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INTRODUCTION

Translation Studies and Literary Theory

In 1987, Rainer Schulte presented critics with the notion of translation research as a challenge for the future, stating that "the comparative study of multiple translations appears to be one of the most successful ways of bringing the reader closer to the original text."\(^1\) This study aims to do precisely that, by examining the various translations into English of Federico García Lorca's \textit{Bodas de Sangre}. It may hardly seem necessary to introduce this author to any reader, since his poetry as well as his theater have been translated extensively, making him one of the best known authors of the twentieth century. His rural trilogy, of which \textit{Bodas de Sangre} is the first part, has been the object of much scholarly research, yet little attention has been paid to the translation and reception of these plays in the English speaking world. This is a typical situation in the United States and Western European countries, where the reviewing and study of translations "is left to a random set of publicists, ranging from philologists and literary critics familiar with the source language and literature to translators from the same or
related fields. Nearly all of them are amateurs in the field of translation studies, and hence translation criticism is amateurish."²

The study of translations of literary texts can yield some interesting insights into both the Source Language text and the Target Language literary system. Pertinent questions concern such matters as the degree of similarity between, or "adaptability" of, the codes and conventions of one literature to those of another; the rationale behind the personal norms different translators adopt for one and the same text, either during the same time period or at different times; and the extent to which those norms reflect an evolution in the target literary system, or are simply influenced by the translator's personal background, philosophy and motivations. Also to be examined are the ways in which seemingly unimportant or virtually unnoticeable changes in the text--translation shifts--affect the translation as a whole. Finally, and most importantly, the reception of the text in the target culture will be considered.

García Lorca's work seems an obvious choice for a study such as this, especially if one considers the rather exceptional position this author holds in the context of twentieth century Spanish theatre in translation. Several of the better known peninsular playwrights, such as Valle-Inclán, Antonio Buero Vallejo, Alfonso Sastre and Antonio
Gala may have had one or two of their most famous plays translated, and sometimes more than one version of the same play exists in English. This is a fair average, and one that seems valid also for the translation of García Lorca's theatre in languages other than English. For Bodas de sangre, however, more than twelve translations are extant, six of which have also been published and are available to the present day in bookstores and libraries in the United States and in Europe. One cannot help wondering, then, what attraction this particular work holds for English speaking readers and audiences. Bodas de sangre, after all, is a culturally marked play, both in form and in content, yet it seems to appeal in an uncommon way to the English speaking public. It may be argued, and justifiably so, that García Lorca's highly controversial life and death and the subsequent elevation of the author to a kind of martyr figure and example of Civil War repression have played an important part in the popularity of his poems and plays. It seems, however, that although this may have been the case with the earliest translations, made in the thirties, forties and fifties, the argument is less valid for the translations made by the "new wave" of translators, starting with Sue Bradbury, whose version was published in 1977 in London.

An attempt will be made in this study to suggest an explanation for the proliferation of the English versions of
Bodas de sangre, taking into consideration the different attitudes the translators of the two periods may have had towards this play, as well as the repercussion these attitudes had on the translation itself. Attention will be paid to the choices made by translators from different cultural environments, British and American, and to differences in translational strategy due to the professional backgrounds of the translators: those who are playwrights and poets themselves, versus those who are primarily literary translators, versus those who are actively involved in the performance of theater, such as actors and directors. Eventually, this will lead not merely to the description of translational strategies, but shed light on the literary and dramatic values of this play from a different angle than has been done up to now.

It is our firm belief that translation criticism is a valid and useful form of literary criticism that has not been exploited to its fullest extent. In fact, it has been argued that the translation of a literary text is an act of "demonstrative" interpretation, as it "interprets by enactment, not by analysis," and thus itself may be considered a form of literary criticism. In this respect, the translator may be seen as a reader and critic who interacts so closely with the text that certain insights will be gained only by him, or at least by him first.
In spite of its obvious relevance and constant presence in the literary evolution of most countries, translation research generally has occupied a marginal position in the study of literature, causing the latter to show "signs, periodically, of a bad conscience." Apart from certain isolated periods in literary history, when translations were used as a weapon in the time's literary debate and in the struggle for renovation of the national literature, translation studies have always taken second place to literary criticism. In recent decades, however, a renewed interest in translation and a dissatisfaction with literary criticism and scholarship have made critics more aware of the importance of reconsidering the function of translation in the context of literature programs, how the art of translation is closely related to the act of interpretation and interdisciplinary thinking, how the act of translation can revitalize the study of literature, and how translations can offer new alternatives to traditional scholarly publications.

Many scholars, not all of whom are translators themselves, now maintain that the relationship translator-literary critic should be one of mutual respect and solidarity, and have ceased to regard the translator as just an able--or in some cases not so able--craftsman, considering him now an equal of the literary critic:

Translator and critic do not "create" the original work, but rather "re-create" a work through the act of translation and interpretation. In one case, the result happens to be a new linguistic structure in a new language; in
the other, a reflection on the text through critical language.7

With the recognition of the influential role of translation in the literary evolution of most all Western nations, translation criticism, as Valentín García Yebra has noted, has recently started to occupy the place in literary history to which it has long aspired.8 It is not that the complex process of rendering in a faithful as well as elegant manner the ideas of a literary work into a different language went totally unnoticed in the past. For centuries a great number of translators have been voicing their concerns, stating their opinions and recounting their experiences in this field. In numerous prefaces, notes and afterwords to their translations, they would apologize for, or more frequently defend, the personal norms they had adopted and the reasoning that guided them in their task. Mounin refers to this as "un empirisme de la traduction,"9 yet these reflections on translation were often no more than a collection of commonplaces and cliches, based on vague intuitions. As Julio-César Santoyo has noted:

Las variantes son escasas: se alude a la dificultad y complejidad de la tarea; de la experiencia del traductor se deducen "reglas" teórico-prácticas siempre generales (...); se repiten los habituales cliches que comparan la traducción con libretos sin música, cuerpos sin alma, támpices del revés o imágenes en un espejo; se desprestigia o se ensalza al traductor; se enumeran las cualidades que el trabajo requiere; se discute si es arte u oficio, libertad o esclavitud (...); se escriben, en fin, prólogos galeatos en los que el ejecutor de la traducción (a veces en los dos sentidos de ejecutar) explica
cómo ha ido resolviendo los problemas concretos que se le han presentado o cómo ha sorteado las insalvables dificultades que todos inexorablemente encuentran, tanto en Demóstenes como en Boccaccio o Beowulf... Pero en ninguna de tales aproximaciones, ni siquiera en las más atinadas, hay método alguno. 

A period of more thorough hermeneutic inquiry, when the "topic acquires a vocabulary, a methodological status of its own, away from the demands and singularities of a given text" was followed by a modern approach that involved the application of linguistics and statistics. At the same time, during the forties and fifties, great promise was believed to be offered by the possibilities of machine translation. When this confidence subsided during the following decade, it was possible to note a return to more "hermeneutic, almost metaphysical inquiries into translation and interpretation."

It is perhaps not unreasonable to suggest the slow emergence of a new stage in translation studies during the past two decades: a greater willingness on the part of literary studies to use the findings of translation criticism and include them in their own discipline, and, within the study of literary translation itself, a move away from prescriptive subjectivity to a more systematic and methodological approach, the search for more subtle ways to describe translation, an interest in the reception and the effects of translated works on the target system rather than a main or mere focus on the Source Text.
A point stressed often by contemporary critics is the possibility of a productive interdependence of literary criticism and translation criticism. Richard Bjornson suggested that "competing literary theories may be put to a simple test by asking their proponents to describe (in terms of their own theories) what actually takes place when an aesthetically structured text is translated from one language to another," giving as an example of this hypothesis the problem of intertextuality in the translation of literary texts.\textsuperscript{13} Paul Mann, in response to an article by Rainer Schulte, addresses the question why translations date whereas great works seem to do so much less, by venturing that the act of translation deconstructs the static appearance of the literary work and that "new and differing translations may signal a fundamental instability in the original works themselves, an instability masked by the fixity of printed words on a page."\textsuperscript{14}

Various critics have stated that translation, being such an intense interpretative activity, can, because of its peculiar condition of involving reading and writing at the same time, bring insights to the text where literary criticism cannot. Furthermore, apart from the obvious act of interpretation that precedes every translation, the finished product itself is an interesting and readily available piece of study material for the literary critic. As André Lefevere has pointed out: "It does not seem to have dawned on the
theorists of literature that a translation constitutes an eminently testable act of reception, which can be studied independently from its production in time.\textsuperscript{15} On the other hand, literary criticism is also a fertile source for the production of new translations. With the development of literary theories, new light is shed on what is latently present in the original and translators or publishers may be convinced that a new translation is in order to bring out or highlight the new insights provided by literary theory.

The Translation of Theatre

Up to this moment, the existing studies and descriptions of literary translations have dealt mainly with poetry, and, to a lesser extent, with the narrative genre. Translation of theatre, in spite of the interesting implications it could have for dramatic theory and literary criticism in general, seems to have been neglected for the most part. This lack of attention to the theatre on the part of translation theory has been noted by Van den Broeck:

Among the scanty contributions the overwhelming majority deals with the question from a prescriptive, not a descriptive point of view. Only very recently writers on the subject have begun to realize that the translator for the theater is confronted with problems that are considerably different from those of translating a novel or a poem.\textsuperscript{16}

This relative neglect of the theatre as a full-fledged object of study is not only noticeable in translation studies, but also in other disciplines. Keir Elam, for
instance, laments the large periods of inactivity in the semiotic studies of the theatre, "despite the peculiar richness of theatrical communication as a potential area of semiotic investigation."

The main difficulty, perhaps in both these disciplines, is the twofold nature of the theatre text, and the relative confusion that exists among theorists of the theatre about a valid object of study. Two dissimilar, yet related kinds of textual material have to be contended with, "that produced in the theater and that composed for the theatre," denominated by Elam "the theatrical or performance text" and "the written or dramatic text" respectively. Whereas in the past, scholars would usually give greater priority to the written text, often disregarding the aspects relative to the performance text altogether, this situation, at least in the field of semiotics, seems to be reversing now as theorists such as Bettetini, de Marinis and Ruffini reject the written text as a legitimate focus for their discipline. Richard Hornby, a practicing director as well as theorist, maintains that the relationship between text and performance is a dynamic and functional one, and that the stage performance, through the mediation of director and performers, is "a projection of a text, via an interpretation." Hornby thus seems to concur with Pavis' circular scheme of "Texte lu - Texte relu" in which the director performs the task of the first reader, who translates the written, incomplete text
into a *mise en scène*, sometimes with the help of the actors' input and feedback, thus enabling the audience to make their collective and personal re-reading of the work.  

When the written or dramatic text is translated into a different language, the situation becomes more complex as the translator is then the first reader and the performance will, at best, be the result of a double interpretation, unless of course the translator and the director/actor are all one and the same person or are working extremely closely together, as is the case for instance in the *Bodas de sangre* translation by Dewell and Zapata. It remains clear, however, that where translation studies are concerned the written text can never be completely disregarded, as this is usually the first and main level upon which the translator operates. The translator influences the performance to the extent that the text contains clues for its realization on stage. Serpieri has pointed out that theatrical *langue* invariably has a status that distinguishes the dramatic text from all other literary texts, and that "every author, in writing for the theater, has in mind a stage realization which he stamps in the text, drawing upon the system of conventions operative in his time." Likewise, many translators will have in mind a certain audience to be reached, a certain philosophy to be conveyed and/or a certain function for the translation to perform in the Target Language culture.
In order for the translated text to perform the desired function in the target system, the translator will have to recognize and transfer codes other than merely the linguistic ones. Thus, he or she will necessarily be faced with a number of problems not only where the rendering of formal and content elements are concerned, but also in the translation of theatrical conventions and codes from the source system to the target system:

Acting conventions and audience expectations are components in the making of performance that are as significant as conventions of the written text. The theater of a given society will inevitably comprise a set of culturally determined codes that are performance conventions but that are also present in the written text... The problem for the translator arises when these codes cease to have functional significance in the Target Language theater.2

When analyzing or attempting to describe the translation of texts for the theatre, even more so than for other genres, it is important to be aware of the translator’s initial norm, a concept introduced by Gideon Toury that denotes a basic choice between opposing poles or options that will guide the translator’s norms throughout the translation.23 When confronted with the dual nature of the theatre text, the translator of a play, as opposed to the translator of narrative prose or poetry, will have to make not one, but two basic decisions, which from then on determine the translation in its entirety.

The first decision that needs to be made is whether the translation will be used for performance, or rather
mainly as a literary text to be read, or both. In the case of *Bodas de sangre*, some of the older translations were obviously made exclusively with performance in mind: Jose Weissberger's and Langston Hughes' translations, for instance, were used for a previously determined series of performances, by specific companies, and hence were never published. Other goals of different translators of this same play were to make the author known in the intellectual world of the target language, or to introduce a new play by an author who was known mainly for his poetry up to that point. Several of the more recent translators stress the fact that they strove for an "actable" or "playable" version, a "script for performance rather than solely a text to be read."

Interestingly, in one of these cases, the written and published translation was the end result of a project that originated on the stage, and benefitted from the constant cooperation of translators, actors and producers. The question to be asked, then, is to what extent and in which ways the choice of this initial norm concerning performance versus dramatic text influences the final translation, and whether the translators are consistent in the execution or realization of their particular choice in this matter.

A second important choice the translator of the theatre faces is that of adequacy versus acceptability:

Accordingly, the translator may subject himself either to ST [Source Text], with its contextual
relations and norms expressed by it and contained in it, or to the linguistic and/or literary norms active in the target literary polysystem...

Thus, whereas adherence to the norms of ST determines the adequacy of TT [Target Text] comparing to it, the adherence of models set up in the target literary pole determines its acceptability in the target literary polysystem as well as its exact status and position within it. 26

Even though this choice will have to be made in all instances of literary translation, it is more acute in theatre translation as the translated play will most likely have to withstand the harsh test of performance, and thus be subjected to a wide range of actors, producers and audiences. Clearly, most translators will endeavor to achieve a middle position between the two extremes, adapting such things as theater conventions to the target system, while translating cultural elements adequately. In their afterword, Dewell and Zapata state that they first made a translation "that would be accepted" by both bilingual actors and audience, and subsequently prepared a new draft for an English-only staged reading: "again, we rewrote during rehearsals and performances, trying to make certain that our words would be valid for actors and audiences who had no previous encounter with Lorca and no bias toward Hispanic culture." 27

The adequacy versus acceptability dilemma is certainly an interesting one in a play such as Bodas de sangre, which has been described as "l’essence même de la mentalité espagnole." 28 Comparing the various strategies used by the
translators in the different versions will shed light on the alternatives selected by the translators with regard to not only word choice, imagery and verse form, but also cultural items and theatrical conventions.

Methodology

In the past, literary studies, if they mentioned translation at all, did so from a position of assumed supremacy of the original text, and thus the study of translation has often served mainly to emphasize the qualities of the original by highlighting the errors and inadequacies of its translation(s). Many of the changes that are now taking place in the study of translation owe their existence to the development of the polysystem theory, which grants translation an unconditional part in the literary system. The polysystem hypothesis was first launched in 1970 by Itamar Even-Zohar and subsequently developed and applied to translation by that scholar as well as by various others. The polysystem theory is an extrapolation of functionalist and structuralist notions and presents a literature, or literature in general, as a system consisting of a collection of layers and sublayers that are forever involved in a struggle for dominance. Hermans has defined the role of translation in the literary system as follows:

In a given literature, translations may at certain times constitute a separate subsystem, with its own characteristics and models, or be more or less fully integrated into the indigenous
system; they may form part of the system's prestigious center or remain a peripheral phenomenon; they may be used as 'primary' polemic weapons to challenge the dominant poetics, or they may shore up and reinforce the prevailing conventions.30

It is clear that the polysystem theory opens up many avenues for the study of translation that were previously unexplored or unthinkable: instead of an emphasis on the source text as the supreme model, the point of departure and the object of study now becomes the translated text as is, including the translator's options and constraints, thus implying a change from normative to descriptive analysis. The question is no longer whether a translation is "good" or "bad," but what its effects are on the target literary system, and what it is in the translation that causes these effects. In order for translation studies to become truly accepted as an asset to the study of literature, they must lose their stigma of being a rigidly prescriptive and subjective collection of opinions and intuitions that serve only a limited group of other translators, and become a more objective and intersubjective discipline.

To this end, a number of translation scholars have developed models for the comparison and description of original texts and their translations. Raymond van den Broeck, who is of the opinion that Western European and American translation criticism lags behind the contributions of such Eastern European scholars as Jiri Levy, Anton Popovič and Frantisek Miko, states that "translation
criticism, despite the subjective element inherent in value judgements, can be an objective account if it is based, at least implicitly, on systematic description. The starting point for this description will be a comparative analysis of the source and target texts."31 Gideon Toury concurs, noting that the study of translation is still a discipline-in-the-making, proven by the fact that it has not yet developed a descriptive branch, perhaps due to the overall orientation or the discipline towards its practical applications.32

In 1972, James S Holmes established that translation description, one of the main branches of translation studies, consists of three kinds of research, "which may be distinguished by their focus as product-oriented, function-oriented and process-oriented."33 According to Kitty Van Leuven-Zwart, "product-oriented research can serve as a starting point: differences between a translation and its original--shifts, as they are called--may provide insights into the translation process as well as into the function the translation is intended to fulfill in the target language culture."34 The concept of translation shifts has been introduced by Catford, Popović and Vinay and Darbelnet and was later developed further by Levy and several other critics in their respective language pairs.35

Translation shifts, or "transpositions", may be defined as changes or deviations from the original text in the
translation, and are either obligatory, when they are unavoidable due to the differences between languages, or optional, when they are dependent on the conscious or unconscious decision of the translator to deviate from the source text, either in form or in content. For the description of translation, the analysis of the different shifts that occur is, obviously, essential, and optional shifts are of more interest than obligatory ones as the former are often indicative of the translators' strategies and decisions with respect to the function that the translation is to perform in the target culture.

An example of a common, yet often unconscious shift is the substitution of a specific term in the original with a more general one in the translation. Psycholinguistics has offered an explanation of this phenomenon by pointing out that the terms that unconsciously come to the translator's mind first are those that have the highest frequency, and are therefore the most general. Another phenomenon that often occurs is that of explicitation of lexical items, ideas or syntax that were only implicit in the original, which seems to stem from the translator's interpretative preoccupation to make things easier to understand and clearer than in the original. Other shifts that frequently occur are concretization, intensification, reduction, objectivisation and so on. If these shifts occur throughout the translated text, and with a certain
frequency, they will obviously have important repercussions on the resulting translation. The identification of shifts in the translated text may serve as a basis to the hypothesis of the translator's norms.

In practice, however, as Van Leuven-Zwart has pointed out, a simple scheme of opposing characteristics of the original and its translation does not cover all the possible shifts that may occur, and the boundaries between the different categories of shifts that were set in the past are often vague and confusing. When attempting to analyze translations into Dutch of Don Quijote, Van Leuven-Zwart has developed a two-part model that aims at covering all the shifts that occur on the micro-structural level (i.e. in sentences, clauses and phrases) during translation, as well as at describing the consequences of these often unobtrusive shifts on the macro-structural level (level of the characters, plot, place and time of events etc.) This model, according to the author, has two main objectives:

The first is to establish intersubjectively valid and verifiable descriptions of how and to what degree a translation differs from its source-text. The second objective, which is a logical consequence of the first, is to use this description as a basis for the formulation of hypotheses concerning the translator's interpretation of the original text and the strategy adopted during the process of translation. Thus, the method could be considered a research tool which is applicable to the entire field of descriptive translation studies.37

Van Leuven-Zwart has proven that micro-structural changes often have important resonances on the level of the story
and even though this model was developed mainly for the description of narrative texts, some of the categories of shifts proposed by this critic are useful also in the analysis of translation of other genres.

To our knowledge, a model specifically for the description and analysis of translations of dramatic texts has not been developed yet, and the present study aspires to contribute to the formulation of one. As a point of departure, however, general models may be used that are sufficiently versatile to function for more than one genre. An example of such a comprehensive methodological framework was developed by Lambert and Van Gorp, members of the so-called "Manipulation School" of translation scholars.38 The model suggested by these two critics approaches the translated text in a manner that goes from the external to the internal elements of the text, from the general to the more specific. The starting point is a preliminary examination of all, or as many as possible, elements that are external to the actual written text: the frame of extratextual features which has as one of its main objectives the preparation of the audience for text reception. When a reading public is aimed for, as in the case of novels or of some translations of plays, the extratextual elements may include the layout of the printed text, book covers, advertising, introductions to the author, book reviews and so on. In the case of a text that is
primarily destined to be performed, there may be additional elements such as announcements in the media, billboards, programs, and theatre reviews. In many of these, the actual input of the translator is minimal: with the exception of forewords, afterwords and translator’s notes, they are often determined by the publisher, or in the case of theater texts, by the companies or producers of the play. These extratextual elements furnish information about reasons for translation or retranslation of the work, about who was responsible for the commission of the translation, about the author and his previous reception in the target culture, and about the translator himself. Even though these data are easily overlooked as one tends to concentrate on the text itself, they can be important as a preliminary indication of the origins of the translation and the direction it may take. A priori extratextual elements refer to the translation itself as well as influence initial audience reception, whereas a posteriori elements such as reviews may have some bearing on subsequent translations of the same play or of works by the same author.

Taking into account some of the aforementioned extratextual elements, the first chapter of this study will give a brief overview of the genesis, history and reception of Bodas de sangre, both in the Hispanic world and in English-speaking countries and theaters. Naturally, in the case of a play like Bodas de sangre, the scope of this study
will permit attention only to the most prominent productions, and, where possible, special attention will be paid to the use of the different translations in the productions. In a study that is concerned with the translation and integration of a play in a different cultural and literary system, some of the most valuable indications of the actual reception are to be found in the reviews written after the performances. These reviews may include information about the language, the presentation of the text on stage, the number of performances, the kind of theatre where it was staged, among other things. The history of the written text will be considered also, since such things as place of publication, number of editions and possible book reviews are all indications of the reception of the play in the English-speaking world.

In a second chapter, the so-called frame of the written text will be considered. It is here that the translator’s involvement will truly become obvious. As mentioned before, the frame may be seen as consisting of two main constituents: first, the texts written by the translators about the play or about their translation, in the form of forewords, afterwords or notes, and secondly, a number of text-structural elements, which may be the first and often the most highly visible examples of the translator’s influence upon the text. Of major importance are, of course, the translators’ own comments and notes on their motivations.
and norms. In the case of Bodas de sangre, these are primarily present in those translations that were at first meant for specific stage productions, but of which the translators then prepared a version to be published, such as in the cases of Dewell and Zapata and David Johnston. The experience of having a translation on the stage seems to have created in the translators a greater awareness of the difficulties in this text, and a greater need for justification of their final solutions. An examination of these metatexts written by the translators will sometimes reveal discrepancies or inconsistencies between what the translator professes to aim for and the actual practical realization in the target text.

The textstructural elements that determine the internal structure of the play are the second group of features that form part of the 'frame' of a theatre text. They include the title, the division of the play into acts and scenes, and the manner of presentation of the cast of characters preceding the actual text. In the translation these elements will often be influenced by the theatre conventions of the target culture and in this way shed light on the translators' attitude vis a vis the place and function the work is to assume in the target literary or theatre system. The textstructural elements of the original and its translations will be carefully compared, and if discrepancies are noted, an attempt will be made to explain
them from the point of view of the translators' possible norms and strategical principles. Some translators may adhere strictly to the presentation and division of the original, whereas other prefer a presentation that is more in line with contemporary American or British theatre conventions. There may be instances of translators adding, in the cast list, explanatory phrases in order to elucidate the relations between the characters for the target audience, or, contrarily, making less explicit these introductions in order to allow for greater freedom in eventual productions of the play in the target system.

The study of elements that make up the frame of a play will often lead to the establishment of some fairly accurate preliminary hypotheses of translational strategies that can then be further analyzed and tested against evidence provided by the internal analyses of micro and macro-levels of the text that will take place in the following chapters. Gideon Toury has pointed out that comparison, by nature, is indirect and requires an intermediate construct or tertium comparisonis, which he calls the Adequate Translation. The notion of Adequate Translation is twofold: on the one hand it is a theoretical translation that satisfies the demands of maximum equivalence, and on the other it is "a hypothetical construct, impure in nature, in the methodology of descriptive translation studies, serving as an intermediary invariant for any actual comparison of ST and
Toury suggests that the comparison of the Target Text with its original must move through various stages: first a textemic analysis of the Source Text, which involves identification of the Source Text textemes, which then leads to the formulation of the Adequate Translation; next, the actual comparison of the ST textemes to the TT units, or the examination of the shifts or deviations that occur with respect to the ST. After Even-Zohar, Toury defines "Texteme" as the basic unit of comparison, "every element possessing textual functions." Clearly, and Toury is the first to admit this, the actual comparison must be a partial one as it is impossible to treat every single texteme and all its possible relations to other textemes. In order to formulate the Adequate Translation, it will be necessary to make an inventory of as many textemes as are relevant for the specific text under study. This inventory will vary from genre to genre and even, within one genre, from text to text, as some textemes will carry more weight in one text than in another. A first step, in any case, should be the analysis of the particular textemes of the ST.

Martin Esslin defines the dramatic performance as a complex system of signs, in which a very large number of signifiers is unleashed upon the audience in the course of the performance. In fact, the multitude of signs is so overwhelming that Esslin considers it virtually impossible
to arrive at a basic unit of meaning. At one time the performance text was seen as a macro-sign with a meaning constituted by its total effect, but at present it is considered "a network of semiotic units belonging to different cooperative systems." It has been established earlier that, exceptions aside, most translators do not actively take part in the actual production and that therefore the written text must be their main concern:

For, after all, it is only within the written text that the performance can be encoded and there are infinite performance decodings possible in any playtext. The written text, troué though it may be, is the raw material on which the translator has to work and it is within the written text, rather than with a hypothetical performance, that the translator must begin.

The same holds true for the describer of translated texts: the linguistic signs of the written text will be the point of departure for the comparison of the original with its translations rather than the multitude of performances that may be, or have been, produced from it. Still, frequent references will have to be made as to how the linguistic signs trigger other signs during the performances, and how the translators' operation on the linguistic signs may influence the realization of the text on the stage.

The written theater text usually consists of two elements: the representation of the dialogue between the characters, which in the performance becomes the spoken text, and the stage directions, which in the performance will be responsible for kinesic, proxemic and gestic signs,
as well as for visuals and set design. Chapter Three of this study will develop the first part of the internal analysis, by confronting the didascalia, or stage directions, of the English versions of Bodas de sangre to those of the original. The stage directions may be considered a "subtext", as they are available in their literal form only to the actual reader, be it the producer of a play or the general reader. In the performance text they are present in an immaterial way, as they are never spoken but merely serve to trigger other signs.

Three common types of stage directions may be distinguished in Bodas de sangre. The first are indications of setting, and refer to decor, props and costumes. A translator who wants, or is commissioned, to deliver a translation that downplays the source cultural elements will often eliminate or change some of these. The second category of stage indications refers to the characters: these give clues about the physical appearance, the personality and the mood of whomever enters upon the stage, and also deal with the interaction between the characters. The third type of stage direction has to do with any kind of movement on the stage: gestures, distance between the characters, exits and entrances are just a few of the most common signs triggered by these indicators. Also included are all interruptions in the action, such as pauses, hesitations and so on. These kinds of directions are important as they play an essential
part in the rhythm of the play: deleting or adding pauses, a frequent phenomenon in many play translations, greatly influences the speed of the dialogue, which, in the written text, may be reinforced by the suppression or addition of punctuation marks. If it appears that some stage directions have been deleted or altered in the translations, they will be examined especially in the light of the function they performed in the original, thus determining whether this function is completely eliminated from the English version or whether it is achieved in some other manner. If stage directions are added or expanded, this will almost certainly point to a definite norm the translator has adopted. It sometimes occurs, for instance, that schematic, "telegram-style" stage directions in the original are expanded into full sentences in the translation. In conjunction with other findings, this may betray a desire on the translator's part to make the text more flowing, more pleasant to read, and in this way point to a translation that was conceived for reading rather than for performance. The treatment of the stage directions by the translators may affirm or contradict statements made in their forewords or notes, and it is, ultimately, the analysis of the text itself that will be conclusive about the strategies the translator has developed.

Chapter Four chapter will deal with the actual comparison of the dialogue in Spanish and English. A first point to be
examined is whether the translation is integral, or if certain parts have been omitted. Next, it will be appropriate to analyze selected parts of the original, establishing categories of textemes that serve as units of comparison for those selections. In *Bodas de sangre* in particular, various different text types are present: prose dialogue, dialogue in poetic form, lullabies and other songs drawn from the rural environment are perfectly balanced in the original text, but they present ever changing and equally challenging problems for the translator.

It is obvious that, where the dialogue is concerned, the analysis cannot be exhaustive. Lambert and Van Gorp suggest that a logical first step would be to examine different representative fragments in order to arrive at general conclusions about the translators' norms and strategies. This will involve studying shifts that occur, for instance on the lexico-semantic, syntactic and stylistic levels of the text, or as Toury called them, within those textemes. Since the textemes represent certain functions in the original text, it is necessary to first identify those particular functions in the Source Text. The conclusions from this stage of research can then be tested against some of the conclusions drawn earlier from analyses of the frame, of metatextual and textstructural features, and of the stage directions. In this way it becomes possible to detect and explain certain discrepancies that occur among the
translations, as they represent different solutions proposed by the translators to specific problems, in keeping with the norms and strategies they have adopted.

The fifth chapter of this study will turn from a primary focus on the written text to the performance text, as it will examine a recent production of Blood Wedding at the Ohio State University. Interestingly, this production, directed by Varun Khanna, may be called an adaptation of the original as well as of the translation utilized, as it shifts the story, setting and characters from Spain to a different locale, a small village in India. This final chapter, consisting of a detailed description and review of the Ohio State production, is supplemented by an interview with Mr. Khanna, which may be found in Appendix B.
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CHAPTER I
GENESIS AND RECEPTION OF BODAS DE SANGRE
IN SPANISH AND IN ITS ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

The Original Text

It is well known that the idea for Bodas de sangre came to the author after reading a newspaper article describing an incident that had occurred in 1928 near the Andalusian town of Nijar. Even though many of the details as well as the outcome of the incident have been changed in García Lorca's play, there is no doubt a debt to the murder case which was first reported in ABC and later in El Heraldo de Madrid, where it was most likely read by the poet, since it was one of his favorite newspapers. Frequently mentioned by critics also is a literary work that influenced the genesis of Bodas de sangre, John Millington Synge's Riders to the Sea. Interestingly enough, Lorca knew Riders to the Sea only in translation, since his knowledge of English was limited. Parts of Synge's play were first translated for him by Miguel Cerón and it may be assumed that eventually he read the entire work in the Spanish translation by Juan Ramón Jiménez. Bodas de sangre borrowed some themes from the play by the Irish author, and affinities exist between the way of
expression of the characters in the two plays. Synge, as later on García Lorca would be, had been accused of having his characters speak a sort of popular language, a "jerga bárbara" as well as of falsifying the language of the rural population.² Bodas de sangre was completed in August of 1932, at which time García Lorca gave a private reading of the manuscript in Madrid, at the house of his friend Carlos Morla Lynch. It was not until the next year, however, that the play was performed in Madrid. The premiere took place to great acclaim on March 8, 1933 at the Teatro Beatriz. Since Lorca's previous dramatic works had certainly not been unanimously well received, the event is generally considered a breakthrough for the author's theatrical career. The first performance was attended by all the major intellectuals of Lorca's time, including, to name just a few, poets and playwrights such as Vicente Aleixandre, Luis Cernuda, Unamuno, Benavente and the Quintero brothers. In the second act of the play, at the end of the colorful scene in which the townspeople summon the Bride for her wedding, the audience demanded that the author come out onto the stage and receive an ovation.³ García Lorca was closely involved with the production of this play, directing the rehearsals and using the experience he had acquired during his work with La Barraca, the traveling theatre company that carried the classical Spanish plays to small towns all over the country. In the first production of Bodas de sangre in
Madrid, the playwright aimed to balance "the play's subtle shifts from prose to poetry, prohibiting any overemphasis on the part of the actors and controlling the rhythm of each scene as if he were conducting a symphony."  Proof of the fact that he succeeded well in this goal may be found in the review by Gerardo Diego of El Imparcial, who has the following comments about the musicality of the play:

Para conseguir lo otro, la "composición", la profundidad atrevida y necesaria de la obra, vista en bloque y en ritmo de fragmentos, Federico ha pedido auxilio a su fiel aliada, y la Música ha acudido esta vez desde el primer instante, dócil como nunca al llamamiento, y tan dentro de la obra, tan personaje y voz de ella como la "Muerte" y la "Luna", si bien menos visible como corresponde a su entidad acústica.

Si Mariana Pineda era un libreto de ópera, Bodas de sangre es ya una ópera, un drama lírico, letra y música a la vez.5

Another favorable review at the time of the performances in Madrid appeared in El Sol, and focuses on the play's dramatic qualities and on the beauty and strength of its imagery:

Suelto andan el odio y el amor en Bodas de sangre, como el viento o como el fuego. El signo de las grandes creaciones domina el proceso dramático. La inspiración del poeta triunfa como una fuerza de la Naturaleza más. (...) Y así el autor mueve a todos con un sentido que tanto descubre al psicólogo -sin otro aparato que el muy sencillo de la metáfora feliz- como al dramático experto en la composición de cuadros genuinamente teatrales. Hay superficie y fondo, porque hay cuerpo. En el cuerpo, alma.6

Bodas de sangre was performed thirty-eight times during that first year in Madrid, and in May, after the end of the theatrical season there, the company took the play overseas,
to Buenos Aires, where it was produced by Lola Membrives at the Maypo Theatre. In that country as well the play became highly successful, and after its run in the capital it was taken on a tour inland and abroad by the Membrives company. In connection with the play’s second season in the Argentinean capital, the poet was invited to Buenos Aires, where he was received with enthusiasm by reporters, poets and critics alike. The second run of Bodas de sangre, this time in a much larger theatre, began on October 25, 1933, in the presence of the playwright, who ended up staying more than 6 months in Argentina. A review in La Nación called the play beautiful and strong, and describes the reception of the October 25 performance as follows:

La atmósfera, amistosamente caldeada por la presencia del autor, determinó en el público un entusiasmo comunicativo, manifestándose en sus escenas culminantes y en los más felices de sus párrafos inspirados, y arrancó aplausos con que fue saludada la presencia de García Lorca en el proscenio.  

It is often pointed out that Bodas de sangre was the first play of Lorca’s to be financially successful, and that it was thanks to this play that the author gained not only fame but also some financial independence for the first time in his life.

From the time of Lorca’s death in 1936, until the sixties, when a timid and gradual relaxation of the dictatorial repression started to take place, Lorca’s plays were not performed in Spain, but during the late sixties
some of his works began to reappear and were performed on a few occasions. However, after Franco's death in 1975, his plays were among the first and few works by prewar authors to be put on the stage in what Ruiz Ramón calls "una operación cultural de rescate y restitución." During the revival of Lorca's work in the sixties, quite a bit of ambivalence of opinion seemed to prevail about these plays on the stage. As Angel Fernández-Santos has pointed out, they were successful from the point of view of the general public, but among the intellectual minority in university circles a generalized feeling of disappointment seemed to prevail:

No hay que andar mucho para oír cosas como éstas: el teatro de Lorca es reaccionario; su lenguaje, retórico y vacío; su visión del pueblo es pura mixtificación, muy apropiada para franceses, ingleses y, en general, para todo tipo de turistas.

Sin embargo, no son los turistas quienes llenan hasta rebosar las salas en que se representan las obras de García Lorca. Si dijéramos que este trueco de opiniones se debe a un cambio en los gustos o las modas del público español de teatro, sin duda faltaríamos a la verdad. Como negocio teatral, Lorca sigue vigente en España, posiblemente más vigente que hace treinta años.10

The Presentation of the Translations to the Target Language Audience

On a purely external level, it is relevant to investigate some of the techniques used in trying to make a translated text acceptable and desirable to a new audience.
Especially in the case of a foreign author, who often lacks the advantage of immediate recognition, more elaborate marketing techniques may have to be used than with authors who are a part of the target culture canon. When a foreign playwright is involved, the problem is especially acute, since putting a play on stage requires considerable effort, both financial and other, on the part of the theater company, and the audience needs to be attracted in order to finance the planned run. Even though, as has been noted before, in the case of García Lorca a recognition factor may exist in a greater part of the TL audience, often he is known more for his poetry than for his theatre.

Before the play actually opens, two kinds of devices are available to raise public awareness: announcements in the media and billboards. During the run itself, playbills inform the audience about the play, the actors or the playwright. Looking at several of the announcements and posters of the older productions of Blood Wedding, it becomes apparent that some rely heavily on the stereotypical images the American audiences may harbor about a play written by a Spanish author: A poster for the Actor's Playhouse production in New York in 1958, for instance, features a flamenco dancer with castanets as well as a bullfighter and bull, and the play is described as "a fiery love story" (Cf. Plate I, Appendix C). This is not the case, however, for other important productions, where companies
adopt a more sober stand and the publicity features only the colors of the Spanish flag, or a stylized representation of some elements of the play, such as daggers, flowers, crosses, the moon and so on. All of the programs of Blood Wedding examined for this study feature the author's name, as well as the English title of the play, and most of them also mention the fact that a translation was used, and provide the name of the translator or translators. Most of the programs list the characters and a brief synopsis of the location of the action in the different scenes, in a few cases preceded by statements such as: "The Action takes place in the Mountains of Southern Spain," "A rural area of Spain. Summertime," "A Remote Village in Old Castille." Of particular interest is the program for the 1988 production of Blood Wedding at the Great Lakes Theater Festival in Cleveland, which is a beautifully presented booklet, complete with photographs of Lorca at various ages, an introduction to the poet's life and works and a perspective on the play by Felicia Hardison Londré, a collection of quotes by Lorca on various subjects, and a conversation among various members of the production team. It furthermore contains bibliographical information on the directors, set designer, composer of incidental music, costume designer, lighting designer and musical director, but none on the translators of the play, Michael Dewell and
Carmen Zapata, whose names, nevertheless, are mentioned on the title pages.

In the case of published translations of play texts, publishing houses will attempt to draw prospective readers in several ways. They solicit book reviews, place announcements and advertisements in the press and provide attractive book covers and an appealing or intriguing general lay-out of the text. All versions of Blood Wedding published in book form include additional information on the play and the author’s life and work, and some also contain translators’ notes and information on the translators and illustrators. Book covers may try to attract readers by emphasizing the exotic, the new, the non-available in the readers’ own literary system, or they may be educational, informing the audience of the value and importance of the author in the more general framework of world literature.

