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In the twentieth century, Spain’s Fascist uprising, ensuing civil war and thirty-six-year Franco dictatorship jettisoned an estimated 114,226 citizens to mass graves and roadside ditches, and compelled 440,000 others to seek exile. Despite more than forty years of democracy, Spain’s governing bodies have not recovered the remains of the forcibly disappeared, addressed the exiled, sought justice, nor created public memorial spaces. Against this reality, this dissertation examines how the intertwined literary corpus and physical body of Federico García Lorca (1898-1936), Spain’s most famous “desaparecido,” have offered a uniquely resonant site for historical memory activism since the poet-playwright’s homophobic assassination in 1936.

Beginning with creative collaborators who knew Lorca intimately, and carrying on into the generations of postmemory, I demonstrate how theater-makers, poets, and performance artists, working in Spain and in exile, have risked their bodies and identities to regenerate Lorca’s dual corpus. Chapter One studies Lorca’s closest theatrical collaborator, Margarita Xirgu (1888-1969), who devoted her thirty-three year exile in Argentina and
Uruguay to transferring Lorca’s dramatic corpus to the Americas. Investigating forgotten archival remains—performances, workshops, a film adaptation, a speech, and poetry recordings—I establish Xirgu as the original theater-maker generating a transnational embodied Lorquian archive. In Chapter Two, I argue that Emilio Prados (1899-1962), a lesser-studied figure of Spain’s “Generación del 27,” was unparalleled in his activism on behalf of Lorca’s poetic corpus through his publishing, editing, anthologizing, and writing of verse. Examining archival materials including epistolary, diary entries, annotated manuscripts and books, I reconstruct Prados’s vital relationship with Lorca’s corpus from the beginning of his career in Spain until his death in exile in Mexico. Glossing his archival library, I offer the first transatlantic study of the poet’s seminal work Jardín cerrado, connecting Walt Whitman, Lorca, and Prados in queer kinship and utopia located at the phenomenological limits of the body.

Chapter Three returns to Spain to investigate embodied Lorquian archives in the generations of postmemory. I study the case of visual and performance artist and early queer activist José Pérez Ocaña (1947-1983), whose transgressive Lorquian invocations in Ventura Pons’s documentary Ocaña, retrat intermitent (1978) challenged Spain’s institutionalized amnesia at the beginning of the Transition to democracy. Recovering lesser-known archived performances, interviews, and visual art, I argue that Ocaña’s Lorquian autofiction constituted historical memory activism through his recovery of the other. In this endeavor, I initiate a novel theoretical reading of Lorca’s own articulations of flamenco’s deep song and duende to illuminate how Ocaña as performer implicated his audiences’ bodies in his work.

In each chapter, my dissertation demonstrates that the early and continued return to Lorca’s dual corpus was not morbid fetishism, but rather vanguard activism. Engaging
performance and historical memory studies, theories of trauma, queer kinship and futurity, phenomenology, haptic theory, and genetic criticism, I argue that these artists created and were embodied Lorquian archives—many years before an official Lorca archive was possible in Spain or elsewhere. These embodied Lorquian archives established an ethics and aesthetics of corporeal interdependence as a vital strategy to defy exile’s erasure and Spain’s collective amnesia, and to begin to recuperate the lost bodies, citizens, artists, art works, and ideals of the Spanish Second Republic. Transmitting affect and knowledge across borders, their cultural interventions signaled the limitless creative potential where the body meets the archive.
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Introduction

Y si la muerte es la muerte,
¿qué será de los poetas
y de las cosas dormidas
que ya nadie las recuerda?

—Federico García Lorca, “Canción Otoñal”
(Granada, 1918)

Todo late en mis archivos como un corazón gigante y salvaje que a veces me impide dormir con su intensidad. He pasado los últimos dos meses buscándole un latido comunicable, lo más cerca posible del que quiere tener y de ese esfuerzo han salido las primeras cien cuartillas a máquina, casi en forma final. Digo casi porque tengo dudas [...] dudas que me paralizan y que impiden darles a esas páginas el toque último y entregarlas [...]¹

—Lorca scholar Agustín Penón
(New York, January 25, 1957)

¹ “Everything pulses in my archives like a gigantic and wild heart that sometimes makes it impossible for me to sleep with its intensity. I have spent the last two months looking for a way to capture and express this heartbeat, the closest possible one that it wants to have and the first hundred typed pages have come from this effort, almost in final form. I say “almost” because I have doubts [...] doubts that paralyze me and impede me from giving those pages the final touch and submitting them [...]” (Letter from Agustín Penón to Thornton Wilder. New York, January 25, 1957 [Osorio X]) [Unless otherwise attributed, all translations from Spanish to English are mine.]

² The pacto de olvido has been identified by numerous historians and scholars, earliest among them including Preston in Politics of Revenge: Fascism and the Military in Twentieth-Century Spain (1990) and Franco: Caudillo de España (1993), Faber (11), Cardus i Ros (“intentional forgetting” [19]), Jelin (“a political act of forgetting, a strategic silence” [32]), Tremlett (Ghosts of Spain 10), Golob (forgetting as a “deep freeze” [127]), Hardecastle (148),
Agustín Penón, the first investigador of Federico García Lorca, described the archive he amassed concerning the poet-playwright’s relationships, assassination and disappearance as a living organ, a heart that pulsed so strongly that it overwhelmed his own physical and intellectual capacity. The responsibility of such an expansive body of knowledge—including remembered voices, manuscripts, letters, legal documents, interview notes, photographs, and artistic ephemera—and the activism required to publish the histories they revealed in a coherent argument, became too much for him. Penón died in 1976, twenty years after his pivotal two years of field research in Granada. He left his book manuscript unfinished, but by all accounts was haunted by this archive that he kept by his side in a suitcase.

Penón’s suitcase archive survived him, and while the historian Ian Gibson compiled the materials into a book in 1990, it wasn’t until 2000 that Penón’s friend Marta Osorio completed his original manuscript and published it as Miedo, olvido y fantasía. In 2015, Enrique Bonet adapted the story of Penón’s investigation and psychological struggle into a graphic novel. La araña del olvido (The Oblivion Spider), titled after an image found in one of Lorca’s earliest poems, “Sueño” (Libro de poemas [1919]), depicts a large and powerful shadow. “La sombra del miedo. / La sombra del olvido. / La sombra del silencio” (Bonet 12) appears as Penón begins his field research in Granada, and pursues him for the rest of his life. This shadow of fear, memory, forgetting, erasure and silence reveals a socio-political dynamic whose lasting effects extend far beyond Penón’s experience and vividly into present day Spain.

This dissertation explains how Penón’s affective experience with an archive of Lorquian materials is part of a larger phenomenon. Like Penón and many scholars before me, I too was drawn to Lorca’s literary corpus and the unresolved crime of his disappeared
body, as well as to exploring how both were uniquely implicated together in Spain’s ongoing struggle with historical memory since 1936. What I encountered and what has ultimately become my driving hypothesis is that this dual body, in the tension of its presence and absence, galvanized new forms of remembrance and activism many decades before historical memory was articulated as something that could even be debated in the public sphere. Specifically, Lorca’s cuerpo/corpus inspired other artists, beginning with close friends and collaborators, to commit their own bodies to recovering and regenerating the poet-playwright’s. In doing so, they transcended Spain’s politics, borders, and the shadow of oblivion. Through the case studies of actress and theater-maker Margarita Xirgu (1888-1969); poet, editor and publisher Emilio Prados (1899-1962); and visual artist and performer José Pérez Ocaña (1947-1983), I map out earlier, vanguard forms of historical memory activism involving Lorca. I demonstrate how this work began in wartime and postwar periods of exile in Latin America, and continued in Spain, at the margins of the Spanish body politic, in the earliest moments of the Transition. The corpus of work each artist contributed is an embodied Lorquian archive unto itself; together, their cultural interventions signal the continued and limitless creative potential at the affective interstice of the body and the archive.

***

In contemporary history worldwide, Spain ranks second only to Pol Pot’s Cambodia for the number of its citizens who, after their forced disappearance, still constitute unrecognized, unrecovered or missing bodies. In the twentieth century, Spain’s 1936 Fascist uprising, ensuing civil war (1936-39) and the four-decade regime led by General Francisco Franco Bahamonde (1939-1975) sent an estimated 114,226 civilians to more than 1,200 mass
graves and roadside ditches, and compelled another 440,000 citizens to seek exile. After Franco’s death from natural causes, and thanks to a transition from dictatorship to democracy that is generally, if problematically, hailed as “exemplary,” more than forty years of constitutional monarchy have followed. Central to this transition was a tacit “pacto del olvido” or “pact of forgetting,” a “gesto de borrar y cuenta nueva” (”a gesture of starting off with a clean slate”) (Vilarós 16) epitomized in the Amnesty Law of 1977 (Ley 46/1977, de 15 de octubre, de Amnistía). While this law freed the dictatorship’s political prisoners and permitted the exiled to return, it also importantly made it illegal to prosecute crimes committed by the Franco regime. As a result of the ostensible success of the founding of Spain’s democracy on impunity and an institutional forgetting of the past, the nation’s governing bodies still have not carried out substantive initiatives for justice, reparations, or reconciliation, nor have they created officially sanctioned public memorial spaces. They have not addressed the multitude of desaparecidos, nor the citizens who were imprisoned, executed or sent to concentration camps; mothers and infants separated at birth; nor those who were otherwise persecuted, tortured, systematically marginalized and/or devastated professionally and economically due to their identities, politics or sexual orientation during the dictatorship.

“Spain is different!” To this day, many a Spaniard with an ironic or dark sense of humor will respond to any international comparison on this or related topics with the famous slogan coined in 1963 by Manuel Fraga Iribarne, the dictatorship’s Minister of

---

2 The pacto de olvido has been identified by numerous historians and scholars, earliest among them including Preston in Politics of Revenge: Fascism and the Military in Twentieth-Century Spain (1990) and Franco: Caudillo de España (1993), Faber (11), Cardus i Ros (“intentional forgetting” [19]), Jelin (“a political act of forgetting, a strategic silence” [32]), Tremlett (Ghosts of Spain 10), Golob (forgetting as a “deep freeze” [127]), Hardecastle (148), Armengou Martín (156-158), and Fox (“There was a tacit public agreement that the past had to be sacrificed for the success of the present and the future” (40). Others emphasize a “pact” or “rule” of silence (Amago 260; Gómez López-Quíñones 209), the decision to not speak of the atrocities committed during the Civil War (Robben 267) and the reconciliation it made possible (Richards 135).
Information and Tourism, as tourism was becoming the country’s largest industry. Indeed, the sociopolitical and historical particulars of Spain’s active state of desmemoria¹ (lack of memory or forgetfulness) deserve examination within larger twentieth century international and national contexts. It is easy from a twenty-first century perspective to question Spain’s lack of transitional justice after the military dictatorship or the state of its tens of thousands of desaparecidos. From our contemporary vantage point we might consider making transatlantic comparisons with Argentina’s 1985 Trial of the Juntas, and the truth commissions and inquiries into forced disappearances conducted there, in Bolivia (1982-84), El Salvador (1992-93), or Guatemala, or even further abroad in Nepal (1990-91). We might also consider the truth and reconciliation initiatives carried out in Chile (1990), Guatemala (1994), Perú (2001-03), and post-Apartheid South Africa (1995).

However, in 1975, transitional justice was still a nascent global concept. At that point, the international military tribunal in Nuremberg that from 1945-46 had investigated and prosecuted the crimes against humanity committed by the Nazi regime in Europe was the clearest example of legal retribution. These landmark cases were conducted under a uniquely global spotlight, with Germany and the other Axis powers already defeated in World War II. The first strictly national transitional justice measure in Europe were the trials of the Greek Junta, but they had only occurred a year prior (1974) to Franco’s death, and their longer-term effect on Greece’s new democracy was not yet clear. While the first truth commission to investigate the human rights violation of forced disappearances committed by a military regime was also held in 1974, in Uganda (“Truth Commission: Commission of Inquiry into the Disappearances of People”), it wasn’t until 1983 that Argentina’s

---

¹ Gregorio Morán famously characterized Spain as the “Reino de desmemoriados” (“kingdom of the forgetful”) (Disremembering the Dictatorship 195).
The decisions made from the time of Francisco Franco’s death in late 1975—the democratic election of 1976, the Amnesty Law of 1977—reflected the psychological and institutional power that the dictatorship still possessed. Political scientist Paloma Aguilar Fernández’s groundbreaking study, *Memoria y olvido de la Guerra Civil Española* (1996) demonstrates how Spain’s collective amnesia stemmed from the traumatic memory of the Civil War (56), which historian Paul Preston asserts had been systematically manipulated by the Franco regime for decades (*The Politics of Revenge* 30). The fear of reviving the bellicose past was greater than any desire for justice and reconciliation; “nunca jamás” (Jelin 32), never again, instead became the guiding principle. Journalist and historian Giles Tremlett corroborates this, emphasizing the very real threat posed by many of the active players in the Transition:

> Nuremberg-style trials of the guilty were out of the question. Many of those who would lead *La Transición* had, anyway, Francoist pasts. It was better to cover their personal stories, too, with a cloak of silence. An atavistic fear of the past, of not repeating the bloody confrontation of the Spanish Civil War, was one reason for this silence. Another was not to upset those, especially in the army, who were among the biggest threats to the young democracy. (10)

A small opposition sought a full democratic rupture with the dictatorship, or “the rapid and total liquidation of Francoism” (Carr and Fusi Aizpurúa, *Spain: Dictatorship to Democracy* 209), but this group did not have “any real organization, any real contact with the future electorate” (214). The great majority of influential republicanos still alive at that point remained
in exile. What occurred instead was what Teresa Vilarós describes as a “psychic rupture”

(16):

[…] una ruptura con el pasado, una retórica de olvido. En la cartografía del
imaginario colectivo se inscribe el periodo transicional como un “Punto Cero” que, aunque se presenta en lo político como reforma, en el
inconsciente colectivo y en la práctica social se escribe como ruptura. 4 (15)

While the Transition might have been inscribed onto Spain’s collective imaginary as

“Kilometer 0,” below the surface of the democracy’s new terrain, the disappeared remained.
The black hole of olvido/zero/oblivion was actually a series of unmarked but locatable mass
graves—behind cemetery walls, or in roadside ditches, ravines, and abandoned fields. As
Francesc Torres notes in the documentary The Mexican Suitcase (Trisha Ziff, 2011), the
disappeared were “literally buried, dead memory” (1h 09min), a metaphor also employed in
the title of the anthology Unearthing Franco’s Legacy: Mass Graves and the Recovery of Historical
Memory in Spain (Jerez-Farrán and Amago, 2010). Most recently, Alfredo González Ruibal’s
Volver a las trincheras (2016) takes the archeologist’s approach of excavating and examining
remains (of humans and objects) from the Civil War trenches to bring these forgotten
histories to light.

The beginning of the legislative and societal destabilizing of the pacto de olvido can be
traced to October 1998, to Spain’s involvement in the arrest of Chile’s former dictator
Augusto Pinochet in London. Under the novel principle of universal jurisdiction for crimes
against humanity, Spanish National High Court Judge Baltasar Garzón indicted Pinochet on
charges of genocide, forced disappearances, torture and terrorism. Garzón’s intervention set
a new precedent, and was applauded worldwide and domestically. Two years later, journalist

4 “[…] a rupture with the past, a rhetoric of forgetting. The transitional period inscribes itself in the cartography
of the collective imaginary as a ‘Kilometer 0,’ that, although it presents itself as a political reform, in the
collective unconscious and in social practice it is written as a rupture” (Vilarós 15).
Emilio Silva Barrera, investigating his grandfather’s forced disappearance, worked with forensic scientist Dr. Francisco Etxeberria Gabilondo and other volunteers to exhume and identify the remains of the thirteen executed men in the mass grave in Priaranza del Bierzo, León. This was the founding case for the grassroots Asociación para la Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica (ARMH), which organized activism for the physical recovery of the remains of the victims of the Fascist uprising, Civil War, and Franco regime. From 2000 onward, Spain’s desmemoria began to unravel. In 2002, thanks to ARMH’s lobbying, Spain was included on the list of countries tracked by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances within the United Nations’ Human Rights Department (Davis 858). Two years later, the neoconservative government of José María Aznar announced that it would form an inter-ministry commission (Comisión Interministerial) to redact legislation that in 2007, now under the socialist government of José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero, was passed as “La Ley de Memoria Histórica” (Ley 52/2007, de 26 de diciembre) (Labayni, “Entrevista con Emilio Silva” 152). While the 2007 Historical Memory Law did not reverse the 1977 Amnesty Law, it did promise (among other initiatives) to establish a governmental agency and provide funding to finally locate, recover, and identify the disappeared.

The catalyst for my project occurred in late 2009, shortly after the Historical Memory Law was enacted, at what appeared to be a liminal moment in history. For the first time in seventy-three years, the remains of Spain’s “universal” poet and playwright might be recovered. Federico García Lorca (1898-1936), who was arrested, assassinated, and jettisoned to an unmarked grave outside of Granada between August 18 and 19 of 1936, might no longer be a desaparecido, and the sociopolitical and cultural implications could be multifold. On October 28, 2009, after a lengthy legal process involving Spain’s Supreme
Court and local/regional courts and governments, a team of archaeologists commenced excavation in the Federico García Lorca Memorial Park in Alfacar. They decided to open four sites in the area that, since 1966, Ian Gibson had indicated as likely burial locations. Gibson’s investigation, complete with testimonial interviews, corroborated Agustín Penón’s original interview-based work conducted between 1955 and 1956, when he had notably discovered Lorca’s death certificate. The memorial park, erected and dedicated in 1986, the fiftieth anniversary of Lorca’s disappearance, included within its perimeters the olive tree signaling the alleged spot of the mass grave he shared with three to five other victims: Republican teacher Dióscoro Galindo González, two anarchist banderilleros (bullfighter’s assistants) Francisco Galadí Melgar and Joaquín Arcollas Cabezas, and possibly the tax inspector Fermín Roldán García and the furniture repairman Miguel Cobos Vilchez. But the 2009 excavation failed to find Lorca or those executed alongside him. Three more excavations—in 2012 and 2016 in the nearby Peñón del Colorado, and in 2018 again in the memorial park in Alfacar—were also unable to locate any trace of human remains or the signs of a previous grave.

The decade during which this dissertation came into being was bookended by events concerning the two most polemical bodies in contemporary Spain, which have repeatedly met very different fates. Almost exactly ten years after the first excavation of Lorca’s presumed grave, on October 24, 2019, by initiative of the then interim Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez Pérez-Castejón (Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party [PSOE]) and on order of the Spanish Supreme Court, the remains of the Fascist dictator Francisco Franco Bahamonde were removed from the Valle de los Caídos mausoleum in San Lorenzo de El Escorial. His glorified tomb in the “Valley of the Fallen” had presided over Spain’s largest mass grave of
33,833 bodies, more than a third belonging to unknown victims, both Republican soldiers and civilians killed and discarded in unmarked ditches, those who had been “disappeared” not unlike Lorca (Ejerique). Franco’s coffin was airlifted to the El Pardo cemetery in Madrid, and afforded the dignity of a private entombment in the crypt where his wife was interred.

Historian Sebastiaan Faber has emphasized that the desaparecidos have suffered three disappearances: first, in the initial crime; second, during the Franco regime; and third, with the inhibition of justice during the Spanish transition to democracy. Extending Faber’s observation, there is danger of a fourth and final disappearance: a national failure to follow through on the actions that the Law for Historical Memory initiated. In 2012, the conservative Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy (Partido Popular) made good on his campaign promise from 2008—“ni un sólo euro para recuperar el pasado”—by closing the national Office for Victims of the Civil War and Dictatorship and eliminating the budget for excavations (Paradinas). The rationale for his argument was the fallout from the 2008 financial crisis, which will likely pale in comparison to the Covid-19-induced economic collapse. At the beginning of 2020, Nieves García Catalán, the granddaughter of Galindo González, petitioned the courts for a fifth search for the grave the latter presumably shared with Lorca, based on testimony that remains had been found and discarded near the Alfacar park’s entrance gate (V. Fernández, Arroyo). As I write, a judge’s decision is still pending. Meanwhile, this January, just prior to the pandemic, Vox, the new extreme right party that forms part of the conservative coalition Parliament of Andalucía, submitted its proposal to replace the Historical Memory Law with a “Ley de Concordia” that would paralyze further excavations.

---

5 Faber made this assertion during a prepared speech as the Chair of the Board of Governors of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade on May 9, 2015 (Japan Society, New York).
However, in a stunning national reversal, on September 15, the national left-wing coalition government led by Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez put forth an Anteproyecto de Ley de Memoria Democrática, a draft bill to replace the Law for Historical Memory with significant enhancements and reforms. The sweeping legislative proposal includes tasking the Spanish state with the responsibility of locating and recovering the remains of the desaparecidos; nullification of criminal sentences dictated by the Franco regime, and further legal reparations; the removal of titles and property bestowed by the dictatorship; and legal sanctions against extolling Francoism. The draft bill would guarantee access to and the protection of historical memory archives, in particular the Centro Documental de la Memoria Histórica de Salamanca. It proposes official collaboration with civilian memorialist associations to promote reconciliation; days of national remembrance; citizenship and commemoration for the exiled and their descendants; and the conversion of the Valle de los Caidos into a public cemetery and pedagogical space. It remains to be seen what will come of this draft bill in a national congress and political climate that is more polarized than ever. With each year that passes the number of survivors with knowledge of where the desaparecidos lie—including those who were victims of, as well as those complicit with, the violence—dwindles. According to ARMH, the earth maintains the impression of a grave for one hundred and fifty years. Time is running out.

***

In his 1957 letter, Agustín Penón was the first to describe the Lorquian archive as alive and visceral, as a body that affects other bodies. More recently, theorists such as Jacques Derrida and Carol Steedman have described the profound pull of the archive; as
Steedman asserts: “What keeps you awake […] is actually the archive, and its myriads of the dead, who all day long, have pressed their concerns upon you” (Steedman 17). It was the crime of Lorca’s disappeared body that weighed on Penón through the materiality of information and the evocative traces of Lorca’s life and artistic corpus that he safeguarded in a suitcase; indeed, Penón’s own body became inextricable from this archive. Decades later, Lorca’s body as archive presses the concerns of thousands of desaparecidos, questioning whether or not justice will be done in their memory.

Penón’s private confession to his friend captures the specific anxieties that I, too, have experienced while researching and writing my dissertation. More than sixty years have passed since Penón’s letter, and the field of Lorca studies is immense and crowded. Moreover, over the decades some respected scholars have sounded the alarm regarding Lorca’s popularity, the manipulation of his figure and poetry, and the presumably morbid fascination with his death and missing body. Paul Julian Smith, for example, warned in 1998 of a cultish, fetishistic obsession, criticizing the notion that Lorca “embodies both the particular character of the nation and a universal human condition; and that his death marks him out as a unique individual, a tragic figure whose sacrifice was inevitable and, obscurely, redemptive” (Smith105). Jonathan Mayhew, studying the “American Lorquismo” of twentieth century U.S. poets, exposed how Lorca was frequently reduced to parody, kitsch, or otherwise appropriated for “cultural and ideological desiderata” (xii), particularly in translation. Noël Valis, focusing on the polemic within Spain over the ongoing search for Lorca’s remains, argued that it reveals

[…] an effort to take possession of his myth and memory and to mold both to fit the desires of ideology and identity politics. More generally, the fate of Lorca and his remains compels us to consider what place poets have in the
public arena (if indeed they do have one, given the modern view of poetry as a private matter). (“Lorca’s Grave” 3-4)

The first of Valis’s assertions reduces the motivations for the search for Lorca’s remains to a bid for ownership and manipulation. Valis’s broader question—“what place [do] poets have in the public arena”?—can be answered by Lorca’s in “Canción otoñal,” cited in my epigraph:

    Y si la muerte es la muerte,
    ¿qué será de los poetas
    y de las cosas dormidas
    que ya nadie las recuerda?

The poet as elegist has the power to eternalize, to capture the ephemerality of human experience, to communicate the affect, sensation, dreams and desires that constitute individuals and connect them to a larger whole. Furthermore, as these verses suggest, if we invert the question, the poet has the responsibility to revive what has already been forgotten by most. The “sleeping things” are not definitively erased, since they are within unique reach of poets; as long as poets fulfill their role, death is not totalizing. As such, we return historical memory agency to both Lorca’s figure and poetry.

Thus far, Melissa Dinverno has contributed the most scholarship demonstrating the significance of Lorca’s absent body. In articles published in 2005 and 2007, she introduced three concepts that have resonated with my project. First, she examined Lorca’s body as a cultural site of mourning to mediate unresolved trauma and break silence, both individually and collectively (“Raising the Dead” 32, 41-42). Second, she traced the re-inscription of “Lorca’s previously censored body” (“Raising the Dead” 31) to observe a “fusion of [Lorca’s] corpus/cuerpo” (“Raising the Dead” 32) in the Spanish collective imaginary from the late seventies until the turn of the century. Third, she studied these recent artistic evocations
through the lens of hauntology. Here, she built upon Jo Labanyi’s interpretation of Jacques Derrida’s study (in *Specters of Marx* [1993]) of the persistence of the past in the present. Labanyi asserted that ghosts in contemporary Spanish filmic and literary production constitute the return of the repressed trauma that is embodied in the *desaparecidos* (“History or Hauntology”). For Dinverno, the ultimate example of this phenomenon is the return of, and continual engagement with, Lorca’s spectral body. Applying Labanyi’s assertion that ghosts are the “‘might have beens’ of history that return as an actualizable, embodied alternative reality” (“History or Hauntology” 79), Dinverno proposes that Lorca’s haunting can offer an “alternative reality, asking viewers to reimagine this body, rewrite the history of which it speaks, and question the nation founded on its silence” (“Wounded Bodies” 31).

Dinverno and Labanyi, together with Joan Ramon Resina, have helped to articulate the current relationship between Spain’s cultural imaginary and politics, and its *desaparecidos*. Resina has characterized these ghosts as the very shadow of Spain’s body politic (*Disremembering the Dictatorship* 14), and proposed an ethics of engagement. Citing Michel Foucault, he advocates for allowing the *desaparecidos* to exist at the limit of our own bodies so that they might touch the body politic (3 [Foucault *Language, Counter-Memory* 169]). Labanyi, referencing Derrida, confirms this approach, asserting that the “being-with-specters” of the *desaparecidos* propels a “politics of memory, of inheritance, and of generations” (“History or Hauntology” 79 [Derrida, *Spectres* xix]). Here, I think it its helpful to remember that Derrida’s concept of hauntology originates in a play on words, alluding to “ontology.” If ontology studies the nature of being, then hauntology interrogates the nature of the existence (or presence) of that which is absent. Only through the lens of phenomenology can we study how the unembodied is in fact embodied; how it is experienced consciously through the
transmission of affect. As such, we open the door to an exploration of the role that our own bodies/embodiment—through touch and affect—can play in historical memory activism.

Postmemory, the other dominant theory within the global field of contemporary historical memory studies, also examines haunting as a vehicle for prioritizing affect over first-hand testimonial knowledge. From their research on the children of Holocaust survivors, Gabriele Schwab and Marianne Hirsch (frequently in dialogue) have discovered “haunting legacies” (Schwab) that have been “transmitted to [this second generation] so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right” (Hirsch 5). Like Labanyi’s and Dinverno’s applications of hauntology, postmemory enables distinct hopes and visions for the future by creating an “affective link” (Labanyi, Memory and Modernity 113) between the present and the past. Postmemory theory moves further beyond trauma than hauntology and considers performance, desire, and alternative archives. Where hauntology looks at the return or recovery of the traumatic past embodied as ghosts, postmemory focuses on how subsequent generations embody regenerative, creative potential. Hauntology might be limited to “nostalgia for lost futures” (Galilx), “[b]ut postmemory is subject to dreams and desires that can shape an alternative archive” (Hirsch 249) to create new pathways forward. While Hirsch recognizes that “…we cannot disguise the lost and shadow archives, and the absences, that haunt all that we are able to collect,” she asserts that “We fill the emptiness through our performative practices of desire” (Hirsch 247).

Across numerous schools of theory, the archive and the body have been conceived of as separate sites of power that are controlled, limited, manipulated or deconstructed. Derrida’s Freudian lens in Archive Fever (1995) envisions the archive as the exterior physical incarnation of the human mind, demonstrating what those in charge of it choose to
remember and to forget (or repress). Etymologically, the archive is the house of authority, where commanding commences (Derrida), and where mechanisms of access and control reveal the power structure of knowledge (Foucault’s “technologies of power”): what and who are valued and therefore preserved, versus that which is suppressed, and therefore omitted or destroyed. “There is no archive without a place of consignation, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside,” Derrida asserts (14 [italics his]). Derrida’s Archive Fever is particularly fruitful in its deconstruction of memory and its laying bare of the realities of absence, silence and control. Nonetheless, it remains limited by upholding the mind | body ontological dichotomy sustained in Western philosophy since Descartes (the Cartesian dualism).

Performance studies, on the other hand, approaches the archive by privileging the full body as the ultimate site of knowledge in motion. The interdisciplinary field investigates ephemeral corporeality through performances of gender and sexuality, and the creation and transmission of knowledge through mortal bodies enacting artistic, cultural and political events. In the last quarter century, performance studies theorists (and theorist-practitioners) have debated if, how and where cultural memory remains, including advocating for alternative archives found in traces of affect. Joseph Roach and Diana Taylor looked at the transmission of the ephemeral from body to body, including across bodies of water and national borders. Roach’s and Taylor’s approaches prioritized bodies (particularly those of exiles) that are often marginalized or under-represented, and the cultural memories that they safeguard. Roach articulated a Circum-Atlantic theory of what he termed “surrogacy,” focusing on how performance genealogy involves one body imperfectly substituting for a prior one (1995-96). Taylor, studying the Americas, argued that memory transmitted through
embodied performance repertoires does not exist in the confines of a traditional archive (2003), that the perpetuation of the live repertoire is necessary for these memories to survive. However, in Taylor’s discourse, the mind | body dichotomy is reified in the impermeable division between the archive and the repertoire. More recently, however, some performance studies critics and theorists have begun to push back against this dualism. André Lepecki, studying reenactment trends in dance, for example, has argued for the body of the dancer as the archive, the bearer of the record.

Advances in queer studies also bring the imbrication of body and archive into sharper view. Ann Cvetkovich and José Esteban Muñoz have helped to bridge performance and archive theories by prioritizing queer affect (ranging from trauma to ecstasy), which is traceable through both alternative and traditional archiving practices. In Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity (2009), Muñoz asserts that queerness is actually an idealistic stance toward a utopia that is not here yet (queer futurity). Ephemeral queerness is evidenced and archived through the performativity of physical relationships, gestures and creations that reveal “a type of affective excess that presents the enabling force of a forward-dawning futurity” (23). Muñoz’s case studies configure both an archive of “lost queer histories” and “queer affect” (Assumpção), and articulate a manifesto for a future that has not yet arrived but is actively desired in the present. Cvetkovich, in contrast, considers how the transnational queer community employs traditional archiving practices in nontraditional spaces to record affect and engage in historical memory activism. In An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures (2003), Cvetkovich implies that the work at hand is paradoxical: in order to privilege affective bodies, we must examine the archives. Even so, we approach archives in new ways, focusing on overlooked as well as traditionally
highlighted elements, and assigning value to the ephemeral. Cvetkovich’s research centers on queer alternative archives, many in domestic spaces; she defines the queer community as transnational and identifies within it “trauma cultures” that respond to “socially situated political violence” in a way that problematizes the common distinction between the affective (mourning) and the political (activism) (Introduction). Cvetkovich’s more recent work, “Accidental Encounters as Archival Practice and Queer Affective Method” (2015) furthers this critical exploration, highlighting the role of the artist in “queer archive activism” to create the archive or be the archive by asking, “Will artists be involved in/as activist archives?” For her part, Elizabeth Freeman, in Queer Belongings: Kinship Theory and Queer Theory (2007), recognizes and assigns value to queer networks of interdependence. Freeman’s scholarship illustrates how queer bodies become responsible for one another across space and time, forming ties of kinship that are often stronger than biological familial bonds. Much as Roach’s and Taylor’s performance studies work looks at transmission from body to body, Freeman’s scholarship has inspired me to see how queer embodied archives might be connected and why they are essential to one another in the activism of both mourning and utopic futurity.

As I will detail, Margarita Xirgu, Emilio Prados, and José Pérez Ocaña are each key case studies that prove the existence of embodied Lorquian archives and queer archive activism. By studying each artist’s forgotten contributions, I am able to map out an earlier, alternative historical memory activism through Lorca’s cuerpo/corpus in the twentieth century. With each, I also adopt Cvetkovich’s critical, activist approach, which she has articulated as “working as much to produce an archive as to analyze one” (An Archive of Feelings 8). I have found the primary sources for my case studies in such disperse archives as
the Fundación Federico García Lorca, the Residencia de Estudiantes, the Centro de Documentación Teatral, the Filmoteca Española and the Biblioteca y Centro de Documentación Museo Reina Sofía in Madrid; the Centro Documental de Memoria Histórica (formerly the Franco dictatorship military archive for political enemy files) in Salamanca; the Centro Cultural Generación del 27 in Málaga; the Ateneo Español in Mexico; the Institut del Teatre in Barcelona; the Centro de Estudios Lorquianos in Fuente Vaqueros; and the digital Xirgu archive (www.margaritaxirgu.es). Unlike Xirgu and Prados, I have had the extreme fortune to travel back and forth from Spain and the Americas to not only conduct research in these archives, but to retrace and experience many of the places that defined each artist’s life.

Chapter One, “Margarita Xirgu: Surrogating a Dramatic Lorquian Body in Exile,” presents the first and most unequivocal case study by examining the figure of the Catalan theater-maker Margarita Xirgu (Molins de Rei, Catalonia, Spain, 1888 – Montevideo, Uruguay, 1969), Spain’s most famous actress of the early-to-mid twentieth-century. Xirgu was the key agent in the success of Lorca’s dramatic oeuvre during the playwright’s lifetime as the protagonist in Mariana Pineda (1927), Yerma (1934), and Bodas de sangre (1935). Leaving Spain in early 1936 for a theater tour to promote Lorca’s plays in Latin America, Xirgu would spend the remaining thirty-three years of her life in exile, the majority under threat from the Franco regime. Based in Montevideo, Buenos Aires and Santiago de Chile, but traveling extensively (including residencies in Mexico City and the U.S.), she made it her mission to successfully disseminate Lorca’s body of work throughout the Americas. This chapter offers a novel reading of Xirgu as a Lorquian artist through the lens of queer kinship; it is also the first to argue that Xirgu herself was physically an embodied Lorquian
archive. I focus on her phenomenological approach as an actress, director and educator, most notably through the use of her voice. Likewise, I prioritize and examine never-before-studied early interventions to recover and regenerate Lorca’s corpus at the beginning of Xirgu’s diasporic migration across Latin America, as well as a forgotten speech manuscript and audio recordings from decades later that demonstrate the full arc of her activism and commitment to surrogate Lorquian knowledge.

With the 1937 performance poem *Cantata en la tumba de Federico García Lorca*, written by Mexican poet Alfonso Reyes, and staged at Teatro Smart, Buenos Aires, I read Xirgu’s performance of the role of La Madre in dialogue with Lorca’s poetry and plays, and contextualize it with press interviews the actress gave following his assassination. Next, I retrace the out-of-circulation film adaptation of *Bodas de sangre* that was directed in 1938 by Argentine theater critic Edmundo Guibourg. This adaptation also featured Xirgu reprising the role of La Madre, and captures the only footage of Xirgu performing with sound, as well as the entire cast of actors who had worked with Lorca on staging this play. Subsequently, I recover the manuscript that is the only example of Xirgu’s own public writing, her twice-performed annotated text of a speech, “De mi experiencia en el teatro” (1951), which she delivered in Montevideo and Santiago, and which features both her relationship with Lorca and a recitation of “Soledad de la pena negra.”

Chapter One concludes with an exploration of Xirgu’s particular relationship to Lorca’s poetry. Lorca dedicated three poems to Xirgu: two directly address the actress (“Margarita cada rosa” [1934] and “A Margarita” [1936]), while the other, “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla,” belonged to his most successful poetry collection, *Romancero gitano* (1927-28). In 1960, Xirgu completed an audio recording of the
entire collection, as well as of *Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías*. While a recording of Lorca’s voice has never been found, Xirgu’s voice was essential in her every artistic intervention. Here, I demonstrate how these recordings are proof of Xirgu’s critical surrogacy of her knowledge of Lorca as poet-performer and theater-maker. Many have observed the aesthetic importance of poetry in Lorca’s theater; I propose that at the intersection of Federico García Lorca’s poetry and theater stood Margarita Xirgu.

**Chapter Two, “Emilio Prados: A Secret Garden to Regenerate Lorca’s Poetic Corpus”** argues that this little-studied poet of the Generación del 27 created another significant embodied Lorquian archive, but through writing poetry, editing, publishing, typesetting, and the cultivation of his own library of annotated manuscripts and books. Emilio Prados (Málaga, Andalusia, Spain, 1899 - Mexico City, Mexico, 1962) has often been characterized as a reticent figure and an enigmatic poet who upon exile to Mexico in 1939 retreated into a life of monastic solitude. This chapter contributes a new understanding of Prados as a lifelong poet-activist before, during, and after the Spanish Civil War. It is also the first sustained study of Prados’s private and essential relationship with Lorca’s corpus from the beginning of his career in Spain until his death in exile.

I establish Prados and Lorca’s mutual influence and queer kinship through the former’s earliest poems, only recently found in epistolary exchange, and through diary entries that demonstrate how this friendship sparked Prados’s vocations as a poet and activist. Prados’s poem “Jardín” (1921) together with Lorca’s “El jardín” (*Suites*, ≈1920-23), are the keystone—if not the Rosetta Stone—to an intertextual corpus of both Lorca’s and Prados’s poetry that would culminate in the latter’s magnum opus, *Jardín cerrado* (1940-46, 1953, 1960). Bringing the two young textual bodies to touch, I demonstrate how they began their
exploration of the elegiac and utopic metaphor of the garden together, and made it a uniquely productive space for queer futurity. My historical research illuminates Prados’s exceptional knowledge of Lorca’s published and unpublished poetic corpus, highlighting his unrivaled access to, and unique responsibility toward *Suites* (not published until 1983). While still in Málaga, Prados typeset manuscripts of selections of Lorca’s *Romancero gitano* and the complete *Canciones* in the inaugural editions of his publishing house Imprenta Sur and literary magazine *Litoral*, where he quite literally defined the Generación del 27 through the poets he published (Díaz de Guereñu 46-47). Prados’s first physical contribution to a Lorquian archive in exile in Mexico City was typesetting a manuscript of the previously unpublished *Poeta en Nueva York* (Séneca [June 1940], edited by José Bergamín).

As in Chapter One, I first present Emilio Prados by studying his activism to recover Lorca’s dual corpora during the Civil War. As an organizer of the II Congreso Internacional de Escritores (1937), part of the Alianza de Intelectuales Antifascistas, Prados published *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte* (1937), the first collection to anthologize Lorca’s texts with elegies and essays about his persona from other key literary figures. *Homenaje* includes two elegies composed by Prados: “Llegada” and “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca,” the latter standing out as the only elegy that invokes both the poet and his friend's corpus in a quest to continue to touch one another. My exegesis of “Estancia” and Prados’s intertextual and phenomenological approach to “being with” Lorca in death draws on genetic criticism to source both Prados’s annotated copy of his anthology as well as his manuscript of the poem. I read the anthology *Homenaje* in its entirety as a

---

* Edna St. Vincent Millay, with particular artistic liberty, translated “Llegada” into English in 1937. “Estancia,” to this day, is difficult to find in print and has not been translated into English, as is the case of the majority of Prados’s poems.
Lorquian body curated by Prados, and consider Prados’s annotations as part of his activism even decades later to perpetuate this recuperation.

The second half of Chapter Two is devoted to Prados’s seminal work, *Jardín cerrado* (1940-46, 1960). *Homenaje*, “Estancia,” and Prados’s publishing activity with Editorial Séneca prove his explicit commitment to the Lorquian corpus after his friend’s assassination, but it was through *Jardín cerrado* that Prados spent the rest of his life secretly regenerating Lorca’s corpora together with his own. Tracing its genesis back to “Jardín” and “El jardín,” and its inspiration to “Oda a Walt Whitman” from *Poeta en Nueva York* as well as Whitman’s “Song of Myself,” I argue that in the *leaves of grass* of Prados’s enclosed garden, the exiled *malagueño* was able to re-root, safeguard, and grow the “common ideals” and “political” “cause” of love shared between the two poets. Glossing Prados’s copy of poet León Felipe’s translation of “Song of Myself,” *Canto a mí mismo* (1941), I offer the first transatlantic and comparative study of *Jardín cerrado* that connects Whitman, Lorca, and Prados in queer kinship and in a utopia located at the phenomenological limits of the body, as well as in the deceptively simple and sensual image of the *hoja seca*—the dry leaf, or page. Through his most expansive, public poetic body, Prados overcomes both exile and oblivion to create a queer alternative archive that is both personal and transnational.

While the first two chapters examine artists with direct relationships to Lorca who carried their memories and knowledge into exile in Latin America, my third chapter returns to Spain to investigate the potential of an embodied Lorquian archive in the generation of postmemory. **Chapter Three, “Ocaña: Reviving a Lorquian Body (Politic) during the Spanish Transition,”** studies the artist José Pérez Ocaña (Cantillana, Andalucía, Spain

---

7 These quotes are from a late 1920 entry in Prados’s diary, describing his relationship with Lorca (Prados, Salinas 21).
1947-1983). The Barcelona-based painter and sculptor, performance artist and early queer activist’s transgressive Lorquian invocations in Ventura Pons’s documentary *Ocaña, retrat intermitent* (1978) were among the first to challenge Spain’s institutionalized amnesia. Since 2012, when I began my research, Ocaña has been notably recovered and vindicated as both an important artist and activist through the lenses of queer studies, the *Movida barcelonesa*, and the larger politics of resistance against Francoism. However, the specific contribution of his Lorquian historical memory activism, which was inextricable from the aesthetics of his performance and visual art corpus, has yet to be interrogated. As such, this chapter offers the first Lorquian reading of Ocaña and of *Ocaña, retrat intermitent*, and reveals Ocaña’s extended history of Lorquian autofiction through a recovery of other archived performances, interviews, and visual art. In this endeavor, I initiate a novel extension of haptic theory from Lorca’s own articulations of flamenco’s deep song and duende—ultimately the artistic phenomena of profound, painful embodiment that implicates both the performer and their audience. While Pons’s filmmaking debut (after ten years as a theater director) is unquestionably centered on the subject of Ocaña, I demonstrate how Ocaña’s invocations of Lorca create a powerful vehicle for recovery and mediation of trauma. In a culminating performance filmed in Montjuïc cemetery, Ocaña breaks taboos to both acknowledge and protest Lorca’s status as a desaparecido, and implicates his audience (viewers) in the project of collective memory. With an outpouring of duende and an economy of verses, Ocaña animates a desirous Lorquian corpus of music, theater, poetry, and drawings. His cemetery performance alone alludes to “Zorongo gitano” from *Canciones populares* (1933), *La zapatera prodigiosa* (1933, 1935), “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla” and “Muerte de Antoñito el Camborio” from *Romancero gitano* (1927-28). Emphasizing
embodiment through his voice and alluding to “Prendimiento,” Ocaña’s performance demonstrates a transnational “jump” from Xirgu. Through haptic theory, *deep song* and *duende*, I demonstrate how the repertoire of Ocaña’s embodied performances affectively crosses the borders of the filmic archive to transmit, touch, and charge our bodies to bear witness.

My archival research recovers earlier and subsequent visual art and performances to locate the documentary within a longer history of Ocaña’s forgotten Lorquian interventions, including *Exaltación de Federico García Lorca* (1976), which was staged on the premises of the OJE Francoist youth organization headquarters in Moguer; another performance filmed by Video-Nou and Barcelona’s Mec-Mec Gallery in 1977; and Ocaña’s painting *Mi velatorio* (1982). I illustrate how engaging with the poet-playwright’s corpus and signaling his missing body were essential components of Ocaña’s autofiction and activism to embody personal trauma as well as the lost potential of the Spanish Second Republic (1931-1936), and, at the same time, to articulate a transcendent, queer utopia. Ocaña’s intrepid artistic activism allowed Spain’s desirous bodies to be revived through Lorca’s *cuerpo/corpus*, pointing the way for subsequent decades of “manifestations of love and survival” and the contemporary “Spanish ‘queering’ of García Lorca” (Smith 143).

In each chapter, my dissertation recovers exiled and marginalized artists and demonstrates that the early and continued return to Lorca’s dual corpus is not morbid fetishism nor appropriation, but rather vanguard activism—beginning seventy years before Spain’s Historical Memory Law—to defy exile’s erasure, and to begin to recuperate the lost bodies, citizens, artists and art works, and ideals of the Spanish Second Republic. Margarita Xirgu, Emilio Prados, and José Pérez Ocaña risked their bodies to create Lorquian archives at a time when Lorca’s corpora were in danger of erasure or subject to censure. Retracing
their work from decades before the opening of an official, public Lorca archive, my
dissertation, like postmemory itself, shapes an alternative, more expansive vision for what
such an archive could be. By studying how each artist engaged with Lorca’s literature,
performance legacy and persona, I initiate a new approach to scholarship on Spain’s most
translated poet, emphasizing the interconnectedness of his literary, social and political value.
Indeed, I offer a new way of appreciating many of the themes that were central to Lorca’s
life and work. Federico García Lorca was unquestionably the center of the artistic and social
constellation that was the Generación del 27, but my dissertation demonstrates and
celebrates the interdependence of these brilliant poets, artists and friends, and the ethical
mandate that they passed on to the generations of postmemory.
Chapter 1.
Margarita Xirgu: Surrogating a Dramatic Lorquian Body in Exile

Si me voy, te quiero más,
Si me quedo, igual te quiero.
Tu corazón es mi casa
Y mi corazón tu huerto.
Yo tengo cuatro palomas,
Cuatro palomitas tengo.
Mi corazón es tu casa
¡y tu corazón mi huerto!
—Federico García Lorca, “A Margarita” (1935)

Federico, proseguiremos juntos.
—Margarita Xirgu (1936)\(^8\)

Recordāri. Recordar. Record. The affective body, memory, and the archive. Today, a commonly accepted division exists between historical memory and history. The former is much criticized for being unstable and subjective, a matter of living individuals and communities; the latter is supported by national institutions, by societal and governmental archives built on systems of “objective” physical records surpassing human lifetimes. And yet, when we retrace the Spanish etymology of the verb recordar, to remember—a choice made by an individual or a society antecedent to the creation of any “official” history—we find in its Latin forerunner, recordāri, that the affective body is the original agent. Recordāri means “to be in or pass through the heart again;” its two components, re- and cordis, are repetition and the heart (www.deChile.net, Diccionario de la lengua española [DRAE 22ª edición]). In Classical Antiquity, the heart was where memory (and possibly the mind) existed, and as the word evolved in the Middle Ages into the thirteenth century French verb reorder it implied learning through repetition and rehearsal (par cœur—by heart), and

---

\(^8\) Rodrigo, Margarita Xirgu 244
testimony and oral transfer to others, telling and making something known. It was not until the fourteenth century that the noun form appeared, *record*, which meant the product of setting testimony down to writing, where it would be used in law, and as the nineteenth century ended, the verb also took on the meaning “to put sound to disk” (*Random House Dictionary*). As such, while an initial gloss of Lorca’s dedicatory poem to his stage muse Margarita Xirgu might have only gleaned a lyrical play of images from the poet steeped in Andalusian popular song, an etymological reading deciphers a deeper, ancient message. And after Lorca’s assassination nine months later, in August 1936, it takes on an even greater charge; it becomes a vow. Considering also that the etymology of the other Spanish verb for remembering, *acordarse de*, is *acordare*, meaning the joining of hearts (www.deChile.net), and that *acordar* now is to agree, we can read their pact to remember: *If he should go, her heart shall remain his home, her heart his garden. Their hearts—the memory of one another—are inextricably bound.*

Margarita Xirgu (1888-1969) devoted the rest of her life to this covenant by diasporically disseminating her friend’s theatrical and poetic corpus throughout Latin America. A key agent in the success of Federico García Lorca’s staged dramatic oeuvre before his assassination, the Catalan actress, director and educator would make of her unexpected thirty-three-year exile from Spain—ending only upon her own death—a magnum opus for Lorquian historical memory. This chapter studies Xirgu as a queer embodied Lorquian archive by recovering and examining her *magna tarea* to harbor and

---

*Antonina Rodrigo is the first scholar to assign the description “*magna tarea*” to Xirgu’s work with Lorca. “La hija del obrero catalán asumirá hasta su muerte, conscientemente, la magna tarea de su destino de actriz: aportar su contribución, con ilimitada curiosidad, al enriquecimiento cultural de los países de habla castellana y honrar la memoria de su ‘imposible Federico’. Cuando el periodista Alba Medina le pide que explique el ‘misterio lorquiano’, ella responde rápida, como herida: ‘No hay tal misterio, yo le llamo liturgia. Recuerda *Yerma*’” [“The daughter of a Catalan laborer would accept responsibility, until her death, for the cultural enrichment of Spanish-speaking countries and honor the memory of her ‘impossible Federico.’ When the journalist Alba Medina asks her to explain the ‘Lorquian mystery,’ she quickly responds, as though wounded,
regenerate Lorca’s corpus and cuerpo across borders. The transnational archive that Xirgu created worked in spite of, and against, the Spanish archive of power during her exile: the Franco regime’s Archivo General de la Guerra Civil Española, which included among its dossiers of Tribunales de Responsabilidades Políticas a folder of legal actions taken against Xirgu as an enemy of the Spanish state. In my investigation of Xirgu, I focus on scarcely studied examples of the theater-maker’s work to regenerate Lorca in Latin America. First, I consider two of her earliest interventions: the December 1937 staging in Buenos Aires of Alfonso Reyes’s performance poem, Cantata en la tumba de Federico García Lorca, and the first film adaptation of a Lorca play, Bodas de sangre, directed by Edmundo Guibourg, filmed and released in Argentina in 1938. In both, I demonstrate Xirgu’s key role as the surrogate, or as the artist with unrivaled embodied knowledge of performing Lorca’s corpus, and I study each text (theater, film, and poetry) for its particular activist aesthetic. In the second half of the chapter, I review Xirgu’s acts of transfer via her creation and leadership of national theater schools, and her direction and staging of Lorca’s plays. Here, I study Xirgu’s speech “De mi experiencia en el teatro,” which was her only self-authored document on the subject. Finally, I address her mostly forgotten recordings of Lorca’s poetry, Romancero gitano and Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, concluding with the one poem that she recorded twice, “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla,” in 1933 and 1961.

“There is no such mystery, I call him/it liturgy”” (El Día, Buenos Aires, 28 Oct. 1956). While Rodrigo identifies the importance of and does groundbreaking research on Xirgu’s continued relationship with Lorca’s work beyond his death, my dissertation goes further to treat this “liturgy” as Xirgu as embodied artist recovering Lorca’s cuerpo-corpus, and in doing so, creating an alternative archive.

