

FROM CATALOGUE TO CORPUS IN DTS: TRANSLATIONS CENSORED UNDER FRANCO. THE TRACE PROJECT

Raquel Merino
Universidad del País Vasco

ABSTRACT

Selecting representative textual corpus for descriptive comparative work in DTS has always been considered a key matter. When dealing with translations censored (TRACE) in Franco's Spain, the analysis of the information contained in the (narrative, theatre, cinema) catalogues of censored translations has led to the establishment of explicit criteria for selecting representative texts. This makes the textual corpora selected for closer comparative study prototypical rather than anecdotal or randomly chosen. A crucial question, justifying the selection of certain texts as the object of descriptive comparative work in DTS, is thus tackled in a progressive and explicit manner by proceeding from catalogue to corpus.

KEY WORDS: Catalogue of translations, censorship, corpus of translations, Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), theatre translations.

RESUMEN

Una de las cuestiones clave con la que nos hemos encontrado en la investigación sobre TRAducciones CEnsuradas en la época de Franco (proyecto TRACE) es la selección de corpus textuales representativos derivados del análisis de la información tabulada en los diferentes catálogos de traducciones censuradas (narrativa, teatro, cine). La compilación de inventarios y su procesamiento en bases de datos informáticas manejables, facilita enormemente la selección de textos objeto de estudio descriptivo-comparativo. Del análisis de la información contenida en los catálogos surgen criterios de selección textual razonados, una cuestión crucial que, hasta la fecha, había planteado serios problemas a la hora de justificar el estudio de un texto como tal texto individual o como prototípico.

PALABRAS CLAVE: catálogo de traducciones, censura, corpus de traducciones, Estudios Descriptivos de Traducción (EDT), traducciones de teatro.

TRANSLATIONS CENSORED: THE TRACE PROJECT

In 1997, in the wake of a research project on Ideology and Translation (Rabadán, *Censura*), Spanish censorship archives were first accessed and a new rich source of data was identified. TRACE was launched then, it developed from 1998

to 2000 under the auspices of the Universidad del País Vasco, and it finally become a three-year Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología funded project.*

TRACE can be defined as a joint venture by groups of TS researchers at the Universidad de León and the Universidad del País Vasco at Vitoria (Merino, “Presentación”). But before launching TRACE, members of research groups in both universities had completed several investigations on the History of Translations English-Spanish (Pajares; Fernández López) and quite a few were under way (Gutiérrez Lanza, *Traducción*).

Until 1997 most contextual research had been carried out using traditional sources, such as libraries or published bibliographies, and most catalogues compiled were based on information about the published translated text (distributed dubbed film, performed play...) gathered from various sources which each yielded partial data. The end product, published translations, films as shown in cinemas and/or their corresponding scripts, was our object of study.

Almost overnight, censorship records held by the AGA (General Administration Archives) proved to be, when sampled back in 1997, the richest source of information for all types of cultural manifestations in the Franco period, including translations. Along with native texts, one could find detailed information on translated texts, whether they were finally published (performed, shown...), and therefore came into existence in the target culture, or just drafts submitted to censorship that would finally be banned, or did not simply come all the way to the public. 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.

Until 1997 we would start from the last possible trace of a text in culture—published plays in the case of theatre, printed books when tackling literature—, added any other target published texts, when or if different versions were found, and coupled them with the source text(s) when possible. We would then build up contextual information from various sources: film or theatre reviews, introductions or meta-texts in publications. But now for the first time most contextual data could be found along with the text. And not only that, different draft versions of the same text were available, and part of the process of textual production could actually be traced back.

* Reference: BFF-2003-07597. Coordinated Project: Universidad del País Vasco, Universidad de León. General coordinator: Raquel Merino. Universidad de León coordinator: Camino Gutiérrez Lanza.

The advantages of using the AGA as the main source for investigations on the history of translations in Spain were patent. And the possibility of drawing more thorough inventories of translations opened new ways of unveiling better selected and defined corpora of translations.

It seemed feasible now to account for the history of translations of various genres—drama, narrative, films—and (sub)periods, and it seemed that catalogues could be compiled more accurately than ever. A reliable map of translated culture proved, at long last, an attainable target.

As may be drawn from the above, we can say that TRACE is a collective project, in which individual investigations are planned and coordinated in such a way that they do not overlap but lead to the accumulation of data in an organised way. In TRACE, using the AGA as the main source of data, we adapt each member's investigation to the “blank” areas not yet studied. We have incorporated members who can tackle language combinations, genres or periods not dealt with to date and have adapted TRACE needs to researchers' capabilities. In this way we have recently opened TRACE to two additional source languages, German and French, and one more peninsular target language, Basque; that had not been systematically studied so far. The map of translated literature and cinema in 20th century Spain that we started off by drawing in pre-TRACE stages, has now more discernible boundaries and a far more accurate picture of what really got translated (by whom, why, when...) is emerging as we advance.

METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND: DTS

TRACE studies are retrospective and diachronic by nature, and use the theoretical and methodological background of Descriptive Translation Studies. We aim at reconstructing the map of what actually got translated in Spain, not from what could have been, or could nowadays be, but from empirical evidence drawn systematically from rich documentation sources.

Certain key DTS concepts, such as assumed translation or pseudo-translation, prove radically useful for example in the compilation of catalogues, since the aim at this stage is not so much to check whether a translation is actually so—often it is all but possible to discern its translational nature—but to compile inventories of texts that were produced and received as translations in a specified period.¹

¹ In Toury, the authors of the introduction extracted from Toury's work a list of concepts that have extensively been used in TRACE studies (*Estudios* 17-33). In the same line, such concepts are used in the description of the Irving corpus (Merino, “Progresión”).