Thus, publishing houses will often be faced with a dilemma similar to that of the translator, namely whether to present the play in an "acceptable" or rather in an "adequate" manner. In this respect, the covers of the three most recent versions of Blood Wedding offer some interesting variations. The 1987 translation by Gwynne Edwards in the Methuen edition has a sober cover and features one of Lorca’s own drawings, "Soledad Montoya" from the Romancero gitano, while the back cover has a picture of the poet and a brief description of Lorca’s death and the works included
in the volume. The name "Lorca" is featured in bold white letters on the front page, and the names of the translators are mentioned also, but most of the front cover is taken up by the drawing, which is framed in black. The Dewell and Zapata front cover has a black background as well, but the whole gives a more colorful impression, for besides black, the dominant colors are pink and blue. About half the page is taken up by the poet's name, which appears in full, in a bright pink color, while the lower half is taken up by a reproduction of the oil painting "Death of a Poet (Lorca)" by Leonard Maurer. The translators' names appear at the bottom, together with the name of Douglas Day, who wrote the introduction to this edition, and the fact that this is a new translation is noted. The back cover mentions "Three by Lorca," repeats twice the titles of the plays included, and provides a brief introduction to Lorca's style and themes. It is of importance that the fact is stressed that García Lorca is Spain's most important playwright and that his vision deals with the elemental society of Spanish peasants and gypsies. This is not the case with the 1989 Johnston translation, where the text on the back cover stresses that this work is "one of the most powerful and innovative plays written for the European theatre this century." Unlike in the other two editions, Lorca himself, and his death, are not mentioned, while more emphasis is put on the merits of the play itself, and on the translation, which, "unlike
existing translations," is said to have been proven on stage. This lack of emphasis on the author is reflected also on the front cover, where Lorca's name appears in rather small print, unlike on the Dewell and Zapata version, and where a great part of the cover is taken up by the title of the play, which is repeated in only slightly smaller letters on the back cover. The front cover also features a drawing with overtones of red, orange and black, a stylized representation of the forest, with menacing trees, the moon, a horse, a bird. The background color of the cover is white, and it mentions that the translation, introduction and notes are by David Johnston.

These three covers give some indication of the publishers' interests: whereas the Dewell and Zapata translation and the Edwards version are aiming to attract readers by the appeal of Lorca himself and the exoticness of the Spanish environment, the Johnston version tries to minimize the difference between target and source cultures, and endeavors, with quotes from Target Language newspapers, to include the play in the realm of the target literature. As mentioned before, more often than not these are decisions made not by the translator but rather by the marketing department of the publisher, and therefore the impression that the reader is given on the cover may be altogether different from the philosophy and the norms of the
translator, and therefore from the manner in which the translator has rendered the text.

The Reception of the Translations in the Target Language System

From the point of view of translation, it is interesting to note that Bodas de sangre is the only play of the rural trilogy that was translated into English and performed in the English speaking world while the author was still living. According to Ian Gibson, before the first New York performance on February 11, 1935, the playwright had cooperated quite actively and enthusiastically with Jose A. Weissberger, the American translator, as well as with the director, sending both music and suggestions. A certain disagreement about this matter seems to exist among the various critics. Robert Lima, for instance, notes that Lorca had "little contact with the American group which was to perform Bodas de sangre in New York."14 The group in question was the Neighborhood Playhouse, the director of which was Irene Lewisohn, and the play was being produced in honor of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of that "unworldly little theatre in Grand Street where the drama was once served unselfishly and well."15 Carlos Morla Lynch describes a tertulia at his house in Madrid in 1933, attended by García Lorca and several other poets as well as by "un señor que traducirá al inglés Bodas de sangre."16
Even though this person goes unnamed and is not mentioned again by Morla Lynch, one may assume that it was Jose Weissberger, the play’s first translator, who was paying the author a visit. Robert Lima confirms that Weissberger had conferred with García Lorca in Madrid, but adds that this was the poet’s only known participation in the production of *Bitter Oleander*.17

Weissberger was born in 1880, and seems to have been best known as an expert and collector of fine art. After retiring from his position as an insurance executive in Madrid, he settled in New York, where he died in 1954. He was highly respected in the community, not so much for his work with Spanish drama as for his artistic expertise:

A collector of early paintings for many years, Mr. Weissberger was an expert on Spanish Renaissance works, a connoisseur of Spanish decorative art, and specialized in Persian miniatures, both as a collector and a writer. He translated from the Spanish for the English-speaking stage.18

Mildred Adams, who seems to have known Weissberger personally, refers to him as "a friendly art expert who had lived long in Madrid, one of those polyglot internationalists who moved easily from one tongue to another."19

The first performances of *Bodas de sangre*, in the Weissberger translation ran from February 11 until March 2, 1935. Most of the major New York newspapers published reviews around the date of the first performance, and in
general one may say, as Gibson does, that although the critics were "bemused, some made encouraging noises." This is the case, for instance, with Brooks Atkinson, of the New York Times, who states:

What "Bitter Oleander" was like in its native tongue this reporter has no way of knowing. Perhaps it was simple and rooted in the earth, with songs and folk music for blossoms. Once, when the wedding guests arrive at Novia's house with dancers and singers and castanets, it has something of the dash a poet might give it.

In 1932, in a conversation with Konstantin Raudive, German translator of some of Valle-Inclán's work, Lorca stated that he was of the opinion that Spanish authors were very difficult to translate in an effective manner, since the peculiarities of the different dialects and the many provincialisms abounding in their works seemed to puzzle foreigners. It seemed to him that even Spanish writers used different languages, all tending to retain their local dialect. If this does not hold true for all Spanish writers, it certainly did for Lorca's own plays, in which the author makes a conscientious effort to uphold a feel for the language and culture of the rural Andalusian people, stylized though it may be. The fact that American critics were well aware of the cultural distance that existed between this play and its target audience is illustrated in many of the reviews of the New York production, for instance in the following statement: "'Bitter Oleander' is, in this estimator's opinion, a play to be attended only by friends
of the Spanish stage." A similar opinion is expressed by Stark Young: "Racially the play is hopelessly far from us. (...) The whole of it is at best an importation that is against the beat of this country." 

Judging from the numerous reviews, articles, and photographs published by the New York press, Bitter Oleander nevertheless attracted its fair share of attention. Some of the reviewers vacillated between criticizing the translation or the production by Irene Lewisohn, but many objected to both. In general the translation was perceived by these critics, most of whom, according to their own confessions, did not speak any Spanish, as being "as literal as it is literate," wordy, outdated and "unbearably flowery." It was especially the latter aspect of Bodas de sangre that drew the most violent criticism: one reviewer compared the language of the play to that found in a Henderson Co. Seed catalogue and then went on to state: "All of which may prove that Spain is full of blooms, but it makes Señor García Lorca’s play more nosegay than gay... and prompted me, for one, to retaliate by telling him that he was giving me an anguish in the crocus." It is interesting that Jose A. Weissberger was certainly aware of the problems associated with the vegetative semantic set in Bodas de sangre. In his personal notes, most likely directed to Irene Lewisohn, in which he recounts some of the advice García Lorca had given him with respect to the translation of
certain items, the translator offers his rationale for the ways in which he translated some of the flower images. One example he mentions is the word for "la flor del oro" that is used to describe and characterize the Bridegroom in the wedding song. His advice to the recipient of his notes was to pick the name of a strong and virile flower, like the German "Rittersporn," or any other masculine sounding flower in English, since he could not think of the right one.27 Some positive reviews on the translation pointed out that the language was characterized by great musicality and that "Jose A. Weissberger has made a translation that carries into English much of the fire, rhythm and beauty of Lorco's [sic] tale (...)" The manuscript of Bitter Oleander was never published, and was most probably never again used in any other production of the play.

Although the exact date of the second translation is unknown, Langston Hughes' version, entitled Fate at the Wedding is generally assumed to be the second translation of Bodas de sangre into English. A recent study of Hughes' life and works mentions his travels in Spain and France in 1937, during which he began translating Bodas de Sangre and Gypsy Ballads.28 The interesting thing about this translation is, of course, that it was done by an African American translator whose main occupation was that of poet and playwright. It is often claimed that poetry can only be adequately translated by another poet, and it will be
interesting to see, during the internal comparison of the play text with its translations, in which ways Langston Hughes dealt with the problems that presented themselves in the translation of *Bodas de sangre*. At the time of the translation, Langston Hughes himself was already known in the United States as a playwright and poet, and throughout his career he translated several works from the Spanish. Although he never seems to have written anything about his translation of García Lorca’s play, some of his ideas on the nature of translating and translation may be inferred from his foreword to his rendering of Gabriela Mistral’s poetry:

> I have no theories of translation. I simply try to transfer into English as much as I can of the literal content, emotion, and style of each poem. When I feel I can transfer only literal content, I do not attempt a translation.29

*Fate at the Wedding*, like Weissberger’s translation, was never published and one may assume that it was made with a specific performance in mind. Some of the major bibliographies on Lorca mention a one time only performance at Fordham University, of unknown date.30 The manuscript is now being preserved at the New York Public Library.

Whereas the above mentioned translations were undertaken with the objective of performance, in each case by a specific company, the third translation of this play, published in 1939, was obviously conceived as serving another purpose. To our knowledge, that translation was published but never performed. The fact that it appeared in
the journal *New Directions in Prose and Poetry* points to the reality that Lorca at that time seemed more well known, at least in the United States, as a poet, a fact that is confirmed by the short description of the author given in the journal: "Federico García Lorca, Spain’s great modern poet, (...) Widely recognized as a poet of the first order, his work is being read all over the world. Two volumes of his poetry are now available in America (...)." This translation seems to have aimed at introducing Lorca the playwright to those American intellectuals who would read this journal or the separate publication in the *New Directions Pamphlet Series*. Of the translator, Gilbert Neiman, little is known. He is described in the journal as a resident of Denver and as having done, in addition to his work with Lorca, some translations from the French, more specifically of works by Rimbaud. He is also the author of the novel *There is a Tyrant in Every Country*, set in Mexico, and described by one reviewer as "turbulent, extravagant fiction." Neiman’s translation of *Bodas de sangre* was reviewed by Muriel Ruckeyser in the *Kenyon Review* in 1941:

> Mr. Neiman has been absolutely faithful to the prose, letter by letter, but in the songs and verse passages, he has inserted and omitted and changed the meter as he pleased, and on page 27 he has invented a little, and on page 12 even introduced a grammatical error. (...) He has done, for the most part, a workmanlike translation of lines which afford the most extreme difficulties to the translator."
The next translation, by Richard O'Connell and James Graham-Luján, was copyrighted in 1941 by Charles Scribners and eventually published by New Directions in 1947. It is certainly the most well known translation, since for many years it served as the official and authorized English version of Bodas de sangre. The New Directions edition of the three plays that comprise the rural trilogy was introduced by Francisco García Lorca, the poet's brother, then a member of the faculty at Columbia University. Besides the rural tragedies, Richard O'Connell and James Graham-Luján translated some of Lorca's comedies and puppet plays as well, and teamed up not only for the Lorca translations, but also for other translations from the Spanish, such as that of the novel by the Ecuadorian author Enrique Amorín, A Horse and his Shadow. James Graham-Luján, who has Scottish as well as Mexican ancestors, is the son of the poet Rosa Luján, with whom he wrote poetry. He is now known principally for his work in the dance theater, with companies such as the San Francisco Ballet and Lincoln Kirstein's American Ballet. Richard O'Connell, who specialized in translations from classical Greek and Latin as well as from Spanish, was an instructor in the Drama Department of the University of Texas when he met Graham-Luján, who was teaching English Literature there. O'Connell made a career as a theater director, taught at Syracuse University and was on the faculty of New Mexico's Highland
University in Las Vegas, where he directed, among several other plays, The Shoemaker’s Prodigious Wife and also, on February 8 and 9 of 1951, Blood Wedding.

The latter performance was not the premiere on stage of the Graham-Luján/O’Connell translation, however. Three years previously the production of Blood Wedding by the New Stages Theatre Company had created a small stir off-Broadway, when it was staged at their theater on Bleeker Street. The direction was in the hands of Boris Tumarin, and again the performances received mixed reviews. Several of these reviews duly refer to Graham-Luján’s and O’Connell’s version as the "authorized" translation, as was noted also in the programs. In most of the critiques, there seems to be a greater awareness of the inherent values of the play, but also of the difficulties that may be encountered in translating and producing it for the American stage. Richard Watts Jr. of the New York Post Home News, for instance, makes the following remarks: "Here again is one of those plays from a foreign language which hint at enough striking things to make one who has not read it in the original tongue blame the defects, perhaps unfairly, on the translators." However, as in the previous production, the translators are given their share of the blame: Brooks Atkinson of the New York Times calls the translation by O’Connell and Graham-Luján "obtuse," Russell Rhodes of the New York Journal of Commerce finds it "pedestrian." It is
interesting to note that in these critiques García Lorca himself is often mentioned, and unlike in the reviews that discussed *Bitter Oleander*, he is treated with great respect. This points to a greater familiarity on the reviewers' part with the author's work, and gives an indication of the fact that Lorca was fast becoming a mythical figure. He is, for instance, referred to as the "Owen Davis of the Iberian Peninsula," "the illustrious Spanish playwright who was murdered by his country's fascists," and "a gifted poet and musician."

Unlike the Neiman translation, O'Connell and Graham-Luján's version was directed to a more general public, who may not have been aware, or only slightly, of García Lorca's poetry and other work. Being the only authorized, and for some time, only the second published translation in the United States, it was widely used in University courses and performances by theatre groups, both professional and amateur, and in general was being read rather extensively, if the continuous reeditings are any proof. Some examples of the use of this translation on the stage, both in the United States and abroad, are productions by the Los Angeles City College Department of Drama (1957), The Actor's Workshop in San Francisco (1952), The Playwrights Repertory Company (1954), The Playmaker's Theater of North Carolina (1955), The Theater Guild of New Orleans (1960), and the National Institute of Dramatic Art of Sydney, Australia in 1970. One
production worth mentioning is that by the Actors' Playhouse in 1958 in New York, which was staged by Patricia Newhall, a young producer who had previously directed Sartre’s No Exit as well as various plays by Synge, among them, Riders to the Sea. Although she used the same translation of Bodas de sangre as the New Stages Company, the reviews of her production are unanimously less negative, and the play ran for well over five months, breaking all records for García Lorca’s work in the United States. The translations by O’Connell and Graham-Luján are still readily available in bookstores in the United States, despite the fact that since their publication several other translations of the rural trilogy have come on the market.

In 1959, yet another translation was produced, this time within the framework of a doctoral dissertation, presented by William I. Oliver at Cornell University. The dissertation deals with differences in style, content and form between Spanish and North American drama, and contains the translations by the author of three plays from different eras: Lope de Vega’s La dama boba (The Lady Nit-Wit), Unamuno’s Phaedra and García Lorca’s Blood Wedding. It is interesting that of these three plays only Bodas de sangre had already been translated previously. Oliver recommends the study of these and other Spanish plays as a valuable discipline for American student playwrights as well as for
theatre artists, and calls his translations "actable" versions.\textsuperscript{35}

Professor Oliver, who is a professor of dramatic art as well as a director, has written various articles dealing with Lorca and the experience of putting his plays on the American stage. In his article "The Trouble with Lorca," he points to several "pitfalls" in \textit{Bodas de sangre} as reasons for its lukewarm reception by the public in the United States and "audiences the world over." He refutes the easy explanation that the translations are to blame, and goes back to the original itself and the shortcomings therein. These include, in Oliver's opinion, Lorca's imagistic excess and his abrupt shifts between a realistic plane and a symbolic and highly expressionistic level, his method of characterization, "not quite in line with our popular criteria", and his approach to scenic design, which is "Seriously limited by the conventions of Spanish theatre practice, as well as by his formative experiments with puppet theaters." The main cause, however, Oliver maintains, is "the inability to perform the plays in such a way as to make their form or their organism clearly and comfortably perceived by audiences not acquainted with Spanish theatrical conventions."\textsuperscript{36} Oliver puts his finger on the main problems other translators have also experienced, and one that will be articulated later by the two most recent translators of \textit{Bodas de sangre}: is it an inherent necessity
for this play to be adapted, as far as such things as imagery and tone are concerned, to the audience for which it is intended? Would this imply that for each performance a new translation/adaptation is required?

The above mentioned translations, which will be dealt with in this study, together make up what could be called a first "wave" of English translations of Bodas de sangre, all published in the thirties and early forties, or in Oliver's case, the fifties, and thus all within little more than two decades after the poet's death. During that same period at least two more translations were undertaken with specific performances in mind. The important Lorca bibliographies fail to mention these translations altogether, and it has proven impossible to secure copies for this study. Therefore, they are mentioned here for the sake of completeness only, but will not be included in further discussions. The first translation was used for a performance of Blood Wedding on June 1 and 2, 1945, by the Experimental Theatre of Vassar College. The program of this production mentions the title only in Spanish, and notes that "the translation of the play was made by Miss Winifred Smith, Miss de Mayo and Miss Heinlein, with suggestions from Miss de Madariaga, Mr. Moss and Mr. Brinnin." Margarita de Mayo, one of the translators mentioned, had been in contact with the playwright previously, during his stay in the United States. In response to an invitation by this
assistant professor, García Lorca gave the first of only two
lectures in this country at Vassar College, in January of
1930. The second translation is A.L. Lloyd's The Blood
Wedding, which began a four week engagement on March 11,
1958 at the Library Theatre in Manchester, U.K.

The next series of translations into English of Bodas
de sangre starts in 1977 with Sue Bradbury's version, in the
beautiful edition of the rural trilogy by the London-based
Folio Society. This edition is illustrated with striking
lino-cuts by Peter Pendrey that represent various key scenes
of the play. Ms. Bradbury, who as a teacher spend two years
in the Canary Islands and one year in Seville when she was
in her early twenties, was invited to do the translation of
Bodas de sangre by the Folio Society, for which she had
started working upon her return to England. The introduction
to this edition was written by Sue Bradbury herself, but
deals with Lorca's life and works rather than with problems
concerning the translation. It does mention that Professor
Francisco García Lorca, the poet's brother, encouraged a new
edition of the play in English. In a personal letter, Ms.
Bradbury, who is now the Editorial Director/Deputy Managing
Director of The Folio Society, confirmed that her
translation of Blood Wedding has not been produced on stage
and in fact was made "solely for circulation among Folio
Society members," because it was felt that "the only
available [translation] was pretty inadequate."
The next translation to be published, and used several
times on stage, is Gwynne Edwards' 1987 version of Bodas de
sangre. In November of 1987, it was produced by Contact
Theatre in Manchester, and one of the introductory pages of
the Methuen edition also mentions a production by the
Theatre Clwyd Company, under the direction of Toby
Robertson, scheduled for 1988. The translation is published
in a volume that also contains Yerma, translated by Peter
Luke and Doña Rosita the Spinster, translated by Gwynne
Edwards. This may be considered somewhat unusual, since one
customarily expects to find the three plays of the rural
trilogy (Bodas de sangre, Yerma and La casa de Bernarda
Alba) appearing together. The volume further contains a
chronology and an introduction by Gwynne Edwards to Lorca's
life, his works, and the three plays, as well as separate
notes on each translation by the respective translators.
Edwards is Professor of Spanish at the University College of
Wales, Aberystwyth, and a literary scholar with wide-ranging
interests: he has published works on the cinema, on Spanish
renaissance and Golden Age literature, and, more recently,
The Theatre beneath the Sand, a work dealing entirely with
García Lorca's theatre.

In the United States, Bantam Books published a new
translation of the rural trilogy by Michael Dewell and
Carmen Zapata in the same year, 1987. Both of these
translators are active in the theatre. Michael Dewell is
president of the National Repertory Theatre Foundation, an award winning producer, and the writer of numerous articles on the theatre for magazines and newspapers. Carmen Zapata is a well-known actress, producer and founder of the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts. The introduction to the three plays is written by Professor Douglas Day of the University of Virginia, and an afterword by the translators is also included. This afterword describes in some detail the interesting genesis of this particular translation: when Carmen Zapata was creating the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts in 1977, and wanted to produce some of Lorca’s plays, "there were no translations that she felt were playable. And BFA’a audiences and actors - unlike some others- would not be apt to blame weak translations on the original author."

Interestingly, the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts, as the name suggests, presents performances in the original Spanish version and in the English translation on alternate nights. In the particular case of Bodas de sangre, the actors, having first rehearsed the Spanish version, could provide quite a bit of input about dialogue and rhythm, and the translation was rewritten several times, until it was satisfactory to all. The next task these translators then undertook was to make a new version for an English-only staged reading and mono-lingual actors. According to Michael Dewell, García Lorca’s sister Isabel and his nephew and
executor, Manuel Montesinos, were in full agreement that new translations of Lorca’s plays were in order.39

The first performances of Blood Wedding by the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts at the end of the seventies apparently met with continued success throughout the two month run, and the play was then revised even further for a revival in 1984. The Dewell and Zapata translation was eventually selected by the García Lorca Estate as the new authorized translation in 1986, at the time of the fifty year anniversary of the poet’s death. Two years later, this translation was also used by Gerald Freedman and Graciela Daniele, who produced the play for a series of performances, first at the Great Lakes Theatre Festival in Cleveland, then at the Old Globe Theater in San Diego and finally at the Coconut Grove Playhouse in Miami. This co-production by the artistic director of the Great Lakes Theater Festival and a renowned Broadway choreographer with Hispanic background has been called a "landmark in English Language productions of García Lorca’s masterpiece." In an interview with the directors, in TheaterWeek, the question of translation is raised on several occasions:

I felt that the translation into English, as good as it is, missed the musicality that Spanish has(...) The passion of one of the play’s most famous scenes, between the bride and Leonardo in the woods, has always been a headache for translators. In Spanish, the words are just too hot to explain.
Just as translators often do, the directors of this play tried to compensate for these losses in the translation by other means, for instance, by way of the addition of some of the dances that normally take place off-stage in order to enhance the sense of musicality and poetry of the text. Where the scene in the woods is concerned, Freedman and Daniele juxtaposed a second couple in the shadows, who were nude: "the passion, lost in translation, has been transferred onto them."40

The last translation of Bodas de sangre to date was published in 1989 by David Johnston, who provides an introduction to the author, a short foreword to the problems of translating this play in particular and Lorca in general, and a series of endnotes, clarifying the text and justifying some of the translation choices made. This translation was first performed by the Communicado Theatre Company, in the Lyceum Studio at the 1988 Edinburgh Festival. The direction was by Gerard Mulgrew, and original music was commissioned by Communicado and composed by Karen Wimhurst. In his introduction, Johnston mentions that the performance at the Edinburgh Festival won the prestigious Scotsman Award, and a review in The Times (London) of this production emphasized some of the positive points: a more lighthearted approach to the play than had been done previously--"It is a surprise to hear an audience laughing heartily at Blood Wedding"--a sophisticated musical score, "with Andalusian rhythms and
ornamentation but modern and different harmonies," and the use of Scottish every day voices instead of the somewhat forced "Received Pronunciation" whenever foreign classics are performed. David Johnston himself has published an article recently in Insula about the difficulties he was faced with during the translation of Lorca's play, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

As was the case with the older translations of Bodas de sangre, among the more recent ones there are several that were never published and obviously made with specific productions and theatre companies in mind. The first instance is that of the 1980 production of Blood Wedding by the New York based INTAR Company, which was announced as featuring "a new English adaptation by Maria Irene Fornes." Ms. Fornes, according to press releases on this production, is an established playwright herself, winner of three OBIE's and author of the play Eves on the Harem, produced the previous year by the same theatre company. The direction of this "new" Blood Wedding, which played May 15 through June 22, was by Max Ferra, and original music had been composed by the Columbian composer Francisco Zumaque. The reviews of this production and of the new translation were mixed. Some reviewers were of the opinion that "Maria Irene Fornes' new adaptation floats the poetry past us without a seam or a song," whereas others question the validity of the claim of a new adaptation as "The English seems quite close to the
translation by James Graham-Jujan [sic] and Richard L. O'Connell. Yet certain parts of the poetry (...) have been rendered into more contemporary and more felicitous English (...). And the play's spoken text seems, in spots, more idiomatic."43 One reviewer, Eileen Blumenthal of the Village Voice rejects this opinion by comparing a fragment of the two English versions in her review:

Fornes's language closely parallels the standard Graham-Lujan and O'Connell version--except that she consistently deflates the poetry into something more like a conversation. (.....) Fornes's language flows more easily from actors' mouths, to be sure, but it also tames the play's terrific lushness and helps strip the tragedy into melodrama.44

The version by Ms. Fornes has only very recently become available for consultation only at the New York Public library, and will not be included in this study.

Another new translation that was conceived for a series of performances only is the one by Crispin Larangeira, presented by the Juilliard Theatre Center in 1984, and directed by René Buch. Buch went on to become the artistic director for the Repertorio Español company and has since staged both Bodas de sangre and La casa de Bernarda Alba in the original Spanish versions. Crispin Larangeira is active at this moment as a theatre critic. Repeated inquiries to the director about the location and availability of this translation have proven unsuccessful and therefore it will not be included in this study. Finally, in 1989, a translation of Bodas de sangre apparently was commissioned
by the Asian Cooperative Theatre Company and the Half Moon theatre of London. As in the case of the GL/O'C and D/Z, this translation again was a cooperative one: the director of the play, Jonathan Martin, teamed up with the Peruvian actor Mary Ann Vargas, and produced "a new translation that is sober and beautiful, using simple, earthy epithets." The production itself set the action in an Asian location, which in general seemed to have been viewed as a "suitable correlative for Lorca's Spanish peasants."
NOTES

1. Ian Gibson, Federico García Lorca, A Life (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989) 335-340. In these pages, Gibson provides a detailed account of the events that took place at Nijar, and especially of those elements related directly to Bodas de sangre. He also notes similarities and differences between Lorca's play and Synge's Riders to the sea.


5. Gerardo Diego, "El teatro musical de Federico García Lorca," rev. of Bodas de sangre, by Federico García Lorca, El Imparcial Madrid, 10 April 1933.


8. Gibson 349 and 368.


11. Exception to this rule are often the programs of college productions of Blood Wedding. Some examples are the program of the 1957 production by the Department of Drama of Los Angeles City College, which fails to mention the translators' names, but does include a short synopsis of the author's life, the symbolism of the play, and biographical information on the composer and writer of the original music.
for the performance. The programs for the productions by the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Boston University (1963), and the 1978 production at the Trueblood Theatre, at the University of Michigan, also fail to mention the translators.

12. Programs of the productions by the University Showcase at the Trueblood Theatre, Ann Arbor, Michigan (November 1-4, 1978), by Los Angeles City College, Dept. of Drama (February 14-23, 1957), and by The National Institute of Dramatic Art, New South Wales, Australia (October 14-17, 1970), respectively.

13. For a comparison between the three covers, we refer the reader to Plates II, III, and IV in Appendix C.


17. In an interview held in 1933, García Lorca mentioned his close supervision of the English translation of Bodas de sangre. Also mentioned was the name of Edward M. Wilson, translator of Góngora, who supposedly would be in charge of the translation of the poetry, whereas Weissberger would do the prose passages. The name of Wilson does not appear in reviews, nor in any other writings on the subject, nor on the script of Bitter Oleander. Also, Wilson is never mentioned in the meeting that Weissberger had with Lorca about some of the more problematic passages, which were mostly poetry passages. Since it seems doubtful that Wilson ended up being actually involved in the project, we have opted to only mention José Weissberger in connection with this translation. References to this matter may be found in the Introduction to Bodas de sangre, Allen Josephs and Juan Caballero, eds. (Madrid: Cátedra, 1990) 42.


20. Gibson 400.


27. Personal notes of Jose A. Weissberger are to be found at the Library for the Performing Arts, a branch of the New York Public Library, in a file dedicated solely to the production of Bitter Oleander by the Neighborhood Playhouse.


30. Our own inquiries into specific dates of the performances at Fordham University have so far been unsuccessful.


35. William I. Oliver, "Spanish Theatre: A Study in Dramatic Discipline," diss., Cornell University, 1959, 235. In addition to its inclusion in the dissertation, Oliver's translation of Bodas de sangre is also available on microfilm at the Columbia University Library.


CHAPTER II
THE PLAY'S FRAMEWORK:
THE TRANSLATOR'S FIRST INTERVENTION

Gideon Toury mentions two major sources for the study of norms in translation:

(1) the translated texts themselves;

(2) extratextual, semi-theoretical or critical formulations, such as prescriptive theories (or poetics) of translation, statements made by translators, editors, publishers and other persons involved in or connected with translation, in public as well as in private, critical appraisals of single translations, and so forth.¹

Whereas the previous chapter gave a brief overview of many of the extratextual elements surrounding the translations, Chapters Three and Four of this study will be devoted to the examination of selected textual passages that present particular difficulties. However, all elements previously discussed, such as critical reviews and introductions to the play and the author by literary critics and biographers, were mostly a posteriori additions to the text proper, frequently not produced by the translators themselves, but rather the result of decisions made by editors and the publishing houses' lay-out or marketing departments. The present chapter will examine some features of translation
for which in normal circumstances the translator does bear full responsibility. Consequently the study of these elements can yield some fairly accurate preliminary indications about the translators' motivations and norms.

Two particular aspects that may be considered part of the framework of the translated text, as they both enclose it and lend insight into it, will be examined in this chapter: text-structural features and text-critical features. Unlike critical texts that reflect on the target text, which are exclusively part of the framework of the translation, text-structural features are inherent to the original play, constituting its intrinsic skeleton. Examples of text-structural features are the play's division into acts and scenes, the manner and order of presentation of the cast of characters, and the title.

The terms "text-critical" and "metatext" in this study will be used to indicate those writings that are not part of the original, but rather added texts, notes or comments that reflect on the translation. The term metatext is one frequently used in literary scholarship and usually refers to a text that draws attention to another text, or a text within a text. In contemporary translation theory, the notion of metatext includes not only the translation itself, but also all kinds of interpretational texts. In the present study, however, we will regard as metatexts only those texts actually produced by the translator, be they the
translation itself or all kinds of annotations, commentaries, introductions and reflections on the text. Since the previous chapter has dealt with critical texts that were not written by the translators, usually those dealing with the literary aspects of the play or with the author, this chapter will limit itself to those metatexts added by the translator, and mainly to those dealing with the sources for the choices and the motivations of the translator. In many cases these texts will be published together with the translation, in the form of afterwords, introductions, footnotes or endnotes, but in some cases they may appear in an altogether different publication, such as a scholarly journal or in an interview with the translator.

Text-critical Features

A logical starting point is to consider which translators of Bodas de sangre into English have addressed in writing the literary aspects of the play, and what their opinion of its imagery and themes was, as these opinions most likely found some resonance in their translations. It has proven impossible to locate any articles written on the play by either Hughes or Neiman, and although Richard O’Connell and James Graham-Luján wrote introductions to their translations of several other of Lorca’s plays, in the case of Bodas de sangre this task was delegated to the poet’s brother, Francisco García Lorca.
The first actual instance of literary commentary by a translator is provided by William I. Oliver’s dissertation, completed in 1959, which deals with the differences between Spanish and American theater. One may actually perceive of this study as a reversed metatext, since it is the translated text that serves as an illustration to the thesis of the translator, rather than the metatext illustrating the problems of the translation. As the play’s central theme, this scholar saw "the nature and dangers of excessive pride or pundonor, as the Spanish call it." As mentioned in the previous chapter of the present study, Oliver has written several articles on García Lorca’s work and the problems of staging this play for an English speaking audience, but none of his writings deal with specific problems encountered during the translation of *Bodas de sangre*.

After providing the reader with a brief overview of the Lorca’s life in the introductory pages of her translation, Sue Bradbury does give some insight into her interpretation of *Bodas de sangre*. She considers the plays of the rural trilogy as having "very simple themes culled from his rural childhood." Ms. Bradbury focuses her attention especially on the female characters, whom she calls "tragic":

They are all the Virgen María, carried on the shoulders of men, weeping their eternal plaster tears; wild, enduring, superb, and stronger than God to the Spanish Catholic. The tragedy lies not in the men, the barren and abstract male lovers wrapped in the arms of death, but in women who have seen through the man-made machinery of
society's law, realized it's only a substitute for life, and live on to use or defy it.4

As the major theme of all three plays in the trilogy, Gwynne Edwards notes "the clash between the individual who follows the path of instinct (...) and the forces of convention and tradition which stand in his or her way."5 David Johnston, after an introduction to the poet's life and death, focuses on the notion of the duende and on Lorca's symbolism in order to access the play's theme, which he defines as "the tragedy of love baulked by both materialism and the fervent acceptance of society's most relentlessly violent responses" and the poet's tragic vision of life as expressed here: "the whole impulse of the universe is hostile to human fulfillment."6

Some translators accompany their translation with an analysis of the literary aspects of the play, or a short overview of the author's life and works, but fail to mention any personal objectives that may have motivated them to undertake the task of translating this text. Sue Bradbury is a case in point, as she provides a brief analysis of the three plays included in the Folio Society edition, but does not include any personal motivation other than expressing the hope that these plays "may find a wider audience."7 Other translators, like David Johnston and Gwynne Edwards, not only add comments and clarifications about imagery and themes of the text and the value of the author, but also provide separate texts on the problems they encountered when
rendering into English the language of the original. Obviously, when these sorts of texts are available, they may be considered the most direct way of insight into the translator's initial norms, but some caution is warranted: a translator may profess certain beliefs and motivations in his or her foreword, but in the text itself deviate from these norms on occasion, or even frequently. An examination of the translator's motivation as stated in the metatexts will always have to be tested against concrete examples from the text.

It is interesting to note that only the three most recent translators of Bodas de sangre have addressed specifically the problems of their task in a written form meant to accompany in one way or another the translated text. Certainly, the custom of translators of defending or justifying their translational strategies in print is not a new one, and many of the theories on translation have proceeded from such published statements. In the United States, however, it seems that this is a rather new phenomenon, which possibly has to do with the fact that translations are often considered inferior texts, of a purely utilitarian nature. An example of this opinion may be found in Oliver's discussion of the loss of musicality in his version of Bodas de sangre: "The inferiority of the translation to the original is due not only to the much smaller poetic talent of the translator, but also to the
quantity and quality of music to be achieved from the two languages."8 Opinions of this kind have, traditionally, led to an emphasis on the original text and author, while the translator chose to remain in the shadows.

This does not mean that the earlier translators of Bodas de sangre were not preoccupied with these problems. Jose A. Weissberger, for instance, left a series of detailed personal notes dealing with some of the problems he encountered and the solutions he proposed. These notes actually reflect some of García Lorca’s opinions, as Weissberger was the only translator who had the good fortune of consulting with the author about the translation into English of Bodas de sangre. Although Lorca’s English was limited, he tried to clarify some images to the translator, which makes for interesting reading, since Lorca did not write a great number of other comments on this play. An example of such an exchange has to do with the subject of poetic language in the wedding songs of Act Two, Scene One: "I told Federico that I can’t get any meaning out of it. He answered: ‘No need to seek to understand.’ (....) Don’t try to find sense. It’s poetry pure and simple. Perhaps not quite simple. I guess the meaning."9 It has been established previously that it is not certain to whom these notes of Weissberger were directed, but it may be assumed that the intended receiver was Irene Lewisohn, the first American producer of the play, who had taken a genuine
interest in it ever since she had seen a first performance in Spanish, and had acquired the rights of production in 1933.

The first metatexts in which the translator actually reflects on problems that occurred during the translation comes from the hand of Gwynne Edwards, in the form of an afternote to the translated text as well as an article in *New Theatre Quarterly* about the problems of producing and translating Lorca for an English-speaking audience. An afternote to the translation is present as well in the version by Dewell and Zapata. As mentioned before, the latest translator, David Johnston, has several metatexts to his credit, not only the ones included in the publication of the translation, but also an article in *Insula* that addresses in a more general manner the problems encountered in the translation of Lorca in English. This article in particular attacks the translation made by O'Connell and Graham-Luján:

En su caso traducir sí que era traicionar. Sus versiones, hechas en Estados Unidos, en el ambiente puritano de los años cuarenta, y publicadas en Gran Bretaña por Penguin, no sirvieron más que para cerrarle la puerta al teatro de Lorca. (...)en caso de duda, tienden a inclinarse hacia el lado más literal del español, produciendo resultados que muchos espectadores británicos asocian a los crucigramas de *The Times*.

The metatexts written by these translators, Edwards, Dewell and Zapata, and Johnston all stress that a new translation was needed in order to remedy the fact that
previous translations were "unplayable." They also express a preoccupation with creating a text that is actable as opposed to one that merely serves to be read. Except for Dewell and Zapata, who focus almost entirely on this issue, neither Edwards nor Johnston list any specific examples about what exactly they have done to make the text actable. Rather, they give their views on how best to proceed in translating and successfully staging this play for a target language audience. Interestingly, they profess some diametrically opposed norms for achieving those objectives. Edwards expresses the opinion that

(...) it is important not to dilute the Spanishness of Lorca's language by seeking approximations or equivalents which will make the dialogue more polished, more acceptable, and ultimately more cozy for an English-speaking audience. (...) an English translation should seek to capture the rhythms of this most 'operatic' and passionate of twentieth-century Spanish dramatists, be it in relation to the prose or the poetry of the play.12

Johnston, on the other hand, considers the language and imagery of Blood Wedding "geared towards the communication of a restless passion which an English-speaking spectator may simply dismiss as excessive." He therefore deems it necessary that "certain degrees of linguistic and cultural concessions" be made by the translators of this play.13 These two opposing opinions will, to some extent, manifest themselves in the translation of the dialogue. Johnston, who adheres to Toury's notion of "acceptable" translation may tone down the intensity of the emotion and adapt the imagery
and expression to an English speaking public. Edwards, more in favor of what Toury labelled the "adequate" way of translating, will most likely make efforts of preserving the cultural, linguistic and stylistic characteristics of the original.

Dewell and Zapata, for their part, at first seem to concur with David Johnston's approach, stating that they wanted to create a text that was acceptable to actors as well as to audiences, both those who were bilingual and those that were monolingual, as they staged performances "in an Anglo theater for an all-American audience." As mentioned before, this team of translators has firm ties with the theater. Thus, approaching this translation first and foremost from a practical point of view, they soon noticed that their first draft was problematic on stage: "when good actors just couldn't force our words out, we knew that changes were called for. Hundreds of changes, from single words to complete sentences." The metatext that accompanies this translation is a fascinating report of the long process of rewrites and trials, which, with the input of actors and audiences, yielded the text of this publication. However, even though the translators express the hope of having, for the first time, produced a tried and tested, and therefore truly accepted translation for the target language audience, the final statement of their objective seems somewhat contradictory, as it expresses a
judgement about the superiority of the original text: "my dearest hope is that reading and seeing Lorca in English will encourage Americans to read his poems and see his plays in their incomparable original Spanish."\textsuperscript{15}

Text-structural Features

In the event one were dealing with an adaptation rather than with a translation, some of the elements discussed in this chapter would be drastically transformed, and one might encounter such things as rearrangement of the internal structure of the play, changes in the names and functions of the characters, radical omissions in the dialogue or even additions of the adapters' own philosophies via the characters' words or actions. All the translations of Bodas de sangre discussed in this study may be considered translations proper, not adaptations, and therefore there are no changes of the above mentioned magnitude in any of the textstructural features. Nevertheless, when studying these features, some smaller shifts become apparent, and even though they may seem minimal, in conjunction with changes in the stage directions and the dialogue they may entail some transformation in the overall focus of the play.

1. The Division of the Play in Acts and Scenes

All translations dealt with in the present study respect the original's division into acts and scenes. The
original text, underneath the title and above the year of
the play's premiere on stage, briefly states the internal
structure and tone of the work: "Tragedia en tres actos y
siete cuadros." Three of the translators, GN, GL/O'C and
DJ follow this pattern word for word, whereas others are
less specific: LH avoids the word "Tragedy", and opts for
the more general "A Play in Three Acts and Seven Scenes," SB omits the fact that there are seven scenes, and JW, GE,
WO and D/Z fail to mention the play's structural division
altogether. The latter, however, provide a detailed outline
listing all of the play's acts and scenes under the heading
"Contents."

