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Retracing the Text: Francisco Brines' Poemas excluidos

Abstract
In 1985 Francisco Brines published Poemas excluidos [Excluded Poems]. In this work he included, ironically and paradoxically (considering the title), various poems that had been excluded from his previously published collections of poetry. This essay investigates the critical activity of reconstructing the text within the included-excluded intertextual context of Brines' poetic production. In particular, as will be shown, Poemas excluidos demonstrates the play of texts and play of meaning that constitute the complex object the literary critic seeks to describe. One aspect of the play of texts evident in this work is that the poem is a symbiont not only of other poems of the collection but also of earlier and later poems of Brines' other collections. From this symbiosis arises the interplay of texts and the indeterminacy of meaning of Poemas excluidos. Textual reconstruction yields yet another important result. As critics attempt to untangle the tangle of texts, they become more and more caught up in the snarl of texts, and the play of meaning of the object scrutinized. Critical commentary, then, itself becomes yet one more thread in the intricate intertextual web of Poemas excluidos.
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Francisco Brines’ Poemas excluidos (Excluded Poems) of 1985 is a unique work because it demonstrates, as does no other Brinesean collection, the play of texts and play of meaning that constitute the complex object the literary critic seeks to describe. In Poemas excluidos, the poem is a symbiont not only of other poems of the collection but also of earlier and later poems of Brines’ other collections. From this symbiosis arises, as will be shown in this study, the interplay of texts and the indeterminacy of meaning of Poemas excluidos.

The texts of Poemas excluidos move within what Geoffrey Hartman calls an “intertextual sphere.” In his description of deconstructive criticism, Hartman observes:

Each text is shown to imbed other texts by a most cunning assimilation whose form is the subject both of psychoanalytic and of purely rhetorical criticism. Everything we thought of as spirit, or meaning separable from the letter of the text, remains within an ‘intertextual’ sphere; it is commentary that reminds us of this curious and forgettable fact.

As critics invade this intertextual sphere, they discover what J. Hillis Miller describes as “a long chain of parasitical presences—echoes, allusions, guests, ghosts of previous texts. These are present within the domicile of the poem in that curious phantasmal way, affirmed, negated, sublimated, twisted, straightened out, travestied. . . .”

When critics become more involved in the intertextual fabric of Poemas excluidos and more aware of the ever-expanding “chain of parasitical presences” they come to realize that instead of moving closer to a definitive interpretation of the text, they are moving further
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away from such an interpretation. Rather than disorienting the critic, however, this knowledge has a liberating effect. Free to roam the intertextual maze of Brines’ poetry, critics can now incorporate the previously excluded texts constituting Poemas excluidos into the totality of Brines’ poetic production while simultaneously interrelating the thematic content of all of Brines’ poetry.

Since the text under consideration forever points to other connections, contexts, and correlations awaiting textual reconstruction, critical commentary receives an added dimension. As critics attempt to untangle the tangle of texts, they become more and more caught up in the snare of texts and the play of meaning of the object scrutinized. The result of their task, curiously, itself will become yet one other thread in the complex and intricate weave of Poemas excluidos.4

At the outset of Poemas excluidos, in the “Nota a manera de prólogo” (Note in the manner of a prologue, 7–8), Francisco Brines stipulates the role readers are to have as they interact with the poems and appended notes constituting his collection. He writes,

Mucho he dudado antes de dar este pequeño volumen a la imprenta, pero a instancias de la amistad y por considerar que algunos de los textos no tienen inferiores méritos que otros recogidos en colecciones, he decidido darles su segunda y más poderosa vida: aquella que tiene su nacimiento en los ojos del lector. (7)

(Before publishing this small book of poetry I had great doubts, but at the urgings of friends and upon considering that some of the texts were not inferior to others already gathered in collections, I decided to give these poems their second and more powerful life: that which would have its origin in the eyes of the reader).