COMPILING CATALOGUES

Each TRACE individual study on a sub-period, genre or intersection thereof starts with the compilation of a catalogue of translations. Each catalogue is pre-textual by definition and may thus be rightly labelled zero-corpus (Rabadán's label used in Gómez and Gutiérrez Lanza, "Labor").

The compilation of a catalogue as such is often done by systematically feeding the database with the information gathered from AGA archives, through sampling the huge amount of data available for a period or genre selected as the starting point. In some cases direct searches are made by author (Irving, Shakespeare) or title (*Tales of the Alhambra*) in order to investigate a pre-selected topic (Merino, "Tracing"; "Progresión"; Bandín), or more often as a means to explore in depth the potential of the material found in censorship archives. Nonetheless sampling has been by far the preferred mode of research into a period or genre, for it ensures that no external, arbitrary selection criteria are imposed on the study.

Catalogues are structured around a core database ad hoc record file that has been designed to suit all genre(s) or period(s) (Rabadán, "Modelos"). The fields that make up TRACE core record are a reflection of all potentially recurrent information that may be drawn around a single target text. These fields are structured in three levels: 1 —contextual TRACE information and basic data about the text, 2 —publication, performance, exhibition...— information, 3 —other sources & interrelations with other records or texts) graphically present in the basic layout. Each individual target text is accounted for in a single record, that contains both contextual and pre textual information related to that target text. This is what makes TRACE database a potential matrix for the selection of corpora (Merino, "Presentación"), and why each catalogue can be defined as zero-corpus.

From the analysis of the information recorded in the database, certain sets of texts can be identified as more representative of the period or genre than others. Thus we could say that a single TT which went smoothly through the censoring filter, and was either rapidly authorized or banned, does not render much "prototypical" information, apart from the purely statistical; whereas a set of target texts derived from a single ST, belonging to a complex set, made up of successive drafts that were subject to scrutiny and rewriting, along with one or more published translations of the same work, pose the researcher with many more questions and are in principle a richer source for qualitative information. The better we can reconstruct complex cases involving a great amount of contextual data, and a series of intermediate texts, the deeper we can go into the myriad mechanisms at work in the period.

ANALYSING CATALOGUES

The information gathered in each catalogue is processed so that a description of the period under scrutiny can be provided from different points of view: author, genre, publisher, source countries, source languages, etc. We then proceed

to identifying recurrent phenomena, regularities (Toury, “Handful” 15-16), which will in later stages be useful to establish criteria for further corpus selection.

From the analysis of the 1960-1975 theatre English-Spanish catalogue² we could gather the following (see also Merino, “Teatro”; Merino & Rabadán):

- Box office success abroad was a key argument when attempting to import a foreign product to Spanish stages. It was often used as counter argument to balance a potentially “dangerous” topic. Producers would often select theatre plays following criteria such as success abroad or prizes given to the play and thus assumed box office success at home.
- Quality productions coexisted with more popular or commercial productions, the latter were much more numerous. In 1960s censors and censorship boards became more professional, members were chosen for their know-how in theatrical terms. They would write comments assessing the quality of plays under scrutiny. They also seemed to have a regard for playwright’s, translator and adaptor’s copyright.
- Play scripts were read and assessed using thematic criteria: homosexuality and adultery rated among the most “dangerous” topics
- Censorship sanctioning procedures were so that the more problematic a play in terms of topic, author..., the bigger the chances that it would be granted permission to be shown in chamber theatres only, and only later on, the play would be considered for commercial theatres. “Approved with changes” was granted to up to 80% of plays submitted to censorship, whereas banned or “approved with no changes” were much less frequent in the period.
- Censorship boards judging “public shows”, theatre & cinema, shared some of their members and would follow similar procedures, interchanging information when a work was submitted in both formats.
- Theatre productions generated mainly in Madrid, although some companies premiered in Barcelona, and would then tour other provinces (the “periphery”). In granting permission to problematic plays certain provinces were deemed to have better “prepared” audiences, whereas in some other capitals the audiences were taken to be more conservative, according to the reasons given for granting or denying permission to present a production on tour.
- The main source language was English³ (around 90% of all foreign theatre imported). Most foreign plays were by American (around $\frac{3}{4}$) followed by British authors.

² Pérez L. de Heredia has compiled and studied a theatre catalogue for the period 1938-1960, and Bandín is compiling a catalogue of theatre publications of classical authors, including Shakespeare.

³ Both in theatre, cinema and narrative, the pre-eminence of American products, with English as the main source language, is clear throughout Franco’s period. See Sturge for a completely different situation, with Scandinavian languages almost equalling English as source language for translated narrative in Nazi Germany.



- Spanish was virtually the only target language used in translation until 1960; in the 1960s, plays in Catalan, Basque and Galician are found in censorship records, most of them translations from intermediate Spanish versions of foreign plays.

FROM CATALOGUE TO CORPUS

From an overall vision of translated culture we proceed to revise boundaries of previously drawn periods, and we establish sub-periods if sufficient evidence is found to back up further divisions (theatre in 1960-1975, 1975-1985). The same may have to be done for certain genres: in the light of evidence found (Rabadán, “Cadenas”), narrative—mostly 1950s to 1970s—had to be split into sub-genres: western vs. other popular literature.