2. The Title

_Bodas de sangre_ has been translated into a great number
of Western as well as non-Western languages. In most cases,
the title of the play has been a virtually literal
translation of the original title. Some examples of this are
the German _Bluthochzeiten_, the Dutch _Bloedbruiloft_, the
Italian _Nozze di sangue_, the Portuguese _Bodas de Sangue_, the
Norwegian _Blodbryllaupet_, the Danish _Blodbryllup_, to mention
just a few.

Two exceptions to this practice occur in the French and
English translations of the play. Among the former, the
first French translators, Marcelle Auclair and André
Prevost, chose _La noce meurtriere_ for their version
published in 1938. The title of this translation was changed, however, to the more literal Noces de sang in the 1946 republication by Gallimard, presumably because another translator, Robert Namia, had used that title in a translation he published in 1945. In English, three titles have been given to the translations: Bitter Oleander, Fate at the Wedding and finally Blood Wedding.

Bitter Oleander, the title of the first translation into English, was criticized quite relentlessly by some reviewers. Contrary to what is commonly the case, the translator, Jose A. Weissberger, did not give this title to his translation. In her biography of Lorca, Mildred Adams suggests that the title was chosen by Irene Lewisohn, director of the first performance in New York, after she had returned with the translation from Madrid where Weissberger resided at the time. An article published in The New York Herald Tribune of January 26, 1935, a few weeks before opening night, seems to concur, mentioning that "Bitter Oleander is the title finally selected by the Neighborhood Playhouse for the tale of Gaudix [sic] by Federico Garcia Lorca, which was called 'Bordas [sic] de Sangre' when produced in Madrid."

The English title, referring to the cross of oleander placed on the Bridegroom when his body is carried into the Mother's house, created some confusion on the part of the audience, as one reviewer pointed out: "In the lobby of the
Lyceum two non-professionals were talking. "What does 'oleander' mean?" asked one. "'Oleander' is Spanish for onion," replied the other. Which goes to prove that critics are born, not made."19 The criticism notwithstanding, Bitter Oleander, as well as referring to a line spoken by the Mother in the text, "Que te pongan al pecho/cruz de amargas adelfas," is the only English title that endeavors to imitate the rhythm and vowel sounds of the original. As opposed to the later usage by most translators of the title Blood Wedding, which consists of only three syllables, Bitter Oleander, with its six syllables approximates more closely the five syllable original title. Furthermore, the word "oleander" imitates the o-a-e-a-e vowel sounds of the original title, and therefore one may assume that the decision to choose this title was not completely arbitrary. Unfortunately, it emphasized the vegetative images that abound in the text, and that were almost unanimously rejected by the American reviewers, as has been pointed out in the previous chapter.

Fate at the Wedding, the title of Langston Hughes' translation, emphasizes the element of inescapable and irrational fate as an overpowering force in man's life, one of the main themes of the play. The concept of "Fate" may be seen as personified in this title, presented as a character at the wedding. In this way the word alludes to the two surreal characters that represent the forces of fatality in
the play, the Moon and Death in the guise of a beggar woman, who are present during the hunt for the Bride and Leonardo, who cannot escape them. *Fate at the Wedding*, less musical than *Bitter Oleander* and less striking than *Blood Wedding*, is the most transparent one of the three titles, and may remind readers familiar with Spanish theatre of the subtitle of a play by another Andalusian playwright, the Duque de Rivas’ *Don Alvaro o la fuerza del sino*.

It is remarkable that both these translators made a conscious effort to avoid using the word "blood" in the title of their translations, perhaps for fear of shocking or alienating the American audience, or perhaps in order to avoid reinforcing the stereotypical idea of a Spanish culture being violent and bloody. In this light, Gilbert Neiman has to be given credit for being the first to select the title that would henceforth be used by all other translators. As stated before, Neiman’s translation was not conceived as a playtext, but rather as a text aimed at a reading public only, and a rather educated one at that. Thus, the previously mentioned hesitation about using the word "blood" in the title was not operative in this case. *Blood Wedding*, the most logical of the three titles, as it is a direct translation of the original title, expresses well the opposition between the wedding as a social convention and the blood as the passion that rules the characters’ destiny. With its use, Neiman started what may
be considered a canonization of the title in the English speaking world.

3. Presentation of the Characters

The original text presents the cast of characters in a definite order that is linked to the themes of the play. The female characters are listed first, followed by the male characters. In many of the editions in Spanish of this play the characters are divided into two columns, male and female. Within each group of characters, a definite hierarchy is present: the characters appear in order of importance, with for instance, the Mother leading the list of female characters, followed by the Bride, and then the groups of minor, collective figures such as Muchachas. The same holds true for the male group, where not the Bridegroom, but rather Leonardo is the first on the list, followed by characters of decreasing importance. The presentation of the characters in this manner implies a definite indication of judgement, as it may be considered a subtle clue for the reader or the audience to recognize the significance of each character: whereas in a play about a wedding one might expect the Bride and Bridegroom to play the major parts, in actuality the Mother and Leonardo are the main protagonists, representing the opposing forces that lead the other characters' actions.20
The translations display a number of variations on the original's manner of presentation of the characters. The shifts introduced by the translators are of three kinds: they may involve a change in the order of the characters, a change in the number of characters, or a modification in the characters' identification in the cast. Whereas the first may be ascribed to the desire on the translator's part to conform the original to the conventions of the target system, the second and third modifications actually have much greater consequences, and imply a definite interference into the text on the part of the translator.

Where the order of presentation of the characters is concerned, three tendencies are noticeable in the translations: some translators follow the original's order faithfully, others maintain the male/female division, but order the characters differently within this division, and finally some choose to use an "in order of appearance" approach, more common in the American theater, perhaps under the influence of the film industry. It is notable that this practice is followed by the two most recent translators, D/Z and DJ, but also by LH. However, even though LH states that he will be presenting the characters "in order of appearance," he lists "Wedding Guests" after "the Moon" and "Death," whereas in the play they appear on stage before these characters.
The original cast of characters consists of fourteen items, which may be single characters or groups of characters, such as Leñadores, Mozos, and so on. GN, GL/O'C, WO and GE preserve this number of items, and the characters appear in the same order, although always in only one column. All the other translations end up with more items than the original's fourteen. This does not necessarily mean that new characters are added, but rather that they are presented in much greater detail than in the original text. Whereas in the original the number of male vs. female characters is well balanced, JW ends up with twenty-two items, and more female characters than male ones. As far as the order is concerned, JW tends to pair off the characters in sets, as for instance "Novia / Her Servant; Leonardo's Wife / Her Mother" (my emphasis), and, as in the original text, lists all the female characters, including the minor ones, first.

With regard to the number and identification of characters, we see a definite shift from the general to the specific in JW. Instead of the non-defined groups of collective characters of the original, some of which have minor speaking roles, such as Muchachas and Mozos, this translator meticulously lists each character separately, and goes so far as to do this by acts. For example, he lists "1st Girl," "2nd Girl," "3rd Girl" (2nd Act) and then the same for the third act. He distinguishes further between
those characters and "Little Girl," "Extra Girls." The reason for the imbalance between the number of male and female characters in the cast list of this translation is that JW does not go into quite as much detail for the male ones, where he lists "3 Woodcutters" as a unit, yet separates what in the original was designated simply as Mozos into "1st Man," "2nd Man," "Extra Men."

A similar phenomenon takes place in D/Z, where 23 items make up the cast of characters. In this translation, everyone who enters upon the stage is painstakingly registered, and all of the collective groups that make up the choruses, such as the Woodcutters and the Wedding Guests are separated and numbered. For instance, what in the original is not really listed at all, and in LH and DJ as the more general "Wedding Guests," in D/Z becomes "First Girl," "Second Girl," "Third Girl," "First Young Man," "Second Young Man," "First Youth."

The original text is very brief with regard to the actual description or identification of the characters, and will often just mention the generic name without clarifying the actual relationship between one character and another, at least in the cast list, although it will do so in the text by way of the stage directions. It needs to be noted here that of the three rural plays, Bodas de sangre has the most concise cast list. In Yerma, the characters are presented in much more detail, and the collective groups
tend to be separated, as for instance in the case of six Lavanderas, which are all listed singly. In La casa de Bernarda Alba, the cast list is of a much more descriptive nature, and includes the characters' ages and relations to one another.

The five translators of Bodas de sangre who do not follow the original's presentation of the characters closely where number and order are concerned also tend to provide more details about the nature of the characters in this play. DJ, for instance, follows several of the characters in the cast list with explanatory phrases between parentheses, such as "Mother (of the Bridegroom)," "Maid (to the Bride)," "Mother-in-law (of Leonardo)," or otherwise provides information about the characters that is not in the original cast list: "Girls from the village, Women in mourning". On the other hand, he follows the original in not specifying the number of characters in each collective group, and thus ends up with 16 items, only slightly more than the original.

An interesting phenomenon in the various translations of the cast list is the use or non-use of the definite article. The use of the definite article is more common in the Spanish language than it is in English, and in the original, the article is used in front of all characters except the collective ones and Leonardo. This reinforces the notion that the characters are not individuals, but rather "symbolic figures that represent, besides an individual
situation, a general problem and a prototype; for example, [Lorca] uses the mother in Blood Wedding as really more than "a mother"—as, in fact, The Mother." In the English versions, the article is used in most cases also, but there are some exceptions. JW, for instance, does not use the definite article at all, but sometimes inserts an indefinite article, "A Neighbor," "A Beggar Woman." He uses the Spanish terms novia and novio as if they were proper names, such as in the characters related to them directly: "Novia’s Father," "Mother of the Novio." LH uses the definite article in most of the characters except in some of the minor ones, where he uses the indefinite article," A Servant," "A child," while he precedes the collective characters by a number: "3 Bridesmaids," "2 Youths." From then on, the translators follow the use of the definite articles closely, until the two most recent translations, by D/Z and DJ, in which they are omitted.

The figures of the Woodcutters, the Moon and Death (personified as a Beggar Woman), often referred to as surreal or symbolic characters, are of special interest. Although they are representatives of a higher, metaphysical power, they still have their bearing in the real world: it is not uncommon for woodcutters to be in the forest, a beggar is a common sight in many places, and there is nothing unusual about the moon coming out. However, the symbolic significance these characters acquire in this play
presents a problem for the translator since in the target audience the reactions to these figures on stage may not be the same as in the source culture. Luis Fernández Cifuentes has made some pertinent observation about the success of Bodas de sangre in Spain: "en medio de toda su pretendida novedad, Bodas de sangre aparecía inequivocamente construida con elementos que el Romancero Gitano había hecho familiares al espectador." It can be said that certain themes, images and characters such as the Moon, the Woodcutters and Death feature prominently not only in the Romancero Gitano, but in most of Lorca’s poetic work, and that this is missing from the cultural background of at least part, and perhaps a majority of the members of the Target Language audience. Whereas JW includes these characters in the cast list of his translation, there is evidence from the script book used by the Neighborhood Playhouse that the characters of the Moon and Death were eliminated from the production in New York. 

Leñadores is translated in various ways in the English versions of Bodas de sangre. The most common translation is "Woodcutters" (JW, LH, GL/O’C, GE, D/Z and DJ), but GN translates into "Woodsmen," WO into "Lumbermen," and SB into "Forresters." Clearly this is dependent on the translator’s background, and probably in most cases the choice of this word was not given much thought. However, for the reader at least, the words "Forrester" and "Woodcutter" may evoke different images, the first being seen more as a
person who maintains and protects the forests, the second as one who is part of the forest, but who is also a destructive force in it. Naturally, the term "Woodcutter" also connects these characters with the series of images referring to cutting, knives and sharpness that are prevalent throughout the play.

There is a clear desire on the part of the playwright to create sexual ambiguity in the character of the Moon. Whereas the Moon is usually presented as a female in Spanish literature, in this play it is to be played by a young male woodcutter with a white face, and it appears among the male characters in the cast list. One translator, JW, includes this figure in the list of female characters, and some directors have used an actress to portray this role.

Some interesting variations on the ways in which the figure of Death was translated may be noted as well. First of all, even though this figure is included in the cast list of the original, in the first scene of the third act, when the beggar woman makes her first entrance, Lorca notes that: "Este personaje no figura en el reparto." True to the original's cast list, however, all translators do include this character in the English versions. While most translators translate "Death," followed by "(As a Beggar(woman))," just as it appears in the original, both JW and D/Z avoid the word "Death" and simply list "a beggar woman" without further details.
**Conclusions**

It is clear that the translators studied here had in mind definite norms when undertaking the translation of *Bodas de sangre*. Those translators who added to the translated text some kind of testimony of this in the form of footnotes, commentaries or other metatexts intended to provide the reader with insight into their motivations and norms, which ultimately may have influenced their entire translational strategy. These metatexts are thus to be considered guidelines by the describer of translations. In the case where no such texts are present, the translation of the textstructural features may be able to provide the first indications of the norms the translator followed throughout the translation.

In the case of *Bodas de sangre* and its nine translators, the preliminary indications seem to point to a tendency to adhere closely to the original in GN, WO, O'C/GL, GE and, to a lesser extent, SB. It has been determined earlier that of these translators, GN, WO and SB were translating specifically with a reading public in mind, while O'C/GL aimed at a translation that could be used for both reading and staging. GE, stating that he endeavored to produced a text that would be actable, on various occasions has professed his belief in "conveying to the English audience the essential Spanishness of the play." The other translators were translating this text specifically with
performance in mind, and their preliminary statements as well as the strategies they used in the translation of some of the text-structural features tend to indicate a tendency towards shifts from the general to the specific, from the implicit to the explicit.

It remains to be seen if the correlation between dramatic text and faithfulness to the original vs. performance text and greater freedom and a desire to elucidate the Source Text, continue in the translation of the dialogue. As mentioned before, the analysis of dialogue and stage directions will give a more detailed picture of the practical translational strategies used by the translators in order to realize the priorities they mention in their forewords as well as in the norms that govern their manner of intervention in the text-structural features. As Toury points out during his discussion of "initial norms":

> Obviously, the initial norm determines the a priori global approach of a specific translator to the translation of a specific text (or, even more globally, to literary translation as a whole!); but it may reappear--and generally does--in the later stages of the translation process as well, in a way which is either consistent or inconsistent, in full or in part, with the a priori, overall tendency, again with regard to the entire text, but also with regard to its parts or even to small units and minute details in it.
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9. These notes are available for consultation at the Theater Collections Department of the Library for the Performing Arts, a branch of the New York Public Library.
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16. Henceforward, the translations discussed will be indicated solely by the translator's initials in capital letters. In the cases where more than one translator participated, only the initials of the last names will be used, separated by a slash mark. The following will be the abbreviations used: Jose A. Weissberger (JW), Langston Hughes (LH), Gilbert Neiman (GN), James Graham-Luján and Richard O'Connell (GL/O'C), William I. Oliver (WO), Sue Bradbury (SB), Gwynne Edwards (GE), Michael Dewell and Carmen Zapata (D/Z), David Johnston (DJ).

17. All quotations from the translation by Langston Hughes are Copyright (c) 1989 by George Houston Bass, Surviving Executor of the Estate of Langston Hughes.


20. At this point in time, it is very difficult to determine with certainty whether Lorca really meant to divide the male and female characters in two columns, as they appear in the majority of the editions of the play in Spanish. If so, then there can be no doubt about the fact that the playwright was following the convention of Spanish classical theatre in this regard. However, the opposition Male/Female does play a role in Lorca's drama and poetry and it is hinted at on several occasions by characters in Bodas de sangre. In that respect, the division of the characters in two columns would not be merely conventional, but also thematically important, and the translators' reorganization of the characters can therefore be considered a shift, be it conscious or unconscious, in the focus of the play.
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CHAPTER III
THE TRANSLATION OF THE STAGE DIRECTIONS

The Function of Stage Directions in the Drama and Theatre Text

Theatrical performance has been defined by Keir Elam as "a network of semiotic units belonging to different cooperative systems".¹ Other scholars, many of them semioticians, have endeavored to list or categorize these systems that together constitute the totality of the theatrical experience. Tadeusz Kowzan was one of the earliest of these semioticians to tentatively propose five basic sign systems that make up the performance:

- Texte prononcé (la parole, le ton)
- Expression corporelle (mimique, geste, mouvement)
- Apparences extérieures de l'acteur (maquillage, coiffure, costume)
- Aspects su lieu scénique (accessoire, décor, éclairage)
- Effets sonores non-articulés (musique, bruitage)²

This scheme, though incomplete in certain ways and refuted by some later theoreticians, is a helpful tool in the study of the stage directions of a play, especially when examining the translation of the stage directions, as it lists quite meticulously the different functions these may
fulfil in the performance. Whereas the spoken text is laid down in written form in the play's dialogue, the four other elements Kowzan lists often find their only expression in the stage directions. Even the element of tone, which Kowzan mentions as a part of the spoken text, will in some cases be specified by the playwright by means of the stage directions, since it includes intonation, rhythm, speed of delivery, and intensity of voice.3

It goes without saying that all the elements listed by Kowzan may also be either partially or completely expressed or reinforced by the dialogue. Patrice Pavis, basing himself on the distinction established by the Polish philosopher Roman Ingarden, distinguishes between the principal and the secondary text in the theatre, the former being the text spoken by the characters on stage, the latter the stage directions. The dialectical relationship that exists between those two texts is described by Pavis as follows: "Le texte des comédiens laisse entrevoir la façon dont le texte doit être énoncé, et complète les indications scéniques. Inversement, le texte secondaire éclaire l'action des personnages, et donc le sens de leur discours."4

It may be noted that the stage directions, which have as one of their main characteristics the fact that they are only available to the reader of the drama text, determine mostly the non-linguistic signs of the performance. Some playwrights endeavour to exercise a greater amount of
control over these elements than others, who may wish to leave more freedom or influence to the "readers" of the text, be they the actual readers using their imagination, or that person who may be referred to as the "first" reader, the director of the play.

It has been stated previously in this study that descriptive translation analysis should concern itself mainly with the written or dramatic text, since frequently the translator has no control over the text's fate once it is seized by a director and put on stage. The only instance of control over the theatre text that the translator does exert is in the translation of the stage directions, which are a guide to the director, who still has the freedom to use or ignore them as he deems necessary:

Aujourd'hui, beaucoup de mises en scène prennent le contrepied des informations données dans le texte secondaire par le dramaturge et éclairent le texte principal par une illustration critique (sociologique, psychanalytique). Ce type d'interprétation transforme évidemment le texte à jouer, ou du moins le fixe dans une de ses potentialités.5

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that most of the changes introduced by the director will not influence the text permanently, except in rare cases, whereas unilateral changes in the written or drama text will very often, if not always, cause changes in the theatre text. Since the object of descriptive translation research is to determine which type of equivalence is present between the text and its translations, it will be concerned in the first place with
the written text, but will nonetheless also take into account non-verbal equivalence, in as far as this is laid down in the text by verbal means, i.e. in the stage directions.

Several different types of functional scenic indications are present in almost any play, and the different categories of sign systems established by Kowzan will be used to examine these different types. In the most general sense, one may say that a play like Bodas de sangre contains stage directions that refer either to the setting or to the characters, those "hors de l'acteur" and those pertaining to the character's personification on stage through the actor.

Where the indications referring to the actor are concerned, Kowzan's scheme may be seen as decreasing in the number of ties to the spoken text. The stage directions that most closely link the actor to the spoken word are those that dictate his or her vocal expression or diction, the tone (intonation, speed, intensity and so on) in which the text is delivered. Prosodic elements are determined in the theatre text in at least three ways: by means of the content of the spoken words; graphically, by way of the punctuation; and, in the most transparent way, by means of stage directions that specify tone, timing and intonation. The speed of delivery of the dialogue is an interesting tool for the examination of the character's personality and also
serves as an indication of the speech habits of the society to which the characters belong.

Besides those that determine the vocal expression, a second category of stage directions pertaining to the actor refers to the bodily expressions of the actors representing the characters on stage. Great variation is frequently found in the gestic and mimic signs occurring during performance, as they may include the actor’s idiosyncratic gestures and facial expressions, besides those specified in the stage directions and those suggested by the dialogue. The bodily expression of the actor corresponds to the expression of the character’s personality and mood. Whereas personality is often rendered by gestures and the actor’s general way of behavior, mood will frequently be expressed by facial or mimic expressions.

Elam has noted that some types of Eastern theatre, such as the Indian Kathakali dance theatre, have a tradition of rich gestural and mimical repertory: "(64 limb movements, 9 head movements, 11 kinds of glances and so on) and a range of fixed meanings correlated to them (in terms of character, emotions, etc.)" Since the Western theatre seems to be lacking such specific traditions, gestures and expressions are usually structured in such a way that they draw directly upon the everyday life of a specific community and thus are immediately intelligible to all members of a that particular community. Here again, obviously, lies a pitfall for the
translator of plays. Whereas in narrative prose the significance of a character's gesture or expression can be made more explicit, either in the text or by way of notes to a Target Language audience who may not be familiar with that significance, in a play problems may arise and frequently it becomes nearly impossible to clarify those signs without extensively changing the original. Even in the written text of a play, meant to be read, it is more difficult to insert a clarification unobtrusively, due to the extreme conciseness of many stage directions.

The third element that makes up the system of bodily expression in the theatre is that of the movement of the actors on the stage. Stage directions control entrances and exits of the actors upon the playing space, as well as all kinds of proxemic relations, not only between the characters, but also between the characters and elements of the decor, and between the actors and the spectators. These kinds of stage directions are frequently tied in with indications referring to the playing space, when the decor and the props are described in their relation to the characters.

Relations between man and space in the world are studied by the scientific discipline of proxemics, developed by the anthropologist Edward T. Hall, who defines it as follows: "The interrelated observations and theories of man's use of space as a specialized elaboration of
culture." This scholar distinguishes between fixed feature space, semi-fixed feature space and informal space, notions which Elam has applied successfully to the realm of the theatre. Fixed feature space refers to the actual space of the playhouse, and thus to the dimension, shape and nature of the stage and the auditorium. It is clear that the stage directions cannot change this element as it is permanently determined, but they can suggest how the illusion of a different shape of stage may be created. Some plays are created specifically with a small theater and audience in mind, and when attempts are made to stage these plays in a different kind of playhouse, or one in which the audience is seated in a different manner, it will frequently be noted that the play is not received as it previously was, or subsequently will be, in a more adequate environment.

Semi-fixed space consists of elements that are non-dynamic, but moveable at will, and thus include the decor, lighting and props. The stage directions will be very influential in these matters, although it is here also that the director has a great amount of freedom. In productions of foreign plays especially, stereotypical images frequently will crop up in the backdrop or the props, in an effort to preserve some of the "local color" of the original. Some translators, with this intention in mind, may actually add various of these elements to a play, something which is easily done by means of the stage directions.
Understandably, there is often less hesitation on the part of translators to change these than the dialogue itself.

Informal space in the theatre applies to the distances between the actors, but also between the actor and the spectator. In some forms of theatre, where audience participation is required, the latter may change several times during the performance, whereas in more traditional theatre the actor-spectator distance remains essentially the same. The actor-actor relation, however, usually shifts constantly throughout the play. Again, there may be some challenges for the translator when translating a play for a different culture, especially with plays that are far removed from the target culture where the proxemics of everyday life are concerned. Even in the translation into English and the staging of a play like *Bodas de sangre* in the English-speaking world this could create some difficulties. One need only think of the studies that have been done about the differences in distance with which an English speaker vs. a Spanish speaking individual feels comfortable during everyday social contact. An English translator who chooses to delete or alter some of the indications that specifically refer to closeness between the characters may want to create the illusion that the action takes place within the spectators' everyday realm of existence by adapting the distances to those with which the spectators would feel comfortable.
The kind of adaptation described above reflects the translator's desire to produce what was earlier called an "acceptable" or an "adequate" drama text, which will also be manifest in his treatment of the stage directions that describe the characters' physical appearance, especially where the costumes are concerned. The playwright may not be too specific in the original's stage directions about the costumes, but the translator, in an effort to give the play a taste of the foreign may tend to give more details about the typical costumes. It is here that we see the similarity between the translator of the drama text and the director, who may have the same motivations and therefore feel the need to take great freedom with regard to the indications given by the original author. The same holds true for the actor's make-up and hair styling, the two other elements besides the costumes that define the characters' physical appearance, and that complement, to a certain extent, the actors' facial expressions, but are of a more permanent nature.

The non-spoken sounds of the performance, which include music and all kinds of noises, either on or off-stage, are the last category of stage directions mentioned by Kowzan. Sounds that occur on or off-stage have the function of creating a certain atmosphere, or they may play a part in the plot or imagery of a play. The same holds true for the music played during the performance, which may have some
important semiologic functions: "Exprimant ou suggérant une emotion, une humeur, un état d'âme, la phrase musicale devient un signe de l'inquietude, de la hâte, de l'ironie, de l'allégresse ou de la tendresse." It is clear that the translator bears no responsibility for the music, as he deals with the written text rather than with its presentation on stage, but in the case of a play like Bodas de sangre, where several key moments of the performance are given over to music--one thinks of the lullaby and wedding songs--two possibilities present themselves. In those cases where the translation was produced with a specific performance in mind, an important and extremely demanding part of the translator's task consists in making the text conform to the music that will be played during the performance. This will almost always have to involve a greater freedom in handling the original text than when it is not known which music will be performed. In that case, it is the music that will have to conform to the text, and although most likely there will be greater adherence to the original text's wording on the part of the translator, subsequent adjustments are bound to be made by the director or the musical director in charge of the particular production.
The Stage Directions in Bodas de sangre.

Bodas de sangre contains stage directions that fulfill all the functions described by Kowzan at least once, although not necessarily in every act. Except for the indications that appear at the beginning of each scene and that provide a brief description of the playing space, all stage indications are concise, consisting of one single word or a short elliptical sentence, and are graphically presented in the text between brackets. Noting the lack of interest most critics have displayed in the stage directions of Lorca’s theatre, Ricardo Doménech stated the following:

(...)Lorca rehuye en las acotaciones cualquier exceso descriptivo. Las suyas son acotaciones rápidas, nerviosas. Ahora bien, nos equivocaríamos si no advirtiéramos en ellas—aparte que en los diálogos y en las acciones—una concepción muy rigurosa del ámbito, el color, la línea, en que los textos dramáticos deben plasmarse.10

Whereas some of the stage directions of Bodas de sangre fulfill one single function, such as determining a mimic or gestic sign, others are a combination of several functions. A numerical count of the stage directions and repliques in each act reveals that Act One contains 332 repliques and 109 stage directions (ratio of 3.04/1), Act Two 359 repliques and 144 stage directions (2.49/1), and the last act 192 repliques and 77 stage directions (2.44/1). Compared to the other plays of the rural trilogy, Bodas de sangre is situated between Yerma and La casa de Bernarda Alba in its
use of stage directions: somewhat more spare than the former, but more abundant than the latter.\textsuperscript{12}

Of the total number of 330 stage directions that occur in \textit{Bodas de sangre}, the indications pertaining to characters predominate over those of setting. Within the predominant group, the directions that refer to vocal and bodily expression occur far more frequently than those of physical appearance. Naturally, it is sometimes impossible to separate the different functions a certain stage direction fulfills, as in the case of \textit{alegre} or \textit{serio}, where vocal expression--a certain tone of voice--but also where mimic signs, and frequently gestic signs too are involved.

Each scene begins with a rather long stage direction that refers mostly to setting: the location of the action, the decor, the props and where they are situated. In several instances a simple time scheme is provided, such as "es de noche," which causes elements of either the decor or the lighting to be activated. It is notable that as the play progresses, the stage directions at the beginning of scenes gradually become more detailed, listing not only props, color of decor and lighting, but also elements of the characters' physical appearance and non-vocal sounds. The same gradual increase in intricacy of the stage directions is also notable in those that are inserted in the text itself, especially during the last act, where the stage directions are fewer in number but more detailed. This last
act is characterized by forceful stage directions at the end of each scene that create visually dramatic endings. Within the text the number of stage directions that refer to the playing space is limited. They may involve some additional props, but most commonly have to do with lighting. Some instances of this are the suggestion of night changing into day in the first scene of the second act, or the play between the darkness of the night in the forest and the appearance of the moon accompanied by a radiant blue light in the first scene of the third act.

The first stage direction of each scene sometimes also lists the characters present at the onset of the scene, their position and activity. Two scenes in *Bodas de sangre* open with a completely empty stage (Act II, Scene 1 and Act III, Scene 1). In some instances, the stage directions at the beginning of the scene do not mention who is present. The very first scene, for example, simply states the decor: "Habitación pintada de amarillo," but from the following dialogue it becomes clear that the Mother was present at the opening of the curtain. Francisco García Lorca has described the manner in which his brother used the stage as a sort of passage: "Muchas veces el espacio escénico creado por Federico es un lugar de tránsito: el personaje viene de un sitio, que está vivo dramáticamente, para ir a otro lugar no visible, también dramatizado por la acción." On several occasions, a scene begins with one or more characters
walking in at the precise moment the curtain opens, carrying out an action that has started elsewhere in the house or outside. This is for instance the case in the first scene of the second act, where the Bride and the Servant walk onto the patio and in their dialogue, by means of deictic markers of place, refer to an action that was initiated previously, in a space not visible to the spectator at that moment:

CRIADA: Aquí te acabaré de peinar.

NOVIA: No se puede estar ahí dentro, del calor.

Francisco García Lorca, in his analysis of La casa de Bernarda Alba, convincingly argues that more than many other playwrights, his brother would not confine the action to the playing space, but rather make it the focus of a much larger space that lies well beyond the limits set by the fixed space of the stage. This is certainly true also for Bodas de sangre, where even more than in La casa de Bernarda Alba the inside and the outside spaces are in a dialectical relationship and continually encroach on each other. The relationship outside/inside, in Bodas de sangre as in various other plays by García Lorca, finds its main expression in the repeated references, both in the dialogue and in the stage directions, to walls, doors and windows. Whereas the walls, real or symbolic, create a confinement and a feeling of suffocation and heat, often expressed by the characters, the doors and windows are gateways to the outside, and in this particular play at least, suggest
freedom and a return to the values of the earth without the shackles of society's rules. It is, for instance, through the window that the Bride keeps in contact with Leonardo.

Of special interest in this respect also are the off-stage sounds and music that may be heard throughout Bodas de sangre. Not only do they play an important part in the creation of an atmosphere—"se oyen dos violines que expresan el bosque"—but they also contribute considerably to the symbols and themes of the play and reinforce the relationship of continuum between the inside and the outside spaces, between what happens outside of the visible environment of the playing space and the events taking place in front of the spectators.14 Some examples of the former are the sound of the horse's hooves heard off-stage at the end of the first act, as well as the concluding events of the first scene of Act Three: "Bruscamente se oyen dos largos gritos desgarrados y se corta la música de los violines." Some of the American critics who reviewed the early performances of Bodas de sangre in the United States lamented the lack of action on the stage and the fact that the most dramatically gripping moments, such as the fight between Leonardo and the Bridegroom were merely suggested by off-stage noises:

If this were a Greek Tragedy the author would be quite right in handling these scenes as he does, but his method, in view of his own explicit method elsewhere in the play, seems merely feeble avoidance. Both the important dramatic scenes occur off-stage. The play loses, in consequence,
the dramatic pivot it should be balanced on, and leaves the stage to dull narrative, a little eloquent sorrow and much posturing by women in black shawls.\textsuperscript{15}

Although Kowzan, in his discussion of the sign systems of theatrical performance in the category of sounds only provides for non-vocal sounds and music, it is reasonable to include in our analysis of stage directions the sound of the voices that are audible off stage during the first scene of the second act, even though they are accompanied by text. Their slow approach begins at a moment of high tension, during the encounter between Leonardo and the Bride on the morning of the wedding, and although the message they bring should be a joyful one, the impression they convey is the opposite: they seem to be the voices of the destiny of the two characters and to forecast their doom if the wedding takes place as planned. Their gradual approach culminates in the appearance of the invited on the stage towards the end of the scene, which constitutes an interesting materialization of the unseen, off-stage presences.

As mentioned before, the stage directions that refer to the characters are much more common than the ones pertaining to playing space in this work. Where the stage directions that refer to vocal expression are concerned, we are mostly dealing with adjectives or adverbs that denote an intensity or tonal expression that is less common in regular speech. The most commonly used adjectives and adverbs in this play are fuerte (8 times), serio,-a (6 times), alegre (6 times),
dramático,-a (5 times), agrio,-a (4 times), enérgico-a (3 times), con rabia (3 times) and bajo,-a, tímido,-a, en voz alta, sombrío,-a, inquieto,-a, seco,-a, impaciente, quejándose, sarcástico,-a (2 times each). Twelve other qualifying adjectives and adverbs are used only once during the play.

Of equal importance in the vocal expression are the stage directions that denote a pause in normal speech. The absence of words and the theme of silence in Lorca’s theatre have in recent years received critical attention. Dru Dougherty, in an article that treats the language of silence in the work of García Lorca, notes the following: "Hombre completo de teatro, Lorca era consciente de que a veces una pausa bien calculada decía más, en el escenario, que todo un parlamento." There are 11 such instances of pauses in the first act, 4 in the second act, which is characterized by greater activity, and none in the last act, where the dramatic intensity reaches a climax. The addition or deletion of pauses in the translation could change the rhythm of speech dramatically, which may be further reinforced by changes in the punctuation. The stage directions that denote breaks in the spoken text are closely linked to those determining absences of action. When these two types of stage directions occur simultaneously, the stage is briefly converted into a tableau that expresses the complete suspension of the action. In the third scene of the
first act, for instance, besides the various pauses, there is a marked emphasis on the inmobility of the characters: "Quedan madre e hijo sentados, inmóviles como estatuas. Pausa larga." The tension between the Mother and her son that was building during the first scene, and between the Mother, the Bride and the Father, here reach their highest point, which is expressed by the short sentences and by large pauses interjected between the characters' words.

The gestic and mimic signs are by far the most common stage directions in Bodas de sangre, and are especially dominant in the second act. This is consistent with the opinion of one critic who compared the three plays of the rural trilogy as follows:

En Bodas de sangre, pues, el autor reduce el diálogo al mínimo y acentúa el ademán; mientras que en La casa de Bernarda Alba, pone los gestos de los cohibidos personajes y carga el peso de la obra en el diálogo; y en Yerma, hace resaltar el monólogo o el soliloquio, necesario para aclarar la omisión de palabras en otras partes.17

Besides the gestic and mimic signs, the stage directions that determine scenic movement are frequent throughout the play. It has been necessary, for the sake of clarity, to subdivide these stage directions into yet other categories, that are more specific about the type of movement involved in each indication. A first important movement to be considered is that of exits and entrances, which is the most frequent, prevailing especially in the second act, where there is a constant coming and going of
both major and minor characters. The second scene of this act is therefore the most animated scene of the play, but very ominous as well. It is an interplay between the coming and going of the wedding guests and the anxious crossing of the stage by the four characters who realize that not everything is as joyful as it seems: Leonardo, his wife, the Bride and the Servant, who together make the majority of the 30 exits and entrances that occur during this scene. The first scene of the second act, in which the Bride is being prepared to leave for the wedding, has been described by Francisco García Lorca as follows: "Técnicamente, todo el cuadro del segundo acto a que me refiero es la orquestación de una salida de escena. Según el lenguaje teatral, nada más que un ‘mutis’." It may be added that the same holds true for the second scene of this act, where the Bride makes another, even more dramatic exit. The great number of exits and entrances, obviously, is closely linked with the previously discussed opposition between the closed space of the interior and the open space of the exterior that pervades all of Lorca’s theatre.

Another type of movement that occurs less frequently in this play is that of movement between the characters: they get closer or move farther away from each other, but the number of times this happens is far less than the exit/entrance movement. In fact, in Acts Two and Three, absence of movement is mentioned and a sense of inmobility,
especially on the part of the female characters, is emphasized in the stage directions. There are, also, several instances of what may be called false movements, where one of the characters is about to move, but is kept from doing so by another character or circumstance.

Certain movements may be called vocal, or deictic, in those cases where the characters direct themselves to specific other characters, without, however, actually moving. The movement may then occur by means of facial features or the stage direction may just specify to which character a certain reply is directed.

This short overview of the stage directions that occur in Bodas de sangre is helpful in the determination of the type of play the translators had to deal with and provides an idea of the general attitude of the characters. Certainly, it is not a play with a great amount of graphic action: the movements are subdued, and the more violent actions occur off-stage and are either suggested at the time of their occurrence by sounds or later on discussed by other characters, or both. Nevertheless, it may be regarded as a drama of great intensity and emotional violence, expressed by vocal intonation patterns and brief yet powerful and well-determined mimic and gestic responses by the characters. García Lorca left a great deal of freedom to the directors or the imagination of his readers where the physical appearance of the characters and the stage is
concerned. The only instances of specification of these by the author is when a highly symbolic value is attached to them, such as in the rather detailed description of the colors of the walls, ceilings and even floors of the playing space, or in the description of the figure of Death in the guise of a beggar woman, wrapped in rags that form an ominous cloak. *Bodas de sangre* is not a work in which each emotion is laid down and discussed in words, as was the case in the more realist drama in the style of Benavente, with its nearly novelistic qualities. Lorca's dramas are works of and for the theater in the true sense, where the spoken word is only one of a wide array of signs brought together on the stage, not only through the text, but also through stage directions and the *mise en scène*. The way in which the stage directions are translated is an indication of the translator's general attitude towards the text; they are often regarded as being easier to manipulate than the dialogues, yet they are decisive in the outcome of the performance or in the image the reader forms when reading the text.

The Treatment of the Stage Directions in the Translations of *Bodas de sangre*

The shifts that occur in the translation of the stage directions of *Bodas de sangre* are of various types. Examining the different categories of stage directions
described above, we see that they are treated differently by the various translators, and even within one and the same translation, the translator's strategy with regard to them may vary depending on the place where they occur in the text and the character or situation to which they apply. There will be a marked difference between those translators who view the function of the stage directions to be solely a part of a text to be read, and thus render the text as literature, with the stage directions as a clarifying device, or those translators who aim to provide a text to be performed on the stage, in which case the stage directions fulfill a more active role. There can exist no doubt about the fact that for Lorca himself the purpose of this text was to be performed. Even the first reading of *Bodas de sangre* was not a private affair, as a small audience gathered at Morla Lynch's residence, to hear the author recite his text in a kind of one-man performance. However, from the study of other elements, it has been established previously that some translators did not have performance in mind when they undertook this translation, the clearest examples of this being Gilbert Neiman and Sue Bradbury.

1) Stage Directions Referring to the Scenery

Several kinds of stage directions refer to the playing space: the physical space itself, the decor, which includes props and color indications, the lighting and the off-stage
sounds that suggest the space beyond the playing space. The first category of stage directions that will be examined here is that of those directions that refer to the physical reality of the playing space, since such directions usually appear at the beginning of each scene, and since they have the least bearing on the text, influencing rather the performance. The opening stage direction consist usually of two subsets, those indicating the decor and scenery, and those that have to do with the characters and the action on stage at the moment the curtain goes up. In his version, LH distinguishes clearly between those elements by separating them into two headings, "Setting" and "Action." These stage directions are translated integrally by all translators, with one exception: JW omits the directions that refer to the setting, although he does include the ones referring to action, in both Act I, Scene 2 and Act II, Scene 1.

