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1. Introduction
One of the most prolific translators into Spanish in the first two decades after the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) was Juan González-Blanco de Luaces or Juan G. de Luaces, as he was known. The large number of translations he produced draws a parallel with other outstandingly prolific translators of the postwar period, such as Eduardo de Guzmán Espinosa, Manuel Bosch Barrett, Alfonso Nadal, Julio Gómez de la Serna or Oliver Brachfeld. The initial section of my work attempts to locate the reader in the historical context in which Juan G. de Luaces’ work as writer and translator took place. The period I will refer to takes in the first half of the 20th century until the early 1960s, when Luaces died. Secondly, I will provide a section which carries biographical data on Luaces, my intention being to demonstrate how the ideology of a given translator may influence the target text. In the following section, I will highlight the translators’ role, function and relevance in the literary world of post-war Spain, concentrating on the figure of Juan G. de Luaces. Finally, I will briefly compare two of his translations: Charlotte Brontë’s Jane Eyre, produced in 1943, and Rosamond Lehmann’s The Weather in the Streets, published in 1945.

2. Socio-historical context
Luaces’ first experience of the literary world was at the age of thirteen when he was collaborating in Prensa Gráfica, that is to say, around 1919. Nevertheless, the fact that I am only focusing on the decades after 1930 is because his most outstanding works and his task as translator were pertinent to those particular years. Given the attention I shall be devoting to Luaces’ translation of Rosamond Lehmann’s The Weather in the Streets and the translation of Charlotte Brontë’s Jane Eyre, I wish to concentrate here on gender issues and focus on the role and social status of women during the Second Republic and on their position under the Franco Regime. In her book, Las mujeres en el franquismo (2004), Carmen Domingo talks about the attempt to create a democracy during the period of the Second Republic in Spain. This process of democratization included women who witnessed a considerable improvement in their social position. The 1931 Spanish Constitution was the political focus and the basic law of the Second Spanish Republic. If we consider Clause III of this Constitution, we can perceive the interest in social issues and citizens’ rights, including those of women. This Constitution promoted equality before the law; established the divorce law; created legislation regarding prostitution, birth control, maternity, sick benefits, and education; and gave women the right to vote. The fact that women were allowed to vote in general elections meant their first opportunity in history to be recognised publicly in the political domain of the state. Once Franco became Head of the Spanish State, his maxim was «Dios, patria y familia [sometimes called tradition]» (Neuschäfer 1994: 46). His power as dictator and as Head of the Armed Forces, together with his alliance with the Catholic Church and the Falangist movement, created an ideology that would be particularly repressive for women. Catholic thought considered that women were vestal virgins who should be devoted to attending church services, making sacrifices, and being submissive. This

1 The Republican Constitution was established on 9 December 1931.
submission was to be applied before their parents, their husbands, the Head of State and, finally, God. There was also very strong repression with regard to sexuality due to the Catholic belief that the only purpose of sexual relationships should be procreation. This ideology, as in other fascist regimes, was reinforced by the biological difference between men and women. Women were the «templo de la raza [...] depositaria [...] de la socialización de los hijos en los valores del régimen» (Gracia 2001: 93). And as Riaño Campos (1943: 61) argued, «formada la mujer de una parte del varón, corresponde a éste la supremacía del derecho y la fuerza de su autoridad: la una ha sido hecha para amar, el otro ha sido hecho para el mando». All told, the intellectual, critical or political capacity of women was undermined, women were seen as fragile both physically and mentally. As I have mentioned above, «la patria» was the second of the maxims of the Franco regime. Therefore, those women who dared to transgress established norms were seen as a threat to the *status quo*, for instance, when having a paid job outside the home. Thirdly, the family was another traditional priority for Franco, which affected women in a very direct way. To begin with, young women could not become independent before they were 25 years old, and their «independence» from their parents meant becoming a nun or getting married. Once married the following step was to have children. From that moment on, their main priority was the education of the future members of the regime and the maintenance of family unity.

