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Abstract

Performability and performativity in the English translation of colour metaphor in Federico García Lorca’s rural trilogy

Sara Jane Naylor

Federico García Lorca (1898-1936), one of the greatest poets/playwrights of the 20th Century, is probably best known for the rural trilogy; Bodas de sangre (1933), Yerma (1934) and La casa de Bernarda Alba (1936). There are numerous (re)translations of these three plays and they are regularly performed in the UK.

This project examines the English translation of Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour in these three plays focusing on ‘performability’ and ‘performativity’. Performability is a contentious term in the field of theatre translation but operational on a practical level, while performativity is a concept that still requires definition. Colour metaphor has been chosen for several reasons. Firstly, in the source text it is a cohesive device which also provides social commentary. Moreover, it is related to Lorca’s brand of theatre. It is thus an essential element of the dramatic effect of the original which needs to be addressed in translation. It is a way of ‘acting’ upon the receiver and is therefore related to performativity. Secondly, in the actual performance, colour plays an important part as a physical element of lighting, costume etc.

I develop a model to carry out a comparative analysis of four published translations of each play (drama texts) and three performances (performance texts). My model is based on a predominantly pragmatic framework including Austin’s Speech-Act Theory (1962), Grice’s notion of implicature (1975), Sperber and Wilson’s Relevance Theory (1986, 1987), and Peirce’s semiotics (1940). I also use Lefevere’s (1982, 1984) notion of refraction to conceptualise translation as multiple versions of one source text. The findings reveal how performability and performativity are interrelated and how translators ‘act’ upon the text. I put forward the notion of ‘hearability’ as a key element.
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Introduction

This study arose from a personal interest in the theatre of Federico García Lorca, along with an interest in translation from both a practical perspective and a theoretical one. My interest in Lorca’s work was stimulated by the ten year period that I spent living in Andalusia, which afforded me an insight into the nature of life in cities such as Granada, and in the rural villages of Córdoba, Granada and Jaén. These insights helped me to understand the rural context that inspired much of Lorca’s work.

The object of this study, the three plays, known as the rural trilogy, Bodas de sangre, Yerma and La casa de Bernarda Alba, offer plenty of scope for research into the nature of translation as there are numerous translations available in English. Moreover, they are regularly performed in the UK, in both amateur and professional productions, which makes them current and of interest to a wider audience, not solely an academic one.

From a theoretical stance, this study explores the nature of the concepts of performability and performativity through Lorca’s work. The notion of performability is contentious in the field of Translation Studies and seems to defy definition whereas the concept of performativity is a current topic in the field which equally requires a robust definition. My own notion of performativity draws predominately on Austin’s (1962) Speech-Act Theory and his notions of language as both purposeful (the illocutionary effect) and affective (the perlocutionary effect); this is discussed in more detail in Chapter Three. This notion of performativity allows me to evaluate the work of the theatre translator as that of an active, or performative, agent, who has to negotiate the various layers of meaning present in the source text while at the same time recreating them for a new target audience, on both the page and the stage. My own interpretative position as researcher is that of a Hispanist with an in-depth knowledge of the original texts. This may imply an academic reading that, both consciously and unconsciously, seeks an ideal equivalence between source and target texts based on a reverential evaluation of the source text. However, my position is also that of a translator, who understands that a text of any genre has to meet the needs of the receiving audience. Yet, at the same time, I do not envisage or imagine the needs of the audience in a
univocal way; I believe that translation opens up the possibility for a range of interpretations dependent on the individual receiver, even when the act of reception is collective as is the case of the theatrical experience.

In order to explore the two theoretical concepts of performability and performativity, the analysis of the translation of the plays focuses specifically on the theme of Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour. This theme has been chosen for several reasons. Firstly, in the source text it is a cohesive device that provides a link between the symbols evoked and, at the same time, it serves as a comment on the society of the time; moreover, it is key to Lorca’s particular brand of theatre. It is an essential element of the dramatic effect of the original and, therefore, needs to be addressed in translation. Colour acts upon the receiver (either the reader of the written text or the audience of the text in performance) and I therefore relate it to performativity. Secondly, colour plays an important part in performance, as it is a physical element of lighting, costume and scenery. Its visual impact has meaning independent of verbal utterance and it can act as a visual metaphor, reinforcing or replacing a verbal one, or adding one that is not present or not evident. Colour in this way provides a link between the text and the performance. In itself it can be considered performative as it can have an immediate impact on the audience because it not only ‘is’ but ‘does’. As Kress and Van Leeuwen (2002: 349) state colour not only ‘expresses’ and ‘means’ but it is also able to produce an effect.

The corpus I am investigating consists of four published translations of each play (twelve texts) by a variety of translators, ranging from poets and playwrights to academics. Most of these texts have been performed in a variety of productions, which makes them an ideal testing ground for the notion of performability. I understand performability as ‘making performable’ in the context of theatre; I discuss this notion from different viewpoints in more detail throughout the thesis. In addition, three performances (one of each play) are studied. I chose these particular productions because they are all recent performances that I have watched. They offer an up-to-date representation, or what I will refer to as ‘refraction’ (Lefevere 1982, 1984), of the text in performance.
My analysis addresses the following research questions:

1. How has colour metaphor been translated from linguistic, socio-cultural, symbolic and performable perspectives?
2. What does the translation of colour metaphor in the drama text and the performance text reveal about the relationship between the two in terms of performability and performativity?
3. What can a study of performativity tell us about the concept of authorship/ownership in translation?

The study consists of eight chapters. Chapter One gives a brief introduction to Lorca’s life and, in particular, the political and socio-historical contexts in which he was writing. I discuss the relevance of Lorca’s work today showing that both his figure and his work continue to provoke controversy. I argue that while Lorca and his work may often be considered a ‘site of struggle’ (Smith 1999: 37), his work is also a site of innovation and creation. My study focuses on how that innovation and creation is translated into English. Metaphor and translation are often discussed in similar terms, for example as a struggle between mutually alien worlds. However, rather than consider translation in a negative light, as a violent act (Venuti 1995), this study focuses on the creativity, and thus the performativity, of translation. Chapter One also provides a brief plot synopsis of each play along with a discussion of Lorca’s theory of theatre and how the metaphorical use of colour provided a vehicle for the expression of his ideas. The chapter thus presents a critical introduction to the notions of performability and performativity through Lorca’s work.

Chapter Two discusses the rural trilogy in translation with reference to how the translation of metaphor in general is dealt with in the literature. Information is provided about the translators whose translations make up the corpus, about how the published translations are presented and about what the translators say about their approaches to translating the rural trilogy. This chapter thus provides an analysis of how the translators themselves view the work of a translator of drama and what performability means from the translators’ perspective.
Chapter Three provides an analysis of current debates within the field of theatre translation highlighting the complex dualistic nature of the play, which is both a text written to be read and a text for performance. I distinguish between the notions of the drama text and the performance text and discuss the relationship between the page and the stage drawing on a traditional semiotic theatre model (cf. Elam 1980). I discuss the concepts of the gestic text and performability and the source-versus-target debate in the context of theatre translation. This chapter closes with an analysis of the concept of performativity in Translation Studies suggesting as possible frameworks Austin’s (1962) Speech Act theory, Grice’s (1975) Theory of Implicature and the Cooperative Principle and Sperber and Wilson’s (1986, 1987) Relevance Theory, as well as Lefevere’s (1982, 1984) concept of (re)translation and (re)performance of the text as ‘refraction’. I also draw on Peirce’s semiotics (1940), in particular, his notion of the interpretant as applied by Venuti in his ‘hermeneutic model’ (2010). The findings from this review inform the theoretical model used in subsequent chapters to carry out the analysis of the translation of Lorca’s colour metaphor into English.

Chapter Four explains the methodology employed in this study and sets out my model of analysis, which identifies different levels within the translations and pulls in strands from the theoretical frameworks mentioned above. This model is applied in a comparative analysis of several published translations of the same source texts, along with the analysis of three performances. I adopt a semiotic view of textuality, defining the written translations as drama texts and the performances as performance texts. I also draw on the concept of refraction (Lefevere 1982, 1984), which allows me to confer equal status on all the translations both on the page and the stage, as refractions of or responses to the same source texts. Although the analysis is source-led, it focuses on translation solutions and how connections have been made, or have the potential to be made, with the audience in both mediums.

My analysis is presented in three chapters. Chapter Five considers concrete objects: sheep, the horse, and the Moon. Chapter Six analyses the natural elements of the sun,
water and the dichotomy of heat and cold, while Chapter Seven analyses the abstract use of colour with reference to sterility, silence, cleanliness and the body.

Chapter Eight discusses the findings from the three analysis chapters, answers the research questions and highlights the value of these findings to practice and theory within the field of Translation Studies. In my conclusion, I suggest how this study opens up areas for further debate and research.

The published translations referred to in the body of this work are referenced under the name of the individual translator(s) and all examples from the source texts are taken from Federico García Lorca, Obras Completas II Teatro (1997) abbreviated to OCII. In the tables in Chapters Five to Eight, the source text (ST) examples are referenced as Lorca followed by the relevant page number in OCII. The target text (TT) examples are referenced with the name of the translator followed by the page number in the corresponding translation. All other translations provided are mine.
Chapter 1 Lorca and colour metaphor

This chapter provides background information on Lorca and his work, and more specifically on the three plays that form the object of this study; *Bodas de sangre*, *Yerma* and *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. It is divided into four sections; first, background information is provided on Lorca and his influences, exploring the relevance of his work in its own historical context and the relevance it has today. The second section discusses Lorca’s theory of theatre and colour as an essential element of his work. The third section discusses Lorca’s use of metaphor and the fourth section analyses his specific use of colour metaphor in the rural trilogy, drawing on examples from all three plays, underpinned by theoretical insights into metaphor. Throughout this chapter, the discussion seeks a critical introduction to issues of performability and performativity through the prism of Lorca’s rural trilogy, and presents the specific challenges involved in the translation of these plays into English.

1.1 Lorca past and present: the ‘site of struggle’

Federico García Lorca is one of the most important poets/playwrights of the 20th Century and, as Edwards (1980: 1) puts it, ‘[w]ith the exception of Cervantes, Lorca is for many people the most famous name in Spanish literature’. The universality of themes expressed in his work has led many to consider him as the most universal of poets, which could explain his enduring appeal.

Born in 1898 in the southern Spanish village of Fuente Vaqueros, in the province of Granada, the rural environment in which he spent his early years greatly influenced his work, as did the period from 1919-1929 that he spent living in the Residencia de Estudiantes in Madrid, where he met the future film director Luis Buñuel and the artist Salvador Dalí. His close friendship with Dalí, in particular, was to have a profound influence on both their work (Gibson 1989: 120-204).

Lorca came from a wealthy family. His father, Federico García Rodríguez, was a landowner and his mother, Vicenta Lorca Romero, (whom his father had married after the death of his first wife) was a schoolteacher. The rural environment of his early...
childhood in the villages of Fuente Vaqueros and Asquerosa (now called Valderrubio) in the province of Granada left a permanent impression on him. He felt an emotional bond with the earth and described himself as having ‘un complejo agrario’ (an agrarian complex) (OCIII: 527). He not only felt a connection with the earth itself but also to the people who inhabited this land:

Through the shape and color of the Spanish landscape, through the earth-bound idioms, images, and emotions of the Spaniards, Federico García Lorca saw and expressed the suffering and joy, beauty and terror, love and death of mankind. (Barea 1949: vii)

According to his brother, Francisco (García Lorca 1980: 71-72), it was to this environment and the constant flux of servants in the family house that Federico owed his knowledge of popular songs and folklore. One maid in particular, Dolores, always dressed in black and nick-named ‘La Colorina’ (the Goldfinch), was the inspiration for many of Federico’s servant characters in his plays with her ‘lenguaje pintoresco’ (colourful language) and her sense of social justice and liberal moral attitudes (idem). As a child Federico liked to dress up and play at mass and puppet theatre with the maids (Edwards 1980: 5), a genre that he was to later employ in his theatre.

Despite a privileged childhood, an awareness of social injustice was instilled in him at a young age. As Gibson (1989: 18) recounts, Federico was shocked on learning that a local playmate was confined indoors on the day the family washed their clothes as they only possessed one set each. In his essay Mi pueblo (My Village) Federico recalls his pity for the women who suffer endless pregnancies, many dying in childbirth, and the poor who seem unable to demand the food they need to survive (Gibson 1989: 18-19).

A talented musician, Lorca wanted to devote himself to music but conceded to his father’s desire that he study law, philosophy and letters at the University of Granada (Gibson 1989: 42-43). In 1916 he went on a study trip around Spain organised by one of his teachers, Martín Domínguez Berrueta. The prose he wrote during this trip resulted

In Granada, Lorca moved in creative circles, becoming friends with the composer Manuel Falla and regularly frequenting the Café Alameda where a group of aspiring writers, who called themselves *el Rinconcillo* (the Little Corner), would read their work to each other (Gibson 1989: 52-61). This practice of reading his work to friends, and also to family, was one that he would continue throughout his lifetime and in this way his work was an on-going performance, in a constant state of rehearsal, with an audience always in mind.

In 1919, with the encouragement of his teacher, Fernando de los Ríos, Lorca moved to the *Residencia de Estudiantes* in Madrid. His ten year stay at the *Residencia* was crucial to his artistic and creative development as here he became friends with the future poet Rafael Alberti, the future film director Luis Buñuel and the future artist Salvador Dalí, among others. As well as a university halls of residence, the *Residencia* was also an important cultural centre where Spanish contemporary writers, such as Juan Ramón Jiménez and Antonio Machado, were invited to give talks, along with foreign intellectual and artistic figures of the day, such as Paul Valéry, Louis Aragon, André Breton and H.G. Wells (Anderson 1984: 4). Lorca was thus exposed to a wealth of creative and artistic talent as well as the latest ideas emanating from avant-garde circles in Paris. The group of Spanish artists and writers that had resided at the *Residencia* were later to become known as *la Generación del 27* (the Generation of 1927).

Lorca’s first play, *El maleficio de la mariposa* (The Butterfly’s Evil Spell), which opened in Madrid in 1920, was a disaster as the audience were unable to connect with the insect characters (Anderson 1984: 6). However, his *Libro de poemas* (Book of Poems) that appeared in 1921 fared better; although it received little critical attention, the writer Juan Ramón Jiménez commented positively on it (idem). Attempts to get his next play, *Mariana Pineda*, produced in 1923 suffered from the censorship imposed by the dictator General Miguel Primo de Rivera (1923-30) (Anderson 1984: 9), which was hardly surprising considering that the play’s content could be interpreted as revolutionary. The
play was finally produced in 1927 in Barcelona by Margarita Xirgu, who was to become one of Lorca’s greatest friends and promoters of his work. The set was designed by Dalí and it ran for a second season in Madrid (Anderson 1984: 10).

Lorca’s real breakthrough came with the publication of Romancero gitano (Gypsy Ballads) in 1928 (Gibson 1989: 212). While this collection of poems was to make him famous and give him financial independence, Lorca was not entirely happy that it led to a perception of his work as popular folklore. Dalí’s critique of it as stereotyping and conformist (McMullen 2002: 131) was particularly upsetting and McMullen (idem) argues this negative reaction from his close friend produced a crisis in Lorca’s work that would ultimately push him to explore new ideas, later reflected in Poeta en Nueva York (Poet in New York).

In addition to this crisis in his work, Lorca was also experiencing a crisis in his personal life. His friendship with Dalí had cooled and he was said to have suffered from depression after an affair with a young sculptor (Gibson 1989: 231). In June 1929, he travelled to New York where he resided at Colombia University until April 1930 when he left for Cuba (Anderson 1984: 12). The materialistic society he experienced in New York had a profound effect upon him and the resulting Poeta en Nueva York was a completely new departure.

When he returned to Spain, the Primo de Rivera dictatorship came to an end and the democratic elections held in April 1931 led to the abdication of King Alfonso XIII and the start of the Second Republic. During the Second Republic (1931-1936) Lorca become involved in La Barraca, a travelling student theatre company that took the traditional Golden Age plays (such as those by Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Calderón de la Barca and Tirso de Molina) to new audiences in the rural communities around Spain, which would not normally have access to the theatre. This provided him with a training ground to develop his skills as a director. He adapted these plays to make them accessible to farmers and poor country people, who in many cases could not read or write. He even changed the ending of one play during its performance to comply with audience demands (García Lorca 1980: 444). This highlights the importance Lorca gave to the
audience in the theatrical experience; he even entitled one of his plays *El Público* (The Audience although this is known in translation as *The Public*). However, despite this, he was resolute that an artist should not be dictated to by public opinion but should maintain their artistic integrity (OCIII: 256).

The period from 1930 onwards was very productive for Lorca. Not only did he work as director of *La Barraca* until 1935, he also produced most of his own theatrical output: *La zapatera prodigiosa* (The Shoemaker’s Wonderful Wife) and *Amor de Don Perlimplín con Belisa en su jardín* (The Love of Don Perlimplin and Belisa in the Garden) in 1930 followed by *Bodas de sangre* (Blood Wedding) in 1933; *Yerma* in 1934; *Doña Rosita la soltera* (Doña Rosita the Spinster) in 1935; and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (The House of Bernarda Alba) completed just before his murder in 1936 but not performed in his lifetime. He also produced what is often deemed his experimental or ‘impossible’ theatre (Delgado 2008: 138) including *El público* (The Public), written in Havana in 1930, *Así que pasen cinco años* (When Five Years Pass) in 1931, and the single act play *Comedia sin título* (Play Without a Title) in 1936.

The plays that are the object of this study are the so-called rural trilogy; *Bodas de sangre, Yerma* and *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. These are often deemed to be Lorca’s most mature work and undoubtedly his best known both in Spain and abroad. The plays, while not a trilogy in the traditional sense of a continuing story, are often referred to as the rural trilogy because of their shared rural backdrop, common themes and recurrent symbolism. The three plays present a combination of music, song and movement with dramatic dialogue often in verse form (*Bodas de sangre* and *Yerma*).

*Bodas de sangre* was a success in both Spain and Argentina where it went on tour. It opened at the Teatro Beatriz in Madrid on 8th March 1933 and ran for thirty-eight performances (Gibson 1989: 349). Inspired by a real event that Lorca had read about in a local newspaper (the Crime of Níjar), it tells the story of the Bride who runs away with her former lover, Leonardo, on her wedding day after the ceremony has taken place. Leonardo is a member of the Félix family who are responsible for the murder of the Bridegroom’s older brother which took place when Leonardo was a boy. The murder
holds painful memories for the Bridegroom’s Mother, who has come to loathe Leonardo’s family. Her pain is expressed from the beginning when she rants about the perils of knives or any kind of instruments that can wound. She also expresses mistrust of the Bride who was engaged to Leonardo in the past. There are hints that this engagement was called off by the Bride for materialistic reasons, and Leonardo later married the Bride’s cousin. The Bride and Leonardo escape on horseback to hide in the forest, where they are eventually found by the Bridegroom and his entourage. During the forest scene, the Moon comes down to earth (represented by one of the Woodcutters) calling for blood, and Death itself appears in the guise of a Beggar Woman. The Bridegroom and Leonardo then kill each other off-stage. The Bride returns home, her dress and hair stained in blood, and asks the Mother of the Bridegroom to take revenge on her, which the Mother refuses to do as without her son she no longer cares what happens. The play ends as it began with the Mother’s rant over the dangers of the knife.

_Yerma_ relates the story of a woman desperate to conceive and how this desperation increases over the years to culminate in tragedy when she strangles her husband, the very person who could theoretically solve her childless state. It was first performed in Madrid at the Teatro Español on 29th December 1934, opening in Barcelona on 17th September 1935. Its opening, at a time of growing political unrest, was not without tension as a protest was planned which was thought to have been against the leading actress Margarita Xirgu’s connection with the controversial former Prime Minister of the Republic, Manual Azaña (García Lorca 1980: 347). However, the initial commotion soon died down as the play got underway and Lorca received a standing ovation both at the end of the first act and at the end of the play, described by his brother as the greatest ovation that the Spanish public had given him so far (idem). Despite this warm reception, _Yerma_ was particularly offensive to some and Lorca soon found himself the enemy of the Church and the political right wing, hardly surprising given lines such as the following from Act One, Scene Two:

YERMA. Entonces, que Dios me ampare.
VIEJA. Dios, no. A mí no me ha gustado nunca Dios. ¿Cuándo os vais a dar cuenta de que no existe? Son los hombres los que te tienen que amparar. (OCII: 490)

YERMA. Then, God help me.

OLD WOMAN. God, no. I have never liked God. When will you all realise that he doesn’t exist? Men are the ones who have to help you.

_La casa de Bernarda Alba_ tells the story of a widow, Bernarda, who exerts a suffocating control over her five unmarried daughters. The sexual tension that builds up within the house culminates in tragedy when the younger daughter, Adela, hangs herself after being led to believe that her mother has shot her lover, Pepe el Romano, who is engaged to her older sister Angustias. Lorca was shot dead a few months after finishing the play and was thus never able to bring it to the stage. It was performed posthumously in Argentina.

This period of Spanish history was particularly volatile with increasing political polarisation against a backdrop of instability in Europe with the establishment of communism after the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy. General Francisco Franco's military coup in 1936 began what was to become a long and bloody civil war. At this time, Lorca had decided to remain in Spain and travelled back to Granada where, despite seeking refuge at the home of a friend with right-wing sympathies, he was arrested by Nationalist partisans, shot and buried in an unmarked grave along with a teacher and a bullfighter. He was 38 years old. While the exact reasons for his murder still remain unclear, various theories have been put forward, including a family feud, but there can be no doubt that while he may not have been a political activist, famous liberal thinkers could influence others, and his connection to Margarita Xirgu and his brother in law, Montesinos, as well as his homosexuality, would have caused right-wing nationalists to consider him a threat.

Lorca’s influences as described above are fundamental to an understanding of his poems and plays. From this very brief synopsis of Lorca’s life, we can appreciate the very fertile creative landscape in which he found himself, from the rural environment he grew up in
to the wealth of artists and writers he came into contact with, both in Granada and, particularly, in the *Residencia de Estudiantes* in Madrid. Added to this was a social awareness and equally an awareness of the inner struggle of the individual and how society suppresses this, his own homosexuality making him often feel like an outsider. From these multiple layers of personal experience and creative influence we see a multi-layered creative output.

Lorca himself has influenced a whole generation of poets, writers, playwrights and singers, including, for example, Leonard Cohen (who named his daughter Lorca), and the renowned Spanish film director Pedro Almodóvar. Lorca’s untimely death and the fact that his body has never been found has fuelled the myth that has been created around his person. He has become a martyr who, for many, represents the martyrdom of Spain itself and the divisions within the country that, despite democracy, resist the healing passage of time.

On the centenary of Lorca’s birth in 1998, the then conservative Prime Minister, José María Aznar (Thompson 1999a: 9) declared ‘España hoy se llama Federico’ (Spain today is called Federico), pointing to Lorca as a symbol of reconciliation. However, the facts about his murder are still glossed over. The Spanish newspaper *El País* reported in May 2014 that a recent textbook for primary school children, published by Anaya, had been withdrawn after complaints that it had distorted historical facts and was anti-democratic. The text stated that Lorca had died near his village during the war in Spain, with no mention of the fact that he was shot and buried in an unmarked, mass grave, the whereabouts of which has still not been located (García de Blas 2014).

Controversy also surrounds ownership of Lorca today. Writing in 1999, Smith (1999: 37) considered Lorca a ‘site of struggle’ between centre and periphery as in the past there has been disagreement over where his archive should be sited. More recently this struggle has been seen on a local level with the building of the new *Centro García Lorca* in Granada, which it was envisaged would contain the archive from the *Fundación García Lorca* in Madrid. After a five-year delay, it finally opened in July 2015 but without any of the archival documentation. This has meant that the building was opened initially as a
cultural centre rather than as an historical archive as originally intended. The delay in finishing the building was mainly due to disagreements over funding between the local city council and the regional Andalusian government, which some consider were politically motivated since the local city council was under control of the conservative right-wing Partido Popular while the regional government was under the left-wing Socialist Party. Further controversy arose due to the Secretary of the Fundación being taken to court by Lorca’s niece, Laura García Lorca de los Ríos, for embezzlement of funds and falsifying documents (Martín-Arroyo 2015).

Similarly, controversy has surrounded the search for Lorca’s body. The Ley de Memoria Histórica (Law of Historical Memory) passed in 2007 by the Socialist government made it possible for families of victims of the Civil War and the Franco dictatorship to search for their remains. Lorca’s family initially opposed any search as they did not want media attention around his figure to the detriment of attention to other victims, and preferred his remains to be left where they were. This caused speculation that the family may have actually removed the body at the time of his murder and buried him in a private graveyard. After pressure from the family members of the other victims supposed to have been buried with him, Lorca’s family conceded but attempts to locate his body have to date proved futile.

However, controversy surrounding Lorca extends beyond that of archives and graves, to be reflected in the attitudes towards Lorca and his work. While the circumstances surrounding his death led to him being considered a martyr by many, his homosexuality (refuted for many years by friends and family) made him a gay icon for others. In 2007, a very public argument over Lorca and his work broke out between two Spanish academics from the University of Granada, Luis García Montero and José Antonio Fortes, which ended in court (Cortés/Valverde 2008). García Montero subsequently left his post, although he has recently returned. Lorca’s work is thus often a site of struggle and

---

1 The relocation of the archive materials did not begin until March 2018.
a site of controversy; this struggle and controversy often acted out on a very public stage.

In this way, Lorca and his work can be considered an on-going site of performance. As stated, Lorca constantly performed his work, whether in the form of a reading for friends and family, or in the more formal environment of the theatre. His work was thus in a continual fluid state of rehearsal, in the constant here and now of performance, with the presence of an audience. Since his murder, the struggle and controversy described above, has added another layer to his work, so not only his work but also his person become that site of performance; a place that envisages an audience, and that produces a response. Moreover, Lorca’s work as a site of performance is undoubtedly a site of innovation and creation; this study will focus on that innovation and creation and on how they translate into English.

1.2 Duende, the somatic and death

While Lorca did not develop a specific theory relating to his own brand of theatre, he wrote many essays and gave many talks and interviews where he spoke about what he felt theatre should be and the effect it should produce on the audience. Lorca described his theatre in the following way:

El teatro es la poesía que se levanta del libro y se hace humana. Y al hacerse, habla y grita, llora y se desespera. El teatro necesita que los personajes que aparezcan en la escena lleven un traje de poesía y al mismo tiempo que se les vean los huesos, la sangre. (OCIII: 630)

Theatre is poetry that gets up from the page and makes itself human. And when it does that, it talks and shouts, cries and despairs. Theatre needs its characters that appear on the stage to be clothed in poetry and at the same time that their bones and blood show through.

For Lorca, theatre is thus poetry that lives on the stage, it is given human form and in this way it expresses human emotion. The poetry that the actors wear is transparent so
that their bones and blood show through, in other words, the raw emotion that is expressed by the words they speak. For Thompson (1999b: 70) Lorca’s description of a physical poetry serves to ‘emphasise the centrality of verbal language’. However, it is much more than this, it creates a physical connection to the emotion of that language. It is not an embodiment of the words in terms of physical action but an embodiment in terms of physical emotion. Lorca’s much-cited teoría del duende (theory of duende) (OCIII: 150) gives an insight into this concept of physicality.

A duende is often described as a woodland spirit, but for Lorca it was something mystic, difficult to pin down, that only true artists possess, something that could not be learned but that was instinctive; art that produces what Johnston (1998a: 43) calls a ‘pre-civilized, pre-socialized response’ in the receiver. According to Lorca (OCIII: 455), duende is ‘ese misterio magnífico que debe buscarse en la última habitación de la sangre’ (that magnificent mystery that can only be found in the last room of the blood). This concept of duende is not present within the English language and culture, and thus represents a challenge for the English translator.

Lorca described artists who can sing cante jondo (deep song), which he describes as an ancient form of flamenco originating not in the throat but through the whole body, starting from the soles of the feet, as having duende. It is thus a force rather than an action. It is the ‘sonidos negros’ (black sounds) (OCIII: 151) of duende that give it its mystery, which Lorca associated with pain and suffering and in this way with tragedy. Clearly, cante jondo, and the notions of the black sounds of duende are concepts that are very difficult to reflect in English translation for an audience who may not be aware of such concepts.

Lorca described duende as ‘el espíritu oculto de la dolorida España’ (OCIII: 150) (the hidden spirit of Spain’s pain); it is thus almost a tangible being that makes a connection between the performer and the spectator and produces a response in them:
Lorca saw *duende* as the shiver of response produced in the listener or spectator by the projection of emotional intensity against the constant awareness of death’s inevitability – a sort of poltergeist of the emotions. (Johnston 1998a: 43)

Lorca’s concept of theatre is thus related to the expression of emotion through the body which is somatic; in other words, visceral rather than rational and in this way it is connected to the idea of fatalism and the inevitability of death. The theme of death is a constant one in Lorca’s work. It takes many concrete and abstract forms with colour being used as a means of expressing it:

> The theme of death, constantly nourished by a fundamental melancholy constituting one of the most typical traits of the Spanish character, is present in all his work. (Parrot (1947), 1962: 60)

However, as Johnston (1998a: 32) points out it is ‘a vision of darkness which does not negate life’, death is seen as the inevitability of life itself and thus rather than ignore death Lorca calls upon it constantly and plays it ‘as the bullfighter plays the bull’ (Johnston 1998a: 31). Death is a spectacle, to be played out in front of an audience. In *Juego y teoría del duende* Lorca emphasises the more open attitude to death in Spain, compared to the rest of the world, ‘[u]n muerto en España está más vivo como muerto que en ningún sitio del mundo (OCIII: 156) (a dead person in Spain is more alive when dead than in any other place in the world). Therefore, underlying Lorca’s notion of *duende* is that of a universal Spanish (or perhaps more specifically Andalusian), penchant for melancholy and a view of death that is very different from an Anglo-saxon one. I think we can perceive Lorca’s notion of *duende* that underpins his theatre as a notion of performability, in terms of it being a physical embodiment of emotion, or a performance of that emotion on the body of the actor. It is thus a means through which the verbal text performs in a physical sense. Yet, it is above all a physicality that produces a response in both performer and spectator and I thus also relate it to the notion of performativity that I develop in this thesis. In this sense, Lorca’s plays are conceptually challenging to translate into English on both the levels of performability and performativity, as expressed in the original.
1.3 Lorca’s use of metaphor

‘Metaphor’ stems from the Greek *metaphora*, ‘to carry over’, and the idea of transfer is expressed in the so-called comparison view of metaphor. Aristotle (1967: 57) described it in *Poetics* as: ‘the application of the name of a thing to something else’, or as Hawkes (1972: 1) explains it:

> It refers to a particular set of linguistic processes whereby aspects of one object are ‘carried over’ or transferred to another object, so that the second object is spoken of as if it were the first.

This comparison view sees metaphor as deviant on the normal usage of language. Miall (1982: xiii) argues that such a view does not take into account the context of use of the metaphor. The ‘interaction theory’ of metaphor, developed by Black (1962, 1993) based on work by Richards (1936), on the other hand, sees metaphor not so much as semantic anomaly but as a bringing together of different contexts to create new meaning. Richards (1936: 94) saw metaphor as more than ‘a shifting and displacement of words’ as ‘it is fundamentally a borrowing between and intercourse of *thoughts*; a transaction between contexts’. This view moves metaphor beyond a study of linguistic structures to that of creation. Apter (1982: 56) describes this as a synergy where ‘two processes are working together to produce an effect which neither could produce alone’. Moreover, as Miall (1982: xii) points out Richards (1936) also stressed that ‘metaphor can convey abstract ideas as well as pictorial, taking metaphor beyond the domain of a purely ornamental or image-presenting entity’.

There has been a renewed interest in the study of metaphor in recent years, particularly since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson’s book *Metaphors We Live By*, originally published in 1980 and subsequently revised and reprinted in 2003. Their work was both controversial and ground-breaking in that they view metaphor as related to the concepts by which we live. This has particular relevance when it comes to translating metaphors from one language to another, as concepts that relate to one culture form the basis of how that culture expresses itself in linguistic terms. The way in which Lorca
expresses his metaphor is directly linked to how both the Spanish culture views certain concepts and also his own personal view, and interpretation of those concepts. Lakoff and Johnson ((1980), 2003: 247) explain that ‘which metaphors we have and what they mean depend on the nature of our bodies, our interactions in the physical environment, and our social and cultural practices’ and that ‘innovation and novelty are not miraculous; they do not come out of nowhere. They are built using the tools of everyday metaphorical thought, as well as other commonplace conceptual mechanisms’ (Lakoff and Johnson ((1980), 2003: 251). This is clearly a challenge for translation, as metaphors are not only portrayed in linguistic terms, but are culturally dependent. In Chapter Two, I discuss how the translation of metaphors is viewed within the field of Translation Studies.

For Lorca (OCIII: 60): ‘La metáfora une dos mundos antagónicos por medio de un salto ecuestre que da la imaginación (metaphor brings together alien worlds by means of an equestrian leap of the imagination). Zardo ya (1954: 295) describes Lorca’s metaphorical technique as a carefully calculated one; a style that was both personal and, therefore, unique but at the same time mixed with traditional Spanish forms. But how does Lorca’s use of metaphor work? When interviewed by Luengo (OCIII: 614-615) regarding his use of metaphor in Yerma, Lorca’s explanation sheds light on both how his metaphors work and the role of the audience in the creation of meaning:

Mi teatro tiene dos planos: una vertiente del poeta, que analiza y que hace que sus personajes se encuentren para producir la idea subterránea, que yo doy al “buen entendedor”, y el plano natural de la línea melódica, que toma el público sencillo para quien mi teatro físico es un gozo, un ejemplo y siempre una enseñanza. El hombre que dice que “ahonde” el marido, a la mujer marchita, expresa una doble idea, como la que surge de la interpretación del crepúsculo. Mientras para el campesino es un signo exterior del Universo, en el que agoniza la luz y le señala la hora de cesar en el trabajo y de comer, el espectador agudo y sentidor se ve reposando en un ataúd con los gusanos eternos.
My theatre has two planes: the poet’s side which analyses and brings the characters together to produce the underlying idea which I give to the ‘more astute’ and the natural plane of the melodic that a more simple-minded (in other words less astute) public will understand; those who enjoy my physical theatre and are able to learn from it. The man who says that the husband should ‘dig deeper’ to the ‘withered’ woman expresses a two-fold idea, just as that which comes from the interpretation of twilight. While the farmer sees twilight as an external sign from the Universe showing that light is fading and marking the time to stop work and to eat, the astute and sensitive spectator will see themselves resting in a coffin with eternal worms.

This statement portrays two important elements of Lorca’s use of metaphor. The first is the idea that it contains different layers of meaning and if we analyse the phrase ‘que ahonde’, when Victor says to Yerma that her husband should ‘ahonde’, literally ‘dig deeper’, the first layer is ‘keeping trying’, ‘don’t give up’. Secondly, there is the obvious sexual connotation. Thirdly, there is reference to the rural farming community where images related to the land are part of everyday speech, and the implication that Juan work his land, in other words his wife, harder denotes a macho society. Finally, the more subtle layer which Lorca felt might only be perceived by the more astute spectator is that of the irony of digging deeper in a barren land that will ultimately come to nothing, as there is nothing there but literally an empty hole of blackness and death, the reference to digging invoking the image of the gravedigger burying the dead.

The second element that Lorca highlights in this quotation is that not everyone will grasp all of those meanings. Lorca refers to ‘el plano natural de la línea melódica que toma el público sencillo para quien mi teatro físico es un gozo’. This suggests a first-order meaning, a superficial or surface meaning where the melody of the utterance produces joy in the spectator, whereas, ‘la idea subterránea’, the deeper meaning, is only perceived by the more astute and produces anguish and horror. The different meanings of this metaphor rely not on the context to extract them but on the perception of the receiver. This highlights how the same metaphor can perform in different ways for
different receivers. The challenge for the translator here is how to represent all these different layers of meaning in English; moreover, as Black (1993: 29) points out ‘[a]mbiguity is a necessary by-product of ... metaphor’s suggestiveness’.

1.4 Colour metaphor: the grammar of colour

Colour is an important element in all of Lorca’s work. As mentioned before, he was particularly inspired by the Catalan painter, Salvador Dalí, and Lorca himself produced many paintings throughout his lifetime. It is hardly surprising then that he uses an extensive and vivid palette of colours and shades in his poetry which are related, in particular, to nature, drawing on his early childhood experiences. According to Parrot ((1947) 1962: 57):

There was no poetic image which did not appear to him without a vibrant color, surrounded by a musical rainbow. More than any other Hispanic poet, Lorca succeeded in making us feel this rainbow around the most familiar words.

This highlights the strong visual element present in his poetry which is accompanied by the lyrical. Analogies have often been drawn between Lorca’s poetry and painting, for example Parrot ((1947), 1962: 59) likens Lorca’s use of colour in Romancero gitano (Gypsy Ballads) to that of Vincent Van Gogh, while others have likened his work to cubist or surrealist painters. Hernández Valcárcel (1978: 214) likens the composition of the splashes of colour in El poema del cante jondo (Poem of Deep Song) to paintings by Mondrian, Miró and Kandinsky.

Colour has an equally important presence in Lorca’s theatre. For example, in La zapatera prodigiosa the colours red, purple, black, green and yellow are personified in the names of the neighbours: ‘Vecina Roja’, ‘Vecina Morada’, ‘Vecina Negra’, ‘Vecina Verde’, ‘Vecina Amarilla’. In the rural trilogy Lorca continues to draw on this canvas of colour:

Lorca’s use of colour in Bodas de sangre is so carefully organized as to demonstrate that his artist’s sense of composition is matched by a painter’s sense of tone and contrast. (Morris 1996: 44)
In *Bodas de sangre*, as we would expect from the title, the colour red is evoked in the references to blood. The colour white has a strong presence with the image of the Moon as a symbol of death which interacts with the Beggar Woman in her dark green rags, who represents death itself. We also have references to flowers and the greens of nature, and a range of colours in the stage directions which describe the places where the different characters live. Thus, direct references to colour in the stage directions and in the dialogue itself interact with colours which are evoked to reinforce their meaning (Morris 1996: 46).

To begin with the colours in the stage directions: In the first scene we are presented with a ‘Habitación pintada de amarillo’ (room painted yellow) where the Mother and the Bridegroom live; in the second scene we move to the ‘Habitación pintada de rosa con cobres y ramos de flores populares’ (room painted pink with copper pots and bunches of the usual flowers) where Leonardo, the Wife and the Mother-in-law reside. The third scene then takes us to the inside of the cave where the Bride lives described as:

> Al fondo, una cruz de grandes flores rosa. Las puertas redondas con cortinas de encaje y lazos rosa. Por las paredes de material blanco y duro, abanicos redondos, jarros azules y pequeños espejos. (OCII: 427)

> At the back, a cross of large pink flowers. The round doors with lace curtains and pink bows. On the walls, made of a hard white material, round fans, blue jugs and small mirrors.

‘Las puertas redondas’ (round doors) suggest that the doors are arched to fit the shape of the cave. According to Salazar Rincón (1998: 283-284), arches, doors and thresholds are all symbols of death in Lorca’s work as they represent at once a meeting point and a separation between this world and the next. The ‘yeso y cal’ (gypsum (plaster) and lime (whitewash)) suggested by the hard white material of the walls complete the connection with death that the arch portrays:
En efecto, la cal y el yeso evocan en primer lugar las tapias, los arcos y los nichos blanqueados de las iglesias y los cementerios; la cal viva se ha utilizado además como materia antiséptica, para evitar la descomposición de la materia orgánica, y nos obliga a pensar en el oficio del enterrador; el yeso, en fin, con sus cristales lechosos, recubre muchas tierras áridas, típicas de nuestra España interior, y nos recuerda los parajes yermos, en que nada crece; y ambos, cal y yeso, con su palidez sin vida, simbolizan por sí solos lo débil, lo enteco, lo aniquilado y lo muerto. (Salazar Rincón 1998: 288)

In effect, lime and plaster evoke in the first place walls, arches and the white-washed tombs of churches and cemeteries; quicklime has been used moreover as an antiseptic, to avoid the decomposition of organic material, and it makes us think of the job of the gravedigger; gypsum (plaster), with its milky shards of glass, covers much arid land, typical of our Spanish interior, and makes us think of barren spots, where nothing grows, and both, lime and gypsum, with their lifeless paleness, symbolise on their own the weak, the sickly, the annihilated and the dead.

The colour here of the whitewash and the milky shards of gypsum are thus not solely referential but are functional in that they have the potential to evoke death in the mind of the reader or spectator.

For Act Two, Scene One we stay in the Bride’s house where she appears dressed ‘en enaguas blancas y un corpiño blanco’ (in white petticoats and a white bodice), and we are told the Maid is similarly dressed. It is night. She is getting ready for the wedding, the white undergarments a typical symbol of virginity. In the dialogue we have the contrast between the Maid’s excitement and the Bride’s sullen mood and her expression of outward suffocation due to the heat and inward suffocation due to her impending marriage. In the next scene, though, we move to the outside of the cave where the colours of ‘blancos grises’ (grey whites) ‘azules fríos’ (cold blues), ‘tonos sombríos y plateados’ (sombre and silvery tones) and the ‘todo endurecido’ (hardened) exterior create a distancing effect. This is then transformed into the dark atmosphere of night in
the first Act of Scene Three. In the final scene, after the death of the two men in the forest, we have a dazzling white backdrop:

Habitación blanca con arcos y gruesos muros. A la derecha y a la izquierda escaleras blancas. Gran arco al fondo y pared del mismo color. El suelo será también de un blanco reluciente. Esta habitación simple tendrá un sentido monumental de iglesia. No habrá ni un gris, ni una sombra, ni siquiera lo preciso para la perspectiva. (OCII: 466)

A white room with arches and thick walls. White staircases to the right and left. Large arch at the back and wall of the same colour. The floor will also be a shining white. This simple room will have a monumental feeling like a church. There will be neither a grey, nor a shadow, not even enough for perspective.

Whereas earlier we have the description of the Bride’s cave having ‘puertas redondas’ alluding to the arches, in the final scene we have no doubt that we are in a church-like place, grieving the dead. The dazzling white room connects us to death, elevating it to the sacred but at the same time the unavoidable. Colour once again goes beyond the mere referential.

Morris (1996: 44) argues that these descriptions connect the characters to a particular setting until the women all come together in grief in the stark white mausoleum-like room at the end of the play, and that the chromatic distinctions between these homes aims to show:

[…] the emotional and physical gulf separating those who inhabit them. The diverse colours we see in such large expanses in the first three scenes – yellow, pink, white – will separate the three homes in the minds of the spectators. (idem)

Colour is thus used by Lorca as an aid to performance, as a way of physically representing the different dwellings to the spectator. Morris (idem) also highlights the chromatic link between the pink bows of the lace curtains in the Bride’s house and the pink walls of Leonardo’s house, and the connection between the blue inside and outside the Bride’s
cave with the forest and the blue light that appears with the Moon. However, the colours themselves have further significance: the yellow walls of the Mother’s and the Bridegroom’s house can give a sense of happiness and harmony, as do the pink walls where Leonardo and the Wife live. However, this sense of happiness and harmony is displaced in the words spoken in the scene. The Mother’s loathing of the knife, her grief for her murdered elder son and her apprehensions about the engagement of her only surviving son to the Bride quickly paint a far from happy and harmonious household.

Likewise, the homely feeling induced by the pink decoration of Leonardo’s house is quickly dispelled as the scene begins with the ominous singing of the lullaby and the anger Leonardo shows at being challenged about his horseback escapades and the impending engagement of the Bride (his former lover). We thus have a contrast between outward appearances and inner reality. Yellow is a colour that Lorca often associates with death, for example in *La zapatera prodigiosa* (Arango 1998: 281) and in *Bodas de sangre* the Bridegroom and Leonardo are later described as having ‘labios amarillos’ (yellow lips) in death. The pink present in Leonardo’s house could be interpreted as an augury of the blood that will later be spilt, while the cross of pink flowers and the pink bows in the Bride’s cave connect her with that bloodbath; as mentioned above, she later returns from the forest scene with her dress and hair stained with blood. The hard white walls of the cave associate her with death and the mausoleum-like room of the final Act; the ‘puertas redondas’ define her cave as the threshold between life and death. We thus see how Lorca uses colour to frame each scene. These colours are then reinforced by or contrasted with the images that are created by the dialogue, generating what Edwards (1987: 21) calls ‘stage pictures whose resonances go beyond what is actually seen on stage’. Edwards (1985: 108) thus considers the importance of the scenery as indicated in Lorca’s stage directions in terms of the tension and dramatic effect of the play, as it is ‘the accumulating and accelerating clash of opposites, pessimism/optimism, harmony/discord, aspiration/frustration’ that create tension and thus ‘the stage settings are themselves an integral part of that tension’. In the staging of the plays in translation, this element of the dramatic effect of the play as a whole may not be present as directors may decide to minimise the scenery, or demands of the theatrical location may force a
compromise in this respect. We thus see how elements that can be related to the performativity of the text can be constrained by its performance.

In *Yerma* there is a stripping back of this chromatic range in the stage directions. The play begins with a dream-like sequence where Yerma is asleep. The scene has a strange blue, dream-like light; a shepherd holds a child dressed in white; when the clock strikes, the blue light changes to a light described as ‘alegre’ (happy) of a spring morning and Yerma wakes up. The happy light of the spring morning instils a sense of calm and happiness, and through the child dressed in white and the bright light Yerma is connected from the start with the colour white, a colour evoked throughout the play to portray the central theme of her sterility. The Second Scene describes the setting with a single word ‘campo’ (countryside), and we are left to imagine what this might look like. For an English-speaking audience, this notion of countryside is clearly very different from that which would be perceived by a Spanish-speaking audience. In Act Two, Scene One there is no direct reference to colour although the water and the Washerwomen evoke ideas of cleanliness and purity. In Scene Two the stage directions are also simple, and the only reference to colour is the lighting as we are told that it is getting dark. At the end of this Act, when the two Sisters-in-law are looking for Yerma, who has gone to the house of Dolores to carry out a fertility ritual, it is almost completely dark. In Act Three it is daybreak and in the final scene we return to dusk, whereas by the end ‘está muy anochecido’ (it is pitch black) as the play culminates in Yerma strangling Juan. Lorca again uses colour metaphorically to signal an evolution from a hopeful beginning to the final tragedy, as the blackness of the final scene contrasts sharply with the dazzling whiteness of the opening scene.

One of the sharpest contrasts between colours is between the black and white depicted in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. In fact, Lorca informs us in a note at the beginning of the play: ‘El poeta advierte que estos tres actos tienen la intención de un documental fotográfico’ (The poet advises that these three acts are intended to be a photographic documentary). These words could be taken to mean that Lorca had moved away from the poetry and surrealism of *Bodas de sangre* and *Yerma* to a more realistic
(photographic) representation of real life. This idea of a ‘photographic documentary’
evokes images of the black and white photographs of the era and, indeed, we are
presented with stage instructions that portray dazzling white-washed walls: ‘Habitation
blanquisima ....’ where two hundred women dressed in the black colour of mourning,
holding their black fans, later file in two by two. However, Lorca’s brother (García Lorca
1980: 375) suggests that to take this at face value as a realistic representation is to
misunderstand Lorca’s theatre. Wright (2007: 60) suggests that the white walls of the
house in La casa de Bernarda Alba are the frame and that ‘rather than being ‘realistic’
the characters threaten to almost become caricatures’.

The use of the stark contrast between black and white is instrumental in portraying a
clinical, distancing effect that emulates the visual impact of a photograph. Lorca has
made these observations of everyday Andalusian life - the white-washed walls, and
specific cultural symbols, such as the custom of wearing black in mourning -
metaphorical so that more than representing a vision of Andalusia itself they come to
symbolise the interplay between life and death. This is reinforced by the evolution of
the colour white; the ‘Habitación blanquisima’ (extremely white) of the first Act, is just
‘blanca’ (white) in Act Two. By Act Three it is tinged slightly blue to denote night.
However, metaphorically it also denotes a darkening within the house, metaphorically
portraying the impending doom. In this way, colour again does more than represent, it
performs.

We thus see how, in the stage directions, colour paints a picture of the scene but also
establishes metaphorical connections with the characters and the tragedy that unfolds.
The colours, which are evoked either directly or indirectly within the dialogue, also
reinforce these connections. Colour thus acts as a cohesive device linking images within
each play, and creates the build-up of dramatic tension. The cohesive links created are
circular, working together to produce a coil which gets tighter and tighter as each play
progresses until it implodes in the final tragic outcome.

Binding (1985: 51) and Johnston (1989: 18) refer to Stephen Spender’s idea of Lorca’s
‘grammar of images’. This highlights the role of images in the cohesive texture of the
play; however, rather than a ‘grammar of images’, I would prefer to refer to it as a ‘grammar of colour’ as it is colour, by either inference, association or direct reference, which acts as the cohesive device between images rather than the image itself. Colour also acts as a link between the three plays, because similar themes are explored with similar colours.

Lorca creates this ‘grammar of colour’ by mixing and merging colours, using them to create an outward image of conformity that juxtaposes with the inner suffocation experienced by the characters. In this way, Lorca metaphorically portrays the inner struggle of the individual against the ideas that have been somatically programmed into them by the society in which they live. In this way he comments upon the rural society that is portrayed as patriarchal, repressive, religious, violent and superstitious. The individual’s inner struggle is often portrayed as one affecting the body, so that words and emotions become a physical infliction while society demands the body’s silence. Those who are unable to silence the body and maintain respectability in terms of ‘honra’ (honour) are doomed to a tragic end. Colour thus goes beyond the decorative and aesthetic to become primarily functional. Colour is used not merely referentially but performatively. Lorca’s brother (García Lorca 1980: 434-435) highlights the importance of colour and light in understanding Lorca’s theatre:

Su teatro mismo no sería del todo inteligible si no tuviésemos en cuenta esta participación del color y la luz, que llegan a tener en más de una ocasión verdadera función dramática.

His actual theatre would not be completely intelligible if we did not take into account that participation of colour and light, which come to have on more than one occasion real dramatic function.

Lorca thus employs colour as a functional tool for dramatic effect. Kress and Van Leeuwen (2002: 348-349) explain how ‘[j]ust as language allows us to realize speech acts, so colour allows us to realize ‘colour acts’, [...] [i]t is not just the case that colour ‘expresses’ or ‘means’, [...] but that people use colour [...] to act on others’.
The metaphorical use of colour is, therefore, an excellent choice for analysis as it is not only a link between themes in the plays but also between the page and the stage, in both its verbal and visual forms. This can be in terms of stage directions put into practice but also in terms of the visualisation of the written text. An example of the visualisation of the written text in the dialogue, rather than the stage directions, is the green dress that Adela wears in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. The green dress stands out against the interplay of black and white as described before in the stage directions. Adela wears it as an act of defiance against the eight years of mourning that her mother, Bernarda, has imposed upon the household. However, its significance goes beyond this, as the colour green can have both positive connotations of hope and negative ones such as envy. For Lorca the colour green is also connected to death as it portrays the fragility of life destined to complete its natural cycle and so doomed to eventually wither and rot. Adela is told to dye the dress black by her sister, in other words she is being told to conform. Adela shows the dress to the hens and the fleas from the hens bite her legs. She is young, virginal, green, full of hope but also full of envy of her sister, who is engaged to Pepe. The fleas metaphorically represent society, which will not allow the individual to fulfil their true desire, but they also represent death and decay; Adela is literally being eaten alive, just as she suffocates within the household. This example also shows how colour makes a connection between the page and stage, because if the actor playing Adela wears a green dress, the words on the page are visualised, creating non-verbal meaning that can reinforce the words spoken. In this way, colour is a powerful non-verbal conveyer of meaning. Mitchell (1994: 152) points out the limitations of the verbal compared to the visual:

A verbal representation cannot represent - that is, make present - its object in the same way as a visual representation can. It may refer to an object, describe it, invoke it, but it can never bring its visual presence before us the way pictures do. Words can ‘cite’ but never ‘sight’ their objects.

Adela’s dress is ‘cited’ on the page but on the stage it is also ‘sighted’ as Adela later appears wearing it. The impact of the visual memory is more immediate and the word
and the image interact to reinforce the meaning. In this way we see a dialogic relationship between the page and the stage.

As discussed, Lorca’s self-confessed ‘agrarian complex’ is resonant in the images that he evokes. He presents us with a natural world often in opposition to man and he connects man to the natural cycle of life and the three Greek fates (birth, life and death). Colour is the natural state of objects although it can be fleeting because colours change as death takes hold. When Lorca links people to colour it is a physical characteristic and is used as a way of expressing on the outside what is felt or what is happening on the inside. Lorca’s grammar of colour is thus more than referential, it is functional; a coherent creation of images linked by colour which perform on the reader/spectator and connect to the overall discourse of the plays. In this way, the grammar of colour can be seen as performative.

I will now move on to analyse the metaphorical use of colour in the dialogue itself, drawing on a range of examples from the three plays, highlighting the complexities involved in translating this grammar of colour into English.

1.4.1 ‘White’ as a physical description

In Yerma the colour white dominates (Anderson 2003: 57) in different ways to represent the central theme of sterility. In the first scene, Yerma sings to her unborn child, asking the child what he/she will ask for, the imaginary child answering:

“Los blancos montes que hay en tu pecho”. (OCII: 482)

“The white mountains that are on your chest”.

The allusion here is to the milk Yerma’s breasts will contain once her child is born. However, this early feeling of hope changes as the Washerwomen later lament that Yerma’s breasts contain only sand:

¡Ay de la que tiene los pechos de arena! (OCII: 498)
Ah for the one who has breasts of sand!

Yerma later describes her breasts as blind; doves with no eyes and no whiteness:

¡Ay pechos ciegos bajo mi vestido!

¡Ay palomas sin ojos ni blancura! (OCII: 505)

Ah blind breasts beneath my dress!

Ah doves with neither eyes nor whiteness!

We thus see a metaphorical evolution in the use of white from useful and fertile white mountains to useless or blind and lacking in whiteness.

As Tourangeau (1982: 18) points out, there are metaphors that may describe a situation which could be classed as strange or unusual but do not deviate semantically from the norm. In the pilgrimage scene, the Male Mask says ‘¡Ay qué blanca la triste casada!’ (OCII: 520) (Ah how white the sad wife!); we can take this literally, in which case we would assume Yerma (or sterile women in general) is pale from sadness or illness, or we can take it metaphorically at which point meanings that are associated with the colour white are evoked, such as purity or innocence. This takes us to what Moore (1982: 6) calls ‘second-order’ usage. Yerma is depicted as innocent in the naivety she expresses at times; however, her whiteness is not just pallor because of sadness at her predicament, but it is also ‘a whiteness’ in the sense of sterility. It is not a temporary state but a physical description and thus part of her natural being. For the translator of such lines, the challenge is whether to translate these references literally, or whether to provide an interpretation, through the use of addition or clarification, for the reader/spectator. The translator may feel that the demands of performability in terms of the ephemeral nature of the stage, require a more explicit interpretation than a literal translation would give. On the other hand, they may feel that a literal translation is necessary in order to ensure the connection with the play’s overall grammar of colour.
Juan is also described as white at the beginning of the play when Yerma says that he has a white face as if the sun never shines on it. The fact that Juan is also described as white in colour implies that he is also responsible for Yerma’s barren state. She encourages him to go and swim in the river or get soaked by the rain on the roof. Yerma describes him as having become more gaunt as time has passed as if he were growing backwards, in other words as if he were shrinking or withering away. He is becoming whiter both literally and metaphorically. White thus has negative connotations here. Yerma has previously offered Juan a glass of milk which he rejects and now she encourages him to carry out a ritual bathing in water as his gaunt state implies that he is dry and withered, as if in need of watering, the implication being that he is sterile, destined to rot and die. This implication of dryness is one that is used elsewhere more directly to describe Juan, as will be discussed later.

These examples show how Lorca creates a symbolic meaning from direct reference to the colour white itself. There are other instances where colour metaphor is employed more indirectly, by association. In Yerma one of the most powerful symbols is that of water and its representation of fertility and sexual attraction. The dichotomy of water and dryness is used to highlight the irony of Yerma’s barren state. The following example shows how the association between water and sheep works to produce multiple levels of meaning which bring us back to this central theme.

1.4.2 The flood of wool

In Act Two, Scene One, the Washerwomen refer to the flocks of sheep as:

> Es una inundación de lana. Arramblan con todo. Si los trigos verdes tuvieran cabeza, temblarían de verlos venir. (OCII: 498)

> It’s a flood of wool. They sweep everything along. If the green wheat had a head (in other words ‘if they were wise’), they would tremble to see them coming.

The sheep rushing past are described as a ‘flood of wool’, bringing together two nouns that do not naturally collocate. They could be described as ‘semantically deviant’ (Moore
1982: 1) or ‘alien’ (Aristotle 1967: 59) as they belong to different semantic worlds. On a simple level, the transfer that takes places when the property of ‘fast-moving water’ moves from ‘flood’ to ‘wool’, evokes a pictorial image of sheep moving quickly *en masse*. While wool may evoke positive images of softness, the fact that they are a flood makes them a negative image of danger. This negative aspect is reinforced by the situational context in which the ‘flood of wool’ appears with the verb ‘arramblar’ in the next sentence. According to *The Real Academia Online* ‘arramblar’ is:

Dicho de un río, de un arroyo o de un torrente. Dejar cubierto de arena el suelo por donde pasa, en tiempo de avenidas.

Said of a river, of a stream or a mountain torrent. Leaves the ground covered in sand where it has been, in times of flood.

It can also mean ‘[a]rrastrarlo todo, llevándoselo con violencia’ (drag everything along, taking it with violence) or ‘[r]ecoger y llevarse con codicia todo lo que hay en algún lugar’ (gather up and take away everything with greed (or lust) that is in a certain place).

The element of danger is reinforced in the next utterance where the threatening mass of a flood of wool is described as: ‘¡Qué manada de enemigos!’ (What a herd of enemies!). The image of fast-flowing water naturally contains an element of danger as it can be over-whelming and presents a risk of drowning. However, the danger to the wheat goes beyond this because it is described as green indicating that it is young, innocent and thus virginal. Here, we see deeper levels of meaning because while the wool takes on the property of the flood, the flood can take on the property of the wool, in other words, its white colour. This whiteness can take us to other layers of meaning insofar as the white flood could be an image of ejaculation as a flood of seminal fluid flows down towards the green virginal wheat. We thus see how this image can become a metaphor for fertility, reinforced by the fact that sheep are naturally fertile animals. The irony of Yerma’s predicament is highlighted in what Ter Horst (1980: 50) refers to as a ‘multiplicity of seminal images’ as the word ‘arramblar especially suggests the
whiteness of rapids, the emotional wealth of that inexhaustive sexuality of which Yerma is deprived’.

This example illustrates the restrictive nature of the traditional Aristotelian view of metaphor as ‘transfer’; while properties are clearly transferred between the two elements, flood and wool, it is the interaction as a result of this transfer that creates meaning, and this is a two-way process. As discussed previously the ‘interaction theory’ (Black 1962, 1993) sees metaphor not so much as semantic anomaly but as a bringing together of different contexts to create new meaning, or as Apter (1982: 56) describes it as a synergy where ‘two processes are working together to produce an effect which neither could produce alone’. In this example, a synergy of colours takes us to deeper layers of meaning, and there is interaction not only between flood and wool but also between the colours white and green. On the surface we have a direct reference to the actual colour of the wheat, which serves to create a pictorial image in the mind of the receiver, but it is also symbolic and, in this way, the colour produces additional meanings or reinforces them. The colour white and the colour green here are the key to Lorca taking us via his ‘equestrian leaps’ (OCIII: 60) into deeper levels of meaning. The translator again has to take into consideration here whether to use a literal translation that connects to the overall grammar of colour of the original, or whether to produce a translation that seeks to explain the symbolic meanings of these colours. They would also need to take into account the ephemeral medium of the stage. We thus see the challenge of the performativity of the original pitted against the performativity and performability of the translation.

In terms of the other elements of this utterance, the translation of the word ‘arramblar’ needs careful consideration. As discussed above, when related to a flood of water it means that the water drags everything along with it, with violent force, but it also has the sense of taking everything greedily. Words in English such as ‘sweeping along’ may not sufficiently relay the dangerous sexual image of the original, whereas, words such as ‘engulfing’ (which also collocates well with water), or ‘appropriating’ may not be suitable in terms of register. The translator may want to portray the rural speech to
achieve credibility of characterisation, which is particularly important on stage. We also note here that Lorca uses two very short sentences: ‘Es una inundación de lana. Arramblan con todo’, which add a certain unnaturalness to the utterance. The translator may feel that they need to make the utterance sound more natural in English.

Unlike the example of white as a physical description, we know immediately that the wool is not literally a flood and that we are faced with a way of describing figuratively a large quantity of sheep moving quickly. We can thus easily reach a second-order usage; however, it may take us longer to process the multiplicity of meanings present. This reminds us that the receiver takes an active role in processing the metaphor and taking it beyond what Moore (1982: 7) calls ‘first-order usage’, which he equates with Austin’s (1962) ‘locutionary act’ (uttering words with a certain sense and reference), to a ‘second-order’ function that resides in the ‘illocutionary’ (purposeful) and ‘perlocutionary’ (affective) levels of language as defined by Austin (1962). We must also remember that different audiences will process a metaphor in different ways as Lorca pointed out with reference to his audience’s understanding as in the example of ‘ahonde’ discussed in Section 1.3. Moreover, the fact that Lorca’s metaphors are received both on the page and the stage means that the medium of reception will have an impact on the processing of the utterance, as the text-in-performance does not offer the receiver the luxury of re-reading it, so associations may not be so easily accessible on the stage as they are on the page. Moreover, there is a clear challenge here for translation between the illocutionary effect related to the author intention and the perlocutionary effect related to audience uptake.

1.4.3 The river of men

The metaphor of animal instinct is exploited further by Lorca as this image of the ‘flood of wool’ is connected to the image of a ‘river of men’ coming down the mountains in Act Three, Scene Two, which he uses to describe the men that go to the shrine in search of sexual partners:

Un río de hombres solos baja por esas sierras. (OCII: 517)
A river of single men is coming down those mountains.

Just as the sheep are presented as a danger to the green wheat, the men are likened to water coming down the mountainside. This metaphor thus brings us back to the previous one of the sheep, linking the men with animal instinct and, therefore, with fertility. If we are in any doubt as to what these men might represent, Lorca tells us of the threat they pose in the preceding lines as the First Girl (Muchacha 1) describes how her sister was molested the previous year by some of these men. Lorca thus aids our comprehension of this metaphor with more information about these dangerous predators. However, this metaphor can be taken to further levels, where the nature of the water they represent can be connected with wider religious implications. Fernández-Cifuentes (1984: 304) sees this reference to a river as a calculated metaphor that implies that instead of the women drinking blessed water at the shrine, the water these men represent is profane.

In this way, ‘the men’ take on the property of a river as a dangerous flood down the mountainside, and the water itself takes on properties related to ‘the men’ so that there is an interaction of concepts between the two linguistic items that compose the metaphor ‘river of men’, illustrating again the synergy discussed in the previous example. It also illustrates the idea of opposition in Lorca’s use of metaphor, evoking the whiteness or purity of the blessed water in opposition to the dark dangerous profane water these men represent. Moreover, Lorca presents the hypocrisy involved when the women go to the shrine to pray for a miracle with the implication that if they conceive it is actually due to them sleeping with one of the many men that hang around precisely for that purpose. There are many references to this opposition of blessed and profane, or what could be described as Catholic and pagan throughout the play, which are related to the colour white. We are thus taken beyond the realms of ‘poetic diction’ (Lefevere 1992: 49-51) into the functional realms of a higher-order usage. Once again, we see a multiplicity of meanings and also a circularity of images as connections are made between the early image of the sheep and this later image of the men. The ‘metaphor patterning’ where ‘a particular metaphorical image [is] maintained over a fairly long
stretch of text’ (Dickins 2005: 251) in this case is a connection between images and colours, and this connection is particularly important to produce the tension and dramatic effect of the play. The translator needs, firstly, to be aware of this metaphorical patterning and, secondly, to strive for strategies that represent this metaphorical patterning in English. Moreover, the religious context in which Lorca was writing may have less relevance for a predominately non-Catholic, largely secular society such as the British one. The challenges of translating Lorca’s work are often on this level of an inherent symbolism that relies on specific cultural and religious references that are not explicit but part of an underlying discourse that runs through the plays. A translator into English may feel the need to explain this symbolism. In a performance on stage some symbolic references can be made more explicit by visual means.

1.4.4 The flies of silver

One of the powerful symbols Lorca uses in Bodas de sangre is that of the horse. Arango (1998: 174) points out the multiple meanings the symbol of the horse can portray: ‘el caballo es un símbolo de fuerza, de poder creador, de juventud cuyo valor es eminentemente sexual’ (the horse is a symbol of strength, of creative power, of youthfulness whose value is eminently sexual). But it is also a symbol of death:

Al comienzo de la historia, el caballo estaba asociado a las tinieblas del mundo cósmico, donde él surgía, galopando como la sangre en las venas, de las entrañas de la tierra y de las olas del mar. (Arango 1998:70)

From the beginning of time, the horse is associated with the darkness of the underworld from which it came, galloping like blood in the veins, from the depths of the earth and the waves of the sea.

The horse is a recurrent symbol in Lorca’s poetry and theatre, where he employed all of these interpretations. In Bodas de sangre the horse first appears in Act One, Scene Two in the lullaby (la nana) that Leonardo’s wife and Mother-in-law sing to the child. There is no one particular colour directly associated with it but it is described as ‘el caballo del alba’ (horse of dawn) which evokes the image of a white horse. Lorca (OCIII: 115-116) in
his essay on lullabies explains the dark side of the Spanish lullaby, which is melancholic and expresses the burden rather than the joy that a child brings for the mother living in poverty. However, this particular lullaby is not a mere melancholic cultural reference but it acts as a premonition giving us an insight into what will happen at the end of the play in the forest scene when Leonardo and the Bride are confronted by the Bridegroom and his entourage. In the lullaby the horse is weeping and refuses to drink because the water is black. In the next verse its hooves are wounded, its mane is frozen, in its eyes there is a dagger of silver and blood is flowing stronger than water. We thus have an interplay of the white horse, black water, the silver of the dagger and the red blood. The combination of these colours creates a picture that depicts the tragedy to come in the forest. The reference to the colour of the dagger continues in the next verse with ‘flies of silver’:

MUJER. No quiso tocar
la orilla mojada,
su belfo caliente
con moscas de plata.
A los montes duros
solo relinchaba
con el río muerto
sobre la garganta.
¡Ay, caballo grande
que no quiso el agua!
¡Ay dolor de nieve,
caballo del alba! (OCII: 422-423).

WIFE. He didn’t want to touch
the wet riverbank,
his muzzle warm
with flies of silver
To the hard hills
he was only neighing
with the dead river
on his throat.
Ah, big horse
that didn’t want the water!
Ah, pain of snow,
horse of dawn!

This is another example of the circularity of Lorca’s images as the flies of silver evoke an image of horseflies that look silver in the moonlight but also, through the colour, connect to the image of the knife present at the beginning of the play in the first scene and again later when it is connected to the Moon. At the end of the play it is evoked again by the Mother. We thus have a pictorial image of flies buzzing around a fresh corpse, as the horse’s muzzle is warm but he is neighing to the hard hills which we can either take literally or more metaphorically as the dead bodies of the Bridegroom and Leonardo. The horse is further connected with death with the reference to the pain of snow and the dawn. Similar words will be used later when referring to the Moon and the knife when they interact with Death in the forest scene. The challenge again for the translator is how to represent this grammar of colour. Is literal translation the most performative strategy or does performability in terms of the ephemeral nature of the stage require that some of those elements of the grammar of colour be explained for an English-speaking audience? The poetic element here is another challenge for the translator, as while the lullaby is pictorial and symbolic, its form is lyrical, as Lorca uses assonance to create rhythm. According to Johnston (2007b: 79) ‘[i]t is the marked contrast between [the] poetry and the flintier, hard-edged speeches that speak of self-control and conformism that forms the central axis of the language universe of Lorca’s theatre’ and he maintains that:

Only if the translator is able to re-create meaningfully and coherently the system of culture-specific references within the framework of the linguistic tensions that inhabit this universe will he or she be able to re-create in turn
the complicity that Lorca sought for his plays in performance. (Johnston 2007b: 80)

Johnston thus views the contrast between the poetry and the normal dialogue as an essential element for the creation of linguistic tension within the text which the translator should aim to recreate.

