

MEASURING CENSORSHIP?: DETERMINING THE LEVEL OF “CENSOREDNESS” OF FILMS SUBTITLED DURING THE DICTATORSHIP IN PORTUGAL

Katrin Pieper*

University of Coimbra

ABSTRACT: During the Portuguese Estado Novo (1933-1974), many films were banned and others mutilated by the cutting of scenes and suppression and manipulation of subtitles. What reached the audience, in many cases, was a cleansed version of the original. A quick look into censorship documents shows how many cuts a film might have suffered. Suppressed subtitles are also relatively easy to detect. Yet, to get a complete picture, one has to take a deeper look at the subtitles, comparing them with the original spoken dialogues to detect ideological manipulations on the linguistic level. But how can one tell if a film was heavily or slightly censored? Is “censoredness” comparable? This article sets out to find an answer to the question of whether these measures are objectively describable and structurable, and if so, how the level of “censoredness” of subtitled films can be determined, with a view to allowing a larger-scale comparison of films.

KEYWORDS: Estado Novo, Film Censorship, Subtitling, Manipulation

1. Introduction

During the dictatorship in Portugal, from 1933 until the Carnation Revolution in 1974, when the state sought to control and influence all kinds of cultural production, all foreign films had to pass censorship. The aim was to keep people’s minds free of subversive thoughts from abroad, preserve values like obedience, patriotism, conservatism and faith, and thus secure “paz social” [“social peace”] (Silva, 2013, p. 185) in the country. In charge of this defence of the state’s ideology was the Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional – SPN [National Propaganda Office], renamed the Secretariado Nacional da Informação, Cultura Popular e Turismo – SNI [National Information, Popular Culture and Tourism Office] in 1945, before being transformed into the Secretaria de Estado da Informação e Turismo – SEIT [State Information and Tourism Office] in 1968, with Marcello Caetano’s political “spring” (Pieper, 2018, pp. 157, 162; Reis Torgal, 2000).

Many films were not even imported into Portugal, since film distributors often deemed it not worth their while trying to go through the censorship process. In cases of doubt, however, they could submit a film for *censura prévia* [“pre-censorship”]. If a film was banned at this stage, the film would be sent back, and the import taxes would be saved. Even if the distributors had concerns that a film might be rejected, they might risk submitting it directly for regular censorship, making cuts beforehand in order to make it more acceptable. There was also the option to submit it again at a later time.

* kpp.pieper@gmail.com

For the regular censorship session, a list of subtitles had to be presented on paper; indeed, in most cases, the subtitles were only added to the footage after they had been formally approved. Here another aspect comes into play, which could influence the censor’s assessment: the use of “safe” vocabulary, an act of self-censorship. Once in the censors’ hands, images and subtitles were always scrutinised by at least two inspectors of the censorship board, a procedure that could be repeated several times if there was disagreement. After reaching a consensus, the censors would write a report giving their final decision: *aprovado sem cortes* [“approved without cuts”], *aprovado com cortes* [“approved with cuts”] or *reprovado* [“rejected”]. When a film was approved, the distributors would then carry out the orders to cut scenes, and suppress or rewrite subtitles, and after a final check by the censors the film could be released (António, 2001, pp. 31-37; Pieper, 2018, pp. 157-159).

Although censorship reacted to certain historical events,¹ over the decades, it can be generally noted that the two most censored issues were eroticism (or moral issues, in a wider sense) and violence. But the questioning of hierarchies and the political order or of traditional and religious values would also be targeted by the censors’ “blue pencil”² (António, 2001, pp. 56-71; Morais, 2017, p. 15).

Today, the censorship documents are archived in the Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo – ANTT [Portuguese National Archive], in Lisbon. These documents include correspondence between distributors and the censorship board, censors’ reports and also lists of subtitles, which were often marked with comments by the censors, as they viewed the films with the lists in their hands. The ANTT provides information about the archived documents in the form of a spreadsheet, which contains the film’s original and Portuguese title, country of origin, genre, year(s) of the censorship process, and the censors’ decision (i.e. if the film was rejected or approved, with or without cuts, and, in some cases, if the film had been rejected before).

This article analyses the censorship processes undergone by two German films, one comedy and one crime film, both produced in the mid-1960s. Both were submitted for pre-censorship and initially rejected, though some years later, in the more relaxed climate of the Caetano regime, they were approved. A closer look into the documents reveals more details about the censorship process, but only a comparison of the subtitles with the original films allows judgements to be made about the extent to which censorship took effect. The objective of this study is to create and apply a system of analysis to determine if the censorship of subtitled films is comparable and thus “measurable”. In what follows,

¹ For example, after the beginning of the colonial war, films with pacifistic tendencies were more likely banned (António, 2001, p. 57; Pieper, 2018, pp. 159-164).

² Although the censors also used red or green pencils, the *lápiz azul* [“blue pencil”] is known as a synonym for censorship during the Estado Novo.

two films will be used to test the analysis system and to find out if it might also be applicable to a larger number of films.

2. Two films courting disapproval

Frühstück im Doppelbett with the Portuguese title *Pequeno almoço em cama de casal* [English title: *Breakfast in bed*], directed by Axel von Ambesser (1963), is a German post-war version of a screwball comedy. After their wedding, the newspaper publisher Henry Clausen increasingly neglects his beautiful young wife Liane, and the “breakfast in bed” soon does not take place anymore. The disappointed young woman starts a flirt with yoga teacher Victor, who lives in the apartment below the couple’s. When Henry also acquires a lover, a young author called Claudia, to make Liane jealous, the marriage seems to exist only on paper. But after the divorce, Henry and Liane discover that they actually love each other, and that it was marriage that had turned their relationship less passionate. They re-bond happily, while Claudia and Victor discover each other (Pidax film, 2014). Even though the spouses get back together again, we might expect their sexual immorality to have been a thorn in the side of the censors. Apart from that, the title suggests that parts of the film might take place in bed and feature sleepwear and nudity, which could also have been a reason for the negative assessment.