«España está echando los cimientos de una nueva estructura social y política, que se apoyará en las realidades más fundamentales y dará a todas las cosas su puesto exacto» are the first lines of an article in the weekly journal *Destino* in 1940, entitled «Misión de la mujer», which from the early years of the new regime, summarises the Francoist ideology regarding women. After providing a fierce criticism of the previous period, summed up as, «democrático-marxista», the article goes on to provide a detailed explanation of the new roles that women should commit themselves to:

[...] elevamos nuestra concepción cristiana y tradicional del papel de la mujer en la vida. Partimos de un hecho básico indiscutible: las diferencias esenciales entre los sexos. Diferencias, no de calidad sino de cualidad. [...] la misión fundamental de la mujer, derivada de su naturaleza, es la maternidad. [...] la gran creación de la mujer es el hogar. [...] Y si abandona esta labor —que el hombre, por su vocación, es incapaz de cumplir— queda en la vida humana un vacío, un desequilibrio que se traduce en la infelicidad y la dispersión moral de quienes lo padecen. Todo ello influye decisivamente en la marcha de la sociedad y en el carácter y tarea colectiva de la nación. De aquí la importancia grandísima de la reintegración de la mujer al hogar, primer desigio de la política femenina de la nueva España. (1940: 1)

The emphasis on ideological repression was reinforced by legislation. This can be verified if we consider that there were laws passed which specifically regulated women’s circumstances. New laws regarding the political and social situation of women were necessary as the existing ones (from the Constitution of the Second Spanish Republic) allowed women too much freedom and were potentially dangerous for the newly-established order. Principally, these laws dealt with women’s possibilities of having a job, with a view to keeping them at home, such as «el Fuero del Trabajo»\(^2\), or the 1942 «Ley de reglamentaciones». Apart from these laws, there were other ones that affected women: prohibition of abortion, adultery, and divorce; contraception became illegal and women were denied the right to vote.

---

\(^2\) El «Fuero del Trabajo» was constituted on 6 March 1938 by General Franco and was highly influenced by Mussolini’s «Carta del Laboro». 
3. Biography

Juan González-Blanco de Luaces was born in Luanco (Asturias), on 22 April 1906, the son of Edmundo González-Blanco, himself a successful and extraordinarily prolific writer and translator, and María Luaces Mandujo. Despite the fact that Luaces attended school for a year, the intellectual atmosphere he was surrounded by at home substantiated his education. Already in the mid-nineteenth century, his grandfather, Andrés González-Blanco, a teacher of both deaf and dumb as well as blind people, could read English and produced his own books in Spanish. The following generation, namely, Luaces’ father, his uncles and aunts were also well-read people and interested in literature and education. His aunts were graduates in the Arts; his uncle Pedro González-Blanco, also started an Arts degree, and, later on, had to go into exile in South America, where he was successful; and Andrés González-Blanco, another of Luaces’ uncles, worked as an editor and director of different newspapers and magazines (Suárez 1955). Similarly, as regards Luaces’ immediate family, his mother was a well-educated woman and Edmundo, his father, followed the family tradition of writers and translators. Edmundo was a Republican sympathiser, as is revealed in the articles and books he wrote.

All told, the generations brought about a family of writers, translators and intellectuals who had close contacts with leading Spanish intellectuals, such as Ortega y Gasset, Manuel y Antonio Machado, Miguel de Unamuno and Rubén Darío, and who themselves enjoyed considerable prestige in the intellectual circles of the time. According to Luaces’ daughter, Consuelo González Castresana³, her father was highly intelligent and was able to learn English, French, Portuguese, German, Russian and Italian by reading newspapers in their original language. Although he never managed to speak all those languages, he certainly took on translating from them.

At the age of three, Luaces’ family moved to Madrid. His daughter has declared: «Sin duda fue en aquella casa de la calle Monteleón donde empezó a gestarse el poeta […], pues el ambiente lo propiciaba.»⁴ At that age he was able to read perfectly and he memorised the long poems that his aunts asked him to recite. He then, began to be interested in reading and he read many of the volumes from his father’s vast library. A few years later, when he was ten, and the family’s financial straits required it, Luaces helped his mother in her translations from the French. When Luaces was only 13 years old he started working for Prensa Gráfica, to which his father contributed articles as a writer and as a translator.