10 These files are now found at the Centro Documental de la Memoria Histórica in Salamanca, the renamed institution that houses the Franco regime’s files on political enemies. These documents were not officially declared invalid by the Spanish state until the end of 2007, in Article Three (Declaración de ilegitimidad) of the Ley de Memoria Histórica.
My (re)construction of embodied Lorquian archives, beginning with Margarita Xirgu, privileges the affective body, acknowledging the work of the heart and of moving muscle, flesh, and blood to continually regenerate memory and as such offer new temporalities for Lorca’s own body and body of work. I take up Ann Cvetkovich’s broader theoretical inquiries in *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures* and read Xirgu as an example of “queer archive activism.” What began as fervent mourning over Lorca’s death would remain an “indistinguishable trauma” (Rodrigo, *Margarita Xirgu* 243), and become the keystone of a life’s work of artistic activism. The question of ephemerality and its relation to archives—to the source, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge and memory—is essential to any investigation of performance, and even more so when performance is read as historical memory activism capable of creating an alternative archive.

The theorists who have guided my examination of Xirgu’s archival potential are scholars who have built or passed through the original Performance Studies program at New York University’s Tisch School of the Arts: Joseph Roach, Diana Taylor, Rebecca Schneider and André Lepecki. Supported by Joseph Roach’s Circum-Atlantic theory that performance genealogies are prone “to jump across bodies, objects, continents, and to be given to irruptive and even ‘desperate’ repetition and revision” (Schneider 96), I see a critical “surrogacy” occurring in Xirgu’s exile. As an artistic and activist response to the Spanish state’s disappearance of Lorca, Xirgu would substitute her theater-making body as a counter-archive. Through her diasporic performances, workshops, and theater schools, Xirgu sowed a genealogy that would “also attend to counter-memories.” This is the capacity and responsibility of surrogacy, as Roach asserts: that it can address the “disparities between history as it is discursively transmitted and memory as it is publically enacted by the bodies
that bear its consequences” (Cities of the Dead 26). Substituting her voice and flesh, her corazón as his huerto, Xirgu would also be the catalyzer of transnational “acts of transfer”—what Diana Taylor termed as a “doubling, replication, and proliferation” (46) of cultural memory through embodied performance.\footnote{Taylor’s articulation of the archive and the repertoire, and her theory of acts of transfer (2003) proceeds from Roach’s theory (1995); and both were published during their tenures at the New York University program. In The Archive and the Repertoire, Taylor glosses Roach’s concept of surrogation as a potentially negative process with the risk of erasing individuals and cultural singularities by replacing them, “allow[ing] for the collapse of vital historical links and political moves” (Taylor 46). However, I do not read Roach’s surrogation as doing so, at least in the case of Xirgu, and instead argue that the surrogate is quite conscious of her role in representing and continuing—regenerating—the work of her predecessor. This work is quite often political activism in that it attends to the counter-memories, countering official History, as I have cited from Roach’s explanation (Cities of the Dead 26).} Xirgu’s regeneration of Lorquian cultural memory continued across the Americas (Cuba, Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and the United States), and beyond her lifetime into post-dictatorship Spain.

While Roach, Taylor, and Schneider’s theories on theatrical performance appear more immediately relevant to an investigation of Xirgu, Lepecki’s scholarship on dance has offered me a unique point of entry into the theater-maker’s project to create an embodied Lorquian archive. In “The Body as Archive: Will to Re-Enact and the Afterlives of Dances” (2010), Lepecki identifies a recent tendency within dance performance art to re-enact past choreographers’ works, which he asserts is driven by a “will to archive” that is not associated with fixing a single authoritative record. Lepecki explores the “question of archiving onto/into one’s body” (Lepecki 34) and the importance of repetition to achieve this, and in doing so, unknowingly returns to the original meaning of recorder: learning by heart, par coueur. Lepecki sees re-enactment as the demonstration of “the artist’s ability to find new, unexplored possibilities in a past work” (31), the proof of “the body as the privileged archival site” (34). “[I]n dance re-enactments there will be no distinctions left between archive and body. The body is archive and archive a body” (31), he asserts, and the dancer’s body works as the...
“collector of bodies, pieces, affects and movements” (34). Similarly to Cvetkovich’s
discourse on queer archives, Lepecki moves beyond the construct of affective history as
melancholic lamentation and finds activism in the will to become an embodied archive:

...recent dance re-enactments could be seen not as paranoid-
melancholic compulsions to repeat but as singular modes of politicizing time
and economies of authorship via the choreographic activation of the dancer’s
body as an endlessly creative, transformational archive. In re-enacting we
turn back, and in this return we find in past dances a will to keep inventing.
(Lepecki 46)

No different than a dancer’s, Xirgu’s entire gesturing body was essential to her captivating
performances. The culminating movement of her body—from interior to exterior—was the
expressive intonation and musicality she achieved with her voice, but this was inextricable
from her facial expressions, how she held her torso, moved her arms and placed her hands.

As I will detail in this chapter, repetition and re-enactment were inherent in Xirgu’s work
with Lorca’s corpus, as evidenced through numerous stagings, recitations, film and musical
adaptations. As a holistic theater-maker she combined her own staged play performances
with teaching workshops, using reenactment and repetition to train other actors’ bodies to
become archives for Lorca’s work and, in doing so, to continue the acts of transfer.

Xirgu’s particular relationship with Lorca and resulting duty to recover and revive his
corpus can also be read through the lens of queer kinship. Lorca was a homosexual with no
progeny, and Xirgu, while committed to two heterosexual marriages that spanned her entire
adulthood, did not have children. On multiple occasions during their intimate friendship

---

12 The Xirgu web archive explores the theory that Xirgu was a lesbian, and that she had relationships with the
journalist Irene Polo and set designer Victorina Durán. See “21. ¿Margarita Xirgu lesbiana?” The New York
Times’ “Overlooked” obituary project, a recently launched initiative to recover the stories of “remarkable
people” in a section previously “dominated by white men,” dedicated one of its first obituaries to Margarita
Xirgu. There, citing Andrea Weiss in the documentary Bones of Contention, the journalist Kathleen Massara
repeatedly describes Xirgu as a lesbian who married twice (to men) to survive, and remained in exile in part
because of her sexual orientation.
before and after Lorca’s death, she would play the role of grieving mother (*Bodas de sangre, La casa de Bernarda Alba*) or of a woman mourning her inability to bear children (*Yerma, Doña Rosita la soltera o el lenguaje de las flores*). This preoccupation with reproduction, the anxiety over the possible loss of future generations, would certainly echo in Xirgu’s prolific creation of Lorquian productions across the Americas. In Xirgu’s surrogation of Lorca’s corpus, she would achieve an example of what Toni Morrison has termed “historical ‘re-membering,’” where (as Elizabeth Freeman explains it) “the knitting together of individual bodies that have been ideologically and physically objectified, fragmented, or shattered is linked to the renewal of collective life. […] suggest[ing] an embodied but not procreative model of kinship that has powerful resonances for theorizing in a queer mode” (299). I believe that Xirgu recognized Lorca’s vulnerable cuerpo/corpus (in murder, disappearance, queerness) and understood its “corporeal dependency” (Freeman 298) upon hers. I see Freeman’s conceptualization of this kinship’s potential as aligning with both Roach’s and Taylor’s envisioning of deep cultural knowledge transferring from body to body, as well as Lepecki’s description of the dancer’s body “collecting” a creative archive to safeguard and regenerate other bodies. Indeed, as Freeman has explained, queer kinship harnesses “the technique of renewal: as a practice, kinship can also be viewed as the process by which bodies and the potential for physical and emotional attachment are created, transformed and sustained over time” (298). While Freeman’s concept is theoretically novel, it echoes the earliest meaning for the affective, embodied heart-work of remembering.

---

13 Xirgu’s “Overlooked” obituary recounts that the actress learned that Lorca had been killed just before she was to stage *Yerma*, causing her to change her performance of the climactic line “Yo misma he matado a mi hijo” to “Han asesinado a mi hijo” (Massara).
Lorca’s poem, “A Margarita,” and the context of its genesis unknowingly encapsulate all of these components of the two artists’ queer kinship. The poem’s manuscript is the theater program for the December 13, 1935 world premiere of Doña Rosita la soltera o el lenguaje de las flores at the Principal Palace in Barcelona, staged by the “Gran Compañía Dramática de Margarita Xirgu.” The Doña Rosita debut occurred three weeks to the date after Xirgu’s company performed Bodas de sangre for the first time at that same theater, with Xirgu also in the lead role. In the span of less than a month, Xirgu bridged a Lorquian repertoire of a woman who loses her progeny and another who refuses to abandon her faith in a future coupling. Unlike Doña Rosita, Bodas de sangre had already premiered with a different company and different lead (Josefina Díaz), in 1933 at the Teatro Beatrix in Madrid. However, as Lorca declared to the newspaper L’Instant, the Barcelona staging more than two years later was the real debut of the play.14 This was because Margarita Xirgu understood the true nature of Bodas and conveyed it through her and her company’s performance: “Se trata de un verdadero estreno. Ahora verán la obra por primera vez. Ahora se representará íntegra. […] Yo, afortunadamente, he topado con una actriz inteligente como Margarita Xirgu, que bautiza las obras con el nombre que deben bautizarse” (Rodrigo, García Lorca en Cataluña 365-366).15 Bodas de sangre was baptized—reborn—by Xirgu who delivered it as a tragedy instead of a drama.

Lorca’s dedicatory poem appeared on the night of the public birth of Doña Rosita, a sensitive “comedy” about an aging single woman who faithfully waits for her love interest to

14 Bodas de sangre premiered in Buenos Aires in 1933, during Lorca’s stay there. Lola Membrives played La Madre. Lorca declaration’s that theirs was the real debut is that much more significant given that Xirgu and her company were the third group to stage the play.

15 “We’re dealing with a real premiere here. Now they will see the play for the first time. Now it will be performed whole. […] I’ve fortunately come upon an intelligent actress like Margarita Xirgu who baptizes plays with the name by which they should be baptized.”
return, although he never will. The poet-playwright handwrote “A Margarita” on page 11 of the program, and Xirgu included a signed dedication on page 4. The combination of Xirgu and Lorca’s inscriptions suggests that they might have read them aloud together as part of the debut celebration. The Fundación Federico García Lorca archive now safeguards this document (FFGL “Prog-6”), in all likelihood because Lorca himself had kept it among his treasured possessions, in his personal archive of affect and ephemera. Doña Rosita would be the last play that Lorca would live to debut.

1. CANTATA EN LA TUMBA: “SECRET BLOOD” AND SEEDS OF REGENERATION IN THE AMERICAS

Margarita Xirgu and her company left Spain in February of 1936, parting with Federico García Lorca in the port of Bilbao as they boarded the Orinoco for Cuba.16 They planned to take a six-month theater tour of Latin America featuring Lorca’s plays, and Lorca intended to join them in Mexico. However, first a romantic relationship,17 and then the military uprising, held him back. The poet-playwright was assassinated one month after the Civil War erupted, by which point Xirgu and her company were seven months into their extended tour.

16 “De forma inesperada, dos días antes de emprender el viaje a Cuba, Lorca decidió despedirse de Margarita y Rivas Cherif en Bilbao, renunciando a la proyectada gira americana. Ninguno de los tres sospechaba que este adiós sería para siempre. En verano de 1936 cambiaría para siempre el destino de los que habían sido, en los últimos nueve años, incondicionales amigos, compañeros y colaboradores. [Surprisingly, two days before their departure for Cuba, Lorca decided to say goodbye to Margarita and Rivas Cherif in Bilbao, renouncing their projected American tour. None of the three suspected that this farewell would be their last. In the summer of 1936, the destiny of the three who had been unconditional friends, colleagues and collaborators for the last nine years, would change forever](Gil Fombillida 100).

17 In May 2012, it came to light that the art critic and journalist Juan Ramírez de Lucas (1917-2010) was in all likelihood Lorca’s last lover. For seventy-four years, Ramírez de Lucas had hidden a wooden box filled with love letters and poems from Lorca, ultimately entrusting them to one of his sisters to be published after his death. The dates of these artifacts indicate that Ramírez, under the age requirement in 1936 to be able to travel without his parents’ permission, was the probable reason that Lorca did not leave with Xirgu’s company for the Latin American tour (Castilla and Magán).
On December 23, 1937, one year and four months after Lorca’s murder, Margarita Xirgu, the lead actress for the playwright’s entire critically acclaimed dramatic repertoire in both Spain and Latin America, would embody a new but not unfamiliar role as La Madre. This time, however, she would play the desaparecido’s own grieving mother in Alfonso Reyes’s *Cantata en la tumba de Federico García Lorca* at the Teatro Smart in Buenos Aires. Xirgu and her company, with music by exiled Catalan composer Jaime Pahissa, only staged the *Cantata* that one night. It was not filmed, and only Reyes’s original text, a few photographs, and the testimony of those who witnessed the performance, including Argentine theater critic Edmundo Guibourg, appear to remain (Rodrigo, *Margarita Xirgu* 254). *Cantata’s* event of explicit public mourning did not serve as a final catharsis for Xirgu; Lorca would not remain in this theatrical, metaphorical tomb. Instead, his corpus would be migrated, surrogated and regenerated by the bodywork of his most intimate collaborator. Together, in exile, Xirgu and Lorca would *proseguir*, unconfined by artistic mediums, emigrating and traveling across borders, they would *persist and carry forward*.

By the time Xirgu and company staged Reyes’s *Cantata* in Buenos Aires in late 1937, they had already performed several Lorca plays (*Bodas de sangre*, *Doña Rosita la soltera* o el *lenguaje de las flores* and *Yerma*) as part of the tour and given various workshops in Cuba, Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Chile and Argentina. The day prior to *Cantata*, they staged the one hundredth performance of *Yerma* at the same theater (Rodrigo, *Margarita Xirgu* 253). Reyes was finishing a diplomatic post in Argentina that year, and was reportedly inspired by a Xirgu company performance of *Doña Rosita* which he attended that May; immediately after

---

18 Reyes spent ten years in Madrid (1914-24) writing, translating, and researching. Among his various posts, he worked for Ramón Menéndez Pidal at the Centro de Estudios Históricos, where Xirgu, later, in 1933 would first record “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio” for the Centro’s “Archivo de la Palabra” initiative.
viewing it, he wrote *Cantata* (Díaz Arciniega). *Cantata* is historically situated at the end of a year that produced several literary homages to Lorca in Latin America. These included *Homenaje de escritores y artistas a García Lorca*, published in Buenos Aires and Montevideo; *Poeta fusilado* in Montevideo; and *Madre España. Homenaje de los poetas chilenos* with an opening dedication “A Federico García Lorca, el poeta asesinado en Granada por los fascistas. Identificamos con su nombre nuestro homenaje a España.” Unlike these texts, or Antonio Machado’s famous elegy *El crimen fue en Granada* (1936), or Emilio Prados’s contemporaneous multi-genre anthology *Homenaje a Federico García Lorca contra su muerte* (1937) in Spain, *Cantata* was written as a poem to be performed, and specifically by Margarita Xirgu.

It is curious—quite important, I will argue—that Reyes stated in the written text (the official version that would be archived) that he singularly “entrusted” the staging to Margarita Xirgu. The full Xirgu company made up the cast, with Alberto Contreras as “El Padre,” Isabel Pradas as “La Hermana,” and Amelia de la Torre as “La Novia,” while the “Voces” that delivered the final line were comprised of the remaining members (Juana Lamoneda, Emilia Milán, Amalia Sánchez Ariño, Eloïsa Vigo, Eloïsa Cañizares, Antonia Calderón, Isabel Gisbert, Teresa Pradas, Pedro López Lagar, Alejandro Maximino, Enrique Álvarez Diosdado, José Cañizares, Alberto Contreras [jr.], Emilio Ariño, Gustavo Bertot, Miguel Ramírez and Luis Calderón). “La Madre” only spoke (or sang) three times, repeating subsequently smaller portions of her first lines, but Reyes’s introduction to the published text reveals that Xirgu’s power over the performance extended beyond her assigned verses. As Reyes recounts, *Cantata* debuted in May of that year with Mony Ermello’s “recitation,”

---

19 “To Federico García Lorca, the poet murdered in Granada by the Fascists. We identify our homage to Spain with his name.” Pablo Neruda also edited a
but “el poema quedó confiado a la teatralización de Margarita Xirgu” (Cantata). We can infer that Xirgu’s agency was instrumental in all aspects of the staging, from the casting of roles to each actor’s performance. Whether it was because of the Doña Rosita performance, or Xirgu’s leadership of the company and more than ten years of experience working with Lorca, or her quite visible acts of mourning Lorca in the previous year, Reyes understood that the embodiment of his epic elegy needed to be undertaken wholly by Xirgu.

While Cantata certainly performs in an elegiac mode, we can find within its text the seeds of transnational regeneration, and a poetics and politics that gesture toward the future. As Reyes explains in his introductory notes,

> El trueno de los Milicianos, desde el fondo, la arraiga en el presente; la evocación de los temas líricos gratos a Lorca, la reminiscencia del Caballero de Olmedo, la atan a la tradición, al pasado: y el grito vengador final (tras los esfuerzos abortados de la Madre, que por más que hace no logra salir de la obsesión de una frase trunca: “¡Pero tu sangre…!”), la lanza al porvenir, al porvenir que es nuestro.

“Nuestro,” within the body of the performance poem, will include not only the cast and characters from Xirgu’s company, and the various peoples (“los pueblos”) of Spain as enunciated by El Padre, but also, importantly, “El lazador de América y el fiero mexicano,” according to La Novia. This invocation of a future in which transnational mourning becomes migratory, diasporic regeneration, is encapsulated most clearly in La Novia’s lines:

---

20 “[…] the poem was entrusted to Margarita Xirgu’s dramatization.”
21 Xirgu began collaborating with Lorca in 1927 when she agreed to play the protagonist of Mariana Pineda (Martínez Cuitiño 28). I will detail this first collaboration in the next section of this chapter.
22 Xirgu’s biographer Antonina Rodrigo describes how Xirgu would hang a large photograph of Lorca in the theaters in which the company performed, and how she would lead a minute of silence for him before each performance (Margarita Xirgu 244).
23 “The background thunder of the Militia roots the work in the present; the evocation of lyrical themes germane to Lorca, the reminiscence of El caballero de Olmedo [Lope de Vega’s tragicomedy based on a popular song], ties it to tradition, to the past. The final avenging cry (after La Madre’s aborted efforts, who for all that she tries, cannot escape her obsession with the truncated sentence: ‘But your blood…!’) launches the work into the future, the future that is ours.”
“Crezcan la mejorana, / la yerbabuena, / dalia y clavel del aire, / flores de América.” As such, while La Madre’s repeated cries function as a thread of apparent mourning, they also transform into an act of revival:

¡Pero tu sangre, tu secreta sangre!
¡Abel, clavel tronchado!
¡Pero tu sangre, tu secreta sangre
que revuelve la tierra y ciega el puente,
colma los surcos y amenaza el vado,
Abel, clavel tronchado!

In his introduction, Reyes characterizes La Madre’s “aborted” efforts through the visceral language of maternal loss and emphasizes that it is the chorus who will help to complete her “truncated” declaration. Indeed, the words that they will repeat are hers originally: “¡Pero tu sangre, tu secreta sangre, / Abel, clavel tronchado, / colma los surcos y amenaza el vado!”

The vision being carried into the future has come from La Madre’s mouth, from her understanding of Lorca’s body, and of his “secret blood.” This metaphor supports the queer and transnational kinship that would be enacted through Xirgu’s work to regenerate Lorca. Reyes’s text, as embodied by Xirgu and her company, is an early summoning and even an overflow. In this reading of the performance poem we can find a gesturing beyond mourning, and we can envision Xirgu’s subsequent and continued surrogacy of Lorca’s body as indeed transference of this “secret blood.” The one performance of Cantata would be sufficient. The true embodied cultural knowledge to be surrogated and transferred across nations and artistic mediums (theater, workshops, film, musicals) would be found in the intersection of Lorca’s textual corpus and Xirgu’s artist’s body.
Two months after staging Cantata, Xirgu once again embodied the role of La Madre, but this time as the protagonist of the first filmic adaptation ever of a Lorca play: Bodas de sangre. With the Spanish Civil War still raging, she and her company committed to this urgent, dangerous adaptation project with an untested director, the Argentine theater critic Edmundo Guibourg. The cast that participated in the shooting of the film in the small city of Jesús María, Córdoba, Argentina, from February through March 1938 included every actor in the company that had left Spain for the Latin American tour of 1936—notably Margarita Xirgu (La Madre), Pedro López Lagar (Leonardo), Enrique Álvarez Diosdado (El Novio), Amelia de la Torre (La Novia), Helena Cortesina24 (La Mujer), Alberto Contreras (El Padre)—and other Spanish actors, including Amalia Sánchez Ariño (La Criada), who joined their precarious state of exile in 1937. These were the same actors who had tirelessly continued the Latin American tour through 1937, which ended that year with the Cantata performance (attended by Guibourg, as I previously noted). This was also, in majority, the same cast that had staged Bodas de sangre for its Barcelona debut with Xirgu and Lorca in late November 1935.25 With the Fascists gaining strength over the democratically elected Republican side, the chance of the actors’ prompt return to Spain looked improbable; with Lorca’s murder came the clear signal that Republican artists of demonstrated liberal vision were also in mortal danger in the country. Neither Xirgu nor her company members could have known

24 Cortesina was notably also Spain’s first female film director, with Flor de España o La leyenda de un torero (1923).
25 In a letter dated December 12, 1966, Xirgu’s second husband, Miguel Ortín, recounts to Doménech Guansé (who was working on the first biography of the actress) that “En enero de 1938, filma una película (Bodas de sangre) en la que interviene todo el elenco con que salió de España. [In January 1938, Xirgu films Bodas de sangre, in which the whole cast who left Spain participates]” (Foguet i Boreu “Margarita Xirgu” 42; transcription of Ortín’s letter). As Ortín gathered this information for Guansé while Xirgu was alive, we can infer that he consulted with the actress to compare his recollections with hers.
that this would be their last full-ensemble collaboration,\textsuperscript{26} nor that, while Xirgu would embark upon more than thirty years of dedicating her body’s work to the regeneration of Lorca’s corpus in Latin America, \textit{Bodas de sangre} would remain as her only audio-filmic archival representation together with her original cast.\textsuperscript{27}

While Xirgu herself would later voice the stage actor’s anxiety about oblivion—“The memory of the actors really only lasts as long as the recollection of their contemporaries. We are not a statue, a painting, a poem, a melody” (Xirgu, qtd. in Delgado 21)—\textit{Bodas de sangre} (1938) serves as a partial response to her concern regarding the fleeting quality of her craft. We can trace a line from the ephemeral—Xirgu’s first performances in Barcelona in 1935, and her subsequent stagings of \textit{Bodas de sangre} throughout Latin America—to what in certain form remains in the archive, Xirgu’s performance in the play’s filmic adaptation. The film captures Margarita Xirgu’s theater company performing for posterity, but also transmitting Lorca’s body of work in exile, in a medium that would have the potential to cross the boundaries of both nation and time, surviving even beyond the death of all of its creators.

Contrary to Diana Taylor’s dichotomy of the archive and the repertoire, \textit{Bodas de sangre} (1938) demonstrates an “act of transfer” of collective memory from a repertoire into the archive of the filmic document. \textit{Bodas de sangre} constitutes a unique agent for historical memory activism because it reveals and safeguards the embodiment of Lorca and Xirgu’s

\textsuperscript{26} In the same December 12, 1966 letter, Ortín explains that Xirgu’s company dispersed in late 1939 due to the actress’s health problems at the time: “Sigue la temporada de 1938 hasta fines de 1939 en Argentina, Uruguay y Chile, donde disuelve su compañía por enfermedad, quedando radicada en aquel país por algún tiempo, ya que no puede dedicarse a ninguna actividad. [The theater season continues from 1938 until the end of 1939 in Argentina, Uruguay and Chile, where her company dissolves due to [her] sickness. Xirgu ends up residing in Chile for awhile because she cannot do anything else]” (Foguet i Boreu “Margarita Xirgu” 42; transcription). Various members would continue their exile in Argentina, Uruguay, and Mexico, collaborating on certain occasions with Xirgu, while others would return to Spain (Margarita Xirgu virtual archive, margaritaxirgu.es).

\textsuperscript{27} Uruguayan-born (to an exiled Spanish father) director Narciso “Chicho” Ibáñez Serrador worked with Xirgu to film \textit{La casa de Bernarda Alba} for Televisión Argentina in November 1958 (Xirgu web archive), but this project did not include Xirgu’s full theater company, and the play was not one that Xirgu had staged with Lorca during his lifetime.
work and manifests limitless possibilities for transmission. Generations later, we can even apply Laura Mulvey’s theory of spectatorship in *Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image*, in which she explores the spectator’s ability to rewind, replay and freeze a film, often with a consciousness that the actors performing in it have long passed. Mulvey echoes Roland Barthes’s preoccupation in his essay *On Photography* that the medium captures as hauntingly present what is now absent, reminding us of our own mortality. Mulvey’s theory and Barthes’s reflections are doubly resonant when we watch *Bodas de sangre* knowing not only that all of its creators have now passed, but that their original intention appeared to be a certain recovery of the recently assassinated Lorca via the preservation of his dramatic—and poetic and musical—corpus.

In *El último bohemio* (1981), a collection of interviews published as a book, Guibourg describes his relationship with Lorca and recounts the situation in which the *Bodas de sangre* adaptation arose. Here, he makes a series of assertions that are relevant to understanding the film’s intended purpose and its current capacity to transmit Lorquian historical memory.

Con García Lorca y Eichelbaum dirijimos [sic] una compañía radial, con Lola Membrives de primera actriz, que fue un gran fracaso. Duró tres meses no más, porque no hubo productor para eso. Pero cuando ocurrió la gran tragedia del fusilamiento de García Lorca, la pena cundió en el mundo, especialmente entre los que habíamos tenido una gran amistad, un entendimiento total con él. García Lorca, entre la gente de teatro, tuvo real afinidad con Encarnación López, “la argentinita,” mujer de Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, y con Margarita Xirgú [sic] a quien consagró sus mejores obras. Teniendo la certeza de esta intimidad, me vino a ver Margarita, después de la muerte de García Lorca, en el año ’38, y me dijo que el único que podía hacerle el guión y la dirección de la película era yo. Intenté hacerle ver que no era un hombre de cine, pero Margarita insistió que ninguno estaba tan identificado con García Lorca, y con su obra, como para hacer un trabajo de esa naturaleza. Repetí que no era hombre de cine, pero que iba a tratar de
aprender. Ella me dijo que no había tiempo, que había que aceptar y hacerlo. Y acepté.28 (Guibourg, *El último bohemio* 70)

The film debuted on November 16, 1938 and was screened for thirteen days at the Cine-Teatro Monumental in Buenos Aires, where according to Guibourg it enjoyed “[m]ucha repercusión” (Guibourg, *El último bohemio* 70-72). However, it did not appear to have much impact elsewhere. According to Guibourg, the problem was not the quality of the film, but rather its lack of circulation. In 1938, it wasn’t distributed throughout Latin America or even Argentina because the private company C.I.F.A. (Compañía Industrial Filmadora Argentina)—founded by the Argentine socialist Silvio Ruggieri for the sole purpose29 of producing *Bodas de sangre* (Rodríguez Terceño)—was not affiliated with other distributors. In fact, the *Bodas de sangre* film appears to have been almost forgotten for at least thirty-two years. According to Guibourg, when Xirgu’s widower Miguel Ortín returned to Spain in 1971, he expressed a desire to recuperate and circulate the film there (*El último bohemio* 72). However, Guibourg claimed that unfortunately, with the passage of time, all the copies had been lost (“Lástima que se perdieron las copias” [72]).

*Bodas de sangre* (1938) is the second exilic text that demonstrates the existence of the crucial and yet partially forgotten embodied Lorquian archive that Margarita Xirgu forged.

28 “García Lorca, Eichelbaum and I directed a radio performance, with Lola Membrives as the leading actress, and it was a huge failure. It lasted just three months because there wasn’t a producer for it. But when the great tragedy of García Lorca’s execution happened, pain spread throughout the world, especially among those who had shared a great friendship, a complete understanding with him. García Lorca, among the people of the theater world, had a true connection with Encarnación López, “The Little Argentine,” wife of Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, and with Margarita Xirgu, to whom he dedicated his best works. Having the certainty of this close relationship, after the death of García Lorca, in 1938, Margarita came to see me, and she told me that the only person who was able to make a screenplay and direct the film was me. I tried to make her see that I wasn’t a man of the cinema, but Margarita insisted that no one else could identify so closely with García Lorca, and with his work, such that they could do a project of this nature. I repeated that I wasn’t a man of the cinema, but that I was going to try to learn. She told me that there wasn’t any time, that I had to accept the job and do it. And I accepted.”

29 Utrera Macías also emphasizes the responsibility that the larger artistic community in Buenos Aires felt toward commemorating Lorca, and that this was due to his several month sojourn in the Argentine capital on the occasion of Lola Membrives’s debut of *Bodas de sangre* (1933-1934) (Utrera Macías 38-9).
The production and archival history of the film are rife with contradictions and false claims—including by Guibourg—that appear to be at least partially responsible for the scant scholarly attention that it has received to date (in Spanish, English, and Catalan). As such, there are two levels of historical memory to be addressed: first, the film as a trans-American and Atlantic archival artifact repeatedly lost and then found, only to be subsequently forgotten (suffering multiple exiles, of sorts); and second, the adaptation project as the first instance of filmic activism to preserve and proliferate Lorquian embodied knowledge. *Bodas de sangre* (1938), as an artifact, is an essential piece of the fragmented puzzle that remains of Margarita Xirgu’s work as a performing actress. *Bodas* (1938) and *Cantata*, in their existing archival states, comprise complementary pieces of that puzzle because one lacks where the other is rich in accessible information. As I mentioned earlier, the original manuscript of *Cantata* is not available, and no photos or audio or filmic recordings have ever been found. However, a transcription of the text is easily located, together with Reyes’s intention for Xirgu in the introduction, on the universally accessible Cervantes Virtual web archive. Meanwhile, it turns out that—despite Guibourg’s claims—the audiovisual components of *Bodas* (1938) have survived, but there is no extant screenplay or officially recognized (or easily accessible) original copy. Furthermore, testimony from various sources (including Guibourg and those who knew Xirgu) varies regarding who truly took the lead on the film project to make key decisions regarding the adaptation of Lorca’s original text and the direction of the performances to be included.

Xirgu scholars who presumably, by writing about *Bodas de sangre* (1938), had an opportunity to view the film have failed to underscore its significance. Antonina Rodrigo purportedly took pains to recover a full copy of the 35 mm film (Tapia [Valverde]), but she
only devoted a short paragraph to it in her extensive 1974 biography, *Margarita Xirgu y su teatro*, and has never published more extensively on it.\(^{30}\) The description of the film on the Xirgu web archive is mainly drawn verbatim—albeit without attribution—from Rodrigo. For her part, Maria Delgado repeats earlier scholars’ dismissals of the work, noting in the single sentence she devotes to Xirgu’s cinematic adaptation that “[a]t the beginning of 1938 [Xirgu] was involved in a film version of *Bodas de sangre* with which she was disappointed, stating to the actor Alfredo Alcón that the director Guibourg was a fine critic but a poor film director” (Burgueño and Mirza 22 qtd. in Delgado, 48-9). Nonetheless, the question that all of their critical dismissals begs is how much of the original film they were able to view or if they were each simply citing the testimonies of others.

*Bodas de sangre* has been recovered, “premiered” in Spain, and subsequently disregarded multiple times. Aided by online and in-person archival research, I have been able to reconstruct the timeline of the film’s public screenings. *Bodas de sangre* most likely debuted in Spain on November 12, 1983, in Madrid. The Círculo de Bellas Artes in the capital hosted this premiere, but only sixteen spectators attended; at a second screening there on December 22, sixty-seven spectators were present.\(^{31}\) On June 12 and 15, 2000, Cineclassics aired the film on television (“Televisión,” Hemeroteca *ABC*). Unfortunately, the version they screened includes a number of scenes out of their proper order.\(^{32}\) In 2007 and 2008, *Bodas de

---

\(^{30}\) Rodrigo’s writing on the film adaptation is limited to this paragraph: “A principios de 1938 empezó a rodarse en la ciudad de Jesús María la obra lorquiana *Bodas de sangre*. La realizaba Edmundo Guibourg, para la compañía Industrial Filmadora Argentina. La música era de Juan José Castro, los decorados de Rodolfo Franco y los figurines y ambientación de la madrileña Victoria Durán. El reparto estaba a cargo de Margarita Xirgu, como protagonista; Amelia de la Torre, López Lagar y Enrique A. Diosdado en los primeros papeles. A mediados de noviembre del mismo año, se estrenaba en el Monumental de Buenos Aires” (Rodrigo, *Margarita Xirgu y su teatro* 255).

\(^{31}\) Filmoteca Española librarian José Luis Estarrona kindly accessed and shared with me the Filmoteca Española database of all of the film screening dates and attendance figures on January 21, 2016.

\(^{32}\) Cineclassics was a television channel owned by Canal Satélite (Digital), affiliated at the time with the French station Cinefil, which ran from 1994 until 2001 with presenter Julio Feo Zarandieta, a Spanish journalist and
sangre “premiered” again at the Teatre Zorilla in Badalona (Xirgu archive) and at the Centro de Estudios Lorquianos in Fuente Vaqueros (Valverde). This last “premiere” is perhaps the most disappointing, not only for the specious claims of a Spanish and European debut embraced by periodicals including *El País*, *ABC*, *Granada Hoy* and *Ideal*, but because nothing more substantial was achieved to publicize or study the film in the following decade. While the Centro de Estudios Lorquianos announced plans to create a digital archive of lost “gems” of Lorquian filmography (together with the Patronato Federico García Lorca, the Diputación de Granada, the Filmoteca de Andalucía and the Consejería de Cultura), the initiative culminated in 2011 in a book and website authored by Rafael Utrera Macías, *Mar de lunas*, that added minimal scholarship but did not make the film available online.

A handful of accessible copies of *Bodas de sangre* exist in Spain today. Two copies of the 35mm reels are archived, one at the Filmoteca Española in Madrid and another—in poor condition and unusable—at the Centro de Estudios Federico García Lorca in Fuente Vaqueros. At least four DVD and VHS copies of the film are housed and viewable at those two institutions, and at the Centro/Fundación Federico García Lorca in Granada; the latter’s VHS tape of *Bodas de sangre* (1938) is most likely from the 1983 premiere, but the archivist there does not know who donated it. While the film is not listed in their online catalogue

film critic based in France since 1976. The copy of the television emission includes a brief introduction by Feo Zarandieta. The improper sequencing makes the film especially difficult to follow since Guibourg’s adaptation already takes liberties with the plot’s chronology and includes various scenes not found in the dramatic text.

33 Following journalist Juan Luis Tapia’s claims to have “discovered” the film, the national newspaper *El País* ran the headline “Margarita vuelve con Lorca: Se estrena en España la película ‘Bodas de sangre’ tras 70 años de olvido” (Valverde).

34 The Fundación Federico García Lorca copy is marked Buhigas Films. Buhigas Films was a production company that was founded in Madrid in 1960 by Juan Jesús Buhigas Villaverde. It is unclear when Buhigas Films purchased the rights to *Bodas de sangre* (1938) from CIFA in Argentina.

35 I encountered and consulted the Centro/Fundación Federico García Lorca’s VHS copy of *Bodas de sangre* (1938) multiple days in early February 2016 when the Fundación was still based in Madrid at the Residencia de Estudiantes. The FFGL archivist and librarian Rosa Illán attempted to trace the provenance of the Fundación’s copy and could not find this information.
and has never been publicly screened, it was available for individual onsite viewing and is in proper sequence. A fifth copy is accessible on YouTube, but only for viewers outside of Spain. In sum, more than one functioning copy of Bodas de sangre (1938) arrived in Spain and the film has been debuted multiple times across the country, but to little impact. Certainly, the first filmic adaptation of Lorca’s corpus, replete with theater, poetry and music, and the only sound film produced, mere months after the playwright’s death, by the theatrical company with which he had worked extensively, demands more sustained critical attention. In this next section, I take up this endeavor and examine three key questions in Bodas de sangre (1938): first, how the film depicts Xirgu as its primary subject, demonstrating the theater-maker’s agency and prioritizing her performances; second, how its historical memory activism is visible through aesthetic and adaptation choices; and third, how a larger Lorquian corpus and repertoire are preserved in the film.

3. BODAS DE SANGRE (1938): READING XIRGU AND LORCA’S REPERTOIRE

Lorca’s fame as a poet grew exponentially in the 1920s, such that he quickly became the most prominent figure of what would come to be known as the Generación del 27. His publication of Romanero gitano in 1928 made history as the bestselling collection of poetry of its day, lauded by critics and enjoyed by a diverse reading public. However, Lorca’s talent as

36 I first encountered Bodas de sangre (1938) on the user Azanista2’s channel (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ffmd0p-lZkA) in late 2013. According to YouTube, Azanista2 uploaded the film on April 15, 2012. While Azanista2 appears to be uploading video content from Spain, their Bodas copy cannot be viewed from a Spanish IP due to local copyright law (but can be from the US and Mexico). Indeed, the rights to Bodas de sangre (1938) are now owned by Video Mercury, the distribution company belonging to Enrique Cerezo, who in turn possesses seventy-seven percent of all Spanish cinema (Mucha). (It’s not clear what percentage of Argentine film they claim to possess.) Cerezo is currently the president of EGEDA (Entidad de Gestión de Derechos de los Productores Audiovisuales), which blocks illegal uploads. According to the Filmoteca Española’s database, Video Mercury bought the distribution rights to Bodas de sangre (1938) in 2001 from the Spanish production company Buhigas Films, which had acquired the film from its original distributor, CIFA.
a playwright was not recognized and did not flourish until he began collaboration with Xirgu. Ten years his senior, the Catalan theater-maker was already known throughout Spain and Latin America for her uniquely powerful performances and socially committed theater. As Delgado recounts in her chapter “An author of authors: Margarita Xirgu” (‘Other’ Spanish Theatres), Xirgu’s credentials spanned Catalan and Spanish Golden Age and contemporary theater, and international theater in translation. From very early on, her social commitment highlighted feminist agency. Xirgu’s radical performance of Oscar Wilde’s Salomé in 1910 “articulated an urge not to be desired as an object but to sexually desire” (Delgado 29), decades before embodying the freedom-seeking protagonists of Lorca’s Mariana Pineda and Yerma, or playing the powerful foil to La Novia in Bodas de sangre. She had a track record of promoting internationalism and cultivating Spanish dramaturgy (Delgado 32-34). In Xirgu’s case, this meant staging European theater in translation in Spain, and inspiring Spanish playwrights to compose theater for her to perform domestically and abroad. By the time she met Lorca in 1926, Spanish playwrights such as Benito Pérez Galdós, Benavente, Marquina, and the Quintero Brothers had all written plays for her to successfully stage in both Spain and Latin America (Delgado 34; Xirgu archive, “Biografía cronológica”), and she had completed three transatlantic tours to Argentina, Cuba, Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Peru, Venezuela, and Puerto Rico. Lorca, meanwhile, experienced a major critical failure with the debut of his first play, El maleficio de la mariposa, at the Teatro Eslava in Madrid in 1920, and his career as a playwright stalled. His greatest success in the performing arts prior to collaborating with Margarita Xirgu was working with Manuel de Falla to stage the Concurso de Cante Jondo, a landmark celebration of flamenco, in Granada in 1922.
It was not until Xirgu agreed to take the eponymous lead in Lorca’s *Mariana Pineda*, finally debuting in June 1927 in Barcelona,\(^{37}\) that the doors began to open for the playwright. In fact, it was the weight of Xirgu’s performance, as well as her image as a star theater-maker that brought further production opportunities in Madrid, Barcelona, and abroad in Argentina, coinciding with what would be Lorca’s most productive play-writing period and the creation of his famous “Blood Trilogy”: *Bodas de sangre* (1933), *Yerma* (1934) and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (1936). One of the uniquely defining characteristics of Lorca’s most popular plays (read: frequently staged, both in his lifetime and afterward) is that they prominently feature women. This should be credited, at least in part, to the original assurance of his success with Xirgu as his protagonist. Delgado emphasizes Xirgu’s influence on Lorca:

> His own comments on their relationship, his dedication of a poem to her – ‘Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla’ (Arrest of Antoñito el Camborio on the road to Seville) – as well as interviews given by both practitioners during the period between 1927 and 1936 indicate that Xirgu may have shaped the Granadine’s theatrical vision in ways which are too rarely acknowledged. (39)

As I have cited earlier in one of Guibourg’s interviews, the theater critic-turned-filmmaker also acknowledged that Lorca “consecrated” his best works to Xirgu (Guibourg 70). Aligning with Delgado’s scholarship, I believe that Xirgu’s creative influence was inextricable from how Lorca created and staged his dramatic works. Together, they forged a formidable partnership of unparalleled talent. In their nine years of collaboration, Lorca quickly became a seasoned practitioner of both his own plays and Golden Age theater. As Rodrigo recounts, Lorca was known to “cuidar todos los detalles,” taking an active role both staging and performance (*Margarita Xirgu* 143), which demonstrates his personal involvement and

\(^{37}\) For a detailed historical account of Lorca’s struggle to stage *Mariana Pineda* before Xirgu joined the project, see Martínez Cuitiño (28).
firsthand knowledge of how Xirgu and her company built his repertoire. Xirgu was not a surrogate in its most literal definition as a secondary “substitute.” Rather, she embodied the full garden (wellspring and bounty) of Lorquian dramatic creation and was most equipped to further its growth and dissemination, as Lorca’s poem “A Margarita” conveys.

Just prior to filming *Bodas de sangre*, Xirgu and her company visited the University of Chile in Santiago to stage and offer theater workshops on Lorca’s *Bodas de sangre, Doña Rosita la soltera, Yerma*, and *La zapatera prodigiosa*. Cipriano Rivas Cherif, the original artistic director to work with her on these plays, had left the company’s tour in July 1936 to return to Spain to support the Republican cause. (Rivas Cherif’s brother-in-law was Manuel Azaña, Prime Minister and President of the Spanish Republic.) Since Rivas Cherif’s departure, Xirgu had assumed the role of artistic director, in addition to continuing her roles as director of the company and the lead in each of its productions. In his essay describing the workshops, complete with illustrations, *Federico García Lorca a través de Margarita Xirgu*, the Chilean poet Arturo Aldunate Phillips testifies to witnessing Xirgu’s directorial authority over the text. Aldunate Phillips goes so far as to characterize her as the embodied medium through which the audience was able to access Lorca’s theatrical corpus.

In the first section, titled “El teatro, el autor, y la intérprete,” Aldunate Phillips notes of the workshops that “[…] Los rasgos distintivos del teatro del poeta granadino, conocidos entre nosotros, más que todo, por presentimiento, han sido puestos, materialmente a nuestro alcance por la gran actriz catalana (17).”38 Aldunate Phillips further asserts that Lorca’s theater “needed” Xirgu (18), explaining that the actress coexisted (“convivió”) with the playwright during the creation of his works (18), a notion that further contributes to an understanding

---

38 “The distinctive characteristics of the granadino poet’s theater, known amongst us, more than anything by intuition, have been materially put at our reach by the great Catalan actress” (Aldunate Phillips 17).
of their queer kinship. Aldunate Phillips’s subsequent description of Xirgu as a Lorquian theater educator will be of even greater importance to analyzing Bodas de sangre (1938), as it provides elements observed in her theater performances that we can find in the film:

Margarita Xirgú [sic] emplea para debelar ante nuestros ojos los diversos matices de la creación artística, todos los medios al alcance de su vigorosa personalidad; desde el significado literal de las palabras, pasando por la interpretación que le presta la inflexión y la entonación de la voz, hasta la profunda evocación del silencio, la eufonía del sonido, y la traducción emotiva del gesto. [...] Pone, en seguida, en su trabajo, tal cariño y emoción, da al contenido de la obra, tal manejo litúrgico que logra valorizar, con perfecta nitidez, todas las graduaciones escondidas en su texto. (Aldunate Phillips 18)

All of the strategies that Xirgu adopts to transmit the Lorquian corpus for the Universidad de Chile workshops, as detailed by Aldunate Phillips, will also be evident in her filmic performance in Bodas de sangre. These include inflexion and intonation, her use of silence, the song-like articulation of her lines (“eufonía”), and her emotive gestures, all performed with great feeling and precision to reflect a profound understanding of the layers of the text.

The film Bodas de sangre, like the play, is a tragedy concerning two feuding families whose covetous desires cause generations of spilled blood. The first family is represented by La Madre (Xirgu) and her son, El Novio (Enrique Diosdado), who is engaged to La Novia (Amelia de la Torre). La Novia is the former lover of Leonardo (Pedro López Lagar), who is now married to La Mujer (Helena Cortesina). Leonardo’s family is responsible for the death of both La Madre’s husband and her other son. While Guibourg’s adaptation eliminates many lines from Lorca’s original drama, including those of Xirgu’s character, his camera

---

39 “Margarita Xirgú employs, to conquer before our eyes, the diverse aspects of artistic creation, all the forms at the reach of her vigorous personality; from the literal meaning of the words, to their interpretation that she provides with her voice’s inflexion and intonation, to the emotive translation of her gestures. [...] She immediately puts such affection and emotion into her work, and gives such liturgical control to the content of the play that she is able to evaluate with perfect definition all the hidden levels within the text.”

40 Aldunate Phillips’s description beautifully anticipates Xirgu’s own description of her work as “liturgia” in the 1956 El Día interview. See footnote 1.
works from the very beginning to establish her as the protagonist. The film begins well before Lorca’s text, with the murder by shooting that sets in motion the tragedy of fated repetition in the next generation of men. La Madre (Xirgu) is initially shown in two long shots. First we see her inside her home, sewing in the company of her two young children. This domestic interior shot, with one child in a cradle, is similar to a later depiction of La Mujer de Leonardo at home, perhaps foreshadowing that the two women will share a similar fate. Suddenly, presumably after having heard the gunshot, La Madre stands alone in the doorframe. She is about to receive the news of her husband’s death. In these initial glimpses of La Madre (min. 3), the camera teaches us as spectators to observe Xirgu’s full body, and shortly afterward, to follow its gestures. When she encounters her fallen husband (min. 4:29), the camera is centered on him, with La Madre’s body descending from the top right corner of the frame to embrace him. The scene occurs with two takes edited together, such that the second half of La Madre’s embrace, a medium close-up, features the characters on the left side of the frame. Both shots emphasize how Xirgu moves her body to grapple with the tragedy, the second one illuminating La Madre’s hand cradling her dead husband’s head.

![Fig. 1 - Stills taken from 00: 04:37 and 00: 04:39.](image-url)
Guibourg’s film adaptation also includes the death of El Novio’s brother by the same knife that will be responsible for the final tragic dénouement. The scene before this second death is an adapted version of the opening of Lorca’s play, with El Novio’s lines shared between the two brothers in dialogue with La Madre. Guibourg’s inclusion of this brother and son’s death is another opportunity to feature Xirgu’s performance of grief, and the camera framing and lighting similarly focus on the movement of the actress’s hands. In this second scene, however, the camera follows her bloodied trembling hands as they move away from touching her son’s body and rise toward her lips. She will repeat a similar gesture after the death of El Novio.

![Fig. 2 - Stills taken from 00:18:29 and 00:18:42.](image)

Guibourg’s plot adaptation to include these two prior deaths offers two forms of archive activism. By making the tragic metamorphosis of La Madre from wife and mother into widowed mother who has lost both of her children more prominent, *Bodas de sangre* (1938) creates more opportunities to capture Xirgu’s repertoire of affect. La Madre’s metamorphosis also alludes to Xirgu’s personal transformation from Lorca’s partner and co-progenitor of his theater to one who has suffered deeply from his assassination, and who has become the primary guardian responsible for the memory of what was lost.
Costume in the *Bodas de sangre* film adaptation also plays an important role in how we see Xirgu as its central archival focus. In the first scenes, Xirgu wears lighter colors, her hair uncovered. She’s not a widow yet, but on the (literal) threshold of becoming one. While other characters will also change costume for the wedding scenes, La Madre’s transformation into a widow is much more powerful in the high contrast aesthetic of black and white film. Indeed, La Madre’s new costume of all black mourning clothing, including various headscarves, will better frame her face so that the spectator is more quickly drawn to observe her intense facial expressions. Guibourg’s camera framing will take this intention to another level, reserving extended tightly cropped close-ups only for the Madre on several occasions throughout the film. Here we see how Guibourg’s contribution to the Lorquian archive also serves as historical memory activism to remember the exiled Xirgu, capturing her multiple times in animated portraiture.

![Fig. 3 - Stills taken from 00:19:19 and a dramatic track-in to an extreme close-up at 1:19:10.](image)

That the camera grants primary importance via visual prominence to Xirgu is also evidenced in various dialogue scenes with the other characters essential to the plot, namely, El Novio, La Novia, and La Mujer. In a scene following the death of El Novio’s brother, La Madre’s son, we are presented with a long shot of the two remaining family members in their home. At this point, La Madre has made the full transformation to wearing all black,
including a black veil/headscarf. During the length of their conversation about his brother’s death, the camera will cut away from El Novio’s question, “¿A qué evocar siempre lo mismo?” to a close-up of La Madre’s face (19:17) as she delivers her lines, “Dos hombres, que eran dos geranios. Cien años que yo viviera, no hablaría de otra cosa.” While the camera will cut back to the long shot for La Madre to complete her response, “Cien años que yo viviera, no hablaría de otra cosa,” the sudden insertion of a close up of her emphasizes that the actor whose reactions are most important for the transmission of affect is Xirgu. Once again, this moment underlines the act of bearing witness and testifying to these deaths.

Shortly afterward (min. 20-21), in the scene in which La Madre is presented to her surviving son’s fiancée/La Novia and her father/El Padre (Alberto Contreras), with El Novio present, we observe that the camera emphasizes Xirgu once again. In a medium close-up, La Madre inspects La Novia, whose back is to the camera. Once again, Xirgu’s expressive face is that much more captivating because it is framed by her widow’s headscarf. The camera will repeat the same framing technique during the wedding scene (min. 56-57), giving us another medium close-up of Xirgu’s face while La Novia is turned toward her, and away from us.

Another character that we might expect to be similarly visually distinguished is La Mujer de Leonardo because Guibourg initially appears to amplify her role in his adaptation of the plot. In Lorca’s play, El Novio is the first acknowledged character to leave the wedding scene to look for his bride, only to return announcing that he can’t find her (Acto Segundo, Cuadro Segundo 139). In Guibourg’s adaptation, this part is cut and replaced with images of what Lorca’s play would have the public assume happens offstage: La Mujer de

41 “Why do you always evoke the same thing?” El Novio asks. La Madre responds, “Two men, that were two geraniums. If I were to live a hundred years, I wouldn’t speak of anything else.”
Leonardo, shown in long shots looking for her husband (1:08:00 through 1:10:00).