Readers of Brines’ poetry, especially of Insistencias en Luzbel, are already well aware of the active, collaborative role they are to assume. For example, readers come to realize that throughout this collection concerning the meaning of Being they will be called upon repeatedly to provide a new life for the anguished, mortal, personalized speaker of the poems by means of the resurrective process of clarifying the potential of the text in the activity of reading. This task is, perhaps, most apparent in the poem “Al lector” (To the Reader, P, 215). Reviewing Brines’ collections published prior to
Insistencias en Luzbel, readers come to realize that, as they relate and interrelate the pervasive theme of Being in the intertextual sphere of Brines’ poetry, they have always had this role. The mortal speakers of poems such as “El visitante me abrazó, de nuevo” (The visitor embraced me, again, P, 22–23), “Oscureciendo el bosque” (The darkening forest, P, 95–96), and “Extinción” (Extinction, P, 160), to name but a few, secure immortality through the reader’s activity. The reader of Poemas excluidos merely continues, then, the life-extending process already initiated in earlier readings of Brines’ other poems. This life-giving role is further described by Brines in the introduction to Selección propia. Directing himself to each new reader of his works, Brines writes: “Siempre será para mi motivo de hondo agradecimiento que un tiempo que no me pertenece, esa parte unica de tu propia vida, hayas querido que cumpliera su acabamiento en el encuentro con mi ya perdida vida” (53). (My cause for deep gratitude will always be that you have desired that that unique part of your own life, a time which did not belong to me, should realize its completion in the encounter with my already lost life).  

In comparison to Brines’ other works, Poemas excluidos seems to be a very strange collection, not only because explanatory notes written by the author accompany each of the poetic texts but also because thematically there is disparity among the texts. In his appended prose commentaries to the sixteen poems of the collection Brines informs the reader, in a familiar, conversational tone, that the poetic texts have an unusual history. He openly and honestly admits the reasons for their exclusion from his previously published collections. Brines explains, for example, that he believed some of the poems were inferior and therefore not worthy of publication. Another was a fragment he could not bring himself to finish. Another was lost. Another was judged to be too intimate in tone, while yet another did not fit in tone or theme with the collection he was writing at the time. Another was published in a magazine but never republished in one of Brines’ collections, etc. The opening “Nota a manera de prólogo” establishes that Brines has decided to rescue these poems from this state of exclusion, banishment, and abandonment and include them in a collection whose sole unifying thread is, curiously, exclusion. 

No longer “excluded” (in this way Brines’ title is contradictory), the poems of Poemas excluidos have now received new life through inclusion in this publication. There is, however, an additional form of life for these poems that Brines not only seeks but
also openly urges at the outset of Poemas excluidos: “Mas su
salvacion, si es que la tienen, sera la que el lector les otorgue. Era pre-
ciso para ella que previamente yo les concediera la mia; sola asi
podra, acaso, cumplirse mi deseo” (8). (But their salvation, if that is
what they are to have, will be that which the reader grants them. For
this salvation it is necessary that I previously would have granted my
own; only in this way, perhaps, will my desire be realized).

The reader of Poemas excluidos is asked not only to provide the
poems with their “second birth” (7), thereby continuing their life and
the personalized existence of the poetic speakers recorded by each
poem, but also to provide their “salvation” (8). The reader has been
asked to assume the role of reader-savior and to save the text.6
Baffled, the reader of Poemas excluidos might ask from what peril,
from what evil, is the text to be saved? Etymological overtones of the
word “salvacion” might also prompt other questions. How is the text
to be protected or guarded from damage, loss or destruction? How is
the text to be preserved?

In many ways, the poet has already performed his own act of
saving the text from the states of oblivion, exclusion, extinction, aban-
donment, and destruction. Also, the poet, by rescuing the poems from
the temporal peril of their non-published state, now has preserved
them in their newly published form. What, then, is left for the reader to
do in this process of salvation? The reader must deliver new life to the
text, as the poet urges. One way this could be accomplished is for the
poetic text to gain new existence, new readings, new interpretations,
new dimensions, when understood and read in the context of the
intertextual sphere of Francisco Brines’ poetry. In this way, the reader
of Poemas excluidos delivers not merely the present text but also pre-
vious and even future texts from their perilous state of being unread
into their new state of regenerated life contingent upon the activities of
reading, interrelating, and reconstructing texts.

The “assimilation” of texts, to borrow Geoffrey Hartman’s term
(viii), occurring in Poemas excluidos is indeed complex because it
involves a symbiotic relationship between numerous texts.7 For
example, a symbiotic relationship exists between Brines’ poetic text
and the poet’s prose commentary on that particular text. Further,
within these now combined poem-prose texts are imbedded previous
texts of Brines’ published collections from which, by the poet’s own
doing (as the title indicates), such texts have been “excluded.” Addition-
ally, the texts of Poemas excluidos can be related to and viewed in
terms of more recent collections of Brines’ poetry. Further, this now contextual-textual space of *Poemas excluidos* also includes Brines’ reformulation of Heraclitean texts on time, Heideggerian and Sartrean texts on the nature of Being, Freudian texts on love, Proustian texts on memory, to name but a few. The reader is also caught attempting to untangle and interrelate the multi-faceted texts that are, at once, internal and external to *Poemas excluidos*. Finally, the critic’s assimilative activity of textual commentary also infiltrates the intertextual sphere as the critical activity itself becomes entangled in the revolving and evolving concentric and eccentric texts of *Poemas excluidos*.

