

*Readers' responsibility: literature and censorship  
in the Kádár era in Hungary*

The problem of censorship is only indirectly linked to the field of cultural memory, yet it can hardly be overlooked that the role a foreign author can play in the cultural memory of a nation depends largely upon the availability of his or her works in translation. After the nationalisation of Hungarian publishing houses in 1949, the publication of foreign literature became an issue strictly controlled first by the Hungarian Workers' Party, then, after the revolution of 1956, by the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. Besides literary qualities, ideological issues and moral considerations exerted considerable influence on publishing policy in Hungary – and thus the reception of foreign authors – up until 1989. As the first step towards more extensive research into the mechanism of censorship in the field of British literature during the era of the one-party system in Hungary between 1949 to 1989, this paper examines the reader's reports on George Orwell and Anthony Burgess to be found in the archives of Európa Publishing House, which was established by the cultural authorities in 1956 for the publication of foreign literature. My aim is to investigate the manner in which aesthetic principles and ideological as well as moral judgments are conflated in these reports, which often have the quality (and sometimes the length) of a critical essay. The reports were not intended for publication, consequently the readers' names, in accordance with the policies of the publishing house, will not be disclosed unless the reader has given his or her permission. István Géher, poet, essayist, critic, translator, Professor of English at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, who was an editor at Európa between 1965 and 1972, and who has published some of his own reports, states that “a reader's report is not a scholarly publication, nor a critical essay, nor a literary genre. The reader's opinion is the property of the publishing house; it is confidential material.”<sup>1</sup> This strict policy of the publisher, apart from concealing the names of censors, results in the fact that a number of nuanced and professional literary analyses remain unknown to the public. One can only hope that this confidential status will change, and that in the future not only the contents of the reports but also the names of the readers can be

---

<sup>1</sup> István Géher, *Mesterségünk címere* (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1989 [1978]), p. 21, my own translation.

revealed – a practice that is natural in some countries with a dictatorial past such as Spain or Portugal.

The period of Soviet-style dictatorship in Hungary can be divided into two distinct eras: the Rákosi era, that is the Stalinist period between 1949 and 1956, and the Kádár regime between 1956 and 1989. The cultural policies of the first period can be characterised in Zsófia Gombár's words by a "narrow-minded arrogance and repressive censorship" in order to "remould all spheres of life according to a [...] Soviet type of model."<sup>2</sup> According to Csilla Bertha "[b]asically, all Western literature, including English, was suspected of being ideologically dangerous for Socialist readers."<sup>3</sup>

"In contrast to the Rákosi regime's sectarian close-mindedness, the cultural policy of the Kádár era finally brought a certain opening up in ideological and cultural terms to the country."<sup>4</sup> Ferenc Takács, critic, essayist, translator, Reader in English at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, claims that Kádár's cultural policy, indeed, brought about "the greatest and most productive era of literary translation in the history of the country"<sup>5</sup> – ironically very often due to the availability of authors who, unable to publish their own works, turned to translation out of necessity.<sup>6</sup>

### *The Stalinist era*

To describe the complex and direct mechanisms of censorship in the Rákosi era, I rely on an unpublished interview from 1990 by literary historian Ágnes Kelevéz with Mátyás Domokos and Pál Réz, two editors of Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, a publishing house of high standing with a focus on Hungarian literature from the early 1950s.<sup>7</sup> It is apparent from the interview that the publishing industry was under very strict political control in the 1950s. Publishing houses had to seek approval of their yearly publication plans by the Kiadói Főigazgatóság (General Directorate of Publishers), a body established in 1953 to coordinate the policies

<sup>2</sup> Zsófia Gombár, "Dictatorial Regimes and the Reception of English-Language Authors in Hungary and Portugal," in *The Censorship of English Literature in Twentieth-Century Europe*, eds. Alberto Lázaro Lafuente and Catherine O'Leary (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> Csilla Bertha, "The Hungarian of the West: Yeats's Reception in Hungary," in *The Reception of W. B. Yeats in Europe*, ed. Klaus Peter Jochum (London: Continuum, 2006), 150–161, pp. 153–154.

<sup>4</sup> Gombár, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Ferenc Takács, "The Unbought Grace – Literature and Publishing under Socialism," *The Hungarian Quarterly* 43 (Spring 2002), 75–78, p. 78.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Gombár, p. 6.