Luaces did his military service in Madrid in 1927. A year later, he met León-born Ester Castresana Álvarez in Madrid, who eventually became the mother of their five children. In the summer of 1936, during the family holidays, the Spanish Civil War broke out. Following the outbreak of war, they went back to Madrid. After a medical examination, in the wake of being called up, Luaces was considered unfit for duty and, thus, it was decided to keep him in the reserves. He was told to report to headquarters periodically. In fact, his sickly aspect and apparent feebleness were due to a state of depression, a consequence of the horrors he had seen in Madrid during the war. This, together with a firm pacifist conviction led him to reject what he was witnessing; his only desire was to escape from Spain to the American continent.

On 17 November 1938, Luaces, Ester and their children left for Valencia. Before his trip to Valencia, Luaces had bought some tickets to travel from Marseille to Mexico in a

³ Unpublished interviews with Consuelo González Castresana.
⁴ Extract from the unpublished biography of Juan González de Luaces by his daughter Consuelo González Castresana, henceforth CGC. The text carries no page numbers.
merchant ship. Given that Luaces was constantly trying to establish contact with ships that could take his family and himself out of Spain, he was thought to be a spy and he was imprisoned for a month and a half. His imprisonment stopped the family’s plans to escape from Spain temporarily. Nevertheless, immediately after Luaces was set free, they set off for Marseille but the ship could not set sail for America because of the outbreak of World War II. Therefore, they decided to return to Spain and near Christmastime (1939), the family returned to Madrid.

After attempting to escape from Madrid on several occasions, Luaces travelled to Lisbon, leaving Ester and his children in the capital. His daughter recalls that for a short period of time, he worked under the orders of the dictator Antonio de Oliveira Salazar, who, it seems, gave Luaces texts to translate from the Portuguese. The collaboration with Salazar meant an important improvement in the family income. After this episode, Luaces returned to Madrid but the hunger and the misery were still so ubiquitous that in early 1941 the Luaces family moved to Barcelona. He wrote many letters to different publishers and the first one to reply was Luis Miracle: «Y en Barcelona, el milagro: Miracle. ¡Qué bien le sentaba el nombre!»5 He believed in Luaces’ capacities as a translator and introduced him into the translation market. It was at this time that Luaces met and became a close friend of Josep Janés, who offered him many texts to translate. Moreover, he worked for José Manuel Lara, Joaquín Gil in the latter’s publishing house, Iberia, as well as for other publishing houses such as Juventud, Argos, Plaza y Janés, Destino, Planeta, Éxito, or Mateu. This was a very challenging time for Luaces. He was exhausted due to the amount of work he had to do to support the family. At that time CGC remembers that he would spend 15 or 20 days in a row translating, without leaving the house. The Luaces family decided to return to Madrid for a year and a half. But back in Madrid, Luaces’ work was rejected by some publishing houses after he had published titles such as _La Ciudad Vertical_ (1948). That was probably due to the fierce criticism he received from journalists. One from Luis de Galinsoga is a case in point, the editor of the well-established Barcelona newspaper, _La Vanguardia_. In Madrid Luaces got in touch again with Janés and came back to Barcelona, where he stayed until the end of his days. He died in the city in 1963, at the age of fifty-seven.

5. Luaces as translator

The literary situation in Spain after the Civil War was devastating. Many writers, translators, journalists, booksellers, printers and publishers who were opposed to the regime had died during the war, were imprisoned or had gone into exile, mainly to France or South America:

Eran investigadores, arquitectos, fotógrafos, artistas plásticos, intelectuales, difusores del cine obrero, escultores, escritores... Todos ellos republicanos españoles, vascos, catalanes, gallegos o canarios, progresistas, constructores de utopías y libertades. Muy pocos de ellos superaron la masacre que significó el golpe de Estado fascista de 1936. Para los Generales todos eran unos rojos, homosexuales y masones asesinos, y bajo la bandera del con nosotros o contra nosotros, los asesinaron, de cuerpo o de obra. En ninguna otra guerra a lo largo del ancho mundo murieron más artistas antifascistas que en la española.6