In the same way if a source culture or literature was found to be predominant in the target Spanish culture, judging by evidence in the catalogue—American theatre in the 1938-1959 period—it would then be selected as preferred object of study and primary corpus that will account for such predominance would be drawn (Pérez L. de Heredia).

The same goes for certain source authors (Tennessee Williams from 1950s onwards), or target authors (recurrent names of translators such as Vicente Balart or José López Rubio), and theatre publishers (Escelicer) or companies, agents for almost four decades of the introduction of foreign theatre in Spain.

The rich variety of documents that may make up a specific “expediente” or record, give us abundant data from which to reconstruct self censorship and external censorship processes, which together with criteria such as topic and success would help further select representative corpora which may be subject to further scrutiny.

Corpus-1 or primary corpus would usually be mostly contextual, and will thus be organized according to selection criteria (period, genre, source culture, source author...) derived from the analysis of censorship information found in the records gathered for each catalogue.

At this early stage a corpus may still remain mainly contextual, and although we usually gather texts along with contextual documents when feasible, it may not necessarily be the case that a text (of a play, film, book) is readily available. But this does not lead on to exclusion of a corpus-1 as defined above.

On the contrary, if the only trace we have of a potentially representative censorship case (see *The Boys in the Band* below) is the target published text (even the corresponding TT-ST bi-text), the potential of such set of texts for further study is greatly reduced until some contextual censorship information is found that may help explain how the final publication came to be presented the way it was.

Availability of as many texts as can be found is an overall criterion for finally establishing secondary corpus. From the analysis of each corpus-1 we may potentially establish a corpus-2 counterpart, applying previously used selection criteria (self and external censorship, topic, success...); and making availability the decisive criterion. Ideal corpus-2 would include instances of all texts that make up



comparable pairs (ST-TT, TT-TT, TT-AT), liable to be organized in a reconstructed chain of texts (ST> TT1> TT2... > AT1> AT2...).

If a textual corpus-2 has to be weighed against another as object of further analysis and eventually as a candidate for a computer corpus, availability of all texts (or as many as have possibly been found) is paramount; unless there are strong reasons that render an “incomplete” textual corpus more representative than a complete one.

SETS AND CHAINS OF TEXTS

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 plays that are submitted to be used for a specific stage production, or books printed elsewhere—in Argentina—that require a censorship importation permission to be sold in Spain). If the censoring process is not simple and fast—immediate granting of permission (or ban) to publish, perform, show a text—but long and complex—initial rejection followed by subsequent negotiations on both sides, censors and producers/publishers/distributors—the chances that we may have access to different scripts of the same text, handled between all parties involved, are high. It may also happen that the very fact that a text was handled among many parties could lead to its becoming difficult to find or even declared lost or non-existent (see *The Boys in the Band* case study below).

Even if just one “censorship text” (only a script or printed version) is found in the record, there is still a potential printed published version that may be found in non-censorship sources of documentation. A simple chain then may have this shape (censored target text> published target text -ceTT>pubTT, or rather, when reconstructed for study purposes ST>ceTT>pubTT).

Sets of texts that we are currently studying would rather be of the type: (previously published TT> ceTT1>ceTT2>ceTT3...>pubTT, + ST(s) (Merino, “Traducciones”).

When a set of texts is selected as object of study from the catalogue (or zero-corpus) what we usually deal with is a virtual set of texts, inasmuch as what we get is usually references to texts, and just randomly the complete texts (whether ceTTs or pubTTs) as such. As has been pointed out above, this does not invalidate the selection of a primary corpus, for corpus 1 contextual analysis does not necessarily require recourse to complete texts, references thereto are usually enough. Even in establishing potential text pairs, when in corpus 1 stage, the presence of all texts mentioned is not necessary (Pérez L. de Heredia).

Availability of all or most texts in a set becomes paramount when selecting corpus-2 sets of texts, for it is at this stage that we would need to reconstruct the chain and trace back the processes that gave way to text production.

When a complete set of texts is selected as corpus-2, texts would then be sampled and compared in depth, comparable pairs (of complete texts or fragments)



may be identified, and corpus-1 evidence and hypotheses may be confirmed or refuted. Labels assigned to texts would now have to be reconsidered, and the very position of a text in a chain, or as member of a pair, may have to be reformulated (Merino, “Complejidad”; “Tracing”; “Progresión”).

Corpus-2 chains of full texts, and the pairs that make up each chain in a corpus, would ideally be finally digitalized, aligned and compared using ad hoc software tools.⁴ Since the texts in corpus-2 are selected using fine methodological filters, digitalisation, alignment and comparison would be more profitable in terms of potential use of such computer corpora if done on complete versions for each text.

For practical reasons we often start with randomly selected fragments of ST-TT or TT-TT, combined with “thematic” searches, what got censored, modified, cut, adapted. For the latter, evidence in the records analysed in corpus 1 and 0, as well as actual editing in the ceTT manuscripts themselves would be used. But significant as it may prove partial comparison of fragments cannot be the final target, because much more can be learnt about the processes (translation as well as adaptation-censorship, editorial intervention) that yielded the final texts if whole texts are subjected to scrutiny.

And this is where the use of computer corpora comes into play: one of TRACE’s long term goals is to compile a multilingual corpora of TTs, STs and adapted texts (ATs) (first, fragments, and complete texts later on) which would run parallel to TRACE’s catalogues. Each corpus having been drawn from a catalogue in DB form by using justifiable selection criteria as filters, rendering those corpora representative rather than randomly chosen.