<sup>7</sup> Available in Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum (Petőfi Museum of Literature), Budapest, audiovisual section, ref.: PIM K886/1. Date of interview: 2 October 1990.

of the various publishing houses. The editors of Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó reviewed all books intended for publication. These long and detailed reviews (and, when the Directorate demanded, full manuscripts) were sent to the Directorate, which acted as an instrument of direct political control. After approval, the Ministry of Culture issued the *printing permit*, which was the key to the system: no printing office was allowed to print a manuscript without the Ministry's permit. The permit functioned as a "nihil obstat" up until the 1980s, when, with the appearance of private enterprises in the printing industry, the overall power of this permit diminished. The printers first produced two proofs: one for the publishing house, one for the Ministry – providing a further opportunity for censorship. Once the proofs had been checked and the book finally printed, one copy had to be submitted to the Ministry for the issue of a *permit for distribution*. Were the book to fail this last test, it was not sold but pulped. This system meant that all books published went through an extremely complex fivefold censorship regime from publication plan to distribution.

It may be unclear to the present-day reader why so much effort and sophistication was employed to control the publishing industry. In his book on the publishing policy of the Kádár era, István Bart, editor, translator and critic, examines the question of publication in the framework of the cultural policy of the period, which he describes as "planned mental manipulation." He claims that, because on Marxist grounds literature was considered to be an ideological construct, publication was looked on as an important cultural, political and theoretical issue.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, since "the Communist rulers of Hungary were firmly convinced of the educational power of literature in the process of building Socialism, literature [...] was given an almost exaggerated significance."<sup>9</sup>

However, even this complex system did not always prevent the publication of politically problematic texts. According to Réz, the problem within the sophisticated system of censorship was that the sense of individual responsibility was reduced by the multiple layers.<sup>10</sup> In the same interview Mátyás Domokos calls the mechanism of censorship in the Kádár era a system of "Asian mistrust"; in practice the complex organisation became numb, as none of the individual officers felt the burden of final responsibility – they all supposed that somebody else would be careful enough. Apart from the structural problem, the

<sup>8</sup> István Bart, *Világirodalom és könyvkiadás a Kádár-korszakban* [*World Literature and Book Publishing in the Kádár Era*] (Budapest: Osiris, 2002), p. 11. All quotations are my own translation.

<sup>9</sup> Gombár, p. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Réz, in the 1990 interview by Kelevéz, also claims that scandals concerning books were deliberately organised, and he mentions the case of the second volume of Tibor Déry's *Felelet* (*Answer*) in 1952. It was harshly criticised by József Révai, Minister of Culture for not towing the official line in its depiction of the illegal communist movement. This book, just like any other, went through the fivefold filter, but Réz claims that such scandals could not be foreseen because they were created on purpose, and as a well-known communist writer of Jewish origin, Déry was the perfect target for such a scandal.

most important factor in the system's inability to faultlessly filter out politically unwanted material was the professionals' passive resistance. In principle the editors and readers were prejudiced against the authors, who were viewed with suspicion by the authorities. According to Réz, the editors were supposed to represent the state or communist ideology, but this was often not the case. In Réz's view the greater part of the apparatus joined the "enemy" (that is, the authors): those who remained uncritical of communist ideology and practice in the fifties were usually not learned enough to be the partners of the writers, whereas those members of the apparatus who were at least tacitly critical did not act entirely according to party directives. Often enough the editors and readers tried to mislead the higher authorities, i.e. the officials responsible for political control. These reports therefore can only be viewed within the context of intellectual resistance, which remained a factor to be taken into consideration until censorship ceased to exist.

It must also be noted that in this period (and according to Bart, basically until the mid-1970s) economical considerations were not taken into account.<sup>11</sup> Once it was decided that a book should be printed, it was published quickly in great numbers, and sold at a price level that reflected neither the costs of publication nor the value of the book. The interviewees also mention that the editorial offices of the publishers were large, and that by the 1960s, the publishers employed highly trained professionals.

### *The Kádár era*

János Kádár (First Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party from 1956), in order to maintain the illusion of democracy, preferred indirect methods to control the publishing industry. Censorship officially disappeared from the legislative system, the word itself was rarely used (it was often replaced by the expression "administrative methods"), but the Ministry's printing permit remained necessary, even though it was denied to be a form of censorship. The complex system described above was simplified, but partly because editors and readers within the publishing houses were expected to exercise self-censorship without direct interference from the Ministry. Sándor Révész claims that the duties of editors and censors overlapped, and prohibition formed a part of the selection

