ABSTRACT: Taking as a starting point Chesterman’s (2009) proposal for an interdiscipline of Translator Studies within a sociological scope, this article discusses the concept of translatorial self-censorship in light of the 20th-century Portuguese dictatorship. The play Gata em telhado de zinco quente, a translation of Tennessee Williams’ Cat on a hot tin roof, commissioned to Sérgio Guimarães in 1959 by impresario Vasco Morgado, provides sufficient archival material for a debate on the multiple layers of censorship in the target (con)text, with implications for translator agency.
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1. Introduction

With nearly fifty years having passed since the end of institutionalised censorship in Portugal,1 there is already a considerable body of research into translation under the Estado Novo (e.g. Cabrera, 2013; Seruya, 2018; Seruya et al., 2008). However, further quantitative and qualitative research is crucial in order to obtain a more comprehensive historiography of the phenomenon of censorship and translation in the Portuguese context. Such studies will also provide a better understanding of the individual and collective practices involved in the multiple layers of state-imposed censorship, along with other types of censorship during dictatorial regimes.

At the height of the longest Western European dictatorship of the 20th century, censorship was fundamental to the modus operandi of artistic creation. As authors, playwrights and other artists had increasingly limited conceptual tools at their disposal with which to exercise their craft, translation was a means to an end: to keep cultural production alive. Hence, the translation of foreign plays became one of the most important ways of renewing the Portuguese theatrical repertoire.

According to Luiz Francisco Rebello (2000, p. 494), the compulsory censorship impeded the production of many theatrical works, whether national, international or from different historical periods. Hence, translatorial self-censorship was a way of escaping the “blue pencil”2 and the political repercussions attached to it. The written word may have posed a threat to the regime, but the performed word arguably brought even greater risks and fears of reprisal.

---

1 Legally instituted in the 1933 Portuguese Constitution, it was abrogated in 1974 with the Carnation Revolution.

2 Lápis azul [“blue pencil”] became the iconic symbol of censorship in Portugal in the 20th century. Censors struck out texts considered unsuitable for national audiences, namely those with content that would go against the core values, beliefs and assumptions proclaimed by the Portuguese autocratic regime: Deus, Pátria e Família [“God, Homeland and Family”].
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Extending Francesca Billiani’s (2007, p. 4) approach, I intend here to query the “degree of paradoxically productive freedom” present in Sérgio Guimarães’ translatorial work for the Portuguese stage, and explore the extent to which he manifests agency through translatorial self-censorship within a context of institutional repression. In other words, the aim is to reach a better understanding of censorship as both a repressive and “productive” tool and to investigate “how power structures are put in place when censorship acts upon translation” (Billiani, 2007, p. 4).

According to Billiani, the relationship between the various agents in the translation process and the fluidity of censorship practices therein may be productively studied via archives, because “correspondence between (...) diverse cultural agents (...) sheds light on the process by which a certain aesthetic, ideological and cultural understanding of reality is shaped and, more importantly, shared” (2007, p. 5). In “analysing the narratives” in archives, “we can understand how a community negotiates its own identity and textuality as well as its cultural and aesthetic paradigms” (p. 5). Therefore, self-censorship can be simultaneously understood as a device that triggers not only repression but also creativity (p. 10), which in turn is affected by a person’s attitude towards the government’s regulations and norms.

In this regard, over the past decade, valuable documented files have been examined by translation studies scholars who have contributed towards an archaeology of translation and censorship in Portugal (e.g. Cabrera 2013; Seruya et al. 2008; Seruya, 2018). As we have seen, compulsory censorship affected all areas of intellectual production under Salazar’s regime, including the visual and performing arts.

Tennessee Williams’ 1955 play Cat on a hot tin roof (Williams, [1955] 2009), translated by Sérgio Guimarães as Gata em telhado de zinco quente (Williams, [1955] 1959) in response to a commission from Vasco Morgado’s Monumental Theatre, is a paradigmatic example of a translated play censored by Salazar’s regime. Focusing on the translator’s craft, this article raises questions about the phenomenon of censorship and self-censorship that shaped the play and its circulation in the late 1950s, in light of the sociopolitical background in Portugal.

