

BETWEEN THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY AND THE LATIN AMERICAN
“BOOM”: BRAZILIAN LITERATURE IN THE UNITED STATES

*ENTRE A POLÍTICA DE BOA VIZINHANÇA E O “BOOM” LATINOAMERICANO:
A LITERATURA BRASILEIRA NOS ESTADOS UNIDOS*



Victoria LIVINGSTONE¹
Doutora em Letras Latinoamericanas (Boston University, EUA)
Professora visitante em *Whitman College*,
Walla Walla, Washington, Estados Unidos
vlivingstone@gmail.com

Abstract: This article studies the translation of Brazilian literature in the United States between 1930 and the end of the 1960s. It analyzes political, historical and economic factors that influenced the publishing market for translations in the U.S., focusing on the editorial project of Alfred A. Knopf, the most influential publisher for Latin American literature in the U.S. during this period, and Harriet de Onís, who translated approximately 40 works from Spanish and Portuguese into English. In addition to translating authors such as João Guimarães Rosa and Jorge Amado, de Onís worked as a reader for Knopf, recommending texts for translation. The translator's choices reflected the demands of the market and contributed to forming the canon of Brazilian literature translated in the United States.

Key words: Translation, Harriet de Onís, Alfred A. Knopf, João Guimarães Rosa, Jorge Amado

Resumo: Este trabalho aborda a tradução da literatura brasileira nos Estados Unidos entre 1930 e o final dos anos 60. Analisam-se alguns fatores políticos, históricos, e econômicos que influenciaram o mercado editorial norte-americano de tradução. O foco da pesquisa é o projeto editorial de Alfred A. Knopf, a editora mais influente para a literatura latino-americana nos EUA durante aquele período, e Harriet de Onís, que traduziu aproximadamente 40 obras do espanhol e português para o inglês. Além de ser a tradutora de autores como João Guimarães Rosa e Jorge Amado, de Onís trabalhava como leitora para Knopf, recomendando textos para ser traduzidos. Desta forma, as escolhas da tradutora refletiram as demandas do mercado e contribuíram para formar o cânone de literatura brasileira traduzida nos Estados Unidos.

Palavras-chave: Tradução, Harriet de Onís, Alfred A. Knopf, João Guimarães Rosa, Jorge Amado

In recent years, scholars such as David Damrosch and Pascale Casanova have challenged notions of world literature as a utopian, politically neutral space and have instead argued that the movement of texts across linguistic and cultural borders reflects political and economic inequalities. According to David Damrosch, “foreign works will rarely be translated at all in the United States, much less widely distributed, unless they reflect American concerns and fit comfortably with American images of the foreign culture in question” (18, 2003). Similarly, Casanova argues that when a work moves from a peripheral to a central

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american “boom”: brazilian literature in the United States

Belas Infêéis, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

market, it tends to adopt the values and aesthetic preferences of the target culture (154, 2004). Due to the multiple agents² and often random factors that determine whether a text is translated,³ these theories of world literature cannot entirely account for the circulation of texts in the global market. However, because the publishing market cannot be separated from economic and political contexts, a study of the history of translated Latin American literature can offer insight into U.S. attitudes towards other American countries.

Before the twentieth century, the U.S. showed little interest in cultural production of the rest of the Americas. The only Latin American texts published in English translation in the United States during the 19th century tended to be non-fiction or regionalist fiction framed in didactic or moral terms. These early translations⁴ included Domingo Faustino Sarmiento's *Civilización y barbarie: Vida de Juan Facundo Quiroga* (1845), translated by Mary Mann as *Facundo: Life in the Argentine Republic in the Days of the Tyrants; or Civilization and Barbarism* (1868), Colombian writer Jorge Isaacs's 1867 novel, titled *María* in Spanish and *Maria: A South American Romance* in Rollo Ogden's 1890 translation, and a book of chronicles from Cuba titled *Ramón the Rover of Cuba: The Personal Narrative of that Celebrated Pirate* (1829, anonymous author and translator). Of these, it is worth noting that Sarmiento was well connected in North America and therefore could advocate to have his work translated into English. He counted Horace Mann among his friends, and it was Mann's wife Mary who translated the book (Rostagno, 1997, xii).