The second film, *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*, launched in Portugal under the title *O monstro da cidade de Londres* [English title: *The monster of London City*], was directed by Edwin Zbonek in 1964, and is one of a series of successful German pseudo-British film adaptations of Edgar Wallace crime novels. In the narrative, actor Richard Sand plays the infamous woman killer “Jack the Ripper” on the stage of London’s Edgar Allen Poe Theatre. When one night a prostitute is murdered in town, the historical sexual murderer seems to have been resurrected, and so not only Scotland Yard Inspector Dorne and his colleagues, but also two private detectives, decide to take a closer look at the actor and other suspects in the theatre milieu (Universum Film, 2009). Since the story features prostitutes and a cruel sexual killer, eroticism may once again have been the reason for the film’s failing to win the approval of the Portuguese censors, though the scenes of murder and crime could also have provided the impulse for its banning.

In short, these two films offer typical examples of the most frequently censored issues: sexuality and violence. The question is, which one suffered more censorship.

3. A look into the censorship documents

The distributor Doperfilme submitted *Frühstück im Doppelbett* for pre-censorship on 28 January 1964, and in this phase, it was viewed by four groups of censors. One censor from the first group wrote on 21 February 1964:³

A “coexistência pacífica” do casal com os respectivos amantes, é levada neste filme, em nosso entender, longe de mais, e uma grande parte do diálogo é desnecessariamente atrevido. Votamos pela não importação do filme. (SNI-IE-ECF,⁴ 1964)

[The couple’s “peaceful coexistence” with their respective lovers is, in our opinion, taken too far in this film, and much of the dialogue is unnecessarily bold. We vote not to import the film.]

A censor from the fourth group had another opinion and wrote on 4 March 1964:

Em meu entender o filme com alguns cortes de imagens e de diálogo, não excederá a bitola habitual [*illegible*] parecendo-me portanto que nessas condições poderia ser autorizada a sua importação. (SNI-IE-ECF, 1964)

[In my opinion, the film, with some image and dialogue cuts, would not exceed the usual (*illegible*) standards, and so it seems to me that, under these conditions, it could be authorized for import.]

However, the final decision was to reject the film, which was communicated to Doperfilm on 5 March 1964. The same day, the distributor sent a letter asking for the decision to be revised, since two copies of the film had already been imported by mistake (they had not anticipated that a comedy might not be approved), and offering to make cuts if necessary. A week later, on 13 March, the answer was the same: rejected. On 1 April, Doperfilme had another try and resubmitted a cut version, reiterating that the taxes had already been paid. The distributor’s letter reads:

(...) efectuámos cortes e nova montagem no filme em referencia de forma a passar a existir sòmente um “flirt” entre a esposa do jornalista e Lex Baxter (...). (SNI-IE-ECF, 1964)

[(...) we have made some cuts and re-edited the film so that there exists only a flirt between the journalist’s wife and Lex Barker (...).]

The censorship board must have given another negative answer (the document is not preserved) because, over half a year later, on 29 January 1965, Doperfilme submitted the film once again, repeating that it would mean a complete loss of the taxes already paid if

³ The spelling has been taken from the original document and may be outdated and incorrect. The English translation is my own; this applies to all further quotations from the censorship documents.

⁴ SNI-IE-ECF stands for Secretariado Nacional da Informação, Cultura Popular e Turismo – Inspecção dos Espectáculos – Exame e Classificação de Filmes [National Information, Popular Culture and Tourism Office – Film and Theatre Inspectorate – Analysis and Classification of Films].

the film remained banned. Another three viewing sessions followed. On 14 May, one of the censors wrote:

Vi o filme. Parece-me que os cortes efectuados não melhoraram o filme e em nada ajudaram a resolver o problema no sentido de obter a aprovação. (SNI-IE-ECF, 1964)

[I have seen the film. It seems to me that the cuts made have not improved the film and have done nothing to help solve the problem in order to get approval.]

One more time, on 20 May 1965, the answer was negative. Then, four years later, when censorship was slightly more lenient under Marcello Caetano, Doperfilme submitted the film again and, on 17 March 1969, it was finally approved, on condition that two more scenes were cut. The instructions were that the cuts had to be made around subtitles 26 on page 31 and 104 on page 39.⁵ The screening license (for adults aged 17 and above) was finally issued on 8 June 1969. Interestingly, there is a note in the files indicating that the film was shown in Angola and Mozambique in 1964 and 1965. The documents also contain two different subtitle lists, as well as the censor’s complaint, in 1969, that the list of subtitles submitted on paper did not match the subtitles that actually appeared in the footage.

As for *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*, this was first submitted for pre-censorship on 19 July 1965. In one viewing session, on 2 August 1965, two censors agreed to reject the film, and another censor signed the report two days later. This was their comment:

Trata-se de um filme morbido que decorre em ambientes condenáveis e recorda factos tristes que devem ser esquecidos. Votamos pela não autorização da importação. (SNI-IE-ECF, 1965)

[It is a morbid film that takes place in condemnable environments and recalls sad facts that should be forgotten. We vote for the non-authorization of importation.]