In actual fact, the question of how to select text(s) for multilingual corpora has always been considered a key matter. For the compilation of TECTRA (a corpus of English to Galician translations of literary works, and for some time the only attempt in Spain to establish this type of corpora) Álvarez Lugrís resorted to chronological criteria (1989-1994 period) and to quantitative criteria (14 complete target texts and their ST counterparts, amounting to 1,127,044 words, of which 551,878 came from TTs).

In building TRACE computer corpora, we are proceeding in a tentative way, since the texts chosen for inclusion are being selected by proceeding from catalogue to corpus, in the way briefly described above. Instead of using the sets of texts that make up already selected TRACE corpora just as a reservoir of examples to illustrate what got censored in the (sub)period, genre... being studied, we have chosen to sample complete texts, selecting ST-TT, TT-TT fragments to describe and analyse the process(es) that gave way to each TT. Those fragments would then be part of computer corpora, that would eventually hold sets of complete texts.

⁴ Wordsmith and Multiconcord have been tried, and at least for one TRACE thesis (Serrano), Bergen HIT center staff, particularly Knutt Hoffland, tried their tools with cinema scripts.

In the case study that follows, texts have been sampled and compared and fragments have been chosen for further comparative analysis (some brief examples are given in the Appendix). All texts of both *The Zoo Story* (45,000 words) and *The Boys in the Band* (27,000 words — Act II) corpora, have been scanned and digitally prepared. The examples provided, though, have been taken from an interim MSWord version, after pairing or coupling ST-TT and TT-TT *repliques* manually, since no computer tools were instrumental for this basic initial comparison.

CASE STUDY: *THE ZOO STORY* AND *THE BOYS IN THE BAND*,
OR HOW DID “HOMOSEXUALITY” ENTER SPANISH
STAGES UNDER FRANCO’S RULE

The Zoo Story by Edward Albee in Spanish was identified and selected when analysing an extensive catalogue of theatre censorship records (one fifth of all records for 1960-1985 period) as one of the potentially representative would-be corpus (Merino, “Teatro”; “Traducciones”). It was then a prototypical case of a play deemed problematic by censors: most of the comments and strong objections had to do with a topic latent in the text: homosexuality.

In 1963 a draft version of Albee’s play was submitted to censorship to seek permission for the stage. *The Zoo Story* “record” went through a long process of negotiations between censorship authorities, translator and producer. An initial strict ban on the text was contested by the translator who immediately offered to trim the draft version. When the text was modified following censors’ indications it was finally granted permission to be staged in a Chamber Theatre.⁵ But it was not until 1973 that *The Zoo Story* could be offered to theatre-goers in mainstream commercial theatres.

A well-recorded decade of transactions between censors and producers, and the fact that two manuscripts were mentioned, and were possibly kept in the AGA, led the investigator to select this as a potential corpus 1 case study. Two censorship scripts were found in AGA archives, and a 1991 published version signed by the same translator was found in a specialized performance-oriented collection (La Avispa). These three target texts along with a published stage version make up the Zoo set of texts. Extra-textual evidence piled up and gradually enriched this corpus 1 case study.

The fact that an average of a production per year of *The Zoo Story* can be identified from 1963 to 1973 in Chamber Theatres proves that homosexuality had

⁵ A National Register for Chamber Theatres —private cultural associations that offered stage productions which could only be attended by members— was officially passed and officially published in 1955. Since then “Teatros de cámara y ensayo” became the main gate through which more avant-garde, daring theatre (both in terms of topics and authors) would enter Spanish theater.



found a way to reach Spanish stages as early as 1963. But theatre critics would sometimes quote other plays through which such delicate topic was shown to Spanish audiences: Peter Shaffer's *Five Finger Exercise* Spanish production (1959) is mentioned in reviews of *The Zoo Story*. Three years earlier (1956), Robert Anderson's *Tea and Sympathy* has been identified (Pérez L. de Heredia) as the first play to have permission granted in spite of its "dangerous" topic.

Nonetheless *The Zoo Story* remains possibly the most representative case of all, for since its premiere it has been staged at regular intervals of time in different Spanish cities, and since 1973 in commercial theatres until the last recorded performance in 2002 in Spain. It is obvious that success abroad, the key to explain permission granted to *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf* (Merino, "Teatro"), another play by Albee, was not in the case of *Zoo* the main reason why it became so much a part of Spanish theatre. Rather its morally dangerous topic, one that would be often shown in translation, made the play become part and parcel of Spanish theatre.

In terms of social impact and press coverage of its Spanish premiere, *The Boys in the Band*, by Mart Crowley, could be considered a very influential production. Huge success in Broadway in 1969 was soon used to try to obtain permission from Spanish authorities. But such permission had to wait for almost five years.

The case seems to have been so complex that finding any traces of it in the AGA records proved elusive to the researchers. Not even the name of the author could be found in AGA "author" files: "Crowley" was simply not an entry, and neither was the title of his play. Judging by censorship evidence the play was not even presented to censorship.

Until January 2005 all the evidence we had to the contrary was the Spanish 1975 MK Ediciones published version. The publication itself is a rich source of data, for photographs as well as a whole range of reviews, quoted from leading newspapers and journals, were carefully reproduced in the 1975 edition, which was issued immediately after the stage production.