The critic’s activity at once mimics that of the reader while at the same time providing commentary on and a furthering of the chain of intertextual relations constituting *Poemas excluidos*. As J. Hillis Miller explains in “The Critic as Host”:

> The critic’s version of the pattern proliferated in this chain of repetitions is as follows. The critic’s attempt to untwist the elements in the text he interprets only twists them up again in another place and leaves always a remnant of opacity, or an added opacity, as yet unraveled. The critic is caught up in his own version of the interminable repetitions which determine the poet’s career. The critic experiences this as his failure to get his poet right in a final decisive formulation which will allow him to have done with the poet, once and for all. . . . The critic cannot unscramble the tangle of lines of meaning, comb its threads out so they shine clearly side by side. He can only retrace the text, set its elements in motion once more, in that experience of the failure of determinable reading which is decisive here. (247–48)

Since a “determinable” reading of *Poemas excluidos* is no longer sought, nor even possible, the reader as critic and the critic as reader are free to roam the collection’s expanding intertextual space and ravel and unravel the poem’s textual and intertextual strands. It is this act of retracing the text that both sheds light on the indeterminacy of meaning of the included-excluded and excluded-included texts of *Poemas excluidos* and also highlights the critic’s role in the process of textual reconstruction.

*Poemas excluidos* continually underscores the poet’s newly assumed and somewhat surprising task of providing his own textual
commentary, since to each poem Brines has appended personal observations regarding various aspects of the poetic text under scrutiny. In the commentary (38–39) accompanying “Encuentro urbano” (Urban encounter, 16–17), the poem that will serve as representative of the collection, the poet’s note reveals that he himself has fulfilled the expectations that he had placed on the reader at the outset of Poemas excluidos. Usurping the reader’s assigned role of saving the text, Brines, the note informs us, has rescued the lost poem from oblivion and thereby has assisted in the desired “second birth” not only sought but also mandated by the poet in his opening prologue (7). In the appended commentary Brines writes: “Este poema pertenecía a la última parte (Otras vidas) de Las brasas . . . Cuando apareció la segunda en Hontanar quise incorporarlo, pero no lo encontré el texto. Recobrado ahora, lo incluyo aquí” (38–39). (This poem pertained to the last section [Other lives] of The Live Coals . . . When the second edition appeared with Hontanar I wanted to incorporate the poem, but I could not find the text. Now recovered, I include it here). The reader, having read this poem and its commentary, immediately realizes that there is a difference, even a contradiction, between the poet’s expectations of the reader, as set forth in the prologue, and the poet’s own actions, as recorded in the appended note. Since “Encuentro urbano” and its accompanying explanatory text have been placed fourth in the collection, the reader is aware of this opposition in the early stages of reading Poemas excluidos. Skeptical of his assigned role of the savior of the text, the reader might turn to the traditional task of assembling the poem’s meaning. Here too, however, as will be shown, the reader of “Encuentro urbano,” and the reader-critic commenting on the poem, encounter a series of irreconcilable differences.

The content of “Encuentro urbano,” as the explanatory note reveals, itself mimics the poet’s act of recovering the lost text. The author of this poem, in engaging in the activity of writing, seeks to recover and recollect an amorous experience that has since been lost to the past in the course of living. The verbal recounting of this amorous “encounter” resuscitates the past. When the poet rescues the lost poetic text from oblivion, he is able to reclaim a part of his past that is both present and absent in the poem’s text of Being.

Está el cuerpo desnudo. La penumbra
me rodea la cama mientras miro
un imposible cielo liso, lleno
de sol, hasta dormirme.