The article begins by briefly describing the genealogy of Salazar’s censorship mechanism in accordance with legislation. The next section is subdivided into three parts. The first introduces the translator, Sérgio Guimarães, while the second provides archival information that has greatly contributed to our understanding of the translator’s profile, raising questions about the degree of agency he enjoyed in the translation process. Finally, in the third part, examples are given of textual excerpts that illustrate the translator’s subordination to the values of the regime and his attempts to rework Tennessee Williams for the Portuguese stage.

2. The Inspectorate-General for Theatres and theatre censorship in 1950s Portugal

McCarthyism, the body of political and social repression which shaped cultural production in the United States between 1950 and 1957, considerably influenced the work of writers
Like Tennessee Williams. *Cat on a hot tin roof*, in its page, stage and cinema versions, did not escape this dictatorial mechanism. At a time when not only communists but also homosexuals, like the author himself, were prosecuted and imprisoned by the government, the playwright was constrained in his depiction of Brick’s sexual orientation.

The translation of this work circulating in the Portuguese context also underwent similar processes. It was subject not only to the state-imposed control of literary production and the performing arts, but also to a process of self-censorship by the translator. This article aims to shed light on the intricate relationship between the two.

Censorship in Portugal started after the coup of 28 May 1926 that installed the dictatorial regime. Formally established on 6 May 1927, it entirely changed theatrical life in order to prevent “the perversion of public opinion” and “offences against the law, morals and good customs” (Santos, 2002, p. 196):³

Although censorship did not always have well-established rules – relying on the mood of the censors – it became normal, from then on, to shred texts, veto authors, and forbid theatre plays on the opening night, even when they had been previously approved. It was a disgusting thing, which never slowed down, damaging theatrical life so deeply that even today, after so many years of freedom, it is difficult to have a clear idea of its true dimension. Authors and companies started to watch themselves, undergoing self-censorship, an attitude that takes decades to cleanse from the spirit. Although freedom was restored in 1974, it is hard to think about theatre after this time and until the end of the century, without considering such conditions.

Following the fall of the First Republic, the Inspectorate-General for Theatres was created on 6 May 1927 with the publication of Decree-Law no. 13,564, overseen by the Ministry of Public Education (Ministério de Instrução Pública). The aim was to define rules that would govern the operations of entertainment companies, ensuring the “interests of artists, authors and translators” and other theatre-related professionals (Cabrera, 2013, p. 19). On 25 September 1933, the Secretariat for National Propaganda was created, though it was extinguished in 1944 and integrated into the National Secretariat for Information, Popular Culture and Tourism. In the following year – marked by the end of World War II – the Censorship Board (Comissão de Censura) was created, focusing particularly on cinema and theatre.

The Censorship Board had a number of functions: to issue professional licenses to artists; to inspect national companies, verifying compliance with obligations to artists and property rights; to apply fines; to authorise shows and punish any offenses against the law, morals and good customs (Cabrera, 2013, p. 20). Data available at the National Archives of Torre do Tombo (Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo – ANTT) show that plays could be (1) approved, (2) approved with cuts or (3) rejected, in which case they would be banned

---
³ All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.
from performance throughout the whole of Portugal (mainland and islands). Some, however, might be reassessed later in the wake of political changes.\(^4\)

Considering the typology of censorship established by Assis Rosa (2009, p. 127),\(^5\) data show that texts were subject to prior censorship and \textit{a posteriori} repressive censorship. In addition to these two phases, theatre plays would have to undergo an intermediate stage, which occurred at the dress rehearsal. The report issued by the Inspectorate-General for Theatres monitoring services about the work analysed here presents data on the genre, title, number of acts, names of author and translator, date and starting time of dress rehearsals, name of intervening censors, and classification obtained in accordance with the age of approved audiences. The first sheet also presents the names of the cast and other professionals involved in the production, such as the director, while the second remarks on the costumes and scenery, rehearsals’ closing time and expected date of the first performance. Some more or less restrictive comments made by the censors are also given. In brief, all this information was required for the compulsory censorship process, and the document had to be signed by the Board’s chief inspector (Lopes, 2014, p. 16).

When a play was approved, a document would be issued that enabled its performance throughout Portuguese territory. In addition to basic descriptive information (i.e. the play’s title and genre, number of acts and names of author and translator), the document also contained a registration number and a classification according to the age of the audience allowed to attend (Lopes, 2014, p. 16).