The loss of so many relevant figures for Spanish literature after the Civil War (either dead or in exile), and the strong repression exercised over the men of letters who decided to stay in Spain meant a loss in the quality and quantity of artistic production. The anti-Francoist Spaniards related to the world of letters who remained in Spain,

5 CGC.
experiencing what Paul Ilie (1984) has diagnosed as «inner exile», were further affected by the severe regime of censorship. These writers who decided to keep on with their literary career adopted two different positions. Some, such as Buero Vallejo, had recourse to «posibilismo», that is, they took advantage of opportunities afforded by the Regime with a view to introducing subversive ideas. Others interpreted this attitude as abandoning their principles and, therefore, opted for more radical texts, which, needless to say, encountered major problems as regards publication. My main interest, though, lies in a group of men of letters who came across so many obstacles in their attempt to publish in the post-war period that they had no other option but to leave their previous jobs and begin new professions, such as translating, in order to survive, among them, the refashioned poet and novelist Juan G. de Luaces.

In order to better understand this shift from different professions to that of translating, it is necessary to highlight the new protagonism acquired by translation in the post-war years. Consultation of several articles from the weekly journal Destino from 1940 to 1946 provides an idea of the increase in translations from foreign languages to the detriment of a national literary production. Already in 1941, two years after the victory of Franco, in an article entitled «Sobre las letras en 1941», the writer, Luis Perales mentions the absence of «la obra de imaginación, la creación literaria estricta». He adds that this lack has been replaced by anthologies and translations, «una porción de autores alemanes, ingleses, escandinavos, italianos, franceses, han asomado a los escaparates de nuestras librerías» (1941: 10). The increase in translations created a demand for people to translate. Publishers of the time recruited translators, professionals, or not, who became a major source for the transmission and maintenance of book culture.

English became the most translated language, a reality referred to by journalists and literary critics. According to Hurtley (Craig 1998: 163):

> literary works were being translated in ever-increasing numbers [...] from English.

> [...] This was largely the result of the parallel enterprises of the eccentric Irishman Walter Starkie, director of the British Institute in Madrid from 1940 to 1953, and the most prolific Spanish publisher of English literature in the era, Josep Janés i Olivé.

Among the vast number of translators that emerged during the Franco Regime, Juan G. de Luaces became one of the most relevant figures, in so far as he translated not only from English but also from German, Russian, French, Italian and Portuguese. In terms of the number of translations he produced in English between 1940 and 1950, they amounted to 84 and, as regards translations from other languages he produced 23. Among the literature written in English, Luaces translated texts by authors such as the Brontës, Winston Churchill, P.G. Wodehouse, Margaret Mitchell, or Jonathan Swift. On the other hand, he also translated texts by Milly Dandolo, Octave Aubry, André Maurois, Feodor Dostoievsky, Ivan Turgueniev, and Joaquim Paço D’Arcos, among others.

6. Two translations at odds with one another

In this last section, I wish to consider Juan G[onzález], de Luaces’ translation of two very different texts: Charlotte Brontë’s Jane Eyre in 1943 and Rosamond Lehmann’s The Weather in the Streets in 1945. The source texts are: on the one hand, a nineteenth-century novel that challenges Victorian gender roles, and, on the other, a 1936 novel that deals with much more controversial issues such as abortion, divorce, and extramarital relationships. Although the two translations were produced within a very close space of time —1943 and 1945— the analysis of the target texts confirms the notion that
censorship during the Franco regime was not based on homogeneous criteria.

In very general terms, one can state that the result of the analyses presents a significant modification in the character of Jane Eyre, whereas Intemperie, the Spanish translation of The Weather in the Streets, offers few variations from the original text in English. Furthermore, it is remarkable that in the latter some of the changes introduced by the translator increase the subversive nature of the text. Trying to find some kind of explanation for this incoherence, I consulted the archives of the Archivo General de la Administración (AGA) in Alcalá de Henares, where the censorship files are housed. Unfortunately, my visit was not as fruitful as I expected in so far as the files that contained the comments of the reader/censor regarding these two translations were missing.