Es muy tarde

cuando despierto, los velozes faros
persiguen golondrinas, y a la casa
suben los gritos de la calle. Cubren
las cercanas montañas sus contornos
de un humo bajo; quedara este cielo
vivo de luz, un bosque de altas cuevas,
sera bella esta noche. Mi piel siente
frescura súbita, la breve dicha
de un aire. Como ayer, para encontrarnos,
bajo hasta la ciudad y cuando llego
adivino de lejos tu postura.
Iniciamos los pasos, tantas cosas
no sabemos los dos que, con urgencia,
precipitamos nuestras vidas. Cuánto
me amarga lo que cuentas, te adivino
de poca edad, doblado en la ventana,
triste, viendo pasar los coches. Tardes
que hacian daño, te quedabas serio
como un mayor, con los distantes ojos
con que miras las cosas. Estos días,
en mi país salvaje, se han cruzado
dos corazones solos. Somos jóvenes,
con un secreto íntimo que a veces
alguien, con turbación, nos adivina.
Tienes suave la piel, y muy amigos
los ojos. En solicitos cuidados
me adviertes el amor, cuando en la vida
momentos hay en que, vencido el hombre,
dejá pasar el aire del otoño.

The body is nude. The penumbra
surrounds my bed while I watch
an indifferent, clear sky, filled with
sun, until I fall asleep.

It is very late

when I awake, the swift headlights
pursue swallows, and toward the house
shouts from the street swell. The nearby
mountains cover their environs
with a faint smoke; this sky will remain
alive with light, a forest of high caves,
it will be beautiful tonight. My skin feels
the sudden coolness, the brief happiness
of a wind. Like yesterday, in order to meet each other,
I walk down to the city and when I arrive
I guess afar your posture.
We begin our steps, so many things
the two of us don’t know that, with urgency,
we hasten our lives. How much
pain it gives me what you say, I guess
that you are very young, bent out toward the window,
sad, seeing the passing cars. Afternoons
harmed you, you remained serious
like someone older, with distant eyes
with which you watch things. These days,
in my barbarous country, two lonely hearts
have crossed. We are young,
with an intimate secret that at times
someone, with confused embarrassment, guesses about us.
Your skin is soft, and your eyes
very friendly. With anxious apprehension
you guess my love, when in life
there are moments in which, the worn-out man,
allows the autumnal air to advance.

Preoccupied by the transitory nature of human existence, the
speaker of Brines’ “Encuentro urbano” and the commentator of the
accompanying note fully comprehend that in life the experiences of
youth, pleasure, love, and intimate communication between men are
ephemeral. In remembering the past and recording this memory in the
poem, the poet is able, in a sense, to recover what might have been lost
forever. The creative act, however, as an act of recovery, itself under-
oscores that within the flow of time the recollection of the past is as
fleeting as the experience recollected. Both the amorous experience
recounted and the poetic experience of recounting are merely, as the
title of the poem indicates, a brief “encuentro.”
“Encuentro urbano” and its appended note are more than a
The poet’s commentary reveals that the poem has undergone various readings by the poet himself. In these readings and re-readings, the poet has approached the poetic text from new perspectives, new perspectives which, curiously, subvert the poet’s initial reading. Brines observes:

No sé por acentuarse en él excesivamente la anécdota, en contraste con la mayoría de los poemas del libro, o por la especial indole tan íntima, de aquella, lo excluí... La duda estriba en que advierto en el una leve autocompasión que incomoda en mi sensibilidad actual, y quizás una exposición de inocencia que he dejado de valorar. Pero nosotros, y los hechos, éramos entonces así. (38–39)

(I do not know if it is because the poem is excessively anecdotal, in contrast to the majority of the poems of the book, or because of the special, intimate nature of that anecdote that I excluded it. ... The doubt is based on the fact that I perceive in the poem a faint sense of self-pity that troubles my present sensibilities, and perhaps an exhibition of innocence that I now no longer value. But we, and the deeds, were like that then).

These incompatible readings given by the poet to his own poetic text warn the reader, and ultimately the critic, of the possibility of unsynthesizable readings that might be furnished as the text is read and reread. For example, a first reading of “Encuentro urbano” might focus on the poetic speaker’s recollection of a heterosexual amorous experience since the repeated object pronouns “nos” (II. 14, 29), “me” (II. 20, 32), and “te” (II. 20, 23) are ambiguous with respect to gender and also since the speaker’s observation “doblado en la ventana” (I. 21) follows the description “adivino de lejos tu postura” (I. 16). A new reading, however, might focus on the phrases “doblado en la ventana” (I. 21), “te quedabas serio” (I. 23), “en mi país salvaje” (I. 26), and “Tienes suave la piel, y muy amigos / los ojos” (II. 30–31), which could point to a homosexual amorous experience if the first person speaker of the poem is viewed as male. Brines himself suggests such a reading in the appended note: “Más pormenores anecdotícoss podria aun añadir: el lugar era un Madrid entonces entrañable, a aquel aire joven, dorado y romano. El país
semeja ahora, respecto al clima moral al aquel aquí se hace referencia, mucho menos salvaje” (39). (“I could even add more anecdotal details: the place was a Madrid that was then most affectionate, in that youthful, gilded and roman atmosphere. At present the country seems, with respect to the moral climate that is referred to here, much less barbarous”).