But for over five years, lack of censorship information, led us to work from indirect extra-AGA evidence. We established *The Boys in the Band* bi-text (source text and target text published versions), but could not proceed any further, since no traces of censorship records were found.

Interesting as it was, this potential case study, fairly illustrative of an established tradition to import plays on homosexuality into Spain, was once and again ruled out by lack of direct censorship evidence. And still we insisted, since there are so many reasons why *The Boys* is such a potentially representative object of study. For one thing from beginning to end the text is a continuous reference to homosexuality, all the characters except one are homosexual, they get together in a party where a wide variety of prototypical homosexual characters come and go. Plot, words, situations, everything is explicitly exposed, there are no obscure references, there is no double meaning.

And that such a play had been granted official permission to be staged in a commercial circuit theatre, a month before Franco's death, with the enormous impact it had on the press the day after its premiere (quotes in the published edition

run as follows: “the spectacle could be found among spectators”); made it a potentially representative case to do further work on.

Along with an eminently thematic line for selecting corpus (homosexuality in *Zoo* and *Boys*), we have been developing two more corpus: *Equus* and the musical *Jesus Christ Superstar*. The former, a play by Peter Shaffer, staged in 1975, showed for the first time on Spanish stages “authorized” male and female nudes. The latter, “an irreverent vision of Jesus Christ” was finally premiered in 1975, three years after the first attempt to seek permission.

When one considers that these plays, together with *The Boys*, were authorized shortly before the death of Franco, late 1975, and that all three went precisely against censorship norms and challenged censors with topics long considered “dangerous” and thus not fit for Spanish audiences; the question at the head of this section could now be reformulated: how come a homosexuals’ party, a man and a woman naked on stage, and an irreverent play, were granted permission and thus staged on commercial Madrid theatres weeks before the death of Franco?

Surely the answer is not straightforward. Changes never happen overnight. That is why I have chosen for this contribution to relate *The Zoo Story* corpus and *The Boys in the Band* emerging⁶ corpus by showing, albeit in a brief manner, how we have proceeded from catalogue to corpus, down to text selection and comparison. Tackling a topic like homosexuality and trying to follow its trail back to the 1950s and possibly forward to 1985 and beyond, will not only allow us to have a panoramic view of the development of official censorship in Spain, but also of the extra-textual and textual means used to make such a dangerous “forbidden” topic part and parcel of Spanish stages long before the official end of censoring activities.

In the same way *The Boys* case study has strong “synchronic” links with *Equus* and *Jesus Christ* for the three are symptomatic of a key year in Franco’s period.

As will be obvious even from the small amount of text selected for the Appendix, potential non-censorship studies may be derived from these corpora. It is beyond doubt that once compiled, stored and compared, TRACE textual corpora will be used for purposes other than those that inspired research at the outset. The very process of aligning and comparing ST-TT and TT-TT pairs, which has led to fragments such as those presented here, makes it advisable to go beyond censorship evidence. In doing so quite a few remarks crop up when we tackle text comparison:

- The analysis of censored fragments in texts is surely worth studying, and in doing so the investigator is bound to establish not only ST-TT pairs but pairs of ceTTs, that is, of “adapted” rather than only strictly speaking “translated” texts.

⁶ The censored target text (ceTT) in the Appendix, has been partially reconstructed from direct notes taken from a censorship copy found and consulted in January 2005 in the AGA.

- Translation and adaptation thus emerge as parallel processes for text production.
- Text comparison leads to findings that go beyond censorship changes (cuts, modifications...), so that texts in a corpus should be compared using other variables.

AGA censorship files have been for TRACE research the most complete source of textual and contextual information. We can still affirm, as we did when we launched the project, that censorship in 20th century Spain is an excellent “balcony” from which to study the history of translations, and TRACE’s catalogues have no doubt gathered more information on what got translated, and how, by whom..., than any other to date. Censorship files in Spain are for present day researchers the most comprehensive source of documents to look into Spanish cultural life for half a century. That is why the enormous potential of TRACE’s databases needs to be exploited by carefully selecting representative corpus for each of the sub-periods (genres...) that are being studied.



WORKS CITED

- ÁLVAREZ LUGRÍS, Alberto. "TECTRA: teoría y práctica de las investigaciones con corpus en el marco de los estudios de traducción." *TRANS: Revista de Traductología* 5 (2001): 185-204.
- BANDÍN, Elena. "Traducción y censura de teatro clásico inglés en España: construcción del corpus TRACEci (1939-1985)." Diss. Universidad de León, 2004.
- FERNÁNDEZ LÓPEZ, Marisa. *Traducción y literatura juvenil: narrativa anglosajona contemporánea en España*. León: Universidad de León, 1996.
- GÓMEZ, Cristina. "Traducción y censura en España: diseño y construcción del corpus 0 TRACEni (1970-1978)." Diss. Universidad de León, 2003.
- GUTIÉRREZ LANZA, Camino. *Traducción y censura de textos cinematográficos en la España de Franco: doblaje y subtítulo inglés-español (1951-1975)*. León: Universidad de León, 2000.
- . "Herramientas de investigación en EDTAV: la ficha y el catálogo TRACEc." *Actas del II Simposio Internacional: traducción, texto e interferencias*. CD-ROM. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2003. 447-455.
- . "La labor del equipo TRACE: metodología descriptiva de la censura en traducción." *Trasvases culturales: literatura, cine y traducción* 4. Ed. R. Merino, J.M. Santamaría & E. Pajares. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, 2004. 55-64.
- MERINO ÁLVAREZ, Raquel. "Complejidad y diversidad en los estudios descriptivos de traducción: la *Alhambra* de Washington Irving en España." *Aproximaciones a los estudios de traducción*. Ed. P. Fernández Nistal & J.M. Bravo Gozalo. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1997. 51-70.
- . "Presentación de la base de datos TRACE: traducciones censuradas inglés-español." *Trasvases culturales: literatura, cine y traducción* 3. Ed. E. Pajares, R. Merino & J.M. Santamaría. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, 2001. 287-298.
- . "Progresión metodológica en un estudio descriptivo de traducciones: los cuentos de *La Alhambra* de Washington Irving en español." *A New Spectrum of Translation Studies*. Ed. J.M. Bravo Gozalo. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2004. 231-264.
- . "El teatro inglés traducido desde 1960: censura, ordenación, calificación." *Censura y traducción inglés-español, 1939-1985: estudio preliminar*. Ed. R. Rabadán. León: Universidad de León, 2000. 121-151.
- . "Tracing Back (in Awe) a Hundred Years' History of Spanish Translations: Irving's *The Alhambra*." *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives*. Ed. G. Anderman & M. Rogers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2003. 92-111.