The playing space of Bodas de sangre is often defined in a somewhat general manner, as is the case with the first scene of the play, which notes only the type of scenery, "una habitación," and its rudimentary physical appearance "pintada de amarillo." As this is a type of room that may occur in any society at virtually any time, the direction is rendered faithfully by all translators. The passive turn of the sentence, common in stage directions, is also followed by most translators, except LH, who translates "a room in yellow," and D/Z, who render the phrase in more narrative
way as "The room is painted yellow." Whereas these are only
minor shifts, that may or may not have have some bearing on
the style of the play as a whole, it is a different matter
with those stage directions that are of a more detailed
nature and include, for instance, particulars of the
surrounding landscape as well as cultural elements that are
part of the decor of the playing space. Thus, when
confronted with a cultural element that may not be
understood clearly by the English speaker, such as in the
third scene of the first act--"interior de la cueva donde
vive la Novia"--the translators opt for several different
solutions. GN, GL/O'C, WO, GE and D/Z translate the word
cueva literally as "cave," and thus leave the interpretation
to the reader. Someone not familiar with the dwellings hewn
out of the rock that are found in the particular region of
Spain where the action of the play takes place may envision
this as a rather primitive or poor type of home, and thus
get a false picture of the status of the Bride and her
father, who, though not wealthy, are not poverty stricken,
as is clear from the dialogue between the Mother and the
Father about their respective land ownership. Certainly all
translators were aware of the difficulty with this segment,
and the following are some of the solutions proposed:
whereas SB attempts to soften the image somewhat by
translating cueva as "cave-house," JW omits the image
completely by a generalizing shift of cueva to "house." LH
endeavours to preserve the original image, but provide an explanation at the same time: "Interior of a house dug into a cliff, where the Girl lives." DJ uses the same technique but takes it one step further as he translates "Interior of the Bride’s house, carved out of the rock itself," and also includes a lengthy endnote on the particularities of such dwellings and where they occur.

In the description of the setting for the first scene of the second act, "Zaguan de la casa de la Novia," the word zaguan is likewise adapted to a more familiar setting and is translated differently by all translators: "courtyard" by LH, "vestibule" by GN, "entrance hall" by GL/O’C, "hall" by WO, "porch" by SB, "entrance" by GE, "veranda" by D/Z, and "hallway" by DJ. Yet another example occurs in the directions at the beginning of the second scene of the second act when an element of the natural surroundings of the Bride’s house is mentioned: "Grandes chumberas," which is translated as "Big/large fig trees" by LH and D/Z, "Large prickly pears" by GN and GE, the more general "Large cactus trees/cacti" by GL/O’C, WO and DJ. JW, on the other hand, is more specific, translating "Big barber figs (a variety of cactus)", while SB interprets the segment as "formidable looking cliffs."

Another problem that the translators encountered in the same stage direction involves the monotony and harshness of the landscape, which García Lorca described as follows:
"Panorama de mesetas color barquillo, todo endurecido como paisaje de cerámica popular." Some of the more inventive translations of this description are GB's "Background of plains the colour of biscuit, and everything hard as if it were a landscape in popular ceramic;" LH's "Panorama of earth-colored mesas, all hard as a plaque in ceramics;" DJ's "In the background brownish hills in sharp relief, as though painted on ceramics" and SB's "The tablelands beyond are an ochre colour--burnt uncompromisingly on to the landscape like the colours of local ceramics." It is in a passage like this one that the amount of personal experience that the translator brings to the translation and his strategy of conveying meaning are noticeable, as three different problems are to be solved: first, an equivalent needs to be found for mesetas, with which an American or British reader may not be familiar (only one translator uses the term "mesas"); secondly, the color attributed to such a landscape, going from tan to ochre to "water colored" (GN); and last, the image of hardness comparable to landscapes on ceramics, an original one by Lorca, but one that may speak more to Spanish audiences, who have a long tradition with that kind of craft.

The colors used in the descriptions of the playing spaces of Bodas de sangre offer a particular problem for the translator as well. They have been the object of a number of
articles that emphasize mainly the symbolic value of these colors and their reinforcement of the themes of the play. In the first act, the original lists the following colors, associated with particular objects: amarillo (habitación), rosa (habitación), rosa (flores, lazos), blanco (paredes), azul (jarros). The second act is characterized by more detail and nuance in the colors. As opposed to the stark, primary colors of the first act, this act gives the following stage directions: "Entonación en blancos grises y azules fríos (...) tonos sombríos y plateados (...) color barquillo."

The third act, on the other hand, has a marked absence of colors other than the intense and radiant blue light of the moon in the first scene and the predominance of white in the walls, stairs, arches, ceiling and floor of the playing space of the last scene. In the latter, the author specifies the following: "No habrá ni un gris, ni una sombra, ni siquiera lo preciso para la perspectiva." This predominance of the color white contrasts with the red skein of wool and the dark colors in the costume of the characters. It is also a shocking opposition to the murky atmosphere of the woods created in the previous scene.

Various studies exist on the differences in color perception between peoples of different cultures. These studies usually compare societies far removed, and conclude that colors are often compartmentalized depending on the
language spoken. We may note, however, that changes do not only occur in languages spoken in societies of different levels of development, but that even in the translation of this play translators deliberately change the colors in a few specific instances. A first instance may be found in the manipulation of a less common color term such as barquillo, which, as mentioned before, was translated in a number of different ways in the various English versions. The Diccionario de uso del Español (DUE), lists barquillo as follows:

1) Golosina consistente en una hoja muy fina de pasta de harina sin levadura, dulce, tostada y crujiente, a veces en forma más o menos parecido a un barco, otras veces arrollada en forma de canutillo, o en cualquier otra forma.

2) (n. calif. usado con "de" o en aposición). Se aplica al color de los barquillos, o del grupo de colores claros con mezcla de ocre y amarillo: 'Un vestido de color barquillo'.

The ways in which this term is translated in English in this play varies: "light brown" (JW), "earth-colored" (LH), "Water-colored" (GN), "light tan" (GL/O'C), "tan colored" (WO), "ochre colour" (SB), "the colour of biscuit" (GE), "The color of paste" (D/Z), "brownish" (DJ). Obviously, changes in this color in the English version could possibly be explained by lack of research on the part of some of the translators. However, the fact that in the original version an uncommon qualifier such as barquillo is used instead of, for instance, pardo and that this nuance is ignored by some translators who translate to the more common "tan" or
"brownish" may point to the desire to make the text more accessible to a greater part of the target audience.

Another instance, which, in our opinion, cannot be blamed on a misinterpretation of an unusual term such as barquillo in the original, may be found in the stage direction at the beginning of the third scene of Act One. Part of this direction reads as follows in the original: "Al fondo, una cruz de grandes flores rosa. Las puertas, redondas, con cortinajes de encaje y lazos rosa. Por las paredes, de material blanco y duro (...)." LH and GN substitute "rosa" in both instances by "red." Whereas a misreading cannot be completely ruled out, we are of the opinion that this change by the translators was a deliberate one, and that it served the purpose of accentuating the symbolic imagery of the red/white colors, repeated later on in the third act. The fact that the flowers mentioned are in the form of a cross, with its symbolic religious overtones of ritual sacrifice and human suffering may have been a motivation for these translators to make this change in order to accentuate the connection of the sacrifice of the innocent. It needs to be noted here also that some of the translators eliminate the symbol of the cross and substitute with "big rose colored flowers" (JW) or "wreath of pink flowers" (SB). The original's use of the color rose instead of red was certainly not arbitrary. It forms part of García Lorca's framework of gradual intensification of color
imagery, going from the softer colors to the stark contrasts red/white and black/white in the last act. It may even be suggested that the author used some of the colors associated with the bullfight, with which he was fascinated. In particular, he may have had in mind the capa used in this sport, which has one side in yellow, and the other in a deep rose or magenta. In contrast to the colors of the capa, the muleta or smaller cape used at the end of the bullfight is entirely bright red.

The props that are mentioned at a few instances throughout Bodas de sangre are, in general, translated faithfully by the translators in the English versions. As with all translations, in some cases it was necessary for the translators to interpret, as with the items cobres and flores populares in the stage direction "Habitación pintada de rosa con cobres y ramos de flores populares." DJ translates "A room painted pink, filled with gleaming copperware and flowers," thus emphasizing the item cobres more than the flowers, which receive equal attention in the original. All other translators retain the image of the "flores populares," by either adding the adjectives "common" (GN, GL/O'C, GE), "everyday" (D/Z), "wild" (SB), by expanding into "common garden flowers" (WO) or by interpreting "paper flowers" (LH). As one of the meanings of cobre, DUE lists "Batería de cocina, de cobre." The latter is further defined as "conjunto de pucheros, ollas,
Although it is not specified as such in the original, the item cobre to a native speaker of Spanish would therefore usually be associated with a kitchen. Whereas one translator, JW, omits this entire stage direction, some of the others render this term by specifying that a kitchen is involved: "copper kitchen utensils" (GN), "kitchen furniture" (D/Z). Others translate by the more general "copperware" (GL/O’C, WO, SB and DJ) or "copper plates" (LH).

Another prop that seemingly was problematic for the translators may be found in the last act, where two girls are busy "devanando una madeja roja." This particular prop has been the object of attention of various critics, who have pointed out the symbolic value of the color red, referring to the blood spilled and the action of the unwinding of fate in man’s life. Most translators refer to the girls’ activity as "winding a red skein" (GN, GL/O’C, WO) or a "skein of red/crimson wool" (SB, GE, DJ). JW lists as an alternative to skein the word "spindle," and D/Z conserve the Spanish word followed by an explanatory phrase "(...) unwinding a madeja--a skein of red wool." In a subsequent stage direction, which features the skein again, only the Spanish word is used "she pauses, staring at the madeja."
One last example of a prop that is understood to be present, but understated in the original, and presented in a more specific manner in the translations, occurs in the first few pages of the play. The Mother, cursing all knives and other weapons, as she looks for a knife her son requested, is described as doing so "entre dientes y buscándola." Whereas D/Z omit this stage direction altogether, all other translators insert it. While some of them follow the original by never specifying whether the knife is ever found and handed over, GL/O'C clarify that she is looking "for the knife" and subsequently close this action by adding another stage direction, "she takes a knife from a kitchen chest." Naturally, the action of actually producing the knife on stage instead of just talking about it can have a powerful impact and create certain expectations in the audience. With regard to this, Jiří Veltrusky has remarked the following:

The prop is not always passive. It has a force (...) that attracts a certain action to it. As soon as a certain prop appears on the stage, this force which it has provokes in us the expectation of a certain action. It is so closely linked to this action that its use for another purpose is perceived as a scenic metonymy.19

The lighting directions present in the original are followed closely in the various English versions of the play. In some instances, a simple mentioning of the time of day will trigger a lighting change, whereas on other occasions the change of light on stage is specified in a
much more detailed way, as for instance in the first scene of the last act, with the numerous appearances and disappearances of the Moon. The time indications on which the lighting changes depend are translated in most instances, except in the first scene of the second act, where "Es de noche" is omitted by JW and WO. LH, on the other hand, specifies that "It is night, shortly before dawn," most likely to make more smooth the transition to the following lighting direction, which occurs about halfway through the scene: "Empieza a clarear el día."

A second type of stage direction that concerns the playing space does not refer to material items such as props and decor, but rather controls the occurrence of off-stage sounds. These non-linguistic signs create a desired atmosphere, and except in a few instances, proceed from activities by humans. They consist of the sounds of voices off-stage, screams or singing without actual text being discernible, musical instruments being played, and guests knocking at the door. One exception to this is the sound of a horse being heard at the end of the first Act, which is not so much a stage direction that creates an atmosphere as one that carries the plot and events into an entirely new dimension. Whereas previously the presence of Leonardo around the Bride’s house was only hinted at, this single noise makes all those hints real and leaves the reader/spectator with a sense of foreboding and doom.
regarding the wedding. The Spanish "Se siente el ruido de un caballo," makes this sense of impending doom especially tangible, as the generality and neutralness of this statement clashes with the intensity of the moment and the mixture of excitement and fear that the Bride experiences when she hears the sound. GN, GL/O'C, WO and GE follow this lead and translate literally, "The sound of a horse is heard." Other translators specify more, by substituting part of the animal for the whole, "The sound of hooves/hoofbeats is heard," (SB and DJ) or by making this stage direction slightly more dramatic "the clattering of hoofs is heard." (JW) Two translators specify instead the direction in which the animal is going: LH, "there is the sound of a horse drawing near," and DJ "The sound of an approaching horse is heard." Since the original does not give any specification of the particular sound made by the horse, or whether the animal is approaching or rather leaving the premises, it creates more uncertainty in the reader/spectator than a more specific stage direction. In the case of the last two translators the audience is left wondering what will happen next, after the horse has reached the house, and the next act does not bring any clarification.

Other sounds occur more frequently, and one example of an atmosphere-enhancing sound is that of the various musical instruments. Some of the musical instruments serve merely as
accompaniment to the text of the songs, yet others clearly play a mood-provoking part. Some examples of the latter are guitars and violins. The guitar sounds appear mostly in the second act, and are associated with the joyfulness and hubbub of the wedding festivities. They are often mingled with other sounds, such as "algazara," "voces fuera," as well as other musical instruments such as "palillos y panderetas." The violins, on the other hand, express the tragedy to come and the ominousness that pervades the first scene of the last act. They accompany the entrance of the tragic chorus of the Woodcutters, and are associated with the woods, as is stated in the following stage direction: "Se oyen lejanos dos violines que expresan el bosque." Also, after the confrontation between Leonardo and the Bridegroom, the music of the violins is cut off abruptly, symbolizing the death of the two men.

In the English versions of Bodas de sangre, the reference to the sound of guitars is translated in all cases except in one, where JW omits the reference in conjunction with that of the castanets and tambourines at the end of the first scene of the second act. Where the latter two instruments are concerned, tambourines is the translation in all other versions, whereas "palillos" is usually translated as castanets or castanettes, but rendered as "sticks" by D/Z and omitted by DJ, who translates this stage directions as "Rhythmical music of guitars and tambourines."
The three instances in which the music of the violins is heard are rendered by all translators, which may indicate a greater willingness on their part to translate sounds that have a more universally understandable meaning as opposed to the other instruments, which make the play more bound to the Spanish culture. LH emphasizes the literary and poetic quality of the violin music when he translates the stage direction "Se oyen lejanos dos violines que expresan el bosque" as "Two violins in the distance sing like the singing of the woods."

2) Stage Directions Referring to the Actors

Since this study of the translation of the stage directions endeavours to treat the stage directions in a bottom to top manner, with those at the top most closely related to the spoken text, including such directions as those dealing with tone and intonation, the next ones to be considered are those that involve the physical appearance of the actors. These stage directions give indications about the characters' make up, hair style and costumes. Frequent insertion of these stage directions may indicate a wish on the author's part to situate the play in a certain time or social class, and may also indicate a character's age, status or personality. In Bodas de sangre, the indications referring to make up and hairstyle are rather scarce, but those of costume occur more frequently. On only one occasion
does Lorca give an indication of the age of a character through his hair color. When the Father enters, he states "Es anciano, con el cabello blanco, reluciente." JW translates this as "He is an old man with white and long hair," but all other translators render as "white and shining hair." WO uses the color gray instead of white for the father's hair color. Another instance in which the hairstyle of one of the characters is used in this play is that of the Bride. In the second act, much attention is devoted to, and several of the repliques address, the matter of the grooming of the Bride's hair, as well as the positioning of the orange blossom and her reluctance to wear it. This orange blossom, which may be considered part of the Bride's costume, serves as an indicator of the Bride's state of mind, and her wearing or not wearing it at different times points to her doubts as well as to certain events that have happened off-stage. One particularly disturbing item for some translators was the hairstyle of the Bride that was described as follows by Lorca: "Sobre el peinado de visera lleva la corona de azahar" (Act 2, Scene 1). JW, LH, D/Z and DJ simplify the hairdress by simply indicating that the wreath or crown is on her hair or on her head, with SB not indicating the exact position and simply stating: "She wears the crown of orange blossom." The remaining translators do attempt to indicate a more detailed type of hairstyle, from the rather vague "About her hairdress" (GN) to the similar...
translations by GL/O'C, "Upon her hair, brushed in a wave over her forehead" and WO, "Above her hair, brushed in a wave over her forehead," to a more contemporary "On her hair, which falls across her forehead," by GE.

Exact indications of the characters' costumes are not common in Bodas de sanare and in general are translated faithfully in the English versions. Some instances of deletions of at least part of these directions may be observed, however. In the first scene of the play, it is noteworthy that only the dress of a minor character, the neighbor, is described in any detail. "Aparece en la puerta una vecina vestida de color oscuro, con pañuelo a la cabeza." The two elements of this description are handled in different ways by the different translators: All translators mention the item pañuelo, either as a "shawl" (JW) or as the more literal "'kerchief." Where the color is concerned, GN assumes that "color oscuro" must mean "black," and SB translates with the rather negative "drab colours," whereas all the others maintain the item as "dark." JW and GL/O'C omit the item "vestida de color oscuro" altogether, yet photographs from the different productions using this translation provide evidence of the fact that the neighbour was dressed in black in most cases. It may be assumed that the costume designers and directors of the different performances had a mental image of Spanish country people
dressed in black, even if this was not specified in the stage directions.

The next series of stage directions that refer to the actor are by far the most important in Bodas de sangre as they guide the actors’ bodily and vocal expression while they enunciate the theatre text. Two translators in particular are of interest with regard to this series: JW, whose translation contains numerous additions to the original, and, contrariwise, D/Z, who delete quite a few items found in the original. Both cases will be discussed at length below, but first more general remarks that pertain to the other translations are in order.

It has been established previously that the stage directions that refer to the actors’ bodily expression include directions of movement, as well as gestic, mimic and vocal signs. Gestic signs include all activities the characters undertake that are not of a purely mimic kind. They include interaction with the environment and with other characters, and manifestations of the characters’ personality, such as shyness, violence, bitterness and so on. The mimic signs are the ones most closely related to the vocal directions, as they imply a facial expression, and are more frequently than the other directions tied to certain tone and intonation of voice, or emphasis. Vocal directions include tone of voice and intonation, emphasis on the words spoken, speed of enunciation, hesitations or pauses in the
speech. In practice, however, it is impossible to separate these directions in such rigid a manner and as we shall see, often one stage direction will include elements of three or four of the different types. This study will therefore treat the translation of the gestic, mimic and vocal signs signs together.

a) Directions of Movement

Two types of stage directions of movement are the directional ones and those that rule the characters' entrances and exits. Directionals tell those characters remaining on stage where to place themselves or which way to turn. These stage directions bring about a physical displacement of the actors, but they may also simply indicate to whom a character directs a certain remark. This kind of direction is very common in Bodas de sangre. Directions of movement that produce the opposite effect are those that call for an action to be stopped, or suspended, or for a character to remain where he or she is.

It is the indications of movement, of both types, that are most frequently eliminated by all the translators of Blood Wedding: LH omits eight, GN and SB seven, GL/O'C five, WO two, GE one, D/Z sixteen, and DJ six. We note that even translators who render the other types of stage directions in a faithful manner occasionally omit some of the directions of movement. The reasons for this phenomenon may
range from simple oversights to the desire for simplification of the characters' movement on the stage.

Of special interest, in our opinion, is the translators' treatment of the indications of entrance/exit, as they are not only eliminated, but also frequently altered. The directions that govern the characters' entrances and exits on and off the stage may be very simple: a character enters or leaves the scene, without further commentary. In other cases, however, these directions are more complex and may include either a gestic or a mimic sign. If they do not do so in the original, some translators will add details in order to elucidate the actions. SB, for instance, translates "va a salir" as "He goes to the door," thus adding a concrete point of reference on the stage to which the character is directed. The exit/entrance stage directions are present in the theatre text mainly as technical guidelines to the director, and frequently seem a little jarring to the reader who reads the play solely for esthetic reasons. It may be observed that in SB's version, produced exclusively with a reading audience in mind, some of the plain "sale," "entra" and "se va" directions are embellished. "Sale Leonardo," for instance in the second scene of Act One, becomes "Leonardo strides out," clearly a more specific way of leaving the stage. In the same way, the direction "La mujer ha permanecido de pie, inmóvil," in the same scene, was translated by SB as "Leonardo's wife has not
moved, she stands like stone." The addition of the simile imparts a more literary character to this stage direction. Another example of modification that occurs in the translation of the stage directions of entrance/exit is the combination of two or more directions in the original into one in the English versions. Considering, for instance, the stage direction "Aparece la muchacha, alegre. Entra corriendo," which occurs in the second scene of Act One, it may be noted that first the appearance of the girl on stage is mentioned, and then her state of mind, both illustrated by the gestic direction "running". JW, SB and D/Z omit the item "appears" and summarize thus: "A girl runs in, joyously" (D/Z). On the other hand, LH adds an element to the external appearance of the girl that was not present in the original: "A child with pigtails flying, enters gaily, running." Since it is unlikely that pigtails were a common hairdress in the place and time situation of the original, additions such as this one, even if not frequent, may draw in elements that are closer to the reality of the Target Language audience.

b) **Gestic, Mimic and Vocal Signs**

Although in general they are not as frequently eliminated as the directions of movement, stage directions that govern gestic, mimic and vocal signs often present a wide array of different English translations, as they are
the stage directions that seem most open to interpretation by the translators.

One of the directions of this kind that is most frequently omitted is the word dramático, -a, which is a good example of a direction that implies the triggering of gestic and mimic as well as vocal signs: the actor may use gestures or facial expressions to convey this quality, and usually a certain tone of voice will be involved as well. Some translators, such as LH, may have been of the opinion that this stage direction, which appears five times in Bodas de sangre would result in a manner of acting with which an American audience might be unfamiliar, and possibly uncomfortable. LH eliminates all five instances of this stage direction, while GN omits two cases and GL/O’C and D/Z both eliminate one of the five occurrences. It is interesting to note that some translators simply translate this stage direction as "dramatically" every time it appears, but that others use different adverbs at different times. GE, for instance, only translates the item dramático,-a into "dramatically" once, and uses instead "strongly" twice, and "powerfully" and "intensely" at other times.

The phenomenon of having one and the same item of the original rendered differently in all nine English versions of this play occurs in the first scene when the adverb fuerte is applied to the Mother. It is translated as follows: "energetically" (JW), "surprised" (LH), φ (GN),
"sternly" (O'C/GL), "reprovingly" (WO), "suddenly aggressive" (SB), "strongly" (GE), "firmly" (D/Z) and "loudly" by DJ. In other places in the play, the same adverb is translated in yet other ways: "emphatically," "hard," "reprimandingly," "strongly," "with decision (irritation)," "with intensity," "angrily," and so on.

Within the context of translation analysis, an interesting type of vocal sign are the pauses, which define the rhythm of the performance, including both movement and vocal delivery. Bodas de sangre contains fifteen pauses in all, and eleven of them are concentrated in the first act. This act contains the more mundane conversations between the characters, and conveys the slow and at times stilted ways of interaction of the characters. This stands in sharp contrast with the passionate way in which Leonardo and the Bride relate to each other, and Act Three in its entirety, which does not contain any pauses in the original, and in general shows a much accelerated pace. Whereas most of the translators leave the pauses as they were in the original, JW adds no less than sixteen pauses in the first act alone, and twenty one in total throughout the play. Obviously, these additions accentuate, and in certain situations create an extreme slowness in the dialogue. Some of the passages thus give the impression, even more than in the original, of a static tableau with characters that barely move. A good example of this is the third scene in the first act, which
takes place at the Bride’s house. In the conversation between the Bridegroom, his mother and the Father, and later on between the Bride and the Servant, JW adds six more pauses to the original’s six. This translator further specifies whether the pauses should be long or short in four cases, and in one of the two instances where a pause appears in the original as "pausa larga," the less detailed "pause" is used in the English version. In order to further accentuate the slowness in this part of the dialogue, JW adds two other stage directions: "very slow," and "all remain immovable," neither of which can be found in the original. Some of the other translators take a different approach where the pauses are concerned: LH omits four pauses throughout the play, two of which occur in the scene just described at the Bride’s house, and GN and D/Z both omit one.

A Case of Extreme Addition: Jose Weissberger’s Translation

It has been noted previously that Jose Weissberger was the only translator among the group studied here who actually had the opportunity of conferring with the author of Bodas de sangre. In a little known interview, García Lorca himself commented on the changes he suggested to the translators: "La versión será fidelísima, pues yo he reemplazado por otros los vocablos o los giros intraducibles." The result of this meeting with the
author was undoubtedly the previously mentioned set of notes that Weissberger sent to New York, as well as changes in some of the poetry passages, but the meeting may also account for some of the changes in the stage directions. Whereas every translation is, to a certain extent, an interpretation by the individual producing the new version, either with or without the cooperation of the original's author, it is not an exaggeration to say that Weissberger's translation is the most interpretative of all the versions studied here. It is especially in his treatment of the stage directions that this interpretation is the least subtle. When compared to the original, it becomes evident that the English version made by Weissberger contains nearly one hundred additional stage directions, as well as a few omissions, mostly pertaining to scenery, props and costumes.

Besides adding stage directions when none are given in the Spanish text, there are also a number of amplifications of simple stage directions in the original. In the first scene of the third act, for instance, three stage directions with regard to the beggar woman become much more detailed in JW: "Lo mira" is rendered as "Looking at him, her voice acquires a sensual, beautiful quality;" "Se levanta" becomes "She rises, with the poise of a divinity;" and the direction "dramática" is amplified into "cold and cruelly, dramatically."
Appendix A, which lists all the additions in the stage directions made by JW, proves that this translator added stage directions of all kinds, but that his most frequent and elaborate additions serve two purposes: clarification and dramatization of the original text. Weissberger's relative inexperience with the translation of Spanish theatre may be a reason for his attempt to amplify the stage directions in order to elucidate the theatre text, which, according to his own notes, was often puzzling to him. In order to minimize confusion, most probably in the first place for Irene Lewisohn, the director, but ultimately for the American audience, JW both includes simple directions of characters entering and exiting, getting up or sitting down and also some longer ones that clearly endeavour to explain some of the character's actions. Some examples of the former are to be found in the first scene, where JW specifies that the Mother is "squatting down," in the second scene, where Leonardo "drinks," or in the first scene of Act Two where the Bride is "glancing at Novio's tan shoes" before she comments on them. None of these simple actions are mentioned in the original, but in most cases a director would deduce from the text that a certain action is called for. Simple directions of movement or entrance of the original are made much more elaborate in JW: "Entra una vecina" in the last scene becomes "Enters a woman, goes to a corner, remains quiet, hands folded, head down." Thus the simple entrance
has become a direction of movement as well and additionally includes several gestic directions. This direction is closely followed by one that does not appear at all in the original: "While Mother and Novia speak, more women enter, dressed in black and stand against the white wall." The addition of these stage directions by the translator in order to elucidate the action places him on a level similar to that of the director, as he interprets the action and characters of the play not only through the theatre text, but also by means of the drama text. A more blatant example of additions with the clear purpose of clarifying the original occurs at the beginning of the Act Three, where some girls are unwinding a red skein of wool. JW adds the following two stage directions at the end of the first two repliques: "All this is mysterious and purely rhythm. It means that the girls are making an incantation to find out from the strand of wool what has happened at the wedding" and "This is a mysterious allusion to bloodshed--the strand is red."

The second purpose that the addition of stage directions in JW seems to fulfil is the intensification of sentiment and emotion throughout the entire play, although mostly in the repliques of the Mother and the Bride. We have posited previously that on a few occasions LH seemed to use the stage directions in order to strive for the elimination or at least moderation of what an American audience may have
conceived of as heavyhandedness or even melodrama in the language and in some of the characters' behaviour or appearance. LH tried to achieve this by adding touches with which the target audience may have identified--instead of a formal hairdress, a girl with pigtails--and by the repeated deletion of directions such as "dramática." JW, on the other hand, adds many stage directions that enhance the dramatic aspects of the play, and in some cases even create a certain sentimentality that is not present in the original. JW's treatment of the pauses, discussed in the previous section of this chapter, creates a sensation of slowness and immobility throughout the entire play, not present as pronouncedly in the original. This deceleration of the already reduced action in the original contributes to Bitter Oleander evoking a feeling of theatricality, but JW also adds entire clusters of stage directions to passages that may have a strong intensity in the original, yet never fall into the quite melodramatic turn JW often seems to seek. A case in point is to be found in the first scene of Act Three, in the passionate dialogue between Leonardo and the Bride after their elopement. García Lorca specified about this crucial scene only that it should be violent, and full of great sensuality, and achieved this goal with a minimum of stage directions, as well as two other means: the intense quality of the imagery and the use of verse in this passage. The author thus relies mostly on language to externalize the
characters' feelings. There are very few instances in which he provides direction on the ways they should touch, exchange embraces or interact: all the power lies in the words and great freedom is given to each director on how to interpret them on the stage. This is not the case, however, in JW's version, as the following brief passage illustrates.

All additions by JW are underlined:

LEONARDO:
We have taken the step! Be silent. They are almost upon us and I must take you with me.

NOVIA:
(Reacting violently, nearly hating him for her own weakness)
Only by force will I go.

LEONARDO:
(Manly and dominating)
By force? Who was the first to come down the stairs?

NOVIA:
I was the first.

(....)
LEONARDO:
And what hands put the spurs on my boots?

NOVIA:
(Embracing him fervently, between love and hatred)
These hands which are yours. But when they touch you they would crush the branches of your veins and silence their murmer of life.
(Passionately)
I love you! I love you!
(With hatred, shaking him off)
(....)

LEONARDO:
(...)
Like pins of silver my blood turned black.
(very passionately, embracing and sometimes separating)
(....)

LEONARDO:
(lyric and embracing her)
Song birds of the morning
Against the trees they beat.

A Case of Extreme Deletion: the Translation of *Bodas de sangre* by Dewell and Zapata

Michael Dewell and Carmen Zapata, as may be recalled, referred to their translation as "stage-tried", since it was the final product of a series of experiments, trials and revisions made with the help of actors on the stage. It is notable that this translation pares down considerably the number of stage directions, reducing it to 285, as compared to the original's number of 330. There are also five instances of additional stage directions in the D/Z translation, four of which are directions of exits and entrance by the characters. In one case, a replique that may have seemed too Source Text oriented, "Ay," said by both the Mother and the Neighbour in the first scene of the play, has been substituted by the stage direction "She sighs." Appendix A lists all deletions and additions in the translation by D/Z.

Contrary to the deletions in the JW translation, which affected mostly stage directions referring to the scenery and costumes, the omissions made by D/Z involve exclusively directions that pertain to the actors. In many cases gestic, mimic and vocal signs are eliminated, as well as entrances, exits, directional indications and pauses. Appendix B, which provides a listing of all omitted stage directions by
scene, demonstrates that the characters most affected are the Bridegroom and the Mother, with six and five omissions respectively. Next are Leonardo, with four, and the Wife, Bride and Servant with three omissions each. Some of the minor characters are affected by an occasional omission as well: each of the Girls, the Woodcutters and the Little Girl.

Stage indications that determine the movement of the characters are of a more technical nature, and are often meant more as a guide to possible directors than as information to the reader of the play. In the D/Z translations, several directions are omitted of characters sitting down, entering or getting up, and the motivation in those cases is usually the elimination of redundancy or of actions that may have seemed unnecessary to the translators or of no interest to the reader. In spite of their claim that this translation is performance-oriented, it may be assumed that the elimination of some of the stage directions of movement is a concession to the reader, as the reduction of scenic indications makes the text more fluid and less cluttered. This assumption is also based on the fact that some of the preserved indications are made more narrative than the original ones. A plain "pausa," for instance, will be rendered by D/Z as "She pauses" (Act 1, Scene 1), "There is a moment of silence" (Act 1, Scene 1), "There is a pause" (Act 1, Scene 2 and Act 2, scene 1), "After a
pause" (Act 1, Scene Three). This narratization of the stage directions, which occurs throughout the play makes the text more pleasurable to read.

The elimination of several directions of movement might make a play more static, but since the occurrence of this phenomenon is low here, it may not come across to the reader as such. In general their omission will not present characters in a different light as may those from which an action or emotion, expressed by gestic, mimic and vocal signs, ensue. One of the most flagrant omissions is a stage direction that occurs at the end of the first scene and that combines two different types of direction: movement and gestures: "La Madre se dirige a la puerta de la izquierda. En medio del camino se detiene y lentamente se santigua." D/Z, when choosing to delete that particular direction, may have had one or several motivations: ending the scene with the Mother left alone on the stage may have been considered a more dramatic close to the scene, as it accentuates the Mother's utter loneliness; it also introduces a circularity in the scene, the premonition that things will be repeated. On the other hand, the translators may have wanted to eliminate the religious reference to the sign of the cross.

The omission of gestic, mimic and vocal stage directions may occur with the objective of changing the way a character is perceived by the audience. Although a relatively small number of stage directions are omitted per
character in this translation, it is of importance to note that all the vocal, mimic and gestic directions omitted for a specific character occur in the same scene. The Mother, for instance, loses three stage directions in the first scene of the play, as does the Bridegroom, and none in the rest of the play. Leonardo also loses his three stage directions "serio," "fuerte" and "agrio" in the second scene and so on. If the elimination of these stage directions were spread throughout the play, most likely it would not have made much difference, since the occurrences would be so sporadic. The fact that they are concentrated and furthermore occur when the characters are first introduced does affect the audience’s perception of these characters and of the dialogues, which become somewhat less caustic.

The directions that are most frequently omitted are those that create a certain intensity in the spoken words: directions involving words such as fuerte, serio,-a, agrio,-a, dramática, sarcástica and also tímida, alegre, and riendo. Although one would assume this may make the dialogue less intense, another phenomenon in this translation may be detected that, in our opinion, is closely related to the omission of the stage directions, especially those pertaining to voice and intonation: the addition of a great number of punctuation marks. Dewell and Zapata add two hundred and fifty exclamation marks throughout the play, as well as various other punctuation items, that were
nonexistent or rare in the original: suspension points and dashes, as well as question marks and commas. Of course, this does not concern the question of the stage directions but rather that of the textual analysis, and will therefore be discussed in the following chapter, especially from the point of view of comparison between the various translators. What is of importance here is the fact that such an extreme addition of exclamation marks has a profound impact on the play, making it more animate and emotional. Thus, in many cases it will counteract and supersede the elimination of the stage directions. Two instances where "fuerte" is deleted become repliques that have an added exclamation mark. One of those occurs in the first scene of the second act: in the original the Servant's replique "No salgas así" is accompanied by the stage direction "fuerte," which is deleted in the D/Z version, where the replique becomes: "Don't come out here like that!" On the other hand, the elimination of certain stage directions, in conjunction with the addition of an exclamation mark may sometimes change the nature of a replique considerably, as the following example from the first scene of the play illustrates:

    NOVIO: (Bajando la cabeza) Calle usted.
    BRIDEGROOM: Mother, be quiet!

In the English version, the Bridegroom assumes a rather rude attitude in order to express his frustration immediately, whereas the original draws the young man's mounting
frustration gradually in the next three repliques by the Bridegroom. The replique following the one cited above has no stage direction, only the request to stop in the form of a question, and in the third replique the direction "fuerte" is added in order to demand the Mother to stop in a more forceful way. Interestingly, the D/Z version omits this stage direction, thus also eliminating the gradual build-up of the emotion.

Conclusions

Of the nine translations studied here, most follow the original’s stage directions in a fairly consistent manner. However, at one time or another modification occurs in each of the English versions. This modification may take the form of an omission or an addition, an embellishment or elaboration, a recombination of separate stage directions into one longer one, a clarification or a simplification. The paradox of stage directions is that they are placed within the text in order to somehow modify the performance: a character does not just speak, but speaks with intensity, dramatically, bitterly. However, being linguistic entities, the stage directions are available only to the reader of the text, and only the reader profits from their embellishments by the translator. In the case of additions or eliminations however, the performance is affected to a much greater extent.
When merely a few shifts occur in the stage directions, it is difficult to determine whether they were produced deliberately by the translator--and if so, with which purpose in mind--or if an oversight or misinterpretation took place. In some cases, however, the changes are so extensive that they point to a definite strategy on the translators' part. JW stands out for his profuse additions to the original, clarifying and emphasizing the characters' actions as he sees fit. D/Z, contrarily, delete quite a number of stage directions, often replacing them by other means, such as punctuation. The study of LH's treatment of the stage directions, with its few, yet selective additions and deletions, seems to point to the desire on the part of this translator to make the play more accessible to the target audience. SB, though not frequently omitting or adding entire stage directions, seems to strive for greater 'literariness,' by embellishing some of them, making them more pleasant to read. The same holds true for D/Z, who omit some of directions they consider superfluous, and narratize some of the remaining ones to add interest for the reader. One may therefore assume that both of these translations are reader-oriented.
NOTES


2. Tadeusz Kowzan, *Littérature et spectacle: dans leurs rapports esthétiques, thématiques et sémiologiques* (Varsovie: Editions Scientifiques de Pologne, 1970) 172. The scheme that incorporates these terms also makes the distinction between signs that refer to the actor and those that are "hors de l'acteur," and between auditory and visual signs.


5. Pavis 404.


9. This was the case in the recent production of *Blood Wedding* at the Ohio State University, where the translated text served as the basis for the lyrics of some of the songs composed by the musical director (Cf. Chapter Five).


11. The term "replique" in this study will be used to indicate any utterance by the characters, however short or long, that lasts until it is interrupted by an utterance by another character.

12. *Yerma*, with 661 repliques and 209 stage directions in total, and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* with 905 repliques and 394 stage directions.


18. Francisco García Lorca 339.


20. This statement by García Lorca originally appeared in Pablo Suero, "Hablando de la Barraca con el poeta García Lorca," Noticias Gráficas, 15 Nov. 1933. It was quoted in the introduction to Bodas de sangre, Allen Josephs and Juan Caballero, eds. (Madrid: Cátedra, 1990) 42.
CHAPTER IV

INTO THE TEXT: TEXTEMES AND THEIR ENGLISH COUNTERPARTS

Up to now, this study has examined some of the elements that are external to the text of Bodas de sangre as well as those elements that form its framework, and from these certain hypotheses have been suggested about the translators' norms and strategies when dealing with this text. The textual analysis, the object of this chapter, entails the observation and, where possible, the explanation of shifts between the Source Text and its nine English variants. It must be kept in mind that descriptive translation studies do not compare texts in order to find out whether equivalence exists between them; they assume, rather, that that equivalence exists and then proceed to determine its degree and nature. The factor that frequently and most crucially determines the equivalence between the Source Text (ST) and the Target Text (TT) is that of the translational norms adopted by the translators. In previous chapters, through the examination of the translators' backgrounds and of information regarding the reception and genesis of the various translations as found in the translators' notes and comments, we have attempted to
determine what the initial and operational norms of some of the translators were. It remains to be seen whether the textual analysis will confirm our findings to this point.

Selecting the Passages

It goes without saying that the study of a complex play such as Bodas de sangre, that furthermore has so many translated versions, cannot be exhaustive. We will limit the analysis to two passages, and, within those passages, primarily consider optional shifts, unless an obligatory shift brings about an definite and major change in the text. The passages have been selected for their diversity of elements and for their particular embodiment of textemes that create the intrinsic characteristics of this text.