As regards the translation of Jane Eyre, we can hypothesise that Luaces contemplated the possibility that the text would not be allowed for publication as he decided to include an introductory note referring to the status of the novelist, Charlotte Brontë, as one of the most outstanding writers of all times. With this note, Luaces probably attempted to «canonize» the text because it would «automatically require a much more respectful (source-oriented) retranslation» (Franco Aixelà 1996: 67) and, thus, censors would possibly be more obliging in accepting some of the problematic passages of the text. In any event, it is worth mentioning some passages in the translation which offer a different image of the character of Jane Eyre, re-presenting her as less subversive.

The first passage that I would like to comment on is a fighting scene between Jane and her cousin John Reed. Immediately before this fight, Jane’s discourse has been notably modified and her fury has been eased in Spanish. One can highlight the omission of «with my hands» (Brontë 1943: 13), which originally indicated Jane’s physical participation in the fight, a typically masculine activity, which implied gender role subversion. Moreover, the connotations of «unrestrainedly», «like a bull», and «roar» contained in «bellow out loud», referring to John, are diluted in the Spanish version, probably to make the fighting scene less violent and, thus, more acceptable for a female to be involved in.

A second relevant episode during Jane’s stay with the Reed family is the confrontation with Aunt Reed in which she explodes with anger and rejects her family bond with her aunt. If we consider that «el dogma de fe del franquismo es: Dios, patria y familia» (Neuschäfer 1994: 46), it is not surprising that Aunt Reed’s dispossession of Jane, expressed in her: «I am glad you are no relation of mine» (Brontë 1994: 38) has been completely transformed in the Spanish translation as «Me alegro de no tener que tratar más con usted» (1943: 46). Similarly, the Spanish text offers the addition of «perdóneme» (1943: 46) in Jane’s speech, creating a much more regretful Jane than the original character. A further example from this extract is the omission of Jane’s «the very thought of you makes me sick» (1994: 38), which aims to domesticate the Spanish version so that it is in agreement with the dictatorship’s postulates on family bonds. And, finally, when Jane affirms that she hates living in that house (1994:39), Luaces offers a lighter version of her disgust and resentment by saying «no quiero vivir aquí» (1943: 47).

Some passages exist in which Jane vindicates her rights as a woman in the source text, which have also suffered alterations. For a better understanding of the reasons why these modifications may have taken place, we should bear in mind Molinero’s words about the Francoist policy regarding women: «la mujer [era] un ser inferior spiritual e intelectualmente, que carecía de una dimensión social y política y que tenía una vocación inequívoca de ama de casa y madre» (Gracia García 2001: 92). In the
translation, we find an omission of Jane’s «restlessness» that was in her nature and agitated her «to pain sometimes» (1994: 111) probably due to the idea above-mentioned, according to which, women ought to be submissive and passive. However, a more evident opposition to the Regime’s antifeminism is reflected in the original when Jane declares that «[women] suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer; and it is narrow-minded in their more privileged fellow-creatures» (111). Here Jane is, on the one hand, asking for women’s rights, demanding equal opportunities, and activity, and on the other, she accuses those men who deny these rights to women of being «narrow-minded». All this has disappeared from the Spanish version once again (1943: 134-135).

When Jane becomes the governess at Thornfield Mannor, she meets Mr Rochester, her employer, whom she treats as an equal. This is revealed when Jane’s thoughts are reproduced after Mr Rochester urges her to speak: «Accordingly I sat and said nothing: ‘If he expects me to talk for the mere sake of talking and showing off, he will find he has addressed himself to the wrong person,’ I thought» (1943: 134). Jane does not say anything, indeed, but her thoughts in the English version confer that, first of all, she dares to consider Mr Rochester her equal and, moreover, she is not going to accept any humiliation. Some chapters later, Jane affirms that she has been treated as an equal at Thornfield by Mr Rochester and she has not been hurt or «petrified» (250). In the first instance, Luaces has decided to translate this whole passage as «Yo no dije nada» (1943: 162), which implies a notable modification of Jane’s proud character. And in the second example, the translator has diminished the intensity of Jane’s words and some phrases have been omitted (296).