All of the English titles of these works include specific references to the region or to the language, which would imply that they were marketed as explicitly foreign rather than as universal texts. In her preface to *Facundo*, Mary Mann praises Sarmiento's preference for "the cultivated cities of the Argentine Republic, where Europeans find themselves at home in all that constitutes civilized societies, and where the high culture of the few is painfully contrasted with the utter want of it in the body of the people" (1868, vii-viii). That is, she separates Sarmiento from most of his countrymen and emphasizes the author's preference for urban spaces and values that align with European models over rural zones with less European influence. In his introduction to the translation of *María*, Thomas A. Janvier notes an "air of realism" in Isaac's work that would allow U.S. readers to know these "stranger neighbors of ours as they truly are" (1890, ix, xi).

By the early twentieth century, translated Latin American literature began to be presented as a way of improving intercultural relations. In his introduction to Isaac

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american "boom": brazilian literature in the United States
Belas Infieís, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

Goldberg's *Studies in Spanish-American Literature*,⁵ J.D.M. Ford writes, "a sermon might well be preached on this subject, but instead of a sermon a book is now presented in the hope that it will help to break down barriers for the maintenance of which there is no just excuse of a racial, political, commercial, cultural or other nature." (1920, viii). During this period, Goldberg was a significant figure in bringing Latin American literature to the U.S. In addition to publishing critical volumes on Spanish American and Brazilian literature, Goldberg edited anthologies such as *Brazilian Tales* (1921), which included his translations of work by Machado de Assis, Medeiros e Albuquerque, Henrique Coelho Netto, and Carmen Dolores (Emília Moncorvo Bandeira de Melo). Other influential translators during this period included writer Anita Brenner (Mexico/U.S.), who translated Mariano Azuela's *Mala Yerba* (1909), published in English as *Marcela, A Mexican Love Story* (1932) and Mildred Adams, who translated Germán Arciniegas' *The Knight of El Dorado: The Tale of Don Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada and His Conquest of New Granada, Now Called Colombia* (1942).

By 1930, as U.S. policies towards Latin America began to shift, interest in Latin American fiction grew. That year, in an article for *Scribner's*, writer/translator Waldo Frank argued that the U.S. and Latin America should strive for "a deep mutual knowledge" that could be built through literature.⁶ It was in this political climate that Harriet de Onís began translating. Earlier translators such as Samuel Putnam and Isaac Goldberg had helped establish the canon of translated Latin American literature, but none of them came close to translating the volume of work de Onís produced.

De Onís translated for Farrar and Reinhart, Barron, Dolphin Books, and other publishers, but the majority of her work was published with Alfred A. Knopf. The Knopfs relied heavily on de Onís as a reader as well as a translator. At a time when few editors could read Spanish and Portuguese, de Onís was important in this capacity as well. They sent her so much material to evaluate that she once told them, "You boys at Knopfs are going to have to get together, and decide whether you want me as a translator or a reader."⁷ Later, she complained again of being overburdened, saying, "It seems to me a great pity that you do not have on your editorial staff someone who knows Spanish well, and better still, Portuguese, too. In that way I could act as a sort of 'corroborator' without having to assume such a load of responsibility."⁸ Because she recommended texts for publication as well as translating approximately forty books, de Onís significantly contributed to shaping the canon of translated Latin American literature. Deborah Cohn writes that de Onís was "in effect an

extremely powerful gatekeeper: in José Donoso's words, 'she controlled the sluices of the circulation of Latin American literature in the United States and by means of the United States throughout the whole world' (Cohn, 2012, 12).⁹ Through her husband, the Spanish critic Federico de Onís, chair of the Spanish department at Columbia University, Harriet met most of the major Latin American writers working in the mid-twentieth century.¹⁰ While Federico's contacts certainly impacted Harriet's career, her individual contributions to shaping the canon of translated Latin American literature are major.