The patterns of imagery and the strong audial and visual qualities of Bodas de sangre are created in part by the diversity of the levels of language encountered in the text and the different impressions these levels create. This play, with its juxtaposition of passages in prose and in poetry, and of common, earthy characters, such as the Father and the Servant, with supernatural characters such as the Moon, the Woodcutters and Death, draws the audience’s or readers’ attention from a realistic, even prosaic level to a level dominated by figurative language and surrealism.

In the selection of passages that will be given greater scrutiny, we have strived for as much diversity as possible,
given the many types of discourse available in this play, yet at the same time we wanted to be systematic. We have therefore opted to analyse the opening scenes of the first and of the third act, which offer good contrastive text types, while at the same time possessing in common some of the textemes that are extremely interesting from the point of view of translation. The first scene of the play is characterized by seemingly realistic language, in the dialogues between mother and son and mother and neighbor. The first scene of Act Three is of a highly poetic nature, with the presence on stage of the Woodcutters, the Moon and Death, and finally a dialogue between the Bride and Leonardo. All of the dialogue in this scene is characterized by lyrical language, different sentence structures, and an extensive network of rhetorical devices and tropes that create what has been called a grammar of images.¹

Selecting the Textemes

The comparison between this Source Text and its Target Texts shares with any comparative effort the fact that it is partial and that it is indirect. Partial, since only certain aspects are compared, and indirect since these aspects are compared by means of a "tertium comparationis" which acts as the invariant of the comparison. This intermediary has been called the Adequate Translation (AT) by Gideon Toury and consists of an inventory of all the textemes that are
relevant to the text or to certain aspects of the text under study. The shifts that inevitably occur between the textemes of the original and those of its variants can then be determined in a more systematic way, and hypotheses may be postulated about the effect of those shifts on the text as a whole.

The texteme, or basic unit of comparison, includes all elements that possess textual functions:

Linguistic elements entering into a literary text carry with them the functions that they possess by virtue of the linguistic and the literary systems (codes). But as the text imposes on them its own organization (structuration), the new frame of reference acts as a system in its own right, and these elements turn into textual ones through a network of relations among themselves and between them and the text as a whole. This textual system of relations lends the textual elements textual functions.²

From this it follows that textemes are flexible rather than fixed units of comparison, that they may be different or at least of different importance for every text and that they do not necessarily correspond to the traditional linguistic units of textual functions: "Any type of element may become a texteme, since all types of signs inserted into a literary text may acquire textual functions, even major ones. Signs which are habitually regarded as subordinate, trivial or redundant are no exception."³ A good example of the latter is punctuation. Scholars have lamented the lack of attention devoted in literary criticism to punctuation, and graphic elements in general.⁴ Even if the graphic
organization of the text on paper is not as important in *Bodas de sangre* as it would be in a vanguardist poem, it is of importance where the relationship between the theatre text and the performance text is concerned. Graphemic elements are crucial in the author's quest for correspondence between content and manner of expression: "El espacio es así componente gráfico del signo lingüístico y las palabras pueden invadir el campo de la pintura, o intentar sustituir lo que la práctica escrita había arrebatado a la oralidad: la expresividad sonora del recitado y del canto."5

From the above it follows that textemes can take the form of fragments of words, words, sentences, paragraphs or even longer passages of text, depending on what function these elements fulfill within the entire translated text under study. The selection of the textemes to be included in the AT will vary from text to text. One important factor to keep in mind is the nature of the material under study: "Being a literary text, ST is thus structured on the basis of two codes: a primary, linguistic one, and a secondary one, which could be termed "textual" or "literary." 6 We would like to add that in the present analysis, two subcodes of the literary text come into play as well, namely those of the theatre text and those of the poetry text, which will also have to be taken into account in the comparative analysis of the original and its translations. The first and
foremost criterion of selection is based on the particularities of this work, the elements Lorca used in order to convey the message and create the atmosphere he had in mind when writing this play. Since Bodas de sangre is such a complex, hybrid text, the textemes that are of importance are part of the poetic component of the text as well as of its theatrical component. Therefore, the selection of the textemes will be based on existing literary analyses of this play, and on theories of poetic and theatrical analysis.

It will prove useful to further arrange individual textemes in broad categories in order to organize and reduce the number of individual items. Under the general heading of "Cultural Textemes," for instance, we will deal here with textemes that refer to customs, lexical items and idiomatic expressions. Under the heading of "Grammatical Textemes" we will focus mainly on punctuation and syntax. Finally, we will consider three additional categories of textemes that are of importance in this text: they are rhetorical, deictic and prosodic textemes.

The discussion of prosodic textemes will focus on metre and versification. Obviously, this category is most applicable to the poetry passages, and therefore will not be included in the discussion of the first scene of Act One, which is entirely in prose. The cultural textemes, on the other hand, seem to be more abundant in the prose passages,
since they find their expression mostly in everyday speech. They refer to a specific cultural context---Southern Spain---in contrast to the universality of the passages in poetry. However, we will examine the question of whether cultural textemes play a role in the poetic passages as well.

The rhetorical textemes include all kinds of devices used by Lorca in order to create the imagery and textual style in Bodas de sangre. They occur in both the prose and poetry passages. Finally, the analysis of the deictic textemes, so typical of theatre texts, represents a continuation of the investigation started in the previous chapter, as they are closely related to some types of stage directions. This category of textemes has often been used in descriptive translation analysis, as it is one of the most subtle ways in which a text can be manipulated, either voluntarily or unconsciously.

In a text such as Bodas de sangre, many textemes are what Toury calls "junctions," or textemes that have aspects that fulfill more than one textual function and thus overlap the different categories of textemes. A case in point would be for instance the use of tú and usted in the original text, clearly a grammatical problem, but one which can have repercussions on the deictic as well as on the cultural level of the text. Junctions will be discussed within the category of textemes in which they fulfill the most important function.
The first scene of the first act is one of only two scenes in Bodas de sangre that contain no passages in poetry. This does not mean, however, that the language is completely naturalistic. Even though this dialogue, insofar as content is concerned, could occur in any number of realist plays of the nineteenth or twentieth century, in it Lorca manages to lay the basis for certain patterns of imagery as well as for some of the main themes that will be developed throughout the play. This scene carries great importance for a number of reasons: it sets the tone of the characters' way of thinking: the Mother represents and expresses the traditional values of honor and family loyalty and the role of men and women in their marriage and in society. Through her conversation with her son, the reader or spectator receives indications of the Mother's personal history as well, the basis for many of her motivations. In order to do this, Lorca refers to certain local cultural traditions, which will be the first thing we shall look at in our analysis. The environment in which the characters of Bodas de sangre move, though founded in the reality of Andalusia, is also a dramatic world, which enables the playwright to change or leave unspecified certain things in order to fulfill his theme or purpose. To a lesser extent, the translator, as well as possible directors of this play,
are endowed with the same power. They may do this by toning down cultural elements, which various translators of this play do, or by changing the context altogether to a different locale, which is what the director of a recent production of this play did, situating the play in India instead of in Spain (cf. Chapter Five). Besides the cultural elements of the play, the dramatic world can also be changed by manipulating the deictic textemes. We notice that in Bodas de sangre, spatial and temporal markers are deliberately kept very vague. And, as our research will indicate, some translators are eager to make these markers more concrete, doing so in a number of different ways. We have mentioned in the previous chapter that some translators add stage directions that refer to deictic relationships, such as those directing a character to speak to a certain other character, even if this was not specified in the original. There are some instances of translators doing this within the text also.

Where the rhetorical aspects are concerned, even in this prose passage Lorca uses certain devices that may be termed poetic. He develops a pattern of floral and vegetative imagery that will run through the play, and establishes some strong central metaphors that will be developed as the play progresses, such as those that have to do with blood and knives.
In this passage, in our opinion, the main problems of translation stem from two elements: the references to a certain cultural mentality or world view, and the invasion of poetic elements in an otherwise realist language. Therefore, though other aspects will be considered also, the analysis in this passage will focus on those two closely related elements.

**CULTURAL TEXTEMES**

Much has been written about Lorca’s introduction into his works of items that refer to his beloved Andalusia. Although no location is directly mentioned in the text, *Bodas de sangre* is clearly set in the Andalusia that Lorca knew from his youth. Indeed, the play is pervaded with elements that refer to the Andalusian context, such as culture-bound figures of speech, objects, traditions, customs and folk wisdoms. It will be clear that the translators, rendering this text for American or British audiences are faced with the difficult choice of adequacy versus acceptability. We will be analysing these cultural textemes in a bottom to top manner. First, we will see what the translators did with culture that has actually been fixed in language by means of idioms and expressions. One particular form of expressions that we will include are those that accompany leave takings and greetings. Here, equivalent expressions will often exist, or the image will
be sufficiently clear to permit translation in a satisfactory manner. Secondly, we will consider references to certain objects that form part of the cultural context. Naturally these are often quite difficult to translate as they entail the choice between preserving the local color or approaching the audience to the play. Finally, we will analyze references to customs or traditions. These are particularly problematic for the translators, since often no such traditions exist in the target culture. The translators then face the choice of eliminating the reference, clarifying with explanations, for example in footnotes, or substituting an equivalent or near equivalent tradition in the target culture.

**Idioms**

In the introduction to his translation David Johnston rightly made the following remarks: "Perhaps no one Andalusian would speak with the wealth of expressions as do Lorca’s characters, but a Spanish audience would immediately recognize and respond to the powerful sense of a community voice that the playwright has vested into each and every one of those characters." One of the ways in which the playwright achieves this "community voice" is by inserting proverbs, folk wisdom, popular expressions and typical forms of address throughout the play. Again, the translators will be faced here with the dilemma of translating literally,
thus risking that the target audience does not comprehend
the reference, or of substituting by what they consider a
suitable alternative in the Target Language, or of
attempting to achieve that sense of community in some other
way.

The following few examples will illustrate some of the
different strategies the translators have adopted. (We will
exclude here those expressions that contain images of
flowers or other vegetation, as we will deal with those in
the next segment.) Some of the expressions are translated
literally in all cases because they are considered
sufficiently clear for target audiences to be able to
comprehend them or because they are equivalent or similar to
an expression in the Target Language. An example of this
case is "un hombre, que es un toro." Still, although the
image is rendered literally, there are certain variations in
the different translations, which have to do with a desire
on the translator's part to clarify the image or to make it
sound more acceptable to the ear of the Target Language
audience. The translator who renders this expression in the
most literal way is GE, who translates "a man who's a bull."
JW and D/Z emphasize the likeness of man and bull by means
of a subordinate phrase "a man who is like a bull," probably
in order to avoid the ambiguity created by the context "to
finish off a man like a bull," as found in the translation
by SB. GL/O'C and WO use appositions to introduce the
comparison: "a man--a bull of a man" and "a man ... a man like a bull," respectively. LH and GN both endeavour to make the comparison as clear as possible by mentioning the similarity between the two items: "a man (who is) strong as a bull." Of course, in the context of the original, the image of the bull does not only conjure images of strength and valor, but also of the sacrifice of bulls during the bullfight. Thus, the fact that the Mother mentions it here is a forewarning of the tragic outcome of the play as well.

Another technique of Lorca's to suggest the community voice is to transform an existing expression by giving it one or more new elements, so that it is still vaguely familiar, but at the same time different. At one point, for instance, the Mother says: "Eso me gusta. Los hombres, hombres; el trigo, trigo." In his comments on his translation, DJ has noted that this replique echoes the Spanish proverb "llamar al pan pan y al vino vino," but that "the fact that it depends on the linguistic frame of reference of its audience for its success means that a literal English translation is impossible." With the exception of DJ, all translators preserve the two items, men and wheat, but combine them in various ways: some of the combinations may be called comparative, as in "men to be men, as wheat is wheat" (JW), "Men are men like wheat is wheat" (GN), others are juxtaposed: "men, men, wheat, wheat" (GL/O'C), "manly men and wheat of the wheat" (WO) and "Men
that are men, wheat that is wheat." (D/Z) Some combinations also express a judgement: "Men should be men and wheat, wheat!" (SB); "Men to be men; (and) wheat, wheat" (GE) and (LH). DJ eliminates the item "trigo" and renders this replique as follows: "That's the way it should be. Men...life..."

Since it is clear that in many cases expressions of the original lose at least part of their connotative value in the translation, some translators apparently decided to compensate by substituting with common expressions in English or by introducing folkloric or colloquial expressions when none are used in the original in order to transfer the community voice from the source culture to the target culture. The following few examples, all taken still from the first scene of Act One, illustrate that this strategy is adopted by three translators especially, GN, SB and DJ. The remark by the neighbor "Las cosas pasan," for instance, is translated by most translators in a fairly literal way, with variations of "things happen/pass." GN and SB give this expression a more proverbial ring, however, by rendering it as "so much water has flown under the bridge" and "life goes on," respectively.

GN, translating the Mother's replique, "Una mujer con un hombre, y ya está," introduces the saying "(...) and the cards are played." The same translator, instead of rendering literally the expression "como si me dieran una pedrada en
la frente," as the others translators do, substitutes with "as if I’d been slapped in the face." SB introduces the expressions "that’s cold consolation" for "todo eso son invenciones, pero no consuelos" and "brown as berries" for "iban negros los chiquillos(...) ." She also intensifies some of the Mother’s words by adding popular images: "brood of assassins" for "familia de matadores" and "hold one’s tongue" and "hold one’s peace" for "no hablar" and "callar." DJ, finally, introduces "an angel of a man" for "un hombre hermoso" and "in the back of beyond" for "tan lejos," both intensifications by means of expressions taken from the collection of common expressions in the target culture.

Other kinds of expressions closely linked to the cultural fabric of a community, are those of greeting and leavetaking. This scene contains two leavetakings, one at the son’s departure and one at the end of the neighbour’s visit. The traditional Anda con Dios and Adiós are the two forms used by the characters, and there is a great variation of ways in which the translators deal with these. The first one, spoken by the Mother to her son is usually translated rather literally, which in the English definitely conveys a religious connotation: "God bless you/keep you," "Go with God" and "God go with you" are some of the English equivalents used by the translators. The only exception to this is DJ, who modernizes and makes less formal with "take care." The word adiós, which for most people in Spanish has
probably lost any religious connotation, as it is the most common way of leavetaking, is a good example of an item that is more equivalent in the translation when it is not rendered literally. Some translators do render this expression with reference to God, whereas other translators render with the more common "good day" or "good-bye." Interestingly, DJ renders this as "God bless," even though he eliminated the reference to God from the replique discussed above.

Finally, one other translator, LH, needs to be mentioned here because of his endeavors to adapt this text in order to make it more accessible to the target--North American in this particular case--audience. He does so in this passage primarily by changing the ways in which the characters address each other, which will be discussed in the section on deictic textemes, and by adding popular interjections, typical of spoken language, as in the following repliques: "Why, to cut them!"; "Aw, what does that matter now?"; "He'll get married now, I guess."9 One consequence of this is obviously the toning down of the formality of the language used by mother and son. Other translators also occasionally try to evoke a more colloquial feel to the language by adding items, or by interrupting a sentence before it has ended. Some examples are SB, in the replique "Do you want me to kill them or something?" and DJ "She had...there used to be somebody else, didn't there?"
Lexical Items of Cultural Importance

Whereas in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* Lorca specifies that it is a tragedy about women "en los pueblos de España," he never does give any concrete indications of place or time in *Bodas de sangre*. In our previous chapter, we have pointed out many of the elements of the Andalusian landscape and way of life that the playwright incorporated in the stage directions, and the fact that some translators deemed it necessary to clarify or adapt to the realm of the target culture some of those elements, as was the case with the item cueva, the Bride's house. In the text itself, and especially in the first scene of the first act, there are again many references to objects that form part of the everyday life of the source culture, such as *tapia*, arroyo, *pendientes de azófar*, serpiente and arcón. Again, some translators seem willing to handle these items somewhat more freely for the sake of greater adaptation to the target culture, or for a number of other reasons that will be discussed as we comment on each example.

*Tapia* in the DUE is defined as "1. pieza grande de tierra amasada y seca, empleada para hacer muros. 2. Pared hecha con estas piezas. 3. Valla o cerca hecha de obra de albañilería." It conjures images of the familiar white stucco walls found in Southern Spain, and is generally translated as "wall," which does not completely convey the
specific image of the original. WO specifies that it concerns "the wall of the cemetery," and GN renders the item as "fence."

Arroyo is translated variously as well. Again, WO is the only one who specifies: Arroyo becomes "irrigation stream" in his version. An interesting case is found in the translation of GL/O'C, who maintain the Spanish "arroyo" throughout the play. When encountered in an English text, this word usually is associated with the landscape of the American Southwest. Some of the other translators choose "stream" (GN and GE), still others adopt "river" (SB and DJ). Both of the earliest translators eliminate this item altogether and link it with the item campo of the Mother's previous replique, either by repeating "fields" (JW) or by the more vague "out there" (LH). D/Z, finally, render campo as "field," and arroyo as "vineyard."

Another example of culture-bound lexical items occurs in one of the Mother's first comments on knives: "No sé cómo te atreves a llevar una navaja en tu cuerpo, ni como yo dejo a la serpiente dentro del arcon." Apparently, there were two problems for the translators in this sentence: serpiente and arcon. The word serpiente, used as a metaphor for the knife, holds several connotations in both Spanish and English. However, in Andalusia specifically, a superstition exists: "Toda mención de serpiente o culebra en Andalucía es de mal agüero." Of course, this is one connotation that is not
translatable in English, unless it is substituted by a different item, which risks losing some of the other connotations. In both the Spanish and the English-speaking reader or spectator, the word serpiente conjures the image of a vile and dangerous animal, but it also has biblical suggestions of temptress and instrument of the devil. In this respect, it follows up the Mother's previous comment on knives: "Malditas sean todas las navajas y el bribón que las inventó." One translator, when rendering this item, focuses primarily on the connotation of Satan by translating: "I don't know how you dare to carry a knife on your body, nor how I can keep the devil in his place" (GN). This is a continuation of the first outburst by the Mother, which this same translator renders as "Curse them all and the devil that invented them." Here "devil" is a translation of the Spanish bribón, certainly not as strong a curseword as "devil," and one which most of the other translators render simply as "scoundrel" (JW, LH, GL/O'C, SB, GE). DJ, the latest translator of Bodas de sangre makes this a very strong replique by the Mother: "Damn the knife, damn them all and the devil who brought them into the world..." On the other hand, DJ softens the image of serpiente by turning the metaphor into a simile: "I don't know how you can bear to carry a knife, nor why I even have one in the house at all, like a snake in my kitchen."
As this example from the translation by DJ illustrates, the term *arcón* may be generalized and is rendered in a variety of ways by the different translators. SB simply uses "house," a generalization as well, and D/Z translate into "cupboard" maybe in order to refer to a more common way of kitchen storage in the target culture. GL/O'C, WO and GE use the term "chest," probably the closest English equivalent to "arcón," and LH continues the image of the serpent by translating: "I don't know why you'd dare carry a knife on you, nor why I leave this serpent here in its den."

Another lexical item which elicited great variety among the translators is *pendientes de azófar*, which is translated as "brass earrings" (GN, GE and D/Z), "bronze earrings" (SB, WO and GL/O'C), "AZOFAR earrings" (LH), "seed-pearl earrings" (JW) and "studded earrings" (DJ). An item like this may seem like a small detail, but it is our view that each element of the text contributes to its total meaning, and that DJ's "studded earrings," for instance, call up to the reader or the spectator completely different connotations than "brass earrings." Certainly studded earrings are much more more common in the target culture, but there is a certain vagueness as to what kind of earrings they really are, and what their worth is.
Customs

A first example in this passage can be found in the Mother's ninth replique and refers to a custom performed at a person's death: "(.....) ... y ese hombre no vuelve. O si vuelve es para ponerle una palma encima o un plato de sal gorda para que no se hinche(.....)." There is both a religious and a practical custom referred to here, (the placing of a palm leaf on the body and the application of salt in order for it not to swell in the heat) neither of which are familiar in the target culture. Yet we notice that only one of the nine translators adapts this to any great extent. GN substitutes the religious reference by one of folkloric usage, and modernizes the other custom as follows: "...and that man doesn't come back. Or if he comes back it is for you to put pennies on his eyes or to spread chemicals over him so he won't bloat up." DJ likewise endeavors to clarify this custom by removing the religious connotation and by specifying the use of the salt: "And then he just doesn't come back. Or if he does, it's only so that you can lay out his body, and rub it with salt so it doesn't bloat in the heat."

All the other translators translate the custom fairly faithfully, although there is a noticeable shift in the agent of the actions mentioned above. In some cases the original's image of the body coming back to its loved ones so they can perform these actions is kept, as would be the
case in a rural context. In other instances, the actions are
depersonalized by having the body come back already prepared
for burial, as would be the case in a more modern society.
The above examples illustrated the former, and the
translations by LH and SB are examples of the latter:

MOTHER: ...Then that man doesn’t come back! Or if he
does come back, it’s with a palm on his breast, or
a saucer of rock salt sprinkled on his body to keep
it from swelling (LH).

MOTHER: ...and he never comes back. Or he comes back
covered with palm leaves or rock salt to stop his
body swelling (SB).

Another set of customs refers to the traditions of the
wedding itself, the prior courtship, the act of asking for
the hand of the bride and the dowry. The following fragment
illustrates some of the characters’ ideas about courting and
the status of women before marriage.

MADRE: (....) ¿Cuántos años llevas en relaciones?

NOVIO: Tres años. Ya pudo comprar la viña.

MADRE: Tres años. ¿Ella tuvo un novio, no?

NOVIO: No sé. Creo que no. Las muchachas tienen
que mirar con quien se casan.

MADRE: Sí. Yo no miré a nadie. (....)

Mother and son use a relatively formal way of speaking about
the courtship and the possible other man the girl may have
known. In the English versions, some translators tend to
make the items llevar en relaciones and novio less weighty
by translating for instance as follows:
MOTHER: (....) How long have you been going with the girl, son? (....)

MOTHER: Three years! She had a sweetheart before, didn’t she? (LH)

MOTHER: (....) How long have you two known each other? (....)
MOTHER: Three years. She had a sweetheart once before, didn’t she? (SB)

MOTHER: (....) How long have you been seeing the girl? (....)
MOTHER: Three years. She used to see someone else, didn’t she? (D/Z)

Other translators preserve the same formality by translating llevar en relaciones as "courting" (JW and GN) and novio as "suitor" (JW), "engaged" (GN) or "young man" (GE). The words novio and novia are problematic for the translators anyway, as in Spanish they have a broad meaning and may refer to anything from boyfriend or girlfriend to fiancé(e). In the cast of characters these items are rendered by the translators in a number of different ways: Boy/Girl (LH), Novio/Novia (JW), Lover/Betrothed (GN), and (Bride)groom/Bride in the more recent versions. In the replique by the Bridegroom at the end of this scene, "estoy seguro de que usted querrá a mi novia," several translators manage to avoid the problem also by substituting by the pronoun "her," or in other case rendering novia by "my wife" (SB) or "my sweetheart" (LH).

The second answer by the Bridegroom in the previously mentioned fragment of text denotes on the one hand his
innocence and naïveté about the Bride’s past, and on the other reflects the morality of the community which specifies that women have to be chaste before their marriage or they will not be able to marry. The Mother wholeheartedly agrees with this statement and posits herself as an example of this. The different English translations reflect two interpretations: there are those that imply the same thing as in the Spanish version, such as for instance GN and SB:

LOVER: I don’t know. I don’t think so. A girl has to consider well who she’s going to marry.

MOTHER: Yes. I didn’t consider anybody (....)(GN).

GROOM: I don’t know. I shouldn’t think so. Girls should only look at the man they’re going to marry.

MOTHER: True: I never looked at anyone (....)(SB).

Other translators take a more liberal approach, implying that maybe a woman should be allowed to look around before getting married:

NOVIO: I don’t know--I don’t think so. Even so,11 girls must see whom they marry.

MOTHER: Yes. I have not looked at any man (....)(JW).

BOY: I don’t know. I don’t think so. But girls have to look close now before they marry.

MOTHER: I never looked at anybody except your father (....)(LH).

In both previous examples, the translators manage to remain close to the wording of the original text but change the meaning by the addition of the conjunctions "even so/anyway" and "but." DJ, on the other hand, reflects a more updated
code of morality on the Bridegroom’s part, which also implies a shift in the Mother’s reply from agreement to a doubtful "perhaps":

BRIDEGROOM: I don’t know...I don’t think so... Anyway, girls have a right to have a good look at the man they’re marrying....

MOTHER: Perhaps. But I didn’t look at anyone until I met your father.

It is clear from this and other passages that DJ has set himself the norm of modernizing the original text greatly. The custom of the parents asking the other parent for their children in marriage is another one that seems outdated to this translator. In an endnote he explains that the Mother’s question "¿Cuándo quieres que la pida?" is "a reference to the contractual arrangements which placed social formalities over individual rights," but opts to translate the question instead with the milder "When do you want me to speak to her father?"

GRAMMATICAL TEXTEMES

The way a certain segment of the population expresses itself does not only have to do with lexical items or idiomatic expressions. It is also determined by the length of the sentences, assertiveness or the lack of it, syntax, ways of addressing others and so on. The characters in this play, supposedly reflections of the rural population of Andalusia, in general relate information to each other in short and to-the-point sentences. The punctuation in the
original denotes that, except at times of extreme emotion, the characters do not often raise their voices and express their ideas in well rounded but brief and sometimes halting sentences.

In this first scene of the play, the conversation between mother and son is characterized by an alteration of very short sentences, especially those spoken by the son, and longer sentences when the Mother expresses her anger over the events of the past and her feud with the Felix family. Where the short repliques are concerned, one has to keep in mind that this is a theatre text and that therefore, these short repliques may be accompanied on the stage by gestures and facial expressions that convey a great deal more than the simple words. For instance, the replique "Hijo, el almuerzo," will be accompanied by a directive movement, and maybe some props may clarify the meaning further. Again, SB and DJ prove that their strategy is dictated by a concern for keeping the interest of the reader as much as that of the spectator, by clarifying the remark and including it in a complete sentence: "You’re going without your lunch, son" (SB) and "Son, take some food with you" (DJ).

The Mother’s repliques are brief as long as the subject of the Felix family and her husband and son’s death are not mentioned. At those times she speaks in longer sentences of several subordinated and juxtaposed clauses. Some
translators break these longer sentences up into shorter units by punctuation that is different from the original. In the previous chapter, we touched briefly on the changes in punctuation that occur in the D/Z translation; as noted there, their frequent addition of exclamation marks counteracts the deletion of some of the stage directions. D/Z add a great deal of punctuation marks, such as dashes, commas, but mainly exclamation marks throughout Bodas de sangre. One example of the division of a long sentence in the original is in the Mother’s following replique: "(...) But I just hear--Felix! (between her teeth)---and hearing "Felix" is like having my mouth fill up with slime! (she spits) And I have to spit! I have to spit so I won’t kill!"

In his work Introducción a la Traductología, Gerardo Vázquez-Ayora has pointed out that the Spanish language may be considered as being more hypotactic in nature than English, in which paratactic structures are favored:

Pero en comparación con otras lenguas, si frente al inglés el francés se precisa de ser lengua 'ligada', el castellano lo es en más alto grado. Se caracteriza todavía por su mayor profundidad o 'densidad sintáctica' y por el enlace de 'circunstantes'. (....) [El Inglés] se aleja de los párrafos largos y complejos y prefiere las clausulas cortas, marca en forma tajante la
incorporación de elementos oracionales, mantiene la 'incrustación' al mínimo. (....) Emplea, así mismo, en grado notable la puntuación, para interconectar sus unidades más cortas, que acaso es tarea más difícil.

El español, como no sea por razones de efectos expresivos, conforme a lo expuesto, busca la relativa 'profundidad estructural', subordina siempre que le es posible, incorpora aún los circunstantes en forma más estrecha, su sintaxis le exige mayor 'coherencia interna' de la oración, del período y del texto en general.12

The predilection that English has for independent sentences where punctuation takes precedence over conjunctive words is obvious in many instances in D/Z's translation of Bodas de sangre. Their predilection for dividing longer sentences into two or even three shorter ones, often followed by exclamation marks, speeds up the rhythm of play considerably and gives the impression of the characters being in a constant state of excitement. DJ, on the other hand, also breaks up the sentences and introduces drastic shifts in the punctuation of this play. Contrary to D/Z, however, he adds a great number of suspension points, thus creating a more hesitant and halting speech. The Mother, instead of the highly emotional character with violent outbursts as represented in D/Z, thus becomes a more reflective and pensive character, prone perhaps to repressed anger. Consider the following replique by this character in the original text:

MADRE: No. Yo no puedo dejar aquí solos a tu padre y a tu hermano. Tengo que ir todas las mañanas, y si me voy es fácil que muera uno de los Félix, uno de la familia de los matadores, y lo entierren al lado. ¡Y eso sí que no! ¡Ca! ¡Eso sí que no! Porque con las
unas los desentierro y yo sola los machaco contra la tapia.

In this replique, in the original, there is a gradual rising of the Mother’s emotion, from a convinced refusal to leave and a rational explanation of the reasons, to a climax in feeling indicated by the exclamation marks, the repetition of the phrase "eso sí que no" and the interjection "Ca." This climax is then followed by another sentence of relative calmness in which the Mother explains what her vengeance would be.

D/Z and DJ render the passage as follows:

MOTHER: No. I can’t leave your father and brother alone here. I have to go there every morning. And if I go away, one of the Felixes might easily die. One of that family of killers! And they could bury him right next to them. And that--never! Never! Because I will dig him up with my fingernails! And all by myself, I will smash him against the wall!(D/Z)

MOTHER: How can I? I won’t leave your father and brother alone here...I go to see them every morning, and if I went away, and one of the Felix family died, they might put them beside them...and I’ll have no murderer lying with any of mine. Never. Because I’d dig them up with my nails and teeth, and smash their bodies against the wall... (DJ)

These two examples illustrate well the power of punctuation in translation. Whereas the original has three exclamation marks, in the middle of the replique, D/Z’s version has five, which occur in the middle as well as at the end of the passage, and DJ’s has not one exclamation mark, but several added suspension points. The resulting paragraph in this translation displays less emotion but more
quiet resolve in the character, and the discourse of the play is slowed down considerably.

DEICTIC TEXTEMES

Keir Elam has noted that dramatic discourse consists first and foremost in "an I addressing a you here and now." Other semioticians of theatre, such as Alessandro Serpieri, go even further by contending that all meaning in theatre is entrusted to the deixis, "which subsumes and unites the meaning borne by the images, by the various genres of language (prose, poetry), by the various linguistic modes of the characters, by intonation, by rhythm, by proxemic relations, by the kinesics of the movements, etc." While the range of this statement is arguable, Elam convincingly argues that dramatic discourse is incomplete, and dramatic worlds unestablished, until the contextual elements, such as addressee and speaker, time and location, are provided for by means of what he calls "shifters", after Jacobson. "Shifters" can be personal and possessive pronouns or adjectives, demonstrative adjectives and pronouns, or adverbs and adverbial phrases of time and place.

When examining the first scene of the first act of Bodas de sangre, it becomes obvious that the relationships among the characters, and between the characters and their world are established immediately, in the first eight lines:
NOVIO (entrando). Madre.
MADRE. ¿Qué?
NOVIO. Me voy.
MADRE. ¿Adónde?
NOVIO. A la viña. (Va a salir.)
MADRE. Espera.
NOVIO. ¿Quiere algo?
MADRE. Hijo, el almuerzo.

First, the relationship Mother-Son is established, followed by the mentioning of a specific location, the vineyard, referring to a rural context, even a certain climate, and finally a time of day is fixed by means of the item almuerzo.

When we look at the translations of these lines into English, we notice that the deictic units are different, and that the translators were faced with some obligatory shifts where the deictic elements were concerned. One of these has to do with the use of pronouns. In Spanish, the personal pronouns are often not mentioned since the conjugational system sufficiently denotes the subject. In English, however, they are in most cases indispensable. Thus, the shift toward the addition of personal pronouns in English is an example of an obligatory one, but it alters the meaning of the text in certain ways. One such alteration is the lack of emphasis in the English versions, in those cases where the Spanish does mention the pronoun. As is well known, "la
repetición insistente de los sujetos pronominales puede traer un matiz de énfasis o de agresividad, aparte de la pesadez que comunica al estilo."16 In the relatively short conversation between mother and son, in the first part of this scene, the personal pronoun "Yo" is used seven times by the Mother in cases where it was not obligatory, versus once by the Bridegroom. This may denote a certain domination of the Mother over the son, and also a degree of emphasis in the Mother’s convictions. Some examples are "yo no miré a nadie," "Yo sé que la muchacha es buena," "Yo no puedo dejar aquí solos a tu padre y a tu hermano," "Que yo quiero bordar y hacer encaje y estar tranquila." The same holds true in the second part of this scene, in the conversation between the Mother and the Neighbor, where the pronoun tú is repeated, mostly for reasons of emphasis: "Tú me preguntaste," "Tú estás vieja. Yo también," among other cases. It seems that in general the translators do not attempt to compensate for this loss of nuance, although JW underlines some of the pronouns: "No sé cómo te atreves a llevar una navaja en tu cuerpo, ni como yo dejo a la serpiente dentro del arcón" becomes "I can’t see how you dare to carry a knife upon you, nor how I can leave the serpent in the coffer," which accentuates the opposition between the two clauses.

A second difference between the Spanish and English system of personal pronouns involves a shift in the level of
formality that the original text indicates as existing between mother and son, since the distinction between tú and usted for the second person singular does not exist in the Target Language. Clearly, we are entering here into other levels of the text as well, since this presents not just a deictic problem, but a grammatical and cultural challenge as well. As is customary, the son, when talking to his mother always uses the usted form, while the Mother uses tú. The Mother and the Neighbor, since they are on the same level of acquaintance and social status, both use tú. About the problems the translator faces when confronted with this discrepancy between the two language systems, Vázquez-Ayora has noted:

El problema de traducir el mayor o menor grado de formalidad de la segunda persona acosa a los que vierten al Inglés, pues esta lengua no conoce el tuteo, y se tiene que recurrir al procedimiento de la compensación. El formalismo de usted podrá comunicarse por medio de terminos honoríficos (Sir, Ma’am, etc) o por una sintaxis más rígida y formal.¹⁷

Most of the translators of Bodas de sangre studied here do not compensate for this obligatory shift. One thing that GN does is to use the syntax in order to develop a more formal feeling. In four different repliques by both the Mother and the Neighbour, he uses an exclamatory sentence starting with "how," perhaps in order to put emphasis on the repressed desires these two women harbor. This more declamatory style creates greater formality, as we see in the following examples: "How I wish you were a woman;" "How
I want to embroider and make lace and be peaceful;" "How well you look;" "How much water has flown under the bridge."

In the section on cultural textemes we have noted that unlike GN, some translators, such as LH or DJ, strive to make the dialogue less formal by adding popular interjections, or by changing the expression the characters use to take leave of each other.

Another way in which formality may be affected by the use of deictics is in the manner of address between the characters. Again, LH is the translator who is the most radical in his adaptation to the target context. The son in LH's translation does not say "Mother," as he does in the original and in all of the other translations, but rather the more affectionate "Mama." Whereas in the original, the Bridegroom only says "Madre" three times during the entire conversation of the first scene, LH uses his term of address much more frequently, and adds it in the following repliques: "Stop talking about it, mama," "Will you hush, mama" and "Oh, mama," "The first one'll be for you, mama."

In the conversation between the Mother and the Neighbor, the term mujer, commonly used between friends, appears twice, thus reinforcing the impression of their familiarity with each other. LH translates literally on the first occasion, but substitutes "Darling" in the final greeting. Some of the other translators also render this term, which is rather jarring to the English ear, by
substituting for *mujer* other terms that have the connotation of endearment: "my dear" (SB), "my friend" (D/Z) and "woman dear" (DJ).

Possessive and demonstrative pronouns and adjectives are less prominent in this passage, and in general they were not a problem for the translators. Two exceptions must be noted here of shifts that concern possessive adjectives. In the replique by the Bridegroom "démé la navaja," the definite article in the original text is changed to a possessive "my" in the translation by LH. As we will observe in the next passage studied in this chapter, the Spanish language often uses the definite article in cases when English requires a possessive adjective. However, in this case, all the other translators use the definite article in English also: "Give me the knife."

The other shift takes place in a replique by the Mother, describing the Bride: "Amasa su pan y cose sus faldas." DJ translates this sentence as "She bakes her father's bread and sews her own skirts." The Spanish *su* can mean "his," "her" and "your," but since the Father has not been mentioned at this point all of the other translators assume that in both cases "her" is the more logical translation. DJ, by introducing the Father at this point may have wanted to prepare the reader or spectator for his arrival, or he may have wanted to focus attention to Lorca's
theme of the Bride’s life of drudgery and submission, which is that of women in general in his work.

Adverbs of time and place that serve as deictic markers are rare in this scene, although where time is concerned two items may be considered deictic markers "by default." The first one refers to the time of day, and is indicated by "el almuerzo." Some translators translate this item by "lunch" others by "breakfast." This passage also contains the only indication of historical time, when the Neighbor mentions that an acquaintance of hers was injured by "la máquina." This is the only indication that the action of this play takes place after the Industrial Revolution. Most translators render this item in the same vague way as it is in the original "the machine." The use of the definite article denotes that for the Mother and the Neighbor the referent is clear, and thus that there is only a limited number of machines. LH uses the indefinite article, "a machine," which makes it seem as if there is any number of machines from which to choose; SB introduces a negative value judgement denoting suspicion and distrust on the part of the neighbor by using the demonstrative "that machine." DJ, on the other hand, specifies that it is "the harvesting machine," perhaps to emphasize the fact that the context of the play is rural. We have to keep in mind that DJ also was the only translator who footnoted an element like cueva, in order to clarify its precise meaning to the reader.
Rhetorical Textemes

Imagery: The Floral and Vegetative Set

A first remark that needs to be made is that all the elements of the physical world that refer to the Andalusian countryside have been preserved in all translations: viñas, olivas, arroyo. The floral and vegetative set of images is one that will run throughout the play, but its foundation is laid in this first scene. As mentioned before, it is one of the elements of this play that received the most criticism when it was first performed in the United States, and the question to be examined is thus whether subsequent translators, influenced by this, tried to change or tone down the imagery somewhat, in order to adapt the play more to the target audience. GE, in an article dealing with the problems of translating Bodas de sangre, has rightly pointed out that where the flower imagery is concerned, "the difference between Spain and England (...) is less to do with types of flowers than with the fact that in Spain they are less 'cultivated,' more often associated with the wild than than with neat and tidy gardens, and therefore seem closer to nature."18

The following are some of the most prominent instances of floral and vegetative imagery in the first scene:

"Un hombre hermoso, con su flor en la boca"

"Primero tu padre, que me olía a clavel"

"Mis muertos llenos de hierba"
"Dos hombres que eran dos geranios"

"Es que quisiera que ni a la viva ni a la muerta las conociera nadie. Que fueran como dos cardos, que ninguna persona les nombrá y pinchan si llega el momento."

The first thing that may be noted is that all these examples are taken from the Mother's dialogue, and as we have observed previously there is a marked difference in her style of speech and that of the other characters, such as the Bridegroom, or the Bride's father. Four of the examples refer to the Mother's husband and/or son, whereas the last one describes the Bride and her mother. The images are always preceded by the persons they refer to, and we will include the translators' versions of these references in our discussion.