Guibourg’s adaptation rejoins Lorca’s dramatic text as La Mujer bursts back onto the scene of the wedding, announcing that La Novia and Leonardo have abandoned the celebrations and run off together. However, while the lines that are delivered are an exchange between La Mujer, El Padre, La Madre and El Novio, the camera once again emphasizes La Madre over all others. We watch the dialogue through a medium close-up of La Madre as she delivers her accusatory affirmation, “Tu hija, sí” to El Padre. Xirgu’s powerful delivery of these lines as the majority of the cast in the wedding surrounds her is another archival window onto her theater performances, where proper vocal projection to reach her full audience was necessary. While we might expect La Mujer and El Novio to follow La Madre’s reaction and show devastation at the news of their respective spouse’s escape, the camera does not foreground their expressions through clear reaction shots. Instead, the camera only briefly pans over to La Mujer, whose face is obscured by her dark hair.

The final scenes of Guibourg’s *Bodas de sangre* best exemplify the film’s ability to archive Xirgu’s embodied Lorquian knowledge. They do so by privileging La Madre in a series of close-ups that are exceptionally well lit so as to focus our attention on her facial expressions and gesturing arms, as well as the slow crescendo of her voice. As the townswomen gather for the funeral of El Novio and Leonardo, an early close-up of La Madre speaking (beginning at 1:22:44) hints that her reaction, at 1:26:17, will be of greatest significance in the dénouement.
Roach has emphasized how “[p]erformance genealogies draw on the idea of expressive movements as mnemonic reserves” (*Cities of the Dead* 26). We can find this concept illustrated in Xirgu’s gestures and voice (a gesture emanating from her interior), particularly in the final scene of *Bodas de sangre* (beginning at 1:26:00). About to faint, held up by the townswomen, La Madre enters the church where the bodies of her son, El Novio, and Leonardo, lie. The two have killed one another with knife wounds in an offscreen fight over La Novia. Xirgu as La Madre kneels in front of the bodies and recites the last lines of the play as a monologue. “Con un cuchillo (with a [mere] knife),” she begins, her voice rising from a deep tremble.

Several times during her career, Xirgu expressed that she doubted that she could achieve the same level of performance in film as in theater. As she saw it, the medium lacked both the momentum of a staged play and the live, embodied connection with an audience. In a July 16, 1930 interview for *Imágenes* Xirgu explained,

> Como invento, algo maravilloso. Artísticamente, faltará siempre la emotividad propia de una representación teatral. Cuando estamos ante el público, los actores formamos con el público un conjunto, que vibra al impulso de la misma emoción que hemos logrado transmitirle. En el cine, usted sabe que se filman seguidas las escenas que se desarrollan dentro de un mismo escenario, aunque pertenezcan a dos momentos bien distanciados de la obra. Forzosamente el artista debe encontrar a faltar el calor ascendente, la unidad
In the climatic scene of *Bodas de sangre* (1938), Xirgu does have a live and captive audience with whom she can connect. Surrounded by the townspeople, her theater company, Xirgu’s performance is inseparable from their reactions. The camera emphasizes this by framing a variety of long and medium shots of the funeral and its attendees (one of whom, an older woman, helps La Madre remain standing), before closing in on Xirgu for her final monologue. As such, it is clear, even in the extreme close-ups of Xirgu, that she is not performing alone. In a change of camera and editing technique, the last close-ups of La Madre alternate with close-ups of the townspeople listening and reacting to her monologue. As such, the film offers a solution of sorts to reunite the “calor ascendente” of the actress’s climatic performance with the audience of those present with her, allowing the spectator to witness the emotion she transmits to them.

Xirgu’s final monologue in the film diverges from Lorca’s dramatic text, where both La Madre and La Novia, alternating in a sort of poem-dialogue, recite the last lines together. In the film version of *Bodas de sangre*, however, it is La Madre who is verbally and visually most compelling. Her authority as the ultimate protagonist of the film is confirmed for a final time in various shots of Xirgu in sharply focused and tightly framed close-ups, which

---

42 “As an invention, it’s marvelous. Artistically, it will always lack performed theater’s ability to emote. As actors, when we are in front of an audience, we form a union together that vibrates at the impulse of the same emotion that we are able to transmit to them. In cinema, you know that they all film the scenes that will take place on the same set together, even if they belong to moments that are far apart in the narrative. As a result, the artist must force how they find rising heat/intensity, the unity of their action, the cohesion between the depth/truth of the plot and the spectator.” (*Imagenes*, qtd. in Xirgu web archive)

43 Citing Guibourg’s May 9, 1975 interview in *La Opinión*, Utrera Macías claims this scene employs shot reverse shot because Xirgu “abandoned” the filming. According to Guibourg, Xirgu insisted on ending the scene with the delivery of her complete monologue. While part of her recitation might have been shot separately, even in the close up frames we can see the hands of other actors/townspeople attending the funeral. Furthermore, later in this chapter I assert that Xirgu’s recorded recitations of Lorca’s poetry were also embodied knowledge in action.
are intercut with panning and static close-ups of other townspeople listening to her. There is only one shot of La Novia, in a medium shot listening to La Madre with her head hung in tragic defeat (1:26:39)—we do not even see La Novia’s face. Indeed, in every scene she shares with La Madre, La Novia seems to serve as a visual foil to Xirgu. In this final scene of them together, Guibourg’s camera will return to Xirgu in an extended close-up for the delivery of the last lines. Although Francisco García Lorca, the playwright’s brother, would insist that Lorca considered the dialogue version of the play’s ending to be Federico’s ultimate intention, citing the last version of the manuscript (Josephs and Caballero 167), Xirgu’s filmic performance makes an authoritative replacement. Together with the gestures of her body—on her knees, bowing her head and ignoring the camera—Xirgu’s voice transmits profound pain and deeply engrained knowledge, signaling both her embodiment of Lorca’s tragedy, and alluding perhaps to the historical memory activism of her unique responsibility to bear her friend’s corpus.

As I have demonstrated, Guibourg’s adaptation privileges Xirgu as the actor whose Lorquian performance was the most important to capture (archive) filmically. However, Bodas de sangre (1938) can also be studied for its historical memory activism to recuperate poems, and possibly music, that were not a part of his original play. Guibourg’s filmic adaptation reorganizes, re-layers and thickens the tissue of the Bodas de sangre text, and also includes two of Lorca’s poems from Romancero gitano: verses from “Reyerta”44 (min. 5) as a super text summarizing the plot of families feuding over land (but also, possibly alluding to the Spanish Civil War), and stanzas from “Romance sonámbulo” eerily sung by La Novia (min. 36-37). The film also expands on the original dramatic text to include a wedding scene

44 “Sangre resbalada gime / muda canción de serpiente” (25-26).
(approximately 1:00:00) of most of the cast singing Lorca’s widely popular\textsuperscript{45} composition of the Spanish folk song “¡Anda, Jaleo!” as well as a performance of the “Despierta la novia” song found in the play set with the same melody as Lorca’s arrangement of “Las tres hojas” (also from \textit{Canciones populares}). (José Jordá had arranged the choral music [Rodrigo, \textit{García Lorca en Cataluña} 363]). Additions such as Lorca’s poem “Reyerta” to open the film appear to reflect Guibourg’s vision for the adaptation, but the poetry of “La Nana” (beginning min. 33:11), the cradle song performed by La Suegra and La Mujer, is original to the poet-playwright and musician, who accompanied on piano when he was present for theater stagings (Rodrigo, \textit{García Lorca en Cataluña} 363). It is unclear if La Novia’s song version of “Romance sonámbulo” was also Lorca’s composition, but the possibility, given its context, is quite suggestive. The layering of Lorca’s poetic and musical corpus onto the film demonstrates both the will and capacity of the original cast, led by Xirgu and supported by Guibourg, to recover and regenerate the poet-playwright’s fuller corpus in the filmic medium and archive.

4. “EL TEATRO ES LA POESÍA QUE SE HACE HUMANA”: XIRGU’S LORQUIAN PEDAGOGY TRANSFERRED TO THE AMERICAS

After her film collaboration with Guibourg, Xirgu re-approached \textit{Bodas de sangre} with several important artistic interventions that demonstrated her continued dedication to the text and its playwright. First, in 1939, she assumed the role of director for Juan José Castro’s musical adaptation of \textit{Bodas de sangre} staged at the Teatro SODRE in Montevideo. This progression

\textsuperscript{45} “Anda Jaleo” was employed much later in subversive Transition-era documentaries addressing the Civil War by such filmmakers as Basilio Martín Patino (\textit{Retablo de la Guerra Civil Española} [1980]). As such \textit{Bodas de sangre} (1938) is a coincidental but curious precursor, demonstrating both what memory needed to be recovered, but also what sort of texts or songs might activate or provoke the recuperation of both the lost Second Spanish Republic or the traumas of that loss.
into new generic terrain suggests that Xirgu had at least enjoyed the creative collaboration with Castro, who was responsible for the musical arrangements in the film. Perhaps, indirectly, it also reveals her concern to avoid fossilizing the Lorquian archive in Guibourg’s filmic adaptation. Xirgu had already, and would again, perform her role as La Madre hundreds of times, but her reenactment of Bodas as a director and in yet another genre demonstrates Lepecki’s theory that “one re-enacts not to fix a work in its singularity [...] but to unlock, release, and actualize [it]” (31). Lepecki’s understanding of the artist’s body as an archival space that promotes continuous unlocking and exploration can be applied productively to approach the rest of Xirgu’s dramatic career in exile, which would shift toward running theater programs and directing plays, even as she continued to act. As such, Xirgu demonstrated that her mission to continue forward with Lorca beyond his death did not solely involve the surrogacy of archiving his cuerpo/corpus “onto/into her body” (Lepecki 34); it simultaneously involved transferring her embodied Lorquian knowledge to aspiring Latin American theater-makers such that they might also unlock and embody that archive. This work was pedagogical and political, expressing a commitment to spreading the vanguard theater that was most emblematic of the Spanish Second Republic throughout the Americas, and to do so by playing a leadership role in the national and university theaters of Chile and Uruguay.

Other scholars (such as Guansé, Rodrigo, and Foguet i Boreu), as well as the curators of the Xirgu archive, have already completed the extensive research to document every play that Xirgu staged, and the theaters and schools where she worked in Latin

---

46 In 1939, Castro also worked with Manuel de Falla, Lorca’s mentor, collaborator, and friend, who left Spain at the end of the Spanish Civil War for Argentina. Falla and Castro would continue their creative collaboration until Falla’s death, in exile, in 1946.
America. I will not repeat their work here, but rather extract a selected timeline for
consideration, highlighting in particular the events that exemplify her continued commitment
to regenerating Lorca’s corpus. These include performances, major pedagogical projects, and
significant political moments that contextualize the activism inherent in her career in exile.

The beginning of the 1940s was a challenging period for the exiled artist,
professionally and personally. At the end of 1939, after three years of continuously staging
Lorca’s plays throughout Latin America, Xirgu’s health troubles required her withdrawal
from such a frenetic pace. At this point her company disbanded to seek new professional
opportunities in Latin America, mainly in Argentina. (Two of her main actors, Amelia de la
Torre and Enrique Álvarez Diosdado—La Novia and El Novio in Bodas de sangre—would
marry and return to Spain in the 1950s, forming their own company there.) On July 10,
1941, Xirgu was officially included on the list of the Franco regime’s political enemies,
“como responsable política de hechos graves.” She was accused of prior and continued
affiliation with the “izquierda republicana,” “dedicándose a realizar propaganda roja en
festivales, representaciones teatrales y giras” and housing “marxistas en una finca que ha
adquirido en Chile.” The latter claims reveal that she was being watched closely by Franco’s
agents or sympathizers in Latin America, and that staging Lorca’s plays (and perhaps hanging
the large photo of him in theaters) was deemed a political act. In this July 1941 convening of
the Tribunal de Responsabilidades Políticas de Barcelona, she was sentenced in absentia to
“las sanciones de pérdida total de bienes, inhabilitación para cargos de toda clase a
perpetuidad, y extrañamiento, también [sic] perpetuo, del territorio nacional.” 47

47 Xirgu was charged by the Franco tribunal “as politically responsible for serious acts” […] with the
“Republican left” […] “working to create red/communist propaganda in festivals, theater performances and
tours” […] and housing “Marxists in a property she had acquired in Chile.” She was sentenced in absentia to
“the sanctions of complete loss of her properties and estate, permanent disqualification from all kinds of
Liquidadora, Tribunal Nacional de Responsabilidades Políticas. 2022-2047-2052. 28 February 1952, Madrid), a complete stripping of her property, capital, ability to work or participate as a citizen in Spain, as well as perpetual exile from the nation. Xirgu would go on to fight this sentence, but the process took more than a decade in the Spanish courts.

The following selected chronology shows how, after her company disbanded and she was officially criminalized as a political enemy of the Spanish state, Xirgu individually carried forward her project. Through another twenty-eight years of acts of surrogation and transfer in performance and pedagogy, she engendered her transnational Lorquian archive.

1942. She founds the Escuela de Arte Dramático in Santiago, Chile.

1943. Xirgu directs a season of the Auditorio Nacional de SODRE in Montevideo, Uruguay.

1945. After the García Lorca family provides Xirgu with the long-awaited manuscript that Lorca had written for her, she directs and stars in the March 8 world premiere of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* at the Teatro Avenida in Buenos Aires.

In recognition of the achievement—Lorca had intended for the play to debut in fall 1936 (Domínguez 199)—Federico García Rodríguez, Lorca’s father, sends the actress a telegram from his own exile with his family in New York:

“Emocionados, sabemos cuánto corresponde a usted a mantener vivo el recuerdo de mi hijo”48 (Xirgu archive). As Sonia Domínguez documents Xirgu’s comments on the premiere: “Y la voz de Margarita volvió a profetizar: ‘La vida de Federico se ha contado de todas maneras. Unas veces

---

48 “We know how much of keeping the memory of my son alive corresponds to you.”
exagerando, otras… Y se seguirá contando. Se seguirá contando”
(Domínguez 201).

1947. On May 5, 1947, the state prosecutor for the Tribunal Regional de Barcelona acknowledges Xirgu’s appeal of her sentence from the Tribunal de Responsabilidades Políticas and does not oppose it.

1949. Her official appeal is submitted on February 14, 1949 to the Tribunal Regional de Barcelona, with legal representation in Barcelona and in Santiago de Chile. That year, Xirgu is named director of the Escuela Municipal de Arte Dramático (EMAD) in Montevideo and the co-director of the Comedia Nacional de Uruguay. She takes up official residence in the Uruguayan capital. She refers to her EMAD theater students as “disciples,” addressing them as her living “will” (Mármol).

1950. Xirgu directs and stars in Bodas de sangre at the EMAD and the Teatro Solis in Montevideo. Her last Spanish passport expires in July.

1952. Xirgu participates in an homage to Lorca arranged with poets in Salto, Uruguay, where they reveal a monument in his name in Parque Harriague. Her homage includes three selections from Bodas de sangre in which she performs as La Madre.

That same year, on February 28, the Franco regime’s Comisión Liquidadora de Responsabilidades Políticas retracts Xirgu’s original sentence from the Tribunal de Responsabilidades Políticas. Her sanctions are reduced to a two thousand peseta fine for not having returned to Spain—confounding given

49 “And the voice of Margarita made prophesy once more: ‘Federico’s life has been told in many ways. Sometimes exaggerating, others… and it will continue to be told. It will continue to be told.”
her original condemnation to exile. Her sentence is described in the
document as “light” (“leve”) due to her “sex” (Comisión Liquidadora,
Tribunal Nacional de Responsabilidades Políticas. 2022-2047-2052. 28
February 1952, Madrid). Xirgu does not, and will not, return to Spain.

1957. Celebrating fifty years of making theater, Xirgu once again stars as La Madre in
_Bodas de sangre_ at the Teatro Solis in Montevideo.

1957. Invited by the Unidad Artística del Bosque and the Instituto de Bellas Artes,
Xirgu travels with a Uruguayan passport to Mexico to celebrate the
inauguration of the two new Mexican arts institutions by staging _Bodas de
sangre_ and _La casa de Bernarda Alba_ at the Teatro del Bosque de Chapultepec.
Her stay extends to five months.

1958. Directed by Narciso “Chicho” Ibáñez Serrador, she films _La casa de Bernarda
Alba_ for Televisión Argentina in November 1958.

1959. Xirgu performs a recitation of Lorca’s _Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías_ in
composer Maurice Ohana’s _Cantata: Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías_. She
receives documentation of her new Uruguayan citizenship and is named
Delegada General de la Generalitat de Catalunya en Uruguay by Uruguay’s
President Tarradellas.

1960. She records readings or recitations of _Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías_ and
_Romancero gitano_ for Distex (Buenos Aires), for the album _Federico García Lorca
por Margarita Xirgu_. 
1963. Xirgu directs the actress María Casares, also a Spanish exile, in *Yerma* at the Teatro San Martín, Buenos Aires. Xirgu also repeats her role reciting *Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías* for Ohana’s *Cantata*.

1967. Notwithstanding her poor health and a doctor’s orders to rest, Xirgu travels with Ortín to Smith College (Northampton, Massachusetts, USA) to workshop and direct a student performance of *Yerma*. Despite needing to pass most of the time in the local hospital, Xirgu, with Ortín’s help, successfully collaborates with students and professors on both the performance of an English translation and a staging in Spanish (Kelley 32-33). This will be Xirgu’s last artistic and pedagogical intervention in her lifetime, completing forty years of working with Lorca’s corpus. She dies on April 25, 1969 in Uruguay.\(^{50}\)

While it would certainly be a valuable scholarly endeavor to study the traces of her embodiment that we might find in each of these artistic interventions, perhaps examining the ephemera scattered throughout archives such as theater programs, newspaper coverage and student testimonies, here I will instead give priority to Xirgu’s own written voice during those years. Xirgu maintained an extensive correspondence\(^ {51}\) with family members in Spain, often mentioning her current theater projects in Latin America, but her only extant self-authored document directed to a larger public is a speech that she delivered twice, titled “De mi experiencia en el teatro” or, alternately, “Mis experiencias en el teatro.” The speech, typewritten and twice annotated by Xirgu (with two different pens, one in black ink and the

\(^{50}\) In 1988, the Generalitat de Catalunya repatriates Xirgu’s remains. They are buried in her birthplace, Molins de Rei alongside Miguel Ortín’s.

\(^{51}\) All of the known letters that Xirgu wrote were edited by Manuel Aznar Soler and Francesc Foguet I Boreu and published as a collection, *Margarita Xirgu. Epistolario* in 2018. Lorca is one of the most frequently referenced figures.
other in blue, both in her handwriting), was not published until 2002 in *Assaig de teatre: revista de l’Associació d’Investigació i Experimentació Teatral*, transcribed with a brief introduction in Catalan by Francesc Foguet i Boreu, the first scholar to bring attention to the document.\(^{52}\)

The original speech was delivered on June 11, 1951 at the Universidad de Montevideo, two years into Xirgu’s role directing the Escuela Municipal de Arte Dramático (EMAD) and co-directing the Comedia Nacional Uruguaya, but the archival artifact (and Foguet i Boreu’s transcription) is the version of the speech that she used for a conference at the Universidad de Santiago de Chile, sometime between 1951 and 1957 (Foguet i Boreu, “Conferència inèdita” 161).\(^{53}\) The Institut del Teatre in Barcelona now maintains Xirgu’s typewritten manuscript in its archive, along with her collection of passports and national documents from Spain and Uruguay, theater awards and newspaper clippings.

“De mi experiencia en el teatro” is the linchpin between Xirgu’s pedagogy, her performance philosophy, and her forty-year project to embody a Lorquian archive. What’s more, it is the ultimate sign of Xirgu’s role as the conduit between Lorca’s poetry and his theater. There are four aspects of the speech that most effectively achieve this: Xirgu’s declarations about poetry in relation to her theater; the poems that she includes; how she describes the importance of an actor’s profound embodiment; and her obvious allusions, in her words and his, to Lorca as “her author.”

\(^{52}\) Foguet i Boreu also references Xirgu’s speech briefly in his monograph from the same year, *Margarida Xirgu. Una vocació indomable*, citing it indirectly: “Per generositat, però també per amor propi: si l’actor troba el seu autor, l’èxit és molt més gran. El seu autor fou Federico García Lorca” (137).

\(^{53}\) On page twelve of the manuscript, we can find “[aquí] en Santiago” with “aquí” crossed out in pen. However, in the penultimate paragraph of the speech, we also find, “Hoy en mi visita a Santiago” and “la cordial acogida a la Comedia Nacional Uruguaya, y especialmente al señor Gutiérrez Echevarría, regidor de la Municipalidad de Santiago, que me dedicó frases muy amables en la función inaugural de la temporada [the cordial welcoming of the Uruguayan National Theater, and especially Mr. Guitierrez Echevarría, councilor of the Municipality of Santiago, who offered very friendly words for the season’s opening performance]” (Xirgu, “De mi experiencia” 13; Foguet i Boreu, “Conferència inèdita” 169-70), such that we know the second speech was delivered in Santiago in the context of one of the Comedia Nacional Uruguaya’s performance residencies in the Chilean capital.
Xirgu begins the speech sharing the story of how she became an actress, recounting how an early experience working with the Catalan actress María Morera, “que todavía mantiene en alto el prestigio del teatro catalán, para el papel de la Madre”\(^{54}\) (Xirgu, “De mi experiencia” 2; Foguet I Boreu, “Conferència inèdita” 162), permanently marked her. In the original manuscript, this excerpted quote is an example of the significance of Xirgu’s annotations: she expanded the sentence by writing in “para el papel de la Madre.” As all of her characters for Lorca’s theater engaged in one powerful way or another with the role of the mother (desiring to be one, as a widowed mother, or as a mother with living children), Xirgu’s inclusion of this detail makes a genealogical connection from her early influences to her later career choices, mainly working with Lorca’s corpus. Shortly afterward, her discourse shifts to highlight her specific motivation, in terms of aesthetic and socio-political activism, for becoming a theater-maker. Xirgu details her rigorous discernment when choosing plays, not simply for her own “vanity,” “sino [para] servir la causa del buen teatro, divulgar las grandes obras haciéndolas llegar a las distintas clases sociales” (Xirgu 3, Foguet i Boreu 163\(^{55}\)). Toward the end of the speech she cites Lorca’s collaboration with the traveling university theater group La Barraca (the only time she cites him directly by name) and Alejandro Casona’s work with Las Misiones Pedagógicas (Xirgu 13, Foguet i Boreu 169), as this “buen teatro.” Both epitomized the social activism funded by the Second Republic to bring theater, art and education to rural and underprivileged communities in Spain.

Immediately after describing her career-long social cause, she introduces the theme that will carry through the rest of the speech, poetry: “Con vocación y fervor

\(^{54}\) “that still maintains the prestigious reputation of Catalan theater, for the role of the Mother” (Xirgu, “De mi experiencia” 2; Foguet I Boreu, “Conferència inèdita” 162)

\(^{55}\) “instead to serve the cause of good theater, to make the greatest plays known to different social classes” (Xirgu 3, Foguet i Boreu 163)
inquebrantables, con el estudio constante del teatro de todos los tiempos, se fue formando mi personalidad artística, quedando ésta marcada preferentemente por las obras poéticas. [...] uní poesía y teatro en mis admiraciones y preferencias” (Xirgu 3, Foguet i Boreu 16356).

While we can logically infer from her statement that she was attracted to Lorca as a poet-playwright, to plays that incorporated poetic verse and songs that were also poems, her argument builds more slowly. Xirgu quotes excerpts from two poems—“Soledad” (1923) by Pedro Salinas, and “Caminante, no hay camino” (“Proverbios y Cantares,” 1912) by Antonio Machado—to characterize her own solitary path as an actress, the record of whose work she believes will disappear upon her death: “…con su desaparición se extingue el recuerdo” (Xirgu 3; Foguet i Boreu 163). In choosing these poets to limn her own life, she makes an allusion to the trials and travails of her own exile, and also, in another gesture of artistic activism, revives their corpuses from death in exile. Salinas, also a member of the Generación del 27, died in Boston on November 27, 1951, a few months after Xirgu first gave this speech. Machado had died in Collicure, France in 1939, becoming the second literary symbol, after Lorca, of the tragically lost Second Republic.

Xirgu returns from this rumination on the ephemerality of the actor to center once again on her vocation as a “misión” (Xirgu 11, Foguet i Boreu 168), suggesting that it constitutes a surrogation of “her author,” Lorca:

Hoy comprendo que no había dentro de mí solamente generosidad, el pequeño monstruo que llevamos dentro, y que está siempre en acecho, sabía que cuando el actor encuentra su autor, el éxito es más grande. Con el afán de lograr mayores éxitos, buscaba y estrenaba obras de toda mi vida artística: El teatro español se enriquecía con un nuevo valor, con un poeta deslumbrante y maravilloso, que en muy pocos años fue universalmente

56 “With vocation and unbreakable fervor, with the constant study of theater from all eras, my artistic personality formed itself, marked with preference for poetic works. I united poetry and theater in what I admired and what I preferred.”
conocido y admirado. Desde entonces mi propia personalidad no me importó nada, eran sus versos los que arrebataba a los públicos, era él, sólo él.⁵⁷ (Xirgu 11, Foguet i Boreu 168)

In this passage, Xirgu offers the audience a pointed image of herself: after years of heeding the inner monster that pursued fame through seeking out the top playwrights, she became a selfless vessel for Lorca’s verses. She does not refer to Lorca as a playwright (nor by name, although the description of his “pocos años” makes it clear), but rather, as author and poet, which, given her early statement valuing poetic theater, is certainly a form of praise.

Curiously, in the manuscript of the speech, this passage is followed by a sudden half-page break without text. It is the only section of the typewritten manuscript with a spacing break.

Foguet I Boreu includes Xirgu’s recitation of Lorca’s “Soledad de la pena negra” at the end of Xirgu’s speech, but it is possible that Xirgu originally planned to recite it at this juncture.

Or perhaps, quite simply, she intended for a lengthy, dramatic pause before continuing.

I will return to the possibility of Lorca’s memorized, recited poetry filling—embodying—the empty spaces of her speech. First, however, I wish to address Xirgu’s most direct statement about the physicality of an actor’s work, as it is proof of her profound artistic alignment with Lorca. Describing the actor’s discipline, she states: “El actor, al penetrar psicológicamente en el personaje que va a representar, debe adueñarse de él. Con nuestra inteligencia, hemos de llevar el personaje nosotros, dándole nuestra sangre, nuestros nervios. Conseguido esto, el personaje teatral cobra entonces nuestra propia realidad y se

---

⁵⁷ “Now I understand that it wasn’t only generosity inside of me, but also the small monster that we carry inside, that always lies in waiting, that knew that when an actor finds her author, her success is much greater. Desiring to achieve greater success, I looked for and premiered plays my whole life as an artist: Spanish theater was enriched with a new prodigy, with a marvelous and stunning poet, who in very few years was known and admired everywhere. Since then my own personality has not mattered to me at all; it was his verses that grabbed the audiences, it was him, only him.”
hace humano” (Xirgu 6, Fuguet i Boreu 165). These lines are her most explicit discourse on how an actor should perform a role, surrogating it—“adueñarse”—not only with his/her mental capacity, but with sensory nerves and blood. These words, in retrospect, will represent twenty-five years of pedagogy. One of Xirgu’s students from EMAD, Estela Medina, would describe what we can characterize as an act of transfer, from the teacher’s body to Medina’s, of this methodology of extreme embodiment:

Xirgu como maestra era tan intensa como lo era sobre las tablas. Cuando se le preguntaba algo, ella miraba fijamente y seguía ella la pregunta, llevándola más allá todavía, desarrollaba más cada detalle, daba más pautas con más preguntas, y después decía: «¡Haga!» Y si la acción no venía o no la satisfacía, ¡saltaba al escenario! y ella misma interpretaba la escena. Pero de una manera tan personal, tan intensa, que enseguida te abría la cabeza, quedaba cristalina y claro cómo era que había que hacerlo.59 (Bravo)

Maintaining the image of “adueñarse” and of jumping up on the stage to wholly embody a deep understanding of the poetry in a text, Lorca’s own words resurface. Indeed, fifteen years before Xirgu first delivered her speech, in April of 1936, while she was already in Latin America, Lorca granted one of his last interviews60 to journalist Felipe Morales of La Voz, a newspaper in Madrid. In Morales’s article titled “Conversaciones literarias con Federico García Lorca,” Lorca explains his mission and vision for the theater:

El teatro fue siempre mi vocación. He dado al teatro muchas horas de mi vida. Tengo un concepto del teatro en cierta forma personal y resistente. El

58 “The actor, when psychologically penetrating the character that he is going to represent, should take possession of him/her. We have to carry the person with our intelligence, giving him/her our blood, our nerves. Once this is achieved, the theater character will take on our own reality and become human.”
59 “As a teacher, Xirgu was as intense as she was on the stage. When someone would ask her something, she would look at the person with great attention and follow the question, taking it even further, developing each detail more, providing more guidelines and examples with more questions, and afterward she would say: “Do it!” And if the actor couldn’t perform it or if the performance didn’t satisfy her, she would jump up on the stage, and she herself would act out the scene! But in a way that was so personal, so intense, that it would immediately open your mind, and it would be crystal clear how it was that you had to do it.”
60 Lorca is quoted in a conversation-interview with a reporter, Felipe Morales, from La Voz (Madrid) (April 7, 1936), in which he reveals his perspective on embodiment in poetry and theater, as well as his plans to join Margarita Xirgu on the company’s Latin American theater tour once they reached Mexico (making a stop first in New York) (OC I, LXVIII 728-733).
teatro es la poesía que se levanta del libro y se hace humana. Y al hacerse humana, 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. Han de ser tan humanos, tan horrorosamente trágicos y ligados a la vida y al día con una fuerza tal, que muestren sus traiciones, que se aprecien sus olores y que salga a los labios toda la valentía de sus palabras llenas de amor o de ascos (...)

While it is not clear if Xirgu was aware of or had occasion to read this interview, it is irrefutable that her words, and even Medina’s testimony of Xirgu’s teaching style, echo his views on how theater should be poetry embodied, made viscerally human.

Xirgu and Lorca further coincide on how they articulate the relationship between the performer and the audience. Lorca’s “Teoría y juego del duende” (1933), a conference essay that can be read as its own theory of embodiment in performance, and even haptic theory in film, describes how a performance with the spirit-like “duende” moves from the inside of the performer’s body to affect the bodies of their spectators. While Xirgu does not specifically mention the concept of “duende” in her lecture, she does emphasize the importance of embodying and conveying the “vuelo poético” of the play and that it should reach, connect and resound with the audience: “He procurado asimismo captar el vuelo poético que no está en las palabras, que va por el aire entre frase y frase, y he cuidado después que la dicción tuviera resonancia en los espectadores haciéndoles llegar la armonía del verso, o de la prosa; cuidando de destacar las palabras que por su eufonía producen una...

---

61 “Theater was always my vocation. I’ve given theater many hours of my life. I have a concept of theater that in a certain way is personal and resistant. Theater is poetry that rises up from its book and becomes human. By becoming human, it speaks and shouts, cries and despairs. Theater needs its characters who appear on stage to wear a suit of poetry and at the same time that their bones and blood can be seen. They have to be so human, so horribly tragic and tied to life and their day with such a force that they show their betrayals, that their smells are appreciated and that all of the bravery of their words full of love or disgust come forth from their lips (...)”
mayor belleza al pronunciarlas” (Xirgu 8, Foguet i Boreu 166). While I am not suggesting that the “duende” and “vuelo poético” are necessarily the same, both conceptions of a charged, affective meaning being transmitted from body to body are compatible in Xirgu’s and Lorca’s lectures.

The last component of “De mi experiencia en el teatro” that compellingly demonstrates Xirgu’s life mission to create an embodied Lorquian archive is another example of archival mystery. According to Foguet i Boreu’s transcription, Xirgu concludes the lecture with “Soledad de la pena negra” from Lorca’s Romancero gitano (1928). Though she does not name the author directly, Xirgu quite literally gives Lorca the last words of her only written lecture regarding her philosophy on theater, poetry, teaching—in sum, her life’s mission. While “Soledad de la pena negra” does not appear in the typed manuscript, the document indicates an original intention to include a poem from him. “Y para final, para no dejarles mi mal gusto de estas mal hilvanadas palabras, recurro a otro gran poeta…” are the last typed lines of the typed speech (Xirgu 14). They are not included in Foguet i Boreu’s transcription because Xirgu had crossed them out with blue pen, instead writing in the final words of thanks he would transcribe. However, Foguet i Boreu, unlike the Xirgu archive, continues the “transcription” to conclude with the entirety of “Soledad de la pena negra,” based on press coverage from Xirgu’s original Montevideo speech. As such, Xirgu’s sharing of Lorca’s poem becomes her ultimate intervention with the audience. At last, we can return to the idea of Xirgu inviting Lorca’s corpus to embody these empty textual spaces, or the

---

62 “I’ve been able to capture at the same time the poetic arc that isn’t in the words, that moves through the air between sentences, and have paid special attention such that the diction should have resonance with the play’s spectators so that the harmony of the verse or prose would reach them; and taking care to make the harmonious words, that when spoken offered more beauty, stand out” (Xirgu 8, Foguet i Boreu 166).

63 The Xirgu archive cites Foguet i Boreu in the section where they display the annotated copy of the typewritten speech. Foguet i Boreu cites the Institut del Teatre as housing this manuscript.
spaces pregnant with dramatic engagement in the actual time of the performed speech. We are reminded that while the existence of the written document of “De mi experiencia en el teatro” contributes significantly to our understanding of Xirgu’s work, what exceeds it is the image of Xirgu lifting her gaze up from the page to recite from memory Lorca’s verses, surrogating the text with her embodied voice, and transferring it to the new generations of aspiring theater-makers in Latin America who were sharing the room with her.

5. PASSING THROUGH THE HEART AGAIN: RE-RECORDING “PRENDIMIENTO DE ANTONITO EL CAMBORIO”

[…] donde la vena aorta canta como si fuera un ruiseñor.64
—Federico García Lorca on Margarita Xirgu
(Obras completas. 3 Prosa 194)

In October of 2014, the Lorca Foundation collaborated with the annual poetry festival, Poetas por Km2, to stage an exhibit entitled “La voz de Lorca” (“Lorca’s Voice”) at the Conde Duque, a former military quarters, in Madrid. The bitter irony of the choice of exhibition title and space was not missed; no recording of the executed poet’s voice has ever been found, despite press attention (in the airline Iberia’s magazine Excelente) and revived scholarly interest in combing archives (namely, of Argentine radio transmissions dating between October of 1933 and March of 1934) to find an interview with Lorca. Historians have already discounted the possibility of discovering a recording in Spain, as Lorca missed his appointment with Tomás Navarro Tomás for the Archivo de la Palabra65, an initiative to

64 “[…] where the aorta vein sings as though it were a nightingale.”
65 Shortly afterward, the librarian Tomás Navarro Tomás became the Director of the Biblioteca Nacional de España during the Spanish Civil War. He was responsible for saving many important documents from the Fascist bombings of Madrid, including the twenty-four recordings for the Archivo de la Palabra project.
record famous intellectual and artistic figures in Spain undertaken from 1931 to 1933 within Ramón Menéndez Pidal’s larger linguistic project at the Centro de Estudios Históricos.

The Conde Duque exhibit represented Lorca’s absent voice with disembodied and shadowy fragments: a silent film of him performing under a heavy, veiled costume in La Barraca’s staging of Calderón de la Barca’s *La vida es sueño* (*Life is a Dream*); selections of his clothing, including his jumpsuit for the traveling theater group; and a 1931 recording that registers him performing his piano arrangements (*Canciones populares*, 1933). Laura García-Lorca de los Ríos, the Fundación Federico García Lorca’s president and the poet’s niece, offered a statement printed on the exhibition’s main wall: “Todos los que le conocieron hablan de su voz grave, de la emoción que comunicaba. […] Se echa de menos ese sonido.” Sin embargo, cada vez que alguien dice las palabras de Lorca está dándole la razón en la importancia que daba a la voz, y él acaba reapareciendo en la voz de todos”66 (*La Voz de Lorca*). Xirgu’s voice, however, was essential in every artistic intervention. There are sixteen known audio recordings of Xirgu performing Lorca’s corpus in exile, counting the *Bodas de sangre* film, the fourteen poems of *Romancero gitano*, and *Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías*, the later two recorded in 1960. And yet, her voice was also absent from the exhibit at the Conde Duque, where it rightfully could have served as the surrogate that it was for more than thirty years after Lorca’s death.

Amidst such an abundance of options, which recording should have played at the intimate, short-lived exhibit? I would propose Xirgu’s 1960 recording of “Prendimiento de Antoñito de Camborio en el camino de Sevilla” (1 minute, 53 seconds), alongside her

---

66 “Everyone that knew him spoke of his deep voice, of the emotion that it conveyed. […] That sound is missed. However, every time that someone speaks Lorca’s words s/he proves the importance he placed upon the voice, and he ends up reappearing in the voices of all.”
recording of the same poem for the Archivo de la Palabra in 1933 (1 minute, 56 seconds).
Together, they would have testified to Xirgu’s artistic activism that created an embodied archive to regenerate Lorca’s corpus. As Lorca never completed his audio file for the Republican project, Xirgu’s choice to record (most likely reciting from memory) the poet’s “favorite” poem, which he had dedicated to the actress, stands in as direct surrogation.

When Xirgu recorded the poem for the second time, twenty-seven years later, she could not have had access to her first recitation. In the second recording, her voice has a slightly lower register, perhaps from age and experience, or perhaps because this poem that in some ways prefigured Lorca’s own fate held a graver meaning for her. Nonetheless, Xirgu’s intonation and the rhythm of her delivery is still quite similar to her first recording, suggesting that she carried the poem memorized inside her as part of her Lorquian repertoire, perhaps since the moment of its dedication, or perhaps after hearing him read it to her. Certainly, there is an archive emitting from Xirgu’s body in these recordings. If we allow ourselves to listen carefully, repeat, rehearse, learn by heart, and unlock it, we can take it into our own bodies to explore new possibilities for reenactment, re-recording not to re-cover historical memory with our own memory, but rather to regenerate it.

Memory is history that circulates through the body, creating an affective archive that we can trace in the physical record, but that does not only remain there. Instead, it transcends institutional confines and national borders, transmitting embodied knowledge to other bodies willing to receive it. For all that she had expressed a concern that her work as

---

67 In a letter Xirgu sent to Lorca on July 12, 1928, Xirgu wrote “le agradezco su atención de dedicarme el romance que mas [sic] le gusta á [sic] usted [I appreciate your kindness in dedicating to me your favorite poem]” (“Carta de Margarita Xirgu a Federico García Lorca, Barcelona (España), 1928, Julio, 12” [Fundación Federico García Lorca, COA-1036]). Lorca dedicated, in total, three poems to Xirgu: “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla” (1928), “Margarita: Cada rosa” (1935) and “Margarita” (1935). “Prendimiento” is the only poem of the three that she would record.
an artist would die with her body, Xirgu might just have found peace before her death. As the Centro de Investigación, Documentación y Difusión de las Artes Escénicas del Teatro Solís (CIDDAE) recounted as part of its contribution to the 2008 exhibit in Mérida, *Margarita Xirgu, la primera actriz* at the very end of her life, mostly confined to her remote home in Punta Ballena, Uruguay, Xirgu was heard to repeat one reflection. “Creo que ya está bien, ¿no?” she would ask, referring to her life’s work, more than sixty-two years in the theater, forty of them dedicated incomparably to Lorca’s corpus. “Su casa solitaria, con muchos árboles y mucho silencio, fue su rincón preferido, su último refugio durante los dos años que le restaron de vida. Y Federico” (Margarita Xirgu, la primera actriz). Her surrogation was complete, and at the time of her death, she could be sure that she had transferred her embodied knowledge to students, artists, and a large public in Uruguay, Chile, Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Colombia, Cuba, and the United States. What she might not have anticipated is that her acts of transfer would also return to Spain, and not only through her direct “disciples,” as I will demonstrate in Chapter 3.

---

68 The exhibit and its catalogue celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of Xirgu’s staging of Medea, where she, Rivas Cherif, and Miguel de Unamuno re-inaugurated the Teatro Romano.

69 “I think that’s enough now, right?” [...] Her secluded house, with many trees and much silence, was her favorite corner, her last refuge during the two years that remained of her life. And Federico” (Margarita Xirgu, la primera actriz).
Chapter 2.
Emilio Prados: A Secret Garden to Regenerate Lorca’s Poetic Corpus

As a map of the impossible,
El jardín de lo posible.
—Federico García Lorca, “El jardín” (≈1920-23)

He callado a mi cuerpo
y paseo a mi alma sobre las hojas secas.
—Emilio Prados, “Jardín”
(October 1921)

La hojita más pequeña de hierba nos enseña que la muerte no existe […]
—Walt Whitman, Canto a mí mismo, trans. León Felipe (1941).

Verse marked with an em dash and exclamation mark in Emilio Prados’s personal library

From late January into February 1939, more than 440,000 Spanish Republican troops and civilian women, men, and children evacuated Spain, crossing the Pyrenees border in hopes of refuge in France. Barcelona had just fallen to the Nationalists, and with it the third and final domestic headquarters of the Republican government. Arriving in Banjuls, thirty-nine-year-old poet, publisher, editor and antifascist literary activist Emilio Prados suffered a severe nervous breakdown. In a blur that spanned multiple days, Prados wandered lost and alone, and threw his private wartime diary off the cliffs and into the sea (Jiménez Millán, “El compromiso político” 144). Prados was found by fleeing Republican troops, and years later would recall that when he regained consciousness in Port-Vendres he was holding a Bible in one hand and carrying his copy of Gerardo Diego’s Antología de poesía española 1915-31 in his coat pocket (Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira 51).

The latter (hi)story is Prados’s testimony, his account of a liminal moment fraught with trauma. Prados disowned the copy of the Bible, claiming that concerned strangers had given it to him. For my purposes, what was in his pocket was far more significant; tucked away as his treasured possession to be safeguarded was the anthology. In those first hours of what would turn into twenty-two years of exile, Prados’s copy of Diego’s first edition of this
anthology represented much more than the poems it contained. The physicality of the book itself reveals that it was not simply a literary collection: it was a photo album. Miguel de Unamuno, Manuel Machado, Antonio Machado, Juan Ramón Jiménez, José Moreno Villa, Pedro Salinas, Jorge Guillén, Dámaso Alonso, Juan Larrea, Gerardo Diego, Federico García Lorca, Rafael Alberti, Fernando Villalón, Emilio Prados, Vicente Aleixandre, Luis Cernuda, and Manuel Altolaguirre were all included; and with the exception of Prados, a photograph of each man shrouded with tissue paper prefaced the selection of his poems. Prados had in fact protested participating in the anthology, asking Diego to remove him (Soria Olmedo, “República y compromiso” 129), and consequently he did not appear in the second edition, Poesía española. Antología (Contemporáneos) (1934). It was only Diego’s first anthology that included the photographs—the images of these men embodied, alive—and parts of their textual corpora together with Prados’s. (See Appendix 1.) While Jiménez Millán has observed “[u]na ironía cruel, en cierto modo” (“El compromiso político” 144) that Diego’s anthology should be one of the only two books in Prados’s physical possession after crossing into exile, I believe it was a conscious choice on Prados’s part. In one single object, small enough to carry on his own body, Prados held the only family album (albeit incomplete) of seventeen Spanish literary kin, two interconnected generations of poets and friends.

Prados could not have known that he would never see the great majority of these men again, but he might have had a premonition. They were already divided by the Civil War, the generations dismembered by political beliefs, and the much larger constellation of

---

70 From his formative years onward, Prados experimented with self-erasure and disappearance. During his time at the Residencia de Estudiantes, Prados was known to remove himself from photos by scratching out his image (Chica, Emilio Prados, 1899-1962 22-23, 51; see “Residentes ante el Pabellón Transatlántico de la Residencia de Estudiantes, en 1919” [Colección Fundación Federico García Lorca]).
writers and artists would be flung far across oceans and continents. Approximately half of the poets featured in the anthology, like Prados, would go into exile: José Moreno Villa, Luis Cernuda, and Manuel Altolaguirre also found their way to Mexico; but Juan Ramón Jiménez, Pedro Salinas, Rafael Alberti, and Juan Larrea spread out across the Americas. Manuel Machado, Jorge Guillén and Gerardo Diego stayed in Spain, siding with the Nationalists. Dámaso Alonso and Vicente Aleixandre would be the only two loyal to the Republic to survive in Spain, albeit with the notable challenges of interior exile. Fernando Villalón had died in 1930, before the anthology’s publication. Three of these men would be mortal victims of the Falangist military uprising of 1936 and the Civil War: Federico García Lorca was assassinated in Granada; then Miguel de Unamuno was placed under house arrest where he died that first New Year’s Eve. Antonio Machado would die within days of Prados’s exile, three kilometers from Port-Vendres in Collioure, of heart and respiratory conditions aggravated by extreme exposure to cold and rain as he too fled along with the 440,000.

Prados’s copy of the anthology survived the rainy winter days in Port-Vendres and the following months in Paris, where he worked for the exiled Republican government making passports before he too left Europe. Decades after Prados’s exile to Mexico—after his solitary death on the staircase to his apartment at Rio Lerma 265 in the capital; after his small funeral and burial in Mexico City’s vast Panteón Jardín; after his grave succumbed to neglect, the letters disappearing and making way for ragged leaves of grass to slip like pages and rise between the stone’s cracks—his personal album has come home from exile. It is housed in the Residencia de Estudiantes where Prados met the majority of these men, and safeguarded in its subterranean archive. Diego’s first anthology is item P138 in the Prados archive, and signed “E Prados S.” (the “s” for his second surname, Such) on the
“PRÓLOGO” page divider. Among Prados’s Madrid archives—the twenty boxes of manuscripts and notes, and the majority of the personal library that he would build in Mexico—the second oldest item, P73, is another anthology: *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca, contra su muerte*, edited by Prados in 1937.

The story of Prados’s copy of the Diego anthology has never before been examined. It does not shed light directly on Prados’s public or private contribution to the embodied Lorquian archive, my focus for the remainder of this chapter. What it does illustrate is that in the pivotal moment at the border between two lives, Prados committed himself to the physical and textual corpora of his literary kin by rescuing this miniature archive and bringing it to refuge in exile. The relationship between these threatened corpora and his own body and persona could not be clearer than in this moment of carrying the other—of regaining consciousness and feeling the steady weight of such a responsibility.

It is rather the second oldest of Prados’s archived books,71 *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte*, that is the proof par excellence of the poet’s activism on behalf of the Lorquian corpus. But it does not begin or end there. While Xirgu was unparalleled in her surrogation and diasporic proliferation of Lorca’s dramatic corpus, Prados contributed uniquely to the (re)generation of Lorca’s poetic body before and after his assassination. I argue that this is because Lorca, like no other poet, friend or figure in Prados’s life, is inextricable from Prados’s own corpus/cuerpo.

71 While the means of transport are not certain, i.e. Prados did not carry *Homenaje* on his person, it is possible that this copy is the one that Prados sent to his family members, who had already sought exile in Chile in 1938. He refers to this in a letter from Barcelona dated May 6 of that year: “Habréis recibido otros libros hechos por mí que os habrán enviado por el Ministerio del Estado. Se llama <<Homenaje al poeta García Lorca, contra su muerte>>” (Hernández-Pérez, *Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido* 343). Regardless, *Homenaje* survived the transcontinental and transatlantic journey into exile and is included in the collection donated to the archive by Prados’s adopted son, Francisco “Paco” Salas. As Prados gave away many of his books to his friends and family during his lifetime, and since Salas and his wife Mercedes, as well as Prados’s brother Miguel, most likely kept certain books, it would be impossible to state definitively that *Homenaje* was the second oldest book in Prados’s library in Mexico or at the time of his death.
There are many instances of Prados dedicating his literary skills to social and political activism, but I will focus primarily on the anthology *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca, contra su muerte* (1937); on the two elegies published there that Prados wrote to Lorca, “Llegada,” and “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca”; and on *Jardín cerrado* (1940-46, published in 1947 with a second edition in 1960), which Prados revisited during the last years of his life, much as Walt Whitman (1819-1892) continued to edit *Leaves of Grass* until his “deathbed edition.” *Jardín cerrado* recovers imagery from Prados’s earliest poetry, including the recently discovered poem “Jardín” (1921), which was inspired by the two young men’s affective relationship and composed in epistolary exchange with Lorca (Hernández and Tinnell 11, 15). I will argue that it also dialogues with Lorca’s early and late poems, some of which were not published in his lifetime, including poems from *Suites, Poeta en Nueva York*, and *Diván del Tamarit*. *Jardín cerrado* was composed during Prados’s first years in exile while he typeset *Poeta en Nueva York* for José Bergamín’s Séneca press 1940 Mexican edition. “Oda a Walt Whitman” is featured among the poems in *Poeta en Nueva York*. Prados’s recovered library includes a hand-annotated copy of León Felipe’s Spanish translation of Whitman’s *Song of Myself, Canto a mi mismo* (1941) with illustrations by Attilio Rossi.

This intertextual regeneration was only possible because Prados had intimate knowledge of Lorca’s poetic corpus. Prados held it in letter and manuscript form, deciphering his friend’s often enthusiastically-rushed-and-unintelligible handwriting; he leaned in with his body to set it to print with his own hands. That Prados continued this activism in one form or another throughout his entire literary career reveals a conviction that his personal relationship with Lorca was fundamental to both men’s lives. When examining
Prados’s most evocative interventions, I reveal the particular embodiment in action. Emilio Prados’s contribution to an embodied Lorquian archive—no less than Margarita Xirgu’s—was about personal affinity and a deep knowledge shared, experienced and transferred from one textual and human body to another. With Prados’s work, I widen the aperture on the embodiment theory I already deployed to study Xirgu, now including José Esteban Muñoz’s queer futurity, Martin Heidegger’s dwelling in the poetic instant, Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of touching, and genetic criticism’s revival of the manuscript in constant dialogue and motion. In the case of Jardín cerrado, I will demonstrate how Whitman’s ecstatic phenomenology and queer utopia are latent. Once again, these theories in dialogue disrupt Taylor’s dichotomy of the archive and the repertoire, revealing their intersectionality in the vulnerable human project of historical memory.

