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Abstract

This dissertation comprises a study of the perceptions of the Spanish poet and playwright Federico García Lorca, and how these have affected people’s view of the poet and his work. Due to the broad nature of this project, the focus will be limited to Lorca’s rural trilogy: *Bodas de sangre*, *Yerma*, and *La casa de Bernarda Alba*; and the study will centre on productions in Spain and the United Kingdom. The scope of this work deals with the different images of Lorca which have developed and evolved before his death in 1936 and after; how different institutions and people have tried to control and manipulate these different images. I use the term ‘image’ here to refer to specific perceptions that people constructed and then projected onto the poet, thereby causing audiences (and at times those who work in the theatre) to view Lorca as: the national icon, specifically one always associated with Spain and Andalusia; the Civil War victim; the Romantic and exotic figure, who has elements of classical Romanticism in his work and has strong associations with the Spanish gypsy; and the gay icon, the most recent image of the poet which has opened up new interpretations of his work. The analysis of these images will be related to a discussion of how they affected the productions of Lorca’s work and their reception of the playwright. An extensive study will be done on Lorca productions in the UK and Spain from 1975 to the present day, and how these productions reflect and construct the many images of Lorca. Audience’s reactions and interpretations of these productions will be analysed using theatre reviews by critics and, when possible, published interviews with those involved with the production.
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Introduction

It may seem that the subject of Federico García Lorca and his work is utterly exhausted. There have been countless interpretations and analysis of his poetry and plays; the media (both Spanish and British) have reported on Lorca, his life and his work on a regular basis, his plays and poetry are widely performed and published, and his image and name are even today being seen associated with politics. Those who study the poet know the complexities associated with his work and the controversies which have arisen around Lorca the playwright and his private life. But little comment has been made (by academics and the media) on the myth of Lorca or the Lorca that people are presented with when they come into contact with the playwright’s work or life (for example, details about the poet’s life in the media and academia). The figure of García Lorca has had many masks placed on him before and since his death in 1936. That is to say, that those who have and have had great power over Lorca’s image have placed these different masks on the figure of the playwright. The playwright was indeed, to use a line from one of his own plays, ‘a man devoured by the mask’, although this results with the figure of Lorca being surrounded by conflicting images: that of the national icon, the Civil War victim, the Romantic figure, and finally the gay icon. These images have been so embedded in the minds of Spanish and British society that they have leaked through in the productions of Lorca’s plays, especially in his famous rural trilogy (Bodas de sangre, Yerma and La casa de Bernarda Alba), the most performed Lorca plays.

1 This is said in El público by the character of the Director (García Lorca, 1994: 5). The mask or ‘la mascar’ is symbolic of the social conventions and hypocrisies which is being forced upon some of the characters in the play. The director describes a time when a young man was ‘devoured by the mask’, presumably when he broke social convention and this resulted in an attack. I use this term in connection to Lorca’s image as some people have tried to place certain social conventions and perceptions upon the poet, as will be explained (perhaps an exception to this is the poet’s new ‘gay’ image).
It seems it is impossible to write anything about Lorca without discussing the overwhelming myth which envelops him. Because, after all, it is the myth of Lorca which has lived on until today and which has carried the weight of these different images. Henry Kamen explains very eloquently what a myth today is:

Even if unreal, a myth always has a point of origin, and that origin is related to our human consciousness and experience. The myths of world history are born out of perceptions and hopes that have formed our lives. They therefore reflect reality, even if they are not real or truthful. One evening after dinner in his Cambridge college in 1931, the literary scholar C. S. Lewis went for a walk with his guest J.R. Tolkien and talked about myths. Lewis claimed that myths were ‘lies’. ‘No, they are not’, said Tolkien, and went on to explain his view. Myths, Tolkien felt, are an expression of reality and therefore not entirely false. Some myths are even partial versions of a truth that lies behind them. The conversation changed Lewis’ perception of the problem. (2008: IX)

The idea that a partial truth or reality is contained within a myth is argued further by Barthes in his essays on mythologies, although he approaches the matter using semiology. However, Barthes claims that myth is created through false truths and distorted history. Without delving into the enormous semiological detail he undertakes in his essay Myth Today, Barthes argues that myth is a type of speech; derived from the formation of language (i.e. the Signifier (the acoustic sound) and the Signified (the object) are connected by the Sign (like the word ‘tree’)). In myth or meta-language however, the linguistic Sign becomes Form, a visual or literal representation which is empty and devoid of history. The Concept absorbs the history removed from the Form but distorts it, which leads to the Signification (which connects the two) to be artificial and the myth itself. In this case, Lorca as a whole is Form however he is drained of meaning and history by the Concept; his work, private
and public life are distorted. This leads to the *Signification*, Lorca as a Myth, supported by the distorted concepts of Romanticism, nationality, civil war victim, and homosexuality. According to Barthes, ‘it is the motivation which causes the myth to be uttered’ (2000: 118). Due to the issue of memory in Spain (which will be discussed in the following chapter), Spanish society gives justification and motivation for this Lorca myth; however in their minds it is not read as motive but reason. By doing so, it makes the Lorca myth seem natural, myth ‘transforms history into nature’ (Barthes, 2000: 129), giving it a sense of immortality and the eternal:

Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact. (Barthes, 2000: 143)

As the *Concepts* are weak and poor (as they contain only a knowledge of reality), a rather incomplete image is given which is ideal as ‘a complete image would exclude myth’ (Barthes, 2000:127). Therefore, the fact that Lorca’s body has never been found and the circumstances surrounding his assassination and homosexuality are unclear makes strong foundations for the Lorca myth: ‘But in general myth prefers to work with poor, incomplete images, where the meaning is already relieved of its fat, and ready for a signification […]’ (Barthes, 2000: 127). However, this Lorca myth did not spring out from emptiness; according to Barthes ‘Men do not have with myth a relationship based on truth but on use: they depoliticize according to their needs’ (2000:144). The myth of Lorca has been used to justify interpretations of his work and his personal life.
The myth of Lorca also influences the ‘Author Function’ as it presents critics and audiences with a predetermined but false image of the poet. According to Foucault’s theory on the Author, ‘the author is not spontaneous but constructed by the reader’ (Smith, 1989: 106); this is linked by Paul Julian Smith to Lorca:

García Lorca is perhaps the most extreme case of proprietorial authorship in Spanish literature: it seems impossible to approach his texts without acknowledging his person, and it is almost an article of faith amongst critics that in Lorca literature and life are one. (1989: 107)

The attachment that people have created between Lorca’s work and his life can be seen with the interpretations of some critics of the rural trilogy, particularly using homosexual readings (which will be discussed in depth in chapter four). Like Barthes considered the myth to be a use for men, Foucault also believed that ‘…the author is not a person but a function’ (Smith, 1989: 106), and it can be argued that Lorca served as a symbol for different people, whether it be political or social. With this function come certain preconceptions which Smith discusses:

First, Lorca is often presented as being at once universal and particular: the great man transcends his socio-historical limitations but must be called to account, none the less, for his political and sexual convictions. Second, this juridical assessment is historically specific: the anti-fascism and homosexuality repressed or condemned by early critics are proclaimed and celebrated by later ones. Third, the image of Lorca as author does not arise spontaneously, but is actively constructed by critics. (1989: 107)

These preconceptions (and repercussions and influence they have had) together with the notion of the Lorca myth have helped create the Lorca that is presented to us
today: this Lorca, since his assassination in 1936, has sprouted from the minds of the Republicans who mourned him, the fascist dictatorship which tried to censor and then celebrate him, and from the pens of those who are attempting to revive and reveal the private side of the playwright after so many years of silence. Of course, there are many sides to Lorca, but today the media are saturated with only a few of these images, and each of these selected images have in turn been used to serve a purpose.

Lorca as a national icon was used by both the Nationalists and the Republicans after the Civil War for their own means, whether it was to promote a positive image of Spain or to use his fate as an example and a reminder of the atrocities of the past. These images proved to be so popular and strong that they spread outside of Spain to other countries like the United Kingdom.

Therefore, the focus of this work will be these images, how they developed and evolved over the past seventy years or so, what they are today, with some final thoughts of what might become of them in the future. The images will first be drawn in some detail as a prelude to considering how they have impacted on performances of his work. Although a variety of Lorca’s work will be touched upon, the main focal point will be his rural trilogy. By first analysing the poet and his different images, it will be possible to see how these representations affected the productions of the plays in the UK and Spain. The productions that will be discussed vary from those which follow Lorca’s plays faithfully, those which involve some experimental twist, and those which transfer the plays to a different context or adapt them into something completely different from the original. Finally, discussion will turn to how audiences have received these plays as indicated by a range of critics’ reviews in the

---

2 For example, productions which follow Lorca’s dialogue, set design and stage directions as they are in the original manuscript.
newspapers. To complement the investigation of the production and reception of the three plays, some mention will also be made of several films of the plays (as adaptations) and Lorca’s life, given that since the death of Franco in 1975 they have become more popular, and because they are available to a wider audience.

Therefore there will be four main chapters that deal with the different aspects of the poet’s image and the Lorca productions: the first chapter will deal with the critics of Lorca and the productions, and the translation of these productions in the UK. Although this chapter uses the critical writings of Gwynne Edwards as a starting point, many other critics’ points of view will be looked at and compared. The way in which the translations and adaptations of these productions affect Lorca’s image will also be analysed.

The following chapter deals with Lorca as a national icon. This section will be divided into Spain and nationalism, Lorca as a Civil War victim, and Lorca and the issue of memory. The whole chapter deals with the myths of nationalism that surround Spain and its history and how, in turn, Lorca came to form part of this myth. The chapter then investigates how some institutions and people controlled Lorca’s image from after the Civil War to the present day.

The third chapter looks at Lorca as a Romantic and exotic figure. This section sees how the nineteenth century idea of the Romantic and exotic attached itself to Spain and the playwright himself. The chapter then goes on to see how this imposed image of Lorca infiltrated into productions of his work, therefore giving the audience a certain view of the poet and his native country.
The final chapter investigates a fairly recent image of Lorca which is developing in Spain: that of the gay figure. It is known today that Lorca was homosexual; however the journey that this figure has taken has been turbulent, filled with secrets and often hidden. The point of this section is not to prove that Lorca was or is a gay icon, nor am I saying that Lorca should be a gay icon. However, as the subject of Lorca’s sexuality is being discussed even today, it deserves investigation.

I believe that the modern images of Lorca are dictated by a myth that has enveloped his figure since his death in 1936. As the myth has influenced critics and audiences alike for such a long time, his work, in turn, has also been affected by it. The productions of the rural trilogies in particular have acted as an extension of the Lorca myth in both Spain and the UK. Therefore, the reception of Lorca is often based on loose concepts of his character, life and work; audiences see Lorca as certain figures, and they then expect to see echoes of these figures within his work itself. However, the Lorca myth is not solid or complete; I believe that it is continually evolving, having the capacity to add to the myth when new revelations or interpretations of the poet arise, while keeping the myth and image of Lorca eternal. With this work, I hope to bring to light some of these images (and the myths behind them) and show how they have affected Lorca and his work.
Chapter One: The Critics and Translations

If we were to consider the notion of the Lorca myth, it can be argued that theatre and the productions that are shown carry a heavy cultural weight upon their shoulders, in that they are considered to be a reflection of the society and times in which they were written and performed. According to the anthropologist Victor Turner, ‘To look at itself a society must cut out a piece of itself for inspection. To do this it must set up a frame within which images and symbols of what has been sectioned off can be scrutinized, assessed, and, if need be, remodelled and rearranged’ (cited in Bennett, 1997: 104-5). The arts represent a major form of self-reflection and analysis, not only in depicting the Spanish transition after the dictatorship but also in understanding the country’s past ghosts. After the death of Franco in 1975 Spain went through a cultural transformation in which cinema, music, literature and theatre became the forms of liberal expression, for example, from the counter-cultural movement ‘la movida’ emerged people like director Pedro Almodóvar and singer Alaska who were symbolic of a new Spain. Although many made their mark in Spanish culture, none penetrated the media or the public’s consciousness as much as the playwright Federico García Lorca; the mystery surrounding his death, the sudden popularity of experimental versions of his drama in theatre and cinema from the 1980s onwards, revelations about his private life and more recent media attention regarding Baltasar Garzón and his involvement with Civil War victims have kept Spanish (and non-Spanish) audiences constantly fascinated with the poet. Lorca, one of Spain’s most

---

3 See Tremlett (2006) for discussion of the country’s fascination with the Civil War and Franco’s dictatorship.
performed and popular artists for the past eighty years or so,\textsuperscript{4} forms part of this artistic culture in Spain.

The aim of this chapter will be to lay down the foundations of this investigation by looking at and discussing some of the Lorca productions since the 1970s. Naturally, Spanish and English productions will be examined throughout this work. As is it quite difficult to get audience’s views of the productions without conducting a detailed survey of present productions or indeed finding similar investigations performed in the past, the easiest method is by gathering a variety of reviews by theatre critics and interviews of those involved with the production (i.e. actors, directors, adaptors/translator). What will be specifically looked at in this chapter are some of the Lorca productions which made the critics write certain generalisations concerning the poet therefore adding, (or indeed constructing) some of Lorca’s different images.

The following section of this chapter then deals with the translation issues surrounding the playwright and how these issues in turn assist in forming a precise image of Lorca. By doing this, it gives us a wide view of how productions impact on the audience, and how people’s interpretation of these productions impact on the image of the playwright.

The sheer quantity of Lorca productions in Spain and the UK after 1975 is worth analysing (see tables and graph). In the table provided are all of the main Lorca

\textsuperscript{4} I also include Franco’s dictatorship in this timeline as, even though Lorca’s work was censored for a certain period of time, his poetry was still being printed and productions like La zapatera prodigiosa and Doña Rosita were still being performed. In the 1960s, censorship was relaxed for the rural trilogy, which was performed with great success up until Franco’s death. Newspapers also frequently reported on foreign Lorca productions in France, the UK and so on, showing a clear interest in the success of a Spanish playwright abroad, regardless of censorship. This will be discussed in more depth in the Nationalism chapter.
productions in Spain from 1970-2010. From the table it is easy to see the abundance of Lorca productions, and from the graph it is possible to compare these productions. Bodas de sangre is clearly the most popular production and Yerma (although not seen as often in the UK) was the first performance (of these three plays) to impact the stage a few years before Franco’s death. Despite there being many conventional productions, i.e. ones which stay faithful to the text in tone, scenery and dialogue, the mid seventies to late eighties saw a flourish of surreal and experimental productions. The most notable being Angel Facio’s La casa de Bernarda Alba, in which the character of Bernarda was played by a man, and Yerma starring Nuria Espert, where the scenery was made up of trampoline like floors. In many ways the type of productions reflected the mood and situation of the audience who came to watch them: for example, Facio’s production (staged the year following the dictator’s death) seemed to mirror Spain’s newly found freedom of expression which led to a certain degree of sexual permissiveness. This can be seen in the figure of a male Bernarda Alba riddled with Freudian undertones. These Lorca productions also opened doors for many actors and directors who are now directly associated with the playwrights work, for example, Lluis Pasqual and Nuria Espert are seen as those who make and act in Lorca plays (see table). This is seen even today with Lluis Pasqual and Nuria Espert joining forces to make the highly successful production of La casa de Bernarda Alba in 2009.

An interesting aspect seen in the table is the duration of many of these productions, some of which have the longevity of a London West End musical. Víctor

---

5 The list includes all full Lorca productions (entire play and not selected scenes), excluding productions which ran for one day (for example, some festival productions) and university productions.

6 ‘Reflecting the new freedom of expression on the stage, the production[s] introduced visual sexual elements not indicated in the texts. The entrances of the Lorca tragedy were shaped like vaginas; Bernarda, played by a male actor, sat in a space in the form of a clitoris’ (Zatlin Boring, 1980: 465).
García’s production of *Yerma* was first staged in Spain in May 1972 after a successful run in London’s Theatre Festival. Originally the production was only meant to run for a couple of months, however, due to its roaring success, it was performed for two years (with breaks) in the Teatro de la Comedia amounting to over 200 performances, followed by a short run in Sevilla and Barcelona, and then a world tour (the UK, France, USA, Japan, Israel, etc). After stopping for a few years, the production came bounding back onto the Spanish stage in 1986 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Lorca’s death, however this time without the director Victor García who died suddenly in the early eighties. Although Nuria Espert took over direction, the production itself was exactly the same as when it first came out in 1971. The endurance of this production can only be matched by Antonio Gades’ *Bodas de sangre*, first produced on stage as a flamenco show (and made into a film directed by Carlos Saura). First performed in 1975, this production has persisted (on both stage and film) to this day, despite the film being made in 1981 and the death of Antonio Gades in 2004.

The variety of productions is also something worth commenting on and, as explained by Hutcheon, ‘adaptation is repetition, but repetition without replication’ (2006:7).

The majority are straightforward stage productions, varying from the traditional (Lluis Pasqual’s production of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, 2009), the experimental (Victor García’s *Yerma*, 1972-1986), to the surreal (Lluis Pasqual’s *El público*, 1987).

Equally popular are the adaptations into other theatrical forms such as dance (i.e.

---

7 Initially the production’s premiere was planned for 1971 in the Teatro Griego (Barcelona). However, in the month of its opening the play was suddenly cancelled due to apparent work and construction needed in the theatre. Even the *ABC* (a relatively right wing newspaper) appeared sceptical regarding the excuses given, although ending the report with ‘Es obvio apuntar que la prohibición no se debe a la obra de Lorca, que permanece en el libro, y en el buen teatro, íntegra y admirable’ (Vila San Juan, 1971: 51). The fact that the newspaper felt it had to state this shows that this Lorca production may have been too controversial for an audience under Franco.
Flamenco and ballet), opera and even a puppet show was made out of *Yerma*.\(^8\)

Flamenco is the most common form of adaptation of Lorca’s work after conventional stage productions and this, in itself, makes for interesting analysis in Chapter 3.

By far the most successful flamenco version of Lorca’s plays is, as mentioned before, Antonio Gades’ *Bodas de Sangre* (1975). This production contains no dialogue from the original play other than the songs (with music written by Lorca himself); the story is told and expressed through flamenco dance. More recently *La Casa de Bernarda Alba* has been made into an opera (Oliver, 2009) not long after a German opera version of the play was written. Although it did not enjoy the same fame as some of the flamenco versions of Lorca’s plays, it is an example of the possibilities and the flexibility of Lorca’s work (Lorca and adaptation will be discussed shortly).

By no means did Lorca’s popularity stay within the boundaries of Spain. His plays have been performed in countries with cultures as diverse as Israel, Japan, France and Greece, and have been translated into languages ranging from English to Esperanto.\(^9\)

However, for a foreign playwright who has the notorious reputation for being difficult to translate and stage, Lorca has accomplished great success in the UK. As in Spain, *Blood Wedding* has been the most popular and produced play, followed by *The House of Bernarda Alba* and *Yerma*. Plays from outside the rural trilogy have also been

---

8 A production by the Swedish company El Grillo in Seville (May, 1993). This production is not mentioned in the table as it was initially performed for school children only, and then for one night for the general public.

9 *La Casa de Bernarda Alba* and *Bodas de Sangre* were translated into Esperanto by Miguel Fernandez in 1987 (Anon, 1987).
reasonably successful (mostly the plays from Lorca’s posthumous work\textsuperscript{10}). As the UK was only restricted by censorship until 1968, Lorca productions were already being staged before 1975, but it was really in the seventies when Lorca plays became popular (most likely due to the lifting of all censorship and the theatrical success of Lorca abroad, for example, Victor García’s production of \textit{Yerma} won awards in the UK). One of the first and most successful productions was not even British, but the Spanish production of Victor García’s \textit{Yerma} on tour (performed in the UK before Spain in 1971). Unlike Spain, however, the United Kingdom seems to have frowned upon deviating away from traditional productions of the plays, a curious aspect which will be discussed in the following paragraphs. English productions, as in Spain, attracted celebrity names like the Mexican actor Gael García Bernal and British actresses Joan Plowright and Glenda Jackson. Although British productions have yet to achieve or create Lorca plays with more surreal elements like those in Spain, the productions have still remained popular with theatre-goers.

If we were to consider that theatre is ‘an event which relies on the physical presence of an audience to confirm its cultural status’ (Bennett, 1997: 86), then it is vital to investigate the audiences’ and critic’s reaction to these Lorca productions as well as the performances themselves. It is from these responses that we can discover how much the productions affect the image of the playwright and how these images are created and developed. Analysing these images is complicated, but can be done by looking at the productions and the various responses to these productions by the critics and those working within the play.

\textsuperscript{10} Lorca’s posthumous work consists of \textit{El público} (1930), \textit{Comedia sin título} (1936) and any other work published after Lorca’s death (according to Hardison Londré, 1983).
In 2005 two Lorca productions were staged in London within two months of each other: *Blood Wedding* (shown in the Almeida Theatre in London between May and June) starring Gael García Bernal and adapted by Tanya Ronder, and *The House of Bernarda Alba* (shown in the Lyttleton Theatre in London between March and July), adapted by David Hare. With the attraction of a celebrity cast and the novelty of two Lorca plays being shown around the same time (which incidentally had never occurred in the UK11), many critics and Lorca scholars pounced upon the opportunity to review them. In his critical article ‘Lorca on the London Stage: Problems of Translation and Adaptation’, Gwynne Edwards begins the analysis of these productions with the question: ‘But to what extent did they succeed in doing justice to the work of a dramatist, who is essentially Spanish, and whose plays have the reputation, unjustly, of being difficult to stage in English?’. With this one question Edwards has already made three clear statements: the first is that these two productions need to do (or at least attempt to do) justice to the original piece, meaning (as will be discussed shortly) that the play should preserve certain qualities associated with the playwright and his work; the second is that the playwright is what Edwards refers to as, ‘essentially Spanish’, a term he does not define; the third is that Lorca’s work has a notorious reputation when it comes to translation into English and for the English stage (which will be discussed later).

As we move further through Edwards’ critique we find that he becomes more adamant in his belief that people should be loyal to the source texts, not only in

---

11 Edwards states in his article that ‘Lorca’s *Blood Wedding* and *The House of Bernarda Alba* have been staged in the United Kingdom on numerous occasions, but never before have two major productions appeared as recently, within two months of each other’ (2005: 382). Edwards does not define what he means by ‘major productions’, although judging by the type of the two productions he discusses in his article, it can be assumed that he may mean large scale productions in popular theatres in London with high calibre/well known actors and directors.
dialogue but also in what Edwards refers to as ‘essential Spanishness’. The interesting aspect of Edwards’ article is his repetition of the idea of ‘essential Spanishness’ or his reference to Lorca himself as ‘essentially Spanish’ and the link he makes between this and doing justice to the work of the playwright. For instance, this can be seen when Edwards compares what he believes Lorca would have wanted from the settings and comparing that to what was used in the productions: ‘Through simplification and stylization, [Lorca’s] purpose was, very clearly, to broaden his work’s resonance, thereby transforming the action of the plays into a much more universal image while at the same time retaining their essential Spanishness’. (2005: 382). Edwards then goes on to criticise these two productions, not only for their translations but also for their apparent failure to mirror an Andalusian setting (the cave in the case of Blood Wedding, and the country house in The House of Bernarda Alba) and an Andalusian attitude. Edwards states that, although these productions have served Lorca well by promoting his work, they were unfaithful in staging and dialogue to the original plays.

Edwards states at the beginning of his article ‘The importance of these productions lies in the fact that they afforded London theatre-goers, as well as visitors to the capital, the opportunity of seeing two major Lorca plays in stagings which received considerable publicity, were expensively produced, and called on some famous names’ (2005: 382). Later on, while concluding his article, Edwards says ‘[…] Although the London productions of Blood Wedding and The House of Bernarda Alba drew welcome attention to Lorca’s theatre and helped to make his work more familiar in the United Kingdom, they also illustrated to the full a lack of familiarity with the dramatist’s background and style on the part of their respective directors and adapters’
In other words, Edwards is arguing that in order for the plays to remain loyal and do justice to Lorca, they must maintain a certain Spanish quality.

As Edwards refers so much to ‘essential Spanishness’ throughout his article without ever giving an idea of a definition, it would be useful to comment on some recent critical debates dealing with the question, what is Spanishness? The notion of Spanishness or Spanish identity is quite complex as it encompasses the language, Spanish citizenship, and practically anything that can be related to Spain (Sánchez-Conejero, 2007: 1). To actually define ‘Spanishness’ as a concept seems near impossible; however, what seems to be evident is that Spanishness and identity has changed over time, particularly in relation to the issue of memory. According to David K. Herzberger: ‘Past time in particular resonates deeply in our efforts to convey the fullest sense of identity – it enables us to define the nature of our communities in relation to all that has come before’ (2007: 11). With this in mind and without losing focus on Lorca, it is important to briefly analyse how Francoism formed and affected Spanishness, and how Spanish identity has changed since 1975. Under Franco Spanish identity was based on ‘ethno-cultural elements of Spanishness’ (Herzberger, 2007: 13), that is to say, elements like Catholicism which in turn points to heritage. Herzberger states:

For Francoist Spain, the ethno-cultural model was crucial, especially because the regime represented itself as “la coronación de un proceso histórico”, which in turn allowed it to offer itself as a cynosure for Spanishness. But equally important, this same ethno-cultural model demanded exclusion from Spanishness for all aspects of the past that might rupture continuity. (2007: 14)
As well as grasping on to historical elements to define Spanishness, Franco also played with the notion of ‘Otherness’, particularly in the 1960s. This will be mentioned later on in this dissertation, but for now, it is suffice to say that tourism was a major factor in the promotion of Spain and its differences to the rest of Europe. When it came to the Spanish transition after Franco’s death, there was an attempt to move away from the old fashioned views of Francoist Spain, in a way, a search for a new Spanish identity. However, Spanishness and identity are unable to escape from historical exclusion, disremembering, and remembering; all of which will be discussed in the following chapter. So far, there is an understanding of Spain’s complications and changing definitions of Spanishness; Herzberger concludes his essay: ‘…an understanding of time in contemporary Spain supports ethno-cultural as well as civic claims to Spanishness, and this same understanding opens identity-making to a dynamic and transformative proliferation of times and voices’ (2007: 20). The notion of Spanishness is loose and dependant on time, therefore Edward’s quote of ‘essential Spanishness’ lacks foundation and context.

