UNIVERSIDAD DE SALAMANCA
Facultad de Filología
Departamento de Literatura
Española e Hispanoamericana

VNiVERSiDAD
Ð SALAMANCA

TESIS DOCTORAL

UN VASO QUE NO ES VASO.
Procedimientos de conexión escritura-mundo
en la obra poética de Eduardo Milán, 1975-2015

Autor: Pablo López Carballo
Directora: Dra. Mª Ángeles Pérez López

2016

ÍNDICE

SUMMARY

A glass that is not a glass. Procedures of writing-world connections in the poetry works of Eduardo Milán, 1975-2015.

INTRODUCTION

In the last years, the works of Eduardo Milán have become an essential reference in the world of poetry in Spanish. Amongst the factors that explain the relevance of his aesthetic in academic research about poetry is his popularity and influence on both sides of the Atlantic. The main objective of the present work has been to propose a critical approach of his poetry, in order to understand its scope and relevance. On the other hand, also given that the analysis here proposed is the first monograph about his poetry taking this approach, it has been necessary to take into account several matters that conditioned both the approach and the development of this study. In this sense, since the very first critical approaches of his work, it has become clear that Eduardo Milán always wrote from the awareness of the chasm between language and reality. Because of this, the first question is to ask how the poet faces that chasm, in order to showcase the problems that this causes in its poetry.

The second question has been finding an analytic framework to systematically show the conflicts between poetry and the world. However, the first challenge has been the establishment of patterns to depict a structured image of his work, with all its elements classified and compartmentalized, and this had to be compared with his work itself. This means that the organization and systematization of his poetry would be by itself an unobtainable goal. However, this study has kept is purpose of classifying and give an order and coherent structure of his works. Because of this, the structure here presented has not been a starting point, but rather a road taken; a flexible, inclusive and open-ended structure. Thus, in order to tackle a literary work of such background, it has been essential to take an approach that, despite being compatible with its topic of study (because of its versatility, absence of an explicit division of topics, and the instability of the material) could establish a pattern of research and organization of the results.

When studying the works of the Uruguayan poet, we have been able to tell apart two different phases: 1975-2000 and 2001-2015. In the year 1999, the poet made his anthology Manto, which contains all his production between 1975 and 1999, as a framework in which he himself gives firm and coherent coordinates for his work. Despite this fact, we decided to use the year 2000 as a landmark for his work, because it marks a 25-year long period and because his following book, Razón de Amor y Acto de Fe, would not be published until the year 2001. On the other hand, it is important to highlight that in Manto his two first publications, Cal para primeras pinturas (1973) y Secos y mojados (1974) are absent by his own decision, because he considered Estación, estaciones (1975) as his first publication. This way, we have established our starting point in 1975, being it the year when the author becomes aware of his own work. The first period takes place between the established dates, and it includes the following poetry works: Estación, estaciones (1975), Esto es (1978), Nervadura (1985), Cuatro poemas (1990), Errar (1991), La vida mantis (1993), Nivel medio verdadero de las aguas que se besan (1994), Algo bello que nosotros conservamos (1995), Circa 1994 (1996), Son de mi padre (1996), Alegrial (1997), El nombre es otro (1997) y Dedicado a lo que queda (1999). The second period lasted between the years 2001 and 2015, and it contains the following publications: Razón de amor y acto de fe (2001), Ostras de coraje (2003), Cosas claras (2003), Querencia, gracias y otros poemas (2003), Ganas de decir (2004), Habrase visto (2004), Acción que en un momento creí gracia (2005), Unas palabras sobre el tema (2005), Por momentos la palabra entera (2005), Habla [Noventa poemas] (2005), Índice al sistema del arrase (2007), Dicho sea de paso (2008), Hechos polvo (2008), Pan para las hormigas (2008), Obvio al desnudo (2009), Silencio que puede despertar, (2009), El camino Ullán, Durante (2009), Evacuación del sentido (2009), Emergencia del escucha (2009), Solvencia (2009), Vacío, nombre de una carne (2010), Disenso (2010), Desprendimiento (2011), Donde no hay (2012), Tres días para completar un gesto (2013), Chajá para todos (2014) and Visiones de cuatro poemas y el poema que no está (2015).

1ST CHAPTER

One of the main motivators for our non-conventional approach to his works has been the attempt to pin the works of Eduardo Milán within a cultural context or tradition. Despite being Uruguayan, and therefore Latin American, his aesthetic premises are hard to classify in a clear-cut context. Of course, it would be possible to

look for traits within the two mentioned frameworks, but this would mean to overlook some of the requirements established by these contexts, as well as to ignore some other interpretations more useful for our works. Within his poetry, several traditions meet, which made us to look for more productive formulas to place his writing within a framework. Furthermore, the author himself has dissociated himself in several occasions of these classifications stemming from political criteria or national cultures, in favor of a more organic and ample approach. This way, starting from the aforementioned positioning towards language, we have tried to find a reference framework or contextual delimitation more compatible with the poetic works of Eduardo Milán than the one based on national identities. In this sense, his cultural universe does not stem from the tradition, but within an internal change born of personal experience, that finds its purpose in the relation between poetic language and its relationship with reality.