Censorship processes were formalised through correspondence between the impresario and the chief inspector of the Censorship Board. Letters addressed to the Inspectorate-General for Theatres indicate that the first request involved announcing that the play was ready to be censored. Before the response was received from the National Secretariat for Information, the translations were delivered and examined, and then artistic directors had to “invite” the censors to the rehearsal. This process will be further discussed in the second part of this article in connection with Sérgio Guimarães’ translation of \textit{Cat on a hot tin roof}.

\subsection*{2.1 Sérgio Guimarães: the translator and his craft}

In the introduction to his article “The Name and Nature of Translator Studies”, Andrew Chesterman (2009, pp. 13-14) states that “all research on (human) translations must surely at least imply that there are indeed translators behind the translations, people behind the texts”. The sociological framework within which such studies would take place covers, he says, “such issues as the status of (different kinds of) translators in different cultures, rates

\(^4\) A good example is \textit{Chá e Simpatia}, translated by Sérgio Guimarães in 1964, which was re-evaluated in 1970. Although no specific reasons are provided in the process regarding the play, this decision could have been made in the aftermath of Salazar’s death.

\(^5\) Assis Rosa (2009) establishes five different types of censorship in the Portuguese context: 1) prior censorship/\textit{a priori}/preventive system vs repressive censorship/\textit{a posteriori}/repressive system; 2) transitory censorship, regime censorship, censorship in war time, the gag-law (\textit{Lei da Rolha}); 3) selective censorship; 4) debugging (\textit{depuração}); 5) \textit{stricto sensu} censorship vs internal censorship/self-censorship.
of pay, working conditions, role models and the translator’s *habitus*, professional organisations, accreditation systems, translators’ networks, copyright, and so on” (p. 16). He also suggests that the term *telos* could be used to refer to the personal motivation of translators, and that it could comprise both the general motivations (*teloi*) for working in the field and the reasons for translating a specific text (p. 17).

In the context of censorship, Chesterman’s line of thought has been complemented with considerations derived from Bourdieu’s sociological framework, since “to understand fully how censorship operates, one needs to take into consideration its relationship with the habitus of the field in which it circulates” (Bourdieu, cited in Billiani, 2007, p. 6).

(...) it follows that structural censorship occurs in the field within which a text circulates and is determined by the habitus of the agents belonging to that field. In this respect, censorship has to be seen not as an institutional set of rules, or even as an overtly repressive means of controlling public opinion and discourses: rather as a set of unwritten rules, shaped both by the current habitus and by the symbolic capital a text enjoys in a certain field. (Bourdieu, cited in Billiani, 2007, p. 6)

As we shall see, in the case of the 1959 Portuguese translation of *Cat on a hot tin roof*, the translator is himself a central agent in the censorship process, having internalised the rules and values circulating within his habitus.

Sérgio Guimarães’ profile is marked by two crucial factors: versatility and professional instability. He was also clearly a jack of all trades, having worked as a photographer, costume and set designer, actor, publisher, secretary and illustrator, as well as a translator. This suggests that his working conditions will have been very unstable throughout most of his life.

There are three different entries for him in the database of the Centre for Theatre Studies in Lisbon (CETbase, 2020): one as a translator, one as an actor (he played the character of Bernard in Arthur Miller’s *Death of a salesman*, translated into Portuguese as *Morte dum caixeiro viajante*) and a third that corresponds to *Death of a salesman*, the theatre play itself, translated by José Cardoso Pires and Victor Palla. We also know that he worked as a secretary to impresario Vasco Morgado for five years (1959-1964), during which time he translated the theatre plays shown in Table 1.

