

*Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal*, Campo Grande 83, 1749-081 Lisboa, URL: [www.bnportugal.pt](http://www.bnportugal.pt) [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

*Biblioteca/Museu República e Resistência*, Estrada de Benfica 419 ou Rua Alberto de Sousa, n.º 10 A, Zona B do Rêgo, 1600-002 Lisboa, URL: <http://republicaresistencia.cm-lisboa.pt/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

*Fundação Mário Soares*, Rua de São Bento, n.º 160, 1200-821 Lisboa, URL: <http://www.fmsoares.pt/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

*Hemeroteca Municipal de Lisboa*, R. de São Pedro de Alcântara, 3, 1250-237 Lisboa, URL: <http://blx.cm-lisboa.pt/gca/?id=428> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

### 2. Newspapers, Magazines and Periodicals

*Comércio do Porto*

*Confluências*

*Dedalus: Revista Portuguesa de Literatura Comparada*

*Diário de Notícias*

*Diário de Lisboa*

*Génesis*

*Jornadas de tradução*

*O Primeiro de Janeiro*

*O Século*

*O Sol*

*O Tempo e o Modo*

*Polifonia*

*Polissema*

*Seara Nova*

*Vértice*

### 3. Interviews and Personal Communications

ALMEIDA, Anna de (b. Němcová), ALMEIDA, José Vidal de. Interview. 27 September 2007. Tel.: 00351-213001020. E-mail: [annaalmeida@fl.ul.pt](mailto:annaalmeida@fl.ul.pt).

DISMÁNOVÁ, Ludmila. Personal Communication. 2 August 2011. E-mail: [ludmiladisma@gmail.com](mailto:ludmiladisma@gmail.com).

LISTOPAD, František (Jorge). Interview. 2 November 2007. Rua João Dias 15, 1400-000 Lisboa, Tel.: 00351-213011875.

ŠTĚPÁNKOVÁ, Kateřina. Personal Communication. 14 March 2009. E-mail: [katcha19@yahoo.com](mailto:katcha19@yahoo.com).

#### 4. Fiction Cited

ČAPEK, Karel. 1936/1972. *Válka s Mloky*. Praha: Československý spisovatel. 18<sup>th</sup> edition.

ČAPEK, Karel. 1936/2010. *Válka s Mloky*. Praha: Fragment. ISBN 9788025310786.

ČAPEK, Karel. 1937/2010. *War with the Newts*. London: Penguin Books. Translated by M. and R. Weatherall (with the assistance of W. Francis and G. Johnston). ISBN 9780141192703.

ČAPEK, Karel. 1961/1969. *La Guerre des Salamandres*. Prague: Artia; Verviers: Gérard et Co. Traduit du tchèque par Claudia Ancelot.

ČAPEK, Karel. 1965. *A guerra das salamandras*. Lisboa: Livros do Brasil. Tradução de Lima de Freitas.

ČAPEK, Karel. 1979. *A guerra das salamandras* [War with the Newts]. Lisboa: Caminho. Traduzido do francês por Mário de Sousa.

ČAPEK, Karel. 1985/1999. *War with the Newts*. North Haven, CT: Catbird Press/UNESCO. A New Translation from the Czech by Ewald Osers. ISBN 0945774109.

ČAPEK, Karel. 2009. *A Guerra das Salamandras*. Mem Martins: Europa-América. Tradução de Isabel Neves. ISBN 9789721059771.

CARROLL, Lewis. 1865/1871/1998. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*. London: Penguin Books. ISBN 9780141439761.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1920-23/2004. *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války*. Praha: KMa. ISBN 8073091518.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1926-27/2008. *Die Abenteuer des braven Soldaten Schwejk*. Berlin, Weimar: Aufbau. Aus dem Tschechischen von Grete Reiner. ISBN 9783746661087.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1930/1965. *The Good Soldier Schweik*. London: Penguin Books. Translated by Paul Selver.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1932/2007. *Le brave soldat Chvéik*. Paris: Gallimard. Traduit du tchèque par Henry Horejsi. ISBN 9782070366767.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1932. *Nouvelles Aventures du Brave Soldat Chvéik*. Paris: Gallimard. Traduit du tchèque par Aranyossi.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1961/1971. *O valente soldado Chveik*. Lisboa: Europa-América. Tradução de Alexandre Cabral.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1971/2005. *Nouvelles Aventures du Brave Soldat Chvéik*. Paris: Gallimard. Traduit du tchèque par Claudia Ancelot. ISBN 207037663X.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1973/2000. *The Good Soldier Švejk*. London: Penguin Books. A new and unabridged translation from the Czech by Cecil Parrott. ISBN 9780140449914.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1980/2008. *Las aventuras del valeroso soldado Schwejk*. Barcelona: Destino. Traducción de Alfonsina Janès. ISBN 9788423325078.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1980/2009. *Les Dernières Aventures du Soldat Chvéik*. Paris: Gallimard. Traduit du tchèque par Claudia Ancelot. ISBN 9782070124398.

HAŠEK, Jaroslav. 1986. *Aventuras do valente soldado Svejk e outras histórias*. Lisboa: Vega. Tradução de Maria Alberta Miranda e José Carlos Rodrigues.

KUNDERA, Milan. 1994/1999. *Verratene Vermächtnisse*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch. 3. Auflage. Aus dem Französischen von Susanna Roth. ISBN 3596129885. (French original: *Les Testaments trahis*, 1993, Paris: Gallimard).

KUNDERA, Milan. 2005. *Le Rideau: essai en sept parties*. Paris: Gallimard. ISBN 207077435X.

KUNDERA, Milan. 2007. *The Curtain: An Essay in Seven Parts*. New York: HarperCollins. Translated from the French by Linda Asher. ISBN 9780060841867.

KUNDERA, Milan. 2009. *Une Rencontre*. Paris: Gallimard. ISBN 9782070122844.

KUNDERA, Milan. 2010. *Encounter*. London: Faber and Faber. Translated from the French by Linda Asher. ISBN 9780571250899.

LISTOPAD, František. 2001. *Chinatown s Rózou*. Praha: Dauphin. ISBN 8072720465.

MERCIER, Pascal. 2004. *Nachtzug nach Lissabon*. München, Wien: Carl Hanser. ISBN 9783442734368. (English as *Night Train to Lisbon* by Barbara Harshav in 2008)

ORWELL, George. 1949/2000. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books. ISBN 9780140817744.

PESSOA, Fernando. 1925/2008. *Lisbon: What the Tourist Should See*. Exeter: Shearsman Books. ISBN 9781905700752.

REMARQUE, Erich Maria. 1962. *Die Nacht von Lissabon*. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch. (English as *The Night in Lisbon* by Ralph Manheim in 1964)

SARAMAGO, José. 1984/1991. *The Year of the Death of Ricardo Reis*. San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace. Translated by Giovanni Pontiero. ISBN 0156996936. (Originally published as *O ano da morte de Ricardo Reis*, Lisbon: Caminho, 1984)

SARAMAGO, José. 1990/2000. *Journey to Portugal: In Pursuit of Portugal's History and Culture*. New York, London, etc.: Harcourt. Translated by Amanda Hopkinson and Nick Caistor. ISBN 0156007134. (Originally published as *Viagem a Portugal*, Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores, 1981).

