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The history of Spanish classical theatre in Mexico in the 1950s is largely the history of the Teatro Español de México (hereafter TEDM). In assessing one of the TEDM's productions in 1957, Margit Frenk Alatorre remarked that the play “cuya perfección conocíamos de manera abstracta sobre la plana y descolorida página del libro se nos ha convertido en portentosa realidad por la mano artista de Alvaro Custodio y la apasionada entrega de los actores.” Although Professor Alatorre was commenting at the time on El gran teatro del mundo, she could have been expressing the sentiments of many theatregoers and critics in Mexico in regard to TEDM's dramatic productions throughout the 1950s. The company's continuing operation throughout the decade was a major theatrical event. It gave many young actors the kind of experience that is often difficult to acquire. For the general public, it was a kind of continuing seminar in classical theatre. It also provided many young playwrights and critics with their first opportunity to see professional productions of dramatic works of generally recognized merit.

The founder and director of the TEDM, Alvaro Custodio, had a law degree and served in the diplomatic service in Spain, but his theatrical background is particularly significant in view of his subsequent work in Mexico. He came from a theatrical family and played children's roles in his grandfather's Teatro Custodio in Sevilla. Later he was associated with García Lorca's famous La Barraca, and has acknowledged Lorca as his “master” in the world of theatre. It is not surprising that someone who had been connected with Lorca's teatro ambulante should be concerned with bringing theatre to the people. Custodio's sense of mission led him to take his productions to the provinces, to the people in such towns as Jalapa, San Luis Potosí, Villa de Santiago, Torreón, Durango, San Pedro de las Colonias,
where there was scant opportunity to witness theatrical performances of any kind. The company also visited larger cities such as Guadalajara, Monterrey and Querétaro. Some of the plays staged in the provinces were not staged in Mexico City. Throughout the period, Custodio published the Boletín del TEDM in which he discussed current and past productions as well as critical reaction to them.

Early in 1953, the Secretary of the Ateneo Español de México conceived the idea of a series of lectures on Spanish theatre, lectures which would be illustrated by scenes from the works discussed. Custodio delivered a lecture on La Celestina at the Ateneo Español de México and later at the Instituto Francés de la América Latina. He was assisted by the veteran Spanish actress Amparo Villegas, who, with some lesser known actors, presented scenes from La Celestina. The enthusiastic reception accorded the lecture encouraged Custodio to stage La Celestina at the Instituto Francés in its small Sala Molière, where his adaptation ran—not for three days, as planned—but for three months with performances on weekends only. During the decade the Custodio adaptation of La Celestina was revived successfully in several other theatres in Mexico City. So it was that Alvaro Custodio and the newly-formed TEDM began to present great works of Spanish literature to Mexican audiences.

Fernando Mota declared that neither La Celestina nor the Quijote had had a successful dramatic adaptation up to that time. He believed that the nature and scope of the two works made it difficult if not impossible to adapt them to the stage without damaging their content. But Mota was writing before he had seen the TEDM production of La Celestina. After seeing the work at the Sala Molière, he reacted most enthusiastically, and his admiration for the production was such that he seemed to set it as a standard by which he judged later TEDM productions.

Miguel Guardia carped in México en la Cultura at technical deficiencies of the production and also criticized Custodio's adaptation, feeling that the play would have been more effective if it had ended with Melibea's suicide rather than with Pleberio's monologue. Furthermore, he disagreed with Custodio's direction of the actor Guillermo Orea, arguing that Orea's Sempronio was too much like a bobo before the period of bobos.

However, the majority of critics and the public were enthusiastic about the production which owed much of its success to Amparo Villegas’ remarkable portrayal of Celestina. The Spanish director Cipriano Rivas Cherif declared in an interview that Alvaro Custodio’s greatest bit of good fortune was the presence of Amparo Villegas in Mexico. The run of the play at the Sala Molière ended only with the illness of actress Pilar Crespo.