1.4.5 The pins of silver

Another example of the circularity of Lorca’s images is found in Act Three, Scene One, when Leonardo and the Bride have fled and are hiding in the forest, and Leonardo describes the effect the Bride has had upon him:

¡Qué vidrios se me clavan en la lengua!
Porque yo quise olvidar
y puse un muro de piedra
entre tu casa y la mía.
Es verdad. ¿No lo recuerdas?
Y cuando te vi de lejos
me eché en los ojos arena.
Pero montaba a caballo
y el caballo iba a tu puerta.
Con alfileres de plata
mi sangre se puso negra,
y el sueño me fue llenando
las carnes de mala hierba.
Que yo no tengo la culpa,
que la culpa es de la tierra
y de ese olor que te sale
de los pechos y las trenzas (OCII: 463)

Let pieces of glass stab my tongue!
because I wanted to forget
and I put a wall of stone
between your house and mine
It’s true. Don’t you remember?
And when I saw you from afar
I threw sand in my eyes.
But I would ride my horse
and the horse would go to your door.
With silver pins
my blood turned black
and my sleep was filling
my flesh with weeds.
It’s not my fault
it’s the fault of the earth
and of that smell that comes
from your breasts and your plaits.

Leonardo describes the intensity of the attraction that he feels towards the Bride in a way that works within the grammar of colour of the play as a whole, as he refers to the arid landscape and the connection of man and earth, and blames the earth itself for the situation he and the Bride find themselves in. The ‘pins of silver’ is a cultural reference to the Spanish tradition of brides wearing pins in their hair on their wedding day, which they later give to some of the single female guests. This is similar to the English tradition of throwing the bride’s bouquet for one of the single female guests to catch. Lorca uses this cultural reference symbolically as Leonardo says that it is the Bride’s wedding that has turned his blood black, in other words, poisoned him and made him act the way he is acting. Secondly, it implicates what will happen to him later in the forest, although it will be the silver knife that will turn his blood black, in other words, kill him. Furthermore, this description creates a pictorial image of physical pain of silver pins stabbing his skin. For the translator, there are challenges on various levels; a literal
translation of ‘afileres de plata’; will not make the cultural reference evident for an English-speaking audience. The word ‘plata’ in Spanish is used to emphasise the colour of the pins, creating a reference to the grammar of colour within the play. Moreover, the dramatic, intense language with which Leonardo expresses himself here may appear melodramatic and over-emotional. As Edwards (1980: 156) points out, Lorca’s penchant for a ‘heightened, intense and concentrated’ style of language is ‘the material of melodrama, and for many theatregoers, particularly the more phlegmatic North European, it remains the difficulty of appreciating fully Lorca’s plays’.

1.4.6 The personification of the Moon

Another symbol that Lorca relates to both sexuality and death is that of the Moon. Arango (1998: 58) states that for Lorca rather than being the traditional romantic Moon, the Moon is a symbol of malice. It is often a symbol of death in his poetry (idem). It is one of the most potent symbols in Bodas de sangre where Lorca uses it as a metaphor to represent the interplay between life and death; he does this by linking it to the red blood, the silver of the knife, and its complicit interaction with Death in the guise of the beggar woman which brings about the final tragedy played out in the dark forest. The Moon is essential for Death to be able to act as it lights the way for the knife to strike. It describes itself as:

\[\text{Cisne redondo en el río,}
\text{ojoo de las catedrales,}
\text{alba fingida en las hojas}
\text{soy; [...] (OCII: 457)}\]

\[\text{Round swan on the river,}
\text{eye of the cathedrals,}
\text{false dawn on the leaves}
\text{am I; [...]}\]
Lorca makes this poetic description of the Moon appear sinister as its multiple guises gives the unsettling feeling that it is everywhere and there is nowhere the lovers can hide. It takes on human characteristics as it describes itself as having cheeks:

Pues esta noche tendrán
mis mejillas roja sangre, (OCII: 457)

So tonight they will have
my cheeks red blood,

This personification of the Moon is made all the more real when the Moon comes down to earth and the complicity between the Moon and Death is taken to heightened extremes. In the stage directions, Lorca tells us that this part is to be played by a young Woodcutter with a white face. This is a visual representation of the Moon but, at the same time, it establishes a further connection with death as the Woodcutter is literally wearing a death mask, so that the moon is represented on stage as the face of death. In staging this scene, the director will have to decide whether to follow the stage directions or provide another interpretation, as following the stage directions may cause some confusion for the audience. The challenge here is thus perhaps more related to staging than to translation. The director may wish to use more explicit costume, rather than just a painted white face, in order to represent the Moon as a person. Make-up could be used here to explicitly highlight the sinister nature of the Moon. In the translated text, the translator could add further stage directions to aid the director in this respect. Equally the translator can ensure that the language used by the Moon in the written translation is in keeping with the sinister aspect the Moon portrays.

1.4.7 The dichotomy of water and dryness

Lorca often uses dichotomy in his poetry, as Yudin (1980: 117) reminds us. As previously discussed in the ‘flood of wool’ example, water is used as a metaphor for both fertility and sexual instinct. Throughout Yerma, Lorca plays with the presence and absence of
water to explore these themes, and the stark contrasts between flowing water, stagnated water and the sea are used metaphorically in all three plays.

Yerma, whose name means barren in Spanish, is thus a personification of barrenness. This is a connotation that an English audience will generally not experience, and it is difficult to imagine how a translator might enable them to do so; even in the unlikely event that a name were invented that might connote barrenness, the audience would not in general be aware of Yerma’s connection with the region of Spain where the play is set. As Ter Horst (1980: 43) points out, the ‘Vega’ of Granada is a barren wasteland where irrigation is key, so much so that ‘[...] the relationship between the soil and the tiller of it becomes almost conjugal’ and ‘[d]espite the good soil, the rivers, and the springs, sterility is the primordial situation, which the husbandman, by bringing water to the land reverses. In every sense, he is wedded to the earth’.

Like the earth, Yerma needs tending by her husband to become fertile, and the play contains many mentions of rituals connected with water. For example, Yerma encourages Juan to immerse himself in water in an effort to connect with its life force. Knowles & Moon (2006: 152) point out that water often has a metaphorical significance as it represents the beginning of life in a physical and a spiritual sense in the Christian faith and in many other faiths. Lorca relates it to fertility in descriptions of the birth of children, for example. ‘los hijos llegan como el agua’ (OCIl: 488) (children arrive/come like water), and references to infertility are described in opposite terms, as lacking in water and being dry. Yerma constantly questions her infertile state in these terms:

¿Por qué estoy yo seca? (OCIl: 488)
Why am I dry?

She describes herself as dying of thirst, for example:

... la que se muere de sed. (OCIl: 489)
... she who is dying of thirst.
The Washerwomen later take up this lament, as mentioned before, describing her as dry and her breasts as full of sand:

¡Ay de la casada seca!
¡Ay de la que tiene los pechos de arena! (OCII: 498)

Ah for the dry wife!
Ah for she who has breasts of sand

As the years go by, Yerma’s frustration grows as she feels her situation is more and more hopeless, and lack of water also becomes associated with a lack of freedom:

Yo pienso que tengo sed y no tengo libertad. (OCII: 512)
I think that I am thirsty and I have no freedom.

This lack of freedom that Yerma laments is linked to the fact that she feels the very rights of her gender are denied her, in that her sole role in life is that of producing children, something that she is unable to do. She is offered a solution to her predicament by the Old Woman who suggests that in order to quench Yerma’s thirst she should turn to another man and even offers her own son as a potential partner:

Cuando se tiene sed, se agradece el agua. (OCII: 523)
When one is thirsty, one appreciates water.

But for Yerma her predicament is so bad, that:

Yo soy como un campo seco donde caben arando mil pares de bueyes, y lo que tú me das es un pequeño vaso de agua de pozo. (OCII: 523-524)
I am like a dry field where a thousand pairs of oxen can plough, and what you give me is a small glass of water from a well.

Water in this instance is described as ‘agua de pozo’ (water from a well), in contrast to the free-flowing waters described earlier, the insinuation being that it is stale, or bad, as
it is dishonest water, belonging to another man than her husband. Lorca brings us again to the idea he portrays before with the ‘river of men’ as profane water. Due to Yerma’s own code of honour, she is unable to take this stale water from the well. The implication is that Yerma needs irrigation but in the form of love not just the seed, as land needs tending to be productive. Yerma’s husband spends so much time in the fields irrigating his land that he has no time left to irrigate his wife.

Although the implication is that Juan could solve Yerma’s predicament if he spent more time at home, like Yerma, Juan is also described as dry but in his case it is a dryness or seriousness of character:

Tiene un carácter seco. (OCII: 493)

He has a dry character.

The Washerwomen echo the theme of Juan’s dryness when they describe him as deaf to Yerma’s dissatisfaction and he is likened to a lizard, in other words, a creature that needs little water and has a dry, withered appearance. He is cold-blooded, in other words, not sensual or passionate:

El marido está como sordo. Parado como un lagarto puesto al sol. (OCII: 497)

The husband it’s like he’s deaf. Still like a lizard in the sun.

Later, Yerma goes further when, describing their sex life to Dolores:

...pero yo le noto la cintura fría como si tuviera el cuerpo muerto... (OCII: 512)

...but I feel his waist cold as if his body were dead...

This link between sterility and death gives an indication of the tragedy to come, as Juan will be dead at the end of the play. The contrast between describing Juan as a lizard, which is a creature that likes the sun, and as having a cold waist juxtaposes the elements of heat and cold, portraying the irony of the situation and the tragedy of the play. The
linguistic challenge here is that the implications of the references to dryness may not be fully evident if translated literally. These notions of dryness are closely related to the physical environment in which the characters live, and Lorca exploits this physical environment to express this underlying theme of the play. An English-speaking audience may have completely different notions of what an Andalusian rural environment looks like, and thus implies.

I have discussed the colour white as represented in the dichotomy of fertility in terms of water, and sterility in terms of dryness; I will now move on to discuss another representation of the colour white, this time in terms of the heat produced by the sun which is another life giving force, but also an oppressive element.

1.4.8 The dichotomy of heat and cold

Like water, the sun is a natural life giving force as plants need water and the light to grow and produce seeds. However, the sun’s heat is often portrayed as an oppressive, destructive force as the stifling Andalusian heat can quickly destroy anything that grows. The sun’s heat has an important presence in all three plays. It portrays the contextual setting but is also symbolic of the frustrations that the characters feel in the context of repression and the expectation of conformity. In many cases the sun is presented together with silence as a repressive force (see section 1.4.9), and in La casa de Bernarda Alba it is described as being like ‘plomo’ (lead):

Cae el sol como plomo.
Hace años no he conocido calor igual. (OCII: 588)

The sun is beating down like lead.
I haven’t known heat like this for years

Moreover, this image of the sun bearing down with force evokes images of burning passion and sexual frustration that exist in the household and at the same time serves as a metaphor for repression. Similarly, in Bodas de sangre, the Mother refers to a fierce
heat which is a metaphor for the burning passion between the Bride and Leonardo which will ultimately lead to a tragic end.

Often Lorca exploits the contrast between heat and cold. As discussed before, Yerma describes Juan as having a cold waist as if he were dead and says that although she has always abhorred ‘hot’ women, she wishes that she could be a mountain of fire:

 Cuando me cubre, cumple con su deber, pero yo le noto la cintura fría como si tuviera el cuerpo muerto, y yo, que siempre he tenido asco de las mujeres calientes, quisiera ser en aquel instante como una montaña de fuego. (OCII: 512)

When he covers me, he does his duty, but I feel his waist cold as if his body were dead, and I, who have always felt repulsion towards hot women, would like to be in that instant like a mountain of fire.

While this contrast between heat and cold brings us back to the central theme of sterility, it also shows Yerma’s character influenced by her strict Catholic upbringing where the sexual act is seen as a means of reproduction and not for pleasure. María, who due to her name, appears as the personification of Catholic values, likens her unborn child to a dove (another white motif) that her husband slipped into her ear. Fernández-Cifuentes (1984: 296) points out that the language Lorca uses to describe this act is magical. There are obvious religious connotations here with the Immaculate Conception. However, such connotations may not be so readily perceived by an English-speaking audience, and the language that Fernández-Cifuentes considers magical may seem strange, or rather abstract, to a modern, English-speaking audience. The translator may choose to compensate for this in some way.

On a more realistic level, Lorca is commenting on the naivety of María and women like her who believe in this magical explanation of conception due to a strict Catholic upbringing. The dove is a symbol of love but in this instance the dove is also described as one of fire indicating that there is in fact sexual chemistry between them, something that appears to be lacking between Yerma and Juan. For the English translator there are
challenges here as to how to portray these symbolic elements, as well as the socio-cultural references to Catholic society.

In the example above related to the sun, Lorca exploits the physical environment in order to comment on the socio-cultural environment, drawing analogies between Catholic conformity and the way in which the physical environment stifles the individual, acting as a metaphor for oppression within this Catholic society. The translator may need to consider using addition or explicitation to make some of this inherent symbolism more apparent for the English-speaking receiver.

1.4.9 Abstract use of colour

According to Arango (1998: 277) colour is linked to the unconscious and while he stresses the universality of colour, he also points out that the meanings colours denote vary according to cultures; we know that the colour red, for example, in China is associated with luck, and the colour white with death. But colours may also have specific meanings for individuals, and Lorca’s brother (García Lorca 1980: 434) explains that Lorca often uses colour as an abstract representation of feelings or emotional states.

Silence and society

Lorca equates silence with the sterility of society and the struggle of the individual against that sterility. The Catalan poet Foix (1992: 212) likens whiteness to a cascade of silence and Lorca uses the colour white as an abstract representation of silence and repression. This reading depends on knowledge of the play as a whole and of how Lorca uses colour symbolically. The translator may use strategies of addition or clarification to make this more apparent, whereas the omission of the references to colour can have an effect on the dramatic texture of the play as a whole.

Emotions are often expressed as physical pain while Lorca portrays a society, through some of his characters, that demands silence and conformity. There are many references to the social context of the plays: a patriarchal society where women are shut in both literally and metaphorically, denied a voice and expected to conform. In this
patriarchal society, women are likened to animals; for example, in Yerma, Juan likens women to sheep when insisting that Yerma should know her place and not go out so much. In this way, Lorca comments on a society that sees the male as dominant and women as mere possessions with the same status as sheep. In this instance, we see the ambiguity in Lorca’s metaphor; in the ‘flood of wool’ example, the whiteness of the sheep could be related to fertility, whereas by likening women to sheep suggests a sterile society. This reading depends on the discourse of the play as a whole, and only becomes apparent as the play evolves. Translation decisions on one level may impact on this overall discourse which relates not only to what the play is about in terms of plot, but is integral to its dramatic structure and impact.

In La casa de Bernarda Alba we also see how women liken themselves to animals, submissive to men who are only interested in accumulating wealth:

¡Qué les importa a ellos la fealdad! A ellos les importa la tierra, las yuntas y una perra sumisa que les dé de comer. (OCII: 595)

What do they care about ugliness! They care about land, the oxen and a submissive bitch (literally female dog) to give them food.

The women, however, are collusive in these attitudes as men are considered blameless for their actions. In La casa de Bernarda Alba, Adela is considered responsible for provoking Pepe. This patriarchal society is also one where there are sharp differences between rich and poor. For example, in La casa de Bernarda Alba we have a political reference to the social situation at the time where the poor were forced to work for the rich landowners and had no land of their own:

Nosotras tenemos nuestras manos y un hoyo en la tierra de la verdad.
Ésa es la única tierra que nos dejan a los que no tenemos nada. (OCII: 586)

We have our hands and a hole in the earth of truth
That’s the only land that they allow those of us who have nothing.
This growing social unrest was a contributing factor to the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War. This metaphor thus evokes the inevitability of death but at the same time is a socio-political comment which may be less easily understood by an English audience, and moreover is not easy to convey because of the double meaning of the word ‘tierra’, which can be translated as both ‘earth’ and ‘land’ in English.

We see a society built on convention and conformity, which likes to keep up appearances as there is a fear of what the neighbours will say. The woman’s role is that of wife, mother, cook and cleaner and she is expected to remain silent and stay indoors. These values are upheld through silence. Those who deviate are either considered mad, whores or God-less. This idea of maintaining appearance is also reflected in the obsession with cleanliness.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, as discussed earlier, the stage directions describe ‘una habitación blanquísimá’ (an extremely white room) and in the dialogue there are references to glass being stained and muddy footprints on the gleaming white floor. In this way colour is used metaphorically to depict the cracks that are starting to show in these outward appearances:

Este cristal tiene unas motas. (OCII: 586)
This glass has stains.

This obsession with cleanliness is also present in *Yerma*. Juan brings his two spinster sisters to live with them to keep an eye on Yerma. Again, we see the opposition in the colour white where cleanliness represents the idea of keeping up appearances whereas the truth is a farce. The Washerwomen describe the situation in the house as a living hell:

Cada hora que transcurre aumenta el infierno en aquella casa. Ella y las cuñadas, sin despegar los labios, blanquean todo el día las paredes, friegan los cobres, limpian con vaho los cristales, dan aceite a la solería. Pues, cuando más relumbra la vivienda, más arde por dentro. (OCII: 497)
With every hour that passes the hell in that house increases. She and the sisters-in-law, without unsticking their lips, whitewash the walls all day, they wash the copperware, steam the glassware, oil the floor. So, the more the house shines, the more it burns inside.

St Clair (2016: 41) explains that the Swiss-French architect Le Corbusier (1925: 190-195) saw whitewashing walls as a moral and spiritual act of cleansing for society. In this way the Sisters-in-law are metaphorically cleansing Yerma’s sins. This obsessive whitewashing and cleaning in complete silence is thus a metaphor for repression, as the more sterile the environment, the more it suffocates the individual. We thus have an interplay between cleanliness, silence and hell. The Sisters-in-law who maintain this living hell are related to death as the Washerwomen liken them to waxy leaves that grow on gravestones. They are thus likened to the dark side of nature and their black attire represents Catholic conformity. In this particular example, the translator needs to decide whether to translate the specific references to the items cleaned in the house, or whether to provide more generic terms. However, it is perhaps the notion of conformity that is again conveyed here through implicit socio-cultural references that are perhaps not so evident to an English-speaking audience, which the translator needs to address.

Silence is a pivotal theme in all three plays and, in particular, in La casa de Bernarda Alba where ‘[t]he absence of sound becomes one of the most significant features of the intricate and finely calculated acoustic texture [...]’ (Thompson 1999b: 73). Bernarda’s control over her family is largely a control of language so that language itself becomes that control and in this way is something physical, an entity in its own right.

Bernarda’s first word to the maid is ‘Silence!’; her character is thus established from the start as controlling, seeking to keep up appearances and obsessed with cleanliness. Bernarda’s enjoyment of silence arises not only from a desire for relaxing calm but from an authoritarian demand for control:
Disfrutando este silencio y sin lograr ver por parte alguna “la cosa tan grande” que aquí pasa, según tú. (OCII: 625)

Enjoying this silence and without managing to see anywhere “the thing so big” that is happening here, according to you.

La Poncia considers silence a visible presence:

¿Tu ves este silencio? (OCII: 626)
You see this silence?

At the very beginning of the play, in the stage directions, a connection is established between white and silence; we have an ‘extremely white’ room and ‘a great shady silence extends across the scene’, so the silence is slightly dark and equated to a living being and thus represents oppression. Silence can be heard and felt.

Silence has an accomplice in the heat and the two work together to oppress, for example, where the silence of the heat itself is referred to:

(Entrando con su bastón.) ¡Qué escándalo es éste en mi casa y con el silencio del peso del calor! Estarán las vecinas con el oído pegado a los tabiques. (OCII: 612)

(Coming in with her stick). What scandal is this in my house and with the silence of the weight of the heat! The neighbours will have their ears glued to the walls.

Lorca thus uses white, silence and the heat to show social oppression but the oppression is also political as Bernarda is presented as the dictator of the house who seeks to control speech with violent force:

¡Silencio digo! Yo veía la tormenta venir, pero no creía que estallara tan pronto. ¡Ay qué pedrisco de odio habéis echado sobre mi corazón! Pero todavía no soy anciana y tengo cinco cadenas para vosotras y esta casa levantada por mi padre para que ni las hierbas se enteren de mi desolación. (OCII: 614)
Silence I say! I saw this storm coming, but I didn’t think it would explode so quickly. Ah what hailstone of hate you have all thrown on my heart! But I am not old yet and I have five chains for you all and this house built by my father so not even the weeds will find out about my desolation.

We thus see Lorca using the colour white in interaction with silence and heat to indicate oppression; we see a society that likes to keep up appearances and deny themselves and others their true feelings. However, more than this, the interaction between white, silence and heat is a reflection of the inner struggle of the individual, not just against what society tells them to do but against the force of nature itself and against their own subconscious.

**Silence of the Body**

The characters in all three plays often express the emotional pain they feel as a result of enforced silence, or repression of true feelings, as physical, allowing Lorca to suggest to his audience that the physical pain is caused by a repression of instinct as a result of conformity to the somatic conditioning imposed on the characters by the society in which they live:

> Callar y quemarse es el castigo más grande que nos podemos echar encima.  
> (OCII: 438)

Keeping quiet and burning inside is the greatest punishment that we can inflict upon ourselves.

The pain of suppression of emotion is connected with producing the physical pain of burning. The colour of that emotion is both white as in the concept of sterility and black in the concept of duende. In *Bodas de sangre* we see a manifestation of duende in the emotional pain felt by the Mother as she describes her tears as coming not only from her eyes but through her whole body from the soles of her feet. The physical pain she feels is perceived as real rather than purely emotional, reverberating through her whole body, with her tears burning hotter than blood. The challenge that this type of very
emotional language in Spanish presents to the translator into English is that it can appear to be over-emotional, overly melodramatic. Johnston (2007b: 78) makes this point, highlighting the ‘parallel difficulties of a residual cultural opacity and an embarrassing level of melodrama in performance’. Criticisms of the rural trilogy on the English-speaking stage often centred on this level of melodrama (Anderman 2005: 294-296) as I will discuss in more detail in Chapter Two.

1.5 Conclusion

It is evident that Lorca produces a complex interweaving of meaning, which makes everyday words metaphorical. He creates oppositions in the world of nature, creating tension and challenging the reader/spectator in every line. His metaphors are multi-layered and take on deeper meanings than the merely referential or pictorial, which as Lorca himself was aware will be understood by different audiences in different ways. Lorca’s complex web of metaphors not only brings mutually alien semantic worlds together but makes them interact to create multiple meanings which are poetic but above all functional, from a dramatic perspective but also on a sociocultural level. Moreover, they symbolise the inner struggle of the individual against the somatic programming of society. Colour takes us to new and often abstract meanings via association and thus provides access to the deeper layers of language. For the translator, the challenges are how to perform Lorca’s grammar of colour for an English-speaking audience. How to deal with the multiple layers of meanings as well as the temporal distance between the original text and the new audience. On the surface, the grammar of colour appears not to pose difficulties for a translator into English. For example, ‘blanca’ can be translated literally as ‘white’; however, there are challenges on the level of the symbolism inherent in the terms and of the socially constructed references to the physical environment in which the characters live. If a translator tries to explain the ambiguity of the grammar of colour they may disrupt the texture of the play as a whole.

In this chapter, I have presented some background information on Lorca and his creative output. I have shown that Lorca has been presented as a site of struggle and how the discourse around both his work and also his person have attributed to this notion of
struggle. I have presented what I consider to be Lorca’s own notion of performability in terms of his theory of *duende*, but also what I perceive to be his performativity in terms of what I refer to as his grammar of colour, which uses colour to create dramatic cohesion and tension throughout the plays. I have discussed several examples from the texts that show instances of different uses of colour metaphor, from the referential and the associative to the abstract. The different examples show the challenges for the translator in terms of the multiple layers of meaning present and how the translator must negotiate these, while at the same time negotiating the performability of a text that is both read and performed on stage.

In the next chapter, I discuss the translation of the rural trilogy, presenting the translations that form part of the corpus of this study, and evaluate the notion of performability, in particular, from the translator’s perspective. I also present a discussion of approaches to metaphor analysis within the field of Translation Studies.
Chapter 2 The rural trilogy in English translation

This chapter focuses on the rural trilogy in translation and its reception historically on the English-speaking stage before leading on to discuss what the individual translators say about how they have translated these plays and what this tells us about the notion of performability from the translators’ perspective. The final section discusses the translation of Lorca’s metaphors within the framework of the literature on the translation of metaphor.

2.1 The rural trilogy in English on the page and the stage

Lorca’s poems and plays have been (and continue to be) translated and retranslated into multiple languages, including English, and the rural trilogy continues to be performed regularly in English, both in amateur and professional productions. Some local examples of recent productions are: Blood Wedding performed by Theatrical Niche at Kentwell Hall on 2nd May 2014 (funded by the Arts Council); The House of Bernarda Alba at The Crescent Theatre, Birmingham from 14th-20th June 2014; and Yerma at The Lace Market Theatre, Nottingham from 30th June to 4th July 2015.

In Chapter One, I highlighted some of the challenges that a translator might face when presenting Lorca’s work in English, in fact the rural trilogy has often been described as difficult to translate into English and equally difficult to perform. Gwynne Edwards, who has himself translated many of Lorca’s plays, describes them as ‘a veritable minefield for the potential translator to navigate’ (Edwards 1988: 344). They are linguistically challenging, as discussed in Chapter One, due to a mixture of dialogue and poetic verse, often in the form of song, which evokes images that refer in many cases to the natural world but at the same time operate on an abstract, figurative level which makes them particularly complex in Spanish, and equally complex to translate into English. There are many short sentences and pauses that create an unnatural, unsettling effect, for example, in the ‘flood of wool’ (section 1.4.2), the two short sentences followed by a longer one create an unnatural representation of spoken dialogue. Moreover, the language used reflects its temporal location, with cultural references to items of clothing,
everyday objects, superstitions, customs and traditions which all locate the action and, therefore, have the potential to dislocate it in translation. For example, in Chapter One I discuss the reference to the ‘pins of silver’ (Section 1.4.5) where Lorca takes a cultural reference and makes it metaphorical, fitting it into the discourse of the grammar of colour of the play as a whole.

As discussed in Chapter One, the texts also present complexity on a socio-cultural level as Lorca’s characters are set within a rural, Catholic, male-dominated society where social oppression and violence are the norm, and honour an important factor. This inherent symbolism related to societal, Catholic norms may not be evident to an English-speaking audience, and the translator may therefore feel the need to explain them.

However, while the location of the plays is specific (rural Granada in the early 20th Century), the universal themes such as female repression, social injustice, morality, infertility, violence, honour, passion, desire, love, religion and politics have made the plays popular and may explain why they have gradually become part of the canon on the English-speaking stage. In 2005, Anderman (2005: 8) reported that Lorca had not achieved the status of ‘honorary British dramatist’, enjoyed by both Chekhov and Ibsen, and he still remained behind Strindberg in the queue. However, given the growing popularity of the rural trilogy on the English stage in recent years, this assessment of Lorca’s place in the canon is perhaps due for renewal.

The plays pose challenges on linguistic, cultural and theatrical levels, and often prove problematic to stage. The first translation by José Weissberger of Bodas de sangre under the title Bitter Oleander, staged in New York in 1935, was ‘virtually laughed off stage’ (Collins 2008) as Lorca’s floral imagery was considered ‘verbal gardening’ (idem). For example, in Act One, Scene One, the Mother refers to her dead relatives as: ‘dos hombres que eran dos geranios… (two men who were two geraniums), an analogy that may sound strange or comical for an English-speaking audience, particularly when spoken on stage. In Chapter One, we also saw how the lullaby (1.4.4) presents a series of floral images which again may sound overly poetic when sung on stage.
This harsh critical reception of Weissberger’s translation ‘foreshadowed the reaction to ‘English Lorca’ in years to come’ (Anderman 2005: 294), although Lorca himself liked Weissberger’s translation and collaborated with him on it (Anderman 2005: 293-294). However, it is known that Lorca had a very basic level of English and he was perhaps viewing it from a source perspective without taking into account the demands of a foreign audience. The script used in this first stage performance was never published. The first published translations into English appeared in the 1940s in the United States. In the UK they were first published by Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd in 1959, and then by Penguin Books in 1961. The Penguin translations have been reprinted many times over the years.

These translations, by James Graham-Luján and Richard L. O’Connell, were commissioned by the Lorca Estate with the remit that they should adhere closely to the original to protect Lorca’s work (Anderman 2005: 296). The very literal translations that resulted were felt difficult to perform and served to establish a reputation for Lorca that his work did not translate well (Johnston 1998b: 55). These translations have been fiercely criticised for being overly literal, described by Delgado (2008: 6) and Johnston (1998b: 55) as ‘reverential’. It could be argued that all translations of literary texts start from a point of reverence, or are a labour of love as Johnston (1998b: 55) points out, for both the source author and the text itself, although arguably this reverence can be demonstrated in different ways. Johnston elaborates further stating that the Lorca plays were not translated but rather ‘photocopied into English’ (1998b: 56). Such an analogy implies an exact, perhaps slightly faded, copy, which would seem impossible due to the grammatical constraints of the two languages. However, such an analogy serves to highlight the literalness of these translations. A few examples from the three plays show how literal, awkward and, at times, almost comical they are. I have provided a translation in brackets for comparison.

From Blood Wedding:

SUEGRA Por mí, que reviente. (OCII: 425) (He can burst for all I care)
MOTHER-IN-LAW: He can burst for all of me! (Graham-Luján and O’Connell: 43)

From Yerma:

YERMA  […] (él era un zagalón)... (OCII: 489) (he was a big lad)

YERMA: […] he was a husky boy – (Graham-Luján and O’Connell: 109)

From The House of Bernarda Alba:

ADELA  Tenía mucha ilusión con el vestido. (OCII: 598) (I was really excited about this dress).

ADELA: I had a lot of illusions about this dress. (Graham-Luján and O’Connell: 165)

The tight control exercised by the Lorca Estate at the time was perhaps understandable because Franco, who was responsible for Lorca’s murder in 1936, was then in power. However, this drive for faithful replication had a detrimental effect on the Lorca’s reputation and also on how the plays were received on the English-speaking stage for many years because, as mentioned above, they were often criticised as being difficult to perform. This highlights the paradox that translation can have effects that are contrary to the translator’s likely intentions, producing a negative effect on the image of the author and of the text itself.

According to Anderman (2005: 296), these were the only published translations of the rural trilogy available until 1986 when the 50 years copyright temporarily elapsed. However, the Folio Society, because it was a book club, was able to publish the plays as a collection entitled Three Tragedies in 1977, translated by Sue Bradbury. Other translators were granted translation rights for a one-off performance or several productions but this did not extend to publication of the translation. This was the case of W.S. Merwin’s translation of Yerma which was performed in 1966 but not published until 1994 under the initiative of Melia Bensussen who included it with Langston Hughes’s translation of Blood Wedding which had also evaded publication, albeit for
different reasons. However, from the mid-1980s onwards, with the temporary lapse of copyright, many new translations appeared on the market, some of which were written for a particular stage performance, for example Peter Luke’s translation of Yerma staged at the National Theatre in London in 1986, starring Juliet Stevenson. Many of these translations are still in print and are used in performances; Luke’s translation, for example, was used at The Lace Market Theatre in Nottingham in July 2014. The Lorca Estate has also relaxed its view in recent years and the fact that the copyright expired in 2017 is likely to lead to further translations.

Early stage productions in Britain were criticised for being too melodramatic or for portraying the characters as too ‘middle-class’ (Anderman 2005: 294-296). As discussed in Chapter One, the highly charged emotional language used by Lorca creates an effect that can be perceived as over-emotional and melodramatic, when translated into English. It could be argued that this melodrama is part of the otherness of the text, what Johnston (2007b: 85) refers to as its ‘cultural voice’. However, Johnston (2007b: 83) feels that the language used in English to translate Lorca’s work needs to be able to render the ‘locations and dislocations of identity’ found ‘between the social and personal being, and the darker recesses of the personal’ that Lorca’s work explores and that if the translation does not do this then ‘the productions may well lurch into self-conscious poeticisation, melodrama or sheer linguistic confusion’. Johnston’s analysis here is one that is clearly rooted in his reaction to past performances. He is responding to past performances, not only in his role as academic Hispanist with an in-depth knowledge of the original texts, but, more precisely, in his role of translator.

Anderman (2005: 295-296) reports that in its first English performance at the Arts Theatre Club in London on 31st July 1957, Yerma (based on the Graham-Luján and O’Connell translation) was dismissed by the critic from The Evening News, in his review entitled ‘The Lorca legend may suffer’, because despite over-emotional traits it gave the impression that it was not a tragedy. It was also felt that pauses went on for too long. Another criticism was the middle-class English used:
Something disturbing happens when Spanish poetic drama is translated into English and produced over here. The hot passion is frozen into prim Kensingtonian vowel sounds; the lyric verse is heightened into lush rhetoric; the symbolism acquires an unbelievable artificiality. (a critic quoted in Anderman 2005: 295-296)

These reviews raise the question of the relationship between the texts and the staging. Clearly, the comment relating to ‘prim Kensingtonian vowel sounds’ relates to the actor’s delivery which seems to conflict with the play’s supposed rural setting. While this can be said to be related to factors beyond the realm of the translated text as it is more concerned with actor delivery, the text is still part of this delivery, for example in terms of register. A formal register will naturally sound more upper/middle class than a more colloquial one. It can also sound more artificial as it may not represent natural spoken language. This indicates the presence of the text in the performance, not just as providing a speech utterance but also determining the way in which that speech utterance is delivered, having an impact on the overall reception of the play. We thus have indications here of the importance of performability, in terms of speakability, and the relationship between the page and the stage.

According to Anderman (2005: 299) stage productions of Lorca’s rural trilogy fared better after 1986, as the temporary lapse of the 50 year copyright opened the way for other translations. In the 1986 production of The House of Bernarda Alba, translated by Robert David MacDonald and directed by Nuria Espert, it was felt that the interpretations by Glenda Jackson as Bernarda and Joan Plowright as La Poncia moved the play away from a middle-class interpretation and closer to an Andalusian one (idem). However, these comments are rather vague, as the idea of the play being more ‘Andalusian’ depends upon what ‘Andalusian’ means in an English-speaking context, as the concept of a supposed Andalusia could be quite different from the reality.

This particular translation was praised for being ‘highly speakable’ (The Spectator) and ‘splendidly anglicised’ but still retaining ‘Lorca’s vivid colours’ (Time Out) (Anderman 2005: 300). The praise of the play as ‘anglicised’ and ‘highly speakable’ indicate that such
notions are considered important for a successful performance. However, Edwards (1988: 346) is more critical, outlining translation errors in the text, and pointing out that those critics who have judged the translation favourably do not understand the Spanish original. We thus see a clash between a source-based assessment of the translation and a target-based one.

However, despite perceived improvements in terms of critical success, Lorca’s reputation as challenging to produce persists. The programme that accompanied the production of *The House of Bernarda Alba* at The Crescent Theatre in Birmingham on 15th June 2015, states:

> It would seem that in this country the plays of Frederico [sic] Garcia Lorca are the Marmite of theatre both for actors, directors and audiences.

Yet despite the challenge they present, the plays continue to be performed regularly in amateur and professional productions aimed at a wider audience rather than a solely academic one. From July to August 2016, Simon Stone’s adaptation of *Yerma*, starring Billie Piper, ran at the Young Vic in London, to generally rave reviews. The production enjoyed a second run in 2017 with a national screening in cinemas around the country. Although an updated version, with Yerma reinvented as a blogger and appearing inside a glass box, which was far removed from the original, it highlights the enduring appeal of the text.

As mentioned above, since the first translations of the rural trilogy by Graham-Luján and O’Connell, there have been many other translations, some still unpublished as they were produced for a particular performance, others published after a particular performance and still used in performances. They are also, in many cases, plays that are read. Given the dual nature of the text, both as a script for performance and as a play to be read, it is not surprising that we have a diverse body of translators which highlights the question whether these plays are considered as literature or as theatre, as will be discussed in more depth in Chapter Three.
The translators tend to fall into three main categories; poets, academics and playwrights with some cases of overlap. Some translators, such as David Johnston, worked closely with a director in order to produce a translation for a particular performance. The different backgrounds of the translators mean that they have different motivations and influences and different responses to Lorca’s work. They thus view the source text, both consciously and unconsciously, from different interpretative positions. This also highlights that Lorca’s plays reside in different fields; the academic, the literary and the theatrical. It is thus impossible to pin Lorca’s work down to any one field and there is naturally debate around how Lorca’s work should be translated, both for the page and for the stage, and also around how it should be performed. In the following section, I will briefly discuss the translators of the rural trilogy whose translations form the corpus of this study.

2.2 The translators

2.2.1 Langton Hughes and W. S. Merwin

Before the first official translations by Graham-Luján and O’Connell, the American poet/playwright Langston Hughes translated Bodas de sangre (under the title Fate at the Wedding) in 1938. However, his translation remained unpublished until 1994 after it had been discovered by Melia Bensussen in the 1980s amongst the deceased poet’s papers (see Bensussen’s introduction in Hughes/Merwin 1994: x-xi). Bensussen edited Hughes’s draft along with the executor of his Estate, George Bass, until the latter’s death in 1990. Her intention was that the play should be performed and she finished her revisions during rehearsal. The result was published in 1994 by Theatre Communications Group along with a translation of Yerma by another American poet/playwright, W. S. Merwin. Bensussen (Hughes/Merwin: vii-viii) explains that the reason for the delay in publishing Merwin’s translation was the strict control exercised by the Lorca Estate; he had written the translation in 1966 and been allowed to use it for a few performances but had not been granted permission to publish it.
According to Bensussen (Hughes/Merwin 1994: viii-xiii) the difficulty involved in translating Lorca’s work has often been attributed to the fact that American culture does not understand the passion that Lorca expresses. Similarly to some of the reviews referred to in section 2.1, she also points out that Lorca’s work can come across as ‘melodramatic and arch’, if not placed ‘in the proper linguistic and theatrical context’. However, she highlights the universality of themes and quotes Merwin who said that: ‘Lorca’s “folkloric aspects have been taken as gospel” … and his “fancified language taken too literally”’ (Hughes/Merwin 1994: ix). However, according to Bensussen (Hughes/Merwin 1994: xii), in an attempt to ‘preserve as much as possible the character of the original, [Merwin] keeps his translations extremely literal’ as he considered translation a ‘relatively anonymous activity’. We thus see a contradiction in Merwin’s theory of translation because despite his rejection of ‘folkloric aspects’ and overly literal translation, according to Bensussen, he keeps the translation very literal in practice.

Regarding Hughes’s translation of Bodas de sangre, Bensussen (Hughes/Merwin 1994: xi) claims that:

Hughes was obviously concerned with staying as close as possible to the original, but also with making changes necessary to capture in English the essence of Lorca’s poetry.

and to do that:

 [...] Hughes took liberties with the original, translating not so much literally as culturally, to his own African-American idioms. (idem)

We thus see how these translators are concerned to stay close to the original although Hughes’s translation is considered more cultural whereas Merwin’s is more literal. This also suggests a contrast between how these translators consciously view the act of translation; Merwin assumes a more passive, anonymous role whereas Hughes seems to have brought his own cultural background to the translation, taking a more active role.
2.2.2 Sue Bradbury

Sue Bradbury’s translations of the rural trilogy were published by the Folio Society in 1977 as a collection entitled ‘Three Tragedies’. In her introduction, Bradbury provides no information about herself as translator but focuses on Lorca and the plays, but further investigation reveals that she was the editor of the Folio Society. She explains that her motivation for translating the plays was that there had been no published translations since 1945 and that she had the blessing of Lorca’s brother:

[…] I was therefore honoured to have the chance of producing a new translation with the encouragement of the poet’s brother, Professor D. Francisco García Lorca, who, sadly, died last year. I offer it in the hopes that three great plays may find a wider audience. This was, after all, their author’s intention. (Bradbury 1977: 16)

Bradbury’s volume is now out of print but is available on the second hand book market. While written for publication rather than performance, Bradbury (personal communication 2017) informed me that her translation of La casa de Bernarda Alba was used for a radio play. The volume is interesting in its presentation, as at the start of each scene we have a lino-cut representing the scene. These black and white illustrations, which are typical of the Folio Society’s policy of presenting classical works, give an impression of a folk or fairy-tale as we see images of women with shawls and big earrings reminiscent of flamenco dancers. They also give away the plot in some instances as we see an image of Yerma strangling Juan at the beginning of the last scene whereas readers would not otherwise be aware of this denouement until the very end. We also see a large image of Lorca on the inside front cover where he resembles a bullfighter or a 1970s popstar.

As stated, after 1986 a number of new translations appeared on the market, notably those by Gwynne Edwards, David Johnston and Peter Luke.
2.2.3 Gwynne Edwards

Gwynne Edwards, academic and translator, has written extensively about Lorca and his work, most notably the books *Lorca: The Theatre Beneath the Sand* (1980) and *Dramatists in Perspective: Spanish Theatre in the Twentieth Century* (1985), as well as articles discussing the difficulty of staging Lorca’s work on the English stage (Edwards 1988, 2005, 2009). He has also translated many of Lorca’s plays including the rural trilogy. The play considered here is his translation of *Bodas de sangre* first published in 1987 by Methuen London Ltd, and later by Bloomsbury Methuen Drama in a collection entitled: *Lorca Plays: One. Blood Wedding-Doña Rosita the Spinster-Yerma*. (The translations *Blood Wedding* and *Doña Rosita* are by Edwards and the translation of *Yerma* is by Peter Luke).

Edwards’s translation *Blood Wedding* was first performed at the Contact theatre in Manchester on 11th November 1987. Edwards (1987: 94) explains that:

> The aim of this translation is to render as accurately as possible both the meaning of Lorca’s words and the ‘feeling’ of the play as a whole. As far as the former is concerned, 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 cosy for an English-speaking audience. (underlining added).

He highlights specific strategies for translating the assonance, adopting two strategies ‘rhyming patterns’ for the songs and ‘free verse for the poetry of Act Three’ (idem). In striving for accuracy he stresses that he has not produced ‘a literal translation, which would make it unplayable. My whole purpose is to produce a translation suited to stage performance’ (Edwards 1987: 95). The stage thus takes precedence over the page. He is also rejecting literal translation, perhaps in response to the first published translations, which were criticised in this regard. In the transcription of the Translators’ panel that took place at The Newcastle Playhouse on 30th May 1998 (Doggart and Thompson 1999: 241-242) he professes not have a theory of translation, ‘much loved by academics, but
surely the kiss of death for the genuine translator’, but he finds that using the appropriate register and ensuring that the dialogue flows like real speech are of utmost importance, while still portraying the meaning of the original. Although rejecting the notion of a theory of translation, Edwards is clearly describing a method he has applied to translating the play. He is also in effect describing his own notion of performability, as his intention is to produce a translation for the stage which achieves speakability in terms of register and a flowing dialogue that sounds genuine even though he wants to maintain a supposed ‘Spanishness’ by not diluting the dialogue to make it more acceptable for the audience.

2.2.4 Peter Luke

As stated, Peter Luke’s translation of Yerma appears in the same volume as Gwynne Edwards’s translations of Blood Wedding and Doña Rosita. Luke’s translation was written for a performance at the National Theatre in London on 19th March 1986, directed by Di Travis with Juliet Stevenson as Yerma. At the end of the translation there is a ‘Note on the translation Yerma revisited’ (1987: 207) in which Luke explains that his:

[...] credentials for presuming to translate Lorca’s Yerma are pretty slim. I am not an academic hispanist nor, alas, am I a poet. True I am a working playwright but that in itself would not be enough. The only qualification that gives me – perhaps uniquely among English playwrights – a right to think I could do it is that I was for ten years an Andalusian farmer living not many miles away from the García Lorca home at Fuente Vaqueros.

Luke had originally translated Yerma with an actor friend, Carlos Douglas, whilst filming a dramatisation of Lorca’s poems for the BBC in 1967 in Spain. Douglas translated the text literally and then Luke put this literal translation into what he terms ‘plain English’ (Luke 1987: 207). They did not translate the poems and songs, which they considered too difficult. Seven years later, Luke revisited this translation when, after living in Spain, he spoke ‘not Castellano but fluent Andaluz’ (idem). He now felt able to take on the songs and poems and, above all, ‘wanted to produce an actable version which an English
company might wish to perform’ (1987: 208, underlining added). Once again, we see how performability in terms of actability is highlighted. Luke’s comments also illustrate the need to offer a justification of his own suitability as a translator of Lorca’s work.

2.2.5 David Johnston

David Johnston is a Professor at Queen’s University Belfast. He has translated many Spanish plays, particularly those of the Spanish Golden Age theatre of Lope de Vega and Calderón de la Barca, as well as Lorca’s work. He has published extensively on theatre translation drawing on his own practice to inform his theory.

The editions under study are *Blood Wedding* first published by Hodder & Stoughton in 1989 and *Yerma* also published by Hodder along with Johnston’s translation of *The Love of Don Perlimplin for Belisa in the Garden* in 1990. The translation of *Blood Wedding* was performed by the Communicado Theatre Company, directed by Gerard Mulgrew, in the Lyceum Studio at the 1988 Edinburgh Festival, winning the Edinburgh Festival Scotsman Award (Johnston 1989: 27).

The blurb on the back of the book states that:

> 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 (underlining added).

The fact that this translation is ‘new’ is stressed, not only literally but also in terms of it being different to other translations as it has been ‘proven on the stage’. Its avowed equivalence to the original in terms of ‘dramatic tension’ and ‘intensity of Lorca’s language’ has been achieved through recreation. We thus see a response to the first translations that Johnston described as ‘photocopied into English’ (1998b: 56), this translation claiming to recreate rather than replicate as a photocopy would.
In the ‘Note to this translation’ (1989: 25) Johnston points out that although the translation was written for performance and not just to be read, this does not mean that the translator can be given a ‘green light for ‘translator’s licence’’; but he stresses that the play should work on the stage. Johnston (idem) highlights the difficulty on an emotional level that the text presents. Furthermore, the linguistic and cultural differences mean that the translator must ‘make certain degrees of linguistic and cultural concession’ (idem) with a fine line between respecting the original and understanding that the English-speaking audience will not receive the play in the same way as a Spanish one. Johnston (1989: 26) feels that in order to deal with what Stephen Spender calls the ‘grammar of images’ (as referred to in Chapter One) the translator needs to find a corresponding ‘grammar of images’ in English ‘clarifying or adding in the interests of clear cultural transposition, but always within the framework of that grammar’. As discussed in Chapter One, the translator may need to clarify cultural references such as the silver pins (Section 1.4.5) in Bodas de sangre.

Johnston stresses that literal translation is not possible for the songs and poetry but if the translator works within the ‘grammar’ then ‘it is possible to be totally faithful to the original in terms of its dramatic impact’ (idem). He claims to have translated the force of Lorca’s drama rather than remaining completely faithful to the original (Johnston 1989: 27). Examples from Yerma presented in Chapter One include Yerma and Juan being described as white (Section 1.4.1) and dry (Section 1.4.6), and such references may require adaptation or clarification, in order to convey their underlying meaning within the grammar of the play, whereas literal translation may appear strange or meaningless in English.

Johnston’s translation of Yerma (1990) was performed at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival in 1989. According to the blurb on back of the book:

‘David Johnston [...] has done the practically impossible, which is to make Lorca speakable in English’. Frank McGuinness in the Irish Times (underlining added)
There is an emphasis here on the translation being ‘speakable’. Johnston’s (2007b: 88) notion of performability is one that is concerned with providing the actors with ‘lines that are speakable and that, at the same time, recreate the stylistic marking and the cultural significance of the original’.

2.2.6 Michael Dewell and Carmen Zapata

The three plays translated by Michael Dewell and Carmen Zapata were published by Penguin in 1992 as The House of Bernarda Alba and other plays (Blood Wedding and Yerma are the other plays). This title obviously emphasises The House of Bernarda Alba at the expense of the other two plays contained in the edition, which are presented as ‘The New Authorised English Translations’ with an introduction by the Hispanist Christopher Maurer. Michael Dewell was President of the National Repertory Theatre Foundation in the United States and Carmen Zapata was a Hollywood actress who produced more than sixty plays in both English and Spanish.

In the note on the translation (1992: xxvii), Dewell explains that they began translating the plays in 1977 as Zapata was creating a new, bilingual theatre company in Los Angeles and was interested in the female characters in Lorca’s work. However, she felt that none of the existing translations were ‘playable’. When testing their translation of Bodas de sangre, Dewell and Zapata found that bilingual actors found them challenging, so they went through a process of major rewriting, often in collaboration with the actors themselves. After a two-month run, they wrote a new draft, this time for a monolingual version with actors who did not speak Spanish. Further productions produced further revisions over several years and they applied the same process to productions of Yerma and The House of Bernarda Alba. The Lorca Estate granted permission to publish these translations, as they wanted to have ‘better English translations of these plays’ (Dewell and Zapata 1992: xxviii). The translations were checked against the originals by Maurer and the 1992 edition is a revision of the first version published as The Rural Trilogy by Bantam Books in 1987. Blood Wedding won ‘a cornucopia of awards in its 1984 revival, and Yerma was given a 1983 Drama-Logue Award for stage writing, the first time a translation had won it’ (idem).
Dewell and Zapata thus employ a strategy of rigorous testing, through trial and error with input from many different people, with an emphasis on playability and a rejection of previous translations which were considered lacking in this respect. We also see a repackaging of the translations, first published as *The rural trilogy* in 1987 whereas the 1992 revised edition was entitled *The House of Bernarda Alba and other plays*, clearly highlighting this play over the other two.

2.2.7 John Edmunds

John Edmunds is an actor, director and academic. His translations of the rural trilogy were published by Oxford University Press in 1997 in a collection entitled *Four Major Plays, A new translation* by John Edmunds. The four plays were *Blood Wedding*, *Yerma*, *The House of Bernarda Alba* and *Doña Rosita the Spinster*, with an introduction by Nicholas Round, then Professor of Spanish at Sheffield University.

The blurb on the back of the book emphasises:

> the *duende*, [...] – of Lorca’s theatre, finely conveyed here in John Edmunds’s fluent and rhythmic new translations that lend themselves admirably to performance. (underlining added)

This notion of performability is related to the original, as Lorca’s own notion of performability in terms of *duende* is cited as having been ‘finely conveyed’. The notion of *duende* is also related to fluency and rhythm, which is, in fact, a problematic interpretation of Lorca’s notion of *duende*, discussed in Chapter One. Performability is reinforced in the translator’s note at the beginning of the book where Edmunds (1997: vii) states that he has endeavoured to produce an ‘actable’ script for the theatre but also a text for students of drama and the general reader. He is thus striving to meet the expectations of several different types of audience. Edmunds compares the job of the translator to that of an actor in that they both have to work out the ‘subtext’ to the text and that is a subjective interpretation:
The best one can do is to endeavour to capture in the new language the tone, the degree of emotional intensity, and the shade of meaning as they strike one’s own sensibility – and pray that the dramatist is somewhere smiling approval. (idem, underlining added)

Once again, we have an emphasis on the emotion expressed in the original and a desire that the translation would meet with Lorca’s approval, thus placing the translator in a subservient role to the source author.

Round, who assisted Edmunds in his translations, advocates what he describes as ‘combined tactics’, ‘[t]he more discussion [...] that informs the translation process, the better the eventual product’. (Round 1999: 226-227). Round and Edmunds had lengthy discussions as they exchanged over 250 pages plus drafts and revisions which Round estimates at around 1500 specific points of discussion (1999: 228). As a theatre practitioner and academic, Edmunds (Doggart and Thompson 1999: 243) takes a practical approach, professing not to have a theory of translation but confessing to reading the text out loud, actually rehearsing all the parts to ensure they work. This illustrates the dialogic nature of the translation process.

2.2.8 Jo Clifford

Jo Clifford (formerly John Clifford) is a playwright, poet and performer, and has been an academic. She translated The House of Bernarda Alba for a 1989 production at the Royal Lyceum Theatre in Edinburgh, which was revised before being published by Nick Hern in 2012. Clifford (Doggart and Thompson 1999: 249) describes her translation process as consisting of three stages; the first is dictionary based, the second is a search for an emotional link by becoming the characters and rehearsing out loud, and finally she relates the text back to the Spanish original, as ‘sometimes characters are a bit wicked and they run away with themselves’ (idem). This translator thus sees a need to perform or rehearse the translation, as a way of securing the text’s performability. She likens this performing/becoming the characters as similar to writing an original play and feels the
need to refer back to the Spanish original as a way of assuring that she has not departed too far from it.

2.2.9 Section summary

Each translation has its own history of development. The literal translations of Graham-Luján and O’Connell in many cases provoked a direct response from translators who did not consider them playable and claim to have focused their own attention on producing a performable script. This is particularly true of Edwards, Johnston, Luke and Dewell and Zapata. Hughes and Merwin’s translations are not so much a response to these first translations but arise from a desire on the part of Bensussen to bring to the public domain hitherto unpublished translations by two deceased American poets. In this respect they are reverential to the cultural legacy of the two translators rather than a direct response to translations that had come before.

We see a consensus among translators to make the translations suitable for performance and focus on the audience, and also to do justice to the original plays. According to Round (1999: 225), this is ‘damnably hard graft if it’s going to be done properly’ and ‘[w]hat has to sustain you must be your own commitment to this author, these texts’. This places Lorca at the forefront in the process. However, in the context of this idea of placing Lorca at the forefront, or of what could be described as reverence, it is important to distinguish between the different backgrounds of the translators and how this relates to their notions of reverence. Johnston (2007b: 81) discusses the distinction between the outward looking analysis of the performance translator and the inward looking analysis of the linguist. Jackson (2004: 22) discusses the uneasy relationship between theory and practice within the realm of theatre and performance studies, and how the scholar of drama is often at odds with the theatre practitioner. In the corpus considered here, the academic, the playwright and the poet may have very different and conflicting notions of how reverence should be achieved, and how to reflect it in the text. For Lorca’s plays this highlights that they reside in various fields, the academic and the theatrical which may be at odds with one another. We can thus consider Lorca in translation as a site of struggle in this respect.
2.3 Translation of metaphor

While Lorca’s translators do not specifically address the translation of his metaphors and deal more with considerations at a macro level rather than a micro one, it is useful to consider what the literature on translating metaphor addresses. In the early 80s, Van den Broeck (1981: 73) highlighted the lack of attention that metaphor had received in the field of Translation Studies and, in 2005, Dickins (2005: 236) reported that this was still the case.

Literature on the translation of metaphor (Van den Broeck 1981, Newmark 1988: 104-113, Dickins 2005, Prandi 2010) tends to focus on classifying metaphors into different types with translation strategies suggested, and assessed according to these classifications. While various categories are offered, there are essentially two main divisions, between those that are considered conventional and those which are considered creative or original. Dickins (2005: 231-232) distinguishes between metaphors which are ‘lexicalized’ that have a fixed dictionary meaning, and so called ‘non-lexicalized’ metaphors whose meaning is not fixed as they depend upon both the context and the receiver for interpretation. Lakoff and Johnson ((1980), 2003: 139) explain that conventional metaphors are ‘metaphors that structure the ordinary conceptual system of our culture, which is reflected in our everyday language’, whereas ‘metaphors that are imaginative and creative [...] are capable of giving us a new understanding of our experience’. Knowles & Moon (2006: 121) argue that creative metaphors are ‘an essential literary ingredient’, used for poetic effect. However, as discussed in Chapter One, Lorca uses his metaphors for much more than poetic effect in the decorative sense, his use of metaphor is primarily functional. Attempting to classify metaphors into categories is in itself problematic as the dividing line between conventional and creative metaphors may be blurred; and Lorca’s use of metaphors resists this type of classification as many of them have their roots in popular folklore and are often ambiguous.

Prandi (2010: 319-320) argues that it is conventional metaphors that are the most difficult to translate as concepts between languages may not be shared, whereas
creative metaphors are less problematic, as they allow a range of interpretations, what Dickins (2005:235) terms ‘an open-ended denotation or potential range of denotations’. However, on a practical level how does the translator make a choice between this ‘potential range of denotations’? The translator must choose from the range of possible meanings, and this is problematic when, as is the case with Lorca’s metaphor, many of these meanings are hidden and other demands must be met, such as making the text suitable for a stage performance. Above all, the circularity of Lorca’s metaphors cannot be ignored as this produces dramatic effect and tension, bringing us back time and again to the overall tragedy of the play.

Therefore, rather than aiming to categorise metaphors and apply a sweeping translation strategy which in practice would prove impossible, each instance of metaphor needs to be considered individually, but also in terms of its place in the overall plot. The emotional force of the metaphor enables it to make a connection with the audience and thus lies at the heart of the way it can perform. Metaphor is able to produce a reaction in the receiver, whether one of pleasure or surprise. According to Dagut (1976: 22), metaphor enlarges the hearers’ or readers’ emotional and intellectual awareness. Dagut (1976: 28) maintains that:

[…] metaphor [is] governed by a subtle interaction of cultural experience and semantic associations: so that what determines the translatability of a SL metaphor is not its “boldness” or “originality”, but rather the extent to which the cultural experience and semantic associations on which it draws are shared by speakers of the particular TL.

In this account then, translatability of metaphor is related to shared cultural and semantic relationships between the SL and the TL. This implies that linguistic and cultural factors may mean that the translation of a metaphor is impossible. However, the multiple translations and stage performances in English of the rural trilogy (and many other plays and prose texts containing metaphors) suggest otherwise, although whether the translations are successful is difficult to measure. Nevertheless, the fact that translations continue to be made and existing translations continue to be used indicates
some degree of success. However, it is clear that literal renderings of metaphors may not be possible and that the translator may need to search for different linguistic solutions to those of the ST to translate some metaphors.

Toury (1995: 82-83) lists four main strategies for translating metaphors; metaphors into the same metaphor, metaphor into a different metaphor, metaphor into non-metaphor, or omission. He points out that omission is controversial for those who champion the rights of the source text. However, from a target text perspective Toury (idem) considers that metaphor can be considered a solution rather than a problem and highlights two strategies; non-metaphor into a metaphor, or the addition of a metaphor that did not appear in the source text. Van den Broeck (1981: 77) suggests three possibilities which he terms: sensu stricto (which equates with literal translation that may either produce an idiomatic expression, or if there is no corresponding expression the result will be either a semantic anomaly or a daring innovation), substitution, or paraphrase. In reality he considers that translators will probably use a mixed method. If source language norms are adhered to then ‘metaphors will tend to be translated sensu stricto’, whereas if a target approach is taken then ‘SL metaphors are most likely to be replaced by more or less corresponding (or equivalent) TL metaphors, or will at least often be adapted’ (Van den Broeck 1981: 85). Dobrzyńska (1995: 595) suggests a similar translational procedure for metaphor as that put forward by Van den Broeck, with three possibilities being metaphor to equivalent metaphor, metaphor to similar metaphor and literal paraphrase when a metaphor is deemed untranslatable. Van den Broeck (1981: 85-86) points out that how metaphor is translated may relate to what he terms ‘higher hierarchies of constraints than merely linguistic ones’, or what might be called norms. This suggests a target-dominated strategy which may ignore the source text. Moreover, what are the norms for translating Lorca’s plays? We can suggest that there are norms in terms of ‘not too literal’ as we know that this has caused rejection in the past and also the need to make the translation performable on stage. Lefevere (1992: 37) recognises that translators may have to adapt metaphors or substitute them but he warns this should only be as a last resort. Translators may try to make the metaphor less
ambiguous. However, it is precisely this ambiguity in Lorca’s use of metaphor that opens up the multiple possibilities of interpretation.

According to Schäffner (2004: 1253-1254), translation models, whether normative or descriptive, tend to propose a procedure for translating metaphor which is based on metaphor as a stylistic device. However, she feels that a cognitive approach, which looks at the effects on the text and text reception, is more useful. Lorca’s metaphor is certainly a stylistic device in terms of cohesion but it is precisely how that stylistic device produces effect which is of interest as both are connected. If we are to define Lorca’s metaphors as a creative force then it is imperative to consider them from the point of view of the effect they produce or have the potential to produce.

2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the translation of the rural trilogy historically showing that the plays have often been deemed difficult to perform because of the very literal nature of the first published translations. Later translations that were considered successful by critics were viewed by academics as inaccurate when compared to the source text. The various translation strategies expounded by the translators of the rural trilogy advocate the replication of authorial intention, as well as notions of performability and speakability. The diverse body of translators and their views on translating the rural trilogy leads to a consideration of Lorca as a site of struggle for ownership in translation. An analysis of the field of metaphor translation leads to the conclusion that strategies that aim at metaphor translation according to metaphor classification are restrictive in this case while a focus on metaphor’s potential effect seems more useful for the analysis to be carried out here. The next chapter analyses the literature in the field of theatre translation.
Chapter 3 Theatre translation

Chapter One provided an in-depth analysis of Lorca’s use of colour metaphor which showed that this comprises many different layers, and in Chapter Two I discussed that the notion of performability is a dominant criterion among translators of the rural trilogy. This chapter reviews literature on theatre translation, highlighting the complex dualistic nature of the play which is both a written text to be read and a text for performance. The introduction discusses the field of theatre translation today and is followed by five main sections. The first identifies three different practices of theatre translation common on the UK stage today. The second examines the dualistic nature of the play, distinguishing between the drama text and the performance text with particular reference to their place and potential functions in different systems. The third section discusses the relationship between the page and the stage, drawing on the traditional theatre model of semiotics (cf. Elam 1980) and the concepts of the gestic text and performability, while the fourth section focuses on the source-versus-target debate in the context of theatre translation. The final section analyses the concept of performativity, which has recently come into focus in Translation Studies, drawing on pragmatic approaches such as Austin’s (1962) Speech Act theory, Grice’s (1975) theory of Implicature and Sperber and Wilson’s (1986, 1987) Relevance Theory as possible frameworks. (Re)translation and (re)performance of the text as refraction (Lefevere 1982, 1984) are also discussed. The conclusion explains how the findings from this review inform the theoretical model which is used to carry out the analysis of the translation of Lorca’s colour metaphor into English.

Susan Bassnett’s statement ([1980], 2002: 119) that theatre translation was an under-researched area helped fuel the increased interest in the field in recent years. For example, the symposium on Translating Theatre: ‘Foreignisation’ on Stage held at Europe House in London in October 2016 sold out with a waiting list of more than 70. Bigliazzi, Kofler & Ambrosi (2013: 1) consider that the heightened interest in theatre translation constitutes a ‘performative turn’ in Translation Studies which, according to Schechner (2006: 4-5) suggests that modern society has changed its perceptions of the
The world with the advent of the internet: everyone and anyone can participate/perform on the world stage. Social media, Youtube and phenomena such as fansubbing and crowdsourcing, enable anyone to perform, participate or make a contribution. The performative turn has meant that translation itself has come to be seen by some scholars as performance. According to Schechner (2006: 38), any event can be considered as performance but whether something is a performance is dictated by its historical and social context. Biglazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi (2013: 1) consider theatre translation both as performance and in performance, and Espasa (2013: 38) agrees: 'If translation has been seen as performance, the performance of a written text has also been considered as translation.' Similarly, Aaltonen (2013: 386) considers the translation process 'as performance'. This has ramifications for the relationship between the written text and the performance of that text as both can be considered as performances, as translations and in performance.

However, the field remains blighted by a lack of systematic theoretical models and methods of study, as well as an abundance of vague terminology. As Biglazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi (2013: 3) put it 'no convincingly comprehensive method has been elaborated or even roughed out', and Marinetti (2013: 309) highlights that the absence of theory that Bassnett (1998: 90) had lamented in 1998 'seems to be more elusive than ever' (Marinetti 2013: 309). Bassnett (1998: 90) suggested that this lack of theory 'is connected to the nature of the playtext itself, which exists in a dialectical relationship with the performance of that same text'. Reasons for this lack of theoretical models/methods are also perhaps historic, because although plays were being performed approximately a thousand years before the novel came into existence, in Western culture the translation of drama has traditionally been considered a sub-field of literary translation (Windle 2011: 153). This has meant that rather than theatre translation being considered a field in its own right, the same criteria which are applied to the translation of literature have been applied to the translation of plays. Likewise, theatre translation is often described in terms of models and theories relating to the translation of literature with no consideration of the difference between the genres. Hale and Upton (2000: 12) consider that the role of the translator in Theatre Studies has
been largely ignored because theatre translation tends to fall between the categories of Theatre Studies and Translation Studies.

The complex nature of theatre translation will be discussed in more detail in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, but first it is necessary to consider the different practices of the translation of plays and their performance on the UK stage today.

3.1 The practices of theatre translation

It is possible to identify three main theatre translation practices:

1. The performance of an existing translation which has been used in one or numerous performances and has thus been ‘tried and tested’. It may originally have been written for a particular performance and subsequently published. There is often a considerable time difference between the publication of the text and its re-performance on stage.
2. A new text is produced for a particular performance and may or may not be published after the event.
3. A new literal translation is commissioned which is subsequently adapted, often by a famous playwright, for a particular production. The playwright may have little or no knowledge of the original language. The literal translation and the adapted script may or may not be published after the event.

There have been uses of translations of Lorca’s rural trilogy in performances in each of these categories. Of the three case studies carried out here, two performances originate from texts in the first category and the other falls into the second category. I am not proposing to analyse examples of the third type but it is important to recognise that this two-stage process is very common on the English-speaking stage today. Brodie (2010: 59) employs the term ‘direct’ translation to denote translations written directly from an original and used in a production (categories 1 and 2) and the term ‘literal, indirect’ to define those which have used a literal translation (category 3). This practice of ‘indirect translation’ she reports to be common in mainstream London theatre. An example of the dual approach of linguist plus adapter is her case study of David Hare’s adaptation
of *The House of Bernarda Alba* at the National Theatre in 2005 using a literal translation by Simon Scardifield (Brodie idem). While this dual approach is often criticised, Windle (2011: 157) notes that although ‘usually in a subordinate and often unacknowledged role [...] some (linguists) have reported quite satisfactory working relationships’.

The fact that plays have often been treated as literature in translation rather than as performance could perhaps explain this practice which produces two physical versions of the source, both serving a particular purpose or function; the literal translation has no autonomy, and is not usually published. For my analysis, rather than this dual practice, I am more interested in observing the dual life of the one physical text and the relationship between that text on the page and its existence on the stage. The next section will discuss in more detail the dual life of the physical text and the challenges this presents.

### 3.2 The drama text and the performance text: different systems, different functions

It is important to distinguish between the written text in its two varieties: the written text which is read and the written text which forms the script of a performance. Ritchie (1984: 65) summarises the fundamental differences between the two as follows: ‘On the page a play is fixed, permanent, spatially arranged, and access to it is conceptual. On the stage a play is fluid, ephemeral, primarily temporally arranged, and access to it is physical.’

While there is obviously a fundamental difference between how the play on the page is accessed by the receiver, conceptually on the page compared to physically on the stage, it is erroneous to assume that the play on the page is fixed and permanent. It may be permanent in terms of the printed word on the page but the receiver’s interpretation of it is not fixed. The multiple translations of the same text indicate that there are multiple interpretations and thus multiple meanings. As with Lorca’s use of metaphor, discussed in Chapter One, it is impossible to pin down one definitive meaning. However, the opposite appears to be true if we consider that the reader of the drama text constructs
their interpretation of the written word whereas the audience of the text in performance receives an almost pre-determined interpretation imposed on them by the director/actors. For Pavis (1992: 49) the dramatic text is only fixed in terms of being in a written form; because it is repeatedly read, it is unstable and impermanent. However, I think that while the performance text may give the illusion of having no boundaries, it becomes fixed to an extent as the director interprets it. Ritchie (1984: 72) considers that the director takes over the role of reader and ‘presents a ‘reading’ of the play in stage terms, having interpreted the play for the audience’ so that the audience still ‘reads’ the play but it is ‘through the eyes of the director’ (idem).

This imposition of an interpretation on the audience can be illustrated by the example of a production of The House of Bernarda Alba at The Crescent Theatre in Birmingham on 15th June 2014 which forms part of this corpus. The director cast two bearded male actors who were dressed in tunic-like costumes giving the impression they were playing the role of women or possibly priests. The director said that the casting of male actors in an all-female play was controversial but he wanted to show the emasculation of Bernarda during the play and how she becomes male by the end. The director was thus fixing his own interpretation onto the performance. This may suggest to the audience that these characters appear in the original although when, in the spoken text, Bernarda says that she does not want any men in the house, the audience may understand that the men were conceptual rather than physical. The director stated that he was faithful to the translated text word-for-word due to copyright law but his interpretative force can clearly be seen in non-linguistic elements. This interpretation by the director is subsequently interpreted by the audience, which raises questions about authorship: is the director taking over authorship of the text or is he simply making something visible that is metaphorically implicit in the text itself? For Aaltonen (2000: 37) a text ‘cannot be awarded any supreme place, nor can there be any single definite reading of it’. While

---

2 The director informed me of this in a group discussion that took place after the performance.

3 Idem.
it may be true that any single meaning cannot be defined, Aaltonen suggests that the target text can be moulded to whatever interpretation the director wants to impose upon it, which may have little or nothing to do with the original, and if we assume the death of the author (Barthes 1977: 142-148) and that ownership of the text has moved into the target system, this stance is justified. What does this mean for the relationship between the drama text and the performance text? The interpretation described above is metaphorical, taking a reading of the source text, i.e. the emasculation of Bernarda, and bringing that metaphorical reading to the fore, making it more explicit, although its effectiveness would depend on the receiver’s knowledge. It is thus a visualisation of a director’s interpretation, one that may be buried deeper in the written text, both in the source text and presumably in the target one, and which is extracted by the director for the performance.