## 5. Secondary and Reference Works

ÁLVAREZ, Román – VIDAL, M. Carmen-África (eds.). 1996. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters. ISBN 1853593508.

ANDRADE, Adriano da Guerra. 1999. *Dicionário de Pseudónimos e Iniciais de Escritores Portugueses*. 1.<sup>a</sup> ed. Lisboa: Biblioteca Nacional, Ministério da Cultura. ISBN 9725652622.

ANTUNES, Maria Alice Gonçalves. 2009. *O respeito pelo original: João Ubaldo Ribeiro e a autotradução*. São Paulo: Annablume. ISBN 9788574199597.

APTER, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press. ISBN 0691049971.

ASSMANN, Jan – ASSMANN, Aleida. 1987. *Kanon und Zensur*. München: Wilhelm Fink. ISBN 3770523792.

AZEVEDO, Cândido de. 1997. *Mutiladas e Proibidas: Para a história da censura literária em Portugal nos tempos do Estado Novo*. Lisboa: Caminho. ISBN 9722111175.

AZEVEDO, Cândido de. 1999. *A censura de Salazar e Marcelo Caetano: Imprensa, teatro, cinema, televisão, radiodifusão, livro (Nosso mundo)*. Lisboa: Caminho. ISBN 972211283X.

BAKER, Mona – MALMKJÆR, Kirsten (eds.). 2006 (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 1st edition 1998. London, New York: Routledge. ISBN 9780415255172.

BAKER, Mona – SALDANHA, Gabriela (eds.). 2008. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 1<sup>st</sup> edition (2<sup>nd</sup> edition in 2011). London, New York: Routledge. ISBN 9780415609845.

BALAJKA, Bohuš. 1998. *Přehledné dějiny literatury I* [Synoptic History of Literature I]. Praha: Fortuna. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. ISBN 8071683663.

BALAJKA, Bohuš, SOLDÁN, Ladislav, CHAROUS, Emil. 1997. *Přehledné dějiny literatury II* [Synoptic History of Literature II]. Praha: Fortuna. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. ISBN 8071685011.

BARRETO, António – MÓNICA, Maria Filomena (eds.). 1999. *Dicionário de história de Portugal*. Volume VII, suplemento A/E. Lisboa: Figueirinhas. ISBN 9726611601.

BASSNETT, Susan – LEFEVERE, André (eds.). 1990/1995. *Translation, History & Culture*. London: Cassell. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. ISBN 030433622X.

BASSNETT, Susan – LEFEVERE, André. 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto: Multilingual Matters. ISBN 1853593524.

BAUBETA, Patricia Anne Odber de. 2009. "Censorship, Translation and the Anthology in the Estado Novo". In *Traduzir em Portugal durante o Estado Novo: V Colóquio de Estudos de Tradução em Portugal*. SERUYA, Teresa, LIN MONIZ, Maria & ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra (eds.). Lisboa: Universidade Católica, pp. 37-66. ISBN 9789725402382.

BĚLINA, Pavel et al. 1992. *Dějiny zemí koruny české II* [History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown II]. Praha: Paseka. ISBN 8085192306.

BEYLARD-OZEROFF, Ann – KRÁLOVÁ, Jana – MOSER-MERCER, Barbara (eds.). 1998. *Translators' Strategies and Creativity: Selected Papers from the 9th International Conference on Translation and Interpreting, Prague, September, 1995: In Honor of Jiří Levý and Anton Popovič*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 9789027216304.

BILLIANI, Francesca. 2007. *Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome. ISBN: 9781900650946.

Bibliografie zahraničních vydání děl českých autorů [Bibliography of the Foreign Editions of Works by Czech Authors]. s.d. URL: <http://www.czechlit.cz/bibliografie/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

BLAS, Alejandro Hermida de – JESÚS, Patricia Gonzalo de. 2007. "Translations of Czech and Slovak Literature in Spain: an Approach". In *Iberian and Slavonic Cultures: Contact and Comparison*. CIESZYŃSKA, Beata E. (ed.). Lisbon: CompaRes, pp. 187-204. ISBN 9789899544406. URL: <http://www.iberian-slavonic.org/iberianandslavoniccultures.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-04-17].

BIRMINGHAM, David. 1993/2008. *A Concise History of Portugal*. Cambridge: CUP. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. ISBN 9780521536868.

BROECK, Raymond van den. 1998. "Translational Interpretation as Prerequisite for Creativity". In *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*. BEYLARD-OZEROFF, Ann – KRÁLOVÁ, Jana – MOSER-MERCER, Barbara (eds.). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 1-13. ISBN 9789027216304.

BUESCU, Helena Carvalhão. – DUARTE, João Ferreira (eds.). 2000. *Sublime. Tradução*. Lisboa: Colibri. ISBN 9727721419.

BUESCU, Helena Carvalhão. – DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2007. “Communicating Voices: Herberto Helder’s Experiments in Cross-Cultural Poetry”. In *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 43, no. 2. Oxford: OUP. ISSN: 0015-8518.

ČAPKA, František. 1999. *Dějiny zemí Koruny české v datech* [History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown in Dates]. Praha: Libri. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. ISBN 8072770004.

CECC – CEAUL. 2009-2010. “Intercultural Literature in Portugal 1930-2000: A Critical Bibliography”. Research Centre for Communication and Culture at the Portuguese Catholic University (CECC) and the University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies CEAUL /ULICES.  
URL: <http://www.translatedliteratureportugal.org/eng/index.htm> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

ČEŇKOVÁ, Ivana – HRDLIČKA, Milan. 1995. *Bibliografie českých a slovenských prací o překladu a tlumočení* [Bibliography of Czech and Slovak Works on Translation and Interpreting]. Praha: Jednota tlumočnicků a překladatelů. ISBN 8090169880.

CHESTERMAN, Andrew. 2006. “Questions in the Sociology of Translation”. In *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. DUARTE, João Ferreira, ROSA, Alexandra Assis, SERUYA, Teresa (eds.). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 9-27. ISBN 9027216762.

CHUILLEANÁIN, Eiléan Ní – CUILLEANÁIN, Cormac Ó – PARRIS, David (eds). 2009. *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*. Dublin: Four Courts Press Ltd. ISBN-10: 1846821436, ISBN-13: 978-1846821431.

CIESZYŃSKA, Beata E. (ed.). 2007. *Iberian and Slavonic Cultures: Contact and Comparison*. Lisbon: CompaRes. ISBN 9789899544406. URL: <http://www.iberian-slavonic.org/iberianandslavoniccultures.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-04-17].

CLOSE, Frank. 2009. *Nothing: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: OUP. ISBN 9780199225866.

Comissão do Livro Negro sobre o Regime Fascista. 1981. *Livros proibidos no regime fascista*. Lisboa: CLNRF, Presidência do Conselho de Ministros.

CULLER, Jonathan. 1997/2000. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP. ISBN 9780192853837.