Throughout the decade La Celestina was revived on four different occasions in the capital and many times on tour. In November, 1957, Custodio announced the presentation of a somewhat revised adaptation. In this one
he added the scene in which Celestina swears to Pluto, as well as a few
other parts from the original. Heeding perhaps the words of Guardia and
other critics, Custodio also suppressed the monologue of Pleberio. However,
the Oficina de Espectáculos saw fit to forbid the showing of the play at the
Teatro del Caballito. This was unexpected since it was essentially the same
work that had been staged in 1953. The suppression seemed incomprehensi­
able to many critics, but almost as incomprehensibly, the censorship was
suddenly lifted and the play had a successful run at the Teatro del Caballito
and later at the Teatro Trianón. It opened amid the curiosity of the public
who wanted, as Antonio Magaña Esquivel put it, to see for themselves “las
escenas crudas” and hear “las frases altisonantes, que escribió Fernando de
Rojas.” However, Magaña Esquivel decided that despite the frankness of
the language and the crudeness of some scenes, beauties of the text and
strength of the characterization were still maintained. While most of the
cast had changed, the challenging role of the go-between remained in the
capable hands of Amparo Villegas. Angel de las Bárcenas noted in Clari­
dades that the literary values of the text were conserved in this fine produc­
tion of the classic work. Miguel Guardia expressed considerably more
enthusiasm than he had when La Celestina was first staged in 1953 and he
now urged the public not to miss the play.

In October, 1953, Armando de María y Campos, the dean of Mexican
critics, commented in Novedades that the presentation of the Spanish classi­
cal theatre in Mexico had never ceased and pointed to the entremeses of
Cervantes in Guanajuato as an example of current interest. But in recent
years, productions in Mexico City of Golden Age plays had been, at best,
sporadic. Starting with Custodio’s staging of Las mocedades del Cid in
October, 1953, Mexico City audiences would see in the course of the next
few years plays of Lope de Vega, Calderón de la Barca, Guillén de Castro
and Vélez de Guevara.

Throughout the decade critics voiced their approval of Alvaro Custodio’s
tenacity in bringing classical theatre to Mexico. They praised the enterprise
and vigor of the director in staging these plays of universal significance.
Concerning Guillén de Castro’s Las mocedades del Cid, the second play
staged by the TEDM, J. S. Gregorio said that such a classic is a universal
possession, belonging to all nations. Since Mexico is a Spanish-speaking
country, the work belonged especially to Mexico. María y Campos thought
the director’s alterations had been quite effective, for the play, he found,
moved swiftly to its conclusion. Custodio had, for example, made the
scene in the third act where Jimena asks for Rodrigo’s head, the second act
curtain.

Alvaro Custodio produced three plays by Lope de Vega during the
decade, La discreta enamorada, Fuenteovejuna and El castigo sin venganza.
Of the three, the most successful in terms of popular and critical acclaim was
an impressive production of *Fuenteovejuna* in the natural setting of a colonial plaza in an old section of Mexico City. The critics received *La discreta enamorada* with least enthusiasm.

Although the choice of the play pleased critics, they were ready to quarrel with Custodio’s staging and direction of *La discreta enamorada*. His emphasis on the play’s farcical elements suggested to critics a displeasing modernization of the play. Sigfredo Gordon Carmona stated the case for the other critics in *México al Día*, when he said that everything should not be modernized. He did not appreciate the undue emphasis on the farcical tone of *La discreta enamorada*, he observed, the same as he would not enjoy seeing Mephistopheles dressed in a *frac* coat. Mota and Bárcenas agreed with Gordon Carmona. Bárcenas, moreover, criticized the scenery and costumes that were, he said, extravagant and inadequate. Such a production might be expected, he mused, from a person of non-Spanish background who did not understand that Spanish dramatic art is characterized by its realistic simplicity. It was hard to justify such misunderstanding in a man who had done such a fine piece of work in his simple productions of *La Celestina* and *Las mocedades del Cid*.

In discussing Lope de Vega, Bárcenas, a Spaniard himself, interjected an anti-regime note. He lamented the treatment of Lope in Spain, but how, he asked rhetorically, could one expect otherwise in Spain with its current cry of “abajo la inteligencia.” Surely, he declared, Lope deserved a permanent theatre in Spain where his plays could be produced. While Shakespeare was accorded the treatment he deserved in England where his plays were given worthy productions with some kind of regularity, the most glorious playwright that Spain had produced did not receive treatment befitting his dramatic stature. A monument to Lope in the form of a permanent theatre where his plays could be seen regularly did not exist. Bárcenas felt that in the anti-intellectual atmosphere of Spain, it could not be expected that works of Lope such as *Fuenteovejuna* with its theme of justice could be truly appreciated.