De Onís's career as a translator- from her translation of Martín Luiz Guzmán's *El águila y la serpiente* (*The Eagle and the Serpent*) in 1930 through her death in 1969- roughly corresponds to the era between the Good Neighbor Policy and the beginning of the Latin American Boom, the publishing phenomenon that saw writers such as Gabriel García Marquez and Carlos Fuentes achieve international recognition. Beginning in 1933, motivated by the fear that Latin American countries were vulnerable to the Axis threat and the need to encourage trade after the Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the Good Neighbor policy. Besides promising that the United States would not intervene in the affairs of Latin America (a promise that was revoked with the beginning of the Cold War), the policy had a strong component of cultural exchange and government agencies were established to this effect. In 1938, the Division of Cultural Relations of the State department was created. Two years later, the Office for the Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics- an agency that later became the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA)- was formed, headed by Nelson Rockefeller (Cohn, 2012, 30). It was one of the biggest agencies in the Roosevelt administration (Tota, 2014, 119).

The OCIAA sponsored cultural activities in all of the Americas, producing films, articles and radio shows that promoted a Pan-American ideal for both Latin American and U.S. audiences. In the southern hemisphere, the OCIAA distributed propaganda such as a free magazine in Spanish and in Portuguese modeled on *Life* (Cramer, 2006, 798). Disney collaborated, acting as an unofficial ambassador and producing *Alô, Amigos*, a film released in Brazil in 1942 and in the U.S. the following year. It featured the samba-loving Brazilian parrot José Carioca (Zé Carioca in Portuguese), a character that conveyed a stereotyped image of Brazil (Tota 119). In the U.S. in 1944, five million people in the U.S. per month were watching OCIAA- sponsored programming on Latin America (Cramer, 2006, 795). The OCIAA also promoted the teaching of Spanish and Portuguese, funded art exhibits, and

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american "boom": brazilian literature in the United States
Belas Infieís, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

subsidized translations (Cramer, 2006, 797). Many of the cultural products exported from Latin America provided a superficial or distorted understanding of other American countries, what Antonio Pedro Tota calls a sort of “lazy sociology” (Tota, 2014, 133, my translation).

Knopf and de Onís saw translated literature as a deeper way of building mutual understanding within the Americas, a vision that was in line with U.S. government policies. The publisher maintained relationships with political figures, seeking the help- for example- of Sumner Welles, Roosevelt’s Undersecretary and one of the president’s foreign policy advisers. Welles had facilitated Blanche Knopf’s visit to South America (as a sort of literary scout) in 1942.¹¹ Blanche later asked Welles to write a few paragraphs for a brochure promoting Knopf’s newly released translations. He agreed, though he asked Blanche to make explicit that, although he had a hand in her scouting trip to South America, he did not choose the works to be published. The brochure Welles wrote for Knopf framed the literary works in political terms:

The works from the Latin American republics which will have the widest appeal in this country are recent volumes on inter-American or international affairs and novels. And it is perhaps in the field of novels that the greatest benefit will result from the standpoint of inter-American relations for the novel which deals with the character and the individual manner of being of each American people necessarily affords to its readers the easiest and, in many ways, the most effective method of getting the “feel”, and understanding the life, the national customs, and the problems of Central and South America.¹²

119

Because of the publisher’s commitment to publishing Latin American literature in a difficult market and because of their ties to Latin America, Gilberto Freyre called Knopf an “extra-official ambassador” and de Onís said that Knopf was “a one-man alliance for progress” (Cohn, 2012, 10).