Throughout his article, Edwards considers the two productions from three different angles: location/stage design, actions and characters, and translation. While Edwards points out some valid flaws in the misreading of Lorca’s original text (i.e. the common mistake of assuming that Bernarda Alba and her family are wealthy middle class when in reality they are simply the richest family in a poor farming/working class village), he does, curiously, comment on several extremely minor aspects that do not impact on the play as a whole. For example, when discussing Blood Wedding in his ‘Action and Characters’ section, Edwards says of the Wife in Norris production, that she ‘is hardly the kind of woman the volatile Leonardo would be likely to marry’
because her dress is that of a ‘little girl’. However, this in itself does not explain why the character’s appearance does not suit that of Leonardo. In *The House of Bernarda Alba*, Edwards goes to the extent of noticing that the stockings worn by the five sisters are flesh-coloured rather than the traditional black worn when mourning. While these two London productions may indeed show a ‘lack of familiarity of Lorca’, they are adaptations and not direct translations of the original script12, therefore it seems inappropriate of Edwards to compare his own interpretation with that of David Hare and Tanya Ronder. The examples given are just a few compared to a reasonably extensive list of complaints.

The opinions expressed by Edwards are reiterated by other critics (some of whom are mentioned in the article). Michael Billington, writing for *The Guardian*, starts off his review of *Blood Wedding* by asking ‘Can Lorca’s Blood Wedding work in English?’ (2005). This question is often disputed in the translation world: ‘Giving voice to the overall theme of a Lorca play by allowing it to speak metaphorically may arguably be a simpler task than attempting to transfer discrete aspects of his symbolism in translation. Not only are Lorca’s metaphors and images difficult to capture, there is also the problem of ‘fixing’ the meaning of a word or phrase in the original. As a result, translators are likely to find themselves in the unenviable position of having to transfer into English what Lorca wrote in Spanish, the meaning of which he was unable to explain himself’ (Anderman, 2005: 303-304). Although this quote does support Billington’s belief to a certain extent (in the sense that Lorca’s work is difficult to translate and has always caused problems for translators), Anderman also mentions the ‘applicability’ of the plays to social events, saying that theatre has a

---

12 The adaptations of these plays were made using literal translations of the original text, therefore they had no contact with the source text. This will be discussed in further detail in the second half of the chapter.
‘social mission’. In other words, Anderman is saying that Lorca’s plays have a universal aspect to them (2005: 312-313). Like Edwards, Billington uses stock phrases to describe Lorca and his work: for example, ‘quintessentially Spanish tragedy’, ‘obstinately rooted in an Andalusian world of honour and pride’. However, unlike Edwards, the Guardian critic does not make reference to a sense of universality in Lorca’s plays. His main quibble with the London production is the confusing international cast (made up of Mexican, Dutch, Icelandic and Irish actors), stating that: ‘Norris's production is full of visual invention, but lacks clearly defined roots’. Specifically in respect to the Irish actress Rosaleen Linehan (playing the Groom’s mother) he says that ‘her Irishness makes her a strangely isolated figure’. Billington’s view in this matter is concerned with the actress’s Irish accent which distances her from the rest of the cast, although whether or not Bernarda Alba should be seen as an ‘isolated figure’ is debatable. As with Edwards, Billington does not say what he means by ‘quintessentially Spanish’. At one point in his review he states: ‘Bernal's Leonardo is authentically Latin’; obvious perhaps considering Bernal is a Mexican actor, but here we see Billington extending his reference from Spanish to Latin which carries the implication that suggests something Spanish which may not be universal but is not unique to Spanishness itself. Billington makes much of the play (and Lorca) being Andalusian and Spanish, and yet is satisfied with a Latin American actor. For that reason, the reader remains unsure, although it seems possible that Billington is unaware of his further extension of the term Spanish to Latin. He then concludes his article with the question he started with: ‘Can Blood Wedding be done in English? I’d say the jury is still out’.
Paul Taylor (also mentioned by Edwards), writing for *The Independent*, like Billington, begins his short article with a statement regarding the transference of Lorca to a British stage, although, unlike his Guardian contemporary, mentions why the translation may be difficult:

> The plays of Federico García Lorca are damnably difficult to pull off on the English stage. To the Anglo-Saxon temperament, communicating mild dyspepsia in Dorking comes much easier than conveying volcanic passion in Andalucia. The equivalent of a white handkerchief tends to be draped over Lorca's sun-baked dramas, or there's a desperate resort to cultural tourism - castanets, cicadas, wiped brows - that can feel as close to the real thing as a Morris dance is to a bullfight. (Taylor, 2005)

Despite Edwards disagreeing on some points like the critical remarks that Taylor makes about García Bernal, both writers remark upon the universality that emerges from Lorca’s work. For example, Taylor states ‘Rufus Norris's brilliantly imaginative production of Blood Wedding avoids all such traps and creates its own compelling and coherent poetic world’ (Taylor, 2005), although with this specific production Edwards believes that the production failed in its attempt to be universal.

The interesting aspect of these examples (by Edwards and the other critics) is they are all similar to Edwards’ original claim of Lorca being an ‘essentially Spanish’ playwright. At the end of his article, Edwards concludes:

---

13 Taylor states that García Bernal ‘hasn’t enough stage presence to convince as a *homme fatale*, and his delivery of the English script has intonations not always in synch with the natural emphases in the lines’. Edwards retorts that ‘the truth of the matter is that, in a production which was decidedly patchy in acting terms, Bernal moved well and produced one of the more effective performances…’ and concludes ‘the scenes involving Bernal and Thekla Reuten as the Bride were among the most effective’ (cited by Edwards, 2005: 386).

14 Although Taylor does not mention specifically what these ‘traps’ are, judging by his previous comment it can be assumed that he means falling into the trap of making productions using what he sees as stereotypical views of Spain (i.e. using flamenco, big white houses as the set and so on).
It could be argued, of course, that the work of any truly great dramatist can be adapted in many ways, but the fact remains that Lorca’s rural tragedies are rooted in the particular environment and traditions of Andalusia. To remove them from that context by seeking to give them an international flavour or by transposing their action and characters into an English background in order to make them more accessible is to invite disaster. And attempts to move away from the poetic language of a great poet-dramatist or to water down and refine his language are simply to put in its place something much inferior. What, one may ask, is the point of that? (2005: 394)

Edwards may believe that moving Lorca away from a ‘Spanish’ text is pointless, but similarly he does not see the need to define what he constantly refers to as ‘essentially Spanish’, and simply assumes the reader would understand this term.

Judging by what has been said by Edwards and the other critics, it is possible to derive an interpretation for what they seem to believe is ‘essential Spanishness’. It appears that their expectations of what a Lorca play should be are centred around stereotypical references: Spanish flamenco guitar music and song, Spanish dress, and so-called Andalusian temperaments (whatever they may be). However, none of these critics makes an attempt to define what is or what makes a Spanish playwright, yet condemn these Lorca productions for their lack of faithfulness. Why is it that a foreign playwright like Lorca is placed on a pedestal, while experimentation is allowed with the plays of other writers like Shakespeare (for example, the productions of Peter Brook15)? Even non-English Lorca contemporaries are allowed a little more leeway than Lorca himself. The Italian playwright, Luigi Pirandello, is a clear

---

15 Perhaps the most famous Peter Brook production is that of the RSC’s *Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1970). Here Brook rejected the conventional staging of the play and placed it into what he called a ‘heightened realm of metaphor’ (Williams, 1997: 225). The set itself was a white room with two doors and props were made up of slinkys and trapezes.
example of this. In June 2008, a production of *Six Characters in Search of an Author* directed by Rupert Goold was staged in the West End with a modern twist. Instead of being set during a rehearsal (as it is in Pirandello’s original play), the Goold production is set in a television production office with the director (a TV executive in this version) trying to make a documentary/drama about a terminally ill boy. Goold went as far as making up a new final act. Yet, despite this radical change from the original, it had a long and successful run in the West End with extremely positive reviews. The theatre critic from the *Telegraph*, Charles Spencer, acknowledges the differences but claims ‘the piece's themes emerge with clarity and wit, the scenes of angst and anguish are truly harrowing, and the whole hi-tech show has a rare zing and confidence’ (Spencer, 2008). Granted, Pirandello’s surreal play has more in common with Lorca’s *Comedia sin titulo* and *El público* than it does with his realist rural trilogies. However, in spite of the play’s absurd story, Goold experimented with it and changed the plot to an extent which has yet to be done with Lorca in the UK.

Having said all this, experimentation in Lorca productions is not unknown in Spain. A famous example of this is the Spanish production of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* in 1977 by Angel Facio in which the character of Bernarda was played by a man dressed in a huge fur coat symbolising a vagina. This stage production of the play was one of the first since the death of Franco in 1975 and therefore it drummed up a lot of debate and controversy in Spanish newspapers, especially since it was so far away from a traditional staging of a Lorca play. The production had already been staged in Portugal (with a Portuguese cast), a year before the director decided to open the play in Madrid and Barcelona, with reasonable success. Just before the play premiered in April 1977, Facio wrote an ‘antecritica’ in La Vanguardia:
La trayectoria de la represión arranca del sexo y hace impacto en el sexo, tras un recorrido sexualmente animado. Bajo la máscara inflexible de un estado, tiembla el azogue de un grupo social inseguro, rendido al enajenamiento de un trabajo envilecedor que hace del hombre un animal con pretensiones de comer caviar y de adquirir un frigorífico para conservarlo. Por debajo del poder, solloza un río interminable de sexos cortados. (1977: 30)

This short article serves to justify his new and unusual production. Clearly, the underlying theme behind Facio’s version of La casa de Bernarda Alba is repressed sexuality and sexual urges (for example, seen in the transvestite Bernarda and in the incestuous lesbian relationship between two of the sisters). Facio goes on to reinforce this:

La casta policíaca de los eunucos dominó siempre los sótanos de la Inquisición. El castrado castra, y así se venga inútilmente. Bernarda no es una mujer ni un hombre, sino un anfibio viscoso y enlutado, un absurdo grotesco que dictamina sobre la muerte. El gesto ambiguo de un "Travestí". Por eso, Bernarda Alba es interpretada por un hombre.

Las palabras no bastan. Las palabras son momias. Usadas, retorcidas y exprimidas por filósofos, literatos y oradores, apenas sirven para articular el suspiro de un inmenso fuego de artificio. La tierra no habla, la tierra dispara su grito de hembra traspasada contra los cimborrios de las academias. Y en sus veletas queda enganchado el desafío imposible. Por eso, el cante flamenco, visceral y telúrico. Contraste y diapasón del juego de actores. (1977: 30)

Within the theatre Facio began to break the norms of the repression imposed upon Spanish society during the dictatorship, using perhaps one of the biggest taboos at the time: sex. Although there are reports of great applause and cheers at the end of the
play\textsuperscript{16}, many critics took an instant dislike to the production. Some disagreed with the sex change of Bernarda Alba, others with the strange set (external characters would open little doors in the ceiling, perhaps an attempt to show how claustrophobic the household was). But what most critics share is their dissatisfaction with moving away from what they believe to be Lorca’s original intention in the play. The Vanguardia article by A. Martínez Tomás, for example, goes to great lengths to describe to the reader the background behind the play (who Bernarda Alba is based on, when it was written, etc) and then finishes the first section of the article with the following comment:

\begin{quote}
El deseo del autor es ofrecer de este sombrío drama una visión realista, que su estro embellece mediante un lenguaje de fuerte sabor popular, pero impregnado, como el de Valle Inclán, de un fondo poético profundo. El núcleo trágico de la obra sigue siendo válido, y aun cuando estos casos de represión ya es poco probable que se den, basta que hayan sido posibles en otro tiempo, para darles fuerza y contenido. García Lorca pretendía también que su obra fuese un documento, casi una visión espectográfica de unas realidades que le sobrecogían. (1977: 48)
\end{quote}

This final paragraph before Tomás moves onto criticising the actual Facio version is quite clearly stating to the reader what Bernarda Alba should be and, more importantly, what Lorca wanted it to be. With this, Tomas sets the stage for a negative critique for Facio’s production. The most criticised part of the play is the use of a male actor to play Bernarda Alba, which is described by Tomás as ‘un error’. He goes on to say:

\textsuperscript{16} Manuel Pombo Angulo reported in La Vanguardia that ‘Hubo bravos, ovaciones, recuerdos, todo lo que ustedes quieran’ (1976: 27).
Porque, Bernarda, contra lo que cree, por lo visto, Facio, no es un virago ni un ser asexuado, sino una arcaica figura deformada moralmente por los prejuicios ancestrales. No es que ella, madre de muchas hijas, sea indiferente al sexo. Es su moral, su rutina mental, su estrechez de espíritu, su identificación con las normas viejas, la que le mueve al despotismo y la crueldad. (1997: 48)

Despite the negative review, Tomás notes the positive reaction from the audience once the play ends. The journalist Lorenzo López Sancho (writing for the ABC) is equally, if not more, condemning of the Facio production. Many similarities to Tomás’ critique can be drawn: using the background story of Lorca and Bernarda Alba to justify the review and pull apart the production and so on. López Sancho, unlike Tomás, takes the time to go through intricate details of the production and it is clear that his main issue is the lack of naturalism within the play, especially with regard to a male actor playing the title role: ‘Tratar de ese modo a Bernarda Alba es, pues, desrealizarla. Es el primer elemento desrealizador, desnaturalizador que Angel Facio introduce en la interpretación de la tragedia lorquiana’. Sancho devotes two pages to dismantling the production from many different angles and finally completes the review with the short phrase ‘Pobre García Lorca…’ (1976: 62-63).

Both writers’ reviews are quite scathing, after all, such a radical change of a relatively well-known play after more than thirty years of a dictatorship can seem sudden and shocking. What both journalists seem to ignore is that this specific production may have been using Lorca as a tool to explore other aspects of a new, modern and free society in a manner that may be considered a precursor to ‘La movida’ of the 1980s. The main issue that continues to appear when discussing Lorca and his work (in Spain and abroad) is that of ‘Spanishness’ and the assumption that people would know what it is and therefore have no reason to define it. Not only is
there a reluctance to define the notion but also a knee jerk reaction to sustain
‘Spanishness’ when this perception is challenged. This type of response to the
question of Spanish culture is often seen in the UK; in Spain the defensive nature of
critics lies with changing what they assume is Lorca’s vision of his own work. It
seems that people like to place different masks over Lorca: that of the civil war
victim, the national icon, the Romantic and exotic figure and, more recently but to a
lesser extent, the feminist or gay writer. In turn these imposed images of Lorca impact
on the way people interpret and produce his work. This is not to say that this does not
occur with the majority of other playwrights; however, as just seen, people seem
exceedingly protective over Lorca’s legacy. The aim of this work is to identify these
different representations of the writer through productions of his work (in this case the
rural trilogy), depictions of Lorca in the media and how (and why) the playwright is
used in terms of Spanish culture.

Theatre Translations in the UK

In the UK, foreign plays have always had a certain presence in the theatre scene,
although not all plays by foreign playwrights have been successfully produced on the
British stage. In a recent article in The Guardian John J Morrison writes about the bad
habit acquired by theatrical producers over the years:

Whatever will these silly foreigners get up to next? Did you hear about the
Chinese version of Hamlet that gave the play a happy ending? Surely we all
know you can't rewrite the classics, and my Chinese example is imaginary.
But British theatre commits artistic assault and battery of this kind on an
increasingly regular basis. The victims, sprawled in the wings with their
scripts torn to shreds are invariably playwrights who had the misfortune not to write in English. (Morrison, 2010)

Morrison goes on to give recent examples of this type of treatment, namely a production of *Prince of Homburg* by Heinrich von Kleist which is currently playing in London, which had the ending of the 200 year old play completely changed. Morrison also mentions other European theatre like the two Russian playwrights Gorky and Bulgakov and how their work has been suited to the apparent tastes of the British audience claiming ‘now it's just torn up to suit the tastes of modern London audiences who have no idea that what they're seeing is quite different from, and vastly inferior to, the original’ (Morrison, 2010). Although Morrison makes no direct mention of Lorca his comments and beliefs can be applied to, not only how an audience would react to a Lorca play, but also how the British audience are today:

One can argue that in the theatre anything goes, particularly when the author is safely dead and long out of copyright. But one of the principles that marks off theatre from film is respect for the artistic integrity of the author's text, even when he or she is no longer around to complain. That's why we squirm to think of Nahum Tate reworking King Lear in the 1680s to give Shakespeare's tragedy a happy ending.

Treating foreign works in this cavalier fashion sends the same message as the decline of language teaching in schools; we are increasingly a monoglot culture, treating classic plays in other languages as mere raw material for our own theatre. (Morrison, 2010)

Even though Morrison’s opinion of Britain becoming a ‘monoglot culture’ can be challenged, there is some resonance of this in some current Lorca plays staged in the UK, that fail to understand or seek to adapt in the way Morrison decries.
As noted previously, critics like Lorca translator Gwynne Edwards disapproved of two 2005 Lorca productions due to their distance from Lorca’s original play and so-called intentions, and the lack of ‘essential Spanishness’ within the two productions. No attempt was made, by any of the critics discussed, to define this loose term, yet it has been used rather frequently. As they do not describe ‘essential Spanishness’ (perhaps because they assumed that this term was sufficiently obvious), it falls to the reader to decide what this means. Judging by the several different aspects they were complaining about (and perhaps assuming that they are unaware of the historical implications of ‘Spanishness’ and the role memory plays), it can be assumed that they did not see the Romantic and exotic qualities normally associated with Lorca and his work (in this case his rural trilogy). As with countries like France, Germany and Russia in the nineteenth century, the UK also delighted in the Romantic qualities and myths of Spain. Like the French artists of the day, some English authors also took part in writing about Romantic Spain, for example, George Henry Borrow who wrote about his travels around Spain in the book *The Bible in Spain*. These writers took a few exotic elements of Andalusian culture which came to represent the whole of Spain in the foreign imagination, with many people associating stereotypical traditions like bullfighting, flamenco and gypsies with not only Andalusia but the whole of Spain. This will be discussed in more depth in the following chapter.

As in Spain, there were British productions of Lorca’s plays while Franco was still alive. However, UK audiences were faced not only with a foreign play but also having to deal with the difficulty of understanding a translation of Lorca’s lyrical poetry, prose and dialogue, creating a further barrier between Lorca’s theatre and the English speaking spectators. Although the focus of this study is Lorca’s theatre in the UK and
Spain, it is worth mentioning the first ever Lorca production in English (due to the
difficulties in translation and performance it had), which was staged in New York in
1935. The play was *Bodas de Sangre* translated into *Bitter Oleander* by José
Weissberger and performed at the Lyceum Theatre by the Neighbourhood Playhouse.
What makes this particular production interesting is that Lorca collaborated with
Weissberger. However, the translation was heavily criticised due to the difficulty in
understanding the translation of several motifs (i.e. flower motifs) due to the
‘linguistic faithfulness to the original’ (Anderman, 2005: 293). In a book about
European theatre in translation Gunilla Anderman writes:

Culturally and socially the Anglo-American and the Spanish worlds appear to
be too far removed and the languages spoken, English and Spanish, not
sufficiently similar in structure for a simple transfer of Lorca’s text to be
possible without some degree of acculturation. The fidelity of José
Weissberger’s translation was in fact praised by García Lorca himself, who
collaborated with the translator, helping with untranslatable words and phrases
which were replaced by others suggested by the author himself…It would not,
however, have been the first time that the original author’s inclination to view
the text from the point of view of the source language speaker did little to help
the translator arrive at a version likely to match the theatrical expectations of
the target audience. In sum, the 1935 New York reception of *Blood Wedding*,
targeting aspects such as Lorca’s floral imagery and the inherent element of
melodrama, foreshadowed the reaction to ‘English Lorca’ in years to come.

The problem of an ‘English Lorca’ continues to haunt English productions today.
Although there have been several very successful productions of Lorca in English in
the UK, there are many translations of the poet’s work which struggle to cope with his
very specific florid language in translation.
Recently there have been several adaptations of some of Lorca’s plays rather than actual translations. Before moving onto specific Lorca adaptations it is important to understand transcultural adaptations. Adaptations into different cultures are quite common in cinema and theatre and frequently with extremely positive results (for example, Akira Kurosawa’s *Throne of Blood* (1957) is a famous and successful transcultural film adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*). Although theatre transcultural adaptations are faced with more pressure from their audience, as Hutcheon writes:

> […] performance media present the greatest challenges for adaptations across cultures and not only because of the presence of paying audiences – on site and ready to respond with incomprehension or anger. Adapting across cultures is not simply a matter of translating words. For audiences experiencing an adaptation in the showing or interacting mode of engagement, cultural and social meaning has to be conveyed and adapted to a new environment […] (2006: 149).

With a theatrical adaptation of a foreign play the adaptor has to consider many different factors such as time (as in the setting of the play), religion, race, linguistic differences, ‘Facial expressions, dress, and gestures their place along with architecture and sets convey cultural information […]’ (Hutcheon, 2006: 150). It is a lot to consider and produce effectively, especially when dealing with someone as complicated and as regionalised (in setting) as Lorca.

---

17 Translators such as Gwynne Edwards are used rather frequently and as the standard text.
An example of this is Rona Munro’s modern adaptation of *The House of Bernarda Alba*, which was staged in Glasgow by the director John Tiffany in 2009. Although the published version of the play script refers to Munro as the translator and makes no reference to the play being an adaptation, Munro adapted the play using a literal translation and several different translations of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. It is important to distinguish between a literal translation and the other translations that Munro would have used, although there is no mention of which literal translation Munro has used to adapt the play. The purpose of a literal translation is for adapters (who do not speak the source language) to get a general idea of the work. It would provide readers with an idea of specific imagery used (like the importance of colours and animals) and a sense of the poetic nature of the language. Therefore an existing translation of the play would have to be used in order to make sense of the dialogue and plot. Naturally, this form of adaptation is done by people who do not speak the language and who are unfamiliar with the play/playwright. The main issue with this type of adaptation is that the audience eventually sees a production which has been thrice removed from the original source text, and is distanced because the play has gone through at least three different interpretations.

In a resource pack provided by the National Theatre of Scotland, Munro speaks about her experience re-writing this play:

This is my second attempt at translating the play. My first, produced by Shared Experience in 1999, was a wonderful, if intimidating experience. I was initially uncertain I could do it justice. I had never done a translation before. I had only a shaky grasp of Spanish from political solidarity trips to Central America, which provided me only with a vocabulary of revolutionary slogans and the ability to order vegetarian food in several
dialects. I had seen one (bad) production of the play years before, but no good ones.

At the start, I was quite uncertain I could love the text enough to do it justice. However, after battling my way through several drafts, armed with a literal translation and several other people’s versions, I emerged with a real love of this play and of all Lorca’s writing [...] I loved the dark, explosive, brooding world of Bernarda Alba. I loved doing that translation and the production that followed, but the experience still left me unsatisfied. (House of Bernarda Alba Resource Pack, 2009: 4)

It is curious that the job of translating and adapting a play by a playwright who is notoriously difficult to translate into English was given to (as it says below) someone who not only did not speak the source language and only had a vague idea of who Lorca was, but also did not quite enjoy or grasp the play in the first place. This struggle with The House of Bernarda Alba is reiterated in the translator’s note of her adaptation for Polly Theale ten years before:

When Polly Teale first approached me to translate La Casa de Bernarda Alba I was flattered but initially uncertain. I hadn’t attempted a translation before. I was familiar with the play itself, with only a vague memory of a very bad production years ago at the Edinburgh Festival. When I read it my uncertainty increased. It seemed so relentlessly grim, page after page of weeping, black-shawled women gnawing at each other and moaning about their fate. I found myself longing to give them a good slap and to shout at them to get a life. (1999: 7)

From this statement Munro’s uneasiness, lack of experience and initial comprehension of the play is evident.18 Despite this preliminary negative impression

---

18 Munro’s lack of experience and understanding is due to her unfamiliarity with Lorca, his work and the Spanish language, not of theatre itself. Munro is an established and award winning playwright.
of Lorca, Munro does show how some ‘bad’ productions can affect the view of the writer and the play as a whole. Writing for the NTS student pack, Munro explains:

The problem was that I felt a lot of the play’s original shocking power had been diluted by time. We could observe the repressed world of Bernarda and her daughters, but it wasn’t our world, we were just voyeurs on the past. We could appreciate the absolute taboo of an unmarried woman letting a man put his fingers on her skin through the bars of a window . . . but there were no bars on our windows, and plenty of naked skin on view anywhere you cared to look. We understood, but we couldn’t feel it as Lorca’s intended audience would have done. (The House of Bernarda Alba Resource Pack, 2009: 5)

Judging by what Munro has said in these introductions, several aspects of the Lorca play made her feel uncomfortable or that the play itself was unnatural in a British setting (or more specifically for the Tiffany production, a Glaswegian setting). She comments on the grimness of the original play and what perhaps she considers to be stereotypically Spanish (i.e. women weeping, ‘moaning about their fate’ and dressed in black shawls).