- “TRAducciones CEnsuradas inglés-español: del catálogo al corpus TRACE (teatro).” *Primer Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Ibérica de Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación, AIETI*. CD-ROM. Ed. R. Muñoz. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2003. 641-670.
- MERINO ÁLVAREZ, Raquel & Rosa RABADÁN. “Censored Translations in Franco’s Spain: The TRACE Project-Theatre and Fiction (English-Spanish).” *TTR* 25.2 (2002): 125-152.
- PAJARES, E. “Richardson en España.” Diss. Universidad de León, 1989.
- PÉREZ L. de HEREDIA, María. *Traducciones censuradas de teatro norteamericano en la España de Franco (1939-1963)*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, 2004.
- RABADÁN, Rosa. “Las cadenas intertextuales inglés-español: traducciones y otras transferencias (inter)semióticas.” *Trasvases culturales: literatura, cine y traducción* 3. Ed. E. Pajares, R. Merino & J.M. Santamaría. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, 2001. 29-42.
- ed., *Censura y traducción inglés-español, 1939-1985: estudio preliminar*. León: Universidad de León, 2000.
- “Modelos importados, modelos adaptados: pseudotraducciones de narrativa popular inglés-español, 1955-1981.” *Censura y traducción inglés-español, 1939-1985: estudio preliminar*. Ed. R. Rabadán. León: Universidad de León, 2000. 255-277.
- SERRANO, Luis. “Traducción y censuras de textos cinematográficos inglés-español, 1970-1985.” Diss. Universidad de León, 2003.
- STURGE, K. “Censorship of Translated Fiction in Nazi Germany.” *TTR* 25.2 (2002): 153-169.
- TOURY, Gideon. *Los estudios descriptivos de traducción, y más allá: metodología de la investigación en estudios de traducción*. Trans., introd. and notes Rosa Rabadán & Raquel Merino. Madrid: Cátedra, 2004.
- “A Handful of Paragraphs on “Translation” and “Norms”.” *Translation and Norms*. Ed. Christina Schäffner. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1999. 9-31.



APPENDIX: *THE BOYS IN THE BAND TRACE CORPUS*

(*Replique* numbers correspond to original numbering in Act II of each text: ST, censored text, published TT)

Boys ST-ceTT repliques “underlined by censors” (ST repliques 25 to 37, ceTT repliques 23 to 35)

- 25 LARRY- Speaking of beasts. (BERNARD *sits in Down Right chair.*) 23 LARRY- Hablando de bestias...
- 26 EMORY- From me to you, darlin'. How do you like it? 24 EMORY- Dímelo, sinceramente, querida... ¿Verdad que te gusta?
- 27 HAROLD- (*Crosses to COWBOY.*) Oh, I suppose he has an interesting face and body—but it turns me right off because he can't talk intelligently about art. 25 HAROLD- Bueno, realmente no está mal de físico... pero, ¿qué quieres? ...no me produce mucha emoción, porque sospecho que no sabe hablar de arte.
- 28 EMORY- Yeah, ain't it a shame? (COWBOY *goes to ottoman and sits.*) 26 EMORY- Sí, ¿verdad que es una pena?
- 29 HAROLD- I could never *love* anyone like that. (*Going to EMORY.*) 27 HAROLD- Nunca podría amar a un ser así.
- 30 EMORY- Never. *Who could?* 28 EMORY- Claro, ¿quién podría?
- 31 HAROLD- I could and *you* could, that's who could! Oh, Mary, she's *gorgeous!* 29 HAROLD- Tú, yo y cualquiera, guapa. ¡Oh, María... hermana, es absolutamente glorioso!
- 32 EMORY- She may be dumb, but she's all yours! 30 EMORY- Quizás sea un poco tontorrón, ¡pero es todo tuyo!
- 33 HAROLD- In affairs of the heart there are no rules! \Where'd you ever find him? (*Crossing to COWBOY.*) 31 HAROLD- En los asuntos del corazón, no hay reglas. ¿Dónde lo compraste?
- 34 EMORY- Rae knew where. 32 EMORY- Me lo buscó Ray.
- 35 MICHAEL- (*To DONALD.*) Rae is Rae Clark. That's *R.A.E.* She's Emory's dilse friend who sings at a place in the Village. She wears pin-striped suits and bills herself, “Miss Rae Clark-Songs Tailored To Your Taste.” (COWBOY *picks up crab tray and investigates.*) 33 MICHAEL- (A DONALD). Ray es Ray Clark. Una amiga íntima de Emory, que trabaja como travesti en un antro.
- 36 EMORY- Rae's a fabulous chanteuse. I adore the way she does “Down In The Depths On The Nineteeth Floor.” 34 EMORY- Ray es una «chanteuse» fabulosa. Me chifla como canta: «Es mi hombre.»
- 37 MICHAEL- The faggot national anthem. (*Exits to the kitchen with soda glass.*) 35 MICHAEL- El himno internacional de los mariquitas. (SALE POR LA COCINA CANTANDO «ES MI HOMBRE»).