CUNICO, Sonia – MUNDAY, Jeremy (eds.). 2007. *The Translator. Special Issue. Translation and Ideology: Encounters and Clashes*, vol. 13, no. 2. ISBN 97811905763009. URL: <https://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa/issue/26/> [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

D’HULST, Lieven. 2001. “Towards a metahistoriography in translation research”. URL: <http://www.soas.ac.uk/literatures/satranslations/Dhulst.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-04-17].



DELISLE, Jean – WOODSWORTH, Judith (eds.). 1995. *Translators Through History*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins/UNESCO. ISBN 9027216169.

DIJK, Teun A. van. s.d. *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. URL: <http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

Directorate-General for Translation of the European Commission. 2010. *English Style Guide*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. URL: [http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/documents/styleguide\\_english\\_dgt\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/documents/styleguide_english_dgt_en.pdf) [retrieved 2011-01-31].

DOLEŽEL, Lubomír. 1990. “Nomothetic and Ideographic Knowledge in Poetics”. In *Os estudos literários (entre) ciência e hermenêutica*. SEIXO, Maria-Alzira (ed.). Lisbon: Portuguese Comparative Literature Association, pp. 115-122.

DOLEŽEL, Lubomír. 2000. “Poststructuralism: A View from Charles Bridge”. *Poetics Today*, vol. 21, no. 4, Winter 2000, pp. 633-652. Tel Aviv.

DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2000. “The Politics of Non-Translation: A Case Study in Anglo-Portuguese Relations”. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2000. FLOTOW, Luise von (ed.). URL: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2000/v13/n1/037395ar.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-03-04].

DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2000. “Uncrowning the Original: Carnivalised Translation”. *TRANS, revista de traductología*, no. 4, 2000, pp. 9-18, Universidad de Málaga, Departamento de traducción e interpretación.

DUARTE, João Ferreira (ed.). 2001. *A tradução nas encruzilhadas da cultura. Translation as/at the Crossroads of Culture. La traduction aux carrefours de la culture*. Lisboa: Colibri. ISBN 9727722164.

DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2002. “A tradução enquanto metáfora e modelo”. In *Actas do IV Congresso da Associação Portuguesa de Literatura Comparada*. Universidade de Évora. URL: <http://www.eventos.uevora.pt/comparada/VolumeII/A%20TRADUCAO%20ENQUANTO%20METAFORA%20E%20MODELO.pdf> [retrieved on 2007-08-27].

DUARTE, João Ferreira. 2004. “Os tradutores têm corpos? Para uma crítica da ‘intercultural’”. *Dedalus*, no. 9, pp. 193-204.

DUARTE, João Ferreira – ROSA, Alexandra Assis – SERUYA, Teresa (eds.). 2006. *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 9027216762.

ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz. 1985a. *Teória literárnej komparatistiky* [Theory of Comparative Literature]. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.

ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz. 1985b. *Teória medziliterárneho procesu* [Theory of the Interliterary Process]. Bratislava: Tatran.

ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz. 1988. *Systematika medziliterárneho procesu* [Systematisation of the Interliterary Process]. Bratislava: Veda.

ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz. 1991. "Artistic Translation in the Interliterary Process". *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1991, pp. 113-127.  
URL: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/1991/v4/n1/037085ar.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-03-19].

ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz. 1996. *Teória medziliterárneho procesu I / Théorie du processus interlittéraire I*. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV. ISBN 8088815010.

ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz – GNISCI, Armando. 2000. *Il Mediterraneo: Una rete interletteraria. La Méditerranée: Un réseau interlittéraire. Stredomorie: medziliterárna sieť*. Roma: Bulzoni. ISBN 8883194705.

ESTEVEZ, Henrique Nuno Heliodoro. 2005. "Chicotes com gatilho, peixes-frades e censura literária no Estado Novo". Tese de Mestrado. University of Lisbon. Faculty of Letters. Supervisor: António M. Feijó.

EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. 1990. *Polysystem Studies. Poetics Today*, 1990, vol. 11, no. 1. Durham: Duke University Press. URL: <http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/ez-pss1990.pdf> [retrieved on 2006-08-21].

EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. 1997. "The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer". *Target*, 9 (2), 1997, pp. 373-381.  
URL: [http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers/papers/rep\\_trns.htm](http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/papers/papers/rep_trns.htm) [retrieved on 2011-04-09].

EVEN-ZOHAR, Itamar. 2004. *Papers in Culture Research*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Chair of Semiotics, Tel Aviv University. URL: <http://tau.ac.il/~itamarez/works/books/ez-cr2004.pdf> [retrieved on 2006-08-21].

EZROW, Natasha M. – FRANTZ, Erica. 2011. *Dictators & Dictatorships: Understanding Authoritarian Regimes and Their Leaders*. New York: Continuum. ISBN 9781441173966

FERRÃO, Manuela – OLIVEIRA, Susana – FONSECA, Teresa (eds.). 2005. *Livros proibidos no Estado Novo*. 2.<sup>a</sup> edição. Lisboa: Divisão de Edições da Assembleia da República. Lisboa. ISBN 9725563611.

FIGUEIREDO, Antonio de. 1975. *Portugal: Fifty Years of Dictatorship*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

FLOTOW, Luise von (ed.). 2000. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, Vol. 13, no. 1. *Idéologie et traduction. Ideology and Translation*. ISSN 1708-2188. Association canadienne de traductologie/Canadian Association for Translation Studies, Université McGill. URL: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2000/v13/n1/> [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

FRANCE, Peter (ed.). 2000. *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*. Oxford, New York, etc.: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0199247846.

FREEDEN, Michael. *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP. ISBN 9780192802811.

GÁFRIK, Róbert. 2010. "Ďurišin's Concept of Interliterary Communities and the Contemporary Debate on Cultural Identity". In *New Imagined Communities: Identity Making in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe*. VAJDOVÁ, Libuša, GÁFRIK, Róbert (eds.). Bratislava: Kalligram, Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, pp. 17-26. ISBN 9788081014077.

GEBHART, Jan. KUKLÍK, Jan. 2006. *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české* [Comprehensive History of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown]. Vol. XV.a, 1938-45. Praha, Litomyšl: Paseka. ISBN 8071852643.

GENETTE, Gérard. 1997a. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. ISBN 9780803270299. (Originally published in French as *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1982).

GENETTE, Gérard. 1997b. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: CUP. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. ISBN 9780521424066 (Originally published in French as *Seuils*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1987).

GIANNOSSA, Leonardo. 2009. "A Paratextual Analysis of *I Promessi Sposi*". URL: [http://www.uottawa.ca/associations/act-cats/Young\\_Researchers\\_archive/Giannossa\\_I\\_Promessi\\_Sposi.pdf](http://www.uottawa.ca/associations/act-cats/Young_Researchers_archive/Giannossa_I_Promessi_Sposi.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-04-02].

GIBALDI, Joseph – LINDENBERGER, Herbert – ABELMAN, Arthur F. 1998. *MLA Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing*. 2nd ed. New York, USA: The Modern Language Association of America. ISBN 0873526996.