Because World War II made travel to Europe difficult, Knopf was not the only publisher that began to look to Latin America in search of new authors during this period. In 1941, with the assistance of the Division of Intellectual Cooperation and the Pan American Union, *Red Book* magazine and Farrar and Rinehart established a Latin American novel prize, which the Peruvian writer Ciro Alegría won with his *El mundo es ancho y ajeno* (1940) (Pane, 1942, 117). De Onís later translated the novel as *Broad and Alien is the World* (Farrar and Rinehart, 1941). Suzanne Jill Levine argues that the publication of this novel in translation “reinforced the trend towards realism, regionalism and local color” in U.S. publishers’ choices of Latin American texts (2005, 300).¹³ The political climate of the Good Neighbor policy

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american “boom”: brazilian literature in the United States
Belas Infieís, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

may have contributed to this tendency to translate regional literature, as the texts were seen as a way of understanding Latin American customs. During this same period, critic Remigio U. Pane prefaced his bibliography of translated Latin American literature with a short text that included comments such as, “We must study our Good Neighbors” (1942, 117).

By the end of Roosevelt’s administration, Latin America was losing its strategic value for the U.S. (Tota, 2014, 166). As the U.S. government shifted its focus to rebuilding Europe after the war, most publishers followed, turning away from Latin America and setting their sights once more on Europe. According to Rostagno, only Knopf and “to a lesser degree, James Laughlin at New Directions” remained committed to Latin America (1997, xv). Cohn confirms this, writing, “the Knopfs were virtually the only publishers of Latin American literature in the United States throughout the 1950s, and de Onís was the Knopfs’ primary translator- and arbiter” of Latin American literature (2012, 12).

The Knopfs and de Onís claimed to have a “vow of silence on Latin American politics.”¹⁴ However, the correspondence between editors and translators reveal that political beliefs dominant in the U.S. (and shared by the publisher) determined which works they were willing to promote. Not surprisingly, therefore, Knopf resisted publishing Jorge Amado’s political works, but the editors were excited about his *Gabriela, cravo e canela* (1958), a novel they determined free of communist ideology. De Onís predicted that the book would be a commercial success¹⁵ and encouraged publication by telling editor Bill Koshland that *Gabriela* had “as much party line as the Uncle Wiggly stories.”¹⁶

Although de Onís recommended *Gabriela* for publication with Knopf and helped promote it, William Grossman and James L. Taylor completed the translation, titled *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* (1962). Shortly after the translation was published, de Onís suggested that her son Juan- then a correspondent for *The New York Times*- interview Amado and write a piece discussing the author’s political affiliation.¹⁷ Juan agreed, and in a 1962 review he wrote, “*Gabriela* represents undoubtedly the artistic liberation of Senhor Amado from a long period of ideological commitment to Communist orthodoxy” and noted that the author’s “artistic integrity has prevailed over the intellectual ‘Party Line.’” Juan also argued that the novel would function “as a striking portrait of Brazilian reality and change” that would help “bridge the gap of understanding between two culturally and psychologically distinct areas of the New World.”

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american “boom”: brazilian literature in the United States
Belas Infieís, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

The correspondence between editors at Knopf regarding *Gabriela* also suggests that publishers began to see universality as a selling point for Latin American literature, a shift from the earlier vision of translated literature serving a sort of anthropological function and the preference for regional texts. Arthur Meyerfield wrote to Knopf saying that *Gabriela* had “everything: Entertainment supreme, violence, romance, happiness, sadness, wit and sensitivity, a cosmos entirely complete. And it almost could be Sacramento in the early days just as well as a town in Brazil....or, for that matter, any place.”¹⁸ The English translation did in fact become a best-seller and de Onís wrote to Knopf saying, “I purr with pride every time I see *Gabriela* move up a notch on the best-seller list. You were right about this one breaking the sound barrier.”¹⁹ De Onís later translated three of Amado’s other novels: *Os Velhos Marinheiros*, *Os Pastores da Noite*, and *Dona Flor e Seus Dois Maridos*.