*Fuenteovejuna*, however, could be—and was—appreciated in Mexico when Alvaro Custodio produced the Lope play there in 1956. In March of that year, Francisco Monterde, writing in the *Revista de la Universidad de México*, praised Alvaro Custodio for returning to the path best suited to him in his production of *Fuenteovejuna* in the Plaza de Chimalistac. Evidently, Monterde felt that modern plays such as León Felipe’s *La manzana* in 1955 were not Custodio’s forte. For Monterde, the suppression of scenes and personages at the Court in *Fuenteovejuna* was entirely justifiable in the light of the fine results. The Plaza de Federico Gamboa in Chimalistac was, Monterde said, a perfect setting for the play. As he pointed out, more than a hundred people could act in the colonial setting without bumping into one another. The spaciousness of the setting was in distinct contrast to
the smallness of the teatros de bolsillo, most of which were built during the 1950s or shortly before, where Custodio often staged his plays. So great was the impact of Fuenteovejuna on Mexico City critics and the general public that it ran for a month and a half instead of having the ten-day run that was originally planned.

When the TEDM's production of Lope's El castigo sin venganza opened in the Teatro Trianón, it was the use of the Mexican accent by the actors that captured the praise of the critics. Although the Mexican accent had been used generally in plays in Mexico since the 1920s, Alvaro Custodio's original decision, when forming his company, was to use a Castilian accent. This seemed appropriate for the presentation of classical Spanish theatre. Now critics had only approval for Alvaro Custodio's decision to have his company, even though it was performing Spanish classical plays, use a Mexican rather than a Castilian accent.

In speaking of Alvaro Custodio's accomplishments in training actors, Gordón Carmona had mentioned in 1953 the difficulty of training Mexican actors to speak with a Castilian accent as one surmounted by Custodio. As the years passed, and as actors Custodio had trained moved off to work in other theatres and in motion pictures, the difficulty of keeping together a group of actors trained to use the Castilian accent became apparent to Custodio. The production of El castigo sin venganza was a turning point, for, as he explained in the Boletín del TEDM, henceforward the Mexican accent would be used in his productions. As for the adaptation of El castigo sin venganza, Luis D. Vicent declared approvingly that Custodio's adaptation had all the flavor of the original and made it move more rapidly. Miguel Guardia deplored the justice meted out in the play, protesting that it was completely inhuman.

The Custodio interpretation of Vélez de Guevara's Reinar después de morir delighted critics for several reasons: they felt that the simplicity of the production in contrast to the elaborateness of the production of La discreta enamorada was the right path for Custodio to take with his company, and they praised the acting, especially that of Ignacio López Tarso and Ofelia Guilmain. Bárcenas, for example, was so greatly impressed by the excellent diction and interpretation of the performers that he felt that attendance at the play should be obligatory. Rafael Solana agreed with Bárcenas as to the excellence of Ignacio López Tarso's performance, but he disagreed with him regarding the diction of the rest of the cast. The members of the cast, Solana complained, were swallowing the diphthongs and ruining the rhyme schemes that Vélez de Guevara had measured so well. For Mota, the highest praise he could bestow upon the work was that it was comparable to the productions of La Celestina and Las mocedades del Cid. Reinar después de morir ran on weekends in the Sala Molière starting in May, 1954.
In the fall of 1954 in the Teatro del Seguro Social, Custodio combined on one program Calderón’s *La hidalga del valle*, an *auto sacramental*—the first of three plays by Calderón undertaken by the TEDM—with a dramatization of one of the best known poems in the Spanish language, Jorge Manrique’s *Coplas a la muerte de su padre*. Again, there was general praise among the critics but with a few reservations. Sergio Magaña, for instance, praised the purity of Calderón’s language, but felt that the young girl who played the *hidalga* was not good enough for the part. Icaza was most enthusiastic about the program, noting that it was a shame that the theatre had degenerated as much as it had, when there were such fine works as these waiting to be staged.