On 5 August 1965, Doperfilme was informed of the decision. By 15 July 1966, the film seems to have already been imported, despite the negative assessment, since Doperfilme now requested permission to export it to the Portuguese colonies. This was probably denied, as the request was made again on 19 July 1967 by Talma Filmes, a company operating from the same address as Doperfilme. No response to this request is found in the documents, only a note on the cover page of the revision documents indicating that the film had been authorized for Angola. Three years later, Talma Filmes resubmitted the film for censorship, and it was approved without cuts on 1 October 1970. The censors commented that the subtitle list on paper did not correspond to the subtitles used in the film footage, so a new list was requested. On 8 February 1971, the final screening license

⁵ The censors normally used the subtitle numbering to indicate which images had to be cut.

(for adults aged 17 and over) was issued. In this case too, the files contain two subtitle lists. What does not emerge from the documents, however, is whether any cuts were made before the film was resubmitted in 1970.

As this short overview shows, the archived documents are by no means complete and the processes are not seamlessly traceable. It is clear, however, that the route of a film into Portuguese cinemas was marked by obstacles and negotiations between distributors and the censorship board. What this archival research has provided is an insight into the time the censorship process took, the “trouble” a film caused and the reasons why it was eventually altered.

Based on this information, it can be concluded that *Frühstück im Doppelbett* was indeed initially banned on the grounds of immorality/sexuality (“peaceful coexistence of the couple with their respective lovers”), while morbidity (“it is a morbid film”), and thus violence in a wider sense, was the reason for the rejection of *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*. The fact that the censorship process took longer in the case of *Frühstück im Doppelbett*, and involved the order to cut two scenes, suggests that the censor interfered more extensively with this one than with *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*. Let us see if the analysis of the subtitles will confirm this impression or not.

4. Proposal of an analysing method

Cuts were only one measure of censorship and, as described above, were usually made by the distributors or ordered by the censors. In practice, this meant that a piece of film footage (a whole scene or only a few images) was literally excised. The other two measures impacted the linguistic level: suppressions and manipulations. In the case of a suppression, the footage would remain, so the audience could see the image and hear sound of the original text, but whole subtitles or significant parts of them are missing. Suppressions could be carried out by the translator, so the translation would never reach the censor’s knowledge,⁶ or be ordered by the censors, who would usually mark or cross out the respective text in the subtitle list.

The phenomenon that Díaz Cintas (2012) calls “ideological manipulation” involved the translator intentionally deviating from the source text, so the subtitle does not match the original spoken text (only very rarely would a censor take the trouble to propose an alternative text). Compared to cuts and suppressions, manipulations are subtler and more difficult to detect, since, without knowledge of the source language, one can only suspect an act of censorship. At this point, it is important to point out that reduction (the omission of single words or short phrases that do not interfere with the sense of the statement) and compression (reformulating it in a more concise way) are usual translation techniques in

⁶ Often the note “sup” (*suprimida* = suppressed) marks that spoken text was not translated, due to problems in understanding the original or to technical issues, but also for ideological reasons.

subtitling (Díaz Cintas and Remael, 2007), given the time and space limitations. In addition, a translation might contain mistakes. Thus, when it comes to distinguishing between legitimate deviations, mistakes and manipulations, the central question is the underlying intention: variance or invariance (Schreiber, 1993). Manipulation is to be defined as intentional variance for ideological reasons (for more details see Pieper, 2018, pp. 169-174). Table 1 demonstrates the differentiation of translation, mistakes and manipulation:

	Maximum invariance in meaning of text	Variance in meaning of text
Intended invariance	Translation (reduction, compression)	Mistake
Intended variance	x	Manipulation

Table 1. Differentiation of translation, mistakes and manipulation.

In sum, three measures have to be considered in an analysis of censored films: cuts, suppressions and manipulation. But there is another important factor to be kept in mind: a censorship measure can have more or less impact on the meaning of the film. That is to say, cutting out a crucial scene, and thus altering the message of the whole film, is a far more severe intervention than merely eliminating a scene in which too much naked skin is seen. It seems appropriate, therefore, to differentiate the measures in terms of the level of impact they have in a given context. Below is a proposal for a five-step scale to assess this dimension:

- [1] Nuance:** film story unmodified
- [2] Slight:** film story slightly modified
- [3] Relevant:** film story noticeably modified
- [4] Strong:** film story strongly modified
- [5] Crucial:** the whole film’s message altered

In the following analysis, all cuts, suppressions and manipulations are attributed a score on this scale of one to five, according to the impact the alteration has on the film’s story or message.

Of course, it has to be kept in mind that this scheme is an abstract reduction of complex procedures against the background of an even more complex political system. However, this model is supposed to serve as a tool to determine the level of “censoredness” in order to compare two or more films in this respect.

5. Application

The analysis was carried out using a commercially available DVD of the uncensored film and involved comparing the spoken dialogue with the subtitle lists. Given that both censorship files contain two subtitle lists (both by the same translator, Júlio de Seabra Vicente Ribeiro),

the first step was to establish which one was actually added to the footage. As mentioned above, the censors had first viewed the films with the non-matching lists on paper, on which they marked unwanted content and wrote their comments (henceforth, this will be referred to as the *first list*). The other lists were formally and linguistically improved, so it can be assumed that it was these that finally reached the audience (the *second list*). For this reason, the second list will be analysed for alterations at the linguistic level, though both lists will be considered with regard to the censor’s comments and markings. It is beyond the scope of this article to exhaustively list all examples of alterations made, hence some examples shall serve for illustration. The examples contain the whole scene as it was marked by a censor, either in the first or the second list (the text in the examples is always taken from the second list, even if the censor marked the scene in the first list, given that the second list was the version seen by the audience). The relevant passages are highlighted in bold. Mistakes in the original subtitles have been retained.