- 46 BERNARD- (*To EMORY*)- You'll feel better after I bathe your face. (BERNARD
and EMORY *exit to bath*) 44 BERNARD- Te sentirás mejor en cuanto te ponga un poco de agua fría.
- 45 EMORY- Da igual. Ya se ha estropeado una noche más de mi vida. (BERNARD
SUBE CON EMORY Y SE METEN EN EL BAÑO).
- 46 HAROLD- Just another birthday party with the folks. 46 HAROLD- ¡Bueno, otro party de cumpleaños con los amigos! (MICHAEL
VUELVE CON UNA BOTELLA DE VINO Y UN VASO DE CRISTAL
VERDE QUE VA LLENANDO EN EL CAMINO).
- 47 MICHAEL- (*He has a wine bottle and a green crystal white wine glass. Going to
HAROLD*)- Here's a cold bottle of Pully-Fuisse I bought especially for you,
kiddo. (*Pours a glass*.) 47 MICHAEL- Aquí tienes una botella fría de Pully-Fuissé... que he comprado
especialmente para ti, querida.
- 48 HAROLD- Pussycat, all is forgiven. You can stay. (*Takes glass*.) No. You can stay,
but not all is forgiven. Cheers. (*Sits Down Left chair*.) 48 HAROLD- Amor, con este detalle, todo queda perdonado. Puedes quedarte.
No. Puedes quedarte, pero no todo está perdonado. Salud.
- 50 MICHAEL- I didn't want it this way, Hallie. (*Puts wine bottle on Left table*.) 49 MICHAEL- Yo quería haberte hecho otra clase de recibimiento.
(DONALD *crosses to Left of stairs*.)
- 51 HAROLD- (*Indicating ALAN*.) Who asked Mr. Right to celebrate my birthday? 50 HAROLD- (SEÑALANDO A ALAN). ¿Quién ha pedido a este honorable señor
que celebre mi cumpleaños?
- 52 DONALD- There are no accidents. 51 MICHAEL- No soy culpable. Ha sido un accidente.
- 53 HAROLD- (*Referring to DONALD*.) And who asked him? 52 DONALD- Nada se produce por casualidad. No creo en los accidentes.
- 54 MICHAEL- *Guiltily again*. 53 HAROLD- ¿Y quién se lo ha pedido a éste otro?
- 55 HAROLD- Always got to have your crutch, haven't you. 54 MICHAEL- La culpa también es mía. Cuando meto la pata, la meto hasta aquí.
- 56 DONALD- I'm *not* leaving. 55 HAROLD- Sigues apoyándote en cualquier muleta, ¿verdad?
56 DONALD- Yo me voy.

289 MICHAEL- (*Crosses to Left end sofa.*) It's too much trouble to find enough 245 MICHAEL- Caliente, caliente rico.

pencils, and besides, Emory always puts down the same thing. He dislikes artificial fruit and flowers and coffee grinders made into lamps-and he likes Mabel Mercer, poodles, and "All about Eve" -the screen-play of which he will then recite *verbatim*.

290 EMORY- I put down other things sometimes.

291 MICHAEL- Like a tan out of season?

292 EMORY- I just always put down little "Chi-Chi" because I adore her so much.

293 MICHAEL- If one is of the masculine gender, a poodle is the *insignia* of one's deviation. (*Goes to desk for pad and pencil*)

294 BERNARD- (*Crosses in to EMORY*.) You know why old ladies like poodles- because they go down on them.

295 EMORY- *They do not.* (*Gives BERNARD a swat as BERNARD returns to Pillar.*)

296 LARRY- We could play B For Botticelli.

297 MICHAEL- (*Crosses to Right end sofa.*) We could play *Spin* The Botticelli, but we're not going to.

298 HAROLD- What would you like to play, Michael, The Truth Game?

299 MICHAEL- (*He chuckles to himself*) Cure, Hallie.

300 HAROLD- Or do you want to play Murder? You all remember that one, don't you? 246 HAROLD- ¿O preferies jugar al asesino?

APPENDIX: *THE ZOO STORY* TRACE CORPUS

(Replique No. 123 in Source Text, censored Target Text1 and published Target Text.)
(Text pairs: ST-ceTT1, ceTT1-ceTT2, ceTT2-publishedTT)

Zoo ST-ceTT1

JERRY: No. I wonder if it's sad that I never see the little ladies more than once. I've never been able to have sex with, or how is it put-make love to anybody more than once. Once, that's it. Oh, wait; for a week and a half, when I was fifteen-and I hang my head in shame that puberty was late-I was a h-o-m-o-s-e-x-u-a-l. I mean I was queer-(very fast) queer, queer, queer-with bells ringing, banners snapping in the wind. And for those eleven days, I met at least twice a day with the park superintendent's son-a Greek boy, whose birthday was the same as mine, except he was a year older. I think I was very much in love-maybe just with sex. But that was the jazz of a very special hotel, wasn't it? And now; oh, do I love the little ladies; really, I love them. For about an hour.