The first example, "un hombre hermoso, con su flor en la boca," has several implications. First of all it indicates the character's age: "estar en la flor de la vida" refers to being in the prime of one's life. The item boca has several connotations also. We have already commented on Lorca's technique of using expressions that echo existing sayings but are nevertheless modified. The above expression may very well be an allusion to "comerse el mundo," which has a partial equivalent in English as "to have the world in the palm of one's hand." There is another reference to boca in the first scene of the second act when Leonardo's
wife says "Acuérdate que sales como una estrella! Así salí yo de mi casa también. Que me cabía todo el campo en la boca." Furthermore, the linking of "flor" and "boca" evokes the image of flamenco dancers, especially the women, who often have a flower in their mouth while dancing. The fact that it may seem a feminine image, is further reinforced by the use of the adjective "hermoso," which is often limited to women rather than men. The translators chose different strategies with regard to this replique. Some of them eliminate the word boca, but keep the flower image: "...in the flower of his youth" (JW) or "in the flower of his life" (DJ). Others do exactly the opposite: they eliminate the item flor, but keep the figure associated with the mouth, as in: "tasting the fullness of life" (GE). Others keep both as in "with a flower in his mouth" (LH), or more specifically "with the flower of his youth in his mouth" (WO) or "with life like a flower in his mouth" (D/Z). Finally, others translators eliminate both images, and endeavor to translate the Spanish with a more or less English equivalent: "in his prime" (SB), "full of young life" (GL/O'C) or "in the flush of youth" (GN). Where the referent is concerned, there seems to be an evolution through time of the ways in which a man’s physical aspects may be described. The earliest translators, such as JW, LH and GN tend to use the neutral "fine" or "fine-looking;" GL/O'C and SB make a definite choice by using a term that is
only applied to males: "handsome," and some of the more recent versions translate into "gorgeous" (WO), or "beautiful" (GE and D/Z), thus preserving the male-female ambiguity, as does DJ, who adds the comparison "an angel of a man."

The second use of floral imagery in this passage, "que me olía a clavel," which refers to the father of the Bridegroom, is preserved by all translators. However, some translators are a little more specific than the original and embellish or clarify the image, perhaps to make it more acceptable to the ear of the target audience. GE, quoting this particular example, has pointed out that "Spaniards, as much in the towns as the countryside, often express themselves in terms of flowers in a way which the English would probably find embarrassing." This translator, as well as LH and DJ add to the simple "he smelled like a carnation" (JW, GN, GL/O'C, SB, D/Z), the word "scent," as in "like the scent of a carnation to me" (LH), or "who filled me with the scent of carnations" (DJ). WO selects one attribute of the flower and translates "he smelled as sweet to me as a carnation." One other thing that needs to be noted in these examples is the position of the phrase "to me," which is very variable in English and in the different translations appears in three different places: before the sentence, in the middle or at the end; sometimes it is eliminated. The emphasis, naturally, will differ greatly
depending on the various positions and especially on the stage it will most certainly change some of the meaning if one hears the simple "who smelt of carnations" (SB) versus "to me, he smelled like carnations" (D/Z), "he smelled to me like a carnation" (GN), or "he had the scent of carnations for me" (GE).

In the example "mis muertos llenos de hierba," the main problem the translators faced had to do with the very general meaning of the word hierba, which can refer to grass, herbs or weeds. It is rendered variously in the translations as "herbs and grass" (JW), "grass" (LH, GN, WO, SB, and DJ), and "weeds" (GL/O'C, GE and D/Z). It is true that "weeds" will convey a much more negative image than "grass" or "herbs," and the negativity may even be reinforced by the translation of the adjective "llenos." There is a gradation of intensity noticeable in the translators, from a neutral to a fairly graphic description of the weeds' action on the dead men. Some translators present the action as ongoing: "grass fills the bodies" (LH) and "slowly filling with grass" (DJ). JW, GN and GE, on the other hand, present the action as completed, by means of the phrase "full of." WO reinforces the action even more by adding "stuffed full of." The action of filling the bodies, as if they were receptacles receiving the grass or herbs is replaced by D/Z by the more traditional "covered with." GL/O'C and SB, however, reinforce the image more by using
the verb "choking with weeds" or "choked with grass," thus presenting the forces of nature as being much more powerful than humans, and as being actual killers.

The example "dos hombres que eran dos geranios" is interesting because it is one case where some translators have deliberately substituted a particular flower by the generalized "flower." GL/O'C translate "two men like two beautiful flowers," and DJ renders simply "who were like two flowers." The reasons for these generalizing shifts may be that in the target culture the geranium is considered a rather common and not very beautiful flower, or a feeling that the text was getting too heavy with floral references. Various translators (JW, LH, GL/O'C, D/Z and DJ) deliberately add the comparative "like" which tones down the complete assimilation of the two items as they appear in the original. SB, as she often does, embellishes the image with a verb that reinforces the floral image: "Two men that flourished like geranums," and she also eliminates the repetition of the number two.

The last example of vegetative imagery that we would like to treat here is of interest since its translation has obviously been problematic from an interpretative point of view for the translators. When talking about the Bride and her dead mother's reputations, the Mother makes the following statement: "Es que quisiera que ni a la viva ni a la muerta las conociera nadie. Que fueran como dos cardos
que ninguna persona les nombra y pinchan si llega el momento." Apparently, there is some difference in opinion among the translators about who performs the act of "pinchar." Most translators assume that the meaning is that thistles, by their very nature, have a way of defending themselves against anyone who would want to harm them, but also that because of their unattractiveness, nobody pays attention to them, and they are therefore left in peace. It is interesting to note that as time goes on, this image has been clarified more and more by the translators.

JW is the most literal of the translators, and translates "that they were like two thistles that nobody mentions and that prick when the moment arrives." LH makes the last part a little more specific: "and that prick if they're fooled with." We see a gradual desire on the translators' part to eliminate at least the vagueness of the last part of the image. SB, for instance, adds a prepositional phrase that denotes place, but eliminates the connotation of defence and turns the thistles into victims of vicious gossip: "as if they were two thistles in the field. That way there'd be no rumors to hurt them." Two of the most recent translators, D/Z and DJ, also make clear that it is gossip that would be the reason for defensiveness: "That they were like two thistles that would prick any wagging tongue that touched them"(D/Z) and the elaborated image by DJ: "I wish they were like two thistles,
untouched and forgotten, but always ready to scratch and jag if any tongue comes too close." This already clarified replique is furthermore accompanied by a footnote in which the translator explains the Mother's concern for "el qué dirán." Where the interpretation of the meaning is concerned, however, GL/O'C and WO differ, with the latter almost certainly influenced by the former, and interpret the image as follows: "That they were like two thistles no one ever names but cuts off at the right moment." As we see, it is the image of the two thistles taken to the extreme and in the sense of the two women being helpless and under the total control of others, i.e. men, it also has its rationale. WO expresses this interpretation in a similar way: "or if they were like two thistles that no one ever notices but can be cut down when the time comes." It is our opinion that this last translation is not the one the original poet suggested, and the difference in interpretation could be an oversight or a deliberate choice on the part of GL/O'C to make the image fit in more strongly with the image of women as victims, both forgotten and ignored, but at the same time forever scrutinized by the rest of society. This example, in our opinion, also illustrates the fact that certain translators, in this case WO, may be strongly influenced by the translations that preceded them, and on occasion base their interpretations on them.
Other patterns of imagery, besides the vegetative set, that are established in the first scene of the first act, are those connected with the knife and the blood. The knife and other sharp and treacherously dangerous objects related to it are, of course, given abundant attention, but it is worth noting that blood is only mentioned once here, and in a positive context, when the Mother describes her late husband as "eso es buena casta. Sangre," which in the next act is opposed to the bad blood of the Felix family. The reason it needs to be mentioned here is that this important allusion to an element which in Act Three will be a major referent and carry much of the weight of the imagery, is eliminated here by LH, GN and SB.

PASSAGE TWO: ACT THREE, SCENE ONE

Analysis of the Original Text

The second passage of Bodas de sangre that will be examined closely here is one that is crucial for a number of reasons. The play, which up to this point has progressed in a traditional linear manner with a "realistic" plot and development, suddenly in this scene is taken in a different direction. The characters who appear on stage in this scene are personifications of metaphysical forces that dominate man's life. The Bridegroom, the Bride and Leonardo are not the same characters they were in the previous scenes, as
they have become embodiments of higher powers, of universal tragic desires. The Bridegroom expresses this when he says: "Ves este brazo? pues no es mi brazo. Es el brazo de mi hermano y él de mi padre y él de toda mi familia que está muerta. Y tiene tanto poderío, que puede arrancar este árbol de raíz si quiere." The characters on stage are no longer rational, independently acting human beings: they have been swept up in the universal force of their respective destinies. This change is reflected in their form of expression also. Lorca himself has declared that he uses poetry for a number of different reasons:

Venga en buena hora la poesía en aquellos instantes que la disipación y el frenesi del tema lo exijan. Mas nunca en otro momento. Respondiendo a esta fórmula, vea usted, en Bodas de sangre cómo hasta el cuadro epitalámico el verso no hace su aparición con la intención y la anchura debidas, y cómo ya no deja de señorear la escena en el cuadro del bosque y en el que pone fin a la obra. (....) El realismo que preside hasta ese instante la tragedia se quiebra y desaparece para dar paso a la fantasía poética, donde es natural que yo me encuentre como pez en el agua.

This declaration proves that Lorca used the theatre as yet another way to display his poetic talent, and it is therefore not unreasonable to consider this particular scene as a poetic text.

The passage chosen may be separated into various parts on the basis of the different kinds of language in each part. There is some prose dialogue, between the Woodcutters in the beginning of the scene, between the Bridegroom and
his helper and also between the Bridegroom and Death. There is the chorus comprised by the Woodcutters, two incantations enunciated in verse form and directed to the Moon and Death, respectively. There is poetic dialogue, between the Bride and Leonardo, towards the end of the scene, and between the Moon and Death. Finally, the passage that comes closest to poetry and is the farthest removed from theatrical dialogue in the play occurs in this scene as well: the soliloquy of the Moon, that has frequently been extracted from this work in order to be included in anthologies of poetry.

CULTURAL TEXTEMES

Cultural textemes were abundant in the previous passage, and also in many of the other parts of the play, such as in the conversation at the Father of the Bride’s house, or in the songs and preparations to the wedding. Clearly, the passage under study here, as well as the last scene of the play, deviate from this, which is noticeable in the reduction of items that have to do with the outside world. The environment of this scene is far removed from the dry, barren and sun-scorched landscape reminiscent of Andalusia that was both mentioned in the stage directions and referred to by the characters in previous scenes.

There are no instances in this scene of Andalusian idioms or expressions, but two cases of a translator adding common Target Language expressions need to be noted. When
the Woodcutters remark that the lovers are being looked for everywhere, the Spanish provides the neutral "los buscan por todas partes." In DJ's version, this becomes "they'll not leave a single stone unturned." DJ also translates the phrase "esto es una caza" which occurs later on in this scene as "this is like hunting for a needle in a haystack," which gives the language a much more colloquial and trivial tone, and also evokes a different connotation than the original.

As is the case in all translations, some images from the Source Language have different connotations in the Target Language, and may even be culturally unacceptable in it. An example of such a problem in this passage is when the Bride, in her final dialogue with Leonardo, describes herself as follows:

Y yo dormiré a tus pies
para guardar lo que sueñas.
desnuda, mirando al campo,
(dramática)
como si fuera una perra,
porque eso soy! Que te miro
y tu hermosura me quema.

The Bride's comparison of herself to "una perra" does not have the negative connotation that it does in English. Surprisingly, all translators do render this item as either "bitch" or "dog," and DJ reinforces the image by translating "like a bitch in heat, because that's what I am." He then also slightly changes the following image to "I look at you and feel myself burn." As in the two previous examples, this
is undoubtedly the result of this translator’s effort to colloquialize and bring down to earth the high level of language of the original.

One element that is of importance here is intertextuality, since it may affect the reception of this particular passage in the target culture. The Moon as a character is very common in Lorca’s work. Most members of the source culture who read or attend this play would be aware of this, but this is not the case for members of the Target Language audience. Obviously, this may have some bearing on the translation, although from the translator’s point of view it is hard to remedy this lack of reference for the target audience. DJ seems to be the only translator who provides notes that point to recurrent symbols in Lorca’s work or who endeavors to introduce other literary allusions with which the target audience might be more familiar. 21

GRAMMATICAL TEXTEMES

Whereas the dialogue in the passage analyzed earlier in this chapter was characterized by an alternation of short and long repliques, the Woodcutters’ repliques are all relatively short, and consist generally of one, or at the most, two sentences, with very few subordinated clauses. This creates the effect of rapid alternation of the actors’ deliveries, and during performances, the timing of the
deliveries in this particular passage is of crucial importance. However, in some of the translations there is a reversal of the situation described earlier, where long Spanish sentences were separated into shorter units. In this passage, the shorter units of the original are sometimes combined into longer sentences, as in the following example:

LEÑADOR 3o: El novio los encontrará con luna o sin luna. Yo lo vi salir. Como una estrella furiosa. La cara color ceniza. Expresaba el sino de su casta.

The earlier analysis of Act One, Scene One, as well as the examination of the stage directions demonstrated that SB has the tendency to remake the text into one that is more flowing for the reader, and here this translator demonstrates that tendency once again:

THIRD FORESTER: Her husband will find them with or without the moon. I saw him ride out. Like a raging star, his face ashen, branded with the mark of his race.

Surprisingly, D/Z, who go to some lengths to shorten the repliques in the earlier scene by way of punctuation, opt for a strategy that is similar to SB’s here. Their tendency to change the punctuation, however, has not subsided:

THIRD WOODCUTTER: The bridegroom will find them--with the moon or without the moon! I saw him start off--like a raging star! His face, the color of ashes, expressed the fate of his whole family.

Another problem of a grammatical nature the translators apparently faced in this scene concerns the use of the subjunctive, since several changes in meaning seem to occur when the subjunctive is involved. Obviously, the difference
in the linguistic system of the two languages requires a shift in this case, as the subjunctive mood in English is not used except in rare cases, and after a limited number of phrases. Ignoring the subjunctive may bring about a change in meaning of the enunciation. In the conversation between Death and the Moon, the latter stipulates its wishes about the death of the Leonardo and the Bridegroom: "Pero que tarden mucho en morir. Que la sangre/ me ponga entre los dedos su delicado silbo." Both LH and GN treat this passage without regard to the subjunctive, which turns this replique into a neutral observation, thus eliminating some of the feeling of the Moon's cruelty. In LH's version the replique becomes: "But they'll take a long time dying. And the blood will make a soft sound in my fingers." GN does translate the second part of the replique taking the subjunctive into consideration, but the first part is also a simple statement of fact: "They take such a long time to die."

RHETORICAL TEXTEMES

We have mentioned before that, for all practical purposes, this scene may be considered a poetic text. As observed earlier, the previously analysed scene did use selected tropes in order to establish patterns of imagery; however, the passage under study here is far richer in figures of speech and rhetorical devices, and many of them were problematic for the translators. Where the imagery is
concerned, the vegetative set is continued, though to a lesser degree in this passage, and it is usually associated with negative images. One example of this is Leonardo’s remark "y el sueño me fue llevando las carnes de mala hierba." Even though Leonardo is referring here to his life without the Bride, his words are also a foreshadowing of his destiny, death, and in this respect they are connected with a remark the Mother makes in the first scene when she refers to her dead men: "mis muertos, llenos de hierba." Some critics have pointed out that "la hierba" or "las hierbas" are associated with death many times in Lorca, citing the poem Omega, or Poema para muertos which ends with the scream "Las hierbaas!!" 22 Those translators who rendered that image in the first scene as "grass," fail to make the connection with this subsequent reference to it.

Other floral and vegetal images emerge from the Woodcutters' dialogue. Jasmine is mentioned when the Woodcutter says "Llena de jasmin la sangre." DJ, who all along has tried to tone down the flower imagery, translates "cover their red blood with white flowers."

Another set of images, however, dominates this passage, and it is developed by means of a great number of different figures of speech. They deal with sharpness and penetration, and they connect with the imagery of the knife on the one hand, and with heat and coldness on the other. Throughout this passage, the Moon and Death are presented, and present
themselves, as being cold, cruel and unsatisfied. The lovers, on the other hand, use images of heat and burning in their dialogue.

The symbol of the knife, which in his introduction DJ calls "the most forceful long-term image of the play," is developed in this passage in a number of ways. Although the knife itself is mentioned various times, for instance by the Moon in "la Luna deja un cuchillo/ abandonado en el aire," other words and phrases develop the image of sharpness further. We see this in the the Moon's remark, "el aire va llegando duro, con doble filo." Earlier the Woodcutters had mentioned the fact that there were many clouds and that therefore the Moon may not come out, which would help the lovers in their flight, but this phrase clearly indicates that all elements of nature are cooperating with the Moon and Death in order to grant them their wishes. As we may observe, the knife itself is not mentioned in the Moon's remark about the wind, but the double edge attributed to the latter associates it with the knife's purpose of bloodshed. The three first translators of Bodas de sangre all make this association explicit in their translation, by turning the metaphor into a comparison: "the wind is coming hard, like a double edged knife," (JW) "the air is hardening, like a two-edged knife," (LH) and "the wind is coming sharply now, like a double edged knife" (GN). GL/O'C are the first to adhere to the original and thus, they render: "the wind
blows hard now, with a double edge," which will be followed also by WO, GE, D/Z, and SB, who uses "crystallises" for "llegar duro", which later on will be associated with the image of glass splinters. DJ uses a different image, probably for reasons of creating rhyme, but retains the association with the knife: "Watch how the air hardens/how its profile sharpens."

Another instance of the image of sharpness associated with that of the knife is in the exclamation "¡Qué vidrios se me clavan en la lengua!" The use of vidrios, combined with the verb clavar, evoke images of sharpness and penetration. This line, said initially by the Bride, is subsequently repeated by Leonardo. The repetition is not followed by all translators: LH uses "bits of glass" in the Bride's replique and "splinters" in Leonardo's. WO translates the Bride's line as "splinters of glass stick in my tongue" but Leonardo says "and what splinters of glass tear at my tongue." Most translators use the word "splinters," with the exception of GN, SB, and D/Z and DJ. Whereas some translators emphasize the image of penetration, others choose to eliminate it. An example of the former is JW: "What splinters of glass are piercing my tongue!" This translator subsequently adds yet another image that conveys a similar idea, and that is not present in the original: "What sword of flint pierces my heart!" Examples of translators who do not render the image of penetration are
Even though the images of sharpness and penetration are frequent in the original, and the entire soliloquy of the Moon expresses the desire to enter by force, some translators add further images, to reinforce the original's. The recognition by Leonardo, for instance, of the Moon's power over his and the Bride's destiny--"claves de luna nos funden/mi cintura y tus caderas"--is treated by DJ as a parallelism with the Bride's earlier replique in the original: "Splinters of moonlight have pierced my waist and your hips." That earlier replique, however, was rendered by DJ as "my tongue is run through and through with sharpest glass," which shows that he did not intend to create a parallelism there, but rather saw it as another means of reinforcing the image of sharpness. DJ also changes the Bride's plea "pon en mis manos de novia/el cañón de la escopeta" to "then put the knife into my hands," again for reasons of reintroducing and reinforcing the imagery of the knives. SB, D/Z and JW follow suit: we have already mentioned the latter's addition of a line to the Bride's lament, but he also renders "desgarrado vuelo de los gritos" as "the piercing flight of screams" and the synesthesia "un rumor de claridades" as "a sound of piercing light." SB translates the Moon's plea "Quiero entrar en un pecho" to "I
want to pierce a breast," and D/Z speaks of "lacerated screams."

The examples above are not the only instances of the addition of images by the translators. Especially in SB, DJ, and occasionally also in D/Z and LH’s versions, there seems to be an overriding tendency to make this rather complicated passage more accessible to the reader/spectator. This is done by either adding images that seem to be more common to the English speaking audience, or by simplifying considerably the images of the original. Some examples of the addition or modification of the original’s images may be found in SB, especially in the Woodcutters’ dialogue. "Hay que seguir el camino de la sangre" becomes "it’s the only way in the end;" "el chorro de la sangre" becomes "the floodgates of blood," and the Bridegroom’s question to Death, "¿Viste un hombre y una mujer que corrian montados en un caballo?" is embellished with an added simile: "Have you seen a man and woman on horseback, going like the wind?" On the other hand it seems that this translator wants to avoid some of the more erotically tinted images of the original. For example, the Moon’s replique, "mira que ya mis valles de ceniza despiertan/en ansia de esta fuente de chorro estremecido!" becomes in her version: "My ashen valleys wake, and wait/the final trembling, terrifying fountain!", which tones down the ultimate meaning of sexual satisfaction that the Moon hopes to receive from the death of the two
lovers. An even more radical modification is found in her translation of another replique of the Moon: "¡Un corazón para mí!/Caliente, que se derrame/por los montes de mi pecho;" which is rendered by SB as "At the very heart!/To hug me till my own heart glows!"

Finally, some examples of translators endeavoring to simplify imagery or actions by the characters are to be found in DJ and D/Z. Leonardo's question "¿Quién le puso/al caballo bridas nuevas?" is rendered as "Who untied the horse?" by D/Z. The more complex image in the following verses is simplified greatly in DJ: "De aquí no pasan. El rumor del río/apagará con el rumor de troncos/el desgarrado vuelo de los gritos." His English version reads "They'll go no further. Here the dark music/of the forest will still their cry." The passage being studied here in the DJ's version also contains an example of a modification of an image in order to make it "fit" the rest of the imagery better. The personification of the knives in "Ilumina el chaleco y aparta los botones,/que después las navajas ya saben el camino" is replaced by a comparison of the knives to fish, an image that will be used by the Bride in the last scene of the play: "pez sin escamas ni río." DJ's version of the first verses becomes: "Just make their waistcoat buttons gleam/after that, the knives like fish/will come marauding in..." There are really three shifts in this short passage: the first two actions of lighting up the jacket and opening
the buttons is combined into one, the knives are compared to
fish, and "gleam" is paired with "marauding in," probably in
order to produce the slant rhyme.

DEICTIC TEXTMES

From a deictic point of view, Act Three, Scene One is
extremely interesting. Whereas the first scene of the first
act was characterized by the I-you (first and second person)
dynamic between mother and son, the beginning of this
passage emphasizes the third person. The various sections of
this passage, the Woodcutters' dialogue and invocation, the
Moon's soliloquy, the ensuing conversation between the Moon
and Death, and finally the conversation between the lovers,
are all characterized by different deictic structures in the
original.

First, the Woodcutters' assessment of the situation and
their double plea in the original are characterized by a
focus on the third person of the plural. The dialogue in
prose between the woodcutters contains a great number of
personal pronouns, or forms of the present tense that
include the personal pronoun in their ending, but only two
of them refer to first person singular, two to second person
singular and three to the first person plural. All others
refer to the third person plural, or, to a lesser extent,
third person singular. This passage, and these characters
represent what Elam calls the choric dithyramb or a
descriptive rather than a pragmatic discourse.23

Certainly, this is not usual in theatre of this century,
and it seems that some of the translators did not feel very
comfortable with it, as they tried to remedy this narrative
function in order to make it more action-oriented. They did
so mainly by adding deictics that refer to the first or
second person: some of these are replacements of third
person deictics, others are new accretions to the text. The
result of this is that in most translations, the Woodcutters
participate more actively in the action instead of being
passive bystanders who reflect on the events. The
amplification of an existing personal pronoun affects for
instance the following three lines:

LENADOR 1o. ¿Qué? ¿Oyes algo?
LENADOR 3o. Oigo los grillos, las ranas, el acecho de
la noche.
LENADOR 1o. Pero el caballo no se siente.

This is the first time that the Woodcutters in the original
switch from the pure narration of events to the expression
of a personal observation: "oigo." Only one tú and one yo-
form are given in the original, and in the third line, there
is a return to the narrative mode in the passive third
person construction. All translators who modify translate in
the vein of "You can't/don't hear a horse?," and JW also
adds another "I hear" in the second line. Whereas this is
not as drastic a change, since a personal pronoun referring
to first and second person was already understood as present, JW and SB add some personal pronouns in places where they make a fundamental difference in the Woodcutters' role and function in the play. JW includes the Woodcutters in the group of those caught in the violence around them, without having any blame for it. This he manages by adding personal pronouns for the first person plural to the impersonal lines of the original: "They seem to be nearing us from every path. (...) The world is big. There is a place for all of us."

SB takes the involvement of the Woodcutters one step further, having them assume roles as part of the persecuting party, when she translates the following:

LEÑADOR 2o. Es difícil. Hay cuchillos y escopetas a diez leguas a la redonda.
(....)

LEÑADOR 1o. Ya estamos cerca.

LEÑADOR 2o. Un árbol de cuarenta ramas. Lo cortaremos pronto.

The last two lines of course are an allusion to the lives of the two young men who will be "cut down" soon, but it also provides a logical explanation of why the Woodcutters are in the vicinity. In SB's translation, the association Tree/Leonardo/Bridegroom is clarified by means of a comparison, and the woodcutters are presented in an altogether different light:

SECOND FORESTER: Difficult. We've got knives and rifles covering them for fifteen miles.
(....)
FIRST FORESTER: And we're all around.

SECOND FORESTER: Like a tree with forty branches. We'll cut him down.

Another instance of a deictic marker that is added or made more explicit in some of the English translations occurs in the lines:

LEÑADOR 1o. Se estaban engañando y al final la sangre pudo más.

LEÑADOR 3o. ¡La sangre!

LEÑADOR 1o. Hay que seguir el camino de la sangre.

The word "sangre" is preceded in the original by a definite article, which is not unusual in this case: Vázquez-Ayora has noted that the definite article in Spanish possesses "propiedad 'conceptualizadora' que se mantiene en el plano intelectivo en que se desenvuelve nuestra lengua, frente a la tendencia hacia lo real que una vez más deja entrever el inglés con el uso de los posesivos (...)." The effect of the definite article, which is the norm in Spanish, in the above lines universalizes the statements about the power of the blood, which acquires autonomy and thus refers not only to the lovers, but also to the audience. The translators have solved this problem in three different ways. GE and WO attempt to convey the same sense of universality by translating with the definite article:

FIRST WOODCUTTER: They were deceiving each other. In the end the blood was strongest.

THIRD WOODCUTTER: The blood!
FIRST WOODCUTTER: You have to follow the blood's path. (GE)

JW, GL/O'C, SB and D/Z eliminate the article completely, and in some cases the impersonal "your" is added in the third replique. LH, GN and DJ render the definite article as a possessive pronoun:

FIRST WOODCUTTER: They kept on trying to fool each other, but their blood got the best of them.

THIRD WOODCUTTER: Their blood!

FIRST WOODCUTTER: You've got to do what your blood tells you.

The change of this deictic marker to the possessive pronoun in English modifies the sense of these lines somewhat, from being the expression of the universal power of the blood to a more limited statement about the Leonardo and the Bride.

The soliloquy of the Moon presents different challenges yet with regard to the deictic textemes. Serpieri has pointed out that in monologues "the character directs his speech toward himself on one or more axes of orientation, toward the public on another axis, toward other characters (absent or hidden) on yet another." 25 Whereas the Woodcutters' passages are dominated by verbal forms referring to the third person, the soliloquy of the Moon and its subsequent conversation with Death are riddled with first person references in the personal and possessive pronouns. This is no more than logical, since this passage is a poem, in which a lyric subject expresses personal emotions, in this case the need for warmth and human
passion. The soliloquy starts out with three descriptions of falseness, things that the Moon seems to be but is not:

Cisne redondo en el río,
Ojo de las catedrales,
alba fingida en las hojas
soy; ¡no podrán escaparse!

We notice that the verb form, soy, with its implicit first person pronoun, is postponed to lengthen the suspense, and to keep the spectator guessing as to what those images refer to. WO and D/Z radically modify this syntax of inversion by starting off every one of the three first lines with the personal pronoun:

I'm the round swan on the river.
I'm the cathedral's eye.
I'm the false dawn in the treetops.
They will not get away!

This certainly focusses the attention on the I-form, and contrasts it sharply with the use of the third person form in the Woodcutters' invocations. Some translators seem eager to accentuate the yo-form in other ways also. In one of the next lines, the figure of the Moon reverts briefly to the third person, while still referring to itself: "La luna deja un cuchillo abandonado en el aire." GN finds it necessary to clarify this statement by inserting a first person pronoun: "I, the moon, leave a shining knife/ abandoned high up in the air." DJ makes the figure of the Moon more active than in the original by having the "I" do things that in the original are performed either by others or in a different way: "mis cenizas/ de soñolientos metales, /buscan la cresta
del fuego" becomes "I seek the crest of fire" and the following verse, apart from being simplified and made to rhyme, transforms the Moon from a passive object to an active subject:

Pero me lleva la nieve I ride the dark night
sobre su espalda de jaspe and across water and snow
y me anega, dura y fría as cold as the dead
el agua de los estanques. I am made to go.

The possessive pronouns in this passage as well were somewhat of a problem for some translators, due again to a grammatical difference of pronoun usage between the two languages. Although the replacement of a definite article by a possessive pronoun is often mandatory, in English it is not always necessary. Several translators insist on doing so, however, in order to clarify to whom or to what something is referred. When the referent is not totally clear it is the translator’s task to select the possessive pronoun and thus attribute an action or thing to a certain someone or something. If this happens a great deal and the same referent is chosen every time, it will definitely draw the meaning of the particular passage in the direction of that character. If different characters are selected, more confusion may result, as is the case in LH’s translation. He translates "Abren los cofres" as "open your trunks;" "la brisa/recogiendo en su falda los gemidos" as "the breeze’ll gather their cries;" "yo haré lucir al caballo" as "I’ll make your horse glitter," which are just a few of the many examples. Strangely enough, in the rare case where a
possessive is used in Spanish, this translator uses an indefinite article: "mi casa de tierra" is rendered as "a cave."

During the short dialogue between the Bridegroom and his companion in the search for Leonardo and the Bride, an interesting case of specification of a deictic marker of place occurs, in the replique "Y vamos pronto, que siento los dientes de todos los míos clavados aquí de una manera que se me hace imposible respirar tranquilo." Whereas JW adds the stage direction "points to his throat," SB specifies in the text itself: "(...) because I feel the teeth of all my family fastened on my neck and I can hardly breathe!" DJ, on the other hand, specifies also but by means of a comparative phrase: "(...) because I feel as if their teeth had bitten right into my heart, so that I can hardly breathe."

The last part of this scene, the Bride and Leonardo's dialogue, is once again oriented on the yo-tú axis, as both characters participate in the dialogue. However, slight priority is given to the yo in the alternating repliques as both characters express their own feelings, their past suffering and their hopes for the future from their point of reference. This dialogue is a good example of what Elam has called "egocentric" dramatic discourse: "The speaking subject defines everything (including the you-addresssee) in terms of his own place in the dramatic world."
translators seem to faithfully render the dynamic of the I-You exchange, and it is only in certain expressions that there is a slight tendency to emphasize the "I" even more. "Ay que sinrazón," for instance, is translated as "I must be mad" by DJ and "How foolish we all are" by LH. The former's tendency in general to provide more information than the original sometimes prompts him to greatly increase the number of deictics in a replique, as for instance in the following one by the Bride:

Con los dientes, con las manos, como puedas,
quita de mi cuello honrado el metal de esta cadena
dejándome arrinconada allá en mi casa de tierra
Y si no quieres matarme como a víbora pequeña
pon en mis manos de novia el cañon de la escopeta.

Not all of the underlined deictic markers are additions; most are, in fact, included in the Spanish verb form, or are obligatory shifts due to the impossibility of using the definite article in cases that require a possessive in English, but the addition of three non-obligatory possessives and one demonstrative shifts the dynamic between the characters somewhat: in this version Leonardo is expressly blamed for the figurative imprisonment of the Bride, and the simple "manos de novia" is expanded with a
descriptive phrase that includes the Bridegroom, with the use of the possessive "his" in the last line.

PROSODIC TEXTEMES

Although the passages in prose have some of the characteristics of poetic language and are very much conceived as poetry as far as rhythm is concerned, as we have seen in the analysis of the rhetorical textemes, in this section we shall concern ourselves exclusively with the poetry passages, i.e. those passages that are in verse form.

In poetry in free verse, the graphemic presentation on the page is often an important first indication that the text is poetry, and it must be noted that LH does not graphically present any of the poems in this passage as poems, with the exception of the soliloquy of the Moon. The passages in verse are integrated into the text as if they were prose. We have to keep in mind, however, that this particular translations was conceived for performance, not for reading, and furthermore for one specific theatre company with which, most probably, the translators was in close contact.

1) The Woodcutters' Invocations

The Woodcutters in this text fulfil a mainly choral function, and as we have seen in the section on deictic textemes, they focus their conversation almost exclusively
from a third person point of view. They do not interfere in the events except as observing outsiders, although they do express an opinion about them. They are advocates for personal freedom, even if it means death, and their two poems are a plea to the Moon and Death for clemency, which will not be granted. The interest in these poems, in our opinion, lies in the parallelism that can be found between them when they are juxtaposed:

Poem 1

LEÑADOR 1o.
¡Ay luna que sales!
Luna de las hojas grandes.

LEÑADOR 2o.
¡Llena de jazmines la sangre!

LEÑADOR 1o.
¡Ay luna sola!
¡Luna de las verdes hojas!

LEÑADOR 2o.
Plata en la cara de la novia.

LEÑADOR 3o.
¡Ay luna mala!
Deja para el amor la oscura rama.

LEÑADOR 1o.
¡Ay triste luna!
¡Deja para el amor la rama oscura!

Poem 2

LEÑADOR 1o.
¡Ay muerte que sales!
Muerte de las hojas grandes.

LEÑADOR 2o.
¡No abras el chorro de la sangre!

LEÑADOR 1o.
¡Ay muerte sola!
Muerte de las secas hojas.

LEÑADOR 2o.
¡No cubras de flores la boda!

LEÑADOR 3o.
¡Ay triste muerte!
Deja para el amor la rama verde.

LEÑADOR 1o.
¡Ay muerte mala!
¡Deja para el amor la verde rama!

The structure of these invocations consists of two verses alternated with one, up until the last two stanzas, which consist of two verses each. The poetic structure,
however, may be seen as consisting of a pair of three verses followed by a pair of two verses. The rhyme pattern is aaa bbb cc dd in both poems, with assonant feminine rhyme in a-e in the first set of three verses in the first poem, o-a in the next three, a-a in the first couplet and u-a in the last couplet. The second invocation is identical in its assonances, except for the first couplets: the first of these has assonant rhyme in e-e, the second, assonant rhyme in a-a.

Where the rhyme is concerned, the only translator who makes an attempt to maintain rhyme in the translated poems is GN. However, as opposed to the original's assonant, feminine rhyme, this translator renders the passage with masculine consonance. Some examples are:

FIRST WOODSMAN: 0 moon, alone!  
   Moon of green monotone!
SECOND WOODSMAN: Silver on the bride's face!
THIRD WOODSMAN: 0 evil moon!  
   Let love find a branch-darkened place.
FIRST WOODSMAN: 0 sad, sad moon!  
   Let love, in the dark, hide its face!

Some translators break up the parallelism of the two poems, by varying the ways in which the Moon and Death are addressed. An example of this is D/Z, whose first lines of Poem 1 are "0 rising moon!/Moon of the giant leaves," and those of Poem 2 are "Death! Death is coming,/ Beneath the giant leaves." Whereas the first parts of the two poems in
the original are almost perfectly parallel, there is gradual breakdown thereafter in the parallelism. In the two invocations, to the Moon and to Death, the first repliques are different only because the referent is different: "Luna" vs."Muerte." The second set of repliques adds to that a difference in the adjectival phrase: "de las verdes hojas" vs."de las secas hojas." The last two couplets of the poems are characterized by crossed parallelism, with the fifth stanza in the first poem corresponding, both in adjective--"mala"--and in form--inversion of noun and adjective in the last line--to the sixth stanza in the second poem and vice versa. This is of importance from the point of view of this study, since none of the translators follow the structure of the original exactly. JW, as well as WO, omit the last couplet of the first poem, but do include it in the second poem. Most translators do make the cross by way of the alteration "evil moon...sad moon" in Poem 1 and "sad death ...evil death" in Poem 2, but then simply repeat the last line of each couplet, without the inversion adjective/noun in either poem. An example of this is DJ, who also modifies the image of the original:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem 1</th>
<th>Poem 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOODCUTTER 3</td>
<td>WOODCUTTER 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evil, evil moon</td>
<td>Sad, sad death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave the world to darkness</td>
<td>let the branch of love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to love</td>
<td>grow green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WOODCUTTER 1
Sad, sad moon
leave the world to darkness
and to love.

WOODCUTTER 1
Evil, evil death
let the branch of love
grow green.

SB goes as far as to repeat the same end line "leave to love the shadow of the branches" four times, twice in each poem at the end of the couplets. It goes without saying that this brings about a certain monotony, which may have been what the translators aimed for in these chorus-like incantations by the Woodcutters. The only two translators who attempt the inversion noun/adjective in their translation are GL/O'C and GE, although they only do it in one of the poems. GL/O'C render the lines in the second poem "Leave for their love a green branch" and "Leave for their love a branch of green." GE, on the other hand, tries it in the first poem as "leave for their love a shadowy branch..." and "Leave for their love a branch in shadow!" Clearly, this is a valiant attempt to be more faithful to the original, but it does not evoke the same connotations as the original, as the deviation from the norm "rama verde" in the original evokes in the native speaker a feeling of closeness to and affection for the branch.

The last line of each stanza of three, or in terms of delivery on the stage, the second and fourth replique of each poem express different sentiments. In the invocation to Death, these lines contain negative commands; in the invocation to the Moon, however, the final line of the second stanza consists of an affirmative statement "plata en
la cara de la novia," whereas the final line of the first stanza is ambiguous in its meaning, as its referent is unclear. In a case like this, the translator must make a choice and interpret the passage to the best of his knowledge of the context. The phrase "¡Llena de jazmines la sangre!" may be interpreted as a command or request, as GL/O'C have done: "Cover the blood with jasmines!" On the other hand, it may be seen as a descriptive phrase meaning "La sangre está llena de jazmines," as has been done by D/Z: "The blood is filled with jasmine". Then, too, one translator takes this phrase to refer to the Moon: "Drenched with blood of jasmines!" (GN)

2) The Moon and Death

The Moon's soliloquy is a powerful piece of poetic theatre, and like the lullaby in the first act, is a key passage in the play as it foreshadows the things to come and manages to combine the main themes of the play with powerful visual and auditory elements and tropes. The imagery and rhetorical figures that abound in this soliloquy have been dealt with in the discussion of the rhetorical textemes, so here we will look only at the prosodic elements and how the various translators have tried to incorporate those into the target text.

The structure of the soliloquy is surprisingly simple: it is a ballad, and has the traditional octosyllabic verses
of Spanish ballads, or romances. The rhyme is located in the even-numbered verses, the odd-numbered verses being left free. The romance has for long been one of the most popular forms in Spanish poetry, and Lorca used it extensively in his work.

More so even than in prose passages, the translator of poetry will have to make a choice between form and content, between adhering, for the most part, to the prosodic characteristics of the ST, which is usually paired to some loss of the lexico-semantic characteristics of the text, or rather faithfully rendering the content, preserving images and rhetorical devices wherever possible, but usually abandoning the original's structure of prosodic elements. Most translators will want to seek the golden mean, but other motivations may also be involved, and some translators might want to adapt both form and content to the Target Language system.