Frühstück im Doppelbett

The translation in the first list contains many mistakes. Some of these are incongruences of image and subtitles (on 1 April 1964, the distributor mentions that the translator had worked without viewing the film), while others can be explained by a lack of language skills or difficulties in understanding German (these were often jokes based on word play, with the result that the Portuguese audience had less to laugh about, though the plot remained broadly understandable, if perhaps a little illogical in one or two places). It is striking that the first list contains many red, blue and green markings, traces of the many censors who had worked with the film. Given that the first list was not the final one, it is unclear if the marked passages were actually eliminated, and if so, whether they were cut or suppressed. They may even indicate that the censor felt the need to highlight a passage in order to make an observation without bringing further consequences. In other cases, the markings very likely relate to a cut or suppression that had been made by the distributor, indicating a difference between the subtitles on paper and on screen.

The subtitles in the second list are divided in a more logical way and conform better to the rhythm of the film. However, some of the incongruences present in the first list persist in the second (such as most of the comprehension mistakes). The second subtitle list contains only four markings by the censors, two referring to the cuts demanded in the censorship report (subtitle 26 on page 31 and subtitle 104 on page 39), and one indicating that a cut had been executed: “cortado” [“cut”]. It can be assumed that these scenes were definitely excised.

This means that all four markings in the second list refer to cuts that were definitely executed, whereas the reasons for and consequences of the markings in the first list cannot

be clearly identified. Taking this into consideration, the alterations that ultimately found their way into the final version have been divided into three groups, as follows:

A: Definite alterations: proved by censors’ comments in the subtitle lists, explicit information in the censorship documents (mostly cuts) or by comparing the subtitle list with the original film (manipulation, suppressions).

B: Very probable alterations: executed with a very high degree of probability, through being marked in the subtitle list, sustained by general information in the censorship documents or other fonts.

C: Probable alterations: marked in the subtitle list and/or assumed to have been implemented, given the context and subject matter (such as sexuality, immorality, violence, etc.), yet with no explicit censors’ comment to indicate what was actually done with the respective scene.

Group A:

In the film *Frühstück im Doppelbett*, all definite alterations concern cuts or manipulations (no suppressions). An example for a cut is the scene of Liane and Victor’s first kiss, which was marked by a censor and commented “falta imagem” [“image missing”]:

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, elevator, L+V close to each other.	V lights Liane’s cigarette.	V: Oh, darf ich? [Oh, may I?]		00:35:21
		L: Immer zur rechten Zeit. Ist das ein Zufall, oder wussten Sie, dass ich komme? [Always at the right time. Is this a coincidence, or did you know that I come]	16_138: Sempre a tempo! Foi acaso ou sabia que vinha? [Always in time! Was it coincidence or did you know I would come?]	
		V: Ich wünschte es mir. Und wenn man sich etwas fest wünscht, dann geht es auch in Erfüllung. [I wished it, and if you wish something very strongly, then it comes true.]	16_139: Quando se deseja muito uma coisa, ela realiza-se. [If you wish for something very strongly, it happens]	(continues)
		L: Noch einen Wunsch?	16_140: Tem outro desejo?	

(continues)

		[Another wish?]	[Do you have another wish?]	
		V: Ich wünschte, der Lift bleibt stecken. [I wish the elevator would get stuck.]	16_141: Que o elevador pare. [That the elevator would stop.]	
	L presses a button, elevator stops.			
		L: Noch einen Wunsch? [Another wish?]	17_1: Outro desejo? [Another wish?]	
		V: Ich habe schon einen, aber ich traue mich nicht, ihn zu sagen. [Indeed I have one, but I don't dare say it.]	17_2: Tenho um, mas... 17_3: ...não me atrevo a dizê-lo... [I have one, but I don't dare say it.]	
	L+V come closer.	L: Dann kein Wort. [No word then.]	17_4: Então, nem uma palavra.	
		V: Nein, kein Wort. [No, no word.]	[So, not a word.]	
	L+V: kiss			

Table 2. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: example cut.

Here, the object of concern is the image: Victor and Liane come very close and kiss. It may still be possible for the Portuguese audience to understand that Liane and Victor are having an affair, even without any explicit body contact or kisses (there is nothing more explicit than kissing in the original either), so this information is relevant, but not significant. It has thus been evaluated as level [3] (*relevant*).

The second example contains a manipulation. After Henry, Liane, Victor and Claudia have discussed the state of their relationships prior to Henry and Liane's official divorce, Claudia gives Henry a goodbye kiss and leaves with the following words (C = Claudia):

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, living room.	H, L, V, C standing, say goodbye, C kisses H on mouth.	C: Aber wegen der sechs Monate Enthaltsamkeit brauche ich Bedenkzeit. [But for the six months of abstinence , I need some time to consider.]	32_48: Por causa dos seis meses... vou pensar nisso. [Because of the six months... I will think about it.]	00:35:21

Table 3. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: example manipulation.

In this case, the word *Enthaltsamkeit* (abstinence), which explicitly refers to (the lack of) sexual activity, was eliminated. Astonishingly, this was the only manipulation found in the whole film (even the housemaid’s “revolutionary” discourses about capitalism, class struggle and strikes were quite accurately translated), and it is not even a very clear case, since there may have been technical–formal reasons (lack of space and time) determining text reduction. Hence, this was awarded only one point (*nuance*).