With this methodology the goal has been to avoid a rigid and generalist formal classification (never the most useful), and to find an open but efficient approach for localization. On the other side, efforts have been made to avoid any kind of reductionism that could hinder the holistic comprehension of the works of this author. This way, it is useful to specify that the work of Eduardo Milán stems from several traditional and cultural perspectives. Therefore, the diverse backgrounds associated with his poetic works, each one with its particular characteristics, are all relevant on its own way, which makes impossible to overlook them, which makes harder to place it within a single framework. These backgrounds, with which the poet had a dynamic relationship of constant approach and distance, could be placed within a dynamic that fluctuates between the immediate and the general context. This multiplicity demands the individual study of each one of these backgrounds within the works of the poet, as well as the perceived ebbs and flows of his relationships with them.

In the first place, we have studied his first background, as an Uruguayan, in which we have appointed the poet within a national literary system that, as usual, tended to be dominated and shaped by other conditionings than the mere literary ones. For this, we have tried two approaches, different but related and somewhat complementary: On one side, his presence in anthologies, studies or editions as mechanisms of formation of the literary landscape: On the other side, the relation of his works with earlier poetry from a perspective focused on its closeness or distance to them. Also, we have taken into account a non strictly literary relationship, contemplating too the whole cultural

system and the socio-politic circumstances. At the same time, we have tackled the question of the Uruguayan identity, so often examined through the lenses of its literary production as the basis for these analyses. Moreover, we have analyzed the Uruguayan cultural post-dictatorship system regarding the variables arisen after the political turmoil.

Also, using the aforementioned oscillating dynamic, we have placed the figure of this poet within another Latin-American poetry productions that have directly influenced the holistic and trans-oceanic nature of his texts. The character of Eduardo Milán, as well as his Latin-American writer identity, contains some hard to avoid peculiarities. His relationship with the diverse traditions of the Brazilian and Spanish language forces us to notice the singularity of his situation, in order to offer a more complete interpretation of his works. We should remember that Milán, although Uruguayan from birth and with Brazilian as a mother tongue, exiled to Mexico at 22. However, the universal character of his work would not be significant for his study, had he not integrated his poetry in a global Latin-American framework in Spanish. Using such framework, it has been particularly noteworthy that the author had incorporated the readings of historical avant-gardes, in particular through Brazilian concrete poetry, to his literary background. His vision, structured around poetry and tradition, just like with Brazilian authors Augusto de Campos, Decio Pignatary and Haroldo de Campos, was not the simple application of a fixed and stale language, but it was about self-consciousness and critical attitude. This interpretation of the avant-gardes revealed a recurrent situation in the Latin-American literary world, to-wit, the questioning or revisiting of certain aesthetic precepts associated with innovation and born from a necessity of questioning the very concept of avant-garde. Therefore, starting from the complexities of the relationship between poetry and the world, as well as this interpretation of the avant-gardes, we have tried to place Eduardo Milán in a diachronic tradition that takes into account all the aforementioned factors.

Lastly, seeing the need to formulate a specific conceptual landscape more adapted to his own works and interests, rather than to the interest of the system where it has normally been classified, we decided to scrutinize his work from the viewpoint of a constant we detected in the previous approaches: the persistent attention to poetic language as a mean to understand and change reality. With the goal of studying this perspective more in-depth, we have researched the role of language in contemporary society as well as the particular proposal of the poet in this topic, as well as the

possibilities that the poetic discourse offers within this perspective. Taking all of this into account, it has been possible to depict a framework for the poetry of Eduardo Milán that allows its analysis and understanding. There is no doubt that language is the primary and main element of poetic texts, but, as it has been repeatedly proved in the history of literature, the degree of implication in the problems associated to it, as well as the uses given within the literary system, can be completely opposed to this principle. One of the paradoxes of poetry, in contrast with other arts, is that the raw material used for poetic composition is the same used in everyday communications between all the members of a society with purposes other than the artistic. This means that the language of artistic creation is also the basic tool for human communication, and the tensions and relationships born from this fact create the greatest chasms around poetry as a practice.

CHAPTER II

We decided to tackle the study of his poetic works between the years 1975 and 2000 from the perspective of symbols and allegory, because this approach allowed us to both satisfy the demand of a writing in constant struggle with reality and to respect its insistent inclination towards change. Our choice has also been supported by the realization that these two strategies are the two most important ones of his linguistic works, seeing the constant presence they have along his artistic career. To sum it up, these mechanisms represent the best option from which we can examine and understand the poetry of Milán within this period, because they can embrace a great proportion of the purposed that constitute the aesthetics of this author.