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Bart, pp. 22–23. The change in economical considerations is also reflected on by Géher. In the 1978 edition of his book he mentions only as the fifth (that is, least) important characteristic of the reader the ability to evaluate the expected success of a book (pp. 19–20); he adds to the 1989 edition of the volume (written in 1988) that by the end of the 1980s this skill has become the most valued one (pp. 28–29).

mechanism.<sup>12</sup> According to Takács, the “system was based on an elaborate ritual of tacit negotiations and the constant testing of limits.”<sup>13</sup>

This taciturnity poses problems for research into censorship methods in the Kádár era. Even though written directives and proposals existed, communication was often intentionally not in written form, so the reasons that lay behind the decision to publish (or not) a foreign author cannot always be traced.<sup>14</sup> However, great numbers of reader's reports are undergoing research in the archives of Európa Publishing House, and even though they in themselves cannot account for all levels of decision making, an analysis of them provides useful insights into censorship methods.<sup>15</sup> The study of reports confirms the opinions of experts such as Bart or Gombár, who assert that the reports reflected both practical considerations and party directives. Bart divides the Kádár regime into two periods regarding cultural policies.<sup>16</sup> The first one, up until the mid-1970s, can be characterised by ambitious plans and basically sufficient financial means to carry these plans out (even though a shortage of paper remained a problem throughout the period and funds in foreign currency for copyrights also remained insufficient – in fact these material problems led to the classics being given greater weight than contemporary literature). Bart also claims that in this period the real commissioner behind the publishing industry was not the potential readership, but the Directorate for Publishing, and through it, the cultural policies of the state.<sup>17</sup> From the mid-1970s until the end of the 1980s increasing financial problems forced all participants in publishing to take economic considerations more seriously, which meant that the demands of the market were also taken into consideration (this is reflected in the efforts to publish books by Anthony Burgess). At the same time the disillusionment of the officials grew and plans for changing the way people thought became less and less ambitious. As reflected in reader's reports, the potential success of a book was also calculated, and it was with a view to its commercial potential that the otherwise despised popular culture also appeared on the market. These factors together led to the easing of political control over the publishing industry (or to the diminishing effectiveness of political control) by the 80s. Nevertheless, as we shall see, this control was present until late on in that decade. The slackening of ideological control is reflected in the fact that in the late 70s and early 80s editors often tried to publish books that had been rejected in the 60s.

---

<sup>12</sup> Sándor Révész, *Aczél és korunk* (Budapest: Sík Kiadó, 1997), p. 346.

<sup>13</sup> Takács, p.77.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Bart, p. 13.

<sup>15</sup> The archives of Európa Publishing House are housed in the Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum. I would like to express my gratitude to the staff of the manuscript archive, especially Katalin Varga, Mária Gróf and Csaba Komáromi.

<sup>16</sup> Bart, p.18.

<sup>17</sup> Bart, p.23.

The system of censorship throughout the Kádár era rested on two pillars. One was the firm conviction of the morally and intellectually constructive influence of literature (which is why pessimism or decadence was seen as a major argument against the publication of a book). The other pillar was the exclusion of political taboos, the most important of which were the following: criticism of the Soviet Union or the one-party system, anti-Marxism, and ironically, the existence of censorship.<sup>18</sup> Other expressly prohibited issues were the revolution of 1956,<sup>19</sup> the Treaty of Trianon after the First World War, and the difficulties faced by Hungarian minorities in neighbouring countries. Gombár adds, “[n]on-political censorship categories were ‘graphic description of sexuality’ and abusive language. However, as years passed, the public attitude towards sex, obscenity and verbal vulgarity gradually changed”.<sup>20</sup> Yet descriptions of sexuality or abusive language in literature remained an extensively discussed topic in reader’s reports until the end of the 80s.

### *Reader’s reports*

The gradual softening of the dictatorship after the 1956 revolution did not mean the lack of control: rather, it gave rise to the “three Ps” system: the party promoted, permitted or prohibited the works of an author.<sup>21</sup> What this system meant for *prohibited* foreign authors can be shown by the examples of Arthur Koestler and George Orwell. They also represent the adage “once a thief always a thief.”<sup>22</sup> Nothing, not even politically neutral works, could appear by any author who had ever written politically or otherwise suspect books. Accordingly, the first reader’s report on Koestler that can be found in the archives dates from 1988. Prior to this date Koestler’s name could not be printed in Hungarian – and he remained relatively unknown to the public.

George Orwell’s name probably appeared to be less dangerous, as a number of reports can be found on him – yet no book by Orwell was published until 1989. Orwell’s name is first mentioned in a report in 1963, when a collection of

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gombár, p. 9. and Bart, pp. 44–45.