When John Tiffany approached Munro to adapt her translation and set it in modern day Glasgow, he had a certain vision of the characters that he wanted to translate onto stage. Tiffany and Munro decided to approach the play with a different focus: that of the ‘mother-daughter relationships’:

In the original, Bernarda decides that there will be eight years of mourning, so the girls are going to stay in the house for that time. Obviously, we would never believe that in 2009, but what Rona’s done is build a psychological prison between mother and daughter. The daughters can’t leave because
Bernarda convinces them that they won’t survive without her, that they have to stay at home in order to survive. She won’t let them go. That, I think, is the genius stroke. (The House of Bernarda Alba Resource Pack, 2009: 10)

The main issues Tiffany and Munro had with this Lorca play were the unfamiliar and old-fashioned customs. Again, they attempt to modify what they perceive to be the original message of the play, ‘In the original, sex is the taboo and that worked for a Catholic culture in 1930s Spain. What Rona has done is to reverse that. Here love is the taboo’ (2009: 10). Like Munro, John Tiffany also seems to have the view that Lorca’s original play is just too out-dated for a modern audience to believe. Even though he is transferring the play to a modern-day setting, Tiffany is changing aspects of the play so drastically that (to some) he seems to be sacrificing the original meaning of the play. For example, in the above quote Tiffany claims that sex is the taboo in the original La casa de Bernarda Alba, whereas in his version Munro has made love the forbidden act. By saying this Tiffany gives the impression that the frustration felt by the five sisters was a sexual one, although some may believe (for example, critics and scholars like Edwards) that there is much more to the play than Tiffany claims. Sex and sexual frustration, of course, is a theme within the play, but this is clearly just one of many subject matters. Love is equally a taboo subject within the play: the fact that all the sisters want the same man (sexually and perhaps to fall in love with), Angustias’s arranged marriage is one of financial convenience rather than love and, of course, Bernarda’s cold-heartedness towards her daughters. Despite Tiffany’s comments on the Catholic setting of the play and the era for which it was written, Lorca’s aims of universality and realism remain consistent (Edwards often says that Lorca’s work is universal: ‘Through simplification and stylization, his

---

There are several example of this, La Poncia gossiping to Bernarda about the sexual escapades of the villagers, the stoning of an adulterous woman, Adela’s sexual relationship with Pepe and so on.
purpose was, very clearly, to broaden his work’s resonance, thereby transforming the action of the plays into a much more universal image while at the same time retaining their essential Spanishness’ (2005: 282)).

Putting the modernisation of the play aside, Tiffany and Munro are putting forward a fairly out-dated image of Lorca, and an image which is very specific to a Spanish audience. From reading their comments in this ‘Educational Pack’ (which includes, as well as the interviews, questions and discussions about the production for school children), students would have a specific image of the playwright. However, by modernising this play both director and adapter have shown how flexible the work of Lorca actually is, and how his themes can translate into any place or time. Tiffany continues in his analysis of the play by stating:

I think there’s something brilliant about the idea of five sisters all fighting over the same boy. I’ve always found that quite funny as well as seeing the tragedy of it as it unfolds. I’d only ever seen productions or pictures of productions or heard about productions of the play done in the original way, set in Spain, with lots of black, being very dry and very hot and that fuelling a kind of languid quality and atmosphere. Seeing actors delivering the lines in Received Pronunciation, I didn’t really buy it, I just don’t think our culture is fuelled in that way. (The House of Bernarda Alba Resource Pack, 2009: 9)

Tiffany makes an interesting point that La casa de Bernarda Alba can have elements of comedy in it as well as tragedy. There is humour in the original play, but due to the tragic nature of the plot, this can be easily ignored. For example, in Pepa Gamboa’s version of the play there are frequent parts of the play filled with innuendo and jokes; and in David Hare’s adaptation of the play (directed by Howard Davies), there are also humorous parts. This light relief in turn emphasises the tragedy that occurs at the
end of the play. Tiffany also mentions that the productions he has seen or heard about are ‘done in the original way’, by this he might be referring to the Romantic and romantic elements associated with Spain and the playwright, like the colour black and the heat which fuels ‘a kind of languid quality and atmosphere’, and the oppressive and tragic themes. Tiffany completes his statement with ‘I just don’t think our culture is fuelled in that way’, which raises a parallel question: In the same way that Gwynne Edwards and other fail to define ‘essential Spanishness’, Tiffany does not explain in which way ‘our culture’ (i.e. British culture) is fuelled, although judging from his production of *The House of Bernarda Alba* his interpretation is far from the hot villages of Spain. Rather, the setting is in rainy Glasgow, the Alba family are a modern day family with the five daughters having the freedom to go clubbing and Bernarda (or Bernie, as she is named in this production) being the head of some sort of organised crime group. Although, as mentioned before, this is quite common with adaptations of plays as they are ‘not back-dated but rather updated to shorten the gap between works created earlier and contemporary audiences’ (Hutcheon, 2006: 146).

The character of Bernarda is one which is talked about by Tiffany:

Bernarda Alba is a tragic figure. In trying to save her daughters, she kills one of them and that is the tragedy. What’s fascinating is seeing how tragedy has changed over the twentieth and into the twenty-first century. When the play was written it was very much about authoritarianism with Bernarda Alba as an authoritarian character. Lorca identified her with Spain at the time and the dangers of suppressing sex or passion. Obviously, we’re not in 1930s Spain so that doesn’t apply here and my taste isn’t to make characters into symbols. So while arguably, we do live in an authoritarian culture, it didn’t feel as though that was urgent for me. What Rona has done is to make Bernarda a tragic figure along the lines of Willie Loman in *Death of a Salesman* or Blanche DuBois in *A Streetcar Named Desire*. She doesn’t stand for anything, it’s just
a human story. In trying to make her daughters survive, she’s responsible for one of them committing suicide and realises it along with the audience. We can see it coming. That, for me, is absolute tragedy and I’m really, really excited to see how an audience connects with that. This adaptation is faithful to Lorca, almost line by line – although we do have references to Dubai and Asda – but it connects and it’s about trying to keep the play as urgent as it was when people first saw it […] We directors always like to think that we are restoring something in terms of taboos but I do believe Bernarda Alba is a genuinely tragic figure in Rona’s version. (The House of Bernarda Alba Resource Pack, 2009: 11)

The character of Bernarda is a curious one and is often layered with different interpretations by different people. As Tiffany suggests, some scholars have drawn parallels (due to her authoritarian figure) with the troubled and unsettled situation of pre-Civil War Spain and at the same time is also based on actual events from Lorca’s childhood.20

Although there were some positive reviews for Tiffany/Munro’s production, some critics felt that there was something lacking:

With not an Andalusian plain in sight, this House of Bernarda Alba is not exactly as Federico García Lorca imagined it in 1936: it’s less about pre-Franco oppression than post-credit-crunch neurosis. The closest we get to Spain is a Royal Doulton figurine of a flamenco dancer. And even that smashes on the plushly carpeted floor of Bernadette Alba's all-beige Glasgow living room as soon as the play begins […] But although the relocation does

---

20 In a conversation with Morla Lynch, Lorca said: ‘…There is, not very far from Granada, a small village where my parents owned a small property: Valderrubio. In the house immediately next to ours lived ‘Doña Bernarda’, a very old widow who kept over her unmarried daughters an inexorable and tyrannical watch. They were prisoners deprived of all free will, so I never spoke with them; but I saw them pass like shadows, always silent and always dressed in black…there was born The House of Bernarda Alba, its enclosed women Andalusian, though, as you say, they do have, perhaps, something of that harsh colouring more in keeping with the women of Castile’. (trans. Edwards, 1980: 235).
not jar, it cannot match the brooding intensity of the original. Having swapped Spanish austerity for consumerist comfort, these women are more grumpy than desperate. When things get tough, they can always lie back on the sofa and escape into an episode of Gossip Girl. That might make us smile, but it doesn't elicit our sympathy. And, refreshing though it is to see Lorca played with humour, John Tiffany's production strikes an uncertain note. It looks like a raucous all-girls-together comedy – especially with Munro's waspish language – but it pulls us in the opposite direction, towards tragedy.

The approach works well in the communal scenes, as the strong cast engage in a delicate tussle for power. It is less successful in quieter moments, however, when the actors' energy is muted by Laura Hopkins's enclosing white box of a set. The result is a 21st-century family drama with a conclusion that is bitter and bloody, but lacks any sense of cruel inevitability. (Fisher, 2009)

Mark Fisher remarks on the unusual non-Andalusian setting of the production, but his main quibble is not with the relocation of the play but with the feeling of the production itself. Even though Tiffany claims that Munro and the production have remained faithful to Lorca line by line, this is not necessarily the case. There is nothing wrong with attempting to transfer the play to Glasgow and trying to modernise it, many productions have created modern adaptations of Lorca’s work (Spanish and English) and in a sense they are promoting Lorca’s work as flexible and universal (in other words, people can empathise with the issues that Lorca writes about, regardless of the country or language).

What appears to be the case when it comes to performing Lorca on the UK stage is that the productions tend to fall into two different categories: the productions which try to recapture Lorca’s original plays by setting them in (what they deem to

---

21 The claim that they have remained faithful to Lorca ‘line by line’ is unusual, as they do not say in which way they have remained true to him. Clearly, the translation and adaptation of the play is not faithful as there are references to places like ‘Matalan’. Perhaps they mean they have stayed faithful in essence, but again, they do not define it.
be) an arid Spanish landscape, with Romantic and exotic elements like Flamenco music; and then the productions which attempt to move the play to a new or modern setting and change elements of the play (such as the characters and plot lines) in order to bring a British audience closer with this adaptation. However, these two methods tend to falter in different ways. The first method of keeping the play filled with Romanticism and exoticism while having the actors speak in Received Pronunciation, makes the audience recognise that it is a foreign play and may very well distance them from it. The second method, on the other hand, distances Lorca from the finished production, and while there is nothing wrong with experimenting with the plays (as Spain has done since the 1970s), the issue and the message can often be lost. Also, to assume that audiences would not understand the foreign or exotic aspects of a Lorca plays seems slightly patronising, especially in the more recent productions of this decade. Due to modern media and travel, a lot of people are more familiar with Spain and its customs, like the food, the culture and even the language to a certain degree. This is reflected in some translations, for example, in Gwynne Edwards 1980s translation of La casa de Bernarda Alba, he uses the word ‘sausage’ instead of ‘chorizo’. Today, many people would recognise and know about chorizo, making that particular translation of the word outdated. In addition, there are examples of successful experimental Lorca plays staged in the UK, like the Victor García production of Yerma which won awards in the London Theatre Festival. It can be argued that this production is not British but Spanish (as it was on tour from Spain), however the fact that a foreign production of a foreign play was so popular in the 1970s in Britain shows how open audiences were to non-English theatre.
More recently are the British-Indian/Punjabi productions of two of Lorca’s rural plays *Yerma* and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (renamed *The House of Bilquis Bibi*). Mark Cook, who reported on this new production wrote:

> The House of Bilquis Bibi, adapted by Sudha Bhuchar and directed by Kristine Landon-Smith, is set in Pakistan's Punjab region. Just like Andalucia, there's a parched, dusty landscape, and the task of a domineering matriarch in marrying off five daughters is just as fraught here as in Spain. (Cook, 2010)

The interesting aspect of this production is the attempt of bringing together three different cultures in one play: Spanish, Indian/Pakistani and British. Today, Indian, Pakistani and British culture have co-existed for many years, making aspects of Indian and Pakistani traditions commonly seen (this ranges from food, to becoming accustomed to mosques and temples and the celebration of religious festivals). Meanwhile, it can be argued that Francoist Spanish society had similarities with Indian and Pakistani culture (i.e. the close sense of family, religion having a large influence on everyday life, etc). While the combination of these different cultures may appear awkward, it is an example of how universal Lorca’s plays can be. Unfortunately, this production proved to be too confused for the tastes of some people, like *Guardian* critic Michael Billington, who wrote:

> Transposing plays from one culture to another is always tricky. But this version of Lorca’s *The House of Bernarda Alba*, which transfers the action from pre-war Spain to modern Pakistan, misfires on just about every level. Sudha Bhuchar's text flattens out Lorca's original and Kristine Landon-Smith's joint Tamasha-Harrogate Theatre production is so poorly articulated as to be at times barely comprehensible. 22 (2010)

---

22 Here, Billington is referring to the delivery of the lines.
Yet again, some critics feel like there was something lacking in this Lorca production and although the type of language used turned out to act as more of a barrier to the London audience, showing that the mixture of English and Punjabi limited the wide spectrum of people who would normally go to a London show. Regardless of the negative feedback this production received, it still illustrates how valid Lorca is to different cultures:

The longevity of any dramatist's work relies on how universal its themes are. The Spanish tragedies of Lorca may have a very specific setting and mindset, but the notion of blood and honour reverberates in other cultures (and, of course, they're riveting human dramas, too). (Cook, 2010)

Despite the lack of success of this production, it is an example of how theatre in Britain is at least embracing and beginning to attempt to experiment with Lorca, although the UK audience feel more comfortable when viewing a Lorca play with all the traditional or Romantic and romantic elements they expect. Interestingly it is difficult to see this kind of audience reaction with other foreign playwrights. Looking at critic’s reviews of plays by Chekhov, Brecht and Sartre, the stark contrast between Lorca and these playwrights is evident. Chekhov for example is an extremely well-known Russian playwright with famous and frequently performed plays like The Cherry Orchard. Despite this Chekhov productions do not get the same intensity of exotic treatment as Lorca. Theatre director Dan Rebellato said of Chekhov, ‘One hundred and fifty years after his birth, Chekhov’s plays have become almost as much part of the British theatre’s repertoire as Shakespeare’ (2010). Similarly the

\[23\] The play was made up of English and Punjabi dialogue. According to the reviewer of The Stage, Nosheen Iqbal, ‘The play’s allegorical swipe at fascism, critiquing modern day Pakistan instead of Franco-ruled Spain, is largely still intact, but the best (or at least, the most natural) asides are delivered in Punjabi. A shame for the typical Hampstead audience, but not a real obstacle in the way of the play’s success’ (Iqbal, 2010).
nationality of the German playwright Brecht is not constantly mentioned in theatre reviews. A review for a 2009 production of *Mother Courage and her Children* focuses on the playwrights ‘epic structure’ and ‘stoic survival’ (Billington, 2009). Even Sartre, someone who is better known as an essayist, author and philosopher, and his nationality is relieved from the scrutiny of the critics. In a *Guardian* article by Susannah Clapp entitled ‘Yes, but is it Sartre?’, a production of *The Novice* is criticised for not adding up to Sartre’s ‘stature as a thinker’, but only briefly does Clapp refer to the plays ‘post-war France’ setting (2000). This is not to say that the nationalities of these playwrights or the localisation of their plays are never mentioned. For example, a recent Howard Davies production of *The Cherry Orchard* was criticised by *Telegraph* critic Charles Spencer for not reflecting the age the play was set in (2011). However, the exotic and foreign elements of these modern productions and the nationalities of the playwrights are rarely focused on in comparison to Lorca.
Chapter Two: Lorca as a National Icon

Nationalism, as noted by Benedict Anderson, is by its very nature a complex subject: ‘Nation, nationality, nationalism – all have proved notoriously difficult to define, let alone analyse’ (1983: 3). This question becomes even more problematic when considering Spain, a country which has often been divided by language, culture and politics. For some, the search for Spanish national identity goes back as far as the sixteenth century and is directly inspired and driven by the values and culture of the Golden Age. However, it was not until the mid-nineteenth century that the people of Spain began to question their own sense of national identity, a process which was intensified by the loss of the country’s last colonies at the end of the century.

Due to the complex nature of this subject, the chapter will be divided into different sections in order to show the gradual development of Lorca’s national icon image. The first section will deal with the beginnings of the myth of nationalism in Spain, and how Lorca comes to form part of this myth in the twentieth century. The second section sees the next phase of Lorca’s national image which began with his assassination. This evolves into how people deal with the memory of the Spanish Civil War, how memory affects Spanish national identity and how this affects Lorca’s image.

---

24 ‘One of the most extraordinary aspects of Spain’s sixteenth century is that many Spaniards are still living in it. In a sense, they have never left it. The sixteenth century has dictated a good part of their ideas and aspirations, their vision of the past and of the future. Pick up any newspaper, any novel, and you will find echoes of the sixteenth century somewhere. When politicians wish to make sense of their policies, they look backwards to it for inspiration…Not without reason did Franco choose emblems – the yoke and the arrows – that belonged to that epoch’ (Kamen, 2008: IX).

25 According to Angel Smith and Clare Mar-Molinero ‘The very concept of a Spanish nation was for the first time thrown into some doubt in the second half of the nineteenth century’ (1996: 5)
Discussions of national identity in Spain in the nineteenth century were strongly influenced by the beginnings of vocal peripheral nationalism in the regions of Catalonia, Galicia, Valencia, Andalusia and the Basque Country. These regions began to embrace their own languages and traditions (such as songs, dances and festivals) and although today the media tend to focus on the three main non-Castilian regions of Spain (Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country), other regions like Valencia also became proud of their heritage (an example of this being when Catalonia wanted Valencia to be seen as part of the Catalan countries, Valencia rejected this claiming to have not only linguistic differences, but cultural and economic as well (Smith and Mar-Molinero, 1996: 14-16)). By the time of the loss of the Spanish empire at the turn of the century, the peripheral regions began to have more of a political voice and moved more to the left on the political scale. Although literature of the time (namely that of the Generation of ‘98) painted a rather bleak and disillusioned image of the country, most academics agree that the liberal governments that ruled from the turn of the century to 1923 were to a certain degree successful in establishing peace:

The liberal project failed in the sense that it did not manage to create a modern nation-state based on solid foundations. The liberal governing elites never accomplished the successful transition of Spain from a sluggish, largely rural economy, whose social and political life was still marked by localism and elitism, into a modern, democratic and centralised state. However, the liberal State remains to the present day the most successful and long-lasting era of social peace and political stability in modern Spanish history. (Romero Salvadó, 1996: 199).

In many ways Spain has never had a singular sense of national identity, and any attempt to quash peripheral or separatist nationalist feeling has led to extremism (for
example, ETA) and a general sentiment of oppression from the Castilian states (in effect, the regions who shared the common language of Castilian like Madrid).

One of the complicating factors in the many defences of national identity is the confusion between myth and reality. It is no surprise that Spain has an obsession with its much written about glorious past (namely the Golden Age, as mentioned before). According to Kamen, ‘the main purpose of myth-making at a political level was to outline a common past that would explain the present and also define the future’ (2008: 206). Kamen’s work states that Spain has always suffered from an inferiority complex compared to its European neighbours and blamed all of its failures on foreign intervention (an example of this being the enforced Napoleonic leadership in the first half of the nineteenth century and the loss of the Spanish Empire at the beginning of the twentieth). However, Kamen claims that this in itself is a myth. The politicians of the early nineteenth century believed that Spain as a nation formed due to the united sentiment against the French, and the belief that they could defeat the French in July 1808 (at Bailén) contributed to the formation of a nation. In fact quite the opposite occurred, as Kamen describes it:

In reality, there was no patria nor any feeling of national solidarity, and the measures of 1812 and 1813 were not the healing measures they appeared to be. Quite the reverse: they had a devastating effect on Spanish public life for the next hundred years. Moreover, they created an illusion of national unity that had little foundation on reality. (2008: 2).

---

26 According to Kamen, ‘a myth always has a point of origin, and that origin is related to our human consciousness and experience. The myths of world history are born out of perceptions and hopes that have formed our lives. They therefore reflect reality, even if they are not real or truthful’. (2008: X).
And so the myth of the Spanish nation began, faltered and expanded even further to include the myth of the glorious Golden Age or as it has been referred to by José Álvarez Junco ‘the mythical construction of a legendary past’ (cited in Kamen, 2008: 3).

It is clear that the myth surrounding nationalism in Hispanic culture is one which pursued Spain up to the present day. Over the years Lorca has been identified (in national terms) as either Spanish and/or Andalusian. Although sometimes, even other regions and places try to make a claim to the poet. For example, in an article in La Vanguardia called ‘García Lorca, Catalanista’, they use a quote by Lorca (taken from a letter he wrote to a friend) to emphasise his connection to Catalonia:

> En cambio, Barcelona ya es otra cosa. ¿Verdad? Allí está el Mediterráneo, el espíritu, la aventura, el alto sueño de amor perfecto. Hay palmeras, gentes de todos los países, anuncios comerciales sorprendentes, torres góticas y un rico pleamar urbano hecho por las máquinas de escribir. ¡Qué a gusto me encuentro allí con aquel aire y aquella pasión! (…) Además, yo, que soy catalanista furibundo, simpaticé mucho con aquella gente tan construida y tan harta de Castilla. (Cited by Eduard Molner Flechazo, 2009).

Clearly, those who used this text believed having this link to the playwright was culturally beneficial to the area in some way. It shows, even in this current decade, the great influence and importance attached to the poet’s name and image. Despite the attempts of other regions to claim a part of Lorca for their own, Lorca’s image is firmly associated with Andalusia and is used as a symbol of Spain via this association. There are elements and traces of the Romantic and the romantic, which will be discussed in the following chapter on Romanticism, which are often related to Andalusia and, therefore, Lorca. These links often develop into stereotypical views of the region and playwright (i.e. a strong link with gypsy culture and their customs such
as flamenco, an exotic lyrical quality), and interestingly (and ironically) Franco used these clichéd views as an acceptable face of Spain to the rest of the world. Lorca was to become part of this mask representing his nation. Before reaching this mythical national level, Lorca and his image had to essentially turn into a myth. The notion of Spain being weighed down by a myth of the past and nation has formed a link with Lorca and his status as a national icon or figure. Questions of national identity often transform or overlay history with myth. On a cultural level, the same can happen with other historical figures, like writers and poets. In highly contested political contexts historical and cultural myths can be intimately linked. A certain myth clings to Lorca (the man) and in turn affects the modern productions of his work. As with many myths, Lorca’s myth has a starting point: his assassination during the Civil War, the era in which Kamen says Spain’s myths (not Lorca’s myth) of the past abruptly (though temporarily) stopped.27

**Lorca and the Issue of Memory**

Although regionalist sentiment and myth have affected the sense of national identity in Spain, the notion of modern Spanish nationalism cannot be discussed without analysing the impact of Franco on the topic. As mentioned in the previous chapter (when discussing ‘what is Spanishness’?), the concept of Spanish identity has always been complicated due to changing definitions over time and the issue of memory. At the beginning of his essay on identity and the residue of time, Herzberger states: ‘It was Nietzsche who argued most persuasively that remembering and forgetting, that the imposing power of the historical and the unhistorical are equally necessary to the

---

27 ‘This hold of the mythical past on the imagination was broken decisively at only one point in time, during the Popular Front government of the Second Republic in 1936’ (2008: 207).
health of the nations’ (2007: 11). Herzberger then goes on to say that a society needs to know when and under which circumstance it should implement forgetting and remembering, and that a decent understanding of the past is vital for a nation to thrive and have a secure sense of nationality. However, this was not necessarily the case for Francoist Spain. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Franco focused on ethno-cultural elements of Spanishness, or technically a strong Spanishness heritage, for example, through religion. In order to push through an ethno-cultural identity, Franco used ‘a past embraced’ and ‘a past renounced’ to his advantage:

In Francoist Spain […] it was not a matter of setting out to forget purposely or remember willingly, but rather it became an official pragmatic exercise to construct an origin and an end for the nation using both remembering and forgetting, and to create an illusion that both (origin and end) were already and naturally found in the world. In other words, stories were narrated whose purpose was to exploit past time as a natural anchorage for the national identity. The primary tool for this under Franco was historiography, which the regime used to define the traditions within which Spanishness could be perceived. (Herzberger, 2007: 12)

The idea of using the past as tool and the attempt to create an illusion of naturalness can be interpreted as the beginnings of a potential myth. Especially since Franco’s form of identity and heritage depended on certain exclusions from the past, including ‘an absence of an imperial Spain’, the Bourbons and any Jewish or Moorish history (Herzberger, 2007: 14). For Franco, these false truths and distorted history were an essential part in forming, what is basically, a false identity or the myth of a Spanish identity.
Once Franco died and the Spanish transition began, there was a clear analysis and focus on some of the absences of the past:

…during the early years of the transition, when the future of democratic Spain remained unsettled, memoirs, novels, films, and other forms of civic and ethno-cultural representation began to open time to scrutiny and to allow the absences of the past to have a presence. (Herzberger, 2007: 15)

Some aspects of Lorca can probably be included in the list of absences in which many Spaniards began to investigate, for example, his private life and his death. This brought about the “Ley de la Memoria Histórica” in which there was an attempt for the “recuperación de la memoria”.