Rather than attempting to define the different properties inherent in the written text and the text in performance, Aaltonen (2000: 36) distinguishes between these phenomena as part of different systems, and thus subject to different conventions:

[...] Only the function - past or present – rather than any intrinsic properties defines both a dramatic text and a theatre text. The general guideline is that if a text is used as a dramatic text, it is a dramatic text, and if it is used on stage it is an element of the theatrical system. (Aaltonen, 2000: 36)

While the written text (which I refer to as ‘the drama text’) resides in the literary system, the performance of that text (which I refer to as ‘the performance text’) resides in the theatrical system. Of course, there are drama texts that may not even have been intended for performance, as in the case of so-called ‘closet drama’ (Aaltonen 2000: 4, 33), drama that is read rather than performed. Many drama texts may have been used for one or several performances but are now considered outdated. These are therefore no longer used on stage, and move back into the literary system where they continue to exist outside of the theatrical system (Aaltonen 2000: 4). This suggests that translated texts often reflect the time in which they were written and that the target culture demands the latest version. However, this hypothesis can be challenged by one of the
case studies considered here. The production of *Yerma* at The Lace Market Theatre in Nottingham in July 2015 used Peter Luke’s translation from 1987 even though later texts are available. This text thus moved from the literary into the theatrical system. Moreover, the literary system and the theatrical systems in themselves form part of the wider cultural, social and economic systems (Aaltonen 2000: 33) which all bring different pressures to bear upon the performance. I have used a series of diagrams to illustrate the different systems that Aaltonen describes.

**Figure 1 shows that the literary and theatrical systems form part of the overall cultural, social and economic systems.**
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Aaltonen (2000: 33) explains that texts may be part of either or both the literary or theatrical systems and may move between them.

**Figure 2 illustrates the position of the drama text and the performance text within the wider systems and shows that some texts can move between the two.**
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If we apply these categories to Lorca’s rural trilogy, we can illustrate how different translations of *Bodas de sangre*, move between systems historically.

**Figure 3 shows the position of several translations of *Blood Wedding* when they were originally written.**
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- Bradbury (1977)
- Edwards (1987)
- Johnston (1989)
- Hughes (1938 – not published so outside of any system)
Figure 4 illustrates the position of the translated texts today.
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Although Figures 1-4 refer to Blood Wedding, it is worth mentioning that the Dewell/Zapata version of The House of Bernarda Alba was used in a 2001 production of the same at The Little Theatre in Leicester which shows that translations written in different periods are still used in performance. Moreover, all of the texts in our example have the potential to move back into the theatrical system at any time.

All the translations studied are written texts which have been published. The Graham-Luján/O’Connell translations (1941-46) have been used for many performances and have previously been part of both the literary and theatrical systems, moving in and out of them. As discussed in Chapter Two, these were considered the authoritative texts because no other translations were authorised for publication by Lorca’s Estate for many years, although other translations were given permission for one-off performances, as in the case of Merwin’s translation of Yerma in the 1960s. Langston Hughes’s translation of Blood Wedding (written in 1938, published in 1994) was perhaps intended for
performance although it was not performed until the 1990s after it was found and revised by Melia Bensussen, making it part of the theatrical system at that moment in the United States and subsequently the literary one. Edwards’s translation (1987) was written with a particular performance in mind as was Johnston’s (1989) and Dewell/Zapata’s whose 1992 version was the result of numerous changes that had been made to the 1988 version after a number of performances. These three translations were thus published after performance and were, therefore, tried and tested before the printed versions were produced. In contrast, Sue Bradbury’s translation (1977) began life in the published, written form and has had a limited participation in performance. The only performance Bradbury is aware of was a BBC Radio Play of The House of Bernarda Alba (Bradbury: personal communication 2017).

Attempting to apply Aaltonen’s systems model to the translations of Lorca’s rural trilogy highlights the complexity of trying to categorise texts in this way and the simplistic nature of a model of this type. Further complexity is added if we consider that the printed stage version may not be an exact reflection of the performance. Moreover, this type of classification stresses the different functions that the texts fulfill; and according to Aaltonen (2000: 40) the use of translation strategies depends on which system the text belongs to. What is considered acceptable in the theatre may not be considered acceptable in the literary system. The drama text is often considered too scholarly which is seen as an obstacle to its performance (Aaltonen 2000: 40). Zatlin (2005: 23) quotes the British playwright Pam Gems who adapted Yerma for the Manchester Royal Exchange using a new literal translation rather than an existing one. According to Gems, ‘[...] academic translation was not drama. It was faithful and boring and CRAP’ (idem). We thus see a tension between systems. On the other hand so-called ‘requirements of the stage’ may mean that rules of the literary system are flouted in favour of what is deemed necessary for a successful performance. For example, in the performance of Yerma studied here, the final pilgrimage scene was removed as it was considered unsuitable for a small production. In such cases, the amount of change that a play will undergo far exceed those that may be carried out during the translation of a novel (Windle 2011: 154). Farrell (1996: 54-55) agrees that changes such as cutting of scenes
and removal of characters would be frowned upon in any other literary genre. We thus see different conventions and different expectations depending on the function of translation.

Within a functionalist approach to translation it is the function of the translation that is held to define a suitable translation strategy. One such approach is that elaborated by Katharina Reiss ((1971), 2000) whose text typology is based on Karl Bühler’s ([1934], 1990) three functions of language: to represent, to express and to appeal, although these functions may not be present to equal degrees in every linguistic utterance and whole texts may fulfil several functions at the same time. However, Reiss argues that a dominant function can be determined and, therefore, texts can be divided into content-focused, form-focused and appeal-focused according to that dominant function. Texts which are predominantly designed to present factual information, such as technical texts, are content-focused. Expressive texts are form-focused as in the case of literature or poetry, and texts which aim to persuade, as in advertising, are appeal-focused. She also highlights a fourth category that she calls audio-medial (later renamed multimodal), which includes texts that are not ‘written to be read’ but to be ‘heard’, often ‘with the aid of some extra-linguistic medium’ (Reiss (1971), 2000: 27). She considers that translation strategy is dependent on the text typology; thus content-focused and appeal-focused texts should be target-oriented, which would mean that the text may sound more like an original rather than a translation, whereas form-focused texts require a source-oriented translation method which would aim to stay closer to the original. Regarding plays, while the written source text can be classified as either content, form or appeal-focused, she suggests that the appropriate translation method should ‘preserve the same effect on the hearer that the original has in the source language’ (Reiss (1971), 2000: 46) and that it may be necessary to depart from the source content and form more often than in appeal-focused texts. In films, for example, the translation may be little more than a model to work from due to the restrictions imposed by the medium. She classifies plays under the category of audio-medial if the visual and dramatic effect is a priority, whereas if the translation is for a study edition of a dramatic work, it would be considered a form-focused text. However, this classification
does not take into account that the same text may fulfill two functions at the same time. Moreover, it is problematic to apply Reiss’s model to the translations of Lorca’s rural trilogy because it could be classified under all three text types. If we take their original function, which was to be performed, to be the dominant one, they should come under the audio-medial category. However, this category is very broad, and only vague suggestions are offered about how to address the particular problems of performance translation; for example, how can we pin down and thus ‘preserve the same effect on the hearer that the original has in the source language’ (Reiss (1971), 2000: 46)? In the case of the rural trilogy there is a considerable temporal gap to be considered.

Later versions of the functional approach, for example, Skopos Theory (Reiss and Vermeer (1984), 2013) similarly focus on the function or purpose of the text. ‘Text reception and text effect’ (Reiss and Vermeer (1984), 2013: 18) should be the main concern in translation, and the same text can have a different skopos or aim depending on the function it aims to fulfill. Translations may be aimed at different audiences, in different time periods than the original. However, in terms of theatre, every time a translation is performed, whether an existing translation or a new one, it takes on a different function or highlights a different ideology or aesthetic. Reiss & Vermeer ((1984), 2013: 53) suggest that as the cultural distance between the original and the translation becomes greater, the function of the translation will change. In this, the target audience is the driving force. As Nord (2005: 18) stresses, ‘a text does not “have” a function; a function can only be assigned to the text by the receiver in the act of reception’. The function cannot, therefore, be determined in advance and where we have a play which can have both the function of the drama text and of the performance text, it is difficult to determine a translation strategy according to translation function.

A play can be said to fulfill two different functions as both the written text (the drama text) and the performance of that text and can thus have a dual existence or double life. Aaltonen (2000: 36) suggests that it is necessary to distinguish between the written text of the script and the oral text spoken on stage, as they are ‘two […] different entities, each with its own semiotic system’. However, the oral text spoken on stage does not
exist in a vacuum, but alongside all the other elements that make up the entire performance (the script plus the other elements involved) which in turn can be described as ‘text’ (Bigliazzi, Kopfler and Ambrosi 2013: 2). As de Marinis (1993: 47) points out, ‘an image, or group of images, is, or can be, a text’; he therefore classifies the performance itself as the ‘performance text’ even if he recognises that this classification is an ‘extreme example of textuality’ (de Marinis 1993: 47). The semiotic concept of textuality sees a text as a broad phenomenon that incorporates both verbal and non-verbal features, including images. It is an entity in its own right, albeit a rather fluid one, separate from the text on the page. This means that there are two distinct phenomena which are related through the same text, and this study, therefore, adopts two classifications: the drama text (the written text on the page) and the performance text (that same written text in performance where it exists alongside all the other elements involved). In addition, I use the concept of refraction (Lefevere 1982, 1984) which enables the conceptualisation of the drama text and the performance text as equal responses to the one source text, in the form of different manifestations of (re)translation and (re)performance. This view of text as a fluid notion is shared by Biber and Conrad (2009: 5) who take the term ‘text’ to mean ‘any natural language which is used for communication, whether it is realized in speech or writing’. A sermon or a face-to-face conversation are considered to be texts in the same way as a written novel is. With specific reference to theatrical performance, Elam (1980: 8) considers that the audience ‘perceive the performance as a network of meanings, i.e. as a text’. The following section will discuss the relationship between these two refractions of the source text; the drama text and the performance text.
3.3 The relationship between the ‘drama text’ and the ‘performance text’: the page to stage debate

3.3.1 Semiotics

One theoretical framework that has been widely used to analyse theatre is semiotics, the science of signs, based on work by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure and the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, at the beginning of the 20th Century. In his Translator’s Introduction to de Saussure’s *Course in General Linguistics*, Roy Harris (de Saussure (1983: ix) states that de Saussure’s ideas (set out in a series of lectures delivered at the University of Geneva from 1906-11), were revolutionary in that rather than words being considered peripheral to our understanding of reality, the social use of verbal signs was seen as central to that reality. De Saussure saw languages as ‘collective products of social interaction’ (idem) in other words, rather than language being simply ‘a nomenclature: a list of terms corresponding to a list of things’ (de Saussure 1983: 65), it was a social product. De Saussure thus challenged the tradition of studying language diachronically as a historical phenomenon, claiming that it should be studied synchronically, from the point of view of current use (de Saussure 1983: x-xi).

De Saussure argued that the linguistic unit which he termed the ‘sign’ comprised two elements, the ‘signification’ (or ‘signified’) and the ‘signal’ (or ‘signifier’), where the ‘signification’ refers to the concept and the ‘signal’ to the sound although he stresses that the sound is actually the psychological impression of a sound (de Saussure (1983: 66-67). The sign is thus a ‘two-sided psychological entity’ (de Saussure (1983: 66); these two parts of the sign cannot be separated from each other; in fact, one serves to trigger the other. He likens a language to a piece of paper where thought is one side and sound is the other: the two cannot be separated from each other (de Saussure 1983: 111).

The linguistic sign has two main principles; first, it is arbitrary: there is no natural connection between the signal and signification (with the exception of instances of onomatopoeia and exclamations) (de Saussure (1983:67-69). The second principle is that the signal is linear, one-dimensional and as it is auditory it is temporal (idem). De Saussure stresses the social nature of the linguistic sign, highlighting that it is due to its
arbitrary nature that it needs a social community to have value. It is thus far more than ‘the combination of a certain sound and a certain concept’ (de Saussure 1983:112), it is part of a system which should be taken as a whole and then divided up into the different elements. All of these elements fit together but the value of one element depends on the coexistence of all the others (de Saussure 1983: 111-113). It is this contact with other words that defines each word’s meaning, and connections between words are based on association, not just between similar significations but also similar sound patterns, so that in some cases there is a double associative link based on form and meaning (de Saussure 1983: 121-125).

Peirce, on the other hand, envisaged a tripartite semiotics comprising the Sign, its Object and its Interpretant which exist in a triadic relationship. He describes the Sign or representamen, as ‘something which stands to somebody for something in some respect or capacity. It addresses somebody, that is, creates in the mind of that person an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign’ (Peirce 1940: 99). He calls this created sign the ‘interpretant’ of the first sign and explains that the sign stands for something which he terms its ‘object’ (idem). The sign represents the object and gives information about it, and a sign may have a number of objects, which can be single or collective things that have existed or been known to exist. He explains the triadic relationship between these three concepts; where the sign is a First, a Second is its ‘object’ and a Third is its ‘interpretant’. The interpretant is a mental thought process where one thought triggers another and so on (Peirce 1940: 99-100).

Eco (1976b: 1461) explains that the object is not necessarily a concrete thing, but something that is known through the process of interpretation. The interpretant, according to Eco (1976a: 70), is complex. While it ‘could be equated with any coded intensional property of the content, i.e. with the entire range of denotations and connotations of a sign vehicle’, it is in fact much more than this, as interpretants ‘can be complex discourses which not only translate but even inferentially develop all the logical possibilities suggested by the sign’ (idem). In addition, Eco points out that the interpretant can be a response in terms of a behavioural habit and that this response
can be emotional and/or physical (Eco 1976b: 1465). Moreover, any verbal term has interpretants which are not only linguistic but can have ‘visual, objectal, and behavioural interpretants and vice versa’ (Eco 1976b: 1469). For example, ‘[a]mong the interpretants of the word *red* there are also images of red objects or a red cue as the specific space within the graduated continuum of the chromatic spectrum’ Eco (1976b: 1468). We thus see complex interrelated systems of signification that are both cultural and individual.

As Hookway (1985: 138-139) explains, Peirce envisaged three kinds of interpretant: the immediate, the dynamic, and the final. The immediate interpretant is the immediate thought that the sign generates or what is understood when the sign is first interpreted; the dynamic interpretant is derived by drawing on other knowledge about the object; whereas, the final interpretant can be reached once further scientific investigation has been carried out and a consensus reached. The final interpretant is thus where all the objects of the sign come to the fore. This idea of reaching a consensus and of the existence of a final interpretant suggests a fixed meaning which is problematic when applied to literature and literary translation. However, if we envisage the interpretant as producing further interpretants, which may or may not relate to the object, then we can envisage interpretation as an on-going process. Eco (1976b: 1471) refers to the ‘normal condition of signification... [as a] continual circularity’. However, interpretants may produce other interpretants which do not relate back to the same object but trigger other unrelated interpretants that go beyond the original object of the first interpretant. For Eco (1976b: 1465) the final interpretant is related to effect, and it is transformative as ‘after having received a series of signs and having variously interpreted them, our way of acting within the world is either transitorily or permanently changed’. The final interpretant in this analysis then is not a definitive interpretation.

The notion of different types of interpretants can help us understand how knowledge develops over time. In the case of the rural trilogy, it can account for how different readings can uncover different layers of meanings in the text. Moreover, it can account for how interpretation lies with the interpreter and the knowledge they bring to what the sign signifies. The academic translator and the playwright translator will
undoubtedly interpret the object, in this case the source text, from different interpretative positions.

In addition, Peirce identifies three trichotomies of signs. Of these, the second trichotomy of the Icon, Index and Symbol has received the most attention as it is considered the most interesting (Ayer 1968: 149). According to Peirce, ‘An Icon is a sign which refers to the Object that it denotes merely by virtue of characters of its own’ (Peirce 1940: 102). Peirce subdivides the icon into three categories; images, diagrams and metaphors where images are those which show simple qualities, diagrams are those which represent analogous relations in their parts and metaphors represent a parallelism in something else (Peirce 1940: 105).

Whereas the icon resembles the object, the Index is ‘a sign which refers to the Object that it denotes by virtue of being really affected by that Object’ (Peirce 1940: 102). He gives a whole range of examples of indices, including the demonstrative pronouns ‘this’ and ‘that’, relative pronouns ‘who’ and ‘which’, possessive pronouns, adverbs of place and time, ‘a knock at the door’ to indicate that someone is there, ‘the pole star’ or a ‘pointing finger’ which indicate which way is North, a warning or information notice, in fact anything which focuses our attention, in order words, anything that establishes a connection between our mind and the object in question (Peirce 1940: 107-111).

Peirce’s third category in his tripartite typology is the Symbol described as ‘a sign which refers to the Object that it denotes by virtue of a law, usually an association of general ideas, which operates to cause the Symbol to be interpreted as referring to that Object’ (Peirce 1940: 102). He explains that a symbol is related to convention or habit, so that an ordinary word such as ‘give’, ‘bird’ or ‘marriage’, is a symbol, it is able to make a connection between the idea and the word, not by showing us the image of a bird, for example, but by allowing us to imagine one and thus associate the word to it. Furthermore, symbols have the propensity to grow by stimulating new symbols and thus new concepts which then spread among people through use, and over time their meaning can change (Peirce 1940: 113-115).
As mentioned above, Semiotics has been applied to the analysis of the theatrical performance. For example, in the 1930s and 40s Prague Structuralists (such as Mukařovský 1934) perceived the performance text to be ‘a macro-sign, its meaning constituted by its total effect’, so the performance was viewed ‘not as a single sign but as a network of semiotic units belonging to different cooperative systems’ (Elam 1980: 5). In the 1960s and 70s, Kowzan (1968) developed the structuralist principles of the Prague School and proposed a distinction between natural and artificial signs, suggesting that the natural sign on stage becomes an artificial one (Elam 1980: 13). Peirce’s trichotomy of the Icon, Index and symbol has also been applied to the stage (Kott 1969, Ubersfeld 1977 and by Elam himself 1980).

Elam (1980: 14) considers that theatre is at the same time iconic, indexical and symbolic. Moreover, theatre can exploit iconic identity, particularly in the relationship between the sign-vehicle (or signifier) and the signified in the relationship between the actor and the character played by the actor. Elam explains that iconism, while usually associated with visual signs, can be extended to acoustic signs and the performance as a whole. However, Elam (1980: 15) points out that the notion of similitude between the sign itself and what it represents is challenged when, for example, boy actors take on the role of women in Shakespearian plays, although he concedes that similitude can be a cultural convention as in this case where it was the norm for boys to play women, and the audience were still able to recognise the signified from the signifier. Similitude can often be at the level of a very general structure. Lorca deliberately plays with iconic similitude when he informs us in the stage directions of Bodas de sangre that a young man plays the part of the moon, walking across the stage with a white face, the actor’s body personifying the moon and the colour of his face making the link to the object represented.

Elam (1980: 17) explains how the performance in itself is indexical as ‘what predominates on stage is a ‘pointing to’ rather than an imagistic mode of signifying’. Moreover, gesture obviously indicates objects which are present or not, and lighting can be used indexically to draw the attention of the spectator to a certain object or actor.
Moreover, Elam (1980:17) emphasises the importance of deixis in drama as it establishes a relationship between speaker and audience through the use of ‘I’ and ‘you’ and reference to the time and place of action through the adverbs ‘here’ and ‘now’, ‘as well as the supposed physical environment at large and the objects that fill it (through the demonstratives ‘this’, ‘that’, etc.)’ (idem).

Elam (1980: 17) concludes that ‘on stage the symbolic, iconic and indexical sign-functions are co-present: all icons and indices in the theatre necessarily have a conventional basis’. They are thus associated with conventions and norms. Snell-Hornby (1997: 189) agrees that ‘the system of signs belonging to the world of the theater presents a kaleidoscope of these three types’. Moreover, Elam (1980: 19) makes an important distinction between theatrical semiosis and other art forms such as literature in that in the theatre it is possible to use ‘ostension’, in other words, to be able to refer to an object the actor is able to merely show it to the audience. Eco (1977: 110) describes ostension as ‘the most basic instance of performance’, where objects and events are ‘shown’ rather than described and as such are de-realised or abstracted so that they come to represent an entire class of objects: ‘The ostensive aspect of the stage ‘show’ distinguishes it, for example, from narrative, where persons, objects and events are necessarily described and recounted.’ (Elam 1980: 19)

What does this mean for the drama text? Does it imply that the page describes and recounts the story while the theatrical performance shows it? This would mean that the performance text is a display of the drama text, a reproduction of it in another form rather than a recreation. This would downplay the influence of the director and actors and all those involved in the theatrical performance and imply some form of ideal, inherent way of displaying the text. As the drama text is written in the present tense, we could argue that it also ‘shows’ the story rather than recounts it, but rather than a visual ‘showing’, this ‘showing’ is in the mind of the reader. However, as pointed out above, Peirce (1940: 113-115) tells us that ordinary words become symbolic not by a showing of the image of that word, but by making a connection between the idea that the word represents and the word itself. Snell-Hornby (1997: 188) argues that in drama
there is no description or narration as these are ‘replaced by direct portrayal and action, as indicated in the verbal text by stage directions on the one hand and dialogue on the other’. So the drama text and performance text appear closer than initially imagined.

In the theatre, it is important to distinguish between different types of signs. On the one hand, there is the linguistic sign which derives from the written text and requires a situational and cultural context to be interpreted. On the other hand, there is the theatrical sign which is non-verbal and relates to visual and acoustic features. According to Snell-Hornby (1997: 189) the verbal sign is secondary to the non-verbal sign and is only valid ‘by virtue of its position within a constellation of non-verbal factors, commonly called the dramatic situation’. She considers that it is by means of theatrical signs and the interaction between them that the dramatic effect is generated from the written text. Kowzan (1968: 52-80) identified 13 signs or sign systems that occur in the theatrical performance. These are words, voice inflection, facial mimicry, gesture, body movement, make-up, headdress, costume, accessory, stage design, lighting, and music and noise. The words of the text are thus one of many elements that produce the stage performance. However, the words on the page are able to generate the verbal spoken text as well as gesture and movement. Snell-Hornby (1997: 190) applies the three categories of ‘paralinguistic’, ‘kinesic’ and ‘proxemic’, identified by Poyatos (1977) in narrative literature, to explain how the drama text becomes the performance text in terms of generating spoken dialogue, gesture and movement. The paralinguistic elements include vocal features such as pitch, intonation, tempo, and rhythm; the kinesic relates to movement and gesture, including facial gesture; and the proxemic relates to physical distance on stage. According to Snell-Hornby (1997: 190-191), the generation of these elements makes the text performable and enables the verbal text to produce non-verbal action. Johnston (2011: 26) considers that primarily kinetics: words matched to movement, but also to a lesser extent kinesics: words creating spaces for the non-verbal, are crucial to establishing the rhythm of the performance. This creates a firm link between the drama text and the performance text, going some way to explaining how the written linguistic signs of the drama text are able to produce all the theatrical signs, both the non-verbal and the verbal. However, Snell-Hornby (1997: 189)
195) seems to imply that the performance needs a different translation as she distinguishes between the needs of the reader and the needs of the spectator. For the reader it is enough to translate just ‘what is said’, i.e. the verbal text, but a stage performance needs to go further: ‘What is needed here is not a reproduction of the source-language script, but a new dramatic ‘score’ for a performance that is coherent and acceptable within the target culture.’ (Snell-Hornby 1997: 195). This requires there to be two different texts, one for the reader and one for performance, when in reality the same text often serves both purposes. Moreover, Snell-Hornby’s view devalues the reader, implying that it is easy to fulfill their needs when in reality ‘translating what is said’ can be particularly complex, as in the case of Lorca’s metaphors and the multiple layers of meaning they contain. There are also implications for the performance if we consider the director to also be a reader. This positions the performance text at the top of the hierarchy, above the drama text, with an emphasis on the non-verbal completing the verbal within the performance environment. It also firmly dethrones the source text and the idea of seeking some sort of ‘equivalence’ or ‘reproduction’ of it, and gives precedence to the idea of a ‘new score’ which is more than just a text; it is a script which encompasses all the elements, the ‘performance text’ as discussed before.

Pirandello (1936: 25 cited in Wood 2013: 142) made a clear distinction between the page and the stage in this respect:

Theatre is not archaeology. Not to lay hands on ancient texts, to bring them up to date and make them suitable for new productions is a form of neglect [...] The text remains intact for those who wish to read it at home for their own personal culture. Those who want to enjoy it will go to the theatre where it will be offered with its old wrinkles smoothed out, its out-of-date expressions renewed, and readapted to more contemporary taste.

Similarly, Johnston’s (2013: 373) concept of ‘writing forward’ supports this idea of producing something new rather than a reproduction of the original, although he maintains that the translator needs to ‘develop a relationship with a past text that allows that pastness both to be protected and brought to new life’ (idem).
Alter (1981: 114) makes the important point that when the verbal signs of the written text become verbal signs in the performance they remain linguistic signs, but their mode changes from graphic (written) to sound (spoken). The written mode can be ambiguous but intonation and pitch can serve to disambiguate. Alter (1981: 114-115) identifies two opposing views which he terms ‘the literary fallacy’ and ‘the performing fallacy’. The autonomy of the written text has led to the literary fallacy according to which verbal signs do not undergo any change from page to stage, whereas the performing fallacy reduces the text to ‘the status of a pre-text’, so that it becomes just one of many other staging signs. According to the literary fallacy, theatre is reduced to a ‘genre of literature’ whereas the performing fallacy sees it only as performance and thus reduces it to a ‘genre of show’ (Alter 1981: 114). Alter (1981: 123) also distinguishes between different types of staging signs, compulsory and non-compulsory, which interact with the verbal to materialise the performance. The compulsory signs are not necessarily stated in the text but they are basic, essential elements that are required in order to stage a performance:

[...] there must be sets (be they reduced to a bare surface in the open), costumes (be they reduced to nudity), actors who talk (even if absent physically) and/or use face and body language (even if masked or motionless), light and colors (be they reduced to darkness), a certain tempo, etc. (idem)

On the other hand, the non-compulsory, optional signs are not essential to the performance but may be added for a number of reasons. Some may appear compulsory as they may be implicit in the text but they are not necessary to perform the text and so can still be considered optional. Alter (1981: 124) gives the example of stage props which might be indicated or implied in the text. However, sometimes these staging, non-verbal signs are driven by the verbal, implicitly and explicitly, so they could be considered both compulsory and optional. The director’s referent is not just the text but the whole performance: ‘In that sense, he does not look backward to the verbal pre-text of his work, but forward to the implications of the completed staging’ (Alter 1981: 126). These optional signs, therefore, seem to reduce the role of the text. Moreover, they have
implications for authorship as the director is not just using the basic compulsory signs that he needs to stage the performance but is constantly making choices about which optional signs to add. These decisions may be driven by the text, either implicitly or explicitly, or by ideology, or by more practical considerations such as space restrictions.

This network of signs involved in theatre is clearly complex, and as Zuber-Skeritt (1984: 8-9) points out the translator has to decide whether they should be maintained as in the source text or whether they should be replaced by other signs which portray the same idea. This concept of theatre is somewhat rigid, and the semiotic approach has been criticised for not taking into account other factors, such as the cultural context which influences the generation of theatrical signs and the ephemeral nature of theatre. According to Allain and Harvie (2006: 204) it is necessary to:

> [...] isolate certain aspects of performance such as costume, lighting or sound for analysis, before reassembling these elements. This fragmentation meant that semiotics was less able to deal with the temporal flow of theatre, as Pavis pointed out. (Allain and Harvie 2006: 204)

This view is perhaps valid for a Saussurean approach to semiotics which, moreover, appears unable to account for the ambiguous nature of the types of metaphors considered here. A Peircean semiotics, on the other hand, is better able to deal with the sign as a continuum. The indexical nature of the sign is particularly useful to the analysis of theatre, as it firmly positions the theatrical performance in the present context. It is clearly one of the challenges for the translation of the rural trilogy to create a connection between the cultural context of the original 1930s Spain and the cultural context of present-day Britain. Elam (1980: 7) considers that the sign-vehicle (or signifier) has an extensive semiotic range not limited to a single class of objects, which means that it can take on secondary meanings for the audience and thus can be related to the ‘social, moral and ideological values operative in the community in which performers and spectators are part’ (idem). The theatrical sign is thus able to go beyond its denotation and acquire other cultural signification, it is ‘polysemic’ in nature as ‘a given vehicle may bear not one but ... second order meanings at any point in the
performance continuum’ (Elam 1980: 7). Elam (1980: 8) gives the example of a costume that ‘may suggest socioeconomic, psychological and even moral characteristics’ although he recognises that such connotations depend upon the spectator and the context (idem).

While semiotics cannot fully account for theatre translation, it is undoubtedly a useful tool to analyse how the verbal element (dialogue) or written stage directions become the non-verbal elements that make up the whole performance or mise en scène. Moreover, the consideration of the optional staging signs can give insight into the tension between the drama text and the performance text and the role of the director which is relevant to the idea of authorship in theatre translation and to how these optional signs may be embedded in the written text.

3.3.2 The gestic text

The discussion in the previous section takes us to the debate about whether the performance is inherent in the written text. Pavis (1992: 44) sees the text as ‘made to speak’ by the director in the role of ‘torturer’ which suggests that the director has to extract a meaning that resides within the text, but cannot be retrieved without his/her intervention. This has implications for authorship. For Aaltonen (2000: 2), the source text is a complex system of linguistic, socio-historical, cultural and theatrical codes, and the translation process reinterprets and redirects these codes into target society codes. This suggests a gestic text that can be decoded to make the performance. However, is it the translator who does this decoding when producing the written text or the director when producing the performance? Bassnett has famously changed her mind about the existence of an ‘undertext’ or ‘gestural text’ or what she later refers to as the ‘subtext’, ‘gestic text’, ‘inner text’ (1998: 90-91). In 1980, she adopted the semiotic view that the translator needs to take ‘the coded gestural patterning within the language itself’ into account (Bassnett (1980) 2002: 130). In the 1990s Bassnett (1991, 1998: 90-92) refuted this, considering that it is impossible to deduce the acting subtext from an analysis of the target text because its existence would imply a single authoritative reading of that text that could be decoded by actors. The fact that there are many translations of the
same texts indicates that this is not the case. Pavis agrees that the ‘[m]ise en scène is not the staging of a supposed textual ‘potential’’ (Pavis 1992: 26). Furthermore, Bassnett (1998: 92) points out that if this so-called gestic text existed, the translator’s task would be impossible. De Marinis (1993: 25) likewise considers that this concept of the dramatic text as a deep structure of performance is outdated. Johnston (2011: 23) however, remarks that the translation should provide some basis, or ‘scaffold’ upon which the actor can build the performance. Others, such as Ubersfeld (1977: 49) considered that the dramatic text is not complete but has ‘holes’ or ‘gaps’ (trous textuels) and that the mise en scène completes it. However, written texts on which a performance may be based are in themselves complete in that they function as texts in their own right. Nevertheless, the views discussed above place the text in a secondary position in relation to the performance, as other factors are required to complete it.

On the surface, the concept of the gestic text can be taken to imply gesture, not only in terms of what is said but also how the utterance is delivered. In that sense, all language is by nature gestic, as tone, intonation, and gesture contribute to the meaning of any utterance, both implicit and explicit. In the case of translation, however, the written language of the source text may imply different gestures to those of the language in the target text. Although context of utterance, characterisation and the plot contribute to determining how the lines are delivered, it is in the rehearsal of the performance that the director will check for clashes between the verbal utterance and the gesture that accompanies it. I suggest then that the gestic text can also indicate meaning so that the written text is not just acted out physically, but also produces meaning, and that non-verbal elements which are concerned with staging effects such as lighting, costume, scenery etc, are used to express what is implicit and explicit within the written text in non-verbal terms.

The relationship between language and the actor’s body is also important in the stage performance. Pavis (1992: 138) uses the term ‘language body’, which is a combination of speech and gesture while Robinson (2003: 70-71) explains the relationship between
language and the body through somatic theory drawing on the work of Damasio (1994) in neurological studies:

[...] language is both stored and ideologically and idiosyncratically inflected through what Damasio calls “somatic markers”, body responses that the autonomic nervous system learns from our experience to send us in order to guide our rational thought processes. (Robinson 2003: 19)

All of our choices related to our language use are ‘somatically marked’ which explains why according to Robinson (2003: 70-77) we feel what is correct or more appropriate on an emotional level. This has been learned from our experience, both in the collective social groups we belong to and as individuals, so that they can at the same time be unique or idiosyncractic, which he terms ‘idosomatic,’ or collective ‘ideosomatic’ (Robinson 2003: 76). According to Robinson (2003: 80), ‘[a] somatics of language helps us to situate language use firmly in the realm of performance’ as it is related to body language and gesture in what he calls an ‘embodied performance’ (Robinson 2003: 81). This embodied performance can be shown in two ways; externally with the use of stress, intonation and gestures which accompany and deliver the utterance, and internally by the feeling or emotion created from using certain words. We can relate this idea of a ‘somatics of language’ to Lorca’s concept of *duende* discussed in Chapter One, and also to the way in which the characters in the rural trilogy express their emotion through their bodies. The gestic text is thus not an action but an expression of emotion. The idea of ‘a somatics of language’ can also be related to how the translators react to the source text and bring their own ‘idiosomatic’ and ‘ideosomatic’ experiences to the translations; for example, there may be marked differences between translation choices made by the academic, the playwright and the poet. Moreover, as different cultures may use a different set of bodily gestures, language and the body are interlinked, through both gesture and emotion. Maier (2013) describes translation as a whole bodily experience: ‘Translation so intimately involves not only semantics but cadence that, particularly when working with syntax, I sense my body rhythms alter; it is those altered rhythms that return when I re-think a passage or a poem.’ I would thus argue that considering
the gestic as inherent within the text reinstates the text to a central position as it drives
the performance, while other factors, such as lighting, costume etc, add to the
performance in different ways. The text can stand alone whereas these other features
need the text to serve a purpose. The idea of the gestic being inherent in the text does
not, however, imply that a simple decoding process can produce the performance. The
text is performed in two ways; through the actor’s body in gesture and intonation which
express the emotion contained in the text and also through the non-verbal staging
elements. This indicates a dialogical rather than the ‘dialectical relationship’ that
Bassnett (1998: 90) perceives. But if we argue that a gestic text exists, how can we
counter Bassnett’s argument that the existence of a gestic text implies a definitive
reading? It is clear that there is no one definitive reading of a text as no two
performances of Lorca’s rural trilogy, for example, will ever be the same because the
performance is always part of the here-and-now and different directors and actors will
produce different performances. However, it is possible for a gestic text to exist as a
potential which is interpreted by the director and actors within the current cultural
context. The idea of a gestic text is also connected with the concept of performability
which is discussed in section 3.3.3 below.

3.3.3 Performability

As discussed in Chapter Two, performability is an important criterion among the
translators of the rural trilogy, but performability is a contentious term which seems to
defy a robust definition. It is often related to speakability or actability. Windle (2011:
156) states that ‘speakability’ has become an accepted term and terms such as
‘playability’, ‘actability’, ‘stageability’, and ‘performability’ are often used to express
similar ideas. Levy ((1963), 2011: 128) equated speakability to intelligibility on stage:
‘Theatre dialogue is spoken text intended for oral delivery and aural reception. On the
most elementary, acoustic level this means that sequences of sounds which are difficult
to articulate and which the audience may mishear are unsuitable’ (idem). This equates
speakability with simplicity, but as Aaltonen (2000: 43) points out, ‘[t]heatre texts do
donot need to be simple and easy to speak’. Bassnett (1998: 95-96) criticises such terms as
‘resistant to any form of definition’. Moreover, she claims that performability is a term used to justify changes or taking liberties with the text (Bassnett 1991: 105). She considers that the translator should not have to worry about whether the text is performable. Pavis (1989: 30) considers speakability can mean that the text should be easy to articulate although he warns that: ‘[t]he danger of banality lurking under cover of the text that ‘speaks well’ lies in wait for the *mise en scène*. Espasa (2000: 49) asks whether such notions, which from a textual point of view are equated with the ‘ability to produce fluid texts which performers may utter without difficulty’, from a theatrical viewpoint are connected with ‘saleability’ (idem). However, although Johnston (2011: 18) considers that performability escapes theoretical paradigms, and while he questions the value of constantly debating it, he believes that it is valid as part of the re-creative strategy, so the translator should endeavour to provide ‘a rhythmical solution that enables speakability’ (2009: 67). Snell-Hornby (1996: 33) reports that performability was complemented by the introduction of the concept of ‘breathability’ by the German director Ansgar Haag in 1984. By breathability it is meant ‘that stress patterns and sentence structures should fit in with the emotions expressed in the dialogue’ (idem). Edmunds (Doggart and Thompson 1999: 244) and Clifford (Doggart and Thompson 1999: 249) concur that taking into account the breathing patterns in the text is an essential part of translating for the theatre. Snell-Hornby (1996: 33) adds ‘singability’ to the list and considers that ‘performability’, ‘speakability’ and ‘singability’ depend largely on acting traditions and conventions of the target language culture. These concepts thus escape determinate theoretical paradigms but are operational on a practical level. However, these debates around the notions of performability and speakability concentrate on actor delivery, seeming to ignore the ephemeral nature of the text in performance and the impact of this on audience uptake.

3.4 The relationship between source and target

I have discussed the concept of one text which has a dual life and has to perform different functions at different times as it moves between different systems. I have also looked at the relationship between the drama text and the performance text and at the concepts of the gestic text and performability. However, it is also necessary to consider
all of these factors within the on-going source-versus-target debate which lies at the heart of translation theory, and which is especially pertinent in theatre translation where other factors, such as financial and/or critical success may dominate.

Whereas early translation theories tended to focus on equivalence between source and target, the cultural turn in the 1990s, associated with Bassnett and Lefevere (Gentzler 1998: xi) saw a shift towards considering translation as cultural transference, pointing out that translation does not take place in isolation but is part of, and indeed a product of, its cultural environment. Toury (1981: 9-10) advocated a target-oriented approach that sees translations as shaped by the target system to which they belong.

Aaltonen (2000: 65) distinguishes between directors who consider the source text to be central and treat it reverentially and others who will produce an adaptation of the ideas of the play, or go further still and use the performance text as a concept to create something completely new. Pavis (1992: 131-132) considers that interlingual transposition is a limited strategy for stage translation which he describes as a ‘concatenation of situations of enunciation’. Rather, this transaction between the situations of enunciation of the source and target ‘may glance at the source, but [...] has its eye chiefly on the target’ (Pavis 1992: 133). Bassnett ((1980), 2002: 30) considers that the target culture, in any type of translation, should take precedence:

The translator cannot be the author of the SL text, but as the author of the TL text has a clear moral responsibility to the TL readers.

This has important implications regarding authorship which is further complicated in the case of the performance of the text as there is another player involved in the process, namely the director. On the other hand, the ultimate goal of any production is financial success and critical acclaim, and in an arena where audience and critical approval is paramount, a strategy that ignores the target context is doomed to failure.

The source-oriented versus target-oriented debate can be described in terms of whether the translation is faithful to the source author or free in that it ensures that the target reader fully comprehends it by using a more fluent, readable style. This debate dates
back to Schleiermacher (1813), resuscitated by Venuti (1995, 2008) in his discussion of domestication versus foreignisation and translator visibility. Venuti (1995, 2008) claims that in British and American translation traditions domestication has been and remains the dominant strategy. Domestication requires a fluent translation that subjects the foreign text to domestic cultural norms and expectations, and thus reduces or eradicates its foreignness. This produces the impression that the translation has been written by the original author and is not a translation. Venuti blames this strategy for having made translators seek invisibility and for translation being regarded as a second-rate activity. The translator’s marginal status is enhanced by copyright laws that give the original author and/or the publishing house control over the translation, resulting in financial exploitation of the translator. Venuti sees this demand for fluency as a reflection of British and American cultural relations with others, which he describes as ‘imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home’ (Venuti 2008: 12). Lefevere (1992: 11) had argued that there may be other norms at work regarding whether a translation is considered acceptable, and these may be to do with ‘power and manipulation’ rather than ‘knowledge and wisdom’. Zatlin (2005: 4) agrees that translators do not have the same status as the original author and are often invisible. With regard to the translation of plays, she feels that this is a double invisibility, as ‘spectators, who for centuries did not object to invisible translators, now demand famous adapters’ with a move away from academic translations to playwright translations (Zatlin 2005: 21), the practice referred to in the third category of drama translation in Section One of this chapter. In the leaflet produced by The Crescent Theatre in Birmingham in 2014 detailing their upcoming productions, the translation of The House of Bernarda Alba used in this case study was advertised as:

THE HOUSE OF BERNARDA ALBA by FEDERICO GARCIA LORCA

There is no mention of this being a translation or of the translator’s name. However, on the page directly opposite, another production was advertised as follows:

THE DISPUTE by PIERRE DE MARVIAUX translated by NEIL BARTLETT
In the latter case, the well-known playwright Neil Bartlett is credited as the translator although it is not clear if he has translated directly or whether there has been a two-way process with the use of a literal translation. The fame of the translator thus influences how visible they are allowed to be.

Linked to the issue of translator (in)visibility are the terms domestication and foreignisation (Venuti 2008). In domestication, the demand for fluency leads to a translation that violates the source text (idem). Foreignisation, which for Venuti (1995, 2008) is not the polar opposite of domestication, is a way of remaining faithful to the foreign text by deviating from standard, target cultural norms. This does not mean that the translation is not fluent but that it is ‘reinvented in innovative ways’ (2008: 19). However, Venuti recognizes that this ethnodeviant strategy of foreignisation can create an alienating reading experience. Indeed, publishers may not be willing to pay for what could become a costly experiment. This is even more true in the case of theatre translation where economic viability is crucial. However, different theatres have different priorities and some may be more willing to take a risk on a lesser known play, as Brodie (2012: 77) found when comparing two English-language productions of two very different Spanish plays; Lorca’s The House of Bernarda Alba and Juan Mayorga’s Way to Heaven. David Hare’s production of The House of Bernarda Alba at the National in 2005 was aimed at the general public ‘in a theatre which emphasises the national heritage’ (idem), whereas the Royal Court theatre was prepared to put on a modern, lesser known and, therefore, riskier play such as Way to Heaven in its studio theatre.

3.4.1 The role of the source text

Roland Barthes’s (1977: 148) proclamation that ‘the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author’ has been enormously influential in postmodernist critical studies and also in Translation Studies. The dethroning of the author and the source text meant that translation no longer needed to be considered within the constraints of the original and could steer towards the receiver. Aaltonen (2000: 37) argues that both theatre and theatre translation start with the death of the author and sees foreign plays as a reflection of the target society, with an emphasis on ‘self’ rather
than ‘other’: Translation provides the mirrors in which we can see ourselves rather than windows through which we see the rest of the world. (Aaltonen 2000: 52). Although Aaltonen (2000: 30) considers that the source only has relevance in terms of the target text, she concedes that ‘[w]hile the original never reappears in the new language [] it is always present’. However, Scolnicov (1989: 95) asks: ‘Which ‘nature’ does the mirror reflect? Is it the playwright’s own contemporary society, the social mores of the past, or our own ethical problems?’ and in the game of reflections it is no longer clear which is then the ‘true’ image and which its reflection.

Aaltonen (2000: 1) points out that this reflection or mirror image of the ‘self’ may contain parts of the foreign texts but these parts or fragments are better received when they are familiar. The familiar is seen as authentic and therefore more acceptable. She thus sees the source text as being of interest only in terms of the use made of it by the target text. Others, such as House ((1977), 2015: 69) believe that in a target-oriented type of translation (what she calls ‘covert’ translation) a cultural filter is placed between the source and target text by the translator. This implies that the translator as mediator takes ownership of the translation.

This idea of the subjugation of the source text to the demands of the target society and as such as a reflection of it is not without its critics. As Bigliazzi, Kofler & Ambrosi (2013: 4) point out, the two approaches, which they describe in relation to theatre translation as the ‘source-text-oriented’ versus the ‘target-performance-oriented’, depend on ‘the different attitudes towards the ‘author-God’ text and the present-ness of the performance which lie behind much of the present debate’ (idem). Lorca is the ultimate representation of the author-God. The vast amount of scholarship about him and his work testify to his enormous influence, which extends well beyond literature into the realms of popular culture, music and film, in both Spain and abroad. However, it must be remembered that Lorca’s plays were written for performance and publication only happened after many rehearsals and performances had taken place. In fact, during his lifetime only two of his plays were published, *Mariana Pineda* in 1927 and *Bodas de sangre* in 1936.
Ritchie (1984: 65-66) argues that the very concept of the author imposes limitations on the performance, as it derives from literary discourse whereas performance derives from an oral one. He suggests that the reason for the dominance of the literary discourse is first of all the obvious one that the written text preexists performance, but also that the literate is considered permanent and consistent which is preferable to the ephemeral and dialectical qualities of the performance. The dominance of the author is historical, and the text is considered as belonging to the author, and thus the actor is presented with a book-language considered ‘authoritative and official’ (Ritchie 1984: 66). De Marinis (1993: 15-17), however, considers that the idea of the dramatic text occupying a privileged position over the performance is outdated, although understandable because the written text is the only part of the performance that survives, even if some other traces of the performance may be available such as reviews, photographs or even recordings.

It thus becomes clear that the interplay between the source author, the text, the translator, the director and the performance defines how the written text becomes the performance; and which is dominant depends upon how each of these elements is viewed.

3.5 Hermeneutics

The interpretative position of all those involved in theatre translation is clearly important in any analysis. In this respect, a hermeneutic framework may offer insights into the relationship between the translator and the source and target texts. As stated in the introduction, my own hermeneutic position in this thesis is one of Hispanist with an in-depth knowledge of the source text and who thus views the source text from a position of reverence. This position may, both consciously and unconsciously, seek an ideal equivalence between source and target texts. However, my position is also that of translator who understands the need to address a new audience, and the unstable position in which the translator finds themselves when trying to achieve this goal. Likewise, each translator of the rural trilogy brings their own hermeneutic position to their translation, again this may be conscious or otherwise, and it is precisely this
position that characterises and determines the way they view the source-target relationship and the way in which they make their translation decisions. In the case of the theatre translator, their position is further complicated in that they potentially have two envisaged audiences; the spectator and the reader. One of the translators whose translation is analysed here, John Edmunds (1997: vii), perceives three possible audiences for his work; the theatre audience, students of drama and the general reader.

Venuti (2010: 131-136) develops what he terms the ‘hermeneutic model’ of translation which stands in contrast to what he terms the ‘instrumental model’. He describes the ‘instrumental model’ as one that reproduces or transfers an invariant in the source text to the target text; either in terms of form, meaning or effect. In contrast, in the ‘hermeneutic model’, the relation is a hermeneutic one. He draws on Peirce’s (1940) semiotic notion of the interpretant, explaining that in the hermeneutic model of translation there is an ‘interpretation that varies source form and meaning through the application of an interpretant’ (Venuti 2010: 131). The target text is thus an interpretation of the source text ‘that varies in accordance with values, beliefs, and representations in the translating language and culture’ (Venuti 2010: 136). The hermeneutic relation is transformative due to the cultural and social aspect of any interpretant, but it is also interrogative as it is a way of exposing the cultural and social conditions of both source and target (Venuti 2010: 132). Venuti (idem) further argues that the interpretant overcomes the issue of privileging the source over the target and allows each to have an autonomy in their own right, as any interpretation is one of many possible interpretations. While the interpretation of the source text is undoubtedly related to those of the receiving language and culture, as Venuti points out, it is also related to how the translators themselves view the relationship between the source and target and how this informs their translation choices within the receiving language and culture.

Venuti (2010: 140) explains that translator choices are based upon the application of a category that consists of interpretants, which are either formal or thematic. He explains that:
Formal interpretants may include a concept of equivalence, such as a semantic correspondence based on dictionary definitions and philological research, or a concept of style, a particular lexicon and syntax linked to a genre or discourse.

Or:

Thematic interpretants are codes: they may include an interpretation of the source text that has been articulated independently in commentary; a discourse in the sense of a relatively coherent body of concepts, problems, and arguments housed in a cultural or social institution; and an ensemble of values, beliefs, and representations affiliated with specific social groups.

According to Venuti (2010: 138-139) the translator applies interpretants, simultaneously decontextualizing and recontextualising the source text, replacing source intertextual relations with target language and culture relations. He feels (2010: 145) that in this recontextualisation of the source in the form of the target, ‘the application of an interpretant in establishing the new context is never simply interpretive, but potentially interrogative’. I also believe that it is responsive, as Eco points out that the interpretant can be a response in terms of a behavioural habit and that this response can be emotional and/or physical (Eco 1976b: 1465).

Venuti (2013: 37) explains that the unavoidable losses and gains that happen in the translation process imply that textual effects are created ‘that go far beyond the establishment of a lexicographical equivalence to signify primarily in terms of the translating language and culture’. Venuti (2013: 13, 37) calls these effects the ‘remainder’, a notion he derives from work by Jean-Jacques Lecercle (1990). Venuti (2013: 13, 37) explains that the ‘remainder’ in translation can be a variation from non-standard language use, such as dialect, jargon, stylistic innovations, metaphors, puns, archaisms and neologisms. This so called remainder ‘complicates the communication of a univocal signified by calling attention to the linguistic, cultural and social conditions of any communicative act’ (Venuti 2013; 37). Venuti (2013: 14) considers that translation, and in particular, the translation of literature releases ‘a domestic remainder’, as the
‘source text is rewritten in domestic dialects and discourses, registers and styles, which produce textual effects that signify only in the history of the translating language and culture’. So for Venuti (2013: 37), while the remainder is the ‘most visible sign of the domesticating process’, it can also be ‘a significant point of foreignizing effects by deviating from the current standard dialect, the form of the translating language that is the most familiar to readers and the most frequently imposed on translators by editors’ (idem).

While the release of the remainder may be a conscious act on the part of the translator, such as the use of compensation in one part of the translation to make up for a loss elsewhere, Venuti (2013: 38) argues that it can also be released unintentionally, so that some decisions are in fact largely unconscious, and he raises the question as to whether translation decisions are not just unconsciously motivated but also subliminal, or even repressed. Venuti (idem) considers that experienced translators may make mistakes that can generate meanings which may be a repressed interpretation of the ST; and the remainder can show the working of the translator’s unconscious in relation to a particular text. Moreover, the remainder can reveal the translator’s desire to address a perceived untranslatability of the text. This desire can take collective forms, and is determined by cultural traditions and social institutions. The translator’s desire may also be a desire to achieve recognition for the work of the translation (Venuti 2010: 50-51). This is particularly true of theatre translation, as the immediacy of the reception of the work comes into play. Moreover, the translator may unconsciously strive to make the text performable and address the ephemeral nature of the stage. Venuti (2013: 51) says that the translator may release an unconscious remainder, which may even reveal the repressed desire to challenge the source author:

This desire may be one to assume a position of authority in translation, to emulate the source author’s status as an original creator and – depending on the author – as a canonical figure by producing a translation that implicitly questions that status. (idem)
I think that all of Lorca’s translators feel a reverence towards him and would not deny his canonical status, however, it is precisely that status which generates the discourse around him and perhaps determines, and/or characterises, the translations. In the case of the rural trilogy, we can perhaps perceive a range of desires on the part of the translators to address the untranslatability of a complex source text, address the inadequacies of the very literal first translations, and a desire to achieve a notion of performability, as well as a desire to seek authorial approval for their work. Some of these desires have been clearly articulated by the translators themselves, as discussed in Chapter Two. However, some such desires may be unconscious or even repressed, for example, some translators may have an unconscious desire to make Lorca’s plays work better in English.

The unconscious remainder that Venuti refers to may even take the form of errors in translation. Venuti (2013: 55) argues that because errors are made by experienced translators they are not merely mistakes or oversights but are in fact ‘symptomatic of an unconscious motivation, a repressed anxiety, an unsatisfied desire’. Venuti’s suggestion here is clearly questionable, as it is difficult to ascertain why such errors may have occurred, particularly when the translators themselves are unable to account for them, as Venuti found in his analysis. However, Venuti does raise awareness of the unconscious aspect of the translating process, which I think can be related to the hermeneutic notion of translator agency and raises questions as to what this notion of agency can reveal about the ownership/authorship of the rural trilogy in translation.

While Venuti raises interesting questions here, he only provides a limited number of examples to support his speculations. Pym (2015: 795-796) is particularly critical of one such example which he (Pym) tested on twenty-three translators and found that none of them made the same associative links, or inferences, as Venuti did. This led Pym (2015: 796) to conclude that such examples are more indicative of Venuti’s own unconscious or frustrated desires to make literary translation a political act. Despite, some obvious drawbacks to this notion of the remainder, Venuti raises some important questions regarding the translator as an active agent, as we see how the translator
brings their own interpretative position to the translation, as does the critic (in this case Venuti).

3.6 Performativity

I will now discuss the concept of performativity, which was deemed a ‘new topic’ in Translation Studies in 2015 (Gabrakova, Milton, and Robinson 2015), one which ‘has yet to be fully articulated in relation to translation’ (Marinetti 2013: 309). While the concept is not limited to theatre translation, as all types of translation can be considered ‘performative’, theatre translation provides an ideal field of research into the nature of performativity, as Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi (2013: 1) highlight:

Theatre has become the overall model for what cultural studies have defined as ‘performative turn’, prompting critics to discard both hermeneutic and semiotic approaches in favour of an ‘aesthetics of performativity’.

While Bigliazzi, Kofler and Ambrosi claim an abandonment of semiotic and hermeneutic methods, both semiotics and hermeneutics (as discussed in Section 3.3.1 and Section 3.5 respectively) can provide useful frameworks for the analysis of theatre translation. But what about the notion of performativity? The terms ‘performative’ and ‘performativity’ are important in performance studies. They are obviously connected with performance on stage, but have also come to mean performance in a wider sense. Loxley (2007: 2) states that ‘performativity’ has become a ‘carry-home concept’ which has been employed in diverse fields, such as philosophy, linguistics, gender studies, and politics among others; indeed, it has been applied more generally to ‘include anything that has a theatrical or performance-like quality’ (Allain and Harvie 2006: 185). Performativity is often associated with Butler (1990) who used the concept in her analysis of gender, although the origins of the ‘performative’ can be traced back to the philosophy of language of the 1950s and 1960s and, in particular, to J. L. Austin’s Speech-act theory and his description of *performatives* in a series of lectures he delivered at Harvard University in 1955. The content of these lectures was later published in 1962 under the title *How to Do Things with Words*.
3.6.1 Austin’s speech-act theory

Austin initially distinguished between what he termed ‘constative’ and ‘performative’ utterances. ‘Constative’ utterances state, describe, or report whereas ‘performative’ utterances ‘do’ or ‘perform’ an action (1962: 3-5). He gives several examples, including ‘I do’ when said in the marriage ceremony which rather than being a statement is part of an action, namely that of marrying (1962: 6). He names these types of utterances ‘performatives’ from the verb ‘perform’ as in ‘performing an act’. Two examples which illustrate the constative-performative distinction are: ‘I apologise’ which does not just state that ‘I am apologising’ but actually performs the act of ‘making an apology’ as opposed to the statement ‘I am running’ which merely describes a fact. Constatives differ from performatives in that constatives are either true or false but performatives, if they fail, are unhappy (1962: 18). He goes on to ask whether infelicities can also affect statements (1962: 20), and after testing his theory by way of many examples, Austin comes to the conclusion that in fact statements can suffer from the same infelicities as performatives (1962: 50-52), that there is no real distinction between a statement and a performative utterance, that statements can be happy and unhappy and some performatives may be true or false. Moreover, the same utterance can be both performative and constative according to the context in which it is used (1962: 67 & 89). Austin illustrates this by dividing his performatives into those which are explicit, such as ‘I bet’ and those which are implicit such as ‘there is a bull in the field’ which could be taken as a warning (and therefore performative) or alternatively as a statement, depending on the situation and who is taking part in it. Interpretation, as Austin points out, is dependent on the receiver (1962: 31-32).

Austin (1962: 61-62) attempts to define rules for the performative, concluding that explicit performative verbs are, normally, in the first person singular active non-continuous present indicative tense in English: ‘[A]ny utterance which is in fact a performative should be reducible, or expandable, or analysable into a form with a verb in the first person singular present indicative active…’. And since one of these verbs is ‘state’, as in ‘I state that …’, all speech is performative.
Parasitic speech acts

Austin is concerned with real-life utterances spoken in real-life situations and considers that ‘[a] performative utterance will ... be in a peculiar way hollow or void if said by an actor on the stage, or if introduced in a poem, or spoken in soliloquy’ (Austin 1962: 22).

Nevertheless, Scholars such as Elam (1980) have applied speech-act theory to the stage and consider the performance of theatrical texts as speech acts in their own right. Eco (1977: 115) sees every dramatic performance is made up of two speech acts, while Serpieri, Elam et al (1981: 165) define a play as ‘the dynamic progression of intersecting speech acts’. I think that is it important to make a distinction between two types of ‘intersecting speech acts’ that occur in the theatrical performance. The first is the fictional, pre-rehearsed speech act which takes place between the characters on stage and which has a pre-written, pre-rehearsed response which has already been decided by a combination of the source author, the translator, the director and the actors; not only what will be said but the way in which it is said. We might name this a ‘staged speech act’, which, although it has no immediate effect on the world outside the stage, mirrors real-life speech acts. The second type of speech act is that which is carried out by the performance itself, the response to which, by the audience, is uncertain. Within the play we have a series of speech-acts taking place consecutively, with a series of responses. Responses to speech acts can be seen as the production of effects. Austin dealt with the effects and consequences of speech acts in his trichotomy of locution, illocution and perlocution.

Locution, illocution and perlocution

Austin (1962: 94ff) insists that in every utterance, a speaker performs three acts, locution, illocution and perlocution. The locutionary act is the act of uttering words as part of a given language and conforming to a certain grammar. The illocutionary act is the act performed ‘in saying something as opposed to performance of an act of saying something’ (Austin 1962: 99). In addition:
Saying something will often, or even normally, produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons: and it may be done with the design, intention or purpose of producing them: [...]. We shall call the performance of an act of this kind the performance of a perlocutionary act or perlocution. (Austin 1962:101)

Austin (1962:108) sums up his categories as follows:

[...] in saying something [...] we perform a locutionary act, which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to ‘meaning’ in the traditional sense. Second, we said that we also perform illocutionary acts such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, &c., i.e. utterances which have a certain (conventional) force. Thirdly, we may also perform perlocutionary acts: what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading.

A perlocutionary act can also be achieved by non-locutionary means and produce a non-verbal response. For example, waving a stick may function as a warning and may produce a feeling of intimidation (Austin 1962: 117). On stage, we might argue, costume and lighting, for example, as well as colour, can produce illocutionary effects and possibly perlocutionary ones. The audience can be convinced to feel a certain emotion or a certain empathy with a character can be achieved. Indeed, Lorca’s concept of duende implies an illocution (an effect) and a perlocution (a consequence) which is experienced by both the producer of the locution (in this case the singer) and the audience.

Where illocution (effect intended) and perlocution (consequential uptake) are problematic is in how to pin down intended effect and how to measure uptake. Austin (1962: 105) is well aware that there may be the intention for a certain consequence to take place but this consequence might not be achieved and other unintentional consequences may occur. For instance, the audience watching a play may not empathise
with the characters and may not enjoy the performance or feel entertained by it in any way, in which case, arguably, the intended illocution would not be successful and the consequential perlocution would not be achieved.

The achievement of effect then involves the securing of uptake on the part of the receiver and this effect depends on context, as highlighted by ‘the bull in the field’ example. The question is how do we know what intention is and whether it has been achieved?

Both Austin and Searle recognise that one utterance can have different effects; however, for Searle (1969: 70) this is linked to intention:

Both because there are several different dimensions of illocutionary force, and because the same utterance act may be performed with a variety of different intentions, it is important to realize that one and the same utterance may constitute the performance of several different illocutionary acts.

This view then sees the performance of several different illocutionary acts as related to several different intentions and takes into consideration that speakers (and indeed writers) can say one thing but actually mean something else, as in the case of Lorca’s metaphors where he is commenting on society through the use of colour. In ‘Expression and Meaning’ (1979) Searle discusses instances of what he terms indirect speech acts. These occur when a speaker says something which means one thing but also has an additional meaning/s, so that more than one type of illocutionary act is taking place at the same time (Searle 1979: 30). For example, ‘Can you reach the salt?’ is not just meant as a question but also as a request that is intended to produce the effect on the hearer of passing the salt. Indirect speech acts, he explains are ‘cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another’ (Searle 1979: 31).

The speaker communicates these other illocutionary acts by relying on the mutual background information that both speaker and hearer share. This knowledge is both linguistic and non-linguistic, and relies on rationality and inference (Searle 1979: 31-32). For translation, the difficulty is that the inferences made in one language are not
necessarily the same in another language. It is also important to consider that inferences are not fixed, the hearer can understand inferences that may be intended by the speaker but equally can misunderstand them, or draw other inferences that are not intended. This is important in translation because when making translational choices, translators aim to enable their audience to generate the inference of the original, but also need to be aware that their choices may produce other, perhaps undesired, inferences.

Speech-act theory provides an extremely useful insight into how communication works, and while not originally perceived by Austin as applicable to fictional discourse, we can overcome the challenges it presents on this level; but can we apply it to translation? According to Hickey (1998: 47) Speech-act theory is the area of pragmatics which is most useful for translation. In his application of it to the analysis of Yerma in translation he gives an example of Juan’s instruction to the Sister-in-law ‘Puedes poner la mesa’ (You can lay the table) which will have the perlocutionary effect on the other characters of getting them to lay the table but it will obviously not have the same perlocutionary effect on the audience as they will not lay the table. However, Hickey (idem) argues that the audience may infer that the interaction between the characters indicates a male-dominated society and for them the perlocution is on this level. Hickey (1998: 47-48) states that translators will strive for locutionary and illocutionary equivalence with the original, preserving ambiguities where possible although a loss may occur at the illocutionary level. Hervey (1998: 12) considers that while illocutionary functions are translatable across cultures, a loss of meaning will inevitably occur. Hickey (1998: 48) recognises that perlocution may be more difficult to ascertain given the role the reader/hearer plays although this may also be the case with the original text as not all receivers would have received it in the same way. There were clearly very mixed reactions to the original Spanish performance of Yerma, as discussed in Chapter One. Despite Hickey’s reservations regarding whether perlocutionary equivalence is possible in translation, he suggests that two strategies could lead to it. One is ‘recontextualisation’ which consists of placing the target text in a different context, for example, in terms of the place and time, than that of the source. Hickey (1998: 49) explains that such a strategy ‘may involve abandoning the literal, propositional or
The other translation strategy Hickey suggests is what he terms ‘marking’, which ‘refers to some kind of indication or series of indications that the reader is reading a secondary text which derives from some absent primary source’ (Hickey 1998: 49). This invites the reader to imagine a new ‘world’ very different from their own context: ‘[T]hey may imagine a new ‘world’ or society and mentally adapt references and realities to fit in with their image of that different world’ (idem). This is the strategy Hickey recommends for translating the rural trilogy, explaining that ‘the tactic of taking the reader into the ST world should be considered’ and ‘marked should be translated as marked’ (Hickey 1998: 51). Hickey does not give a precise definition of ‘marked’ although he likens it to House’s (1997) notion of ‘overtness’, and we can perhaps thus assume that it resembles a foreignising approach rather than the more domesticated ‘recontextualisation’. However, surely the effects belong to the context of reception as much as they do the context of production, so it is difficult to see how we can know what that effect was and whether that effect remains relevant. I suggest that rather than looking at translating equivalent perlocutionary effect, it is more interesting to consider the effect as a creative response.

Pérez González and Sánchez Macarro (1996: 90) in their analysis of Peter Luke’s translation of Yerma also focus on pragmatic equivalence. However, for them pragmatic equivalence is not achieved through textual equivalence but at a macro-level as they advocate the need to be aware of the literary and social role played by the source text in addition to the linguistic difficulties it poses. It might not be possible to reconcile the two, meaning that the translator has to prioritise (Pérez González & Sánchez Macarro 1996: 92). They argue that in striving for pragmatic equivalence, the translator ‘shifts the dramatic emphasis from the tragic consequences of barrenness in the original text to the study of women’s sexual repression in the translated version’ (1996: 91). The translator thus makes a connection with the wider discourse of the play, making the play more universal. Equivalence is considered here not at the level of the micro-linguistic
unit but at the macro-level of the wider discourse of the play; but I would argue that the two cannot be separated.

*Overhearing and audience design*

We can thus counter Austin’s idea of the parasitic speech act by pointing out that a play seeks to evoke a real-life response in terms of a reaction or emotion from the audience. The speech acts in the rural trilogy have many performative traits, for example, the role of the word silence as discussed in Chapter One. We have identified the multiple speech acts that take place on the stage at the same time, between the characters and between the performance and the audience. Burger (1984: 44ff quoted in Bubel 2007: 56) explains these relationships (with reference to television and radio) by distinguishing between two circles of communication; an ‘inner circle’ (or ‘primary situation’) and an ‘outer circle’ which is the dialogue between the characters and the audience (the ‘secondary situation’). The characters simultaneously address the inner and outer circle in their communication (Burger 1991:7 quoted in Bubel 2007: 56). Short (1981: 188) similarly describes ‘embeddedness’ in dramatic discourse, where ‘features which, for example, mark social relations between two people at the character level become messages about the characters at the level of discourse which pertains between author and reader/audience.’

Clark (1996: 353) terms this ‘discourse layering’. This does not relate to micro-level layers of language of the type identified in the rural trilogy in Chapter One but is on a macro-level which Clark (1996: 354-355) terms ‘layers’ or ‘domains of action’. In her analysis of film, Bubel (2008: 58) identifies three layers of which one is the characters and their context (time and place of setting). The second layer is the actors who pretend to be the characters at a different time and place setting, the director and all those involved in filming. The final layer is the emission of the film by the TV channel which has been edited by a production crew, and the audience who pretends that the actors are the characters, again at a different time and place. Within this concept of layered action, Clark identifies the two concepts of ‘imagination’ and ‘appreciation’ (Clark 1996: 366-367) where the primary participants imagine what is happening in the highest layer,
that of the characters, and appreciate the way in which the highest layer has been created (Clark 1996: 359). This shows how the audience is a co-structor of meaning. But how does the audience actually actively participate?

Clark and Schaefer (1987: 209) discuss the idea of ‘audience design’ which relates to how speakers design their utterances taking into account not only those involved in the direct conversation but also those who may be within earshot, who they term ‘overhearers’. Those partaking directly in the conversation use ‘common ground’ which is mutually shared knowledge, which can be communal or personal and also that which is directly related to the current conversation, to infer what the other speaker means (Clark and Schaefer 1987: 210); whereas overhearers can only infer what is meant from insufficient evidence, as they may not share the same common ground, through what Clark and Schaefer call ‘conjecturing’. Speakers can conceal information from overhearers, exploiting their mutual common ground which may be ‘closed’ to the overhearer, using what Clark and Schaefer (1987: 211) call ‘a private key’, information which is only known to them. Bubel (2008: 63) explains that:

When overhearers make conjectures, they retrieve stored cognitive models or frames that are prompted by the utterance. These models are then compared to what is said, and if they do not fit, other models with a better fit are retrieved; in case there is no matching model, the new information is fitted into the existing knowledge structures, expanding and combining these or establishing new cognitive models. The cognitive models that stand up to the comparison constitute the part of the common ground referred to in the utterance.

In translation, the same cognitive models may not exist and the translator has to supply the correct cognitive model. Bubel (2008: 69) points out that ‘film dialogue has to be carefully designed for overhearers so that they can reconstruct the participants’ common ground’, in other words, explanations of common ground information shared by the characters may be given for the benefit of the audience. It is thus through ‘audience design’ that the audience is able to construct meaning. This is often necessary in translation as common ground may not shared between source and target cultures.
This leads to the question whether the theatre audience is an overhearer or a participant in the speech act. Bubel (2008: 61-64) suggests that they are overhearers and as such are unratified participants with no conversational rights or responsibilities. I think that the concept of the audience (whether reader or spectator) as an overhearer is problematic because it appears to relegate them to a secondary position; however, it does highlight the fact that they may not share all the common ground between source text and source audience, so that the translator (and all those involved in the performance) has to supply that common ground. Conversely, it can be argued that the audience is not a passive overhearer or overlooker but an active constructor of meaning and thus an active participant in the speech act or acts. We can also see response as part of the discourse layering that is taking place. Malmkjær (1998: 32) posits that the reader of the literary text is both the writer’s audience and the overhearer of the characters’ conversations and thoughts. I would suggest that this can also be true for the stage. This leads on to the question whether the page performs in the same way as the stage.