JERRY: No. Me pregunto si no es triste que jamás esté con las chicas alegres más que una sola vez. Nunca he sido capaz de tener relaciones sexuales o ¿cómo se dice?... hacer el amor con alguien más que una sola vez. Una sola vez y basta. Ah, espere: durante una semana y media, cuando tenía quince... Y bajo la cabeza porque la pubertad llegase tarde fui un h-o-m-o-s-e-x-u-a-l. Fui maricón... (MUY RÁPIDAMENTE). maricón, maricón... con campanas sonando, banderas estallando en el viento, y durante aquellos once días, me encontré por lo menos dos veces cada día con el hijo del Superintendente del Parque... un muchacho griego cuyo cumpleaños coincidía con el mío, excepto que él era un año mayor... Creo que estuve muy enamorado... puede que sólo con el sexo. Pero aquello era bailar al son de un jazz muy especial, ¿eh? y ahora, (DA UN SILBIDO) ¡Que si me gustan las chicas alegres! La verdad, me encantan. Durante una hora.

Zoo ceTT1-ceTT2

JERRY: No. Me pregunto si no es triste que jamás esté con las chicas alegres más que una sola vez. Nunca he sido capaz de tener relaciones sexuales o ¿cómo se dice?... hacer el amor con alguien más que una sola vez. Una sola vez y basta. Ah, espere: durante una semana y media, cuando tenía quince... Y bajo la cabeza porque la pubertad llegase tarde fui un h-o-m-o-s-e-x-u-a-l. Fui maricón... (MUY RÁPIDAMENTE). maricón, maricón... con campanas sonando, banderas estallando en el viento, y durante aquellos once días, me encontré por lo menos dos veces cada día con el hijo del Superintendente del Parque... un muchacho griego cuyo cumpleaños coincidía con el mío, excepto que él era un año mayor... Creo que estuve muy enamorado... puede que sólo con el sexo. Pero aquello era bailar al son de un jazz muy especial, ¿eh? y ahora, (DA UN SILBIDO) ¡Que si me gustan las chicas alegres! La verdad, me encantan. Durante una hora.

JERRY: No. Me pregunto si no es triste que jamás esté con las chicas alegres más que una sola vez. Nunca he sido capaz de tener relaciones sexuales o ¿cómo se dice?... hacer el amor con alguien más que una sola vez. Una sola vez y adíos. Ah, espere: durante una semana y media, cuando tenía quince años... Y bajo la cabeza porque la pubertad me llegó tarde... fui un h-o-m-o-s-e-x-u-a-l. Fui maricón... ~~(MUY RÁPIDAMENTE)~~; maricón, maricón... con campanas sonando, banderas estallando en el viento... y durante aquellos once días, me encontré por lo menos dos veces cada día con el hijo del Superintendente del Parque... un muchacho griego cuyo cumpleaños coincidía con el mío, excepto que él era un año mayor... Creo que estuve muy enamorado... puede que sólo con el sexo. Pero aquello era bailar al son de un jazz muy especial, ¿sabe? y ahora, ¡Que si me gustan las chicas alegres! La verdad, me encantan. Durante una hora.

Zoo ceTT2-published TT

JERRY: No. Me pregunto si no es triste que jamás esté con las chicas alegres más que una sola vez. Nunca he sido capaz de tener relaciones sexuales o ¿cómo se dice?.. hacer el amor con alguien más que una sola vez. Una sola vez y adiós. Ah, espere: durante una semana y media, cuando tenía quince años... Y bajo la cabeza porque la pubertad me llegó tarde... fui un h-o-m-o-s-e-x-u-a-l. Fui maricón... **(MUY RÁPIDAMENTE):** maricón; maricón... con campanas sonando; banderas estallando en el viento; y durante aquellos once días; me encontré por lo menos dos veces cada día con el hijo del Superintendente del Parque... un muchacho griego cuyo cumpleaños coincidía con el mío; excepto que él era un año mayor... Creo que estuve muy enamorado... puede que sólo con el sexo. Pero aquello era bailar al son de un jazz muy especial, ¿sabe? y ahora, ¡Que si me gustan las chicas alegres! La verdad, me encantan. Durante una hora.

JERRY: No. Me pregunto si no es triste que jamás esté con una de ellas más de una sola vez. Nunca he sido capaz de tener relaciones sexuales o, ¿cómo se dice?, de hacer el amor con alguien más de una sola vez. Una sola vez y adiós. ¡Ah!, espere; durante una semana y media, cuando tenía quince años... y bajo la cabeza porque la pubertad me llegó tarde, [fui un ho-mo-se-xu-al. Quiero decir, un gay... (muy rápido)... gay, gay, gay. Viví en Sodoma, ¡yaya sodomital, revoloteando como una mariposa. Y durante estos once días, me encontré dos veces por día con el hijo del guarda del parque... Un muchacho griego cuyo cumpleaños coincidía con el mío, pero él un año mayor. Creo que estuve muy enamorado. Aunque tal vez era puro sexo. -Párrafo cortado por el censor-]. Pero aquello era bailar al son de un jazz muy especial, y ahora, ¡que si me gustan las chicas alegres!, las adoro. Una horita y punto.