It seems to be the case, with Spain today, that there are two concepts when it comes to memory or remembering its past, called ‘la memoria’ and ‘la desmemoria’; the need to remember and the willingness to forget. This, in turn, becomes more complicated when we consider other factors that involve memory such as the inability to remember (i.e. not having the capacity to remember everything), and the outright refusal to acknowledge a memory. Herzberger talks of the purpose of forgetting and remembering in post-Franco Spain:

For post-Francoists, forgetting emerged as a strategy to seek protection from a truth that was out there in the world and available, but that might imperil the collective task of nation building. For those wishing to evoke the past in post-Francoist Spain, for those seeking truth, perhaps the antonym of forgetting was not remembering, but justice. (2007: 16)
However, these two concepts evolved from more than just people who simply chose to recall or deny their common past. Joan Ramon Resina refers to two types of memories: the social and the historical, which must be treated as different and separate:

Proposing historical memory as a topic for reflection – but whose memory, why precisely historical and not social, political, cultural, or popular? – presupposes that this kind of memory is intrinsically problematic. To raise this issue is to suggest that historical recollection is precarious or threatened. It is to assume, furthermore, that historical remembrance is a normal function of societies, just as memory, without adjectives, is a constitutive faculty of individuals – meaning, of course, not the banality that this faculty is common to all but that memory constitutes the subject. (2000: 83)

In many ways the historical memory of the Spanish Civil War was distorted to suit the victors (vencedores), and the losers (vencidos) of the war developed their own historical memory. The vencedores played the role of rewriting history and purposely excluding, as mentioned before, certain parts of the past. This resulted in the suppression of memories for the vencidos who, after Franco’s death, attempted to recuperate lost memories and point out false truths. Both interpretations evolved and each side attempted to justify their actions by demonising the other (Aguilar, 2002: 132). Franco and his government recognised the power of this memory:

[…] at least during the first few decades of the Franco regime, a resentful and distorted discourse regarding the war was elaborated, designed to legitimise the seizure of power by the Nationalist forces and perpetuate the memory of the war in order to avoid, through exploitation of fear, any attempt to replace the regime. A large part of the symbolic policy of the Franco regime sought to keep its specific version of the war alive, so that it might come to form part of Spanish daily life. (Aguilar, 2002: 132)
The Franco regime was to use Lorca as a tool to keep alive their version of the war and the Spain they wanted. In fact, Franco’s government managed to achieve this aim, censoring and then publishing Lorca when they pleased (as will be seen below), staging and then removing plays from theatres, and supressing any information surrounding his death. By the time of the Cold War, Spain already began to alter:

Through the relative convergence of Republican and Nationalist memories it was possible to progress from a state of rancour to the idea of ‘never again’ and from accusatory charges aimed at others to an acknowledgement of collective blame, avoiding, in both cases, having to address the real historical problem. No genuine consensus existed regarding the substance of that memory, although a consensus did exist regarding the lessons that were to be drawn from it. Neither did any collective reflection exist that explained the brutal behaviour of the Spanish during the war; only an overall and depersonalised repentance existed, which involved a certain degree of amnesia, forgiveness through forgetting, amnesty. (Aguilar, 2002: 134)

The reluctance and forgetfulness of many affected Spain culturally, however, despite this apparent “forgiveness” and “amnesty” the war affected the lives of many people; many artists and writers (like Luis Buñuel and Juan Goytisolo) were forced (or in the case of Goytisolo, went voluntary) into exile due to the threat of execution, imprisonment and censorship; those who stayed behind had to adapt to the regime’s rules and go under strict scrutiny (like Antonio Buero Vallejo and Camilo José Cela); and the work of the deceased artists and writers was at the mercy of the government.

Although the poet was assassinated in 1936 and much of his work censored after the Civil War, this does not mean that Lorca disappeared from the Spanish literary scene or from Spanish memory. The media of the dictatorship took the view that Lorca was
‘accidentally’ killed in the confusion of the first days of the Civil War\textsuperscript{28}, therefore his work could still be discussed and mentioned in the media before the 1960s. It should be said that the censorship or banning of someone’s work is never simply black and white. Although at the beginning of and during the Civil War Lorca was seen as an enemy of the state, by the time of the mid-1940’s, his work was being selectively banned for different reasons, and gradually the ban began to lift when Lorca’s popularity flourished in the 1960s and 1970s. The ban after the Civil War is unsurprising due to the use of Lorca’s work on the Republican side during the war. After Lorca’s assassination in 1936, his theatre group ‘La Barraca’ (even though ‘Lorca’s aims for La Barraca were avowedly apolitical’ (Byrd, 1991: 205)) started providing entertainment for the Republican troops:

> It is a fitting tribute to García Lorca that, in the early days of the conflict, the Republican government quickly reactivated La Barraca to serve as force to boost the morale of their troops in the bitter struggle for survival. (Byrd, 1991: 205).

The use of theatre to heighten the spirits of those in conflict went far beyond using Lorca’s famous theatre company. Theatrical groups in Republican areas like Madrid, Barcelona and Valencia began to appear, often paying homage to the now legendary victim of the Civil War. For example, a theatre group in Madrid became known as troupe “García Lorca”, and Lorca productions sprung up in the cities and were received with great enthusiasm. As Suzanne W. Byrd points out ‘It is obvious that Spain’s Republican citizens and soldiers looked upon Lorca as the patron of their theatre heritage’ (1991: 207). In retaliation to this eruption of Republican theatre, the

\textsuperscript{28} Published in the \textit{ABC} but read out on the radio, Carmen Soler stated that Lorca ‘fué víctima de una condenable acción personal en la confusión de los primeros días del Alzamiento, cuando Granada, la ciudad en que murió el poeta, se hallaba aislada del resto de España’. (1946: 24).
Nationalists started the theatre group ‘La Tarumba’ which gave way to El Teatro Nacional de la Falange Española, and then turned into simply Teatro Nacional. Ironically, ‘La Tarumba’ was greatly influenced by the style of Lorca’s La Barraca:

It is ironic that this National Theatre should have had its root in the La Barraca of García Lorca. But nonetheless, it is a fitting tribute to the theatrical genius of Federico García Lorca that he should have laid the foundation for Spain’s National Theatre. (Byrd, 1991: 213).

The Republicans’ use of the playwright is probably one of the reasons which led to the censorship of some of his work in the years to come, although it is clear that Lorca’s influence never really left the Spanish stage.

The rural trilogy was affected by censorship, for example, *Bodas de sangre* was seen to ‘be both politically and morally innocuous’ (O’Leary, 2005: 47) when it was first performed in the 1930s. However, by the 1940s the government’s attitude towards the play changed. In 1948 an application to put on the play was rejected and in a handwritten note on the application itself said: ‘Queda en suspenso la tramitación de esta obra por hallarse vetado por la D. G. de Seguridad del autor’ (Ministerio de Educación, 1948). *La casa de Bernarda Alba* was also withdrawn from publication and performance by the Lorca family (Eisenberg, 2002: 125). Despite this selective ban of the poet’s work some plays were still put on stage, for example, Lorca’s early works like *Doña Rosita la soltera o el lenguaje de las flores*, which was performed as early as 1945 (performed for only one night in the Teatro de Lara on the 6th March). In 1954 a censored edition of Lorca’s *Obras Completas* was finally published in Madrid (Grant MacCurdy, 1986: 759), although this collection of work did not include *Poemas de un amor oscuro* due to its homosexual content. The *Ley de Prensa*
(this law censored all type of media like books, radio, newspapers, theatre and cinema), which was passed in 1938, was relaxed in the early 1960s then replaced by the new Ley de Prensa in 1966 thanks to the Minister of Information, Manuel Fraga Iribarne. According to Chris Perriam ‘Marxist literature was cautiously allowed in bookshops’ (2000: 16). This combined with the publications of Lorca’s work would have given theatres the confidence to put on a production. In 1960, Luis Escobars company produced *Yerma* for the Madrid stage, followed by *Bodas de sangre* in 1962 and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* in 1964. Even when Lorca was not being performed or published, however, he was still referred to in the media on occasion. In the 1940s, a number of articles about or mentioning Lorca and his work were published in national newspapers, despite there being a ban on much of his work and him being murdered by Francoists only a few years previously. Perhaps inevitably, some of these articles were fairly negative about Lorca. For example, in an article about the poet Dionisio Ridruejo in *La Vanguardia* the journalist writes that the poetry of Ridruejo inspires young Spanish poets more than ‘en su momento influyó la poesía graciosa y demasiado externa de Federico García Lorca’ (G. R., 1944: 8). Of course, it is unsurprising that, during the dictatorship, the media would praise the co-writer of the lyrics to the Falangist anthem *Cara al sol*, even though at the time Ridruejo had been dismissed as Franco’s Minister of Propaganda (in 1941) due to his discontent over Franco’s use of the military. This, perhaps, can be seen as the Francoist government’s manipulation over the arts and certain information. Despite this patronising and, frankly, ill-informed review, most of the literature published on Lorca was positive. In fact, Lorca was used to promote the greatness of Spanish literature, Spain itself and, in particular, Andalusia. In a passionate article published in *ABC*, Antonio Colon goes into vast detail describing Lorca’s association with Andalusia. Colon starts his
commentary ‘Federico García Lorca, desde el mirador pleno de armonías de Granada, asoma a la vida literaria española, su aparición no tarda mucho en tener resonancia, y más tarde, afianza un éxito, que cada día se extiende más’(1946: 6). Unlike the previous journalist, Colon acknowledges Lorca’s expanding fame and does not deny his influence on Spanish literature. Colon even seems influenced himself and, while discussing Lorca’s deep connection with Andalusia, adopts some of Lorca’s colourful language:

Así, las hojas de los lirios son, para Federico, espadas que se baten con el viento, como el bracear en una danza gitana; la luna es verde, y verde son casi siempre sus motivos, un verde fuerte, lujuriente, un verde que se sale del campo y lo invade todo, emborrachando la vista y los sentidos. (1946: 6).

The journalists’ obvious reference to Lorca’s *Romance sonámbulo* from the *Romancero gitano* gives the impression that, although people are unable to physically get hold of Lorca’s work, the poetry (and arguably the most famous poem by Lorca) is still embedded in the Spanish consciousness. Another interesting aspect of the article is the strong connection of Lorca with Andalusia:

Si Andalucía no es completamente lo gitano, ni los gitanos pueden representarla, ya que universales son, sí hay que reconocer que aquí ellos escarban en el suelo, se empapan de su esencia y nos dan una versión andalucista, que parece completamente sacada de su más honda raíz. Por eso, Federico García Lorca, que ama más que nadie el sentido profundo de Andalucía, su alma angustiada hecha nardo y clavel, miel y sangre, sombra y luz, escoge este modo de cantarla. Sus romances son pedazos de esa Andalucía, y no pedazos precisamente de mármol blanco, sino de puro barro amasado en sudor y sentimiento…
La Andalucía, vista y sentida desde su atalaya granadina, es tan grande y tan honda, que hablar de ella es hablar, y hablar sin saber cómo ni cuándo encontrar el fin ni por qué caminos llegar a él. Sólo se intenta divagar un poco sobre ella y apenas se pasa la piel, que aquí es morena y fuerte sobre una carne constantemente estremecida por ramalazos de sangre de pasión primitiva. Y lo fuertemente primitivo es el nervio de toda la poesía de García Lorca, con una esencia antigua que se fija en los elementos de naturaleza pura, aire, sol, agua, luna, amor y sangre. En él, este sentir de lo andaluz es como una balada de colores y pasiones, que preenden en la carne que quema con un dolor que se agarra a la garganta. Tan sólo sintiendo también su poesía como el clavarse de la emoción andaluza en nuestra propia alma es como puede comprenderse toda la honda y trágica interpretación de la Andalucía garcilóquista. (1946: 6)

Colon states several times that he is writing about Lorca’s Andalusia (he even titles the article ‘De la Andalucía de García Lorca’) and he repeats this so often that he makes the connection between this earthy and passionate sounding region and the playwright unbreakable. In doing so Colon strengthens Lorca’s regional connection and (to some from outside of Spain) his status within Spanish culture as a whole. This reiteration of Lorca’s firm Andalusian and Spanish status is referred to a number of times by others. For example, in an article by Emilio García Gómez written a year after Colon’s, we find this association with Lorca and Andalucia again by quoting his poems when talking about the gardens of the Generalife.29

With the government’s allowance of Lorca’s work to be put into print again and gradually appeared on the Spanish stage again in the 1950s, the media started to remember Lorca fondly as one of the best Spanish writers of the century. Not only

29 The poem used is ‘Casida del herido por el agua’ from Divan del Tamarit. The first stanza of the poem is used: ‘Quiero bajar al pozo,/ quiero subir los muros de Granada,/ para mirar el corazón pasado/ por el punzón oscuro de las aguas’. (cited by García Gómez, 1947: 3)
this but the media elevated Lorca to a high cultural status. In an article reviewing a new poetry book of ‘poesía de hoy’ (1956), the writer lists the poets included in this anthology, ranging from what he calls ‘la Generación de la Dictadura’ to Lorca’s friends and contemporaries like Alberti. However, Lorca himself is not included, ‘ya que las ediciones completas de su obra hacen de dominio general en cualquier país culto el conocimiento del autor del “Romancero gitano”’ (Anon, 1956: 13). By 1956 Lorca had already reached such a high cultural status that people were happy to use his name, however in this case they were unwilling to publish his work. The reason given by the writer seems odd and almost like a poor excuse, although it might be due to his Obras completas being published only two years before or simply that not everyone was prepared to publish him but quite happy to name-drop. It is as if some people (namely critics and journalists) saw Lorca in a completely different league to other poets, even those of the Generación de la Dictadura. This shows that the media and Franco’s government were willing to encourage people’s interest in Lorca by staging his plays and publish his work in one very large anthology, that they were happy to have him associated with Spain and promote him to be one of the great Spanish artists, but this image had to be controlled and it had to suit the ethos of the fascist dictatorship. The memory of Lorca as a victim of the Civil War and therefore a victim of the fascist government had to be eradicated from people’s minds. By excusing Lorca’s assassination as a mistake (see footnote 28), Franco’s government attempted to put forward this new image of the poet, one which shed the Civil War connotations of the past and promoted the Spain under the dictator to Spaniards and foreigners/tourists alike. In order for Lorca to fully become a national icon, he had to be seen as romanticised, and have all notion of the Civil War removed.
Lorca and the Civil War

Lorca was extremely well known before his death in 1936. His poetry was well known even before he went to university, his equally famous friends would often pay homage to him through their work (Salvador Dalí would paint Lorca’s face into his paintings like Cenicitas (1927)), and his plays had achieved success in Spain, Latin America, the US and parts of Europe. Yet he is constantly remembered as being a victim of the Spanish Civil War. Lorca is revered as one of Spain’s greatest playwrights and poets, yet it is the nature of his death that is a cause for huge fascination in the Spanish and British media; even when the focus is on his work there is always mention of his assassination. Examples of this fascination can be seen in many different articles, for example, Susannah Clapp writes in The Guardian ‘It is 70 years since Federico García Lorca, poet, playwright, republican, homosexual, was murdered by Franco's supporters’, when reviewing a recent production of When Five Years Pass (Clapp, 2006).

This fascination with Lorca’s death has led to it becoming the subject of some films, presenting an interesting way of seeing how Spain views and portrays Lorca’s assassination. There have been a number of films made about the poet, for example Lorca, muerte de un poeta (1987). This TV series received average reviews but has a unique aspect concerning the poet: it tells the story of Lorca’s death rather than his

---

30 This television film was first screened in the Valladolid Film Festival 1987 with great anticipation. The film is made up of five fifty-five minute films, tracing Lorca’s life from infancy to his death, however, each film is made up of flash-backs Lorca has in the final moments of his death, making his assassination a constant presence in all five films. The film received fairly mixed reviews often criticising the use of a British actor (Nickolas Grace) for the character of the poet. J. M. Baget Herms reported ‘Que Nickolas Grace guarde un extraordinario parecido físico con el poeta es una mera anécdota ya que el extraordinario actor británico no tiene de momento, otras posibilidades de identificación con el personaje’ (1987: 88). Baget Herms also mentions contradictory elements to the film, and reports by B. Torquemada that there were ‘aplausos fuertes, pero no entusiastas’ (1987: 94).
life. *El balcón abierto* by Jaime Camino (1984) is another film which contains Lorca’s assassination, but filmed more like a documentary with school children learning about the poet and his life through films of his poems and snapshots of episodes of his life. Paul Julian Smith writes of these two films: ‘…both films begin and end with the reconstructions of García Lorca’s death, thus reinforcing the commonplace that it is in that fatal moment that life and work find their fulfilment’ (1998: 68). Although not much is actually known about Lorca’s final moments (though Ian Gibson has played a vital role in trying to reconstruct them and acted as advisor in *Lorca, muerte de un poeta*) it is the part of his life which is frequently shown or talk about in the different media. The most recent film which portrays Lorca’s death is *Little Ashes* by Paul Morrison, a film which tells the story of Lorca and Dalí’s romantic relationship (which will be discussed later on). Before delving in to *Little Ashes*, I shall briefly discuss *Lorca, muerte de un poeta* and *El balcón abierto* in order to get a fuller picture of how Lorca’s life and death were depicted not long after Franco’s death.

*Lorca, muerte de un poeta* is a film filled with a sense of deep foreboding and the inevitable. As Paul Julian Smith points out, there is a ‘prediction motif’ within the film, for example, a pre-credit death sequence and the first scene shows Lorca reading the final lines of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (‘Silencio, silencio he dicho. Silencio’). According to Smith:

But it has already been established that García Lorca’s death will be (like the Civil War itself) a kind of fatal necessity, impossible to avoid, and predestined by García Lorca’s most intimate friends, by his glittering social milieu, and by
the very land itself, the once fertile plains which now require the redemptive flow of blood sacrifice. (1998: 68)

Lorca’s death transforms from an unfortunate event to inevitability, perhaps even a necessity. This natural occurrence all forms part of the myth behind Lorca, even Smith himself refers to this film as ‘mythmaking’ (1998:68). The myth converts Lorca’s death into something natural and eternal, especially since these films are merely interpretations of the end of his life and not necessarily fact. The film itself plays a role in this by making the moments of his life leading up to his death seem as historical and as authentic as possible (at times the film plays out like a documentary, given out exact locations and times that events took place). Despite the effort to ‘recreate historical reality’ (Smith, 1998: 68), another element of the Lorca myth enters the film, as Smith describes:

In spite of the meticulous historicity of Lorca, muerte de un poeta (with all principal figures and events clearly and dispassionately identified) the shooting style produces a somewhat different effect by which the collective, national struggle is separated off from the individual, even personal, narrative of a tragic playwright [...] Motifs drawn from García Lorca’s work and from a national iconography thus serve to ratify, even legitimize, his death, lending it an inevitability and lyricism wholly abstracted from the brutally chaotic and almost banal story recounted by the rest of the film. (1998: 69)

The motifs Smith mentions are that of a bull in a ring and of the moon, symbols often associated to Lorca’s work. Here we find the connection between Lorca’s natural death and the Romantic poetic symbols that help from part of the Lorca myth (Lorca and Romanticism will be discussed further in the following chapter).
Camino’s *El balcón abierto* carries similar themes to *Lorca, muerte de un poeta*. The film starts and ends with Lorca’s death: the start has children speculating the cause of Lorca’s murder and the last few scenes of his life are filmed from the perspective of the poet, with brief close ups of (a black and white) the actual Lorca. Smith suggests that this is an ‘attempt to ensure a juvenile audience identifies with a writer who died fifty years earlier’ (1998: 71). Again, like in Bardem’s film, motifs from Lorca’s work and actual parts of his work are used, for example, characters from *La casa de Bernarda Alba, Bodas de sangre* and *Romancero sonámbulo* all appeared in the film, played by the same actors who play figures in Lorca’s life, blurring the boundaries between history and fiction: ‘…*El balcón abierto*’s persistent juxtaposition of disconnected images (an attempt to reproduce the poetic structure of García Lorca’s lyric and verse drama) tends […] to erase the historical specificity of both work and life’ (Smith, 1998: 71). However, Smith also notes that is an initial reaction and that the subjective end of the film makes ‘the spectator aware of the particular circumstances and unique significance of an event and a life, beyond facile lyricism and retrospective identification’ (1998: 71). Although the end of this film did make a point of realism and empathy, the notion of Lorca’s motifs are still embedded in the audiences mind due to the scenes leading up to Lorca’s death. This acts to extend the Lorca myth and by showing realistic elements (based on interpretation, therefore a false truth) alongside Romantic motifs.

The most recent film made about Lorca’s life differs from the representations shown previously in that it deals with his homosexuality. *Little Ashes* directed by Paul Morrison and starring Javier Beltrán as the poet centres around the much disputed and controversial relationship between Lorca and Dalí, starting when they first met at
university in Madrid up to Lorca’s death. The homosexual aspect of this film is a prominent one and will be discussed later. The character of Lorca is represented in the film as a romantic and yet humble figure, contrasting vastly to the quirky and controversial character of Dalí, and this, in itself, plays an important part in the film. Essentially the focus of the film is on Dalí rather than on Lorca (even though the main theme is the relationship between the two), using the new, young and popular actor Robert Pattinson (from recent successful films like *Harry Potter* and *The Twilight Saga*) as the selling point of the film.

*Little Ashes* is a British-Spanish film by a British director and screenplay writer with a mixed British and Spanish cast, and with funding and support from the National Lottery (UK), TVE (Televisión Espanola), Televisió de Catalunya, ICAA (Ministerio de Cultura), ICIC (Institut Català de les Industries Culturals), ICO (Instituto de Credito Oficial), ICF (Institut Català de Finances) and ASGR (Audio Visual, S.G.R.), all of which are mentioned in the credits at the start of the film. As the writer, director and principal actor are British, there may be some bias with regard to the representation of certain characters. However, with equal support from both Britain and Spain, and equal artistic input from both Spanish and British actors, writers, producers (a team of Spaniards and British) and directors, it can be seen that the view of Lorca is a creation of two cultures.

Despite the film approaching Lorca in a different way, it still contains several elements similar to that of previous films which emphasise Lorca’s so-called national or Spanish status, or perhaps more specifically his Andalusian origins. The film begins and ends with images of a dry wheat field with the sound of someone
whispering one of Lorca’s early poems (in Spanish) from *Cante jondo* (‘Tierra Seca’ from *Poema de la Soledad*). Lorca himself said of ‘el cante jondo’ in a 1922 lecture ‘…el canto peculiar de Andalucía, aunque por sus elementos esenciales coincide con el de pueblo’ tan apartado geográficamente del nuestro, acusa un carácter íntimo tan propio, tan nacional, que lo hace inconfundible’ (1954: 198). The term ‘nacional’ here is interesting considering Lorca used it to describe ‘el canto peculiar de Andalusia’. It seems that Lorca is saying that ‘el cante jondo’ has pushed through the boundaries of Andalusia and expanded to a more national level.

The song or poem, with its inseparable connection to flamenco, leaves the audience in no doubt of where the film is set. As the poem is whispered, almost like the muttering of an incantation, it also gives the audience the sensation of a mystical quality, something which is also very closely associated with Andalusian culture. There are also some more obvious showings of Andalusian (and in turn, stereotypical Spanish) culture. Examples of this vary, from Lorca actually stating he is Andalusian, to a scene where students of La Residencia enter Dalí’s room playing flamenco guitar and drinking coffee, to having a bullfighting scene (a sport which can be seen as Spanish as much as it can be seen as Andalusian). This direct highlighting of what many foreigners seem to deem Spanish or Andalusian culture also, perhaps inadvertently, shows Lorca as a symbol of this society. This is again reiterated with the character of
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31 The ‘pueblo’ to which Lorca refers is the oriental countries (namely India) which have influenced flamenco and ‘el cante jondo’. Quoting his friend Manuel de Falla: ‘Se trata, cuando más (dice Manuel de Falla), de un injerto o, mejor dicho, de una coincidencia de orígenes que, ciertamente, no se ha revelado en un solo y determinado momento, sino que obedece a la acumulación de hechos históricos y seculares desarrollados en nuestra Península…’ (1954: 198).