*Can the page perform?*

We have so far discussed speech acts taking place on the stage but what about the page? Can the drama text perform in the same way as the performance text? Petry (1990: 55) argues that ‘literature is an illocutionary act even if its illocutionary force is vastly different from that of ordinary language’ and ‘[l]ike saying and doing, writing performs’ (Petry 1990: 56). Searle, originally concentrates on real-life speech acts and, like Austin, states that fictional speech acts are non-serious in the sense that they do not actually happen (Searle 1979: 60) although they can be conveyed by fictional texts, ‘even though the conveyed speech act is not represented in the text’ (Searle 1979: 74). Speaking and writing are thus both ways of performing speech acts or illocutionary acts (Searle 1979: 58), although Searle considers that writers pretend to perform illocutionary act rather than actually performing them, so while the utterance itself is real, the illocutionary act is pretended (Searle 1979: 66, 69). Furthermore, ‘the illocutionary force of the text of a play is like the illocutionary force of a recipe for baking a cake’ (Searle 1979: 70), the
playwright producing ‘a recipe for pretense’ (Searle 1979: 69). This view assumes that the text is replicated in performance, a recipe to be followed, and assumes the acting subtext, a gestic text or an inherent performability of the written text, ignoring the role of the director and his/her interpretation, and all those other elements which comprise the performance.

Is the drama text performative in the same way though? Robinson (2003: 26) asks whether a speech act that is not performed, in other words not spoken, even to oneself, can still be classed a speech-act? Although he is not specifically referring to the written text here, we can apply this to the drama text as the written text does not actually ‘perform’ the speech act in the sense of verbalising it. However, Chitanu (2010: 78) emphasises that it is the receiver who determines whether the translation is performative or not, even if that is an implied audience:

[...] the role of the audience is essential, and even when one is not present, one is implied. So the performative quality of a novel or a short story cannot be denied because the author has in mind an addressee; she communicates her text to her reader.

Chitanu (2010: 82) further argues that while the performance might emphasise speech acts, ‘illocutionary acts can function even outside the theatrical performance’ as the text itself can stimulate perlocutionary effects from these illocutionary acts. Likewise, Bermann (2014: 289) argues that literary texts are performative in Austin’s sense but moreover, that they create something new which affects readers.

In terms of translation, Bermann (2014: 290) feels that the source is still a driver of performativity: ‘The translator inclines toward the language and conventions of the source in order to translate them into her own very different language. A new linguistic production results, one infused with the otherness of its source.’

Therefore, I think that just as we can contemplate speech acts happening on stage, we can contemplate them on the page. On the page, the context is clearly different; the context of reception is the imagination of the reader rather than the visual context of
the stage. However, these utterances perform in the same way as they perform on the stage, so that they can have an illocutionary and a perlocutionary effect on the reader in the same way as the performance can have on the spectator. The difference is obviously the medium of reception, so access to the speech act is different. Uptake would equally depend upon the audience, as already pointed out, however, the processing time is different which can have an effect on uptake, as the reader is able to re-read parts of the texts that they do not fully understand which is clearly not possible on the stage, and the translator may need to compensate for this.

**Audience response and translator response**

We have posited the performance of multiple speech acts both on the page and on the stage, and it would seem logical to say that all speech acts have a response, even if that response is silence. Austin points out that ‘many illocutionary acts invite by convention a response or sequel, which may be ‘one-way’ or ‘two-way” (1962: 116). Perhaps it is the illocutionary effect of the locution that invites the response and thus the perlocution. If we apply this hypothesis to translation, the locution and illocution of the original produces the perlocution in the translator whose locutions produce illocutionary effects in turn on the audience and possible perlocutions and other further responses. Whether those illocutionary effects are the ones intended by the translator would be difficult (if not impossible) to measure and they could certainly be very different from the ones intended by the original author, particularly given the temporal gap between source and target. These responses may be feelings of enjoyment or boredom or even further translations. The reading of the drama text by a director would produce the response of a representation of that text on the stage, illustrating a dialogic relationship between the page and the stage. We could also say that the drama text produces multiple responses by all those involved in the production process; director, actors, wardrobe, lighting etc. The production itself, once performed to the live audience, goes on to produce further responses in that audience. A response can thus be a direct physical action, or an emotional, internalised response; and responses may not always be immediate.
The ‘I’ in translation

Austin’s speech-act theory thus allows us to consider translation in terms of effect. So rather than a source-target dichotomy, translation is perceived as a creative response which frames the translator as a creative agent in their own right who produces a speech act. This leads to the question of whether the translator is actually producing their own speech-act or whether they are merely reproducing someone else’s speech-act. Can we give the translator ownership of the personal pronoun ‘I’ in translation? Pym (1993: 50-51) initially argues that ‘the statement “I am translating” cannot be true while the translator is translating. That is, the person who says ‘I’ cannot be the actual producer of the discourse’. This paradox, he goes on, ‘suggests that the translating translator can occupy no first-person pronoun and is thus excluded from the whole pronominal system’. He further asks whether this means that ‘translational discourse, deprived of the first person is also deprived of all performatives?’ (1993: idem). He quotes the example of a chairperson declaring a meeting open and its simultaneous translation into French, asking whether the simultaneous translation can actually perform or merely has the constative function of a statement as it does not actually open the meeting. However, clearly the simultaneous translation does serve to open the meeting for those who do not understand the original language and is thus performative. Moreover, Austin tells us that statements are also performative. Pym further argues that the first-person is already occupied by the chairperson in this instance which seems to exclude any other possible occupier of it. He quotes an example from Brisset (1990) where a line used in a French Quebecois translation of Shakespeare’s Macbeth evokes a prominent feature of the social discourse of Quebec and thus makes a connection between the Scotland of the original and the new context of Quebec. It is only in this particular context that this particular line would be performative in this way, as the same translation in the context of France would not perform in the same way. This illustrates the idea of audience design, as discussed previously, where a connection is made with the audience. This kind of connection can perhaps be considered relocation which will be discussed in the next subsection.
On the one hand it seems logical to consider the translator as the owner of the translation, a creative agent who is making decisions on how to communicate the ST to the TL audience; however, on the other hand, the notion of the translator as owner of the translation calls into question how objective the translator can be. The drawback of considering the translator as the author is that they may move far away from the ST and the TT may come to represent their own ideology rather than that of the source author. In the case of David Hare’s production of *The House of Bernarda Alba* in 2005, Brodie (2010: 65) reports that despite Hare’s reputation as a political playwright Lorca’s own ideology was presented and that ‘Lorca and Hare experience a symbiotic relationship, each enhancing the status of the other in the canon for the British audience’ (Brodie 2012: 68). This suggests equality between author and translator/playwright/director. I think, however, there is a fine line between making connections between contexts and using the foreign play to promote your own ideology.

*Relocation*

As mentioned, relocation of the performance text is one way in which a connection can be made with the theatre audience. Relocation can be portrayed in various ways; it can be verbal in terms of pronunciation or dialect, or it can be visual, in terms of costume and scenery. It can be realised through just one word, or a whole set, or a combination of things, which anchor the play in a particular location and in a particular time period. These decisions have implications for both the source and target text and the performance; for example, many productions of Lorca have been criticised for having the actors speak with middle-class accents, far removed from the original. Lorca, however, did not attempt to render the Andalusian dialect in the originals which, it could be argued, serve to give them (along with other aspects) a more universal setting. Johnston (2000: 94) in his translations of Valle-Inclán’s *Divine Words* and *Bohemian Lights*, used an Irish vernacular and even relocated the action to an Irish setting in the case of *Bohemian Lights*.

Related to the debate on relocation is temporality. There is much debate about whether classic texts should be modernised or whether the audience should be transported back
to another time. Zatlin (2005: 34) points out that (re)translations of known works seem to be more popular than new translations of unknown works. This indicates that translations, and also the staging of translations, are always evolving, becoming part of the present context, while the written source text remains ‘fixed’ in terms of its temporal and geographical context. A translation, both written and performed, is a product of its time, meaning that it can date quickly. Reiss [(1971) 2000: 71] points out that a translation made when the source text was written cannot be judged in the same way as a later translation of the same text because the target language may have changed considerably more than the source language. In addition, new readings may emerge which may affect the translation product. This highlights the fact that the wider cultural context needs to be taken into consideration when observing the translation product. We can think of first-person/second-person address in this way: that relocation in terms of time and place are macro-level ways of addressing the audience through the linguistic micro-level. As stated, there can be degrees of relocation; it may be at the level of a few linguistic choices or it may be on a larger scale.

Due to the temporal gap, it can also be argued that Lorca’s blasphemous language in Yerma may not have the same shock effect on the audience today as it did on the original audience. However, it can have an indirect effect in that they can be shocked on behalf of the original audience, so long as the play is presented as a 1930s piece as the audience would need to be aware of the original context. Relocation makes this more difficult as it removes the context of the original and is, therefore, not acceptable to those who want to experience the foreign and/or past context, and those who champion the rights of the source text and believe in the author-God. Whereas staging of the performance text may invite relocation on a larger scale, the drama text can also relocate although it is more likely to do so on a smaller scale, for example, by translating unknown cultural references with more familiar ones.

Whether we agree or not to addressing the audience through relocation, I think that by considering first-person address, the role of the translator is reconceptualised; it is no longer a question of ‘what the translation is or is not’ but how the translator/director
responds to the text, acts upon it and ultimately creates a potential perlocutionary effect on the audience.

We have now established that the translator might be considered as a performer, an actor upon the text and the audience and we have discussed possible ways in which they do this, including addressing the receiver directly through, for example, relocation which is often on a larger scale on stage with the intervention of the director. Austin’s speech-act theory thus allows us to conceptualise both the drama text and performance text as multiple overlapping speech acts and responses which take place throughout the reading or watching of the text and often go beyond those specific instances of reading or watching. Following on from Austin’s speech-act theory, we will now consider other pragmatic approaches that may be useful for establishing a framework of performativity.

3.6.2 Grice’s Implicature, Maxims and the Co-operative Principle (CP)

H. Paul Grice delivered the William James Lectures at Harvard in 1967 (published as ‘Logic and Conversation’ in 1975) in which he developed his theory of implicature. Implicature is what is suggested or implied by an utterance in a certain context in addition to what is actually said. He arrives at implicature (implying) and implicatum (what is implied) from the verb to implicate (1975: 43-44). A question such as ‘Can you reach the salt?’ implicates the that you should not just answer ‘yes’ but actually do the action of passing the salt. Some implicatures are conventional (what he terms ‘conventional implicatures’) where what is said may by convention implicate something else, whereas others are non-conventional. Malmkjær (2005: 146) explains that ‘conventional implicature is tied to linguistic expressions’ whereas non-conventional implicatures depend upon ‘the non-linguistic circumstances surrounding a speech event’. Grice (1975: 45) also identifies a subclass of non-conventional implicatures which he terms ‘conversational implicatures’. When we engage in conversation, we produce a series of ‘cooperative effects’ because each one of the participants recognises a common purpose for engaging in the exchange, which may be either defined from the beginning, such as a topic proposed for discussion, or it may evolve as the conversation
progresses (Grice 1975: 45). He terms this cooperation the ‘cooperative principle’ (idem), and draws up four sets of maxims falling into four categories which, following Kant, he calls: Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. The first category of Quantity relates to the amount of information provided in the cooperative exchange and it has two maxims:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required (1975: 45).

In other words, just the right amount of information should be given, no more and no less. How can we really know what the right amount of information is? Relevance obviously has an influence here and as Grice points out (1975: 46) the second maxim of not providing more information than necessary might really belong to the maxim of relevance.

The category of Quality has the supermaxim of truth which in itself contains the two maxims:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence (1975: 46).

Metaphor can be an obvious violation of this maxim.

The category of Relation contains the maxim, ‘Be relevant’ although what is relevant may change during the conversation. Grice himself raises the obvious question ‘relevant to what’? (1975: 46).

The fourth category of Manner he explains is to do with how things are said rather than what is said. He produces the supermaxim ‘Be perspicuous’ and the following sub-maxims:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.

3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).


The list is not exhaustive as participants observe other maxims such as aesthetic, social or moral ones, for example, ‘Be polite’ which may also generate non-conventional implicatures (1975: 47). In a conversation, a participant may deliberately violate a maxim or stop cooperating, or there may be a clash between maxims. But in a cooperative conversation, if a maxim is being deliberately flouted, the interactants will generate whatever implicature is needed to re-instate the maxim (1975: 50).

Like Austin, Grice is principally concerned with spoken language and thus the obvious drawback for such a theory with regards to literary fiction is that in spoken communication it is easy to see how the participants make themselves understood. However, it is possible to apply Grice’s theory to fictional literature as Malmkjær (1998: 25) points out; ‘[t]he notion of cooperation is relevant to the reading of literature in many ways’ and ‘to approach a text, whether fictional or not, as a literary work, constitutes a type of cooperation with the text and with the norms and expectations of the culture within which it exists and is accepted as a literary text’ (idem). She feels that it is also possible to generate some of the cues to interpretation that are used in spoken language, such as tone and stress, by the use of punctuation, different fonts, reporting verbs such as ‘exclaimed’ and adverbs such as ‘emphatically’, ‘happily’. Moreover, the co-text can provide further referential information (Malmkjær 1998: 31). In the case of the drama text, the stage directions can obviously indicate how lines are to be delivered.

With specific regard to translation, Malmkjær (1998: 33-36) is more cautious, expressing doubts as to whether Grice’s theory can account for cooperation when there are two languages involved as the intervention of a third party mediator in the guise of the translator is not accounted for. Moreover, what is said in the original does not necessarily implicate the same in the target (Malmkjær 1998: 35). The challenge for translation is how to enable the target text to allow its reader to generate the implicatures of the original. The entire context may of course help. For example, we may be able to get to the fact that when Yerma is referred to as white, she is not ill or pale
but infertile as we become aware of the story as the play unfolds. Despite reservations, Malmkjær (1998: 37) recognises that implicature is a useful notion for translators to keep in mind and that the co-text, or notes at the beginning or end of the text may be able to generate implicatures to compensate (Malmkjær 1998: 33). With the performance text, the stage directions can obviously do this. Moreover, the stage offers the possibility of generating implicatures visually.

Wolf (2011: 87) in his application of Grice’s implicature and the CP to the staging of Anouilh’s Antigone found that ‘the staging process of the play either helped towards the understanding of inferences or added inferences which were not there to begin with’. This suggests on the one hand a dialogic relationship between the drama text and the performance text as inferences are explicated in the performance, but on the other hand, it suggests that the performance text moves beyond the drama text by producing additional implicatures. Interestingly, Wolf found that implicatures generated in the original were not recovered in the written translation (the drama text) but were finally recovered in the staging process (the performance text) by the directors and actors, as in one instance where the translation sounded archaic, they updated it, thus inadvertently recovering the implicature of the original. The rehearsal thus served to highlight tensions between the drama text and the performance text but also showed the dialogic nature of the process of staging the drama text. Wolf (2011: 102) therefore argues that we cannot separate the performance from the intentions of the original text, concluding that ‘[t]he efficacy of the staging process is such that it can enable the recovery of standardly implicated inferences as well, even when the actors and director have no knowledge of the source text’.

Despite obvious obstacles to the application of Grice’s theory to the translation of plays, I think that the notion of implicature is useful as we can see the potential for a whole series of instances of generation of implicatures (and also loss) firstly between the ST and the written TT and between the written TT and the performance text, during the stage production process. The staging process can choose to show some parts that are implicated by the text as a whole over others; for example, in the case of the rural trilogy,
there has been a tendency for the folk elements to dominate. Moreover, the maxims and the CP can be useful in considering the cooperation that may take place between the translated drama text and the performance text and whether this is indeed cooperative or how it is made cooperative.

3.6.3 Relevance theory and translation

On the basis of Grice’s maxim of relevance, Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1987), developed the theory of relevance. Sperber and Wilson (1987: 697) challenged the traditional code model or semiotic theory of communication and although they concede that encoding and decoding does take place, they advocate a more inferential theory of communication. Gutt (1992: 13) agrees, arguing that ‘inference can override coding, and hence is the more basic factor in communication’. Sperber and Wilson’s (1987: 698) rejection of the code model is further based on the fact that it relies on participants sharing the same assumptions or knowledge which they feel is ‘psychologically implausible’. Taking Grice’s (1957) inferential model as their starting point, they argue that the speaker modifies the cognitive environment of the audience by deliberately producing a stimulus on the basis of an ‘informative intention’ to inform the hearer of something and a ‘communicative intention’, to inform the hearer of the speaker’s informative intention (1987:699). The cognitive environment of an individual they define as: ‘a set of facts that are manifest to him’ (idem) and the idea of ‘manifestness’ is explained as follows: ‘A fact is manifest to an individual at a given time if, and only if, the individual is capable at that time of representing it mentally and accepting its representation as true or probably true’ (idem). Moreover, ‘the same facts and assumptions may be manifest in the cognitive environment of several people’ (idem) and there may be an intersection between the cognitive environments between people. Robinson’s (2003: 70-77) somatic theory, as discussed previously, adds the idea that the body is part of that environment while Clark and Schaefer’s (1987: 209) concept of ‘overhearing’ suggests how the shared environment works in audience design.

Sperber and Wilson (1987: 700) explain that it is in what they term ‘a mutual cognitive environment’ that speakers modify the thoughts of hearers by modifying their cognitive
environment and they thus argue that ‘[h]uman cognition is relevance-oriented’ (idem). This may often be problematic in translation when the sender and receiver do not share this mutual cognitive environment and as with Grice’s CP there is no room for a third party mediator. Sperber and Wilson (1987: 700) explain that an intention to make something manifest is indicated by means of ‘ostention’ or pointing something out in terms of drawing attention to what is relevant:

_The communicator produces a stimulus which makes it mutually manifest to communicator and audience that the communicator intends, by means of this stimulus, to make manifest or more manifest to the audience a certain set of assumptions._ (Italics in original)

Communication, moreover, is a matter of degree as assumptions may be more or less manifest. However, how it becomes more manifest is down to the receiver as even receivers with a mutually shared cognitive environment may not all understand the same thing (1987: 700). Central to the idea of relevance is contextual effect. ‘An assumption is relevant in a context, if, and only if, it has some contextual effect in that context’ (1987: 702) and it is processed by ‘a synthesis of old and new information’ (idem). Sperber and Wilson (1987: 703) explain that contextual effects require a processing effort. This is an efficient process where maximum contextual effects are achieved by minimal processing effort. The conditions of relevance are thus the following:

_Extent condition 1: An assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that its contextual effects in that context are large._ (Italics in original)

_Extent condition 2: An assumption is relevant in a context to the extent that the effort required to process it in that context is small._ (Italics in original)

It is via mental short cuts that hearers are able to pick out relevant information, drawing on contexts which are accessible to them to process new information (1987: 702). If we consider translation in this way, we have an on-going conversation between the source and its translations. As the conversation progresses, further contexts are added to the
initial one. This can perhaps give some insight into (re)translation. The idea of a cost/benefit analysis of maximum effect for minimum effort is also relevant to the theatre as there is clearly a reduced window in which to process the information.

The level of relevance that is presumed considers the interests of both parties in the communication act, which Sperber and Wilson (1987: 704) term optimal relevance, and they thus define the principle of relevance as follows: ‘every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance’, which means that the communicative intention is fulfilled. According to Sperber and Wilson (1987: 704) the first interpretation available which is consistent with the principle of relevance is the one that is selected, and if it is the one intended then the communication is successful. They further explain how the principle of relevance differs from Grice’s CP and maxims which they feel are norms which can be violated for effect whereas the speaker and hearer do not need to know the principle of relevance in order to communicate, they do not consciously follow it and are, therefore, not able to violate it (1987:704).

As with Austin and Grice, the question is whether relevance theory can be applied to literature. Gutt (1992: 52) argues that Relevance theory is applicable to literature as the author invites the reader to explore the cognitive environment they provide. In the ‘Open Peer Commentary’ at the end of the ‘Precis of Relevance: Communication and Cognition’ Clark (1987: 715) argues that relevance theory cannot be applied to literature due to the two domains or layers that fiction contains; relevance cannot go beyond the surface level. Raboui (1987: 729) disagrees, arguing that relevance is useful due to the contextual effects/processing effort factors and is particularly interesting for the analysis of style.\footnote{Boase-Beier (2004) applies Relevance theory to the analysis of the translation of style.} In their author response to these questions Sperber and Wilson (1987: 751) maintain that their theory can deal with layering, as ‘a first-level act of ostensive communication can serve as an ostensive stimulus for a second level act of ostensive communication’ and that fiction as ostensive communication can ‘achieve relevance
through a vast array of weak effects, rather than through a ‘meaning’ or a ‘message’ (1987: 751). However, regarding the existence of various interpretations at the same time, they maintain that ‘an utterance cannot have more than one interpretation consistent with the principle of relevance’ (1987: 739). They are, therefore, unable to account for the same person being simultaneously aware of different interpretations. How does relevance deal with figurative language then? In order to explain how poetic effects work with regards to relevance, Sperber and Wilson give an example of ‘my childhood days are gone’ and ‘my childhood days are gone, gone’ (1987: 706-707). They explain that the repetition of ‘gone’ causes extra processing effort, however, this can be justified as it achieves some extra effect. The hearer expands the context in order to understand the many weak implicatures that are produced concerning the repetition of the word ‘gone’. However, I think that repetition could also reinforce an utterance, so that redundancy rather than creating a poetic effect as in Sperber and Wilson’s example, could be used to ensure uptake by effectively reducing processing effort, which is particularly pertinent to the performance text. Moreover, colour can be used to achieve maximum effect with minimum processing effort as it has an immediate visual impact.

Metaphors are often used to explain complex concepts to make them more accessible, which would be in line with the principle of relevance. However, Lorca’s use of metaphor is ambiguous with multiple interpretations, so how can the principle of relevance explain these types of metaphors? For Sperber and Wilson (1987: 708) metaphors do not require any particular interpretive procedures, they are thus the same in this respect as other utterances. However, they state that ‘[a] good creative metaphor is precisely one in which a variety of contextual effects can be retained and understood as weakly implicated by the speaker’ (1986: 236). The writer thus triggers the contextual effects but it is the hearer who has the responsibility of discovering them (1986: 237). Bach and Hamish (1987: 711) challenge Sperber and Wilson’s insistence that it is the first interpretation that the addressee takes as the one that was intended, asking how other inferences get through if the addressee only goes to the first, most relevant interpretation? This is clearly problematic for Lorca’s metaphors as there are multiple
interpretations and different audiences will be able to reach some or all of those inferences.

There are obvious challenges to Sperber and Wilson’s theory of relevance, such as how contextual effects and processing effort are measured. On the one hand, Sperber and Wilson treat metaphor as any other type of language but, on the other hand, recognise that metaphors can produce a series of weak implicatures which may take longer to process; but this is acceptable if there is a greater contextual effect. Yet, they also claim that the addressee takes the first relevant interpretation as the intended one, which does not accord with their discussion of metaphor. Gutt (1992: 61) also makes the point that a crucial factor for figurative language is that the same cognitive environment is available to both the communicator and the receiver. This may often not be the case when two languages are involved.

Gutt (1992: 15-17) applied Relevance theory to Bible translation arguing that it is a sharp analytical tool for translation as it can provide a deeper understanding of the ST and thus allow for better translation solutions. Gutt recognises the challenges of translation where the target text context may be so far removed that contextual effects are not achieved and the audience is unaware of what the intention was, so that the translation provides unfamiliar information which has few contextual effects (Gutt 1992: 28-29). This assumes that unfamiliar information does not have contextual effects and implies that translation should remove information that is unfamiliar. Gutt (1992: 30-31) argues that as there may be a contextual gap between the original and that available to the receiving audience, a translation should be optimally relevant in the current receiving context. However, this denies readers the experience of a new, different context. As a proposed solution Gutt (1992: 32) suggests that ‘[m]aterials need to be prepared that will help the receptor audience derive sufficient contextual effects in the cognitive environment they live in so that they can relate the text to their own lives’.

Gutt (1992: 42) explains that the principle of relevance ‘heavily constrains the translation with regard to both what it is intended to convey and how it is expressed’. It should resemble the original in terms of adequate relevance to the audience, providing
them with adequate contextual effects, without additional processing effort. The idea of adequate contextual effects is clearly vague.

Gutt (1992: 61) envisages two strategies which could be applicable to translation: ‘direct versus indirect speech quotations’, where direct quotation is a ‘reproduction of the original stimulus’ (Gutt 1992: 62) whereby the properties of the original are preserved so that the audience can get to its full meaning. He considers this the most risk free strategy as it avoids misunderstandings. However, whether the receiver is able to reach the interpretation that the speaker intends them to reach will depend on whether the text is processed using the same contextual assumptions as the original, so it gives ‘potential access to the authentic meaning of the original’ (Gutt 1992: 62). On the other hand, the indirect quotation method does not require the same context as it is addressee-oriented (Gutt 1992: 64). Gutt (1992: 65) points out that when it comes to translation we do not have the ‘same mechanical means of reproduction’, however, it is possible, by producing a stimulus in the target language which communicates all the implications intended by the source author, to produce a ‘complete interpretive resemblance’ to the original. To succeed, this stimulus needs to be processed by means of the context that was envisaged by the original author, this will then ensure that there is optimal relevance for the target receiver. Gutt (1992: 66) terms this ‘direct translation’. However, he stresses that it is a presumption of resemblance as there is no guarantee (Gutt 1992: 66). There are obvious constraints, as he points out (Gutt 1992:66), as to whether the linguistic structures of the target language allow for the construction of the stimulus and whether the target audience are able to use the original context.

Access to the contextual assumption of the original author is key here, as the less the receivers have access to the original context, the less the translation will resemble the original. This is independent of whether the translation is literal or not. Gutt is assuming that translation is unable to meet the gap between the contextual effects of the original and the target audience, based on the gap between their contextual assumptions. However, he is clearly referring to Bible translation where the distance between the
original text and the receiver is great. He thus suggests that additional materials are
needed to allow the target receiver to see the relevance of the original to their lives
today. In terms of the translation of the rural trilogy, the temporal distance between
the original and the target receiver is not so great but there are still many specific
cultural references which are unfamiliar to the target reader/audience. Co-text in the
form of introduction, notes or footnotes in the drama text can fill this informational gap
and provide those contextual assumptions. This is clearly not so easy for the
performance text although the programme can provide additional information. In the
case of The House of Bernarda Alba at The Crescent Theatre in Birmingham, the audio-
visual before the play provided background information about the author.

Gutt (1992: 68) advocates that translation alone is not able to provide all the objectives
of scripture translation and, therefore, the contextual gap needs to be bridged in other
ways. Not only does this gap need to be bridged at the level of original context and target
context but that translator intentions need to match audience expectation. How does
the translator know what their audience expect? Gutt (1992: 68-69) argues that
translators make assumptions about the type of translation expected. However, this is
always the case as there is no pre-dialogue between translator and audience and it
would be, in most cases, impossible to establish one. There is, of course, often a dialogue
between translator and commissioner which can be in the form a translation brief, and
in the theatre the rehearsal is clearly a way of establishing a pre-dialogue with a
presumed audience, as the text is tried and tested by the director and actors before
finalising the production. Gutt’s (1992: 70) suggestion of presenting the audience with
different translations, explaining the advantages and disadvantages of each, could be
possible in an experimental translation research project, but is clearly not viable under
the normal circumstances in which translation is produced. Moreover, it will still only
relate to the subjective opinions of a reduced group of receivers. Gutt (1992: 71) does
suggest more viable options to bridge the contextual gap such as the use of explication
within the text, study notes and other separate background materials, which it may not
be the job of the translator to provide. Johnston provides comprehensive notes in his
translations of *Blood Wedding* and *Yerma*, which could be conceived as establishing a
dialogue with the reader and also the director.

Gutt (1992: 75) explains how different types of translations can suit different audiences.
A freer translation would be easier for those with little background knowledge and a
closer one would be more suitable for those with more indepth knowledge. This places
the receiver to the fore in the communicative act and distinguishes between different
types of receivers, with different needs. However, it undermines the audience’s ability
to process new contextual information which, in the case of a play, may be the very
reason they have chosen to read it or watch it. Moreover, while study editions are
available to meet the needs of one type of audience, the plays under consideration here
are fulfilling two functions as drama text and as performance text.

The main advantage of Relevance theory seems to me to be the insights it provides into
the need for translators to stimulate contextual effects in the receiver, both on the page
and on the stage. It can also helpfully address the ephemeral nature of the stage as
translators may need to provide ways of compensating for the medium of delivery, and
it can thus offer a useful framework for understanding performability, both in terms of
producing contextual effects verbally and non-verbally.

3.6.4 (Re)translation and (re)performance as refraction

As discussed in Chapter One, there are many (re)translations and (re)performances of
the rural trilogy in English. According to the retranslation hypothesis, ‘later translations
tend to be closer to the source text’ (Chesterman 2004: 8). In the case of the rural trilogy,
we can dismiss this view as the closeness or over-literalness of the first translations were
considered an obstacle to their comprehensibility and performance and subsequent
translations have attempted to address these shortcomings. Lefevere (1984: 139-140)
sees (re)translation as refraction, along with any form of rewriting a text for a new
audience, whether it be (re)translation, the production of a play or film, literary criticism,
anthologies, teaching materials etc. All of these multiple refractions are produced under
the constraints of the system of which they form a part. Refraction is defined in physics
as ‘the fact or phenomenon of light, radio waves, etc. being deflected in passing obliquely through the interface between one medium and another or through a medium of varying density’ (Oxford dictionaries online) or through a prism where a single white light is refracted into different colours. This seems a useful metaphor to apply to (re)translation because it allows us to conceptualise translations as multiple versions, differing to varying degrees, radiating out from one source text. The degree of difference is often related to the medium, so that a film or a play based on the translation of a novel may vary more from the original than the written translation of the same novel might. Moreover, refraction allows us to view these versions as multiple responses which can all have an equal status as representations of the source text. For Lefevere (1984: 129) refraction is ‘the cultural strategy that becomes operational when a text belonging to another culture is rewritten in such a way as to become acceptable to the patron, or patronage groups dominating the receiving culture at a certain point in time’. He thus connects it to power and a way of determining which authors are admitted into the target system and which are not, and even those authors who are admitted may only be known for specific works (Lefevere (1984: 140). This is true of Lorca’s status in the UK insofar as his fame here is constructed almost solely around the rural trilogy, particularly in the minds of the general public.

Similarly, Johnston (2007a: 263) feels that translation is a prism through which the translator should unleash the text rather than trying to fix it in a similar way that Lorca himself unleashed his plays:

[...] Lorca unleashed plays, like Blood Wedding, Yerma, and The House of Bernarda Alba. These are plays that opened up new spaces within their own theatrical contexts, both in terms of a force of language with which Lorca sought to counter a perceived crisis in contemporary theatrical writing, and of the public expression of hitherto closeted manifestations of sexuality identity. When we come to translate Lorca it is this explosive occupation of new spaces that must concern us as translators.
Lefevere’s concept of ‘refraction’ points to a target-oriented approach to translation. As stated, it is a useful concept when studying the translation of Lorca’s rural trilogy, as it allows a consideration of these plays in their multiple forms (on the page and on the stage), and as multiple refractions radiating out from one source over space and time. Additionally, there is a multiplicity within the source text itself as Lorca repeats themes and symbols that he has used in his other plays and poetry, and the three plays are connected in many ways through these themes and symbols, particularly with reference to his use of colour, as discussed. In terms of the translated text, this multiplicity can also been seen in the staging of the plays, where one play may contain elements from or inspired by the other plays, for example, in the performance of *Blood Wedding* at Kentwell Hall on 2nd May 2014, the use of masks reminds us of the Female and Male Masks in *Yerma* and the use of puppets to represent the Moon and the Beggar Woman, is reminiscent of Lorca’s own puppet plays. Likewise, the addition of the weaving of the rope scene in the production of *The House of Bernarda Alba* at The Crescent Theatre, Birmingham on 15th June 2014 was a deliberate echo of the weaving scene in the original text of *Bodas de sangre*. These refractions thus become multi-layered, influenced by each other and in turn influencing further refractions.

Refraction can thus be connected with performativity as it is a way of performing upon the source text and creating multiple responses to it, which can be both in the form of the written text and the text on the stage. In this way, performativity is connected with creative production rather than reproduction.

3.6.5 Conclusions regarding performativity

It is clear that the concept of performativity can be related to the idea of translation as a new ‘production’ rather than an old ‘reproduction’; it is an action that does ‘something’ to the target receiver rather than simply conveying source-text information. The idea of authorship and translation is thus reconceptualised as the translator is no longer seen in the traditional view as a message transmitter but as an active cultural agent who is creative in their own right. Metaphor exemplifies this performativity, as it brings together different concepts which are not usually related and thus is creative.
rather than reproductive. Lorca’s use of the colour metaphor is creative on many levels as discussed in Chapter One. Moreover, performativity is a particularly important concept with regards to the type of translation being examined in this study.

As has been discussed, performativity can also allow a reconceptualisation of the translator as as an actor/performer rather than a conveyor/transmitter. This challenges the concept of the translator as a violent destroyer or appropriator. Performativity also challenges those who see the translator in the passive, secondary role of negotiator/mediator/channeller of information. This reconceptualisation means that the translator can take centre stage on an equal footing with the source author and be viewed as a creative actor upon the text. Performativity thus makes the translator more visible, as desired by Venuti (1995, 2008). It moves the translator from the periphery to the centre in the translation process.

However, we also need to consider the role of the director. Is the relationship between director and translator a dialectical one? In some cases there may be active collaboration or, in other cases, the drama text is the only connection between the two, and the translation may have been written many years before the performance is to be staged. In this case, does the director make themselves more visible and push the translator back to that role of secondary mediator? Whereas, when the translator actively collaborates with the director in the production of the performance text, is the relationship more equal? Thus, tension may not only exist in the relationship between the drama text and the performance text but also in the relationship between the people who act upon it at different times.

Performativity is thus a useful concept but it does not yet appear to be a fully defined framework. The application of the concept in this study will help to define what performativity is and how it can be useful for the exploration of the relationship between the drama text and performance text, and contribute to the source-target debate.
3.7 Conclusion

It becomes clear from a review of the literature that both the theory and the practice of theatre translation are complex, a complexity aptly described by Bassnett’s (1985: 95) metaphor of the ‘labyrinth’, implying a tortuous path leading to many dead-ends. The existence of two forms of the same text and the ephemeral nature of performance itself highlights this complexity. However, perhaps this labyrinthine complexity is more on a theoretical level than on a practical one as translated plays are performed all the time, often very successfully.

An evaluation of the debates within the field has shown that such concepts as Venuti’s (1995, 2008) domestication/foreignisation are not sufficiently nuanced to account for all types of translation strategies, particularly in a text such as Lorca’s with its depth of meaning. Equally, approaches which aim to classify texts into typologies or systems prove problematic due to the complex nature of the texts involved. However, it is important to consider the drama text (written text) and the performance text (the text in performance) as two different forms refracting out from the same source. These two different forms have different demands which implies there is a dialectical relationship existing between the two, as Bassnett (1998: 90) attests. In order to explore this relationship, the traditional model for theatre, semiotics was discussed. It is clear that semiotics can be limiting, although it may be useful in helping to evaluate the page to stage process, in particular, how written signs become non-verbal signs and whether these are inherent in the drama text or whether they are added in the performance. This led to a discussion of performability and the gestic text where again a clear division can be seen between those who refute the existence of the gestic text and those who advocate its existence. The discussion of performativity and a consideration of Austin’s speech-act theory, Grice’s implicature and the CP, and Relevance theory and its application to translation showed each to be useful to some degree. Finally, refraction was discussed as a way of viewing the multiple versions of the same text which affords the drama text and the performance text the same status. Performativity is not a fully developed framework but it promises a way to move beyond the traditional source-versus-target debate.
Chapter 4 Methodology and model of analysis

4.1 Rationale and research questions

In Chapter One, I explain that colour had been chosen as a focus for my analysis of Lorca’s plays for several reasons. Firstly, it is an important element in both Lorca’s poetry and plays as it takes on a metaphorical meaning that goes beyond the referential, pictorial or poetic. This metaphorical meaning is both a comment on society of the time and is also related to Lorca’s own particular brand of theatre. In Chapter One, I analyse Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour through a series of examples taken from the written STs of the rural trilogy plays drawing on scholarly work in cultural studies underpinned by work in the field of metaphor research. These observations led to the formulation of the first research question as to how the linguistic/referential, socio-cultural and symbolic layers present in the STs are dealt with in translation.

In Chapter Two, I discuss the rural trilogy in translation. An analysis of the comments made by the translators shows that, while there was a desire to portray the world created in the STs, the notion of performability was cited as an important concern. Moreover, some of the translators had worked with directors and seen their translations evolve as part of the staging process. A review of the literature showed that performability was a contentious term that escaped a robust definition. It is related to terms such as speakability which for some equates with ease of articulation (Levy 1963), 2011: 128) while others consider that the text does not have to be easy to speak to make it performable (Aaltonen 2000: 43). According to Bassnett (1998: 90-92, 96) making the text performable is beyond the translators’ remit. Moreover, she considers such that terms such as performability tend to be used as a justification for making changes to the text (Bassnett 1991: 105). Pavis (1992: 44) argues that the responsibility for the performance lies in the hands of the director while Johnston (2011: 23) believes that the translator should provide the director with some sort of basis on which the performance can be built. As discussed in Chapter Three, the debate regarding whether performability is contained in the text itself can be related to the existence, or otherwise, of the so-called gestic text. While such a view can be related to an
understanding of the written text as a series of semiotic codes, it implies a decoding in performance. Bassnett ((1980) 2002: 130) in the 1980s held this view of the written text containing a coded gestural patterning, but later she refuted it (Bassnett 1991: 99-100, 1998: 92).

The relationship between the actor’s body and text is also seen as important for the stage performance. Pavis (1992: 138) puts forward the term ‘language body’ to describe a combination of speech and gesture while Robinson (2003: 70-71) argues for the embodied performance drawing on somatic theory. The embodied performance is expressed externally with stress, intonation and gesture, and internally by the feelings and emotions created using certain words. I argued for the definition of the gestic text as not just the physical acting out of the text by the actors but also as a production of meaning.

I argue in Chapter Three that these conflicting viewpoints provide no stable definition of the term performability and speakability. However, as a starting point, the notions of the gestic text and speakability can perhaps be placed under the umbrella of performability. In addition, the challenge of the ephemeral nature of the text in performance needs to be taken into account in any discussion of performability. It is thus envisaged that the analysis carried out in this study will add to our understanding of these terms and the relationships between them. In addition to the notion of performability, the literature on theatre translation also indicates recent trends which are related to the notion of performativity. This concept was also found to be lacking a robust definition in the field of Translation Studies.

The observations from Chapter Three thus led to the addition of the layer of ‘performability’ to the first research question. The first research question is formulated as follows:

1. How has colour metaphor been translated from linguistic, socio-cultural, symbolic and performable perspectives?

It is important to point out here that the linguistic, socio-cultural and symbolic
perspectives are all source-driven, whereas, the ‘performable perspective’ is target-driven. However, the two are obviously interrelated.

Bassnett’s (1998: 90) view that the relationship between the written text and the performance of that text is a dialectic one led to the formulation of the second research question, as follows:

2. What does the translation of colour metaphor in the drama text and the performance text reveal about the relationship between the two in terms of performability and performativity?

These research questions, in turn, led to the third research question concerning what the solutions employed by the translators when translating Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour reveal about ownership/authorship in translation. The third research question is thus formulated as follows:

3. What can a study of performativity tell us about the concept of authorship/ownership in translation?

It is envisaged that through the three research questions outlined above this study will add to our understanding of the concepts of both performability and performativity and their place in the theory of the translation of plays.

4.2 The Corpus

4.2.1 The source texts (STs):

The STs consulted in this study are those published in Obras Completas II, Teatro (1997).

4.2.2 The target texts (TTs):

There are many (re)translations in English of Lorca’s rural trilogy as the list below shows. I compiled this list by online google searches for the terms Blood Wedding, Yerma and The House of Bernarda Alba in English, supplemented by consulting the British Library Catalogue online. Some of the translations listed form part of collected works with the other plays of the rural trilogy or with other translated plays by Lorca. Texts that are self-
proclaimed ‘versions’ rather than ‘translations’ are marked with an asterisk. This list does not take into account any online translations/versions of the plays. The translations are listed in chronological order by date of first publication except for Langston Hughes’s and W.S. Merwin’s translations which were written many years before they were published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blood Wedding</th>
<th>Date published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston Hughes</td>
<td>1994, originally written in 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Graham-Luján &amp; Richard O’Connell</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Bradbury</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Hughes * (version)</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynne Edwards 6</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dewell &amp; Carmen Zapata</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Kennelly * (version)</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Edmunds</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Ronder * (version)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The British Library Catalogue also contains a copy of David Hare’s version of The House of Bernarda Alba, which was prepared using a literal translation by Simon Scardifield, as discussed in Chapter Three, and a copy of Pam Gems’s adaptation of Yerma, also referred to in Chapter Three. These have not been included on this list as they used a literal translation before they were adapted. It is also worth noting that the text used in Simon Stone’s production at the Young Vic in 2016, starring Billie Piper, referred to in Chapter Two, is now available from Amazon. In 2017, all three plays translated by a Laurent Paul Sueur, which are also available from Amazon, have not been taken into consideration when compiling this list as they have only become available this current year.

6 There are also student editions of Gwynne Edwards’s translations of Blood Wedding and The House of Bernarda Alba.
In order to draw up a definite list of translations to be analysed, the following criteria were used. Firstly, although the translations by Graham-Luján & O’Connell were the first authorised for publication and worthy of study for that reason, I decided not to analyse

---

7 A representative from Nick Hern books informed me that a collection of the rural trilogy is forthcoming with translations of all three plays by Jo Clifford (email communication 10th January 2017).
them because some analysis of these translations was carried out in Chapter Two, along with a discussion of other scholars’ critiques of these translations.

Secondly, as space restrictions will not permit an extensive analysis of all the texts identified it has been necessary to limit the corpus of drama texts to four translations of each play. I have applied five criteria in the selection process. I have chosen plays:

1. which are deemed to be ‘translations’ rather than ‘versions’ or ‘adaptations’ as per the title cover. Perteghella (2004: 15) argues that the term ‘version’, along with the term ‘imitation’, is an ‘extreme form of adaptation, or indeed a considerable rewriting’, and thus these types of texts have been excluded.
2. which represent different time periods.
3. translated by translators with diverse profiles.
4. which are the most well-known published translations in printed book format, and therefore those texts which are most likely to be read and/or performed.
5. which are texts used in the performances that form part of the corpus (see below). The exception to this is the performance of *Blood Wedding* by Theatrical Niche, which was prepared using several unidentified translations.⁸

In line with the criteria stated above, I decided to analyse texts by the following translators.


---

⁸ The producer explained this in the Question and Answer session that took place at the end of the performance on 2nd May 2014.
This selection seems to me the most diverse in terms of translator profile and also in terms of time period thus a diversity of data is assured.

The following translations of *Blood Wedding* have, therefore, been chosen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blood Wedding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date published</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston Hughes</td>
<td>1994, originally written 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Bradbury</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynne Edwards</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Langston Hughes’s translation was chosen as a representation of an early translation of the play, as it was originally written in 1938, although it was not published until much later and once it had been tested in performance. Because he is a poet we can also assume that Langston Hughes’s use of language may differ from that of the two academics, Gwynne Edwards and David Johnston. The reason that two texts by academics who are contemporary have been chosen is that Edwards’s and Johnston’s opinions differ with regard to translating Lorca, as discussed in Chapter Two, so their translations are interesting to compare. They are both in print and readily available, and each was written for a particular performance. Gwynne Edwards’s translation is published in a collection entitled *Plays: One. Blood Wedding, Doña Rosita the Spinster, Yerma*, with the translation of *Yerma* in this collection by Peter Luke, whereas *Blood Wedding* and *Doña Rosita the Spinster* are by Gwynne Edwards. Moreover, this edition, published by Bloomsbury, is today one of the most well-known and it is the only English translation of any of the plays of the rural trilogy currently (as of my visit in 2015) for sale at the Lorca House-Museum, *La Huerta de San Vicente*, in Granada.

The Bradbury text has not been used for a particular performance. It was written initially for publication and is, therefore, representative of the drama text with a single function. It is also unusual because, as discussed in Chapter Two despite the strict application of
the copyright laws by the Lorca Estate, Bradbury was able to publish her translation in the 1970s. It is therefore the only published (re)translation that existed until the temporary lapse of copyright in the 1980s. Moreover, it has largely been ignored by scholars.

The following translations of *Yerma* have been chosen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yerma</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date published</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.S. Merwin</td>
<td>1994, originally written 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Bradbury</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Luke</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of *Yerma*, the Peter Luke translation has been chosen because it was the text used for the performance under study; *Yerma* performed at The Lace Market Theatre, Nottingham on 4th July 2015. The David Johnston translation is a good comparison to the Peter Luke one as it was written at a similar time and also for a particular performance. The W.S. Merwin translation is a similar case to the Langston Hughes’s one, written by a poet and published many years after it was written. Again, the Sue Bradbury translation has been chosen as a representation of the drama text. The translation by Ian Macpherson & Jacqueline Minett was excluded because although it was written for a particular performance in 1978, when it was published in 1987 it was presented more as a study version containing the original Spanish text and the English translation on facing pages.

The following translations of *The House of Bernarda Alba* have been chosen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The House of Bernarda Alba</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date published</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Bradbury</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael Dewell & Carmen Zapata 1992
John Edmunds 1997
Jo Clifford 2012

The Jo Clifford translation was chosen because it was the text used for the production of one of the performances under study; *The House of Bernarda Alba* performed at The Crescent Theatre, Birmingham on 15th June 2014. The Bradbury translation was chosen for the same reasons as above\(^9\). The Dewell & Zapata and Edmunds translations extend the diversity of translations considered.

These translations are all published texts which can be classified as drama texts according to the discussion in Chapter Three. Some of the texts have been specifically written for a particular performance. The fact that most of these texts have been tried and tested in performance, in other words, their performability has been tested and possibly proven, makes them an ideal testing ground for studying the nature of performability and performativity.

As explained in Chapter Three, I have adopted a semiotic view of textuality, so I consider the performance text to comprise the written text plus the *mise en scène*, in other words, the text-in-performance. In order to explore the relationship between the written text and the performance on a macro level, three performances were added to the corpus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blood Wedding</td>
<td>Theatrical Niche at Kentwell Hall</td>
<td>2nd May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The House of Bernarda Alba</td>
<td>The Crescent Theatre, Birmingham</td>
<td>15th July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerma</td>
<td>The Lace Market, Nottingham</td>
<td>4th July 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) *The House of Bernarda Alba* translated by Sue Bradbury was used for a radio play (personal communication 2017).
These were chosen because they are all recent performances that have been available to watch first-hand, so from a pragmatic point of view they offer an up-to-date representation, or refraction, of the text in performance. Aaltonen (2000) considers theatre as being ‘the here and now’ and, therefore, I thought it important and necessary to analyse recent representations. Moreover, these performances took place in and around the Midlands rather than being London-based so they could be considered peripheral.

4.3 The data

The data was compiled after a manual comparative analysis was carried out of the STs and the TTs listed above, in relation to the metaphorical use of colour in the STs. This comparative analysis identified a number of ‘shifts’ (Catford 1965) between the STs and the TTs. Due to the complexity of the texts involved, a considerable overlap was found between examples, therefore, in order to analyse this data coherently, it was grouped into the following categories:

Concrete objects: sheep, the horse, the Moon
Natural elements: water, the sun, heat/cold
The abstract: the sterility of society, cleanliness, silence, the body

Although the analysis is source-led, it focuses on the solutions translators have adopted and how new connections have been established with the audience, both in the drama texts and the performance texts.

4.4 Methodology

Chapter Three shows that there is no one definitive model that can address all the complexities involved in the translation of this type of texts. Thus, a model was devised that brings together different strands from different theoretical frameworks. This model seeks to peel back these layers of meaning, and with it, I aim to explore the different layers of translation as not just a linguistic exercise but one related to its cultural context.
and, additionally, the specific case of performance and how the written word becomes part of the performance or pre-empts the potential performance. There is an important connection between the use of colour metaphor in the source text and what the translation of it achieves. The analysis, therefore, will consider the written text (defined as ‘the drama text’) and several performances (defined as ‘performance texts’), focusing specifically on Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour and how this has been conveyed in translation, on a micro and macro level in both mediums. As discussed in Chapter Three, I use the concept of refraction (Lefevere 1982, 1984) which allows me to consider all translations as ‘refractions of’, or ‘responses to’, the same source text both on the page and on the stage. As different representations of the STs, all translations, whatever the medium, are considered of equal status. This does not imply that all these responses are equal in terms of success, but an evaluation of their success is beyond the scope of this study.

The manual comparative analysis carried out of the STs and the TTs identified a number of ‘shifts’ (Catford 1965: 73-82). When analysing the shifts found, I adopted a ‘bottom-up’ approach, which is viable from a practical perspective because by looking at the micro-level first it is easier to reach conclusions on the macro-level. While a ‘bottom-up’ approach has been criticised (Pym 2009: 64-66) for presupposing stability of meaning, I apply it as a starting point for the analysis before shifts observed at a micro-level are analysed within the wider context moving the analysis from the level of the word and sentence, and taking into account the situational context of the metaphor, on to the level of the context of the utterance and the text as a whole, and in some cases beyond to the context of reception.

4.5 The Model of analysis

The Model consists of a set of criteria which have been applied to the target texts in a comparative analysis with the source texts. I follow the DTS (Descriptive Translation Studies) stance of observing/describing rather than criticising translation and, following Lefevere (1982), the translations are not rated or ranked in any way but rather these criteria are used as a method for observing phenomena relating to the translational act.
Although errors or differences are highlighted and alternative translations are suggested, where appropriate, the reader is left to make up their own minds regarding which are the ‘better’ translations. In this way, this analysis is based around what translation ‘does’ rather than what it ‘is’.

As discussed above, the analysis consists of two distinct levels: a micro-level which aims to look at the linguistic structures of the drama text; and a macro-level which aims to consider the wider cultural context in which the translation takes place and the actual performance itself.

4.5.1 Micro-level (of the written text)

The levels are as follows:

*Linguistic level/referential level*

This level considers how the translators have dealt with Lorca’s metaphors on the linguistic level of what Austin (1962) terms the locution. It assesses whether translators use literal translation (by literal I refer to Vinay & Darbelnet’s (1958, 1995: 130) definition of ‘the direct transfer of a SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text’) or adopt other solutions determined by the other layers. According to Lefevere (1992: 17) the translator should only be concerned with the illocutionary level as this is the most problematic area for translators, they should be able to deal with the ‘locutionary’ level without any problem. However, I would argue that the illocutionary level depends on the locution, so they cannot be separated.

*Socio-cultural level*

Lorca’s use of metaphor, as determined in Chapter One, is not just decorative, it is pictorial and, above all, functional. It often works on a socio-cultural level, so that it is a comment on the society of the time; a rural, oppressed, male-dominated Catholic society constructed on strict codes of honour and conformity. Can the translations portray this element of Lorca’s social comment?
**Symbolic level**

This is the layer where the seemingly straightforward meaning takes on a deeper metaphorical one relating to Lorca’s brand of theatre. It is essentially circular, as the plays revolve around themselves, so that there is a connection between images and colours evoked or words uttered at the beginning and at the end of the plays. In terms of dramatic effect, this layer is important for the translation to be able to portray a connection between utterances and imagery. There are also non-verbal metaphors within the text, such as the use of personification, and some of the characters themselves are metaphorical representations. Other non-verbal metaphors are also present in the visual and acoustic effects evoked and those contained within the stage directions.

The linguistic level, the socio-cultural level and the symbolic levels are analysed by means of Austin’s (1962) notion of locution, illocution and perlocution, and Grice’s (1975) Implicature.

**Performability**

This level relates to translation solutions adopted by the translators in order to achieve a level of performability, or potential performability, within the written text. As identified, the ephemerality of the text on stage is closely related to performability. I use Sperber and Wilson’s Relevance Theory (1986, 1987) in order to explore the idea of achieving maximal contextual effects for minimal processing effort. This is important on stage because whereas a reader can take their time to re-read parts of the text, the performance of the text on stage has a limited window in which to present the play to its audience.

It is necessary to point out that the levels mentioned above overlap and choices made on one level inevitably have an effect on the other levels. Equally, it may not always be possible to analyse each level in every individual case. It is also necessary to consider the connection between individual examples and the text as a whole, as many images interconnect to create a whole.
4.5.2 Macro-level

Cultural context

On a macro-level it is necessary to consider the translation within its context. We have already explored the idea of the socio-cultural level within the source text and what this can mean for the target text in linguistic terms. However, it is also necessary to consider the cultural context of the translation. Aaltonen (2000: 28) states that translations:

[...] are always context generated, and therefore a correlation exists between the discourse of the translated texts and their linguistic, sociocultural and theatrical context.

This level can be particularly complex to analyse as there can be a considerable gap between the time of the production and the time of the reception of the translation. The performance of Yerma at The Lace Market Theatre in Nottingham in 2015 used the Peter Luke translation which was written in 1987 for a particular performance. We thus have three different contexts to consider, that of 1930s Spain, Britain in the late 1980s and Britain in 2015. How do all these contexts connect together? This question can be explored by drawing on the idea of refraction in that the two contexts connect through a [re]performance. I also draw on Peirce’s (1940) notion of the interpretant here as applied by Venuti in his ‘hermeneutic model’ (2010) to explore how translators apply interpretants in translation that signify in the context of reception.

The performance

In order to assess the other refraction of the text, the performance text, it is necessary to add another aspect to the model that will aim to look at the performance at a macro-level. This level will analyse the performance not just at the level of the text (i.e. the spoken word) but also the non-verbal elements that may be inherent in the text and how these may be added, removed or new ones created. This will serve to highlight the tensions between the written text and the text in performance and explore the relationship between the two, both in presence and absence. This level will be analysed
using Peirce’s semiotics (1940) and Grice’s notion of implicature (1975) to explain how linguistic signs of the colour metaphor within the written text, both those which are explicit, relating to the stage directions, and those which are implicitly embedded within the drama text, become the theatrical signs of the performance. In this way, the relationship between the drama text and the performance text is explored and there is a connection with the level of performability within the drama text.

The Model can thus be mapped as follows:

**Micro-level**: analyses the language of the written text and its performance/potential for performance. Compares source to target on the following levels:

- Linguistic/referential
- Socio-cultural
- Symbolic
- Performability

**Macro-level**

- Cultural context (how a connection is made between the context of reception and that of production).
- Performance (analysis of the performance of the text drawing on three performances).

The two levels of the Model, the micro-analysis and the macro-analysis, serve to provide a Model which is able to not only address the levels present in Lorca’s use of colour metaphor but, in addition, address the more general levels that are present when translating a text of this type, a text which has to be a linguistic, cultural and performable product that connects the past context to the present context.

### 4.6 Limitations and criticisms of the Model

One of the constraints of a model of this type that is immediately evident is the fact that it is primarily text-based, it therefore appears to give the text a reverential status over
the performance. As discussed in Chapter Three, one of the criticisms of past studies of theatre translation is that the play was treated as if belonging to the field of literary studies rather than the field of theatrical studies due to a dominance of the written text. It could, therefore, appear that taking the written (literary) aspect of the performance as a point of departure indicates a bias in favour of the text over the performance. However, while it is recognised that the text is not the only element of performance, it is the point of departure in that the performance ultimately starts with the text and after the performance is finished it is the only part that remains. It is true that a performance may remain in our memories, and possibly as a recording but essentially the text is usually the only physical remnant of that performance, in terms of it being a permanent prompt to the experience of that performance. Therefore, in order to be able to explore the relationship between the text and the performance, and thus better define performativity, we have to start with the first manifestation of the performance, which is the text. As I argued in Chapter Three by considering the gestic as inherent within the text we reinstate the text to a central position as it drives the performance while other factors such as lighting and costume add to the performance in different ways. Moreover, as discussed in Chapter Three, performativity is not only present in staged performances but also in the written text; and by considering all the texts involved, drama texts and performance texts, as refractions or different responses to one source, the written text and the performance of that text can be conferred equal status.
Chapter 5 Analysis of concrete objects

5.1 General introduction to analysis chapters

In Chapter One, I discussed how Lorca creates a complex web with his metaphorical use of colour, and how multiple layers of meaning are present. I argued that colour acts as a cohesive device or a ‘grammar of colour’ linking images internally within each play through direct reference, inference or association, and externally as it acts as a connection between the plays. As discussed, Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour is both aesthetic and functional as it not only refers to the natural world it portrays but also serves to comment on society and, moreover, it portrays the inner struggle of the individual against the ideas somatically programmed into them by the patriarchal, repressive, religious, violent, superstitious society in which they live. The individual’s inner struggle is often portrayed as affecting the body, so that words and emotions become a physical infliction while society demands the body’s silence. Those who are unable to silence the body and maintain respectability in terms of ‘honra’ (honour) seem doomed to a tragic end.

The complexity within the original plays is great as many layers of meaning are present. Moreover, access to Lorca’s symbolism is further complicated by his use of densely poetic language, often in the form of verse and song, particularly in Bodas de sangre and Yerma. The translator thus has the task of dealing with multiple layers of meaning and, at the same time, must strive to produce a text which can serve as a script (or potential script) for performance.

In order to analyse how these multiple layers of meaning are addressed in translation, the analysis section of the study consists of three chapters (Chapters Five-Seven), followed by a final discussion chapter (Chapter Eight). In Chapter Five, examples have been classified relating to concrete objects starting with sheep and the horse, then moving on to Lorca’s symbolic use of the Moon, predominately in Bodas de sangre. Chapter Six looks at the translation of the natural elements of water (in both its presence and absence), the sun, and the dichotomy of heat and cold, while Chapter Seven
analyses the translation of the interplay between the abstract use of colour, in terms of a sterile society where silence and cleanliness are used to maintain outward appearances and of how the inner emotions of the characters are expressed as physical pain on the body. Examples are taken from the drama texts and the performance texts of all three plays and these three chapters address the first and second research questions:

1. How has colour metaphor been translated from linguistic, socio-cultural, symbolic and performable perspectives?

2. What does the translation of colour metaphor in the drama text and the performance text reveal about the relationship between the two in terms of performability and performativity?

Chapter Eight summarises the findings from the three analysis chapters, and draws on a few general examples identified while carrying out the analysis related to the metaphorical use of colour. Chapter Eight also addresses the third research question, concerning what these findings tell us about authorship and ownership in translation and, in addition, the insights these findings reveal about the notions of performability and performativity.

As stated, the examples, drawn from both the drama texts and the performance texts, are arranged by themes and, in accordance with my definition of text and the concept of refraction, these representations of the TTs are conferred equal status.

In my linguistic analysis, I draw on Vinay & Darbelnet’s (1958, 1995) terminology as a means of describing the translation phenomena on a linguistic level. These terms are:

1. **Literal translation.** Vinay & Darbelnet define this as ‘the direct transfer of a SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text’ (idem: 130). While their concept of an ‘appropriate TL text’ is problematic, I employ the term ‘literal translation’ to mean a replication of the habitual dictionary meaning of a word, or idiomatic expression.
2. **Borrowing.** The use of SL terms in the TL, to either fill a lacuna or add local colour.

3. **Transposition.** Expressing the same meaning by using a different grammatical construction, which can be obligatory due to the grammatical structure of the target language, or optional and used for stylistic reasons.

4. **Modulation.** Change of point of view of the sentence, which can often be a negative turned into a positive

5. **Adaptation.** The SL unit is adapted into a TL equivalent, which may be quite different from the SL unit.

6. **Explicitation.** ‘A stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation.’ (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995:342)

My analysis draws on Austin’s Speech-Act Theory (1962), Grice’s (1975) notion of Implicature, Sperber and Wilson’s Relevance Theory (1986) and Peirce’s (1940) semiotics, in particular, Peirce’s notion of the interpretant as applied by Venuti in his ‘hermenutic model’ (2010). These tools are applied according to the model set out in Chapter Four.

The examples taken from the drama texts are presented in table format, with the ST first referenced as Lorca followed by the page number from OCI, followed by the TTs, the names of the translators included after the utterance under investigation. The translations are ordered according to publication date, with the exception of the translations by Hughes and Merwin where the original date of writing is used instead.

5.2 **Analysis of concrete objects**

5.2.1 Sheep

In Chapter One, an example from *Yerma* of the ‘flood of wool’ (Act Two, Scene One) shows how Lorca creates a metaphor for sexuality and fertility by bringing the alien semantic worlds of ‘flood’ and ‘wool’ together to form a new pictorial image, of sheep moving *en masse*. Moreover, a two-way transfer of properties occurs between these
nouns to evoke on one level this pictorial image of sheep moving quickly, as in a fast flowing river, which in turn creates associations of danger as opposed to the white softness normally associated with the word ‘wool’. The negative aspect of this image as one of danger is reinforced by the situational context in which the utterance appears with the verb ‘arramblar’ along with the rest of the utterance which describes the supposed threat this avalanche of sheep pose to the green wheat, reinforced further in the next utterance where this threatening mass of sheep is described as ‘¡Qué manada de enemigos!’ (What a herd of enemies!). Deeper levels of meaning are activated by the transfer of the property of the colour white of the wool to the flood; so that the image becomes a metaphor for fertility, reinforced by our knowledge that sheep are naturally fertile animals. This is further reinforced by the associations between water and fertility that Lorca exploits in the play, and the irony it expresses in relation to Yerma’s own infertility. Thus the coming together of alien semantic worlds interact to create multiple meaning within the rural context of the play. If we compare the ST to the TTs of the drama texts, we have the following translations. The utterances take place at the beginning of Act Two, Scene One, between the Washerwomen:

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strophe 5: Fifth Washerwoman (Watching)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lavandera 5.ª (Mirando) Van juntos todos los rebaños.</td>
<td>All the flocks are going off together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavandera 4.ª Es una inundación de lana. Arramblan con todo. Si los trigos verdes tuvieran cabeza, temblarían de verlos venir.</td>
<td>It’s a flood of wool. They sweep everything along with them. If the green wheat had a head it would tremble to see them coming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavandera 3.ª ¡Mira cómo corren! ¡Qué manada de enemigos!</td>
<td>Look how they run! What a band of enemies!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lorca: 498

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strophe 5: Fifth Washerwoman (Watching)</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washerwoman 5: All the flocks are going out together.</td>
<td>Washerwoman 4: It’s a flood of wool. They sweep everything along with them. If the green wheat had a head it would tremble to see them coming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merwin: 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIFTH WASHERWOMAN: All the flocks are going off together.
FOURTH WASHERWOMAN: A flood of wool, sweeping aside everything in its path. If the green wheat had eyes it would tremble now to see those flocks approach.

THIRD WASHERWOMAN: Look how fast they’re going! What a hoard of enemies!

FIFTH WOMAN. Look, all the flocks leaving together.

FOURTH WOMAN. It’s like a flood of wool. If that young corn had eyes to see it would be trembling now all right.

THIRD WOMAN. Just look at them run.

WOMAN 5 watching That’s all the flocks out now.

WOMAN 4 The whole countryside’s swimming in wool. Like a white army. If the young corn knew what was coming its way...

WOMAN 5¹⁰ Look, how quick they are … a whole white army on the move.

The utterance of ‘una inundación de lana’ is translated literally by Merwin, Bradbury and Luke, thus allowing the same transfer of properties between the two concepts as in Spanish, which on one level creates the same image of sheep moving en masse. Literal translation also retains the paradoxical metaphor that relates the flood of wool to water, although wool is a fabric that naturally repels water. It is the synergy of these ideas within the context of the play as a whole that creates a metaphor for fertility, which contrasts with Yerma’s sterility. In this way, literal translation activates these different levels of meaning. Merwin, Bradbury and Luke thus work within Lorca’s grammar of colour here by creating the same image as the ST, which has the potential to generate the same implicatures. They thus employ a formal interpretant to generate ST performativity in the TT.

¹⁰ This translation attributes this speech to Woman 5, whereas the ST and other translations attribute it to the Third Washerwoman.
Luke, however, uses a simile as he likens the sheep to a flood of wool rather than stating that they actually are one. While similes can be considered types of metaphors, they are slightly different when it comes to interpretation, as Goatly (1997: 118) explains ‘[s]imiles and overt comparisons are ways of specifying metaphorical interpretations, bringing to light the process of interpretation which is left implicit with metaphors proper’. Similes can thus make the interpretation slightly more immediate, and in this way the translator is aiding audience uptake of the metaphor, influencing the illocutionary effect to some degree. We can thus see how the ephemeral nature of the stage is addressed here, although this may not be a deliberate intention on the part of the translator. This use of the simile is performative in the sense of aiding performability as while it may lessen the literal impact of Lorca’s metaphor, it may aid audience uptake.

Merwin and Bradbury retain the verb ‘arramblar’ by translating it as ‘sweep everything along with them’ and ‘sweeping aside everything in its path’, respectively. As discussed in Chapter One, ‘arramblar’ when related to a flood of water means that it drags everything along with it, with a violent force, and also in the sense of taking everything greedily. Merwin portrays the way in which the water affects whatever is in its way, whereas Bradbury’s choice implies that everything is swept aside rather than taken along. However, the choice of the verb ‘sweep’ in both cases is less able to reach the full illocutionary force of the dangerous sexual image. We are thus able to get to some, but perhaps not all, of the illocutionary effect of this force of nature; a different choice could be made here using ‘engulfing’, which also collocates with water, as for example: ‘engulfing everything in their path’. A choice such as ‘appropriating everything along the way’ may also be able to take us further towards the sexual connotations of the image. However, the register of the words ‘engulfing’ and ‘appropriating’ is rather formal, and the rural speech also needs to be portrayed in a natural way to achieve credibility of characterisation, which is particularly important in terms of performance. This shows how performability through the notion of speakability (or potential speakability), related to the characters speaking convincingly within the rural context of the play, may determine and affect linguistic choice. Another possible option here is ‘taking everything in their path’. The ambiguous double meaning of ‘taking’ in English which, moreover, is
not so formal as ‘engulfing’ or ‘appropriating’, perhaps serves to portray the sexual implications of the original and would thus allow for a greater possibility of uptake on the part of the receiver. Naturally, the actor’s delivery of this speech-act can aid this uptake as stress on the word ‘taking’ can imply innuendo.

Luke’s option to omit the phrase ‘[a]rramblan con todo’ weakens the image as ‘arramblar’ portrays the particular danger the sheep represent when they are a collective force, and moreover helps to take us beyond this to the sexual reference. The reader/spectator is thus left to make their own inferences concerning the danger that a flood of wool might be to the wheat/corn; and the omission in the following line of ‘¡Qué manada de enemigos!’ further reduces the potential for illocutionary uptake on the part of the receiver, although the use of ‘now all right’ can compensate to some extent for these omissions. This text was written for a performance so we can speculate that the translator perhaps omitted these sentences in the interests of time constraints of the stage. However, what happens to the text when it is used subsequently for other performances? It has already been edited for supposed superfluous text as a result of its first performance, and if further edits are made when other performances occur then the distance between the original and the translation becomes greater, and it perhaps becomes more of an adaptation rather than a translation. Translators may make decisions related to practicalities connected to the actual staging of the performance, but which can affect meaning, and this indicates that the theatrical system of the target text can take precedence over strict adherence to the source text. This example suggests that the translator (Luke) considers the ST as a malleable entity, where maximal contextual effects are sought with minimal processing effort, and that the performability of the TT has taken precedence over strict adherence to the ST. Paradoxically, I think that omissions of this type do not aid the illocutionary effect on the stage with its reduced window of uptake.