<sup>19</sup> Gombár claims that Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World Revisited* was not published because of a brief reference to the Hungarian revolution in the preface (“The chapters that follow should be read against a background of thoughts about the Hungarian uprising and its repression[...].”) <<http://www.huxley.net/bnw-revisited/index.html>>; retrieved on 27 August 2010). This fact might have contributed to the low number of Hungarian versions of Huxley’s works in print in the period.

<sup>20</sup> Gombár, p. 9.

<sup>21</sup> The “three Ts” in Hungarian: *támogat, tűr, tilt*; translated into English as the three Ps (promote, permit, prohibit) by László Kontler. See László Kontler, *Millennium in Central Europe: A History of Hungary* (Budapest: Atlantisz, 1999), p. 445.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Bart, p. 47.

English essays was being edited. His name appears in the first draft, but a later reader claims that none of his essays has literary merits that would justify its translation. Anyone familiar with some of Orwell's essays might suspect that this is not the real reason, and even though the reader claims that it is not a political question, this statement cannot be taken at face value.

Twelve years later in 1975, the publication of the minor work *Down and Out in Paris and London* was considered, and two readers argued for its publication; they also mentioned that the reading public would expect a different book by this author. However, no work of Orwell was published until 1989, and no report was written on him until 1988. Even in that year one of the readers found the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* too early and politically dangerous, as the public "would not understand it as a fictive negative utopia, but as a realistic description of their everyday lives." Exaggeration though this statement may be (everyday life in Hungary in the 80s hardly resembled the distressing fictional world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*), the fact remains that all through the Kádár era political implications were taken very seriously in the publication of English fiction.

Anthony Burgess is a writer who, compared to the authors discussed above, is not politically exposed, nevertheless only one book of his exceptionally large oeuvre could appear in Hungary from his exceptionally large oeuvre during the Kádár era (which coincided almost exactly with Burgess's career as a writer). Despite the fact that only one book by this prolific writer was translated into Hungarian during the Kádár era, his oeuvre is well represented by the large number of reader's reports that were written on his books. A table listing all the available reports is to be found in the end of this paper; in what follows I shall discuss the most interesting reports.

The first report on Burgess dates from 1966 and the subject is the comic novel *The Doctor is Sick* (first published in 1960). The reader praises the book for its style and the superb combination of reality and imagination. Despite the positive report, the publisher seems to have dropped the idea of publishing this book; in 1972 three more reports were written on this novel – unfortunately two of them were negative. One reader claims that the book is of poor literary quality, not even witty. So the publication of *The Doctor is Sick* was postponed another decade, when Ferenc Takács was commissioned to review it. We learn from an editor's note that it was this review that opened the gate for the publication of the book, after earlier reports had been unappreciative of Burgess's humour. Takács praises both Burgess and this novel; he finds *The Doctor is Sick* a superb comedy and an embryonic satire of the life of ease – which can be read as a criticism of western society, something that party propaganda was eager to hear. Less crucially from a political point of view, Takács praises the book for its postmodern features: Spindrift, the protagonist exists *in* words and *through* words after having become an object instead of a subject in the hospital. Takács interprets this procedure as an initiation into the lack of personality. *The Doctor*

*is Sick* appeared in a series called “Vidám Könyvek” (Funny books) only in 1990, in the translation by the recently deceased Pál Békés under the title *Beteg a doktor*.

Despite the fact that the publication of *The Doctor is Sick* was delayed twenty-four years after the first reader’s report, another book by Anthony Burgess was published in Hungarian. As the first book by Burgess in Hungary, *One Hand Clapping* was translated by Gabriella Prekop and published in 1979 under the title *Egy tenyér ha csattan*. It took five years after three positive reports in 1974, all of which praise the book as a witty satire of the consumer society. One reader points out that (in 1974) it is high time at least one book by the author were published – a remark frequently made by readers. Often mentioned is the fact that despite the lack of political problems, in many cases there are technical difficulties in translating the language-based humour of Burgess. *One Hand Clapping* is a challenge for the translator, but the reader considers it worth the effort because the book is a minor masterpiece, and Burgess published nothing more significant in the mid-70s. As Ákos Farkas reminds us in his article on the reception of Burgess in Hungary, *One Hand Clapping* was also turned into a moderately successful musical comedy in Hungary, a fact that Burgess also mentions in his autobiographical *You’ve Had Your Time*.<sup>23</sup> Burgess points out that he believes the success of this particular book in the Soviet bloc owes to the fact that “Socialist critics had mistaken the work for a blanket condemnation of ‘the whole capitalist Western life.’”<sup>24</sup> Indeed, contemporary Western authors, who were generally viewed with suspicion by the authorities, were rarely published in Hungary unless they were thought to be critical of capitalism.