Further incompatible readings are apparent when the author’s prose analysis of the romantic encounter is contrasted to his poetic speaker’s recollection of the same event. The first-person speaker of the poem is not as self-pitying as the author’s note suggests. Instead, the reader witnesses what appears to be an irreconcilable difference between the speaker’s compassionate view of the amorous encounter of the two youths (ll. 17–22; 25–29) and the harsher, even less sympathetic view of the effects of this incident on the now more knowledgeable poetic voice of the closing moment (ll. 31–34). Such differences are intensified further when the air of innocence displayed by the lovers (ll. 17–19; 20–21; 27) is contrasted to the wisdom and maturity also exhibited by both the lover (ll. 22–25) and the speaker-lover (ll. 32–34). Despite their youth, the protagonists of “Encuentro urbano,” due to previously acquired knowledge (ll. 23–25; 31–34), now approach both life and love with “anxious apprehension” (l. 31). This interplay of innocence/knowledge, youth/age and ignorance/wisdom, on the part of the lovers within the scene of the poem, points to one further play of forces occurring between the poem and the appended note. The poem’s protagonists seem to know more than the author of the note intimates. Their behavior, thus, not only contradicts but also undermines the poet’s analysis of this behavior in his prose commentary.

“Encuentro urbano” shares certain similarities with many of the poems of the collection from which originally it had been excluded. A narrative tone, anecdotal scenes, interplay of first, second and third person protagonists, the contemplative stance adopted by the speaker, the symbolic motif of the waning afternoon, metaphoric tensions between youth/old age and ignorance/knowledge, and, finally, the speaker’s ability to distance himself from the event recounted and thereby gain understanding from this new perspective, all place the poem within the context of Las brasas.

Symbiotic relationships between the excluded poem and the texts of Las brasas are numerous. As critics have observed, the central theme of this collection is the passing of time."Encuentro
urbano,” however, does more than manifest thematic, situational, and tonal similarities to other poems of Brines’ 1960 collection. In “Encuentro urbano” knowledge of the temporality of existence is attained when the poem’s speaker learns that the fleeting amorous “encounter” recounted merely predicts the possible and inevitable dissolution of both love and life. In the poem “Ladridos jadeantes en el césped” (Barking, panting in the yard, P, 24–25), from Las brasas, the poem’s speaker also comes to know the temporal nature of love. However, unlike his intertextual counterpart in “Encuentro urbano,” the former speaker claims both defeat and victory while witnessing the fleeting moments of existence:

En el amor era veloz el tiempo,
iba pronto a morir, y en vano el joven
pensaba detenerlo, se soñaba
vencido en la vejez y desamado.
Entonces su victoria
era querer aún más, con mayor fuerza. (ll. 16–21)

(In love time was swift,
soon he was going to die, and in vain the youth considered detaining it, dreaming
he was vanquished by old age and hatred.
His victory then
was to desire even more, with greater strength).

This seemingly triumphant attitude in the face of the inexorable flow of time echoes the poem’s final observation:

... La casa, oscurecida,
se ha perdido en los árboles, y él oye
el dulce nacimiento del amor,
escucha su secreto. Ya de nuevo
vive su corazón, y el hombre tiembla,
siente cargado el pecho, y apresura
un llanto fervoroso. (ll. 28–34)

... The house, darkened,
has been lost among the trees, and he hears
the sweet birth of love,
he listens to its secret. His heart now
lives again, and the man trembles,
he feels his heavy chest, and hastens
fervent weeping).

The closing moment of the last poem of Las brasas, “No es en
vano andar por el camino incierto” (It is not in vain to walk along the
uncertain path, P, 39) also serves as a contrastive intertextual con-
text for “Encuentro urbano.” Unlike the disillusioned lover of Brines’
excluded text, the speaker of this final poem describes the positive
results of love: “. . . Sueña / que hay Dios, y que hay amor en el
camino, / y que tus hijos crecerán hermosos.” (ll. 21–23) (Dream /
that there is a God, and that there is love along the path, / and that
your children will grow up to be beautiful).