In this sense, both of them have been understood as expressive resources that, on one side, have helped us to articulate the complex relationship between poetic writing and reality, and, on the other side, can comprehend the semantic scope of aesthetic representation in his words. It was not in vain that, in the beginning of the last century, Walter Benjamin wondered how it was possible that a procedure as inconvenient as allegory were so present in the poetry of the 20th century. We do not intend to answer the question of this German philosopher, although it has helped to bring to light the importance and relevance of this procedure, as well as the symbolic, both broadly used in different forms, periods and context, by contemporary poetry. On the other side, as it was already mentioned, the works of Eduardo Milán have a closer bond with these mechanisms, more than with the ample range of literary writing. Therefore, for the poet metonymy would be more accurate than metaphor when describing the tension between

language and reality, because the latter tends to fossilize it, and in our study we wanted to take into account the variety of his work. Thus, in our analysis we had to keep an approach appropriate to the topic, that would not bias or promote the nullification of change, of evolution. For this reason, with the lenses of allegory and symbolism we have always tried to take into account the tension between the linguistic world and the real world in the poetry of this author, using for this these two metonymy tools that are very hard to classify. After revisiting the different definitions of the ideas of allegory and symbol, in the second chapter we have built on the ones that better define the position maintained by the author, this means, the one that allows to talk beyond the poem or the words it contains. We have not used the contributions of the perspectives that understand symbols as the ambiguous expression of ideas and allegories as means to talk about what is not present using what is present. With this background, we would like to mention that, for this work, we have used an inductive methodology that starts from the poems and moves on to show a general perspective of his aesthetic procedures. At no point we have attempted to apply a fixed theory about these texts, because the very material of study is so heterogeneous that the task would be beyond reach.

When structuring this research, we have dedicated for his first period a chapter about allegory and symbols, in which we try to lay across the main theories about these two concepts that better suit our requirements. In our work, we have always work to avoid that in the part dedicated to the analysis of the writings of Milán had to constantly reference the historic considerations and implications of these concepts, dealing with them in the first place in this chapter. The purpose of this section is to give a first outline of the different readings of these concepts, as well as to develop the ones more relevant to the ulterior analysis of the works of the poet.

The different aesthetic systems throughout Western culture have greatly determined the interpretations and functions of poetry. In this sense, the relationship between literary interpretation and literature has not only been unidirectional, with the poetic trends shaping the genre; there was also a theoretical reflection taking place that regulated, promoted, and excluded certain uses of poetry, thus deciding what was part of it and what was not. Also, one of the key points when tackling literature, and art in general, has been the relationship between artistic-literary forms and what we call "reality". Since the birth of aesthetic thinking, poetry and world have been defined as opposing concepts in a field where both extremes differ to each other, but are also linked, in a fundamental way, depending on the category given to poetry. There has

been a multitude of interpretations, varying from the radical separation of literature and its contexts, to the direct connection of them, with an ample variety of possibilities in between.

Therefore, if the purpose was to understand the relationship between poetry and world underlying in the works of Eduardo Milán, this purpose has demanded an approximation to the concept of symbol, a widely used procedure in his work, that allowed to establish the particular position of the poet in relation to this formula of representation. In order to achieve this goal, we had to analyze some of the main mutations undergone by this concept from the perspective of modern and contemporary poetry. For this reason, and as a result of the diachronic character inherent to every cultural concept, we have established several ways of interpretation, with different uses and formulations, that have allowed us to trace some lines to describe the current situation. In this sense, departing from the several reincarnations of the symbol, the most useful for us in this work have been the concepts of the romantic period, in particular of the early German romanticism, being a peak point of reflection around the different conceptions around this phenomenon. Thus, in order to place this notion within the aforementioned period, in the first place we had to go back to the origin, in order to make a thorough reading of it.

The allegory, as well as the symbol, has been used by all kind of literary movements, genres and modalities, and it is not possible to limit it to a single kind of literature. Only through contrast and comparison we can reach conclusions about its nature, changing and irreducible, that has created a vast catalog of usages. Within the framework of this research, we have been interested in its continued ability to tend a bridge between the chasm between poetry and the world. After outlining the evolution of allegory in history, we have focused on the possibilities offered for the linking of realities and art, and afterwards on how Eduardo Milán has used allegory to this end.