---

6 Entry number 7812 (CETbase, 2020).
7 Entry number 11911 (CETbase, 2020).
8 Entry number 1483 (CETbase, 2020). This play was performed by Porto’s Teatro Experimental on 16 November 1954 (Lopes, 2014, p. 64) and, according to this entry, a new performance was staged on 28 March 1958.
9 According to Pedro Marques (2018), a bionote to this effect was found in the National Archives of Torre do Tombo.
10 This list comprises plays translated between 1959 and 1964. The last play, *Tea and sympathy*, was revised in 1970. Although the listed plays were originally written in different languages (English, French, Spanish and German), Guimarães was fluent only in French and had reasonable knowledge of English, according to António Ferra (2009). According to the blogger, this means that if Guimarães translated Marx Frish, it could not have been from the German source text. As for the play by Jorge Llopis in Castilian, despite the language’s proximity to Portuguese, we do not know for sure whether Guimarães’ translation was the result of an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Portuguese title</th>
<th>Date of translation</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat on a hot tin roof</td>
<td>Tennessee Williams</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Gata em telhado de zinco quente</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Drama in three acts by Tennessee Williams, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, approved with cuts, to be staged by impresario Vasco Morgado</td>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double image</td>
<td>Roger MacDougall (written in collaboration with Ted Allan, with plot by Roy Vickers)</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Eu não sou eu</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Comedy in two acts by Roger MacDougall and Ted Allan, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, approved with cuts, to be performed at the Teatro Monumental</td>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The million pound note</td>
<td>Max Régnier</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Milionários sem vintém</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Comedy in a prologue and two acts by Max Régnier, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, forbidden by the Censorship Commission, to be staged at the Teatro Monumental</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mousetrap</td>
<td>Agatha Christie</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>A ratoeira</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Play in two acts by Agatha Christie, approved with cuts, to be staged at the Teatro Monumental</td>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie’s aunt</td>
<td>Based on the farce written by Brandon Thomas</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>A tia de Charley</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Comedy in two acts by George Abbott, translated and adapted by Sérgio Guimarães, approved with cuts, to be performed at the</td>
<td>EN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indirect translation through English or French, since these were the two languages he mastered (Lopes, 2014, p. 66).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>La tentación de va de compras</em></td>
<td>Jorge Llopis</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td><em>O diabo é um anjinho</em></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Comedy in three acts by Jorge Llopis, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, approved with cuts, to be performed at the Teatro Monumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Die Grosse Wut des Philipp Hotz</em></td>
<td>Max Frish</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td><em>A grande raiva de Filipe Hotz</em></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Comedy in one act by Max Frish, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, to be performed at the Teatro Monumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>L’Apollo de Bellac</em></td>
<td>Jean Giradoux</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td><em>O Apolo de Bellac</em></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Comedy in one act by Jean Giradoux, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, to be performed at the Teatro Monumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The marriage go-round</em></td>
<td>Leslie Stevens</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td><em>Lições de matrimónio</em></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Play in two acts by Leslie Stevens, translated by Sérgio Guimarães, approved with cuts, to be performed at the Teatro Variedades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Plays translated by Sérgio Guimarães (adapted from Lopes, 2014, pp. xli-xliv).
According to Marques (2018), Guimarães was born in 1933 in Porto, where he attended Manuel II High School. He had acquaintances in the world of arts and knew writer Luís Pacheco, with whom he collaborated in book publications (Ferra, 2009). According to the same source, he lived in Paris for a while during the 1960s and worked for Elle magazine, having attended Fernand Léger’s atelier. He illustrated the book Morse de sangue by João Apolinário, published in Porto in 1955.

Ferra (2009) also mentions a poster created for the Carnation Revolution in Portugal from a photograph by Sérgio Guimarães, distributed by the publisher Avante. The photograph depicts a child apparently placing a red carnation inside the barrel of a G3. Charged with a powerful symbolic anti-Fascist meaning, the image became widely popular, which meant that Guimarães was required to give a number of interviews to international newspapers and magazines, although, as emphasised by the author in his bionote, the poster was easily disregarded by the Portuguese media.

Guimarães worked as a professional photographer in the field of advertising but did not limit himself to this activity. As a photographer, he published books with titles such as As paredes na revolução (“The walls in the revolution”), Diário de uma revolução (“Diary of a revolution”) and O 25 de Abril visto por crianças (“The 25th of April seen by children”). Hence, it is not a surprise to learn that he was a proud member of the Portuguese Communist Party, as Ferra confirmed via e-mail. After his advertisement contract work ended, Guimarães became a publisher of erotic literature, producing titles such as Os prazeres do sexo and História de O (Portuguese translations of Alex Comfort’s The joy of sex and Pauline Réage’s Histoire d’O, respectively). Regrettably, this business ended up going bankrupt (Marques, 2018).

Given these circumstances of Guimarães’ life, it becomes even more important to ask: how does Gata em telhado de zinco quente comply with the more conservative or subversive forces circulating at the time of its performance in Portugal in 1959? To what extent does creativity thrive on translatorial censorship? What do we learn about the role and status of Guimarães from his translations? And most of all, how does the translator’s agency gain shape in the circulation of a text coming from the politically repressed United States of America to a peripheral southern European autocratic country?