32 The mythical quality can be described as ‘el duende’ a term and notion often associated with Lorca and spoken about in a 1933 lecture ‘Juego y Teoría del Duende’. ‘El duende’ is an ancient internal mystery or sentiment related to darkness and death which is felt in Spain and specifically in Andalusia. In this speech Lorca stated ‘En toda Andalucía, roca de Jaén o caracola de Cádiz, la gente habla constantemente del duende y lo descubre en cuanto sale con instinto eficaz’ (1954: 306). The concept of ‘el duende’ will be discussed in greater depth in the following chapter.
Lorca stating he did not like New York and preferring Spain instead, and even showing him as a revolutionary figure in a scene where he makes a pro-socialist speech the people in a bar while wearing workers overalls (again, connecting his image to the Civil War). Despite Dalí being Catalan, his cultural and regional heritage is never really focused on in the same way as Lorca. Throughout the film, Dalí does not seem to connect to Spanish culture and at one point rejects it in order to find his fortune in France. The most prominent evidence of this is Dalí’s rejection of Lorca and their romantic relationship. Lorca is presented as a symbol of Spain in the film, being already famous by the time he goes to university and being known to the then unknown student, Dalí. Not long after that Dalí’s character then flourishes as an artist during his relationship with Lorca. Suddenly Dalí refuses Lorca’s advances and moves to France, in a way rejecting his homeland as well as his lover. Meanwhile, Lorca always stays faithful to Spain and, in return, rejects Dalí when he returns and proposes that they should write an opera together. Symbolically, these actions or personal choices could be used to reinforce Lorca’s status as a national icon; his reluctance to move away from his home country and customs, while the two other famous Spaniards (Dalí and Buñuel) left quite eagerly to France to embrace another culture, and then staying in Spain in the face of war and death makes Lorca look like a national hero. Buñuel’s character plays a similar role, by first rejecting Lorca’s and Dalí’s relationship, and then later on also moving to France. However, unlike Dalí, the director returns to Spain and befriends Lorca again, and even warns him to move away from Granada. Therefore Lorca’s death, the frequently repeated scene in most Lorca-based films, can represent the death of Lorca’s Spain and the beginning of Franco’s regime.
The fascination with Lorca’s assassination goes beyond remembering the playwright as a victim. The success of Ian Gibson’s biographical research on Lorca’s final days (La represión nacionalista de Granada en 1936 y la muerte de Federico García Lorca, published in 1971 and subsequently banned by Franco’s government) no doubt contributed to this fascination. In a recent article Gibson praises the decision to exhume his assumed grave and how this affects Spanish society, and it is clearly a very emotional event for him personally. This is, perhaps, no surprise coming from someone who has dedicated so much of his work and life to the poet, however there is a sense that Gibson’s passionate writing reflects the feelings of many Spaniards. At one point he even expresses his frustration towards the Lorca family and their difficult attitude towards the exhumation of his grave:

Que no hayan aceptado ser adalides del movimiento para la recuperación de la Memoria, dado el hecho de ser el autor de La casa de Bernarda Alba el desaparecido más célebre, y quizás más llorado, de la fratricida contienda. Los que nos sentimos en profunda deuda con Lorca, el hombre y su obra, queremos, necesitamos, saber dónde yacen, exactamente, sus mortales despojos.

The kind of language Gibson uses implies an enormous amount of power to the image of Lorca and places a great degree of importance in the relation between the poet and Spain’s contemporary history. Gibson also uses interesting terms to describe the poet, for example, ‘desaparecido más célebre’ and referring to him as ‘más llorado’. Here Gibson is reinforcing Lorca’s connection to Spain and its tragic past, and to some extent giving a legendary quality to the playwright by emphasising that his body has yet to be found. Gibson repeats this again when he states ‘Los que nos sentimos en

---

33 At one point in the article Gibson writes ‘El momento es de maxima emoción, en España y alrededor del mundo. Me siento muy afectado’. (2009: 57)
profunda deuda con Lorca […]’. Why is it that Gibson (or we) should feel so in debt to Lorca? Gibson does not say whether this debt is due to Lorca because of the work he produced, thus perhaps culturally enriching people. Or perhaps Gibson feels that debt is owed to Lorca because of his assassination, because he was not only a victim of the Nationalist forces in the Spanish Civil War, but a representative of all tragedies of the Civil War:

Para que España avance con fe hacia el futuro es imprescindible, a mi entender, resolver la situación de los más de cien mil asesinados por el franquismo que, tirados en cunetas y fosas comunes, esperan todavía, tantas décadas después, un entierro digno. Para que esto ocurra incumbe pedirle magnanimidad a la derecha democrática actual. Los vencedores dispusieron de cuarenta años para exhumar a los suyos, y lo hicieron a rajatabla. Las familias de los perdedores deben tener ahora el mismo derecho, tan largamente postergado. No se trata de sembrar cizaña sino de curar, en lo posible, las heridas que quedan. (2009: 57)

Lorca’s fate as a national icon is inescapable, because he will forever be attached to one of the greatest atrocities to occur in Spain in the twentieth century. He goes on to conclude ‘…Espero que así se vaya entendiendo. Y que, muy pronto, Federico García Lorca pueda ser símbolo, no sólo del dolor de su pueblo, sino de una auténtica reconciliación nacional. Creo, sinceramente, que éste sería su deseo’ (2009: 57).

Gibson is clearly championing Lorca as a tragic figure of the Civil War, and even goes as far as to call him a potential ‘symbol’. To many, like Gibson, Lorca will
always be representative of the ‘dolor de su pueblo’, and it is unlikely that this image will disappear while the memory of the Civil War lives on in Spain.

Currently there is a lot of reference to Lorca due to the controversial case concerning Judge Baltasar Garzón, the judge who allowed the exhumation of Lorca’s grave earlier on this year (but alas the body of the playwright or the people who were executed with him have yet to be found) and is now on trial himself and facing twenty years of suspension. His involvement with cases such as Lorca’s has led to great uproar from right-wing supporters and to claims that he is working out of his jurisdiction and against the 1977 Amnesty Law (*La ley de amnistía de 1977*). The exhumation of Lorca’s grave has divided opinion across Spain: on the one side there are people, like Ian Gibson and Baltasar Garzón, who firmly believe in the rights of the victims of the Civil War and that Spain can only move forward if certain ghosts of its past are confronted; on the other side however there are people of the opinion that the constant obsession with the war and the dictatorship is destructive to the progression of Spanish society. Ander Mayora Unzueta argues:

…es precisamente para la reivindicación de la memoria por lo que los restos de Lorca no deberían ser exhumados. Si al final se hace, habrá toques de corneta, manifiestos y artículos rememorando el asesinato, el proceso de búsqueda, el litigio, etcétera. Pero transcurrirá un tiempo en el que regresaremos a los quehaceres de siempre, es decir, al olvido. Si los restos de Lorca permanecen donde están, habrá un lugar para la memoria, más allá del mero monolito conmemorativo de rigor. Lorca, bajo esa tierra, de algún modo permanece como símbolo de lo que sucedió, sucede y sucederá siempre. Porque a veces la restitución es olvido, y la injusticia imperecedera es lo que mueve a recordar. (Mayora Unzueta, 2009)
The case of Garzón is an example of a collective issue that is apparent in Spanish society today: the memory and the ‘desmemoria’ of the Civil War. These two opposing beliefs are supported by two laws currently in practice, that of ‘la ley de amnistía de 1977’ and ‘ley de la memoria histórica’ put into place in 2007. Unlike the 1997 Amnesty law, the Historical Memory law gives rights to the victims of the Spanish Civil War (on both sides) and the victims of Franco’s dictatorship. This law contains several provisions regarding the rights of the victims (such as the removal of Francoist symbols, the prohibition of political events at the Valle de los Caídos), the specific provision which brought about criticism and uproar from right wing supporters and the PP was the identification and exhumation of victims who were still missing. Accusations of opening old wounds were thrown about and the Amnesty Law was used as a contradiction against this new law. I mention this specific case and laws because it shows how the atrocities of the Spanish Civil War are still at the forefront of many people’s minds, and that there are still people living with the consequences of the war. In order for such things to stay alive, Lorca is often used as a tragic figure and an example of what should be done now in order to rectify what was done in the past. In other words, Lorca as a victim serves a national and important purpose to those who feel that they have been wronged by the war. In a, perhaps failed, attempt to distract people from Lorca’s connection to the Civil War, the Romantic and exotic image of the poet was used as part of the Lorca myth.
Chapter Three: Lorca as the Romantic Figure in Spain and Abroad

Within the Mediterranean dome of the Eden Project (Cornwall), next to some olive trees, is a poem by Lorca from his collection of poetry *Cante Jondo*. The poem ‘Paisaje’ describes, in Lorca’s beautiful poetic fashion, an olive grove at night:

El campo
de olivos
se abre y se cierra
como un abanico.
Sobre el olivar
hay un cielo hundido
y una lluvia oscura
de luceros fríos.
Tiembla junco y penumbra
a la orilla del río.
Se riza el aire gris.
Los olivos,
están cargados
de gritos.
Una bandada
de pájaros cautivos,
que mueven sus larguísimas
colas en lo sombrío.

At first, the sight of this Lorca poem might not seem very peculiar, especially to the many tourists who see this poem in the Mediterranean basin section of the Eden Project. They simply make the connection between the two: a poem about Mediterranean landscape and character next to olive trees; the poem seen in both Spanish and English side by side amongst the foreign scenery; the name Federico
García Lorca, recognisable to some, to others an unknown foreign poet. And why would they not make this connection? Lorca is a foreign poet, Lorca is specifically Mediterranean. However, the fact that Lorca and this poem were chosen shows how some people in the UK may see the poet: as a Romantic and exotic figure who represents a foreign and romantic land. Although I use the terms Romantic and exotic (or sometimes written as ‘romantic’ with a lower case ‘r’), it is important to differentiate the two.

Definition has often been difficult as the two concepts are similar and overlap, and vary depending on different European countries. On a basic level, the term ‘Romantic’ refers to the nineteenth century movement in which the artists of the time (William Blake, Charles Baudelaire, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe to name but a few) began reviving classical elements in art, literature and music, while using components of realism, the gothic, nature, sensibility and even science; whereas ‘romantic’ refers to the more exotic or foreign elements (i.e. writing about distant countries or characters) which these artists began to embrace. Although the term ‘Romanticism’ is often related to countries like France, Germany and England, the Iberian Peninsula played an important role in the development of European Romanticism. Maurice Cranston writes: ‘[…] Spain played a dominant role in the pre-history of romantic literature; Spain was its birthplace’ (1994: 120), in reference to Spain’s Moorish history, the troubadours and the cantigas from Galicia. The Romantic Movement arrived a little later in Spain and the Romantic artists (like Zorrilla and Larra) never reached the same heights of fame outside their own country like some of their European contemporaries, however, despite Spain being the birthplace of Romanticism, it was a little different to the Romanticism sweeping across Europe.
Cranston said: ‘Since Spain was […] uniquely rich in pre-romantic literature, the Romantic Movement could fairly consider itself to be a movement of revival rather than of revolt…’ (1994:135). Nationalism played a great role in European Romanticism, as Michael Ferber states: ‘Love in this social sense sounds universal in many Romantic visions, as love of the human race or ‘philanthropy’ […], but it in practice was usually invoked as the basis for the ‘nation’ (2010: 101). Examples of this love for the nation can be seen with the French Revolution and the Germans call for a unification (Ferber, 2010: 101-102). Spanish nationalism also played a major part in its Romantic Movement, although quite different from France or Germany. According to Cranston, the Spanish ‘saw their purpose as asserting the particular national identity, the Spanishness of Spain; and this entailed a repudiation of anything considered foreign, including the kind of cosmopolitanism which was characteristic of French romanticism’ (1994:135). Spaniards also differed from other European Romantics as they were ‘too proudly masculine to weep’ and even the Spanish female Romantics (namely Rosalía Castro) was ‘too fiercely passionate for tears’ (Cranston, 1994: 134). Despite these differences, Spain did have some similarities with their European contemporaries, for example, a passion for the grotesque or gothic (as seen in Zorilla’s Don Juan de Tenorio) and a love for the natural, nature and the country, like Castro’s poems about Galicia (Cranston, 1994: 135-137).

The exotic or ‘romantic’ aspect of Romanticism comes into play with the fact that the Romantics ‘yearned for other places, other times, other cultures, almost anything other than the increasingly tedious, regimented, soulless, worldly life of modernizing Europe’ (Ferber, 2010: 111). The other place and culture that the Romantics focused on was the ‘Orient’, although this included the Far East and the Islamic World and,
within this, North Africa and Spain. To many people in Europe, Spain was seen to be colourful, exotic and seductive, yet dangerous and mysterious due to its exotic culture (a mixture of Moorish, Christian, etc). A popular figure which embodied these characteristics is the Spanish Gypsy, who became the focus of many Romantic works outside of Spain and, as time went on, a figure which became firmly connected to Spain, as will be seen.

Lorca has many of these Romantic and exotic characteristics in his work: his description of nature and the country (an example of which is seen at the beginning of this chapter) and the characters of proud masculine men as seen in Bodas de sangre are to name but a few, although the one which stands out the most is his connection with gypsies, which Lorca carried throughout his life (after the publication and success of Romancero gitano) and well after his death. In order to gain a full image of the importance and influence of the Gypsy to Spain and to the image of Lorca, the history of this figure must be analysed further.

The creation of the gypsy as a symbol of an exotic Spanishness came not from Spain, but from Romantic France. Through different events between these two countries, France began to develop a certain image of Spain. The first of these events is the Napoleonic occupation in the early 1800s. According to José Colmeiro:

The first decades of the nineteenth century saw French imperial power at work in Spain with the Napoleonic occupation, the War of Independence (1808-1814), and the military intervention of 1823 decreed by Chateaubriand in his role as Minister of Foreign Affairs to restore the Bourbon dynasty. Since these events coincided with the loss of the Spanish American colonies, Spain became less threatening as an imperial rival – events that clearly placed France
in a position of superiority and situated Spain as a conquered other, literally and symbolically. (2002: 4).

With the threat of Spain as a powerful empire removed, it allowed other countries to view the Peninsula in a different light. Colmeiro also emphasises the importance of the presence of the ‘orient’ which gave Spain an exotic and unfamiliar quality.

Another important aspect neglected by Said is the particular double bind of Spanish culture due to its experience of orientalism from both sides: as a European Christian culture that has repressed a constitutive element of its historical identity and sees the oriental as its cultural and political other, and as a mirror of oriental culture constructed by other Europeans (emphasizing the historical imprints left by several centuries of close contact with Arabic and Jewish culture and highlighting the Gypsies as a symbolic representation of Spanish orientalism). (2002: 129)

This exoticism went beyond finding the orient in the west. According to Colmeiro (in reference to the findings of Raymond Williams):

…Romanticism rejected industrialism and encouraged an interest and admiration for idealized pre-industrial societies and a desire to return to a pre-modern past […] Their idealization of the Middle Ages, a distinctive romantic trope for the age of innocence, paralleled their idealization of exotic lands and cultures, particularly the Orient. Their anti-industrialism generated a predilection for natural scenery, unspoiled “primitive” societies, and remote landscapes. (2002: 128)

Colmeiro points out a number of interesting aspects, although the main point he keeps on reiterating is the sense of the ‘Other’, or more precisely “the primitive Other”.
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Writers from abroad pounced upon this new image of Spain in their work. For example, José Colmeiro goes into great detail about Borrow’s autobiographical travel book, *The Bible in Spain* (1843). Colmeiro writes: ‘Mixing picturesque adventures with ethnographic observations, Borrow’s work reiterates well-known negative perceptions of the Gypsies (as primitive, uneducated, sensual, degenerate, living on the fringes of society, and devoted to thieving and fortune telling), while simultaneously revealing other traits dear to the romantic fantasist (Gypsies as rebel outcasts and outsiders, travellers, musicians and dancers, whose free-spirited women possess both the power of seduction and the occult) (2002: 133). A prime example of this exotic vision that was bestowed upon Spain and particularly Andalusia is the creation of Carmen, a fictional Spanish gypsy made immortal by its creator, the French writer, Mérimée (whose novella was published in 1845) and the French composer Bizet (whose opera was composed and performed in 1875):

[...] Spain’s image changed. It is not that the old “Black Legend” died, but as a product of a shift in the sensibilities of the Europeans it was re-evaluated. To Montesquieu, Spain had only been the country of idle nobility, ignorance, cruelty, arrogance, fanaticism and, as a result of all that, decay. For Romantic writers, first influenced by the Spanish performance against the Napoleonic armies, Spain was a country of strong passions, brave people, banditry, blood and sun. Almost all the characters were the same (the conquistador, the inquisitor, the idle aristocrat – now converted into guerrilleros, bandits, Carlist friars, proud beggars, bullfighters), but they now represented different things: bravery, pride, dignity, intense religious feelings, closeness to death and scorn for it. All this was epitomised in Mérimée’s *Carmen* later translated into the enormously successful opera by Bizet. (Alvarez Junco, 1996: 93)

In José Colmeiro’s essay about *Carmen* he mentions various authors/composers/artists that were influenced by the new wave of Spanish exoticism
that spread through Europe, for example, (as mentioned before) George Borrow (The Bible in Spain, 1843), Theophile Gautier (Voyage en Espagne, 1843). The character of Carmen epitomises the stereotypical Spanish gypsy living in a world dominated by other Romantic Spanish tropes such as flamenco and bullfighting. As said by Lema-Hincapié, ‘Carmen and her myth, along with all the reverberations that she carries with her, still continue to be useful beyond the borders of Spain, as a simplistic key for the interpretation of all things Spanish’ (2005: 157). In a study by the European Union it was found that ‘after Don Quixote and Don Juan, Carmen was the fictional character most identified with Spain’ (Colmeiro, 2002: 127), which is quite impressive considering that a French construct is identified with Spain alongside perhaps the two most famous Spanish fictional characters. Carmen came to represent Spain itself, a country as ‘exoticised as a dark Gypsy woman, highlighting the strangeness and wildness of her oriental substrate and of her picturesque acquaintances (Gypsies, bullfighters, smugglers, bandits), (2002: 135). But while in its day the idea of the gypsy or Carmen was an appealing yet threatening one, today the image of the non-threatening Romantic gypsy remains, firmly grounded in Andalusia, in what is in modern times seen in equally exotic terms as Lorca’s Spain.

Despite all the different regional and nationalist claims to Lorca, his stereotypical Andalusian roots have proved impossible to shake off. The name ‘Andalusia’ itself conjures up pictures quite unlike any other of Spain’s regions. According to the Romantic writers’ interpretations, old traditions and arts such as bullfighting and flamenco still dominate the region; finally, and perhaps most importantly and as just analysed, it is seen as the land of the Spanish gypsy. As mentioned before, in order for Spain to be seen as exotic or Romantic it needed to be stripped of all its political
powers and thrive on the myths imposed upon it. In Angel Smith’s and Clare Mar-Molinero’s chapter on nation building, they describe how each peripheral region of Spain (in the early twentieth century) attempted to form a separate and political power. However, when it came to Andalusia:

the *Andalucistas* […] under the Left-liberal leadership of Blasco Infante between 1910 and 1936 were unable to build a significant social base…Moreover, Andalusians had been depicted by Spanish nationalists as central to the Spanish national character, and it seems likely that these stereotypes were assimilated as the dominant self-image of elites and the urban middle classes. (1996: 15).

Despite Andalusia’s rich cultural history, it was and still is one of Spain’s poorest regions (along with Extremadura). As well as the poor in the Spain, the educated middle and upper classes became involved with the construction of the nineteenth century Spanish myth. They started to ‘appropriate’ this new popular culture like their European counter-parts (English, French and Russian):

Spaniards themselves had helped create this confusion of identities as a nationalist act of resistance against foreign influences. The Spanish aristocracy reacted against the French and Italian models imported by the Bourbon monarchy during the Enlightenment because of the perceived threat to national identity […] The aristocracy also embraced forms of popular entertainment that were seen as typically Spanish, flamenco and bullfights, where Andalusians and Gypsies prevailed as performers. As a result, Gypsies, Andalusians and Majos became clichés identified with Spanishness in Spanish music and theatre. The diffusion of these images both inside and outside of the Spanish territory prepared the way for the Romantic discovery of "oriental Spain" (Colmeiro, 2002: 130).
Therefore, in accepting the Romantic stereotype that was imposed upon them by others, the upper and middle classes ended up adopting elements of the myth even in their attempts to act against it. These stereotypical aspects of Andalusia have pursued the region through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and beyond the Spanish Civil War. Franco even used this exotic element of Spain to promote tourism with the famous slogan ‘Spain is different’.34 Today, parts of this stereotype are starting to be quashed in some of the Spanish regions, for example bullfighting. Although the tradition of bullfighting has been kept alive in Spain (especially in the south) and many bullfighters are celebrities who constantly appear in magazines and television shows, only last month bullfighting was banned in Catalonia.35

Today the lasting significance of the French Romantic ideas of Spanishness can be seen in Modern Spanish culture, although perhaps for the benefit of tourism. However, in contemporary Spanish cinema an attempt can be seen to reclaim this type of French Romanticism and convert it into something more authentic. A key example is Carlos Saura’s trilogy, which has been already mentioned in a previous chapter: *Bodas de sangre* (1981), *Carmen* (1983), and *El amor brujo* (1986). A few years later, Saura makes three films based purely on dance, *Flamenco* (1995), *Tangos* (1998), and *Fados* (2007). Each film deals with flamenco or a Hispanic form of dance (i.e. *Tangos*) (three of the six films being choreographed by Antonio Gades) in different contexts. I will not go through every one of these six films but I will point out certain

---

34’Lo de “España es diferente” lo lanzó Fraga en los años sesenta, cuando era ministro de Turismo, como campaña de promoción del sol, la paella, los toros y la pandereta. Y desde un principio la frase pegó, porque por desgracia los españoles nos sentíamos distintos, socialmente atrasados, fuera de nuestro tiempo. Éramos una anomalía política e histórica, pura caspa racial, un disparate.’ (Montero, 2010)

35 At the end of July 2010, Catalonia voted against bullfighting in the region and is now banned. Although it may seem that this was done for animal rights reasons, there is a definite undertone of defiance against Madrid (Roger et al, 2010 and Toibín, 2010).
elements of Romanticism that are apparent. The first film, *Flamenco*, acts as a documentary of the various types of flamenco that are found in Spain and South America and contains many famous flamenco singers, dancers and musicians, such as La Paquera, Paco de Lucía, Los Farrucos and Joaquín Cortés. *Flamenco* also uses authentic gypsies in the film (some famous like La Paquera and El Torta). At the start of the film (while each group goes to their rooms to prepare for their performances) a narrator gives a brief history (the only spoken dialogue of the film) of flamenco and its external influences. This introduction provides the same message to two different audiences (the Spanish and the non-Spanish):

El flamenco aparece en Andalucía en el sur de España a mediados del siglo diecinueve como una consecuencia del cruce de pueblos, religiones y culturas, que dan lugar a un nuevo tipo de música. Connota los griegos, jarchas mozárabes, cantos gregorianos, romances de Castilla y lamentos judíos, el son de la negritud y el acento del pueblo gitano que viene de la lejana India para quedarse aquí, se entremezclan para formar la estructura musical de lo que hoy llamamos flamenco y que se expresa mediante el cante, el baile y la guitarra. (*Flamenco*, Saura, 1995).

The main message the film conveys is that, although flamenco forms a part of Spanish and Andalusian culture, it is derived from ancient and diverse arts essentially from foreign lands as well as from Spain. The film speaks of and shows an amalgamation of national and international arts that come together to form a regional (and perhaps even national) identity to those outside of Spain. The film also reclaims flamenco by showing a variety of singing, dancing and music that might not be instantly recognisable as the stereotypical flamenco that some tourists are presented with today.

---

36 I use the term ‘Flamenco’ to mean everything that embodies the musical tradition in this film, from the singing (Cante Jondo), the guitar and the dancing.
Saura succeeds in doing this by recording traditional gypsy flamenco as well as a more modern and evolved flamenco dance (as seen with Joaquín Cortés). By re-evaluating flamenco (by showing its true roots) and moving it away from French Romantic perceptions, Saura has demonstrated a tradition can be preserved without giving in to clichés.

*Bodas de sangre*, is another example of this move away from French Romanticism. As previously discussed, it is a flamenco dress rehearsal of the play with a monologue by Antonio Gades (the original creator of this production) at the beginning while he is applying his makeup. Unlike *Flamenco* the monologue does not give any historical information about Lorca’s play or the production. Instead, it is as if Gades was giving a short speech about his life and flamenco dancing. The second and third film of the 1980’s trilogy, *Carmen* and *El amor brujo* respectively, are worth commenting on due to the exotic themes which both films contain. The themes of *Carmen* have already been discussed at the beginning of this chapter: a French invention, the story of Carmen is filled brooding passion, exoticism and seduction. It is interesting that Saura chose the theme which is perhaps the most associated with Spanish Romanticism:

‘The essential point of Saura’s archaeological recouping of the sources of the Carmen myths is a very contemporary one: Spaniards, having come under the spell of the foreign, imposter impressions of Spain, find themselves seduced by this falsification of their own cultural past’. (D’Lugo, 1991: 203) Although it is the story which romanticises the gypsies and Andalusia the most, Saura and Gades (in his choreography) convert the tale into a more pure flamenco, while showing how stereotypes exist in the story.\(^{37}\) *El amor brujo* is based on a ballet suite composed by

---

\(^{37}\) For example, the actress who plays Carmen is seen in the full cliché Flamenco dancing dress.
Manuel de Falla (a friend of Lorca’s who, like the poet, played a role in preserving musical traditions without converting them into a cliché) and was transformed for the cinema with choreography by Antonio Gades (who also played the role of Carmelo alongside another Saura favourite, Cristina Hoyos). Like some of the films just mentioned, the Romantic theme of the gypsy and their lifestyle is strong in the plot of the story or film. However, in this particular production the mystical element of black magic is used in the final scene, linking to the medieval themes that Romantic writers would often refer to (for example, \textit{El trovador} by Antonio García Gutiérrez, in which one of the principal characters, a gypsy woman, makes several magic references).