GILLESPIE, Stuart. 2005. "Translation and Canon-Formation". In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English Volume 3: 1660-1790*. GILLESPIE, Stuart – HOPKINS, David (eds.), pp. 7-20. ISBN 9780199246229. URL: <http://fds.oup.com/www.oup.co.uk/pdf/0-19-924622-X.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

GOMES, Joaquim Cardoso. 2006. *Os Militares e a Censura: A Censura à Imprensa na Ditadura Militar e Estado Novo (1926-1945)*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte. ISBN 9722413899.

GROMOVÁ, Edita – HRDLIČKA, Milan. 2004. *Antologie teorie uměleckého překladu* [Anthology of the Theory of Literary Translation]. Ostrava: FFOU. ISBN 8070426675.

GRYGAR, Mojmír. 1999. *Terminologický slovník českého strukturalismu* [Terminological Dictionary of Czech Structuralism]. Brno: Host. ISBN 8086055612.

- HAMPEJS (HAMPL), Zdeněk. 1959. *Observação à divulgação do Português na Checoslováquia*, Lisboa: Separata do Boletim da Sociedade de Língua Portuguesa, número especial I.
- HARTMANN, Zdeněk. 2009. “Haškův Švejk v němčině” [Hašek’s Švejk in German]. M.A. Thesis. Charles University, Prague. Faculty of Arts. Institute of Translation Studies. Supervisor: doc. PhDr. Gabriela Veselá, CSc.
- HELGASON, Jón Karl. 1999. *The Rewriting of Njáls Saga: Translation, Politics and Icelandic Sagas*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters. ISBN 1853594571.
- HERMANS, Theo (ed.). 1985. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London, Sydney: Croom Helm. ISBN 0709912765.
- HERMANS, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome. ISBN 1900650118.
- HODOUŠEK, Eduard et al. 1999. *Slovník spisovatelů Španělska a Portugalska* [Dictionary of the Writers of Spain and Portugal]. Praha: Libri. ISBN 8085983540.
- HOLMES, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. BROECK, Raymond van den (ed.). Amsterdam: Rodopi. ISBN 9062037399.
- HOLMES, James S. – HAAN de, Frans – POPOVIČ, Anton (eds.). 1970. *The Nature of Translation. Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*. Mouton, The Hague, Paris: Vydavatelství SAV.
- HRALA, Milan (ed.). 2002. *Kapitoly z dějin českého překladu* [Chapters in the History of Czech Translation]. Praha: Karolinum. ISBN 8024603861.
- HRDLIČKA, Milan. 1998. *Translatologický slovník. Výběr z českých a slovenských prací z teorie překladu* [Dictionary of Translation Studies. A Selection from Czech and Slovak Works on the Theory of Translation]. Praha: Jednota tlumočnicků a překladatelů. ISBN 8090220894.
- HUBER, Alexander. 1997. “Paratexte in der englischen Erzählprosa des 18. Jahrhunderts”. Diss. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. URL: <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~bod10153/elzma.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-04-03].
- IMDb. *The Internet Movie Database*. URL: <http://www.imdb.com/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- Instituto Português na Eslováquia. “Zoznam českých a slovenských prekladov diel portugalských spisovateľov” [A List of Czech and Slovak Translations of Portuguese Writers]. URL: <http://www.portugal.sk/kultura/literatura/lista.html> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

JANOŮŠEK, Pavel, et al. 2007-08. *Dějiny české literatury 1945-89*. [History of Czech Literature 1945-89]. Praha: Academia. Ústav pro českou literaturu AV ČR. 4 volumes. I. 1945-48 (2007a) ISBN 9788020015273. II. 1948-58 (2007b) ISBN 9788020015280. III. 1958-69 (2008a) ISBN 9788020015839. IV. 1969-89 (2008b) ISBN 9788020016317.

JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana. 2005. "East Meets West: On Social Agency in Translation Studies Paradigms". In *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klauďy*. KÁRLOY, Krisztina – FÓRIS, Ágota (eds.). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 95-105. ISBN 9630582570.

JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana. 2008. "Czech and Slovak Translation Theories: The Lesser-Known Tradition". *Tradition Versus Modernity: From the Classic Period of the Prague School to Translation Studies at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. KRÁLOVÁ, Jana – JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana et al. Prague: Charles University, Togga, pp. 15-46. ISBN 9788073082215.

URL: [http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Jettmarova\\_4%2002\\_08.pdf](http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Jettmarova_4%2002_08.pdf)  
[retrieved on 2011-04-21].

JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana. 2009. "Explanatory Notes to/on Additional Chapter".

URL: [http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Pym\\_Explanatory\\_Notes\\_Czech.pdf](http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/ETT/Pym_Explanatory_Notes_Czech.pdf)  
[retrieved on 2011-04-23].

KITTEL, Harald – FRANK, Armin Paul – GREINER, Norbert – HERMANS, Theo – KOLLER, Werner – LAMBERT, José – PAUL, Fritz (eds.). 2004. *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung, An international Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*. Volume 1. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. ISBN 3110137089.

KITTEL, Harald – FRANK, Armin Paul (eds.). 1991. *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*. Göttinger Beiträge zur Internationalen Übersetzungsforschung, Band 4. Berlin: Erich Schmidt. ISBN 3503030158.

KLÍMA, Jan. 2005. *Salazar: Tichý diktátor* [Salazar: The Quiet Dictator]. Praha: Aleš Skřivan ml. ISBN 8086493156.

KLÍMA, Jan. 2007a. *Dějiny Portugalska* [History of Portugal]. Praha: Lidové noviny. ISBN 9788071069034.

KLÍMA, Jan. 2007b. *Dějiny Portugalska v datech* [History of Portugal in Dates]. Praha: Libri. ISBN 9788072771660.

KLIMEK, Antonín – KUBŮ, Eduard. 1995. *Československá zahraniční politika 1918-1938* [Czechoslovak Foreign Policy 1918-1938]. Praha: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku. ISBN 8085241889.

KOLLER, Werner. 1979/2004. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. 7. Auflage. Wiebelsheim: Quelle & Meyer. ISBN 3494013799.