1. ‘COMO UN MAPA DE LO IMPOSIBLE’: ‘AMOR-AMISTAD,’ QUEER FUTURITY, AND THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL PLENITUDE OF ABSENCE

Lorca and Prados as homosexual and literary bodies were threatened subjects whose survival depended on “the knitting together of individual bodies” (Freeman 299) that was made possible through queer kinship. In the case of Xirgu and Lorca, I have argued that their kinship ultimately led to Xirgu’s magnum opus of surrogation. With Prados, however, I see a deeper vulnerability that is the source of both his inspiration and his activism. Prados’s textual corpus is inextricably intertwined with Lorca’s body and body of work. While Prados was first encouraged to write poetry by Juan Ramón Jiménez and Manuel García Morente it was the close relationship that he forged with Lorca at the Residencia that ultimately

---

72 José Esteban Muñoz was a faculty member of the Gender and Performance Studies Department at New York University’s Tisch School of the Arts, dialoguing with many of the performance studies scholars I reference in Chapter 1.
catalyzed his artistic vocation (Chica, *Emilio Prados, 1899-1962* 49), and enabled him to recognize and express his homosexual desire and identity. Prados enrolled in the Residencia de Estudiantes in 1914 as part of the “Grupo de Niños” who were taught by Juan Ramón Jiménez and Manuel García Morente. Lorca scholars diverge slightly on whether Lorca joined the Residencia toward the end of 1919, or not until early 1920. Prados began writing “in secret” (Prados’s words, Hernández-Pérez, *Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido* 428) at around the age of 17 under the tutelage of Juan Ramón Jiménez, and, soon after, inspired by Lorca and his friend José Moreno Villa (Hernández-Pérez, *Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido* 24). In two October 1958 letters to José Sanchis Banús, Prados appears to emphasize Lorca’s connection to his poetry other than greatly encouraging him for his “launch” as a poet (“el me animó enormemente para mi ‘lanzamiento’”), and that the two shared Granada roots (Hernández-Pérez, *Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido* 428). However, by bringing to light other original sources, this chapter will reveal Lorca’s life-long influence over his friend. Through close readings of Prados’s poetry at distinct moments in his career, including his seminal collection *Jardín cerrado*, I will demonstrate their continued proximity.
shared with another person in manuscript form. Lorca’s side of the correspondence has (to date) never been found; Prados claimed he had left Lorca’s letters in a personal desk whose contents at the outbreak of the war were then deposited at the Banco de España in Madrid (Hernández-Pérez, “Presentación del epistolario”). Despite Prados’s frequent references in these missives to his friend’s delay in responding, and to a growing sense of amorous rejection, it is worth noting that Lorca saved at least thirty postcards, letters, telegrams and poems sent to him by Prados between 1921 and 1934. As scholar Francisco Chica characterizes Prados’s correspondence:

Sus cartas desvelan un homoerotismo del que fuera de esta ocasión apenas habla el poeta, aunque su presencia se haga patente en la idea de <<amor-amistad>> que practicará a lo largo de su vida. […] Cargada de elementos confidenciales, la cercanía entre ambos poetas puede seguirse en algunos de los motivos comunes que aparecen en sus respectivas obras. (Chica, Emilio Prados, 1899-1962 50)

---

74 “La Hermana de la Luna,” “Jardín,” and “Tarde” all appear to be typed originals given to Lorca, as suggested by the edits throughout these manuscripts. “Callaron las alondras” was most likely a transcription of Prados’s original composition. While handwritten, it is without edits and separately dated (March 1921) within his summer Waldsanaatorium Davos letter to Lorca.

75 Patricio Hernández-Pérez cites Prados’s correspondence to Camilo José Cela, in which Prados recalls that his letters from Lorca were left with the Banco de España; Hernández-Pérez reports that neither the letters nor Prados’s supposed desk there were able to be located by contemporary scholars. Meanwhile, Francisco Chica notes that Prados left the “papers” in his possession as of January 1939 with the Embajada de México in Barcelona, just before fleeing to France. The exception to this is Diario íntimo de un poeta en la guerra España, which Prados then threw off a cliff and into the ocean in Banyuls (Chica, Emilio Prados, 1899-1962 72). Prados destroyed the manuscripts of his earliest poetry collections (Feria de las voces, Vínculo, Luz del Puerto, and El libro de los tactos) in 1925 after receiving negative feedback from his peers at the Residencia. It is possible that Prados also destroyed his letters from Lorca in another moment of emotional turmoil, although his testimony suggests otherwise.

76 Thanks to the research of scholars Patricio Hernández and Roger Tinnell, the bulletin FGL, produced by the Fundación Federico García Lorca, published the most complete collection of the Prados-Lorca epistolary known to date in December 1997 (FGL 21-22). The bulletin catalogued twenty-six pieces of correspondence, one of which was the undated [summer 1921] letter from Waldsanaatorium Davos that included “Callaron las alondras” and a fragment of another poem. In 2013, Hernández and Tinnell, together with scholar Christian de Paepe and Fundación archivists Rosa Illán de Haro and Sonia González García, discovered three more poems that appear to have been originally included in other early letters from Prados to Lorca.

77 “His [Prados’s] letters reveal a homoeroticism that aside from this occasion the poet barely spoke of, although its presence was made clear in his idea of “love-friendship” which he would practice his whole life. […] Loaded with confidential elements, the closeness between both poets can be followed in some of the common themes that appear in their respective work” (Chica, Emilio Prados, 1899-1962 50). Chica’s observation is another counterpoint to Prados’s minimization of Lorca’s influence on his poetry.
The homoerotic nature of Prados’s friendship with Lorca catalyzed his awakening as a political activist. In late 1920, Prados took to his diary to describe their relationship and expresses this causality:

La única gran alegría que he tenido ha sido el haber encontrado en Federico al amigo que tanto deseaba. A él le he abierto mi corazón y él ha sabido comprenderlo. Al principio de conocerle no lo pude comprender bien. Su poesía, su literatura, lo envolvían en una costra difícil de atravesar; pero luego, una vez que he logrado llegar a su corazón, he comprendido su bondad infantil y su cariño. Tendría un enorme desengaño si esta idea que de él tengo fuera falsa; pero creo que esta vez he encontrado el compañero que buscaba y con el que podré hablar de mis cosas íntimas sin que se ría de ellas. Su manera de ser y de pensar es muy semejante a la mía, su misma niñez de hombre [underlined in the original manuscript], su afán por subir a la cumbre de la gloria, no comprendido, pero deseado por descar lo nuevo y lo revolucionario: todo es igual a lo mío. Sus ideales políticos, contrarios a su bienestar, son los mismos míos, y esto le hace que sea más querido por mí.

Quisiera tenerlo estos días aquí, para poderle contar todo lo que en estos días siento. Y esto seguro que sabría consolarme y alegrarme en mis tristezas. Tengo grandes ganas también de que esté aquí para organizar la propaganda de nuestros comunes ideales, que tantas ganas tengo de ver realizados. Mi sangre toda la daría para ver a la humanidad unida con amor, y que la igualdad fuera completa para todos. Me da horror pensar cuánta hambre y cuántos sufrimientos hay que pueden cambiarse en alegrías.

En fin, cuando venga Federico trabajaremos con ardor por esta causa y aún cuando de mí no espero grandes triunfos, pues no tengo confianza en mi inteligencia embrutecida, a él le hablaré con el corazón y él suplirá mi falta...

78 “The only great happiness I have had has been finding in Federico the friend that I had wished so much for. I have opened my heart to him and he has known how to understand it. When I first met him I couldn’t understand him well. His poetry, his literature, they wrapped him in a crust that was difficult to break through; but then, once I was able to reach his heart, I understood his childish goodness and his affection. I would be extremely deceived if this idea I have of him were false; but I believe that this time I have found the companion that I was looking for and that I can talk with him about my most intimate things without him laughing at them. His way of being and of thinking is very similar to mine, the same child-like manhood [underlined in the original manuscript], his eagerness to climb to the peak of glory, not understood, but wished for because he desires the new and revolutionary: Everything is the same as mine. His political aspirations, against his wellbeing, are the same as mine, and this makes him more loved by me.

I would like him here with me these days to be able to tell him everything I am feeling. And I’m sure that he’d know how to console me and cheer me up. I also wish he were here so that we could organize the propaganda of our common ideals which I have such desire to see come to life. I would give everything—my blood!—to see humanity united with love, and full equality for everyone. It horrifies me to think of how much hunger and suffering need to be changed for happiness.

In conclusion, when Federico comes we will work passionately for this cause and even when I don’t expect great triumphs for myself, as I do not trust in my brute intelligence, I will speak with him from my heart and he will compensate for what I lack.”
While Prados’s political causes over the course of his life were multifold—including literacy, workers’ rights, anti-fascism, supporting the Second Republic, and the education and adoption of Spanish Republican orphans in Mexico—they are ultimately encapsulated in this passage about love and equality. While it might not have been possible for Prados to be a direct political activist with respect to sexual identity and orientation, I believe he found another way through his work with Lorca’s corpus. Frequently (mis)characterized as a solitary/recluse, from his days at the Residencia until his death in exile in Mexico, Prados’s sense of kinship and responsibility for Lorca’s corpus repeatedly enabled him to test and overcome the oppressive limits of his immediate circumstances and his friend’s death and disappearance. Just as scholar José Esteban Muñoz explained of Ernest Bloch’s philosophy, Prados was “doing the work of imagining another life, another time, another place—a version of heaven on earth that is not simply denial or distraction but a communicative and collective mode of transport that helps one think of another place where Eros is not conscripted in the fashion that civilization demands” (Muñoz 144); he was building a queer utopia. Indeed, to use Muñoz’s term, I see queer futurity active in Prados’s Lorquian regeneration and elegiac stance, living not in the limits of the present, but in the “then and there”:

Queerness is not yet here. Queerness is an ideality. [...] Queerness is a structuring and educated mode of desiring that allows us to see and feel beyond the quagmire of the present. The here and now is a prison house. We must strive, in the face of the here and now’s totalizing rendering of reality, to think and feel a then and there.
(Muñoz 1)

If Lorca is the “preeminent poet of absence” and “the greatest of Spain’s elegiac poets” (Maurer, Federico García Lorca. Collected Poems xi, xxvi), Prados shares his aesthetic and demonstrates his own deep exploration of this terrain. An essential part of reading queer
kinship, embodiment and futurity in Prados’s Lorquian regeneration requires careful attention to his deployment of elegy. Prados uses the elegiac form to invoke multiple, cohabitating temporalities. As such, the same poem can activate queer futurity while dwelling in the absence of what once was, and what could have been but was never realized.

Christopher Maurer, one of the preeminent scholars of Lorca’s poetry, pinpoints the essence of elegy’s unique temporalities as they relate to desire: “Whatever its terms, elegy compares modes of being. It feeds on desire: on the yearning to have what is absent or does not exist. And desire and elegy are the essence of Lorca’s poetry. The poetic expression of desire is itself a presence of sorts” (Maurer, Federico García Lorca. Collected Poems xxvi). Following Lorca’s assassination, Prados dwells in his friend’s absence, (re)membering his corpus and desiring that it live on, making it his present and complete natural world. He achieves this through “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” and Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte. Later on, in Jardín cerrado, Prados creates a much more complex and vibrant ecosystem of memories, desires and dreams—not unlike Lorca’s gardens in Suites—of what might have been but never was. The evolution of Prados’s elegiac project with Lorca is driven by queer futurity; and in the immensity of his magnea tarea with Jardín cerrado, he finally (re)constructs their queer utopia.

Prados’s understanding of temporality expanded immensely with his study of metaphysics and phenomenology. His primary philosophical influence when writing Jardín cerrado was Martin Heidegger. The German scholar’s texts ¿Qué es la metafisica? and Hölderlin y

---

79 The philosopher María Zambrano, a fellow exiled malagueña, encouraged Prados in his continued exploration of the metaphysical, in the relationship between man and the divine. Zambrano and Prados forged their friendship through shared literary activism in Spain, and coincided briefly in exile in Mexico. After Zambrano left Mexico, they maintained their close friendship through detailed correspondence and extensive telephone conversations. Zambrano’s philosophy, also influenced by Heidegger, connected metaphysical inquiry with political activism via poetic reflection.
la esencia de la poesía were translated and published by Séneca in México in 1941 and 1944 respectively, when Prados worked under José Bergamín’s direction as an editor and typesetter. The books are found among Prados’s recovered library (items P56 and P202 respectively), as well as the 1958 compilation of Heidegger’s essays “Holderlín y la esencia de la poesía” and “El origen de la obra de arte” published as Arte y poesía (item SXX 44586), which coincides with when Prados was revising Jardín cerrado.

Heidegger imagined the phenomenological nature of poetry through his concept of dwelling (Buan in Old English and High German, later bauen), the basic essence of which “is to spare, to preserve… dwelling itself is always a staying with things. Dwelling, as preserving, keeps the fourfold in that with which mortals stay: in things” (Heidegger 150-151). According to Heidegger, humans recognize our relationship with the earth in the instant “when we stand in a site, open to its being, when we are thrown or called” (Bate 261). It is only through dwelling that we experience our relationship with what would otherwise be understood as external to us as almost indistinguishable from our internal Being (Dasein). Poets capture this dwelling through a language that moves beyond representation of the world (Vorstellung) to exist in the instant of the encounter. In fact, Heidegger glosses poetry’s linguistic heritage, poiesis, as “synonymous with ‘bringing-forth into presence’” (Bate 253). His gloss concurs with the long-believed power of poetry to revive or create the ephemeral anew, all the while heightening our awareness of the phenomenological, the vibrancy in language:

For Heidegger, language is the house of being; it is through language that unconcealment takes place for human beings. By disclosing the being of entities in language, the poet lets them be. That is the special, the sacred role of the poet. What is distinctive about the way in which humankind inhabits the earth? It is that we dwell poetically (dichterisch). (Bate 258)
Phenomenology proponent Maurice Merleau-Ponty and ecocritic David Abram remind us that dwelling and the presence it awakes reveal our ever-existing relationship with the natural world. Unconcealment is nothing more than a sensation of a membrane, that we are part of what Merleau-Ponty has called the collective “Flesh… flesh of the world” (Abram 66):

…for as we shall see, the boundaries of a living body are open and indeterminate; more like membranes than barriers, they define a surface of metamorphosis and exchange. The breathing, sensing body draws its sustenance and its very substance from the soils, plants, and elements that surround it… it is very difficult to discern at any moment precisely where this living body begins and where it ends. (Abram 46-47)

In “Estancia,” Prados inhabits Lorca’s missing corpus by dwelling poetically with both his friend’s carnal and textual bodies, through his insistence on touch and a deeply sensorial experience of his grief. In Prados’s work of “unconcealment,” he brings Lorca forth into presence to be with him such that the two are indistinguishable from one another. With his ongoing construction of Jardín cerrado, Prados creates a sacred house of being, a queer utopia rooted in the plenitude of his and Lorca’s shared literary imaginary. The sensorial experience of Merleau-Ponty’s “flesh of the world” is ecstatically present in Whitman’s Song of Myself, a key influential text for Jardín cerrado. Prados will, in turn, explore the boundaries of the flesh of the two friends’ bodies with the flora of their remembered natural world (Andalucía) and the one he experienced in exile in Mexico.

Genetic criticism offers the final lens through which I read Prados’s embodied Lorquian archive. I am inspired to employ this theoretical approach by the material evidence of Prados’s manuscripts and annotated library, and the poet’s active role as an editor and publisher throughout his lifetime. Genetic criticism values the study of the process of creation of a writer’s text over any one “final” product. It considers the context(s) and chronology in which the text arose (Lois 5), and adds dimension and possibility by
recovering drafts and annotations. Ultimately, as genetic scholar Élida Lois explains, this approach allows for more knowledge to be learned heuristically by engaging in the two complimentary phases of editing and interpretation (Lois 5). In the case of this chapter, reconstructing these complimentary phases and engaging with them not only uncovers forgotten knowledge; it also revives Prados’s own acts of reading and revising his texts.

Jacques Neef’s genetic criticism on margins offers a particularly fruitful approach to studying Prados’s manuscripts, his copy of the *Homenaje* anthology he had edited and published, and his annotations of Whitman and Felipe’s *Canto a mi mismo*. Neefs asserts that marginalia add new “temporal depth” (Neefs 139) and “perspective” (143) to a printed text; they offer “difference and dialogue” (137-138) and give the printed body of the text “more worth.” In the case of the author’s own marginalia, Neefs argues that they instill a new “liveliness” (143) in this body by marking the act of returning to read the text again. Marginalia undo the “finite body of the printed text” (Neefs 143), breathe new life into it (145), and even offer “a text with two bodies” (157). Neefs’s theory augments queer kinship’s notion of bodies interwoven for revival and survival. It enriches our understanding of embodiment in Prados’s revised texts, both on the page and his acts of revision. Marginalia further reveal the complex temporalities of Prados returning to dwell on the printed pages of his own Lorquian corpus. If Prados’s marginalia construct a second body that opens up the first one through dialogue and physical contact, we can witness the unconcealment of a sensuous membrane through which his living desire passed. Indeed, some of Prados’s earliest verses to Lorca in “Jardín,” which I will return to throughout this chapter, can offer a metaphor for his lifelong dwelling and revision. “He callado a mi cuerpo / y paseo a mi alma sobre las hojas secas,” the young poet wrote in 1921. In solitude and in exile, he found the immense
stillness within his body to take up these wandering walks of readership again. Passing his soul over the dry pages of his printed books and manuscripts, reencountering his friend in dialogue and touch, Prados revived and regenerated their personal garden of the possible.

2. AN ANTHOLOGY TO (RE)COLLECT TWO BODIES AS ONE: HOMENAJE AL POETA FEDERICO GARCÍA LORCA, CONTRA SU MUERTE

When the Fascist and military uprising that instigated the Civil War began in July 1936, Emilio Prados was living in Málaga, which quickly fell under golpista control. Sometime within those fraught first two months, Prados escaped by boat with his family, reaching Cartagena and then continuing on to join other loyalist writers in the Spanish capital by the end of August or early September. It is most likely that Prados first learned of Lorca’s death when he reached Madrid. In the capital he resided and collaborated with the Alianza de Intelectuales Antifascistas, including poets and writers such as Manuel Altolaguirre, León Felipe, José Moreno Villa, Rafael Alberti, and María Zambrano. When the Republic moved its seat of government to Valencia, Prados and the Alianza followed. There, in 1937, he would help the Alianza to organize the Segundo Congreso Internacional de Escritores para la Defensa de la Cultura, held simultaneously in Valencia, Barcelona, and the now-surrounded Madrid. The congress drew such international writers as Pablo Neruda, Ernest Hemingway, César Vallejo, and Octavio Paz, and under Prados’s direction, the Alianza gathered more than 900 romances and coplas, publishing a selection of 302 for its anthology titled Romancero general de la guerra de España, dedicated to Lorca and distributed to all the delegates at the congress (Hernández, Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido 46-47), along with Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte. Prados was the ideal person to take on this endeavor, not simply because of his editorial talent, but also because he was one of the
“principle cultivators” (de Luis 2) in the 1930s of the romance. According to de Luis, “Puede ser que Prados aprendiera a escribir romances en García Lorca, pero, con menos lujo verbal que el granadino, logró en ellos mayor enjundia y una perfección admirable” (2; also Hernández, Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido 43). As a poet, Prados already utilized this form extensively; between 1933 and 1937, he created and published three other romancero collections.

“Llegada,” featured among the 302 romances in Romancero general de la guerra de España, is Prados’s first direct elegy to Lorca. The poem evokes and invokes Lorca’s Cante jondo and his Romancero gitano, reflecting Prados’s struggle to accept his friend’s death and constituting a rising call to action. The elegiac image of Lorca’s body “Con cinco llamas agudas / clavadas sobre su pecho” (“Llegada,” v. 25-26) echoes the llanto of Lorca’s “La guitarra,” with the embodied instrument bearing a “Corazón malherido / por cinco espadas” (v. 26-27). In the

---

80 The Romancero genre is the thread that runs through the history of Spanish poetry, from its medieval origins in the cantares de gesto, captured in written form in Poema de Mio Cid, to the Early Modern Golden Age Romancero anthologies, to the “Silver Age” Generación del 27 until today. Generally, its written format is marked by stanzas of octosyllabic verses and pairs of verses with assonant rhyme. More than anything, the romance is notable for its oral and modest origins and its role in transmitting collective memory. The romance was the principal medium in which Spanish history was narrated and reached the nation’s people until the twentieth century. (In 1936, when the Spanish Civil War began, twenty-five percent of Spaniards were still illiterate.)

According to the theory proposed by Ramón Menéndez Pidal, the audiences who listened to cantares de gesto sung by troubadours memorized their most popular verses and transformed them into the romance. The romances “went viral,” travelling as anonymous verses that were memorized, and sung or recited by townspeople in public. (We can think once again, as in the Chapter 1 discussion of recordar, of this embodied knowledge learned par coeur; and also of acts of transfer.) The romance was named in the 14th century and split in form (oral and anonymous versus written by a named poet) and its verse structure was solidified between the 16th and 17th centuries when Cervantes, Lope de la Vega, Góngora, and Quevedo composed and published collections. Lorca and Prados’s generation, named for its homage to Góngora, reclaimed the romance as part of their revival of the Golden Age poet and the Baroque culturanismo aesthetic that he represented. Lorca and Prados employed the romance to represent marginalized groups as well as to craft metaphors elusive to simple interpretation; in doing so, they created their own synthesis of and contribution to the form’s history.

81 “Prados might have learned to write romances from García Lorca, but with less verbal richness than the granadino, he achieved more substance and an admirable perfection” (2; also Hernández-Pérez, Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido 43).

82 Prados’s three collections Calendario incompleto del pan y el pescado (1933-34), Llanto de octubre: Durante la represión y bajo la cenuria posterior al levantamiento del año 1934, and Romances de la Guerra Civil (1936) were compiled and published as Llanto en la sangre (Valencia: Ediciones Españoles) in 1937. Romances de la Guerra Civil (1936) included “Llegada (A Federico García Lorca),” which Prados also published separately in November of that year in the literary magazine Mono Azú, which was directed by Manuel Altolaguirre.
fifth stanza, Prados revives Lorca’s imagery from “Romance de la luna, luna” and “Romance de la Guardia Civil” respectively:

Un temor se va agrandando
temor que encoge los pechos.
De noche los olivares
alzan los brazos gimiendo:
la luna lo anda buscando
rodando, lenta, en el cielo;
la sangre de los gitanos
lo llama abierta en el suelo;
más gritos lleva la sombra
que estrellas el firmamento;
las madrugadas preguntan
por él, temblando de miedo.
¡Qué gran tumba esta distancia
que calla su hondo misterio? (Prados, “Llegada”)

In the seventh and final stanza, Lorca’s gypsies and Prados’s fishermen (also the protagonists of Calendario incompleto del pan y el pescado) unite to confront Lorca’s “negros carceleros”; it is a poetic summoning to avenge Lorca’s death and also that of the gypsies slaughtered by the Guardia Civil (“Los caballos negros son. / Las herraduras son negras”) in “Romance de la Guardia Civil.” In “Llegada,” Prados begins the explicit work of elegizing Lorca’s missing body through the regeneration of a Lorquian poetic corpus, reviving and calling upon these verses to rise up and (re)act. Likewise, Prados begins to weave this hybrid corpus enmeshed in his own romance together with hundreds more in the anthology. Through his literary protest, Prados honors the legacy of his murdered friend, and arms national and international poets and writers with a body of activist literature to disseminate.

However, neither “Llegada” nor the Romancero general de la guerra de España compare to the Lorquian activism that Prados initiated later that same year with “Estancia en la muerte con Federico Garcia Lorca” and Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte.

“Estancia,” a second, significantly more extensive elegy to Lorca, sits at the heart of Prados’s
anthology *Homenaje al poeta*, the first posthumous collection of his friend’s work and anthology of literary tributes. *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca, contra su muerte* was at its inception more than an anthology; it was a protest and an active re-composition of Lorca’s missing figure and threatened literary corpus.

The armature and genetic characteristics of the archival object that is Prados’s own copy of *Homenaje* reveal how he conceived this new corpus. The index (pages 199-200) shows how the book is effectively divided evenly into two parts. These sections uphold in equilibrium the dual mission indicated in the anthology’s title: honoring the figure of the poet and speaking out against his death, and doing so by assembling a multi-genre corpus.

*Homenaje(s) al poeta Federico García Lorca*

The homage includes essays about and elegies to Lorca from Antonio Machado, José Moreno Villa, José Bergamín, Dámaso Alonso, Vicente Aleixandre, Prados, Pedro Garfias, Juan Gil Albert, Pablo Neruda, Rafael Alberti, Manuel Altolaguirre, Arturo Serrano Plaja, Miguel Hernández, Lorenzo Varda, and Antonio Aparicio. The elegies, as the form entails, generally lament the poet’s death, but the short essays serve as counterbalances celebrating Lorca’s life and person. This first half of the volume includes seventeen tributes to Lorca, spanning pages 7-70. The index spotlights the individual authors’ names, which are capitalized, while the titles of their contributions are in parenthesis. Just as Prados added an “s” in pencil to pluralize *Homenaje* on the cover page of his copy, his anthology emphasizes the personal and human, the community of authors and the multitude of living voices engaged in this revival of Lorca as embodied poet. Likewise, Prados marked various passages of essays and stanzas of poems by underlining and using brackets and “X”’s, demonstrating his ongoing interest in the project after it was published.
Contra su muerte

The second half is predominantly\(^{83}\) Prados’s “pequeña selección” of Lorca’s texts and drawings (“poemas, prosas, teatro, música, dibujos” as described on the cover), spanning pages 79-170. It is the first instance of such a diverse compilation of Lorca’s work, and notably begins with “Balada del agua del Mar” (Libro de poemas, 1921), which, as Prados’s pencil annotation makes clear, Lorca had dedicated “A Emilio Prados[,] cazador de nubes.”

The remaining selection of twenty-some works emphasizes the importance of song in Lorca’s poetry and theater, and his musical compositions. In the index alone, the repetition of various words for “song” is striking: “canción,” “balada,” “baladilla,” “Sevillanas,” “Son,” and even “Romance.” These genres of poetry were performed aloud to a rhythm, memorized and passed on orally and often inter-generationally in popular culture. As historical memory activism, Prados’s selection of musical poetry also gives Lorca’s voice to the reader; as such the anthology sings Lorca into continual life.

Notably, the balance of Prados’s editorial selection is also unabashedly skewed toward texts with which Prados had some sort of personal connection, be it the dedication of “Balada,” poems he first published (Romancero Gitano’s “San Miguel,” to open the inaugural edition of Litoral), or works Lorca created during the height of their friendship (Poema del cante jondo, Mariana Pineda). (For the full selection with notes, please see Appendix 2.) Prados makes his desire to highlight his distinctive relationship with Lorca explicit in the preface to this section. While published in the first person plural (we / nosotros), Prados’s

---

\(^{83}\) As indicated in the anthology’s index, this second half is bookended with two selections not composed by Lorca: The first are “Dos romances del <<Romancero de la Guerra Civil>> publicado de La A.I.A.D.C. de Madrid” by Emilio Prados and Manuel Altolaguirre. Prados’s romance is “Llegada,” marked with an “X” in his copy and lightly edited. Altolaguirre’s poem (the only other invited author to be featured twice) is “A Saturnino Ruiz.” This romance remembers the print technician of Altolaguirre and Prados’s Imprenta Sur and Litoral who died fighting for the Second Republic, as well as his hand in printing Lorca’s poems “hoja a hoja, letra a letra.” The final contribution that follows Lorca’s corpus is “El poeta Federico García Lorca,” an essay by Ángel del Río.
In just two sentences/paragraphs, Prados indicates three goals. First, to gather the richest variety of published material that best demonstrates Lorca’s “human value.” Second, to allow new readers of Lorca to most fully familiarize themselves with his “poetic persona.” Third, and equally important for those who knew Lorca personally, to better sustain his “constant,” “open memory” among them. Prados also clarifies that Homenaje is not an attempt to create an anthology of Lorca’s complete oeuvre; nor is there any other hidden agenda in his project. Prados’s declarations are significant because of what they do and don’t make explicit. Prados indirectly presents himself as having such a vast knowledge of Lorca’s work that he is the most capable of creating a selection that can attest to the author’s “human value,” and keep Lorca’s memory “open,” or alive. Prados also refers to Lorca as “nuestro compañero desaparecido” (italics mine). “Compañero” encompasses a range of meanings, from colleague (as a fellow poet, perhaps in this case) to comrade, but it is the early characterization of Lorca as disappeared, as a desaparecido, that is striking. In the elegy section of the Homenaje, Antonio Machado’s “El crimen fue en Granada” already makes clear that Lorca has been murdered, but Prados’s characterization, while also a euphemism at the
time for a deceased person (DRAE), refers to the status of Lorca’s body. From a twenty-first
century perspective the term of course coincides with Spanish historical memory activism
and the universal terminology for a victim of this particular crime against humanity (forced
disappearance). While it would be anachronistic to read it precisely that way, Prados’s
statement is still powerful in what it dares to verbalize, particularly as he is the only one who
uses this supposed euphemism within the anthology. Both Prados’s preface and his own
anthologized work reflect a mission to (re)construct an embodied Lorquian corpus, one that
might live anew in the exchange between editor, author, text, and reader. His elegy
“Estancia,” also grapples with Lorca’s missing body more directly than any other poem or
essay in the collection, and is an exemplary illustration of the mission Prados outlines in the
preface.

3. INFINITE DWELLING: “ESTANCIA EN LA MUERTE CON FEDERICO GARCÍA
LORCA”

“Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” (pages 31-38 of Homenaje) is the
blueprint for Prados’s queer regeneration and futurity, and his phenomenological dwelling
with Lorca. While not as overtly political as “Llegada,” which describes the “rojos” coming
to avenge Lorca’s murder, it is the more extensive and boldly intimate of the two Lorca
elegies that Prados wrote before leaving Spain. Among numerous elegies featured in the
Homenaje anthology and later in others (including Isabel Clúa’s El crimen fue en Granada: Elegías
a la muerte de García Lorca, published in 2006), Prados’s “Estancia” stands out for how it
invokes and implicates both the poet’s and Lorca’s [absent] bodies in a form of activism
through unwavering vigilance. This activism is encapsulated in the poem’s title, bridging the
dichotomy between constant absence (“la muerte”) and conscious, unlimited presence
Important, this dwelling or being (“estancia,” *estar*) is not with Lorca’s death, but rather *together with* him (“con Federico García Lorca”) in death. As the poem unfolds by section, this dwelling reveals Prados’s shifting understanding of his relationship with Lorca. Furthermore, Prados’s final annotations years later strengthen this intimacy and give Lorca voice and agency.

In my close reading of “Estancia,” I mainly examine two versions of the text. The first, which I will refer to as the “original,” is the one that initially appeared in July 1937 in *Hora de España*, and that was either unchanged or only very slightly modified by Prados when he subsequently published *Homenaje*. This is the version that Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira include in their posthumous collection of Prados’s *Poesías completas*. The second, Prados’s self-annotated manuscript found among the five boxes of manuscripts that he had arranged in his apartment at the time of his death, was never published nor has it been studied before. This version of “Estancia” is a facsimile that Prados himself most likely made of the *Hora de España* publication, as evidenced by the page numbers 145-150. (See Appendix 5 for the full annotated manuscript.) The earliest of Prados scholars, Carlos Blanco Aguinaga, who was responsible for cataloguing Prados’s boxed files, included this annotated facsimile of “Estancia” in a folder he titled *Destino fiel (y otras cosas)*.

*85* See Appendix 4 for a complete English translation of this version.

*86* Carlos Blanco Aguinaga would then further divide these five boxes into twenty (*Lista de los papeles* ix-x).

*87* “Estancia” was first published in July 1937 in the seventh edition of *Hora de España*. This literary magazine was produced monthly from Valencia by *Republicano* writers and intellectuals during the Spanish Civil War.

*88* *Destino fiel* (1938) was never published in Prados’s lifetime, nor has it been to date. While it is understood to have been Prados’s compilation of his wartime poetry, much of which was published elsewhere at the time, the exact contents and order of this collection are unknown because the complete original manuscript was lost. Prior to its expected release, the collection won the Premio Nacional de Literatura bestowed by the Republican government, but the final months of the Civil War did not allow for its printing and distribution. Years later, Prados would recall of those uncertain months and *Destino fiel*: De ahí salí para Barcelona en donde el Gobierno ya se ocupó de mi trabajo. En Barcelona hice el *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca* --construyó su muerte y recogió y publiqué (con prólogo de R. Moñino) el *Romancero general de la guerra de España*. El libro *Destino fiel* fue una recolección de poemas.
In both versions, the poem is organized into four numbered sections, but in the final one Prados strikes the titles that accompany the numbers: “I. PERDIDA,” “II. BUSCA,” “III. ENCUENTRO,” and “IV. PERMANCIA.” I characterize the unpublished version as the “final” one for two reasons: namely, it demonstrates a clear progression in perspective from the published versions; and it is the one that Prados chose to leave behind in his carefully-organized home archive, which he was compiling for an anthology of his complete works (Chica, *Emilio Prados* 86). In this version, he strikes various verses and adds new ones, replaces words, changes tenses, and clarifies with possessives and new verse the relationship between the poetic “I” and Lorca. As the form is a personal elegy, I will refer to this poetic “I” as representing Prados himself; indeed, much of the aim of its content is to invoke the close relationship between the two men.

The only other published “Estancia” to consider, perhaps as an intermediary version between what I am terming the original and the final versions, is the text that was published by Prados in *Homenaje*. Curiously, Prados’s own copy of the anthology, found in his personal library, contains various annotations throughout, but none for “Estancia.” Instead, it is physically marked in another way, with creases. As evidenced from the bottom right corners

---

obligados --circunstanciales-- que di en revistas y otras publicaciones más o menos oficiales. // Afortunadamente, después de obtener el primer premio nacional, antes de editarlo pedí el original y... ¡se lo llevó el gato! ¡Gracias a Dios, por decir algo! [From there I left for Barcelona, where I worked for the [Republican] Government. I composed *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca* — contra su muerte and compiled and published (with a prologue by R. Moñino) *Romancero general de la guerra de España* in Barcelona. *Destino fiel* was a recompilation of obligatory—circumstantial—poems that I gave to magazines and other more or less official publications. // Fortunately, after it won the first national prize, I asked for the original manuscript before it was edited and...the cat got it! Thank God, let’s say!]” (Hernández-Pérez, *Emilio Prados: la memoria del olvido* 442)

However, Prados included to be a mostly complete typeset manuscript in his archive, where one can find various unpublished poems. Nonetheless, scholars Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira did not choose to publish this manuscript as *Destino fiel* in the *Poesías completas*, but rather included the poems that were published in literary magazines or other anthologies of the era in the sections *Romances de la guerra civil* and *Otros poemas, II* — *Poemas sueltos de la guerra civil*.
of pages 31-38, it is the only poem whose pages were folded together. (See Appendix 3.) As such, the poem becomes its own sort of placeholder, tucked away as a central treasure in _Homenaje_, to be opened and revisited, or conversely, to be hidden, disregarded, or amended later. Because Prados had folded these pages as a unit, only the first, with the beginning four stanzas of “PÉRDIDA” would have been immediately readable; the corner of page 31 was turned up to fittingly cut off the final word of the fourth stanza: “ausencia.” While we might never know why Prados folded the pages of “Estancia,” that they were the only ones gathered as such demonstrates that Prados had a unique relationship with that poem, one that continued long after its second publishing in the anthology, and long after Lorca’s death. Coupled with the final manuscript version, it is fair to posit that Prados maintained some sort of special connection to “Estancia” for the remainder of his life, over twenty-two years in exile, and as such lived out the promise his poem makes to forever dwell with Lorca’s cuerpo/corpus.

The only difference in the _Homenaje_ version of “Estancia” published that same year in _Hora de España_ can be found in the second stanza of the second section, “BUSCA”: “la palabra construye la rosa de tus glorias, / sin conocer apenas el calor de tu mano” (7-8, page 34 in _Homenaje_). In the last verse of this stanza (8), Prados published “calor” instead of “color.” This is either his editorial change or a correction of _Hora’s_ misprinted version. While Prados did not change “color” in the final version found among his organized papers, instead, surprisingly, “tus labios” replaces “tu mano,” changing the declaration to be: “la palabra construye la rosa de tus glorias, / sin conocer apenas el color de tus labios.” The first transformation of color into heat is significant as it emphasizes personal touch and therefore closer proximity between Prados and Lorca. If we remember Merleau-Ponty’s articulation of
the sensing body as a membrane, “calor” gives the text more phenomenological impact.

Other acquaintances and friends might have known the skin tone of Lorca’s hands, but not as many would have known or specifically recalled the feeling of his pulsing flesh touching theirs—of experiencing the warmth of his hands. When compelled to choose between the two published versions of “Estancia,” in *Hora de España* and *Homenaje al poeta*, Aguinaga and Carreira opted for “calor” in *Poesías completas* (I, 615), footnoting “color” as the original. Since Prados never published his final (heavily) edited version of “Estancia,” I understand Aguinaga and Carreira’s decision. The change to “calor” brings the image closer to the rest of the poem’s progression, in which Lorca’s cuerpo/corpus will be maintained in Prados’s, and even to the intimacy also implied in “el color de tus labios.” Despite the fact that Prados did not amend “color” in his final, annotated copy of *Hora’s* version (which would have transformed the verse fully into “el calor de tus labios”), the possibility of the “calor” interpretation is invaluable to a phenomenological reading of “Estancia.”

With this in mind, I will turn fully to the study of the original and final versions of “Estancia,” beginning with how the two are structured. As Jiménez Millán has observed, “Dividido en cuatro partes, el poema de Prados guarda cierta similitud estructural con el *Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías*” (“El compromiso político” 142). However, while both are in principle about a dear friend’s death, the narrative and thematic evolution of the four parts largely diverge. *Llanto* revisits the public scene of Sánchez Mejías’s mortal injury in the bullring and relives a dramatized version of his death,\(^9\) whereas “Estancia” is a more personal and phenomenological exploration of grief and a journey toward a metaphysical recovery of Lorca through Prados’s own body. However, if Prados did wish to make a

\(^9\) Sánchez Mejías did not die in the bullring; rather he succumbed two days later in the hospital from the gangrene caused by the bull attack.
reverential allusion to his friend’s iconic elegy, this does come through intertextually in one common theme: the elegist’s claim to have personally known the fallen subject, and to therefore be more authentically mourning him. This avowal is made in contrast to the masses who are fleetingly captivated by the subject’s death simply because of his fame. As proof, Jiménez Millán cites the verse “mientras fuera te cantan los que no te conocen” from Prados’s penultimate stanza in the fourth and final section of “Estancia” (“PERMANENCIA,” 16) as a possible allusion to Lorca’s “No te conoce nadie. Pero yo te canto,” from the last stanza of the fourth and final section of Llanto (“Alma Ausente,” 17). Several verses throughout “Estancia” repeat this theme; others allude to different poems from Lorca’s corpus, as well as evoking and invoking his missing body. I will explore this in greater detail when unpacking the major themes of “Estancia,” demonstrating that Prados’s elegy moves far beyond any honorary echoes of Llanto and into regenerative terrain that begins to knit their literary bodies together.

While Prados strikes the original titles for each of the four sections of “Estancia” in the final version, they clearly indicate the poem’s successful journey toward active recuperation. The loss (pérdida) of Lorca provokes Prados’s search (busca), which leads to an embodied encounter (encuentro) and to the poet’s commitment to actively and perpetually harbor Lorca’s living memory in his own body (permanencia). A certain tension in the meaning of the word “estancia” is eventually resolved; initially, given its reference to a stay of an unspecified but typically limited amount of time, “estancia” can suggest ephemerality. “Permanencia,” however, encapsulates multiple meanings: a sojourn as well, but also a military post, continuity, continuation, presence, and perpetuation. These various dimensions build a message of individual and militant activism, a vigilant keeping-watch.
The first part of “Estancia” bears “loss” as its original title, but the stanzas that compose this section resist acceptance of such a definitive experience. While the poetic “I” of Lorca’s *Llanto* struggles with accepting Sánchez Mejías’s death—“Qué no quiero verla!” (referring to his spilled blood)—he is able to witness his corpse (“Cuerpo Presente”). Prados’s poetic “I” is not allowed this direct catharsis because Lorca’s body is missing. In the first section of “Estancia” Prados searches until the ends of the earth for physical contact with his friend, reaching the precipice of death (“A la oscura ventana donde mueren las sombras”; 7-8 original, 11 final). Lorca’s death is not directly mentioned until the second-to-last stanza, “No te llegan las manos / pero llega la espuma / que como el mar tan lento / avanza de tu muerte” (50-53). In the case of some other person’s death, an elegist’s search could simply be viewed as a poetic gesture, but in the case of the desaparecido Lorca, Prados’s search points to a missing person, one that begs to be found. “No te llegan las manos / y tú mismo te buscas” (19-20) appears in the first version; Prados’s final manuscript brings the elegist even closer to his object: “No te llegan mis manos / y tú mismo las buscas” (23-24). In Prados’s revision years later, the bonds of responsibility and affinity have strengthened: Lorca’s missing body reaches for Prados’s touch, expecting that Prados’s hands should find him (even if it’s ultimately not his hands that do). In this final version, Prados also inserts his friend’s voice and inverts the dynamic of the relationship. By converting his original verses into words that he asserts his friend often spoke to him, it is Lorca’s thoughts and voice that now search and yearn for Prados:
No te llegan las manos. ¿No te llegan mis manos? … Igual que me decías:
Mis brazos se prolongan, abro en mi pensamiento
como la voz profunda como la voz profunda
que te busca en el mundo; que te busca en el mundo;
¡qué vuelos por tu ausencia! ¡Qué vuelos por tu ausencia!

(original, I. Pérdida 9-13)

(“Estancia,” final, I 33-36)

In the metamorphosis that occurs from the original to the final version of this first section
of “Estancia,” Lorca’s voice is also momentarily recovered through song. The image-
metaphor of the “ephemeral” rose rising up to confront the “impure” war (25-28) is
replaced with the multivalent “caracola”—both a shell thought colloquially to capture and
replay the sound of the sea, and an Andalusian song genre to which Lorca contributed.
Prados’s revision echoes Lorca’s own verses in the poem “Caracola – Canciones para niños”
found in Canciones, the collection written between 1921-24 and published per Prados’s
insistence as the first supplement to Litoral in 1927.

Mira, esta caracola Me han traído una caracola
que tú, para mí, cantaste Dentro le canta
abriendo su nacar [sic] un mar de mapa.
la luz que tú me has dado.

(“Estancia,” final, I 33-36) (“Caracola – Canciones para niños” 1-3)

But Lorca’s song is fleeting (“la huida de tu canto,” original verse 35, final 39) and his
murder is ultimately acknowledged (“tu sangre” first “en la arena,” and finally “en la
tierra…” 36 / 40). Despite the continued childlike search for even a fragment of this song
(“Como niños buscamos / la concha de tu nombre,” 39-40 / 43-44), the reality of Lorca’s
forced disappearance and death demands that the subject (Prados) find another approach to
recover and revive his object (Lorca).
The section originally titled “Pérdida” establishes key priorities for Prados’s recovery of Lorca’s \textit{cuerpo}-corpus that will carry through the remaining three sections, strategies that largely diverge from those of the vast body of elegies written to Lorca in \textit{Homenaje} and to this present day. That Prados’s own embodiment is implicit in this activism is the most notable; his is a body with outreached arms and hands that seek touch, but also, in the final version, his very voice is an expansively tactile instrument, his tongue an extremity that reaches out: “los tactos de mi lengua / se extienden sobre el viento” (3-4). Prados’s body, largely defined by its capacity and desire to touch, is driven by the knowledge and memory of Lorca’s body, which introduces two intertwined themes: proximity/intimacy and sensuality. Once again, this becomes even clearer in Prados’s final revision of the poem.

\begin{verbatim}
No te llegan las manos, 
donde tu piel lejana 
te incorpora a los vientos 
que ni el sueño conoce.
\end{verbatim}

\textit{(original, I. PÉRDIDA 2-5)}

\begin{verbatim}
¿No te llegan mis manos? 
¿No han llegado mis manos, 
hasta donde la piel lejana, 
de que tanto me hablaste?
\end{verbatim}

\textit{(final, I 5-9)}

In this final version, a dream appears and it is one known in private conversation between Lorca and Prados. This dream is ambiguous and so, therefore, is the “distant skin.” The dream could constitute the queer utopic ideals that Prados alludes to in his late 1920 diary entry, which would make this “distant skin” a heavenly, sensuous embrace. Otherwise, the dream could be the premonition of death that various poems from Lorca’s own corpus indicate and that biographer Ian Gibson has studied (Gibson \textit{Vida, pasión y muerte} 868 [80, 97, 105, 198-199, 228, 242, 292, 349, 410, 414, 508]). While it might be impossible to decipher this stanza conclusively, what is more important is that Prados makes this secret reference, revealing that his relationship with Lorca was both intellectual and physical. As such, all
intertextual references are qualified as part of this intimacy and bring the skin or membranes of their poetic corpuses to touch (once again recalling Merleau-Ponty), and embrace.

Together with the themes and aesthetic techniques of embodiment, proximity/intimacy, sensuality, and intertextuality, Prados does not shy away from the fact that Lorca’s death was a political assassination. The “blood on/in the earth” (final, 40) and the news of Lorca’s death (49 / 50) first appear as somewhat general allusions, but as Prados’s embodiment increases throughout the rest of “Estancia,” so does his early and explicit historical memory activism.

II. Busca
The second part of “Estancia” marks a sudden change in tone from desperation to accusation, from allusion to forthrightness. Others have abandoned the search for Lorca, and even Republican loyalists appear to risk reducing Lorca to a mere propagandistic icon:

In these first two stanzas, Prados makes his personal obligation based on queer kinship clear and urgent. The world has abandoned Lorca as a corporeal being and is content to fetishize him as a missing martyr of war, but (as I elaborated earlier) Prados has not forgotten his
knowledge of the touch and heat of his friend’s hands and lips. This intimacy and consciousness keeps his memory and verse physically proximate to Lorca’s body.

As such, even when in the following verses Prados evokes idealistic images reminiscent of the utopian communist workers in *Calendario del pan* (“[…] hacia el dulce horizonte / donde el pan y el azúcar con el carbón y el aire / alzan bella la aurora porque el hombre trabaja” [9-12, unchanged]), he gives Lorca more and more agency as a subject. Prados connects his image of the workers with the queer futurity (“el imán de tu brújula,” [9]) that Lorca has represented for him since that early diary entry. While Prados was a supporter of various activist causes before and during the Civil War, “Estancia” reveals how his personal queer activism is triggered by Lorca’s death. Prados remembers perceiving the physical pain of Lorca’s footsteps on the earth (“un dolor más profundo cuando tú la pisabas,” 14 unchanged), his “pulsos” (17) and, once more, his blood (23)—blood that moaned (26), a sexual allusion, but also the pain of his murder—and realizes his unique role in recovering his “hermano” (28) amidst the countless masses “que no te conocen” (27):

Prados’s revision of this stanza is particularly moving; the statement addressed ambiguously in second person that might reference the reader, Lorca, or Prados himself becomes a rousing series of questions meant to activate the reader (or even Prados, self-reflexively) to do the embodied work of remembering. “Presentir,” which signifies intuition experienced physically, is an action Prados’s body will perpetuate “constantly” in the final version, not
simply on more than one occasion, as indicated in the original. That this intuition should occur through his forehead is an image that comes from Lorca’s poetry, specifically returning to the last stanza of “Romance de la Guardia Civil”: “¿Quién te vio y no te recuerda? / Que te busquen en mi frente” (García Lorca 122-23). Prados’s single-verse declaration of his constant sensing of Lorca stands as a confident sentinel answering the “necessary” “call” of “the moment” to ward off the oblivion of others.

III. Encuentro

The third section of “Estancia,” marks a pivotal transformation for Prados as the embodied subject, and is a clear departure from the first two sections, which are centered on Lorca as the object. While the original title would suggest that this section is about the moment of encounter with Lorca (following his loss and the poet’s search for him), the discovery occurs instead within Prados’s body. By consciously dwelling in the finite, mortal, and private space of his corporeality, Prados encounters the infinite and eternal that bridges life and death. While he makes no direct reference to Lorca, this newfound phenomenological embodiment will become the key to reencountering his friend, and the aesthetic activism he will continue to build beyond “Estancia” and into Jardín cerrado.

While Prados makes fewer revisions to this section in comparison to the other three, the changes that he does choose to make strengthen the argument that the “final” version was completed much later in his life in exile in Mexico, after writing Jardín cerrado. Jardín cerrado extensively explores phenomenological embodiment and the thresholds between life and death, the present and eternity, and Prados’s final revisions to “Estancia” strengthen his subject with a more experienced, confident voice with respect to these themes. In the first
stanza, Prados changes “Basta cerrar mis ojos” (1, 3) to “He cerrado mis ojos,” and “[…] me imagino / hallarme nuevamente en la vida que pierdo” (3-4) to “despierto nuevamente en la vida que pierdo” (4), opting for action in both the preterite perfect and the present tenses over mere contemplation. He amplifies the interconnected images of light and life and removes shadows, exits and limits. In the opening of the second stanza, “No es que del sueño surja mi sangre iluminada / cuidadosa y activa a levantar sus cuerpos de la sombra” (5-6), Prados cuts “de la sombra.” In the final revision, the conclusion of this stanza, “[…] mis pulsos en silencio / buscan por mi memoria campos para su suerte” (11-12) is also changed: “buscan por mi memoria la carne que ilumina.” In the third stanza, “Basta entrar en mi muerte para salir de nuevo” (13), he exchanges his escape (“salir”) for the more confident “vivir,” transforming the verse into the exclamatory: “¡Basta entrar en mi muerte para vivir de nuevo!” Likewise, Prados revises the end of the stanza. “Basta cerrar mis ojos para entrar en mi muerte / donde termina el cuerpo sin que avance el olvido” (22-23) now concludes with “para vivir mi cuerpo sin que avance al olvido” (23), returning to his body to experience the life inside of it instead of advancing toward oblivion. The final changes that Prados makes to this section are less clear in the manuscript, but his preoccupation with the image of closing his eyes is important. Prados adds question marks to this shortest stanza, changing only one original declaration into an interrogative: “¿Basta cerrar mis ojos para nacer despertado, / sin límite de sangre y sin dolor de origen?” Removing any doubt that this question might have implied, Prados follows with the final stanza, its words unchanged, by addressing an unnamed audience that includes any reader: “Cerrad, cerrad mis ojos; / quiero hallarme presente” (27-28 [made one verse in the final version]).
Ultimately, Prados’s question of closing one’s eyes is the key to fully experiencing transcendental embodiment in this section. The first section, “Pérdida,” mainly preoccupied with reaching Lorca by extending arms and hands, ends with the desperate extension of his eyes: “y ya en sus cabos últimos / ondean mal mis ojos / casi sin esperanza” (53-33 original, 55-57 final). The second criticizes the voices and words of the masses and the way they contrast with Prados’s personal knowledge of an embodied Lorca. By the third, Prados succeeds in shutting out the external world (“Por fuera queda el mundo, su noche involuntaria, / como un gran cielo muerto que enterrara mi vista” [9-10, unchanged]), and not only by excluding the people who inhabit it, but also by closing his own eyes, which distract him from the sensory universe inside himself. He does not reject touch, but instead explores the interior sensations of pulsing blood that shines in darkness and reveals and touches his interior flesh: “mi sangre iluminada/ cuidadosa a levantar sus cuerpos” (5-6); “[…] caminando mis pulsos en silencio, / buscan por mi memoria la carne que ilumina” (11-12); “y aquí mi sangre alumbra su límpida existencia” (18); “quiero hallarme presente / bajo la tierra oscura que con mi piel hundo” (27-28 / 28-28-29); “quede abierta mi carne a la muerte infinita” (33/ 32).