CHAPTER III

In the next chapter, we have carried on with this line of work and with the relevance that Eduardo Milán gave to the role of poetry as a creator, rather than an emulator, of meaning, and with that we have analyzed the symbolic and allegoric relationships that the poet has put in use in order to create a connection between the poetical and the real universe. In this sense, the first question that we tackled was that the organization of this chapter, for which we have considered two aspects: the

chronological and the thematic. Both questions showed from the beginning certain methodological difficulties, related to the fact that there is not necessarily a correspondence between the changes in one and the other. However, had we only used one of these two criteria for our approach, we would have not been able to depict the variety of the material we are studying. Likewise, it would have forced a useless pigeonholing of his works in order of understanding his proposals as a whole. The analysis and structure of this chapter have been determined by both aspects in a symbiosis, with the explicit goal of making a complete study. Thus, whenever it has been possible to study in-depth the strategies of allegory and symbol, and how they relate to the real, we have used the chronological evolution of his work as a *leitmotiv* of his discourse. This made necessary to include some exceptions that escaped the temporal framework of each case. Starting from the same approach, we have established a thematic and procedural relationship between the texts that, sometimes differing from the chronological analysis. This has been always signaled, depending on its presence or scope. This way, our intention has been to accurately reflect such unclassifiable poetry, and thus work with the best methodological tools that allowed a systematization and study suited to it.

Secondly, we have to mention that the poetry of Eduardo Milán between the years 1975 and 2000 shows a clear dichotomy of interests, that consistently drives his poetry. Within this neutral place, between the linguistic system and the immediate reality -two elements very hard to classify- the poet tries to take both of them into account, and to register the problems arisen from the confluences between them. In this sense, we had to start from the fact that the concerns of the poet cannot be contained neither by the linguistic field nor by the social, but that, with poetry, he tried to register both an internal and external conflict fought by individuals and society.

Therefore, allegory here is the best resource to express something beyond the scope of what is literally present, and this way to add meaning in order to avoid a thematic or formal determinism. This aspect has been analyzed and nuanced, in all its used, in order to check how the different methods of applications are useful to tackle the conflicts born from this tension. Likewise, the symbol has also played an important role in this approximation, in the sense that it has not been used as a relationship between a figure and a clear reference, but as an ambiguous possibility of allusion to a complex and ever-changing society.

In this chapter, we have established two different sub-periods, that try to account for the particular problems related to the general idea of the thesis. The first period we have studied is the one between 1975 and 1985, that contains the books *Estación, estaciones*; *Esto es*, and *Nervadura*, and that represents a well-defined cycle extraordinarily important for his poetry. This first publication showed a marked influence by the technical aspects of concrete poetry, as well as his interest to bring the proposals started by the Latin-American and European avant-gardes to an extreme, that allowed to make a re-read of tradition. The purpose of these approach was to allow new interpretations of canon, de-centralized readings that could reveal new dimensions to the traditions of Latin-American poetry. With this act, the author did not want to replace an author with another, nor replace the canon by a new one. What Eduardo Milán intended was to put in the spotlight a tradition that had always existed but that was not visible. To this end, he emphasizes the labor carried out by Haroldo de Campos, prime example of the Noigandres group and of Brazilian concrete poetry.

For Eduardo Milán, *Nervadura* was the closing of a cycle and the confirmation that he was on the way towards the consolidation of a poetic voice of his own. The importance of this book stems from the fact that is based on the character of closing or gathering of all the problems of this period. The starting point of this texts was the same as in the other books, namely the relationship between poetry and the world and therefore the role it plays in the poetic fabric. *Nervadura* was published in the year 1985, and it already showed signs of developing a very personal style of poetry, that separate it from the Latin-American poetry of the period. Therefore, we have tried to emphasize the process of individual establishment with respect to another poetry, and the relationship with the previous tradition that tried to open new poetic ways. This approach, however, is not a process of identity dilution, for the references are still there, only integrated in the journey towards the creation of an individual perspective.

The following publications of the author confirm the vision exposed around the creation of a linguistic fabric capable of establishing a bond between poetry and the world, with some differences that mark them as part of a new period of production. *Cuatro poemas* was the book published immediately after the one previously study. It is a transitional book, in which the old recurring aspects of the previous period are still visible, but they show a glimpse of his following keystone text, *Errar*. So, in the same way that *Nervadura* was a milestone in his literary career and the first period, *Errar* is the work heralding the new period. Visually, there is a clear deviation from his previous

publications: poems are no more interspersed with spatial silenced, but are compact, and the poet, despite still paying close attention to the visual form of the poem on the blank page, aims to create another structure of the composition from a different perspective.

The same way that, up to that moment, the new contributions or perspective changes about writing that Eduardo Milán developed in his first publications, we can say that the concept of fragment becomes a constant in his work. Despite these facts, it was in *La vida mantis* where the use and expansion of its nature became more relevant. In his first sub-period we find traces of this process too. In this sense, we have to take into account that the poems of *Estación, estaciones* that became a part of *Nervadura*, underwent a fragmentation process that divided the originals into two, three or four independent texts. On the other side, besides the general consideration on the fragmentation of the composition, in this case of the poems in *Nervadura* we have to add that it is a part of the construction of the poem, and it is referred by Milán as "minimal structures" or "threads". Thus, the poet chooses disparity and independence for every element, developing a compositive procedure with a very strong symbolic and allgorical character, in stark contrast with the traditional and consolidated structures.