Burgess’s most famous book, *A Clockwork Orange* could only appear in 1990 alongside *The Doctor is Sick*, after the state monopoly of book publishing ceased. (Nor was Kubrick’s movie screened.) In the archives only one report can be found, from 1974, which recommends the publication of the novel – in vain, it would seem. A particularly interesting feature of this report is the reviewer’s remark on language: “After careful reading I report that the Russian vocabulary has neither openly, nor indirect, political implications.” On the other hand, he recommends the use of a different language in the translation. It was an important statement: readers were expected to look for political implications,<sup>25</sup> and a number of cases prove that the Soviet comrades were careful and unforgiving if any critical remark of the Soviet Union appeared in Hungarian.

<sup>23</sup> Ákos Farkas, “Orange Juice for the Bears: Anthony Burgess in Hungary,” *Anthony Burgess Newsletter* 7 (2004) 5–17, p. 8. <<http://bu.univ-angers.fr/EXTRANET/AnthonyBURGESS/NL7farkas.htm>> retrieved on 27 August 2010.

<sup>24</sup> Anthony Burgess, *You’ve Had Your Time: Being the Second Part of the Confessions of Anthony Burgess* (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 29; quoted by Farkas, p. 8.

<sup>25</sup> Géher (pp. 24–25) mentions the reader’s duty to draw the attention of the publisher to ideological or moral factors that could make the reviewed book “debatable” – a statement that can be understood as an allusion to censorship.

No other work of Burgess was published under the Kádár regime, yet a number of other interesting reports were written. The reader of *The Wanting Seed* in 1967 opined that in socialist literature utopian novels do not exist, that the utopianism of this book determines its world view, which is considered cynical. Indeed, the obligatory optimism of socialist realism made negative utopias an anomaly unsuitable for publication. When this view of utopian writing was challenged in and around 1990, a huge number of books belonging to the genre appeared: not only Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was published, but also Zamyatin's *We* and Rex Warner's *Aerodrome*. Burgess's *1985* might also have fitted into this wave, and two positive reports were written in 1989, but the book was not translated. *The Wanting Seed* was not considered again in the 80s (though the book continues to be unavailable in Hungarian). For the 1967 reader of this novel, Burgess's theory of the cyclical nature of history (the constant reoccurrence of Augustinian and Pelagian phases) is particularly problematic, as it expresses mistrust in any form of state, including socialist states, and shows too much respect for liberal bourgeois politics. The circumspect reader considers it important to point out a marginal feature, the relatively greater freedom enjoyed by the proles; he identifies this as an Orwellian influence, making the novel unsuitable for publication.

*The Malayan Trilogy* also received some negative reports. The greatest problem, according to one reader in the late 60s, is that this series cannot be fitted into social realist categories: it treats social and political problems on the psychological level. The *Enderby* quartet received a number of negative reports as well, and has only recently been translated (even though Ferenc Takács finished almost all his reports of other novels by Burgess with the remark that the *Enderby* series should be translated). Particularly telling are the remarks of a 1969 reader, who claims that *Enderby*, just like most works by Burgess, provides a wonderful reading experience, however her conscience prevents her from recommending it because of its destructive nature.

*Honey for the Bears*, a novel set in the Soviet Union, could not be translated according to its 1973 reader: it transmits direct anti-Soviet ideas, which was anathema and no further argumentation was needed. A similar problem was encountered by the readers of *The End of the World News* in 1985. One part of the book is a satirical musical featuring Trotsky in New York. Both readers point out this feature, claiming it to be problematic or "prickly" ("kényes", a phrase that often occurred in reports), yet hoping that it would not be an obstacle to publishing the book. Otherwise the novel's technique is praised by Ferenc Takács, who points out that its three stories with their different realities reflect on the very nature of fiction. In 1985 Trotsky may or may not have been an obstacle; all we know is that both readers considered it important to mention and that the book was not published; whether this was because the easing of political control did not go this far or because of other reason cannot be proved.