Gabriela, however, was an isolated case and most of the Latin American texts that Knopf published did not sell well. Yet despite the continued financial losses translated Latin American literature represented, the Knopfs and de Onís remained motivated by their deep commitment to Latin America and the symbolic capital associated with publishing prestigious works (Cohn, 2012, 111, Rostagno, 1997, 33). De Onís told Knopf that she never needed the money, but that she was “intensely interested in helping to bring to the attention of the American public the work of Latin American authors.”²⁰

This desire to introduce important Latin American writers to U.S. readers- rather than high hopes for commercial success- drove de Onís’s interest in João Guimarães Rosa’s *Grande Sertão: Veredas* (1956) and *Sagarana* (1946), which she published in translation as *The Devil to Pay in the Backlands* (co-translated with James L. Taylor, 1963) and *Sagarana* (1966). *Grande Sertão: Veredas* had a particularly troubled translation history. De Onís began the translation, but decided she could not complete it because of the limitations of her Portuguese, health problems,²¹ and the amount of other work she had as a translator.²² The editors and de Onís then enlisted the help of James L. Taylor, a lexicographer and Stanford professor who had written a Portuguese-English dictionary.²³ Taylor took on the translation, though with poor results. De Onís later complained to Bill Koshland about Taylor, saying that “one can be a good lexicographer without being a good writer.”²⁴ Taylor had a good knowledge of Portuguese, including the vocabulary of the *sertão*, the region of Brazil where Rosa’s narrative is set, but he was not a seasoned literary translator.²⁵ De Onís and Taylor may not have been the ideal translators, but the editors’ inability to pick and choose reflected

a larger obstacle to the promotion of Brazilian literature abroad: that is, the lack of Portuguese-English translators.

De Onís has often been criticized for translating Rosa’s language, which Antonio Candido described as surregional,²⁶ into standard English. Following are the first lines of *Grande Sertão: Veredas* in Portuguese and in Taylor and de Onís’s translation:

Nonada. Tiros que o senhor ouviu foram de briga de homem não, Deus esteja. Alvejei mira em árvore, no quintal, no baixo do córrego. Por meu acerto. Todo dia isso faço, gosto; desde mal em minha mocidade.

It’s nothing. Those shots you heard were not men fighting. God be praised. It was just me there in the back yard, target-shooting down by the creek, to keep in practice. I do it every day, because I enjoy it; have ever since I was a boy.

The neologism “nonada” becomes the common “it’s nothing” in English. In the Portuguese, “alvejei mira em árvore” is also difficult construction, as *alvejar* (to take aim) and *mira* (target) are not normally used together in this way. “Target-shooting” is an accurate translation, but reduces the difficulty of the language. In a lecture on translating *Grande Sertão: Veredas* into German, Berthold Zilly noted that Rosa omits the article before “tiros” (and in many other parts of his narrative) and adds “homem” which seems strangely redundant, but is not, given the theme of the devil in the book. The English translation normalizes all of these elements.

122

Taylor and de Onís’s decision to use standard English rather than try to recreate Rosa’s experimentation likely reflected certain realities in the market. Since a translation is already more difficult than an original text because of the amount of information readers must process, translators may be hesitant to use language that would be too unfamiliar to readers in the target culture.²⁷ Zilly has noted that the distance between Rosa’s style and standard language cannot be as great in the translation as in the original because if the language of the translation is too inaccessible, the work will not circulate at all (2013, 323). De Onís may have felt that in order to introduce Rosa to a wide public, his language would have to be simplified, especially because she was translating in an era in which there was less tolerance in the U.S. publishing market for an experimental translation.

In order to make *Grande Sertão: Veredas* understandable for the U.S. public, de Onís used the popular genre of the Western as an equivalent for Rosa’s narrative. The decision was deliberate. Regarding one of the stories in *Sagarana*, she told Rosa “Without exaggerating, I

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american “boom”: brazilian literature in the United States
Belas Infieís, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

have tried to give [“Duelo”] a Western flavor, which is the milieu which would roughly correspond to that of the story.”²⁸ Knopf promoted both *The Devil to Pay in the Backlands* and *Sagarana* in accordance with de Onís’s interpretation of the books as exotic westerns. In an advertisement for Knopf’s publications, critic/translator Mildred Adams wrote, “In a curious tropic fashion [*Sagarana*] touches on our own love for almost any kind of Wild West and the combination of splendidly drawn character and savage country holds one to the page.”