In his following texts, Milán persevered in the highlighting of the idea of incompleteness and brokenness, that appears as a *leitmotiv* in his writing. In *Errar*, we could also tackle these topics, insisting as well on the reflection around language and the use of the latter in poetry. However, despite of the obviousness of this vision, it was only after *La vida mantis*, where this procedures became more evident and acquired relevance. There we could glimpse the necessity of looking into the form and the configuration of the poem in order to find the meanings of it, contesting thus the format of texts being a closed and finished entity on themselves. Because of this, starting from the tension between the fragment and the whole, the change and the stability, the ephemeral and the permanent, the texts were constructed.

The melancholic stance of Eduardo Milán about his poems is caused by the awareness of reality, understood as something contradictory and impossible to represent as a whole, that in turn creates the necessity of using allegorical and symbolical procedures, as well as fragments, in order to apprehend it. In this sense, melancholy would be the symptom of a complex reflective process, in the sense that the subject can never completely satisfy his desires for a total and clean-cut relationship with the world. At the same time, however, instead of staying a simple *Weltschmerzen*, the uneasiness becomes a determining factor in the creative process, that allows him to escape the void

he was facing in the first place. This stance became more present in the poetry of Milán as he kept writing, and it became a determining factor of his writing in the nineties. Because of this, in the works of this period we have studied his aesthetic preferences, as well as the close relationship that he keeps with the strategies of his previous period.

CHAPTER IV

The first book he published in the new century was *Razón de amor y acto de fe* (2001). Besides all the metaphorical aspect of publishing in this date, so auspicious for changes, in this publication his poems show a new style and new characteristics. Therefore, we wanted to take them into account, to approach his new conception of poetry, so different than the one in his previous period. With this, our intention was not to illustrate a complete departing from his previous style, but to point that new visions and procedures were incorporated to his writing. On one side, his commitment becomes social as well as aesthetic, and, despite the fact that his writing already showed political inclinations, they become fundamental in his poetry. As a consequence, his poetic conception becomes focused on language, and it shows clear ideas about its possibilities and functions. In this new chapter, we have been able to see how these ideas about poetry have not been so accepted in the poetic paradigms prevalent in Spanish literature. In the previous chapter, we mentioned several times how the problem of communication in poetry has been a driving force for some of the writing periods of Milán. It was nevertheless a secondary factor, dependent on others. However, in his following publications this questions becomes direct and prevalent.

Moreover, the context in which this debate takes place was influence by several aesthetic manifestations that the poet decided to face, such as the poetry of experience, the communicating poets, or poetry based on communication. All of those stem, so some degree, from a previous discussion in the Spanish-speaking panorama, that has shaped both historiography and means of creation: *knowledge vs. communication.* In several sections, we have been able to show an outline of them, in order to understand the stance taken by Eduardo Milán in front of a poetry that reaches beyond creation and that became a model to read or analyze poetry by, from the middle of the 20th century to our days. He chose to avoid the clarifying aspect of language as a mere communicational tool, and he reveals the necessity of working on language as a problem on itself, rather than as a vehicle for transmitting ideas, because for him poetry

is something more complex. This way, this study has taken as a starting point the problem caused by the mediation between language and reality, a point that was already tackled from different perspectives in the previous chapters. Therefore, this has been the driving factor of our research, in which, departing from the previous considerations, we have tried to find a reference framework to better understand the proposals of the author.

In Latin America, communication poetry, often called *coloquial* or vernacular, or also with the term communicating poets has encompassed a very ample range of poetry during the 20th century. Roberto Fernández Retamar was the first author who, in 1968, used that term to define all the poetic currents that he had started to develop in his writing in the previous decades. This first definition became the standard for several other authors, who considered this classification as valid and definitive, and gave particular characteristics from the general definition of the Cuban critic. His formulation had a significant effect on studies about poetry, and for a long time (for some still nowadays) was essential to define poetry in the 20th century. Eduardo Milán sees this supremacy and considers it an obstacle for contemporary creation, because it limits the approach between the special traits of every poetic current and the social relevance of poetry. He recently mentioned the capacity of distribution and permanence of the concept of communication poetry, thanks to the anthology of interviews *Los poetas comunicantes* coordinated by Mario Benedetti, where he expressed his concern about ulterior ramifications. This work was renowned in the literary panorama of Latin America, creating a lot of expectations before its publication, and sparkling long-winded controversies in innumerable forums. Despite Roberto Fernández Retamar being the writer who coined the term *communicational poetry* and assigned to it its essential characteristics, Benedetti was the one who consolidated its use and started spreading it. The Uruguayan author used the concept of communicating poets as a framework to understand poetry that affected mainly the reception of some authors and the general perception of the state of poetry from several Latin-American poets. Benedetti defended his proposal for what he understood as a radical change on the poetry of that period, and he interpreted a complex panorama, giving also a universal reading to determine the state of the question for poets from several nationalities and ages, not only the ones included in the publication, but also several others who, for several reasons, were not included in the compilation.