Within the intertextual sphere of “Encuentro urbano” also is
imbedded the recent Poemas a D. K. in which the poet has regrouped,
for the most part, previously published poems “de temática amorosa”
(“Razón de una antología,” [Reason for an anthology], 7).12 The
poems of this collection reflect the central concern evident in
“Encuentro urbano,” in particular, and Brines’ love poetry, in
general. The poet of these texts forever seeks to remember and
resuscitate lost, past existence and lost, past love. Each time this is
done, however, he comes to know in a new way the transitory nature
of both. Brines describes this discovery in the introduction to Poemas
a D. K.:

Somos más, y al tiempo somos más humildes, más pequeños. De
la misma manera el encuentro con el poema puede desvelarnos
un hondo conocimiento, crear una nueva realidad, mas al mismo
tiempo nos asedia con ignorados enigmas, y nos coloca ante un
vasto secreto que a partir de entonces no haremos sino arañar
con torpeza. (9–10)

(We are more, and before time we are more humble, more
minute. In the same way the encounter with the poem can make
us attentive to a profound knowledge, create a new reality, but at
the same time it besieges us with unknown enigmas, and we find
ourselves facing an immense secret that up until then we could
only but scratch at sluggishly).
The epigraph introducing the third part of *Las brasas*, the section to which “Encuentro urbano” would have pertained had it not been lost and thereby excluded from the collection, forms another thread of the complex contextual and intertextual fabric of the poem. The epigraph reads: “Unos construyen sus casas y otros andan por los bosques; porque el destino del hombre es el amor, y cada uno tiene su propia lucha y su propio destino” (*P*, 33). (Some build their houses and others wander through the forests; because the destiny of man is love, and everyone has his/her own struggle and his/her own fate). Perhaps, as the epigraph suggests, it will be the destiny of some lovers to love and to have that love continue to be, as is revealed by the speakers of such previously published Brinesean love poems as: “No es vano andar por el camino incierto” and “Recuerdo de la belleza humana” (Remembrance of human beauty, *P*, 234). Or, perhaps, as the epigraph also suggests, since each lover has a specific destiny, some lovers may experience the dissolution of love as do the majority of the protagonists of Brines’ love poems. The speakers of “Encuentro urbano,” “Amor en Agrigento” (Love at Agrigento, *P*, 116), “Las noches del abandono” (Nights of debauchery, *P*, 192), “El triunfo del amor” (The triumph of love, *P*, 157), and “La realidad no permanece” (Reality does not last, *P*, 233), for example, come to comprehend that the essence of love is at once inseparable from and a further reflection of man’s temporality. This knowledge is as evident in Brines’ earliest poetry as it is in his latest collection. In *Las brasas*, for example, the pensive, aging speaker of “Junto a la mesa se ha quedado solo” (Next to the table he has remained alone, *P*, 23-24) affirms: “Ay, se muere todo, / pasa la luz, la flor, los sentimientos / se marchitan, las fuerzas van perdiéndose” (ll. 20-22). (Alas, all dies, / the light and the flower pass, sentiments / wither, forces continue to be lost). It is, perhaps, only through the persistence of memory and the acts of remembering and retelling both the past and the experiences of past love that man can extend time and thereby relive the “Tiempo y espacio del amor” (The Time and Space of Love, 33), as indicated by the title of one poem from *El otoño de las rosas*. This poem’s speaker affirms:

... Lejanos,  
nos poblará el recuerdo del amor,  
me llegará en el sueño tu mágica visita,  
y aún te amaré más. Hasta un día que mueras,
o yo me muera, o muramos los dos,
y así será, aunque sigamos vivos. (ll. 10–15)

(. . . Far away,
the memory of love will fill us,
your magical visit will come to me in the dream,
and yet I shall love you more. Until one day you may die,
or I may die, or the two of us may die,
and in that way it will be, although we may continue alive).