As André Lefevere argues, translators working from minor languages have less freedom than those working from more central languages (1998, 76). Because of the neologisms, archaisms, and other devices he uses, Rosa is often compared to James Joyce. A translator of Joyce into Portuguese, however, likely has more freedom than a translator of Rosa into English because Joyce is already established in the canon of world literature and recognized as an experimental writer. At the time de Onís translated *Grande Sertão: Veredas*, Rosa was not a well-known writer outside of Brazil. A translation that used unfamiliar language in English may not have been accepted in the U.S. market without the writer already having an established reputation, especially considering that the novel is a dense monologue over 500 pages long and full of cultural, historic, and geographic references that a reader of the translation would not recognize.

The normalizing of Rosa’s language would appear to affirm Casanova’s argument that foreign works from the periphery tend to assume the preferences of the target culture when translated. However, while de Onís generally opts for idiomatic English, she leaves a number of terms in Portuguese, or translates them literally in jarring ways. For example, she translates this fragment of “Duelo” (from *Sagarana*) in the following way:

Eí, e Cassiano rastejou, recuando, e, dando três vezes o lanço, transpôs as abertas entre a criciúma e a guaxima, entre a guaxima e o rancho, e entre o rancho e o gordo coqueiro catolé. Acocorou-se, coberto pela palmeira, e espiou, buscando um sinal claro de qualquer vulto movente (187-8).

Cassiano, edging himself backward, in three consecutive bounds crossed the opening between the thickets of crissiúma and guaxima, between the guaxima and the shed, the shed and the thick coconut palm. There he squatted, hidden by the palm, and watched, waiting for some blurred bulk or moving object (128).

Most of the language in the translation of this fragment simplifies Rosa’s language, transforming, for example “dando três vezes o lanço”- an unusual phrase that Brazilian readers would have difficulty deciphering out of context- into the more easily recognizable “in three consecutive bounds.” Yet, when confronted with the plant names *crissiúma* and

guaxima- also unfamiliar to many Brazilian readers- de Onís leaves these in Portuguese. While Brazilian readers have points of reference to allow them to complete the image, the English reader faces a series of entirely foreign terms they may have difficulty pronouncing and which may interrupt the flow of the narrative. Because of the clash between idiomatic English and foreign terms, the translation has what Trudy Balch calls “a mismatched tone,” (Balch, 1998) an uneven register that could be considered to be a foreignizing strategy.²⁹ The same is true for many other aspects of Rosa’s work in translation, such as references to *jagunços*, a term left in Portuguese and superficially explained in a glossary at the end of the translation. It is therefore a simplification to argue that Rosa was entirely domesticated in English translation.

The Brazilian culture de Onís and Knopf hoped to communicate through literature is only partially translated. Amado, whose work reaffirms certain stereotypes of Brazil, was successful in English and Rosa, whose work does not, was a commercial failure. In general terms, the examples of Amado and Rosa fit the models of world literature proposed by Damrosch and Casanova. However, these broad theories, while useful for explaining tendencies, cannot address the complex ways in which works change in translation. Translations are not simply adapted to the target culture (even when domestication is the goal) nor are they always chosen for their marketability. In order to understand the complex relationships between historical contexts and translation, close readings of individual works are necessary. A more detailed study of the translations of works by Guimarães Rosa and Amado would reveal that while the U.S. publisher and translators may have been motivated by the desire to teach U.S. readers about their “good neighbors” to the south, these goals were compromised on the level of specific representations of culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archives:

HRC: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Archive, Harry Ransom Center. University of Texas at Austin.

IEB: João Guimarães Rosa archive, Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.

SW: Sumner Welles Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library, National Archives, Hyde Park, NY.

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american “boom”: brazilian literature in the United States

Belas Infêéis, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.

Other bibliographic references:

Adams, Mildred. Announcement for Knopf. 15 May 1963. JGR-R15,02,43, IEB.

Allen, Esther. "The Will to Translate: Four Episodes in a Local History of Global Cultural Exchange." In **Translation: Translators on Their Work and What it Means**. Ed. Esther Allen and Susan Bernofsky. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013. Kindle file.