Elements of Romanticism and romanticism are an established part of Spanish and Andalusian culture, therefore Lorca seems to fit in perfectly as a Romantic figure and writer within this culture: He was from Granada, his work included primitive and raw elements, linguistically his poetry and prose echoed the exoticism that surrounded Andalusia, and finally, and perhaps more evidently, he was and is considered to be a ‘gypsy poet’. Despite the fame that the \textit{Romancero gitano} brought Lorca, he actually detested this title that followed him: ‘Even before the publication in 1928 of the Romancero gitano, and for several years thereafter, Federico García Lorca both publicly and privately lamented the fame that it had earned him as a poet of the gypsies, \textit{un poeta agitanado’}. (Loughran, 1972: 253). Lorca disliked this name, but his reasons for disliking it lay in the interpretation of the term ‘gitano’ and not in identifying him with this culture. In a lecture about his collection of poems, Lorca talks passionately about gypsy culture in Andalusia:

\begin{quote}
El libro en conjunto, aunque se llama gitano, es el poema de Andalucía; y lo llamo gitano porque el gitano es lo más elevado, lo más profundo, más
\end{quote}
The gypsies of Andalusia and Andalusia itself are deeply connected. Lorca places these two concepts on the same level and because they are ‘la verdad andaluza’ they, in turn, become something which many non-Spaniards (and to some extent, non-Andalusians) have difficulty in understanding. Lorca had often discussed the primitive yet universal notion that surrounded Andalusia. This notion, which some people may identify with Spain, is known as ‘El Duende’. In a lecture entitled ‘Juego y teoría del duende’ Lorca attempts to describe this complex notion:

El duende de que hablo, oscuro y estremecido, es descendiente de aquel alegrísimio demonio de Sócrates, mármore y sal que lo arañó indignado el día en que tomó la cicuta, y del otro melancólico demonillo de Descartes, pequeño como almendra verde, que, harto de círculos y líneas, salió por los canales para oír cantar a los marineros borrachos. (1954: 308).

This extract from a very passionate and lyrical speech echoes familiar images from what was expressed by some of the writers of the nineteenth century: something dark, exotic, ancient (Lorca’s references to marble and salt), and something that comes from the times of ancient philosophers (el ‘duende’ is a descendent from Socrates demon or muse). Lorca makes reference to flamenco and flamenco singers in particular, saying that they have this so-called ‘duende’:

Los grandes artistas del sur de España, gitanos o flamencos, ya canten, ya bailen, ya toquen, saben que no es posible ninguna emoción sin la llegada del duende…Entonces La Niña de los Peines se levantó como una loca, tronchada igual que una llorona medieval, y se bebió de un trago un gran vaso de cazalla
como fuego, y se sentó a cantar sin voz, sin aliento, sin matices, con la garganta abrasada, pero... con duende. (1954: 309-310).

It appears that the gypsy, flamenco and ‘el duende’ go hand in hand, and that also it is something which is innate in some people. So does Lorca, who is so often associated with Andalusia and its customs, have this particular quality known as ‘el duende’ in his work? Many would argue that he does, for example, in a video interview of the actresses in the John Tiffany/NTS productions of The House of Bernarda Alba, Siobhan Redman (who plays Bernarda or ‘Bernie’ as she is called in the production) mentions ‘el duende’. When speaking of the difficulties of the play she says ‘I think what is difficult for us is that whole Spanish thing of ‘duende’, you know, when you suddenly go off on one, and it’s a bit like those flourishes you see in Spanish dance [...]’. 38 Although the actress does not go into the complexities of ‘el duende’, she does recognise it as firstly, something Spanish, secondly, something which a foreigner might find difficult to grasp or portray, and lastly, that Lorca has in his work.

However, Lorca always said there was more to his work than ‘flourishes’. Lorca goes on to say in his lecture of Romancero gitano:

Así, pues, el libro es un retablo de Andalucía con gitanos, caballos, arcángeles, planetas, con su brisa judía, con su brisa romana, con ríos, con crímenes, con la nota vulgar del contrabandista, y la nota celeste de los niños desnudos de Córdoba que burlan a San Rafael. Un libro donde apenas si está expresada la Andalucía que se ve, pero donde está temblando la que no se ve. Y ahora lo voy a decir. Un libro anti-pintoresco, anti-folklórico, anti-flamenco. Donde no hay ni una chaquetilla corta ni un traje de torero, ni un sombrero plano ni una pandereta, donde las figuras sirven a fondos milenarios y donde no hay más que un solo personaje grande y oscuro como un cielo de estío, un solo personaje que es la Pena que se filtra en el tuétano de los huesos y en la savia

---

38 Via the NTS website, the youtube video of the interview.
de los árboles, y que no tiene nada que ver con la melancolía ni con la nostalgia ni con ninguna aflicción o dolencia del ánimo, que es un sentimiento más celeste que terrestre; pena andaluza que es una lucha de la inteligencia amorosa con el misterio que la rodea y no puede comprender.

Pero un hecho poético, como un hecho criminal, o un hecho jurídico, son tales hechos cuando viven en el mundo y son llevados y traídos, en suma, interpretados. Por eso no me quejo de la falsa visión andaluza que se tiene de este poema a causa de recitadores sensuales de bajo tono, o criaturas ignorantes. Creo que la pureza de su construcción y el noble tono con que me esforcé al crearlo, lo defenderán de sus actuales amantes excesivos, que a veces lo llenan de baba. (García Lorca, 1954: 340).

This long speech acts as the antidote to everything that has been perceived as the French Romantic or exotic ideas of Lorca by foreigners. Here the poet rejects all the ‘false visions of Andalusia’, the Romantic and exotic interpretations of Romancero gitano. This can be applied to his theatrical work (in particular his rural trilogy) as well. Like Saura’s films in the 1980s and like his friend and contemporary Manuel de Falla, Lorca’s aim was to bring folk traditions back to life without belittling them and to save the authenticity of these traditions from the Romantic clichés that had become the norm. The construction of Lorca as a Romantic figure has always been and will always be an alien notion, but one difficult to shake off.

Representations of Lorca as a Romantic and Gypsy poet can be seen in the media today. For example, in the most recent film about Lorca’s life Little Ashes we can find many Romantic characteristics in the character of Lorca himself and generally as features within the film. As mentioned in the chapter on nationalism, in a scene near the start of the film we find Buñuel introducing himself to Dalí in his room. Suddenly lots of students bombard the room armed with strong Spanish coffee and playing
Spanish flamenco guitar. Later, when Lorca returns to his hometown in Andalusia there is a short sequence of Lorca roaming the Andalusian landscape in a white suit. He then comes across some gypsies and spends some time with them, while they talk, and sing and dance flamenco in this Romantic scenery. It is possible to interpret this short sequence as a search and connection to the authenticity of Andalusia and the people of it, although it might be difficult to see within the films many clichés.

Regardless of Lorca’s efforts to distance himself from the stereotypical views of Andalusian Romanticism, he and his work are still portrayed in a Romantic light, and the image of a Gypsy poet is still current today and can be seen through different facets. First of all, the most recent production of La casa de Bernarda Alba by Pepa Gamboa is quite literally a Gypsy production. The storyline of the play itself is faithful to the playwright, however, the main difference and indeed the selling point of this production is that the entire cast is made up of authentic gypsy women, many of whom had never even heard of Lorca. As many of the actresses are illiterate they had to memorise an adapted script of the original version, and many exotic and Romantic cultural elements are added such as flamenco dancing and singing. At the end of the play (after the suicide of Adela) a bloody sheet is held up to the audience while Bernarda shouts that her youngest daughter died a virgin. Traditionally, in Spanish gypsy culture, a blood-stained bed sheet is hung from the window after the wedding night to show that the bride lost her virginity to her new husband. This scene of the play is an extremely visual gypsy interpretation of what Lorca had subtly tried put across, in other words that Adela had not died a virgin. I believe that the original Lorca play revolved around never seeing anything that happened beyond the walls of

39 Sonia Joana da Silva (the Portuguese actress who plays Adela) states in an interview ‘Yo nunca había oído hablar de Lorca, pero todo esto me gusta mucho desde que el año pasado vine a los talleres de teatro’. (Molina, 2009)
the house (in order to emphasise the claustrophobic, suffocating and oppressive lives the five daughters had to live). Therefore any activity that occurred outside the house (or away from the eyes of the family) was always insinuated, rather than explicitly said or shown. For example, Adela’s suicide is never seen or described, however the audience is aware that Adela has hung herself when La Poncia comes out of the room with her hands around her throat. Equally, the fact that Adela is not a virgin is known from Adela’s sneaking out to the stable at night and, perhaps more obviously, Bernarda repeating to all her daughters that Adela died a virgin. This is not to say that the Gamboa interpretation of the scene is incorrect, rather it is an interesting way of incorporating an unusual gypsy tradition in the play, thus saying that the gypsy aspect of the production is the main focus. In an interview with Pepa Gamboa and the cast published in El País, the thought process of this production was explained:

La idea de trabajar de una forma profesional con estas mujeres surgió de los talleres de teatro que el TNT ofreció el año pasado. "Fueron ellas mismas las que me dijeron que querían hacer algo. Yo pensé inmediatamente en Pepa Gamboa y ella aceptó el reto y eligió este texto de Lorca. Lo mejor de todo es que no se trata sólo de un tema socialmente interesante, sino también artísticamente", afirma Iniesta.  

It is interesting to see that the idea of putting on a Lorca play was the result of being approached by the gypsy women who wanted to perform in the theatre in the first place. Although no reason is given as to why Lorca was chosen for this gypsy production, anyone who watches or hears about this production would instantly assume it is because of Lorca’s connection and literary history with gypsy themes.

---

Ricardo Iniesta is the director of the TNT Theatre Company, not of the play.
Even the critics seem to believe that the marriage between the two was, essentially, perfect. Theatre critic Javier Vallejo gives a glittering review of the new play:

Gamboa le quita carne al original para dejarlo en una hora, casi toda nervio y tuétano, y le añade humor, sabor popular y un toque flamenco. Exige de estas mujeres empobrecidas económicamente cuanto puede, sin forzarlas: traduce en clímax dramático el excelente clima que hay entre ellas y lo potencia con la cálida luz sugeridora de Alejandro Conesa y un espacio musical evocador de Emilio Morales. Lo profesional y lo amateur hacen aquí buenas migas. (Vallejo, 2010)

Vallejo does not directly make reference to the connection between Lorca and the gypsy cast, but his very positive review of the production implies that the two aspects were not a major concern for him and he believed that it worked regardless. The fact that critics are praising the production without giving the Lorca or gypsy relationship much thought or attention shows how the image of Lorca as a Romantic gypsy poet is integrated into people’s minds. It also appears that this correlation was not at the forefront of Gamboa’s mind either. Later on in the interview with Gamboa, she states her motives for making this production:

“No me interesan ni la visión de un etnógrafo ni la literatura de denuncia, porque sería hacer de la miseria un parque temático. Mi trabajo ha sido buscar una verdad teatral desde la convivencia y la imaginación. Así podemos ofrecer una verdad más sutil, menos explícita, y no una mirada de voyeur”, asegura Pepa Gamboa, directora de escena conocida por sus trabajos con el flamenco.

“Muchas veces, cuando montas un espectáculo, tienes la sensación de hacer una pieza de museo. Sin embargo, esto es un trozo de vida. El proceso ha sido

---

41 This in itself seems like a contradiction considering some of the content of the production. The scene with the bloody sheet is an insight to gypsy culture that many people would never get to see.
mágico y estoy encantada. Es una Casa de Bernarda Alba hilvanada desde las acciones”, explica Pepa Gamboa, que ha tenido que reinventar el texto de García Lorca para adaptarlo a la realidad de las nuevas actrices. (Vallejo, 2010)

At first it may seem that using Lorca in this production process was a mere afterthought of Gamboa. Lorca was not the star of this show, the unique point of having an all genuine gypsy cast was what this theatre company believed was going to draw in the crowds. Yet, would this production have worked if Gamboa had used any other playwright? It is something that cannot be known until it is done, and since Lorca was chosen above all other playwrights (although Gamboa does not say why) it shows that, in the minds of the director and producers, he was the natural choice. Therefore the identification of Lorca as a Gypsy poet was vital in the success of this particular interpretation. Gamboa can also be given credit for trying (although perhaps without realising) to achieve what Lorca had wanted from his work and his connection to Gypsies and Andalusia. Gamboa’s interests do not lie in producing a stereotypical view of the gypsy life but in placing some reality (or ‘una verdad sutil’) in front of the audience. Although the original play is not about gypsies, Lorca had always said that it was a photographic documentary full of realism, even including the subtitle of ‘Drama de mujeres en los pueblos de España’. Therefore, even though the cast is not the traditional one, the production is still representative of women in the villages of Spain. Video clips of the play are available on the Atalaya-TNT website (in order to promote the play). The clips are live showings of the play in front of a live audience. The scenes from this promotional video provide a very interesting insight into the audience’s reaction and to the natural style of the production. The play takes place on a bare black painted stage with nothing other than the props that the actresses bring on

42 The link available on youtube.
(some modern objects like magazines), and the actresses themselves wear their everyday clothes. The dialogue and tone is very natural and lively, littered with jokes and innuendo causing the audience and actresses alike to frequently burst into laughter. An important aspect of this production is the relationship between the audience and those on stage. Quite often the ‘fourth wall’ is broken and there is a connection with the spectators, for example, knowing looks are glanced towards members of the audience, some lines are directed to the spectators and jokes and impromptu songs are shared. Not only does this interactive style make the production appear more realistic but it is in keeping with a theatrical belief that Lorca began to develop near the end of his life. Lorca began to favour a theatre that communicated to audiences on a different and more personal level. This is seen, not only in the realism of La casa de Bernarda Alba, but also in his experimental plays. Lorca’s three plays, Así que pasen cinco años, El público and Comedia sin título distance themselves in style and context from his rural plays. Not only are these three plays more experimental than any of the previous works but they break out of the traditional constraints of theatre. This includes rejecting French Romantic visions of Spain by attempting to make his plays pure, authentic and (what makes these plays different from the rural trilogy) making his audience question reality. For example, in Lorca’s incomplete play Comedia sin título, the protagonist (known as the Director/Author) breaks the rules of conventional theatre by speaking directly to the audience and discussing the concept of reality:

No voy a levantar el telón para alegrar al público con un juego de palabras, ni con un panorama donde se vea una casa en la que nada ocurre y adonde dirige el teatro sus luces para entretener y hacerlos creer que la vida es eso. No. El poeta, con todos sus cinco sentidos en perfecto estado de salud, va a tener, no
el gusto, sino el sentimiento de enseñaros esta noche un pequeño rincón de realidad. (Laffranque, 1987: 123).

*El público* has similar themes in that the director of a theatre wants to bring the audience closer to the play by wanting to put on a “theatre under the sand”, or by wanting to conceal the truths and deceptions of the theatre. Therefore, the efforts of Pepa Gamboa (although perhaps unconsciously done) to provide a more realistic and natural production of Lorca’s most famous play without leaning towards Romantic stereotypes can be said to be an accomplishment. The production itself received many positive reviews and has obtained so much success that it is currently touring around Spain, and will eventually tour around Europe.

It is not surprising that Lorca’s rural trilogy contains Romantic and exotic elements that contain components of superstition. *Bodas de sangre*, for example, has a symbolic scene between an old gypsy-like woman (representing death) and the moon. *Yerma* goes to visit some elderly women in her village who read incantations to make her pregnant and in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* several references are made to Romantic and rural superstitions. Lorca’s use of gypsies and regional folklore in his work, and especially in his rural trilogy comes to form an integral aspect of the play:

> Federico García Lorca's debt to the folklore of his native Andalusia has frequently been remarked. The influence of folk music, the utilization of gypsy themes, and the general awareness of the nature of the popular mind, particularly as displayed in his major tragedies, have all been noted […] (Barrick, 1980: 469)

It can be argued folklore forms a small part of Andalusian culture (although I refer to the folklore that Lorca uses in his work rather than that imposed by the French
Romantics. It seems it would have been necessary for Lorca to include it in his plays, especially if he always wanted to capture realism. Mac E. Barrick notes the importance of folklore and gypsy culture in Lorca’s work:

These seemingly unimportant references to folk beliefs are, in fact, indispensable to the art of the play. Inextricably interwoven with the action of the play, the superstitions serve to define the characters as rural Andalusians; the earthy philosophy of the people also adds greatly to the realism that Lorca sought in this play. At the same time, the inclusion of ill-omened incidents increases the dramatic tension. The feeling of uneasiness suggested by the miscellaneous mishaps of the first act yields gradually to an impression of fear and eventually to horror as the tragic outcome, foreshadowed by the imagery, the dramatic tone, and the increasingly more serious omens of evil, looms in the background. (1980: 477)

These parts of the plays were used as a poetic device as well as for realism. However, rather than accept these aspects as points of realism and attempts to make the plays more authentic, Lorca’s use of folklore and gypsy culture has been hijacked by those who wish to interpret the playwright as a Romantic and exotic figure. It seems that Lorca is shackled by his own myth. People’s misreading and misinterpretation of his work turn something deep in Andalusian culture into a vision which is exotic and superficial.
Chapter Four: Lorca as Gay Icon

The images of Lorca that have been discussed so far are ones which began to take shape while he was still alive. They have lingered on to the present day, and are very likely to continue into the foreseeable future. In order to give a full perspective on all of Lorca’s images, it is important to look at Lorca’s status now and see what may develop in the future. As time has gone by, there has been an attempt to look beyond Lorca’s work and the superficial images forced upon him, and look instead at the poet’s private life. An aspect of Lorca’s personal life which was known about before but not openly acknowledged until the 1980s and is being written about more frequently today is his homosexuality. This side of the playwright has opened up new interpretations of his work, and thus has the potential to make different styles of productions. This is not to say that Lorca is actually gay icon now; merely that the current attention to his private life, especially his homosexuality, has been the cause of so much controversy and debate over the poet and his work, it deserves some attention and investigation.

As this homosexual image of Lorca has not been fully accepted or recognised by some (which will be discussed), this chapter will focus on how Lorca’s homosexuality came into the public light and the impact it had on Lorca productions. Spain’s current stance on homosexuality will be briefly looked at in order to set the background for the types of Lorca productions that came about from Franco’s death onwards. The opinions and sentiments of Lorca scholars and followers in regards to homosexuality will be analysed, showing their frustrations towards different institutions which are seen to control the poet’s work. Although not part of the rural trilogy, Lorca’s most
explicit play in its treatment to homosexual desire, *El público*, and the most popular production of it (Lluis Pasqual (1986)) will be briefly considered. People’s gay interpretations of the rural trilogy and how (and whether) these interpretations have impacted or influenced productions will also be examined.

Before delving into the disputed and controversial world of Lorca’s homosexuality, the image which came prior to the reopening of the subject of homosexuality should be briefly mentioned: Lorca as a feminist figure or icon. It perhaps should come as no surprise that Lorca was and is seen as a feminist writer before and after people began to acknowledge and embrace the poet as a gay author. Lorca’s work often focused on the plight of women and their contemporary issues, and this can be particularly seen in his rural trilogy, in which the problems of infertility, infidelity and unfulfilled desire are addressed. However, when information about Lorca’s homosexuality began to spread and new gay interpretations of his work began to develop, the focus moved away from the figure of Lorca as a feminist icon. This is not to say that Lorca can no longer be considered a feminist icon as his appeal and links to feminism still remain strong: ‘Lorca can be read according to first- and second-wave feminism simultaneously, both for enlightened representations of possible models of equality and for a non-androcentric recasting gender difference as anti-oppressive’ (Perriam, 2007: 160). However, gay readings of his work became more common and popular as some believe that he was using female characters to represent his own frustrated urges and sentiments:

If the *I* of the male author whose object of desire is another man is excluded from the text as it is from the surrounding society, how can *I* be said at all by
one who, because of his sexual orientation, takes a position on the margin of society and decides to speak from that position? (Godoy, 2004: 102)

The notion that women were used as symbols in Lorca’s plays is not necessarily incompatible with feminism (particularly second-wave feminism), therefore the two icons can co-exist.

The idea of the image of Lorca as a gay icon or figure is one which is still developing today, although its origins can be traced back to the 1980s. Although rarely (if ever) declared publicly until recently, Lorca was openly homosexual. He had several gay relationships in his life, some quite well-known (like the infamous Lorca-Dali relationship) and others more private (and which Ian Gibson brings to light in his most recent Lorca book Lorca y el mundo gay). Lorca also addressed the theme of homosexuality in some of his works such as El público (one of his most personal pieces) from his more experimental work, and of course his Sonetos del amor oscuro. This development no doubt has been influenced by social changes in Spain, in particular changing attitudes towards issues of gender and sexuality.

Some might expect that if someone were to study Lorca’s work today in school, his homosexuality would be one of the biographical aspects discussed. However, this does not seem to be the case in many Spanish schools today. Ruth Toledano in an intriguing article in El País, discusses the status of gay rights and describes the

43 It was not until Lorca’s poems Sonetos del amor oscuro (although the titled used in this publication was Sonetos de amor) was published in 1984 that the open debate surrounding Lorca’s sexual orientation began.
44 Ian Gibson’s book is the most recent piece of biographical work to be published on the specific theme of Lorca’s love life. Gibson’s work uses Lorca’s letters to friends and the stories of the people who knew him to piece together Lorca’s private and gay lifestyle. He also analyses the poet’s most explicit work El público and Sonetos del amor oscuro (as well as Lorca’s other plays and poems). Gibson speaks about Lorca’s romantic relationships (both gay and straight), although some newspapers decided to focus on Lorca’s first love: a woman named María Luisa Egea (Ruiz Mantilla, 2009).
homophobia still seen in today’s Spain and how this then has an impact on people’s perceptions of literary figures like Lorca:

Eso significa, por ejemplo, que es muy probable que el pequeño Leo no forme parte del vergonzoso 85% de alumnos españoles de secundaria y Bachillerato que, según denuncian la FELGTB y COGAM, ‘no es capaz de citar ningún personaje histórico que fuera homosexual, bisexual o transexual y prácticamente ninguno tiene referentes lésbicos o transexuales’. Ni forme parte de ese sonrojante 93% de alumnos españoles de secundaria y Bachillerato que acaban sus estudios sin saber que Federico García Lorca era homosexual. Fuera de la más recalcitrante homofobia, es inconcebible que sólo un 7% de esos jóvenes reciba una información (una formación) sin la cual es imposible comprender la obra de uno de los mayores poetas en lengua española de todos los tiempos. (Toledano, 2009)

The lack of knowledge concerning Lorca’s homosexuality is slightly surprising considering his fame in Spain. This kind of information raises questions not only of how this lack of familiarity with the poet affects his image and, in turn, his work, but also of how this homophobic attitude which Toledano speaks of impacts on interpretations of the poet’s work. Accepting Gibson’s assessment that in the crime committed against Lorca ‘desempeñó la homofobia un papel inequívoco’ (cited by Toledano, 2009), Toledano goes on to say:

Tras ese crimen horrendo, nocturno y montaraz, Lorca ha seguido siendo asesinado durante más de medio siglo de forma sistemática y a través de la ocultación, el silencio y la tergiversación de los verdaderos acontecimientos de su vida y del auténtico contenido de su obra. (Toledano, 2009)

Toledano lays the blame for this distortion not only at the feet of the Franco regime and Lorca’s family, but also implicates critics and Lorca specialists in Spain:
[...] ninguno de los cuales estuvo dispuesto, hasta mediados de los 80, "a decir públicamente que Lorca era gay, y que incumbía tener en cuenta tal circunstancia a la hora de analizar su vida, su obra y su muerte (...) La razón principal, inconfesable: si lo hacían se les cerraba probablemente el acceso al archivo del poeta", dice Gibson, arrojando la luz de la justicia histórica sobre este silencio culpable y generalizado. Con rigor cronológico y académico, Gibson hace un recorrido por las ediciones y estudios de la obra de Lorca que silencian su homosexualidad. Produce aterradora fascinación comprobar de manera tan clara los mecanismos de los que se vale la homofobia. (Toledano, 2009)

In an English interview by The Independent, Gibson makes the point that Spain was unable to accept the poet’s homosexuality (before and after the civil war) saying ‘it was a national problem. Now Spain permits same-sex marriage that taboo must be broken’. However, as mentioned in Toledano’s article, the family is a significant obstacle, despite protests from the family members. Laura García Lorca spoke of her uncle’s homosexuality:

"We didn't want his murder to be considered a sexual crime but to stress it was a political crime. It was difficult for my father to accept the homosexuality of his brother. However my Aunt Isabel […] spoke openly in her later years about homosexuality, and came to accept it as something natural. I imagine my father spoke of it among friends, but never publicly". (Nash, 2009)

Comments like these probably have done little to quash Gibson’s anger when family members state that they wanted to stress that his murder was a political crime.

Although the family have always wanted to see Lorca’s assassination as political, it
becomes difficult when there is evidence that the poet’s sexual orientation was a factor.  

Despite knowledge of Lorca’s homosexuality being known to some extent in his home country today (thanks to his devoted biographers, critics and scholars), it is curious that the playwright has yet to reach the status of other gay nationals (Pedro Almodóvar) and internationals (Tennessee Williams, Rock Hudson, Fassbinder). This might seem all the more intriguing given that Spain is often at the forefront of Gay Rights within Europe: homosexuality was legalised in 1979 (only four years after Franco’s death), as were same sex marriages in 2005, and gay men and women are allowed to serve in the Spanish army and to adopt children. Spain currently has more laws and legislation which protect gay rights and affirm equality than the UK, Austria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Switzerland and the majority of Eastern Europe (ILGA, 2010). Even with Spain’s religious Catholic roots still in place, the Transition and the Spanish movida gave way to a new generation for whom, according to José Manuel Lechado, ‘por primera vez en treinta y nueve años, se atisbó una esperanza de modernización y libertad para España’ (2005: 11). Given the social and legislative changes which have taken place it is worth asking why this resistance to accepting Lorca’s homosexuality continues to be so strong, particularly when writers like Toledano and Gibson argue that it leads to a distortion of his work.