The observations of the speakers of poems such as “Encuentro urbano,” “Lamento del distinto” (Lament of the different one, 13) “Desposesión del joven” (The ousting of the youth, 19), “Madrigal a D. K.” (20), and “Posesión de la sonrisa (Fragmento”) (Possessing the smile [Fragment], 26–27) from Poemas excluidos allude not only to other Brinesean love poems but also to the poet’s testimonial introducing Selección propia of 1984. Brines explains:

En mi poesía es más vasta y rica la temática temporal que la estrictamente amorosa. El tiempo es mi cuerpo y mi enigma, y también el fracaso definitivo; el amor es mi inserción en el tiempo con la intensidad máxima, el deseo de mi mejor realización posible, y es también un fracaso que, aunque no tan absoluto como el de la mortalidad, puede ser más doloroso. (20)

(In my poetry temporal themes are more vast and abundant than those which are strictly about love. Time is my body and my enigma, and also the definite destruction; love is my insertion into time with the maximum intensity, the desire of my best possible realization, it is also a destruction that, although not as absolute as that of mortality, could be more painful).

Ultimately, the reader and the critic of “Encuentro urbano” are left with the ghostly presence of Brines’ other poetic texts that both affirm the positive, lasting results of love and lament the effects of love’s caducity. This interplay mimics not only the contradictions of love but also of Being, contradictions which are succinctly summarized in the question asked in the epigraph introducing the third section of Aún no:
¿Dime, cuando ya tantos años se han perdido
y nos quedan tan pocos por vivir,
si no fue lo más consolador de nuestra vida
esta tristeza honda de imaginar un mundo
más perfecto que el mundo tan amado,
haber ardientemente deseado un imposible? (P, 181)

(Tell me, when now so many years have been lost
and so few remain for us to live,
if the most consoling thing about our life
was not that deep sadness we felt when we imagined a world
more perfect than that world we so loved,
ardently having desired something impossible?)

In retracing “Encuentro urbano,” the critic makes a unique discovery. Within the entanglement that is, simultaneously, the poetic text and the poet’s commentary on that text, the poetic text and the poet’s, reader’s, and critic’s readings and re-readings of it and its appended note, the poetic text viewed in terms of the boundless context of Brines’ poetry, the poetic text and the critic’s interpretation of it, the critic learns that the scrutinized text has been “transformed into a difference between the text and the critical interpretation of it,” to borrow Jonathan Culler’s observation in his discussion of deconstructive criticism.14 The critic’s retracing of Brines’ text(s) is an act of identifying the differences, the incompatible readings, and the expanding and entangled intertextual web of his poetry. The critics, like the text they retrace, are not excluded from the the text observed, but rather remain caught up within the activity of setting the textual elements in motion. This reconstructive activity is profitable because by it the critic gains insight not into a definitive interpretation of Poemas excluidos but rather into the chain of differences that make up the collection, the differences that expose the perplexing existential enigmas coiled and uncoiled, only to be coiled again, in the critical activity of interpreting Francisco Brines’ poetry.

The critic, after having retraced the differences, the play of texts, and the play of meaning that are Poemas excluidos, might return to the request for salvation asked of the reader at the outset of the collection. Is such salvation possible? Yes and no. Parasitism among the texts of Poemas excluidos, and also among the texts of this collection
and Brines’ earlier and later collections, points to a never-ending chain of texts that is continuously delivered from oblivion, read and reread, studied and interpreted, thought about and commented on, saved and savored, all within the intertextual sphere of Brines’ poetry. Criticism and parasitism, however, also point to a never-ending chain of texts that continually consumes and destroys earlier and even later texts so that the new text itself can become “its own ground.” J. Hillis Miller writes:

The previous text is both the ground of the new one and something the new poem must annihilate by incorporating it, turning it into ghostly insubstantiality, so that the new poem may perform the possible-impossible task of becoming its own ground. The new poem both needs the old texts and must destroy them. It is both parasitical on them, feeding ungraciously on their substance, and at the same time it is the sinister host which unmans them by inviting them into its home, as the Green Knight invites Gawain. (225)

The new poem then, in Miller’s accurate and clever descriptive phrase, is a “cannibal consumer of earlier poems” (225), and as such engages in an act of destruction that is not the salvation requested by the poet. At the same time, the critic consumes the new poem and also the earlier and later poems that form the chain of parasitical texts at once included in and excluded from Poemas excluidos. As a consumer the critic does not save the text, as Brines had hoped, but rather engages in the activity of destruction that is, curiously, the reconstruction of the text by means of critical commentary. Miller’s observations aptly describe this process. “The poem,” he writes, “in my figure, is that ambiguous gift, food, host in the sense of victim, sacrifice. It is broken, divided, passed around, consumed by the critics canny and uncanny who are in that odd relation to one another of host and parasite” (225).