Only one of the translators, GN, is completely faithful to the original's octosyllabic meter. It is somewhat of a tour de force and GN ends up sacrificing parts of the content and most of the rhyme scheme of the original, as the following example illustrates: "No haya sombra ni emboscada,/ que no pueden escaparse!" becomes "There will be no dark ambuscade/that will not dissolve before me." If we compare these lines to the same verses in D/Z's translation, we see that reflect an entirely different philosophy: these
translators opt for free verse and strive for an entirely updated feel to this poem: "There’ll be no shade, no shadow--/They will not get away!"

The Moon’s soliloquy is characterized by assonant end rhyme in a-e in the even-numbered lines: catedrales, escaparse, valle, aire, sangre and so on throughout the forty-six lines of the romance. There is also a great variety of internal rhyme, as in the following example, where besides the end rhyme in a-e there is also rhyme in o-a and u-o:

No quiero sombras. Mis rayos
han de entrar en todas partes,
y haya en los troncos oscuros
un rumor de claridades

Where the rhyme is concerned, none of the translators succeed in matching Lorca’s great regularity in end rhyme, and most do not even attempt to do so. All try, however, to introduce some rhyme into their versions of this soliloquy, and some translators do this to a much greater extent than others. GN, for instance, due perhaps to his insistence on maintaining the octosyllable, has very few rhyming lines, except at the end, when he introduces two consecutive ones:

Who is hiding? Come out I say!
No! You can never get away!
I shall make the horse shine as bright
as a diamond’s fevered light.

Unlike GN, the translators who use a variety of meters are able to maintain some of the rhyme or to introduce a new rhyme scheme. DJ is certainly the translator who manages to
introduce the greatest variety of rhyme, but he seems to have a predilection for [i], as the following examples illustrate:

Who can hide? Who's that sobbing there in the valley thicket,
in the dark mountainside?
The moon leaves a knife hanging in the sky
a cold trap of lead
that seeks blood's warm cry.
(...)
Let there be no shadow or shade
where they can hide.
Tonight, I want
a heart split wide.

The above examples contain some full masculine rhyme, but most of the other translators opt for single-sound assonant rhyme. One passage that all translators, except SB translate in a very similar manner, contains a great number of such rhyme based on the [ee] sound:

so that this night there will be sweet blood for my cheeks
and for the reeds that cluster
at the wide feet of the wind. (GL/O'C)

"Sweet," "cheeks," "reeds" and "feet" are used also by JW, LH, WO, and D/Z. SB has another rhyme scheme for this passage, which shows once again that hers is an original translation, not influenced by the translations that precede hers:

Tonight my cheeks
will blush with blood,
and rushes will huddle
between the straddled feet of the air.

When the figure of Death appears on stage and gives, in turn, a short monologue, the meter changes: the romance form
is replaced by *romance heroico*, in hendecasyllables, with a assonant end rhyme in i-o in the even-numbered lines: *río, gritos, hilos, herido, gemidos* and *limo*. When the Moon returns and starts her discussion and plotting with Death, the meter changes once again to lines of fourteen syllables, yet the assonance remains the same [i-o].

JW and LH, as mentioned before, return to prose form immediately after the Moon’s soliloquy, and do not revert to verse for the remainder of the play, even though the last scene contains some poetry passages as well. GN, who translated the previous soliloquy in a form equivalent to the Spanish *romance*, translates some of the dialogue between Death and the Moon in prose, and interestingly, maintains the octosyllabic form for the rest of the poetry in this passage, even if the original has a different meter. Where the other translators are concerned, they continue the free verse with a variety of meter throughout the rest of the dialogue in poetry between Death and the Moon.

**Leonardo and the Bride**

The dialogue between the Bride and Leonardo once again is a *romance* with assonant rhyme in e-a, maintained by Lorca to near perfection throughout the long dialogue. The result of this great regularity is a rhythm that approximates a musical composition. In this passage as well, we notice that the different types of strategies the translators adopt
towards this text correspond to some of the possibilities André Lefevre has listed in his work *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint.* Metrical translation by GN, whose dominant criterion is the metre of the original, poetry into prose translation by LH, literal, rhymed translation by GL/O'C and WO and some attempts at more free rhymed translations by DJ and the other translators.

**Conclusions**

If in the previous chapter two translators stood out for their abundance of shifts, additions and deletions, in the present chapter again some translators seem more eager than others to modify the original. The translators that stand out primarily in the analysis of the text are DJ, GN, SB, LH and D/Z. From a cultural point of view, we have noted how GN, SB and DJ add expressions drawn from the Target Language, either in order to replace expressions from the Source Text or to compensate for those that are lost. DJ especially does this in both scenes discussed above, but in the rest of the text also strives to find equivalents for all kinds of cultural items and expressions.

All five of the above-mentioned translators also adapt the text to make it easier to access for the Target Language audience or reader. The adaptation of cultural expressions and items is only one of the ways of doing this. Other strategies used are the clarification of traditions or
images that are considered too complex, the modernization of certain traditions, and the lowering of the level of formality in the speeches of the characters. Where the imagery is concerned, DJ, for instance, frequently introduces new items that will fit in with previously mentioned images or with images that are yet to come. This kind of internal allusion and cross-reference is noticeable throughout DJ's translation.

Another strategy is noticeable in SB, DJ and D/Z's efforts to make certain concessions to the reader. At times these consist of embellishments in the language, at other times of the addition of expressions that qualify a certain event or item. We had noticed a similar strategy earlier in SB and D/Z, in their treatment of the stage directions. D/Z also changes the punctuation in order to make the entire text more animated, which would affect the reading of the text as well as its theatrical performances.

Finally, from a prosodic point of view, GN is the only one who makes a persistent effort to follow the octosyllabic meter of the original, although several translators try to compensate for the regularity of Lorca's rhyme scheme by introducing rhyme whenever possible.

Juxtaposing the nine English versions of just a few lines taken from the dialogue between Leonardo and the Bride, clearly shows some of the translators' different strategies.
A good example is the Bride's exclamation "¡Ay, qué lamento, qué fuego/ me sube por la cabeza!"
The English versions are:
JW: Oh, what woe! What fire is rising to my head!
LH: Oh what pain, what fire flames in my head!
GN: Ah, what a shame, what a hot flame/Rushes up to devour my brain!
GL/O'C: Oh, what lamenting, what fire,/ sweeps upward through my head!
WO: Oh, what shrieking, what fire/rises to my head!
SB: I weep, and my head's on fire!
GE: Oh what sorrow, what fire/ sweeps upward through my head!
D/Z: A song of sorrow--Burning! Burning!--/Rises up inside my head!
DJ: My head is full of grief and fire.

These examples illustrate well the different strategies used by the translators, with regard to several of the textemes discussed in this chapter. Attempts to introduce rhyme are especially blatant in GN's rather forced rendering of these lines. We note GL/O'C, GE and WO's desire to remain as faithful as possible to the original text. In the versions by these translators, the Spanish is rendered literally, almost word for word, as we see in GL/O'C's use of a cognate, such as "lamenting". In SB and DJ we notice the wish to simplify and modernize, and in D/Z the
manipulation of the punctuation is obviously aimed at creating a line that is more animated.
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28. In his notes that accompany the text, DJ mentions instances throughout the text where, in his opinion, cultural substitution was necessary. To name just a few, "hacer las migas" is translated as "to bake bread;" "Macho," which "for a contemporary English-speaking audience (...) would spark a different set of references" is therefore translated as "full of hopes;" "qué lejos vive esa gente" is rendered as "These people live in the back of nowhere;" "demasiado solas" becomes "too far off the beaten track" (all in Act One, Scene Three).
CHAPTER V
THE TRANSLATION ON STAGE: A RECENT PRODUCTION OF BLOOD WEDDING AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

In May of 1993, the Department of Theatre at the Ohio State University presented Blood Wedding in a new production, directed by Varun Khanna. A new twist in this recent production, however, was that the director, who is of Indian descent, decided to situate the play's action in India, more specifically in "A small village at the border of the States of Punjab and Jammu & Kashmir." In this matter, Mr. Khanna was guided by the reasoning that many parallels and points of contact exist between some of the customs, mentality and people of the two cultures, that of the original's Andalusia and this region in Northern India. Some of the parallels that stand out are the strong sense of honor and loyalty to family, the status of women in a traditional society that assigns rigid roles and codes of conduct to both females and males, the relationship of man to the metaphysical world, the power of fate and destiny. In practical terms, the adaptation of the theatre text amounted to some minor changes in lexical, gestic and mimic items;
especially affected, however, was the sub text which determines the set, costumes and lighting.

Certainly, this production was not the first to change the locale of Bodas de sangre to another part of the world: one example of a similar shift occurred in 1989, when a joint production by the Half Moon Company and the Asian Co-operative Theatre of London transported Blood Wedding to "a vaguely Asian location." In that production, however, unlike in the one that took place at the Ohio State University, a translation apparently was conceived especially to this end by the director, Jonathan Martin, and the Peruvian actor Mary Ann Vargas. Khanna, in the OSU production, was probably unique in his deviating from the original text in two ways: starting from a translated text, aimed at a certain target audience, he adapted this "new" Source Text into yet another Target Text, but the audience aimed at remained the same. The total number of 12 performances at Ohio State's Thurber Theatre was generally well attended and received mixed reviews, which will be discussed later.

The Director and Cast

At the time of the production of Blood Wedding, Varun Khanna was a candidate for the degree of Master of Fine Arts in the Department of Theatre of the Ohio State University. The production of this play was one of the requisites of his
degree, but it was certainly not Mr. Khanna's first venture directing this kind of theatre. Having had a great deal of experience as an actor in comic roles, his choices for directing seem to gravitate toward tragedy. Despite the familiarity of Mr. Khanna with this genre, he acknowledged the fact that this particular play was an entirely new experience for him, as it entailed a number of difficulties that he had not encountered heretofore.

Open auditions were held for this production, which resulted in the selection of a young and relatively inexperienced cast drawn from different departments and representing various degrees of maturity. Mr. Khanna noted that "if the actor successfully believed in the world that he/she was creating, then I did not care whether they had any prior experience on stage."4

Physically, the actors were generally well suited for their roles, although in some cases their youthful appearance and vigorous movements were not well matched to the temperament or the age of the character they were portraying. Their inexperience with this kind of multi-layered text, however, complicated by the added rigors of working with a translation, soon proved problematic, as the director noted during the rehearsals:

I was starting to notice that the major problem lay in the fact that the actors were not treating the characters as living, breathing, thinking, feeling people that had needs. Since the text had heightened language I found the actors having an extremely difficult time making Lorca's words
their own. Hence, words were coming from unknown sources that were not defined. The actor would choose the easier route, shouting, yelling, ranting and raving.5

One should keep in mind that during the first Spanish production of Bodas de sangre, directed by the playwright himself, Lorca went to great lengths to avoid a declamatory tone and that similar problems cropped up, due to the actors' unfamiliarity with this kind of theatre text:

Había de luchar con actores no habituados a un tipo de actuación que comportaba una total rectificación del teatro al uso, enfrentados a una obra en la que el movimiento escénico y el lenguaje tienen un fondo musical, acentuado muchas veces por el verso. Federico tuvo que resignarse, (...) a que los leñadores del acto del bosque interpretados por modestos actores que nunca habían dicho, probablemente, un verso en escena, hicieron sus papeles a su propio modo.6

Presentation of the Play to the Target Language Audience

The production of Blood Wedding at the Ohio State University was announced and promoted by means of posters and advertisements in the college and local newspapers, and the spectators received a program containing all the usual information on scene synopsis, time and place of setting, listings of the production staff, cast and crew. It included furthermore a short Director’s Note and a brief introduction to the playwright by the dramaturg, Anca Galron. The predominant color of the matching posters and of the program was pink and purple, which was set departmentally for the entire theatre season, and besides the title, showed a
traditional wedding bouquet, certainly an image with which the target audience could readily identify. The poster called the play "a consuming passionate tragedy," and some of the posters specified that the play was set in India. The author's name figured in relatively small print at the bottom of the programs and posters, and the program also mentioned the translation used, that of James Graham-Luján and Richard O'Connell, as well as the rather puzzling phrase "Adapted for the stage by Federico García Lorca." In the theatre itself, photographs of the production were displayed as well as sketches of the costume design. Furthermore, an informative display on García Lorca was set up, with English translations of some of his poems, drawings by Dalí and by Lorca and a short biographical sketch.

The play opened on May 12, 1993 and the total run was stretched over two weeks with performances Wednesday through Saturday. After each week's Thursday performance, an informal question and answering session took place during which the audience could ask any of the actors, the director, dramaturg and costume designer questions about the meaning of the play or any other matter. These so called "talk backs" were quite successful with a great number of questions being raised. The most commonly asked questions seemed to focus on the following problems:

"Do you think your concept of changing the setting to India translates or 'works' well on the stage?"
"Why was the mother so spiteful? Did she accept what happens in the end?"

"Are the Moon and Death working as a pair? Not knowing Indian culture I did not understand what their connection was, nor why the Woodcutters seemed to want to help the fugitives?"

The last question certainly indicates that at least some members of the audience were not aware of the fact that the original play was not set in an Indian locale. It seems to us that the program remained quite vague in specifying the origins of this play or the reasons for the change in locale.

Reception of the Play

It has been established previously that the most common way of analyzing the reception of a play is by the reviews of its production that appear during or right after the performance run. During the run of the performances on stage, however, an even more direct way is to simply note the audience's reaction to certain developments or utterances, which will be dealt with in our discussion of the production.

Where newspaper reviews are concerned, both the local newspaper and the student newspaper published articles on the production of Blood Wedding. The Columbus Dispatch critic, Michael Grossberg, had some severe reservations
about this production, calling it "an interesting experiment in cross cultural theater, but one whose surfaces count for far more than the play's emotional depths." Although he calls the visual elements and the decor stunning, he is of the opinion that the cast "largely recites the dialogue as if it were a memory exercise for Poetry 101."*

The college newspaper, The Ohio State Lantern, published a review on May 17 by Cathy Runyon, obviously a novice in the field of theatre criticism, who likened the play to "a typical soap opera." The two major complaints expressed by that reviewer were that some of the words by the actors were hard to decipher--"It was like taking a level one, foreign-language course where the instructor expected everyone to be fluent already"--and the fact that in the second part of the play "Lorca threw the audience for a loop" by switching from a conventional, realist environment to a surrealist or symbolic one.*

The Framework of the Text: Metatexts and Textstructural Features

For a more complete overview of the director's ideas and opinions about the play we would like to refer the reader to the interview with Mr. Khanna in Appendix B. In the program notes, other comments about the play may be found, both by the director and by the dramaturg. In his
remarks, the director summarized the meaning that he wanted to convey to the audience: "Blood Wedding is a passionate romantic consuming tragedy that violently explores the rebellion of young blood against the old conservative parameters and 'roles' assigned by society and tradition."

The cast is listed in the program in alphabetical order, which is somewhat unusual. When asked about this, Mr. Khanna said that he considered this play an ensemble piece, where all characters have roles that, while not equal in length, are equal in importance, thus implying that he saw all characters as the embodiment of the idea of victimization of the individual by the rigid rules and dogmas of society. It is certainly true that there were no villains in this production, and neither were any of the characters presented as weak or at fault for their condition. What was expressed, however, was a collective need, shared by both mortal and supernatural characters.

Where other textstructural features are concerned, the play underwent a shift from the original organization of three acts and seven scenes to a work divided in two halves, with a ten minute intermission inserted between the first and second scene of what had been Act Two. The original's division into acts follows strictly temporal criteria: Act One consists of the preliminaries to the wedding, and takes place several days prior to it; Act Two is the entire wedding, from its very beginning, with the Bride's
preparations, to its tragic conclusion; Act Three recounts the events taking place the night and day immediately following the wedding celebration. The third act also takes leave of the realist plane and introduces at its very beginning the forces of the Moon and Death that control man’s destiny. The performance structure in Khanna’s production rejects this triple division, instead centralizing the wedding as the event taking place during the intermission, and thus having the first act include everything before the wedding, and the second act everything after the actual ceremony has taken place. Mr. Khanna noted that he would have preferred to not have an intermission, and have all scenes flow together without interruption except for short periods of darkened stage necessary for manipulation of the scenery. However, the Department of Theatre insisted on a more traditional structure that included the ten minute intermission. Besides the existing scenes of *Blood Wedding*, the director added a "pre-show," in which the Mother appears on stage, by herself at first, and performs a series of activities that make up her daily ritual at daybreak.

Set and costumes: A Director’s Concept of *Blood Wedding*

The director worked with a team of designers consisting of Dennis Hassan for the set, Jayme Rhoades for the costumes, and Damita Peace for lighting. In our previous
discussions of the stage directions of *Bodas de sangre*, we have pointed out that Lorca leaves a good deal of freedom to the directors where the set design and props are concerned: some of the descriptions of the decor are very brief and sometimes mention only a backdrop color or a few small props. They are a starting point for the directors' conceptualization of the play and as such were conceived by Varun Khanna and his designers: "while careful attention should be paid to Lorca's suggestions to scenery, we should not restrict our images to those mentioned by the playwright." The set ended up being quite spectacular, with a variety of colors and elements that suggested the forces of nature, such as water, earth and fire. The main piece of the set had various levels that could be climbed or walked on by the actors, and displayed a certain Indian flavor in its depiction of the characters' dwellings. It consisted of two pieces that could be rotated and recombined in various ways between scenes in order to create the various spaces the play called for. Technically the set seemed to function extremely well.

Where the costumes and colors of the scenery are concerned, by virtue of its locale they were more intense and varied than those envisioned and suggested by the original:

There is a definite progression of colors in this play. Starting with earthy and ordinary colors in the first two scenes; moving onto richer Indian colors (celebratory blues, caressing purples,
blushing pinks, and traditional saffrons) in the
wedding sequence; and further extending into the
surreal worlds with wet sensual greens and blues,
dehthly reds in the forest; and enamoring,
enveloping and consuming whites in the last
scene.11

These colors were a unifying aspect in the production
as they appeared in the costumes and the decor, but also in
the make up and masks of the actors. Since the costumes, set
and spoken text are closely tied together as creators of
meaning in this play, further comments on the design, props
and lighting will be made during the discussion of the
actual performances.

The Production of Blood Wedding

The pre-show mentioned above, which lasted a full ten
minutes, began while the overhead lighting in the theatre
was still on, and while the members of the audience were
finding their seats. In general, the pre-show seemed to
puzzle the audience more than entrance it. In some cases it
took several minutes before the audience noticed that
something was happening on stage. Nevertheless, these
preliminaries, in conjunction with instrumental and vocal
selections, succeeded in conveying well the mood of the
Indian context. The Mother, through her actions, was
presented as a meticulous and brooding woman, somewhat
obsessive in the performance of the daily ritual, and above
all, a victim of extreme solitude when her son was not
present. The pre-show concluded with the Mother sitting
motionless, facing the audience for several minutes, during which the Bridegroom appeared on the stage, looking around in order to find his mother. When the actual dialogue between mother and son began, the lighting scheme responded by darkening the background and illuminating the front of the stage, where the characters were. This lighting scheme served several functions: it signaled to the audience that the play was starting, it indicated the temporal element that day had broken and it placed the Mother, who loves her son above all else, temporarily in a comfortable pool of light even if she was reminded almost simultaneously of the death of her husband and other son.

The conversation between mother and son was characterized by a fluctuation of moods in the two characters, and due possibly to the inexperience of the actors, may have come across as somewhat overplayed, especially to someone aware of the sobriety of the original. The same held true in the last scene of the first act, when mother and son visited the Father of the Bride's house to arrange the wedding. One of the differences between this scene and the original was the absence of the immobility that Lorca had accentuated in that scene. The Mother and the Bridegroom did not sit still in the tableau-like way described in the original, and the Mother especially moved around constantly. Incidentally, an abundance of movement and gesture seemed to be a trend that pervaded this entire
production, from the Mother roaming her kitchen to the Woodcutters jumping and slinking around in a catlike way in the forest, which apparently was not the director's initial plan:

Initially, my concept included selective and rare choice of gesture. (...) I wanted to highlight and magnify only those moments in the text that absolutely demanded from the character to communicate with a gesture. I had to deviate from this choice when I had to accept the fact that these actors needed their natural gestures to communicate this text.\[12\]

The second scene of the first act brought on stage an entirely new set of characters and scenery: the Mother-in-Law, Leonardo's wife and finally Leonardo, gathered at the latter's house. The scenery was rotated in such a way that it showed the crampedness of their dwelling in contrast to the Bridegroom's house in the previous scene and the Father's house in the following one. The first part of this scene, before Leonardo's entrance, was executed in an interesting way: while the Mother-in-Law and Leonardo's Wife performed the lullaby of the great horse, the background, behind curtains, showed an array of characters performing their daily duties. These characters, which included the Bridegroom and some of the wedding guests appearing later on, demonstrated the separation of labor between men and women: the men were working the earth and the women tending to children or performing household duties. Towards the end of the lullaby Leonardo appeared, also behind the curtain,
without participating, however, in the activities of the other men and was thus already presented as a nonconformist outsider, prior to making his actual entrance on the forestage. The lullaby itself showed the tension present in the household. Even before Leonardo entered, the Mother-in-Law, played by the young Pakistani actor Rahimah Shah, came across as a resentful and bitter woman, who seemed pitted against Leonardo’s Wife, her daughter, yet she handled the baby lovingly. She seemed to express what one author, in a book about the situation of women in India, has described as "the take charge look of mothers-in-law across India." The lullaby was performed with great energy, which seems a little contradictory to its very nature; on the other hand it accentuated the violence of some of its images.

Leonardo’s arrival confirmed the tensed relations with his family as well as his repressed anger and tendency to violent outbursts. The actor playing Leonardo, Louis Cavallari, succeeded well in presenting Leonardo as a likeable yet at the same time somewhat unbalanced man, subject to violent moodswings throughout the play. Leonardo’s Wife was portrayed very well also, not as submissive and weak, but rather as a strong woman who, against her will, is caught in a hopeless situation.

In the third scene of the first act, the Bride and her father are introduced. The actor playing the Father lacked the ability to bring across the old man’s bitterness and
sense of disappointment at having to work the land all his life without sons. The youthful enthusiasm that this actor displayed during certain repliques and his attempts to adopt an Indian accent may have contributed to the fact that when he was present there seemed to be some unintended hilarity from the audience. Some instances of this were his delivery of lines such as "she can cut a strong rope with her teeth" and "your son is strong and my daughter is wide-hipped" in the second scene of the second act. Obviously the awkwardness of the last line should not be blamed entirely on the actor but also on a lack of elegance in the translation. On the other hand, what this actor did bring across very convincingly, in our opinion, was the sense of materialism that pervades the actions of the character.

The Bride's first moments on stage gave the impression of her being meek and submissive in the presence of the Mother, but as soon as the guests left, her strength and desperation showed through. Again, there was a problem with this actress overplaying her role, which made her seem inconsistent in her moods at times. The Servant performed her role of older advisor to the Bride in a believable manner. At the end of this scene, during the discussion of Leonardo's nightly visits, the director chose to eliminate the passage where a horse is heard, causing the Bride to rush to the window to catch a glimpse of Leonardo. The text,
however, was not altered, and it was somewhat confusing to hear the Servant say: "Look. Lean out. Was it Leonardo?"

As mentioned before, the director of this production did away with Lorca's division into three acts, and had the scenes flow into each other. The transition from the first to the second act, marked in the original by an intermission, may have been somewhat confusing to spectators unfamiliar with the play since the same characters were on stage as in the previous scene, yet approximately a week had passed. In the interview included at the end of this study, Mr. Khanna, when asked for the reasons of this structural change, indicated that in his opinion, Blood Wedding is a play in seven scenes. In our view, however, the three acts are clearly delineated by climaxes at the end of each one: at the end of the first one, the Bride confesses that she is aware of Leonardo's visits, which had been hinted at throughout the act; the second act ends with the dramatic elopement, the Mother's division of the wedding guests in two groups and her insistence on the Bridegroom defending his honor; the third act, of course, finalizes the play with the confrontation between the Mother and the Bride.

In the OSU production, the "fourth" scene of the first act was initiated by the confrontation between Leonardo and the Bride on the morning of her wedding, after which the guests started arriving. Where the preparations to the wedding are concerned, the similarities between the Spanish
and Indian context are more striking than one might think. In his work *Songs for the Bride*, William G. Archer lists songs that in India are sung to the bride and bridegroom during the extensive rituals of preparation for weddings, mainly in the former Bihar province. Like the invocations sung by the wedding guests in *Bodas de sangre*, these songs are characterized by floral and vegetative imagery, by references to knives and to animals, such as horses, elephants and fish. It was, nevertheless, in this scene that quite a few cultural changes and omissions occurred in the performance text. In several cases, the omissions had to do with the Bride’s appearance and the symbolism of the orange blossom. As is customary in weddings taking place in the Northern region of India in which the play was now located, the Bride wore a sari of red silk trimmed with gold, and had small jewels applied on her face. Intricate designs had been painted on her hands and feet. Some of the omitted repliques concerned the Bride’s hair, as in the servant saying, while she combs: "Es para arreglarte mejor esta onda. Quiero que te caigo sobre la frente" or "el azahar te lo voy a poner desde aquí hasta aquí, de modo que la corona luzca sobre el peinado." The references to "el azahar," or the orange blossom, which functions as a symbol of purity and innocence in the original play, do not produce the same connotation in either the American or the Indian context. Perhaps for that reason, Mr. Khanna decided either
to substitute ("I’m going to put on the wreath" becomes "I’m going to put on your jewelry") or omit whenever possible the references to the orange blossom. Physically, the wreath of orange blossom was substituted with garlands of flowers worn by the Bride and Bridegroom, and it was mentioned on occasion without further explanation of its symbolic value.

As stipulated in Bodas de sangre, the arrival of the wedding guests was announced by a song that started off-stage and gradually increased in volume while the guests, in a great variety of colorful costumes, entered the stage from all directions. At this point, the director attempted to experiment with a "slow walking" technique, which he describes as follows:

This should not be mistaken with slow motion. Slow walking is the essential movement of the entire body that at any given moment, brackets (like on a 35 mm celluloid film) the body motion in such a way, so as to communicate a sense of a world where this kind of kinetic communication is natural, hence real.16

While in the original the Bride disappears from the stage after her discussion with Leonardo, Mr. Khanna elected to have her present on the stage throughout this scene. She stood frozen in one position, with her face towards the audience, turned into a seemingly lifeless object, being inspected and prodded by the circling guests. In our opinion, this was very effective and in conjunction with the slow walking technique produced an eerie and surreal image that conveyed well the contrast between the festivities and
the quiet sense of desperation that the Bride in Lorca's play shares with many Indian brides and which Bumiller described as follows: "There was one thing, though, that marked almost every wedding I attended: the look of dazed terror on the bride's face as she began the rest of her life with a man who was little more than a stranger to her." 17

The Bride's position was maintained until the Bridegroom made his entrance, at which point the singing became more energetic and the movements returned to normal speed. The scene ended with a return to the slow walking technique as the guests and wedding party formed a double line and slowly ascended the highest part of the set. The last sung lines were followed by the curtain closing on the first part of the performance. In the first production of Bodas de sangre in Madrid, Lorca conceived of this scene in the following manner:

El cuadro de la despedida de la Novia, fragmentado de numerosas entradas de personajes desde diferentes y escalonadas alturas, con el juego alterno de voces femeninas y masculinas que expresan en versos de extremada riqueza rítmica, fue principalmente duro; pero en él culminó el éxito de la obra. En los ensayos Federico interrumpía innumerables veces el curso de la escena, diciendo: "¡Tiene que ser matemático!" Y lo logró. Había concebido este cuadro en el interior de la cueva con entradas y luces a diferentes niveles. 18

This almost mathematical sense of rhythm of delivery and of the actors' entrances Lorca is said to have wanted to achieve was also sought after in this production of Blood Wedding. The young actors in this production had their share
of problems with timing and alternation of delivery, yet a
courageous attempt was made and this scene, in our opinion,
thanks to some innovative direction, proved to be one of the
more interesting and fascinating ones of the play.

From the point of view of the translation, in this
particular passage, GL/O'C seem to have strived for a
greater amount of full rhyme than in other parts of their
translation. As opposed to the original's assonance, which
gently guides the rhythm and the musicality of the
repliques, the English version, when put on stage,
accentuated at times the fact that the dialogue appeared a
little forced in order to accommodate the full rhyme. An
example from this scene will illustrate that the translators
had to sacrifice some of the original's imagery and rhythm
in order to maintain the full rhyme:

¡Despierta, paloma!
El alba despejá
campanas de sombra
(...)
Baja morena,
arrastrando tu cola de seda.

Baja morenita,
porque llueve rocio la mañana fría.

Depertad, señora, despertad,
porque viene el aire lloviendo azahar.

Dove, awaken!
In the dawn
Shadowy bells are shaken.

Dark one, come down
trailing the train of your silken gown.
Little dark one, come down,
cold morning wears a dewy crown.

Awaken, wife, awake,
orange blossoms the breezes shake.

After the intermission, the stage was first taken by
the Servant, who was readying the house for the return of
the Bride, Bridegroom and wedding guests, helped in this by
Leonardo's wife, the Father and the Mother. When the Bride
and Bridegroom entered, they were tied together by a sash
and performed some of the rituals associated with Indian
weddings, such as the anointing of the Bride's feet and the
respectful greeting of the parents by the newlyweds.
Throughout this scene, a scrim that ran the entire width of
the stage was in place, separating the wedding celebration
and dances in which the guests engaged in the background
from a series of vignette-like conversations in the
foreground between the Bride and Bridegroom, the Bridegroom
and the Servant, and the Bridegroom and his mother. This
two-part concept worked especially well at the height of the
celebration, when the mounting tension and frantic activity
in the foreground to find the Bride and Leonardo were
matched at the back by a ritual dance performed with sticks
that were rhythmically struck together at an ever-faster
pace. The dance stopped abruptly when Leonardo's wife
announced the elopement, and the scene ended with the
forceful division of the wedding guests in two groups by the
Mother, and the Bridegroom and his relatives setting out on their search.

The changing of the scenery took place against a blood red background, after which all lighting was cut for a brief instant. The next moment, thunder was heard and the scenery had been transformed in a landscape of boulders, drooping trees and water. The prevailing colors were nuances of green and blue, established by both the lighting and pieces of fabric hanging down (cf. Plate V, Appendix C). According to Mr. Khanna, "the forest scene can be compared to the Kurukshetra or the famous battlefield where The Mahabharata was fought. The forest was a battleground where the ordinary mortal was to stand in full stride against the forces of nature and fate." Unlike the Woodcutters of the original, who are mostly immobile, chorus-like figures, the three characters in this production moved across the entire stage in rapid catlike movements and fantastic costumes. In answer to a question about the origin of and inspiration for the costumes, the costume designer acknowledged that the Woodcutters had been the most problematic. The end product consisted of leatherlike body suits, large manes and intricate masks with definite feline characteristics, for which credit has to be given to Brian Russman.

After the Woodcutters' assessment of the situation, the Moon, played by Mitzi Sinnott, who had been instructed by choreographer Indira Satyapriya, climbed to the highest
point of the set and performed the soliloquy in a singsong way, accompanied by dance movements from the Indian theatre. The Moon was dressed entirely in brilliant white, with costume and appearance reminiscent of the goddess Kali. While the Moon was on stage, the Woodcutters hid behind the scenery, while repeating some of the Moon’s words as a chorus. At one point one of the Woodcutters was seized and taken onto the Moon’s platform. The actress playing the Moon delivered her soliloquy with great sensuality and in general expressed in a convincing manner the sense of imminent doom and inescapability of the lovers’ bloodshed. She teamed up well with the figure of Death, who came dressed in a colorful costume of red and black, with facial make up reminiscent of dancers of the Japanese Kabuki theatre.

Both the Moon and Death indicated that they oversaw and turned the events to their advantage by remaining close by during the next scene. It turned Leonardo and the Bride, who express their love for each other in the second part of this scene, into tragic figures, since the mocking stare of the Moon and Death’s hidden presence signalled to the audience that their hopes would not be fulfilled. The set during this scene was pervaded by wetness: rain dripping from a cave-like passage-way, moist trees drooping their limbs and Leonardo and the Bride sitting on the edge of a small pond, a clear prolepsis to the water imagery the Bride uses in the last scene to describe the differences in her feelings for
Leonardo and the Bridegroom. Again, there was far more movement on stage than the original called for, for instance by Leonardo running back and forth to check on the progress of the men pursuing them. The scene ended with Leonardo and the Bride fleeing, and a short shadowplay symbolizing the fight of the two men, which closed with two long cries of agony.

In the last scene, the action returned to the Bridegroom’s house and the stage was cleared of all but the most elementary decor. Three girls rhythmically wound red threads of wool attached in the middle to a fourth girl, while singing the text "Oh wool, red wool/ oh wool red wool/ what would you say (make)/ red wool" to another original composition by Varun Khanna and Michael Milligan, the musical director, who also played the role of the Bridegroom. The color scheme and costumes in this entire last scene were interesting in the light of the comparison between the original and this stage adaptation. While the background was a muted white with a red sun slowly creeping left to right against the backdrop, the characters’ costumes were predominantly white. The departure from the original’s stark black/white contrast in the final scene is obvious, and the use of the color white for mourning, traditional in India, is not part of the original’s frame of reference, nor that of the target audience. All characters wore long white saris and masks that partially hid their faces. Some of the
saris also had red stains on their lower parts, as if blood had been soaked up by the cloth from the ground. The red stained saris were worn by the Mother, the Wife and the Mother-in-Law. The Bride, when she appeared halfway through the scene wore her red wedding sari, but had been stripped of all jewelry and other ornaments. The Bride and the Mother were the only characters on stage who did not wear masks and who appeared from beyond the stage against the backdrop of a silhouetted hilly landscape (cf. Plate VI, Appendix C).

The final scene in this production was in some respects a mirror image of the wedding scene, with women and men entering from all sides. This is a departure from the original, in which the last scene consists only of women on the stage, reinforcing once more the differences between male and female in Lorca’s dramatic world: "El hombre es la pieza móvil que sólo existe de compañía; cuando perece o es desplazado, se restaura la soledad, que es uno de los atributos esenciales y exclusivos de lo femenino(...)". In this production, the men, entering from the left side and the women from the right all wore long white robes and had red handkerchiefs attached to their hands. They performed a traditional mourners’ song in sanskrit, and throughout the rest of the scene moved their upper bodies in extremely slow motion, giving an impression of fluidity to the scene. The scene ended with the Mother walking into a trap door at the back of the stage, a symbolic return to the earth. Even
though this scene was fascinating from a visual point of view, the vocal qualities of some of the actor's voices left something to be desired.

Conclusions

In general, we may say that this production of *Blood Wedding* was inventive and highly interesting. It is clear that many similarities exist between the rural communities of Southern Spain and Northern India. The Indian context added interest and may have actually made some of the situations easier to accept for the audience. Whereas usually an adaptation serves to draw a text closer to a target audience, either in time or in place, making it easier for the audience to identify with the characters or occurrences on stage, this was one instance in which the removal of the audience away from the events may have made them more plausible to an American audience than they would be if occurring in Spain, which is now generally regarded a modern society much like the American. As Allen Josephs has pointed out:

The people of Andalusia still cling to what most of the rest of our world has given up, a strong cultural identity rooted in antiquity, the core of which, primordial but not primitive, preserved but not archaic, is an unremitting sense of what religious historians would call the sacred, what Lorca would have called hieratic, and what depth psychologists would refer to as archetypal. 21

It seems that this kind of preservation of tradition, the sacred, and the mythical, in the eyes of an American
audience at least, might be more easily associated with the enigmatic Eastern societies than with Western European ones.

We think it is safe to assume that Varun Khanna's use of stunning costumes and stimulating decor turned the play into more of a visual pleasure than it has been in most of the other productions in this country or elsewhere. However, we feel that this visual strength may have detracted somewhat from the power of the words, especially as they were delivered by this relatively unexperienced cast. A cast of professional actors trained and experienced in the enunciation of this type of text could probably have counteracted the feeling of words being "lost in the production." On the other hand, some of the strength of the original text had been "lost in the translation," and certainly the addition of visual stimuli compensated for this, making the play more accessible and enjoyable to a wider audience.
NOTES


3. For a more detailed account of the Varun Khanna’s professional background and experience, we refer the reader to the interview with the director in Appendix B.


Some examples of such songs are:

59

In your garden, 0 flower girl
On the brow of the bridegroom
Sandal looks well.
In your garden, 0 flower girl
comes an elephant and howdah.

(....)

60

(....)
And the bridegroom is a lotus bloom
0 you prince of a bridegroom.

The invocations to the Bride on her wedding morning are similar in their descriptions, and certain comparisons may be drawn also between the identification of the bridegrooms with flowers in these songs and those of *Blood Wedding*:

The Bridegroom
is like a flower of gold
when he walks
blossoms at his feet unfold.


17. Bumiller 25.

18. Francisco García Lorca 336.


CONCLUSION

As explained in the Introduction, the aim of this study was to produce a descriptive analysis of nine English versions of García Lorca's *Bodas de sangre*, thereby disclosing some of the translational strategies and norms adopted by the various translators. This study also hoped to establish a model that would prove valid for other research of this kind, and which would stimulate the analyses of theatre texts and their translations. The objective of the study was not to be exhaustive, complete or prescriptive: with a relatively extensive corpus of translated texts available for scrutiny, only certain translational and textual problems could be discussed, and out of practical considerations, not every single existing English version of Lorca's play could be included. Since a variety in the translations studied was considered desirable, however, among those included were all the published translations of *Bodas de sangre* as well as some unpublished ones that are of interest from an historical point of view, notably those of Jose Weissberger and Langston Hughes.

Starting out with information gathered about the genesis and reception of the translated versions in the
United States, and to a lesser extent also in the United Kingdom, some preliminary hypotheses were established about the reasons for the existence of some of the translations, the translators' backgrounds and the reactions to the play in the target culture system. Where the latter is concerned, there seems to have been a gradual rise of approval on the part of the reviewers of the performances, but whether this is actually due to an increase in the quality of the translations, or to more daring and creative mise-en-scenes on the part of the directors, or to greater sophistication and tolerance on the part of reviewers and audiences, is a question this study can only address in part: it traces strategies used by the translators, but its purpose is not to make value judgements on the quality of the translations, nor to be prescriptive in its analysis.

Examined in Chapter Two were the goals that the translators had set for themselves and how these were or were not realized in the translation of the framework of the play. Where possible, we let the translators speak for themselves, by consulting their notes and remarks on the translations. In some other cases, it was possible to find indications of the norms from reports by third parties about the translation, which appeared in publications ranging from literary histories to newspaper articles. From these investigations into the translators' initial purpose, we deduced that JW, LH, GE, D/Z and DJ had as the starting
point of their versions a performance, usually by a specific company. To our knowledge, the translations by GN, WO, SB and GL/O'C were not undertaken with one such specific performance in mind, although some of these translations have at a certain times been used in stage productions of the play. We know for certain that this is the case with GL/O'C, which is undoubtedly the most read as well as most performed, and is still the most readily available of all the translations into English of _Bodas de sangre_.