However, the problems with Burgess were usually not political, but either linguistic (many readers were of the view that Burgess's language could not be translated into Hungarian, a claim that many translators have disproved) or moral. *Beard's Roman Women* was considered too naturalistic in 1979, and even though one reader praised its structure and wit (which are recurring statements in the reports), both the description of sexuality, despite its non-pornographic nature, and the frequent use of swearwords are "more than the Hungarian reading public can tolerate." The same claim was made about *Tremor of Intent* in 1981.

Another taboo in socialist morals was homosexuality, especially when homosexuals appeared as positive characters. According to the reader in 1981 this had been the main problem with *Earthly Powers* – which was translated only in 2008.

In conclusion it can be stated that political caution in publication was present until the very end of the period, and this is well reflected in the reader's reports, which are the best documented facet of the censorship mechanisms. Major concerns of reviewers and editors alike were lack of optimism (that was often described as a "destructive nature"), descriptions of sexuality and abusive language. Political references or allusions were closely scrutinised and books with features that could be labelled as critical of Marxism or the Soviet Union could not be published. An important argument for the publication of twentieth-century fiction is the criticism of capitalistic society – in such a case the book could be labelled as progressive or humanist. The literary ideal being socialist realism, non-realist traditions of modernist or postmodern fiction faced difficulties in finding their ways to the Hungarian audience. These issues lie behind the fact that not until the very end of the Kádár regime could any book appear in Hungarian bearing the name of either Koestler or Orwell, and only one by the politically less problematic Anthony Burgess. Despite the fact that a superb translation industry helped the publication of classic foreign literature, the reception of twentieth-century authors was highly influenced by non-literary factors. And since, in large-scale terms, national culture will only receive a foreign author when at least some of their major works are available in Hungarian, these non-literary factors influenced not only modern English authors' available translations, but also their place in Hungarian cultural memory.

Reader's reports from the archives of Európa Publishing House  
on Anthony Burgess

Date	Title (original publication)	Suggestion (+ recom- mended; – not recom- mended)	Remarks
1966	The Doctor is Sick (1960)	+	
22 April 1967	The Wanting Seed (1962)	–	cynical, yet ideologi- cally not problematic
4 June 1967	The Wanting Seed (1962)	–	
1967	Malayan Trilogy (1964)	+	
1968	Malayan Trilogy (1964)	+	without the third volume
–	Malayan Trilogy (1964)	–	psychological treat- ment of social-political problems
1969	Enderby Outside (1968)	+	
1969	Inside Mr Enderby (1963)	–	
1971	Shakespeare (1970)	–	witty but superficial
1971	Devil of a State (1961)	–	witty, but not worth translating
7 June 1972	The Doctor is Sick (1960)	+	
27 June 1972	The Doctor is Sick (1960)	–	
30 July 1972	The Doctor is Sick (1960)	–	Low quality, narrow- minded humour
1972	Nothing Like the Sun (1964)	–	gossip instead of art
1973	Honey for the Bears (1963)	–	
1973	Nothing Like the Sun (1964)	–	
8 March 1974	One Hand Clapping (1961)	+	
2 May 1974	One Hand Clapping (1961)	+	
30 Oct 1974	One Hand Clapping	+	<b>published in 1979</b>
1974	Napoleon Symphony (1974)	–	It should not be the first Burgess novel to appear
1974	A Clockwork Orange (1962)	+	
30 May 1978	The Clockwork Testament or Enderby's End (1974)	+	The trilogy together
18 Aug 1978	The Clockwork Testament or Enderby's End	–	Not as the first volume by Burgess
10 March 1979	ABBA ABBA (1977)	–	impossible to translate
11 April 1979	ABBA ABBA	–	topic not interesting
8 July 1979	Beard's Roman Women (1976)	–	
30 Sept 1979	Beard's Roman Women	+	abusive language

9 Feb 1981	Tremor of Intent (1966)	+	it could be a popular success
14 April 1981	Earthly Powers (1980)	+	homosexuality
10 Aug 1981	Earthly Powers	-	not well structured
10 Sept 1981	Tremor of Intent	-	
1983	The Doctor is Sick	+	
1984	Napoleon Symphony (1974)	-	chaotic
1984	Enderby's Dark Lady (1984)	-	linguistic problems
4 Jan 1985	Enderby's Dark Lady	+	difficult to translate
3 July 1985	Enderby's Dark Lady	+	
29 July 1985	The End of the World News (1982)	-	
15 Sept 1985	The End of the World News	+	
31 Oct 1985	The End of the World News	+	
1989	Tremor of Intent	+	
13 July 1989	1985 (1978)	+	
28 Aug 1989	1985 (1978)	+	