While this third section is primarily concerned with Prados’s own embodiment, it does not abandon its historical memory activism or recovery of Lorca. At the phenomenological level, this happens as he encounters the universal and infinite in the space of his own body, and activates this interiority. Now, in this awakening and constant dwelling (“quiero hallarme presente” [27/28]), he can more powerfully hold the living memory of Lorca (“[…] mis pulsos en silencio / buscan por mi memoria la carne que ilumina” [11-12]) and embrace him even in his infinite death (“quede abierta mi carne a la muerte infinita”
[33/ 32]). By dwelling phenomenologically, life and death become one limitless and
indistinguishable experience captured in the space of “la eternidad más íntima” (19).
Constant, living memory, held in the fragile space of his body, is activism against erasure by
forced disappearance, war and exile. The experience of this memory moving inside the world
of his body is prioritized over what can be seen. Closing his eyes to the exterior, Prados
enters death (1, 22) to live again (13, 23) in his body (14) without slipping toward oblivion
(23), as he had feared was happening to Lorca’s body in the previous section (II 4). While
the connection to Lorca’s body is less explicit in this section, two verses remind the reader of
the historical context for Prados’s activism, alluding to more than one desaparecido: “Allí la
guerra agita árboles y edificios; / Dentro la luz pregunta constante por los nombres” (20-21,
unchanged). “Constante” harks back to one of Prados’s final revisions in the second section,
“Porque yo te presiento constante por mi frente” (II 14 [italics mine]), demonstrating how
vigilance connects dwelling with this activism. The “light” seeking these missing persons is
in all likelihood Prados’s very own blood, given that in the two prior instances where his
blood is mentioned, he describes it as “illuminated” (5) or “illumining” (“alumbra,” 18). In
this case, Prados’s very living essence, his blood in circulation, is implicated in the work of
recovery.

IV. Permanencia

Prados’s embodied activism is fulfilled in the final section of “Estancia”; his sojourn with
Lorca’s death awakens to its eternal continuity. As the final annotated manuscript reveals,
when Prados revised this section, he made significant changes throughout: adding a new
opening stanza, completely overhauling the closing couplet, and amplifying its intensity (its
confidence and revelations) with exclamatory declarations. In doing so, he would establish more thematic cohesiveness with the previous sections, and demonstrate a maturity of perspective gained with distance and time. The awakening (“despertar”) that Prados describes in the first stanza of the revised third section is further elaborated in the new first stanza of the fourth, and the relationship between consummate living and dying is crystallized:

Despertar no es estar muerto
ni morir es despertar:
morir es vivir entero
pero hay que saber vivir
para morirse completo.
¡Yo, en tu muerte, estoy viviendo! (1-6 final)

At first, this final opening appears to be a general reflection, much as the previous section was addressed to himself and then to the public vosotros. However, as its last verse confirms, Prados is returning to address Lorca in the second person like he did in the first and second sections. The remainder of the final section will speak directly to Lorca, and strengthen the dichotomy between what the external world offers (“aunque” replaced three times by “Y, si” [1/7, 3/9, 5/11]), and what a phenomenologically awakened Prados can achieve by committing his own body to Lorca’s constant revival.

Prados’s vibrant interiority is now prepared to house Lorca, the two dwelling together in this indistinguishable place between life and death—where dying is living fully. By concentrating on his pulse and the bodies of blood in movement that it creates, which he began in the second stanza of the third section, Prados reveals that the skin of these very bodies can reach and call for Lorca (“¿pueden gemirte ausente los bordes de mis pulsos?” [8/14]), just as his hands did in the first section. Prados’s blood can find Lorca’s, which also
moans, as Prados described in the second section in verse 26. Indeed, the following stanza immediately assures Lorca that Prados has found him living and will sustain him as such:

Prados makes two notable changes to two of the verses in this stanza. In the last verse, Prados strengthens the image that his coursing blood is not only capable of finding Lorca, but has already done so and is sustaining him. In the first verse, he changes “tierra” to “canción.” Much as Prados’s editorial selection of Lorca’s literary corpus for Homenaje al poeta emphasizes song, this revision of “Estancia” remembers the activism of reviving Lorca through the singing bodies of others. In this final section, Lorca and Prados’s musical and touching bodies coexist indiscriminately within Prados’s. By closing his eyes, Prados can feel Lorca touching his deepest pulse and stepping as though it were an intimate dance choreography raising Lorca to life (“que pisas los caminos de su latir más profundo. / Basta cerrar los ojos para que te levantes” [10-1/16-17 unchanged]). Lorca’s sonic-haptic embodiment is strengthened further in another of Prados’s revisions in the following stanza: “[…] Si estás en la muerte / sólo de esta manera te escucho: / conmigo caminando, pulso a pulso hacia dentro” (19-21 final), with “escucho” replacing “figuro,” the rhyme and rhythm of “pulso a pulso” continuing this steady dance and song. Once again, this time at the close of “Estancia” as a whole, Prados makes the important distinction between his work and the elegies of others—“mientras fuera te cantan los que no te conocen” (14/20 unchanged)—this time establishing this dichotomy as one of false versus true song.
“Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” closes mysteriously, both in the original published version and in Prados’s emphatic revision, scrawled in large letters at the bottom of the page with the original scratched out multiple times in pen.

El hombre en las cenizas del mundo se deshace;  
su nombre queda entero bajo el sueño del aire.  
(Original 17-18)

¡La muerte en las cenizas del hombre se deshace!  
¡El hombre queda abierto bajo el sueño del aire!  
(Final 23-24)

This new ending covers a page marking (“254”) that Prados would have made when arranging this copy of the poem among others in this section of his final papers, and is further proof that the revisions were completed very late in his life, after the composition of Jardín cerrado (and even after its second edition). What is clear from these final verses is that overcoming death, as we understand it, remains as his central preoccupation; and the transcendental survival of the physical person (“el hombre” in this case) is more important than the status of his name. As such, the revisions once again strengthen the cohesiveness of his argument that the external world cannot sufficiently sustain a living memory of Lorca; instead, his death must pass through Prados’s body to be undone. The ambiguity of “el hombre” allows that this man could be Lorca, Prados, or both together as one, as Prados’s recuperation has already revealed in this section. The final image of this mysterious man “open under the dream of the air” is a distant but poignant reminder of Lorca’s dedication to his close friend in a poem from 1920, “La balada del agua del mar,” just as their intimacy was accelerating: “A Emilio Prados / cazador de nubes.” (This is also the poem that opens Prados’s selection of Lorca’s literary corpus in Homenaje.) As the anecdote goes, Prados was known by his fellow Residencia students for spending hours on the rooftop “catching” clouds with a hand mirror (Hernández, Emilio Prados. La ausencia luminosa 23), the ultimate
poetic gesture of capturing the ephemeral. Lorca’s “Balada” opens and closes with the same stanza, like successive waves, a rhythmic refrain:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{El mar} \\
&\text{sonríe a lo lejos.} \\
&\text{Dientes de espuma,} \\
&\text{labios de cielo.}
\end{align*}
\]

If indeed the “dream of the air” in “Estancia” alludes to Prados’s same heavenly sky with its vanishing and transforming bodies of clouds, then this intertextual exchange with Lorca’s poem is personal and sensual, as in earlier sections. The sea foam in “Estancia” that brought ominous news of Lorca’s death is met with heaven’s/the sky’s lips in “Balada,” and Prados’s anxiety over his loss is replaced with a personal embodied knowledge, not unlike the smiling distant sea.

In its original text, and in the labor of its revisited and revised unpublished version years later, “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” embraces the dualities of being public and private, powerful and vulnerable, expansive and finite. It establishes Prados’s specific form of historical memory activism for Lorca as an embodied person dwelling with his friend’s body, and discovers the metaphysical strategy for transcending his death and unifying the two men’s physical and textual corpora. In the remainder of this chapter, I will turn to a less explicit—indeed, to this day hidden—but surprisingly provocative evolution of this embodied dwelling that Prados continued in his exile in Mexico, which was considered his magnum opus: Jardín cerrado. To my knowledge, no connection has ever been made between these two texts: to explore “Estancia’s” influence on Jardín cerrado, or Jardín cerrado’s influence on Prados’s revision of “Estancia.”

---

Prados signed one of his letters to Lorca (most likely from spring of 1922, two years after “Balada”): “Te abraza alborotado y lleno de espumas, Emilio” (FFGL COA-802, Tinnell, “Epistolario” 41). In this letter, which opens with “Federico de mi alma,” Prados expresses his desperation and unrequited erotic love for Lorca.
is already considered significant for Prados’s construction of his poetic corpus and voice at a new scale. However, it has yet to be examined for how Prados incorporated many of the key themes and metaphors that he first explored with Lorca, or how he recovered the lesser-known literary corpus of his close friend.

As I have demonstrated in the first half of this chapter, shortly after Lorca’s assassination, Prados dedicated his literary activism to anthologies: to Romancero general de la guerra de España, to Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte, to carrying his copy of Gerardo Diego’s Antología de poesía española 1915-31 safely out of Spain. Etymology reveals that “anthology,” composed of the Greek words for “flower” (anthos) and “collection” (logia, from legein ['gather']) “originally denoted a collection of the ‘flowers’ of verse […] by various authors” (New Oxford American Dictionary). Diego’s anthology, with the photographs of its poets preserved under tissue paper, set and safeguarded knowledge of them like dried flowers. Prados’s Homenaje, despite its intention not to anthologize Lorca but instead to keep his memory “open,” was limited by the human need to respond more immediately and collectively to Lorca’s death. It needed to capture the essence of his persona and mourn a missing body publicly, gathering his friends and metaphorically bringing fresh-cut flowers to an empty grave. With Jardín cerrado, however, Prados would use distance, space, privacy and unlimited time to his advantage. He would reflect on the past, experience the present alone, and create a future where both men’s carnal bodies could blossom together and regenerate indistinguishably from the leaves of their verse. A collection of flowers would be replaced with the journey back to the genesis of a queer literary Eden.
4. JARDÍN CERRADO: “EL JARDÍN DE LO POSIBLE”

And still it is not enough to have memories. One must be able to forget them when they are many, and one must have the great patience to wait until they come again. For it is not yet the memories themselves. Not until they have turned to blood within us, to glance, to gesture, nameless and no longer to be distinguished from ourselves — not until then can it happen that in a most rare hour the first word of a verse arises in their midst and goes forth from them.

—Rainer Maria Rilke, *The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*

On the first of April 1939, Franco signed and published a declaration known as the “Último parte de la Guerra Civil Española,” signifying the end of the Civil War and the victory of the Fascists who had overthrown the Republican government. A month later, Prados and other colleagues who had been working for the Spanish Republican government in Paris left Europe definitively. After traveling by ocean liner to New York City, and by bus to Mexico, Prados would begin the last twenty-two years of his life in permanent exile in the capital of the only country to provide continued support to the Spanish Republic. Here he would dedicate years to the wellbeing and education of exiled Republican orphans (adopting one, Francisco “Paco” Salas). Prados would work in publishing and briefly revive *Litoral*, but more than anything, he would extensively grow the immersive but quite enclosed garden of his literary corpus. Deeply woven into the text of what would become his magnum opus are the living memories of his literary and personal relationship with Lorca, many already indistinguishable from his own creative impulse. Like a vine that yokes two trees to grow together, Walt Whitman’s verse would also shape the regeneration of this garden in exile.

As I indicated above, *Jardín cerrado* has never been studied in relation to Lorca or his corpus, nor has it been examined for Whitman’s influence. The latter critical lacuna is perhaps understandable: in addition to comparative literature studies, an understanding of Prados’s dialogue with Whitman entails forensic research and genetic criticism, namely the examination of Prados’s annotated copy of León Felipe’s translation of Whitman’s *Song of*
Myself. The absence to date of investigation into Jardín cerrado’s Lorquian intertextuality, however, is more surprising, and the reasons are no doubt multifold. First, the presence of a perceived geographic and chronological gap appears to segregate the study of Prados’s work during the Civil War—where we find his most explicit writing on Lorca—from scholarship on his exile in Mexico. Ironically, even in the scholarly division of Prados’s work into three periods (early work until a political awaking in 1932; that awakening until his exile; exile until his death) is flawed. While the “third period” begins with Prados publishing his first print edition in Mexico, Memoria del olvido (1940), that text was a recompilation of some of his “first period” or pre-exile collections in Spain: Memoria de poesía and Cuerpo perseguido, from 1926-28. These two books describe anonymous “amores difíciles” (Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira 37), who in all likelihood included Lorca.91 During these initial six years in exile, Prados also wrote Jardín cerrado, first published in 1946 as Jardín cerrado (Nostalgias, sueños y presencias), its very title acknowledging the potent presence of the past in his poetic imaginary.

Second, to my knowledge no scholar has studied Jardín cerrado contemporaneously with Prados’s work in Mexico as a publisher, nor in relationship to the books he was collecting in his personal library. The majority of this chapter so far has demonstrated that Prados not only made multiple contributions to the embodied Lorquian archive during the Civil War, but that on each occasion he expressed a commitment to do so perpetually. As such, it is fair to consider his collaboration with José Bergamín on Poeta en Nueva York as a continuation of the same activism seen in the anthology Homenaje al poeta. In these early years (1940-45), Prados provided his editing and publishing skills to Bergamín’s Editorial Séneca, where one of the earliest assignments was to publish Lorca’s Poeta en Nueva York (1940;

91 The title Cuerpo perseguido is an allusion to Lorca, who dedicated his poem “Perseguido” to “Emilio Prados, claustro de Málaga” (FFGL CAP-L[7]).
originally drafted between 1929 and 1930). Among the poems that Prados would help set to print in this collection was “Oda a Walt Whitman.”

In September 1929, Lorca had visited Columbia University professor Federico de Onís at his upstate home in Newburgh, where he coincided with Léon Felipe. The poet, scholar and translator imparted his passionate knowledge of Whitman’s poetry and previewed his Spanish translation of *Song of Myself* (Gibson, *Federico García Lorca: A Life* 267). It was not until 1941 that this project would culminate in the publication that Prados included in his library in exile. Whitman as both literary figure in Lorca’s “Oda a Walt Whitman” and *Canto a mí mismo* would capture Prados’s attention in those first two years of exile in Mexico. Felipe was already a close friend of Prados; the two coincided with the Alianza de Intelectuales Antifascistas in Madrid. In fact, it was Felipe who confirmed that the generally reticent Prados had openly declared his homosexuality to him during this time (Hernández-Pérez, *Emilio Prados: La memoria del olvido* 26). In 1962 he was one of eight men featured at his casket (most likely a pallbearer) in a photograph of Prados’s private funeral in Mexico City (Chica, *Emilio Prados, 1899-1962* 86; *España Popular* 15 May 1962; Residencia de Estudiantes).

Miguel Prados completed an extensive written and photographic inventory of his younger brother’s small apartment as he left it on the day of his death, documenting that among the few images hanging on Emilio Prados’s walls were portraits of Lorca and Whitman. The scholar Francisco Chica describes how Prados made his home an enclosed garden for his poetic inspiration in exile: “Alejado de oficialismos y refugiado en su

---

92 Lorca left his typed manuscript, littered with cross-outs and annotations, on Bergamín’s office desk in Madrid on July 13, 1936. He included a note for Bergamín, whom he couldn’t locate that day and tragically never would: “He estado a verte y creo que volveré mañana” (Mantilla).

93 During Lorca’s lifetime, “Oda a Walt Whitman” was only published in its full length in a limited edition of fifty copies in 1933 by Alcancía in Mexico.
interioridad, Prados hace de su nuevo hogar (en cuyas paredes cuelgan los retratos de Rimbaud, Lorca, Baudelaire, San Juan de la Cruz, Novalis y Whitman) la imagen de un universo que concentra sus energías en la captación del latido esencial de cuanto le rodea” (Chica, “Emilio Prados en México” 24). Now housed in his archive at the Residencia de Estudiantes, Prados’s copy of Felipe’s translation of Whitman’s Canto a mí mismo (item P169) bears witness to its importance for him; its cover is well-worn, with stains that suggest fingerprints, and various stanzas and verses throughout are annotated in pencil with great enthusiasm, not unlike his copy of Homenaje al poeta. Within this context—together with his growing library that included Heidegger and Rilke—writing in his small apartment, Prados would slowly build the vast landscape and intricate phenomenological environment of Jardín cerrado.

Finally, to thoroughly examine and understand Lorca’s intertextual presence in Jardín cerrado requires looking at multiple unpublished texts by Lorca and Prados that they shared with one another: primarily Lorca’s Suites and Prados’s 1921 epistolary poem, “Jardín.” Not only does “Jardín” begin to explore the space and metaphor of the garden, and incorporate images that twenty-some years later would flourish in Jardín cerrado, but it—and by default later Jardín cerrado—would dialogue with one of Lorca’s early poems “El jardín,” which Lorca wrote between 1920 and 1923 to be included in Suites and published by Prados. While this publication didn’t come to fruition, both “El jardín” (1920) and Jardín cerrado (1947) indicate a close knowledge and mutual aesthetic relationship with gardens. Lorca began writing about gardens in his own first published book94 Impresiones y paisajes (1918); built them more

---

94 Maurer pointed this out in the 2019 exhibit Jardín deshecho that he organized at the Centro Federico García Lorca.
abstractly in Suites, and would later return to this creative space indirectly in Diván del Tamarit\(^5\) (written between 1931 and 1934), another collection unpublished in his lifetime.

Like Whitman’s ever-expanding Leaves of Grass, Jardín cerrado (Nostalgias, sueños y presencias), was Prados’s longest poetry collection, and by all accounts, the one he believed to be his most essential. Antonio Carreira, one of the two editors of Prados’s Poesías completas, illustrates how important Jardín cerrado was to Prados, not simply as a singular work, but as a key part of his literary corpus, and one that he tended to into his last years.

Siempre se ha dicho que Jardín cerrado (México, DF: Cuadernos Americanos, 1946; prólogo de Juan Larrea) es el libro central de Prados, aquel en que encuentra su voz definitiva. El propio poeta debió de creerlo así, puesto que de él publicó una selección amplia en 1953, titulada Dormido en la yerba; en la Antología de 1954 dedica solo a ese libro casi 100 páginas, y, en la misma colección de Losada, publicó una segunda edición completa en 1960, dos años antes de su muerte, indicio de que lo seguía considerando válido cuando su estética había variado de rumbo … (Carreira, “Emilio Prados: las dos versiones de Jardín cerrado”\(^6\))

To thoroughly examine Jardín cerrado and its multiple iterations would require at least a full chapter, if not a dedicated dissertation. For the purposes of this chapter, I will focus instead on how both the overarching work and selections of text connect specifically to Lorca, Whitman, and Prados’s project of a queer utopic, embodied archive against oblivion. It is helpful first to understand the larger narrative arc of Jardín cerrado. Constructed as “one” monumental poem (Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira 51), Jardín cerrado amasses one hundred and fifty-seven poems that are organized through four books, each divided further into two

---

\(^5\) Diván del Tamarit was named for the Huerta de Tamarit, a property complete with a vast orchard owned by Lorca’s uncle and close to the Huerta de San Vicente, where he composed the majority of these poems.

\(^6\) “It has always been said that Enclosed Garden (Mexico City: Cuadernos Americanos, 1946; prologue by Juan Larrea) is Prados’s central book, the one in which he finds his definitive voice. The poet himself must have believed this because he published an extensive selection, titled Asleep/Sleeper in the Grass in 1953; in the 1954 Anthology he dedicated almost 100 pages to this book alone, and, in the same Losada collection, he published a second complete edition in 1960, two years before his death, an indication that he continued to consider it valid when his aesthetic had changed direction […]” (Carreira 2014: 247)
to four parts. This armature outlines a journey from loss to recuperation. Just as the original section titles of “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” reveal a progression toward an embodied transcendence over Lorca’s death and the threat of his erasure, the book and section titles of *Jardín cerrado* trace Prados’s journey from profound loss toward a spiritual and physical discovery and rebirth capable of transcending perpetual exile. Prados’s friend Juan Larrea, who wrote the original prologue, saw in *Jardín cerrado* “la metáfora del cuerpo hispano traslado a América”97 (Chica, *Emilio Prados, 1899-1962* 75). Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira summarize it as a “Libro intenso, todavía agónico, en el que el poeta trata, no ya de huir de la muerte que llevaba, sino, bajo ella, de salvar del olvido su pasado para –con dolor, pero sin nostalgias— soldar fracturas vitales y poder encararse, entero, con lo nuevo que le espera”98 (Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira 67). Outlined here are the titles of the four books and twelve subsections:

---

97 “the metaphor of the Hispanic body transferred to America” (Chica, *Emilio Prados, 1899-1962* 75)
98 “An intense book, still agonizing, in which the poet no longer tries to escape the death [loss] he carried, but rather, under that condition, saves his past from oblivion in order to—with pain, but without nostalgia—solder vital fractures and be able to wholly face the new life that awaits him” (Blanco Aguinaga and Carreira 67).
Most of Jardín cerrado (Nostalgias, sueños y presencias)’s overarching title is repeated in the titles of Book One and its corresponding Part One, leaving only the question of the garden as (en)closed and the meaning of “presencias.” Like in “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca,” the answers can be found through a heightened awareness of the body’s dwelling in the deep present/presence so as to ultimately transcend death. Indeed, I believe that Prados’s understanding of “estancia” is quite similar to what he puts forth as “presencias”: ultimately by meditating on the flora of the natural world, one can draw inward to the enclosed garden of one’s own body and being, and connect more powerfully with the eternal. In the singularity of his own body, Prados finds death and rebirth, and is able to reincarnate what he previously believed was lost.

Before delving into the expansive body of Jardín cerrado, I will consider the important symbolic allusions encapsulated in its title. Two Judeo-Christian references are apparent in
the construct of an enclosed garden to which the poetic “I” has lost access: First, the Garden of Eden or Paradise; and second, sacred virginity. Prados’s circumstance of exile makes it easy to draw parallels between Spain and Eden/the garden of Paradise to which he cannot return. Indeed, the flora inhabiting his lost garden is often native to Andalucía and Madrid. Prados’s attention to the botanical world traces back to his childhood interest, which informed his original choice of pursuing a university degree in Natural Sciences in Madrid. Secondly, while less explicitly relevant, the image of an enclosed garden is historically often associated with the Virgin Mary, and traces back further to the Old Testament in Song of Songs: “Jardín cerrado eres tú, hermana y novia mía; ¡jardín cerrado, sellado manantial! (Nueva Versión Internacional, Ct 4.12)\textsuperscript{99} While I do not believe that Prados’s Jardín cerrado is intended as a larger metaphor of Catholic or Christian virginity, this second historical allusion is fruitful in that it addresses the connection between the sexual human body and the garden. It also addresses the idea of privacy, which invites the interpretation that what is inside the garden is personal and secret—which I believe is in large part intertextuality (read: intercourse) with Lorca’s texts. Furthermore, just like Eden or Paradise, it is both utopic and tragic, a queer futurity spurred on by the Lorquian elegy: what could have been but never was, and as such remains virgin, unborn, and inaccessible but for poetry’s ability to dwell in the fleeting instant. In Lorca’s (dis)embodied death, in the abrupt end to his growing artistic corpus, Prados suffers the profound loss of those “common ideals” of their “cause” (Prados, Diario íntimo 21), even more so in exile and with the demise of the Second Spanish Republic.

\textsuperscript{99} “You are a garden locked up, my sister, my bride; / you are a spring enclosed, a sealed fountain” (New International Version, Song of Sg. 4.12).
Beyond the more universal Judeo-Christian allusion to the Garden of Paradise or Eden, the title *Jardín cerrado* is a specifically Andalusian literary reference to Lorca and Granada via Pedro Soto de Rojas’s *Paraíso cerrado para muchos, jardines abiertos para pocos* (1652). The Generación del 27 was officially born (or “baptized”) when a group of poets gathered in December 1927 in Seville to celebrate the Golden Age poet Luis de Góngora, but Lorca gave two prior homages to *Culturanista* poets at the Ateneo de Granada: one to Góngora in February of 1926, and another to Pedro Soto de Rojas on October 26th of that same year. Lorca had invited Prados to spend the month of October with him in Granada; Prados was thus in attendance at his friend’s second talk, “Paraíso cerrado para muchos, jardines abiertos para pocos,” in which Soto de Rojas and his *Paraíso cerrado* were the central historic and literary reference points. In his lecture, Lorca praised Soto de Rojas for encapsulating the secret nature of Granada’s creative sanctuary. He described how, in order to access that sanctuary, the disillusioned Golden Age poet, “lleno de pesadumbre y desengaños,” needed to close himself off from the rest of the world: “se encierra en su Jardín para descubrir surtidores, dalias, jilgueros y aires suaves” (García Lorca, “Paraíso cerrado”). Tellingly, Lorca’s “Granada (Paraíso cerrado para muchos)” is one of only twenty-some works that Prados selected for the 1937 *Homenaje* anthology to represent his friend’s literary corpus. Both the argument of Lorca’s lecture and

---

100 *Jardín cerrado* could also have been inspired in part by Manuel de Falla’s musical composition *Noches en los jardines de España*, created by the maestro in 1909 and first performed at the Teatro Real in Madrid in 1916. (Prados was already enrolled at the Residencia at the time.) Lorca was a disciple and close friend of Falla, collaborating with him to stage the Concurso de Cante Jondo de Granada in 1922. Prados helped Falla and Lorca by recommending flamenco artists from Málaga for the festival.

101 The Fundación Federico García Lorca preserves an October 1926-dated letter from the artist Benjamin Palencia, sent from Madrid to Prados and Lorca in Granada (FFGL COA-766). This letter, filled with erotic drawings, humor and joyful intimacy, references a recent postcard Palencia received from the two friends.

102 “Full of regret and disappointments… he [Soto de Rojas] locks himself in his garden "Full of regret and disappointments … he locks himself in his garden to discover fountains, dahlias, goldfinches and soft aires” (García Lorca, “Paraíso cerrado”)
the moment in time that they shared influenced Prados for the long-term. Thirteen years
after that early autumn in Granada, in the personal and political defeat of exile, Prados
would begin to remove himself from the external world to build his own Jardín cerrado
(Nostalgias, sueños y presencias), whose first component, as the parenthetical subtitle indicates,
was nostalgia.

Indeed, October 1926 was a pivotal month for Lorca and Prados’s relationship, and
for each of their careers. Margarita Xirgu agreed to play the eponymous protagonist of
Mariana Pineda, which would catalyze and transform Lorca as a dramatist. Prados was about
to publish the inaugural issue of Litoral, which would be printed in November, and would
open with a selection of three\(^{103}\) of Lorca’s “Romances gitanos.” Together with Lorca in
Granada, most likely exultant for his friend and for both of their creative endeavors, Prados
offered to publish Lorca’s Suites together with Poema del cante jondo and Canciones as a
supplement to his literary magazine. Prados was one of a small circle of people closely
familiar with Suites, a collection Lorca composed between 1920-23, and Lorca accepted the
proposal, which was to include a written introduction to the edition from Prados (Martín 24-
25). At the heart of Suites is the image of the garden, predominantly in the series of poems
“El jardín de las toronjas de luna,” which includes the poem “El jardín.” Lorca’s
correspondence with his friends Melchor Fernández Almagro and José de Ciria y Escalante
between July and August 1923 suggests that “El jardín de las toronjas de luna” was
conceived during these months. However, the lacunae caused by lost Lorca-Prados
documents—Lorca’s correspondence to Prados, a possible draft of Prados’s introduction to
the Suites-Poema del cante jondo-Canciones collection, and even the original index to Suites that

\(^{103}\) The first edition of Litoral opens with a drawing by Francisco G. Cossío and selections of “San Miguel,”
“Prendimiento de Antoñito de Camborio,” and “Preciosa y el aire” (4-11).
Lorca gave to Prados—allow for conjectures. In correspondence or in person, did Lorca also share “El jardín de las toronjas de luna” with Prados in 1923—or perhaps even earlier, in some other iteration, such as around the time when Prados wrote to him with one of his first poems, “Jardín” (1921)? As I have cited earlier in this chapter, their affective and amorous relationship began in 1919 and reached its peak in 1923 (Chica, Emilio Prados, 1899-1962 50), and Lorca composed Suites between early 1921 and August 1923 (Maurer, Federico García Lorca. Collected Poems 899). What has survived are two letters written by Prados in which he cites explicit knowledge of poems from Suites. The first is the same undated letter (summer 1921) from Waldsanatorium Davos in which Prados shares his own early poem “Callaron las alondras.” He ends this letter “Te ruego que me escribas “Limonar”, …..si es que me escribes” (Carta 4, transcribed by Tinnell, “Epistolario” 33; FFGL COA-799). “Limonar” is a poem from the “suite” titled “El jardín de las morenas,” which would be published the next year in the literary magazine Índice. In the second letter, most likely from spring of 1922, Prados encourages Lorca to publish Suites, offers to help, and refers to poems from the collection that Lorca did send him: “¡Qué aire[s]cillos más tiernos los que me mandas! Mira yo los pondría después de los poemas densos y los llamaría ‘Abanicos.’” (Carta 7, Tinnell, “Epistolario” 37; FFGL COA-803). “Abanico” would be included in the section “Ruedas de fortuna” near the “suite” “Bosque de las toronjas”—the alternative to “El jardín de las toronjas de luna.” This same letter begins with Prados’s recollection of a garden, which he describes as a metaphor for his love for Lorca:

Mon Repos…mon Repos, Eso eres tú Federico. Desde hace unos días no sé por qué me acuerdo tanto de este maravilloso jardín que vi en Ginebra. […] Es un jardín sobre el lago Leman, quieto y dulce como su nombre, lleno de niños tranquilos y gorriones tranquilos. Al entrar en el jardín se [palabra tachada] mete mi espíritu dentro de la jaulita del nuestro y es uno incapaz [sic] de ser malo ni pensar mal. […]
Mon repos: Nuestro eterno reflejo ha hecho de nosotros una sola lámpara y si soñamos, soñamos juntos para vivir en nuestros alientos mismos. […]

We might never know definitively the linear order of causal relationship between Prados’s “Jardín” (October 1921) and Lorca’s garden poems in Suites. Nonetheless, it is clear that Prados’s initial literary exploration of the space and potentiality of the garden as poet, editor/publisher, lover and intellectual unfolded hand-in-hand with Lorca’s. And, as Lorca wrote to Fernández Almagro and De Ciria y Escalante in the summer of 1923 about “El jardín de las toronjas de luna”: “My garden is the garden of possibilities, the garden of what is not, but could (and at times) should have been, the garden of theories that passed invisibly by and children who have not been born” (translation Maurer, Federico García Lorca. Collected Poems 910 citing Epistolario completo 196-97). Indeed, Lorca’s garden is the embodiment of his particular vision of the elegiac form, inextricably tied up with an unrealized queer utopia, the polar opposite of a lost Eden.

Before leaving Granada, Prados “sequestered” Lorca’s complete handwritten originals for Suites, Cante jondo, and Canciones (Maurer, Federico García Lorca. Collected Poems 912). Their publishing pact would fall apart shortly afterward. Prados’s labored transcription of “Romances gitanos” from Lorca’s often unintelligible handwritten manuscripts (without the help he had requested from his friend) could not stop errata from appearing in the inaugural edition of Litoral in November, prompting Lorca to decide against publishing the full three book supplement (Jiménez Gómez 134). It wasn’t until later, in 1927, that Prados published Canciones. Suites would remain unpublished in Lorca and Prados’s lifetimes. Pages from the Suites manuscript that Prados last had in his possession were lost, most importantly the only known index that Lorca detailed (Martín 25). The history of these pivotal months is
proof of Prados’s unparalleled knowledge of and personal debt to *Suites*, which he then addresses intertextually in *Jardín cerrado*. Lorca’s unborn garden of possibilities would be planted in exile. The promise of extensive collaboration made by the two young poets in Granada under the influence of the Golden Age poet Soto de Rojas—who had enclosed himself in his *carmen* to contemplate infinite paradise through the finite space of his *jardín granadino*—would be fulfilled in more secret terms in *Jardín cerrado*.

While the title of *Jardín cerrado* alone alludes to all of these important Lorquian influences, I believe that Walt Whitman was the external literary figure that unlocked Prados’s creative impulse to build such an ambitious project. Prados would have initially been introduced to Whitman as a literary figure through his earliest mentor Juan Ramón Jiménez. Jiménez visited Whitman’s house in Camden, New Jersey, and wrote about his pilgrimage to that site in *Diario de un poeta recién casado* (1916), published during Prados’s first years at the Residencia while he was under Jiménez’s tutelage (1914-17) (Chica, *Emilio Prados, 1899-1962* 49). Rubén Darío’s *modernismo* also powerfully influenced the young Generación del 27 poets; and Lorca—“tan admirador del dicho poeta” (Gibson, *Lorca y el mundo gay* 242)—and Prados would have known Darío’s poem “Walt Whitman” from *Azul* (1888). Whitman was popular among the *ultraístas* of the 1920s, including Lorca’s friend Guillermo de Torre (Gibson, *Lorca y el mundo gay* 242; *Federico García Lorca: A Life* 247). According to Luis Rosales, Lorca was familiar with the translations *Walt Whitman: Poemas* that Álvaro Armando Vasseur published in Valencia in 1912 (Gibson, *Lorca y el mundo gay* 243). Whitman returned most explicitly as an influence on Lorca during his time in New York, resulting in “Oda a Walt Whitman” (1930). Walt Whitman was also a print publisher, responsible for producing the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* and very close to the publishing process of
subsequent editions. This biographical commonality might have resonated with Prados as he worked on *Jardín cerrado* while employed at Editorial Séneca and *Cuadernos Americanos.*

Whitman/Felipe’s *Canto a mí mismo* from *Leaves of Grass* would have spoken to Prados for many reasons, including its ecstatic sense of embodiment connected with the natural world, its transcendence over death, its celebration of the equality of all and particularly of the common man, and its unabashed celebration of homosexual love. Most likely, it reminded Prados of the “common ideals” of his “cause” with Lorca (Prados, *Diario íntimo* 21). Thanks to his preserved edition at the Residencia de Estudiantes, we can see where certain verses impacted him enough to mark them with brackets and exclamation marks.

Transcending languages and nations, the point of creative connection between Prados, Whitman, and Lorca is encapsulated in the image and symbol of the leaf, one of the oldest metaphors for lyric poetry spanning back to Ovid and Petrarch’s laurel. In English and in Spanish, Whitman’s title *Leaves of Grass* has multivalent significance, including referencing his art form through the leaves of lyric, or even the poetry of grass. (Grass reveals itself within the pages of *Song of Myself* as the eternal metamorphosis from death to life.) In Spanish, more so than in English now, the word for “leaf” and “page” is still commonly one and the same: *hoja.* Of the seven sections that are annotated in Prados’s copy of *Canto a mí mismo,* one stands out for its connection to both the beginning of Prados’s poetry and to *Jardín cerrado: “La hojita más pequeña de hierba nos enseña que la muerte no existe”* (Whitman/Felipe 47). Prados emphatically marked the verse with an em dash and exclamation mark in the margin. (See Appendix 7B.) Indeed, this hopeful image of the eternal in the blade of grass (sprouting from a cemetery plot) is found in a different point in the reincarnation cycle in Prados’s 1921 “Jardín,” in the image of the dead “hojas secas” over which Prados “passes his soul,” his
body “silenced.” Whitman, too, appreciated the sensuality of dry leaves just as he did the new sprouts (“Me gusta olfatear las hojas verdes / y las hojas secas” [Whitman/Felipe 32]). Whitman argues for the eternal in this apparent contradiction, just as in “Estancia” Prados finds proof of Lorca’s reincarnation through his own body’s ability to remember him. Two earlier verses of Whitman’s that Prados annotated also speak to this. First, the inextricable relationship between the invisible (the dead and disappeared, as well as a future utopia) and the visible (the tangibly living world of humans, flora and fauna): “Si falta uno, faltan los dos. / Y lo invisible se prueba por lo visible, / hasta que lo visible se haga invisible y sea probado a su vez”¹⁰⁴ (3, Whitman/Felipe 37 [final two verses bracketed with an exclamation mark in the margin]). Second, Whitman affirms Prados’s belief in the existential and spiritual experienced phenomenologically through nature. We see this in the declarative verse “Lo sobrenatural no existe”¹⁰⁵ (41, Whitman/Felipe 146) that Prados marked with an em dash with an exclamation mark in the margin.

Whitman’s encouragement to explore the sensual and eternal in nature, coupled with profound losses suffered through interminable exile, led Prados to enclose his verse and Lorca’s in the botanical utopia of Jardín cerrado. The fertile, regenerative potential of this imaginative space—first, a world created as external from the body of the poetic “I” with trees, plants and fountains; and soon to be encompassed in the flesh of his own body—was promised by both Lorca and Whitman. In Lorca’s “El jardín,” found within “En el jardín de las toronjas de luna” in Suites (≈1920-23), the poet describes “Como un mapa de lo imposible, / El jardín de lo posible.” (Please see Appendix 6 for the full poem.) Years later,

¹⁰⁴ Whitman’s verses are “Lack one lacks both, and the unseen is proved by the seen, / Till that becomes unseen and receives proof in its turn” (“Song of Myself,” section 3).
¹⁰⁵ Whitman’s verse is “The supernatural of no account, myself waiting my time to be one of the supremes” (“Song of Myself,” section 41).
as Prados embarked on the creation of *Jardín cerrado*, he emphatically marked Whitman’s declaration in his copy of *Canto a mí mismo*: “Yo soy una infinitud de cosas ya cumplidas / y una inmensidad de cosas por cumplir”\(^{106}\) (44, Whitman/Felipe, 157 [verses bracketed with a dash and exclamation mark in the margin]). Indeed, in the infinitude of his own body, Prados would map the impossible.

The journeys through the first two books of *Jardín cerrado* are catalyzed by a series of images connected directly to Lorca and Whitman. In Book One (“Jardín Perdido”), the images of the poplar and the poplar-lined boulevard beckon Prados to commence his journey of recovery. In Book Two, the garden begins to move inward, inside “El dormido en la yerba.” The first poem, “Árboles,” already signals both; here, Prados describes a certain tree as “el material suspiro / de mi oculto silencio” (3-4) and indicates the weight of this private torment: “Pesada está mi frente…/Tal vez mi pensamiento, / voluntario, sus alas / ha fundido en el tiempo” (15-18), the same forehead that in the second section of “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” constantly intuits his dead friend (“Porque yo te presiento constante por mi frente” [II: 24, final]). Now, in the deeper despair of exile, he laments “Los caminos, cerrados / para mi amor abierto” (29-30), and with his heavy head (40), is called to one tree (35) to lie in repose in its shadow (41-42). This first poem begins to paint the image of Prados as “El dormido en la yerba,” the dominating figure and title of Book Two. It is not a coincidence that this image is also found in Attilio Rossi’s first drawing in *Canto a mí mismo* (Whitman/Felipe/Rossi 33); there, it is presumably the naked figure of bearded Whitman laying his (fore)head at the roots of a tree, just opposite the pages including the verses “Me gusta olfatear las hojas verdes / y las hojas secas”

\(^{106}\) Whitman’s verse is “I am an acme of things accomplish’d, and I an enclose of things to be” (“Song of Myself,” 44: 15).
The second poem “Álamo en calma” reveals that the tree is a poplar. The third poem, “Junto al arroyo / Amanecer,” evoking the “Cuerpo fugaz del hombre” (13) and love’s hidden mystery (23-24), ushers in the multi-sensorial flood that is “IV: Primeras nostalgias del jardín perdido.” Here Prados recalls fields of olive groves/trees (“1 Llanuras de sol,” “3 Vega del sueño,” “4 Insomnio,” “5 Campo abierto”), rosemary (“2 Monte oscuro”), and the sea (“1 Llanuras de sol,” “6 Nostalgias de mar y tierra”). The landscape of these poems is clearly Andalusian, demarcating both his Mediterranean home of Málaga and the scented mountains and olive grove plains of Lorca’s Granada. Throughout elaboration of these memories Prados weaves his fear of forgetting, most clearly encapsulated in the closing three verses of “3 Vega de sueño:” “Olivo, oliva, olivar: / mi olvido, olvida, olvidar… // ¡Olivo!,” a haunting allusion to the terrain where Lorca was executed by gunfire and buried.

Las alamedas

It is the poplar, poplar grove and tree-lined boulevard that ultimately beckon Prados on the long, painful journey toward recuperation of Lorca and to rediscover their utopia through embodied, phenomenological dwelling. In the sixth poem, “Bajo la alameda,” his anguish is most latent as he hovers at the liminal threshold, contemplating the past (“1”) and fears embarking on this search (“2”). In the second section (“2”) he also refers to something, or someone, that follows him and a shadow that he pursues. As such, “Bajo la alameda” opens up to different potential readings: Prados could still be dreaming under the poplar amidst a

---

107 Prados’s father was from a small town in the Granada province, a heritage he also proudly claimed. See Footnote 4.
grove of poplars, or in this dream he could be following a tree-lined avenue that takes him back to his lyric origins with Lorca.

1
Ayer, tan cerca el jardín.  
Hoy, ¡qué lejos!

Me voy perdiendo de mi,  
para buscarme en lo eterno...

—¿Hoy?...  
¡Qué lejos!

2
Con temores voy  
pero voy.

Y esto que marcha  
conmigo;  
y esto que va  
tras de mí,  
y esta sombra  
a la que sigo,  
¿a dónde va?:  
¿dónde voy?...

¿Con temores,  
vamos?  
—Con temores.

3
—Y ese rumor?...  

—Es el rumor  
de las hojas secas.  
—Y ¿por qué se quejan?

In the third section of this poem (“3”), Prados confirms his intertextual return to his epistolary poem “Jardín,” and his beginning as a poet in dialogue with Lorca at the Residencia de Estudiantes. In Prados’s “Jardín,” the most repeated image is that of the dry
leaves. The young poet repeats the declaration “¡Hay que callar el cuerpo y pasear el alma / sobre las hojas secas!” and the third time, at the conclusion of the poem, reveals that by doing so he succeeds in accessing the “arteria lírica” of the alameda. (“He callado a [tachado] mi cuerpo / y paseo a mi alma sobre las hojas secas. / ¡Y entro por la alameda!”) Lorca, too, would include the sound of the leaves in “Romance de la pena negra” in Romancero gitano in an evocative Andalusian scene:

No me recuerdes el mar
que la pena negra brota
en las tierras de aceituna
bajo el rumor de las hojas. (García Lorca 19-22)

The older poet Prados now hears the murmur of the dry leaves again; they are dissatisfied that he should hesitate and question his mission.

When Prados gifted Lorca “Jardín,” this earliest of poems, he included the date and location: October 1921, Madrid. The dry leaves easily conjure up an image of autumn in the capital. The alameda evokes strolls through the majestic Parque del Buen Retiro. The linking tree-lined boulevards of the Paseo de la Castellana, Paseo de Recoletos and Paseo del Prado pulse through the center of Madrid like a “lyric artery,” and connect the Residencia where the two young poets lived to the Atocha train station, with its departures and arrivals to and from Granada and Malaga. However, the poplar is particularly significant to the Residencia; the property sat atop what Juan Ramón Jiménez baptized “la Colina de los Chopos,” or Poplar Hill. At the end of his life, Prados returned to the image of the poplar to render homage to the Residencia: his 1961 poem, “Homenaje,” centers around the important

---

108 Prados’s exclamation points appear to be typographical errors, but I use Hernández and Tinnell’s 2013 transcriptions without modification. See Appendix 6 for the full poem alongside Lorca’s “El jardín.”
109 This is the same poem that Margarita Xirgu chose to recite in her speech “De mi experiencia en el teatro,” as I detail in Chapter 1.
relationship between, “El gran álamo, el único -¿el maestro / anterior?- , siempre fiel y junto al agua,” and a young man.

4
La noche, cerrada.
—¿Dónde está el jazmín?
Dormido en el agua.

(¡Qué alto el ciprés!
¡Qué alto el lucero!)

La fuente, callada.
—¿Dónde está la noche?
Dormida en el agua.

(¡Qué alto el ciprés!
¡Qué alto el lucero!)

Si te viera, amor,
Si te viera…
—Ay, ¿dónde está el agua?

(¡Qué alto el ciprés!
¡Qué alto el lucero!)

In this fourth and final section of Jardín cerrado’s “Bajo la alameda,” Prados begins to cross the threshold to search for Lorca (“Si te viera, amor / si te viera…”). Here, three images are at play: the jasmine in the water by the silent fountain; the tall cypress tree; and the stunning, brightest of stars, el lucero (also signifying the planet Venus, the Roman goddess of love [DRAE]). Of all the sensorial images, it is the abundantly fragrant jasmine that brings Prados back to Lorca, and arguably back to the Huerta de San Vicente. In October 1926, the same month they spent together in Granada, Lorca had just planted the jasmine that would flourish at the front of the house. (Years later, Lorca’s family, exiled to New York, recalled how its scent reached the upper balconies [Iborra 13 / Fernández-Montesinos 13]). Jasmine frequently appears in Lorca’s poetry and even in his theater. It is a prominent multisensory
image in one of his last collections, *Diván del Tamarit*, written at the Huerta de San Vicente and inspired by the surrounding landscape. Jasmine is found in “Gacela Primera: Del amor imprevisto,” in “Gacela IX: Del amor maravilloso” as a description of his lover (“eras junco de amor, jazmín mojado”), and in “Casida V: Del sueño al aire libre.” In Lorca’s “Gacela Primera: Del amor imprevisto,” the third and fourth stanzas evoke two images shared in Prados’s poetic imaginary, the garden and the fleeing body (including Prados’s 1927-28 collection, *Cuerpo perseguido*):

Entre yeso y jazmines, tu mirada
era un pálido ramo de simientes.
Yo busqué, para darte, por mi pecho
las letras de marfil que dicen siempre,

siempre, siempre: jardín de mi agonía,
tu cuerpo fugitivo para siempre,
tu boca ya sin luz para mi muerte.

In the last section of “Bajo la alameda” in *Jardín cerrado*, Prados juxtaposes the cypress tree, also present at the Huerta de San Vicente and throughout Granada (and Andalucía) with the *lucero*. Traditionally the perennial that grows around the border of Mediterranean cemeteries, the cypress is both a symbol of death and of the everlasting. (Another powerful example of this juxtaposed symbolism is Vincent Van Gogh’s *The Starry Night* [1889].) Here, Prados alternately proclaims the power of the brilliant star—another metaphor for how he remembers Lorca—and the solitary, perennial presence of his friend’s death. All the while, the mystery of their love and shared lyricism hides with the jasmine in the fountain. While I have previously argued that the tall tree calling to Prados in the first poem of *Jardín cerrado* is a poplar, the other possibility is that the “[…] Delgado, altísimo, / nivelador de vientos” is the same cypress that appears in “Bajo la alameda.” One of the other reasons this species is so frequently planted around cemeteries is for its “cortavientos” ability to shield the stone
structures from the wind. The appearance of “XXI: Bajo el ciprés” later in Book One supports this alternative interpretation.

Ultimately, the key images and metaphors introduced and explored in “Bajo la alameda” accompany Prados on his journey into the garden; they will continue to take on meaning and agency throughout the length of Jardín cerrado. In the short poem “VIII: Refrán,” Prados relives the trauma of Lorca’s death through the lucero:

¿Que un lucero se apagó?...

¡No;
se paró
mi corazón!

¿¡No!

Similarly to “Estancia en la muerte,” through the failure of his external body, Prados discovers his internal body’s capacity to resuscitate life. Here, it is the trauma of the extinguished great star in Jardín cerrado that awakens the interior universe of Prados’s garden (“IX Mi universo”). This subsequent poem begins: “Mi corazón está abriendo los ojos,” and suddenly Prados is walking and moving through the garden. The nostalgic images of Andalucía and Lorca’s poetry return in the following poems of this first book. In “XV: Tres Nostalgias Sin Tiempo,” “XVI: Romance,” and “XVII: Últimas nostalgias del jardín perdido,” the moon, olive grove, jasmine, poplar grove, water fountain (surtidor), lucero, and new Lorquian images appear, most hauntingly the well and the child at the bottom of it. “Tres Nostalgias Sin Tiempo” reveals “Lo que el lucero / perdió, / está en el agua del pozo;” and later “Todo se ha perdido?, “Me acerco al niño que juega: / ¡está al fondo del estanque!” In this immense “jardín del olvido,” Prados begins to struggle with the
recognition of his own body’s presence among these growing lyric ghosts, questioning his fixation on the poplar grove and if he will ever be able to return to it.

It is ultimately the dual image/metaphor of the poplars and the poplar-lined avenue that carry Prados beyond his nostalgia, and deeper into the embodied archive of his enclosed garden. Part Two of Book One, titled “Las alamedas,” contains only one poem, “Cantar del atardecer,” which is unique in that until this point it is the only poem for which Prados includes a location, date, and dedication: “(Chapultepec, 6 de junio) / A José Luis, Paco y Odón, al volver de paseo.” As such, Prados closes Book One by rooting it more firmly in the botanical space of Mexico City, after a walk in the Bosque de Chapultepec, with companions including (most likely) the Republican orphan Paco Salas whom he would adopt in 1942. It is the day after what would have been Lorca’s birthday, and the beginning of the rainy season. In this massive park in the heart of Mexico’s capital, Prados would have found the tall poplars he describes in repeated detail in this poem and possibly in others throughout Jardín cerrado. At the close of this first of the four books, Prados finds both his voice and song (“cantar”) through a productive intertextual return to his 1921 “Jardín” as he focuses on the poplars and the image of the dry leaves. While the poem is dated in June, Mexico City’s climate might have been reminiscent of October in Madrid, with the two months belonging respectively to each city’s rainy seasons and their shedding of leaves. Indeed the second stanza in part one of this poem makes Prados’s emphasis clear: “¡Altas alamedas! / (¿Y las hojas secas?)” (3-4). He is in Mexico in June, but it is clearly autumn (“¡Altas alamedas! / (Y el otoño dice: / ¡altas alamedas!) [9-11]), the moon (6), lucero (15), and a dead star (21) are invoked, and a repeating eco (23) announces his lyrical return from afar (26).
In 1921’s “Jardín,” the multivalent alameda is the “lyrical artery” which allows Prados to dwell in the mystery of the dry leaves. In 1937’s “Llegada” the “alamedas de mi sangre” unlock his elegy to Lorca. Now, in Jardín cerrado, “las alamedas” are the portal to regenerate the shared poetic utopia where their corpuses can thrive:

III

[…] Vengo de las alamedas; las hojas me siguen. Porque me siguen las hojas Siento que mi cuerpo vive. (9-12)

Despite the continued appearance of ominous images, some of which are distinctly Lorquian, Prados concludes Book One with the realization that “las alamedas” is the place he never should have left (VI 16-17).

“El dormido en la yerba”

The second extensive metaphor found in Prados’s utopic garden is that of the sleeping figure in the grass. While “las alamedas” allude to Prados’s lyric relationship with Lorca, “the

110 In the penultimate section of “Las alamedas,” children play while “La tarde estaba soñando / con la muerte” (“V Niños,” vs. 5-6), echoing Lorca’s “Romance de la luna, luna” from Romancero gitano.
sleeper in the grass” primarily evokes Whitman in “Song of Myself.” As I noted earlier, this image first appears at the very beginning of Book One (“Árboles”), when Prados rests his tired forehead at the base of a poplar tree; it is an allusion to Attilio Rossi’s first illustration of the bearded Whitman figure in Felipe’s translation, *Canto a mí mismo* (Whitman/Felipe/Rossi 33). In Whitman’s “Song of Myself,” this figure in repose is more joyful than Prados’s. Whitman invites the reader/lover to “Loafe with me on the grass” (5:3) and quickly enters into an amorous embrace, followed by an extensive laudatory reflection on the grass as proof of universal reincarnation. *El dormido en la yerba* appears throughout Book Two of *Jardín cerrado*, and is prominent throughout Prados’s later career. As I cited of Carreira’s observation earlier in this chapter, Prados also published Book Two of *Jardín cerrado* as a separate poetry collection in 1953 titled *Dormido en la yerba*. Subsequently, in his 1954 *Antología*, Prados included a hundred pages of the original Book Two (Carreira, “Emilio Prados: las dos versiones de *Jardín cerrado*” 247), demonstrating how much the poet valued this selection and how he believed it (and the figure) was representative of his corpus.