45 Perhaps the most famous example is the boasting by Lorca’s murderer Juan Luis Trescastro, who announced ‘Acabamos de matar a Federico García Lorca. Yo le metí dos tiros en el culo por maricón’. (cited by Gibson, 2009: 371). Ian Gibson also puts forward a compelling case ‘Desde el primer momento, pues, los fascistas utilizaron contra Lorca su condición de gay. Desde el primer momento. No les bastaba con su significación política, su amistad con Fernando de los Ríos, sus declaraciones a la prensa, sus actuaciones con la Barraca, el ‘Romance de la Guardia Civil española’, Yerma…y demás supuestos delitos contra la España tradicional. No, había que insistir también en que era ‘maricón’’. (2009: 368)

46 Continuous updates on Spain’s status in regards to gay rights can be found on the ILGA website (International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association), as well as the current laws and gay rights in place in Spain.
From 1976 onwards there has been an average of at least two productions of *Bodas de sangre* (forty two) each year in Spain alone, with the next most popular being *Yerma* (twenty eight) and then *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (twenty five) (the graph in the appendix details the number of productions a year since 1970). So why is it that a playwright and poet who is so well known within Spain and by the modern Spanish public not considered to be a gay icon? One of the answers to this may lie within the many books and essays written on Lorca by experts and critics. This ranges from the biographies of the likes of Ian Gibson to the highly intellectual analyses of academics like Paul Julian Smith, Angel Sahuquillo and Daniel Eisenberg, all of which seem to be characterised by the underlying sense of frustration and anger at the continued censorship of Lorca’s work by others and a reluctance to openly admit to his sexuality. Much of this anger is centred on those who have the most control over his work: the Lorca family.

The family of Lorca, namely his brother, Francisco, when he was still alive, his sister, Isabel, and his niece (Laura, also president of the Lorca Foundation), are frequently blamed for not embracing Lorca’s sexuality and instead repressing it and attempting to keep it hidden from the general public. The extent to which they went to destroy any evidence of Lorca’s private life is noted by Lorca scholars. Ian Gibson, for example, has commented on the family’s actions. When discussing Lorca’s last love before he died, Gibson noted:

> Al final de su vida, Rafael Rodríguez Rapún, secretario de La Barraca, que era heterosexual. Un muchacho muy atractivo que gustaba mucho a las mujeres. Fue su amor oscuro. Cuando muere Lorca, Rodríguez Rapún se suicida. No puede seguir viviendo sin él. Lástima que la familia destrozara la correspondencia entre ellos. (cited by Massot, 2009)
Gibson goes on to accuse Lorca’s brother, Francisco, of being homophobic, saying: ‘Y luego está la censura de los herederos, del hermano de Lorca, Francisco, homófobo’ (cited by Massot, 2009). This may seem quite a shocking allegation coming from Gibson, but it shows how angry people were and still are towards Lorca’s family.

Other academics like Daniel Eisenberg and Ángel Sahuquillo are equally dissatisfied with the family’s treatment of Lorca. Sahuquillo expresses his irritation at the behaviour and attitude of Lorca’s sister, Laura, towards his sexuality in the documentary film about the poet Retrato de una familia (Portrait of a Family):

The general attitude of Lorca’s family in Portrait, expressed elsewhere, is to either ignore the poet’s homosexuality or to try and minimize its importance. Lorca’s sister, as usual, was completely silent on the issue. Others expressed themselves in the following way: “My feeling is that he had a very normal love life, that he was not especially uncomfortable with his homosexuality”. (2007: 235)

Although this reaction by the family suggests an attempt to minimise this significance of the poet’s sense of his own sexuality, in the past the family has gone to great lengths to hide Lorca’s overtly gay work. Daniel Eisenberg touches upon this:

The most important withheld works, however, have sexual content or overtones. Lorca’s family systematically, for years, withheld texts dealing with sexuality. The family also attempted to keep others, such as Martínez Nadal, from publishing manuscripts in their possession when these had a sexual component…More seriously, in 1938 Lorca’s parents prohibited
publication and production of La casa de Bernarda Alba\textsuperscript{47}, and one act of Los sueños de mi prima Aurelia. (1991: 126)

While La casa de Bernarda Alba was published for the first time in Spain\textsuperscript{48} in the 1954 collection of Lorca’s work, Obras completas, and the act of Los sueños de mi prima Aurelia was not published until 1987. Eisenberg’s essay is filled with such anger and frustration towards the different factors leading to Lorca’s censorship that he can barely contain his rage in his (sometimes personal) comments.\textsuperscript{49} Gibson and Sahuquillo also follow a similar but less aggressive path. When speaking of censored material, Eisenberg says ‘These materials may become available sooner if we can admit that Lorca was a homosexual writer and a homosexual thinker. It is my belief that he would want us to think of him that way’ (2002: 11). This comment leads to the other reason why Lorca critics are so angry about the censorship: because it leads to distorted views and interpretations of his work. Eisenberg and Sahuquillo base much of their work on possible homosexual interpretations of Lorca’s work like the rural trilogy. Their outrage to the treatment of Lorca and his work is also a moral one, that even after all of these years since the death of the poet and with an enormous amount of evidence of Lorca’s homosexuality, his family are so reluctant to speak of it. It is not hard to sympathise with the frustrations of these Lorca scholars. Even today many see Lorca’s family’s reaction as homophobic and reluctant:

\textsuperscript{47} The reasons for this prohibition are unclear. The play itself does not have any obvious homosexual themes or undertones, therefore it is unusual to suggest that the Lorca family rejected its publication on these grounds.

\textsuperscript{48} Although not the first time it was published in the world. Argentina was the first country to publish La casa de Bernarda Alba (in Spanish) in 1945. (Grant MacCurdy, 1986: 759)

\textsuperscript{49} Eisenberg’s personal comments vary. At times he sounds passionate and personally hurt by the censorship: ‘Yet even considering this, my position on the censorship is: I’m angry over it. It has made my life poorer’ (2002: 2). Other times, Eisenberg is very direct with his anger, at one point when discussing a Lorca diary kept in a vault by the Chilean ambassador, Carlos Moral Lynch, he says: ‘Morla’s granddaughter, whose address and phone number I’d be glad to give to anyone who wants a go at it, has said she has thought seriously about destroying it. This would be a tragic loss’. (2002: 8)
Those who deny his homosexuality must now shut up, or at least question their prejudices. It's a relief after so many decades of obfuscation and silence, to reveal the truth. (Nash, 2009)

However, there is more to the secrecy of Lorca’s sexuality than his family refusing to talk openly about it. Although at first glance the connection may not seem obvious, Sam Pryke argues, sexuality and nationalism are often connected but are rarely written about:

Previously it might have been thought that nationalism was a concern of macro-political movements, and individual national identity something that is intrinsic to the public sphere, whilst sexuality is a matter of the private, of interpersonal desire within the confines of the bedroom. Now, however, there is probably a degree of acceptance that sex and nation come to produce notions, both real and imagined, of other nationalities’ sexual character and threat, and ideals of virility, fecundity and respectability. (1998: 529).

Pryke’s work focuses on different levels of sexuality and its relationship with nationality, for example, national sexual stereotypes, sexuality in conflict and sexuality in nation building, and how these different types of sexuality can be seen as ‘imaginary’ threats. Of course, not all of this work deals specifically with homosexuality but it does explore the degree to which many gender, sexual, national stereotypes affect the way a country is viewed from the outside and the inside.

Sexuality in conflict comes in different forms and reveals how the manner in which nations see sex can suddenly become a threat to a nation. There are three ways in which this can happen: by seeing the enemy as a nation of immoral sexual deviants and as sexual predators, using rape as a weapon against a nation (both of these are

50 Pryke refers to national and international conflict in this context. He also makes reference to how sex played a role in this conflict, for example, the use of rape during wars. (1998: 537-540)
external factors), and seeing one’s own nationals as a threat to building a nation (internal factor) (1998: 537-540). An example of this last kind of imagined threat involves seeing homosexuals as a negative influence on a country, and Pryke refers specifically to Lorca:

During the Spanish Civil War, pro-Franco propaganda pointed to the homosexuality of prominent Republican intellectuals, like the poet García Lorca, and warned that a socialist reparto would lead to a sharing out of women as an aspect of a wider tearing down of the pillars of order and respectability in Catholic Spain. (1998: 540).

Pryke then goes on to comment on the attitude of one of those responsible for Lorca’s death: ‘One of Lorca’s assassins boasted anti-Republican thinking on these matters appropriately: “I fired two shots into his arse for being a queer.”’ (Carr cited by Pryke, 1998: 540). At the time of his murder, the Spanish poet was seen as a threat (although, as seen in the national icon chapter (footnote 28), Franco’s government claimed it was a mistake) in one way or another. Even though some may claim it was his Republican sentiment, it is reasonably evident that Lorca’s homosexuality was a major factor in deciding his fate. Pryke mentions that homosexuality, historically and today, is seen as ‘the allegation of degenerate practices that reputedly threatens the nation’ (1998: 539):51

I suggested that nationalism and sexuality interconnect through national sexual stereotypes. Such stereotypes refer to the alleged sexual characteristics of a nationality and are used to indicate the scale of national difference. The depiction is usually negative but will contain an idealised element. Stereotypes are not general constructs but specific to particular nationalities, and especially

51 As mentioned, Pryke uses Civil War Spain as an example, but also refers to other countries like Iran, China and Nazi Germany (1998: 539-540).
evident in certain historical periods. In order to understand their specificity it is necessary to locate them within the second type of interrelation, sexuality in national conflict. The crucial issue here is the way in which sexuality exists as an aspect of the perceived threat (or conversely opportunity) one nationality presents to another. (Pryke, 1998: 543)

Therefore, if homosexuality was already seen as something negative and threatening in Spain then, if Lorca were to ever turn into a gay icon, it will be no easy task.

However, before delving deeper into Lorca as a gay figure, it is important to consider what constitutes a gay icon today. Work relating to gay and camp culture is heavily focused within cinematic contexts, whether it is with reference to actors, directors or particular films. For example, there are gay icons such as Judy Garland, who herself was a victim of a tragic life, one to which, according to film scholars like Richard Dyer, homosexuals could relate and with which they could identify their repressed/oppressed lives (Dyer, 1986: 137). If we are to consider that what makes a cultural icon is a figure who represents a certain significance to a certain group, then Lorca can be seen as a potential gay icon as he is ‘the first in Spanish literary history to make the gay male the explicit subject of a published text […]’ (Ellis, 1997: 18).

Many critics and audiences have queer readings of Lorca’s work, and often see him as writer who expressed his homosexual frustrations through his feminine and camp masculine characters. Therefore, like with Judy Garland, audiences can relate to Lorca’s work as they feel his life is reflected through it. Lorca himself did lead a hidden private life and, even though he was a practising homosexual and became more open about it at the end of his life, not everyone was aware (or refused to speak about) of his sexuality. Angel Sahuquillo points out that Lorca, through reading biographies of Oscar Wilde and seeing his own countrymen’s reaction to homosexuality -there were reported stoning of gay men in the 1920s- was fearful of
revealing his true sexuality. The playwright Tennessee Williams has much in common with his Spanish contemporary Lorca, so much so that it is possible to draw similarities between their work. Like Lorca, it is claimed Williams often used women in his plays as representations of hidden and frustrated homosexual desires, almost as a coping mechanism in his homophobic time. Babuscio has argued, for example, that in *A Streetcar Named Desire*, the characters and in particular Blanche ‘express their creator’s own “unacceptable” emotions as a gay man. They all declare the nature of Williams’s own fantasy life at the time of their creation. In them the artist has found a means of dealing with the tensions that plagued and defined him…’ (1993: 33). The same can be said about Lorca’s work, especially the rural trilogy whose female characters have been interpreted from a gay perspective, as will be seen. Lorca’s and Williams’s homosexual expression can go beyond the female characters and spill into those of the male (i.e. male characters with gay sensibilities or camp qualities). However, although Babuscio recognises Williams’s homosexual presence in his work, he also states:

> If we are not too rigid about the drawing of the line between thought and fantasy, but, rather conceive of creative endeavour as encompassing a great range of covert mental processes, then it should be possible to view more sympathetically Williams’s female creations as important both to the conservation and change of this artist’s own sense of identity, as well as for what they reveal of an aspect of love that is neither gay nor straight, but, simply, human. (1993: 35)

This could also be said of Lorca and, although there are numerous gay interpretations of his work, it should also be considered that Lorca was a writer who worked on many other expressive levels. For example (as Babuscio has mentioned), the play *Yerma* could be about an often ignored female dilemma as it could be about Lorca’s
unfulfilled yearnings. However, despite Babuscio’s best intentions, it is extremely hard for an audience or a critic to escape the author function, especially when dealing with a myth as embedded as the Lorca myth. The author function plays a large role in rural trilogy and, as mentioned before, queer readings of the trilogy are quite common. In *Bodas de sangre* critics and, in this particular case, a translator has found strong homoerotic undertones between the characters of Leonardo and Novio. Paul Julian Smith discusses Langston Hughes’s translation and interpretation of the play and compares it to (the less favourable) Weissberger translation. Throughout his argument, Smith notes Hughes sensitive and accurate translation; however Smith also notes Hughes homoerotic interpretation or language of certain sections of the play and that Hughes’s version contains ‘two men in love’ (1998: 63). For example, when discussing one of the Mother’s final speeches (in which she talks about the death of the Novio and Leonardo) Smith writes:

In this final quotation, however, we find most explicitly that eroticization of the male body which is shared by García Lorca and Hughes. This is a body that is (in Hughes’s words), swollen, hard, and rigid; but that tumescence is bought only at the price of death and more particularly the incorporation of the other man’s deadly beauty – the small, pointed instrument that finds its way to the tangled root of a man in love. (1998: 58)

Whether or not this homoerotic lyrical translation of Hughes was done intentionally is unclear, although Smith believes that there are ‘hints of anal intercourse’ (1998: 58). It comes as no surprise that Freudian analysis was used for this particular kind of interpretation, and Smith continues to use Freud when referring to the play’s masochism, finding sexual and homosexual interpretations in many parts of the play. It may seem to some people that these queer readings of *Bodas de sangre* are quite
far-fetched, however, once the connection between the Lorca’s private life and his work are made and, most importantly, the link seems natural, the myth itself will also appear natural and truthful.

*La casa de Bernarda Alba* also has had several queer readings by critics. For example, a common reading is to see the women in this play as a symbol of Lorca’s homosexual longings or frustrations. Paul Binding writes of the poet and of the play: ‘In his rage at the malformation of life to which the women of his drama are subjected Lorca much have been thinking of the denial of natural impulses and feelings to homosexuals in the conservative Spanish countryside’ (via Smith, 1989: 117). In other words: ‘beneath the supposed surface of the text Lorca’s women are really men’ (Smith, 1989: 118). Smith goes onto to state that the play itself can be perceived by some critics as a prison of their own sexual needs, saying that a ‘radical critic’ can say of Adela that:

[… ] she continues to define herself in patriarchal terms as the fallen woman, the mistress […] However it is possible to resolve this problem empirically by appealing to the historical limits on women’s expectations in Spain in the period, or perhaps to the gay writer’s inability to conceive the possibility of his own freedom at that time and in that country. (Smith, 1989: 124)

It could be argued that these readings, especially of the rural trilogy, don’t necessarily add anything to the plays itself and that these critics have fallen prey to the Lorca myth. However, the point of these readings is to show that the Lorca myth *is* unavoidable, especially when it involves a subject matter which holds little knowledge of truth.
Despite all the attempts by the Lorca family and others to limit knowledge of Lorca’s sexuality and work, there has been a recent attempt to portray Lorca as a gay figure, namely in cinema. Firstly, Pedro Almodóvar (a gay icon himself) would sometimes use Lorca’s image or work as a subtext in his films. For example, in his successful film *Todo sobre mi madre* the viewer is confronted with several scenes which involve dress rehearsals or performances of plays or the plays, including Tennessee Williams’ *A Streetcar Named Desire*, *Bodas de sangre* and *Yerma*. The theatrical references are intrinsic to the development of both the plot and the main themes of the film. The film itself is about mother-daughter relationships and how different mothers cope or deal with their children or deal with not having any children. The character of Blanche from *A Streetcar Named Desire* represents a woman who is driven mad by the restrictions of society\(^{52}\) and, crucially, the play was written by Williams who was a homosexual himself. The Lorca play within Almodóvar’s film is *Yerma*, seen at the very end as a dress rehearsal. Again, the motif of the film continues through the play, *Yerma* (a barren woman) is doomed to face a childless future. She is essentially already a mother without a child and therein lies the tragedy. Finally, the poster of Oscar Wilde’s play *Salome* is seen in the background during one of the scenes in the theatre. While it seems like it is more than just coincidence that these three gay playwrights should appear in a film (directed by a gay icon), we cannot be sure that Almodóvar’s aim was to make Lorca into a gay icon. However, the fact that the director would put Lorca in the same context as these other gay playwrights shows his acknowledgement of Lorca’s homosexuality and does not hide it.

---

\(^{52}\) By this I mean the restrictions of society that led women to become dependent on men in their lives. For example, Stella does not believe she can be happy without her abusive husband and Blanche considers marrying for money.
*Little Ashes* (as mentioned in previously) is the first mainstream film that has directly dealt with Lorca’s homosexuality. Although brief mention of this side of Lorca’s life was made in Camino’s *El balcón abierto*, it was never the principal theme of the production. *Little Ashes* follows the complicated (supposed) love affair between the poet and the eccentric artist Salvador Dalí during their university years. Considering it is the first film to depict an infamous and controversial part of the two artists’ lives, most would expect a certain focus on the homosexual aspect within the film.

However, in reviews of the film, the gay content is the point least discussed. Instead the spotlight is placed firmly on the star of the film, Robert Pattinson especially due to the release of the extremely popular teen romance *Twilight* a year previously. *El País* published two reviews of the film: the first briefly describes the film and criticises it on technical grounds; the second is an interview with Robert Pattinson titled ‘El vampiro surrealista’ in which it questions the actor on his experience and feelings towards the film. The interview only mentions *Little Ashes* momentarily and centres on the actor’s feeling towards the sex scene in the film. From this interview there seems to be little interest in the actual relationship between Lorca and Dalí (at the beginning of the article, Pattinson himself states that he did not even know who the three iconic Spanish artists were before doing the film), with the clear focus being on the teen heart-throb. In British newspapers, as well as focusing on Pattinson, the critics heavily criticise the film’s writing, directing and acting. Some even complain about the poor approach to the Lorca-Dalí affair like Xan Brooks of The Guardian who wrote: ‘It’s quite an achievement to make a discreet, diffident film about the rumored love affair between tyro artists Salvador Dalí and Federico García Lorca - but I’ll be damned if *Little Ashes* doesn't manage it’ (Brooks, 2009).
By the time *Little Ashes* came to the screens in 2009, Lorca’s homosexual life had already come to the forefront of the minds of many Lorca scholars and writers due to publications of several books analysing Lorca’s work and life from a gay perspective, like Ian Gibson’s *Lorca y el mundo gay* and Ángel Sahuquillo’s *Federico García Lorca and the Culture of Male Homosexuality*, originally published in 1986. Therefore the expectations of what this new film could accomplish were high or (at least) interesting, as described by David Smith from The Guardian, ‘As nights out at the cinema go, it sounds almost surreal’. The film itself did have a heavy weight on its shoulders for being the most recent film to show the painter and the poet as homosexual figures (*Muerte de un poeta* by Juan Antonio Bardem was the first to portray this in the late 1980s) who came close to embarking on a full romantic relationship, and the first film with this story to be directed to a British audience. It is a relationship which many people may have known about but which had never been put on the silver screen.

From the beginning of the film, Lorca is portrayed as a passionate yet humble young man (there are scenes with him playing Chopin, notably the nocturnes and the revolutionary etudes, placing him as a Romantic and romantic and a political figure respectively) in comparison to the eccentric and unpredictable Dalí. As seen in the previous chapter, this figure is used to reinforce the superficial Spanish quality of the film. Therefore, when the Romantic Lorca is used in this film it acts as a stark contrast to the erratic Dalí and separates Dalí more from Spain while firmly attaching Lorca to his homeland. The kissing and sex scenes between Lorca and Dalí are equally filled with typical Lorquian symbolism, adding to the exotic mystique in the love affair between the two men. There are two sex scenes: one which involves Lorca and Dalí on a dark rooftop, but Dalí abruptly stops the sexual act. The second scene is a
reasonably long one in which Lorca has sex with his female friend while watching Dalí masturbate in the corner of the room. This scene acts as the replacement of the unfulfilled sexual encounter before, in which Lorca and Dalí consummate their feelings for each other through a third party. There are a number of kissing scenes in the film, although the most memorable one is the long night scene on the beach where they first kiss under the moonlight. The kissing scene on the beach is one of the most important parts of the film as it not only represents the start of a relationship but it also shows the first scene of homosexual activity. At first, because the scene is filmed quite directly, it may seem that the gay scene is achieved without shying away or hiding under innuendoes and suggestion. However, the scene itself was filmed at night and is therefore fairly dark apart from the light of the moon reflecting over the water and shining over the two young actors. It is uncertain whether the film makers are attempting to hide the homosexual activity or are merely trying to emphasise the taboo it was at the time, or indeed merely trying to highlight the romance of the scene. It is also interesting that Morrison chose to use the moon as a principal image in this scene. There are numerous writings and theories of the meaning of many Lorca symbols and it is often recognised that the moon is emblematic of passion and something more sinister. This can be seen in his poems like Romancero Gitano (for example, Romance de la luna, luna) and plays like Bodas de sangre where the moon is symbolic of death. Whether or not Morrison or Goslett (the screen writer) were aware of these meanings is not necessarily shown in this scene. It is possible that the moon presiding over the first kiss of the two artists represents misfortunes in the future, however, it appears to be used for its romantic effect rather than as an omen.

Similarly symbolic is the significance of using the sea as a place for beginning the relationship. Water (as with many of the other symbols in Lorca’s writing) can signify
different things depending on context, for example, a running river often symbolises passion, where a still body of water can signify lack of passion or death (again, Romancero Gitano has a number of poems with these symbols like La casada infiel, where there is an affair next to a river, or Romancero sonámbulo, where a woman drowns in water tank or well). Like the symbol of the moon, water can both signify life and death in Lorquian terms. Therefore, the scene in which the sea and the moon are part of the surroundings with the characters of Lorca and Dalí leaves the audience (those who understand a little about Lorca’s work) watching an ambiguous scene where the director is either ignoring these symbols or embracing them. Some insight into this can perhaps be seen in the next intimate scene between the artists. While back in Madrid, Lorca and Dalí are seen to attempt to consummate their relationship in a similar setting to that when they had their first kiss: a dark night with only the light of the moon. However, unlike the first romantic scene, this one is awkward and clumsy, with the audience unable to see clearly what is happening. Again, the audience is left with the feeling that perhaps the indirectness of the scene is due to the then forbidden act. However, by keeping these scenes hidden under the cover of darkness it appears that the director is saying that this is still considered taboo.

Adding to this, Dalí has to stop in the middle of intercourse, making the scene turn into something that was passionate and romantic, to strange and uncomfortable.

Although the main theme of the film itself is the homosexual relationship between the two artists, there seems to be a lack of substance which is frequently noted by film critics:

Madrid, 1922, the meeting point for the young Federico García Lorca and Salvador Dalí, and the sexual tensions between playwright and painter that come to play a part in their emotional and artistic coming of age. Well, that’s
the theory in this speculative biopic whose material intrigues, but whose achievement is patchy.

Balancing the history with the drama of the relationships proves intractable, resulting in a frustratingly bitty time-structure, while the decision to shoot the film in Spanish-accented English doesn’t make the dialogue less awkward […] In the end, it doesn’t satisfy as fact-based bio or love story, but we appreciate the effort. (Johnston, 2009)

The critic, Trevor Johnston, has made the point that the subject of the film is interesting, but that the film itself falters in conveying the story to the audience. Although the majority of reviews for this film were fairly negative, it did open the door to a new cinematic side of the Lorca’s life story and, perhaps, has assisted in breaking the taboo surrounding Lorca’s sexuality by projecting via a different medium.