In total, four cuts and one manipulation belong to category A:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Group A	[3]+[2]+[1]+[1]		[1]	8

Table 4. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: result group A.

Group B:

In accordance with the censor’s comment that Victor and Liane’s relationship was reduced to “only a flirt”, and given the fact that nudity, kisses and sexy poses would most likely have been censored during the Estado Novo, there is a very high probability that the scenes gathered in group B were cut. Furthermore, they are all marked in the first subtitle list, though no explicit comment or instruction to cut has been found in the documents. It includes all the kisses between Liane and Victor, some scenes in which Liane or Claudia can be seen in their underwear, and one scene, in which Claudia takes a shower and her naked silhouette reflects on the curtain.

One of the seven cuts in this category was attributed four points (*strong*), due to the complexity and impact of the scene. Liane and Victor had gone out together that night, assuming that Henry was in Moscow. In the elevator, Liane refuses a goodbye kiss. Very probably, the subsequent scene was cut and the following information got lost for the Portuguese audience:

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, night, elevator.	V+L say goodbye.	V: Also gut, aber ich werde die ganze Nacht an unserem Geheimtelefon auf deinen Anruf warten. [All right, but I'll be waiting all night on our secret phone for your call.]	18_9: Esperarei toda a noite no nosso telefone que me chames. [I'll wait all night on our secret phone that you call.]	00 :50:40
Bedroom.	H sleeps, has glasses on, an open book lies on his hip.	H snores.		
Foyer.	L enters apartment, sees no sign of H's presence.			
L and H's kitchen.	L lowers tin can at a string into the waste shaft.			
Bedroom.	H wakes up from the noise.			
V's kitchen.	Talk through the waste shaft.	V: Liane? Darling!	18_10: Liane, querida!	
		L: Hallo. [Hello.]		
		V: Oben alles ok? [Upstairs everything ok?]	18_10a: Está tudo O.K.? [Is everything ok?]	
L and H's kitchen.		L: Alles ok. Du kannst kommen. Ich warte an der Tür. [Everything ok. You can come. I'll wait by the door.]	18_11: Tudo bem, podes vir. Espero-te à porta. [Everything fine, you can come. I wait by the door.]	
Bedroom.	H listens alertly, sits up.			00:50:08
Foyer apartment.	V enters, L stands next to the door.	V: Darling!	18_12: Querida... [Darling...]	
	Kisses, hug.			

(continues)

		L: Bitte, Vic, jetzt hast du mir gute Nacht gesagt, jetzt musst du wieder gehen. Wir sind ohnehin schon zu weit gegangen. [Please, Vic, now you said good night to me, now you have to leave again. We've anyhow gone too far.]	18_13: Deste-me as boas noites, agora vai-te. 18_14: Mesmo assim, já fômos longe demais. [You said good night to me, now leave. Anyhow, we've already gone too far.]	
	V takes off L's coat.	V: Was macht das schon aus? Diese Nacht gehört uns. [What's the matter? This night is ours.]	18_15: Que tem isso? Esta noite é nossa. [What's the matter? This night is ours.]	
	Kisses, hug.			
Bedroom.	H listens, opens a box with cigarettes and a pistol, takes out pistol.	V: Darling! L moans.		
Living room.	V kisses L's neck.	L: Bitte, Victor, nicht weiter. Ich habe Angst. [Please, Victor, no further. I'm scared.]	18_16: Não continues, eu tenho medo. [Don't continue, I'm scared.]	
Bedroom.	H opens eyes widely with surprise.	V: Vor deinem Mann? [Of your husband?] L: Nein. [No.]	18_17: Do teu marido? [Of your husband?] 18_18: Não. [No.]	
Living room.		V: Hast du etwa Angst vor mir? [Are you scared of me?]	18_19: Terás medo de mim? [Are you scared of me?]	
	V kisses L on forehead.	L: Auch nicht. Ich habe Angst vor mir selbst. [Also not. I'm scared of myself.]	18_20: Também não. 18_21: Eu... tenho medo de mim. [I... I'm afraid of myself.]	

(continues)

		V: Und warum? [And why?]	18_22: Porquê? [Why?]	
	L sits on sofa back, V kisses her neck.	L: Frag nicht. Du bist der Mann. Ich möchte mit gutem Gewissen sagen können, dass ich nichts dagegen tun konnte. [Don't ask. You are the man. I want to be able to say in good conscience that I couldn't do anything about it.]	18_23: Não perguntas, tu és o homem... 18_24: Eu quereria ter a consciência de não ter podido resistir... [Don't ask, you are the man. I wanted to have the conscience that I couldn't do resist.]	
	Kiss.	V: Liane!	18_25: Liane...	00:51:17
	V carries L on his arms, heading to bedroom.	V: Du zwingst mich, dich zu zwingen. [You force me to force you.]	18_26: ...forças-me a que eu te force... [You force me to force you.]	
		L: Bitte, Victor, nicht weiter. Geh, bevor es zu spät ist. [Please, Victor, no further. Go, before it's too late.]	18_27: Não continues. Vai-te embora antes que seja tarde...! [Don't continue. Go, before it's too late...!]	
	Noise from bedroom.			
Door of bedroom.				
Bedroom.	H sitting in bed, disappointed facial expression.			
Living room.	V+L, arm in arm, L releases from V.	L: Cilly? Sind Sie das? [Cilly? Is that you?]	18_28: É a Cilli? [Cilly? Is that you?]	
Bedroom.	H sitting in bed, annoyed face.	H: Nein, die Cilly bin ich nicht. [No, Cilly I'm not.]	18_29: A Cilli é que eu não sou. [No, Cilly I'm not.]	
Living room.	V+L surprised, L signs V to go away, V faces away.			
Bedroom.	L opens door, turns light on.	L: Henry?!	19_30: Henry!	00:51:53