2.2 Cat on a hot tin roof: transitioning to the Portuguese stage

Tennessee Williams was not at all a stranger to European audiences. Not only had his work circulated widely across post-war Europe through decades of cinematographic adaptations, he had himself lived in Europe for a while, particularly in Rome, Paris and Barcelona. As John Bak (2014, p. 7) puts it, Williams was able to challenge European audiences regarding censored topics revolving around sexuality, particularly in countries affected by different degrees of totalitarianism: “to a certain extent, Europe helped Williams out of the theatre’s closet, with plays like Camino Real, Cat on a Hot Tin Roof and Suddenly Last Summer bearing traces of his European experiences in their more earnest treatment of homosexuality than did his plays of the previous decade”.

35
With regard to Williams’ position in his homeland, Mizejewski (1992, p. 90) states:

the “censorship” of Broadway productions tended to be internal and closely attuned to a general sense of public morality. The representation of promiscuity was usually limited to melodramatic suffering (Tennessee Williams) or eventual accommodation into domesticity and romance.

Hence, authorial intent and censorship went hand in hand as far as Williams’ work is concerned. Regarding the Portuguese translations, as detailed below, the situation was no different.

Richard Brooks’ film *Cat on a hot tin roof* premiered in Portuguese cinemas in 1958, when the practice of cutting scenes and omitting subtitles was an institutionalised way of dealing with subversive content such as sex, divorce and adultery. Williams’ plays were also staged worldwide, and there is no doubt they caused great cultural impact amongst European audiences.

As far as the reception of Williams’ works in Portugal is concerned, a survey of the records at the ANTT identifies the translators, titles, and dates of his works translated into Portuguese during this period: (i) R. Magalhães Júnior, *A rosa tatuada (The rose tattoo)*, 1956-1957; (ii) Edurisa Filho, *A descida de Orfeu (Orpheus descent)*, 1969; (iii) Idalina S. N. Pinto Amaro, *A noite da iguana (The night of the iguana)*, 1966; (iv) Costa Ferreira, *Fumo de verão (Summer and smoke)*, 1965; (v) Luís de Ssau Monteiro, *Fumo de verão (Summer and smoke)*, 1966; (vi) Rui Guedes da Silva, *Bruscamente no verão passado (Suddenly last summer)*, 1965; (vii) Correia Alves, *O jardim zoológico de vidro (The glass menagerie)*, 1957 and 1959; (viii) Correia Alves, *uma carta de amor de Lord Byron (Lord Byron’s love letter)*, 1962; (ix) Luiz Francisco Rebello, *Saudades de Berta (Hello from Bertha)*, 1961; (x) António Quadros, *Um eléctrico chamado desejo (A streetcar named Desire)*, 1963. Apart from Guimarães, who is central to this research, a translation into French was also archived at the ANTT, entitled (xi) *Le doux oiseau de la jeunesse (The sweet bird of youth)*, translated in 1972 by Françoise Sagan. In total, four plays were rejected, and those that were approved underwent severe adjustments.

As far as the archival material is concerned, sorting and identifying all the steps taken during the translation censorship process was a challenging task, but revealed further information about translatorial self-censorship. Multiple dates were identified, and numerous decisions were taken regarding different parts of the text. It appears that the censors met regularly before and after the play’s premiere in Lisbon on 16 October 1959. Their reports indicate that most of the negotiations took place over the months of July, August and October 1959. On 28 July the play was officially registered and signed by the president of the Censorship Board. The initial decision to cut parts of the text was agreed upon and signed on 3 August. Four days later, the play’s permit was issued by the Shows Committee and the translation was handed to the censors for official authorisation. The

---

11 Theatre scholar Eugénia Vasques (2007) also conducted a survey on the reception of Tennessee Williams during Estado Novo. Her findings have been incorporated into my own list.
following day the permit was signed by the president of the Censorship Board once again, noting that no official receipt had been submitted for the translation costs (Lopes, 2014, pp. 41-42). This absence of receipts precludes further speculation about Guimarães’ terms of employment as a translator. The fact that he worked as secretary for Vasco Morgado suggests that translating was one of the many tasks he was given to perform on a regular basis.