The sleeper in the grass immediately ushers in the possibility of an eternal cycle of life and death into his own living body. The first poem in the “Primera parte (Cantares, coplas y sentencias)” of Book Two, “I: Cantar del dormido en la yerba,” clearly defines the enclosed garden as the internal space of Prados’s body, the same sanctuary and archive where he promised to safeguard Lorca in “Estancia en la muerte.”

La muerte está conmigo;
mas la muerte es jardín cerrado, espacio, coto,
silencio amurallado
por la piel de mi cuerpo,
donde, inmóvil –almendra viva, virgen–, mi luz
contempla y da la imagen
redimida, del fuego. ("Cantar del dormido en la yerba" 1-9)

Quickly this space is associated with amorous touch: "Lo dice así, la fuente / y el suspiro. / También / mi sangre cuando besa" (10-13, 33-36), and images associated with Lorca in Book One including the fountain (10), jasmine (19), and the lucero (21). The fourth stanza in this poem is another example of how Jardín cerrado houses and regenerates Lorca’s poetic (and even dramaturgical) corpus, recalling lines from the washerwomen singing in Yerma:

LAVANDERA 4.ª.

... En el arroyo frio
lavo tu cinta.
Como un jazmín caliente
tienes la risa.
Quiero vivir
en la nevada chica
de ese jazmín.

(Y el jazmín, no pregunta
Desmayado en la sombra:
—¿Adónde irá el lucero
que mi nieve ha perdido?...)

(García Lorca, Yerma, II: 1) (Prados, “Cantar del dormido en la yerba,” 19-22)

The second extended evocation of the Whitmanian figure is Book Two’s eponymous poem, “XVI: Dormido en la yerba.” Three recurrent images stand out and are at play with this figure: first, the return of the hojas secas immediately prior in “XV: Ya nada busco;” next, the ominous Lorquian image of the well (XVI, 2); and shortly afterward, the poplars in “XVIII: Desvelo” and “XIX: Bajo la alameda.”

The dry leaves, once the sensual key to unlock embodied lyrical inspiration, are now definitively threatened: “…unas con otras” (2) “…por el viento, solas” (6), “…sobre el suelo, rotas” (10), surrounded by endless shadow (1,5, 13, 15) and frozen, dead water (7,11). Prados appears to be drawn to this “dead water” because in “XVI: Dormido en la yerba” he is asleep next to a well (2, 51) lying on the grass (5, 12, 19, 26, 41). The poet’s employment of
the third and second person in “Dormido en la yerba” is particularly interesting in that it reshapes the sleeping figure into a combination of Prados, Whitman, and even Lorca.

“Todos se acercan y me dicen” (3) initiates an extensive description of the figure, which continues for four stanzas without interruption. Because Prados employs the second person, he invites the reader to more openly interpret who is speaking and who is being described.

“Y tú te tiendes sobre la yerba” opens each of these stanzas, evoking an image also of Whitman in the grass, or even of a lifeless body (“tu sangre del silencio” [32]) such as Lorca’s. To add to the potential intertextualities, in “Oda a Walt Whitman,” Lorca contemplates the image of a “sleeping” Whitman, making a euphemistic reference to the bard as dead:

Y tú, bello Walt Whitman, duerme a orillas del Hudson con la barba hacia el polo y las manos abiertas. 
Arcilla blanda o nieve, tu lengua está llamando camaradas que velen tu gacela sin cuerpo.

Lorca’s Whitman lies on the banks of the Hudson River, another cold (although living/moving) body of water, whereas Prados’s sleeper in the grass comes from “[…] la orilla / donde crece el romero y la alhucema / entre la nieve y el jazmín, eternos” (35-37) a clearly Andalusian landscape that mixes coastal Málaga and the Sierra Nevada of Lorca’s Granada. (Once again, Prados’s verse is reminiscent of the washerwoman’s love song in Lorca’s Yerma.) Revealingly, the continuation of Prados’s verse harks back once again to Lorca’s “La balada del agua del mar,” which I have described in the context of Homenaje al poeta and “Estancia en la muerte”: 

Y tú te tiendes sobre la yerba: cuando ya tus cabellos comienzan a sentir más cerca y fríos que nunca, la caricia y el beso de la mano constante y sueño de la luna.

(García Lorca, “Oda a Walt Whitman” 131-137) 

(Prados, “Dormido en la yerba” 12-18)
The disjunction between the last two lines of this stanza—the second person that speaks to “us” (e.g. readers) and the second person sleeping in the grass—increases the possibility of more bodies in play. We have Lorca’s poetic corpus, Prados’s, and his human body working to house and regenerate both, all speaking to “us” readers, and the Whitmanian figure lying on the grass. By circling back to this image, we are reminded of Whitman’s original reflection on the meanings of the grass in Section 6 of “Song of Myself”: hope (2), a gift of remembrance (5), “itself a child” (7), a mysterious yet universal symbol (8), “the beautiful uncut hair of graves” (12), and indeed the embodiment of eternal reincarnation connecting all living and dead things alike:

What do you think has become of the young and old men?
And what do you think has become of the women and children?

They are alive and well somewhere,
The smallest sprout shows there is really no death,
And if ever there was it led forward life, and does not wait at the end to arrest it,
And ceas’d the moment life appear’d.

All goes onward and outward, nothing collapses,

(Whitman, “Song of Myself” 6: 26-33)

Dime:
¿Qué piensas tú que ha sido de los viejos y de los jóvenes,
de las madres y de los niños que se fueron?

En alguna parte están vivos esperándonos.

La hojita más pequeña de hierba nos enseña que la muerte no existe;
que si alguna vez existió, fue sólo para producir la vida;
que no está esperando ahora, al final del camino,
para detener nuestra marcha;
que cesó en el instante de aparecer la vida.

Todo va hacia adelante
y hacia arriba.
Nada perece.

(Felipe/Whitman, “Canto a mí mismo” 47)

Lorca also employed the image of the grass to connote death. In the opening scene of Bodas de sangre (1933), La Madre exclaims: “Mis muertos llenos de hierba, sin hablar, hechos polvo; dos hombres que eran dos geranios…” (Acto I, Cuadro I). In “Omega (Poema para muertos),” “Las hierbas” alternates as a repeating verse reaching an ominous crescendo. This poem was unpublished in his lifetime and most likely dated summer 1931 (Maurer, Federico García Lorca. Collected Poems 938), suggesting Prados was not familiar with it.
Prados’s struggle in *Jardín cerrado* is to accept this transcendent truth of eternal reincarnation; it is only then that he can discover and embrace Lorca as alive in his own body and literary corpus. His focus on his singular missing “amigo” referenced throughout the work makes this clear. The last stanza of “XVI: Dormido en la yerba” articulates this preoccupation with the one friend who alone can reach him with his embrace among the shadows. In the latter half of “XVI: Dormido en la yerba,” death is still ever-present and does not, as it does for Whitman, immediately provide solace. The crushed rose (24-25), the dying scentless violet (49), and the sleeper’s heart bleeding into the ground (44-45) are all cause for initial despair.

“*Constante amigo*”

In the struggle that marks Prados’s phenomenological journey deeper into *Jardín cerrado*, his direct call for Lorca grows stronger and more amorous. This is most evident in the following poems that I will study in Book Two, as well as in Books Three and Four. The “amigo” referred to since Book One (“Primera parte: Nostalgias y sueños,” “XXIV: La pena en el agua” begins: “Recuerda conmigo, /amigo”) is also referred to as his “amor,” “compañero,” and directly in second person as “tú.” With the exception of “el ausente” in Book Four, these terms and verb tenses bring Lorca closer and closer. These interpellations appear amidst the key images—namely, the poplars and the dry leaves—that are first introduced in Book One. In “XVII: Desvelo” Prados as sleeper in the grass summons the poplars/tree-lined boulevards to carry him to the “dream” (2) and in “XIX: Bajo la alameda” he speaks directly to Lorca in each stanza as “amor”:

Era de noche;
era de noche,
amor,
y las hojas secas
eran de noche. (1-5)

While death persistently calls and permanent loss threatens oblivion, Prados returns to the sensual to sustain his living Lorquian archive. As I have argued earlier, the dry leaves are key to catalyzing this relationship between Prados’s physical body and his lyrical corpus. One of the most poignant poems in Jardín cerrado to articulate the depth and importance of Prados’s struggle is found at the end of Book Two, in Part Two (“La soledad y el sueño”), in “El sueño (Dormido despierto).” “—¿Por qué me llamas dormido, / compañero?” the poem asks repeatedly, and at first it is unclear who is doing the questioning and who is the sleeper in the grass. As each stanza that answers also begins with an em dash, the reader finds a dialogue between two subjects: Lorca and Prados. Prados is the sleeper in the grass, the figure he has assumed for the majority of Jardín cerrado. Now he is awakened by this questioning, to confess why the sleep state is so necessary: it allows him the space to re-imagine his shared utopia with Lorca.

Y pregunto a las hojas marchitas
bajo la alameda,
y al agua que duerme en la fuente
pregunto,
y al jazmín abierto,
si te han visto pasar
y me dicen:
“Tan sólo sentimos,
un roce en el viento.” (26-34)

Prados confesses to Lorca that his head is bent over in his chest (36), his eyes burning with lament (37), his hand wet with tears (43-44). His inner body (“la flor de mis párpados” [40]) and this same hand that reached for Lorca in “Estancia” can only feel him present in dream: “Tan sólo sentimos, / un roce en el sueño…” (47-48). The poem closes with Lorca’s sudden awareness of his death, crying out “¡Compañero!” (50) to Prados.
As *Jardín cerrado* progresses, it becomes more evident that this physical and affective relationship is at its core. Book Three, “Umbrales de sombra” is organized into three parts: “Noche humana,” “Otro amor,” and “Constante amigo,” and contains the poems that most explicitly detail a relationship between the two men’s bodies. In “XIV: Jazmín nocturno,” Prados continues to sleep on the grass by the well, together with Lorca, where the scent memory of jasmine reactivates the dream of a queer utopia:

> Yo no sé; pero aquí estoy contigo,  
> agua dormida en paz sobre la yerba  
> y pienso en una flor  
> que, junto al mar nacida  
> casi se ve y es dueña por su aroma,  
> del mundo que perdí  
> y el sueño que recuerdo… (9-15)

In Book Four, “La sangre abierta,” Prados reopens the metaphor of the nocturnal jasmine as part of the homoerotic encounter, “Ayer, en las alamedas / tuve amor” (“II: Jazmín de la noche” 3-4) and

> Tuve amor y hoy sólo quiero  
> saber que pude tenerlo,  
> pues que, por tu flor, ya veo,  
> jazmín, mi sangre perdida. (“II: Jazmín de la noche” 9-12)

While this second poem expresses a certain unabashed pride, Prados’s journey between these poems is a long one and fraught with doubts. In “XIX: En la media noche” from Book Three, shortly after the first of the two nocturnal jasmine poems, we find Prados addressing the difficulty if not the taboo status of his particular love. The first four of five stanzas begin and end with declarations of “Hubiera preferido, nacer” with burnt eyes (2), fused lips (12), “porque no es justo acariciar lo que se ama.” This anguish is mixed with memory (“entre las hojas del recuerdo” [21]), with the fourth stanza evoking the Mediterranean beach and echoing the shell of “Estancia.” Ultimately, his desire vanquishes the pain of remorse. The
sleeper in the grass continues his activist approach to sustaining the dream of a future queer utopia: “Porque no es justo acariciar lo que se ama / duermo y duermo, ya siempre / con los ojos abiertos” (52-53). Lorca, too, called to Whitman to sustain the dream by continuing to sleep with his beard pointed toward true north, his hands outstretched (“Oda a Walt Whitman” 127-128): “Duerme, no queda nada” (131), he assured.

In Part Three of Book Three, Prados reveals that his “constant friend” is one and the same as death: “Sólo la muerte me acompaña y sigue / como constante amigo” (“I: La muerte y el jardín” [18-19]). Through his description, Prados fuses the tensions and central preoccupations of Jardín cerrado: death and life, absence and presence, memory/the remembered and oblivion/the forgotten—states of being that normally stand in polar opposite to one another. “Saliendo por mi ausencia / tras la presencia viva de mi olvido/ […] contigo, noche, bajo tu alameda” is how he characterizes this journey deeper into the garden, his own body “abandoned” in its original form (1) such that he transforms into a “fantasma hueco” (6). However, as “XII: Invitación a la muerte” reveals, this is Prados’s way of assuming the body of his dead “brother,” Lorca. In this poem, he directly addresses Lorca’s assassination and stands in his place. While I highlight this poem as one of the key examples of Prados giving historical testimony to Lorca’s murder, “XII: Invitación a la muerte” is not the only poem in Jardín cerrado to directly mention the shootings of the desaparecidos. “VII: Última sombra” at the beginning of Book Three describes the victim’s experience of the murder scene so frequent during the Civil War: “Frente a su muro / yo, alzado / en cruz, aguardo mi suerte: / un disparo en el silencio” (17-19). Moreover, in “V: Media noche,” the poem prior, a voice questions if he has heard shots (“Se oye un fragor… / ¿Disparos?” [9-10]). “XII: Invitación a la muerte” takes on Lorca’s death but at the same
time, in tone and substance, intertextually recovers part of Lorca’s garden corpus in *Suites*, one of the unpublished collections that Prados knew so well. Much as Whitman\textsuperscript{112} encouraged the activism of taking on another comrade’s burden, Prados declares that he is prepared.

Before embarking on this journey further into assuming another’s death, Prados describes what appears to be the textual orchard (or garden) that he has created with pen and paper.

He is thinking of death, of Lorca, of what he will leave behind, and describes waiting.

Lorca’s “En el jardín de las toronjas de luna” is his most poignant allusion to queer futurity and regeneration and his own journey to find it.

\begin{quote}
Una emoción aguda y elegiaca por las cosas que no han sido, buenas y malas, grandes y pequeñas, invade los paisajes de mis ojos casi ocultos por unas gafas de luz violeta. Una emoción amarga que me hace caminar hacia este jardín que se estremece en las altísimas llanuras del aire.

Los ojos de todas las criaturas golpean como puntos fosfóricos sobre la pared del porvenir . . . lo de atrás se queda lleno de maleza amarilla, huertos sin frutos y ríos sin agua. Jamás ningún hombre cayó de espaldas sobre la muerte. Pero yo, por un momento, contemplando ese paisaje abandonado e infinito, he visto planes de vida inédita, múltiples y superpuestos como los cangilones de una noria sin fin. (Lorca, “En el jardín de las toronjas de luna,” Prólogo)\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{112} Whitman’s original verse here is much more sensual: “If you tire, give me both burdens, and rest the chuff of your hand on my hip,  / And in due time you shall repay the same service to me, / For after we start we never lie by again” (“Song of Myself,” 46: 17-19).

\textsuperscript{113} A sharp & elegiaca feeling for things that haven’t been—good & evil, large & small—invades those landscapes in back of my eyes that my ultraviolet glasses have all but occulted. A bitter feeling that makes me travel toward this garden that shimmers on its skyhigh prairie.

The eyes of all creatures pound like phosphorescent points against the walls of the future... what was past stays filled with yellowing underbrush, orchards without any fruit, waterless rivers. No man ever fell
By embarking on his journey, Lorca discovers “El jardín” that was never born, but could still blossom (1-2), with new pathways opening and his body multiplying (5-8). In “XII: Invitación a la muerte,” Prados also describes a garden of distinct possibilities, new births and regeneration from/despite death and absence; his paper garden (his *Leaves of Grass*) contains an infinite multitude of (un)published life plans with Lorca.

As Prados’s textual body incorporates Lorca’s corpus, his physical body also archives and bears witness to the trauma that he imagined Lorca suffered. He offers his own chest to experience the gunshots that many a cemetery and town wall caught after they passed through those who were executed; his own eye sockets will archive the bullets. He also repeats the image of extending his hands out to grasp for Lorca, just as in “Estancia,” and expresses the same concern that his “brother” dying comprises not only a physical disappearance but also means that his true memory may be lost to oblivion. By “finding” Lorca dying, he can testify actively to the crime in motion.

---

114 According to all of the subsequent research conducted (decades later) on Lorca’s assassination, he was not shot against a wall. Prados could not have known this, and most likely would have imagined his shooting like the majority of others during the Civil War.
At the end of this stanza we find another intertextual Lorquian reference, this time to “Muerte de Antoñito el Camborio” from Romancero gitano. This is the only Lorca poem in which the poet inserts himself by name, also as a witness to an unjust murder of a gay man whose fearless presence threatened a homophobic society. The image of a delicate waist, in this case “talle,” broken from this homophobic violence, also has homoerotic connotations in Lorca’s poetry. A perfect example of this is the image of the young men singing and “enseñando sus cinturas” (Lorca 2) at the opening of “Oda a Walt Whitman.”
“Umbrales vencidos”

(Búscame despacio
estoy en la yerba.
Búscame despacio,
mi sangre te espera.)


Pero búscame en el árbol.
Bajo la sombra del árbol.
Verde, en la tierra, de su sombra;
tierno en la yerba en la sombra del árbol:
¡toda mi sangre a tus labios!

Whitman115/Felipe, 179, 52: 11-22 [final two verses bracketed/half circled, with an exclamation mark in the margin]

Me doy al barro para crecer en la yerba que amo.
Si me necesitas aún, búscame bajo las suelas de tus zapatos.

Apenas sabrás quién soy
Ni qué significo.
Soy la salud de tu cuerpo
y me filtro en tu sangre y la restauro.

Si no me encuentras en seguida,
No te desanimes;
búscame en otro.
Te espero …
En algún sitio estoy esperándote.

Ultimately, the monumental journey that is *Jardín cerrado* culminates in the triumphant images of thresholds surpassed (Part Two), a seed fulfilled (Part Three), and a solitary body at dawn (Part Four). Emilio Prados’s circular odyssey, not unlike the inward spiral of a *caracola*, is ultimately a return to, recovery, and regeneration of origins that, as I have demonstrated, began in lyrical epistolary exchange with his close friend Federico García Lorca. The imaginary garden that Prados began to construct as a young poet in Spain in 1921, and the simultaneous initiation of his poetic corpus and queer utopia, fully materialized decades later.

When confronted with war, defeat and interminable exile, and all the deaths they implied,

---

115 Whitman closes “Song of Myself” with these verses: “I bequeath myself to the dirt to grow from the grass I love, / If you want me again look for me under your boot-soles. // You will hardly know who I am or what I mean, / But I shall be good health to you nevertheless, / And filter and fibre your blood. // Failing to fetch me at first keep encouraged, / Missing me one place search another, / I stop somewhere waiting for you” (52: 9-16).
Prados created *Jardín cerrado* to safeguard an intertextual archive of vulnerable literary and human bodies. His immense garden pulses with life because of its understanding of Heidegger’s unrushed, whole-bodied *dwelling* (“como rosa en presencia constante” [Prados, “El cuerpo en el alba” 60]), because it relentlessly pursues the fleeting instant (“¡Hoy!... ¡presente!... ¡En el momento!” [Prados, “V: Cuatro coplas con tiempo” 7]), and because it finds rebirth like Whitman did in the very grass growing from the graves of past lives and dreams. It is Lorca’s elegiac *what could have been but never was*, and Muñoz’s *then and there*. It is, as many if not all magnum opuses are, strengthened with the help of other bodies, Freeman’s knitting together of many for a more resilient one. As such, it is no wonder that Prados also annotated these Whitman verses: “Inmensa ha sido la preparación de mi ser / y fieles y amigos fueron los brazos que me ayudaron”116 (Whitman/Felipe 158 [verses bracketed with an exclamation mark in the margin]). Book Four, “La sangre abierta. Vuelta y perennidad en el jardín del cuerpo,” confidently confirms that this utopic garden resides perpetually in Prados’s embodied archive, but also opens this body, its blood, to the reader. Definitively, we can see how “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” figures in the larger journey from 1921’s “Jardín” to *Jardín cerrado*; all of these texts constitute essential components of Prados’s conception of the body’s role in perpetuating the queer corpora that are under constant threat of erasure.

---

116 “Immense have been the preparations for me, / Faithful and friendly the arms that have help’d me” (Whitman, *Song of Myself* 44: 24-25).
The path to Prados’s ultimate arrival and return is familiar: “Umbrales vencidos” are synonymous with the tree-lined avenue, poplar and grove, and at his feet the dry leaves (“I: Árboles” 13-16). Just as Book Three made the amorous, homoerotic nature of Prados’s project unequivocal, here Lorca as beloved moves with him: “Amor: tu cuerpo, sin pie, / junto a mi lado… / Tu pie sin cuerpo…” (“V: La forma que aún no llega” 3: 6-8). The jasmine, lucero and cypress, night and shadow, are contrasted by desire and a kiss (“VI: Órbita de mi vida”).

Prados was certainly not the only poet and friend of Lorca’s to contribute significantly to the Lorquian archive. José Bergamín, Rafael Alberti, Vicente Aleixandre and many others come to mind for their publishing work, elegies and memoirs. But it is the unparalleled mix of a continued public and private regeneration of Lorca’s poetic corpus that makes Prados’s little-studied case particularly worthy of recuperation. Just as Mnemosyne, the Ancient Greek goddess of memory and remembrance, was the mother of the Muses, Prados’s embodied and lyrical memories of Lorca generated a lifetime of poetic and editorial creation in perpetual dialogue with his friend’s corpus. The hand outstretched for Lorca in

Mira, que el jardín se hundió.
—¿En dónde?
En tu corazón.

Mira, que el jardín nació.
—¿En dónde?
En mi corazón.

Prados’s “Estancia” offered itself as the “impossible hand” that Lorca’s poetry reached for just before he was assassinated. A hand that knew the sensual touch of dry leaves; that passed along the lyrical artery of the tree-lined boulevard of their youth; that returned to tend to the leaves of the manuscripts and books in his personal library, stopping to react and revise, to reimagine; a hand that would take him into the garden of the possible.

Yo no quiero más que una mano;
una mano herida, si es posible.
Yo no quiero más que una mano
aunque pase mil noches sin lecho.
Sería un pálido lirio de cal.
Sería una paloma amarrada a mi corazón.
Sería el guardián que en la noche de mi tránsito
prohibiera en absoluto la entrada a la luna.
Yo no quiero más que esa mano
para los diarios aceites y la sábana blanca de mi agonía.
Yo no quiero más que esa mano
para tener un ala de mi muerte.
Lo demás todo pasa.
Rubor sin nombre ya. Astro perpetuo.
Lo demás es lo otro; viento triste,
mientras las hojas huyen en bandadas.
(García Lorca, “VI: Casida de la mano imposible”)

Section on Federico García Lorca’s poetry. Photograph of Federico García Lorca and Rafael Alberti, Madrid 1930.
Appendix 2: List and notes on Prados’s selection of Lorca’s works for *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca contra su muerte* (1937):

[I have bolded all references to song.]

- “Balada del agua del Mar” (*Libro de poemas*, 1921)– Lorca had dedicated this poem to Prados; Prados reinserts this in a pencil annotation: “A Emilio Prados cazador de nubes.”
- “Baladilla de los tres ríos” (*Poema del cante jondo*, 1921)
- “Sorpresa” (*Poema del cante jondo*)
- “Canción de las tres hojas” – Lorca’s composition of the folk song.
- “Cinco canciones” (*Canciones*, 1921-1924)
- “Canción” (Primeras canciones, 1923)
- “Granada (Paraiso cerrado para muchos)”
- “Las tres Morillas” (*Canción* del siglo XV)
- “Oda a Salvador Dalí” (1926)
- “Fusilamiento de Torrijo” (*Mariana Pineda*, 1927)
- “Canción del Café de Chinitas” – Lorca’s composition of the folk song.
- “Romance sonámbulo” (*Romancero gitano*, 1928)
- “San Miguel,” (*Romancero gitano*) – It is significant that this was the first Lorca poem that Prados ever published. It is the first text to open the first edition of *Litoral*, the literary magazine Prados founded with Manuel Altolaguirre to be produced by their Imprenta Sur in Malaga. This issue was released in November 1926, two years before *Romancero gitano* would be
published. Prados and Altolaguirre included three “Romances gitanos”;

“Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio” and “Preciosa y el aire” followed

“San Miguel,” each numbered as though they were indeed part of one larger poem (“Romances gitanos”).

- “Thamar y Amnon” (Romancero gitano)
- **Sevillanas** del Siglo XVIII Lorca’s composition of the folk song.
- “Soledad” (1928)
- “Ruina” (Poeta en Nueva York)
- “Son” (1930) – This poem was later published as “El poeta llega a La Habana. Son de negros en Cuba” in Poeta en Nueva York.
- “Canción de Los cuatro muleros” - Lorca’s composition of the folk song.
- “Canción de la boda” (Bodas de sangre, 1933)
- “Escena de las lavanderas” [in which they sing] (Yerma, 1934)
- “Romance de los pelegrinitos” - Lorca’s composition of the folk song.
- “Cuerpo presente” (Llanto por la muerte de Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, 1935)
- Dibujo de Federico García Lorca – This is a black-and-white facsimile of one of the Antoñito el Camborio drawings, similar to others he drew when dedicating copies of Romancero gitano to friends.
Appendix 3: Emilio Prados’s copy of *Homenaje al poeta Federico García Lorca, contra su muerte*, “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca” pages folded

Emilio Prados Collection (P73) at the Residencia de Estudiantes, Madrid.
Appendix 4: Translation of the published version of “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca”

Translator’s note: According to the Real Academia Española, “soledad” translates into six different meanings. In Prados’s poem, it would be fair to translate it as solitude, wilderness, loneliness, or an Andalusian mourning song. What seems unjust is to limit the word to one definition. In English, solitude encapsulates both a positive and negative state of being alone, as well as offering an archaic term for wilderness. What is lost in English is the potential for Andalusian song, another of Lorca’s art forms.
ESTANCIA EN LA MUERTE
CON FEDERICO GARCÍA LORCA

BEING IN DEATH
WITH FEDERICO GARCÍA LORCA

I
PÉRDIDA

LOSS

No te llegan las manos.

Hands don’t reach you.

No te llegan las manos,
donde tu piel lejana
te incorpora a los vientos
que ni el sueño conoce.

My hands don’t reach,
where your distant skin
folds you into the winds
that not even sleep knows.

No te llegan las manos,
a la oscura ventana
donde mueren las sombras.

No te llegan las manos.

My hands don’t reach,
at the dark window
where the shadows die.

Mis brazos se prolongan,
como la voz profunda
que te busca en el mundo:
¡qué vuelos por tu ausencia!

Mis brazos se prolongan
pero no encuentran nunca,
i el término del cuerpo,
i el dolor de sus límites.

My arms are extended,
like the deep voice
that searches for you in this world:
What flights because of your absence!

Mis brazos se prolongan
y tú mismo te buscas,
oporque todos te llaman
y ya no reconoces
la estrella de tu carne.

My arms don’t reach out,
but do not ever find,
the end of the body,
nor the pain of its limits.

No te llegan las manos.

My hands don’t reach you.

Mira, mira el suelo.
Mira estas duras peñas
donde el dolor y el hombre
se desnudan y olvidan.

Look, look at the ground.
Look at these hard rocks
where pain and man
strip down and forget.

Mira, mira la rosa
junto a la impura guerra
levantar defendiendo
su efímera persona.

Look, look at the rose
next to the unholy war
rising up defending
her short-lived person.

No se oculta a sus pétalos,
ni a la piel de los toros,
la huida de tu canto
y tu sangre en la arena.

She does not hide her petals,
nor the skin of bulls,
your song’s escape
and your blood in the sand.

Mira, mira en el suelo.
Mira esta enorme playa.
Como niños buscamos
la concha de tu nombre.

Look, look at the ground.
Look at this enormous beach.
Like children we scavenge for
the shell of your name.
Como niños andamos
buscándote en la orilla
bajo esta noche hueca
sin alma, del silencio.

Mira, mira en el suelo.

No te llegan las manos,
pero llega la espuma
que como el mar tan lento
avanza de tu muerte.

No te llegan las manos.
Mira, mira hacia el suelo.

No te llegan las manos
y ya en sus cabos últimos
ondean mal mis ojos,
casi sin esperanza.

Like children we go
looking for you along the shore
beneath this hollow, soulless
night of silence.

Look, look at the ground.

My hands don’t reach you,
but the sea foam arrives,
just as the sea so slowly,
draws on from your death.

My hands don’t reach you.
Look, look toward the ground.

My hands don’t reach you
and now at the end of their rope,
my weak eyes flutter
almost without hope.
Tu muerte me repiten; el nombre de tu ausencia, y apenas si detienen su voz para conocerte. ¿Manejado está el viento por el antojo humano que ya en él ni pregunta si tu cuerpo reside?

Bajo su piel violenta que hoy la guerra domina o el silencioso límite rolando de una lágrima, la palabra construye la rosa de tus glorias, sin conocer apenas el color de tu mano.

Yo sé que junto al agua el imán de tu brújula, hace girar sus índices hacia el dulce horizonte donde el pan y el azúcar con el carbón y el aire alzan bella la aurora porque el hombre trabaja.

Pero miro la tierra; quizás no ha conocido un dolor más profundo cuando tú la pisabas. Miro rotos los cauces desangrarse en su pecho, donde levanta el árbol su soledad de mártir.

¿Qué paisajes se encienden debajo de tus pulsos? Sentí los misteriosos sabores de tu savia y sé que hoy en la tierra sólo tu dolor fluye, pero no sé seguirte a través de su forma.

Es verdad que te niegas cuanto el tiempo te llama; cuando la voz te busca necesaria en la sombra; que la muerte se viste con la ausencia en tu sangre, pero yo te presiento de nuevo por mi frente.

Los que no te conocen me llevan a tu alcance; los que nunca supieron que tu sangre gemía. Me repiten tu muerte los que no te conocen. Si estás y eres espacio, hermano, canta el cielo.

They repeat your death to me: the name of your absence, And barely, if they hold back their voice to meet you. Is the wind controlled by human whim such that not even he questions where your body lies?

Under its violent skin dominated now by war or the silent round border of a tear, the word builds the rose of your glories, without hardly knowing the color of your hand.

I know that next to the water, the magnet of your compass turns its needles toward the sweet horizon where bread and sugar with coal and air raise the dawn beautiful because man labors.

But I look at the earth; perhaps it hadn’t known a pain so profound when you used to tread it. I watch broken riverbeds hemorrhaging in its chest, where the tree erects its loneliness of the martyr.

What landscapes ignite under your strong hands? I sensed the mysterious taste of your vitality and know that now in the ground only your pain flows, but I don’t know how to follow you in that form.

It is true that you refused when time called you, when its inevitable voice called you in the shadow; that death dressed herself with the absence in your blood, but I conjure you once again through my forehead.

Those who don’t know you bring me within reach of you; Those who never knew that your blood was moaning. They repeat your death to me, those who do not know you. If you are still here and are space, brother, sing the sky.
Basta cerrar mis ojos para entrar en mi muerte, 
qued y el mundo ha terminado su límite in mis ojos. 
Basta cerrar mis ojos, vuelta de espaldas al tiempo, me imagino hallarme nuevamente con la vida que pierdo.

No es que del sueño surja mi sangre iluminada cuidadosa y activa a levantar sus cuerpos de la oscuridad; es que la vida misma me persigue hacia dentro y enclaustrada en mis ojos lucha con su infinito.
Por fuera queda el mundo, su noche involuntaria, 
como un gran cielo muerto que enterrara mi vista, mientras que caminando mis pulsos en silencio buscan por mí memoria campos para su suerte.

Basta entrar en mi muerte para salir de nuevo. 
Basta cerrar mis párpados para entrar en mi cuerpo. 
Basta cerrar mis ojos: 
Allíqueda la tierra 
Conmigo en pie clavado bajo el negro universo y aquí mi sangre alumbraba su limpiada existencia y el misterio en que labra la eternidad más íntima. 
Allí la guerra agita árboles y edificios; 
Dentro la luz pregunta constante por los nombres. 
Basta cerrar mis ojos para entrar en mi muerte donde termina el cuerpo sin que avance el olvido. 
¡Oh soledad sin viento!

Basta cerrar mis ojos para nacer despierto, sin límite de sangre y sin dolor de origen. 
Cerrad, cerrad mis ojos; quiero hallarme presente, bajo la tierra oscura que con mi piel hundo. 
Quiero quedarme en medio, fruto sólo del mundo, flotando por los cielos bajo su hueca altura. 
Cerrad, cerrad mis ojos a la vida sin dicha; quede abierta mi carne a la muerte infinita.

It’s enough to close my eyes to enter into my death, 
that the world has reached its limit in my eyes. 
It’s enough closing my eyes, turning my back against time, I imagine find myself once again with the life that I lost.

It’s not that my visionary blood springs forth from dream, 
careful and diligent to raise bodies from the darkness; 
It’s that life itself pursues me from within 
and entrenched in my eyes battles with its infinity. 
Outside the world remains, its involuntary night, 
like a great dead sky that should/would bury my sight, whereas walking in silence, my heartbeats search for my memory fields for their fate.

It’s enough to enter into my death to leave once more. 
It’s enough to close my eyelids to enter into my body. 
It’s enough to close my eyes: 
There the earth remains 
Nailed standing with me under the black universe 
and here my blood illuminates its limpid existence 
and the mystery in which is cultivates the most intimate eternity. 
There the war shakes trees and buildings; 
Inside the light constantly asks for the names. 
It’s enough to close my eyes to enter into my death 
where the body ends without oblivion breaking through. 
(Oh solitude without wind! 
It’s enough to close my eyes to be born awake, 
without blood’s limit or the pain of origin.

Close, all of you close my eyes; 
I want to find myself present, 
under the dark earth that I bury with my skin. 
I want to stay in between, fruit only of the world, 
floating in the heavens under their hollow height. 
Close, all of you close my eyes to life without fortune; 
may my flesh stay open to infinite death.
Aunque la luz te niega desiertando tus límites
y no entibia tu sangre contra el cielo sus tactos;
aunque tu voz no eleva los ecos que la aguardan
marchitando en la piedra que enmudece tu olvido.

Aunque el alto lucero cumpliendo su mensaje,
nocche tras noche enciende sin rozar con tu sombra,
precisando en el tiempo su temor cotidiano:
¿pueden gemirte ausente los bordes de mis pulsos?

Jamás podrás perder la tierra de mi cuerpo,
que pisas los caminos de su latir profundo.
Basta cerrar los ojos para que te levantes:
si el viento te ha perdido, mi sangre puede hallarte.

Basta cerrar mis ojos; que si estás en la muerte,
últro de esta manera yo muerto te figuro:
conmigo caminando, pulso a pulso hacia dentro,
mientras fuera te cantan los que no te conocen.

El hombre en las cenizas del mundo se deshace;
su nombre queda entero bajo el sueño del aire.

Aunque the light denies you, abandoning your limits
and does not warm your blood against the sky's touch;
aalthough your voice does not proclaim the echoes that wait for it,
withering in the rock that silences your oblivion.

Although the tall bright star carries out its message,
night after night lighting up without grazing your shadow,
fixing in time its quotidian fear:
can the verges of my heartbeats moan to you, absent one?

You will never be able to lose the earth of my body,
for it is you who walks the paths of its deep pulse.
It's enough to close my eyes so that you should awake:
if the wind has lost you, my blood can find you.

It's enough to close my eyes; because if you are in death,
only in this form, only dead can I belong to you:
walking together with me, pulse by pulse from within,
while outside those who do not know you sing your name.

Man in the ashes of the world comes undone;
his name remains whole under the dream of the air.
Appendix 5: Prados’s annotated manuscript of “Estancia en la muerte con Federico García Lorca”

Emilio Prados Collection at the Residencia de Estudiantes, Madrid.
Photographs of manuscript facsimile at the Centro Cultural Generación del 27, Málaga.

Fig. 7
No te llegan las manos
y tú mismo te buscas;
porque todos te llaman
y ya no reconoces
la estrella de tu carne.

¿No te llegan las manos?

Mira, mira en el suelo.
Mira estas duras peñas
donde el dolor y el hombre
se desnudan y olvidan.

Mira, mira la rosa
junto a la impura guerra
levantar defendiendo
su efímera persona.

No se oculta a sus pétalos,
ni a la piel de los toros,
la huída de tu canto
y tu sangre en la arena.

Mira, mira en el suelo.
Mira esta enorme playa.
Como niños buscamos
la concha de tu nombre.

Como niños andamos
buscándote en la orilla.
...En esta noche hueca,
sin alma, del silencio.

Mira, mira en el suelo.

No te llegan las manos,
pero llega la espuma
que como el mar tan lento
avanza de tu muerte.

No te llegan las manos.
Mira, mira hacia el suelo.

No te llegan mis manos
y ya en su cabos últimos
ondean mal mis ojos,
casi sin esperanza.

BUSCA

¿Tu muerte me repiten? el nombre de tu ausencia?
y apenas si detienen su voz por conocerte?

¿Manejado está el viento por el antojo humano
que ya en él ni pregunta si tu cuerpo reside?

Bajo su piel violenta que hoy la guerra domina
o el silencioso límite redondo de una lágrima,
la palabra construye la rosa de tus glorias,
sin conocer apenas el color de tu mano.
Yo sé que junto al agua el imán de tu brújula,
hace girar sus índices hacia el dulce horizonte
donde el pan y el azúcar con el carbón y el aire
alzan bella la aurora porque el hombre trabaja.

Pero miro la tierra; quizás no ha conocido
un dolor más profundo cuando tú la pisabas.
Miro rotos los cauces desangrarse en su pecho,
donde levanta el árbol su soledad de mártir.

¿Qué paisajes se encienden debajo de tus pulsos?
Sentí los misteriosos sabores de tu savia
y sé que hoy en la tierra sólo tu dolor fluye,
pero no sé seguirlé a través de su forma.

Es verdad que te niegas cuando el tiempo te llama;
cuando la voz te busca necesaria en la sombra,
que la muerte se viste con la ausencia en tu sangre,
pero yo te presiento de nuevo por mi frente.

Los que no te conocen me llevan a tu alcance;
los que nunca supieron que tu sangre gemía.
Me repiten tu muerte los que no te conocen:
Si estás y eres espacio, hermano, esta en el cielo.

III

ENCUENTRO

Basta cerrar mis ojos para entrar en mi muerte,
que el mundo ha terminado su límite en mis ojos.

Basta cerrar mis ojos: vuelto de espalda al tiempo, me imagino
hallarme nuevamente en la vida que pierdo.
No es que del sueño surja mi sangre iluminada
cuidadosa y activa a levantar sus cuerpos de la sombra;
es que la vida misma me persigue hacia dentro
y emplazada en mis ojos lucha con su infinito.
Por fuera queda el mundo, su noche involuntaria,
como un gran cielo muerto que enterrara mi vista;
mientras que caminando mis pulsos en silencio,
busan por mi memoria campos para su suerte.

'Basta entrar en mi muerte para salir de nuevo',
Basta cerrar mis párpados para entrar en mi cuerpo.

Basta cerrar mis ojos:
Allí queda la tierra
conmigo en pie clavado bajo el negro universo
y aquí mi sangre alumbra su límpida existencia
y el misterio en que labra la eternidad más íntima.
Allí la guerra agita árboles y edificios;
dentro la luz pregunta constante por los nombres.
Basta cerrar mis ojos para entrar en mi muerte

¿Donde termina el cuerpo sin que avance al olvido?

¿Oh soledad sin viento?
Basta cerrar mis ojos para nacer despierto,
sin límite de sangre y sin dolor de origen?

Cerrad, cerrad mis ojos;
quería hallarme presente,
bajo la tierra oscura que con mi piel limita.
Quiero quedarme en medio, fruto solo del mundo,
flotando por los cielos bajo su hueca altura.
Cerrad, cerrad mis ojos a la vida sin dicha; quede abierta mi carne a la muerte infinita.

Aunque la luz te niega desértando tus límites y no entibia tu sangre contra el cielo sus tactos; aunque tu voz no eleva los ecos que la aguardan marchitando en la piedra que enmudece en tu olvido...

Aunque el alto lucero cumpliendo su mensaje, noche tenebrosa enciende sin rozar con tu sombra, ¿pueden gemirte ausente los bordes de mis pulsos?

Jamás podrás perderte, tierra de mi cuerpo, que pisas los caminos de su latir profundo.

Basta cerrar mis ojos para que te levantes: si el viento ha perdido, mi sangre puede hallarte...

Basta cerrar mis ojos, que si estás en la muerte, sólo de esta manera yo muerto te fiaré, conmigo caminando pulso a pulso hacia dentro, mientras fuera te cantan los que no te conocen...

El hombre en las cenizas del mundo se deshace, su hombre queda entero bajo el suelo del aire.

La muerte en las cenizas del hombre
Appendix 6: Two gardens: Prados’s epistolary poem to Lorca, Lorca’s contemporaneous poem

**Jardín**

Sobre un lecho de hojas
he visto descansar
las aguas del Otoño.

El cuerpo del estanque
es onduloso y sensual
como la carne morena del Sur.

Sus senos
—en los que bebi mi amargura—
dibujaban en el aire
con su leche de plata
los suspiros futuros
con sabor de azucenas y
de nardos dormidos.

¡Hay que callar el cuerpo
y pasear por el alma
sobre las hojas secas!

Detrás de cada arbol
nos acecha un misterio.

¡Silencio!

¡Hay que callar el cuerpo
y pasear por el alma
sobre las hojas secas!

He oído
como un rozar suave
de melodía soñada.

Es el ruiseñor
que sueña con sus alas
Ya el surtidor se duerme
y se duerme la tarde.

La alameda es una arteria lírica
por la que caminando
podríamos llegar
al corazón de la noche.
Sus plátanos
me llaman
con la canción del viento.

¡Silencio!

He callado a mi cuerpo
y paseo a mi alma sobre las hojas secas.

¡Y entro por la alameda!

---Emilio Prados a Federico García Lorca (10-1921, Madrid)

**El jardín**

Jamás nació, ¡jamás!
Pero pudo brotar.

Cada segundo se
profundiza y renueva.

¡Por aquí! ¡Por allí!
Va mi cuerpo multiplicando.

属性
Atravesando pueblos
o dormido en el mar.

¡Todo está abierto! Existen
llaves para las claves.

Mis múltiples senderos
tenidos levemente
hay que callar el cuerpo
y pasear el alma
sobre las hojas secas.

Aquí contempló todo
Lo que pude haber sido.

Hacen una gran rosa
Alrededor de mi cuerpo.

Como un mapa imposible,
el jardín de lo posible.

Cada segundo se
profundiza y renueva.

Jamás nació, ¡jamás!
Pero pudo brotar!

---Federico García Lorca, *Suites* (1920–23; “En el jardín [el bosque] de las toronjas de luna,” of which “El jardín” is a section)
Appendix 7: *Canto a mi mismo*


A. Attilio Rossi illustration of Whitman/Felipe’s verses

---

```
WALT WHITMAN

lo zumbidos,
los murmullos de la selva.
Me gusta sentir el empuje amoroso de las tiernas
través de la tierra,
el latido de mi corazón,
a la sangre que inunda mis pulmones,
el aire puro que nos orea
en inspiraciones y espiraciones amplias.
Me gusta olfatear las hojas verdes
y las hojas secas,
las rocas negruzcas de la playa
y el heno que se apila en los pajares.
Me gusta oír el escándalo de mi voz, forjando párrafos que se pierden en los remolinos del viento.
Me gusta besar,
abrazar,
y alcanzar el corazón de todos los hombres con mis brazos.
Me gusta ver entre los árboles el juego de luces y de sombras cuando la brisa agita las ramas.
Me gusta sentirme solo entre las multitudes de la ciudad,
en las estepas
y en los flancos de la colina.
Me gusta sentirme fuerte yzano bajo la luna llena
y levantarme cantando alegremente a saludar al sol.
```

Fig. 13
B. Prados’s annotation of “La hojita más pequeña de hierba […]”

CANTO A MI MISMO

¿Cuál es su designio?
Quisiera poder traducir lo que dicen de los jóvenes que se fueron para siempre en la mañana, de los viejos y de las madres que partieron en la tarde, y de los niños a quienes la muerte arrebató en la aurora.

Díme:
¿Qué piensas tú que ha sido de los viejos y de los jóvenes, de las madres y de los niños que se fueron?
En alguna parte están vivos esperándonos. La hojita más pequeña de hierba nos enseña que la muerte no existe; que si alguna vez existió, fue sólo para producir la vida; que no está esperando ahora, al final del camino, para detener nuestra marcha; que cesó en el instante de aparecer la vida.

Todo va hacia adelante y hacia arriba.
Nada perece.
Chapter 3.
Ocaña: Reviving a Lorquian Body (Politic) during the Spanish Transition

What happens when two charged bodies meet at the site of trauma? Ocaña, retrat intermitent, Catalan filmmaker Ventura Pons’s 1978 documentary about artist José Pérez Ocaña, captures a complex subject whose body exudes the energy of the Spanish Transition to democracy: its liberated interrogation of societal repression, open resistance, and bold celebration of new possibility. Ocaña, who declares himself to be a marginalized and resilient figure eschewing all limitations of gender\footnote{In an interview with Pep Domènech for the June 1977 edition of Ajoblanco, Ocaña refuses to be limited by hetero-normative definitions of gender and sexuality, and rejects that his performances make him a transvestite. “Me preguntan si yo soy un travesti; yo no soy ningún travesti. Yo soy un teatrero y mi escenario son las ramblas y mi vestuario son ropa vieja de Los Encantes [el mercadillo Els Encants Vells en Barcelona]. […] / […] Yendo por las ramblas disfrazado hay quien me grita: payasa y payaso, es igual. Ni masculino ni femenino; me siento persona y payaso […] Yo estoy enamorado de todos los hombres y amo a los mancebos esbeltos cipreses, como si fueran la fuente inagotable de la vida, y a las mujeres como a la música.” (“Ocaña, el hombre pintado”). Throughout this chapter, I will refer to Ocaña as he/him because, as evidenced in this interview, Ocaña overwhelmingly referred to himself in the masculine.}, sexuality and class, is intermittently depicted sharing reflections on his life and his world as he and Pons offer his body in a series of

Un muerto en España está más vivo como muerto que en ningún sitio del mundo: hiere su perfil como el filo de una navaja barbera.

—Federico García Lorca, “Teoría y juego del duende” (1933)

No te conoce nadie. No. Pero yo te canto.

La madurez insigne de tu conocimiento.

Tu apetencia de muerte y el gusto de su boca.

La tristeza que tuvo tu valiente alegría.

—Federico García Lorca, “Alma Ausente”

(Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías [1934])
performances for public interpretation: in his home/studio, on the street, in the theater, in
the cemetery, in concert, and always in the filmic archive. However, through invocation and
evocation, Ocaña, retrat intermitent is also about a hauntingly absent body, that of Federico
García Lorca, whose victimization and status as a desaparecido came to symbolically incarnate
the subjectivities, bodies, and Second Republic ideals lost to the Spanish Civil War and the
Franco dictatorship. While Pons’s filmmaking debut (notably after ten years as a theater
director) is unquestionably centered on the subject of Ocaña, I will argue the importance of
understanding how Ocaña’s bodily, theatrical, literary, and biographic invocations of Lorca
act as a powerful vehicle for recovery and mediation. Inspired by Diana Taylor, I explore
how performance can transmit traumatic memory (Taylor 164), and I focus in particular on
how both the subject and filmmaker have achieved this haptically, most powerfully through
duende and deep song, two phenomena celebrated by Lorca himself. In Ocaña’s “acts of
transfer” (in Taylor’s terms), his audience’s bodies are charged to bear witness to Lorca’s. By
presciently moving beyond what Jo Labanyi has termed a “politics of truth” to a “politics of
feeling” (“Testimonies of Repression” 204),118 Pons’s documentary, Ocaña, retrat intermitent,
makes Spain’s desirous bodies visible and visceral in a vital contribution to the nation’s
struggle for historical memory in the twentieth century.

Ocaña invokes Lorca three times by name, more than any other artistic or historical
figure within Pons’s seventy-eight minute documentary. The first time is when Ocaña
contextualizes his own biography by referencing Lorca as another persecuted personality; the
second occurs in Ocaña’s staged performance of an Andalusian widow whose object of

118 In her 2010 essay “Testimonies of Repression,” within the collection Unearthing Franco’s Legacy: Mass Graves
and the Recovery of Historical Memory in Spain, Jo Labanyi argues “for a view of testimonio not so much as a ‘politics
of truth’…but rather as a ‘politics of feeling’” (“Testimonies of Repression: Methodological and Political
Issues” 204). This would seem to be an evolution within the discourse around what Joan Ramon Resina had
more broadly defined in 2000 as the “politics of memory” (Disremembering the Dictatorship 5).
mourning is unveiled as Lorca’s missing body; and the third is when Ocaña recounts the
songs that his dead lover, Manolo, used to sing. The first and last named invocations
occur in two of the intermittent interview scenes shot in the Ocaña’s bedroom (which,
over the course of the film, we discover is also his artist’s painting studio). The second—and
what I will argue is the central—named invocation occurs among the tombs of the Montjuïc
Cemetery in Barcelona. While Ocaña does not explicitly name Lorca in the documentary’s
recovered footage of him on stage at the 1978 Canet del Mar rock festival, Ocaña’s
performance and Pons’s placement of it within the film (sequentially after the cemetery
invocation, and after the three Lorca citations) makes it the final Lorquian evocation. I will
argue that this performance can be seen as even more than what Teresa Vilarós
characterized as a “crescendo lorquiano apasionado” (188). Instead, it is a duende-inspired
*happening* that voraciously celebrates Lorca’s body, after mourning it, in a moment of
liberation for Ocaña that also demonstrates how performance can live haptically in the filmic
archive. While I devote much of this chapter to fleshing out the somber tones of trauma and
historical memory in Pons’s documentary, a closer analysis that includes this last
performance will also reveal how *Ocaña* pointed the way to what Paul Julián Smith has
identified as important “manifestations of love and survival” and the “Spanish ‘queering’ of
García Lorca” (143). In some ways, it is possible to see an inversion of Lorca’s own verse,
“La tristeza que tuvo tu valiente alegría” (“Alma Ausente,” *Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías*):
We can witness the bravery of Ocaña’s unbridled joy in the face of deep trauma.

---

119 Ocaña says that Manolo committed suicide by gunshot (min. 47).
120 Ocaña’s clothing and the consistency of the shots Pons takes in Ocaña’s bedroom (as well as the limited
number of days in which the documentary was filmed) suggest one broken up interview sequence.
I. FEDERICO GARCÍA LORCA AND THE BODY OF TRAUMA

Pons’s documentary of Ocaña is historically situated within what Melissa Dinverno has described as “…the Transition’s politics of consensus,” when Federico García Lorca’s “previously censored body”—and other marginalized subjectivities and bodies—were “being reinscribed into collective history and memory… a moment when the dynamics of constructing a Lorquian body were particularly complicated” (Dinverno, “Raising the Dead” 31). While the Transition to democracy opened the door to an international outpouring of cultural and academic discourse about Lorca—his texts, his life, and his death—it was not until almost thirty years later, in December 2007, more than seventy-one years after Lorca’s death, that “La Ley de Memoria Histórica” (Ley 52/2007, de 26 de diciembre) would create the legal possibility of attempting to recover his missing body.