The initial choice of the translators whether to produce a dramatic text or a performance text was further complicated by the matter of acceptability vs. adequacy, the adaptation of the text to the target culture or its adherence to specific source culture values. In the case of the more recent translations of the play--those published from 1977 on, starting with that of Sue Bradbury--the translators' norms could be determined fairly easily by means of their own statements; in the versions of the earlier period--comprising those produced in the thirties, forties and fifties--it was entirely the textual analysis that seemed to point to one norm or the other. The establishment of, and hypotheses about the initial norms were then applied to the examination of the stage directions and two crucial passages of the text, the first scenes of the first and the last act, which together provided good
insight into the different challenges with which the translators were faced when undertaking their work.

In Chapter Three, with some of the initial norms in mind, the actual strategies of the different translators were examined by means of the analysis of shifts that occurred in the stage directions of the English versions as compared to those of the original text. The analysis of the subtext that consists of the stage directions led us to believe that it was sometimes treated in a much different way from the main text, as if not considered a part of it, which resulted in two different translational strategies in some translations. JW, for instance, freely and consistently modifies, amplifies and adds to the stage directions in order to comply with what seems to be a desire to make the text more dramatic, more emotionally loaded than the original text, yet he does so to a much lesser degree in the text itself. DJ, on the other hand, intervenes only rarely in the stage directions, but manipulates the text itself in a looser manner than most of the other translators. D/Z intervenes both in the subtext and in the dialogue: in the former, by eliminating a great deal of stage direction, in the latter, by way of various grammatical and lexical shifts that often point to a desire to clarify and enliven the original text. Whereas the additions to the stage directions, as in JW's case, point to the translators' desire to influence the director, and ultimately the
performance of the play on the stage, the elimination and embellishment of the stage directions, as they occur in SB and D/Z are, in our opinion, done with the reader in mind, even though the latter profess that they produced a performance text. Finally, in the LH translation, the treatment of selective stage directions points to a desire to make the text more acceptable to the target audience, a phenomenon that is continued in the treatment of the dialogue by this translator.

Moving on to the actual text of the play, Chapter Four focussed mainly on those items that literary criticism has established as the cornerstones of Bodas de sangre: the Andalucismo, or cultural context that ties this play to the playwright's region; the imagery, which is typical of and original in Lorca's work; the regularity and musicality of meter and rhyme in Lorca's poetic language. Besides these potential problems necessarily faced by all translators of Lorca's dramatic works, we discussed also two challenges shared by most translators, and especially by those translating for the theatre: differences in the grammatical systems of different languages, and the deictic codes that characterize dramatic texts.

Clearly, translating a literary text is not an exact science, but rather an interpretative activity, and therefore not every move of the translator can be identified with a particular norm or strategy. However, we think that
our analysis has proven that the nine translators of Bodas de sangre into English follow one of two equivalency criteria. First, there are those who produce what once would have been called a relatively "faithful" or "literal" translation, which now is more readily referred to as one that seeks formal equivalence. The relationship between formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence has been formulated as the opposition between translations that focus their "attention on the message itself, in both form and content," and translations that have as their main objective that "the relationship between reception and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message."¹ It goes without saying that those translators pursuing dynamic equivalence will be more willing to produce shifts in their translation if they consider such shifts to be necessary for the target audience to identify with the characters, imagery and so on, especially if such identification existed in the original relationship text/audience.

It is our belief that GL/O'C, WO and GE pursued a more formal equivalence in their versions than some of the other translators. Commenting on his translation of Bodas de sangre, GE states that "the key point here is that all the images, if Lorca's world is to be re-created, must be translated faithfully, without evasion or dilution."² This same translator criticizes other translators of Yerma and La
casa de Bernarda Alba for their versions in which "what is specifically Spanish is generalized and the sense of something precise and particular is lost." Yet, such generalization, along with other phenomena, points to a second tendency in translational strategy, which can be observed in LH, SB, DJ, and, although to a lesser extent, in D/Z: all of these translators seem to strive for a more dynamic equivalence: by means of changes in, for instance, cultural items and expressions, simplification of the imagery and an increased explicitness in the deictic system, and by means of shifts in the syntax and punctuation, they attempt to make the text as clear to the English speaking audience as they assume it was for the Spanish reader or spectator. In an article written shortly after the production on stage of his translation of Bodas de sangre at the Edinburgh festival, DJ notes the following:

El traductor también ha de hacer frente a la todavía más difícil tarea de hallar una expresión lingüística y cultural apropiada en lengua propia. Este es un trabajo lleno de riesgo, que lleva consigo, sobre todo en el caso de Lorca, la adaptación, la clarificación y diversos niveles de concesiones culturales.

In SB this tendency toward dynamic equivalence is manifested by additions of culturally recognizable expressions, and by simplification of the images and of the syntax. In DJ, it is shown by the addition of certain elements to images in order to make them fit in more clearly with the entire network of imagery found in the play, and
indeed in all of Lorca's work. Furthermore, the theatricality and display of emotions that might have been acceptable for an audience of the thirties and forties in Spain is toned down in DJ to a level acceptable for modern audiences used to more realist prose and theatre, and a certain colloquialism is sought after, both in DJ and LH. Especially in moments of heightened dramatic tension, such as in the dialogue between Leonardo and the Bride, all the recent translations, with the exception of GE, seem to exhibit the tendency to colloquialize the text, to make it less formal than the original.

GN and JW are problematic, since their treatment of this text is somewhat ambiguous. GN, who probably had in mind introducing the educated reader familiar with Lorca's poetry to his theatre, demonstrates this norm in his respect for the textstructural elements and in his adherence to the original's form, especially in the poetry passages. His insistence on preserving the romance, probably the meter most used by Lorca--even going so far as to introduce an equivalent of romance in those passages where Lorca uses another form--at times entails a change in the contents. More often, however, the changes made in lexical items by this translator stem from a deliberate choice to introduce more modern, target audience-oriented ideas and elements. This we notice, for instance, in the use of American idioms, or the modernization of certain cultural traditions:
"ponerle una palma encima o un plato de sal gorda" becomes "to put pennies on his eyes and spread the body with chemicals," which suggests a wish on his part to produce a more dynamic equivalence.

JW, whose respect for the dialogue and imagery of the original is obvious, both in his notes and in the translation of the text itself, nevertheless amplifies the stage directions in a way that makes the text more theatrical than the original, which may proceed either from personal preference or from a desire to present the Spaniards as he thinks an American audience would conceive of them. Also, his elimination of rhyme in certain passages denotes conformation to the expectations of the American public, who at the time of this translation seemed more interested in plays of a social-realist kind, comedies, and musicals than in poetic tragedies.

At the outset of our study, we asked the question whether the strategies and norms of the earlier and later periods have changed, and whether the translators' backgrounds made a difference in the strategies adopted. Our conclusion is that the audience aimed at is the single most important factor in the adoption of one strategy over another. We note that one of the earliest translators, LH, the only one in the group who is a poet and playwright himself, keeps the poetry to a minimum by not translating in verse all the parts of the original that are in verse. This
may point to the fact that the translator's professional background was not as important a motivation as the needs of the audience to which the translation was directed. Since the American audience of the Thirties and Forties was not accustomed to this style of poetic theatre, this translator decided to adapt the play to the expectations of the target audience. The fact that GN, translating in approximately the same time period, did render the poetry in a very rigorous manner confirms this, since his version was not meant for performance, but rather for readership by an intellectual audience.

The method of analysis used in this study, which went from examining the external framework to the internal characteristics of the text, from macro-level to micro-level, and which was based on Lambert and van Gorp's "Scheme for Translation Description," proved useful in the description of this theatre text. Since this scheme has a rather general nature, it was necessary to further develop certain elements, such as the categorization of the stage directions, in order for the scheme to be specifically applicable to the description of translations of texts written for the theatre.

Whether the strategies attributed to the various translators are mere individual tendencies, or whether they are trends that occur on a regular basis in, for instance, all translation into English of Lorca's plays, or in the
translation into any language of his theatre, or in the translation in general of Spanish theatre into English, are questions that this study cannot answer. In order to examine such questions, our analysis would necessarily have to be incorporated into a much broader and more generalized series of descriptive translation analyses. We would like to express the hope here that such studies will eventually be undertaken, as they could provide invaluable insight into translation processes and their effects on texts, performances and the reception of foreign literatures in a new and differing cultural system.
NOTES


5. Some of the important American playwrights during the decade in which Bitter Oleander was presented include Lillian Hellman, Maxwell Anderson, Robert Sherwood, Elia Kazan and Clifford Odets, and comedy writers like S. N. Behrman, George S. Kaufman and Moss Hart. The second half of the thirties also saw examples of the modern American musical, such as Gershwin's Porgy and Bess in 1935 and Rodgers and Hart's Pal Joey in 1940.

APPENDIX A

SHIFTS IN THE STAGE DIRECTIONS IN THE TRANSLATIONS BY

JOSE WEISSBERGER AND DEWELL/ZAPATA

The following is a list of the changes that the stage directions underwent in the translations of Bodas de sangre by Jose Weissberger (1935) and by Michael Dewell and Carmen Zapata (1987). As discussed in Chapter Three, the translation by JW is characterized by a many additional stage directions, whereas D/Z omit a great number of stage directions.

For JW, two slightly different scripts were consulted for the discussion of that translation in the present study. The first is a fully typed version, possibly a first draft, with some minor changes made by hand. The second is the script that was apparently used during the actual production in New York in 1935. It includes the names of the actors next to the characters in the cast list, the stage design plans, lighting and character position cues and a great number of additions, deletions and notes on the side, most likely written by the director, Irene Lewisohn. The following list limits itself to those stage directions typed in the script, and disregards those written by hand. There
are some minor discrepancies between the two scripts, and these will be preceded by an * in this list.

All additions to the stage directions of the original in JW are listed by scene and are preceded by the character in whose replique the stage direction occurs. If more than one addition occurs in the same replique by a character, those two or more stage directions will be separated by suspension points. Added pauses will be preceded by the character who delivered the last replique. Stage directions that refer to groups of characters or to nobody in particular are listed between parentheses and are not preceded by a character. When the original's stage directions are rendered, but also expanded upon by the translator, the added material is underlined. Finally, any of the original's stage directions that have been deleted in the JW translation are listed at the end of each scene.

In D/Z the same format is followed: all deletions are listed by scene, and any additions to the original's stage directions are listed at the end.
1. JOSE WEISSBERGER

ACT ONE, Scene One

Additions

*(At curtain Mother is on stage. Soon after rise Novio enters.)

MOTHER: (Pause)
MOTHER: (Squatting down)
MOTHER: (Pause)
NEIGHBOR: (Pause)
MOTHER: (Sadly)
MOTHER: (Pause)
MOTHER: (Sadly and indifferently)
MOTHER: (Pause)
NEIGHBOR: (Pause)
MOTHER: (Eagerly)
MOTHER: (Violent reproach)
MOTHER: (slowly, nodding her head)
MOTHER: (Pause)

Deletions:

NOVIO: (Entrando)

Scene Two

Additions

WIFE: (Pause)
MOTHER-IN-LAW: (Drily)
LEONARDO: (Drinks)

LEONARDO: (Roughly)

MOTHER-IN-LAW: (Pause)

Deletions:

(Habitación pintada de rosa con cobres y ramos de flores populares. En el centro, una mesa con mantel. Es la mañana.)

Scene Three

Additions

MOTHER: (Very slow)

NOVIO: (Pause)

MOTHER: (Short pause, sadly)

NOVIO: (Long pause. Embarrassment. All remain immovable.)

FATHER: (Solemn)

MOTHER: (Solemnly, rising, looking toward heaven)

NOVIA: (Pause)

MOTHER: (With a bit of anxiety)

MOTHER: (With anguish)

NOVIA: (Short pause)

SERVANT: (Impatiently and gaily)

NOVIA: (Drily)

NOVIA: (Curious and anxious, all harshness gone)

SERVANT: (With meaning)

SERVANT: (Drily)

NOVIA: (Trembling slightly, with low voice)
NOVIA: (Trembling)
NOVIA: (Long pause)
NOVIA: (Dramatically)

ACT TWO, Scene One

Additions

NOVIA: (Getting up)
SERVANT: (Pause)
NOVIA: (Pause)
NOVIA: (Tired)
LEONARDO: (Enters)
SERVANT: (Surprised)
LEONARDO: (Ironically)
NOVIA: (To Servant) ... (To Leonardo)
LEONARDO: (Fiercely)
NOVIA: (Trembling)
NOVIA: (With decision and despair)

1ST YOUNG MAN: (While he is speaking, noise is increasing and also light, finishing in laughter and shouts as bride enters)

SERVANT: (The servant speaks these verses to the girls who gather around her. Much movement on the scene)

FATHER: (Enters and chimes in)

(All shout)

(All chant)

SERVANT: (Screaming)

(Novio enters. His mother enters)

NOVIA: (Glancing at Novio’s tan shoes)
Deletions:

(Zaguán de la casa de la Novia. Portón al fondo. es de Noche. La Novia sale con enaguas blancas encañonadas, lleno de encajes y puntas bordadas, y un corpiño blanco, con los brazos al aire. La criada lo mismo.)

NOVIA: (Seria)

CRIADA: (Moviendo algaraza)

(Entran tres convidados)

(Se oyen guitarras, palillos y panderetas)

WIFE: (Levantándose)

Scene Two

Additions

MOTHER: Entering, with great emphasis

(Entrance of people. The stage is full of people.)

MOTHER: (Going)

NOVIA: (They kiss. She goes out)

NOVIA: (Indicating temples)

NOVIA: (Exit Novia)

Deletions:

NOVIA: (Seca)

ACT THREE, Scene One

Additions

((....)Moist, tropic trees with very thick trunks giving impression of deep perspective (....))

3RD WOODCUTTER: (Pause)
2ND WOODCUTTER: (Energetically) ... (Pause)

NOVIO: (Points to his throat)

*BEGGAR WOMAN: (Moaning slowly, and nearly howling with low voice, plaintively)

*BEGGAR WOMAN: (Howling as before)

*BEGGAR WOMAN: (Looking at him, her voice acquires a sensual, beautiful quality) ... (She rises, with the poise of a divinity)

*NOVIO: (Anxiously)

*BEGGAR WOMAN: (Insinuatingly)

*BEGGAR WOMAN; (Coldly and cruelly, dramatically)

NOVIA: (Reacting violently, nearly hating him for her own weakness)

LEONARDO: (Manly and dominating)

NOVIA: (Embracing him fervently, between love and hatred) ... (Passionately) ... (With hatred, shaking him off)

LEONARDO: (Very passionately, embracing and sometimes separating)

LEONARDO: (Lyric and embracing her)

LEONARDO: (Embracing her closely)

LEONARDO: (Energetically) ... (Short pause) ... (Short pause)

Scene Two

Additions

2ND GIRL: (All this is mysterious and purely rhythm. It means that the girls are making an incantation to find out from the strand of wool what has happened at the wedding.)

LITTLE GIRL: (On the threshold. This is a mysterious allusion to blood-shed--the strand is red.)
WIFE: (Frantically)
(The girls walk out rhythmically)

BEGGAR WOMAN: (Amiably, with a bitter smile)

LITTLE GIRL: (very lyric. Exit. Scene remains empty. Enter Mother with a woman. The woman weeps.)

MOTHER: (Energetically, by the threshold)
(Enters a woman, goes to a corner, remains quiet, hands folded, head down.)

(While Mother and Novia speak, more women enter dressed in black and stand against the white wall. Enters the little girl. The novia remains on the threshold. Mother in the center of stage.)

MOTHER: (Looking upward with hands at her breast. All women kneel down, weeping.)
2. DEWELL AND ZAPATA

ACT ONE, Scene One

Deletions

NOVIO: (Entrando)

NOVIO: (Riendo)

MADRE: (Entre dientes y buscandola)

NOVIO: (Bajando la cabeza)

NOVIO: (Fuerte)

MADRE: (Serio)

MADRE: (Entre dientes)

(La Madre se dirige a la puerta de la izquierda. En medio del camino se detiene y lentamente se santigua.)

Additions:

MOTHER: (She sighs)

NEIGHBOR: (She sighs)

(There is a moment of silence)

Scene Two

Deletions

MUJER: (Mirando)

MUJER: (Alegre)

SUEGRA: (Se sienta. Pausa.)

LEONARDO: (Serio)

SUEGRA: (Con intención)

LEONARDO: (Fuerte)

LEONARDO: (Se sienta)
MUJER: (A Leonardo)
LEONARDO: (Agrio)

Scene Three

Deletions

NOVIO: (Por la Novia)

ACT TWO, Scene One

Deletions

CRIADA: (Se levanta)
NOVIA: (Se sienta)
CRIADA: (Fuerte)
CRIADA: (A Leonardo)
MUCHACHA 3A: (Entrando)

Scene Two

Deletions

NOVIO: (Entrando)

ACT THREE, Scene One

Deletions

(Salen tres Leñadores)
NOVIA: (Dramática)
NOVIA: (Sarcástica)
Scene Two

Deletions

NIÑA: (Asomándose a la puerta)
(Las muchachas se agrupan)
MUCHACHA 2A: (A la mendiga)
MUCHACHA 1A: (Tímida)
MADRE: (Se sienta)
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW WITH VARUN KHANNA, DIRECTOR OF BLOOD WEDDING AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY (SPRING 1993)

Q: Could you provide us with a brief outline of your background in theatre to this point and, if any, of your experience with plays similar to Blood Wedding?

A: Let's see, my background... I have worked in India as an actor, mostly, for about ten years. It would be very difficult to define that perhaps as professional theatre in the American sense of the word "professional," but in the loose meaning of the term "professional," as being out there trying to survive in the world of theatre--yes. So in a certain sense it was professional, but not on the level that American--and I won't say professionalism, because that's another thing altogether--professional theatre functions. I was doing that from a very young age. I did a lot of radio. I did radio drama, I sang, for a long time. I also moderated a lot of shows, a lot of discussions, panel discussions. Then I started my own company, when I was about twenty. I wanted to do Peter Shaffer's Equus, one of my favorite plays, and my college wasn't willing to do it. And so I raised the money, got the professional actors that I wanted,
and I directed the show, and I produced it. That's when I opened a company called Stage Coach Theatre Productions, and it was very successful, in terms of reviews, people really appreciated it, but we couldn't get audiences in. So we failed miserably at the box office and we had to close the show down. Yet I consider it a wonderful experience. It's funny, but mostly my background as an actor is in comedy, physical comedy, but as a director I found that what I liked are plays like Equus and Blood Wedding and Brecht and Genet. That's what I like to do. I ran that company for a few years, directed some more plays and then graduated in 1987 with a Bachelor of Science, in Physics, from Bombay University. I left India, came to the States and got my Master's in 1990 from the University of Akron, in Directing and Design. I then came to Ohio State to get my professional Degree, an MFA in Directing, and I will be graduating very soon now, at the end of the Summer[1993].

Q: When was the first time you read Blood wedding, and why did you pick this particular play for this production?

A: I picked this play as the project for my thesis. I first read this play three years ago, in the Summer of 1990. I wasn't doing any theatre at the time, but I read the play. I didn't grasp a whole lot of it; it kind of scared me.
Q: What was it that particularly attracted you to this play when you first read it?

A: I think it was the passion. I think it was because I found that I knew these characters, that I knew these people. And I found the whole connection between the physical and the metaphysical worlds not only fascinating, but also connecting the bridge between representational and presentational theatre, presentational being more typical of Eastern theatre. When I saw that connection I thought this might be a very exciting project, where I could actually explore different forms of theatre from different cultures, bring them together and see if it actually works. I mean, I've never done anything of this kind before, so for me it was a huge risk just to take something that is as famous and 'sacred' in this country as Blood Wedding, and Blood wedding is sacred in this country, why, I don't think most people know why. But they call it sacred for whatever reasons. But there is something in there, and I'm announcing now that after this production I'm going to direct the show again, I know it. I will direct the show again, and it needs another attempt from me, maybe two more, who knows.

Q: I found that it's a play that can literally haunt one.

A: Yes, it does, it does, and in fact I think haunt is the right word. I've directed some pretty tough shows, for
example Quartet last year, The Maids, but I think this production, not only the magnitude of this production but... I think this production has aged me about ten years. It really has. I don't feel 27, I feel more like 37, and it's going to take me a while to get back to being 27. I think somewhere in there I lost something, but thinking more positively I feel I've gained something, I just don't know what. But I've aged.

Q: What is for you the meaning and the significance of Blood Wedding, and what are some of the ways you have tried to convey this meaning to the audience?

A: For me it would be three things. First thing: segregation, when you think of the word segregation as separation, or drawing a line of demarcation, then it becomes a wall that is insurmountable. It is huge, it is an iron wall between the sexes. And for me I have further reconfirmed in my mind that difference does not translate into subservience. It can remain on the level of difference, that man can be a man, and a woman can be a woman, it doesn't mean that he or she is more or less, it just means that they're different, but why can't they live together? That's one thing in this play that I tried to communicate. Two, what women have to face every time man "indulges" in violence. And three is how we human beings can invest and give power to inanimate or animate things, like a knife. A
little knife, how we can give it the power to kill. Because that knife is powerless until we give it the power. The play for me is timeless, it's just timeless. This vicious, violent circle continues, we continue to kill. It's happening in Bosnia, in India, it's happening in Columbus, it's happening everywhere. But I think we're so comfortable now, in our own little cubbyholes. Yes, I think this play is--as much as people say that it is not--I think it's timeless, culturally it applies to everyone. It's about man's violence, unnecessary violence.

Q: Do you think that the adaptation of this play to the Indian culture was a good decision and that it worked out on the stage?

A: Yes, I think it did. I think it absolutely did. And I am further convinced that the cultures are more similar than I thought earlier. There are a lot of areas where I don't know exactly how it is in the Spanish culture, but if Lorca's play is a reflection of it, then yes, the points of communality and universality between the Indian and Spanish cultures are there, definitely there. And I absolutely think it works, it works.

Q: You adapted a lot of details from the original to the Indian context. What were some of the things that you found were impossible to adapt?
A: The orange blossom I couldn’t adapt. The word choices that were changed were for instance references to Christ or to the church, the wreath, although in certain parts I kept the wreath because it became more of a symbol of fertility, of life, power, hope, future. So I did change those, but apart from that I didn’t change a whole lot. Maybe a word like mantilla was changed to dress or to sari, but that’s about it. Lorca’s script is intact, his text is intact. Whether I was able to communicate his text to a young audience of Columbus, Ohio, I’m still evaluating that, I don’t know yet.

Q: You were using the translation by Richard O’Connell and James Graham-Luján in this production. What were the main reasons for picking this particular translation over some of the others that are currently available?

A: In simple terms: economics. It was the only translation available through Samuel French. We had no access to others, and I had to tell my department what I wanted to use. The only other translation listed in the catalogue was unavailable. It wasn’t until recently that I read some of the other translations, but we simply didn’t have enough time to make the changes. And secondly I’m not sure if any translation that I read does justice. I mean, I can see what Lorca is saying. But words are words and you cannot trivialize words. And clearly a lot of these translators have trivialized the words and not just the words, but the
images, the rhythms, the tempos. I know that in translation you lose a lot, but these translators have done injustice, I'm sure of it. I cannot read Spanish, so I don't know what the original text is, but somewhere deep down in my heart I know that this is not Lorca's play. And perhaps that is what I tried to communicate to the audience. My vision seeing through the English words into Lorca's images--why? Because I understand them. This kind of theatre is Indian--very Indian. What I conceive when I read something in English. How successful I was with a young student cast, I don't know. But yes, this translation was very hard to work with.

Q: Were there instances where you personally changed items in the translation?

A: No. Maybe I used some word choices from the other translations, but I did not rewrite a single word, apart from the occasional cultural item, such as changing "dress" to "sari" or something. But I don't change, I don't write, I don't believe in that.

Q: What are some of the main problems you and your cast encountered using this translation? How did you resolve them?

A: Well, for one the transitions from one thought to the other thought, how one idea feeds another idea, or how one idea does not feed the other idea, and that becomes a
transition in itself. But once again, word choices, the way certain things were treated...the language itself became so literal, that I felt the translators just basically had taken the word and translated it literally in English and put it in the unit of a sentence. And that does not a good translation make. The images, the passion, the rhythm, all that does not come through. I'm not sure how much, but I'm sure it did to a certain extent contribute to the actors' problems. But I think that American actors, young American actors' problems were not just with the language, it had more to do with just accepting a culture and going with it, accepting that there are cultures out there that are different. It's the whole political stance of the American audience--because we shouldn't forget the audience in this process--the audience was very important in this process, and I'm not even going to use the word product, because we never did have a product. And I don't believe in "product." But... they find it very hard just to digest the information, to take it and lap it up and find joy in tasting these words, you know. Somewhere down the road these actors could not taste the words.

Q: The actors couldn't, or the audience couldn't?

A: Both. The times where the actors tasted them, the audience did slightly. The times when the audience tasted
them--allowed themselves to taste the words--the actors did. I knew before this play that there are differences in cultures, but not at all that there are such differences in cultures, my God... Columbus, Ohio needs to open its eyes, there is a world outside this town, this country.

Q: What about the audience, are there things that you noticed or heard that give indications of the reception and perception of this play?

A: Well, there were two sets of audiences. On the one hand there was the Theatre Department audience, and they gave comments such as "very brave," "interesting experiment," "huge risks," "stretched everyone, designers, director, actors, everyone." Then there were also students, like the theatre 100 class, who was required to see the play, and then you get comments such as "Moon, on stage? No, that can't happen," which clearly tells us what television has done to our young minds. They cannot think or imagine. Somewhere in there--and I know that as an 18 year old one does believe that one is invincible--but you would think that one doesn't forget the fact that there are metaphysical forces out there that are controlling us. And on stage they can manifest themselves in a physical form. They find that very hard to accept. Essentially, over all, they mostly found the play a visually stunning composition, but I guess where they lost part of the play was the language. And
clearly a lot of them were not listening. The next time that I do this play I'll say to everyone now keep your eyes closed and listen to the play.

Q: Some of the comments that I received from people who knew the original play after they had seen this production was that it was almost too visually stunning—"too lush" is how one person described it—and their expectations were more of a stark scenic environment, where the language stands out. Do you think that especially for an inexperienced audience this contributed to the fact that the words were not received as they should be?

A: Well, that may be true, but the question is do you leave that audience to be inexperienced for the rest of their lives or do you what you do, and let them learn? What I do is images, I communicate in images, I talk through images, and that's what I did. And after all, there were many 18 and 19 year olds attempting this show, and they were attempting it alright. But when someone is used to answering in monosyllables, how do you teach them to use these words? I was just reading this yesterday, it was something that I marked 15 or 16 years ago, from Empty Space by Peter Brook. I marked this in the first and only book on theatre that I read before I came to this country. He says: "The word does not start as a word. It is an end product, which begins as an impulse, stimulated by attitude and behavior which dictates the need for expression." And that's what I wanted to do with this play. That's what I really wanted to do. I wanted to have the actor move only when it was really
necessary to move, make a gesture only when it was absolutely necessary to make a gesture. That's what I originally wanted to do with this show. But I could not. Young actors are very dependent on contemporary televisionesque acting. Unless they do that it is not real to them. So when you make them do anything other than that, the characters don't really become human. They become these things in the air, that don't really exist. And that becomes that deadly word "style." What they don't know is that each one of us has their own style, and that we don't do anything to make it our style, it's us. So those were the choices that I had to make to compensate in one way. And I still believe the fact that it worked, at some level it worked. Powerful images, colorful, powerful, plain.

Q: It's interesting that you should mention the movement aspect, since I was often surprised by the amount of movement on stage in certain scenes where in the original the static is emphasized. I am thinking for instance of the scene at the father's house when the Bridegroom and his mother come to ask for the bride in marriage. In the original, the two visitors sit completely motionless, hardly speak, but in the production there was a constant movement from the Mother on the stage.

A: Right, it was an attempt to physically show how uncomfortable she was after she finally left her house after twenty years. Having her just sit there? It is very difficult for a young actor to show that. They think that to communicate means to do a lot. They don't understand that by
doing less you can show more. So what happens is that when you give them something that is physically still, they think that they’re not acting. That something happens to them and nothing comes out. So you have got to work with a young American actor, the way that they’re used to from watching television. If you really get down to what this is, it’s editing, editing on stage. You see, I had to treat it like television acting to a certain point. Edit, edit, edit. That’s what they’re used to. You have two people sitting and holding a conversation, in that space... this audience that you’re catering to--and when I say cater I don’t mean that I was catering to the needs of the audience, because if I was I wouldn’t have done the show that I did--they just would not understand. I mean the whole part in the beginning, with the mother sitting, the pre-show, one night we had a guy who started applauding at the end of it, which made me extremely angry. Someone said the other day that the audience was uneducated, I think they’re not uneducated, they’re illiterate.

Q: Many people in the audience started fidgeting during the pre-show.

A: Right. There’s a beauty in stillness, there’s a beauty in silence.
Q: Another thing I noticed was what seemed to be inappropriate laughter and chuckling during some of the parts of the play from the audience. Was this something that you had expected, anticipated?

A: Actually I did. Especially when the Mother talks to the son and says "listen, you're the man, the boss." I did expect it to happen there.

Q: There was laughter at for instance the passage where the Mother says: "save your kisses for your wife" and then in an aside adds "when she is your wife," which in the original is a rather ominous statement.

A: But we are dealing with a 1993 mind, where people have lost their virginity by the time they're eleven. Nothing to look forward to. It's far removed from my time, ten years ago, when people would go to a movie and hold hands, and that would be a big thing. It's sad, this generation has nothing to look forward to, nothing. This world stares into an abyss.

Q: Another scene that drew laughter at every performance it seems was the scene where the Father says: "And she can cut a rope with her teeth."

A: Because the thing was that the actor himself refused to believe the fact that that line could be anything more than what it said literally. So you can't entirely blame the audience for this, somewhere in there is a Western, American
actor, at his or her age. Which is what I kept telling Emily, who played the Wife. I told her that the danger in that part was that being a 1993 young American woman, if you see her as being a woman that is completely powerless, who lets her husband walk all over her, there will be a major problem. I said "find her power" and she did, because for her age this actress is a very grounded, centered person. There is power, you just have to find it, and she was one of the few who did.

Q: Just a few more technical questions now. You decided to somewhat change the structure of the play, from three acts to two acts.

A: Well, structure is two ways. One is a literary structure and one is a performance structure. So in that sense, when you’re thinking of translating it--sorry, wrong word--putting it into performance, people want an intermission, that’s why it got two acts, but Lorca says it’s a play in three acts and seven scenes. And really it’s a play in seven scenes. If I could have helped it, I would not do this play with an intermission, but if you’d ask people here to sit still for two hours straight you’d have a revolution on your hands. Last year when I did Quartet I did not want to have an intermission, but I was told I couldn’t do it without an intermission. People are not used to listening. Radio was introduced early on, but television did not come to Bombay
until 1972. And then it was only two hours in the evening, and one hour of that was news. I still remember sitting all Sunday afternoon, with the entire family, listening to quiz contests, radio plays, cricket commentaries, we watched cricket through radio. When you can listen and then have your own images... my average reading a week, back home when I was young, was seven books a week. You went to the library and at a very young age you spent two, three hours reading, things like Enid Blyton. That was fun, that was something you could imagine. Who does the imagining for you, some director who puts it all on television for you, so there’s nothing to imagine. So you don’t listen, you just watch. What do you do with that audience that is devoid of imagination?

Q: Do you think it is your responsibility to teach them, educate them?

A: It perhaps is. But it’s a Catch 22, it’s a vicious circle, because it needs to be started by someone and then people have to help it along. But then on the other hand you can blame television all you want, but television is tied into what else? A man’s best friend here is not his dog, it’s television. The wife comes home at a certain time, the husband at another and what do you do when you’re having dinner? Watch television. So it’s capitalism to a certain
extent, the economics behind it lends itself... It's easy to blame the actor, it's easy to blame.

Q: What about the music? There was a combination of different kinds of music and songs in this production. How did you decide on using the music that you did?

A: The song music was all originally composed. Michael Milligan, who played the bridegroom, composed it. It was an interesting process: Michael and I would sit down and he would say "what?" For instance, for the song "Awake oh Bride, Awaken," I was thinking of an Indian song. And there was an image also that I was thinking of. And I started humming to him, and he took it from there and wrote for the next hour and that's how "Awake Oh Bride Awaken" came about. I would hum a tune, several times, make a selection about which parts to use. The music used for the scenery changes and for the underscoring, was the kind of music I liked, by one of my favorite composers, by the name of L. Subramaniam. He has composed music for Salaam Bombay, maybe Mississippi Massala. Anyway, I love his work, it has this incredible flavor to it, and a lot of the music I used in the show came from him. So pretty much every selection of music that you heard, I made it personally.

Q: Did looking at the original music of the play help you at all in making these selections?
A: It did, but I believe that from Lorca’s sketches, from Lorca’s images, from Lorca’s folk music, that all the other things that Lorca did, were like stones, that created a pathway that leads to the castle, and the castle was his writing. But there are so many stones that he threw in your path, that one could step on whichever one and get to the castle. So ... there’s a certain sense of theatricality, in his sketches and in some of the costume renderings and so on, that for me has a sense of incompleteness, which is very exciting to me, because it leaves something for me to complete it with. Which is what I like about Shakespeare too, he doesn’t complete the circles either, you complete it for youself. So it wasn’t that Lorca’s stuff was not helpful, because it was, but I had to tie my own knot to make it work.

Q: The costumes and the set in this production of Blood Wedding were lavish and beautiful. Where did the inspiration of these come from, and were you guided at all by Lorca’s stage directions?

A: In Lorca’s stage directions the thing was that he said as little as he could, but he said more, which was nice of him. It was a very interesting phase that I have gone through with this play. In reading this play, for perhaps the second time in my life, but more so this time, there... I think Lorca was not a very hopeful man. I read about Lorca, but
mostly I try to read him through *Blood Wedding*. I think somewhere over him loomed this sense of desperation. Lorca’s images are very scary, very disturbing. There’s a sense of gloom, of no hope. He provides no hope, which is what I like about him. He asks questions, which is what I like about the theatre that I believe in. Here’s a question, and the answer is your answer. And the questions that I asked myself were rather disturbing, and then I started sketching, and after I finished the sketches, going back and looking at the sketches was quite unnerving for me. So ... it was through the sketches, I showed them to Dennis [Hassan] and also to Jayme [Rhoades] and that’s how the set came about first of all. For me the connection with the earth was very important, and that was an essential image, you know: wheat, earth, the all-encompassing sky. Elements of nature, faith, destiny, water, fire, wind. All these things were images that you saw in the production. They were all there, in the script, and that’s where that set came from. Dennis and I are extremely feared as a team in this department, by people that know us, because when we get together we do something wild. I told Dennis that I had this image of this house carved out of the mountain side. Initially there were three different units but then we reduced it to two units, and that’s how we came up with the different configurations, the Bride’s house being more wealthy, Leonardo’s house being poorer and so on. That’s where the set came from, and then
Dennis had the idea that we needed to have these swirls, very Van Gogh style, almost like sucking the characters in. I liked that idea and that’s what we did. The colors of land, of burnt land actually, with spurts of red, purple. And then a lot of Jayme’s costumes that she designed come straight out of the culture, the country. The Moon became typically representative of the Kathakali dance form from Southern India; the beggar woman, interestingly became a mixture of Bharatnatyam and South Indian dance form and the facial expressions and the upper part became extremely Kabuki, from Japanese theatre. So we combined the two and we came up with a costume that did that.

Q: I liked the use of the total stage. It seemed that literally every inch of that stage was used by characters and scenery.

A: Everywhere. Which I think is perhaps something that I do. I never ever ask, request a designer to put something on stage that I cannot use. And if he or she does put it there I’m not going to use it. I use the set to its maximum. I get out of it as much as I can. Every spot I will use.

Q: Do you have any concluding remarks, regrets, hopes you’d like to express after directing this complex play?
A: I think in America to pursue a play like this, with a young cast, the next time I would—and it's not that I didn’t do it this time, but I just didn’t have the people—I would perhaps plan in the sense with the chair of the department to have someone, a woman, come in to play the Mother who can touch the people around her, the young actors around. There's this one certain person who can do that. Two, I would try and cast as many different cultures as possible. This was predominantly a white cast—not by choice, that was purely circumstantial. And there's a danger in that with this kind of play. So the next time I would like to use more African-Americans because the whole African-American thinking is just so different. The whole approach to life etcetera etcetera, is so different, and it would be very nice to have more of that. Unfortunately, Ohio State University doesn't have that kind of diversity. So with a young cast that's what I'd do, but in retrospect I have no regrets with this play.

Q: What about if you were to produce this play in a more professional setting? What do you think would come out more?

A: The passion. The passion. The vocal quality. The rhythms. The spirituality. Where the definition of tragedy is not what kind of car you drive versus what someone else is driving. If that's your definition of tragedy, you have a long way to go in life. And that is the definition of
tragedy of a lot of young folks. How do you teach them that, I don’t know. I would like to do Blood Wedding again, perhaps with an all black cast. Or I’d cast as many different cultures as I could bring in. Because the experience is so universal, tragedy is universal. The degree varies, and the degree in this play is perhaps not the degree that Americans are used to. So in that sense I guess it would be different. As far as putting the play in India, I believe it works, I one hundred percent believe it works. Otherwise I have no regrets. I believe that this show stretched everyone, the designers, the director, the actors. So I have absolutely no regrets. It aged me, but I still have no regrets.

Columbus, Ohio, June 1993.
Plate I Poster for Actors' Playhouse 1958 production of Blood Wedding in New York; Patricia Newhall, Director. Poster shows emphasis on stereotypical Spanish images.
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Lorca

Spain's most celebrated dramatic Lorca.

García Lorca was murdered by Nationalist
forces shortly after the outbreak of the Civil
War, 1936. His revolutionary plays are renowned
for their evocation of the profound and primitive
passions of Spanish peasant life. This volume
contains the three complete works: Blood
Wedding, Dona Rosita the Spinster and
Yerma. Lorca's intense lyrical dialogue is
realistically conveyed in this fine selection of new
translations which includes Peter Lake's Yerma for
the National Theatre, London.
Eve^ fifty years after his brutal murder by Francoists,
Garcia Lorca remains Spain's most important twentieth-century
playwright—his works outrage their persecutors. Conveying terrible
beauty and intense power in striking modern terms, three of his greatest plays—
Blood Wedding, Yerma, and The House of Bernarda Alba—
capture the haunting lyricism and surrealistic beauty of his
unique poetic style.

His tragic vision of the rigid family structure and brutally
elemented society of Spanish peasants and gypsies
appeals to audiences with its primal force, mystic dimensions,
and stunningly contemporary stagecraft. In these plays of
passion, conflict, violence, and death, Lucio proves
the human psyche, placing men and women at the center
of an age-old vortex of sexuality and desire, and
creates three masterworks that stand as
forefronts of twentieth-century drama.
Plate IV Cover of Blood Wedding, trans. David Johnston.
PLATE IV

Blood Wedding

Blood Wedding is one of the most powerful and innovative plays written for the European theatre this century. Unlike existing translations, this new version has been proven on the stage, having been awarded a Fringe First at the 1988 Edinburgh Festival. This translation re-creates, for the first time, the fierce energy and dramatic tension of the original, whilst capturing the lyrical intensity of Lorca's language.

The play emerges, scorching and eloquent, as both a psychological cauldron and a tribal rite. Both play and oratorio. The Sunday Times

'Stunning and evocative.' The Times

'David Johnston's translation has in turn the lift of song and the flint of peasant speech.' The Scotsman

Translation, introduction and notes by David Johnston
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