Johnston’s use of paraphrase to expand the utterance into ‘[t]he whole countryside’s swimming in wool. Like a white army’, changes the subject from the ‘wool’ being described as a ‘flood’ to the ‘countryside’ being described as ‘swimming in wool’. The
property of the colour white of the wool is reinforced in the next line as the sheep are described using a simile, ‘[l]ike a white army’. The connection to water is maintained with ‘swimming’ but there is a disconnection in the following line as ‘swimming’ and ‘army’ do not naturally collocate. It could be said that ‘flood’ and ‘wool’ do not naturally collocate either, however the bringing together of these two ideas serves to create a new image, as discussed, which is able to take us to various levels of meaning, whereas bringing ‘swimming’ and ‘army’ together does not serve to create the same image, despite the reference to water. By likening the ‘flood of wool’ to a ‘white army’, Johnston gives the mass of wool a form or an identity rather than describing the action they carry out. While this notion of the sheep being like soldiers connects to the image Lorca uses later with ‘un río de hombres’ (a river of men) and it does portray the idea of a dangerous charging force with connotations of an invading army, raping and pillaging as they go, it is nevertheless a human force which can also imply a controlled military operation rather than the uncontrollable avalanche of sheep driven by animal instinct. Therefore, the symbolic force of the sexual image of the danger the sheep represent may not be so evident. By giving the sheep human qualities, they become part of a more ordered world rather than a world of unstoppable natural forces. Yerma’s inner struggle could perhaps be described as between the ordered human world and that of the natural world around her. Indeed, Lorca’s rural trilogy is concerned with the inner struggle of the individual and the conventions and norms of society as pre-conditioned in the individual. Like Luke, Johnston omits the reference to ‘arramblar’, leaving the receiver to generate their own implicatures from the trembling of the corn.

Johnston continues the image of the ‘white army’ in the following line with ‘a whole white army on the move’ rather than translating more directly ‘¡Qué manada de enemigos!’ (What a herd of enemies!). His interpretant, in this case, is thus a more thematic than formal one. Johnston (1990: 105) provides a note (21) at the back of the translation which states:
The original Spanish, which refers to a ‘flock of enemies’, is probably an echo of *Don Quixote*, when the bemused knight, mistaking a moving flock of sheep for an enemy army, charges with bloody results.

His translation choices are thus guided by his knowledge of a possible allusion to another text. This gives an indication of how the translator uses intertextuality, being influenced by their own personal reading which can then determine their linguistic choices.

Johnston’s choice of ‘white army’ can create a different image in the mind of the reader/spectator that signifies beyond the context of the play itself. The reference could, for some receivers, allude to the Russian army which was described as the white army at the time of the Russian Revolution in contrast to the ‘red’ Bolsheviks. These connotations are particularly interesting if we consider that this translation was produced in 1990. The late 1980s had seen the emergence of the concepts of *glasnost* and *perestroika* which ultimately led to the end of the cold war and communism in Europe with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. While there is no indication that this may have had any influence on the translator’s choices which, as he himself has stated, were made from a personal interpretation of the text based on a wider literary knowledge, the reader/spectator may make different connections and such connections can often be dependent on the context, not only of the production of the translation but also of the reception. This example illustrates how, in an effort to render one idea, a completely different idea can be created in translation with no obvious connection to the source text. Thus, the target text almost takes on a life of its own and removes itself from the source, not just linguistically but symbolically, and not just in terms of the reproduction of the symbolism that may exist in the source text but equally in terms of unconsciously creating a symbolism or meaning that may not exist in the original. This may help to establish a connection to the target audience, and thus produce a perlocutionary effect upon them, although this may not match the illocutionary intention of the translator. Another observation about this particular example can be made on a socio-cultural level, in that by likening the sheep to an army, we see a detraction from the rural setting and the natural world which is so important in this play.
Lorca’s image is cohesive in the choice of verb and the effect that this flood of wool will have on the green, virginal wheat, whereas in Johnston’s translation rather than a coming together of alien ideas of water and wool we see the clash of the man and nature which might be considered a modernising of the setting, as it takes on urban qualities rather than the rural ones of the original. However, at the same time, the translator is refracting the translation through the source author, so that it may appear to be far removed from the text whereas it actually brings out an image that is hidden and accessible only to those who have a similar knowledge of Lorca’s own literary influences. Thus, while it may appear target-oriented in that it does not replicate the original, it is, paradoxically, source-oriented in this respect. Moreover, the translator provides a footnote in order to explain his translation choices. In this way, he establishes a dialogue with the reader, and draws attention to his literary knowledge in his role as academic, while at the same time justifying his translation choices to other Hispanists in his role as translator.

On a symbolic level, the implicature that may be created through the word ‘arramblar’ (as discussed above) of the sexual threat of this flood of sheep which are moving so quickly that they take everything along with them and pose such a danger to the young, virginal wheat is not reinforced in all of the translations although Johnston’s use of ellipsis in ‘what was coming its way...’ compensates as it allows the reader to realise that something has been left unsaid. In performance, this use of ellipsis could be implicated in the tone of the delivery of the utterance; the use of punctuation here aids actor delivery and the text is thus gestic in this respect. Moreover, the repetition of the words ‘white army’ aids audience uptake as the idea is reinforced, aiding the processing time of the image and thus addressing the ephemerality of the stage. This reveals how performability is addressed in the drama text. The translator is thus revealed as an active agent whose writing practice prioritises the stage performance.

Luke and Johnston substitute the reference to the colour ‘verde’ (green) with the word ‘young’. Rather than allowing the colour, which is not solely referential, to produce the implicatures of young and innocent, the translators provide the receiver with the ready-
made implicature, thus aiding the generation of perlocutionary effect with reduced processing time which is particularly useful for the stage. The translator’s practice here is to choose one interpretant from the range that the word ‘verde’ denotes. However, the receiver is unable to access the image of the interaction of colours between the white flood and the green wheat so that the performativity of Lorca’s grammar of colour is reduced in favour of performability. Yet, paradoxically, performability can also depend on cohesion for dramatic effect, not just on immediacy of uptake. We thus see how performability is both target-oriented in terms of aiding audience uptake, and source-oriented in terms of creating cohesion through the reproduction of the ST’s grammar of colour.

The metaphor of animal instinct is further strengthened by Lorca as this image of the ‘flood of wool’ is connected to the image of a ‘river of men’ in Act Three, Scene Two, which he uses to describe the men that go to the shrine in search of sexual partners. They are described as a river of men coming down the mountains. Just as the sheep are presented as a danger to the green wheat, the men are given this same menacing quality and their connection to water connects them to fertility. As discussed in Chapter One, Fernández-Cifuentes (1984: 304) sees this reference to a river as a calculated metaphor using the idea of opposition between the whiteness, or purity, of blessed water in contrast to the dark, dangerous profane water the men represent. This utterance appears in the last scene of Act Three, when María says:

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Expression</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Un río de hombres solos baja por esas sierras.</td>
<td>There’s a river of single men coming down from the mountains.</td>
<td>Lorca: 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s a river of single men coming down from the mountains.</td>
<td>Merwin: 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A river of men on the loose flowing down the mountains!</td>
<td>Bradbury: 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They’re pouring in from the mountains – the men, and every one of them single.</td>
<td>Luke: 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s a river of men pouring down from the mountain. And all of them looking for just one thing.</td>
<td>Johnston: 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merwin, Bradbury and Johnston all translate ‘[u]n rio de hombres’ literally as ‘a river of men’ thus replicating the image as in the ST. However, Merwin and Johnston use an expletive construction ‘there’ with the contracted verb form of ‘is’ with ‘there’s’. This addition is domesticating in that it ensures naturalness in the translation and lengthens Lorca’s short sentence. This shows the performativity of the translators as they respond to the ST by selecting linguistic signs for the TT that are likely to conform to the expectations of the TL audience, and thus counter previous criticisms of Lorca’s work as stilted and awkward in translation (see discussion in Chapter Two).

Merwin and Luke translate the idea that they are ‘solos’ as ‘single’. The word ‘single’ implies that they are not married, which would habitually be translated as ‘solteros’ in Spanish, whereas the Spanish ‘solos’ in this phrase is more ambiguous, as it would normally translate as ‘alone’, ‘by themselves’, ‘lonely’. However, we know that they are not alone as they are with other men and we assume that they are single (although this may not necessarily be the case). Bradbury deals with this by translating it as ‘on the loose’ to generate the implicature of the original that they are on the rampage. The interpretant she applies here is thus on a thematic rather than a formal level.

Bradbury, Luke and Johnston all translate ‘baja’, rather than the more literal ‘coming down’ as in the original, with habitual collocations of ‘river’ and ‘water’ with ‘flowing’ and ‘pouring’ which adds to the cohesion with the description of the men as a river. Rather than describe the men as a river, Luke employs a word that typically collocates with water, ‘pour’ to create the image of a large group of men moving en masse. Luke uses explicitation as he expands the sentence emphasising that the men are single and thus helping the receiver to generate the implicature; he also addresses speakability as he uses punctuation to replicate natural speech, addressing the level of performability in this way. Johnston omits the word ‘single’ and makes two sentences out of one, the second sentence using explicitation to enhance the possibility of the implicature being generated and reinforcing the symbolism. This is even more explicit than Luke’s offer. The translations by Bradbury, Luke and Johnston, by clarifying the implicature for the receiver, ensure that maximum contextual effects are achieved with minimal processing.
effort, which is particularly useful for the performance text and the ephemeral nature of the medium of the stage. It is interesting that while both Luke and Johnston produced their translations for particular performances, Bradbury did not. Nevertheless, she appears to be striving for a perceived Relevance for the reader, and perhaps pre-empting a potential stage performance.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, there is a reference to sheep that implicates several meanings in the ST. In Act Three, Angustias expresses her concern over Pepe’s behaviour as he appears to be distancing himself from her:

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, there is a reference to sheep that implicates several meanings in the ST. In Act Three, Angustias expresses her concern over Pepe’s behaviour as he appears to be distancing himself from her:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGUSTIAS.</strong> Muchas noches miro a Pepe con mucha fijeza y se me borra a través de los hierros, como si lo tapara una nube de polvo de las que levantan los rebaños.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGUSTIAS:</strong> Sometimes when I stare at Pepe through the railings, he looks blurred, just as if a flock of sheep had passed and hidden him in a cloud of dust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGUSTIAS:</strong> I often stare very hard at Pepe, until he grows blurred behind the bars of the window, as if he were being covered by a cloud of dust like the ones the sheep stir up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGUSTIAS.</strong> I often look hard at Pepe through the bars of the window, and he becomes all blurred, as if a passing flock of sheep had covered him in a cloud of dust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGUSTIAS.</strong> I want to know him better. I look at him as hard as I can but he just gets all blurred. And all I see through the bars of the window is this shadow who seems shrouded in dust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bradbury, Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds all maintain the image of flocks of sheep creating a ‘cloud of dust’, although they all add the noun ‘sheep’; in Spanish the word ‘rebaños’ (flocks) does not need the qualifying noun ‘ovejas’ (sheep) which is more usual in English. We thus see a domestication to conform to normal English usage. Moreover,
‘rebaños’ could refer to ‘ovejas’ (sheep) or ‘cabras’ (goats). Clifford removes the reference to ‘rebaños’ and makes the image more mysterious and more tragic with ‘this shadow shrouded in dust’. The implicature in the original is that Pepe is no longer what he seems to Angustias and we know that this is the case as he has started a relationship with Adela. Clifford applies an interpretant here that is thematic rather than formal. However, on a socio-cultural level, the omission of ‘rebaños’ detracts from the rural setting and brings out one side of the metaphor which implies he has become mysterious but does not relate him to animal instinct by covering him in the dust created by these flocks. The receiver is perhaps less able to reach the full illocutionary force of the dualistic nature of this image. Moreover, in Spanish, the reference to ‘polvo’ (dust) brings associations of the slang idiomatic expression ‘echar un polvo’ (literally ‘to throw a dust’), which means to engage in sexual activity. Such an implicature would be impossible to generate for an English audience with no knowledge of Spanish. However, Clifford’s ‘shrouded in dust’ is able to produce implicatures at a macro-level of the discourse of the play as we can relate the words ‘shroud’ and ‘dust’ with death and tragedy. While it is Adela who dies rather than Pepe, it is his affair with Adela and the fact that she believes Bernarda has shot him that leads to her suicide. He thus appears in the image Clifford creates as a shadowy figure literally covered in death. We thus see Clifford acting performatively on the text to produce her own metaphor that in turn creates strong links to the overall plot.

In Yerma, we see an example related to sheep that uses the contextual setting to convey a socio-cultural comment on society of the time. In Act Two, Scene Two, Juan tells Yerma:

| ¿Es que no conoces mi modo de ser? Las ovejas en el redil y las mujeres en su casa. Tú sales demasiado. ¿No me has oído decir esto siempre? | Lorca: 503 |
| Haven’t you learned yet what I’m like? The sheep in the sheepfold and the women in the house. You got out too much. I always said so, didn’t you hear me? | Merwin: 103 |

Table 5.4
You should know what I’m like by now! The sheep in the fold and women at home. You go out far too often. Haven’t I always said the same?

You go out too much. I’ve said it before. The place for the sheep is the sheep-fold and the place for the woman is the home.

Do I really need to tell you? Sheep in the pen. Women at home. You’re out and about far too much. How many times do I have to tell you that?

| You should know what I’m like by now! The sheep in the fold and women at home. You go out far too often. Haven’t I always said the same? | Bradbury: 42 |
| You go out too much. I’ve said it before. The place for the sheep is the sheep-fold and the place for the woman is the home. | Luke: 182 |
| Do I really need to tell you? Sheep in the pen. Women at home. You’re out and about far too much. How many times do I have to tell you that? | Johnston: 44 |

The phrase ‘las ovejas en el redil y las mujeres en su casa’ is Lorca’s comment on a male-dominated society that sees women with only one role in life, that of wife and mother. Bradbury’s choice of ‘fold’, and Merwin and Luke’s of ‘sheepfold’ obviously adequately describe the place where sheep are kept but in English these words also have associations of ‘safety’ and ‘shelter’, when used figuratively to describe people ‘coming back to the fold’. However, ‘redil’ is a place where sheep are shut in to stop them from escaping. It has almost prison-like connotations and, thus, represents the same for the sheep as the house represents for Yerma. It also implies that everyone knows their place. Therefore, these translations may meet the locutionary level as they are not incorrect but they do not fully meet the illocutionary one. This suggests that translators need to address both the locutionary and illocutionary levels of language to be able to take the receiver beyond first-order usage to deeper symbolic levels of meaning.

Johnston (1990: 106), in his note (25) at the back of his translation, states that this saying, although of Lorca’s own creation, has the ring of a traditional folk saying and he rightly points out that the sentiments behind this are typical of society at the time, as discussed above. He thus translates it as if it were a saying, ‘Sheep in the pen. Women at home’. He also uses the word ‘pen’ rather than ‘fold’ which generates the implicature of imprisonment. The socio-cultural aspect of this utterance could be taken further by translating it as ‘Sheep in the pen. Women in the house’, as rather than the comforting idea often associated with home in English, the word house is more functional in the
same way that the word pen is functional for the sheep. Moreover, in Spanish ‘casa’
tends to have more functional connotations and thus equates in many respects more to
house than home in English.

Luke’s translation, ‘the place for the sheep is the sheep-fold and the place for the woman
is the home’, emphasises the socio-cultural aspect that Lorca was portraying with the
addition of ‘place’, while the transposition of the plural ‘mujeres’ to the singular ‘the
woman’ further adds this emphasis as it sounds more derogatory. He thus uses
explicitation to generate some of the implicatures of the original; however in doing so,
he turns a short saying into a much longer utterance which serves to address the level
of performability through speakability by making the utterance flow and inverts the
sentence order, omitting the first line ‘¿Es que no conoces mi modo de ser?’.

Another aspect of the socio-cultural aspect evoked with reference to sheep is present in
La casa de Bernarda Alba where the neighbours are likened to sheep. In Act Three,
Bernarda says to La Poncia:

| Table 5.5 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Lo que pasa en [sic] que no tienes nada que decir. Si en esta casa hubiera hierbas, ya te encargarías de traer a pastar las ovejas del vecindario. | Lorca: 625-626 |
| The truth is you’ve got nothing to say. If you could find any grass in this house you’d soon have all the sheep in to chew it over. | Bradbury: 173 |
| The trouble is, you have nothing to talk about. If there were grass growing in this house, you’d bring every sheep in the neighbourhood in to graze. | Dewell and Zapata: 160 |
| The truth is you’ve got nothing to say. If this house had grass in it, you’d make it your business to bring in all the sheep of the neighbourhood to browse. | Edmunds: 163 |
Bernarda is insisting that her reputation, like her house, is metaphorically spotless and that La Poncia would soon bring the neighbours round to ‘chew the cud’, or ‘chew over all the grass (or weeds)’, in other words ‘to criticise’, if this was not the case. It creates images of society as a mass of white sheep demanding that conventions and norms are upheld and standing in judgement over any supposed deviations from such conventions. Moreover, those who deviate in any way are considered to be social outcasts.

Bradbury, Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds all maintain the image created by ‘ovejas’ (sheep), ‘hierbas’ (grass) and ‘pastar’ (graze). Bradbury’s choice of ‘chew it over’ which implies ‘talk about it’ generates the implicature of the original as in ‘criticise’, while Dewell and Zapata’s ‘graze’ collocates more usually with ‘grass’ than Edmunds’s ‘browse’ which implies they are merely looking. Clifford’s ‘dirt for you to stir’ omits the reference to the neighbours as sheep by using a paraphrase which expresses the implicature of the original as the expression used ‘to stir the dirt’ is reminiscent of the more conventional idiomatic expression ‘to dig the dirt’. However, this expression does not recreate the pictorial image in the mind of the receiver and the colours white and green associated with the sheep and grass are not available. Clifford thus employs a strategy of domestication which, rather than reproducing the performativity of Lorca’s grammar of colour, may enhance the audience’s ability to generate the implicatures of that grammar. This suggests that the translator has prioritised performability over strict adherence to the source text. However, this strategy is restrictive as it lessens the focus on the rural setting and the metaphor of society as a mass of sheep ready to criticise wherever they can.

In Act One, Scene One of La casa de Bernarda Alba, the stage directions state that two hundred women come into the house to pay their respects. This number is representative of the whole village who would customarily turn out for such occasions.
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The earlier image of these two hundred women dressed in black is juxtaposed with this later reference to the neighbours as sheep. We thus have a contrast between the colour black in the women’s dress and the colour white evoked by later likening them to sheep. The source text thus evokes a white society that values outward appearance and dons the black clothes of mourning as convention requires. As discussed in Chapter One, Lorca uses the stark contrast between these two colours throughout the play. The details of these stage directions are as follows:

| Table 5.6 |
|-----------------|------------------|
| (Por el fondo, de dos en dos, empiezan a entrar Mujeres de luto, con pañuelos grandes, faldas y abanicos negros. Entran lentamente hasta llenar la escena.) | Lorca: 587 |
| (Women, dressed in mourning, begin to come in two by two at the back of the stage. They wear black shawls and skirts and carry black fans. They come in very slowly until they fill the stage. [...] ) | Bradbury: 134-135 |
| [From the rear, WOMEN MOURNERS begin to enter, two by two. They wear full black skirts and shawls and carry black fans. They enter slowly, until they fill the stage. [...] ) | Dewell and Zapata: 122 |
| From the rear of the stage WOMEN MOURNERS begin to enter two by two with large black shawls, black skirts, and black fans. They come in slowly until they fill the stage. | Edmunds: 122 |
| From the back, WOMEN IN MOURNING start to enter, two by two. They wear black headscarves, long black skirts, and carry black fans. They slowly enter until they fill the stage. | Clifford: 8 |

As the women finish coming on stage, we are told that there are two hundred of them:

| Table 5.7 |
|-----------------|------------------|
| (Terminan de entrar las doscientas Mujeres y aparece Bernarda y sus cinco Hijas, Bernarda viene apoyada en su bastón.) | Lorca: 587 |
For the performance text, the impact of two hundred women occupying the stage is a difficult one to recreate due to the restrictions of space and the number of actors typically available in a cast. This is obviously not an obstacle that is just present for the translated play as it would present the same difficulty for staging the play in Spanish. We thus see a tension between the written linguistic signs of the stage directions and the visual representation of them in the form of the physical presence of actors on stage. If we look at the translations of the stage directions, all of the translators maintain the reference to the number of women except Bradbury. On the level of performability, Bradbury’s translation pre-empts the problem of representing so many characters on stage; however, from the readers’ point of view, this translation detracts from the sociocultural context of the original as the whole village would normally turn out for such occasions. Moreover, this reference to two hundred women is an important comment on Bernarda’s position and wealth, (or that of her dead husband), as very few families in a village would have a house large enough to fit so many people. Moreover, this image of a formidable mass of women dressed in black, as a representation of grief, filling the stage that the ST creates in our minds is not available. Bradbury’s translation also omits the reference in the ST to the character of Bernarda as ‘apoyada en su bastón’ (leaning on her walking-stick). The absence of the walking-stick shows how a linguistic sign of the original may not be available to be translated into a theatrical sign (as a prop) in a potential performance. This is the first time that Bernarda appears and her walking-

| (The procession of women having entered. Bernarda and her five daughters appear.) Bradbury: 135 |
| As the two hundred WOMEN MOURNERS finish entering. BERNARDA ALBA and her five DAUGHTERS appear. BERNARDA is leaning on a cane. Dewell and Zapata: 122 |
| When the two hundred women have all entered, BERNARDA and her five DAUGHTERS appear. BERNARDA is leaning on a stick. Edmunds: 122 |
| The two hundred WOMEN have all come in. BERNARDA appears with her five DAUGHTERS. BERNARDA leans on a stick. Clifford: 8 |
stick is an important part of her persona. Her use of a walking-stick creates various associations; she is perhaps old, slightly disabled, and thus could appear vulnerable, however, she will later use this walking-stick as a means of control, along with her demand for silence. The written signs of the stage directions that describe her outward appearance contrast sharply with the written signs of the words she utters and the actions she takes, as the stick is used as a weapon to compensate for her physical vulnerability. Dewell and Zapata’s translation of ‘cane’ for ‘bastón’ makes a strong connection with its use as a weapon rather than just an aid to walking, although this choice may be guided by variations between American and British English.

In the performance text of *The House of Bernarda Alba* at The Crescent Theatre in Birmingham on 15th June 2014, which used the Clifford translation, three actors were used to represent these two hundred women mourners (they also played extra unidentified roles at other times, such as the weaving of the rope scene that was added and they restrained Maria Josefa, which will be referred to in Chapter 7.2). We thus see how in terms of performability, practical constraints may outweigh adherence to any type of faithfulness to the source text, which in this case would be difficult to achieve. However, these three actors were more symbolic than a mere way of achieving a supposed performability, as two of them were men with beards and they all wore black tunic-like costumes with long skirts, so that they resembled women or possibly priests. As discussed in Chapter Three the director said that the casting of male actors in an all-female play was controversial but he wanted to show the emasculation of Bernarda during the play and that she becomes male by the end.\(^\text{11}\) He is thus translating\(^\text{12}\) his reading of possible implicatures in the original text into a visual representation on stage. This casting of bearded male actors in an ambiguously gendered role created further implicatures of its own as this performance took place shortly after the controversy that arose when a bearded man dressed as a woman won the Eurovision Song Contest. In

\[\text{---}\]

\(^{11}\) The director informed me of this in a discussion that took place after the performance on 15th July 2014.

\(^{12}\) I use ‘translate’ here in the broad sense of the word.
this context, the audience may have generated implicatures that had no connection with
the source text. In this case, the director’s interpretant may have produced signs that
signify in the context of reception, going beyond the ST creating their own contextual
effects, and at the same time drawing attention to the social conditions of the context
of reception in terms of the current discourse around notions of gender.

Returning to the theme of sheep, Bernarda describes her daughter Angustias as being
like her aunts, whom she likens to sheep ready to follow their animal instinct, implying
that women who act in this way are to be criticised and abhorred as whores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ésa sale a sus tías; blancas y untosas que ponían ojos de carnero al pirope de cualquier barberillo. [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She gets that from her aunts; smooth and self-righteous, with sheeps’ eyes for any Tom, Dick or Harry who makes a pass at them. [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That one takes after her aunts. Soft and slippery – making sheep’s eyes at any little barber who flattered them! [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s just like her aunts, that one: all pale and greasy they were, and making sheep’s eyes at any piddling little barber that buttered them up. [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She takes after her aunts. She’s sweet and white and slimy and she’s got eyes like a sheep. All she wants to do is flirt with any little tradesman who takes her fancy. [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lorca’s description here of the aunts as ‘blancas y untosas’ (white and slimy) is
ambiguous; we can assume that they are literally white in the sense that they have pale
skin or that they are perhaps ill. Alternatively, the receiver can evoke metaphorical
readings as to what the reference to the colour white might mean here, such as those
generally associated with white of innocence and purity. As we know that Lorca often
exploits the dualistic nature of colour, we could take this reference to white as a
negative one suggesting that they are the exact opposite of innocence and purity which
is further reinforced by the adjective ‘untosas’ (slimy) which has negative connotations of disgust or distrust. We see a similar phrase employed in Yerma where the sinister sisters-in-law are described as ‘untadas con cera’ (spread with wax). In translation, Clifford carries over the colour metaphor with the literal translation of ‘blancas’ as ‘white’, where the receiver is left to make their own inferences as to what ‘white’ here means, although the addition of the word ‘sweet’ reinforces the negative connotations, as in ‘sickly sweet’. Bradbury’s ‘smooth and self-righteous’, and Dewell & Zapata’s ‘Soft and slippery’ provide similar negative connotations of character, whereas Edmunds’s ‘all pale and greasy’ is more of a physical description than a metaphorical one relating to their character.

The reference in the ST, ‘mirar con ojos de carnero’ (literally ‘to look with ram’s eyes’) is a common idiomatic expression which means ‘to look at someone in a lustful way’. The English idiomatic expression of ‘to make sheep’s eyes at someone’ is similar but not quite the same, as it implies romantic love, whereas the Spanish expression is more connected to sexual lust. Dewell and Zapata’s and Edmunds’ choice of ‘making sheep’s eyes’ and Bradbury’s ‘with sheep’s eyes’ give an implication that the aunts are perhaps ‘silly and flirty’ rather than lustful. Clifford’s translation of ‘she’s got eyes like a sheep’ is more ambiguous as the receiver may take this as a derogatory comment about her physical appearance. Clifford also transposes the subject of the utterance to Angustias rather than the aunts.

Moreover, the emphasis in Clifford’s translation denotes a different set of values from the ST, as the action is on the part of Augustias, who in Clifford’s translation ‘wants to flirt with any little trademen’ whereas in the ST it is the other way round, in other words, the aunts would look lustfully at any man who paid them a compliment/or flirted with them. In this way Clifford’s translation gives a slightly more modern interpretation of social values, since it is more acceptable in modern society for a woman to flirt with a man rather than the initiative coming from the man first. The translator’s interpretant in this case is thus one that draws attention to the social conditions of the context of reception of the TT rather than that of the ST. This may reflect a desire on the
translator’s part, conscious or unconscious, to ensure that Lorca’s work meets the expectations of a modern audience to the detriment of the portrayal of the 1930s rural context of the ST.

It is also worth mentioning the translation of ‘barberillo’ which in Spanish is the diminutive form of ‘barbero’. The translation of ‘barberillo’ is problematic in that it could refer to ‘barbero’ as in ‘barber’. However, another meaning of ‘barbero’ is ‘flatterer’. Bradbury’s domestication with the use of the common English expression, ‘any Tom, Dick or Harry’ is derogatory in the same way as ‘barberillo’. However, the use of such expressions can in the long term date a translation as certain phrases may fall out of common usage or appear old-fashioned. Bradbury’s linguistic choice here thus draws attention to the time of production of her translation.

5.2.2 The horse

The horse is another animal that Lorca employs symbolically. As discussed in Chapter One, Arango (1998: 70, 264) points out the multiple meanings that the symbol of the horse can portray; they are often related to the elements and can be related to the supernatural. It is an erotic symbol but also one of death, with both interpretations recurrently employed in both Lorca’s poetry and theatre (Arango 1998: 174). The horse is one of the principal symbols of Bodas de sangre, appearing first in the lullaby (la nana), in Act One, Scene Two, which Leonardo’s Wife and the Mother-in-law sing to the child. There is no direct reference to a particular colour associated with the horse in the lullaby, although it is described as ‘el caballo del alba’ (horse of dawn) which evokes the image of a white horse. Arango (1998: 286) points out that symbolically horses of death related to the underworld are either white or black. As discussed in Chapter One, in his essay on lullabies Lorca explains the dark side of the Spanish lullaby which is melancholic and expresses the burden rather than the joy that a child brings for the mother living in poverty (OCIII: 115-116). This particular lullaby is symbolic in that it acts like a premonition as it gives us an insight into what will happen at the end of the play, in the forest scene when the Bridegroom and his entourage confront Leonardo. As Johnston (1989: 108) points out in his notes (12 and 13) Leonardo is identified with the horse from
the outset and Leonardo’s horse is connected to the horse in the lullaby and thus with the scene in the forest. Johnston’s explanations here point to his interpretative position not just as translator but also as an academic. He thus addresses the reader from a positon of authority, thereby positioning his translation as not just a translation but also as an authoritative commentary on the ST.

In the lullaby, the horse is weeping and refuses to drink because the water is black. In the next verse its hooves are wounded and its mane is frozen, in its eyes there is a dagger of silver, and blood is flowing stronger than water. Arango (1998: 212) explains that the river is a symbol of social protest, and it also symbolises fertility, death and renewal because the current or the flow of the river is connected with the inevitability of life and death. In the lullaby we see this interplay with the fertile green riverbank juxtaposed with the black, dead water. Lorca presents us with the white horse with its frozen (white) mane, the black water, the green riverbank, the silver of the dagger and the red blood. The combination of these colours creates a picture of the tragedy to come in the forest. The lullaby is thus pictorial and symbolic but its form is also lyrical, as Lorca uses assonance to create rhythm throughout. Note the stress on the vowel ‘a’: ‘nana,…nana, agua, negra, ramas, llega, canta, agua, cola, sala’ in the first verse. Then ‘clavel, rosal, llorar’ in the second and third verses, followed by ‘patas heridas, crines heladas, puñal de plata, bajaban, la sangre corría, más fuerte que el agua’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUEGRA. Nana, niño, nana del caballo grande que no quiso el agua.</strong> El agua era negra dentro de las ramas. Cuando llega al puente se detiene y canta. ¿Quién dirá, mi niño, lo que tiene el agua,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
con su larga cola
por su verde sala?

MUJER. (Bajo.) Duérmete, clavel,
que el caballo no quiere beber.

SUEGRA. Duérmete, rosal,
que el caballo se pone a llorar.
Las patas heridas
las crines heladas,
dentro de los ojos
un puñal de plata
Bajaban al río.
¡Ay, cómo bajaban!
La sangre corría
más fuerte que el agua.

MOTHER-IN-LAW:
Little child, little child
on a big horse
that won’t drink water.
Under the branches
the water is black.
When it gets to the bridge
It stops to sing.
Who knows, child,
what the water says,
dragging its long train
down the green halls?

WIFE (Softly).

Hughes: 12-13
| Sleep, little pink.  
The horse won’t drink. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOTHER-IN-LAW:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sleep, little rose.  
The horse starts to cry.  
His hooves are bruised  
and his mane is frozen  
and between his eyes  
is a silver dagger.  
They went to the river.  
Oh, see them go down  
where the blood flows fast,  
faster than the water. |
| **MOTHER-IN-LAW:**  
Lullaby, my baby,  
lullaby, great horse  
who would not drink the water.  
Black flowed the water,  
black between the branches,  
and as it reached the bridge  
it stopped and sang.  
Who can say, my sweetheart,  
what the long tail of the water  
trails through her green halls? |
| **WIFE:**  
Sleep, my carnation,  
for the horse refuses water. |

Bradbury 76-77
MOTHER-IN-LAW:

Little rosebush, sleep,
for the horse begins to weep.
With wounded hooves
and frozen mane,
a silver dagger plunged into his eyes,
he went down to the river;
down he went
where blood flowed
wilder than the water.

MOTHER-IN-LAW.

Lullaby, my baby sweet,
Of the great big stallion
Wouldn’t drink the water deep.
There’s the water’s oh so black,
Where the trees grow thick and strong.
When it flows down to the bridge,
There is stops and sings its song.

Who can say, my little one,
What the water’s anguish is,
As he draws his tail along,
Through that nice green room of his.

WIFE (quietly.) Go to sleep, carnation,
For the horse will not drink deep.

MOTHER-IN-LAW. Go to sleep, my little rose,
For the horse now starts to weep.
Horsey’s hooves are red with blood,
Horsey’s mane is frozen,
Deep inside his staring eyes
A silver dagger broken.

Down they went to the river bank,
Down to the stream they rode.
There his blood ran strong and fast,
Faster than the water could.

MOTHER-IN-LAW
Hush, child, hush
sing a song
of the horse
who wouldn’t drink,
of water
that wouldn’t be drunk,
of the stream
singing round
little children’s feet.
Who can tell,
my little one,
what the water holds
in its long tail,
in its dark green rooms?

WIFE softly
Sleep, little flower,
the horse just won’t drink.

MOTHER-IN-LAW

Johnston 39-40
Sleep, little rose,
the horse is weeping,
his wounded hooves
and poor, poor
frozen mane,
and in his eye
a silver dagger shone.
Down to the river,
down to the stream,
all the way down
blood flows fuller
than water.

Firstly, I will look at examples of how the translators have approached the different references to colour, and then I will consider the lyrical level and how this affects linguistic choice.

Hughes and Bradbury maintain the reference to the water being black, moreover, Bradbury repeats the term ‘black’, reinforcing the image of death and aiding uptake on the part of the receiver. Repetition is thus used as a literary device to reinforce the image and can aid potential performability in terms of addressing the ephemeral nature of the stage. Moreover, by drawing attention to the grammar of colour, its performative effect as a cohesive device within the play is reinforced in translation.

Edwards achieves a similar effect, not with the repetition of the colour black but by addition of the word ‘so’ which emphasises the colour but is not as immediate as the use of repetition. Edwards also adds ‘deep’ to rhyme with weep which achieves the poetic effect of rhyme in line with the genre of the lullaby, and additionally aids delivery on stage. In this instance, linguistic choices are driven by a strategy related to poetic effect and performability, rather than that of a close translation to the source text. The
interpretant Edwards applies here is thus a thematic one that priorities the lyrical element of the ST.

Edwards also refers to the horse as a stallion, making a connection to the horse’s virility, which is an important element of the tragedy because the horse is associated with Leonardo and it is the sexual attraction between him and the Bride that leads to a tragic end. The translator thus produces a more explicit illocutionary effect at the symbolic level of the play by the use of a more explicit interpretant that in turn produces specific interpretants that function within the context of the play as a whole. Johnston’s translation moves away from the original considerably in that there is no mention of black water and there are several additions: ‘that wouldn’t be drunk’, ‘of the stream’ ‘singing round’, ‘little children’s feet’. These choices perhaps aid singability of the lullaby and thus connect to audience expectations on that level. We thus see how the level of performability through singability is prioritised over a strict adherence to the ST’s grammar of colour. In this instance, Johnston’s writing practice applies interpretants that relate to the performable at the expense of the performativity of that grammar.

In the ST the river is described as ‘con su larga cola, por su verde sala’ (with its long tail, through its green room). Hughes and Bradbury maintain the reference to the colour ‘green’ with ‘green halls’ but Hughes’s translation of ‘con su larga cola’, which refers to the form of the river, as ‘dragging its long train’ makes a further symbolic connection as the word ‘train’ in this context evokes the ‘train of a wedding dress’. At the end of Act Three the Bride will return from the forest, after the deaths of the two men, with her wedding dress and hair covered in blood. We thus see how the translator’s interpretants here establish an explicit symbolic connection to the overall plot.

In the next verse sung by the Wife, Lorca uses floral imagery to refer to the child, with ‘Duérmate, clavel’ (sleep, carnation) which is continued by the Mother-in-law in the following verse with ‘Duérmete, rosal’ (sleep, rosebush). Lorca’s use of floral references is an obvious connection to the rural setting, and his choice of ‘rosal’ (rosebush) rather than ‘rosa’ (rose) is no doubt motivated by the desire to establish rhyme here. Rather than literally translate the name of the flower ‘clavel’ Hughes employs the colloquial
term for carnations, ‘pinks’ choosing ‘little pink’, whereas in the following floral reference he translates ‘rosal’ as ‘rose’, thus referring directly to the flower itself rather than its colour. Hughes also attempts to produce some rhyme of his own in the two sentences ‘sleep little pink’ and ‘the horse won’t drink’, choices driven by the lyrical element of the lullaby rather than a strict adherence to the ST. We thus see how the translator, who is also a poet, creatively employs a TL colloquialism to both translate effectively the ST and at the same time produce rhyme. The translator’s interpretants here thus draw attention to his writing practice as a poet.

Bradbury translates the first floral reference literally with ‘sleep my carnation’, although for the second she uses a more domesticated ‘rosebud’, that has a more poetic tone. Similarly, Edwards translates the floral reference of ‘clavel’ literally as ‘carnation’ whereas ‘rosal’ becomes ‘my little rose’. Johnston makes the reference to ‘clavel’ less specific with the superordinate ‘flower’ thus making the image more universal and less contextualised as Spanish while ‘rosal’ is domesticated as ‘little rose’. The word ‘little’, which is not implied in Spanish, is used in all the translations as a sign of affection that domesticates the lullaby.

We notice the different translation choices that Edwards makes for the horse: it is first referred to as ‘the great big stallion,’ which emphasises the symbolism of sexual potency as referred to above; he then switches to ‘horse’ in the second verse; and then to ‘horsey’ in the third. The sexual symbolism of the horse is thus reduced as the lullaby progresses. Moreover, the word ‘horsey’ detracts from the context of the traditional melancholic nature of this genre, which Lorca made more sinister by inventing his own premonitory lullaby. The use of ‘horsey’ domesticates it and reduces the illocutionary force as it is less sinister. However, the use of the safe word ‘horsey’, reminiscent of the English nursery rhyme, ‘horsey, horsey, don’t you stop’, juxtaposes with the sinister nature of the rest of the lullaby and the references to blood creating an unsettling effect. Moreover, Edwards reinforces the image of blood with the addition of ‘red with blood’ to describe the ‘patas heridas’ (wounded hooves). Thus, it can be said that this addition serves, as previously stressed, to reinforce the pictorial image of this scene in the mind.
of the receiver and aids illocutionary uptake, which is particularly important for the stage performance. By reinforcing the grammar of colour, the translator is also ensuring the performativity of that grammar. Here, Edwards’s writing practice, by independently applying Lorca’s own grammar of colour, draws attention to the autonomy of his translation. However, this autonomy is only visible to those who understand the ST, and make a detailed comparison between it and the translation.

Edwards’s addition of ‘staring’ to describe the eyes adds a further element of horror at the scene to be witnessed later in the forest. Edwards also refers to ‘his blood’ rather than the generic ‘la sangre’, which makes a stronger connection between the horse and Leonardo. Edwards adds ‘is broken’ to create a part rhyme with ‘frozen’. Johnson adds ‘down to the stream’ but does not translate ‘bajaban’ (they went down) making the lullaby less premonitory in the last line than the ST.

It would be difficult to replicate the assonance of the ST in the English translation, but, as we have seen, the translators use a number of strategies to compensate for it by producing their own rhyme or part rhyme, the lyrical level thus guiding their linguistic choices. This shows how performability in terms of singability is addressed as the translators need to ensure that these verses work when sung by the actors. However, in the performance text of Blood Wedding by Theatrical Niche, the songs were sung in Spanish, blurring the boundaries between source and target.

The reference to the silver of the dagger is carried through to the next verse of the lullaby:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUJER. No quiso tocar</th>
<th>Lorca: 422-423</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la orilla mojada,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su bello caliente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>con moscas de plata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A los montes duros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solo relinchaba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>con el rio muerto</th>
<th>Hughes: 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sobre la garganta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Ay, caballo grande</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>que no quiso el agua!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡Ay, dolor de nieve,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caballo del alba!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>His warm nose</th>
<th>Hughes: 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flecked with silver foam,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doesn’t want to touch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the damp bank of the river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He neighs toward the hard mountains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the dead river around his neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, mighty horse that wants no water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, sharp pain of snow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse born of the dawn!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No muzzling near,</th>
<th>Bradbury: 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the damp shore,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his muzzle warm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with silver flies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He whinnied only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the hard mountains,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the dead river</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in his gullet!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh great horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who will not drink the water!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snows of anguish,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh great horse of daybreak!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horsey will not touch the bank,</th>
<th>Edwards: 40-41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even though the bank is wet,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even though his mouth is hot,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming drops of sweat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the mountains cold and hard,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He could only call and neigh,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsey’s throat is hot and parched,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the river bed is dry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, the great big stallion,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn’t drink the water deep,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain as sharp as coldest ice,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse at the break of day will weep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| He lifts his head                  | Johnston: 40 |
| from the water’s edge              |              |
| through flies and heat             |              |
| with a breaking heart              |              |
| to the shadow of mountains         |              |
| far, far away                      |              |
| and so the river dies              |              |
| and dries upon his throat.         |              |
| Oh, the poor, poor horse           |              |
| who just wouldn’t drink,           |              |
| in the shivering cold snow         |              |
| the cold horse of dawn.            |              |

The image that Lorca creates here is one where the horse does not want to touch the wet riverbank. In the previous verse we are told that the water is black, so we can infer that the riverbank is wet, perhaps not with water but with blood, as we are told in the previous verse that ‘blood flows faster than water’. In the dark, blood could also appear black rather than red.

Lorca tells us that the horse’s warm muzzle has ‘flies of silver’. This is another example of the circularity of Lorca’s images as the ‘flies of silver’ evoke an image of horseflies that
look silver in the moonlight and that also, through the colour, connect to the knife or dagger mentioned in the previous verse, which is also present at the beginning of the play in the first scene and later when it is connected to the Moon. We are told that the horse was neighing to the hard mountains with the dead river on its throat. The ‘montes duros’ in this example could refer to dead bodies and the reference to ‘dolor de nieve, caballo del alba’ (literally ‘pain of snow, horse of dawn’) establishes a connection between the horse and death. As Johnston (1989: 108) reminds us in his note (11) at the back of his translation, snow is another symbol that Lorca connects with death. Similar words will be used later when referring to the Moon and the knife when they interact with Death (the Beggar Woman) in the forest scene.

In translation, Hughes and Bradbury generate the grammar of colour with the connection of silver to the colour of the dagger evoked in the previous verse of the lullaby with ‘silver foam’ and the more literal ‘silver flies’, respectively. ‘Silver foam’ evokes the idea of the horse foaming at the mouth in the heat, refusing to drink from the dead river or river of blood, perhaps foaming because it is dying of thirst. Edwards uses paraphrase as the flies become ‘streaming drops of sweat’, which creates an image of a horse foaming at the mouth but it does not go beyond that; we are not led to the idea of ‘silver flies’ buzzing around the mouth and what these flies could potentially mean. It is normal for a horse to have flies around it, but flies are all the more present when there is death. We are unable to evoke the image of a silver dagger or knife stabbing around the horse’s muzzle, or if we transpose the horse to Leonardo, then the image is one of stabbing around the mouth of Leonardo in search of his throat. In this case, rather than translate Lorca’s grammar of colour, Edwards has interpreted the image that Lorca creates on behalf of the receiver. This detracts from the grammar of colour, and the ambiguous nature of the reference to the ‘flies of silver’. Johnston maintains the reference to ‘flies’ but omits the colour, which again detracts from the cohesive effect of the grammar of colour.

Edwards’s translation of ‘Horsey’s throat is hot and parched, And the river bed is dry’ symbolises the thirst of the horse and the lack of water as the river has dried up rather
than died. While when describing a river, to refer to it as dry is similar to referring to it as dead, in this instance the image of the ‘dead river of red (or black) blood on the throat of the horse’ is not present and thus we do not have the same illocutionary force as in the ST. We have the reference again here to ‘horsey’ and if the translator juxtaposed the image of the child-like language of ‘horsey’ with that of ‘dead river on the throat’ the effect would be more sinister, similar to the kind of effect often used in horror stories when the innocence of children’s songs are used in stark contrast to violence and horror. The register of the word ‘gullet’ in Bradbury’s translation of ‘the dead river in his gullet’ is perhaps too technical and, moreover, implies that he has swallowed the dead river whereas Lorca is referring to the forthcoming death of the two men who cut each other’s throats, creating an image of a cut throat thick with blood that has dried and is turning black.

A few lines on, the lullaby continues with the Mother-in-law telling the horse to keep away and to go off to the mountain through the grey valleys to where the mare is:

**Table 5.11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUEGRA.</strong> ¡No vengas, no entres!</th>
<th><strong>Lorca:</strong> 423</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vete a la montaña!</td>
<td>Hughes: 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por los valles grises</td>
<td>Bradbury: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donde está la jaca.</td>
<td>Edwards: 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MOTHER-IN-LAW:</strong> Stay away! Don’t come in!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go off to the mountains,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the gray valleys,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where the ponies are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes: 14-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MOTHER-IN-LAW:</strong> Don’t enter, don’t come in!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make for the mountains,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the grey valleys,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where your mare awaits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury: 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MOTHER-IN-LAW.</strong> Don’t come near, don’t come in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek the far off mountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards: 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Find the dark, the grey valley,
There the mare will waiting be.

MOTHER-IN-LAW. Stay, child, stay,
let him run
to the mountain side
through valleys grey
and mountains green
to his young
mare’s side

The reference to ‘la jaca’ (the mare) is a clear reference here to the bride and the sexual connotation of the horse seeking out his mare to mate with. Therefore, Hughes’s translation of the specific ‘jaca’ as the more generic ‘ponies’ does not meet the symbolic level, the use of the plural further detracting from the connection with the Bride. The grey valleys denote a place of darkness, foreboding and death. Johnston adds the colour ‘green’ to describe the mountains, in this case to make the song rhyme, thus addressing performability through singability that takes precedence over close adherence to the ST. Johnston is using this addition of colour here as an aid to the performance so that this addition is target-oriented. However, it is also source-oriented as the translator works within Lorca’s grammar of colour, albeit independently of the ST. The translator’s writing practice here is a performance practice; moreover, he uses the performativity of the ST to create his own interpretation of that performativity.

As mentioned above, in the performance text of Blood Wedding, the lullaby was sung in Spanish with a simple guitar accompaniment. However, a translation of it was forfeited in favour of the ST which became part of the performance. The reason for reverting to the ST was that the cast felt that the words were so beautiful in the original that they
wanted to keep them.\textsuperscript{13} Reverting to the source text was also a strategy employed in the performance text of \textit{Yerma}, but on this occasion, it was more due to the inadequacy of the translation rather than the supposed beauty of the source. On stage, this ST fragment becomes part of the performance of the TT, blurring the boundaries between the notion of source text and target text. While using Spanish may help portray the contextual setting of the original, for an audience that does not understand the language, it may create a feeling of alienation or exclusion. Moreover, depriving the audience of the meaning of the lullaby may also have a detrimental effect on the cohesiveness of the play and its grammar of colour, as they will, in most cases, not have access to the symbolic nature of the lullaby, which will be interpreted as nothing more than a Spanish song.

Although the stage directions of the ST do not make reference to the presence of a physical horse, in the performance text of \textit{Blood Wedding}, the actors used their bodies to represent the horse and cart travelling to the wedding. There was thus a physical symbolic resemblance between the action demonstrated on stage by the actors and the galloping of a horse, and this physical embodiment by the actors highlighted its human connection. In this case written linguistic signs that do not pertain to the stage directions but to the actual dialogue became visual theatrical signs on stage through the body of the actors. The interpretants that the director and cast chose in this instance also signify symbolically at the level of the overall discourse of the play, as the actor’s body in the guise of the horse points to the symbolic connection between Leonardo and the horse. The sign thus works as a circular continuum within the play as a whole.

Just as Leonardo is connected with the horse in \textit{Bodas de sangre}, in \textit{La casa de Bernarda Alba} Pepe is embodied in the horse that can be heard in the yard. The stage directions

\textsuperscript{13} The producer explained this in the Question and Answer session that took place at the end of the performance on 2\textsuperscript{nd} May 2014.
in the drama text of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* state that there is a loud banging against the walls:

**Table 5.12**

| **(Se oye un gran golpe como dado en los muros.)** | Lorca: 621 |
| **(A hefty thud on the walls is heard.)** | Bradbury: 168 |
| **(There is a loud thud from the other side of the wall.)** | Dewell & Zapata: 155 |
| **(A loud thud is heard as if the wall were being struck)** | Edmunds: 158 |
| **We hear a heavy blow, as if something is striking the walls.** | Clifford: 58 |

In the performance text of *The House of Bernarda Alba* at The Crescent Theatre in Birmingham these linguistic signs of the drama text, in this instance contained in the stage directions, were translated into both acoustic and visual signs. The resulting loud noises and the shaking walls of the stage scenery produced both an illocutionary effect (a pre-rehearsed one) on the characters and equally on the audience, and a perlocutionary one as well in terms of a sudden shock, as the audience physically jumped in their seats. This perlocutionary effect was produced directly from these acoustic and visual signs, it was not an indirect result of the characters’ reaction to them. This shows that the relationship between the drama text and the performance text can be dialogic, and it is an example of performability in that the written stage directions become part of the performance by an acoustic interpretation. It also shows performativity through that performability, in terms of how illocutionary uptake and perlocutionary effect upon the audience can be achieved. We do not physically see the horse but we are asked to image that it is there and we are told that it is being driven mad by its confinement. The noise points to the presence of the horse although we are not certain what the noise is until we are told in Bernarda’s following speech what is making the noise and why:
Table 5.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El caballo garañón, que está encerrado y da coces contra el muro. [...] Debe tener calor.</th>
<th>Lorca: 621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The stallion. He kicks against the wall whenever he’s tied up. [...] He must be hot in there.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The breeding stallion, locked up and kicking the wall. [...] He must be hot.</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The breeding stallion; he’s shut in and kicking the wall. [...] He must be hot.</td>
<td>Edmunds: 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stallion. He must be kicking the wall. We locked him up. [...] He’ll be feeling the heat.</td>
<td>Clifford: 58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds translate the ST’s ‘caballo garañón’ (literally ‘horse stallion’) similarly with two words ‘breeding stallion’. The word ‘breeding’ may be redundant here as in English the word ‘stallion’ on its own makes a direct reference to the function of the animal. Bradbury and Clifford’s translations, by opting for the single word ‘stallion’, are more domesticated and still create an ambiguous reference with the implicit connection with Pepe. The use of ‘the stud’ here would be a possible alternative that might portray this sexual tension more fully and also create ambiguity with a connection between Pepe and the horse. However, this could also be too ambiguous and produce an unwanted comic effect.

The stallion is described by Adela as ‘white’ and ‘double its size’, ‘filling the darkness’:

Table 5.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El caballo garañón estaba en el centro del corral, ¡blanco! Doble de grande. Llenando todo lo oscuro.</th>
<th>Lorca: 624</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We saw the stallion in the stableyard – looking twice his normal size, and white! Filling the darkness.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stallion was in the middle of the corral – so white! Twice as big, completely filling the darkness!

The stallion was in the middle of the yard, all white! Looking twice as big, and looming in the dark.

The stallion was standing in the middle of the yard. He was so white! He seemed to fill the darkness.

Dewell and Zapata: 159

Edmunds: 161

Clifford: 63

Dewell and Zapata, and Clifford emphasise the colour of the stallion with the addition of ‘so’ and the use of the exclamation mark which, in the ST, is emphasised with the use of the exclamation mark alone. Edmunds produces the same effect with the addition of ‘all’. The translators thus reinforce the grammar of colour, using it performatively to aid cohesion of the play as a whole. If we connect Pepe to the frustrated, restless stallion in the yard, it is fitting that it is Adela who says this as we know that she is having an illicit affair with Pepe. The implicit sexual innuendo created here with reference to the stallion as ‘doble de grande’ (twice as big) is omitted by Clifford.

5.2.3 Moon

Another symbol which Lorca relates to both sexuality and death is the Moon. As discussed in Chapter One, Arrango (1998: 58) states that for Lorca, rather than being romantic, the Moon is malicious and often used as a symbol of death in his poetry. It is one of the most potent symbols in Bodas de sangre where Lorca uses it as a metaphor to represent the interplay between life and death; he does this by linking it to the red blood and the silver of the knife and its complicit interaction with Death in the guise of the Beggar Woman brings about the final tragedy played out in the dark forest. The complicity between the Moon and Death is taken to heightened extremes as the moon takes on a physical presence and comes down to earth. In the stage directions, Lorca tells us that this part is to be played by a young woodcutter with a white face:
The Moon calls for blood, it is essential for death to take hold as it lights the way so that the lovers cannot hide and allows the knife to follow its path. As discussed in Chapter Three, Lorca deliberately plays with iconic similitude when he informs us in the stage directions (above) that the Moon is a young woodcutter with a white face, the actor’s body personifying the moon and the colour of his face making the link to the object represented.

There is a sexual ambiguity about Lorca’s Moon. Wright (2000: 95) highlights the androgynous nature of the Moon that, while it is played by a young man, refers to itself as feminine, with examples such as ‘vengo helada’ (I am frozen) and ‘los montes de mi pecho’ (the mountains of my breast). Wright links the ambiguous sexuality of this supposed switching of gender with the ability to see into the future, making the Moon a menacing, supernatural force. In Spanish the word for Moon takes the feminine article (la Luna) so Lorca creates a contradiction between the body of the male actor and the

---

**Table 5.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Salen. Por la claridad de la izquierda aparece la Luna. La Luna es un leñador joven con la cara blanca. La escena adquiere un vivo resplandor azul.)</th>
<th>Lorca: 457</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They exit. In the glow at the left the moon appears. The moon is a young woodcutter with a white face. The whole scene is a brilliant blue.</td>
<td>Hughes: 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(They go out. The Moon appears. He is a young forester with a white face. The scene is flooded with vibrant blue light.)</td>
<td>Bradbury: 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They leave. In the light stage-left the MOON enters. The MOON is a young woodcutter with a white face. The stage takes on an intense blue light.</td>
<td>Edwards: 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They leave. The MOON appears, surrounded by brilliant light. A young WOODCUTTER with a white face. The scene acquires a brilliant blue glow.</td>
<td>Johnston: 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
spoken dialogue that indicates the feminine. He further highlights this by describing the female body as in ‘los montes de mi pecho’, which can refer to the mountainous surface of the moon on one level and imply the female body on another level. The English translator needs to use other means if they wish to highlight this, such as the addition of the personal pronoun ‘she’ where appropriate. However, with regards to the example of ‘los montes de mi pecho’ the same inferences are possible as in the ST.

The moon begins by describing itself (in the first person) as having multiple guises as its presence is everywhere; it is at the same time a white swan on the river, an eye in the windows of cathedrals and a false dawn on the leaves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisne redondo en el río, ojo de las catedrales, alba fingida en las hojas. soy; ¡no podrán escaparse! ¿Quién se oculta? ¿Quién solloza por la maleza del valle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A white swan in the river, eye of the cathedrals, false dawn on the leaves am I. They can’t get away from me! Who tries to hide? Who’s sobbing in a thicket in the valley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the plump swan on the water, the cathedral’s eye, the dawn disseminating through the leaves, and they will not escape me! Who hides himself? Who sobs among the brambles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lorca: 457
Hughes: 54-55
Bradbury: 111
in the valley?

| Round swan on the river, |
| Eye of the cathedrals, |
| False dawn amongst the leaves |
| Am I; they shall not escape! |
| Who is hiding? Who is sobbing |
| In the thick brush of the valley? |

| Edwards: 76 |

| Round swan in the river, |
| the cathedral’s eye, |
| false dawn on the leaves; |
| all these things am I; they won’t escape! |
| Who can hide? Who’s that sobbing there |
| in the valley thicket, |
| on the dark mountainside? |

| Johnston: 84-85 |

In the first line, Lorca takes the shape of the Moon, ‘redondo’ (round), and transfers it to the swan which, due of its white colour, is able to represent the Moon. Hughes removes the idea of it being ‘round’, and adds ‘white’ thus reinforcing its colour rather than its form. The reference to the colour here is perhaps redundant as we can immediately associate a swan with the colour white. However, this addition can serve to aid illocutionary uptake which is obviously important on stage. Hughes is also creating a connection to the overall grammar of colour here. Bradbury’s offer of ‘plump’ rather than ‘round’ lessens the symbolic force as the adjective ‘plump’ is not usually used to describe the Moon. With the addition of the definite article ‘the’, as in ‘I am the plump swan on the river’, the translator describes a swan rather than describing the moon in terms of a swan. We thus see a confusion of the topic and vehicle of the metaphor. The use of the adjective ‘plump’ gives the Moon human characteristics which aids the personification of it but perhaps makes the Moon appear as a somewhat comic figure rather than a mysterious or dangerous one.
All the translators maintain Lorca’s poetic description of the Moon as a ‘false dawn’ except Bradbury who opts for ‘the dawn disseminating through the leaves’. Bradbury’s choice shows the effect of mistranslation on the illocutionary level as it is not actually ‘the dawn’ that is coming through the leaves but the Moon which is so bright that it pretends to be ‘the dawn’, implying that it is false and devious. The choice of ‘disseminating’ is also problematic in terms of register as it would habitually collocate with information and thus has a more formal tone rather than the poetic one of ‘alba fingida en las hojas’ (false dawn on the leaves).

We also have a mixture of the Moon referring to itself in the first person above, then in the third person, and then back to the first person again when it is associated with the knife creating ambiguity as to whether it is speaking on behalf of the knife or itself. It refers to itself in the third person saying that ‘La luna deja un cuchillo abandonado en el aire’ (the moon leaves a knife abandoned in the air) which wants the ‘pain of blood’. It aids the knife in its search for a warm body to satisfy its lust for blood and its need to cause physical pain:

<p>| Table 5.17 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| La luna deja un cuchillo        | Lorca: 457    |
| abandonado en el aire,          |                |
| que siendo acecho de plomo      |                |
| quiere ser dolor de sangre.     |                |
| ¡Dejadme entrar! ¡Vengo helada! | Hughes: 55    |
| por paredes y cristales!        |                |
| ¡Abrir tejados y pechos         |                |
| donde pueda calentarme!         |                |
| The moon leaves a knife         |                |
| hanging in the air,             |                |
| lurking steel for the pain of blood. |            |
| Let me in! I’m frozen           |                |
| on walls and windows!           |                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poet</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td>Open tile roofs and breasts where I can get warm!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The moon leaves a knife abandoned in the air,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>begging the pain of blood, sensing the leaden ambush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let me come in! I come frozen through walls and windows!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I rip open roofs and breasts to warm myself within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>The moon places a knife Abandoned in the sky,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That is a leaden ambush And longs to be the pain of blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let me come in! I come frozen From walls and windows!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open up roofs and hearts Where I can warm myself!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>The moon leaves a knife hanging in the sky, a cold trap of lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that seeks blood’s warm cry. Let me in! I come frozen and numbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through walls and glass! Open your homes and breasts so that I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>warm myself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bradbury, Edwards and Johnston replicate the reference to ‘plomo’ (lead) with ‘leaden’ (Bradbury and Edwards) and the more literal ‘lead’ (Johnston), whereas Hughes makes it more domesticated with ‘steel’, which is the usual material associated with knives. Johnston adds the word ‘cold’ to describe the ‘trap of lead’ and ‘warm’ to describe ‘the
cry of the blood’. He thus creates the type of opposition that Lorca often uses himself between heat and cold. Johnston’s choices are source-driven in this respect and he creates rhyme with ‘sky’ and ‘cry’ allowing the lyrical level of the TT to take precedence over a strict adherence to the ST.

Lorca continues with the use of the opposition between the cold that the Moon feels and its ashes of sleeping metal which seek the crest of fire:

Table 5.18

| ¡Tengo frío! Mis cenizas | Lorca: 457 |
| de soñolientos metales, | |
| buscan la cresta del fuego | |
| por los montes y las calles. | |

| I am cold! My ashes | Hughes: 55 |
| of sleepy metals | |
| seek a crest of flames | |
| in the mountains and the streets. | |

| I am so cold! | Bradbury: 111 |
| My ashes of drowsy metal | |
| creep through the streets and mountains | |
| looking for the heart of the fire. | |

| I am cold! My ashes | Edwards: 76 |
| Of dreaming metal | |
| Seek the crest of fire | |
| Through mountains and through streets. | |

| I’m freezing. I seek the crest of fire | Johnston: 85 |
| through streets and mountains | |
| to warm my body of ashes | |
| and brooding metals. | |
Johnston’s image of ‘brooding metals’ is more sinister than Edwards’s ‘dreaming metal’ which has more positive connotations. The implication in the original is that the metal of the knife is slowly awakened as the Moon comes out and seeking a crest of fire (a heart). Johnston adds to the personification of the Moon and the connection with the knife by adding ‘body’ in ‘my body of ashes’. It is by searching for ‘the crest of fire’ that death will take hold. Johnston thus creates his own connections to the symbolic discourse of the sexual nature of the Moon. He employs a thematic interpretant to dramatic effect, drawing on the performative nature of Lorca’s use of personification to create his own performative translation, and this may also aid the performance.

Johnston’s Moon describes itself as ‘freezing’ rather than just ‘cold’ as in the original, which makes the contrast stronger with the desire of the Moon to warm itself with a heart. The images of the coldness of death recur in the next lines with references to snow and stagnated water:

| Pero me lleva la nieve sobre su espalda de jaspe, y me anega, dura y fría, el agua de los estanques. | Lorca: 457 |
| I carry snow on my shoulders of jasper, and the water of the ponds pours over me, cold and hard. | Hughes: 55 |
| But the snow bears me on her jasper back, and the water in the reservoir floods me out, hard and cold. | Bradbury: 111-112 |
| But the snow bears me On its back of jasper, And water drowns me | Edwards: 76-77 |
Cold and hard in pools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>But instead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ride the dark night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and across water and snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as cold as the dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am made to go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hughes, Bradbury and Edwards all translate the word ‘jaspe’ literally as ‘jasper’; although this meets the locutionary level, this type of precious stone is not commonly known so a literal translation may cause a reduction in the illocutionary uptake of the utterance and some explicitation may be needed with the addition of ‘hard’, for example ‘hard jasper back’, or the use of a more well-known stone such as ‘marble’ that could provide implicatures of ‘marble headstones’ and make connections to death in this way. The strategy of literal translation in this example is less performative for an English-speaking audience than the use of the term ‘marble’ would be. Moreover, marble would connect to the grammar of colour as marble evokes images of black or white headstones.

Johnston overcomes this issue by omitting it as he paraphrases in order to achieve rhyme over strict adherence to the source text. We thus see how the level of performability through speakability takes precedence. Johnston’s performative choice here priorities speakability over literal translation. On a symbolic level, Johnston also makes a direct reference to death with ‘as cold as the dead’ rather than the allusions to death produced by the snow carrying it on its back of jasper and the drowning by the hard, cold water of the ponds. This aids the illocutonary uptake as the receiver is able to get to the idea of death quicker; in Relevance theoretic terms, greater contextual effects may be achieved for minimal processing effort, and the ephemeral nature of the stage is addressed.

Bradbury’s choice of ‘reservoir’ implies a man-made structure whereas ‘ponds’ (Hughes) or ‘pools’ (Edwards) produce a more poetic aesthetic effect and are in keeping with the
rural context of the original. Bradbury’s translation is thus less effective on the level of aesthetic effect and recreation of the rural context. Hughes’s translation of ‘I carry snow’ does not meet the locutionary level as it is the snow that carries the Moon/knife not the other way round.

In the following verse, we see how the Moon lusts for blood. Arango (1998: 65) highlights Lorca’s obsession with blood, which is found in both his poetry and theatre, and explains that ‘[e]l simbolismo de la sangre, a partir de un sentido arcaico, crea un doble efecto: repulsió n y atracción’ ([t]he symbolism of blood, from an archaic sense, creates a dual effect: repulsion and attraction).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pues esta noche tendrán</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis mejillas roja sangre,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y los juncos agrupados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en los anchos pies del aire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¡No haya sombra ni emboscada,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>que no puedan escaparse!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>But tonight, I will have</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cheeks red with blood,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and reeds will gather</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>at the feet of air.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There’s no shade and no ambush</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>where they can escape me!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tonight my cheeks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>will blush with blood,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and rushes will huddle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>between the straddled feet of the air.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No shadow, no wooded place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>can hide them</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>for they will not escape me.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And so tonight there’ll be
Red blood to fill my cheeks,
And the rushes forming clusters
At the wide feet of the wind.
Let there be no shadow, no hidden corner
To which they can escape!

But this night
red, red blood will caress
my blue cheeks
in the hush of reeds
over the broad steps of the air.
Let there be no shadow or shade
where they can hide.

All the translators, except Bradbury, maintain the direct reference to the colour ‘rojo’ (red) as in the ST. This direct reference helps create the pictorial image of the Moon with blood on its cheeks. However, in Hughes’s translation the emphasis is slightly different as Lorca’s ‘tendrán mis mejillas roja sangre’ (literally ‘they will have my cheeks red blood’), becomes ‘cheeks red with blood’ which describes the colour of the cheeks rather than the colour of the blood directly. Bradbury’s ‘will blush with blood’ implies the colour rather than mentioning it directly, so that the receiver needs to infer what the word ‘blush’ when used with cheeks implicates. The strength of the colour evoked by the word ‘blush’, which could imply ‘pink’ rather than ‘red’, could also implicate embarrassment on the part of the Moon which is certainly not the case.

Johnston repeats the word ‘red’ to emphasise the call for blood and also adds in ‘blue’, which creates a contrast between the coldness of the Moon and the warm blood on its cheeks. It also ties in with the stage directions which state that firstly there is an intense white light that changes to blue as metaphorically the Moon is turning to darkness and death once it has lit the way for the knife and death to take hold. The addition of the
reference to the colour blue perhaps reinforces the supernatural effect of this scene and also makes a connection to the later weaving scene where red wool is wound by the girls wearing blue dresses which according to Johnston in his note 50 (1989: 114) evokes the red and blue of veins and arteries making a connection with life and death. Johnston is thus creating his own connections, aiding dramatic effect, independently of that particular line in the source text although it is effectively a source-driven reading. In addition, this use of repetition of colour aids performability, addressing the ephemerality of the performance text. In this way, the translator is producing a performativity of his own.

The interplay between cold and blood continues as the moon carries on with its call for blood in the name of the knife:

### Table 5.21

| ¡Que quiero entrar en un pecho para poder calentarme! | Lorca: 458 |
| ¡Un corazón para mí! | Hughes: 55 |
| ¡Calientel, que se derrame por los montes de mi pecho; dejadme entrar, ¡ay, dejadme! | Bradbury: 112 |

| I need to hide in some breast somewhere to warm me. A heart for me! A warm heart flowing from the mountains of my breast. Let me in! Oh, let me in! | |
| I want to pierce a breast And warm myself within! At the very heart! To hug me till my own heart glows! Let me come in, oh, let me come in! | |
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For I want to enter a breast
Where I can warm myself!
A heart for me!
Warm!, that will spill
Over the mountains of my breast;
Let me come in, oh, let me in!

Tonight, I want
a heart split wide
so that I may warm myself.
A human heart for me!
Warm, draining itself
over the mountains of my breast.
Let me in, oh let me in

In translation, different images are created of ‘entrar en un pecho’ (literally ‘enter into a breast/chest’) with ‘hiding’ (Hughes), ‘piercing’ (Bradbury), ‘enter’ (Edwards) and ‘a heart split wide’ (Johnston). Johnston clarifies that it is a ‘human heart’ that is sought, which may aid uptake on the part of the receiver. Bradbury’s translation of ‘to hug me until my own heart glows’ presents a more romantic image that contrasts sharply with the ‘piercing’ she uses in the lines above. Although she creates a dichotomy here of her own, her translation turns the utterance into a positive one. It also gives less of a sexual image than ‘que se derrame por los montes de mi pecho’ (spilling over the mountains of my breast’). All the translators replicate ‘pecho’ (chest/breast) in the single form as in the ST. It is possible here to establish more of a connection to disambiguate the sexual nature of the Moon with the use of the plural ‘breasts’ which is implicated with the reference to ‘mountains’.
The Moon’s lust for blood continues as it says to the branches:

**Table 5.22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No quiero sombras. Mis rayos han de entrar en todas partes, y haya en los troncos oscuros un rumor de claridades para que esta noche tengan mis mejillas dulce sangre, y los juncos agrupados en los anchos pies del aire. ¿Quién se oculta? ¡Afuera digo! ¡No! ¡No podrán escaparse! Yo haré lucir al caballo una fiebre de diamante.</td>
<td>I want no shade. My rays must go everywhere, so through your dark trunks let there be streaks of light, so that tonight I may have my cheeks sweet with blood, and the reeds gathered at the feet of the air. Who’s hiding! Out, I say! No! There’s no escape! I’ll make your horse glitter like a fever of diamonds.</td>
<td>Lorca: 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No shadows now. My rays reach every corner</td>
<td>Bradbury: 112</td>
<td>Hughes: 55-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and on each dark tree trunk
a rumour of light will glimmer.
For tonight my cheeks
will **swell with sweet blood**, 
and rushes huddle
in the wide feet of the air.
Who hides himself? Come out, I say,
for you cannot escape me,
your horse will shine out for me
in a fever of diamonds!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I don’t want shadows. My rays</th>
<th>Edwards: 77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must enter everywhere,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And let there be among dark trunks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A murmur of gleaming light,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, that tonight there’ll be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red blood to fill my cheeks</strong>,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the rushes forming clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the wide feet of the wind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is hiding? Come out, I say!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No! They shan’t get away!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For I shall make the horse shine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With fever bright as diamond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I’ll have no shadow. My rays must be everywhere filling the dark trees with the murmur of false day so that tonight my cheeks **will feel the caress of sweet red blood**, in the hush of reeds | Johnston: 85-86 |
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over the broad steps of the air.
Who’s that hiding there?
There’s no way out for you.
I’ll make the horse gleam
with a diamond’s fever.