In Spain there was a clear precedent of this controversy, that we have used to relate to the one of the communicated poems and that, since its start, has the same binary characters and expresses the same problem around communication and the possibilities of poetic language. The stances of Spanish poets were aligned in two opposing, although somehow complementary, factions. This conflict spanned along the second half of the 20th century, and it stems, according to the research of Carme Riera, from a conference given by Gabriel Celaya in the beginning of the year 1950, in which he made the statement that "all art is communication". Later, Vicente Aleixandre published two articles in two different magazines, *Ínsula* and *Espadaña*, in which he also stated that the only true poem is the one of communication, defending one way to write poetry in front of the other options. In the first texts, the one of *Ínsula*, amongs other questions, the poet mentions that poetry is essentially communication, and the author an intermediary between the ineffable realities and the reader. The following month, in 1950, Aleixandre published *Poesía: comunicación. (Nuevos apuntes)*, in which he follows the steps of Celaya, and in the first aphorism published in *Ínsula*, he keeps a similar position, reaching the conclusion that for him poetry was communication. Later, in 1951, he adds to his aphorism a prose text with the title *Poesía, comunicación,* in which he reaffirmed his stance. The declarations of Aleixandre had an enormous relevance among his contemporaries. Thus, in the *Antología consultada de la joven poesía española* coordinated by Francisco Ribes there are signs of support, such as the works of Rafael Morales or Victoriano Crémer, but also some timid rejections.

In the same line of manifestations of this approach, Carlos Bousoño published on 1952 the essay *Teoría de la expresión poética*, encouraged by the previous texts and declarations. This could be considered the text that gives a theoretical foundation for the reflections of Aleixandre. In the first chapter, with the title "Poetry as communication", he tries to systematize the poetical concept, establishing a clear framework and starting point. Bousoño intends to starts from the praxis, and work from there to create a theoretical framework that would contain all the poetry under a common denominator. Thus, the ideas promoted by Celaya and Aleixandre seem to find a theoretical and critical content that supported their own works, at least in the aspect of the central role of communication. However, as it was said before, there were also rejections. We have tried to take into account the different stances on the controversy sparked by the preceptive nature of communicational poetry. To this end, we also picked the criticisms

of Carlos Barral and Jaime Gil de Biedma, and later of Carlos Sahagún and José Ángel Valente, among others, in order to showcase alternatives to the model of communication that could be linked to the proposal of Eduardo Milán. On the other hand, this allowed us to reach beyond the dispute of the half of the century, and to gauge its later implications for poetry in Spanish.

Perhaps, the most relevant ramification of this is movement has been the poetry of experience, born in the year 1983, with the publication of the manifesto *La otra sentimentalidad* in the newspaper *El País* signed by Luis García Montero, Javier Egea, and Álvaro Salvador. In this article, published the 8th of January of that year, the authors described their idea of what poetry should be, understanding it as a social instrument to reach out to the people, and assigning poets the role of communicators of injustices and abuses of the powers that be. They defended the idea of an accessible poetry, focused on daily problems of individuals, incarnated by a fictitious subject that comprised the real and plausible experiences of every citizen. Because of the extraordinary weight that these stances had in the Spanish-speaking literature, as well as the literary model that was popularized because this, it became necessary to examine it. Because of this, we have focused on the analysis of the stances defended in this poetry and the literary implications beyond Spanish literature. This way, we could attest the close kink between the communication poets and the experience poets, in order to show the ideological battlefield where the criticisms of Eduardo Milán take place. In this sense, all of them were beyond the mere literary scope, and became ideological constructs that reproduced the discourse of the ruling class. In contrast to the stance and perspective of Milán, this poetry reveals itself as useless when accounting the complex relationship between language and reality.

This further proves that the formulae applied to poetry by the aforementioned groups do not work for creation or for a virtual critical approach. The pitfalls of literary production must be faced, not avoided. Eduardo Milán is aware of the necessity of starting from these apparent impossibilities, or to pose questions with a difficult solution that invite to complex approaches. That is why, when he deals with another poetry that deliberately avoids the problems that creation entails, he shows his disagreement with those reductionist approach that only aim to communicate with the read while neglecting the particularities of creation and the complex mechanisms that, luckily, do no offer a lineal and delimited reading. The poet justifies his position through the existence of a dialectic that, same with other arts, is opposed to worldly

dispositions. The posture of Eduardo Milán has allow him to depict in his poems the tensions between the several fields of life in common. For all these reasons, in the following chapter we focus on how this stances cause an opposite reaction in the poetry of Milán, and also make them aware of which are the best methods for poetic creation or the possible ways to be in the world, understanding this last concept as social commitment.