(continues)

	L enters room, H sitting in bed, cigarette in his mouth, puts it back into box.	H: Bist du überrascht, Liebling? Hast du mein Telegramm nicht bekommen? [Are you surprised, darling? Didn't you get my telegram?]	19_31: Surpreendi-te, querida? 19_32: Recebeste o meu telegrama? [Did I surprise you, darling? Did you get my telegram?]	
		L. Nein. [No.]	19_32A: Não. [No.]	
		H: Das habe ich mir gedacht. Ich habe dir nämlich keins geschickt. [I thought so. Because I didn't send you one.]	19_33: Pensei isso. Eu não te mandei nenhum. [I thought so. I didn't send you one.]	

Table 5. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: example very probable cut.

Unbeknown to Victor and Liane, Henry is in the room next door and hears what they say, which is significant, because it explains his attempt to make his wife jealous by getting a lover himself. What remains in the footage, just before this probable cut, is Liane's refusal to kiss Victor, which actually leads to a reversal of the original message. At least two censors marked this scene, and it is not clear where exactly the cut scene ends, if before or after Liane enters the bedroom. However, if this part is missing, it becomes illogical that Victor suddenly also appears in the bedroom in the next scene. Interestingly, while Liane and Victor's affair was reduced to a platonic level by the censors, kisses and physical contact between Claudia and Henry did not seem to give them any concern, which suggests a greater tolerance of a husband's infidelity than a wife's.

Group B thus is rated as follows:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Group B	[2]+[3]+[3]+[4]+[1]+[2]+[1]			16

Table 6. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: result group B.

Group C:

The assumed alterations gathered under group C are still quite probable, given that the respective subtitle is marked in the first list. The problem is that no comment or other proof could be found in the documents or subtitle lists. The scenes could have been cut or subtitles could have been suppressed. This category was allocated on the basis of whether the object of concern is found in the image (cut scene) or in the spoken text (suppression

of subtitle). Most of the suppressions concern sexual allusions, though the explicit mention of Henry and Liane’s divorce was also marked. One example is a short dialogue sequence between Henry and Liane. To make Liane jealous, Henry had put lipstick on his cheek and bit his hand before entering the bedroom. He tells Liane about his meeting with the “talented” author Claudia and her book (italics: subtitles marked with a cross by a censor):

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, night, bedroom.	L+H sitting on bed. L paints her nails, H has tousled hair, lipstick on his cheek, a bite wound at his hand.	H: Ja, aber das Buch ist tatsächlich, muss ich dir sagen, also gleichwertig “Lady Chatterly” oder “Lolita” – <i>ein Tatsachenbericht der sexuellen Revolution.</i> [Yes, but the book is in fact, I must tell you, equivalent to “Lady Chatterly” or “Lolita” – <i>a real report of the sexual revolution.</i>]	24_124: ...mas o livro vale tanto como “Lady Chatterley” ou “Lolita”. 25_125: <i>É uma informação realista da revolução do sexo.</i> [... the book is as valid as “Lady Chatterly” or “Lolita”. <i>It’s realistic information from the sex revolution.</i>]	01:05:04
		L: <i>Von dieser Revolution habe ich zu Hause nichts gemerkt.</i> [I didn’t notice anything of this revolution at home.]	25_126: <i>Dessa revolução nada notei aqui em casa.</i> [Of this revolution nothing I noticed here at home.]	
		H: Liane, dazu hast du ja jetzt Gelegenheit. [Liane, you have the opportunity now.]	25_127: Liane... 25_128: ...tens agora oportunidade para isso... [Liane, you now have opportunity for that.]	
	L stands up.	L: <i>Ich habe von der Gelegenheit bisher wenig Gebrauch gemacht. Aber ich sehe, dass du keine Zeit versäumst, warum soll ich dann warten?</i> [I’ve made little use of it... but I see you haven’t wasted any	25_129: <i>Pouco uso fiz dela... mas vejo que não perdeste tempo. Que espero eu?</i>	

(continues)

		[I have made little use of this opportunity so far. But I see that you don't miss any time, so why should I wait?]	time. What do I wait for?]	
	L leaves the room.			

Table 7. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: example probable suppression.

Liane refers to the fact that Henry had been too busy for intimacies with her, and he offers to make up for it now. But, given Henry’s apparent affair, she leaves for Victor’s place. This scene was evaluated with three points (*relevant*).

Altogether, group C includes twelve suppressions and one cut:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Group C	[1]	[1]+[3]+[1]+[1]+[1]+[3]+[3]+[2]+[3]+[1]+[1]+[1]		22

Table 8. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: result group C.

The sum of all three groups leads to the following result:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Groups A,B,C	[1]+[3]+[2]+[1]+[1]+[2]+[3]+[3]+[3]+[4]+[1]+[2]+[1]	[1]+[3]+[1]+[1]+[1]+[3]+[3]+[2]+[3]+[1]+[1]+[1]	[1]	46

Table 9. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: result groups A, B and C.

On the assumption that only the alterations of groups A and B were actually executed, this is the result:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Groups A+B	[3]+[2]+[1]+[1]+[2]+[3]+[3]+[4]+[1]+[2]+[1]		[1]	24

Table 10. *Frühstück im Doppelbett*: result groups A and B.