Another Calderón play, also an *auto sacramental*, received a spectacular production in March, 1957. In view of the smallness of most of the new theatres in Mexico City, one can understand the impact on critics of being in a crowd of some three thousand people when Custodio staged a two-part program of Calderón’s *El gran teatro del mundo* and Seneca’s *Medea* (in Unamuno’s version) in the magnificent old Convent of Acolman, 45 kilometers from the capital. The critics were delighted with the beauty of the surroundings. Comparing the spaciousness of the setting with the smallness of the theatres in Mexico City, Joaquín S. MacGregor declared: “Era el verbo en su casa, no en rumbosos garajes o comedores disfrazados de salitas teatrales.” According to Custodio, the plays were presented before a crowd amounting to 6,000 on March 2 and 3. In a year when critics were complaining about having to go as far as the Bosque de Chapultepec to see a play, it was a bold move on Custodio’s part to present *El gran teatro del mundo* first in the colonial Convent of Acolman and later at the Frontón Cerrado of the Ciudad Universitaria.

When Custodio moved the productions to the Ciudad Universitaria, Solana praised the director of the TEDM for not resting on his well-earned laurels. Although Custodio had shown his ambition by staging the plays in those two places, he was, according to Solana, perhaps more ambitious than successful. It struck Solana that Custodio had to learn to gauge the attention span of the modern audience watching a production of a classical work. After twenty minutes, Solana found that the poetry made him sleepy. As for Seneca’s *Medea*, the night was cold and so was the work. Solana recalled Margarita Xirgu’s performance in Euripides’ *Medea* (it was part of her repertory in Mexico in 1936) as the model for the role. In his opinion, the role was too demanding for María Teresa Rivas. But despite the flaws, these works still had the benefits of any Custodio production, “por ser una exaltación de buen teatro, del teatro cultural, que enseña y no solamente divierte, y por ser una exaltación de nuestros antepasados españoles.”

Custodio chose another picturesque location not far from the Ciudad Universitaria for the third Calderón play. The Jardines del Pedregal de San
Angel served as the setting for Calderón’s *El alcalde de Zalamea* in October, 1958. Fausto Castillo, in reviewing the work, approved of Custodio’s suppression of certain dialogues between don Mendo and Nuño and his division of the play into two acts. In his opinion, the TEDM production was praiseworthy for “naturalidad en la dicción, fluidez en los movimientos y una determinación casi pudorosa para no caer en exageraciones.” Since the ACTM was unable to decide on one person for its prize for directing, it was decided to award the prize to all three directors nominated that year: Seki Sano for Miller’s *A View from the Bridge*, Ricardo Mondragón for *The Diary of Ann Frank*, and Alvaro Custodio for *El alcalde de Zalamea*.

The TEDM contributed to the enrichment of the theatre in Mexico in the 1950s. During the decade a considerable number of Spanish plays from various epochs were staged in Mexico City. Although a few critics showed little enthusiasm for modern Spanish plays when they felt that these works were competing with Mexican plays of equal quality, there was almost uniform enthusiasm at seeing the classical Spanish plays of Alvaro Custodio’s TEDM. The majority of critics welcomed this enrichment of the theatre in Mexico and the opportunity it provided to examine many well-known plays. Where adaptations of plays were concerned, they were willing to accept certain changes if they made for improvement, but in general they preferred not to see the original tampered with, especially if it was a famous and beloved classic. Some of the critics such as Sergio Magaña, Antonio Magaña Esquivel, Francisco Monterde and Rafael Solana, who were also playwrights, could view the plays from the dramatist’s point of view as well as from that of the critic. The theatre-going public in Mexico was able to see works that they probably would not have seen without the TEDM productions. Actors benefitted from having the opportunity of playing a variety of roles sometimes within a short time. Many of the young actors in Mexico in the 1950s figure today among the leading actors as can be seen by reading the list of TEDM productions that follows. They can give credit to Alvaro Custodio for at least part of their training. In discussing the contributions of directors from all parts of the world to theatre in Mexico after World War II, Carlos Solórzano, also a playwright, mentioned as Custodio’s contribution, “el perfeccionamiento en la dicción de muchos de nuestros principales actores.”