- KOŠKA, Ján. 2002. *Dobrodružstvo bádania: O živote a diele Dionýza Ďurišina* [The Adventure of Research: On the Life and Work of Dionýz Ďurišin]. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV. ISBN 8088815134.
- KRÁLOVÁ, Jana. 2006. "La Escuela de Praga y sus implicaciones traductológicas: el papel del receptor". In *Estudios de Traducción: Problemas y Perspectivas*. UTRERA, Bravo S. – LÓPEZ, García R. (eds.). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Servicio de Publicaciones, pp. 111-120. ISBN 8496718271.
- KRÁLOVÁ, Jana – JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana et al. 2008. *Tradition Versus Modernity: From the Classic Period of the Prague School to Translation Studies at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Prague: Charles University, Togga. ISBN 9788073082215.
- KUHIWCZAK, Piotr. 1990. "Translation as Appropriation: The Case of Milan Kundera's *The Joke*". In *Translation, History, Culture*. BASSNETT, Susan – LEFEVERE, André (eds.). London: Cassell, pp. 118-130. ISBN 030433622X.
- LAMBERT, José. 1991. "In Quest of Literary World Maps". In *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*. KITTEL, Harald – FRANK, Armin Paul (eds.). Berlin: Erich Schmidt, pp. 133-143. ISBN 3503030158.
- LAMBERT, José. 1995. "Translation, or the Canonization of Otherness". In *Literaturkanon – Medienereignis – Kultureller Text: Formen interkultureller Kommunikation und Übersetzung*. POLTERMANN, Andreas, et al. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, pp. 160-178. ISBN 3503037276.
- LANZA, Gutiérrez Camino. s.d. "Estudio de la traducción inglés-español y censura de textos cinematográficos en la España de Franco (1951-75)".  
URL: <http://www3.vives.org/pdf/setam/Gutierre.PDF> [retrieved on 2011-02-17].
- LARSEN, Stein Ugelvik – SANDBERG, Beatrice (eds.). 1991. *Fascism and European Literature, Faschismus und europäische Literatur*. Bern: Peter Lang. ISBN 3261043792.
- LEFEVERE, André. 1985. "Why Waste Our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm". In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. HERMANS, Theo (ed.). 1985. London, Sydney: Croom Helm, pp. 215-243. ISBN 0709912765.
- LEFEVERE, André. 1992a. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London, New York: Routledge. ISBN 0415076994.
- LEFEVERE, André (ed.). 1992b. *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London, New York: Routledge. ISBN 0203725840.
- LEFEVERE, André. 1996. "Translation and Canon Formation: Nine Decades of Drama in the United States". In *Translation, Power, Subversion*. ÁLVAREZ, Román – VIDAL, M. Carmen-África (eds.). Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters, pp. 138-155. ISBN 1853593508.



- LERNER, Laurence. 1988. *The Frontiers of Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell. ISBN 9780631149675.
- LEVÝ, Jiří. 1957/1996. *České teorie překladau* [Czech Theories of Translation]. 2nd ed. (1st ed. 1957). Praha: Ivo Železný. ISBN 8023729527.
- LEVÝ, Jiří. 1963/1983/1998. *Umění překladau* [The Art of Translation]. 3rd ed. Praha: Ivo Železný. ISBN 802373539X.
- LEVÝ, Jiří. 1965. "Will Translation Theory be of Use to Translators". In *Übersetzen: Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg*. ITALIAANDER, Rolf (ed.). Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, pp. 77-82.
- LEVÝ, Jiří. 1967. "Translation as a Decision Process". In *To Honor Roman Jakobson on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 1171-1182.
- LEVÝ, Jiří. 1969. *Die literarische Übersetzung – Theorie einer Kunstgattung* [The Literary Translation – Theory of a Genre]. Frankfurt am Main – Bonn: Athenäum. Übers. Walter Schamschula.
- LEVÝ, Jiří. 1971. *Bude literární věda exaktní vědou?* [Will the Study of Literature Become an Exact Science?]. Praha: Československý spisovatel.
- LISBOA, Eugénio – ROCHA, Ilídio (eds.). 1989-2000. *Dicionário cronológico de autores portugueses*. Instituto Português do Livro e da Leitura. Publicações Europa-América. Mem Martins: Europa-América. 6 volumes. ISBN 9721006408, 9721031577, 9721031852, 9721043788, 9721047260, 9721047791.
- LÖSER, Philipp. 2001. "International Literary History: Cultures in Translation". In *Histórias Literárias Comparadas*. Lisboa: Ed. Colibri / Centro de Literatura e Cultura Portuguesa e Brasileira, U.C.P., 2001, pp. 45-56.
- LUSSEAU, Fabienne Frédérique Monique. 1996. "La traduction au Portugal de la littérature francophone de Belgique: Étude d'un cas particulier d'échange culturel." Tese de Mestrado. University of Lisbon. Faculty of Letters. Supervisor: João Almeida Flor.
- MAGALHÃES, Francisco José. 1996. *Da Tradução Profissional em Portugal (Estudo Sociológico)*. Lisboa: Colibri. ISBN 9728288204.
- MARQUES, António Henrique Rodrigo de Oliveira. 1986. *História de Portugal: Volume III, das revoluções liberais aos nossos dias*. 3a edição. Lisboa: Palas Editores.
- MASCARENHAS, João Mário (ed.). 1996. *Relação das obras proibidas cuja circulação esteve proibida em Portugal durante o regime Salazar/Marcello Caetano*. Lisboa: Biblioteca-Museu República e Resistência.
- MATEJOV, Fedor – ZAJAC, Peter (eds.). 2005. *Od iniciatívy k tradícii: Štrukturalismus v slovenskej literárnej vede od 30. rokov po súčasnosť* [From Initiative

to Tradition: Structuralism in Slovak Literary Studies from the 1930s to This Day]. Brno: Host. ISBN 8072941496.

MERINO, Raquel. 2005. "From Catalogue to Corpus in DTS. Translations Censored under Franco".

URL: [http://www.ehu.es/trace/publicaciones/2005aRMA\\_RCEI.pdf](http://www.ehu.es/trace/publicaciones/2005aRMA_RCEI.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

MERINO, Raquel – RABADÁN, Rosa. 2002. "Censored Translations in Franco's Spain: The TRACE Project – Theatre and Fiction (English-Spanish)". *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 125-152.

URL: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2002/v15/n2/007481ar.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

MERKLE, Denise (ed.). 2002. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, Vol. 15, no. 2. *Censure et traduction dans le monde occidental / Censorship and Translation in the Western World*. ISSN 1708-2188. Association canadienne de traductologie/Canadian Association for Translation Studies, Université McGill.

URL: <http://www.erudit.org/revue/ttr/2002/v15/n2/index.html> [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

MERKLE, Denise, O'SULLIVAN, Carol, DOORSLAER, Luc van & WOLF, Michaela. (eds.). 2010. *The Power of the Pen: Translation & Censorship in Nineteenth-century Europe*. Wien, Berlin: LIT. ISBN 978-3643501769.

MERINO, Raquel. 2005. "From catalogue to corpus in DTS. Translations censored under Franco: the TRACE project."

URL: [http://www.ehu.es/trace/publicaciones/2005aRMA\\_RCEI.pdf](http://www.ehu.es/trace/publicaciones/2005aRMA_RCEI.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-04-17].

MIKO, František. 1969. *Estetika výrazu* [Aesthetics of Expression]. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

MIKO, František. 1970. *Text a štýl* [Text and Style]. Bratislava: Smena.

MIKO, František. 1973. *Od epiky k lyrike: Štylistické prierezy literatúrou* [From Fiction to Lyric Poetry: A Stylistic Section Through Literature]. Bratislava: Tatran.

MIKO, František – POPOVIČ, Anton. 1978. *Tvorba a recepcia: Estetická komunikácia a metakomunikácia* [Creation and Reception: Aesthetic Communication and Metacommunication]. Bratislava: Tatran.

MOROZOVOVÁ, Nina. 1995. "Osobnosti české a slovenské teorie překladu: Jiří Levý jako zakladatel moderní české teorie překladu" [Personalities of Czech and Slovak translation theory: Jiří Levý as the founder of modern Czech translation theory]. Diss. Charles University, Prague.

MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 2007. *Studie I* [Studies I]. Brno: Host. ISBN 9788072942398.