Throughout the months of August and October, decisions were made nearly every week. Gata em telhado de zinco quente was registered on 28 July 1959. On 3 August, the Censorship Board signed a document confirming that some parts of the text should be removed. Four days later, on 7 August, the play’s license was issued and the translation was handed to the Board to be censored. The next day (8 August), the Board’s chairman signed a note informing that the translation had been received. New textual cuts were made on 1 October, and on 2 October the play was approved by the Shows Committee. On 10 October, Vasco Morgado sent a letter to the Board confirming that the performance was ready to be censored, and on 13 October he invited the Board to censor the performance. The dress rehearsal took place on 14 October. On 15 October, a report was signed with remarks made by the Board and the play premiered on 16 October. On 28 October, new cuts were made to the text while subsequent performances took place. Finally, on 29 October Vasco Morgado was informed by the Board that further cuts were to be imposed and that selected dialogues were also rejected, namely from pages 33, 104 and 117.

2.3 Translatorial self-censorship

According to Maria Tymoczko (cited in Woods, 2012, p. 4), the translator is permeable to existing external constraints, internalising dominant codes and ideologies due either to pre-existing subject positions or to a perception that such acceptance can bring benefits. With regard to this particular translator’s experience and motivations, I would like to draw attention to two distinct points in Guimarães’ translation of Cat on a hot tin roof, which show how he, too, had internalised the dominant values of the regime.

The first is part of a scene in Act 1 in which Brick has a conversation with his wife Margaret about an alleged friendship between himself and Skipper. After realising that her husband had started showing symptoms of depression and anxiety shortly after his best friend committed suicide, Margaret recalls a day when the two of them had gone out in a foursome with their respective girlfriends (Margaret with Brick and Gladys Fitzgerald with Skipper). Margaret implies that the meeting meant a great deal to Skipper and Brick, since they clearly had an unusual bond that went beyond the standard definition of friendship in the heteronormative society of 1950s Mississippi. However, under the circumstances in which the play was being translated, the suggestion of a potential homosexual relationship between Skipper and Brick was a taboo subject that would surely be deemed as “perverting” the public opinion. Hence, in the translation, the reference to making a good public impression disappears, potentially leaving out any sense of ambiguity.
EN: Margaret: (...) it was like a date between you and Skipper. Gladys and I were just sort of tagging along as if it was necessary to chaperone you – to make a good public impression. (Williams, [1955] 2009, p. 26)

PT: Margaret: (...) foi mais como que um encontro entre ti e Skipper. Gladys e eu éramos apenas as vossas damas de companhia. (Williams, [1955] 1959, p. 33)

Back Translation: Margaret: (...) it was like a meeting between you and Skipper. Gladys and I were only there as your ladies-in-waiting.

The use of “damas de companhia” in the Portuguese translation to render “chaperone” can open new interpretative possibilities, since the term can also mean “lady-in-waiting” or “lady companion”. The last two options tone down the existing sexual connotation in the source text. This indicates that Guimarães had already exerted some degree of censorship even before the translation was examined by the Board. The same thing happens with other problematic episodes.

The second excerpt corresponds to dialogues at the end of Act 2. Mr Pollitt (Big Daddy) and Brick, his son, have a heated conversation about the fact that Brick has no heirs and has been in the grip of a depression since losing his best friend Skipper. Brick has also had an accident and broken his leg, leading him to abandon his sports career:

EN: Big Daddy: All I ask of that woman is that she leave me alone. But she can’t admit to herself that she makes me sick. That comes of having slept with her too many years. (Williams, [1955] 2009, p. 51)

PT: Pai: Tudo o que eu peço àquela mulher é que me deixe sozinho! Mas ela não admite que me enjoa. Saturei-me dela. Foram anos demais. (Williams, [1955] 1959, p. 60)

Back Translation: Father: All I ask of that woman is that she leave me alone. But she can’t admit she makes me sick. I’m tired of her. It’s been too many years.

As mentioned by Seruya and Moniz (2008, p. 3), in the Portuguese censorship context, any ideology that went directly against Christian morality (such as criticisms of marriage or themes of homosexuality, adultery or divorce) would inevitably lead to a rejection of literary content on both page and stage. In this case, the source text allusion to Big Daddy and Big Mama’s sexual life has been omitted in the Portuguese version.

Big Daddy is often blunt and sarcastic, especially when the subject matter is sex. In his opinion, the sexual investment of a lifetime with his wife was a complete waste of resources. In the next excerpt, we can see that the depreciative expression “old woman” was replaced by the noun “wife” in translation. Similarly, his unashamed boasts about his sexual prowess have been completely omitted.