Nonetheless, through the Franco dictatorship, the Transition to democracy, and to this day, Lorca’s body has been charged with “mediating the treatment of these collective wounds” (Dinverno, “Raising the Dead” 30) of trauma on the larger social body (politic) of the nation, and has even been glorified as the embodiment of Spain’s lost Second Republic (James Fernández). Where official and (literary) historical narrative and governmental (in)action have resisted memories first suppressed under Franco, performances such as Ocaña’s that mediate through Lorca’s corpus/cuerpo take on significance and, I argue, transfer to us a great responsibility. When studying Ocaña’s invocations of Lorca, Dominick LaCapra’s words resound: “Writing trauma is often seen in terms of enacting it, which may at times be equated with acting (or playing) it out in performative discourse or artistic

---

121 As Dinverno unveils, testimonial narratives in the 1970s, before and during the Transition, were marked by efforts to construct a definitive historical document regarding Lorca’s death, and, as such, to “rebury a newly depoliticized lorquian cadaver” (43).
122 As I recount in the introduction, Dinverno is the first to articulate this fusion of Lorca’s “corpus/cuerpo” (“Raising the Dead” 32).
practice” (186-187). Beyond the issue of trauma, it is also important to analyze Ocaña’s autofictional invocations as a recovery and self-embodied regeneration of both personal and collective memory. Joseph Roach’s argument becomes key here too: that in cases such as this an “interdependence of performance and collective memory” (Roach, “Culture and Performance” 45) can be found, and that performances may exemplify the embodiment of (social) memory (47). In this context, Ocaña’s body becomes the site for a Taylorian “act of transfer” of the memory of Lorca’s absence and all that it represents. Indeed, Ocaña’s “[e]mbodied practice…offers a way of knowing” (Taylor 3), and as Dinverno has described of Lorca, Ocaña’s body is equally a “signifying space, a site onto which traumatic experience can be transferred, held at a distance, and made intelligible. His [Lorca’s, but now also as I assert, Ocaña’s] body thus functions as a cultural site that mediates an individual and collective breaking of traumatic silence and the working through of a range of losses” (“Raising the Dead” 41-42). What’s more, in the activism of Ocaña’s performances that recover and regenerate Lorca’s cuerpo-corpus, another example of Elizabeth Freeman’s queer kinship theory can be found, not unlike Margarita Xirgu’s. Indeed, Ocaña’s performances of autofiction can be read as a demonstration of “corporeal interdependence” (Freeman 298-99), which I observed to a different degree with Margarita Xirgu’s decades of Lorquian work. While he might not have felt a personal duty to Lorca like Xirgu or Prados did, Ocaña’s multiple performance interventions and media statements, before and after Pons’s documentary, demonstrate both an appropriation of, and a certain artistic and personal affinity for, the dual Lorquian corpus. I will discuss these invocations that occurred beyond the parameters of Pons’s “intermitent portrait” of Ocaña shortly, in the section “Ocaña’s Lorquian Autofiction.”
2. REVIVING A ZOMBIE: SPAIN’S BODY POLITIC IN THE TRANSITION (1975-1978)

At this critical juncture that was Spain’s Transition to democracy, a body politic that included Ocaña was awakening and beginning to work toward claiming agency and self-representation. In this liminal period, bodily absence and presence were renegotiated, both metaphorically and physically. Scholars such as Vilarós describe the societal body politic of Spain at the time of the Transition as fragmented: a “zombie,” in need of “suture” and “(re)composition” (Vilarós 113). But it was also an awakening body with new representatives; as Vilarós observes, artists like Ocaña exemplified the existence of a “nuevo cuerpo social […] [que] dio voz, estilo y marca a un momento específico de la historia española reciente” (183). The role that Ocaña and other queer artists who explored transvestism, gender and sexuality politics through performance (read: their bodies) was a daring one; many of them had been or were becoming victims, scapegoats and martyrs, much like Lorca. In Ocaña, retrat intermitent specifically, Ocaña alludes and ultimately testifies to abuse in his childhood because of his sexuality and to being beaten by the Guardia Civil as an adult. Not long after the fearless display of his bodywork in Pons’s documentary, Ocaña would become another of these martyrs; in 1983 he would die from hepatitis aggravated after accidental self-immolation during a festival performance in his hometown of Cantillana.

In the film, Ocaña’s transvestism and gender performances move beyond singular self-expression and work toward Vilarós’s “(re)composition” of the Spanish body politic.

123 If Lorca embodied the ideals of the Second Republic, Alberto Mira argues that Ocaña represented the Transition’s most dynamic characteristics: “En cierto modo, Ocaña representará las tendencias más vitalistas de la Transición: el entusiasmo, la voluntad de experimentación, de diferencia, la arrogancia frente a las convenciones hipócritas, la necesidad de ser uno mismo pese a y contra todo. [In a certain sense, Ocaña will represent the most dynamic trends of the Transition: the enthusiasm, the desire for experimentation, the sense of difference, the courage against hypocritical conventions, the need to be oneself in spite of and against everything] ” (Mira 455).

124 “new social body […] [that] gave voice, style and marked a specific moment in recent Spanish history”
They do so through a unique contribution to what Dinverno identifies as a general “incorporation of Lorca’s body into national and cultural history during the Transition” (“Raising the Dead” 31). This was an activity that was “heavily mediated by [Lorca’s] deathly presence” (31), and arguably, in Ocaña’s performances, including his own death shortly thereafter, and yet they are examples of restorative activism. Ocaña’s “(re)composition” efforts, regardless of any comments he makes in his interviews to reject labels and therefore disassociate himself from certain queer communities, contribute important work toward solidarity. In this light, I disagree with Alberto Mira’s assertion of Ocaña:

La postura de Ocaña quiere ser signo de un libertarianismo que, si las circunstancias fueran perfectas, llevaría a la utopía. Pero el <<sálvese quien pueda>> nunca ha llevado a acuerdos: se trata, en este contexto, de una actitud fundamentalmente insolidaria. En cualquier caso, no era una actitud que pudiera conducir a articular reivindicaciones en la Historia. (Mira 459)

Ocaña’s summoning performances, his work toward historical memory, and the way he engages audiences to participate demonstrate otherwise. Furthermore, what Mira’s assertion fails to consider is that in the documentary mode, Pons’s Ocaña, retrat intermitent does double representation work. As Anne Hardcastle explains, a documentary’s work to represent the past is inherently tricky when we consider issues of representation in a postmodern context: ““Representation” has become a somewhat suspicious word through its postmodern association with simulacra, performance, and replication of an eternally displaced and inaccessible real world” (150). However, she reminds us that Bill Nichols, in his extensive study of the documentary form, emphasizes that ““Representation’ also refers to the act of standing in for others and acting on their behalf—the basis of representative, democratic government” (Nichols, Representing Reality 111; qtd. in Hardcastle 150). In this way, Pons’s

125 “Ocaña’s attitude wants to signify a libertarianism that, if the circumstances were perfect, would lead to a utopia. But the mindset of ‘save yourself if you can’ has never led to agreements; in this context, it’s an attitude that fundamentally goes against solidarity. In whichever case, it was not an attitude that would have been able to lead to the articulation of historical revindication” (Mira 459).
film aims to represent Ocaña, and Ocaña represents the trauma of those who have been lost, including Lorca.

As an author of a documentary that can be termed “literary” for its insertion of dramatic and illustrative scenes (Mínguez Arranz 72), the theatrical as well as film director Pons played a key role in assembling the layers of representational potential in the project. Where the dramatic scenes are directly taken from a playwright’s work, such as the film’s staging of Doña Clarines (a play debuted in 1909 by the Álvarez Quintero brothers, whose work Ocaña admired), Norberto Mínguez Arranz has pointed out: “Estas últimas secuencias se convierten en algo incluso más literario y autorreflexivo cuando consideramos el hecho de que fue Pons quien descubrió estos dramas populares en el archivo y alentó a Ocaña a que las interpretara para la cámara” (72). While Joan Ramon Resina has asserted that “cultural anti-francoism was primarily lyric, and dramatic to some extent, whereas the Transition has been overwhelmingly a matter of narrative, both in novel and film” (Disremembering the Dictatorship 9), Ocaña, retrat intermitent can and should also be considered a Transition documentary that contributes to historical memory efforts, and often because of its lyric and dramatic sequences, which are inherently antifranquista.

3. THE FIRST INVOCATION: ALIGNING TWO BODIES IN THE DOCUMENTARY MODE

The first invocation of Lorca occurs in the sixteenth minute of Ocaña, retrat intermitent, and demonstrates clearly “the way in which one’s trauma is tied up with the trauma of another, the way in which trauma may lead, therefore, to the encounter with another, through the

---

126 “These last sequences became something perhaps more literary and self-reflexive when we consider the fact that it was Pons who discovered these popular dramas in the archive and encouraged Ocaña to interpret them for the camera” (72).
very possibility and surprise of listening to another’s wound” (Caruth 8). This scene starts directly after a theatrical staging in which Ocaña, acting as a mother in a state of crazed mourning, laments over the papier-mâché figure of her dead daughter. As the camera pulls back from a close-up of Ocaña’s face, we see that he is dressed in the clothes he wears in many moments of the film: a black bowler hat, white shirt, and dark pants.127 The camera settles at a medium long shot that allows us to see Ocaña sitting on his bed, and it will depict him intimately in this way, in his private space as he shares stories of personal childhood trauma with Pons as interviewer. This scene is, as such, filmed in the participatory mode of documentary that was introduced in the 1960s, which included interviews and archival footage (Nichols, Introduction to Documentary 139), whereas the performance scenes are more aligned with what Nichols calls the “performative documentaries” that would gain prominence in the 1980s (180). Pons himself attributes Ocaña’s overarching documentary style to the influence of the British Free Cinema of the mid-1950s, particularly to the documentary and theater director Lindsay Anderson. “Los tres tratan de la admiración que siento por la gente valiente que lucha contra las adversidades de nuestro mundo contemporáneo,”128 he recently explained in the opening remarks of a 2015 anthology, Ventura Pons: Una mirada excepcional desde el cine catalán (21), that studies his now almost-thirty-year film career.

Ocaña speaks of being beaten and stoned by the people in his hometown, rejected and abused for being “fina” (“refined,” or “delicate,” which he uses in the feminine) and for being woman-like. Laughing irreverently, he compares himself to Mary Magdalene, and

---

127 Pedro G. Romero asserts that the bowler hat was part of Ocaña’s “disfraz cotidiano [“daily/normal costume”]” that together with a walking stick was inspired by his love of silent film, specifically Charlie Chaplin’s The Tramp (Romero, “Ocaña: El ángel de la histeria” 57).

128 “The three relate to the admiration I feel for the brave people who fight against the adversities of our contemporary world […]” (Pons, Ventura Pons 21)
Pons, in a rare moment, also speaks; his off-screen voice asks Ocaña why the people stoned him, adding to the documentary style of investigative testimony. As he testifies to his own past—recounting his childhood in Cantillana, a small Andalusian town in Sevilla province—he both subtly and directly aligns himself with Lorca. In the interrupted series of interview scenes, he will share his sexual adventures, and will speak of desirously watching gypsies bathing in the river, taking pleasure in the sight of their male bodies. Similarly, throughout the corpus of his poetry, Lorca’s poetic voice will delight in and desire the male torso (e.g. “Oda a Walt Whitman”), and contemplate the eroticism of the male bodies of Andalusian gypsies in Romancero gitano. Both artists will also use Andalusia as the backdrop and aesthetic inspiration for much of their work.

Ocaña’s vision of his difference—the reason he has been marginalized and abused—is artistic; he sees his sexuality as inextricable from his perception and aesthetic appreciation of the world. His first direct invocation of Lorca is powerful because it connects the latter’s trauma (the ultimate extension of physical abuse—murder) with this artistic vision, and because it aligns his body with Lorca’s:

Y estaba totalmente marginado. [...] cada día me hacían putadas, pero yo pa’lante, pa’ lante, vamos, terriblemente pa’ lante. Y por las tardes lo más bonito era parar la bicicleta y me ponía a cortar flores. Cuando me veían se ponían negros. Es que para ellos, es que un tío que se pone a cortar flores o se pone a ver la puesta de sol no es nada normal. Lo normal es ir a trabajar, si puedes por la noche pues al café, echarte una novia, que es lo normal para ellos. Para ellos un tío que hacía pasos por la calle en primavera cuando pasaba la Semana Santa, o que hacía carrozas de algodón no era nada normal. Por eso era la polémica que tuvo García Lorca, que le mataron con dos tiros en el culo porque era homosexual.  

129 Later in the film Ocaña cites the two “Antoñito el Camborio” poems from Romancero gitano. Lorca’s collection also famously includes “La casada infiel” in the voice of a male gypsy who recounts his sexual affair with a non-gypsy woman at the edge of a river. A lesser-known poem in this series, “El emplazado” [“Ballad of the Marked Man”], dedicated to his lover Emilio Aladren, includes the verses “Los densos bueyes del agua / embisten a los muchachos / que se bañan en las lunas / de sus cuernos ondulados” (14-17).
130 Through multiple interviews with surviving friends and Granadian acquaintances of the García Lorca family, Lorca biographer Ian Gibson captures the rumor that circulated of the anti-gay torture that García Lorca
While Ocaña rejects labeling himself as homosexual, his matter-of-fact description of Lorca as linked to his own experiences is telling. The third and final direct invocation of Lorca’s name in Pons’s film will occur in the forty-sixth minute, when, holding back tears (in a close-up shot of his face), he recounts the memory of his intimate friend and lover, Manolo, who was disillusioned by the Catholic priesthood. After describing the feeling of grabbing Manolo’s torso, he shares that they sang García Lorca’s *Canciones populares* while Manolo played the lute. What he calls “one of the worst shocks of [his] life” (min. 47) was the moment of trauma in which Manolo shot and killed himself later that same night.

Indeed, these two biographical invocations are the most direct indicators of a Lorquian autofiction present in *Ocaña, retrat intermitent*, which as I will demonstrate began before the documentary and continued afterward.

4. OCANA’S LORQUIAN AUTOFICTION: A COMMITMENT TO REPRESENTATION

As I have just detailed, Ocaña’s first invocation of Lorca occurs in an early scene that works to establish his own autofiction. I employ this literary term, most often used with the novel, not to suggest that the confessional scenes in which Ocaña recounts personal experiences that shaped his past and came to define him are fictitious or intentionally fabricated by either

suffered at the hands of his killers (Gibson, *Lorca y el mundo gay* 371-372). In Gibson’s interview with Ángel Saldana (Madrid: May 27, 1966; Gibson *Lorca y el mundo gay* 427), the latter recounts that Juan Luis Trescastro Medina, a militant member of Acción Popular and known homophobe, declared in front of him “Acabamos de matar a Federico García Lorca. Yo le metí dos tiros en el culo por maricón. [We have just killed Federico García Lorca. I put two shots in his ass for being a fag.]” (Gibson, *Lorca y el mundo gay* 371).

131 “And I was completely marginalized. […] Every day they would bully me, but I kept going […] right ahead. In the evenings I’d stop on my bicycle […] and pick flowers. That pissed them off. To them, a guy who stops to pick flowers…or look at the sunset isn’t normal. It’s normal to go to work…and go to the cafe at night. To have a girlfriend is normal…to them. To them a guy parading…the streets in Holy Week, … or making parade floats, wasn’t normal. That was García Lorca’s controversy. They shot him with two bullets in the ass for being homosexual.”
him or Pons. Instead, it is my intention to underline that these scenes serve to assert a presentation or performance of the self, and layer this subject with a significance that, in the case of Ocaña, is weighted by taking on Lorca’s dual corpus. The construction of a Lorquian Ocaña in Pons’s documentary begins in Ocaña’s testimony of his childhood, and then continues with performances and the interview scenes, as I’ve highlighted with the tragic anecdote about Manolo. But before we can study the central performance scene in Ocaña, retrat intermitent that is ultimately the artist’s most powerful recuperation and regeneration of Lorca, it is important to understand the larger autofiction at work, contextualizing the Lorquian self that Ocaña and Pons are constructing with Ocaña’s prior performance history and subsequent media interventions.

Ocaña was known to have been profoundly influenced by three Andalusian theater-makers whose plays and aesthetics were visible in his staged performances: Federico García Lorca and the Álvarez Quintero brothers, the former from Granada and the latter from Sevilla. According to José León Calzado, Ocaña was already known to improvise performances of Lorca and the Álvarez Quintero brothers’ plays with the papier-mâché figures he sculpted: “Él interactuaba con estas figuras, maquillándose y vistiéndose de forma similar, de tal forma que se convertía en una de ellas. Rodeado de estas imposibles e hieráticas estatuas, interpretaba con absoluto y único desgarro guiones populares improvisados y obras de los maestros Lorca o los hermanos Álvarez Quintero”132 (León Calzado). In the case of Lorca, however, not only did Ocaña stage his plays but also, on at least two occasions, he invoked his (missing) figure.

132 “He interacted with these figures, doing his make-up and dressing himself similarly, in such a way that he transformed himself into one of them. Surrounded by these impassive and inscrutable statues, he performed improvisations of popular plays and works by the maestros Lorca and the Álvarez Quintero brothers with an absolute and unique, profound pain.”
One such Lorquian performance is documented as having been planned well before Ocaña met Ventura Pons. As artist and scholar Pedro G. Romero recounted during a 2015 conference at the Museo Reina Sofía in Madrid, Ocaña had prepared an “homenaje” performance to Lorca in 1976 (Romero, “Sácame del teatro”). The catalogue for Ocaña. 1973-1983: Acciones, actuaciones, activismo, a 2011 exhibit at the Macba in Barcelona curated by Romero, describes how Ocaña created Exaltación de Federico García Lorca with Camilo, his friend and frequent artistic collaborator (who would also appeared in Pons’s documentary).

In summer 1976, Camilo and Ocaña and an amateur dramatics company from Moguer produced this Exaltation of Federico García Lorca, which they were to have performed at the premises of the local OJE Francoist youth organisation headquarters. Aesthetically, the piece was in line with the Teatro Estable Lebrijano\(^{133}\) and similar theatre movements in Andalusia. The play and accompanying exhibition of Ocaña’s paintings never finally opened due to a report to the local police (Guardia Civil). The subject also alludes to the political situation immediately after the death of Franco. (Ocaña. 1973-1983 464)

\(^{133}\) The Teatro Estable Lebrijano was an independent theater group founded in 1966 in Sevilla, directed by Juan Bernabé. The T.E.L. achieved critical international success in its last years with its production of Oratorio (1969-71), created in dramaturgical consultation with José Monleón. The T.E.L. disbanded shortly afterward due to the unexpected death of Bernabé. Another independent theater group arose from the same community: La Cuadra de Sevilla, led by Salvador Távora. After also achieving international success with their debut artistic creation, Quejío (1972), La Cuadra collaborated with Monleón to create LOS PALOS (1975), a flamenco performance that aimed to give testimony to the last days of Federico García Lorca as well as the suffering and oppression of many nameless Andalusians.
Fig. 15 - “Ocaña & Camilo, Exaltación de Federico García Lorca, 1976.” Plataforma Independiente de Estudios Flamencos Modernos y Contemporáneos.

After being thwarted earlier by the authorities, Ocaña might have had more motivation as an artist-activist to incorporate Lorquian invocations—exaltations, even—into subsequent performances, including in his filmic project with Pons. What’s more, the photos available in the Ocaña. 1973-1983 catalogue and on the digital archive Plataforma Independiente de
Estudios Flamencos Modernos y Contemporáneos (for which Romero is a collaborator), document certain characteristic facial and body gestures in Ocaña’s dress rehearsal of the Exaltación performance that will carry through to the Lorquian scenes that I will analyze in Ocaña, retrat intermitent. Most notable of these is in the first photo that suggests a moment of duende, or of the “absolute and unique, profound pain” that Ocaña was able to convey (León Calzado). Romero’s catalogue does not reveal if the planned exhibition of paintings alongside Exaltación was also inspired by Lorca; regardless, that it was to accompany the performance is proof enough that Ocaña was already inviting a certain aesthetic—if not also a thematic—connection between his artistic mediums.

Exaltación de Federico García Lorca was not Ocaña’s only attempted Lorquian intervention prior to collaborating with Pons. He staged a second performance that invoked Lorca the following summer, on June 26, 1977, also involving Camilo, within one of his art exhibits recreating Cantillana at the Mec-Mec Gallery in Barcelona. It was captured on film as part of the Video-Nou’s nascent initiative to document counterculture and social change in Barcelona. Formed in 1976 and active until 1983, Video-Nou was a collective “from all areas of journalism, sociology, anti-psychiatry, education, the visual and performing arts and architecture” (Museo Reina Sofía, “Ocaña. Exposició a la Galeria Mec-Mec”); its Servei de Vídeo Comunitari film initiative was launched in 1978. The Reina Sofia, which now owns the original videos, highlights in its description of Ocaña’s film that it was made on the same day as the first protest rally by the Frente de Liberación Gay de Cataluña / Front d’Alliberament Gai de Cataluña (FAGC) in Barcelona’s Parc Güell. The group was demonstrating to overturn the Franco dictatorship’s Ley de Peligrosidad Social\textsuperscript{134} in the new democracy. In

\textsuperscript{134} The Ley 16/1970, de 4 de agosto, sobre peligrosidad y rehabilitación social, which was created in the last decade of the Franco dictatorship when other societal restrictions were considered to be loosening, targeted individuals, groups and activities that the regime believed to be a threat to its social control of public space, including
this light, the Mec-Mec Gallery performance not only demonstrates that Ocaña repeatedly self-initiated elaborate references to Lorca prior working with Pons, but that his autofiction of invocations aimed to have larger socio-political implications as well. Furthermore, the Video-Nou film is a preview of the performance and editing techniques in Pons’s documentary, both in the way in which Lorca (his name and work) is woven intermittently into the film, and in the incorporation of Lorca’s music and verse.

While not as explicitly Lorquian in its entirety as the Exaltación de Federico García Lorca suggests through its title, the Mec-Mec exhibition performance directly invokes the poet three times. The video appears to be largely filmed or at least closely directed by Ocaña (at times working with another cameraman); it begins with Ocaña guiding the spectator through his exhibit at the Mec-Mec gallery, his off screen voice presumably emanating from directly behind the hand-held camera. The camera moves through various rooms, and Ocaña’s voice can be heard describing paintings, sculptures and installations (including a “patio sevillano”) in an apparently improvised and informal manner. At approximately the third minute, the camera closes in on a narrow room with another space just beyond it (the bathroom, according to Ocaña). As the camera moves over a painting of a flower with Ocaña’s larger signature (one that would be used in various posters for his exhibits and also the title credits for Ocaña, retrat intermitent), Ocaña begins to explain his overarching idea for the exhibit: “En realidad que he querido expresar...en toda la exposición como una poesía, donde se ve desde luego mi—el intento de mi personalidad y se ve... cómo es la poesía andaluza. Se ve a García Lorca, también se ve un poco un poeta de más hacia el centro Miguel Hernández, se

homosexuality, prostitution, immigration, narcotics, pornography, and panhandling. This law was not abolished with the 1977 Amnesty Law, and it was not completely overturned until the Ley Orgánica 10/1995, de 23 de noviembre.
ve algo de Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer al fondo…” (“Ocaña. Exposició a la Galería Mec-Mec [1977]” min. 3:25). The camera continues to move in, focusing on two of the men attending the exhibit in the following room: one when Ocaña mentions Miguel Hernández, and another when he mentions Bécquer. The male-on-male gaze of the camera and Ocaña’s simultaneous description delight in the visual joke of comparing these two attractive young men to iconic literary inspirations. As viewers ourselves, we become aware that to one degree or another, Ocaña’s guided tour through his exhibit is an ever-shifting filmic performance combining the camera’s chosen subjects, improvised voiceovers and music. Nonetheless, the subtle switch in this scene from sincerity to playfulness happens with the appearance of the two men, and after Ocaña has cited Lorca.

Twenty-one minutes into the video tour, Ocaña returns to the topic of Andalusia and poetry. At this point Ocaña has already come out from behind the camera, and we have seen him costumed in a white Andalusian flamenco shawl and dress, holding a microphone that is attached to the camera. (This might suggest that there has been a separate cameraman all along, and that Ocaña has been walking very closely beside him/her.) Once again positioned off-screen, he describes two giant-headed papier-mâché figures draped in various Spanish national and regional flags, including the Catalan flag, the Spanish Republican flag, and the Andalusian flag—the combination of which, he describes, make his “favorite” flag, the rainbow one. For a moment he appears to dismiss any political insinuation, declaring “Ay, es que el rollo de las banderas es horrible nene,” but then he passionately describes the Andalusian flag: “Pero desde luego, la poesía que tiene la bandera andaluza. Mira, verde blanco, blanco verde, casas—casas blancas sobre campos verdes. Somos poetas. Es que
somos poetas. Hijo esto es trabajo, y esto es la tierra. Y él que se la quiera tomar por la política, pues que se la tome.” Shortly afterward (min 22:30), describing another of his paintings, he explains that it alludes to “la muerte que siempre está presente en todos los andaluces.”136

These earlier references to Lorca and Andalusians as poets all build toward a spoken-poetry, partially sung performance by Ocaña, accompanied by Camilo playing the flamenco guitar (also wearing a white flamenco gown) in a new scene that begins in the twenty-fifth minute. This performance includes the second explicit invocation of Lorca, this time of his body of work, and is probably the best filmic evidence foreshadowing Ocaña’s Lorquian historical memory activism in Ocaña, retrat intermitent. For more than four minutes, his voice rises and falls with a haptic intensity similar to the cemetery scene in Pon’s film. Not long after declaring “Andalucía está llena de cantares, folclores de llanto, de arte, de pureza, de belleza y de sentimiento” (min. 27:15), he introduces Lorca’s most famous verses, from “Romance sonámbulo” (Romancero gitano). “Verde que te quiero verde” (min. 27:46), he recites emphatically, and continues the poem with his own improvised verses, “banderas andaluzas, casas blancas sobre campos verdes.” Breaking into (deep, duende) song, he intones mysterious and suggestive verses, “¡SILENCIO!…por los caminos…. Que sé que hay silencio porque ése lleva a tu hermano en el campo de los muertos”137 (min. 28: 30). “¡Silencio!” is sung as a loud cry, the word standing alone almost as though it were Bernarda Alba’s famous first and last line, which has often been glossed as foreshadowing the

136 Translations for the quotes from this paragraph: “Ugh, this annoying business about the flags is horrible, baby… But of course, the poetry that the Andalusian flag contains. Look, green and white, white and green, houses—white houses over green fields. We’re poets. It’s that we’re poets. Kid, this is work, and this is the earth. And whoever wants to interpret this as politics can do so. […] death, which is always present in all Andalusians.”

137 Translations from this paragraph: “Andalusia is full of songs, folklore about mourning, art, purity, beauty, and sentiment.” “Green how I want you green.” “SILENCE!…on the paths… I know that there’s silence because this one leads to your brother in the field of the dead.”
oppressive institutional and social amnesia forced upon post-Civil War, Franco dictatorship Spain. However, Ocaña’s lyrical construction quickly evolves. “¡Silencio! Por los caminos […]” as two joined images recall part of a line from Chapter 52, “El pozo,” of Juan Ramón Jiménez’s popular Platero y yo (1914/17). While Ocaña never cites Juan Ramón Jiménez as an artistic influence, Platero y yo became part of the Spanish imaginary after its publication; the story has been read to multiple generations of children. “El pozo” is a haunting, lyrical exploration of the depths of a well, addressing death and employing many other images (the moon, the stars, and the well) that Lorca, another of Juan Ramón Jiménez’s mentees at the Residencia de Estudiantes, would also be known for. However, as Ocaña sings the third fragment of his lyric, its potential message suddenly shifts from the threat of silence to an Andalusian poetic that is, now, undeniably political: “Que sé que hay silencio porque ése lleva a tu hermano en el campo de los muertos.” Ocaña’s hybridization of Lorca’s verse “verde que te quiero” is only separated from this second lyric by Camilo’s brief flamenco guitar interlude; the spoken-word poem, the guitar, and the song are one performance. What silence was Ocaña pointing out in 1977 in the Transition to democracy; what unmarked graves of loved ones or fellow citizens that could not be spoken of, although many knew how to find them? While this invocation might just be one lyric within thirty-some minutes of video footage and performance, it is a potent seed planted for what is to come, and it is sown together with Lorca’s verdant verse. Together they allude to the desire for the recuperation of historical memory, to address the missing victims of a recent trauma suffered by the Andalusian people who continued to live under the oppression of an amnesiac society. Ocaña’s self-representation for the camera and for the exhibit attendees is that of a visual artist and performer who is unafraid to recite poetry, sing, dance, dress in traditionally feminine garb while flaunting his male genitals, kiss a man, and generally demonstrate
unrestrained joy and emotion. On that same day that history would note the FAGC’s first
demonstration against the Ley de Peligrosidad Social, Ocaña also ties his history of self-
representation to the cause of missing subjectivities. And he does this through representing
and regenerating Lorca.

In the years following Ocaña’s death, Nazario, another close friend and collaborator,
became one of the primary sources regarding the artist’s intentions and activity. Curiously,
Nazario also characterized the Mec-Mec exhibits (possibly referring to more than the one
that has been documented) as revealing of Ocaña’s particular cultural, artistic, political, and
even sexual affiliation with Lorca.

Él se crea un mundo alrededor de los cementerios, alrededor de la historia de
los cipreses, de los angelitos y alrededor de las vírgenes…[…] Ocaña lo que
hacia en las exposiciones de Mec-Mec era reproducir Cantillana. Quiero
decir, Cantillana, la feria, era, entre comillas, todo lo contrario, al mundo que
intentaban construir este tipo de artistas conceptuales cercanos casi todos al
partido comunista… Pero para ellos, es curioso porque la exaltación de
García Lorca de ellos, es más o menos la que hacen los gitanos. Diego del
Gastor y dos o tres compañeros en una fiesta, en el que uno recita un poema
de García Lorca y el otro dice “¡Viva García Lorca!” Y hay una especie de
comunión entre que García Lorca, como hablaba de gitanos y entonces ellos
son gitanos, pues ahí está… Eso es lo que ven en Ocaña, lo mismo que ven
en García Lorca. Una cosa que no es. Y Ocaña sí es, sí está exactamente en la
posición, en la postura (risas) política de García Lorca.138 (“Extraña forma de
vida: Una conversación con Nazario” 201)

Nazario’s statement as it has been transcribed is not immediately clear because it switches
subjects, deploying “ellos” to refer to conceptual artists of communist leanings as well as to

138 Translation provided in the catalogue: “He created a world around cemeteries, around the story of
cypresses, little angels and virgins…. […] what Ocaña did in the Mec-Mec exhibitions was to recreate
Cantillana. What I mean to say is that Cantillana, the feast day, was, “the exact opposite” to the world these
type of conceptual artists, almost all of whom were close to the communist party, tried to build. But for them,
it is funny because their exaltation of García Lorca is pretty much like that exhibited by the gypsies. Diego del
Gastor and two or three comrades were at a party and one of them recited a poem by García Lorca and the
other exclaimed, “Long live García Lorca!”. And there is a kind of communion with García Lorca, as he spoke
of Gypsies and they were Gypsies then. Well, there it is…. That is what they [the communists] see in Ocaña,
the same thing that they see in García Lorca. [Something that isn’t. And Ocaña is exactly in the same political
position [laughter] as Lorca]” “Strange way of life: A conversation with Nazario Luque [Nazario, Interviewer,
Alejandro]” (452-460). I’ve included the last two sentences in brackets because they are my own translation.
They are oddly not translated into English; in “Strange way of life,” the passage jumps to a later part of the
interview.
gypsies such as flamenco guitarist Diego del Gastor (1908-1973). Nazario’s interview is also unfortunately undated, but as he refers to Ocaña in present tense, we can infer that it was conducted within the five-year period after the Mec-Mec exhibits of 1977 and before Ocaña’s death in 1983. His interview does, however, immediately affirm the existence of a Lorquian aesthetic in Ocaña’s work in its description of the world Ocaña (re)created in his expositions, and a similarity in the two artists’ ability to represent the marginalized. Nazario compares the work of the communist conceptual artists and the gypsies as “la exaltación de García Lorca,” but his phrasing of their invocations suggests comparison to Ocaña’s own “exaltation” of Federico García Lorca, most explicitly in the 1976 performance with Camilo in Cantillana.

A closer parsing of Nazario’s statement indicates to me that the communist artists of Ocaña’s time exalted Lorca because of his identification with the “other” who was marginalized by economic or ethnic class, as in the case of the gypsies. We cannot say for certain why Nazario might have laughed at the idea of Lorca and Ocaña being in the same political “position,” but it is likely that it is a mix of sarcastic affirmation and sexual innuendo. This sexual allusion reads as affirming that Ocaña and Lorca share sexual marginalization, perhaps more so if Ocaña’s peers are unable to read the importance of the queer activism to be found in his work, an activism that aligns with Lorca’s. Indeed, Nazario’s statement aligns the issues of autofiction and activist representation with the recurrent probabilities of misappropriation and (mis)interpretation.

**Autofictional contradictions: Ocaña’s and post-documentary press and visual art**

Even though both Ocaña and his peers acknowledged the influence of the work and figure of Lorca on Ocaña as an artist and persona, on at least one occasion Ocaña outright
rejected any comparison. *Ocaña, retrat intermitent* debuted on May 26, 1978 at the Cannes Film Festival, and the Spanish premiere followed shortly afterward on May 30 in Barcelona. In early June, several press articles took up the theme of how best to portray Ocaña, as artist and cultural phenomenon, by way of his influences. The Basque newspaper *Egin* offered, “Dice que le gustan sobre todo Lorca y Miguel Hernández. Y que, en mujeres, su ídolo es la Piaf”\(^\text{139}\) (“Retrato vital de Pepe Ocaña”). However, in the national newspaper *El País*’s article related to the Cannes debut, Ocaña was quoted as declaring “¡Coño!, compararme con García Lorca, que no tenemos nada que ver. Hablando ya de clases, para decirlo de alguna manera, él era de una, y yo soy de otra. Él era de izquierdas, ¿y qué? También en la izquierda hay muchos burgueses y gente de mucha pasta, y yo sí que soy del pueblo, pero del pueblo pueblo, que mi padre era albañil y barquero”\(^\text{140}\) (Harguindeguy). Ocaña’s titular quote in the *El País* article is, however, a reminder that his public statements all constitute performative acts in their own right: “Creo que la provocación gusta a todo el mundo.”\(^\text{141}\) As national and international media attention intensified, perhaps Ocaña’s public overly insisted on Lorca’s influence, challenging Ocaña’s own sense of originality as an artist and ignoring his starkly different lack of socioeconomic privilege. Ocaña drew the media’s attention to the socioeconomic class differences between him and Lorca, while also highlighting the political implications of both artists’ work.

It’s unclear if the *El País* journalist quoted Ocaña from a live interview at the Cannes Film Festival, or if he drew upon another interview, since the same exact statement is attributed to the artist in the *Ocaña. 1973-1983* catalogue, but this time it is cited from an

---

\(^{139}\) “He says that above all he likes Lorca and Miguel Hernández. And, among women, his idol is Édith Piaf.”

\(^{140}\) “Geez! Comparing me to García Lorca, but we don’t have anything to do with one another. Just talking about class, to put it one way, he was from one and I am from another. He was leftist, so what? The left also has a lot of bourgeoisie and people with a lot of money, but I’m from a small town, a really small, humble town; my father was a construction worker and boatman.”

\(^{141}\) “I believe that everyone likes provocation.”
article titled “Las ratas doradas IV” [p. 29, date and publication unknown]. In “Las ratas doradas IV,” Ocaña’s statement continues with “Por eso, cuando la gente entraba en el velatorio que yo monté y decía que era lorquiano, yo me cagaba en Dios cincuenta veces, porque eso no es verdad, mi velatorio no era lorquiano” (Ocaña. 1973-1983 238 [“Las ratas doradas IV” 29]). This version of the quote clearly refers to another performance outside of the film since it describes audience members “entering” an installation/scenario that Ocaña created. It is unfortunately difficult to establish when this specific “wake” was staged. He could not have been referring to the cemetery scene in Ocaña, retrat intermitent, as he only mentions himself (and not Pons) staging the performance as well as a public attending. These same details also rule out the possibility that he was referring to the Exaltación de Federico García Lorca, the artistic collaboration with Camilo that was ultimately not performed for an audience.

The “velatorio” that is now most commonly associated with Ocaña is one of his most well-known paintings, El velatorio (1982), created well after Pons’s documentary and the El País interview. As the Archivo Ocañí describes in the blog post “‘El velatorio’ de Ocaña (premonición),” this painting foreshadows his death the following year, with details including a vision of a costume similar to the one he would fashion (the sun) that would cause his accidental self-immolation. It is not the only wake that Ocaña would depict in his paintings and drawings; in fact, the same post refers to another drawing that is similar to the famous painting, titled more explicitly Mi velatorio: “La misma habitación, los ángeles, las veladoras, abanicos, peinetas y mantillas, llantos, alguna sonrisa y una lorquiana que se ha colado en el velorio... Porque Ocaña ha encogido, ahora es un niño difunto, con su bombín entre las

142 “So that’s why, when people came into the wake that I staged and said that it was Lorquian, I was beyond pissed off, because that’s not true, my wake wasn’t Lorquian.”
The existence of the painting and the drawing suggest a specific way that Ocaña staged wakes, both in his visual art and probably in his performances; as such, in all likelihood, the quote from “Las ratas doradas IV” refers to a performance akin to one of these works. And yet, once again, a Lorquian visual aesthetic is apparent, as the post describes, and not simply in the “lorquiana” who I will argue Ocaña appears dressed as in the cemetery scene in Ocaña, retrat intermitent, but also in the prominence and style of the crescent moon colored in black, which is how Lorca frequently drew it.

143 “The same room, angels, candles, fans, combs and shawls, weeping, a smile and a lorquiana that has crashed the wake… Because Ocaña has shrunk, now he is a dead child, with his little hat in his hands… And the window, the starry night, the moon that descends…”
Fig. 17 - “Antoñito el Camborio” (1930). The drawing is a part of Lorca’s dedication of this second edition of Primer romancero gitano (Revista de Occidente, 1929) to Rafael Suárez Solís during Lorca’s stay in Cuba. (Fundación Federico García Lorca)

The above example of Lorca’s drawings will be of great relevance to my subsequent analysis of the cemetery performance in Ocaña, retrat intermitent, as it is further visual proof of the multi-media, intertextual activism that Ocaña achieves, invoking both Lorquian aesthetics and his actual artistic corpus, including drawings, music and poetry verses.

Indeed, while Ocaña appears to have rejected the notion that his autofiction is Lorquian with the fanfare over the documentary’s debut at the Cannes Film Festival, he would later acknowledge Lorca as one of his influences. In an interview with another Basque newspaper, Euskadi Sioux, in May 1979, he named three poets as the authors he read, and in the context of having educated himself.

[Interviewer] ¿Qué tipo de formación o de estudios has tenido?
[Ocaña] Yo ni una, hijo, soy eso, cómo se dice, autodidacta.
[Interviewer] ¿Qué tipo de lecturas?
[Ocaña] Me gustan los poetas, Miguel Hernández, García Lorca, Oscar Wilde y el resto es todo hablado.144 (“Ocaña, la virgen de las Ramblas”)

---

144 [Interviewer] What kind of training or studies have you had?
[Interviewer] What have you read?
The three poets named by Ocaña as the pillars of his self-education were also theater-makers; two were known for their homosexuality; all three were persecuted for political and/or social beliefs and practices. (And two, Lorca and Hernández, were named by the EGIN article in 1978.) Lorca, Hernández, and Wilde are all examples of artists also known for their personae, for fame either in their lifetimes, or perhaps more importantly, beyond them; they became cultural icons because of their art and activism.

Ocaña and Pons’s autofiction: Finding and aligning with the other

Ocaña’s multiple invocations of Lorca through various media—thetater, film, performance, painting, drawing, and the press—constructed a layered and somewhat contradictory autofiction. Nevertheless, what is clear is that Ocaña as an artist developed a close aesthetic and personal affinity for Lorca’s work and various aspects of his figure. In order to represent himself, Ocaña needed to define his persona and artwork in relation to another, to the ‘other’—to Lorca. The attempted project Exaltación de Federico García Lorca, the Mec-Mec gallery performance for Video-Nou, and the press articles and interviews all demonstrate that Lorquian invocations did not originate as Pons’s creative idea nor did they end with Ocaña, retrat intermitent. They are all proof that the agency and autofiction were predominantly Ocaña’s.

However, it is not a coincidence that Ocaña’s collaboration with Ventura Pons to create and shoot the documentary would become his ultimate Lorquian autofictional representation, that this relationship would reach its culmination both artistically/aesthetically and as political activism through this filmic project. Here, Pons’s

[Ocaña] I like poets, Miguel Hernández, García Lorca, Oscar Wilde, and the rest is recitation.
ability to perceive and translate the relationship into film is crucial; Pons’s activism, or larger cause—his *magna tareaxeven*—cannot be separated from his filmmaking. In his introductory essay to the recent retrospective anthology *Ventura Pons: Una mirada excepcional*, Pons highlights the unifying theme in all of his films, fiction and documentary, that we find in his first, *Ocaña, retrat intermitent*: they are all “[…] historias basadas en personajes inmersos en la necesidad de amor, de comunicación, en fin, en la necesidad de encontrar al otro. Todo tipo de relaciones afectivas…”145 (Pons, *Ventura Pons* 21). Ocaña’s affective relationship is both based on memory—aligning his own past with Lorca’s, and sung verses known by heart (*recordâri – reorder*)—and about bringing those histories forward as active autofiction constructing his present, vanguard artistic persona.

Pons has also explained the intensive planning with Ocaña for the documentary, making it clear that “no había nada que no fuera premeditado” (*Ventura Pons*). The first preparation before mapping out the documentary was a dinner in which Ocaña recounted his life for Pons, after which the filmmaker spent the entire night organizing his notes into themes. In the second, Ocaña shared the photos he kept of himself.

En una de ellas vestía faldas, medias, zapatillas y pañuelo en la cabeza, todo en negro, como las viejas de pueblo. Era la primera vez que salió a la calle travestido. “Yo siempre me visto de mis recuerdos”, me dijo. De ahí partió mi idea de hacer una película en la que explicara su vida, como un retrato a cámara que apareciera cortado intermitentemente con “la provocación de la memoria” reconstruida a través del travestismo, el teatro en la calle, la España negra, con Goya, García Lorca, el folklore, los Quintero… el recuerdo. Ése fue el concepto, quizás un poco literario, pero así lo vi y así lo filmé.146 (Pons, *Ventura Pons*)

---

145 “[…] histories based on characters immersed in the need for love, for communication, in sum, the need to encounter the other. All types of affective relationships…”

146 “In one of them [the photos] he was wearing skirts, stockings, house slippers and a scarf on his head, all in black, like the old women from small towns. It was the first time he had gone out in the street cross-dressing. ‘I always dress myself in my memories,’ he told me. It was from there [and the previous dinner-interview] that my idea arose to make a film that would explain his life, like a camera portrait that should appear intercut intermittently with ‘the provocation of memory [*memoria*]’ reconstructed through transvestitism, street theater, the ‘Black’ Spain with Goya, García Lorca, folklore, the Quintero brothers…memory [*el recuerdo*]. That was the concept, perhaps a bit literary, but that’s how I saw it and that’s how I filmed it.”
“The provocation of memory” is a particularly productive “literary” concept to contemplate when studying the Lorquian invocations occurring in Ocaña, retrat intermitent. How did Pons filmically achieve these provocations, through direction, editing and camera techniques? How did Ocaña communicate or instigate them through his performances? In the next section I will outline how we can begin to answer these questions; namely, through a Lorquian understanding of haptic theory, of how duende occurs through film. As Ocaña’s confession to Pons reveals, the artist embodied himself with memories; he wore them as clothes capable of constructing his autofiction and transforming how he was perceived in public spaces. In this action we can also visualize how the artist carried memory on his body, how he recovered memories and let them re-cover him. Certainly this is an unexpected extension of the work of artists like Margarita Xirgu to re-member and recordar Lorca’s corpus.

5. THE HAPTIC NATURE OF THE DUENDE

A haptic investigation of Ocaña and Pons’s work is essential to the understanding of its historical memory contribution, and of how ultimately it is the vehicles of duende and deep song that will lend the greatest impact to the documentary. In exploring the full haptic potential of Ocaña, retrat intermitent—its ability to touch—I draw upon the definitions of Laura Marks, Jennifer Barker, Vivian Sobchack and Giuliana Bruno, to highlight the physical interaction between the film’s body (Barker, Marks), Ocaña’s body as the performer, and the bodies of their audiences (Sobchack, Barker).

Shot on a shoestring budget in five days on 16mm film (Campo Vidal 41) and later stretched in aspect ratio by the film company Compañía Zeta (Mínguez Arranz 71), Pons’s documentary’s grainy-textured, ephemeral quality is at its very surface haptic, according to
definitions put forth by Marks. In interview scenes that tightly crop to Ocaña’s face and hands we see haptic gestures to recover his body, to let the camera touch his image. However, it is in the performance scenes—including the archival footage from the Canet de Mar rock festival—that the film’s haptic qualities are amplified, engaging the viewers’ own subjective bodies, demonstrating that the “lived body sits in readiness as both a sensual and a sense-making potentiality…haptic film remind[s] us of our lived bodies, sensing our own sensuality” (Sobchack 76-77). In these scenes we can first observe that the sound is quite loud, often pushing the limits of what we would feel comfortable with, particularly after the quieter interview scenes in Ocaña’s bedroom. This is akin to the phenomenon Marks describes: “the aural boundaries between body and world may feel indistinct…the booming music may inhabit my chest cavity and move my body from the inside” (183). The transfer of Ocaña’s embodied experience onto and into our bodies happens initially through sound.

As we can observe in the cemetery scene and at the Canet de Mar festival (and as we can argue also for some of the other theatrical stagings), sound is actually part of the larger haptic effect that is the duende and, when singing, also cante jondo, deep song. Deep song is considered the more authentic version of flamenco song for its haptic bodily effects, as described by Lorca in his 1922 lecture “Importancia histórica y artística del primitivo canto andaluz llamado ‘Cante jondo’” at the Granada Flamenco Festival: “Después, la frase melódica va abriendo el misterio de los tonos y sacando la piedra preciosa del sollozo, lágrima sonora sobre el río de la voz. Pero ningún andaluz puede resistir la emoción del escalofrío, al escuchar ese grito [...]” (García Lorca, “Cante jondo”)147. In 1933 Lorca went on to present his “Juego y teoría del duende,” which seemed to be a progressive leap

---

147 “Then the melodic phrase begins to pry open the mystery of the tones and remove the precious stone of the sob, a resonant tear on the river of the voice. No Andalusian can help but shudder on hearing that scream [...]” (García Lorca, “Deep Song” 4)
forward from (but still linked to) his earlier work on deep song. He described the duende as a creature, a phenomenon known among Andalusian flamenco circles that is unlike the angel or the muse, specifically because it works with the artist from within his/her body: “Ángel y musa vienen de fuera […] En cambio, al duende hay que despertarlo en las últimas habitaciones de la sangre. […] Solo se sabe que quema la sangre como un tópico de vidrios, que agota […]” ¹⁴⁸ This experience of pain, in light of Ocaña’s performative transfer of trauma, harmonizes with Caruth’s claim that revisiting trauma is always a necessary re-wounding: by returning to explore the wound, it is re-opened (8). As Lorca stated: “el duende hiere, y en la curación de esta herida, que no se cierra nunca, está lo insólito, lo inventado de la obra de un hombre.” ¹⁴⁹ (“Juego y teoría del duende”). Moving from this carnal space, painfully, the duende enables the performer to touch the audience’s bodies. Lorca describes the voice of the performer opening “como una mano de diez dedos”¹⁵⁰. To extend Giuliana Bruno’s theory of the haptic as enabling new emotional mapping, or new geopsychic spaces, this “ten-fingered hand” of the duende, in the following two scenes of Ocaña, will begin to map forgotten collective memory spaces, to recover once-living bodies that existed in these spaces of unwritten history, and to inscribe in them our own corporeality.

6. OCAÑA AND LORCA IN THE CEMETERY

In the establishing shot for this scene, the camera tilts down from a brilliant blue sky, following the length of ominous, dark green cypress trees (a symbol of endless mourning in

¹⁴⁸ “The muse and angel come from outside us… But one must awaken the duende in the remotest mansions of the blood. […] We only know that he burns the blood like a poultice of broken glass, that he exhausts […] he leans on human pain with no consolation…” (“Play and Theory of the Duende” 51)
¹⁴⁹ “the duende wounds. In the healing of that wound, which never closes, lie the strange, invented qualities of a man’s work” (“Play and Theory of the Duende” 58)
¹⁵⁰ “like a ten-fingered hand” (“Play and Theory of the Duende” 53)
classical antiquity) that are at least double the height of the cemetery below. The frame is spotted with shadows and scratches in what appears to be film damage, a first indication of this scene’s haptic quality. This sensation intensifies as we later observe what appears to be overexposure (perhaps due to filming at high noon). As Marks describes the haptic mortality of the medium, “[b]oth film and video become more haptic as they die. […] In film, techniques such as optical printing, solarization, and scratching the emulsion work with the physical surface of the medium” (Marks 172-73); such intentional forms of “damage” as well as the wear of time alter the historical memory capacity of the medium. In fact, the haptic mortality of the medium, and of Ocaña, retrat intermitent in particular, challenge Taylor’s dichotomy between the living repertoire as the only embodiment of historical memory, and film’s capacity to embody memory. What Taylor identifies as the “archive,” as it has been traditionally understood—“documents, maps, literary texts, letters, archaeological remains, bones, videos, films, CDs” (19 [italics mine])—can no longer be completely segregated from a “live” performance; the repertoire is not the only medium with a “body” capable of touching others. Indeed, in Marks’s definition of “haptic visuality” the eyes function “like organs of touch” that caress and are caressed by the image (162). This scene in Ocaña will demonstrate, in its play between a duende-inspired performance and haptic film qualities and techniques, the inherent tension of Marks’s definition, because “…haptic visuality, in its effort to touch the image, may represent the difficulty of remembering the loved one, be it a person or a homeland” (193). In the filmic medium’s aesthetic attempts to touch, in the

151 Robert Stam’s defense of cinema also catalogues film’s very tangible relationship with bodies: “…for some literary minds the cinema’s engagement with bodies—the body of the performer, the body of the spectator, and even the ‘skin’ and the ‘haptic visuality’ of the ‘body’ of the film itself—detracts it as a serious, transcendent, art form. The body-mind hierarchy which informs the image-word prejudice then gets mapped onto other binaristic hierarchies such as surface-depth, so that films are dismissed as dealing in surfaces, literally ‘superficial’” (Stam, Literature and Film 6-7).
mortal physicality of its archival state, it can succeed in failure, just as Lorca’s own absence echoes with resounding presence.