Armstrong, Piers. **Third World Literary Fortunes**. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1999.

Balch, Trudy. "Pioneer on the Bridge of Language." **Américas**. 50.6 (1998): 46-51.

Casanova, Pascale. **The World Republic of Letters**. Trans. M. B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Cohn, Deborah N. **The Latin American Literary Boom and U.S. Nationalism During the Cold War**. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2012.

Cramer, Gisela and Ursula Prutsch. "Nelson A. Rockefeller's Office of Inter-American Affairs (1940-1946) and Record Group 229." **Hispanic American Historical Review** 86.4 (2006): 785-806.

Damrosch, David. **What is World Literature?** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

De Onís, Juan. Personal interview. 21 February 2014.

_____. "The Town's Story is the Land's: A New Novel Depicts Tensions in Modern Brazil and the Influence of an Unforgettable Woman." **The New York Times**. 16 Sept. 1962.

Goldberg, Isaac, ed. and trans. **Brazilian Tales**. Boston: Four seas Co., 1921.

_____. **Studies in Spanish-American Literature**. New York: Brentano's, 1920.

Golyshev, Victor. "The Foundation Pit by Andrey Platonov: Two Translations into English." Boston University, 13 April 2012. Lecture.

Hansen, João Adolfo. "Forma literária e crítica da lógica racionalista em Guimarães Rosa." **Letras de Hoje** 47.2 (April/June 2012): 120-130.

Isaacs, Jorge. **Maria: A South American Romance**. Trans. Rollo Ogden. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890.

Krause, James Remington. "Translation and the Reception and Influence of Latin American Literature in the United States." Diss. Vanderbilt U., 2010.

Lefevere, André. "Gates of Analogy: The Kavela in English". **Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation**. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 76-89.

Levine, Suzanne Jill. "The Latin American Novel in English translation." *The Cambridge Companion to the Latin American Novel*. Ed. Efraín Kristal. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 297-317.

Martinez, Felipe. "A Conversation with Dr. Piers Armstrong." **A Missing Book**. 11 Feb. 2011. Web. 1 Sept. 2012.

Ogorzaly, Michael A. **Waldo Frank, Prophet of Hispanic Regeneration**. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1994.

Pane, Remigio U. "A Selected Bibliography of Latin American Literature in English Translation." **The Modern Language Journal** 26.2 (Feb. 1942): 116-122.

_____. "Two Hundred Latin American Books in English Translation: A Bibliography." **The Modern Language Journal** 27.8 (Dec. 1943): 593-604.

Rosa, João Guimarães. **Grande Sertão: Veredas**. 19th ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2001.

_____. **Sagarana**. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2001.

_____. **Sagarana**. Trans. Harriet de Onís. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

_____. **The Devil to Pay in the Backlands**. Trans. James L Taylor and Harriet de Onís. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Rostagno, Irene. **Searching for Recognition: The Promotion of Latin American Literature in the United States**. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. *Facundo: Life in the Argentine Republic in the Days of the Tyrants; or Civilization and Barbarism*. Trans. Mary Mann. New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1868.

Tota, Antonio Pedro. **O amigo americano: Nelson Rockefeller e o Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: Companhia das Letras, 2014.

Venuti, Lawrence. **The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation**. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Zilly, Berthold. "A 'Transgermanização de *Grande Sertão: Veredas*.'" Casa de Guilherme de Almeida, São Paulo, 7 Sept. 2014. Lecture.

_____. “Os Sertões e Grande Sertão: Veredas: Reflexões do Tradutor” **Literatura Brasileira: Região, Nação, Globalização**. Eds. Germana Sales and Roberto Acizelo de Souza. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 2013. 311-3

¹ Victoria Livingstone – perfil no Academia.edu. Disponível em: <http://whitman.academia.edu/VictoriaLivingstone>

² Such as publishers, editors, translators, authors, reviewers, critics (because of hoped/feared reaction), cultural organizations, government entities, etc.