Nevertheless, the most remarkable chapter at Thornfield presents Jane’s expression of her most intimate feelings towards Mr Rochester, when she falls in love with him. Their evening encounters in the library become a necessity for Jane when she states «now I desire it [meeting Mr Rochester], because expectation has been so long baffled that it is grown impatient» (1994: 157). This is translated into Spanish as «pero ahora estoy impaciente por reunirme con él» (1943: 189). Although in the target text, Jane is impatient to meet Mr Rochester, the concept of desire has been suppressed. Similarly, Jane’s reference to carpe diem, namely, the idea of seizing the moment (1994: 241-242) is not present in the Spanish text (1943: 285). These suppressions may be due to the second aspect censors/readers took into consideration when analysing whether a novel could be published; that is, morality.

A final aspect to consider in the transformation of Jane Eyre is the modification and omission of passages concerning an inversion of gender roles. After Jane and Mr Rochester become engaged, Jane becomes Mr Rochester’s mistress, at a spiritual level, in the English text (1994: 259). However, the Spanish «discurso de reclusión de la mujer en el ámbito del hogar, su sumisión frente a los padres primero y luego frente al marido» (Gracia García 2001: 93) may be the reason that justifies the changes made by Luaces in Spanish (1943: 307). Straight afterwards, we find a further omission of the conditions imposed by Jane until her wedding day (1994: 268-269). The way Jane speaks to Mr Rochester, the expression of her desire, and her will to remain independent are ingredients enough to make this passage unacceptable, and thus, necessary to suppress from the Spanish translation (see 1943: 315-316).

Now that a few excerpts from the translation of Jane Eyre into Spanish have been analysed, it can be concluded that the presentation of this originally challenging female character is significantly adapted. Her modified feminist speeches, her lack of physical desires and her forced passiveness present a new character that suits the portrayal of
women in the context of General Franco’s totalitarian regime.

As regards the translation of *The Weather in the Streets*, we find a completely different phenomenon. As I mentioned before, the Spanish version, *Intemperie*, presents the same controversial topics as the source text, most strikingly, abortion, divorce, adultery. However, I will not present these examples as they reproduce the same ideas as the English text. My intention here is to highlight Luaces’ further attempt to counter the dominant ideology by introducing «subliminal» messages in the translation with a view to the restitution of a Republican state.

To begin with, Olivia’s revolutionary ideas are reproduced in the Spanish version and even increased in so far as «I’d—just like to blow the whole thing up» (Lehmann 1936: 25), which expresses her wishes in English, becomes a necessity in the Spanish text: «Yo tengo la necesidad absoluta» (1945: 24). Furthermore, exactly in the same way as Olivia ambiguously refers to «the whole thing» in English, Luaces maintains the ambiguity with «todo eso». The reader of both the English and the Spanish texts can build their own hypotheses regarding what Olivia is referring to: she may be alluding to the new kind of constructions she is looking at through the window or she may be talking in much broader terms about society, politics, morality, religion, including the situation of women and vindicating change.

Again, in a subsequent passage, Luaces refers to Olivia’s desire of escaping from the oppressive society she is «imprisoned» in, in order to be able to act freely and in accordance with her way of thinking. Thus, «If I could escape to a new country, I’d soon strip off these sticky layers, grow my own shape again» (1936: 50) becomes «Mas si yo pudiese huir a otro país, arrojaría de mi lado el recuerdo de todas esas gentes. Y procuraría vivir de nuevo con arreglo a mi carácter, a como soy de verdad» (1945: 47). What is more, the Spanish translation of the last sentence «grow my own shape again» as «Y procuraría vivir de nuevo con arreglo a mi carácter, a como soy de verdad» has the addition of «como soy de verdad» that makes the reader perceive an emphasis on Olivia’s personality as being controlled and modified by the circumstances surrounding her. I can surmise here that Luaces created this emphasis in an attempt to be more specific for many of those Spanish readers who found themselves in a similar situation of oppression and, on the other hand, referring to a foreign country as a way out to freedom and acting according to their beliefs.