Edwards and Johnston add ‘red’ which reinforces the image, aiding the illocutionary uptake. This is also a way in which the ephemerality of the performance is addressed, as addition of the colour reinforces the image which can often be less obvious on the stage, where utterances may not be fully heard or understood by the audience and there is clearly no possibility of re-reading the performance text as the reader is able to do with the written text. Johnston links the idea of the Moon being devious with the reference to ‘false day’, the trick of the moon that lights the way pretending it were daytime. He thus creates a connection between the previous utterances, reinforcing the dramatic effect and creating his own performativity.

As stated, the Moon is the means by which the knife can act and death can take hold. These three elements all become dark, evil forces. Johnston, in note 45, states that ‘it [...] presides, like an evil eye, over the ritualistic slaying of the lover and the jilted bridegroom’ (1989:113). Johnston earlier brings in this idea in Act Two, Scene Two when the maid sings:

| Table 5.23 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Giraba,         |                  | Lorca: 445      |
| giraba la rueda |                  |                  |
| y el agua pasaba, |                  |                  |
| porque llega la boda |              |                  |
| que se aparten las ramas |        |                  |
| y la luna se adorne |              |                  |
| por su blanca baranda. |        |                  |
The wheel went round and round,
and the water went over,
and the wedding day came
when the branches parted
and the moon adorned herself
at her white railing.

Turning
wheels turning,
water flowing,
the moon posing
on her white balcony.
Let the branches part
for the wedding comes.

Turning
The wheel was turning
And the water was flowing;
For the wedding-night’s coming.
Let the branches now part,
And the moon shine bright
On her balcony white.

The wheel was turning, turning
as the water was flowing, flowing
all on the wedding day,
and through dark branches
the moon is watching, watching
over the bride’s balcony.

Hughes: 40
Bradbury: 99
Edwards: 63
Johnston: 69

Johnston makes a stronger connection with the Moon waiting behind dark trees giving it a stronger symbolic force as it has a more sinister presence than a mere decorative one. He thus facilitates the generation of the implicature within the original; however,
he also interprets it as the ‘bride’s balcony’ whereas in Spanish it could refer to the Moon. On other hand, Edwards introduces rhyme here, which addresses performability through singability, applying interpretants that focus on the stage performance.

The Moon’s accomplice is the Beggar Woman who represents death, which is all around us waiting to strike. Lorca tells us in the stage directions that she is not on the cast list\(^\text{14}\). She is tired and grows impatient, describing how ‘blancos hilos’ (white threads) are waiting for the heavy bodies with wounded necks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.24</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[...] Aquí ha de ser, y pronto. Estoy cansada.</td>
<td>Lorca: 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abren los cofres, y los blancos hilos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aguardan por el suelo de la alcoba</td>
<td>Hughes: 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuerpos pesados con el cuello herido. [...].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] It’ll happen here, and soon. I’m tired. Open your trunks and let white rays fall on the floor of the bedrooms where heavy bodies lie with wounds at their throats. [...].</td>
<td>Bradbury: 112-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They will be here – and soon. I’m very weary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their coffins wait, their white shrouds wait on the floor of the alcove,</td>
<td>Edwards: 77-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they wait for the heavy bodies with gashed necks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] It shall be here, and soon. I’m tired.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They’re opening the coffins, and white linen waits, spread on bedroom floors,</td>
<td>Johnston: 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the weight of bodies with torn throats. [...].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] It must be here, and soon. I’m tired.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White sheets across empty bedroom floors grow impatient for the return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) There is an anomaly here as she is actually on the cast list.
of heavy bodies with their throats cut. [...].

The translation of ‘cofres’ (chests where linen would be kept) as ‘coffins’ by Bradbury and Edwards reinforces the idea of death and replicates the ambiguity of the original. Edmunds (1997: 231) explains that linen chests were used to lay out corpses. Bradbury’s translation of ‘hilos blancos’ (white threads/linen) as ‘shrouds’, makes the connection with ‘death’ stronger, on a macro-level in terms of reinforcement of the genre. Hughes’s translation of ‘hilo blancos’ as ‘white rays’ is rather ambiguous. Johnston omits ‘cofres’ but translates ‘aguardan’ (wait) as ‘grow impatient’ which makes the personification of ‘hilos blancos’ stronger, making them more complicit in the death of the two men. Johnston thus creates his own personification which is ST-driven.

The knife finds its way as the Moon says:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El aire va llegando duro, con doble filo.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The air is <strong>hardening</strong>, like a <strong>two-edged knife.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The air <strong>crystallises</strong>, <strong>double-edged.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wind is starting to <strong>blow hard</strong>, and <strong>double edged.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch how the air <strong>hardens</strong> how its profile <strong>sharpens.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hughes adds ‘knife’ to clarify the metaphor of the ‘air hardening’, although ‘double-edged’ would be more usual than ‘two-edged’. Bradbury’s ‘the air crystallises’ detracts from the image of the knife and the register is more formal than in the original. Johnston produces the allusion of a knife by saying ‘its profile sharpens’. Lorca’s use of metaphor here, while poetic, has a symbolic level that goes beyond the mere likening of the air to the knife, and it also has a sexual element with the use of ‘llegando duro’
(arriving/coming hard) and highlights the Moon’s bloodlust. Hughes and Johnston’s translations clearly convey this sexual element whereas Edward’s reference is to a strong wind rather than the formation of the wind into a knife.

The Beggar Woman instructs the Moon to light the way for the knives to do their work:

| Table 5.26 |
|------------------|------------------|
| Ilumina el chaleco y aparta los botones, que después las navajas ya saben el camino. | Lorca: 459 |
| Light up their vests and unbutton their buttons, so that the knives will find the way. | Hughes: 57 |
| Light up their jackets, part the buttons, So that the knives will know their way! | Bradbury: 113 |
| Light up the waistcoat, open the buttons, For then the knives will know their path. | Edwards: 78 |
| Just make their waistcoat buttons gleam after that, the knives like fish will come marauding in.... | Johnston: 87 |

Johnston describes the ‘knives’ as ‘fish’ which serves to evoke the image of the silver object that slips easily into the body but, moreover, he creates a connection with how the Mother describes the knife at the end of the play, as ‘pez sin escamas ni río’ (a fish without scales or river). He thus acts upon the text and, therefore the audience, creating cohesion and reinforcing images that will be evoked later. However, the register of ‘marauding’ is rather formal in the context of the performance, and may also detract from the idea that knives ‘know the way’ as it describes the movement the knife makes (like a fish) rather than the fact that it knows where to go.

One of the biggest challenges of staging *Bodas de sangre* is the forest scene and the surrealism of the Moon that comes down to earth. In the performance of *Blood Wedding* by Theatrical Niche, the Woodcutters, the Moon and Death (the Beggar Woman) were represented by puppets. The Woodcutters dressed in brown with faces that appeared etched in wood and with twig-like hands. The Moon was dressed in white, a face of delicate features which gave an androgynous appearance through a round blue/white halo. The expressionless face and large eyes evoked an air of sadness but also of coldness and sexual ambiguity. The Beggar Woman puppet was dressed in black, with an aged, expressionless face and hollow eyes that gave an image of death. In the stage directions, Lorca tells us that the Beggar Woman turns with her back to the audience and lifts her cloak, this action portraying that death has now taken hold. In this performance, rather than translating the linguistic written signs into movement of the actor’s body, they were translated into lighting with a red light being used to light up the puppet. The red light emanating through the puppet’s hollow eyes evoked the sensation that blood had been spilt. We thus see how the linguistic signs in the stage directions become different theatrical signs, in this case stage lighting, with the use of the colour red to make connections to blood and hence death. Colour is thus used independently of the ST to reinforce connections on the macro-level of the play. It is thus performative, producing an act in its own right. It is also performable in the sense that it is through the act of colour performed on stage that the performance produces a cohesive plot, so colour has real dramatic function.

The inspiration for the use of puppets in this performance was taken from Lorca’s own plays and his interest in puppet theatre. This shows how the performance is refracted through the source author by drawing on other areas of his work. Although the personification of these two characters is not literal in the way that the ST stage

16 Photographs of these puppets can be found on the Theatrical Niche website at: http://www.theatricalniche.co.uk/production-shots.php (last accessed on 21.09.17).

17 The producer explained this in the Question and Answer session that took place at the end of the performance on 2nd May 2014.
directions state, it shows an interpretation strategy that equally creates an atmosphere of the supernatural, and colour in the puppets’ outfits is a form of indexically pointing to their function. The use of puppets provides an analogy with emptiness and coldness as they are wooden and thus inhuman. However, the human bodies directing the puppets and the human faces appearing directly above them creates the connection to the human world. In this way the linguistic signs of the drama text are not taken literally but are interpreted and implicatures are generated which are not far removed from the effect of the personification created in the ST.

After the surrealism of the forest scene and the interaction between the Moon and Death, the final act switches to an image of death as the stage directions require a white room with a shining white floor which has the feeling of a church and describes how two girls dressed in blue are winding a red skein of wool and chanting.

Johnston (1989: 114) in note 50 says that:

The colours blue and red here are clear references to the normal manner of representing veins and arteries. Moreover, the wool itself stands for the course of human life, always finite, always liable to be cut.

However, the dark blue of their clothes creates a link back to the forest scene and the red wool is connected with the spilling of blood. We have a similar effect as that created by the lullaby, where the innocence evoked by the genre juxtaposes the violence expressed in the words. Moreover, the words the girls chant are heavily symbolic, the shining white backdrop serving to reinforce the image of death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUCHACHA 1. á Madeja, madeja, ¿qué quieres hacer?</th>
<th>MUCHACHA 2. á Jazmín de vestido, cristal de papel. Nacer a la cuatro,</th>
<th>Lorca: 466-467</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 5.27
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>morir a las diez. Ser hilo de lana, cadena a tus pies y nudo que apríete amargo laurel.</td>
<td>FIRST MAIDEN: Skein of wool, skein of wool, what would you like to be? Hughes: 62-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECOND MAIDEN: A flower of a dress or the crystal of a paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be born at four and then die at ten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just a skein of wool, a chain on his feet, and a knot that binds the bitter laurel. Bradbury: 119-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIRST GIRL: Wool, winding wool, what would you be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECOND GIRL: Dresses of jasmine and glass paper, to be born at four, to die at ten, to be thread chaining your feet, tying you down against the bitter laurel. Edwards: 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIRST GIRL. Oh, wool, oh wool, What will you make?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECOND GIRL. A dress soft as jasmine,
Cloth paper-thin
Begin it at four.
At ten finishing.
A thread of my wool’s
A chain for your feet.
A knot that chokes,
The bride’s bitter wreath.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIRL 1  Wool, wool,</th>
<th>Johnston: 96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what would you do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRL 2  Her jasmine dress and his crystal tie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were born at four and they died at ten.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two strands of wool and a single chain, two leaves of laurel, one bitter pain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edwards makes a specific connection with the Bride in the line ‘the bride’s bitter wreath’, whereas the original states ‘amargo laurel’ (bitter laurel) although the bride’s wreath (or headdress) was made of orange blossom. Johnston also makes specific connections to the Bride, Bridegroom and Leonardo by using the possessive pronoun with ‘her jasmine dress’ and ‘his crystal tie’, ‘they were born’, ‘they died’. However, Edwards removes the idea of life being over quickly with ‘begin it at four’ and ‘at ten finishing,’ which makes it more ambiguous and removes this symbolic force of the fragility of life.
This children’s rhyme presents difficulties for the translator. Johnston introduces rhyme which serves to make it sing-able. There are obvious analogies to nursery rhymes in English such as ‘wind the bobbin up’ which could be drawn upon here. However, incorporating part of a well-known rhyme, for example to translate ‘madeja, madeja’, could be problematic as any initial connection this would establish with the English-speaking audience would subsequently disconnect as the rest of the rhyme would not follow expectations. The idea of spinning wool also evokes a fairytale and the receiver can perhaps make their own inferences between the Beggar Woman and the evil characters in Sleeping Beauty, Snow White or Rumpelstiltskin.

Like the lullaby, this song tells the audience what has happened and is another representation of the Greek-style chorus:

| MUCHACHA 2.  a Madeja, madeja, ¿qué quieres cantar? | Lorca: 467 |
| MUCHACHA 1.  a Heridas de cera, dolor de arrayán. Dormir la mañana, de noche velar. |
| SECOND MAIDEN: Skein of wool, skein of wool, what do you want to sing? Hughes: 63 |
| FIRST MAIDEN: Wounds of wax and pain of myrtle. Sleep in the morning to wake at night. |
| SECOND GIRL: Wool, winding wool, what would you sing? Bradbury: 120 |
| FIRST GIRL: Wounds of wax, wounds of myrtle, |

Table 5.28
the morning sleep,
the night-long vigil.

SECOND GIRL. Oh wool, oh wool,
Of what will you sing?

FIRST GIRL. Of wounds like wax,
And myrtle ache.
Of day’s long sleep
And nights awake.

SECOND GIRL Wool, wool
what would you sing?

FIRST GIRL Of wounds of wax
and of white myrtle pain,
of mornings asleep
and of nights awake.

In this instance Bradbury and Edwards attempt rhyme with ‘myrtle’ and ‘vigil’ (Bradbury) and ‘ache’ and ‘awake’ (Edwards). Johnston reinforces the colour of the plant myrtle by inserting ‘white’ and thus connects it to an English-speaking audience, who may not be aware of the colour of this plant. This aids illocutionary uptake on behalf of both the reader and spectator, and addresses the ephemerality of the stage. This verse further evokes death with ‘heridas de cera’ (wounds of wax) as the blood has drained from the bodies and the skin is becoming wax-like in death. This is an image that all the translators maintain.

In the performance of The House of Bernarda Alba, which forms part of this corpus, there was a scene where the three extras (referred to in Section 5.1.2) wind a rope in the shape of a noose that represents the rope Adela will later use to hang herself. This
was a deliberate reference to the winding of the rope in *Bodas de sangre*\textsuperscript{18} and in this way the director refracts the performance text through another play in the trilogy, blurring the boundaries between Lorca’s plays and disturbing the stability of the plot within each play as signs from other plays are redirected. This highlights that Lorca’s work is a continuous oeuvre.

\textsuperscript{18} The director informed me of this in a group discussion that took place at the end of the performance on 15\textsuperscript{th} July 2014.
5.3 Conclusion

The examples discussed in this chapter show how in the drama texts and the performance texts translators negotiate between the different layers of meaning present in the ST. This negotiation is a creative strategy employed either through the application of formal interpretants to generate Lorca’s grammar of colour, or thematic interpretants that make cohesive links to the overall discourse of the play. It reveals how translation solutions on one level impact other levels when the writing practice of some translators prioritises the performance and the performable as in the case where the lyrical level of the text was reinforced with rhymes which aided singability. However, sometimes the performable was at the expense of the grammar of colour. There were also solutions that reveal how the ephemeral nature of the stage was addressed, for example, through the repetition of references to colour in the ST, or additional mentions of colour. Such additions may be redundant for a reader but may aid potential uptake on the part of the theatre audience.

In some cases, translators add colour where it is not present in the ST, which shows that they are working within Lorca’s grammar of colour, but at the same time independently of it, drawing attention to the autonomy of their translation. However, there were also examples where implicatures that could be generated by the ST were explicitated for the receiver which, on one level can be seen as a strategy to aid uptake, but on another level is restrictive as it limits the audience’s own interpretation to only one of several possible interpretations available to the ST receiver. Moreover, this clarification of implicatures of the ST affected the other levels of meaning present in the ST, such as the pictorial level.

Different registers affect speakability, as shown in TT examples where lexical choices were too formal, or produced unnatural collocations. This is particularly true of Bradbury’s translation which failed to produce a credible rural context for the characters to operate in. Luke and Johnston used punctuation and addition to replicate natural speech, illustrating their greater awareness of the need to produce a text that works on
stage; indeed their translations were primarily produced for a particular performance whereas Bradbury’s was not.

Translator choices were not always either strictly source or target-oriented. For example, in one translation, decisions were based on the translator’s (Johnston’s) knowledge of Lorca’s own literary influences. Such decisions were source-led but, paradoxically, neither strictly source nor target-oriented. Johnston’s choice of ‘white army’ to translate ‘flood of wool’ shows the sign acting a continuum pointing to interpretants that are outside the text, thus drawing attention to the context of production of the translation rather than the context of the production of the ST. Johnston’s use of notes to explain such translation choices establish a dialogue with the reader on one level, but also draw attention to his authoritative position as an academic. These notes also justify his position as translator, pre-empting criticisms of his translation. He thus addresses the reader, and potential directors, from a position of authority and positions his translation as not just a translation but also as an authoritative commentary on the ST.

The performativity of Lorca’s grammar of colour is limited at times in favour of performability. Yet, paradoxically performability can also be related to coherence for dramatic effect, not just to audience uptake. Performability is thus target-oriented in aiding audience uptake, but also source-oriented in creating cohesiveness through the representation of the ST’s grammar of colour. Translators also created new metaphors or enabled implicature generation, which serve to create connections to the overall plot and enhance cohesion and dramatic effect in this way.

It was also evident that translator choices can take us beyond the boundaries of the text itself by alluding to references/events not connected with the ST but with the TL culture. This was seen at a micro-linguistic level in the drama text and also at a macro-level in the performance text. This shows how the sign acts as a continuum and makes connections between the context of production and the context of reception. Colour was also used in the translated drama texts and the performance texts to reinforce meaning beyond the confines of the ST. In one example from the performance text,
colour was given a dramatic function in the way it was used independently of the ST through puppets, producing a performative act on the target stage. The choice of puppets to interpret this scene signified beyond that particular performance of that particular text towards other work by Lorca, placing that production of the play within the wider discourse surrounding the author and his work. In the performance text, we also saw a blurring of boundaries between source and target where the ST formed part of the performance, or the performance refracted the source author’s other plays. This shows the instability of the notions of source text and target text. However, the incorporation of parts of the ST into the TT performance has the potential to produce dialectical reactions; from feelings of enjoyment and inclusion to alienation and exclusion.

The examples analysed here show the translator as an active agent, applying their own interpretative strategies in order to produce a representation of the ST in English. Their strategies bring different priorities to the fore as they negotiate the different layers present within the ST for a new audience.
Chapter 6 Natural elements: water, the sun, heat and cold

6.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses examples related to the natural elements, water and the sun, and the dichotomy of heat and cold in order to explore how the translators have addressed the different layers of language used to evoke multiple meanings in the original and how these multiple meanings have been addressed in translation. These elements evoke the natural, rural setting of the original plays but, at the same time, are universal and thus are able to evoke meanings that go beyond that setting. Examples are taken from both the drama texts and the performance texts as in the previous chapter.

6.2 Water: its presence and absence

Lorca uses water symbolically, both its presence and its absence. The stark contrasts between flowing water, stagnated water and the sea, are used metaphorically in the three plays, with images of pure, clean, free flowing white water contrasting with images of stagnant, rancid water.

As mentioned in *Yerma*, water is a metaphor for fertility; for example, it is used to describe the birth of children: ‘los hijos llegan como el agua’ (children arrive like water). It is, therefore, a positive force connected with the giving of life and also connected with sexual attraction, as the Old Woman informs Yerma in Act One, Scene Two:

| VIEJA. Todo lo contrario que yo. Quizá por eso no hayas parido a tiempo. Los hombres tienen que gustar, muchacha. Han de deshacernos las trenzas y darnos de beber agua en su misma boca. Así corre el mundo. | Lorca: 489 |
|FIRST OLD WOMAN: It wasn’t like that with me. Maybe that’s why you haven’t had any babies yet. Men have to be something you like, girl. We have to want them to undo our hair and give us their mouths to drink like water. That’s how the world is. | Merwin: 84 |

Table 6.1
OLD WOMAN: With me it was just the opposite. Perhaps that’s why you didn’t get pregnant straight away. Men want pleasure, child. They want to undo our hair and give us water to drink from their own mouths. That’s what keeps the world turning.

PAGAN WOMAN. Perhaps that’s why you haven’t got kids yet. Me I was just the opposite. Men like to pleasure us, girl. They like to undo our plaits and give us water to drink from their own mouths. That’s what makes the world go round.

OLD WOMAN You and I are like chalk and cheese. Maybe that’s why you haven’t …because you don’t enjoy it. You’ve got to want your man…let him undo your hair and drink water from his mouth. That’s the way the world comes and goes.

The image Lorca creates here is of intimacy and pleasure, but also of female submission, where the man undoes the woman’s hair and gives her water to drink from his mouth. Merwin’s ‘We have to want them to undo our hair and give us their mouths to drink like water’ produces a different metaphor as the mouth becomes the object that is to be drunk rather than the water, which detracts from the implication of the metaphor of water which is that if you drink enough and enjoy it, you will get pregnant. The translator’s erroneous interpretation here of the ST thus leads to a less cohesive translation in terms of the wider discourse of the play as a whole. The sexual connotation of the man giving the woman water to drink from his mouth, and the notion of submission on the part of the woman are not present.

We see examples of domestication with Johnston’s use of a habitual saying in English ‘like chalk and cheese’ and Luke’s ‘that’s what makes the world go round’; in this way the translators are making a connection with their English-speaking audience. Their interpretations in this instance are thus target-oriented. Johnston omits ‘parido a tiempo’ (‘parir’ is a colloquial expression for ‘to give birth’) and uses ellipsis, aiding the receiver to infer what is implied and he adds ‘because you don’t enjoy it’, thus directly
stating or clarifying the implicature. The interpretant that the translator applies here aids audience uptake.

Bradbury’s ‘Men want pleasure’ is not correct, and the locutionary level here has a direct impact on the illocutionary level as the focus of the sentence is changed.

If we consider this utterance as a whole, Merwin and Bradbury follow the ST, presenting the content of the five sentences in the same order. This contrasts with Luke and Johnston’s translations in that Luke changes the sentence order and Johnston presents the same information over four sentences. Luke’s use of both the first person object pronoun ‘me’ and the first person subject pronoun ‘I’ in ‘Me I was just the opposite’, replicates colloquial spoken language and thus addresses potential speakability, as does Johnston’s reduction to four sentences and the use of ellipsis. We thus see a marked difference between the interpretations of Merwin and Bradbury that favour a structural closeness to the ST (although in terms of content, their translations do not always reflect the ST correctly) compared to Johnston and Luke’s translations that prioritise speakability over a more formal structural correspondence between ST and TT. This suggests that Johnston and Luke prioritise the stage.

We have seen how water in this play is connected with fertility and sexual chemistry and that the lack of it is equated to infertility. Indeed, there are many references to lack of water or dryness. As discussed in Chapter One, the name Yerma means ‘barren’, she is literally ‘a barrenland’. This association in Spanish is not available to an English-speaking reader/spectator with no knowledge of Spanish. The co-text can provide such information, however the Merwin and Bradbury translations do not provide it. In contrast, in his introduction to the edition ‘Plays: One, Blood Wedding, Doña Rosita the Spinster, Yerma’ which includes Peter Luke’s translation of Yerma, Gwynne Edwards explains this significance, as does David Johnston in his introduction to his translation of Yerma. For the spectator of the performance text, the reference could be explained in the paratext that accompanies the performance, for example, in the programme or publicity material. In the performance text of Yerma examined here, it was neither on the programme, nor on the separate cast list that was handed out prior to the
performance. However, this information was provided on the theatre website\(^{19}\) and also on the Experience Nottinghamshire website\(^{20}\), so spectators who looked online for information about the production, or to book the tickets, were made aware of the metaphorical significance of the play’s title.

The physical trait of dryness evoked by Yerma’s name is echoed in the description of her tongue being ‘un pedernal’ (a flint) which evokes an image of a hard, grey stone. In Act Two, Scene One, the Washerwomen are discussing the situation between Juan and Yerma, the First Washerwoman blaming Juan, saying that he should look after his wife, whereas the Fourth Washerwoman says that the blame is with Yerma herself:

\[
\text{Table 6.2}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La culpa es de ella, que tiene por lengua un pedernal.</td>
<td>It’s her fault. She’s got a tongue like a flint.</td>
<td>Lorca: 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s her fault. She’s got a tongue like a flint.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merwin: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s to blame. She’s got a tongue like a flint.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradbury: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s the one to blame with that nagging tongue of hers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke: 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s the one to blame...she’s got a tongue like a piece of flint.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnston: 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This metaphorical image of her tongue as a piece of flint links back to the previous example of how men should give women water to drink from their mouths. Yerma’s mouth is metaphorically dry implying that she does not receive this water from her husband as there is no sexual attraction between them. The reference to the cold, grey colour of the flint also evokes images of a barren wasteland where nothing grows. All the translators but Luke replicate the reference to the flint, which allows the construction of the pictorial image in the minds of the receiver, although they all do this by means of a simile with the addition of ‘like’ rather than stating that her tongue actually is flint as in the ST. As discussed in Chapter Five, while similes are types of

\(^{19}\) [https://lacemarkettheatre.co.uk/LaceMarketTheatre.dll/Archive?Season=6&Programme=640779](https://lacemarkettheatre.co.uk/LaceMarketTheatre.dll/Archive?Season=6&Programme=640779) (last accessed on 24th August 2017)

metaphors, they are slightly different when it comes to interpretation as explained by Goatly (1997: 118). The use of simile makes the interpretation slightly more direct and in this way the translators are perhaps aiding the audience uptake of the metaphor, and thus influencing the perlocutionary effect to some degree. Luke, on the other hand, connects the metaphor with Yerma’s personality using the expression, ‘nagging tongue’. While this generates one part of the implicature that we associate with flint as being sharp and jagged, implying that she is perhaps harsh with a sharp tongue, nagging her husband, the pictorial image linked to the colour of the hard, grey flint and the lack of water it evokes is not present. Luke’s translation here thus only applies a first interpretant, whereas the literal translation employed by the other translators is able to bring out all of the interpretants that the word ‘flint’ denotes. This is particularly important in terms of cohesion within the discourse of the play as a whole given the relevance of the absence of water as a metaphor for Yerma’s sterility. So a literal translation is more performative in terms of cohesion and dramatic effect of the play as a whole, and a translation that is source-oriented can thus be target-oriented in this respect. However, this literal translation may require a longer processing time on the part of the receiver and, if so, although performative for the reader, it may not be performable for the spectator. This shows the dialectical nature of the relationship between the page and the stage.

References to infertility are thus made by way of the concepts of lacking in water and being dry. Yerma constantly questions her infertile state in these terms. In Act One, Scene Two, she asks the Old Woman:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Por qué estoy yo seca?</td>
<td>Lorca: 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why haven’t I had any?</td>
<td>Merwin: 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why am I barren?</td>
<td>Bradbury: 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why haven’t I got any children?</td>
<td>Johnston: 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Spanish colloquial language, ‘seco/seca’ can mean ‘thin’ but in this instance Lorca is using its standard meaning of ‘dry’ to refer to Yerma’s lack of water (infertility) and thus the word ‘seca’ implicates her barren state. Merwin, Luke and Johnston all explicate the implicature that the word ‘seca’ generates in Spanish, with ‘any’, ‘childless’ and ‘any children’ respectively. While these interpretants clarify for the English-speaking receiver what the word ‘seca’ implies, they do not take us to the wider discourse of the play as a whole. On the other hand Bradbury’s choice of ‘barren’ connects more directly to the symbolic level of the meanings of dryness used in the play, while at the same time it overcomes any misunderstanding or confusion that the literal translation of ‘seca’ as ‘dry’ may produce.

In Act Two, Scene One, the Washerwomen describe Yerma as dry and her breasts as being of sand:

| Table 6.4 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| ¡Ay de la casada seca! | Lorca: 498 |
| ¡Ay de la que tiene los pechos de arena! | |
| Oh the **dry** wife | Merwin: 97 |
| With **her** breasts of sand! | |
| Ay, for the **barren** woman! | Bradbury: 39 |
| Ay, for **her** breasts of sand! | |
| Alas, for the **barren** wife! | Luke: 178 |
| Alas, for **her** sand-filled breasts! | |
| But the poor **dry** wife, | Johnston: 39 |
| **her** breasts of sand, | |
| **her** empty life. | |

In this example of the translation of ‘seca’ (dry) some translators take a different approach to the one they adopted in the previous example. Bradbury is consistent in her choice of ‘barren’, which shows cohesiveness and what Dickins (2005: 250) terms metaphorical patterning. Luke also opts for ‘barren’ in this instance, thus making the
metaphor more explicit, aiding the illocutionary force of the utterance and uptake on the part of the receiver; Merwin and Johnston allow the reader/spectator to make their own connections between dryness and infertility with the literal translation ‘dry’. However, Merwin and Johnston do not apply this strategy consistently, as the previous example indicates, whereas Bradbury’s strategy in these two example, is one that employs a cohesive interpretant.

The reference to ‘pechos de arena’ (breasts of sand) provides further connections to Yerma as a piece of barren land where nothing can grow. The implicature of ‘pechos de arena’ is that her breasts have sand instead of milk, but it also takes us further as we can infer the image of Yerma as physically dry, in that she is the metaphorical representation of sterility itself, a dry, dusty, barren land. Merwin, Bradbury and Johnston replicate ‘los pechos de arena’ literally as ‘breasts of sand’, whereas Luke uses modulation with ‘sand-filled breasts’. This modulation is able to take us to the first implicature of Yerma having no milk but does not necessarily take us beyond this. This slight change of syntax in English produces an interpretant that is more limited in scope. Moreover, Luke (and Bradbury) transpose the lament to her breasts rather than to Yerma herself, which focuses on the first meaning of the implicature rather than the wider symbolic meaning. Johnston uses the addition of ‘poor’ to reinforce the feeling of pity and adds an extra line in order to produce rhyme with ‘her empty life’; this reinforces the idea of her barrenness as her literal emptiness, meaning that her life is empty as a result of her empty womb. In this way the translator creates further implicatures that are connected with the overall discourse of the play. He also creates his own rhyme with ‘wife’ and ‘life’ which fits the poetic nature of the text. Johnston’s strategy here of addition produces two different effects on different levels; first, he is able to achieve his own cohesiveness with thematic interpretants that connect to the overall discourse of the play; and second, he is negotiating his own performability thus meeting the lyrical level of the ST, but independently of it.

Bradbury borrows the word ‘Ay’ which is a typical everyday interjection in Spanish, used to express a range of emotions, including pity and pain but also joy, similarly to ‘ah’ in
English. Bradbury’s strategy of borrowing on the one hand seeks to overcome the difficulty of translating the word ‘Ay’ into English, and on the other, exoticises the text making it appear more melodramatic. Lorca’s rural trilogy on stage has been criticised in this respect, as discussed in Chapter Two.

Luke provides a similar lament with the word ‘alas’. In terms of speakability, the choice of ‘alas’ is more literary in English than ‘Ay’ would be in Spanish. However, the choice of ‘alas’ perhaps elevates the chant to a higher plane of poetic language, thus engaging with the source text on a poetic level. ‘Alas’ is also somewhat old-fashioned so it can indicate the temporal element of the ST and meet audience expectations in this way. It is important not to assume that the audience will necessarily want a text that eschews its temporal location, as this might be precisely why they are interested in the play.

Merwin and Johnston’s choices of ‘oh’ and ‘but’ respectively present more neutral solutions, which overcome the difficulties that the translation of ‘Ay’ represents and avoid the possible melodramatic effect that a borrowing of the word produces.

In Act One, Scene Two, Yerma begs the Old Woman to explain things to her and describes herself as dying of thirst:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YERMA. (Triste.) Las muchachas que se crían en el campo, como yo, tienen cerradas todas las puertas. Todo se vuelven medias palabras, gestos, porque todas estas cosas dicen que no se pueden saber. Y tú también, tú también te callas y te vas con aire de doctora, sabiéndolo todo, pero negándolo a la que se muere de sed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorca: 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sadly): Girls that grew up in the country like I did find all the doors closed. It’s never anything but hints and winks, because they say you can’t know anything about all that. You too, you won’t say anything either, and you’ll go away looking wise and knowing all about it, but refusing to give any to somebody who’s dying of thirst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merwin: 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sadly): Girls like me, who are brought up in the country, face closed doors. People resort to half-words, vague gestures, and say we shouldn’t know about such things. And you’re the same. You won’t say anything either. You just wear that knowing expression, as if you knew it all – and denying it to someone dying of thirst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sadly). Everything’s kept such a secret for girls like me, brought up in the country. All hints and half-truths. Things are never talked about. And you’re as bad as the rest of them. You’re like a doctor. You know what it’s all about. Here I am dying of thirst and you won’t give me a drop of water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadly I was brought up in the country, girls like me grow up behind closed doors. Everything is half-spoken words, hidden gestures, because these are the things that shouldn’t be known. And now you too, you say nothing and just walk away holding the key to all of these mysteries, knowing it all full well, and leaving me here dying of thirst.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ST Lorca highlights Yerma’s supposed innocence and lack of education as she asks the Old Woman for an explanation or a cure, as she feels that the Old Woman, with her air of a doctor, is withholding something from her. The reference to ‘la que se muere de sed’ (she who is dying of thirst) can implicate ‘a thirst for knowledge’ on one level. However, Lorca takes us to the other levels of the wider discourse of the play regarding Yerma’s sterility, which as mentioned before is associated with a lack of water, i.e. a physical dryness, rather than just the metaphorical thirst for knowledge. Merwin, Bradbury and Johnston replicate this reference to ‘dying of thirst’, whereas Luke creates a further metaphor of his own with the addition of the sentence ‘Here I am dying of thirst and you won’t give me a drop of water’. This expansion produces implicatures of a thirst for knowledge but also reinforces the symbolic connection between water and fertility, so Luke’s use of addition produces thematic interpretants that connect to the wider discourse of the play.
Only Luke literally translates ‘con aire de doctora’ (with the air of a doctor), whereas the other translators use explicitation with ‘looking wise’, ‘You just wear that knowing expression’, and ‘holding the key to all of these mysteries’, which all aid uptake on the part of the receiver. This is a target-oriented strategy that shows how the translators position themselves in relation to the ST. However, the reference to ‘doctora’ here in the ST perhaps implicates that Yerma feels that the reason that she has not yet conceived is a medical condition but it also tells us something about the society in which Yerma lives, since rather than seek proper medical advice, she asks the Old Woman for information, and she will later visit the local witch doctor/healer Dolores. Smith (1998: 19) sees this as an artistic choice on Lorca’s part rather than a direct reflection of society of the time as ‘[…] the years prior to the play’s composition saw a progressive medicalization of pregnancy and childbirth in Spain (as elsewhere in Europe)’. However, it is still customary today in rural villages in Andalusia for people to visit local healers so it is not unlikely that this would be the case in the 1930s.

Yerma’s lack of water or her thirst affects her whole being; she cannot function properly without water as she likens her thirst to wanting to go up a mountain but not having feet, and wanting to sew but not having thread. Her lack of water is, therefore, a physical characteristic that affects her entire body, not just her womb. In Act Two, Scene Two, she says to María that those who do not suffer from the same thirst, i.e. the same predicament, do not understand the anguish she is suffering. This is again expressed with references to water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YERMA. Las mujeres, cuando tenéis hijos, no podéis pensar en las que no los tenemos. Os quedáis frescas, ignorantes, como el que nada en agua dulce no tiene idea de la sed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YERMA. You women who have babies haven’t any thought for us who don’t. You stay cool and ignorant. Just like people who are swimming in fresh water can’t think what thirst is like.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YERMA: Women with children never understand women without. You stay fresh and ignorant – like someone swimming in fresh water who can’t understand anyone being thirsty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YERMA</th>
<th>Bradbury: 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YERMA. You mothers have no idea what it is like for us, any more than a swimmer in a mountain stream ever thinks of what it’s like to be dying of thirst.</td>
<td>Luke: 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YERMA You’re a mother. How could you understand? How can someone swimming in a cool stream feel what it’s like to be thirsty?</td>
<td>Johnston: 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lorca paints a picture of fertility connected with ‘agua dulce’ (literally ‘sweet water’ although the habitual translation is freshwater, as opposed to seawater). The word ‘fresco/a’ in Spanish has several meanings, habitually ‘fresh’ or ‘cool’ or ‘cold’ when referring to the weather or water. When used to describe people, it can mean ‘defiant’, ‘cheeky’ or ‘unperturbed’. The meaning that Lorca employs here is that women with children are not affected by, or are unaware of how those who do not have children feel. This is reinforced with the use of the second adjective ‘ignorantes’ which does not mean ‘ignorant’ but ‘unaware’. In this sentence, the use of the word ‘frescas’ obviously has connections to water, so that there is an inference here that women with children are also ‘fresh’ and ‘cool’ because they metaphorically swim in sweet/fresh water. It is difficult to convey the double meaning of ‘frescas’ in English. Luke omits the translation of these two adjectives and paraphrases with ‘You mothers have no idea what it is like for us’. Johnston likewise omits ‘frescas, ignorantes’ using explicitation to convey the idea of the mothers being unaware with ‘How could you understand?’. Merwin and Bradbury translate ‘ignorante’ as ‘ignorant’ whereas the meaning is subtler in Spanish, and, as mentioned above, is ‘unaware’ in this context. Johnston translates ‘agua dulce’ as ‘cool stream’ rather than the more usual translation of ‘agua dulce’ as ‘freshwater’. The use here of ‘agua dulce’ has a further symbolic force though, since if we take its literal translation as ‘sweet water’ it metaphorically evokes an image of the bliss that Yerma feels women with children are able to experience. Luke reinforces her predicament with the addition of ‘dying’ in ‘dying of thirst’ rather than ‘thirsty’ as in the
ST. Luke’s choice here makes connections to the overall discourse of the play. An alternative translation of ‘la que tiene sed’ could be ‘such a thirst’, which would also make a metaphorical link with the idea of a thirst for a child being a need.

Yerma is offered a solution to her predicament by the Old Woman who suggests that in order to ‘quench Yerma’s thirst’ she should turn to another man and offers her own son as a potential partner. In the Third Act, at the end of the last scene, the Old Woman says:

Table 6.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuando se tiene sed, se agradece el agua.</th>
<th>Lorca: 523</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you’re thirsty, water tastes good.</td>
<td>Merwin: 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone’s thirsty, they’re thankful enough for water.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you’re thirsty, you’re glad of water.</td>
<td>Luke: 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re thirsty, you should be grateful for water.</td>
<td>Johnston: 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bradbury, Luke and Johnston apply formal interpretants to translate ‘se agradece el agua’, albeit in slightly different forms, that maintain Lorca’s metaphor of thirst and water. Merwin, however, changes the meaning with ‘water tastes good’ rather than ‘when one is thirsty, one appreciates water’. This detracts from the symbolic meaning which the Old Woman implicates, that Yerma should be grateful for what is on offer.

However, Yerma is unable to go against her own code of honour and accept this offer of another man. She answers the Old Woman describing her predicament as now so bad that she is like a dry field where a thousand pair of oxen can plough and the Old Woman is only offering her a small glass of water from a well, stagnant and putrid as it is dishonest water, as discussed in Chapter 5 (Section 5.1.1) with regards to the ‘river of men’. Her pain is now beyond the flesh, there is no cure; it is a pain of the spirit which takes it to a higher figurative level:
Table 6.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yo soy como un campo seco donde caben arando mil pares de bueyes, y lo que tú me das es un pequeño vaso de agua de pozo. Lo mío es dolor que ya no está en las carnes.</td>
<td>Lorca: 523-524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m like a dry field that would need a thousand pairs of oxen to plow it, and you offer me a little glass of well water. My suffering isn’t even in my body anymore.</td>
<td>Merwin: 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m a dry field ploughed by a thousand oxen, and you offer me a glass of well-water. My misery’s no longer a thing of the flesh.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What good in a desert is a drop of water? It’s not my body that thirsts, it’s my heart.</td>
<td>Luke: 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m like a dry field waiting to be ploughed by a thousand pairs of oxen, and you offer me a glass of water from a dusty well. What’s wrong with me goes much deeper than that.</td>
<td>Johnston: 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the translators replicate the metaphor of ‘un campo seco donde caben arando mil pares de bueyes’, (a dry field where there is space for a thousand pairs of oxen to plough) except Luke who reduces this sentence and uses the analogy of a ‘desert’, which is a more habitual metaphor in English to evoke extreme dryness than a dry field would be. This detracts from the cultural context of the rural setting of the farming community, and does not create the same pictorial image as in the ST. However, it can perhaps create an equal impact as the receiver is able to activate the associations of a desert as a place of extreme dryness. Luke’s translation is also less melodramatic than a more literal translation of the ST, and the example illustrates the responsiveness of the translator’s interpretant.

Water in this instance is described as ‘agua de pozo’ (water from a well), this is in contrast to the free-flowing waters described earlier, the insinuation being that it is stale, or bad, as it is dishonest water that belongs to a man other than her husband. Luke omits this reference thus reducing the symbolic element. Johnston’s addition of ‘dusty’
in ‘water from a dusty well’ creates connections with the image of dryness but the implication in the ST is perhaps not so much that the well is dusty and dry, but that the water is stagnant and rancid. However, such additions show that the translator is creating extra contextual effects for the receiver, which can be particularly useful for the stage performance. Other alternatives here could be ‘stale water from a well’ or ‘rancid water from a well’ which would make the ST implicatures stronger, addressing the symbolic layers of meaning present. It is also interesting to note that the translation by Merwin and Bradbury of ‘agua de pozo’ as ‘well water’ and ‘well-water’ respectively, compared to ‘water from a well’, can have an effect on speakability on stage, as an ambiguity could be created, with the potential misunderstanding that the water is well (as in good) rather than coming from a well. Thus the full contextual effects of the utterance may not be so readily achieved. This illustrates the important fact that translation choices which are not erroneous can cause misunderstanding due to the medium of delivery.

As stated, due to Yerma’s own code of honour, she is unable to take this stale water from the well. The implication is that Yerma needs irrigation but in the form of love not just the seed as land needs tending to be productive. We are told earlier at the end of Act One, Scene Two, that Yerma’s husband, Juan, spends so much time out in the fields irrigating his land that he has no time left to irrigate his wife. Yerma says that she will wait up for him, but he tells her to go to bed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. I’ll be up at the watering ditches all night. There’s only a little water and it’s mine until sunrise, and I have to stay and watch out for water thieves. [...].</td>
<td>No. Estaré toda la noche regando. Viene poca agua, es mía hasta la salida del sol y tengo que defenderla de los ladrones. [...].</td>
<td>Lorca: 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I’m going to spend the night watering the fields. There’s little enough water and it’s only mine until the sun comes up, so I must make sure no one steals any. [...].</td>
<td>Merwin: 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradbury: 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No. I’ve got to **irrigate the fruit trees** all night. The water is low and I’ve only got it till sun-up. If I don’t watch out, the others will switch it. [...] Luke: 174

No. I’ll be **watering the fields** all night. What precious little water there is is mine until sunrise, and I’ll have to make sure that nobody else tries to get near it. [...] Johnston: 34

Bradbury, Luke and Johnston all clarify the word ‘regando’ (watering) with the addition of the object ‘fields’ (Bradbury and Johnston) and ‘fruit trees’ (Luke), as required in English. Merwin’s transposition from gerund ‘regando’ to nouns ‘the watering ditches’ detracts from the action being carried out by Juan, which metaphorically implies that he is expending the precious little water he has on the fields rather than on Yerma. Johnston adds ‘precious’ to highlight the scarcity of the water, which is related to the cultural context but it also aids a potential double meaning as to what ‘Juan’s water’ implies. Johnston’s strategy of addition here is thus able to produce further interpretants that connect to the overall discourse of the play.

The direct object pronoun ‘la’ in the phrase ‘tengo que defenderla de los ladrones’ could refer to both water (‘el agua’ takes the feminine direct object pronoun ‘la’ in Spanish) and Yerma. Such a double meaning is not available in English if the phrase is translated literally as ‘I have to defend it from thieves’, in which only the first most immediate implicature of ‘la’ referring to ‘the water’ is available. However, if this is transposed into a phrase such as ‘what’s mine’, so the whole phrase would read ‘I have to defend what’s mine from thieves’ further implicatures could be produced and additionally, a connection with the wider discourse of the play in terms of denoting a macho society, would be created.

Just as Yerma describes herself as ‘dry’, she also describes Juan in similar terms although this is related to his character, implying that it is a fundamental part of his nature. In Act One, Scene Two, in a conversation with Victor, Yerma says of Juan:
In the ST Lorca’s uses the adjective ‘seco’ (dry) in this instance collocated with ‘carácter’ (character) producing the implicature that Juan’s so-called dry character means that he has a serious nature rather than a fun-loving one. However, the reference to dry also produces implicatures that he is sterile within the wider discourse of the play. Merwin replicates the ST more closely than the other translators in this example, creating an ambiguity that may generate both of the implicatures present in the ST. Bradbury reinforces the idea of Juan’s serious character by using paraphrase, which resolves the ambiguity, so that the receiver is not able to access the second implicature of dryness as sterility. Luke and Johnston, on the other hand, make the implicature of infertility more explicit with ‘dried up’ but the receiver is perhaps not then able to access the first implicature of a dryness of character.

The Washerwomen echo the theme of Juan’s dryness when they describe him as deaf to Yerma’s dissatisfaction and he is likened to a lizard, in other words, a cold-blooded, wrinkled creature with a tough skin that needs little water. In Act Two, Scene One, the Third Washerwoman says:

In the ST Lorca’s uses the adjective ‘seco’ (dry) in this instance collocated with ‘carácter’ (character) producing the implicature that Juan’s so-called dry character means that he has a serious nature rather than a fun-loving one. However, the reference to dry also produces implicatures that he is sterile within the wider discourse of the play. Merwin replicates the ST more closely than the other translators in this example, creating an ambiguity that may generate both of the implicatures present in the ST. Bradbury reinforces the idea of Juan’s serious character by using paraphrase, which resolves the ambiguity, so that the receiver is not able to access the second implicature of dryness as sterility. Luke and Johnston, on the other hand, make the implicature of infertility more explicit with ‘dried up’ but the receiver is perhaps not then able to access the first implicature of a dryness of character.

The Washerwomen echo the theme of Juan’s dryness when they describe him as deaf to Yerma’s dissatisfaction and he is likened to a lizard, in other words, a cold-blooded, wrinkled creature with a tough skin that needs little water. In Act Two, Scene One, the Third Washerwoman says:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That is the way he is. He takes life very seriously.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 33</td>
<td>Luke: 173</td>
<td>Johnston: 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, yes. It’s as if he’d dried up.</td>
<td>Johnston: 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He behaves as if he’s deaf. And paralysed, like a lizard in the sun.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 37</td>
<td>Luke: 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, he’s as dozy as a lizard in the sun.</td>
<td>Luke: 177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He’s turned a blind eye to it. He seems half-asleep, like a lizard in the sun.

The dualistic metaphors of deafness and hearing, speech and silence are ones that Lorca uses throughout the play to portray Juan’s inability to meet Yerma’s needs. Merwin and Bradbury maintain the simile of Juan being deaf which meets implicatures at the symbolic level of the wider discourse of the play. Johnston takes a more domesticating approach with the modulation of ‘deafness’ to ‘blindness’ with the use of the common English phrase, ‘He’s turned a blind eye to it’. This strategy of domestication, while it may meet audience expectations in linguistic terms, does not make the connections to the overall discourse of the play as a whole. Juan’s deafness to Yerma’s predicament is paramount to the plot.

Luke’s translation also detracts from the plot in this respect, as he combines the idea of ‘sordo’ (deaf) and ‘parado’ (still) with ‘dozy’ and thus forms one sentence which implies that Juan is like a lizard but detracts from the symbolic implication of Juan’s deafness. Alternatives to ‘He seems half-asleep’ (Johnston) and ‘paralysed’ (Bradbury) could be ‘motionless’ or ‘still’ or ‘idle’, ‘like a lizard basking in the sun’. The implication is that the sun has baked him, dried him up and he is happy to remain that way, deaf to Yerma’s needs, not wanting to move from the position he has taken.

Yerma also associates her thirst with a lack of freedom. In Act Three, Scene One she tells the Old Woman:

Table 6.12

| …[…]. Yo pienso que tengo sed y no tengo libertad. […] | Lorca: 512 |
| …[…]. I think about how I’m thirsty, and how I’m not free. […] | Merwin: 117 |
| …[…]. I believe I’m thirsty and have no freedom. […] | Bradbury: 51 |
| …[…]. But I’m desperate for what should be mine by rights. […] | Luke: 192 |
| …[…]. All I know is that I’m thirsty, so thirsty, and nobody will let me drink. […] | Johnston: 56 |
This lack of freedom is linked to the fact that Yerma feels the very rights of her gender are denied her. Merwin and Bradbury replicate the metaphor of the ST, whereas Luke removes the metaphor of thirst and freedom, making the implicature more explicit, thus aiding the perlocutionary uptake of this particular phrase on behalf of the receiver. However, Yerma in Luke’s translation voices more directly what she feels, making her more outspoken, and in this way the translator modernises the socio-cultural level of the text, addressing his modern audience directly. The translator not only clarifies the implicatures of the ST, he presents the discourse in terms of the cognitive environment of the target receiver, rather than in terms of the socio-cultural context of the characters in the ST. This denies the receiver the experience of the temporal context of the play’s location which may be one element that has attracted the audience to the play. Moreover, the strategy of applying modern interpretants dislocates the play as modern values blend with ST cultural values, making it difficult for the receiver to understand the underlying discourse. This may be deliberate on the part of the translator as he may view Lorca’s critique of female repression in the play as less relevant today than it would have been in its original place and time of enunciation. However, debates around women’s rights were very relevant in the late 1980s when Luke wrote his translation, and are certainly very relevant today.

Johnston similarly removes the metaphor of freedom, however, unlike Luke, Johnston makes a further connection with water using ‘nobody will let me drink’, which implicates repression and connects to the use of the metaphor of water in the play as a whole. Johnston is thus able to create here that connection to the wider discourse of the original play in terms of female repression.

As discussed, we have an image of Yerma as lacking water and also lacking milk, as she has breasts of sand. At the beginning of the play, Yerma offers Juan a glass of milk, which he rejects:
In this dialogue, Lorca contrasts the natural pure image of the white milk and the cold, hard, grey image of steel. Milk is connected with fertility while steel which, although it has connotations of strength, is cold, hard, and manmade, as opposed to the naturalness of milk. Thus, man and nature are in opposition. The reference to steel could also be taken to imply Juan’s lack of empathy with Yerma, that he has no feelings, no heart, and...
is thus metaphorically a lump of steel, both sterile and dead, as he will become at the end of the play. According to Ter Horst (1980: 44), by refusing Yerma’s motherly attentions, Juan is refusing her a child because the white glass of milk represents seminal fluid. Given the dream-like sequence that precedes this dialogue in which an image of happiness and hope is evoked by the child dressed in white, I suggest that Juan’s rejection of the glass of milk could also be seen as a dashing of Yerma’s hopes. He is metaphorically a barrier of steel to her hopes of motherhood. For Knapp (1991: 136) the glass of milk is associated with lactation and considered a fertility ritual associated with the Virgin Mary, similar to the ones that Yerma will carry out later associated with water:

Lactation was the only biological function she [the Virgin Mary] was allowed outside the asexual act of weeping. Yerma’s gift of milk to Juan, then, is to be identified with the joy of a nursing mother in general: it is she who passes on her nourishing power to her newborn. Images such as Mary nursing Christ or Hera, her son Hercules, [...] are all implicit in fertility rituals. (idem)

If we consider the sentence ‘¿No tomas un vaso de leche?, Johnston uses expansion, ‘won’t you have something before you go – even just a cup of milk?’, presumably to add context to the sentence although it is not really necessary as we know that Juan is about to go out. On the level of performability through speakability, this expansion serves to make the speech act more natural. However, the addition of the words ‘even just’ detracts from the importance of the milk and its possible underlying meaning. The interpretants the translator applies here relate to the performance of the text on stage rather than a faithful replication of the ST, and the translator navigates between the layers of meaning present in the ST, and the desire to make the text performable, by applying thematic rather than formal interpretants.

Yerma explains why she wants Juan to have some milk with ‘Trabajas mucho y no tienes tú cuerpo para resistir los trabajos’ (You work a lot and you don’t have the body fit for the jobs). In the ST, we have the plural ‘los trabajos’ (jobs) implying more than one. The use of the plural here has an obvious double meaning; Juan needs to build himself up for the manual labour of working in the fields but equally the implicature is that he is
not up to the job of making Yerma pregnant. Lorca makes a link here between the body of Juan and the jobs he should carry out. All the translators omit the direct reference to Juan’s body (which is as central to the story as Yerma’s body), and ‘los trabajos’ becomes ‘you’re not built for it’ (Merwin); ‘you aren’t really built for it’ (Bradbury); and ‘you’re not fit for it’ (Johnston). The reference to him not having ‘the build for it’ produces the implicature that he is not strong or well-built enough to be able to work so much. This takes us to the immediate implicature but not beyond this to the double meaning implied with the association between ‘cuerpo’ and ‘los trabajos’ in terms of fertilising his wife. However, Johnston’s ‘you’re not fit for it’ provides the double meaning with the ambiguous ‘fit for it’, as in ‘fit for purpose’. An alternative translation could be ‘for the jobs in hand’. Luke’s ‘You’re too thin with the work you do’ produces the implicature that it is the work that makes him thin, rather than the fact that it is his body that is not up to it.

Regarding ‘enjuto’, all the translators render it as ‘thin’ except Luke, who translates it as ‘lean’ although it is more descriptive than this in that it means ‘gaunt’ maybe almost skeleton-like, near death and also dry, which is a description of Juan used later in the play, to imply his infertility. Johnston makes ‘cuando los hombres se ponen enjutos’ into a question ‘Just because you think I’m thin?’ which implies that Yerma considers him to be thin whereas in the original he is stating that he considers himself to be thin, thus by changing the subject from ‘los hombres’ to ‘you’ the emphasis is changed.

The word ‘acero’ (steel) in Spanish is translated by Bradbury as ‘wiry’ rather than ‘steel’, which does not meet the locutionary level fully and could imply ‘of difficult character’ rather than physical strength. Moreover, ‘wiry’ in unlikely to generate the illocutionary force of the image of steel, which implies strength but at the same time is cold and hard, without life or feelings, i.e. incapable of producing new life.

We thus have an image of Juan’s refusal to accept the offer of the white milk and his body described as grey, hard steel in the first lines of the play. As mentioned above, this image contrasts with the dream-like sequence that is described in the stage directions.
at the beginning of the play, which is full of hope and happiness. These stage directions at the beginning state:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al levantarse el telón está Yerma dormida con un tabaque de costura a los pies. La escena tiene una extraña luz de sueño. Un Pastor sale de puntillas, mirando fijamente a Yerma. Lleva de la mano a un Niño vestido de blanco. Suena el reloj. Cuando sale el Pastor, la luz azul se cambia por una alegre luz de mañana de primavera. Yerma se despierta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the curtain rises, Yerma is discovered asleep, with a work-basket at her feet. The stage is filled with a strange dreamy light. A shepherd enters on tiptoe, keeping his eyes fixed on Yerma. He is leading by the hand a child dressed in white. The clock strikes. When the shepherd leaves, the lights [sic] changes to the cheerful light of a spring morning. Yerma wakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the curtain goes up, Yerma is asleep with an embroidery frame at her feet. The stage is bathed in a strange, dreamlike light. A shepherd comes in on tiptoe, leading a little boy, dressed in white, by the hand. His eyes are fixed on Yerma. The clock strikes. As the shepherd goes out, the scene is charged with the sparkling light of a spring morning. Yerma wakes up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curtain rises on a stage lit with a weird dreamlike light. YERMA is asleep with an embroidery frame at her feet. A SHEPHERD enters on tiptoe, leading a small BOY dressed in white by the hand. He stares fixedly at YERMA for a moment. Then a clock strikes and the SHEPHERD goes off. The lighting changes to a sunny morning in springtime. YERMA wakes up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the curtain rises YERMA is sleeping with a sewing basket at her feet. The scene possesses a strange dream-like quality. A shepherd appears,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lorca is, therefore, presenting the spectator with the play’s theme right from the start in a non-verbal, visual way, and the reader with a pictorial image. The image of white is one of happiness and innocence but it is dream-like indicating that it is not reality; the image is fleeting suggesting that it is unobtainable. Gil (García Lorca 1997: 41) sees these stage instructions, which he calls a pantomime, as essential to the development of the tragedy. In the performance text of Yerma considered here, this scene was removed, as was the pilgrimage scene with the Male and Female Mask. The reasons given were a concern that these scenes would not work well, as the audience would not understand them\textsuperscript{21} and that only a lavish production on a big stage would do them justice, particularly the pilgrimage scene. Thus, the location and stage set impose constraints upon the text in performance. However, these constraints are supposed constraints rather than real ones, in that the director, along with the actors, has made a decision to cut scenes that are considered difficult to perform. Meaning is thus fixed to the performance by the absence of parts of the text, as the audience has no connection to these scenes or any possible means of interpreting them. This illustrates a tension between the drama text and the staging of the text in performance. In rehearsals, such tensions are negotiated as the written linguistic signs are redirected into performance signs, and the theatrical system constrains the text.

Yerma carries out rituals connected with water, and encourages Juan to immerse himself in water in an effort to connect with nature and thus feel the effect of its life.

\textsuperscript{21} These explanations were given by the director and the cast in a discussion that followed the performance on 4\textsuperscript{th} July 2015. The decision was taken collectively between the actors and the director during the rehearsal.
force. She describes him as being white as if the sun never shines on his face. She encourages him to go and swim in the river or get soaked by the rain that leaks through the roof. As time has passed, she says that he has become more gaunt, as if he were growing backwards, in other words as if he were shrinking or withering away. He is becoming literally and metaphorically whiter, as if the life is draining out of him. The links with the sun and water are symbolic as they are both creators of life and Juan is lacking in both. We thus have an image of Juan with a gaunt body and a white face that can associate him with sterility and, at the same time, death. He appears from the very beginning of the play as a representation of death, which will be his tragic end:

Table 6.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YERMA. Pero tú no. Cuando nos casamos eras otro. Ahora tienes la cara blanca como si no te diera en ella el sol. A mí me gustaría que fueras al río y nadaras, y que te subieras al tejado cuando la lluvia cala nuestra vivienda. Veinticuatro meses llevamos casados y tú cada vez más triste, más enjuto, como si crecieras al revés.</th>
<th>Lorca: 480-481</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YERMA: Not you. You weren’t like that when we were married. Your face has got all white as though you never had it in the sun. I’d rather you went down to the river and went swimming, and went up onto the roof when the rain was lashing the house. Twenty-four months we’ve been married and all the time you’ve got thinner and thinner as though you were growing backwards.</td>
<td>Merwin: 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YERMA: Not you. It was different when we first married. Now your face is white as if it never caught the sun. I’d like to see you go swimming in the river, or up onto the roof when the rain’s soaking the house. We’ve been married for two years now, and every day you get sadder, thinner – as if you were growing inwards.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YERMA. Not you. You were different when we were first married. But look at your face now! It’s as if it never saw the light of day. Why don’t you go to the river and have a swim? Or go up the roof and let</td>
<td>Luke: 159-160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the rain beat down on you? Twenty four months we’ve been married and you’ve become sadder and skinnier every day. As if you were growing backwards.

YERMA No. You’re not the same man I married. Your face is so pale you’d think you never saw the light of day. I wish you could enjoy life a bit more – go down to the river and just plunge in or even go up to the roof when the rain’s beating down and let yourself get soaked to the skin. We’ve been married for twenty-four months now and every day you seem sadder and skinnier, as though you were shrinking away.

Johnston: 16-17

Merwin and Bradbury replicate the reference to Juan as having a white face and as lacking sun, which allows the receiver to infer that the reference to the colour white might have symbolic meaning. Johnston translates it as ‘pale’ which produces implicatures on the level of meaning of a lack of sun and perhaps also that Juan is ill, sad or depressed; the translator thus provides the receiver with a ready-made interpretation. On the one hand, this may aid uptake of one level of meaning (that of a lack of sun) but it may not allow the receiver to infer other symbolic meanings. Luke omits the adjective altogether, which leaves the receiver to infer what his face actually might look like from never seeing the light of day, thus the processing time of this image may be longer.

Yerma’s plea to Juan to get soaked by swimming in the river or going up to the roof when it is raining are expressions of more than just Yerma wanting him to enjoy life as Johnston implies in ‘I wish you could enjoy life a bit more”. These rituals that she wants Juan to carry out are connected with fertility rites. Later, in Act Three, Scene Two, Yerma is described indirectly in the Male Mask’s chant during the ritualistic pilgrimage scene as being white:
Table 6.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MACHO. (Se levanta y agita el cuerno.)</td>
<td>¡Ay qué blanca la triste casada!</td>
<td>Lorca: 520-521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE (Rising and shaking the horn):</td>
<td>Oh how white The sad bride!</td>
<td>Merwin: 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE MASK (Holding up the horn and brandishing it):</td>
<td>Ay, how pale is the unhappy wife!</td>
<td>Bradbury: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE MASKER. (getting up and making obscene gestures with the bull’s horn).</td>
<td>Ah, how white is the sad nude wife!</td>
<td>Luke: 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE rising, he begins to brandish the horn</td>
<td>And how white the sad, sad wife</td>
<td>Johnston: 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this instance all the translators maintain the literal ‘blanca’ (white) to describe Yerma (or other sterile women), thus replicating the metaphor of the original, except Bradbury whose translation ‘pale’ provides implicatures associated with illness, sadness or depression, as discussed in the previous example. Luke adds ‘nude’, which makes the image more sexually explicit, and produces implicatures that are associated with the ritualistic pilgrimage and reinforce the pagan element of it. However, he is also creating cohesiveness here because in the ST the Female Mask previously chants ‘¡Ay qué desnuda estaba la doncella en el agua!’ (Ah how naked was the maiden in the water). The cohesiveness created by the addition of ‘nude’ in the later utterance is thus not created from a literal translation of the ST but is ST driven, as it relates back to a previous utterance. The translator acts upon the text, creating cohesion by the application of interpretants which are based on other parts of the ST, rather than replicating the ST signs.
Luke’s use of more explicit language than that of the ST can also be seen in his translation of the stage directions, which in Spanish state ‘se levanta y agita el cuerno’ (he gets up and shakes the horn); Luke gives ‘getting up and making obscene gestures with the bull’s horn’ for this, which makes the text more sexually explicit than the original. Johnston and Bradbury translate ‘agita’ as ‘brandish’, which may be more violent than ‘shake’, possibly making the character of the Male Mask more threatening than in the original although the stage directions tell us that neither the Male nor Female Masks are grotesque in any way, but possess a great beauty and with a sense of pure earth (No son grotescas de ningún modo, sino de gran belleza y con un sentido de pura tierra). The reference to ‘the sense of the pure earth’ is ambiguous but it may give the director/actors more of an idea of the pagan impulse of the original as these particular characters may cause a certain confusion about what they represent.

As discussed above, in the performance of Yerma that forms part of this corpus, this scene was removed as it was considered difficult for an audience to understand and more suited to a large-scale production where scenery and more elaborate costumes could be used to depict the pilgrimage. Again, the linguistic signs of the drama text seem to be in tension with the performance. This particular performance was devoid of scenery and the actors were on the same level as the audience, almost forming part of the audience, rather than being on an elevated stage. This served to invite the audience into the performance and create a sense of dialogue. However, the omission of this scene distanced the audience from the text as they were not able to experience this scene and thus decide for themselves its effect. We also have to consider the influence of the translation on this decision as the quite explicit translation by Luke of ‘making obscene gestures’ may have added to the rejection of this scene, not necessarily in terms of possibly offending the audience but rather because this might appear more comical than intended.

While Yerma rejects the solution that the Old Woman offers her, she does have a solution to her predicament in the character of Victor. The descriptions of Juan and Yerma in terms of dry and thus lacking water are in stark contrast to how Victor is
perceived. At the beginning of Act One, Scene Two, Yerma describes how some years before Victor lifted her over an irrigation channel and how that physical contact between them made her tremble, something she has never experienced with Juan:

Table 6.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me cogió de la cintura y no pude decirle nada porque no podía hablar. Otra vez, el mismo Victor, teniendo yo catorce años (él era un zagalón), me cogió en sus brazos para saltar una acequia y me entró un temblor que me sonaron los dientes. [...]</td>
<td>Lorca: 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He caught me around the waist and I couldn’t say anything to him because I couldn’t speak. Another time when I was fourteen the same one, Victor, (he was big by then) picked me up in his arms to jump over a ditch and I started shivering so hard my teeth rattled. [...]</td>
<td>Merwin: 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He put his arm round my waist and suddenly I couldn’t say anything, I couldn’t speak. Another time, when I was fourteen, this same Víctor (he was a shepherd boy) picked me up to help me jump a ditch, and It made me tremble so much my teeth chattered. [...]</td>
<td>Bradbury: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He held me once around the waist. I couldn’t speak. I couldn’t breathe. And another time I was only fourteen, Victor – he was a big strong lad – took me in his arms to jump a ditch and I shook so much my teeth were chattering. [...]</td>
<td>Luke: 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He put his arm round my waist and I couldn’t stop him because I couldn’t speak...My mouth had gone all dry. And another time, when I was fourteen, he took me in his arms – he was so strong – and jumped over a stream, and I began to tremble so much that I thought my teeth were going to start chattering. [...]</td>
<td>Johnston: 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merwin, Bradbury and Luke all translate ‘acequia’ (irrigation channel) as ‘ditch’ which implies that it is dry rather than containing water, or any water that it contains would be full of mud, rather than the free-flowing water of the irrigation channel, which would
enable water to reach the crops. However, Johnston maintains the metaphorical connection of Victor with water and the sexual attraction between them with the translation of ‘stream’. On a poetic aesthetic level, ‘stream’ portrays a more romantic image, and a more positive one, than the word ‘ditch’.

It is also worth mentioning that Bradbury’s translation of ‘un zagalón’ (literally ‘he was big lad’) as ‘he was a shepherd boy’ creates ambiguity affecting the illocutionary level of the ST description which evokes an attractive image of Victor as ‘big and strong’ in contrast with Juan who is thin and gaunt.

At the end of Act One, Scene Two, Yerma praises Victor’s singing voice, likening it to water. This also reminds us of what the Old Woman has said earlier in the same scene about men giving women water to drink from their own mouths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y qué voz tan pujante. Parece un chorro de agua que te llena toda la boca.</td>
<td>Lorca: 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What strength in your voice! Like a jet of water that fills your whole mouth.</td>
<td>Merwin: 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such a powerful voice. Like a surge of water filling your mouth.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s quite a voice – it flows out of your mouth like a fountain.</td>
<td>Luke: 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your voice just seemed to flow. Like a spurt of water filling your mouth.</td>
<td>Johnston: 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we have four different translations of ‘chorro’ each providing slightly different figurative images of the strength of Victor’s voice, from the strongest images of ‘a jet’ and ‘a fountain’ to the weaker image of ‘a spurt’. In the ST Victor’s voice resembles a flow of water that fills his whole mouth, whereas Luke changes the meaning with ‘it [the voice] flows out of your mouth’. This may meet our expectations of what it means to compare someone’s voice to a flow of water but the symbolic implicatures and the circular reference to what the Old Woman has said earlier may not be generated. Luke’s
misinterpretation may meet target expectations on one level, but does not adhere to the cohesive nature of the plot.

In the performance of Yerma analysed, we see an example of tension with what is implied in the drama text on the level of characterisation. The casting of a rather short, middle-aged, slightly balding actor in the role of Victor compared to a young, pretty and taller, Yerma, somehow detracted from the credibility of the plot. Moreover, because the actor playing Victor was Spanish, his accent at times impeded the delivery of the lines in English. This illustrates how decisions which are above the level of the text can affect the performance and supports the view by Zatlin (2005: 16) that the performance of a text relies on many other factors not just translation, and often the translator is unduly credited or blamed for factors which are outside their control. The text gives instructions on how to cast the actors, not always in the form of stage directions, but in the actual dialogue in the way characters describe each other. For example, Yerma is described by the Old Woman as ‘la hermosa muchacha’ (the beautiful girl), who has a beautiful body, ‘¿Quién puede decir que este cuerpo que tienes no es hermoso?’ (Who would deny that this body of yours is not beautiful?). As discussed previously, Juan is ‘triste’ (sad) and ‘enjuto’ (gaunt), while Victor has a powerful voice and was a big lad when he was fourteen. The director can obviously choose to ignore these instructions, which form part of the dialogue rather than part of the actual stage directions, or there may be practical constraints, such as the availability of actors that determine casting.

