

Catherine O'Leary and Alberto Lazaro (eds.), *Censorship across Borders: The Reception of English Literature in Twentieth-Century Europe*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011, pp. vi + 214.

Reviewed by **SANDRA JOSIPOVIĆ**¹
Belgrade University, Faculty of Philology,
English Department,
Belgrade, Serbia

This volume *Censorship across Borders: The Reception of English Literature in Twentieth-Century Europe*, edited by Catherine O'Leary and Alberto Lazaro, published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing, brings together twelve essays which explore European censorship of English literature in the last century. Taking into consideration the various social, political and historical contexts in which literary controls were imposed and the extent to which they were determined by national and international concerns, these essays comment on political and moral censorship, self-censorship, and the role of the translator as censor. What makes this collection of essays valuable is the fact that the authors write about implementation of censorship in the politically, culturally and geographically diverse regions, from the former Soviet Union, former Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Ireland to Spain, the entire second part of the collection is devoted to censorship in Spain. Besides systematic state control, other hidden and insidious forms of censorship are also surveyed in the essays. The study considers why certain works and authors, many of them now regarded as canonical, were targeted in various states and often under opposing ideologies, such as those dominated by conservative Catholic morality and those governed by communism or socialism.

In the first essay "Frank O'Connor and Irish Literary Censorship" Donald O'Drisceoil writes about Frank O'Connor whose books were banned by the notorious Censorship of Publications Board. O'Drisceoil particularly emphasizes the fact that O'Connor was a persistent and articulate opponent of censorship and that his critique of and encounters with censorship provide a useful vehicle of inquiry into the nature of this dark chapter in Irish cultural history. O'Drisceoil discusses the impact of censorship on the Irish writer and on society and concludes that for writers in Ireland, the choice was between silence and exile.

In her essay "Christopher J. O'Reilly: Profile of an Irish Censor", Julia Carson profiles Christopher J. O'Reilly, a censor during the years when the Censorship Board was dominated by members of the lay Catholic association, the Knight of Saint Columbanus. O'Reilly and his fellow Knights were determined to continue their campaign against what they considered to be "evil literature". Julia Carson analyses the workings of the Board in the 1950s and comments how much the female body and its bodily functions were in focus, as well as incest in a censorship system obsessed with sexual morality.

John Bates is the author of essay "Censoring English Literature in People's Poland, 1948-1967". Bates deals with the impact of censorship upon literary translation in

1 Kontakt podaci (Email): sandrajospovic@gmail.com

People's Poland, claiming that it is a fairly neglected issue in Polish scholarly discourse. He tries to consider literary translation in the broader terms of state cultural policy and practices. His primary intention is to augment these factors by placing them in the context of growing Soviet hegemony over the cultural sphere. The author's secondary consideration relates to the status of translations in the first half of the 1950s, and the role played by forewords in domesticating these alien artefacts for a Polish readership.

Marina Kulinich's essay "George Orwell as Un-Person: The History of Censorship in Soviet Russia" comments on the often insidious way in which censorship operated in the Soviet State, and how much it relied on fear and the threat of punishment. She recounts her witnessing of censorship of English literature in the university system. In her commentary on Newspeak from *Nineteen Eighty-four* and its equivalent in Soviet reality, she points to an area worth of further exploration.

Olga M. Ushakova's essay "Who's Afraid of T. S. Eliot? Modernism and Censorship in the Soviet Union" explores the official reception of modernist works in the Soviet Union. Her contribution considers the impact of Trotskyist proletarian aesthetics, Stalinist systematic control, and cold war propaganda on the reception of and access to some of the great Western modernist writers of the twentieth century. She analyses the perceived threat to official, orthodox culture posed by such literature in the context of a battle for cultural identity, and she notes how modernists were associated with the bourgeoisie and with capitalism.

Sandra Josipović analyses in her essay "The Reception of James Joyce's Work in the Twentieth-Century Serbia" the censorship system in the former Yugoslavia which was initially dominated by Soviet influence and was more concerned with politics than morality. Josipović gives some examples of the type of censorship implemented under Communism before analysing why Joyce's work escaped harsher censorship. The role of the translator in the censorship process is a key concern in this essay, which also highlights some of the differences in censorship within the Eastern Bloc.

Zsofia Gombar's essay "Dictatorial Regimes and the Reception of English-Language Authors in Hungary and Portugal" allows the reader to draw some parallels between two ideologically opposed systems of governance and to draw some conclusions about censorship in repressive regimes in general. As well as exposing the similarities and differences between the two systems, Gombar concludes that both systems treated foreign literature less harshly than national literature and both demonstrated, for different reasons, a deep respect for canonical literature.

Jacqueline Hurtley explores in her essay "In a Mirror, Darkly: Dario Fernandez-Florez, the Writer as Censor as Writer" censorship in a Spanish context, highlighting the interesting case of a censor who was a writer and civil servant who became a victim of censorship himself. She draws a conclusion that the gap between Fernandez-Florez's public activities and championing of certain works and writers on national radio, and his more clandestine censorship activities could be interpreted negatively as hypocrisy, positively as an attempt to publicise works of censored authors, or as evidence of his disillusionment with his role as a censor.

Also considering the Franco regime in their essay "The Role of the Censor in the Reception of Shakespearean Drama in Francoist Spain: The Strange Case of *The Taming of the Shrew*", Keith Gregor and Elena Bandin give an overview of theatrical censorship

as the context for an exploration of the reception of Shakespeare's works in Spain. It is clear that Shakespeare's canonical status led to less intervention from the censors, who often viewed themselves as literary critics in addition to their role as protectors of the people and sanitisers of the stage. The essay also looks at the role of the translator in the censorship process, including the impact of self-censorship before the play was staged, and the ease with which translation can be employed to serve censorship.

Monica Olivares's essay "The Controversy Regarding Graham Greene in Spain" contains a detailed examination of the censor's reports on the Spanish translations of Graham Greene's early novels and submitted to the Spanish censorship board in the 1940s. It is interesting to note the contradiction evident in the censoring of novels by an author so clearly associated with Catholicism. The regime's focus on sexual morality is revealed in this analysis, as the Spanish censors report on the "moral deprivation", "pornographic" and "morbid" passages that they find in some of the novels.

"The Reception of Rosamond Lehmann in Franco's Spain" is the essay written by Marta Ortega Saez in which she explores the reception of Lehmann's work in Spain under Franco. Although the subject matter of Lehmann's work was likely to give offence to a regime concerned with sexual morality, her work achieved the relative success which can be contributed, in some part at least, to her foreignness, and also to the fact, that the translators of her work into Spanish may have based their work on versions of the texts that had already been censored elsewhere.

Nuria Fernandez Queasada's essay "Under the Aegis of the Lord Chamberlain and the Franco Regime: The Bowdlerisation of *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*" is a comparative analysis of the official reception of Beckett's work in Spain and in the United Kingdom. Experimental theatre like Beckett's was relegated to theatre clubs and university theatres in both places. She also emphasizes the publishers' failure or inability to negotiate with censors. Fernandez Queasada also comments on the long term effects of censorship, particularly in Spain.

The publishing of the study of censorship is certainly a timely one since Europe is exploring political and social change and the impact of earlier regimes on both the present and on our understanding of the past. These essays contain some previously unpublished material, cover a wide range of authors and analyse diverse censorship systems operating across Europe. Despite the variety of structures of censorship, the study shows that certain common practices can be seen across national borders. The conclusion can be reached about the complex nature and long-term impact of censorship.