³ Esther Allen writes, “it’s clear that the translation of a given text often depends largely or perhaps wholly on contextual factors that have less to do with the work’s intrinsic value (whatever that might be and however you might measure it) than with encounters between individuals and the shifting cultural and political context within which those encounters take place.”

⁴ Titles from Remigio Pane’s 1943 bibliography of translated Latin American literature. He lists only six Latin American novels published in the U.S. before 1900 and some of the texts he lists- such as Sarmiento’s *Facundo*- are not even works of fiction.

⁵ Goldberg was a translator, but this particular book is a compilation of essays on Latin American literature. After translation, criticism is perhaps the next most effective way of disseminating foreign literature. Despite its title, this volume included a number of Brazilian authors. In 1922, Goldberg published another study titled *Brazilian Literature* (Knopf).

⁶ *Scribner’s Magazine* 87, June 1930: 579-86. Cited in Ogorzaly 84.

⁷ AK266.13, HDO to Mr. Robbins, 23 Sept 1959, HRC.

⁸ AK361.3. HDO to AK, 9 April 1962.

⁹ Rostagno also cites this. From Donoso’s *Historia personal del Boom*.

¹⁰ De Onís, Juan. Personal interview. 21 February 2014.

¹¹ SW110, 31 Sept. 1945, note from Blanche Knopf to Sumner Welles.

¹² SW110, 9 August 1945.

¹³ Levine notes that it was the winner of the second prize, Juan Carlos Onetti’s *Tierra de nadie* (1941), which has had a more lasting impact (299).

¹⁴ AK361.2, Memo from AK to HDO, 2 Nov 1962, HRC.

¹⁵ AK327.7 HDO to AK July 1 1961, HRC.

¹⁶ AK339.1, HDO to Koshland, 9 Dec 1961, HRC.

¹⁷ AK295.1, HDO to “Bill” (Koshland?), 25 Nov. 1960, HRC.

¹⁸ AK339.5, Arthur Meyerfeld to AK, 5 Nov 1962, HRC.

¹⁹ AK361.2, Memo from HDO to AK, 7 Nov. 1962, HRC.

²⁰ AK361.3, HDO to AK, 4 April 1962

²¹ I have not seen evidence of de Onís’s health problems, but both Piers Armstrong (*Third World Literary Fortunes*, 1999, 122) and James Remington Krause (2010, 231) cite illness as a reason she abandoned the translation.

²² She protested that otherwise “the work is going to drag on interminably” and she would not be able to work on anything else. AK295.1 AK, HDO to Bill Koshland of Knopf, 1 Nov. 1959, HRC.

²³ The same Taylor who later translated Amado’s *Gabriela*. His translation of Amado was also problematic and required revision.

²⁴ AK327.7 3 June 1961, HRC.

²⁵ In an interview with Felipe Martinez, Piers Armstrong says that Taylor’s “dictionary has a good feel for the lexicon of Rosa, including popular expressions, as well as the names of animals and flora and fauna. I would say it’s a very Sertão-aware type of dictionary.”

²⁶ “Ele fez o livro que supera o regionalismo através do regionalismo. Do ponto de vista da composição literária, a meu ver, isso é um paradoxo supremo. Tanto assim que eu me senti obrigado a criar uma nova categoria, que é trans-regionalismo, ou sur-regionalismo”. From a DVD titled *Nonada* (2006) cited in Hansen 122.

²⁷ Russian translator Victor Golyshev pointed this out (Lecture at BU 13/April-12).

²⁸ JGR-CT-03,014, HDO to JGR, 22 April 1959, IEB.

²⁹ Sandra Vasconcelos originally suggested that this mismatched tone could be a form of foreignizing the translation. Personal interview. 15 May 2014.

RECEBIDO EM: 23/11/2014

ACEITO EM: 03/08/2015

LIVINGSTONE. Between the good neighbor policy and the latin american “boom”: brazilian literature in the United States

Belas Infieis, v. 4, n.2, p. 115-127, 2015.