Furthermore, we find that although divorce was illegal in Spain, in another passage Luaces has translated the word literally from the English version (1945: 45):

- ¿Por qué no te divorcias?
  Olivia rió.
- Ya veo todo lo que piensas.
- ¿Por qué no te divorcias?
- Porque exige muchas molestias.7

Not only has Luaces made use of the word «divorcio» on two occasions (the second time being an addition of the translator that gives more emphasis to the concept) but he has also translated the mocking manner of the women’s conversation. What we do not find in the Spanish version is the sentence «I follow the train of thought» (1936: 48). I

7 «Why don’t you **divorce** him?»
Olivia laughed.
«I follow the train of thought.»
«Well, why not?»
«Too much trouble.»
can speculate on this omission, that it was Luaces’ deliberate decision to stop Olivia from «follow[ing] the train of thought», that much of the Spanish population were obliged to follow during the dictatorship. Or on the other hand, if it was not omitted by Luaces and it was omitted at some stage of the censorship process, probably the disappearance of this phrase can be due to the fact that it gives a sense of a common way of behaving among women, namely, separating from their husbands; a possibility that did not exist in Spain and was not to be encouraged.

As regards adultery, there is a remarkable passage in which we can surmise that the numerous omissions have been produced intentionally by the translator in so far as the concept of illicit relationships in Spanish becomes much more idealised, and expresses greater tolerance, possibly, attempting to convey to Spanish society these progressive ideals. In the following instance, the Spanish version is much shorter than the original text. We find several omissions: Rollo’s marital status, which in English is mentioned three times («married man», «Nicola’s husband», «married man»); the families’ disapproving comments; Olivia’s feelings of guilt; and Rollo’s description as «enemy», «stranger», and «unknown».

The privateness of Rollo and Olivia’s illicit relationship has also suffered some modifications in the translation. In the source text, it is patently obvious that their illicit relationship belongs to the private sphere through phrases such as, «always indoors», «in the safe dark», or «as out of sight as possible» (1936: 145). This nuance of secrecy is not so evident in the translation into Spanish. This latter version also suggests this idea of a clandestine quality; however, some modifications made by Luaces convey a sense of the cosy quality of the relationship. The omission of «always indoors» and of «as out of sight as possible» and the translation of «safe dark» as «grata penumbra» (1945: 130) confirm this idea. Furthermore, at the end of the fragment, the omission of «he [Rollo] never said anything nice» (1936: 145) reinforces the idea of comfort, pleasantness and warmth in the Spanish version.

Finally, I would like to comment on a further transformation of the source text by Luaces, which deals with Rollo and Olivia’s first sexual encounter. In the English text, Rollo affirms that Olivia was «a statue» (1936: 156) that had to be brought to life, by having a sexual relationship with him. Although Olivia initially thought that Rollo would not bring her fulfilment, she feels quite satisfied afterwards. This can be read as an incitement to sexual activity in so far as it makes people feel alive, and full of vigour. The Spanish translation conveys the same meaning although with some additions and modifications which make the scene more explicit than in English: «you made it all right for me» (1936: 156) becomes «lo convertiste todo en fácil y grato para mí» (139-140), and «it had to happen» is now «ello tenía que ocurrir, que era necesario». The comparison of these phrases provides a different connotation from the original text. In Spanish Olivia is not as neutral as she is in the English text as she feels Rollo made their first encounter «grato» for her. There is a sense of necessity with «era necesario» regarding their sexual encounter.

The two examples dealt with above demonstrate the plurality of criteria as regards the discourse of censorship. It has been evidenced with Intemperie that censorship was not strictly adhered to by censors/readers but that there were several discourses of censorship; otherwise, the publication of Intemperie would have never been allowed. However, we cannot forget the role played by the translator. I believe that after comparing Intemperie with The Weather in the Streets, one can state that Luaces was among the «posibilistas» mentioned above. He took advantage of any opportunity that Francoist censorship provided to include subversive ideas in this 1945 translation. My
hypothesis is that by means of the modifications in the target text Luaces was promoting a more Republican (that is, of the Spanish Republic of 1931-1939) view of life. As I have not been able to see his translation of Jane Eyre at the AGA, and taking into consideration his political positioning, I can only surmise that his translation of Jane Eyre was modified by the censorship authorities because the source text becomes a tool that supported the Regime’s ideology regarding women. In very general terms, and in the light of the evidence I have provided, I would argue that Luaces was a fighter against the dominant discourse of the regime, from his position as translator.
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