Although there is still resistance in some quarters, since the years of Franco’s dictatorship, there have been some attempts to understand Lorca’s attitude towards his sexuality and the significance this has for understanding of his work. Lorca’s family are no longer denying his homosexuality (although they are not keen to promote it either) and his work that contains homosexual content or themes is available to the public. However, none of these factors makes Lorca into a gay icon. As mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, the image of Lorca as a gay icon is unfulfilled. This is not to say that Lorca should be recognised as a gay icon, but it is worth pointing out that it is unusual and interesting that the gay community in Spain (and outside) has not embraced Lorca as a symbol of their subculture.
In the 1980s, there was a more positive outlook on Lorca’s sexuality, particularly during the fifty year anniversary of his death in 1986. As seen in the appendix, there was an upsurge of Lorca productions in this year, most famously the return of Victor García’s production of *Yerma* to the stage (but this time directed by Nuria Espert due to the sudden death of the original director). The most controversial production, however, was Lluis Pasqual’s *El público*, which was performed more than 800 times due to its popularity. Although it was not the first time that *El público* had been seen on stage in Spain (or abroad), it was certainly the most unusual and surreal of the productions available for the Spanish (and Italian) public. Interestingly the reviews of the production treated the gay references as merely part of the storyline rather than viewing them as significant thematic elements. In an interview for the *ABC*, Pasqual begins by offering an assessment of Lorca’s image which is similar to that offered by Sahuquillo and de Prada, before suggesting that this is now an opportunity for change:

De tantos Lorcas […] nosotros sólo conocemos una parte, reconocemos una imagen tópica. A mí me parece que su cincuentenario, como ocurre con todos los aniversarios, es una excusa, un pretexto para remodelar las cosas, ponerlas en orden o cambiar su aspecto. El cincuentenario de Lorca ha servido en muchos casos para terminar con una serie de tópicos. El primero: “A Lorca lo mataron por error”. A Lorca no lo mataron por error, lo mataron porque lo tenían que matar, porque Lorca en sí mismo era una provocación. Alguien que es capaz de escribir “El público”, que es capaz de decir las cosas que decía, de comportarse cívicamente como se comportaba, era una provocación que tenía que desaparecer. Otro tópico es el Lorca populachero; nunca Lorca fue así, en él se mezclaban la cultura y la experiencia vital. Hay que olvidarse también de ese tópico que asegura que si a Federico no lo hubieran matado tal vez nadie

---

53 *El público* had been shown as university productions in the late seventies, and then was seen in Poland (alongside *Comedia sin título*) and Italy. For a few days in 1986 (the fiftieth anniversary of Lorca’s death) a ballet version of the play was shown in Madrid, followed by Lluis Pasqual’s version in December of the same year.
se acordaría de él, porque es mentira, es muy bueno “a pesar de”…Personalmente, me gustaría que el cincuentenario sirviera para renovar, para volver a leer su obra, y hacer a Lorca de una manera normal, como cualquier otro autor. (Lluis Pasqual cited by Galindo, 1986: 93).

Pasqual’s use of the phrase ‘hacer a Lorca de una manera normal’ tells us a lot about how the director views the status of Lorca in the theatre at the time this article was published. Pasqual makes note of Lorca’s image up until then and makes the claim that Lorca was never treated like other authors/playwrights, because he was stunted by the images imposed upon him. Therefore we could see Pasqual’s production of *El público* as an antidote to these previous misconceptions about the playwright by not focusing or homing in on any particular image, but treating all the plays themes as equal.

The Pasqual production of *El público* itself is worth commenting on. The collaboration between Pasqual and Puigserver (as the set designer) was to prove to be a highly successful one, with Delgado claiming that ‘theatricality was the definitive idiom’ (2010: 93). Puigserver decided on ‘a more playful approach which recognised and celebrated not only the complex interaction of differing linguistic and dramatic discourses in the play, but also the specific function of the eccentric stage directions’ (Delgado, 2010: 86). This led to the construction of ‘a multi-purpose auditorium’ (Delgado, 2010: 88) in the Lliure in Barcelona and in the Teatro María Guerrero in Madrid. Delgado notes that the relocation of the play (into a different socio-cultural context) involves a process of reinvention (2010: 89). Delgado then goes on to say: ‘Rather than simply seeing their task as the extraction of meaning from Lorca’s text […], Pasqual and Puigserver recognised their own engagement in a creative dialogue with the play’ (2010: 90). As mentioned before, Pasqual’s aim was to not only focus
on one theme, but to try and encompass many, making the production as diverse as possible, and this is reiterated again but this time including Lorca: ‘Dramatist and director refused to endorse readings which would reduce the play to a single issue’ (Delgado, 2010: 91). This allowed the production to touch upon issues like ‘gender, sexuality, social and political interaction’ (Delgado, 2010: 92).

Within this production there are elements which lean towards the notion of myth, although it seemed that Pasqual was presenting these myths rather than adhering to them: ‘Superimposed performative masks seduced the audience into believing that beneath a role lies ‘truth’ but truth proved an elusive concept in Pasqual’s staging. Absolutes were negated’ (Delgado, 2010: 95). This presentation of false truths are ones which Pasqual recognised, as mentioned by Delgado ‘Pasqual consistently recognised the particularity of the reading of the play presented through the production: the many surfaces, reflections and prisms always denying a definitive rendition’ (2010: 95-96). This is what separates Pasqual’s production of El público from any other post-1975 Lorca production is the acknowledgement that a production can never represent an authentic image of the poet:

It is a recognition of the impossibility of presenting a truthful or real Lorca, an understanding of the blurred and ever-shifting boundaries between truth and lies which is the territory of theatre and an articulation of the complex ways in which the self is mapped within cultural, social, economic and political parameters’. (Delgado, 2010: 103)

In a separate interview for the same newspaper, Pasqual touched on how Lorca had become a one-dimensional figure, saying ‘No basta tampoco, con la leyenda folclórica de su andalucismo, que el propio poeta rechazó repetidamente. Hay algo
más: una universalidad que nace de las profundas raíces que le unen a su pueblo, de las metáforas simples y poderosas con que expresa el drama cotidiano de la vida y la muerte.’ (1987: 40). Pasqual wanted to dispel the images or masks that followed him through most of his life and death, and present the universal Lorca to the public. In many ways, Pasqual and those who have reviewed his production have done Lorca a lot of justice by not pigeon-holing him into the most known (i.e. the Romantic and exotic figure) images of him. They focus on the universality and the flexibility of the play, transforming Lorca’s work into a successful production. However, this reviving of Lorca seems to have disappeared by the time of the centenary of Lorca’s birth twelve years later.

If we were to compare the centenary of Lorca’s birth with the fifty year festival of his death, there is a slight difference with regard to his homosexuality. Angel Sahuquillo describes this view of Lorca’s sexuality in the epilogue to his book, in which he discusses the centenary of Lorca’s birth (in 1998) and the celebrations that took place around Spain. He refers to this year as ‘Lorca’s “Holy Year”’ and goes through some of the many activities available.

It was impossible to attend every activity and read everything that was written. Nevertheless, I believe it is possible to say that the general trend was to present a popular Lorca, that is, someone embraceable and saleable. Shortly after the official beginning, the daily El Mundo published Pilar Ortega’s article whose title is fairly symptomatic in this regard: “Lorca, Ambassador of Spanish Culture.” Homosexuality, of course, is not something recommendable

---

54 From the title of an article by Miguel Mora in El País (October 26, 1997) (Mora cited by Sahuquillo, 2007: 235).
55 Sahuquillo mentions “…plans for seven expositions, five movie and television projects, five conferences given by “specialists” and more than 40 musicals and theatrical shows were already announced. When the National Commission for the Centenary of Federico García Lorca published its “Official Program of Activities,” it consisted of 48 pages and included many more events” (2007: 235).

Sahuquillo was not the only person to be disappointed by the activities or celebrations in honour of Lorca’s centenary. Juan Manuel de Prada (columnist for ABC) wrote:

Gigantic expositions are promoted, the specialists give the usual speech with wasted and itinerant saliva and the politicians recite some little poem, which sounds as sarcastic as a gob of spit, in front of the dead person’s grave…the organizers of the splendours trivialize the memory of the guests of honour, and even musical versions of Lorca’s most characteristic poems become commercialized. And what remains after so much sound and fury? An empty hall, devastated by the rotten army, which will not be filled again until the next anniversary. (cited by Sahuquillo, 2007: 236).

The anger of de Prada is clearly displayed here, echoing much that Sahuquillo had commented on and had issue with. The concept of what Sahuquillo calls ‘a popular Lorca’ and what de Prada refers to as ‘commercialised’ seems to be the prominent image that is left with us today, that is to say, the figure of a Spanish national, a victim of the Spanish Civil War and the poet and playwright with Romantic and romantic touches.

So what has happened between the more universal image of Lorca of the 1980’s and the more typecast figure of the poet of the late 1990’s (and even up to today)? One of the reasons for this change could be the cultural climate of 1980’s Spain, namely ‘la movida’, in which Spain flourished as a sexually liberated and open country with people like Pedro Almodóvar paving the way for modern Spanish films. A surreal and sexually driven production like El público clearly appealed to the younger generations of Spanish society at that time. Spain in the 1980’s was also the time in which Lorca’s
sexuality was rediscovered and more talked about. Although it was the late seventies in which Lorca’s close friend Rafael Martínez Nadal decided to publish Lorca’s *El público* and some of his own essays to go along with it, the play never really took off until the 1980’s. Of course, it was in the 80’s that Lorca’s most overtly homosexual work was published: *Sonetos del amor oscuro* (originally published as *Sonetos de amor*). With discussions about Lorca’s private life still making headlines and causing much debate in the media, it would be short sighted to say that this side of Lorca will not be examined further or seen more in Lorca productions, and films and books about Lorca’s life (especially since the connection between Lorca’s assassination and his sexuality is made when considering the reasons for his murder). It is still too early to tell whether recognition of Lorca’s homosexuality will evolve into turning the playwright into an icon for gay society in and outside Spain. However, what can be said is that Lorca as a gay icon or figure is that it is an example of how the Lorca myth is evolving to encompass new (yet incomplete) perspectives of the poet. Not only is it an addition to the myth, but due to the era in which Lorca’s homosexuality became a principal subject, it allowed the myth the remain alive and, as always, eternal.
Conclusion

This dissertation is an analysis of the evolution of Lorca and the reception of him and his work over the years since his death, with particular focus on post-Franco Spain and the United Kingdom. All the images (apart from the image of Lorca as a gay icon) have not only persisted and changed over time, but have also been manipulated by those who have power over Lorca’s work. Since his assassination those with this power (for example, the Franco government and perhaps the Lorca family to begin with) have used Lorca’s image, and therefore his work, to promote a positive representation of Spain. However, although at times Lorca was used for political means (especially to promote tourism in the 1960s), it was the critics and the Lorca productions which reinforced Lorca’s image or myth and, in turn, implanting this image in the mind of the audience.

Although this work has attempted to highlight several aspects of the playwright which is rarely written or spoken about in both academic and social circles, it is merely scratching the surface of this subject. If anything, more questions have emerged from this investigation, one of them being the future of the reception of Lorca, his work and his image in and outside of Spain. In a previous chapter, I mention that Ian Gibson, when writing about Lorca and the Spanish Civil War, says:

Espero que así se vaya entendiendo, y que, muy pronto, Federico García Lorca pueda ser símbolo, no sólo del dolor de su pueblo, sino de una auténtica reconciliación nacional. Creo, sinceramente, que éste sería su deseo.
The use of Lorca as a tool for remembering the atrocities of the Spanish Civil War and the dictatorship that followed is one which will probably continue until Spain reaches, as Gibson says, ‘una auténtica reconciliación nacional’.

I often wonder whether Lorca would have reached such dizzying heights of fame if he had not been assassinated just before the Civil War. Not because of the quality or the durability of his work, but because it seems that it was this event which triggered a possession of his image on both ends of the political spectrum, and an enduring myth that followed Lorca’s work and image. Franco and his regime, on one side, used Lorca as a tool to promote the cultural qualities of Spain to Spaniards themselves and to tourists. On the other side and more recently, those on the left-wing used Lorca as an example of the many atrocities that happened during the war and, after the death of Franco, used his image and memory to assist those who wanted graves exhumed in order to find family members. It is clear from this work that although Lorca had made a political impact, his cultural impact was greater, and it is very likely that this tendency will continue while the issues of the Civil War and the memory of the dictatorship still exist.

Despite the clear manipulation of Lorca, his work and his image, his popularity never waned:

Ni siquiera […] la creación lorquiana ha sufrido el limbo de unos treinta años con que la muerte condena a casi todas las figuras literarias, artísticas y políticas; todo lo contrario, con el paso de los años parece ir descubriendonos nuevos matices y facetas desapercibidos para sus contemporáneos, y así se sigue traduciendo a Lorca a todas las lenguas conocidas, periódicamente se representan sus piezas teatrales, se hacen películas sobre su vida y su muerte,
“ballets” sobre su mundo poético, se escribe música para sus poemas o exposiciones de cuadros inspirados en sus creaciones. (Rafael Martínez Nadal cited in ABC, 1980: 18)

Even though this comment was made in the eighties, it still remains very true today. Lorca’s image is evolving and so are the productions of his work. Now, as the Lorca myth has continued and evolved with new revelations of Lorca’s life and work, many people have developed a variety of opinions when it comes to staging a Lorca play: it can be filled with Romantic and exotic elements like flamenco, or it could be a minimalist production that focuses on the universal components. The fact that people are more willing to experiment and play around with Lorca’s work shows that they can see the many possibilities of the poet’s work. However, at the moment it is very difficult to detach Lorca from his myth, and the more experimental productions that have been accomplished have, to some extent, been within the confines of the myth.

Therefore, as people become more comfortable with his work, the more accepting they are of Lorca’s private life and even hungry to know more of it in an attempt to better understand his work. The concept of Lorca as a gay icon is one which acts as a springboard for what may come in the future. So far, the image of Lorca as a gay icon has not quite yet been embarked on, but is gaining ground with the revelations and acceptance of his private life.

It is important to remember that this dissertation is only the foundation for a much larger investigation, and due to restrictions of time and quantity, only a fraction of what can be done has been analysed. It is quite likely that Lorca’s image and myth has
expanded beyond the borders of Europe, and that it has influenced his work in places like the US, South America and the East.

It is difficult to conclude a piece of work that has opened up so many questions about a man who has been represented in so many ways. It is equally difficult to conclude when the future of the image of Lorca and his work is reasonably unpredictable and has so many aspects depending on it, namely the type of productions that will be created in the future and any new aspects of his life that come to the surface. However, it seems that the myth of Lorca is one that will linger due to its natural and eternal quality. Audiences, critics and those involved in the theatre are unable to detach themselves from this myth and, as the image of Lorca still remains incomplete, it is likely that the myth of the poet will continue to thrive. The only possible break from this myth will be if the image of Lorca is completed, although his assassination has made this almost impossible. Perhaps it is best for Lorca himself to bring to a close this work in which he, unknowingly, summarises his legacy and myth in his speech about ‘el duende’:

En todos los países la muerte es un fin. Llega y se corren las cortinas. En España, no. En España se levantan. Muchas gentes viven allí entre muros hasta el día en que mueren y los sacan al sol. Un muerto en España es más vivo como muerto que en ningún sitio del mundo: hiere su perfil como el filo de una navaja barbera. El chiste sobre la muerte o su contemplación silenciosa son familiares a los españoles. (1954: 312).
Appendix A: Spanish Productions

Bodas de sangre (Table 1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Production Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>José Carlos Plaza</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>CAT/CDN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>José Carlos Plaza</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro María Guerrero</td>
<td>CAT/CDN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>José Antonio</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Zarzuela</td>
<td>Ballet Nacional de España</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>José Carlos Plaza/ Cristina Hoyos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro María Guerrero</td>
<td>CAT/CDN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2009</td>
<td>Paco Mora</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>PACO MORA BALLEÍSTICO</td>
<td>PACO MORA BALLEÍSTICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Ana González Wals</td>
<td>Murcia</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>José Antonio</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de Buero Vallejo</td>
<td>CAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>A. Diaz-Florian</td>
<td>Cordoba</td>
<td>Betty Blue's Café Concert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>Ferran Madico</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Teatro Romea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>A. Diaz-Florian</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Espada de Madera</td>
<td>Espada de Madera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td>María Rosa</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Centro Cultural de la Villa</td>
<td>MARÍA ROSA Y SU BALLET ESPAÑOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Francisco Suarez</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Lope de Vega</td>
<td>Fila 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Francisco Suarez</td>
<td>Getafe</td>
<td>Teatro Auditorio Federico García Lorca</td>
<td>Fila 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Rahim Burhan</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Buero Vallejo</td>
<td>Cia Romani Teatro Pralipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Lluís Pasqual</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro María Guerrero</td>
<td>CDN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Edward Wilson</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Teatre Principal</td>
<td>Teatres de la Generalitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Vincent Montalt</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Teatre Principal</td>
<td>Teatres de la Generalitat/Instituto Núria Espert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>XIII Festival Internacional de Granda</td>
<td>Compañía Roma Theater Pralipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Alicia Alonso</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Albeniz</td>
<td>Ballet Nacional de Cuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Ariel García Valdes</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro María Guerrero</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Ariel García Valdes</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Palacio Central</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Antonio Morillas</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Imperial</td>
<td>Colectivo de Teatro Vistazul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Antonio Morillas</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Cine Español</td>
<td>Colectivo de Teatro Vistazul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Alicia Alonso</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Albeniz</td>
<td>Ballet Nacional de Cuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Pierre Lacotte</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Ballet Nacional de Nancy y Lorena</td>
<td>Tema y Variaciones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Edward Wilson</td>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>Teatro Principal de Valencia</td>
<td>NYT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Nombre</td>
<td>Ciudad</td>
<td>Localización</td>
<td>Teatro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Tatsuji Iwatra</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Colegio Mayor Universitario San Juan Evangelista</td>
<td>La Barraquilla de Japón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Antonio Gades</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Zarzuela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Mariano Anos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Real Coliseo Carlos III</td>
<td>Teatro La Ribera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1988</td>
<td>Mariano Anos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Real Coliseo Carlos III</td>
<td>Teatro La Ribera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>María Alicia Martínez Medrano</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Casa de Campo</td>
<td>Laboratorio de Teatro Campesino e Indígena de Tabasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>José Luis Gómez</td>
<td>Almería</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compañía Teatro de la Plaza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kim Jeong-ok</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>El Grec</td>
<td>El grupo Jayu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Jose Luis Gomez</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Albeniz</td>
<td>Compañía Jose Luis Gomez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>Gines Sánchez</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Lope De Vega</td>
<td>La Jara/Compañía Lobaratorio de Sevilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>Salvador Tavora</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Sala San Hermenegildo</td>
<td>La Cuadra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanas de Espinas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Antonio Gades</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Sala Olimpia</td>
<td>Festival Internacional de Danza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Carlos Saura</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Ben Barka</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cervantes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Production Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Berta Martinez</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Sala Olimpia</td>
<td>Teatro Estudio de la Habana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>María Rosa</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Zarzuela</td>
<td>Ballet Español de María Rosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Antonio Gades</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Monumental</td>
<td>Compania de Ballet Español</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yerma (Table 1.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Production Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Victor Ullate</td>
<td></td>
<td>El Sur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Salvador Tavora</td>
<td>Girona</td>
<td>XIX Festival Castell de Peralada</td>
<td>Cuadra de Sevilla Yerma Mater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Antonio Morillas</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Municipal Juan Rodriguez Romero de Dos Hermanas</td>
<td>Colectivo de Teatro Vistazul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>José Carlos Plaza</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Jardines del Generalife</td>
<td>Compañía Andaluza de Danza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>José Luis Coronilla</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Tech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>A. Diaz-Florian</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Espada de Madera</td>
<td>Espada de Madera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Miguel Narros</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teatro Goya</td>
<td>Centro Andaluz del Teatro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Carmen Cortes/Núria Espert</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de Madrid</td>
<td>Compañía de Danza Flamenca Carmen Cortés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Nombre</td>
<td>Localización</td>
<td>Localización Detalle</td>
<td>Compañía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>Miguel Narros</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Lara</td>
<td>Compañía Andaluza de Danza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Miguel Narros</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Central</td>
<td>Centro Andaluz del Teatro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>Carmen Cortes/Núria Espert</td>
<td>Cuenca</td>
<td>El Auditorio de Cuenca</td>
<td>Compañía de Danza Flamenca Carmen Cortés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1994</td>
<td>Santiago Melendez</td>
<td>Alcalá de Heneres</td>
<td>Teatro Salon de Cervantes</td>
<td>Compañía Teatro Alba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Juanfra Rodríguez</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Café Teatro</td>
<td>Cuarta Pared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Cristina Hoyos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Zarzuela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Etelvino Vázquez</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Sala Beckett</td>
<td>Teatro del Norte de Asturias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Cristina Hoyos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Lirico Nacional de la Zarzuela</td>
<td>Compañía Cristina Hoyos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Cristina Hoyos</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Pabellón de Andalucia</td>
<td>Compañía Cristina Hoyos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Etelvino Vázquez</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Pradillo</td>
<td>Teatro del Norte de Asturias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Tatsuji Iwatra</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Colegio Mayor Universitario San Juan Evangelista</td>
<td>La Barraquilla de Japon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Rafael Aguilar</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Albeniz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alicante</td>
<td>Teatro Principal de Alicante</td>
<td>La Escuela de Danza de Pilar Sánchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Victor García/Núria Espert</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Victor García/Núria Espert</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Teatro de la Comedia</td>
<td>Compañía Núria Espert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Victor García/Núria Espert</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Comedia</td>
<td>Compañía Núria Espert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Teatro Victoria</td>
<td>Compañía Núria Espert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Alvarez Quintero</td>
<td>Compañía Núria Espert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Comedia</td>
<td>Compañía Núria Espert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1972</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro de la Comedia</td>
<td>Compañía Núria Espert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**La casa de Bernarda Alba (Table 1.3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Production Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Pepa Gamboa</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Español</td>
<td>TNT - El Vacie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lluís Pasqual</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Sala Petita</td>
<td>TNC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Lluís Pasqual</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Español</td>
<td>Naves del Español/ Matador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Miguel Ortega</td>
<td>Santander</td>
<td>Festival de Santander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Villanueva</td>
<td>Cordoba</td>
<td>Trápala Teatro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Ramón Oller</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Central</td>
<td>Compañía Metros</td>
<td>Bendita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Amelia Ochandiano</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Fernan Gómez (Centro de Arte)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Autor/Reparto</td>
<td>Ciudad</td>
<td>Localización</td>
<td>Compañía/Nombre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>José Llamas/Ana Vega</td>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>La Casa de Campanas</td>
<td>Chalana-Cor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Carme Portaceli</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Español</td>
<td>Fundación Municipal Teatro Gayarre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Harry Kupfer</td>
<td>Peralada</td>
<td>XV Festival Castell De Peralada</td>
<td>Bernarda Alba Haus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Juan Dolores Caballero</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>TNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Calixto Bieito</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Lope De Vega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Calixto Bieito</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro María Guerrero</td>
<td>Focus S.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Casa Consistorial</td>
<td>Teatro García Lorca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Lluís Pasqual</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Lope De Vega</td>
<td>Ballet Flamenco de Antonio Canales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bengues &lt;&lt;Suite sobre La casa de Bernarda Alba&gt;&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Pedro Alvarez-Ossorio</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro María Guerrero</td>
<td>Centro Andaluz del Teatro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Pedro Alvarez-Ossorio</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Palacio Central</td>
<td>Centro Andaluz del Teatro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Centro Cultural de la Villa</td>
<td>Ballet de Rafael Aguilar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rango</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Katsuya Sano</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Colegio Mayor Universitario San Juan Evangelista</td>
<td>La Barraquilla de Japón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Alfonso Zurro</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>José Carlos Plaza</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Teatro Español</td>
<td>Compañía teatro Español</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>Ramón Resino</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Lope De Vega</td>
<td>Grupo Tiempo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Angel Facio</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>Teatro Talfa</td>
<td>María José Goyanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Angel Facio</td>
<td>Valladolid</td>
<td>Teatro Zorrilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Alvarez</td>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>Teatro Lope De Vega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph: The number of annual Lorca productions in Spain since 1970.
Appendix B: UK Productions

**Blood Wedding (Table 2.1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tanya Ronder</td>
<td>Lara Muth</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Bridewell Theatre</td>
<td>Tower Theatre Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>P. Burton-Morgan</td>
<td>Poppy Burton-Morgan</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Southwark Playhouse</td>
<td>Metta Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ted Hughes</td>
<td>Jen Heyes</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Playhouse</td>
<td>Cut to the Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ted Hughes</td>
<td>Phil Willmott</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>The Scoop</td>
<td>The Steam Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Ted Hughes</td>
<td>Jeremy Raison</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Citizens Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tanya Ronder</td>
<td>Rufus Norris</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Almeida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Gwynne Edwards</td>
<td>Susie Clare</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Baron's Court Theatre</td>
<td>CP Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Brendan Kennelly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Newcastle Playhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Technis Theatre</td>
<td>Telon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Women's Playhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Gwenda Pandolfi</td>
<td>Yvonne Brewster</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Beck Theatre</td>
<td>National Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Luis Gomez</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The House of Bernarda Alba (Table 2.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Rona Munro</td>
<td>John Tiffany</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Citizens Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Tom Stoppard</td>
<td>Patrick Sandford</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Nuffield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>Gadi Roll</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>David Hare</td>
<td>Howard Davies</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Lyttleton Theatre</td>
<td>National Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Rebecca Morahan &amp; Auriol Smith</td>
<td>Auriol Smith</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Orange Tree Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Nuria Espert</td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Lyric Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fusun Demirer</td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Putney Arts Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Tom Stoppard</td>
<td>Robin Phillip</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Greenwich Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Yerma (Table 2.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Frank McGuinness</td>
<td>Helena Kaut-Howson</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Arcola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Pam Gems</td>
<td>Helena Kaut-Howson</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Royal Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Natasha Betteridge</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>National Theatre</td>
<td>NT Studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>Antonio Cantos</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Technis Theatre</td>
<td>Telon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballet de Cristina Hoyos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Peter Luke</td>
<td>Aljah Moshinsky</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>National Theatre</td>
<td>Cottesloe Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>I.Macpherson &amp; J. Minett</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People’s Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aidwych Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aidwych Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Victor García</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aidwych Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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