Das Ungeheuer von London-City

The first subtitle list, bearing the note “Prévia” [“pre-censorship”] handwritten in red, contains only one comment by the censor. The second list is completely clean. It is noticeable that the quantity of text was radically reduced in the second list (the first list is considerably more detailed) to the extent that even questions or answers (thus parts of a dialogue) are missing. However, given that the content is not ideologically charged, this has been interpreted as a mistake. Indeed, despite the drastic reduction of text, there were still a great many translation mistakes, probably due to a lack of language skills.

The only comment in the first list reads “núa” [“naked”] and refers to a scene in which the two private detectives observe a suspect in the theater (B = Betty, T = Teddy):

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, theatre, backstage.	B+T standing. A naked woman passes close to them and disappears in the background.	T: Da ist er wieder. [There he is again.]	227: Aqui está ele outra vez. [There he is again.]	00:25:34
		B: Der vorhin den Kopf durch die Tür gesteckt hat? Verdächtig. [The one who stuck his head through the door earlier? Suspicious.]	228: É o que meteu a cabeça pela porta. É suspeito! [He’s the one who stuck the head through the door? He’s suspicious.]	
		T: Hoechst verdächtig. Wirst sehen, hier im Theater finden wir den Mörder. [Highly suspicious. You’ll see, here at the theatre we’ll find the murderer.]	229: Altamente! Verás, é aqui que descobriremos o assassino. [Highly! You’ll see, it’s here where we’ll find the murderer.]	

Table 11. *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*: example probable cut.

A few scenes later, Teddy, dressed in a police uniform, pretending to be one of the actors, ends up on stage by mistake and stumbles over a woman lying on a chaise longue. For a moment, her naked left breast can be seen.

If the distributor eliminated any scene, it was unfortunately not documented. In the censorship documents no cut is mentioned, and the subtitle lists, apart from the comment “naked”, also provide no further information. This is the reason why (eventual) alterations have to be divided into groups, as was done with *Frühstück im Doppelbett*. The two scenes of nudity were very probably cut, yet as this assumption cannot be proved, they form group C. The narrative remains largely unaffected (indeed the dialogue is barely relevant), so they get one point (*nuance*):

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Group C	[1]+[1]			2

Table 12. *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*: result group C.

A total of seven manipulations were detected in *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*. As mentioned above, it is not always obvious whether words or phrases were eliminated for ideological reasons or for reasons of (radical) technical-formal reduction. However, the need to reduce text offers an opportunity to remove undesirable content. The following

example is a scene in the theatre play *Jack the Ripper*, in which a prostitute fends off her pimp (W = woman, M = man):

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, theatre, on stage, stairs.	W tries to go upstairs, M holds her at her hips, W defends herself.	W: Nimm deine verdammten Hände von mir weg. [Get your bloody hands off me.]	17: Tira as mãos de mim! [Take your hands off!]	00:04:15
		M: Du gehörst zu mir, du wirst tun, was ich will. [You belong to me, you're going to do what I want.]	18: És minha, farás o que quero! [You are mine, you're going to do what I want.]	
		W: Ich denke nicht daran. Was hast du denn schon für mich getan? [I don't think of that. What have you ever done for me?]	19: Que fizeste de mim? Pôr-me neste covil? [What have you done of me? Putting me into this cave?]	
		M: Alles! [Everything!]		
		W: In dieses verdammte Dreckloch mich gelockt. Ich sage dir, ich gehe nicht mehr für dich auf die Straße , lass mich in Ruhe. [Lured me into this damn sinkhole. I'm telling you, I'm not going on the street for you anymore , leave me in peace.]		

Table 13. *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*: example manipulation I.

The woman talks quite fast, so this dialogue would have had to be reduced in any case. Yet it seems no coincidence that the reference to the woman’s work on the street is missing – the fact that she is a prostitute was blurred.

This impression is reinforced by other scenes, as the following example shows:

Image	Action	Voice	Sub	Tc
Interior, day, apartment.	H reads the newspaper.	H: In der Nacht vom Sonntag zum Montag wurde eine Prostituierte in dem Park nahe der Osborne Street ermordet aufgefunden. Das Opfer ist auf eine brutale und unbeschreiblich rohe Weise verletzt worden. [On the night from Sunday to Monday a prostitute was found murdered in the park near Osborne Street. The victim was injured in a brutal and indescribably cruel manner.]	94: Na madrugada de domingo acharam outra mulher assassinada ... 95: ... de maneira incrivelmente brutal! [On Sunday morning they found another woman murdered in an incredibly brutal way!]	00:15:33

Table 14. *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*: example manipulation II.

The word “prostitute” appears five times throughout the film and is never translated as such. Other references to the fact that Jack the Ripper’s victims were all prostitutes were also concealed, so this can be considered a systematic manipulation.⁷ On the other hand, the images (dark streets, women meet men, etc.) also provide information in this regard, so the Portuguese audience could at least surmise that the setting is the red-light district, even though prostitutes and pimps were not explicitly named.

The first example (Table 13) was evaluated as [1] (*nuance*), the second (Table 14) as [2] (*slight*) points. Together with the other manipulations, the final score is as follows:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Group A			[2]+[1]+[2]+[1]+[2]+[1]+[1]	10

Table 15. *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*: result group A.

⁷ This corresponds to the fact that prostitution was prohibited in Portugal from 1 January 1963 (Decreto-Lei n° 44579; see Portugal, 1962).

The film contains a total of six scenes of murder, yet the act of slashing the women is always masked in some way (by a coat, a shadow, etc.), so no bloody or brutal violence can be seen. However, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the distributor had also had a hand in this. In any case, despite what we might have expected on the basis of the narrative and the censor’s arguments for banning the film in 1965, it would seem that it was not violence but again sexuality that was censored in the first place.