As discussed, there are images of free flowing river water, stagnated water in wells, and the sea in all three plays. The image of the sea represents freedom and a more progressive outlook on life. In Bodas de sangre, Act Two, Scene Two, during the wedding celebrations, the Father of the Bride admires the dancing of the Bridegroom’s relatives from the coast, making this comment to the Mother of the Bridegroom:
Table 6.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Phrase</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mira el baile que tienen formado. Bailes de allá de la orilla del mar.</td>
<td>Look at the dance they’re dancing. A dance from the seacoast.</td>
<td>Lorca: 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at the dance they’re going to dance some of the dances of the coast!</td>
<td>Look at that -- they’re going to dance some of the dances of the coast!</td>
<td>Hughes: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at the dance they are forming. Dances from the seashore right over there.</td>
<td>Look at the dance they are forming. Dances from the seashore right over there.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at them dancing, your people from the coast. Rising and falling like the waves of the sea.</td>
<td>Look at them dancing, your people from the coast. Rising and falling like the waves of the sea.</td>
<td>Edwards: 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These phrases are translated similarly by all the translators as being a dance from ‘the seacoast’ (Hughes), ‘coast’ (Bradbury), ‘seashore’ (Edwards). Johnston, however, expands this sentence making it more of a description of the dance as related to the movement of the sea. This allows the receiver to visualise the dancers, and it also helps the director decide what a dance from the sea might look like. In note 36, Johnston (1989: 112) explains how his translation ‘has an echo of Yeats’s ‘The Fiddler of Dooney’’. In this way, he refracts the source through an Irish poet from the same time period, creating a link with works of the period written in English, which domesticates Lorca’s work and reinforces the temporal location. However, this may also suggest a desire on the part of Johnston to validate Lorca as an author by equating his work with that of one of his contemporaries. Johnston is also validating his own work here by explaining, and thus justifying, his translation choices in the light of potential criticism for moving away from the ST.

I have discussed in detail the images of the colour white in terms of the absence of colour and how it relates to fertility in terms of water and sterility in terms of a lack of water. I will now move on to discuss another representation of the colour white, this time in terms of the heat produced by the sun, which is another life giving force but also an oppressive element.
6.3 The Sun

The heat of the Sun has an important presence in all three plays and serves to portray the contextual setting and increase the dramatic tension but is also symbolic of the frustrations that the characters feel. It also represents repression and the way individuals are expected to conform. In many cases it works together with silence as a repressive force; this will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

As I discuss in Naylor (forthcoming 2018), at the end of Act One, Scene One, the Mother asks the neighbour if she has noticed how hot it is that day, to which the neighbour remarks on the effect the heat is having on the children who take the water out to the reapers. Act One begins with the Mother speaking about the knife and the murder of her elder son, then moves on to her voicing her concerns to the neighbour about the integrity of her son’s future bride, and finishes with this reference to the sun which stands as an omen of the tragedy to come. In this first scene, Lorca thus presents the three elements of the tragedy: the knife; the Bride and her relationship with Leonardo; and the heat as a metaphor for an unstoppable force of desire between the two. The Mother’s comment about it being a really hot day is not just idle chit-chat about the weather; it alludes to this burning desire between Leonardo (the Bride’s former boyfriend) and the Bride which is getting stronger every day as her wedding approaches. The oppressive nature of the heat also acts as a metaphor for the repression by society of the individual and their own inner turmoil:

Table 6.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MADRE. ¿Has visto que día de calor?</th>
<th>Lorca: 421</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VECINA. Iban negros los chiquillos que llevan el agua a los segadores. Adiós, mujer.</td>
<td>Hughes: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother: What do you think of this heat today?</td>
<td>Hughes: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor: The children carrying water to the reapers are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 Some of this section appears in Naylor (forthcoming 2018).
sunburned as can be! Goodbye, darling.

MOTHER: Have you noticed how hot it is?  
NEIGHBOUR: The children who take the water up to the reapers are as brown as berries. Goodbye, dear.

MOTHER: Have you ever seen such a hot day?  
NEIGHBOUR. The children were fed up taking water to the harvesters. God be with you, woman.

MOTHER. The sun’s scorching hot.  
NEIGHBOUR. The lads running water to the reapers are fed up with it. I must go. God bless.

Although the first published translations by Graham-Luján and O’Connell are not analysed here, in this case it is worth mentioning their translation of these speech acts as a starting point for comparison.

**Table 6.21**

| MOTHER: Have you ever known such a hot sun? | Graham-Luján and O’Connell: 39 |
| NEIGHBOUR: The children carrying water out to the reapers are black with it. Good-bye, woman. | |

Their very literal translation of ‘iban negros’ (they are going (along) black (with anger/rage) as in ‘estar negro’ or ‘ponerse negro’) as ‘black with it’ creates ambiguity and serves as a barrier to the effective processing of the information. The reader/spectator is left to make assumptions about what this might refer to. In the other translations there is a clear distinction between two opposing interpretations of the colloquial phrase in Spanish; the erroneous physical description of the children being sunburned (Hughes and Bradbury) versus a description of feelings or emotions in a particular situation, as in ‘they were angry/furious’ or ‘fed up’ (Edwards and Johnston). Possible alternative translations could be ‘fuming’ or ‘raging,’ which would allow us to
construct an image of the annoyance the children are feeling, who could be imagined with ‘steam coming out of their ears’. Another alternative translation could be ‘sick to death’, which would make connections to the overall tragedy of the play and thus establish the connection between the omen-like nature of these two speech acts and death.

Phrases such as ‘are as sunburned as can be!’ (Hughes) and ‘brown as berries’ (Bradbury) turn the utterance from a negative into a positive image. Hughes’s usage of the exclamation mark reinforcing the positive connotation. Moreover, in terms of plot, an idyllic romantic notion is created which is far removed from the Mother’s world of violence and pain. The idiomatic expression ‘brown as berries’ is reminiscent of fairy-tales or Enid Blyton stories of children enjoying daring escapades during their summer holidays, rather than the harsh reality of children working in the fields that Lorca is commenting upon. This translation is also a reflection of its time, as it is linguistically dated, and culturally it projects a positive image of a 1970s obsession with sunbathing which today might be frowned upon as we are more aware of the adverse effects of the sun. Moreover, we see a cultural clash insofar as in a sun-deprived nation such as the British one, the sun is always viewed as positive whereas the extreme heat of the Andalusian summer is not one to be worshipped, and working in the countryside, particularly in the heat, is not a pleasurable activity. Therefore, we see how, through mistranslation, the socio-cultural element and the representation of the foreign Other is exoticised in accordance with target culture norms, as the image of Spain as the stereotypical sunshine paradise is evoked.

In La casa de Bernarda Alba we also see the use of the sun as a repressive force described with the use of a simile as being like ‘plomo’ (lead) and the words ‘hace años no he conocido calor igual’, which are similar to those used by the Mother in Bodas de sangre:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUJER 3.ª</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJER 1.ª</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorca: 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD WOMAN: It’s like lead, the sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST WOMAN: I can’t remember it as hot as this for ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD WOMAN: The sun beats down like lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST WOMAN: I haven’t known it to be this hot in years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD WOMAN. The sun beats down like lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST WOMAN. It’s years since I’ve known it so hot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND WOMAN. The sun is heavy as lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD WOMAN. I’ve never known such heat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the translators literally translate the reference to ‘plomo’ which helps create an image of an oppressive sun. Bradbury’s ‘It’s like lead, the sun’ creates an ambiguity as the receiver may not fully access the associations between the sun and lead; it may imply that the sun is the colour of lead, or that it is heavy like lead, but in a more literal sense rather than a metaphorical one. The translation by Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds of ‘the sun beats down like lead’ takes the normal collocation of ‘sun’ and ‘beats down’ with the simile ‘like lead’ creating an image of force. Clifford’s ‘heavy as lead’ also portrays the symbolic quality of the sun, as not only is it very strong that particular day but it also symbolises the sexual frustrations in the household and acts as a repressive force.

In the performance of *The House of Bernarda Alba* at the Crescent Theatre in Birmingham, the audience were able to experience this heat as the central heating had been inadvertently left on, which created a muggy, claustrophobic atmosphere on a summer’s day. The linguistic verbal signs of the performance text referring to the heat, along with the visual signs of the characters physically fanning themselves were thus (inadvertently) translated into a physical representation of that heat on the body of the spectator. This produced a perlocutionary effect on the audience as they were able to

---

23 This translation attributes the utterance to the Second Woman, whereas the ST and the other translations attribute it to the First Woman.
experience the feeling of tension physically on their bodies, in addition to the visual and auditory experience of it that they were witnessing on stage.

6.4 Heat and cold

Lorca often uses contrasting references to heat and cold in the same sentences, for example, in *Yerma* in Act Three, Scene One, Yerma describes her sex life to Dolores when she refers to Juan as having a cold waist as if his body were dead and how she wishes she were the opposite; a mountain of fire:

| Table 6.23 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| [...] Cuando me cubre, cumple con su deber, pero yo le noto la cintura fría como si tuviera el cuerpo muerto, y yo, que siempre he tenido asco de las mujeres calientes, quisiera ser en aquel instante como una montaña de fuego. | Lorca: 512 |
| [...] When he sleeps with me he does his duty but I can feel how cold he is around the middle, as though he were a dead man. I was always disgusted by hot women, but at that moment I wish I were a mountain of fire. | Merwin: 117 |
| In bed he does what’s expected of him, and I am overwhelmingly aware of his cold waist, like a corpse; so that I, who have always despised sensual women, wish I was a volcano. | Bradbury: 52 |
| When he makes love to me, it is a duty. Cold as a corpse. I have always hated women who brag about their sexiness, but there are times now when I’m on fire – a fire no water can quench! | Luke: 193 |
| And when he covers me, he does it as a duty. But I feel his waist cold, as though his whole body was dead. And at that moment, although I’ve always detested passionate women, I would love to burn beneath him like a mountain of fire. | Johnston: 57 |
Bradbury clarifies the idea of ‘cuando me cubre’ (when he covers me) with ‘in bed’, as does Merwin with ‘when he sleeps with me’, while Luke makes it even more explicit with ‘makes love to me’. The idea of ‘cubrir’ in this sense, as Johnston points out in his note 38 (1990: 108), relates it to the breeding of animals. This reference in the ST thus equates the sexual act to reproduction rather than pleasure, which reduces humans, and women in particular, to animals. ‘Sleeps with me’ (Merwin), ‘in bed’ (Bradbury) and ‘makes love’ (Luke) reduce this illocutionary effect as the context of a rural Catholic society is not evident. Merwin, Bradbury and Luke’s application of interpretants here portray the meaning of the ST, but do not go beyond a first-order meaning to the wider discourse of Catholic oppression within the play. Johnston’s more literal ‘covers me’ is able to do this.

Bradbury modulates the ‘montaña de fuego’ into ‘volcano’, which while it has the same meaning, the ‘mountain of fire’ is more figurative, it gives an image of a whole mountain on fire, right from the bottom to the top, evocative of Lorca’s duende which affects the whole body. This fire image then contrasts with the stark reality of Juan’s cold body. Luke removes the metaphorical image of the ‘mountain of fire’ reducing it to ‘on fire’ tied in with the idea of water with the choice of ‘quench’ which creates an additional metaphor to the one in the ST as ‘quench’ also collocates with ‘thirst’, thus a link is made to the overall discourse of the play.

Johnston’s translation of ‘las mujeres calientes’ as ‘passionate’ is probably quite conservative, as there are a whole range of more colloquial words that could be used, such as ‘rampant’, ‘randy’ or ‘hot-blooded’. Whether these are appropriate or not would depend on whether the translation is being updated in terms of language even if the setting is that of the 1930s. It would also depend on the reading of Yerma as a character because if it is felt that she is rather prudish (she is certainly portrayed as being rather innocent) then her language would need to reflect her character. Moreover, she comes from a rural community in 1930s Spain and is unlikely to have received an education, thus she is unlikely to use a sophisticated vocabulary. In addition, it is important to
consider that colloquial language may date a translation, as it draws attention to the context of production of the translation.

The rural, Catholic context of the play, and indeed all three plays, naturally has an impact on how the characters express themselves as they are influenced by a strict Catholic upbringing where the sexual act is seen as a means of reproduction and not for pleasure. María, who due to her name appears as a physical representation of Catholic values, likens her unborn child to a dove (another white motif) that her husband slipped into her ear:

| Table 6.24 |
|------------------|------------------|
| **No sé. Pero la noche que nos casamos** me lo decía constantemente con su boca puesta en mi mejilla, tanto que a mí me parece que mi niño es un palomo de lumbre que él me deslizó por la oreja. | Lorca: 484 |
| I don’t know. But on our wedding night he whispered to me all the time with his mouth against my cheek, so that to me it’s as though my baby is a dove of light that he had slipped into my ear. | Merwin: 78 |
| I’ve no idea. But he said it over and over again on our wedding night, with his mouth pressed against my cheek, as if my son was a dove of fire to be slipped in through my ear. | Bradbury: 23 |
| I don’t know. But on our wedding night he kept telling me about it over and over with his mouth against my cheek. I feel my baby is a bright bird he slipped into my ear. | Luke: 163-164 |
| I don’t know. But the first night we were together, he whispered it to me over and over again, with his mouth pressed right against my cheek, so that sometimes I think that my baby is like a dove of fire that he slipped in through my ear. | Johnston: 21 |

As discussed in Chapter One, Fernández-Cifuentes (1984: 296) sees this image of the dove as magical but it also has obvious religious connotations with the Immaculate Conception. On a socio-cultural level, Lorca is commenting on the naivety of María and
women like her who believe in this magical explanation as to conception due to a strict Catholic upbringing. Or at least this is how society wants to see them, as naïve, non-sexual beings. The dove is also described as one of fire indicating that there is, in fact, sexual chemistry between them, something that appears to be lacking between Yerma and Juan, as discussed before.

Bradbury uses the simple past tense ‘was’ rather than the more formal subjunctive ‘were’ with ‘as if my son was a dove of fire’. The use of ‘was’ here may be an attempt to replicate spoken language. The original Spanish uses the present tense ‘it seems to me that my child is’. So for Maria, this is not a hypothetical situation, a simple analogy, it is a reality; she considers it to be true. At a socio-cultural level, this shows her naivety. The use of the present tense in Spanish reinforces this truth. Equally, Johnston’s use of simile with ‘my baby is like a dove of fire’ gives a more metaphorical reading rather than the more literal analogy of the ST. The translation of ‘la noche que nos casamos’ as ‘the first night we were together’ makes the socio-cultural element of a society that believes in the sanctity of marriage less evident. Luke’s translation of ‘bright bird’ detracts from both the religious context and the sexual one.
6.5 Conclusion

The examples discussed in this chapter show how performability is addressed through speakability. Grammatical conventions of the TL were flouted in one example in order to produce natural speech, and ellipsis and domestication were used to similar effect. We also see a difference in the syntactic closeness between ST and TT (although at the expense of translation accuracy) in translations by Merwin and Bradbury, which contrasts with the translations by Johnston and Luke, who appear to prioritise speakability over a more formal structural correspondence between ST and TT.

Some translators used literal translation, as in the example of ‘seca’ which allows the receiver to make their own inferences based on the wider discourse of the play, whereas others used explicitation to generate the implicatures on behalf of the receiver, although not all the possible meanings were generated fully. In the example of ‘pedernal’ (Table 6.2) Luke applies only a first interpretant with ‘nagging tongue’, whereas a literal translation of ‘flint’, applied by the other translators, brings out all of the interpretants. This is important for cohesion within the play as a whole, and in this instance, literal translation is performative in terms of cohesion and the dramatic effect of the play as a whole. However, although this literal translation may be performative for the reader, it may be less performable (and thus less performative) for the spectator. This shows the dialectical relationship between the page and stage.

We also saw how translators use addition to create their own cohesion of images based on previous utterances within the ST, and also on the wider discourse of the play.

The clarification of ST implicatures was shown to have the potential to affect characterisation, making the characters more modern in outlook, thus presenting the play in terms of the cognitive environment of the target receiver rather than the cognitive environment of the ST characters. We also saw that mistranslation may detract from the rural context of the ST, making the discourse less cohesive, in particular in one example relating to the representation of patriarchy and female oppression. Mistranslation can also produce a conflict between the SL culture and the TL culture,
and lead to the evocation of stereotypical associations. The translation thus signifies beyond the context of the translation to the wider cultural context in which it is received. We also see how a strategy of borrowing can exoticise the TT and create melodrama.

In the performance text, theatrical constraints were shown to influence whether scenes are removed and how the casting of actors can influence characterisation. Removal of scenes shows the tensions between the drama text and the performance text and how the theatrical space can constrain the performance of the text.
Chapter 7 Abstract use of colour

7.1 Introduction

In *Yerma* the colour white is used metaphorically to represent Yerma’s sterility in the sense of infertility; this chapter focuses on the abstract use of colour in terms of the sterility of society and the struggle of the individual against that sterility where emotions are expressed as physical pain on the body while society demands silence, convention and conformity. As in Chapter Six, examples are taken from all three plays, from both the written texts and the performances.

7.2 The sterile society

I will begin by illustrating how Lorca and the translators depict the values of the society that surround the characters in the plays. As mentioned in Chapter Six, this is a patriarchal society where women are shut in, both literally and metaphorically, behind gleaming white façades, denied a voice and expected to conform, while men are considered almost blameless for their actions. In the middle of Act Three of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, La Poncia and the Maid discuss the tense situation in the house, commenting that it is not all Pepe’s fault as Adela is responsible for provoking him. La Poncia says:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No es toda la culpa de Pepe el Romano. Es verdad que el año pasado anduvo detrás de Adela y ésta estaba loca por él, pero ella debió estar en su sitio y no provocarlo. Un hombre es un hombre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not all Pepe el Romano’s fault. I know he was making eyes at Adela last year, and she was mad about him, but she shouldn’t have flung herself at him like that. A man’s a man after all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorca: 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury: 174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s not all Pepe el Romano’s fault. It’s true that last year he was after Adela, and she was crazy for him. But she should have known her place and not led him on. A man is a man.

Dewell and Zapata: 161

It’s not all Pepe el Romano’s fault. Of course, he was after Adela last year and she was mad about him, but she ought to keep her place now, and not lead him on. A man’s a man after all.

Edmunds: 164

I don’t blame Pepe. I don’t think it’s altogether his fault. It’s true that he was after Adela a year or so ago and she was mad about him, but now she should have known her place and left him alone and not provoked him. He can’t control himself. He’s only a man.

Clifford: 67

Dewell and Zapata follow the ST closely in this example, whereas Bradbury, Edmunds and Clifford all use explicitation to convey the implicatures of ‘un hombre es un hombre’ (a man is a man) with the addition of ‘after all’ (Bradbury and Edmunds) and ‘only’ (Clifford). Clifford repeats the idea expressed in ‘pero ella debió estarse en su sitio y no provocarlo’ with the expansion, ‘and left him alone and not provoked him’, and the addition, ‘He can’t control himself’. These repetitions of the same information in different forms serve several functions. Firstly, they reinforce the voice of the patriarchal society, making a stronger connection with the socio-cultural context of the ST. Secondly, in terms of speakability, they replicate natural speech. Thirdly, this type of repetition can aid audience uptake. Clifford’s translation strategy of addition thus applies thematic interpretants to make a stronger connection to the overall discourse of the ST, interpretants that in turn address performability through speakability. Her strategy of repetition is theoretically Relevant in allowing maximum contextual effects to be generated with minimal processing effort, addressing performability. He prioritises the performance over strict adherence to the ST, while at the same time adhering to the socio-cultural context of the ST on a macro-level rather than on a micro-linguistic level.

In this patriarchal society there are sharp differences between rich and poor, a recurrent theme in La casa de Bernarda Alba. In Act One, La Poncia and the Maid gossip about the
household and Bernarda’s severe character. La Poncia explains that the eldest daughter, Angustias, has inherited money from her father, Bernarda’s first husband, whereas the other daughters, whose father was Bernarda’s second husband, have no dowries. The Maid answers that she wishes she had what they have, producing implicatures that they do not have to work for a living as she does. La Poncia replies:

Table 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PONCIA. Nosotros tenemos nuestras manos y un hoyo en la tierra de la verdad.</th>
<th>Lorca: 586</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIADA. Ésa es la única tierra que nos dejan a los que no tenemos nada.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PONCIA: We’ve got our hands and a hole in God’s earth.</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAID: When you haven’t any earth of your own, that’s all there is left.</td>
<td>Edmunds: 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PONCIA: What you and I have is our hands and a hole to be buried in when we die.</td>
<td>Clifford: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAID: That’s all the land they give to us who have nothing!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PONCIA. All we have is our hands, and a hole in God’s earth to look forward to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAID. That’s the only land they give to people like us, who’ve got nothing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PONCIA. All we’ve got is our hands to work with and a hole to be buried in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAID. That’s all we have. All they ever let us have.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as alluding to the fragility of life and the inevitability of death, Lorca makes a political comment on the social situation of the time. The ST mentions ‘a hole in the earth of truth’. Bradbury and Edmunds’s addition of ‘God’ reinforces the implicature of the ST and the religious context. Dewell and Zapata, and Clifford explicate with the addition of ‘when we die’ and ‘to be buried in’ respectively.
The word ‘tierra’ can be translated as ‘earth’ or ‘land’. In the first reference ‘un hoyo en la tierra de la verdad’, the word ‘earth’ is more suitable in the context of being buried. Bradbury’s and Edmunds’s translations of ‘earth’, with the associations of a brown/black crumbling dust, make a symbolic connection with the idea that in death we all become earth. These associations allow the receiver to evoke the grammar of colour. However, in the second reference ‘Ésa es la única tierra que nos dejan’, the choice of ‘land’ by Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds connects to the political protest that the ST makes against conditions in which the poor were forced to work for the rich landowners and had no land of their own. It was this growing social unrest which was a contributing factor to the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936. This is the interpretation that Dewell and Zapata’s and Edmunds’s translations allude to. Bradbury, on the other hand, repeats the word ‘earth’ in both sentences which downplays the socio-political element in the ST. Dewell and Zapata’s paraphrase ‘hole to be buried in when we die’ avoids the dilemma. Clifford omits any reference to ‘tierra’ with the paraphrase ‘a hole to be buried in’ and by making two short sentences of ‘Ésa es la única tierra que nos dejan a los que no tenemos nada’ with ‘That’s all we have. All they ever let us have’, which removes the reference to ‘those of us who have nothing’, but at the same time reinforces the idea of a hierarchical society. Clifford’s interpretant is thematic rather than formal.

Women, in this patriarchal society seem to accept their situation and liken themselves to animals; for example in Act One of La casa de Bernarda Alba, Amelia comments to her sister Martirio how men frighten her, and in any case she is weak and ugly which means she will never get a man. Amelia protests pointing out that Enrique Humanes liked her and that it was a mutual attraction. Martirio rejects this saying that it is mere fabrication because one night when she waited for him at her window, he failed to appear, and he married another girl who was richer than her. When Amelia comments that this other girl was as ugly as a devil, Martirio responds as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¡Que les importa a ellos la fealdad! A ellos les importa la tierra, las yuntas y una perra sumisa que les dé de comer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What does an ugly face matter? Men are only interested in land, pairs of oxen and a submissive little bitch to cook their meals.

| Bradbury: 143 |

What do they care about ugliness? All they care about is land, oxen, and a meek little dog to cook for them.

| Dewell and Zapata: 131 |

What do they care about ugliness! All they care about is land, teams of oxen, and a docile little bitch who’ll dish up their food.

| Edmunds: 131 |

That doesn’t bother them! All they care about is their oxen and their land and some submissive little creature to cook their food.

| Clifford: 20 |

In the ST, the word ‘perra’ means ‘bitch’ as in ‘female dog’. Bradbury and Edmunds translate it literally with ‘submissive little bitch’ (Bradbury) and ‘docile little bitch’ (Edmunds) which has a strong illocutionary effect in terms of the connection with female oppression and the way women are viewed. Dewell and Zapata’s ‘meek little dog’ and Clifford’s ‘submissive little creature’ are less derogatory in this respect. Interestingly, all the translators add the word ‘little’ which reinforces the derogatory nature of the comment. We also note a difference between the translation of ‘sumisa’ with the literal ‘submissive’ (Bradbury and Clifford), ‘meek’ (Dewell and Zapata) and ‘docile’ (Edmunds).

The literal translation, ‘submissive’, connects to the idea of submission in all senses of the word, including that of sexual submission, suggesting that the men are in charge in every aspect of the relationship. The words ‘meek’ and ‘docile’ imply that the women accept their situation without complaint, but do not imply dominance and oppression.

The society Lorca portrays locks away its non-conformists, as is seen in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, where the character of María Josefa (Bernarda’s ageing mother) is depicted as mad, as she says strange things about a lamb being a child and wanting to run away to the coast and get married and have lots of children. However, she in fact speaks the truth and warns about Pepe el Romano’s effect on the household. In predicting the future, she reminds us of an almost witch-like character. When she first appears at the end of Act Two, the stage directions says that she is ‘viejísima ataviada con flores en la cabeza y en el pecho’ (really old adorned with flowers on her head and
We are told that she has escaped from the Maid and is subsequently locked up again with all the daughters helping the Maid drag her away. Later, in the middle of Act Three, it is night-time and she has again escaped and appears with a lamb in her arms. She sings, goes out and reappears on stage with Martirio. She describes herself as having white hair:

**Table 7.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARÍA JOSEFA. Es verdad. Está todo muy oscuro. Como tengo el pelo blanco crees que no puedo tener crías, y sí, crías y crías y crías. Este niño tendrá el pelo blanco y tendrá otro niño y éste otro, y todos con el pelo de nieve, seremos como las olas, una y otra y otra. Luego nos sentaremos todos y todos tendremos el cabello blanco y seremos espuma. ¿Por qué aquí no hay espumas? Aquí no hay más que mantos de luto.</th>
<th>Lorca: 629</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARÍA JOSEFA: That’s true. Everything’s very dark. Just because I’ve got white hair you don’t think I can have babies, yes, babies, babies, babies. This baby will be white-haired, and he’ll have another and so on, all with hair like snow. We’ll come one after the other, like waves, and when we sit together our white hair will sparkle like foam. Why doesn’t anything sparkle here? Here everyone dresses in mourning.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARÍA JOSEFA: It’s true. Everything is very dark. Just because I have white hair you think I can’t have babies. And – yes! Babies and babies and babies! This child will have white hair, and have another child, and that one, another, and all of us with hair of snow will be like the waves, one after another after another. Then we’ll all settle down, and we’ll all have white hair, and we’ll be foam on the sea. Why isn’t there any white foam here? Here, there’s nothing but black mourning shawls.</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARÍA JOSEFA. It’s true. Everything is very dark. Just because I have white hair you think I can’t have babies, but I can: babies, and babies, and babies. This little one will have white hair and she will have another little one, and that one will have another, and all of us with snow-white hair will be like waves: first one, then another, and another. Then we’ll all sit down and we’ll all have white hair and we shall be foam. Why is there no foam here? Here there’s nothing but black cloaks for mourning.

MARÍA JOSEFA. You’re right. It’s very dark. Just because I’ve got white hairs you think I can’t have a baby. But you’re wrong there. I’ll have baby after baby after baby. One baby will have white hair and then it’ll have another baby and another and another. We’ll all have babies and snow-white hair and we’ll be like the waves of the sea: one after another after another after another. And then we’ll all sit down and we’ll all have white hair and we’ll all be like the foam of the sea. But not here. There’s no foam here. Why’s it all so dark? It’s all so dark here. Everyone wears black. Everyone’s always in mourning.

Lorca contrasts the dark background of night with María Josefa with her white hair. She appears as an almost ghost-like figure in the darkness. The ‘crias’ (normally used to refer to baby animals, is a colloquial word for ‘babies’) she refers to will have white hair and are associated with snow, and her discourse creates an image of madness and death. The image of María Josefa and the white-haired babies lined up to look like the white foam of waves on the sea evoke images of freedom and remind us of the example taken from Yerma of the ‘flood of wool’ with the connection between the colour white and water. This image of white haired babies contrasts sharply with the black dress of mourning and death that she says is all around her. Dewell and Zapata reinforce the contrast between the white colour of the foam and the black colour of the mourning shawls by inserting the colours thus aiding the illocutionary uptake of the image.
Edmunds also inserts the word ‘black’ to reinforce the colour of mourning. These insertions of colour are perhaps redundant for the reader but important for the performability of the text as they address the issue of ephemerality and aid maximal contextual effects for minimal processing effort. Moreover, the addition of the colour black in ‘black mourning shawls’ (Dewell and Zapata) and ‘black cloaks for mourning’ (Edmunds) overcomes the ambiguity related to the possible interpretation of ‘mourning’ as the homophone ‘morning’. A tension related to speakability is thus overcome on behalf of the theatre audience to aid their uptake. Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds are not only working within the grammar of colour of the ST, but are using that grammar as an aid to its own reception.

Clifford uses a statement rather than a question with ‘There’s no foam here’ followed by ‘Why it’s all so dark? It’s all so dark here. Everyone wears black. Everyone’s always in mourning’. This addition of three extra sentences repeats the same information, albeit in a slightly different form. This use of repetition is redundant for the reader but can aid uptake on the part of the spectator and, in this way, achieve performability. This suggests that the translator may, perhaps unconsciously, desire to make the play work on stage, and select interpretants in the light of criticisms of earlier translations.

In the performance of The House of Bernarda Alba that forms part of this corpus, the mental state of María Josefa was highlighted further as she was seen above the stage on a balcony and long white sheets were used by extras to create an illusion of restraint from the stage below. This served to draw attention to the madness that her character evokes. Moreover, a connection between the original context and a modern context was created, as the treatment of the aged and mentally infirm was highlighted; a topic which is particularly relevant today. The fact that she was restrained by extras rather than members of the family perhaps serving to highlight how today the older generation tend to be institutionalised rather than forming part of the family; so while María Josefa was clearly living in the house, the extras with their restraining white sheets evoked associations of mental institutions or hospitals. In this way, connections between the original cultural context of the 1930s Spanish setting and the modern audience are made
visible on stage. The signs of the written text are thus re-interpreted into visual theatrical signs which are able to generate their own meanings that go beyond the text. The director’s interpretants in this case draw attention to the social conditions of the place and time of reception, in other words, modern Britain. Moreover, these interpretants are able to generate further interpretants that not only signify beyond the text, but also interrogate the signified, drawing attention to the social ills of the modern society in which we live.

Similarly, in *Yerma*, we are presented with characters that represent the opposing forces of society and the individual, with a series of conformists and rebels. For example, María, whose name describes her function, the archetypal Mother, likens the conception of her own child to that of the Virgin Mary, as discussed in Chapter Six. The Girl (Muchacha) hates cooking and cleaning and was forced to marry by her parents and, although she seems to love her husband, would have preferred to remain as boyfriend and girlfriend. She challenges the conventional norms of the society in which she lives but also proclaims herself ‘mad’ as that is what people would call her for not conforming. Similarly, the Old Woman with her ‘skirts in the air’ who lives life to the full and rejects the existence of God is described as coming from ‘el otro lado del rio’ (the other side of the river), which indicates her non-conformist attitude and pagan beliefs. The Washerwomen, as a chorus, also represent different viewpoints. There is thus a range of voices that Knapp (1991:143) describes as representing ‘collective forces each vying for supremacy’. In my view, more than that, they represent the collective voice of society and the voice of the individual. They are literally and metaphorically washing the dirty linen in public.

In the performance of *Yerma* analysed, the different voices are brought to the fore visually by the use of colour in the costumes to portray both the characters’ personalities and their opinions. One of the washerwomen wore a bright red and white dress and moved about the stage delivering her lines with an ironic tone while another Washerwoman was dressed in black and remained seated during the scene delivering her lines in a much more sombre manner. These colours can portray a range of symbolic
meanings beyond mere characterisation. Related to the Spanish context, they can present on the one hand two fractions of society, tradition versus liberalism, and on the other the stereotypical images of Spanish women, widows wearing black on the one hand, and Spanish flamenco dancers on the other. Additionally, the black dress can symbolise the oppressed body while the red and white dress can symbolise the sexually liberated body.

In contrast to the colours of the Washerwomen’s dresses, Juan was dressed in grey to match his character and his description of himself as ‘como el acero’ (like steel), while Yerma’s white apron drew attention to her white, sterile womb. The Old Woman was dressed in green trousers and shirt, reminiscent of the outfits worn by land girls in 1940s war-time Britain. The typical male attire of trousers rather than a dress, as would be customary in Spain at that time, was suggestive of the Old Woman’s more liberal, or perhaps even more male, outlook on life.

This illustrates that the linguistic signs of the drama text, not just those linguistic signs relating to the stage directions, can be translated into theatrical, visual signs that make an immediate impact and connection with the audience. Colour is used indexically, pointing to deeper symbolic meanings. In this way, colour is gestic as it is able to aid illocutionary uptake on the part of the spectator and generate multiple meanings which connect to the text but also signify beyond it.

Furthermore, some of these characters were given names in the programme which reinforced their personalities and matched their costumes. The flirtatious Washerwoman in the red and white dress was named ‘Mariposa’ (butterfly - although it was not translated into English) and the one dressed in black was called ‘Brunhilde’ (originally a German name). To activate the associations that the word ‘Mariposa’ evokes, the audience would need to have an understanding of Spanish, whereas the choice of ‘Brunhilde’ may more commonly be associated with a stereotype that the director may assume the audience to be familiar with. However, while this naming of characters adds to the symbolism on the level of characterisation, it gives them an identity rather than the function Lorca gave them. Lorca deliberately did not name some
of his characters in order that they be perceived as archetypes rather than individuals. This example shows how implicatures contained within the drama text that do not relate to the stage directions, in terms of what the characters say and how they say it, are visualised in performance, in this instance by the colour of the costumes on the body of the actors. This illustrates a form of cooperation between the drama text and the performance text, as the director’s interpretant originates indirectly from the ST, but is able to signify beyond it, producing further interpretants that signify within both the context of the ST’s temporal and geographical location, and that of the TT. However, these interpretants may evoke certain stereotypes, and provoke rejection on the part of the audience.

In *Bodas de sangre* the collective voice of society is represented in ‘la boda’ (the wedding) that calls, metaphorically and literally, as the guests begin to arrive, chanting wedding songs. In Act Two, Scene One, the First Girl declares:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>La boda está llamando</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por las ventanas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The wedding feast</strong> beckons at all the windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They shout the wedding from the windows!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The wedding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from every window <strong>calls.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your wedding is calling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and calling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>through the rising air.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hughes’s translation of ‘boda’ as ‘wedding feast’ makes the image one of joy at the festive aspect of the wedding, whereas in the original the ‘boda’ is, metaphorically, an unstoppable force which gets closer and closer, calling to the Bride to fulfil her obligations. By transposing the subject of ‘la boda’ to ‘they’, Bradbury changes the illocutionary force of the metaphor and reduces it to the literal level of the wedding
guests shouting their chants. This translation is limiting as we are unable to reach Lorca’s second-order usage. Johnston repetition of the word ‘calling’, reinforces the metaphor of the wedding as an unstoppable force and his choice of ‘through the rising air’ rather than ‘through the windows’ for ‘por las ventanas’, connects to this metaphorical unstoppable force as it provides not only a sense of joy but also a sense of foreboding as the forces of nature are rising. Johnston’s application of interpretants thus work on a thematic rather than a formal level.

7.3 Cleanliness

The society Lorca portrays is built on convention and conformity and worries about village gossip. Deviants are either considered mad, whores or God-less. This idea of maintaining appearances is reflected in the obsession with cleanliness.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, the stage directions describe ‘una habitación blanquisima’ (an extremely white room) and in the dialogue there are references to glass being ‘stained’ and ‘muddy footprints’ on the gleaming white floor. In this way, colour is used metaphorically to depict the cracks that are starting to show in these outward appearances. In Act One, La Poncia says to the Maid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 7.6</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PONCIA. (En la alacena.) Este cristal tiene unas motas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRIADA. Ni con el jabón ni con bayeta se le quitan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA PONCIA (Looking in the cupboard): There are specks on this glass.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAID: I can’t get rid of them with soap or the cloth.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PONCIA: [at the cupboard]: This crystal has some spots on it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAID: Neither soap nor flannel will get them off.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PONCIA [at the cupboard]. There are specks on this glass.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAID. Soap won’t shift them, or dishcloths or anything.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA PONCIA (at the glass cupboard). This is filthy.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bradbury, Dewell and Zapata, and Edmunds all translate the ST closely, albeit with different word choices for ‘motas’ (‘specks’ and ‘spots’) and for ‘bayeta’ (‘cloth’, ‘flannel’ and ‘dishcloth’). Clifford is less specific with the description ‘This is filthy’. Clifford’s omission of the reference to ‘cristal’ (glass) is compensated for in the stage directions with ‘at the glass cupboard’, however, the reduction in the text itself may reduce it to a mere comment about cleanliness, whereas the specks on the glass have a greater symbolic meaning invoking self-reflection and the staining of outward appearance which also acts as a premonition of what is to come. In the performance text of The House of Bernarda Alba studied here, the stage directions of a gleaming white backdrop were reflected in white walls and a white floor that was repainted between performances to keep it spotless. The director’s interpretant sought to replicate the grammar of colour of the ST.

In Yerma Lorca also uses the colour white where cleanliness represents the idea of keeping up appearances whereas the truth is a farce, so much so that it is a living hell. In Act Two, Scene One, the Washerwomen comment on Yerma’s situation and explain that Juan has brought his two spinster sisters to live with them to keep an eye on Yerma. These Sisters-in-law, as former custodians of the church are now custodians of Yerma as we are told in the ST (‘Estaban encargadas de cuidar la iglesia y ahora cuidarán de su cuñada’, ‘they were charged with looking after the church and now they will look after their sister-in-law’). They are thus pious representations of Catholic society, but they are described as ‘dan miedo’ (scary), and likened to waxy leaves that grow on gravestones, cooking their food in lamp oil. They are thus almost supernatural and are equated to evil:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porque dan miedo. Son como esas hojas grandes que nacen de pronto sobre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>los sepulcros. Están untadas con cera. Son metidas hacia adentro. Se me</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>figura que guisan su comida con el aceite de las lámparas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I’d be afraid to. They’re like those big leaves that grow all of a sudden</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>on graves. They’re covered with wax. They’re all turned in on themselves. They make me think they must cook their meals in lamp oil.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They give me the shivers. They’re like those enormous leaves that suddenly sprout from under tombstones – all waxy and curled inwards. I have visions of them cooking their meals in lamp oil.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They give me the creeps. They’re like weeds in a graveyard. And I’ll bet they eat candle-grease and cook it in lamp-oil.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They’re revolting. Like those big slimy leaves that spring up over gravestones. You’d swear they’d been waxed and turned inside out. I’m sure they boil their potatoes in holy water.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bradbury and Luke domesticate ‘porque dan miedo’ (because they are frightening) with two habitual idiomatic expressions in English, ‘they give me the shivers’ and ‘they give me the creeps’, respectively; Johnston translates this as ‘they’re revolting’, which on a locutionary level moves away from the ST but connects with his description of ‘those big slimy leaves’, where ‘slimy’ is inserted for effect, making them sound even more ‘revolting’. Johnston thus creates his own cohesive image.

Luke reduces the content of the ST by omitting the reference to ‘Están untadas con cera’ (they are spread with wax’) but compensates with ‘And I’ll bet they eat candle-wax’, so rather than describing their ‘waxy outward appearance’ Luke transposes the description to what they eat, which does not portray the same image of outward revulsion but still makes them sound unnatural. Johnston’s translation, ‘You’d swear they’d been waxed
and turned inside out’, implies that someone has waxed them and turned them inside out, whereas in reality this is their natural state, implying that they are unpleasant and deformed, in other words, freaks of nature.

Merwin, Bradbury and Luke also translate closely the ST reference to ‘que guisan su comida con el aceite de las lámparas’ (that they cook their food in oil from lamps), whereas Johnston’s translation of ‘I’m sure they boil their potatoes in holy water’ takes a more target-oriented approach as boiled potatoes are part of the English staple diet whereas they are not so popular in Spain. Johnston thus uses cultural transference or adaptation here. In his note (18) at the back of his translation, he states that this ‘seems to work quite well’ (1990: 105). In terms of performance, the translator is thus relocating the play to an English or more specifically Irish setting. This reminds us of the debate, discussed in Chapter Three, about whether plays should be relocated both in terms of time and place; with regards to translating Lorca, the phrase ‘relorcation’ (Teevan 1999: 175) has even been coined. Relocation of place can be indicated simply in terms of accent and dialect, or it can go further and also relocate cultural references. In this case, the reference in the ST to ‘lamp-oil’ is not so much cultural as related to the temporality of the text while ‘boil their potatoes in holy water’ is not. However, this adaptation makes symbolic connections with the pious nature of the Sisters-in-law through a target-oriented cultural reference that the audience can connect with. This shows the translator acting upon the text at a symbolic level of the discourse of the play as a whole. It also shows that Johnston’s notion of equivalence is thematic rather than formal. Champions of the ST may dislike this type of relocation, yet it can also be seen as a type of reverence, insofar as by focusing on the context of reception rather than that of production, Johnston may desire to make the text work better in English.

The Washerwomen describe the situation in the house as ‘hell’, where Yerma and the Sisters-in-law spend all day cleaning and whitewashing:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cada hora que transcurre aumenta el infierno en aquella casa. Ella y</td>
<td>Lorca: 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las cuñadas, sin despegar los labios, blanquean todo el día las</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paredes, friegan los cobres, limpian con vaho los cristales, dan aceite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a la solería. Pues, cuando más relumbra la vivienda, más arde por</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dentro.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That house gets more like hell by the hour. She and her sisters-in-law</td>
<td>Merwin: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whitewash the walls all day, and rub the copper and polish the glasses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and oil the hearthstones, without ever opening their lips, and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more everything shines the hotter it gets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every hour that passes stokes the hell fire in that house. She spends</td>
<td>Bradbury: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all day with his sisters whitewashing walls, steaming the glassware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean, oiling the patio floors – and never a word passes their lips. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more the house shines, the more it burns up inside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That house must be a living hell what with her and the in-laws never</td>
<td>Luke: 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking a word and the whole place scrubbed, whitewashed and waxed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from floor to ceiling even when it doesn’t need it. The better it looks</td>
<td>Johnston: 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside the worse it gets inside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That house is a living hell...and it gets worse by the minute. Stuck in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there with that pair of witches, never a word passing between them,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spending the whole day long whitewashing walls, scrubbing pots and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polishing glass, rubbing oil into the floor. And the more the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glistens, the hotter they all burn inside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a socio-cultural level, Lorca is describing a normal everyday practice taken to extremes to highlight the double standards of a society that demands appearances to be kept while covering up what may be going on behind closed doors. On a symbolic level, he is using the colour white to depict the sterility of society and also produce a contrast between inside and outside space. The house may be clean and white on the inside (and the outside if we imagine the typical white-washed Andalusian houses) but
at the same time it is a sterile tomb, cold and death-like that paradoxically creates a feeling of oppression and is thus hot like hell.

With regards to the specific references to the cleaning of the different items in the house, Merwin and Johnston translate all of these items, albeit in slightly different forms, while Bradbury omits ‘friegan los cobres’ (wash the copperware). Luke, however, makes these cultural references more generic by describing the cleaning from ‘floor to ceiling’ rather than naming each item individually. This detracts from the ST cultural setting, making the setting more universal, but serves to portray the incessant, obsessional nature of the cleaning, reinforced by the addition of ‘even when it doesn’t need it’.

In the ST we have the reference to ‘despegar los labios’ (unstick their lips) which creates images of their lips being glued tightly shut, giving the impression that they are difficult to prize apart. Bradbury and Johnston clarify the implicature of the ST that they do not speak to each other with ‘never a word passing between them’ and ‘never a word passes their lips’, respectively. I think modulation could be used here with ‘their lips remaining firmly shut’, ‘their lips remaining firmly glued together’, ‘their lips tightly shut’, or ‘their lips glued together’. I think a reference to glue here could provide an image of revulsion, as we can imagine a glue-like or wax-like substance oozing out of them, or equally one of death as we can imagine lips that are a yellowy/white waxy colour, and thus they represent the living dead. The sinister nature of the Sisters-in-law is evoked by Johnston’s translation of ‘las cuñadas’ (the Sisters-in-law) as ‘that pair of witches’ which connects back to the earlier description of them as like leaves that grow on gravestones and spread with wax. The translator’s strategy here is addition that is able to produce interpretants that relate back to the overall discourse of the play.

7.4 Silence

Silence depicts the inner struggle of the individual wanting to speak out and live their lives as they wish, but having to silence their inner selves to conform to society’s demands and conventions. It is a struggle between their ideosomatic programming and
their true animal, or visceral, instincts. Silence is a pivotal theme in all three plays and, in particular, in La casa de Bernarda Alba where ‘[t]he absence of sound becomes one of the most significant features of the intricate and finely calculated acoustic texture […]’ (Thompson 1999:73). Bernarda’s control over her family is in large part a control of language so that language itself becomes that control and in this way is something physical, an entity in its own right. Bernarda’s first word to the maid is ‘silence’, her controlling character thus established from the start, along with her need to keep up appearances and her obsession with cleanliness.

At the very beginning of the play, in Act One, the stage directions establish a connection between white and silence with an ‘extremely white’ room and ‘a great shady silence extends across the scene’, almost like a shadowy figure that is equated to a living being:

Table 7.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Description</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Habitación blanquísimas del interior de la casa de Bernarda.</em> Muros gruesos. Puertas en arco con cortinas de yute rematadas con madroños y volantes. Sillas de anea. Cuadros con paisajes inverosímiles de ninfas, o reyes de leyenda. Es verano. Un gran silencio umbroso se extiende por la escena. Al levantarse el telón está la escena sola. Se oyen doblar las campanas.* (Sale la Criada 1º.)</td>
<td>A room in Bernarda’s house with thick walls, painted startlingly white. The arched doorways are hung with coarse woven curtains tied back with ribbons and flounces. Wicker chairs. The pictures are fanciful landscapes, full of nymphs and fairytale kings. It is summer. A brooding silence invades the scene which is empty when the curtain goes up. Bells toll. The Maid comes in.</td>
<td>Lorca: 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very white inner room in BERNARDA’s house. Thick walls. Arched doorways with jute curtains trimmed with black beads and ruffles. Rush-bottomed chairs. Pictures of nymphs or legendary kings in improbable landscapes. It is summer. A great, shady silence envelops</td>
<td>Bradbury: 131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**the stage.** When the curtain rises, the stage is empty. *Church bells* are tolling.

[The MAID enters.]

**A whiter-than-white inner room of BERNARDA’s house.** Thick walls. Arched doorways with hessian curtains edged with tassels and flounces. Rush-bottomed chairs. *Pictures of nymphs or legendary kings in unrealistic landscapes.* It is summer. **A great shadowy silence pervades the stage.** When the curtain rises the stage is empty. Sound of tolling bells.

The MAID enters.

**A blindingly white room inside BERNARDA ALBA’s house.** The walls are thick. There are arched doorways with hessian curtains, edged with tassels and flounces. Cane chairs. On the walls are pictures of unlikely landscapes full of nymphs or legendary kings. It is summer. **A heavy silence. We are deep in shadow.** As the curtain rises, the stage is empty. We hear the tolling of a *funeral bell.*

Enter the MAID.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The translators all maintain the reference to the colour of the room, ‘blanquisima’, with different degrees of intensity: ‘startlingly white’ (Bradbury); ‘very white’ (Dewell and Zapata); ‘whiter-than white’ (Edmunds); and ‘blindingly white’ (Clifford). Dewell and Zapata and Edmunds all replicate the ST’s ‘Un gran silencio umbroso’ (a great shadowy silence) closely with ‘a great shadowy silence’ and ‘a great, shady silence’ respectively, whereas Bradbury’s ‘a brooding silence’ personifies the silence, creating her own metaphorical link to the discourse of the play as a whole. Clifford splits the sentence into two with ‘A heavy silence. We are deep in shadow’ which splits the physical connection between silence and its shadowy like nature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the play progresses the colour white is less extreme, as in Act Two the room is no longer ‘blanquisima’ (very white) but just ‘blanca’ (white):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dewell and Zapata and Edmunds add ‘except for Adela’ as they rightly draw our attention to the fact that Adela cannot be seated with her sisters, as Magdalena will go to find her as the scene progresses. This obvious anomaly between the stage directions and the dialogue is thus pre-empted by these translations, addressing the potential performability of the text on a practical level.

In Act Three, the room is tinged slightly blue to denote night time. However, metaphorically it also denotes a darkening within the house:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.10</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitación blanca del interior de la casa de Bernarda. Las puertas de la izquierda dan a los dormitorios. Las Hijas de Bernarda están sentadas en sillas bajas cosiendo. Magdalena borda. Con ellas está la Poncia.</td>
<td>Lorca: 602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A room in Bernarda’s house, painted white. The doors on the left lead to the bedrooms. Bernarda’s daughters are sitting on low chairs, sewing. Magdalena is embroidering and La Poncia is with them.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A white inner room in BERNARDA’s house. The doors at the left lead to the bedrooms. BERNARDA’s DAUGHTERS except for ADELA are seated in low chairs, sewing. MAGDALENA is embroidering. PONCIA is with them.</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A white inner room in BERNARDA’s house. The doors on the left lead to the bedrooms. Bernard’s DAUGHTERS, except for ADELA, are sitting on low chairs, sewing. MAGDALENA is embroidering. PONCIA is with them.</td>
<td>Edmunds: 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White room inside BERNARDA’s house. Doors to the left lead to the bedrooms. BERNARDA’S DAUGHTERS are sitting in chairs, sewing. MAGDALENA emboiders. LA PONCIA is with them.</td>
<td>Clifford: 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cuatro paredes blancas ligeramente azuladas del patio interior de la casa de Bernarda. Es de noche. El decorado ha de ser de una perfecta simplicidad. Las puertas, iluminadas por la luz de los interiores, dan un tenue fulgor a la escena.

En el centro, una mesa con un quinqué, donde están comiendo Bernarda y sus Hijas. La Poncia las sirve. Prudencia está sentada aparte.

Al levantarse el telón hay un gran silencio, interrumpido por el ruido de platos y cubiertos.

The courtyard of Bernarda’s house, surrounded by four white walls with a slightly bluish tinge. Simplicity is the outstanding feature. It’s night time, and the lights from the inside rooms give the scene a soft glow. Bernarda and her daughters are sitting at a table in the centre having a meal. There is a lamp on the table. La Poncia serves them. Prudencia sits a little apart. When the curtain goes up a profound silence reigns, apart from the noise of the plates and the cutlery.

The interior patio of BERNARDA’s [sic] house. It is night. Four white walls lightly bathed in blue. The décor must be one of perfect simplicity. The doors, illuminated by the light from inside, cast a delicate glow on the scene. At centre, a table with an oil-lamp where BERNARDA and her DAUGHTERS are eating. PONCIA is serving them. PRUDENCIA is seated at one side. The curtain rises on total silence, interrupted only by the clatter of dishes and cutlery.

Four white walls, lightly tinged with blue, of the interior courtyard in BERNARDA’s house. It is night. The décor must be of the utmost simplicity. The doorways, illumined by light from inside the rooms, cast a delicate glow over the stage. In the centre, a table with an oil-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorca</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewell and Zapata</td>
<td>154-155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lamp where BERNARDA and her DAUGHTERS are eating. PONCIA is serving them. PRUDENCIA is sitting apart.

The curtain rises on a heavy silence broken only by the noise of plates and cutlery.

The inner courtyard of BERNARDA’s house. The walls are white with a hint of blue. It is night time. The decor needs to be utterly simple. The doorways are lit from the rooms within and give the stage a feeble glow of light.

In the centre is a table lit by an oil lamp, where BERNARDA and her DAUGHTERS are eating. LA PONCIA serves them. PRUDENCIA is sitting on her own.

The curtain rises in the midst of profound silence, broken only by the clatter of crockery and the sounds of knives and forks.

All the translators closely replicate the stage directions at the beginning of each Act, thus providing linguistic signs that can be converted into theatrical signs of colour in terms of scenery and lighting, and sound or lack of sound, for a performance or potential performance. Their translations all generate the grammar of colour of the ST. Decisions about whether to follow the stage directions precisely are the individual director’s, and may depend on practicalities such as resources available. In each Act, Lorca describes a different room although they all have the common theme of the colour white. The representation of different rooms on stage may be problematic in practical terms. In the case of the performance text of The House of Bernarda Alba studied here the same stage set was used to represent all three rooms. The walls and floor were white and there were a number of white photo frames each containing the same black and white photograph of Lorca. A red carnation had been placed in the upper part of each frame. Lorca was, therefore, metaphorically overlooking the performance and at the same time, he was actually part of it, as the Maid took one of the photos down to clean it and
spoke to the image as if it were a picture of Bernarda’s dead husband. Lorca himself thus became a character, and his image a prop, in his own play. We thus see a reverence to the source author although not all of the audience would necessarily realise that this was indeed Lorca. The director thus refracted the play through the author himself with this visual reference. Moreover, the red carnations might evoke drops of blood hanging over Lorca’s head, making an indirect reference to his murder. The director’s interpretants here are visual signs that relate to the discourse surrounding the author, and generate further interpretants that relate to him, and also signify the director’s reverential stance vis-à-vis Lorca. Equally, the use of the red carnation could evoke stereotypical images of Spain of bullfighters and flamenco dancers, thus making a connection with the audience, whether of attraction to the stereotype or rejection of it.

The same set was used throughout the performance. The bleak white of the walls of the set was enhanced with the use of white furniture, a white painted floor and the numerous black and white photographs with red carnations, as described above. When the audience returned after the interval for the final act, the red carnations had all withered and the photo frames were crooked. Pieces of red and white paper were used to represent the soup served by the maid and were consequently scattered all over the floor after the table was overturned. Thus the director used props as iconic signs to represent chaos and impending doom, reinforced by the colour of those props. Moreover, he is working within Lorca’s grammar of colour, as depicted in this play, and the others in the trilogy.

Bernarda’s enjoyment of silence is not just a desire for relaxing calm but an authoritarian demand for control. In Act Three, the daughters have gone to bed, and La Poncia comes into the room to find Bernarda alone. La Poncia comments that Bernarda is still up to which Bernarda replies:

| Table 7.12 |
|-------------|-------------|
| **Disfrutando este silencio** y sin lograr ver por parte alguna “la cosa tan grande” que aquí pasa, según tú. | Lorca: 625 |

302
Enjoying the peace and so far unable to unearth any of your ‘serious goings-on’.

Bradbury: 172

Enjoying this silence, and unable to find any trace of that ‘monstrous thing’ you claim is happening here.

Dewell and Zapata: 160

Enjoying the peace and quiet, and not seeing much sign of the ‘something very serious’ that’s going on here, according to you.

Edmunds:163

Enjoying the peace and quiet. Strangely enough, I don’t see any trace of this ‘very big thing’ that you’re so sure is going on.

Clifford: 65

In translation only Dewell and Zapata maintain the illocutionary effect of the symbolism of the original by translating ‘silence’ literally, whereas the other translators domesticate it with ‘peace’ (Bradbury) and ‘peace and quiet’ (Edmunds and Clifford).

La Poncia continues to express her fears and when Bernarda leaves the room, the Maid comments that Bernarda is too proud to see what is going on in the house, metaphorically covering her eyes with a blindfold. La Poncia responds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yo no puedo hacer nada. Quise atajar las cosas, pero ya me asustan demasiado. ¿Tú ves este silencio? Pues hay una tormenta en cada cuarto. El día que estallen nos barrerán a todas. Yo he dicho lo que tenía que decir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorca: 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t do anything. I tried to interfere once, but I’m too frightened to try again. Have you noticed how quiet it is? Well, there’s a storm brewing in every room and when it bursts it’ll take us all with it. I’ve said all I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury: 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s nothing I can do. I tried to put a stop to all this, but now it frightens me too much. Do you hear this silence? Well, there’s a storm brewing in every room. The day it bursts, we’ll all be swept away! I’ve said what I had to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There’s nothing I can do. I tried to put a stop to it. But now I’m too scared. You see how quiet it is? Well, I tell you there are storms brewing in every room. The day they break we’ll be swept away, all of us. I’ve said my say, that’s it.

There’s nothing I can do. I wanted to head things off but now they frighten me. Hear that silence? It’s the quiet before the storm. And it’s brewing in each one of those rooms. When it breaks we’ll all be swept away. But I’ve said all I could. What else can you do?

In the ST silence is described as something that is ‘seen’, thus equating it to a physical entity. In this example, Dewell and Zapata and Clifford maintain the symbolism with the literal translation of ‘silence’, whereas Bradbury and Edmunds translate it as ‘quiet’. Edmunds further conveys the symbolism of it as a ‘being’ with the literal translation of ‘ves’ as ‘see’ rather than ‘noticed’ (Bradbury) or ‘hear’ (Dewell and Zapata/Clifford). Clifford also adds in the habitual English expression ‘It’s the quiet before the storm’ to reinforce the effect of the silence.

In the ST, silence and the heat act together to oppress; for example, in Act Two, the reapers are heard singing outside, and the stage directions state:

**Table 7.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Se oyen panderos y carrañacas. Pausa. <em>Todos oyen en un silencio traspasado por el sol.</em>)</th>
<th>Lorca: 610</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(<em>Tambourines and maracas are heard. Pause. They all listen in the stifling heat.</em>)</td>
<td>Bradbury: 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>Off-stage, tambourines and carrañacas play. There is a pause in the conversation; everyone listens in the sunstruck silence.</em>)</td>
<td>Dewell &amp; Zapata: 144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Tambourines and rattles are heard. There is a pause in the conversation. The women all listen in silence shot through with sunlight.

We hear tambourines and drums. Pause. All listen in total silence, a silence pierced through and through by the heat.

Edmunds: 146
Clifford: 42

The daughters thus hear the happy voices of the reapers, singing outside. They represent sexual freedom, while in the interior of the house there is silence and repression. In this example, silence is not seen but heard. Bradbury omits the reference to the silence and refers only to ‘the stifling heat’, which detracts from the illocutionary effect of a silence that is heard. Dewell and Zapata create an ambiguous image with ‘sunstruck’ while Edmunds creates a more positive one than the original with ‘sunlight’. Clifford repeats the word ‘silence’ which may aid illocutionary uptake on the part of the reader/director of the symbolic nature of this silence that is further reinforced by describing it as ‘pierced through and through by the heat’. The director/actors would obviously need to translate these stage directions into gestures and body language.

In Act Two there is another reference to heat and silence, this time to the silence of the heat itself. A fierce discussion breaks out between the sisters as Angustias demands to know who has stolen her picture of Pepe from her room. Bernarda comes in demanding to know what the noise is all about:

**Table 7.15**

**(Entrando con su bastón.)** ¡Qué escándalo es éste en mi casa y con el silencio del peso del calor! Estarán las vecinas con el oído pegado a los tabiques.

**(Coming in):** All over the village it’s as quiet as the tomb because of the heat, and in my house there’s a scandal raging. I suppose all the neighbours will have their ears glued to the wall!

Lorca: 612
Bradbury: 159
(entering): What is all this commotion in my house, and in the silence of this heavy heat? The neighbours must have their ears glued to the wall!

(entering with her stick). What’s this uproar going on in my house, and right in the middle of the afternoon heat when everyone’s quiet? The neighbours must have their ears glued to the walls.

(coming in with her stick), What is the meaning of this scandalous noise? In this heat there should be nothing but silence! All the neighbours will have their ears glued to the walls!

The original states ‘con el peso del silencio del calor’ (with the weight of the silence of the heat). The heat is again depicted as heavy and thus symbolically an oppressive presence. Bradbury creates an allusion of ‘death’ with the translation of ‘quiet as the tomb’, however she refers to the village as being quiet rather than the silence of the heat itself. Similarly, Edmunds makes the village the subject of the utterance with ‘when everyone’s quiet’. Clifford also detracts from the symbolic element with ‘in this heat there should be nothing but silence’, which creates a focus on Bernarda’s demand for silence rather than on the force of the heat itself.

La Poncia finds the photo in Martirio’s bed and Martirio admits she took it, so Bernarda hits her with her stick. Martirio insists that she took it as a joke, which causes Adela to explode with envy saying that it was not a joke. An argument thus ensues between the two of them with Angustias joining in. Bernarda demands silence seeking to control speech with violent force:

Table 7.16

| ¡Silencio digo! Yo veía la tormenta venir, pero no creía que estallara tan pronto. ¡Ay que pedrisco de odio habéis echado sobre mi corazón! Pero todavía no soy anciana y tengo cinco cadenas para... | Lorca: 614 |
vosotras y esta casa levantada por mi padre para que ni las hierbas se enteren de mi desolación. ¡Fuera de aquí!

**Quiet**, I say! I knew there was a storm brewing, but I didn’t realise it would break so soon. Oh, what a storm of hatred you’ve let loose on my heart! But I’m not finished yet. I still have five strong chains for you, and the house my father built to prevent even the weeds spying on my misery. Get out of here!

**Silence**, I said! I saw the storm coming, but I didn’t think it would burst so soon. Oh, what a hailstone of hate you have dropped on my heart! But I’m not old yet, and **I have five chains for you**, and this house my father built, so not even the weeds will know of my desolation. Get out of here!

**Quiet**, I say. I saw the storm coming, but I didn’t think it would break so soon. Ay, what a torrent of hatred you’ve unleashed on my heart! But old age hasn’t caught up with me yet, and I’ve got five chains to bind you with besides this house my father built, so that not even the grass outside will hear of my humiliation. Get out of here!

I said **silence**! I could see this storm coming, but I didn’t think that it would break so soon. What a hail storm of hatred you’ve made break on my heart! But I’m not finished yet. I’ll forge five chains of steel to bind you tight. I’ll bolt and I’ll bar every door against you, every door in my father’s house so not even the walls will know my shame! Now get out, all of you! Get out!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vosotras y esta casa levantada por mi padre para que ni las hierbas se enteren de mi desolación. ¡Fuera de aquí!</td>
<td>Bradbury: 161</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, I say! I knew there was a storm brewing, but I didn’t realise it would break so soon. Oh, what a storm of hatred you’ve let loose on my heart! But I’m not finished yet. I still have five strong chains for you, and the house my father built to prevent even the weeds spying on my misery. Get out of here!</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 149</td>
<td>150-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence, I said! I saw the storm coming, but I didn’t think it would burst so soon. Oh, what a hailstone of hate you have dropped on my heart! But I’m not old yet, and I have five chains for you, and this house my father built, so not even the weeds will know of my desolation. Get out of here!</td>
<td>Edmunds:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I said silence! I could see this storm coming, but I didn’t think that it would break so soon. What a hail storm of hatred you’ve made break on my heart! But I’m not finished yet. I’ll forge five chains of steel to bind you tight. I’ll bolt and I’ll bar every door against you, every door in my father’s house so not even the walls will know my shame! Now get out, all of you! Get out!</td>
<td>Clifford:</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example Dewell and Zapata and Clifford maintain the symbolic effect with the replication of ‘silence,’ which is stronger than Bradbury and Edmunds’s ‘quiet’. Clifford uses addition with ‘I’ll bolt and I’ll bar every door against you’, and repeats the subject pronoun ‘I’ in ‘I’ll’ thus reinforcing Bernarda’s determination to control through silence and violent force and aiding performability on stage to ensure that the idea is fully
captured by the audience. However, this repetition could also make Bernarda appear more vulnerable.

Bernarda then tells the daughters to get out of the room and she is left with La Poncia. She says to herself, as much as to La Poncia, that it is her duty to use physical force on her daughters:

Table 7.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¡Tendré que sentarlas la mano! Bernarda: ¡acuérdate que esta es tu obligación!</th>
<th>Lorca: 614</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They must feel your hand, Bernarda; that’s your duty, remember.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I must use a firm hand with them. Bernarda, remember: this is your duty!</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I must make them feel the weight of my hand. Bernarda, just you remember that’s your duty.</td>
<td>Edmunds: 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will have to make them feel the weight of my hand! That is your duty, Bernarda. Your duty. And don’t you forget it.</td>
<td>Clifford: 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clifford repeats the word ‘duty’ and adds a sentence ‘And don’t you forget it’, which may aid performability as discussed but may also make Bernarda seem weaker, as she is almost talking herself into it. We thus see how decisions that can be related to performability can have an effect on characterisation.

The conversation between Bernarda and La Poncia continues along the same lines, Bernarda insisting that her daughters respect and obey her, and that she is prepared to use physical force to ensure conformity:

Table 7.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PONCIA. ¡Eso sí! Pero en cuanto las dejes sueltas se te subirán al tejado.</th>
<th>Lorca: 616</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERNARDA. ¡Ya las bajaré tirándoles cantos!</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LA PONCIA: All right. But left to themselves they’d fly to the rooftops.
BERNARDA: And I’d get them down again by throwing stones!

PONCIA: That’s true. But as soon as you turn them loose, they’ll be up on the roof.
BERNARDA: I will bring them down soon enough, by throwing stones at them!

PONCIA. That’s very true. But the moment you let them loose they’ll go flying up to the rooftops.
BERNARDA. And I’ll hurl stones at them till they come down.

LA PONCIA. Oh yes, their obedience! Release them from that, and they’d be flying over the rooftops!
BERNARDA. I’d climb up myself and bring them down with grappling irons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury: 163</td>
<td>PONCIA: That’s true. But as soon as you turn them loose, they’ll be up on the roof. BERNARDA: I will bring them down soon enough, by throwing stones at them!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 151</td>
<td>PONCIA: All right. But left to themselves they’d fly to the rooftops. BERNARDA: And I’d get them down again by throwing stones!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmunds: 153</td>
<td>PONCIA: That’s very true. But the moment you let them loose they’ll go flying up to the rooftops. BERNARDA: And I’ll hurl stones at them till they come down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford: 52</td>
<td>LA PONCIA. Oh yes, their obedience! Release them from that, and they’d be flying over the rooftops! BERNARDA. I’d climb up myself and bring them down with grappling irons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example all the translators translate ‘cancos’ literally as ‘stones’ except Clifford’s ‘grappling irons’ that creates a stronger effect of restraint and has more of a resonance of torture. This translator thus creates a symbolic connection with Bernarda as the dictator within her household.

In Act One, we have already seen this attitude of dictatorship from Bernarda as she reprimands her daughters:

**Table 7.19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Golpeando con el bastón en el suelo) ¡No os hagáis ilusiones de que vais a poder conmigo! ¡Hasta que salga de esta casa con los pies adelante mandaré en lo mío y en lo vuestro!</td>
<td>Lorca: 602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Banging on the floor with her stick): Don’t imagine you can do as you like now! I’m the one who gives the orders in this house, and I shall go on doing it till they carry me out feet first!</td>
<td>Bradbury: 147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(rapping the floor with her cane): Don’t entertain the illusion that you are going to be a match for me! Until I leave this house feet first, I will make the decisions – my own, and yours!

Dewell and Zapata: 136

(striking the floor with her stick). Don’t any of you imagine you’re going to get the better of me! Till the day I go out of this house feet first, what I say goes – for me and for all of you.

Edmunds: 136

(hits the floor with her stick). Don’t any of you think for a moment you’re going to get the better of me! I am in command here and shall remain in command until they come to carry me out to my grave!

Clifford: 27

Clifford makes the connection between Bernarda and dictatorship stronger and thus politically refracts the play as she is seen as a commanding officer. By establishing links between Bernarda and dictatorship (Franco in the Spanish context), the translator thus takes the play beyond its portrayal of a domineering, repressive mother into the wider political context of the time. The translator’s interpretant thus generates other interpretants that connect to the context of 1930s Spain.

In Bodas de sangre, silence also plays an important role, as the idea of suffering in silence and not speaking out is present throughout. After a fierce exchange between the Neighbour and the Mother when the Mother finds out that her son’s wife-to-be used to be engaged to Leonardo, one of the Félix family who were responsible for the death of her eldest son, the Neighbour urges her to be calm and not speak out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VECINA. No te opongas a la felicidad de tu hijo. No le digas nada. Tú estás vieja. Yo también. A ti y a mí nos toca callar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBOR: Don’t block your son’s happiness. Don’t say anything to him. You’re old. I’m old, too. It’s time now for you and me to keep quiet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEIGHBOUR: Don’t say anything to your son. You mustn’t spoil his happiness. We’re getting old, you and I, and it’s up to us to hold our peace.