- MÜLLEROVÁ, Lenka. 2009. "Reklamní aspekty sekundárních knižních textů v devadesátých letech 20. století" [Advertising Aspects of Secondary Book Texts in the 1990s]. Ph.D. Thesis. Brno: Masaryk University. Faculty of Arts. Department of Czech Literature and Library Studies. Supervisor: doc. PhDr. Petr Poslední, CSc.
- NERGAARD, Siri. 2007. "Translation and power: recent theoretical updates". In *The Garden of Crossing Paths: The Manipulation and Rewriting of Medieval Texts*. BUZZONI, Marina – BAMPI, Massimiliano (eds.). Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina, 2005, rev. ed. 2007, pp. 33-43.
- NK Klementinum. *Online katalog Národní knihovny ČR* [Online Catalogue of the National Library of the Czech Republic].  
URL: [http://aleph.nkp.cz/F/?func=file&file\\_name=find-b&local\\_base=nkc](http://aleph.nkp.cz/F/?func=file&file_name=find-b&local_base=nkc) [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- NORD, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester, Northampton: St. Jerome. ISBN 1900650029.
- Ó, Jorge Ramos do. *Os anos de Ferro: O dispositivo cultural durante a "Política do Espírito" 1933-1949*. Lisboa: Estampa. ISBN 9723314924.
- Obec překladatelů [Czech Literary Translators' Guild]. "Databáze českého uměleckého překladu po roce 1945. Portugalská jazyková oblast. Překlady" [Database of the Czech Literary Translation after 1945. The Portuguese-Speaking Area: Translations].  
URL: <http://www.obecprekladatelu.cz/ZZPREKLADY/totalportugalstina.htm> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- OKASHA, Samir. 2002. *Philosophy of Science: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP. ISBN 9780192802835.
- PAIS, Carlos Castilho. 1997. *Teoria diacrónica da tradução portuguesa: Antologia (Séc. XV-XX)*. Lisboa: Universidade Aberta. ISBN 9726742137.
- PARROTT, Cecil. 1982. *A Study of Švejk and the Short Stories*. Cambridge: CUP. ISBN 0521243521.
- PÉREZ, María Calzada (ed.). 2003. *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester, Northampton: St. Jerome. ISBN 1900650517.
- PETRILLI, Susan. 1992. "Translation, Semiotics and Ideology". *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 1992, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 233-264.
- PIĘTA, Hanna. 2010. "Portuguese Translations of Polish Literature Published in Book Form: Some Methodological Issues". In *Translation Effects. Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2009*. AZADIBOUGAR, Omid (ed.).  
URL: <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/papers.html> [retrieved on 2011-08-19].
- PIMENTEL, Irene Flunser. 2007. *A história da PIDE*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores. ISBN 9789727599561.

- PINTO, António Costa. 1991a. *The Salazar "New State" and European Fascism*. EUI Working Paper HEC no. 91/12. Florence: European University Institute.
- PINTO, António Costa. 1991b. "The Literary Aspirations of Portuguese Fascism". In *Fascism and European Literature, Faschismus und europäische Literatur*. LARSEN, Stein Ugelvik – SANDBERG, Beatrice (eds.). Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 238-253. ISBN 3261043792.
- PIRES, Daniel. 1996-2000. *Dicionário da imprensa periódica literária portuguesa do século XX*. 3 volumes. (1900-1940 A-Z; 1941-74 A-P, Q-Z). Lisboa: Grifo. ISBN 9728178085, 9728178484, 9728178492.
- POLTERMANN, Andreas, et al. 1995. *Literaturkanon – Medienereignis – Kultureller Text: Formen interkultureller Kommunikation und Übersetzung*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt. ISBN 3503037276.
- POPOVIČ, Anton. 1968. *Preklad a výraz* [Translation and Expression]. Bratislava: VSAV.
- POPOVIČ, Anton. 1971. *Poetika umeleckého prekladu. Proces a text* [Poetics of Artistic Translation. Process and Text.]. Bratislava: Tatran.
- POPOVIČ, Anton. 1975. *Teória umeleckého prekladu: Aspekty textu a literárnej metakomunikácie* [Theory of Artistic Translation: Aspects of Text and Literary Metacommunication]. Bratislava: Tatran.
- POPOVIČ, Anton. 1976. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, Department of Comparative Literature.
- POPOVIČ, Anton, et al. 1983. *Originál/preklad: interpretačná terminológia* [Original/Translation: Interpretation Terminology]. Bratislava: Tatran.
- PORBASE. *Base Nacional de Dados Bibliográficos*. URL: <http://porbase.bnportugal.pt/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- POSER, Hans. 2001. *Wissenschaftstheorie: Eine philosophische Einführung*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam. ISBN 3150181259.
- PYM, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester, Northampton: St. Jerome. ISBN 1900650126.
- PYM, Anthony – SHLESINGER, Miriam – JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana (eds.). 2006. *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. International Conference on Translation and Interpreting (10th: 2003: Prague, Czech Republic). ISBN 9027216754.
- PYTLÍK, Radko. 1983. *Kniha o Švejkovi* [The Book about Švejk]. Praha: Československý spisovatel.

- RABY, Dawn Linda. 1988. *Fascism and resistance in Portugal: communists, liberals and military dissidents in the opposition to Salazar, 1941-1974*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. ISBN 0719025141.
- RAMONET, Ignacio – ACHCAR, Gilbert – REKACEWICZ, Philippe et al. 2003. *L'atlas du Monde diplomatique*. Paris: Le Monde diplomatique. ISSN 0026-9395.
- REISS, Katharina. 1971. *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik. Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*. München: Max Hueber.
- RINGMAR, Martin. 2007. "Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations". *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*. MUS, Francis (ed.).  
URL: <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers2006/RINGMAR.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-03-01].
- ROBINSON, Douglas. 2002. *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester, UK, Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Publishing. ISBN 1900650371.
- ROCHA, Clara. 1985. *Revistas literárias do século XX em Portugal*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional–Casa da Moeda.
- RODRIGUES, António Augusto Gonçalves. 1999. *A tradução em Portugal. Tentativa de resenha cronológica das traduções impressas em língua portuguesa excluindo o Brasil*. Lisboa: Ministério da Educação. Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa. 5 volumes (1495-1930). ISBN 972959032X.
- RODRIGUES, Graça Almeida. 1980. *Breve história da censura literária em Portugal*. Lisboa: Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa. URL: <http://www.instituto-camoes.pt/CVC/bdc/eliterarios/054/bb054.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- RODRÍGUEZ-CASTRO, Mónica. 2010. "The Power of the Red Pencil during Franco's Regime: Censorship and Discourse of Drama".  
URL: [http://www.uottawa.ca/associations/act-cats/Young\\_Researchers\\_archive/Rodriguez.pdf](http://www.uottawa.ca/associations/act-cats/Young_Researchers_archive/Rodriguez.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-08-26].
- ROSA, Alexandra Assis. 2006. "Does Translation Have a Say in the History of Our Contemporary Linguacultures? Some figures on translation in Portugal." *Polifonia*, no. 9, pp. 77-94. URL: <http://alexandra.assisrosa.com/Rosa2006a.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-26].
- ROSAS, Fernando – BRANDÃO DE BRITO, José Maria Gonçalves Pereira – ROLLO, Maria Fernanda (eds.). 1996. *Dicionário de história do Estado Novo*. Lisboa: Bertrand. 2 volumes. ISBN 9722510150, 9722510177.
- RUBIN, Jay. 2005. *Haruki Murakami and the Music of Words*. London: Vintage Books. ISBN 9780099455448.