*University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*

**Repertory of the TEDM from 1953 to 1959**


Octubre de 1953.—*Las mocedades del Cid* de Guillén de Castro. Sala Molière. Intérpretes: Ignacio López Tarso (Premio de la Agrupación de Críticos), Ofelia Guilmain (Terna de la mejor actriz), Guillermo Orea, Pilar Crespo, Miguel Córcega, Miguel Suárez, Virginia
Diciembre de 1953 y Enero de 1954.—Gira a Cuernavaca, Mor., con las tres obras citadas. Se incorporó al elenco Aurora Molina.
Julio de 1954.—Funciones especiales para las escuelas secundarias en el Palacio de Bellas Artes, con Las mocedades del Cid, La discreta enamorada y Reinar después de morir.
Septiembre y Octubre de 1954.—Reposición del repertorio de la compañía en el Teatro del Seguro Social (Reforma y Burdeos) y estreno en México de La hidalga del valle y de las Coplas por la muerte de su padre de Jorge Manrique. Intérpretes: Ignacio López Tarso, Amparo Villegas y Mario Delmar.
Mayo y Junio de 1956.—Gira a Puebla, Jalapa, Querétaro, Guadalajara, San Luis Potosí, Monterrey, Villa de Santiago, Torreón y Durango con Fuenteovejuna.
Julio y Agosto de 1957.—Gira a Durango, Lerdo, Cdad. El Mante, Monterrey y San Luis Potosí, con Medea, Bodas de Sangre, Don Gil de las calzas verdes de Tirso de Molina y La zapatera prodigiosa de F. García Lorca.


Diciembre de 1958.—Gira a la Hacienda Vistahermosa de Tequesquitengo con El alcalde de Zalamea.

Marzo, Abril y Mayo de 1959.—Reposición de El alcalde de Zalamea en el patio del Colegio de las Vizcainas. Intérpretes: Eduardo Fajardo, María Idalia, José Solé, Yerye Beirute, Mario Delmar.

[This information was taken from a booklet published in 1963 at the time of the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the TEDM.]

Notes


2. At the end of this article, see the list of plays presented by the TEDM (known as the Teatro Clásico de México after 1960) during the 1950s. Alvaro Custodio was kind enough to send me this list.

3. Custodio explains this beginning of La Celestina and the TEDM in the Boletín del TEDM (septiembre y octubre de 1959), p. 1. The original lecture at the Ateneo was reflected, according to Custodio, in “La Celestina y la literatura estatal del Siglo de Oro,” Cuadernos Americanos, LXX, núm. 4 (julio-agosto de 1953), 263-75.


5. ibid., núm. 2, 275 (18 octubre 1953), p. 89.


7. In an interview with the author of this study on August 24, 1967 in Mexico City.

8. The ACTM (Agrupación de Críticos de Teatro de México) in 1954 gave a Mención de Honor to Álvaro Custodio “por sus realizaciones de La Celestina y Las mocedades del Cid y por su contribución a la cultura clásica del público mexicano.” Ignacio López Tarso was the Acting Discovery of the Year for the same two plays and a Diploma was given to Ofelia Guilmain for her roles in La Celestina (Elicia) and Las mocedades del Cid (Jimena). Boletín del TEDM (septiembre y octubre de 1959), pp. 2-3.

9. According to Magaña Esquível, the censorship occurred because of a misunderstanding.

10. Ibid.


13. Armando de María y Campos, Novedades, 3ª sección (18 octubre 1953), p. 3. In 1953 Enrique Ruelas started staging the entremeses of Cervantes in the colonial plazas and patios of Guanajuato sponsored by the Universidad de Guanajuato.


15. María y Campos, Novedades, 3ª sección (18 octubre 1953), p. 3.


20. Francisco Monterde, Revista de la Universidad de México, X, núm. 7 (marzo 1956), 25.

21. Ibid. The other two productions of Fuenteovejuna that Monterde recalled were a triumphant one with Margarita Xirgu directed by Cipriano Rivas Cherit in 1953 and another one with the two Rambals, padre e hijo, in the Teatro Iris en 1951.

22. For a list of the opening of new theatres during the decade, see Magaña Esquível and Ruth S. Lamb, Breve historia del teatro mexicano (Mexico, 1958), pp. 161-166.


27. Rafael Solana, Siempre, núm. 49 (29 mayo 1954), pp. 52-54.
The critic indicated that the three competing actors from the same plays, Wolf Rubinski, Miguel Manzano and Eduardo Fajardo all had ardent supporters among the critics, but Rubinski won by a slim margin.


The Center for Curriculum Development announces the availability of tape recordings of original Spanish American plays recorded under studio conditions by the original casts in the countries of origin. Included in the selection are *El cepillo de dientes* (Jorge Díaz), *Collacocha* (Enrique Solari Swayne), *El cruce sobre el Niágara* (Alonso Alegría), and *Las manos de Dios* (Carlos Solórzano). For further information, write to the Center for Curriculum Development, 401 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19106.