The critic’s activity of retracing the text within the intertextual sphere of Francisco Brines’ poetry itself becomes a part of the indeterminate activity of saving-destroying-reconstructing the text. Such an activity serves to underscore further the critic’s task of identifying differences, play of texts, and play of meaning within the intertextual entanglement that is Brines’ poetry. Such an activity also emphasizes what Miller refers to as the critic’s task of identifying “an act of decon-
struction which has always already, in each case differently, been performed by the text on itself.” Finally, by retracing the text the critic not only becomes aware of but also learns more about the indeterminate nature of the activity of critical commentary.

NOTES


2. Geoffrey Hartman, preface Deconstruction and Criticism, by Harold Bloom et al. (New York: Continuum, 1979, 1985), p. viii. Further references to this essay will be cited in the text.

3. J. Hillis Miller, “The Critic as Host,” Deconstruction and Criticism, p. 225. Further references to this essay will be cited in the text. Margaret Persin, in her paper “Francisco Brines’ Poemas excluidos: (Pre)text and Context,” delivered at the Mountain Interstate Conference on Language and Literature, October 3–5, 1985, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina, briefly discusses this parasitical relationship among texts as she examines artistic creativity and Brines’ work.

4. Commentary, as deconstructive readings reveal, can itself disclose that critics are often “caught up in the play of forces,” to use Jonathan Culler’s description, of the text that they seek to describe. Culler explains:

The demonstration that critics attempting to stand above or outside a literary domain in order to master it are caught up in the play of forces of the object they seek to describe—its tropological and transferential ruses—does not imply that deconstructive readings can escape these intractable forces. Demonstrations of complicity between language and metalanguage, observed and observer, question the possibility of attaining a principled mastery of a domain but do not suggest that deconstruction has either achieved a mastery of its own or can ignore the whole problem of mastery from a secure position of externality. The effect of deconstructive analyses, as numerous readers can attest, is knowledge and feelings of mastery. In reading
particular works and readings of those works, deconstruction attempts to understand these phenomena of textuality—the relations of language and metalanguage, for example, or effects of externality and internality, or the possible interaction of conflicting logics. And if the formulations produced by these analyses are themselves open to question because of their involvement with the forces and ruses they claim to understand, this acknowledgment of inadequacy is also an opening to criticism, analysis, and displacement.


7. For an excellent discussion of criticism and parasitism see J. Hillis Miller, “The Critic as Host,” 217–53.

8. Brines’ commentary, although different in design, recalls that of Thomas Watson in the Hekatompastia and also T. S. Eliot in The Waste Land. I wish to thank Professor Susan Jeffords for sharing these observations with me.

9. For a discussion of Jacques Derrida’s notion of “différance” see Culler, On Deconstruction, pp. 95–97. Culler explains: “The term différance... alludes to this undecidable, nonsynthetic alternation between the perspectives of structure and event. The verb différer means to differ and to defer. Difference sounds exactly the same as différence, but the ending ance, which is used to produce verbal nouns, makes it a new form meaning ‘difference-differing-defering.’ Différance thus designates both a ‘passive’ difference already in place as the condition of signification and an act of differing which produces differences” (97).

10. The theme of Being is not new to Brines’ poetry. It underlies all of his published collections to date. Notable studies of various aspects of this theme include: Bradford (Dialectic); Debicki; Jiménez; Nantell, (Modes; Writing); and Persin.

11. Jiménez affirms that the “centro espiritual desde el cual se ha conformado el libro de Brines parece ser la serenidad resignada con que se contempla y medita el paso del
tiempo, pero siempre desde y a lo largo de una existencia humana intransferible (Cinco poetas, p. 419). (The underlining is Jiménez’s.) In his analysis of Las brasas, Debicki states that “Brines often presents a speaker whose situation reveals some aspect of temporality, or describes a scene or event which reflects an attitude in the face of time’s passing” (21).

12. One poem, “Madrigal a D. K.,” (34) first appeared in Poemas excluidos (20). Three other poems, “Un hueco de intensidad” (57), “Las campanas de St. Peter in the East” (58), and “Desde Bassai y el mar de Oliva” (59) also are published in El otoño de las rosas (pp. 77, 82 and 95, respectively).

13. For a study of the role of memory in Brines’ poetry see Benson (Memory).


15. J. Hillis Miller, “Deconstructing the Deconstructors,” Diacritics 5.2 (1975): 31. I wish to thank Professor J. Christopher Maloney for discussing with me the critics’ role in saving-destroying the text.