RUNDLE, Christopher – STURGE, Kate. 2010. *Translation under Fascism*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 9780230203549.

SALLIS, John. 2002. *On Translation*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. ISBN 0253341566.

SANTOS, António Costa. 2007. *Proibido!* Lisboa: Guerra e Paz. 3.<sup>a</sup> edição. ISBN 9789898014597.

SARAIVA, António José – LOPES, Óscar. 2001. *História da Literatura Portuguesa*. Porto: Porto Editora. 17.<sup>a</sup> edição. ISBN 9789720301703.

SERUYA, Teresa (ed.). 2001. *Estudos de Tradução em Portugal: Novos contributos para a história da literatura portuguesa*. Colóquio realizado na Universidade Católica Portuguesa em 14 e 15 de Dezembro de 2000. Lisboa: Universidade Católica.

SERUYA, Teresa. 2002. “História literária e traduções no Estado Novo. Uma introdução possível.” In *Estudos Literários – Estudos Culturais*. Actas do IV Congresso da Associação Portuguesa de Literatura Comparada, Évora, Maio 2001, vol. II., *Tradução, Tradições e Cânones*. Universidade de Évora.

URL: <http://www.eventos.uevora.pt/comparada/VolumeII/HISTORIA%20LITERARIA%20E%20TRADUCOES%20NO%20ESTADO%20NOVO.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

SERUYA, Teresa. 2004. “A tradução como espaço de interculturalidade na vida literária do Estado Novo: o caso das colecções.” In *Tradução e Interculturalismo, Actas do VII Seminário de Tradução Científica e Técnica em Língua Portuguesa, 2004*. Lisboa: União Latina e FCT, 2005, pp. 35-44. ISBN

SERUYA, Teresa (ed.). 2005. *Estudos de Tradução em Portugal: A Colecção Livros RTP-Biblioteca Básica Verbo 1971-1972 – I*. Actas do 3.º Colóquio sobre “Estudos de Tradução em Portugal”, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 18-19 de Dezembro de 2003. Lisboa: Universidade Católica. ISBN 9725401050.

SERUYA, Teresa. 2006. “Zur Koexistenz von nationaler Kultur und internationaler Literatur unter dem Estado Novo Salazars.” In *Übersetzen – Translating – Traduire: Towards a “Social Turn”?* WOLF, Michaela (ed.). Wien, London: LIT Verlag, pp. 317-328. ISBN 3825895521.

SERUYA, Teresa (ed.). 2007. *Estudos de Tradução em Portugal. A Colecção Livros RTP-Biblioteca Básica Verbo – II*. Actas do 4.º Colóquio de Estudos de Tradução em Portugal (*Traduções no Coleccionismo Português do século XX*) realizado na Universidade Católica Portuguesa em 24 e 25 de Novembro de 2005. Lisboa: Universidade Católica. ISBN 9789725401545.

SERUYA, Teresa. 2009. “Introdução a uma bibliografia crítica da tradução de literatura em Portugal durante o Estado Novo”. In *Traduzir em Portugal durante o Estado Novo: V Colóquio de Estudos de Tradução em Portugal*. SERUYA, Teresa, LIN MONIZ, Maria & ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra (eds.). Lisboa: Universidade Católica, pp. 69-86. ISBN 9789725402382.

SERUYA, Teresa. 2010. "Translation in Portugal during the *Estado Novo* Regime". In *Translation under Fascism*. RUNDLE, Christopher – STURGE, Kate (eds.). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 117-144. ISBN 9780230203549.

SERUYA, Teresa. 2011 (forthcoming). "The Project of a Critical Bibliography of Translated Literature and its Relevance for Translation Studies in Portugal". In *Homenagem a João Ferreira Duarte* (Tribute to João Ferreira Duarte).

SERUYA, Teresa et al. 2007. "Notes for a Cartography of Literary Translation History in Portugal". In *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies: Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004*. GAMBIER, Yves, SHLESINGER, Miriam & STOLZE, Rade Gundis (eds.). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 59-71. ISBN 9789027216809.

SERUYA, Teresa – LIN MONIZ, Maria (eds.). 2008. *Translation and Censorship from the 18th Century to the Present Day*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. ISBN 9781847184740.

SERUYA, Teresa, LIN MONIZ, Maria & ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra (eds.). 2009. *Traduzir em Portugal durante o Estado Novo: V Colóquio de Estudos de Tradução em Portugal*. Lisboa: Universidade Católica. ISBN 9789725402382.

SHUTTLEWORTH, Mark – COWIE, Moira. 1997/1999. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester, Northampton: St. Jerome. ISBN 1900650037.

SIMEONI, Daniel. 1998. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus". *Target* 10:1, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 1-39.

SOLDÁN, Ladislav et al. 1997. *Přehledné dějiny literatury III* [Synoptic History of Literature III]. Praha: SPN. ISBN 8085937484.

SNELL-HORNBY, Mary – HÖNIG, Hans G. – KUSSMAUL, Paul – SCHMITT, Peter A. 2003. *Handbuch Translation*. 2., verbesserte Auflage. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. ISBN 3860579959.

SNELL-HORNBY, Mary – JETTMAROVÁ, Zuzana – KAINDL, Klaus (eds.). 1997. *Translation as Intercultural Communication. Selected Papers from the EST Congress Prague 1995*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 9027216215.

SONDROL, Paul C. (1991) "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Dictators: A Comparison of Fidel Castro and Alfredo Stroessner". *Journal of Latin American Studies*, no. 23, pp. 599-620.

SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1993. "The Politics of Translation". In *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. SPIVAK, Gayatri Chakravorty. New York: Routledge. ISBN 9780415904896.

ŠPIRK, Jaroslav. 2008. "Translation and Censorship in Communist Czechoslovakia". 2008. In *Translation and Censorship from the 18th Century to the Present Day*.

SERUYA, Teresa – LIN MONIZ, Maria (eds.). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 215-228. ISBN: 9781847184740.

ŠPIRK, Jaroslav. 2009a. “Anton Popovič’s Contribution to Translation Studies”. *Target, International Journal of Translation Studies*, vol. 21, issue 1. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 3-29. ISSN: 0924-1884. E-ISSN: 1569-9986.

ŠPIRK, Jaroslav. 2009b. “Literatura checa traduzida para português”. In *Ibero-Americana Pragensia, Año XLI – 2007: Anuario del Centro de estudios Ibero-Americanos de la Universidad Carolina de Praga*. OPATRŇY, Josef – BINKOVÁ, Simona (eds.). Praha: Karolinum, pp. 215-220. ISBN 9788024615844, ISSN 0536-2520.