As organs of touch, our eyes take in a colorful stone mausoleum cemetery, its rows crowded with flower-adorned tombs, its wide walkways strikingly empty in the midday sun. We hear the static noise of sound recording (the haptic texture of an older machine’s efforts?) and birds chirping. Our eyes are drawn into the depth of the shot by two rows of mausoleum tombs that create clear perspective lines to direct us to a walkway in the background. Now at the height of an average adult’s view, an extreme long shot anticipates Ocaña’s appearance.

Ocaña enters on this walkway from what in theater terms is up-stage left. The mise-en-scène suggests a theater; the public space of the cemetery—which is, however, private, or intimate, in its emptiness—doubles as a stage. The parallel rows of tombs form a sort of proscenium leading back along the stage’s width, with the third and perpendicular row setting the stage’s backdrop. Our experience of Ocaña’s previous performance scene in this film, presented in a black box, has also aided to establish this theatrical pretext.

From the audience’s perspective, the mausoleum wall blocks the lower trunks of the large cypress trees. In a trick of layered perspective that creates a collapsing of objects into flatness; at the perpendicular meeting point of two cemetery rows and the largest cypress tree Ocaña emerges. It is as though he had walked out of the base of the cypress itself, two images of mourning splitting. As he walks alongside the backdrop row of tombs, his figure, elongated by a black mantilla, aligns twice more with the cypresses. In this traditional garb of an Andalusian widow in mourning, his taller body briefly reduplicates and gestures upward toward these trees.
As he turns to walk toward us, the camera begins to move closer, such that both viewer and performer draw toward one another. We can, without a doubt, recognize Ocaña; in his elaborate costume he is still wearing his everyday painter’s black work boots. Just as we can begin to reflect on his body in this long shot, there is a sudden cut to a medium close-up, backtracking shot of Ocaña and the tombs he is passing.

“La mujer en el cante jondo se llama Pena… […] la Pena se hace carne, toma forma humana y se acusa de una línea definida” (García Lorca, “Cante jondo”). Ocaña’s upper body in profile reveals the detail of his costume: a black draping mantilla, delicate black lace over his hands in fingerless gloves, and further black lacework over a rich orange bodice, a painted face of red lips, rouged cheekbones and heavy blue eye shadow that is accented further with bright yellow carnations at the temple, and jewelry over unshaven chest hair. Curiously, a close up of Ocaña’s face in this makeup and costume became the poster/cover image for the film. As Paul (formerly Beatriz) Preciado has explained, this image of Ocaña—and I will go further, this Lorquian autofiction—became synonymous with the larger documentary project, with a cultural phenomenon, with how his artistic persona was universally known. It was

[…] una de las imágenes más icónicas, con las que se acaba convirtiendo casi como en la esencia misma de la travesti andaluza, es la imagen que va a ser difundida a través de la película de Ventura Pons, por ejemplo en el Festival de Berlín en los años 70, o incluso en el Festival de Cine Independiente en Nueva York con la que más o menos va a ser conocida internacionalmente. (Preciado, “Campcentualismos” [min. 13-15])

---

152 Pedro G. Romero explains that “Ocaña, incluso cuando se travestía como mujer, llevaba siempre unas enormes botas de pastor que, al parecer, había comprado en Galicia [“Even when he cross-dressed as a woman, Ocaña always wore these enormous shepherd boots that it seems he had bought in Galicia”] (Romero, “Ocaña: El ángel de la histeria” 58).
153 “The woman of deep song is called Pain… Pain is made flesh, takes human form, and acquires a sharp profile” (García Lorca, “Deep Song” 15)
As the scene continues, Ocaña fans himself with a traditional abanico, and scans the rows of tombs, mouthing quick neighborly acknowledgements and even smiling. In his boldly bright costume as a widow (this status suggested by the cemetery and his comportment) and his almost humorous gesture of pleasantries with the dead, Ocaña’s initial performance hints at camp. However, once he finds the tomb that will be his first audience on screen, his body begins to shake, even sway slightly, a lump in his throat (his Adam’s apple) moving to push him toward the image of the deceased.

It is important to note here that Ocaña begins his vocal performance without words, a performance that will haptically affect him just as it will affect us. It is undoubtedly deep song, building from its very essence, defined by García Lorca himself as “… a stammer, a wavering emission of the voice, a marvelous buccal undulation that smashes the resonant cells of our tempered scale, eludes the cold, rigid staves of modern music, and makes the tightly closed flowers of the semitones blossom into a thousand petals” (García Lorca, “Deep Song” 3). As Ocaña’s buccal undulation takes lyric shape, his words are indeed Lorca’s:

La luna es un pozo chico,
las flores no valen nada.
Lo que valen son tus brazos
cuando de noche me abrazan,
lo que valen son tus brazos
cuando de noche me abrazan.154

These lyrics, part of Lorca’s song titled “Zorongo” or “Zorongo gitano,” are words that were created and compiled from oral tradition by the poet musician to be performed—transferred—from singer to singer. (See Appendix 2.) The beginning of his invocation, therefore, is one that would resonate within Andalusian and flamenco communities.

154 See Appendix 1 for an English translation of Ocaña’s song.
(“Zorongo gitano” was part of Canciones populares, 1931 recordings of Lorca playing his interpretations of popular folk songs on piano with Encarnación “La Argentinita” López on vocals). Indeed, as fellow poet and friend of Lorca, Jorge Guillén, once explained, “La memoria de Lorca es el más rico tesoro de la canción popular andaluza” (Guillén 55 [de la Ossa Martínez, García Lorca 93]. However, what is most striking is that Ocaña selects lyrics from the second version of “Zorongo,” the version included in Lorca’s play La zapatera prodigiosa (1933), an intertextual allusion to both theatricality and unfulfilled desire.

As he sings the stanza of the “Zorongo,” Ocaña touches the glass pane over a photograph of the dead man inside this tomb. This performative gesture through glass (both of the tomb and, at a filmic level, the camera lens) uses the haptic to show in this case its limits: that it can’t touch the beloved, that the archival photo cannot replace the arms that once held the singer. “Lo que valen son tus brazos / cuando de noche me abrazan,” he repeats with the lament typical of deep song. In the physical absence of the beloved, noted in these mournful lyrics, we are as viewers focused on the very physical presence of Ocaña: his own tensely held arms, fists alternately clenched or palms pressed, and muscles visibly straining as he pushes his voice to varying volume levels. In the style of deep song, we hear (and can see) him grab breaths of air, his very physical life force committing to deliver this performance.

While I argue that Ocaña’s performance in this scene evokes the aesthetics and phenomena of deep song and duende, it is worth noting that artist-scholar Pedro G. Romero, a specialist in Ocaña’s art, has also pointed out the influence of silent film on Ocaña’s highly gesticulated performances (while not specifically singling out Ocaña, retrat intermitent). “Su pasión […] por la calidad sinestésica de la sola imagen en el cine primitivo, es puesta en práctica en muecas y andares con voluntad de imitador. En muchos tonos esa
admiration por la gestualidad en el cine mudo recuerda a las valoraciones que del mismo hacía Federico García Lorca” (Romero, “Ocaña: El ángel de la histeria” 57-58). Romero’s observation is fascinating in its association of Ocaña’s embodied performance with his and Lorca’s appreciation of silent film through the phenomenon of synesthesia. As such, it gives us a new way of understanding how the actor’s body might affect the spectator: as though his/her visual work communicated sound, as though the vision of the actor’s facial and body gesticulations touched the spectator’s body through the synesthetic suggestion of sound. Most importantly, it gives us an understanding of how Ocaña and Lorca were both aware of this capacity of film before sound emanating from the actor was even possible in this medium’s technology. Indeed, it also offers another interpretation of the haptic nature of Pons’s filmmaking, in which the quality of the physical film—both its visual surface and its audio transmission—work to touch the spectator. Haptic film theory and Lorca’s theories of duende and deep song can be read as alternative and complimentary observations of synesthesia.

Pons’s camera moves in and to the right, arcing closely around Ocaña when he repeats these lyrics; from behind, this shot captures him almost entirely in black, as a voice emanating from the dark curtain-like lace. Not allowing even a single beat (musical or theatrical) after this last stanza, Ocaña suddenly turns his body out to the left, his focus flaring out from the first tomb and his arms gesturing now toward the air. “GARCÍA LORCA GITANO,” he wails, turning more toward the camera and piercing the highest register of his volume. It is as though Ocaña were interrupting himself to newly enter the stage, and the duende were breaking through. His body shakes from the power of his voice,

155 “His passion […] for the synesthetic quality of the solitary image in primitive cinema, is put into practice in exaggerated facial gestures/grimaces and comportments that choose to imitate it. In many tones this admiration of the body-language of silent film is reminiscent of how Federico García Lorca appreciated it.”
and “…por medio de los cinco sentidos, gracias al duende que agita la voz y el cuerpo de la bailarina” (García Lorca, “Juego y teoría del duende”)

He sings: “MORENO DE VERDE LUNA.” It is an aesthetic rendering of Lorca, it seems, one that aligns him with the Andalusian gypsies the poet evoked so famously in Romancero gitano (1928).

¿Dónde está tu cuerpo santo
que no tuvo sepultura?
Se olvidaron de tu cuerpo
pero la primavera te está poniendo seda.

As Ocaña delivers these lyrics, his body vibrating, he creates his most powerful performance of collective traumatic memory; in his duende-inspired, deep song recovery of Lorca’s body from oblivion he is yoking the weight of Lorca’s cuerpo and corpus. As the camera moves back, we see more tombs behind Ocaña; as he looks slightly upward and out, he signals that the first tomb was just a set piece, a prop—and that Lorca’s, like that of so many others killed during the Civil War, is not here. And yet this is a space for the dead, one that in its silent stone chambers ironically allows the defiant voice to reverberate. Ocaña’s lyrical and politically charged questioning is a search, and as he communicates this he is harnessing with his very body the “politics of feeling.” The directness of his question to Lorca and the subsequent indirect accusation aimed at the general public (the tombs, his viewers)—Where is your unburied body? They forgot your body—resonates more profoundly yet when we realize that the historical situation of Lorca as a desaparecido is being lyrically interlaced with none other than Lorca’s two Camborio poems from Romancero gitano: “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino de Sevilla” and “Muerte de Antoñito el Camborio.”

---

156 “…by means of the five senses, thanks to the duende, who shakes the body and voice of the dancer” (García Lorca, “Play and Theory of the Duende” 53

157 “Where is your blessed body / that was never buried? / They forgot your body / but springtime is dressing you in silk.”
“Moreno de verde luna” originates in the two Camborio poems; it is the only verse that Lorca repeats between the two, creating a descriptive link. Together, these poems tell the story of an Andalusian gypsy, Antoñito el Camborio, whose only reason for arrest and subsequent murder appears to be that he is different. His flamboyant beauty, proud display and almost magical interaction with nature make the Guardia Civil (the state) and his family (the community) profoundly uncomfortable, “jealous” (“Lo que en otros no envidiaban, / ya lo envidiaban en mí”)—enough to kill him (“Muerte” [italics mine]). These poems were also the only two from Romancero gitano to be set to music by Lorca (“Dos melodías del ‘Primer romancero gitano,” Obras completas I 799-800), further expanding on their orality and performative qualities.

Arrested by the Civil Guard, taunted and told he is not a true Camborio for not virilely and violently defending himself, he is killed in the second poem by his cousins. Within the “Muerte” poem, a voice—aligned with the narrating poetic voice—named none other than Federico García speaks to the dead Antonio, and discovers who has murdered him in this exchange. Speaking intimately to Antonio, Federico García says “¡Ay Antoñito el Camborio / digno de una emperatriz! / Acuérdate de la Virgen / porque te vas a morir” (García Lorca 33-36).” The reference to the “emperatriz” (and even the Virgin), preceded by a description
of the infantilized Antoñito’s elaborate costuming and perfumed skin, together with the
other descriptions of Antonio, invite a thinly veiled questioning of his masculinity and
sexuality. The consequence of his queerness is death, as was the case for Lorca, as Ocaña
has already described in an earlier interview scene with an anecdote that aligns his own
difference—his queerness, and his artistic view of the world—with Lorca’s. This play of
three texts inextricably bound within the film cannot be ignored. And as viewers, should we
realize this intertextual invocation—encapsulated and catalyzed in one line of Lorca’s
verse—we are all the more cognizant of a story (and threat) of trauma inflicted on
marginalized subjectivities that repeats itself through art and history.

Ocaña’s invocation of Lorca’s “Prendimiento de Antoñito el Camborio en el camino
de Sevilla” is also the most direct, textual demonstration of a link between his work and
Xirgu’s. As we recall from Chapter One, Lorca dedicated this poem to Xirgu, and it is the
only poem that the actress recorded twice. While there are other, more direct links from
Xirgu back to Spain that demonstrate a transatlantic return of Lorquian embodied
knowledge in the traditional theater sector (including the actresses Amelia de la Torre and
Estela Medina, theater-maker Ana Diosdado and director José [Pepe] Estruch), Ocaña’s
performance offers another form of potential surrogacy, acts of transfer, recordāri and even
post-memory. Indeed, to return to Rebecca Schneider’s reading of Roach’s surrogacy
theory—that performance genealogies are prone “to jump across bodies, objects, continents,
and to be given to irruptive and even ‘desperate’ repetition and revision” (Schneider 96)—we
can argue that in this scene a “jump” occurs from Xirgu to Ocaña to produce his irruptive
and disruptive historical memory activism through a new Lorquian performance of
“Prendimiento.” Ocaña’s performance of both mourning and celebrating Lorca, amplified
with the intertext of Antoñito el Camborio, also fated to be murdered, transfers Xirgu’s acts
of mourning and defiant regeneration of his corpus to the present of the film. While the trauma is not one that Ocaña has experienced first-hand as a friend or collaborator of Lorca, as post-memory theory asserts Ocaña belongs to the subsequent generation who also importantly experienced the trauma in unique ways. As I have discussed in the analysis of Ocaña’s earlier interview scene with Pons in which he recounts his own childhood trauma and his relationship with Manolo, Ocaña himself identifies with the trauma of Lorca’s assassination. As a progression from that scene, we can read Ocaña’s performance in the cemetery as carrying Lorca’s lyrical and musical corpus to a new place and time—that of the Transition—as desiring and imagining an “alternate archive” (Hirsch 249) emanating from his own body.

The camera appears to react to this part of the performance by pulling back slowly, letting us see all of Ocaña’s dress (but not his boots) in a medium-long shot. As Ocaña holds the skirt wide, his costume in this shape is reminiscent of a Lorca drawing. His last line in this stanza, “pero la primavera te está poniendo seda”\(^{158}\) marks a different turning point in the performance, moving toward a more hopeful activism and alluding to recovery through rejuvenation—the participatory potential of the Transition. As he begins ululating, hands gripped once more into fists and torso shaking, he now walks toward the camera, which pulls back slightly and then lingers to let him draw near again. Here, uniquely, the camera (handheld, it seems) begins an almost rhythmic movement; it moves down and then upward, canted to capture a low-angle medium close-up shot of Ocaña, and then swings back up to a slightly higher position than before, constantly negotiating a closer proximity to Ocaña’s face as he emits another powerful wave of song: “Que tu madre está llorando,” he sings to Lorca,

\(^{158}\) “but springtime is dressing you in silk”
“en su habitación de noche / delante el crucifijo / ay rezando tus oraciones.” Unbound by any predictable tone or character, Ocaña’s woven lyrics and improvisations continue to allude to trauma on a personal level, and the camera’s close dance with him in this moment allows for an almost maternal transfiguration, letting the memory of a mourning mother be transferred and inscribed onto his body.

As film viewers, we may engage with the duende and the trauma as it has pained Ocaña’s body because they have the capacity to affect ours. Diana Taylor’s description of the experience of watching live performance work that recovers historical memory harmonizes with the experience of Ocaña’s filmed performance: “The trauma was palpable, the emotional power contagious, and the sense of political empowerment energizing” (164). This haptic effect that we experience here challenges Taylor’s assertion that film belongs to the archive, rather than the repertoire, and that it is not capable of “enact[ing] embodied memory…individual agency” (19). The performance ends with an open gesture to the public, Ocaña’s body fully extended and offered up, from the hem of his skirt to his outstretched hands. The camera shows us the tall rows of tombs that he is facing in a shaky reverse of the long establishing shot, positioned now at the other end of the walkway.

“¿Dónde está la gente?” he asks in a rhythmic call, to an audience as much as it is an apostrophe to Lorca, “¿Dónde está la gente que por las noches vienen a adorarte?” His immediate spectators, the tombs of the dead—are these the people he is referring to, ghosts of a generation lost? Perhaps, but it is also inevitably his engaged filmic audience. “¿Dónde están los requiebros que se perdieron por las callejuelas? / Solo te traigo flores y adorarte por las noches oscuras de Andalucía.” As he lowers his body to the ground, he seals his

---

159 “Your mother is crying / in her bedroom at night / ay, in front of the crucifix / saying your prayers.”
160 “Where are the people? Where are the people who at night come to adore you? Where are the flirtatious remarks lost on the streets? Alone I bring you flowers and adore you on dark Andalusian nights.”
performative offering, but has left his audience with these questions: Who will recover the lost words, the celebration that was unabashed living—the “flirtatious remarks”? Who will begin this again? And who will continue the memory work and transfer?

Fig. 18 - Stills from Ocaña’s cemetery scene in Ocaña, retrat intermitent (00:29-32).
7. DUENDE IN THE ARCHIVE: A LIVING EVOCATION

It could be argued superficially that Ocaña, retrat intermitent ends in the archive, that these filmed performances of Ocaña are simply documents, and that Pons’s selection of archival photos and footage of Ocaña from the 1978 Canet de Mar rock festival as his last theatrical performance in the film is the crowning evidence. However, as Pons leaves his viewers with this performance (not the last scene, but a climactic one very close to the end of the film), he lets the duende do its work of resistance.

Contextualized first in the participatory documentary mode with archival black and white photos of Ocaña at the inaugural Barcelona LGBT rally, followed by another interview scene (in more or less austere colors) of Ocaña describing a protest, the festival scene emerges powerfully in vibrant flamenco colors, with a haptic lateral close-up of Ocaña in thick, full make-up, sweat pouring down his face. He is shouting through a microphone, in an accusatory tone reminiscent of the end of the cemetery scene—¿Dónde está la gente?—but this time we can hear an audience cheering and clapping. The concert experience is loud, raucous. As the camera pulls back to show his tensed body, arms lifted once more, we also see others onstage—other artists participating in this celebratory protest for gay rights. This performance scene, unlike the others, is fragmented (and expanded) as it switches back to relevant pieces of Ocaña’s interview, and to color stills/photos of the performance, with the audio playing. We see Ocaña’s face motionless but tensed in song, and hear what he was singing at that moment. Pons, at a filmic level, is enriching and contextualizing our experience of Ocaña’s performance by delivering it in these layered forms. Ocaña himself has said “Tengo una mala memoria,” and Pons is doing restorative work.
The documentary’s return to Ocaña’s performance is the ultimate embodiment and release of Lorca through the duende that moves in Ocaña’s flesh. Evoking other embodiments—shouting “¡María de la Rambla es toda una virgen de carne!” he also returns to the metaphor of nature’s (and the Transition’s) rejuvenation despite past trauma, that even in the fall there are “green leaves.” He strips/rips off his flamenco dress; critic Eva Woods Peiró observes he thus performs a “stripping of the repressed civic body” (228), an act of “destape, literally ... associated with taking it all off, drug use, polysexuality, and the general breaking of norms that focused on the body” (229). As he dances a feverish zapateado (flamenco footwork) naked, we can hear a visceral response from the audience at the concert with resounding shouts of “¡Olé!” At once possessed and free, he is thoroughly alive, and transmits these sensations to his concert and film audience so that they might experience their own embodiment through the duende.

…we can attempt to rearticulate that nostalgic passion and maudlin cult of the past typical of the García Lorca legend as an ethics directed toward the future – as the affirmation of life in the face of mortality and the gift of self to others in the risky but necessary passage from the subjective to the social. Such are the ultimate implications (at once textual, Performative, and psychoanalytic) of doing the theater of García Lorca. (Smith 144)

This chapter’s exploration of Ocaña, retrat intermitent has demonstrated how Ocaña’s performances not only fit within the documentary aims of historical memory, but that they should be considered as pioneering contributions within a larger grouping of the theater of García Lorca from the Transition onward that invokes his body and his body of work. As Mínguez Arranz observes, “Aunque se dedica a una comunidad pequeña y mal definida, Ocaña trasciende la singularidad de su contenido al desvelar la incipiente teatralización de la

161 “María de la Rambla is a virgin of the flesh!”
política en una sociedad nuevamente dramatizada”\textsuperscript{162} (72). Together, Ocaña and Pons demonstrate that compelling re-inscriptions of historical memory can be made on other artists’ bodies and on our own, resonating haptically in a way that does not limit them to an archive, but rather activates those who experience them. As a marginalized queer artist seeking to reclaim Lorca during the Transition—narrowly before others in power would aim to deactivate this discourse through journalistic narratives of Lorca’s death—Ocaña offers his body as an affirmation of life. His performative bodywork claims Lorca not for himself, but for others to understand Lorca through his body as well as their own. We are witnesses to Lorca’s corpus as much as to its embodiment of the “politics of feeling,” and we become desirous, evermore living.

El duende… ¿Dónde está el duende? Por el arco vacío entra un aire mental que sopla con insistencia sobre las cabezas de los muertos, en busca de nuevos paisajes y acentos ignorados: un aire con olor de saliva de niño, de hierba machacada y velo de medusa que anuncia el constante bautizo de las cosas recién creadas.\textsuperscript{163} (García Lorca, “Juego y teoría del duende”)

\textsuperscript{162} “Although it is dedicated to a small and badly defined community, Ocaña transcends the singularity of its contents to reveal the incipient theatricalization of politics in a newly dramatized society.”

\textsuperscript{163} The duende. … Where is the duende? Through the empty arch comes a wind, a mental wind blowing relentlessly over the heads of the dead, in search of new landscapes and unknown accents; a wind that smells of baby’s spittle, crushed grass, and jellyfish veil, announcing the constant baptism of newly created things. (García Lorca, “Play and Theory of the Duende” 62, trans. Maurer)
Appendix 1: Ocaña’s song in the cemetery scene in *Ocaña, retrat intermitent*

[These are the English subtitles, with some translation edits made by me.]

The moon is a little well
Flowers aren’t worth anything
What are worthy are / Your arms when, at night / They embrace me
What are worthy are / Your arms when, at night, / They embrace me

García Lorca, the gypsy / Dark-skinned with green moon eyes,
Where is your blessed body / That was never buried?
They forgot your body / But springtime is dressing you in silk

[More singing, mouth open, ululation, building]

Your mother is crying… / [louder] in her bedroom at night
In front of a crucifix / Saying your prayers

[turning to different graves]

Where are the people?
Where are the people who at night come to adore you?
Where are the flirtatious remarks lost on the streets?
Alone I bring you flowers and adore you on dark Andalusian nights.
Appendix 2: Lyrics to “Zorongo [gitano],”\textsuperscript{164} version compiled and set to music by Federico García Lorca for \textit{La zapatera prodigiosa} (1933, 1935)

\textit{Ocaña’s selection of verses is underlined.}

Las manos de mi cariño
te están bordando una capa
con agremán de alhelies
y con esclavina de agua.

[Cuando fuiste novio mío,
por la primavera blanca,
los cascos de tu caballo
cuatro sollozos de plata.]\textsuperscript{165}

La luna es un pozo chico,
las flores no valen nada,
lo que valen son tus brazos
cuando de noche me abrazan,
lo que valen son tus brazos
cuando de noche me abrazan.\textsuperscript{166}

\textsuperscript{164} The order of lyrics presented here is sourced from \textit{Obras Completas 1: Poesía} (ed. García Posada 811-12). The song with these lyrics is alternately called both “Zorongo” and “Zorongo gitano” (García Posada, \textit{Obras Completas}). The version that Lorca recorded with La Argentinita 1931, called “Zorongo gitano,” uses the more popular lyrics of the time, according to Miguel García Posada (1218). Ocaña instead employs the third stanza of the theatrical version of lyrics—lyrics that Lorca used in the 1933 version of his play “La zapatera prodigiosa” that he debuted in Buenos Aires (first version originated in 1930), and in the third and final version in 1935 (Hernández edition, 134-135).

\textsuperscript{165} This section of lyrics appears in OC. In \textit{La zapatera prodigiosa} (1933 version), these lyrics are set apart but also appear in the scene (Act II, Scene V). In their place: “Los zapatos que tú hacías, / Zapatero de mi alma, / Son estrellas que relucen / alrededor de mi cama.”

\textsuperscript{166} Bold underlined indicates Ocaña’s selection of the lyrics in the film (00:28:24-00:29:05 in his cemetery performance).
Conclusion

La misión del poeta es ésta: animar, en su exacto sentido: dar alma...

—Federico García Lorca, “Imaginación, inspiración, evasión” (1928)

Abres el almacén contiguo de residuos que genera la vida, esas instalaciones virtuales que cada cuerpo arrastra. El cuerpo y sus archivos autónomos, tenaces, la piel que se recoge a recordar en los talleres lúbricos y lentos de la memoria oscura y caldeada. Y la piel recupera de las pieles que ha sido aquel placer hiriente que horadó los cimientos de médulas y huesos.

De sus memorias mudas se alimentan las noches transitorias, las noches de antemuerte. La agenda del deseo va archivando lecturas de la piel, notas, elipsis, gloriosos de saliva, las tibiezas viscosas del abrazo, la jugosa demora de los vientres y el placer y su séquito de furias.

En la última hora nadie podrá decir que no le asiste el tenaz, orgulloso repertorio de los deseos nobles y saciados. Nadie pudo ofrecer Otra cosa a la muerte que una carne extenuada, surcada de memorias.

2,343 leaves of Federico García Lorca’s poetry, theater, and prose manuscripts. Forty-six original drawings. Musical compositions and his personal collection of three hundred-some pieces of sheet music and other musical material. His theater production ephemera spanning costumes, puppets, figurines, set pieces and signed programs; clothing such as his jumpsuit uniform for La Barraca. His fingerprinted passport. Federico’s own library, including 125 books dedicated to him and the vanguard literary magazines of his era.

One hundred and seventy-six letters Federico wrote to family and friends; one written on Vermont birch bark with a dry leaf tucked inside its envelope.167 More than two thousand pages of correspondence composed by others to him, attached original poems lost and found. Paintings and drawings that were gifts from his friends Salvador Dalí, Manuel Ángeles Ortiz, Benjamín Palencia, Rafael Barradas, José Caballero, Ramón Gaya, and Ismael de la Serna. More than nine hundred photographs and their inscriptions.

A multilingual scholarly library of more than five thousand collections of Lorca’s oeuvre, biographies, literary criticism and studies of his contemporaries; catalogues, films, and audio recordings. Thousands of press clippings, collected since 1986. Theater and dance performance, concert, homage and cultural exhibit invitations, posters, and programs from Spain and around the world.

In sum: an official archive of upwards of eleven thousand items testifying to a life lived and the creation, remains, impact and regeneration of an artistic corpus.168

* 

Today, this archive resides at the Centro Federico García Lorca in the center of Granada, in a 4,700 square meter building designed for its presence to be seen and felt.

167 “Carta de Federico García Lorca a sus hermanas Concha e Isabel García Lorca”, 1929 (FFGL COD-112).
168 All numerical figures are taken from corroborated journalistic sources including Peñalver and Rama.
Safeguarded in its bespoke corazón de cámara acorazada, as of May 11, 2020 Lorca’s legado of original materials is also registered and doubly protected by the state as Spanish and Andalusian cultural patrimony (“Bien de Interés Cultural [BIC]”). This archive cannot be divided, sold or leave Andalucía without government approval, and its larger institution is overseen by a consortium consisting of the García Lorca family’s foundation, led by Laura García-Lorca de los Ríos; the national Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte; the Junta de Andalucía; the Ayuntamiento de Granada; and the Diputación de Granada. The steel vault heart containing Lorca’s original corpus and possessions hangs over his research library with views of la Plaza de la Romanilla and Granada’s cathedral, where Isabel I de Castilla and Ferdinand II de Aragón rest in their ornate tombs. The archive and library are surrounded by multiple spaces to interact with Lorca’s legacy; the Centro includes a five hundred square meter exhibition space, a modular theater for up to 387 spectators, four workshop spaces adjusted with moving panels, and transparent offices and conference rooms. In accordance with its aspiration to become a global “referencia de la cultura contemporánea,” the Centro’s activities are organized around three aims: to conserve and disseminate Lorca’s corpus, to collaborate with and promote international artists, and to educate future generations to engage with the arts (“Misión del Centro Federico García Lorca”).

But the existence of a publicly accessible, official Lorca archive was never assured, in Spain or elsewhere, and certainly not during the lifetimes of Margarita Xirgu, Emilio Prados, or José Pérez Ocaña. In the first decades of the Franco dictatorship, Federico García Lorca’s artistic corpus—not unlike his disappeared body—suffered erasure and censorship. After

---

169 The poetic (in)justices should not be missed. Regarding the 1492 conquest of Nazarí Granada by los Reyes Católicos, Lorca famously declared, “Yo creo, dijo, que el ser de Granada me inclina a la comprensión simpática de los perseguidos. Del gitano, del negro, del judío… del morisco que todos llevamos dentro. [I believe, and say, that being from Granada inclines me toward a sympathetic understanding of the persecuted. Of the gypsy, the Black person, the Jew… of the Moorish Muslim converted to Christianity that we all carry inside.]” His artistic legacy as institution now coexists with the former monarchs in this city, but his body remains disappeared, without sepulcher.
Lorca’s arrest, his family, fearing that the Huerta de San Vicente in Granada would be sacked, gathered up his papers and hid them at the neighboring Huerta del Tamarit (V. Fernández 12). More documents and objects were saved from the family’s Madrid apartment (Calle de Alcalá 96) in suitcases and desks, with trusted friends and in vaults. The García Lorca family went into exile in New York shortly after the Civil War, and did not begin their return until 1951. (Lorca’s father, Federico García Rodríguez, died in New York in 1945, and was buried there.) With Lorca’s sister Isabel back in the capital, the Spanish Editorial Aguilar was able to take the eight-volume compilation of the author’s works by the Argentine Editorial Losada (1944-46) and publish his Obras completas in 1954 (ed. Arturo Hoyos). Lorca’s brother Francisco and the rest of the surviving nuclear family returned to Madrid in 1967. For the following two decades, a select group of scholars were invited to visit private family homes and a bank vault to consult materials. (Scholar Mario Hernández recounts that Lorca’s manuscripts were safeguarded in a pigskin suitcase at the Banco Urquijo in Madrid [“Cartografías”].)

It wasn’t until half a century after Federico García Lorca’s assassination and disappearance that an official archive to document, preserve, study and promote the diffusion of his corpus commenced public activity. In 1984, Isabel, Lorca’s only surviving sibling, and her six nieces and nephews donated all of his items saved by the family to form the Fundación Federico García Lorca, registering the official nonprofit entity in Spain. After a failed attempt to establish the Fundación in Granada in 1985, in 1986, as the doors to Lorca’s birthplace in Fuente Vaqueros first opened to the public, Lorca’s archive opened at

170 Isabel García Lorca’s memoir, Recuerdos míos, was published posthumously in 2002. Ironically no longer in general circulation today, it is perhaps the best testimony to an embodied Lorquian archive evidenced in the lives and work of the García Lorca family itself to shape and perpetuate Federico’s legacy.

171 That same year, Losada published Prados’s Antología (1923-1954) in Buenos Aires, with a substantial excerpt of the poet’s almost decade-old Jardín cerrado.
the Residencia de Estudiantes, his former artist’s home in Madrid. After the inauguration of the Museo Casa Natal and the opening of the Fundación Federico García Lorca, Lorca’s early childhood and summer home in Valderrubio (formerly Asquerosa) followed suit. The Huerta de San Vicente, the family’s summer home where Lorca composed many of his plays and poetry collections also opened as a house museum in 1995. Directed by Lorca’s niece Laura García-Lorca de los Ríos, the Huerta hosted international artistic collaborations including interventions in Lorca’s bedroom, performances with his piano, and concerts in the garden. In 1998, the Centro de Estudios Lorquianos, an archive and library based on Ian Gibson’s donation of original research files, opened in Fuente Vaqueros. In 2018, the former home of Francisca Alba in Valderrubio opened to the public as the Museo Casa Bernarda Alba. Today, these house museums and the Centro de Estudios Lorquianos are owned and managed by various local and regional government bodies and consortiums.

The Fundación and its archive grew for thirty years in Madrid, publishing FGL, a Boletín of original research, collaborating with the Residencia on exhibits and events, and producing an eight-volume catalogue of its materials led by scholar Christian de Paepe and archivists Rosa Illán Haro and Sonia González García. After multiple legal, economic and staff problems that prompted a two-year closure from 2016 until 2018, the archive finally moved to Granada. On June 29, 2018, at 2:04 p.m., central European time, Lorca’s archive arrived at the Centro. Alluding to poet Antonio Machado’s famous verse “El crimen fue en Granada, ¡en su Granada!”, scholar Andrés Soria Olmedo observed of the moment, “En realidad el archivo del poeta no ‘regresa’ a Granada. Llega por primera vez a ‘su Granada’
quizá para compensar el reproche machadiano. ¿No es el traslado de los restos no mortales de Federico García Lorca?"

Time will reveal how the archival heart of this cultural center will generate new artistic collaborations and lines of scholarly inquiry, and how, like Lorca’s articulation of the poet’s mission, it will “animate” and “give soul” to the full body of this institution and its larger communities. Through its architecture and mission, the Centro Federico García Lorca has an unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate how Lorca’s “non-mortal remains” live on, sustaining and sustained by multiple generations of artists and their embodied archives.

***

One missing body and the questions that it evoked first prompted the writing of this dissertation. How did Lorca come to represent hundreds of thousands more desaparecidos, Spanish Civil War and Franco dictatorship victims, and what were the ethics and politics implicit in the claiming and representation of his body, persona, and artistic corpus? How did his body’s haunting presence defy its physical absence, and what role did other artists play in this corporeal phenomenon? What would be the cultural, social, political and legal impact of the recovery of his mortal remains, seventy to eighty-some years later? I quickly learned that the answers to the first two questions were inextricably bound to his artistic corpus, to Lorca’s engagement with and expressions of the marginalized, desire, embodiment, queer utopia, elegy, death and oblivion. The contemporary “postmemory” landscape presented a superabundance of Lorquian artistic production, including theater, poetry recitals, films, exhibits, new literary editions, and translations. More often than not,

172 “In fact, the poet’s archive is not ‘returning’ to Granada. It’s arriving for the first time to ‘his Granada,’ perhaps to address [Antonio] Machado’s reproach ‘[el crimen fue en Granada, ¡en su Granada!’]. Is it not the transfer of the non-mortal remains of Federico García Lorca?”
this artistic production engaged with Lorca’s body as well as with his body of work.

Historical memory and the question of how Spain should address in legislation and in cultural dialogue the trauma and crimes of the Civil War and Franco dictatorship appeared inseparable from Lorca’s dual corpus. Was this artistic invocation of Lorca’s corpus/cuerpo creating an alternative, embodied archive for Spanish historical memory? If so, when did it start? In the Federico García Lorca Memorial Park in Alfacar, meters away from the excavation sites, the young poet’s verses asked me:

Y si la muerte es la muerte,
¿qué será de los poetas
y de las cosas dormidas
que ya nadie las recuerda? (“Canción otoñal” [1918])

Lorca’s own query in “Canción otoñal” redirected my investigation toward a different discovery, toward the recovery of other bodies. I found traces of these bodies in archives and through my own body’s intuition, through prioritizing kinship, affect and coincidence. I realized that Lorca only became an embodied archive through other artists and poets; I learned how the earliest among them had dedicated their bodies and lives to this risky endeavor. One embodied Lorquian archive did not and could not exist as a single entity, and that ethic was essential to their activism. Instead, there were multiple embodied Lorquian archives, como los cangilones de una noria sin fin.\(^\text{173}\) What started with close friends and collaborators like Margarita Xirgu and Emilio Prados, each assuming personal responsibility for their deep knowledge of areas of Lorca’s corpus, would later proliferate. And yet this burgeoning regeneration could only exist thanks to the original work of a few. From Xirgu’s huerto and Prados’s jardín in exile, Ocaña could summon the springtime for Lorca in the Spanish Transition.

---

\(^{173}\) Lorca, “En el jardín de las toronjas de luna” Prólogo.
As such, what started with Lorca became a project about recovering the histories of other artists who took up the charge of the “cosas dormidas.” My dissertation began to materialize in the time and space of postmemory with Ocaña’s Lorquian intervention in the cemetery scene of Ocaña, retrat intermitent. Attuned to Ocaña shaping an alternative archive through dream and desire (to paraphrase Hirsch) and seeing his filmic performance as embodied historical memory activism, I could then identify the seeds of this original work in Xirgu performing in Bodas de sangre (1938) and Cantata en la tumba before that. In the new expanse of exile and the cultural imaginary of the Americas, I could hear Whitman helping Prados to regenerate Lorca and build their queer utopia in Jardín cerrado. Through Freeman’s “queer kinship” and Roach’s “transatlantic jumps,” I could see how different bodies and their artistic corpora were connected across national borders and generations—whether they were intimately familiar with one another, or unknowingly shared affective resonance. Each case offered new ways to read embodiment critically, to discern how archives of affect are constructed and transmitted, and to witness how they survive.

As this phase of my project concludes, I am plotting out new and necessary lines of inquiry not only into Lorquian studies, but also into the larger fields of historical memory and exile studies, arts activism and archive theory. With Xirgu and Prados, I have demonstrated that Spanish historical memory activism is transatlantic and transnational. The work began immediately after Federico García Lorca’s assassination, not only in Spain but abroad, and continued long afterward. Xirgu and Prados were pioneers, but their surrogation, acts of transfer, and literary regeneration continue to this day in the Southern Cone, Mexico, and the larger Americas. The archives of exiles are affective and material; they are at great risk of erasure, but under this pressure they are also extremely productive. As Xirgu once articulated the difficulty of her circumstances, “Qué sabios eran los griegos; no te
mataban, te exiliaban.”¹⁷⁴ More scholarship is needed to continue this investigation and recover the numerous histories of exiles and their generations of postmemory, to see what archives of knowledge and desire they forged outside of Spain. It is a global humanistic imperative.

From my decade of research (and living for more than half of this time in Madrid), and with Ocaña as the bridge, I am eager to contribute more scholarship linking artists like Xirgu and Prados to the generations of postmemory in Spain. Maria Delgado and Paul Julian Smith published important foundational studies regarding the actress Núria Espert and the theater director Lluís Pasqual, who collaborated on Haciendo Lorca (1996-97) and La oscura raíz (1998). Since then, these artists have made further significant Lorquian interventions together, staging La casa de Bernarda Alba (2009) and Romancero gitano (2018-onward). I am particularly interested in the latter production, which is a one-woman recital, and a manifestation of Espert’s earliest embodied relationship with Lorca. As she recounts in her performance, Espert first learned of Lorca as a child in the 1940s, when her father’s friend gave him a contraband copy of Romancero gitano, hidden under a newspaper. Her father had a single night in which to copy the poems by hand before returning the text to his friend; after that, the young Espert memorized them all. Similar to her previous Haciendo Lorca and La oscura raíz, Espert’s more recent production includes a recital of Lorca’s poetic and dramatic corpus. This time, however, Espert also represents her relationship with the Lorquian corpus as a living archive. In 2016, Pasqual, too, shared the inner workings of his own embodied Lorquian archive by foraying into the genre of memoir, publishing De la mano de Federico (with the title a distant reminder of Prados’s “Estancia”). Here, Pasqual reconstructs his path as a theater director through a lifelong identification with Lorca. Pasqual’s public creation of

¹⁷⁴ “How wise the Greeks were; they didn’t kill you, they exiled you.”
vanguard Lorquian texts is matched with a deeply private commitment, and he recognizes his need for proximity to those who knew Lorca personally. In one anecdote about La oscura raíz, which was inspired by fragmentary references to a velada that Lorca and Xirgu staged together in 1934 (Pasqual 122), Pasqual illustrates perfectly how his regeneration of Lorca can be traced back to Xirgu’s surrogation and subsequent acts of transfer. In a last minute emergency, Xirgu’s “disciple” Estela Medina arrives to replace Espert. Through Medina, Pasqual recounts that he experiences a direct, multisensory transmission of embodied Lorquian knowledge.

It will be essential to also study theater-makers and collectives who—like Ocaña—did not necessarily have the same access as Pasqual and Espert to “direct” acts of transfer, or

\[175\] “Margarita’s memories of Lorca come to me through Estela. I’m reminded of Claudio Arrau when he recounted, with excitement, that his teacher Martin Krause had been one of the last disciples of Liszt and as such he’d had direct access to the knowledge of his music through the direct transmission of his teacher and through the original compositions, where the pencil markings of numbers for his hand positions were still legible; like the water one drinks near a spring, still fresh and with the taste of rock. It’s the internal transmission of knowledge, almost a secret, that art possesses — painting, music, theater… — in order to perpetuate. When Estela performs, I recognize in her a way of “saying” the text, a perfume in the words that, in some way, Alfredo Alcón also had, who [also] knew Margarita and worked with her. And that perfume that the text acquires in her lips reveals the smell [or essence] of Xirgu, which, in turn, reveals Federico’s. I am very curious not only to know how she performed, but also how she rehearsed, how Margarita directed, having been directed by Federico” (Pasqual 16-17).
who do not employ this approach in their Lorquian regeneration. To offer a few examples, theater-makers such as José Sanchis Sinisterra and Jorge Eines, and the Sevilla-based theater company Atalaya TNT (formerly ATALAYA Teatro Experimental Andaluz), each employ unique dramaturgical and performance strategies to engage Lorca’s corpus in historical memory activism. In Sanchis Sinisterra’s play ¡Ay, Carmela! (Elegía de una Guerra en dos actos y un epílogo) (1987), the eponymous protagonist haunts the stage as a desaparecida. Returning from the “espacio borroso,” Carmela testifies that she has met Lorca, who continues to write and has even dedicated a poem to her. In her hands she carries the paper, and these verses are read aloud. In Bodas de sangre. 1941 (2014), Eines stages Lorca’s tragedy as a clandestine rehearsal (par coueur) by a village theater company whose members improvise their survival strategy under the early Franco dictatorship by performing Lorca’s repertoire together. Eines’s metatheater allows the performers to play actors who might once have been audience members of Lorca’s La Barraca. As the actors embody Lorca’s text, they offer one another a vehicle for catharsis from trauma; together as an ensemble, they demonstrate an ethics of collective historical memory under oppression. Meanwhile, Atalaya TNT is a real life example of a theater company (and performance research lab) committed to collectively uncovering new expressions of embodiment and advocacy in Lorca’s most beloved as well as his least known plays. In its thirty-five year trajectory, directed by Ricardo Iniesta, two Lorquian productions merit particular attention: Así que pasen cinco años, debuted in 1986 and revived thirty years later by (many members of) the same ensemble; and the first staging of La casa de Bernarda Alba with a full cast of ethnic Gypsy women in 2009. Atalaya TNT’s commitment to the representation of marginalized groups, as well as its philosophy of repertoire and ensemble signal its capacity to be a powerful alternative archive for the embodiment of Lorquian postmemory.
Ocaña’s Lorquian interventions were neither strictly filmic nor theatrical, but rather performance happenings that frequently invoked flamenco. I believe that critical attention should also be paid to the activist history of flamenco artists’ embodying duende to revive Lorca, as in La Cuadra de Sevilla’s productions *Quejío* (1972) and *LOS PALOS* (1975). La Cuadra de Sevilla alone deserves study as a case of Lorquian historical memory activism occurring in Spain during (the end of) the Franco dictatorship. Carlos Saura’s 1981 flamenco film adaptation of *Bodas de sangre*, starring Antonio Gades and Cristina Hoyos, is prominent in the cultural imaginary of the beginning of Spanish democracy. Celebrated cantaor Enrique Morente (1960-2010) famously produced multiple Lorquian albums of the poet’s verses in the 1990s (such as *Omega* [1996] and *Lorca* [1998]) and continued contributing his voice to other projects, including to the Patronato Cultural Federico García Lorca’s *Llanto por Ignacio Sánchez Mejías* in 2018 and, posthumously, to the Centro Dramático Nacional’s *Yerma* in 2014 (dir. Miguel Narros). His eldest daughter, flamenco singer Estrella Morente (1980), builds on his Lorquian affinity with her own voice and artistry, and frequently invokes Lorca in her concerts.

To examine how Prados’s embodied Lorquian activism through editing and publishing connects to the generations of postmemory, I would begin by retracing *Litoral’s* journey back to Málaga, and consider the revival of the (now Antigua) Imprenta Sur and its original printing presses. More research could be dedicated as well to José Bergamín’s commitment to Lorca, both with Editorial Séneca and *Litoral*, and to his journeys in and out of exile. Currently, Prados’s grandnephew, the collage artist Lorenzo Saval, directs *Litoral*. The Centro Cultural Generación del 27 in Málaga now houses Prados and Altolaguirre’s Antigua Imprenta Sur and an archive on the generation; it also produces the journal *El Maquinista de la Generación*. Many more of the legados of Prados’s contemporaries made their
way to the Residencia de Estudiantes archive, including those of Manuel Altolaguirre, Concha Méndez, and Luis Cernuda, to name a few. Continuing with my genetic approach that contextualizes a poet’s literary production with their personal library, I would seek more constellary connections in both archives and within the pages of *Litoral* and *El Maquinista*.

The literary corpus of poet-playwright Alberto Conejero constitutes a successor to the ethics of queer kinship of Prados, Xirgu, Ocaña, Pasqual and others. As a new kind of embodied Lorquian archive, Conejero’s theater to date demonstrates a preoccupation with three relevant themes: the creative regeneration of Lorca’s dramatic corpus, the intertextual invocation of his *cuerpo/corpus*, and a commitment to the recovery of transnational historical memory. The most powerful example of this work is *La piedra oscura*, which debuted at the Teatro Solís in Montevideo, Uruguay—one of the theater schools that Xirgu had directed—in 2014, the eightieth anniversary of Lorca’s visit there. Directed by the Argentine Pablo Messiez and performed by Spanish actors Daniel Grao and Nacho Sánchez, *La piedra oscura* sold out for two national tours with the Spanish Centro Dramático Nacional in 2015, and then ran for six months in 2016-17 at the Teatro Galileo in Madrid. Conejero continues his Lorquian regeneration through dramaturgy and artistic collaboration. In 2019, his “dialogue” with Lorca’s unfinished (one act) *Comedia sin título* debuted at the Teatro Español in Madrid in the form of the three act play *El sueño de la vida*, directed by Lluís Pasqual and starring Nacho Sánchez.

I conclude this dissertation with the closing lines of *La piedra oscura*, because they signal a new ethic of reconciliation and recuperation for embodied Lorquian archives. Taking its title from a lost Lorca play, *La piedra oscura* is founded on the original artistic activism of Lorquian regeneration—that *garden of the possible*—but begins to *map the impossible*. It is an intimate archive of dreams and desires for what Spain’s generations of postmemory
might offer the 114,226 desaparecidos, the 440,000 exiles, and the countless more lost or diminished in war and dictatorship. The drama centers on an imagined encounter between an adolescent falangista prison guard, Sebastián, and Rafael Rodríguez Rapún, a republicano soldier and one of Lorca’s last lovers, in the hours before Rafael’s execution. Despite Sebastián’s struggle not to engage with Rafael, the two come to listen to one another’s life stories and aspirations, to contemplate one another face to face, to share each other’s names. Rafael entrusts the young guard with his most important truth, treasure, and responsibility: to recover Lorca’s poetry and theater manuscripts, voice recordings, and love letters, inadvertently archived in Lorca’s family apartment in Madrid. Sebastián, finally understanding the dignity of Rafael’s life, of Lorca’s, and of his own, makes a promise. In doing so, he commits his body to the other; he becomes the guardian of a Lorquian archive for historical memory.

RAFAEL
Los que te han obligado a estar aquí. Esos pagarán. Y les perseguirá la vergüenza hasta el último de sus días. No podrán levantar la cabeza sin que un dedo les señale, “este enterró a tres inocentes en una cuneta,” “este sonrió en la tapia en la que fusilaban.” “Estos mataron a Federico, estos mataron a Federico.” Y tendrán encima miles y miles de ojos recordándoles cada segundo la sangre derramada. Y cuando entierren a Federico, cuando lo saquen de ese agujero y descanse en un cementerio, cuando por fin ocurra eso, esta tierra tendrá un futuro. No estés así. Tienes que mantener la cabeza fría. Espera a que las cosas se calmen y viaja a Madrid. Dile a Modesto que estuvo en mis últimos momentos y que le confío todo lo que hay en el apartamento. Y que hay que publicarlo aunque haya que esperar un siglo. Cuando nuestra pequeñez haya desaparecido y nuestra vergüenza y nuestra miseria. ¿Lo harás?

SEBastiÁN
Sí.

RAFAEL
Mirame.

SEBastiÁN
¿Qué?

RAFAEL

SEBASTIÁN
Sí.

Suenan los golpes ya en la puerta. Se abre.

RAFAEL
No voy a desaparecer del todo, ¿verdad? (SEBASTIÁN asiente con la cabeza.) Nadie puede desaparecer del todo, ¿verdad?

Parecer que SEBASTIÁN va a decir algo. Entonces la luz del amanecer inunda la habitación hasta hacerla desaparecer. Afuera retumba el mar.

Y oscuro final.
Appendix: Translation of the final lines from Alberto Conejero’s *La piedra oscura*  
(Scene VIII. Perros de plomo)

RAFAEL
Those who forced you to be here. They will pay. And their shame will follow them until their last days. They won’t be able to lift their heads without a finger signaling, “this man buried three innocent people in a ditch,” this one smiled at the wall where they shot people.” “These men killed Federico, these men killed Federico.” And they will have thousands and thousands of eyes reminding them each second of the bloodshed. And the day that they bury Federico, when they take him out of that hole and he rests in a cemetery, when that finally should happen, this land will have a future. Don’t be like that. You have to keep a cool head. Wait for things to calm down and then travel to Madrid. Tell Modesto that he was with me in my last moments and that I trust him with everything in the apartment. And that it has to be published even a century has to pass first. Whenever our smallness, our shame, and our misery has disappeared. Will you do it?

SEBASTIÁN
Yes.

RAFAEL
Look at me.

SEBASTIÁN
What?

RAFAEL
Don’t lower your head. This will end. Come here, give me your hand. I was so afraid, Sebastián, so afraid. But I found you. (He hugs him.) Now someone knows who I was.

SEBASTIÁN
Yes.

Knocks are heard at the door. It opens.

RAFAEL
I’m not going to completely disappear, right? (SEBASTIÁN nods with his head.) No one can completely disappear, right?

*It appears that SEBASTIÁN is going to say something, but the dawn light floods the room until it makes it disappear. Outside the sea resounds.*

*Blackout. End.*
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