Given that no further information concerning alterations could be found in the censorship documents, a group B scenario does not apply to this film. In total, the result for *Das Ungeheuer von London-City* is:

	Cuts	Suppressions	Manipulations	Total
Groups A+C	[1]+[1]		[2]+[1]+[2]+[1]+[2]+[1]+[1]	12

Table 16. *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*: result groups A and C.

Finally, comparing the two films, the following chart shows the result of this analysis:

	<i>Frühstück im Doppelbett</i>	<i>Das Ungeheuer von London-City</i>
Group A	8	10
Groups A+B	24	-
Groups A,B,C	46	12

Table 17. Result of comparison between both films.

If group A alone were decisive, the film *Das Ungeheuer von London-City* would come out in front. It is more probable, though, that all three groups of alterations were executed, which leads to the conclusion that *Frühstück im Doppelbett* is the more censored film of the two.

6. Conclusion

During the analysis of the two films some unexpected difficulties appeared, leading to a refinement of the methodology. The main problem was the fact that the censorship documents are not complete and do not give a full picture of the processes. Therefore, it would have been helpful if these films, with the subtitles that were added during the Estado Novo, had been available for viewing. But there is little chance that these copies still exist and, if they do, it is unlikely that they would be made available, given the risk this might bring of technical damage.⁸ Consequently, the research had to proceed with the sources that were available, considering various scenarios.

Under ideal conditions, if all cuts and suppressions were evident and unambiguous, the analysis would produce a single value. However, a clean result would only be possible

⁸ This is the reason why the Arquivo Nacional de Imagens em Movimento – ANIM [Portuguese National Film Archive] does not provide access to the existing copies of foreign films.

Pieper, K. – Measuring “censorship”: determining the level of “censoredness”
Translation Matters, 2(2), 2020, pp. 44-66, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21747/21844585/tm2_2a3

to achieve if the censored footage were available, and even then, some degree of uncertainty would inevitably remain as distributors may have made alterations without documenting them. Assumptions have also been made as regards the evaluation of the level of impact the alterations would have on the message of the film, even though the awarding of points is based on the contextualisation of the respective scene within the story of the film. This means that the experience and personal assessment of the researcher exert some influence on the result.

The analysis clearly indicates that the film *Frühstück im Doppelbett* was more heavily censored than *Das Ungeheuer von London-City*. The result is produced in the form of a differentiated score representing the degree of “censoredness”, which may be especially useful when a large number of films is being compared (otherwise a written description of the alterations without scores may be sufficient). Anyhow, further analysis will raise further questions and solutions: the more films that are analysed, the more finely tuned the model becomes. This article is the starting point of a journey through the censorship documents, which still holds many new insights.

REFERENCES

- António, L. (2001) *Cinema e censura em Portugal*. 2nd edn. Lisbon: Biblioteca Museu República e Resistência.
- Díaz Cintas, J. (2012) ‘Clearing the smoke to see the screen: ideological manipulation in audiovisual translation’, *Meta: journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translators’ Journal*, 57(2), pp. 279-293.
- Díaz Cintas, J. and Remael, A. (2007) *Audiovisual translation: subtitling*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Morais, A. B. (2017) *Censura ao erotismo e violência: cinema no Portugal marcelista (1968-1974)*. Famalicão: Edições Humus.
- Pieper, K. (2018) ‘The claws of ideology’, *Transletters: International Journal of Translation and Interpreting*, 1(2), pp. 155-181.
- Portugal (1962) ‘Decreto-Lei n° 44579’, *Diário do Governo*, n. 216, Série I, 19 de setembro.
- Reis Torgal, L. (2000) ‘Propaganda, ideologia e cinema no Estado Novo: a “conversão dos descrentes”’ in Reis Torgal, L. (ed.) *O cinema sob o olhar de Salazar*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, pp. 64-91.
- Schreiber, M. (1993) *Übersetzung und Bearbeitung: Zur Differenzierung und Abgrenzung des Übersetzungsbegriffs*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Silva, P. N. (2013) *Citações de Salazar: 300 citações, 110 reflexões e pensamentos*. Alfragide: Casa das Letras.

Films

Frühstück im Doppelbett (2014) Directed by Axel von Ambesser (BRD: CCC-Filmkunst, 1963) [DVD]. Germany: Pidax Film Media.

Pieper, K. – Measuring “censorship”: determining the level of “censoredness”
Translation Matters, 2(2), 2020, pp. 44-66, DOI: https://doi.org/10.21747/21844585/tm2_2a3

Das Ungeheuer von London-City (2009) Directed by Edwin Zbonek (BRD: CCC-Filmkunst, 1964) [DVD]. Germany: Universum Film.

Archive documents

SNI-IE-ECF (1964) *Frühstück im Doppelbett/Pequeno almoço em cama de casal*, RG: 187/64.
ANTT: SNI, IGAC (2ª Inc), cx. 335.

SNI-IE-ECF (1965) *Das Ungeheuer von London-City/O monstro da cidade de Londres*, RG: 627/65. ANTT: SNI, IGAC (2ª Inc), cx. 381.

Sobre a autora: Katrin Pieper licenciou-se em Tradução na Universidade de Leipzig e especializou-se em Tradução Audiovisual. Atualmente cursa o Doutorado em Línguas Modernas: Cultura, Literatura e Tradução nesta universidade, e sua tese aborda a relação entre censura e legendagem durante o Estado Novo.