ŠPIRK, Jaroslav. 2009c. “Literatura checa traduzida para português”. In *Traduzir em Portugal durante o Estado Novo: V Colóquio de Estudos de Tradução em Portugal*. SERUYA, Teresa, LIN MONIZ, Maria & ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra (eds.). Lisboa: Universidade Católica, pp. 343-357. ISBN 9789725402382.

ŠTĚPÁNKOVÁ, Kateřina. 2009. “Rir em português: Estudo comparativo das traduções de Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války de Jaroslav Hašek” [Laughing in Portuguese: Comparative Study of the Translations of Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války by Jaroslav Hašek]. Tese de Mestrado. University of Lisbon. Faculty of Letters. Centre for Comparative Studies. Supervisor: Prof. Doutor João Ferreira Duarte.

STOLZE, Radegundis. 2001. *Übersetzungstheorien: eine Einführung*. 3., aktualisierte Auflage. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. ISBN 3823349562.

STOLZE, Radegundis. 2003. *Hermeneutik und Translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. ISBN 3823357638.

STOLZE, Radegundis. 2008. *Übersetzungstheorien: eine Einführung*. 5. Auflage. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. ISBN 9783823364313.

STRIEDTER, Jurij. 1989. “Czech Structuralism and the Present Debate about Aesthetical Value”. In *Literary Structure, Evolution and Value. Russian Formalism and Czech Structuralism Reconsidered*. STRIEDTER, Jurij. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. ISBN 0674536533.

STURGE, Kate. 1999. “Comment on Translation in the Nazi Literary Journal *Bücherkunde*”.  
URL: <http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/Papers1999/Sturge%201999.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-02-16].

THOMSON-WOHLGEMUTH, Gaby. *Translation under State Control: Books for Young People in the German Democratic Republic*. London, New York: Routledge. ISBN 9780415995801.

TOURY, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 1556196873.



- TOURY, Gideon. 1998. "A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'". In *Translation and Norms*. SCHÄFFNER, Christina (ed.). Clevedon, etc.: Multilingual Matters, pp. 10-32. URL: [http://www.tau.ac.il/~tourney/works/GT-Handful\\_Norms.htm](http://www.tau.ac.il/~tourney/works/GT-Handful_Norms.htm) [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- TOURY, Gideon. 2006. "Conducting research on a 'Wish-to-Understand' basis". In *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. DUARTE, João Ferreira, ROSA, Alexandra Assis, SERUYA, Teresa (eds.). 2006. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 55-66. ISBN 9027216762.
- TYMOCZKO, Maria. 2000. "Translation and Political Engagement: Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts". *Translator*, 2000, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 23-47.
- UNESCO. *Index Translationum – World Bibliography of Translation. Bibliographic Search*. URL: <http://www.unesco.org/xtrans/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- UNESCO. 1972. "Tentative List of Representative Works of World Literature (Recommended for Translation)". Paris, 25 June 1972. URL: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000012/001229EB.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-03-22].
- UNESCO. 1974. "Fifty+ Books to Span the World: The UNESCO Literature Translations Program". URL: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0001/000115/011543eb.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-03-25].
- UNESCO. 1976. "Recommendation on the Legal Protection of Translators and Translations and the Practical Means to improve the Status of Translators". URL: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13089&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13089&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) [retrieved on 2011-08-24].
- UNESCO. 1985. "Recommendation concerning the International Standardization of Statistics on the Production and Distribution of Books, Newspapers and Periodicals". URL: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=13146&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13146&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) [retrieved on 2011-04-18].
- UNESCO. 1986. "UNESCO Collection of Representative Works: Treasures of World Literature". The Courier, January 1986. URL: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0006/000681/068108eo.pdf> [retrieved on 2011-08-25].
- VACULOVÁ, Barbora. s.d. "Estado Novo e Cultura". Brno: Janáčkova akademie múzických umění, Divadelní fakulta. URL: [http://www.premioibam.cz/documentos/9naedicion/MencionIX\\_BarbaraVaculova.pdf](http://www.premioibam.cz/documentos/9naedicion/MencionIX_BarbaraVaculova.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

VAJDOVÁ, Libuša. 2009. *Sedem životov prekladu* [Seven Lives of Translation]. Bratislava: Veda. ISBN 9788022411011.

VALENTOVÁ, Mária (ed.). 2002. *Work of Art: From Reception to Morphology (Essays in Pragmatic Aesthetics)*. Nitra: Institute of Literary and Artistic Communication, Faculty of Arts, University of Constantine the Philosopher. ISBN 8080505691.

VENUTI, Lawrence. 1986/95. *The Translator's Invisibility*. London: Routledge. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. ISBN 9780415394550.

VERMEER, Hans. 1998. "Starting to Unask What Translatology Is About". *Target* 10:1, 1998, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 41-68.

VIMR, Ondřej. 2006. "When the Iron Curtain Falls: Scandinavian-Czech Translation 1890-1950". *RiLUnE*, no. 4, 2006, pp. 51-62.

VIMR, Ondřej. 2009. "'...here, in this world, I am utterly useless and redundant.' Roles of Translators in Scandinavian-Czech Literary Translation 1890-1950". In *Translation Research Projects 2*, PYM, Anthony – PEREKRESTENKO, Alexander (eds.). Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, pp. 139-150. ISBN: 9788461316205. URL: [http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp\\_2\\_2009/chapters/vimr.pdf](http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_2_2009/chapters/vimr.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-05-25].

VRINAT-NIKOLOV Marie, TCHILINGIROVA Krassimira. 2006. "Création et diversification du canon littéraire bulgare (XIX<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles): entre tradition nationale et innovation par la traduction". *RiLUnE*, no. 4, pp. 19-35. URL: [http://www.rilune.org/mono4/5\\_Nikolov.pdf](http://www.rilune.org/mono4/5_Nikolov.pdf) [retrieved on 2011-08-26].

WILLIAMS, Jenny – CHESTERMAN, Andrew. 2002. *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester, Northampton: St. Jerome. ISBN 1900650541.

WOLF, Michaela (Hg.). 1997. *Übersetzungswissenschaft in Brasilien: Beiträge zum Status von "Original" und Übersetzung*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg. ISBN 3860572423.

WOLF, Michaela (Hg.). 2006. *Übersetzen – Translating – Traduire: Towards a "Social Turn"?* Wien, London: LIT Verlag. ISBN 3825895521.

WOODS, Michelle. 2006. *Translating Milan Kundera*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto: Multilingual Matters. ISBN 1853598828.

WORLDCAT. *The World's Largest Library Catalogue*. URL: <http://www.worldcat.org/> [retrieved on 2011-08-24].

ZÍDEK, Petr. SIEBER, Karel. 2007. *Československo a subsaharská Afrika v letech 1948-1989* [Czechoslovakia and Sub-Saharan Africa from 1948 to 1989]. Praha: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů. ISBN 8086506584.



ŽILKA, Tibor. 2006. *Vademecum poetiky* [Vade Mecum of Poetics]. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav literárnej a umeleckej komunikácie. ISBN 8080509654.

## **XVI. Appendix**

The following appendix consists of 32 censorship files regarding 33 books either originally written in Czech or Slovak or otherwise concerning Czechoslovakia, ordered chronologically.