EN: Big Daddy: Should have quit much sooner but that old woman she never got enough of it – and I was good in bed (...) I never should have wasted so much of it on her. (Williams, [1955] 2009, p. 51)
PT: Pai: Um homem, no que respeita a sua própria mulher, deve retirar-se a tempo, percebes? Se não, fica saturado. Ela era uma fera insaciável e eu deixei-me ir atrás disso. Gastei demasiado, sabes? (Williams, [1955] 1959, p. 60)

**Back Translation:** Father: As far as his own wife is concerned, a man should back off in time, do you understand? If not, he gets saturated. She was an insatiable beast and I fell for it. I've wasted too much, you know?

There is also a change of tone in Big Daddy’s speech in the Portuguese translation. Emphasis is put on the role of a man within the marital bond in relation to the woman, suggesting that the male is the one who should always take the lead, knowing when to act and what to do in order to keep his integrity and things running smoothly within the household. Bearing in mind that this is a conversation between a father and his son, who is also going through marital trouble himself, this piece of advice goes against the morality praised by the Portuguese government.

Finding out that his cancer diagnosis was wrong and that he would no longer die of illness, Big Daddy makes clear his wish to have sex with another woman. Therefore, his plan is to find a mistress and give into temptation and carnal pleasure. Unlike the previous scene from page 33, which had been completely eliminated by the censors, this scene is modified by the translator, who simply suggests physical fatigue as a potential consequence of aging, rather than refer to the character’s sexual impulses or his desire to find a mistress, both of which had been present in the source text.

**EN:** Big Daddy: Well I got a few left in me, a few, and I’m going to pick me a good one to spend’em on! I’m going to pick me a choice one. (Williams, [1955] 2009, p. 51)

**PT:** Pai: Mas julgas que fiquei definitivamente gasto? Estás muito enganado. Ainda tenho muito de sobra, muito, garanto-te. (Williams, [1955] 1959, p. 60)

**Back Translation:** Do you think I was definitely worn out? You’re very wrong. I still have a lot left, I assure you.

These excerpts provide strong evidence that the translator changed the content of Williams’ play to circumvent the Portuguese institutional censorship at the time. However, despite this, parts of the script were still considered inappropriate for theatre audiences, and a speech from the end of Act 2 was removed by the censors, as shown in Figure 1.
With this speech from page 60 removed, the play managed to make an appearance on 28 October 1959. However, the censors were still dissatisfied, and the work was withdrawn for further alterations. Some “immoral” material found on page 33 of the script was also eliminated, severely altering the content of Williams’ original play (Figure 2).
Thus, we can observe the intricate oscillation between self-censorship and institutional censorship that went hand in hand in the translation and staging of Williams’ plays.
3. Concluding remarks
In his translations, Sérgio Guimarães shows that he was fully aware of the political, social and aesthetic values of the regime, and would often anticipate them. Indeed, his first version of Gata em telhado de zinco quente was actually approved by the censors. Only after the premiere were entire scenes removed, suggesting that elements of the staging and performance might have contributed to the censors’ decision.

In the process of translating this play, Guimarães was left with no other choice than to use self-censorship and his own creativity. Institutional decisions were not always clear and minds could change overnight, representing more obstacles for all the agents involved in the performance on and off stage. Hence, as we have seen, the process of representing the cultural other became, more than anything else, a virtual confrontation with the repressive official mechanism.

In the correspondence between the Censorship Board and the impresario Vasco Morgado, the translator is largely invisible, indicating that he held little cultural capital in the censorship process. However, Guimarães clearly used self-censorship to comply with the requirements of the system. After all, it was in his best interest to produce material that could be approved and staged, since this would translate into more revenue for the company he worked with.

Guimarães seems to have taken ownership of his text to a certain degree by proposing feasible alternatives that met the criteria prescribed by the censors and sustained the core values endorsed by the Portuguese government. This meant that the lines were often blurred in terms of decision-making. Although he was unable to fully convey the source text, in the end he managed to manifest his own agency by choosing what to say on page and by allowing others (the actors) to say it on stage. Hence, this case study shows how the translator would employ self-censorship in order to make potentially risqué content acceptable in a theatre context under the Portuguese dictatorial regime.
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