CHAPTER V

In the last chapter we analyzed the poetic paradigm in Spanish, in which the idea of communication has been more relevant than in another poetic traditions that valued more elements of the discourse that went beyond what was already. It was easy to check how the theoretical stances did not find a correspondence in the praxis, and, finally, practices ended up defending ideological stances opposite than what the authors in theory defended. This allowed us to find the conflicts in literary interpretation generated by this communication problem and the formation of ideas that dominated the poetry. With the imposition of these ideas over the others, the apparition of an hegemonic literary conception, as well as the maintenance of a framework of literary behaviors that become patent in the texts, that determined the orientation and meaning of literature in the Spanish-speaking context. Eduardo Milán responds to this problem with his poems, with texts that try to expand the very ideas of *writing, experience or politics.*

Because of this, in the following chapter we have used another way of systematizing the analysis than in the previous chapters, in which the progression of content and publications run in parallel. As stated above, the methodology had to suit the object of study, and, in this concrete case, we considered necessary to structure the analysis around thematic areas, in order to allow a better approach. Due to the increasing number of publications compared to the period 1975-2000, in which fifteen books were written, in the period 2001-2015 (ten years shorter), the corpus of study comprises 25 books. This concentration of publications, as well as the constant assimilation of poems or even whole books in other publications, make harder to establish a clear difference between the different books, and therefore we approached this corpus of work as a whole. Obviously, along the chapter we have established delimitations when we considered it necessary, but in general it has been more useful to

approach the texts from a perspective that does not distinguish between dates or limits of publication, which has been more fruitful for our purposes.

These general considerations around the creative background of the last decades have driven us to study some theoretical considerations that made easier to understand the scope and consequences of the political implications of literature, both as a whole and as the poetic works of Eduardo Milán. We have already highlighted some of the common characteristics between different literary stances, some of them different in appearance and within a variety of literary system, but containing similarities between the productions of meanings and values and offering a closed and simplified vision of reality, society, or the world. On the other side, the linking of these discourses with the structures of power in all their forms made us look for new mechanisms to relate with the literary productions we had studied. From a non-ideological position, adopted both by the Latin-American and the Spanish poets, they intended, each one in their own country, to reconstruct an alleged literary order. This restitution implied the simplification of the spectrum of creation and the limitation of future possibilities, because it establish a restrictive order that did not welcome other kinds of poetic works.

It is evident that every society establishes its own model of acceptable behavior, that affects both public and private life. These models reveal themselves through daily actions, and poetry of course does not escape this logic, meaning that also in poetry it is possible to confirm its existence and mechanisms. Using a very simplified definition of the term, these patterns mirror the concepts of ideology. Its development strategy is very simple, for it seeps through all the situations and aspects of life, and replicates itself through the behaviors of the people, making receivers producers as well. This way, ideology became too a topic to be analyzed in our work. The conflicts around ideologies have existed from the beginning of the human race, and it would be a vast and inconclusive task to document its evolution and development, but we have offered an outline of the main points of conflicts in relation with literature. They are a way of organizing existence and rules derived from the ideas of control of the different ruling classes and institution. From this approach, along the 20th century, conflicts have happened, that have sparkled frequent and fruitful debates, or debates that have tried to destroy the very concept of ideology, and we have tried to document this fact.

As we have mentioned, ideology is absorbed as a pattern in individuals, who in turn reproduce it with their actions. Therefore, a way to understand the world and generate meaning imposes itself over others, and prevails in a field that does not

undergo significant transformations, thanks to the fact that the roles acquired perpetuate it. These assumptions cause the apparition of contradictions in the social order, that are the ones that in turn generate the ideas defended in the different ideologies. In the previous chapters, it was mentioned that the poetry based on communication of reality becomes something granted and easy to delimit. However, reality has never been granted; it has been an indefinable whole in constant creation. Not only we are unable to show a given reality perpetuated in time: in every historical moment we undergo a process of constant transformation, in which actions determine and modify all aspects of life. The proposals of Marx and Engels were based on the relationships of production and its material processes. Because of this, we do not have an exact definition of what ideology is, and they did not have the intention of completely developing this theory. Because of this, we have used the contributions of different thinkers in order to define an approach of ideology that allowed us to assess the importance of ideology in writing. This way, in opposition to stances that are markedly ideological and with strong implications for power, to assume our own concomitances is the previous step to resist them and to dissent them. From this attitude we can derive a political stance, a way of adopting an attitude towards the ruling class and to regard language as a disputed territory.