Bradbury: 75

NEIGHBOUR. Don’t stand in the way of your son’s happiness. Don’t tell him anything. You’re an old woman. Me too. You and me, we have to keep quiet.

Edwards: 39

NEIGHBOUR  Don’t stand in the way of your son’s happiness. Say nothing to him. You are I are old. We must hold our peace.

Johnston: 37

In this example, Lorca uses the verb ‘callar’ (to be/keep quiet) which is replicated by Hughes and Edwards. Whereas Bradbury and Johnston’s translation of ‘hold our peace’ evokes the traditional wedding vow in English with states ‘speak now or forever hold your peace’, in this way they address the audience directly and, at the same time, they create a metaphorical link to the overall plot.

7.5 The Body

As discussed in Chapter One, silence works as an oppressive force. The effect of this enforced silence, or repression of true feelings, is physical pain on the body; the characters, in all three plays, often express the emotional pain they feel as a physical one. This physical pain is caused by a repression of instinct and a result of conformity to the somatic conditioning that has been imposed on the characters by the society in which they live. We thus see performativity in terms of the perlocutionary effect of (the absence of) words on the characters in the ST.

In *Bodas de sangre* silence is connected with producing physical pain as keeping silent is equated with burning inside. In Act Two, Scene One, Leonardo visits the Bride on the morning of the wedding and recriminates her for rejecting him in the past for financial reasons. She tells him to keep away from her and Leonardo replies:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.21</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Callar y quemarse es el castigo más grande que nos podemos echar encima.</strong></td>
<td>¿De qué me sirvió a mí el orgullo y el no mirarte y el dejarte despierta noches y noches? ¡De nada! ¡Sirvió para echarme fuego encima! Porque tú crees que el tiempo cura y que las paredes tapan, y no es verdad, no es verdad. ¡Cuando las cosas llegan a los centros, no hay quien las arranque!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Just to stay quiet and burn up inside, that’s the worst thing that can happen to us.</strong></td>
<td>What good did pride do me, keeping me away from you? Letting you toss without sleep night after night? No good! It just set me on fire inside, that’s all! If you think time heals, and walls shut out, it’s not true. When something’s deep down in your soul, there’s nothing on earth can tear it out!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To say nothing and be inwardly consumed is the worst punishment we can inflict on each other.</strong></td>
<td>What good does my pride do me? Or staying away from you, or leaving you lying awake night after night? None at all! All it does is set me on fire! You think time heals and walls conceal, but it’s not true, it’s not true! The roots beneath the soil hang on so grimly there’s no one in the world strong enough to wrench them out!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To keep quiet and burn is the greatest punishment we can heap upon ourselves.</strong></td>
<td>What use was pride to me and not seeing you and leaving you awake night after night? No use! It only brought the fire down on top of me! You think that time heals and walls conceal and it’s not true, not true! When the roots of things go deep, no one can pull them up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To burn in silence is the worst punishment we can inflict upon ourselves.</strong></td>
<td>What good did pride do me – what use was it pretending you didn’t exist, leaving you to lie awake night in, night out? None...none at all. I burned all the more. Because you think things like that fade with time or that they can be locked away behind thick walls. And they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lorca: 438</th>
<th>Hughes: 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bradbury: 92-93</th>
<th>Edwards: 56-57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johnston: 60</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lorca creates a pictorial image here of a body burning as a result of remaining silent which is described as the greatest punishment we can inflict on ourselves. It is not just a metaphorical inward emotion of burning but Lorca presents it as an outward physical burning, allowing us to imagine the whole body of Leonardo on fire. Hughes’s translation of ‘Just to stay quiet and burn up inside’ presents it as more of an inward emotion than a physical pain, as does Bradbury’s ‘To say nothing and be inwardly consumed’. The word ‘consumed’, although it does collocate with ‘fire’, is perhaps too formal a register here and more literary in tone. This could have an effect on the level of performability through speakability. Regarding the translation of ‘castigo’ (punishment) Bradbury, Edwards and Johnston all replicate the ST, whereas Hughes’s choice of ‘worst thing’ does not convey the implicature of physical pain and suffering, nor the feeling of guilt associated with an admission of true feelings.

Regarding the last sentence, ‘cuando las cosas llegan a los centros, no hay quien las arranque’ (when things reach their centre, no-one can pull them out), the Spanish is rather enigmatic, creating the image of a fast-spinning whirlpool, where things have gone so far that there is no going back. Hughes opts for ‘when something’s deep down in your soul’, whereas Bradbury and Edwards make a connection with nature with the translation of ‘the roots beneath the soil’ and ‘when the roots of things’, respectively. Johnston on the other hand makes a connection with water. He explains his choices in note 29:

The image of the ‘water rising in an unstoppable well’ is an attempt to re-create the sense of folk wisdom of the original, and is ‘borrowed’ from an early Pablo Neruda poem. (Johnson 1989: 111)

Johnston is refracting his translation through one of Lorca’s contemporaries and friends, the poet Pablo Neruda. This borrowing establishes other metaphorical connections that
fit in with Lorca’s own metaphor of water and wells and, therefore, make the cohesive
ties within the text stronger. This aids dramatic effect and shows that performativity can
influence performability. Johnston’s interpretant here also points to a validation of
Lorca’s work, and of his own translation.

The Bride answers Leonardo by describing the intoxication that he causes in her:

Table 7.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[...]. Es como si me bebiera una botella de anís y me durmiera en una colcha de rosas. Y me arrastra, y sé que me ahogo, pero voy detrás.</td>
<td>Lorca: 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]. It’s just as if I’d drunk a whole bottle of anisette and gone to sleep in a bed of roses. The current drags me down, and I know I am drowning, but I have to go.</td>
<td>Hughes: 32-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]. It’s as if I was drunk and sleeping on a bed of roses. I’m going down, and I know I’m drowning, but I can’t stop going down...</td>
<td>Bradbury: 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]. It’s as if I’d drunk a bottle of anise and fallen asleep on a bedspread of roses. And it drags me along, and I know that I’m drowning, but I still go on.</td>
<td>Edwards: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s as though I’d drunk a bottle of sweet wine and I was lying on a bed of flowers. And I feel myself being dragged along and I know I’m drowning, but I go anyway.</td>
<td>Johnston: 60-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hughes and Edwards translate ‘anís’ literally as ‘anisette’ and ‘anise’, respectively; Johnston makes it more generic with ‘sweet wine’, clarifying the reference for an English-speaking audience and, at the same time, making the text more universal. Bradbury omits the cultural reference, transposing it to the effect that drinking the anise would have with ‘I was drunk’. Again, this translation choice makes the text more universal. This interpretant of substituting the specific for the generic is one that indicates a desire on the part of the translators (in this case Bradbury and Johnston) to bring Lorca’s work to a wider audience. This desire was articulated by Bradbury in her introduction to her translation, as discussed in Chapter Two. I suggest that Johnston’s
may be as a response to previous criticisms of Lorca’s plays that they did not work well on stage.

Likewise, by translating ‘rosas’ with the superordinate ‘flowers’, Johnston makes the specific reference generic, which in this case obscures the colour metaphor, because when we construct this image mentally we are not sure which colour the flowers are. In Spanish the image is of a bedspread of red roses, which is an image of bliss but also highly symbolic as later we will be told that the bride will return from the forest with her dress and hair covered in blood. It is due to her metaphorical intoxication of Leonardo that she will end up like this and the two men will be dead. This utterance perhaps acts a premonition of what is to come, although the red she will be covered in will not be roses but blood.

Johnston (1989: 111) justifies his choices in note 30, stating that ‘[…] the idea of a ‘bed of roses’ would be misleading in English’. In English, the expression ‘bed of roses’ is a metaphor for ‘an easy life’. However, I think in this instance we can also take the expression literally and it can thus evoke the sensual image of the Bride being intoxicated by the drink and the pungent smell of red roses, which would bring in the symbolic colour metaphor. Moreover, we can draw on modern images such as that evoked in the scene from the 1999 film American Beauty where a middle-aged man lusts after a young girl and imagines her lying on a bed surrounded by rose petals, which evokes images of virginity and lust. Images of rose petals scattered on a bed is one often used in the advertising of honeymoon suites. In this way translation can open up those spaces for the linguistic signs to create mental pictures and connect with a modern audience. However, the image evoked in the minds of the audience would obviously depend upon their own ideosomatic programming and experience. This shows that in translation interpretants can generate other interpretants that are removed from the ST object, as they signify only in the context of reception of the translation.

Towards the end of Act Three, Scene Two in Bodas de sangre, after the death of the two men in the forest, the Mother orders the Neighbour to stop crying. The Mother describes her own tears as not coming from her eyes but from the soles of her feet, from
her roots. We thus see a manifestation of *duende* in this expression of pain by the Mother:

\[\text{Table 7.23}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[\ldots]. Vuestros lágrimas son lágrimas de los ojos nada más, y las más vendrán cuando yo esté sola, de la plantas de mis pies, de mis raíces, y serán más ardientes que la sangre.</th>
<th>Lorca: 471</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[\ldots]. Your tears come from the eyes, that’s all. But when I’m alone, mine come from the soles of my feet and the roots of my hair. They burn like blood.</td>
<td>Hughes: 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[\ldots]. Your tears are tears in the eyes, that’s all. Mine will come when I’m alone, from the soles of my feet, from the very roots of me, and they will burn more fiercely than blood.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[\ldots]. Your tears are tears that come from your eyes, that’s all. But mine will come, when I’m all alone, from the soles of my feet, from my roots, and they’ll burn hotter than blood.</td>
<td>Edwards: 88-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[\ldots]. Because yours are tears from the eyes, nothing else. Mine will come when I’m alone, from the soles of my feet, from my roots, and they’ll flow hotter than blood.</td>
<td>Johnston: 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lorca creates a striking pictorial image here of tears coming up through the soles of the feet, burning the body, hotter than blood: ‘serán más ardientes que la sangre’ (they will be hotter than blood). The emotional pain is expressed as affecting the whole body: Lorca is relating it to instinct rather than reasoning, as Johnston explains in his note 53 (1989: 114). Hughes detracts from this by translating ‘raíces’ as ‘roots of my hair’ whereas in Spanish the tears derive from a deeper place, the very roots of her being.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* Augustías describes the effect that Pepe el Romano has on her body. At the beginning of Act Two, she says:
Bradbury and Edmunds domesticate the Spanish ‘Casi se me salió el corazón por la boca’, which literally translates as ‘my heart nearly came out of my mouth’, with ‘my heart was in my mouth’, whereas Dewell and Zapata create a more forceful image, as in the Spanish, with ‘my heart almost jumped out of my mouth’. Clifford removes this reference to the body focusing solely on the emotion with ‘I was too frightened’, detracting from the symbolic nature of the effect on the body.

In Act Three, Scene One, when Leonardo and the Bride have fled and are hiding in the forest, Leonardo describes the effect the Bride had on his body:

**Table 7.24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yo no hubiera podido. Casi se me salió el corazón por la boca. Era la primera vez que estaba sola de noche con un hombre.</td>
<td>I was tongue-tied. My heart was in my mouth. It was the first time I’d ever been alone with a man at night.</td>
<td>Lorca: 604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t. My heart almost jumped out of my mouth! It was the first time I was ever alone with a man at night.</td>
<td>I couldn’t have said anything. My heart was practically in my mouth. It was the first time I’d been alone at night with a man.</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t say a word. I was too frightened. It was the first time I’d ever been alone with a man.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmunds: 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¡Qué vidrios se me clavan en la lengua!</td>
<td>Porque yo quise olvidar y puse un muro de piedra entre tu casa y la mía. Es verdad. ¿No lo recuerdas? Y cuando te vi de lejos me eché en los ojos arena.</td>
<td>Lorca: 465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Page References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pero montaba a caballo</td>
<td>What splinters of glass stick to my tongue! I tried</td>
<td>Hughes: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y el caballo iba a tu puerta.</td>
<td>to forget. And I put a wall of stone between your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con alfileres de plata</td>
<td>house and my house. Didn’t I? You remember. And</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi sangre se puso negra,</td>
<td>when I saw you far off, I threw sand in my eyes. But</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y el sueño me fue llenando</td>
<td>when I got on my horse, the horse went to your door.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las carnes de mala hierba.</td>
<td>Needles of silver turned my blood black, and in my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Que yo no tengo la culpa,</td>
<td>sleep dark weeds grew in my body. It’s not my fault.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>que la culpa es de la tierra</td>
<td>It’s the fault of the earth, and the sweet scent of your breasts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y de ese olor que te sale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bradbury: 116-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de los pechos y las trenzas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glass nails my tongue,
I wanted to forget you.  
I built a stone wall  
between your house and mine.  
It’s true. Don’t you remember?  
When I saw you in the distance  
I rubbed sand in my eyes,  
but my horse took me to your door.  

---

²⁴ The word ‘of’ is missing in the text.
**Silver needles**

turned my blood black,

and dreams

sowed my flesh with weeds.

Oh, the fault is not mine,

the fault is in the earth

and the smell of your breasts

and the smell of your hair!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What splinters of glass are stuck in my tongue!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And I put a wall of stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between your house and mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s the truth. Don’t you remember?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And when I saw you from far away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I threw sand in my eyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I’d get on the horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the horse would go to your door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And then the silver wedding-pins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned by red blood black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And our dream began to fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My flesh with poisonous weeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, I’m not the one at fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fault belongs to the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And that scent that comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From your breasts and your hair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My tongue is run through and through          |
| with sharpest glass.                          |
| Because I wanted to forget                    |
| and I put a wall of stone                     |
| between your house and mine.                  |

| Edwards: 82                                   |
| Johnston: 91-92                                |
It’s true. You remember, don’t you?  
And when I saw you pass by  
I cast sand in my eyes.  
But my horse  
always took me to your door.  
And the silver pins of your wedding  
turned my blood black  
and my flesh soured  
and grew thick with weeds.  
It’s not me who’s to blame,  
it’s the earth itself,  
it’s the scent of your breasts  
and of your hair.

As discussed in Chapter One, in the reference to ‘con afileres de plata mi sangre se puso negra’ (with pins of silver my blood turned black) the ‘silver pins’ are a cultural reference to the pins that brides traditionally wear in their hair on their wedding day, which they later give to some of the single female guests. This is similar to the English tradition of throwing the bride’s bouquet for one of the single female guests to catch. Lorca uses this cultural reference symbolically as Leonardo says that it is the Bride’s wedding that has turned his blood black, in other words, poisoned him and made him act the way he is acting. Secondly, it implicates what will actually happen to him later in the forest, although it will be the silver knife that will turn his blood black, in other words, kill him. Furthermore, this description creates a pictorial image of physical pain of silver pins stabbing his skin. Hughes and Bradbury translate ‘afileres’ as ‘needles’ whereas ‘pins’ would be the habitual translation, so on the locutionary level this is not quite correct. On an illocutionary level, the use of needles creates an ambiguity, as we often relate needles to knitting or to medical injections/drug use. Edwards and Johnston clarify the cultural reference with ‘silver wedding-pins’ and ‘silver pins of your wedding’, respectively. Moreover, Edwards adds in the colour of the blood ‘red’, which is perhaps
redundant for the reader but can aid uptake on the part of the spectator, and creates an image for both reader and spectator of the impact of the silver pins on the body of Leonardo, as we can imagine the blood changing from red to black.
7.6 Conclusion

In the examples discussed, there are instances where repetition of the same information in different forms reinforces the socio-cultural context of the ST, but also addresses speakability as it replicates natural speech. Moreover, such repetition can potentially aid audience uptake which addresses the ephemeral nature of the stage. We see how one translator in particular, Clifford, applies interpretants that serve several functions; the reinforcement of the social message of the original, the creation of speakability and the aiding of audience uptake. This writing practice prioritises the performance over a strict adherence to the ST, while at the same time the translator adheres to the socio-cultural context of the ST, on a macro rather than on a micro-linguistic level.

As before, there are examples of addition of colour where it is not present in the original. As discussed, such additions may be redundant for the reader but they can aid audience uptake, thus addressing the ephemerality of the stage, helping achieve maximum contextual effects for minimal processing effort. Moreover, this shows the translators working within Lorca’s grammar of colour but using it independently as a means to aid cohesion.

In the performance text, signs of the written text are re-interpreted into visual theatrical signs that generate their own meanings which go beyond the text. Colour was used in costumes to create multiple meanings, some derived from implicatures in the ST, rather than from the stage directions themselves, and which signify in the context of reception. We thus note a form of cooperation between the drama text and the performance text, as the director’s interpretant originates indirectly from the ST, but makes a connection between the ST context and the TT context. However, these interpretants may evoke certain stereotypes that have the potential to provoke dialectical reactions from an audience. In performance, the director’s interpretants can draw attention to the social conditions of the place and time of reception and thus use the ST to interrogate that context of reception, in this case modern Britain. In one performance, the director’s interpretants were visual signs, in the form of props, that generated further
interpretants that draw attention to Lorca and his death, and also signify the director’s reverential stance vis-à-vis Lorca.
Chapter 8 Discussion of findings

8.1 Introduction

In Chapters Five, Six and Seven, I carried out a comparative analysis on a micro-linguistic level between the written STs and the translated written TTs, or drama texts, and on a macro-level between the written STs, the drama TTs and the performance TTs. This analysis focused on Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour and its treatment in translation. The shifts found were analysed by the application of the model set out in Chapter Four that looked at the different layers of meaning present in the ST related to the pictorial, referential, socio-cultural and symbolic elements identified in the ST. In addition, the notion of performability was identified as a criterion that the translators themselves found to be important, and as a contentious term in the literature. The notion of performability was explored via the textual analysis described above and via examples on a macro-level drawn from three performances, which gave insights into the relationship between the page and the stage. These analyses together provide insights into the concept of performativity, a topic of recent interest in the field of Translation Studies in need of a robust definition. In this chapter, I discuss these findings in more detail and explore what these findings reveal about the nature of performability and performativity.

8.2 The negotiation between layers

The analysis carried out on both a micro and macro level produced multiple findings. In addressing the first research question of how the colour metaphor has been translated from linguistic, socio-cultural, symbolic and performable perspectives, I found that a negotiation occurs. Translation choices that address one layer of meaning often had an impact on others, as in the example in Chapter Five (Table 5.5) from La casa de Bernarda Alba where In the ST the neighbours are likened to sheep grazing on grass in Bernarda’s house, as a metaphorical representation of a judgemental society, the reference to the sheep and the grass evoking the rural setting of the original and creating a pictorial image in the mind of the receiver. One of the translators (Clifford) rather than directly
translating the pictorial and rural reference of the utterance as a way of accessing the socio-cultural element of that utterance, chose to clarify the implicatures in the ST. In this way, the translator was aiding the receiver to reach the same socio-cultural and thus symbolic element of the utterance, in terms of a judgemental society, without replicating the animal metaphor that reflects the rural setting of the original. This clarification of the implicature of the ST works in the same way for both the reader and the spectator, but it is particularly useful for the stage performance due to the ephemeral nature of the stage. This strategy of translating metaphor into non-metaphor aids performability and shows that performability can take precedence over a strict adherence to the ST. The grammar of colour is not translated here but the translator applies interpretants found within the ST image to produce TT effect, without strictly replicating the ST image.

A similar strategy of negotiation, where one layer of the ST took precedence over a close translation, was seen in the examples in Chapter Five of the lullaby (Tables 5.9 and 5.10) and the children’s weaving song (Tables 5.27 and 5.28) where in some translations the lyrical element took precedence over a close adherence to the ST, translation choices thus addressing performability through singability. These examples also show performativity in that the translators are clarifying implicatures for their audience (both reader and spectator). The translators apply interpretants here that favour the medium of delivery over a strict adherence to the content of the ST.

However, there were also cases in which only one element of the implicature was translated, as in the example discussed in Chapter Six (Table 6.2) from Yerma, of ‘tiene por lengua un pedernal’ (she has a flint for a tongue). By translating this utterance as ‘with that nagging tongue of hers’, Luke activates the property of sharpness connected with the word flint, but not the properties of grey and hard. It is the properties grey and hard associated with flint that take the receiver to the symbolic discourse of Yerma as a barren land, full of flint where nothing can grow. In this example, the other translators (Merwin, Bradbury and Johnston) adhere more closely to the ST, replicating the reference to the flint (albeit they all use a simile). Literal translation in this instance
leaves the receiver to make their own inferences, thus opening up the various layers of meaning. The translators (Merwin, Bradbury and Johnston) apply interpretants that function within the grammar of colour of the ST, creating cohesive links to the overall discourse of the play. Luke’s translation, on the other hand, does not suggest the grammar of colour, and limits the full range of interpretants that the ST implicates.

In Chapter Seven, (Table 7.24) I discussed another pictorial image, from La casa de Bernarda Alba, ‘Casi se me salió el corazón por la boca’ (my heart almost came out of my mouth), which was translated as ‘I was too frightened’ by Clifford. In this instance Clifford’s translation focuses solely on the emotion produced rather than the figurative image of the effect on the body. However, this clarification of the implicature of the ST can be a way of producing more direct uptake on the part of the receiver, which can be particularly useful for the stage performance. Moreover, it is less melodramatic and thus adheres to target cultural norms, and in this way Clifford’s translation strategy is responsive to past criticisms in this respect. However, Clifford’s interpretant is also restrictive here as it does not reproduce the direct reference to the body, which may limit the cohesiveness of the translation as the female body is central to the plot.

In the examples analysed, we observed some instances of the repetition of a word, or words in a proceeding sentence where this repetition was neither present, nor implied, in the ST. For example, in Chapter Five, (Table 5.20) in the Moon’s soliloquy where it refers to ‘Pues esta noche tendrán mis mejillas roja sangre’ (so tonight my cheeks will have red blood), Johnston repeats the word ‘red’ and adds the word ‘blue’ with ‘But this night red, red blood will caress my blue cheeks’. This repetition of red emphasises the colour of the blood, reinforcing the Moon’s bloodlust. The addition of the colour blue in reference to the cheeks of the Moon that are blue with cold contrasts with the warm, red blood that it desires. This example shows how this translator (Johnston), by using the type of contrasts Lorca himself employs, is producing his own cohesiveness within the text which can aid dramatic effect. In the same example, Edwards also produces his own cohesiveness, with the repetition of the same line that is not repeated in the ST; his translation for the line ‘Pues esta noche tendrán mis mejillas roja sangre’, as ‘And so
tonight there’ll be Red blood to fill my cheeks’ is repeated for the slightly different line in the ST that appears 16 lines on when the Moon addresses the branches saying: ‘para que esta noche tengan mis mejillas dulce sangre’ The ‘dulce sangre’ (sweet blood) of the ST, is again translated as ‘red blood’ by this translator. In these examples, Johnston and Edwards operate within the grammar of colour of the play as a whole, by applying interpretants that are ST driven for TT effect.

This type of repetition aids audience uptake as the image of the colour is reinforced in the mind of the receiver, aiding the processing time for the image and thus addressing the ephemerality of the stage, and so can be related to performability. This example also reveals something about the nature of performativity, in that the repetition of the reference to the colour can aid the illocutionary effect of the utterance. This works in the same way on the page as on the stage, but is particularly useful for the stage due to its ephemeral nature. We thus have the repetition of colour used as a device to aid performativity and through that performativity it aids potential performability. This shows the performativity of the drama text and how performability can be built into it.

There are also examples where colour was added when it was neither present in the relevant utterance nor in the surrounding lines. For example, in the lullaby in Chapter Five (Table 5.9) Edwards added ‘red with blood’ to translate ‘patas heridas’ and also in Chapter Seven (Table 7.25), he added the word ‘red’ to ‘blood’. As discussed, such additions can help reinforce the image in the mind of the receiver, and although they may be redundant for the reader, such additions can aid uptake, which is important for the stage, and thus again aid performativity which in turn aids performability. In another example in Chapter Five, (Table 5.28) Johnston added the word ‘white’ to clarify the colour of the flower referred to. We can relate this to audience uptake on the level of performability, but also on the other levels; symbolically to aid the audience uptake of the connections between white and the use of the colour in the play as a whole and also on a pictorial level, which is particularly useful for the reader too. Johnston is working within the grammar of colour of the ST to produce TT effect, but at the same time drawing attention to the independence of the TT.
These examples reveal how Lorca’s own cohesive device in terms of colour are added in translation, and is thus used independently of the ST to produce TT effect. However, there were also instances where, rather than a literal translation of the colour, the implicatures associated with a particular use of a colour were made explicit. This was observed in Chapter Five, (Table 5.1) with the translation of ‘verde’ (green) as ‘young’ (Luke and Johnston) when referring to the wheat. In this example, the receiver is able to get to the implicature of the ST, not through the same pictorial image created by language but more directly through language alone. The clarification of such implicatures can produce maximum contextual effects for minimal processing effort and thus address the ephemeral nature of the stage. However, the clarification of this implicature also has the effect of not generating the grammar of colour, which restricts cohesiveness on this level. Therefore, this strategy of clarification that can be related to TT effect, at the same time, reduces the TT effect in terms of the cohesive nature of the grammar of colour which in itself is related to the dramatic effect of the TT.

8.3 Performability and performativity

The examples analysed show a complex negotiation, whether conscious or otherwise, between the layers present in the ST and how these are conveyed in the TT. All these negotiations can be related to performativity in the sense that speech acts are being performed and a possible illocutionary and perlocutionary effect is being achieved, both on the page and on the stage. However, it is necessary to consider the nature of both performability and performativity in more detail.

In Chapter Three, I discussed the notion of performability and Bassnett’s (1998: 95-96) argument that it is a term that resists definition. I agree with Bassnett that the term denotes a complex concept; yet, as discussed in Chapter Two, it is a criterion that is important on a practical level. Bassnett (1991: 105) argues that the term is used to justifying making changes or taking liberties with the text. It is clearly difficult to define what constitutes ‘changes to the text’ or ‘taking liberties with it’, as there could be a whole range of practices implied here, from explicitation to explain cultural references through to adaptation. However, we can attempt to draw some tentative conclusions as
to the differences in this respect between those published translations that were written for a particular performance and those that were not. My analyses show that the translations by Luke, Johnston and Clifford do not always adhere closely to the ST, whereas this was not so evident in the translations by Hughes, Merwin, Edwards, and Dewell and Zapata. Yet all of these translations were written for performance; the Dewell and Zapata translation, for example, was the result of many revisions after many performances. It is thus not possible to draw any concrete conclusions as to whether the demands of performability mean that the TT is somehow less faithful in terms of a closeness to the ST than a text that is not written primarily for performance. The translations by Bradbury and Edmunds were primarily written for the page, yet also contain target-oriented examples. It is also important to consider that all translators bring their ideosomatic reading (Robinson 2003: 76) to the text in the same way that directors do. We saw, for example, how one translator (Johnston) used intertextuality as a way of making connections between the context of reception and that of production, establishing a dialogue with the reader by justifying his translation choices in his notes at the end of the translation. However, this was also a way of pre-empting criticisms from other academics and critics. Intertextuality was also used by directors in stage performances, as part of the Spanish ST was used in an English performance so that there was a blurring of boundaries between source and target and between plays. However, this can cause dialectical reactions from an audience. These examples highlight how problematic it can be to apply a source-target dichotomy to translation.

8.4 The ephemeral nature of the stage

As I argued in Chapters Three and Four, the discussion of performability in the literature does not appear to take into account the ephemeral nature of the stage environment. The reader is obviously able to re-read parts of the drama text and can do this over an extended period of time, however, the performance text has a short time span so ease of audience uptake is paramount. I suggest that it may be useful to consider a notion such as ‘hearability’, not in terms of the actor speaking clearly and loudly for the audience to hear, but in terms of aiding audience uptake or the illocutionary effect of
the utterance and in this respect the drama text can provide this. Burton (1982: 86) argues that dialogues in drama texts are designed to be overheard. The examples analysed here show how the translators are producing hearability for over hearers via audience design, in many different ways. The examples analysed show that performability in terms of hearability, is present in the use of repetition and addition of colour but also in the clarification of implicatures of the ST. It is important to point out that most of the drama texts studied here (with the exception of Bradbury and Edmunds) were published after a performance (in some cases after many performances) so it is possible to say that they have the trace of a particular performance already written into them.

In Chapter Three, I discussed speakability as another term used in relation to theatre translation. Speakability was equated with ‘intelligibility on stage’ (Levy (1963) 2011: 128); a fluid text that performers can utter easily (Espasa 2000: 49) although Aaltonen (2000: 43) argued that a text did not have to be easy to speak. When analysing the examples relating to colour, I found that there were instances where a more colloquial type of language was produced by a violation of grammatical rules in English, rather than translating more directly the ST utterance. This can also be seen in the following example, taken from Act One of La casa de Bernarda Alba; La Poncia complains about the noise of the funeral bells:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ya tengo el doble de esas campanas metido en la cabeza.</th>
<th>Lorca: 584</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel as if those bells were ringing inside my head.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My head is bursting with those tolling bells!</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve got those bells tolling right inside my head.</td>
<td>Edmunds: 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloody bells! Going round and round my head!</td>
<td>Clifford: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clifford makes one sentence in the ST into two and omits subject pronouns which makes this utterance slightly more colloquial, and more natural. The translator is thus applying interpretants that work on the level of performability and audience uptake, and this
translation is also responsive to past criticisms. Clifford thus creates a dramatic effect that signifies in the context of reception.

In the following example from *Bodas de sangre*, natural speech is replicated in Johnston’s translation. In Act One, Scene Two, the Girl comes to tell the Mother-in-Law what the Bridegroom has been buying:

**Table 8.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llegó el novio a la tienda y ha comprado todo lo mejor que había.</td>
<td>The young man came down to the store and bought out the best of everything there was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bridegroom’s just been into the shop – he bought the most beautiful things we had!</td>
<td>Bradbury: 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The young man came to the shop and he bought all the best things.</td>
<td>Edwards: 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He’s down there now, the bridegroom, down at the shops, buying the best of everything.</td>
<td>Johnston: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regalarme unas cuantas pulgas que me han acribillado las piernas.</td>
<td>Lorca: 598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Johnston begins the sentence with ‘He’ and then clarifies who the pronoun refers to with ‘the bridegroom’, and then clarifies what ‘down there now’ refers to with ‘down at the shops’. He also puts the action into the present rather than the past as in the ST, which serves to add more emphasis to the excitement expressed by the girl and shows how the text can provide performability in terms of speakability.

There are also examples of domestication, for example, in Act One of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, Magadalena asks Adela what the chickens thought of her dress:

**Table 8.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regalarme unas cuantas pulgas que me han acribillado las piernas.</td>
<td>Lorca: 598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They made me a present of a few fleas which have bitten my legs.

They gave me a gift of a few fleas that bit my legs.

They presented me with a set of fleas that had a good go at my legs!

They liked it so much they gave me a present. About four million fleas to hop all over my legs!

In the ST ‘unas cuantas pulgas’ refers to a small number although it could ironically implicate the opposite. Bradbury and Dewell and Zapata replicate this literally with ‘a few’ while Edmunds’s ‘a set’ implies ‘a contained amount’. Clifford, in contrast uses hyperbole to exaggerate the amount with ‘about four million’. It is typical of English spoken language to exaggerate a number in order to draw attention to it. In this way the translator addresses the English-speaking audience directly through a domesticated use of language. It could be argued that the translator makes the text more melodramatic here. However, this melodrama or exaggeration is an English type of melodrama rather than the Spanish melodrama that Lorca’s use of language often expresses.

8.5 Modernisation

In Chapter Six, we saw an example of how the characters may appear more outspoken in a translation than in the original, for example in the way Yerma, in Peter Luke’s translation (Table 6.12) demands her rights as a woman to bear a child. This addresses a modern audience with modern values, as the translator presents the discourse in terms of the cognitive environment of the target receiver, rather than in terms of the socio-cultural context of the characters in the ST. The text also address a modern audience through the use of more explicit language.
8.5.1 The use of expletives

In *Yerma* there are examples that show a strong contrast between the language used by translators. At the end of Act One, Scene Two, Yerma’s retaliation to Juan when he says that people will start talking about her going out so much, is translated quite differently:

| ¡Puñalada que le den a las gentes!         | Lorca: 494 |
| People can go to the devil!               | Merwin: 91  |
| Damn what people say!                     | Bradbury: 34|
| Well they can fuck themselves.            | Luke: 174   |
| I don’t give a damn about other people!   | Johnston: 34|

The ST has a colloquial expression that literally translates as ‘people can be stabbed’, equivalent to such expressions in English as ‘I don’t give a stuff/toss about people’, or ‘people can go to hell’. Merwin uses a phrase with a religious connotation with ‘go to the devil’ which reflects the socio-cultural context of the strict Catholic society portrayed in the ST while Luke’s use of an expletive updates the language for a modern audience which also makes the character of Yerma seem stronger and more modern in her attitude. However, this may cause confusion for the audience and the actor playing the role of Yerma, as it does not fit within her characterisation.

Another example in *Yerma* (which I discuss in Naylor: forthcoming 2018) shows a very marked difference between the language used by the translators. At the beginning of Act Two, Scene One, the Washerwomen are gathered at the stream commenting on Yerma’s predicament and presenting different viewpoints. The First Washerwoman says that Yerma’s inability to conceive is the husband (Juan’s) fault, while the Fourth Washerwoman replies that it is Yerma’s fault. There follows an argument between the two with interjections from the Fifth Washerwoman that they should be quiet:
| WASHERWOMAN 1: | What devil’s got into your hair to make you say things like that? | Merwin: 98 |
| WASHERWOMAN 4: | And who told you you could give me advice? |
| WASHERWOMAN 2: | Stop it! |
| WASHERWOMAN 1: | I’d like to string every gossiping tongue on a knitting needle. |
| WASHERWOMAN 2: | That’s enough! |
| WASHERWOMAN 4: | And I’d like to smother the hypocrites. |
| FIRST WASHERWOMAN: | You must have the devil tangled in your hair to go on like this! |
| FOURTH WASHERWOMAN: | And what gives you the right to tell me how to behave? |
| SECOND WASHERWOMAN: | Quiet now. |
| FIRST WASHERWOMAN: | I’d like to string all your gossiping tongues on a darning-needle. |
| SECOND WASHERWOMAN: | Be quiet. |
| FOURTH WASHERWOMAN: | And I’d plug the nipples of all hypocrites. |
| FIRST WOMAN. | What in buggeration’s got into you lot talking like that? |
| FOURTH WOMAN. | And who asked you to speak? |

LAVANDERA 1. ¿Qué demonio se te ha metido entre los cabellos para que hables así?  
LAVANDERA 4. ¿Y quién ha dado licencia a tu boca para que me des consejos?  
LAVANDERA 5. ¡Callar!  
LAVANDERA 1. Con una aguja de hacer calceta ensartaría yo las lenguas murmuradoras.  
LAVANDERA 5. ¡Calla!  
LAVANDERA 4. Y yo la tapa del pecho de las fingidas.

| WASHERWOMAN 1: | What devil’s got into your hair to make you say things like that? | Merwin: 98 |
| WASHERWOMAN 4: | And who told you you could give me advice? |
| WASHERWOMAN 2: | Stop it! |
| WASHERWOMAN 1: | I’d like to string every gossiping tongue on a knitting needle. |
| WASHERWOMAN 2: | That’s enough! |
| WASHERWOMAN 4: | And I’d like to smother the hypocrites. |

| FIRST WOMAN. | What in buggeration’s got into you lot talking like that? |
| FOURTH WOMAN. | And who asked you to speak? |
SECOND WOMAN. Shut your **bloody gob**.
FIRST WOMAN. And I’d like to stitch your tongues up.
FOURTH WOMAN. And flatten those false tits of yours.

| WOMAN 1   | What’s got into you, making you say things like that? |
| WOMAN 4   | And who do you think you are to tell me what I can and can’t say? |
| WOMAN 2   | Be quiet, the pair of you! |
| WOMAN 1   | If I had a sharp needle I’d soon stop your tongue from wagging. |
| WOMAN 2   | Shut up! |
| WOMAN 4   | And I’d soon put a skewer through the nipples of those that think they’re a cut above the rest of us. |

Johnston: 38

A very literal translation of the ST would be: ‘What demon has got in your hair to make you talk like that? And who has given your mouth licence to give me advice? Shut up (both of you)! I would insert a darning needle in those murmuring tongues. Shut up! And I (would) sew up the chest/breasts of the pretenders’.

Three of the translators maintain the reference to evil and superstition expressed by the word ‘demonio’ (demon) although they domesticate by translating it as ‘devil’ as in the habitual idiomatic expression in English ‘what the devil’s got into you’. Luke and Johnston remove the reference to ‘demonio’ and Luke adds the expletive ‘buggeration’. Luke carries on in the same vein with ‘bloody gob’ and ‘false tits’ in the proceeding lines. The surgically enhanced body in Luke’s translation stands in stark contrast to the repressed body that Lorca presents to us in this play. Moreover, the choice of register, and the deviation of syntax here gives the text a more modern tone which can make the characters appear more aggressive. While such choices can be attributed to the ways in which translators attempt to connect with a modern audience and make the text more speakable or performable, these decisions can also be viewed as responses to criticisms of the past. Criticisms of the rural trilogy on the stage often centred around register,
‘[o]ne of the stumbling blocks having proved to be the middle-class associations created by the use of standard English’ (Anderman 2005: 301) which tended to be the norm. Luke’s interpretants are thus both interrogative as they challenge the interpretation of Yerma in the ST, and also responsive to criticisms of the past. Moreover, Luke interpretants draw attention to the context of reception of the translation, rather than that of the context of production of the ST.

The following example also shows a distinct contrast in the type of language used. In an earlier part of the discussion between the Washerwomen, the First Washerwoman says that it is not Yerma’s fault that she does not have children, to which the Fourth Washerwomen responds with a very different opinion:

| Table 8.6 |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Tiene hijos la que quiere tenerlos. Es que las regalonas, las flojas, las endulzadas, no son a propósito para llevar el vientre arrugado. | Lorca: 496 |
| The women that want them get them. Your *lazy Janes* and your *momma’s girls* and your *kiss-me-dainties* aren’t going to see their bellies get wrinkled. | Merwin: 94 |
| Anyone who wants children can have them. The point is that *spoil* *woman of easy virtue* aren’t cut out for a wrinkled belly! | Bradbury: 36 |
| Those that want them get them. But *some of these girls today* just don’t want to get a wrinkled belly. | Luke: 176 |
| If she wanted them, she would have them all right. *She’s too sweet and sugary by far, too much in love* with herself to want stretchmarks on her belly. | Johnston: 36 |

In this case, we see the language Merwin uses is very specific to his American 1960s audience with expressions such as ‘lazy Janes’, ‘momma’s girls’ and ‘your kiss-me-dainties’, whereas Luke transposes ‘regalonas’, ‘flojas’ and ‘endulzadas’ into a more generic ‘these girls today’. In these examples, Merwin makes the text and the performance (or potential performance) part of its current context and although such
choices may seem far removed from the rural Spanish context of the original play, this can be a means of making a connection between the context of production and the context of reception. By updating the language, the translator does not explain the cognitive environment of the ST characters but makes the characters part of the TT cognitive environment. By presenting the audience (reader or spectator) with their own cognitive environment a connection can be made with them. As Sperber and Wilson (1987: 702) point out that hearers use mental short cuts to pick out relevant information, drawing on contexts that are accessible to them. However, this may not be acceptable to those who wish to experience the cognitive environment of the ST characters. According to Bensussen (Hughes/Merwin 1994: xii), as discussed in Chapter Two, Merwin considered translation an anonymous activity and adopted a literal strategy. However, here we see the opposite, as he recreates the ST in terms of the context of the production of the TT. His interpretants signify in his context of reception and draw attention to that context.

8.5.2 Sexually explicit language

There are also examples where a more daring use of language is used than in the ST. In La casa de Bernarda Alba in Act Three, the Maid and La Poncia discuss the situation within the house, La Poncia excusing the actions of the girls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son mujeres sin hombre, nada más. En estas cuestiones se olvida hasta la sangre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. They’re just women without a man; and in the teeth of it they forget birth, breeding, everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They’re women without men, that’s all. When it comes to that, you even forget your own blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They’re women without a man, that’s all. When that happens, not even the ties of blood mean anything any more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They are women without men, that’s all. And when it comes to sex, everything else gets swept away. Even ties of blood.

‘Estas cuestiones’ (these questions) is deliberately ambiguous, and this ambiguity is maintained by all the translators except Clifford who makes it more explicit in with ‘when it comes to sex’ and thus updates the text for a modern audience. Clifford’s translation signifies in the context of reception and he produces a target-oriented performativity.

Similarly, there is ambiguity in Act Three in the heated discussion between Adela and Martirio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.8</th>
<th>Lorca: 630</th>
<th>Bradbury: 178</th>
<th>Dewell &amp; Zapata: 165-166</th>
<th>Edmunds: 168</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADELA:</strong> Por eso procuras que no vaya con él. No te importa que abrace a la que no quiere; a mí, tampoco. Ya puedes estar cien años con Angustias, pero que me abrace a mí se te hace terrible, porque tú lo quieres también. ¡lo quieres!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADELA: That’s why you don’t want me to go to him. You don’t care if he has his arms round someone he doesn’t love – neither do I. You wouldn’t care if he was with Angustias for a hundred years. But you can’t bear him to put his arms round me, because you love him yourself. You do!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADELA: That’s why you’re trying to keep me from going off with him. You don’t care if he embraces a woman he doesn’t love. Me neither. Yes, he could spend a hundred years with Angustias, but if he embraces me, it seems terrible to you, because you love him, too! You love him!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADELA: That’s why you want to stop me going with him. You don’t care if he puts his arms round a woman he doesn’t love. Neither do I. It’s all right for him to spend a hundred years with Angustias. But, if he puts his arms round me, you can’t bear it, because you love him too, you love him!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADELA: That’s why you don’t want him to go with me. You don’t mind him kissing a woman he doesn’t love, and neither do I. As far as we’re concerned, he could live with Angustias for a thousand years. But you can’t bear to think of him making love to me because you love him too, don’t you? You love him too!

Bradbury and Edmunds translate ‘abrace’ as ‘arms round’ which is the habitual translation while Dewell and Zapata make it very literal and also more formal with ‘embrace’ which is in stark contrast to Clifford’s more explicit ‘kissing’ and ‘making love’. Clifford here uses the cognitive environment of the audience as a way to make a connection with them, and this illustrates that performativity is context-driven as the interpretants that Clifford applies here signify in the context of reception.

8.6 The page to stage relationship

The previous discussion has shown that performability and performativity are closely related, as performativity can be a way of achieving performability. In this respect performability can be present in the written text. This perhaps contradicts the view that performability is something that is achieved by the director and actors during the performance (Bassnett 1998: 90-92). However, it is also logical to say that the rehearsal and the performance also achieve performability, as Johnston (2004: 34) points out it is in the rehearsal room that the full implications of the potential performability written into the text will be seen. This suggests then that there are various levels to the notion of performability itself.

In Chapter Six, (Table 6.8) I discussed the example where Yerma rejects the Old Woman’s offer of what she terms ‘agua de pozo’ (water from a well). In Merwin and Bradbury’s translation, ‘well water’ and ‘well-water’, the word ‘well’ placed before the word ‘water’ can create ambiguity for the theatre audience about whether the water is ‘well’ as in ‘good’ or whether it is water from a well. Thus the full contextual effects of the utterance may not be achieved on stage, which highlights the importance of the notion of
hearability. In contrast, in the example discussed in Chapter Seven, (Table 7.4), the colour black was added to overcome ambiguity related to the possible interpretation of ‘mourning’ as the homophone ‘morning’. In this instance, addition pre-empts the possible tension between the page and the stage.

There are other examples in which the relationship between the page and stage is revealed. As discussed in Chapter Seven, (Section 7.2), in the performance texts analysed, colour was used to produce different effects, for example, in the costumes in *Yerma*. The colours of the costumes reflected the characters’ personalities and opinions and thereby reflected implicatures in the ST. However, the colours also took us beyond characterisation portraying a range of symbolic meanings, related to both the Spanish context presenting two fractions of society, to universal representations of tradition versus liberalism, and the oppressed body versus the sexually liberated one. The colours could also evoke stereotypical images of Spain, with widows in black and flamenco dancers. As discussed in Chapter Seven, this illustrated that the linguistic signs of the drama text, not just the linguistic signs relating to the stage directions, can be translated into theatrical, visual signs that make an immediate impact and connection with the audience (although this connection may not always be a positive one). This shows that colour is gestic, in that it is performative, or ‘a colour act’ (Kress and Van Leeuwen 2002: 348), it can produce an illocutionary effect on the receiver. The director’s interpretants, which are source-driven, thus signify in the context of reception and this example shows a cooperation between the drama text and the performance, rather than the dialectical relationship that Bassnett (1998: 90) suggests.

However, as discussed in Chapter Five, there can be a tension between the drama text in terms of stage directions and the practicalities of the production on stage. We saw this in particular in *Yerma* and *Blood Wedding* where there was a reduced cast number compared to that stipulated in the ST. In the case of *Blood Wedding* this was overcome by having several actors playing more than one part, with masks being used to differentiate between characters. This also reminded the audience of the use of mask traditionally used in a Greek chorus. Moreover, a connection was made to Lorca’s own
work, as he uses the character of the Male and Female Mask in the pilgrimage scene in Yerma. The director’s interpretants signify on several different levels as connections are made both to Greek tragedy and to Lorca’s work. As discussed in Chapter Six, location and stage set imposed constraints or supposed constraints upon the text in performance which led to some scenes not being presented. In this way director’s interpretants are often related to a context of reception that limits both the ST and its translation, as the place of enunciation takes precedence over a full representation of the ST on stage.

My analysis also found contrasts between translators regarding the length of some sentences. In Luke’s translation of Yerma, which was written for a particular performance, there were omissions of whole sentences and condensing of ideas with the use of paraphrase. This practice creates a loose relationship between the source text and the target text, and mistranslation occurs in some parts, possibly because of time constraints on stage, as discussed in Chapter Five indicating that the theatrical system of the target text may take precedence over strict adherence to the ST. Paradoxically, omissions of this type do not aid illocutionary effect on stage with its reduced window of uptake. Moreover, for the reader, some parts of the ST are not available. In Chapter Seven, I discussed examples that indicate the opposite case. Rather than reducing the length of sentences with omissions, Clifford, in his translation of La casa de Bernarda Alba, for example in Table 7.1, increased the number of words in some of the utterances, repeating the same information in different forms. This served to reinforce the voice of the patriarchal society, making a stronger connection with the socio-cultural context of the ST, but in one example, it also had a detrimental effect on characterisation. The following brief examples demonstrate this use of expansion as some utterances are considerably longer than the ST and the other translations. In Act One, La Poncia says:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tirana de todo los que la rodean. Es capaz de sentarse encima de tu corazón y ver cómo te mueres durante un año sin que se le cierre esa sonrisa fría que lleva en su maldita cara. ¡Limpia, limpia ese vidriado! – 41 words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She bullies everyone who comes into contact with her. She could sit on your heart for a year on end, watching you die, without ever wiping that frozen smile off her devilish face. You’d better make sure those pots are clean.</td>
<td>Bradbury: 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She tyrannizes everyone around her. She could sit on your heart and watch you die for a whole year without taking that cold smile off her damn face! Scrub! Scrub those tiles!</td>
<td>Dewell and Zapata: 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She lords it over everyone around her. She’d sit on your heart and watch you die for a whole year and never once wipe that cold smile off her blasted face. Scrub those dishes, get them clean!</td>
<td>Edmunds: 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s like an empress. She who must be obeyed. Do you know what she’d like to do? She’d like to sit on your heart and slowly squeeze the life out of it. She’d take a whole year to do it, and she’d just sit there, like on a throne, just watching you gasping for air. She’d just sit and watch you and smile. Her cold, cold smile. That cup’s filthy.</td>
<td>Clifford: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 words in the original Spanish become 70 words in Clifford’s translation as more description is added, as well as a question ‘Do you know what she’d like to do?’ which is then answered with more description than in the original.

Similarly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treinta años lavando sus sabanas, treinta años comiendo sus sobras, noches en vela cuando tose, días enteros mirando por la rendija para espiar a los vecinos y llevarle el cuento; vida sin secretos una con otra, y sin embargo, ¡maldita sea! ¡Mal dolor de clavo le pinche en los ojos!</td>
<td>Lorca: 585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.10**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bradbury</strong>: 133</td>
<td>Thirty years of washing her sheets; thirty years of eating her leftovers; sleepless nights listening to her cough; whole days spent peering through the cracks in the curtain to spy on the neighbours and tell her what they’re up to....a lifetime without any secrets from each other, yet I’d see her damned for ever if I could! With nails in her eyes! – 62 words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dewell &amp; Zapata</strong>: 120</td>
<td>Thirty years, washing her sheets. Thirty years, eating her leftovers. Nights watching over her when she coughs. Entire days peering through cracks, to spy on the neighbours and bring her the gossip. A life with no secrets from each other. And yet – damn her! May she have a horrible pain – like nails stuck in her eyes. – 56 words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edmunds</strong>:120</td>
<td>Thirty years I’ve worked for her. Thirty years washing her sheets. Thirty years scrubbing her floors. Eating her leftovers. Up all night when she coughs. Spending days on end with my ears glued to the walls. Just so I could bring her back some titbit of gossip she could blackmail the neighbours with. Thirty years of my life given up to her. And we’ve no secrets from each other. She’s like an open book to me. And I hate her guts. I’d like to tear out her eyes and nail them to the doorpost. – 94 words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clifford</strong>: 5</td>
<td>Clifford’s translation uses longer utterances which are often made up of shorter sentences and the lexis employed is more colloquial than the original. The translator’s interpretants highlight class distinctions and locate the play in terms of an English-speaking context thus addressing criticisms of past translations and performances. The ephemerality of the performance is also addressed by this strategy as ideas and opinions...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are repeated to reinforce them. In the performance of this translation at The Crescent in Birmingham, La Poncia and the Maid spoke with a Yorkshire accent showing how the translation has allowed the director and actors to work with the linguistic signs of the written dialogue and turn them into plausible spoken dialogue, and how the written text and the performance text interact and establish a dialogic relationship. Berman (1995: 282) tells us that ‘[e]very translation tends to be longer than the original’, that ‘addition adds nothing’, and that it ‘is no more than babble designed to muffle the work’s own voice’. Berman (idem) considers that ‘expansion is [...] a stretching, a slackening, which impairs the rhythmic flow of the work’. However, I think that in this case we can relate this use of expansion to performability, as the repetition of the same content in different forms can aid uptake on the stage and aid the rhythmic flow of the translation. Conversely, for the reader this type of overtranslation may be redundant. There is thus a tension between a translation that has been written for a particular performance that subsequently enters the literary system as a text to be read.

There are also examples of expansion in Bodas de sangre, for example, in Act One, Scene Two, the Mother-in-law comments about the impending marriage of the Bride and the Bridegroom:

| Se van a juntar dos buenos capitales. | Lorca: 426 |
| Two solid incomes getting together there. | Hughes: 18 |
| It’s the rich marrying the rich. | Bradbury: 80 |
| Two fortunes joined together. | Edwards: 44 |
| They’re two well-heeled families alright. And money breeds money…. | Johnston: 44 |

In this example both Bradbury and Johnston use common expressions rather than literal translation. Johnston further reinforces the idea with the addition of an extra line with the proverb ‘money breeds money’, thus strengthening the voice of the community. This type of repetition of ideas through the addition of phrases or words serves to add to the
performability of the text and make it more dialogic with the performance as the ephemeral nature of the utterance on stage is addressed.

In Chapter Five, in an example from *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, we saw how the stage directions in the drama text can pre-empt the performance, although interestingly this was in a text that was initially written for the page, rather than the result of a stage performance. Conversely, this had an effect on characterisation. Paradoxically, while the drama text could look forward to the potential performance, and thus could be considered cooperative with that potential performance text, a detrimental effect on characterisation was produced which could affect the reader, and also a future potential director as a reader.

### 8.7 Stereotypes

As discussed above with reference to the use of colour in the costumes of *Yerma*, the colours used evoke multiple meanings, including stereotypical associations related to the Spanish context. As discussed in Chapter Six, stereotypes can also be inadvertently evoked as in the example of the mistranslation of the expression of ‘iban negros’ (Table 6.20). Another example (again from *Blood Wedding*) of this filtering through of stereotypes can be seen in the stage directions that appear at the end of Act Two, Scene One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Salen. Se oyen guitarras, palillos y panderetas. [</em>]*)</td>
<td>Lorca: 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>They exit. Guitars, castanets and tambourines are heard. [</em>]*.</td>
<td>Hughes: 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(They go off. Guitars are heard and the sound of castanets and tambourines. [</em>]*)</td>
<td>Bradbury: 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>They leave. Guitars, castanets and tambourines are heard. [</em>]*.</td>
<td>Edwards: 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>They leave. Rhythmical music of guitars and tambourines. [</em>]*.</td>
<td>Johnston 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hughes: 38)
In this example, all the translators, except Johnston, replace the word ‘palillos’ (drumsticks) for the word ‘castanets’ in English, typically associated with Flamenco dancing. Johnston omits ‘palillos’ but compensates with the insertion of ‘rhythmical music’ which leaves the interpretation of what that might mean open for a director to interpret. In contrast, the word ‘castanets’ creates an image of flamenco in the mind of the reader and, if the translation is performed, the written linguistic sign of the stage directions has the potential to become an acoustic sign in the stage performance, thus imposing an interpretation upon the audience as translation decisions undoubtedly influence staging decisions.

These examples illustrate how stereotypes can be inadvertently reflected or refracted in translation as they are often embedded within the perception of the foreign culture in the receiving culture; and often these images are those which the foreign culture itself has disseminated. Flamenco has been part of many performances of *Bodas de sangre* on the English-speaking stage. The exoticisation of the Spanish Other thus becomes a form of domestication as the target culture accepts the version of the foreign brand that it already understands and feels most comfortable with. It is a way of connecting with the present audience, of achieving so-called local colour, although it is local colour that is known and understood. Lefevere (1984: 134) argues that translators add local colour as they feel that the audience is entitled to it, irrespective of its existence in the source text. However, in the case of the rural trilogy, what once might have been deemed different, is now familiar; the norm or the cliché. This tendency to evoke the stereotype has led Johnston to actively reject it, proclaiming that he would like to ban flamenco from the performance of his translation (Doggart and Thompson 1999: 218). In this way, he is asserting his rights as author of the translation. On the other hand, director Alan Lyddiard (idem) was inspired by the spontaneous performance of flamenco by ordinary people he had witnessed in a bar in Seville and thus maintains that flamenco cannot and should not be ignored just because it is a cliché, as it can sometimes lead the performance in the right direction. Nevertheless, it becomes problematic when such stereotypes highlight one reading and ignore others, so that the folkloric element becomes the dominant factor smothering rather than complementing the performance,
displaying what Alter (1981: 114) describes as the ‘performing fallacy’ which ‘leads to the assimilation of theater to the performance only, and results in its reduction to the status of a particular genre of show’ (idem). Alternative readings of the ST context are, therefore, more difficult to discern, particularly on stage due to the ephemeral nature of the text in performance. A source text that sought to subvert the dominating views of the patrons of the day becomes an exotic spectacle in translation.

Stereotypes are thus refracted from the source culture into the target culture and represented in translation. However, is this the complete picture? What about the role of the source text? Are there stereotypes within Lorca’s plays already which are just being made more explicit? While, on the one hand, these images can be said to be far removed from the harsh realities of the rural existence Lorca was portraying, Lorca himself was accused of promoting stereotypes of the gypsy, bullfighting and flamenco. There are references in *Bodas de sangre* which, it can be argued, are representative of gypsy cultural stereotypes, such as the knife, the moon, superstitions, honour killings and the fact that the Bride lives in a cave. However, many poor families in Andalusia lived in caves before the advent of social housing, and the knife or ‘navaja’ is an everyday object used to cut grapes or bread/cheese/chorizo when working in the fields. The Bride lives in a cave but she also has a maid which would be unusual for a gypsy family. Rather than the gypsy associations, a more metaphorical reading is that the cave represents the idea of oppression as it is physically a dark, cold place carved out of the rock, creating a claustrophobic image of being buried alive. Teevan (1999: 182) reads the cave as a secret place where the Bride harbours a secret desire for her dark love Leonardo. However, Lorca’s other work, in particular his poems *Gypsy Ballads* and *Poem of Deep Song* have reinforced such links. Stone (2004: 120) sees strong correlations between the performance of *cante* (flamenco song) and the way in which the three plays are structured. The 1980 flamenco ballet film version of *Blood Wedding* directed by Carlos Saura makes such connections stronger. We thus see how multiple refractions of Lorca’s work can reinforce stereotypes that may or may not be there in the first place. It can also be argued that it is through the performativity of stereotypical associations that performability can be achieved on stage. This highlights that Lorca’s work does not exist
in a vacuum and interpretants that relate to the context of production of 1930s Spain, and to the Spanish context in general, signify in the context of reception of the translation and its performance.

8.8 What is performativity?

The discussion above has explored the relationship between performativity and performability, suggesting that the notion of hearability might be a useful one to add to the debate. However, it is necessary now to consider the following questions relating to performativity: What is performativity? Where does it reside? Is it related to the source text or to the target text and in what way? What does it mean for the drama text and the performance text? What does it mean for the concept of ownership/authorship where theatre translation is concerned?

In this study, I have explored the notion of performativity through a pragmatic approach to language related to the illocutionary uptake and a potential perlocutionary effect. Performativity can be said to reside in both the written text and the performance text. However, it is important to remember that the ST performed (and still performs) differently from the TT as performativity is context dependent. In this respect, performativity is related to the context of reception, rather than that of production. An audience is vital for the text to have an effect, whether that be a reader or a spectator. Therefore, the performativity of the translation will be different from that of the source text, the effect of Lorca’s plays on his 1930s Spanish audience is clearly a different one to the one that a translation of the same play produces on an English-speaking audience today. Moreover, each reading or watching of the translated play will also be context dependent and individual, even when it is a collective experience as with a play. However, the translation can aid the audience uptake of the performativity expressed in the original text and that new audience can potentially be led to experience the performativity of the original through translation. When it comes to the translated written text (the drama text) and the performance of that text, the way in which performativity is expressed will differ, but again it is audience dependent as it is not the form of the text that determines its uptake but the audience itself.
8.9 Speech Acts and response

I have contemplated the translations of both the drama texts and the performance texts as a series of multiple speech acts taking place on the page and the stage, as refracted forms of the ST radiating across space and time. As discussed in Chapter Three, Austin (1962: 11) points out that ‘many illocutionary acts invite by convention a response or sequel, which may be ‘one-way’ or ‘two-way’, so it is logical to say that all speech acts have a response and I think that we can contemplate the (re)translations and (re)performances discussed here as multiple responses to previous speech acts as well as speech acts in their own right. A response can be a direct physical action, or an emotional internalised response and responses may not always be immediate.

I think it is useful to consider (re)translation and (re)performance not just in the context of their specific reception, but also diachronically. We can see traces of criticisms of past translations and performances in subsequent translations and performances. As discussed in Chapter One, the first performed translation of Bodas de sangre, under the title of Bitter Oleander, was criticised for its floral imagery. In the sample analysed, there were some examples where the floral imagery was made more generic with the use of the superordinate rather than the specific reference. The translator’s interpretant thus show a desire to counter past criticisms, and to make the text more universal and less context specific. However, translator response can also be interrogative of such criticisms, as most translators did replicate the same imagery as the ST through literal translation.

The first published translations by Graham-Luján and O’Connell were criticised for being overly literal which served as a barrier to their effective processing and had a detrimental effect on author reputation, as they were difficult to perform. As I discuss in Naylor (forthcoming 2018) we can consider what can be described as counter strategies to this literalness, such as domestication, or a moving away from a close translation, seen in the translations analysed here, as a direct response to these first translations. Early criticisms of the rural trilogy on stage often focused on three areas in particular: the actors’ middle class delivery (undoubtedly arising from the use of
Standard English on the page); the melodrama; and the reliance on flamenco (Anderman 2005: 295-301). The examples discussed here show that some of the translation solutions adopted can be related to countering these criticisms.

Performativity is thus an intertextual and intercultural refracted response which in turn invites further response, so that the point of departure for translation is not only the source text but other refractions of it. As Maria Tymoczko (1995: 12) points out ‘[t]here are not only text and context, but a fabric of intertextuality that links texts to other literary works, both textual predecessors and contemporaries’.

8.10 The creativity/agency of the translator

Translation can thus be perceived as a creative response with the translator as a creative agent in their own right who produces a speech act and a response. As discussed in Chapter Three, Pym (1993) raises the question whether the translator owns the speech act or whether they are just translating someone else’s speech act? Can we give the translator ownership of the personal pronoun ‘I’ in translation? In the sample analysed, there were examples of how translators produced their own cohesiveness. There are also examples of how translators create different metaphors from the ST that make connections to the macro-level of the play, creating their own metaphorical patterning. Such examples show that the translator is acting upon the text, independently of the ST but inspired by it.

I think that the translator can be considered as a creator of a potential illocutionary effect or a potential perlocutionary response, whether this is in an emotional response in a reader/spectator, or an external response such as reviews, criticisms or further (re)translations and (re)performances. In this respect, the translator owns the ‘I’ performative in translation as they design their translation around their audience, provide that ‘private key’ that Clark and Schaefer (1987: 211) refer to, and invite further speech acts and responses.
We can thus envisage each translator as an active agent displaying this agency in their individual different ways and from different hermeneutic or interpretative positions. For example, Johnston points to his own in-depth knowledge of the ST in the detailed notes that accompany his translation. His interpretants point to his wider literary knowledge and background. He validates Lorca by positioning him on a par with contemporaries such as Yeats and Neruda, and also validates himself as translator of such a text, from a position of authority and expertise. His interpretants not only interrogate the status of the author, but also respond to past criticisms of early translations.

The application of interpretants that can be deemed responsive are present in many of the translations, as there are attempts to reduce the melodrama of the ST, and normalise Lorca’s utterances, which are often short and unsettling, so that they will work better in English. However, the interpretative positions of the translators differ, as do their relationships to the source text.

The interpretants applied by the translators illustrate the independence of the translations, as they signify beyond the text, and draw attention to the context of production of the translation and its reception. Earlier translations can also signify differently in the new context of reception today. Johnston’s ‘white army’ draws attention to the context of reception of 1990s Britain and world politics and interrogates that context. Likewise, the evocation of stereotypes on stage signify in the context of reception, but also interrogate that context in terms of drawing attention to our notions of Spain and Spanishness.

Clifford’s translation strategy of vast expansion shows her relationship to the text and her form of equivalence, which strives for speakability in English. We clearly see her interpretative position as actor here, as we imagine her acting out the part and how she has allowed the characters to get out of hand, as she suggests is the case, as discussed in Chapter Two. The interpretants Clifford applies thus draw attention to the conditions of the stage performance. Edmunds, Dewell and Zapata, and Bradbury’s interpretants show that their relationship to the source text is one that favours close translation, as in many examples they follow the source text closely within the linguistic constraints of
the target text. However, this does not imply that their translations are always appropriate or correct. Dewell and Zapata’s translation was surprising because despite multiple rehearsals and re-workings they still followed the ST closely. Considered as the new authoritative translations, as discussed in Chapter Two, their translations show that they execute this authority from a position that interrogates the notion that a close translation is not performable (see Chapter Three). Yet, their translation was also sensitive to the performance. Bradbury’s use of register was found to be particularly problematic, not just in terms of a potential performance, but in terms of credibility of plot and the rural setting.

The hermeneutic position of the translators strongly influences their translations; equally critics assessing the translations bring their own interpretative positions to their evaluations. This evaluation may be based on a text that, for them, only exists in English, as they do not have access to the original Spanish text. It can also be based on how they view the translator, insofar as translations by a famous poet, such as Langston Hughes, may receive a different evaluation to those of an unknown book editor. Translations made by an academic will be viewed differently from those written by a playwright etc. The translator’s hermeneutic is based on the ST and how they feel it should work in English, while the audience’s hermeneutic is, in many cases, based on the English text only. The audience’s response, moreover, may be very different from the one the translator, or director, intended.

8.11 Conclusion

This study has looked at the concepts of performability and performativity and how they are manifested in translation through an analysis of Lorca’s colour metaphor. This study has its limitations as only a small number of examples are analysed from a limited number of translations and performances. However, the analysis has shown that translation is not just a debate about source-versus-target, as translators provide a series of complex solutions that defy rigid categorisation. The observation of such solutions or strategies can be useful for practicing translators as a way to inform their own practice.
From a theoretical point of view, this study goes some way towards adding to the debate about performability and provides new insights about what the concept of performativity relates to from a linguistic perspective which is relevant to the field of Translation Studies. In this way this study has wider implications for the translation of all types of texts and is not limited to those of theatre translation.
Conclusion

This study has explored the notions of performability and performativity through a comparative analysis of translations of Lorca’s metaphorical use of colour in his rural trilogy. In order to do this, an analytical model was applied to both the written translations, which I classified as ‘the drama texts’, and three performances, which I classified as ‘the performance texts’. This analytical model drew on a predominantly pragmatic framework to explore the multiple layers of meaning present in the STs and how these layers of meaning were dealt with in translation. The analysis followed a Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) stance of observing the translational act and focusing on the effect of translation choices.

The multiple findings of the analysis revealed how translation choices which met one layer of meaning often impacted on other layers. We thus saw a negotiation taking place as, for example, where implicatures that were clarified for the receiver impacted on the transfer of the contextual rural setting of the STs. Such a strategy of the clarification of implicatures was seen as useful for the stage, in particular, due to the ephemeral nature of the text in performance, and in this way it was an aid to performability. This could also be related to performativity as the translators acted upon the text in order to act upon the audience. We also saw strategies where rather than translate the ST literally, translators created their own metaphors making their own cohesive links by using, for example, the STs own grammar of colour to establish cohesiveness on a macro-level of the discourse of the play as a whole. We also saw how in performance colours, which were ST inspired, were able to create new meanings for a theatre audience.

I also drew on a few general examples which showed how the translators were addressing performability, for example, in the length of sentences used, where information was either removed or repeated in several forms of paraphrase. Some general examples also showed the performativity of translation where very different types of language were used to address different audiences of different time periods. This again highlighted how the translators ‘performed’ on the audience through the text.
Regarding the relationship between the page and the stage I concluded that while the relationship may appear dialectic, it becomes dialogic in the rehearsal and thus the relationship can be considered cooperative as implicatures in the written ST are made explicit in performance.

As a result of my findings I concurred with the view that the notion of performability is a complex one. I suggested that there are many layers to it, putting forward the notion of hearability as a criterion that needs to be taken into account. This notion of hearability I related not to the actor’s clear delivery but to the audience’s potential uptake. I also found that in many ways performability and performativity were interrelated. However, performativity is not confined to the stage performance; it is also present on the page. Equally, performability is not only something which is pertinent only to the stage, it is written into the page. However, strategies that aid performability on stage were perhaps redundant for the reader. This leads to the interesting conclusion that translations that had been written for one or several performances contain that performance, and thus the reader is reading, not just the translation of the ST but also a performance of that translation. So, we could actually envisage a potential reverse dialectical relationship from the stage back to the page in this case.

These findings also led me to conclude that the translator can be considered as an active agent, performing on the texts for their audience or potential audience, whether reader or spectator. While translators may still be invisible in terms of not sharing the same status or billing as the original author, they are very much visible in a performative sense.

I also suggested that (re)translation and (re)performance can be considered as speech acts in their own right and, moreover, as responses to the STs, responses to previous translations and performances, as well as responses to the discourse surrounding the original author and his work.

This study highlights how it is impossible to define translation as one of a polarity between source-versus-target, as we see a blurring of boundaries between the two. Equally, it is impossible to explore translation along the binary of strategies such as
foreignisation versus domestication as a whole myriad of translation solutions are employed which may be source-led or source-inspired but which have target performativity.

This study serves to open up the debate on theatre translation. Future research areas are many; from an amplification of the examples studied to the number of translations studied, to a comparison between those translations which deem themselves versions as opposed to translations per se in order to explore the boundaries between translation and adaptation. The corpus could also be extended to include other translated plays by Lorca, for example, a study of the performability of those of his plays that have been classed as ‘impossible’ (Delgado 2008: 138). Further possibilities lie in comparative analysis of the same texts across languages. Moreover, the definitions of performability and performativity that I offer here provide starting points for further debate and research into these topics in the translation of other works and in other languages.

To conclude, this study shows the complexity of translating a text of this nature, and how it is impossible, or indeed, erroneous to suggest that there is one definite way in which to translate the rural trilogy. Wright (2000: 127-128) suggests that ‘[I]t is in the shifting of perspectives of Lorca’s theatre that its power lies’; equally in translation we see a constant shifting of perspectives, a constant performativity, a constant creation of new meanings for new audiences, whatever the medium.
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