In Eduardo Milán we have already seen how this state of things creates a necessity of keeping some degree of distance and mistrust in regard to the political and literary events of the present. Within literature, power structures are built and supported by the ideological apparatus of state, that, in order to not raise suspicions, generate a range of proposals with minimal variations within them and are basically the same conceptions about language and capacity for actions. This way, the variety of interactions within this system creates a mirage of diversity and healthy creation in art. Criticism is abandoned, as well as the range of traditions marginalized by the artistic spectrum presented as "advanced" or inherent to the period. All of this creates a conservative attitude that legitimates every artistic practice with its own formulation. For this reason, the concrete practices must be aware of their role in the conception of art in general, because they contain their own formulation. This way, we pass from a purely ideological mentality, accepted despite its self-negation, to a critical activity fully aware of its scope and possibilities. This way of understanding literature, of interpreting it separately from the legitimizing systems of the structures of power, that embraces variety as a motor of change and criticism, is the stance that Milán uses to keep writing.

Because of this, we have described the so-called "politics of speaking" as a marginal concept, that intends to develop outside of the norms of society and the general debate framework. We would like to add that developing outside of it does not mean to not get involved with events, but rather to not assume the perspective, motivations, forms or models of procedures disseminated by ideological momentum. The author intends to use language as a tool to create a space of writing where he takes responsibility, both of the writing and its relationship with the world, rather than of the interpretation or fidelity to a model.

In this dimension we can classify the reflexive works of this period of Milán's works. It would not be about finding a shape or an expression suited to the message or about finding a solution to problems of composition. This demands a personal critical stance, a social and aesthetic commitment, as well as an open attitude for the common good. The politics in his works are not a theme or a reference, even if conflicts are transferred to the poems, but rather an unavoidable fact of the poems that try to express both themselves and something else. This awareness is the starting point of Miláns's poems, where we found the dissention. To dissent or to be in dissention is to refuse to adapt to the feelings or experiences of someone else. In the case of Eduardo Milán, he shows an attitude towards poetry that he exerts in reality, towards the world order or the social presence of poetry. Likewise, socio-political criticism and linguistics are not two separate entities, but two sides of the same coin.

This fractured, already present in the period 1975-2000, was a symptom of the dissatisfaction of the poet towards his creation, and under this lenses it becomes more evident. The fragment is still fundamental in his poetic creation, but at the same time, now he undergoes a formal crisis. On one side, the concept of work is questioned, and the form of the poem is not complete. We can find an explanation in the circumstances taking place at the same time. On one side, in the relationship with the reader, and on the other side, as the concept of poem as an act of dissent. In other order, the schism is another key concept born from fragmentation. Fragments are excised from a whole, and acquire immediately the status of autonomous beings. For the poet, both man and poetry are nothing but schisms that, within their fragility, must account to the world. In order to do it, when becoming fragments they become critical too, because the continuity demanded by the world order breaks down and comes into question. On other aspect, the subject must also excise itself from old methodologies of knowledge, and the methods of apprehension must be re-structured. This way, together with this attitude of

dissent and schism, to rethink the relationship language and the world becomes a necessity. The works of Milán do no show a yearning or a need for completeness. The dissent and schism are not separations from life, but from standardization and homogenization of experience imposed by power structures and the dominant discourse. It confronts the interest from the power structures to highlight that some poetic practices are separated from the world, vacant of life, because they do not reproduce the standardized language and do not obey the conventions of naming. This would be the battlefield of his writing. Because of this, he have intended to obtain an appropriate interpretation of the strategies, reflections and questions that the works of this author create about the complex relationship between language and reality.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this thesis are the following:

To emphasize the uniqueness of the procedures and themes in the poetry of Eduardo Milán, as well as the singularity and innovative character of his works within the frame of literature in Spanish in the last quarter of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st.

To showcase the presence of diverse strategies and contents that put the poetic perspective of Eduardo Milán within the most relevant questions approached by literary aesthetics and theory, and to reflect about them.

To propose a systematization, as well as an alternative interpretation to the literary, and theoretical, and historiographic discourses that up to this moment have been used as a framework to study poetry in Spanish language, using the works of Eduardo Milán as a reference.

To place this poetic proposal within an ampler context focused on the relationships between texts, without referring to extra-textual elements.

To connect his poetic works with the previous literary tradition.

To make an in-depth study of his literary *Weltanschauung*, and to showcase his concept of language, in particular the role of literary language in world creation.

To establish, to the extent it is relevant, axes to relate his poetical production with his views on politics from writing.

CONCLUSSIONS

The analysis of the works of Eduardo Milán in the previous chapters shows how significant it has been to proceed with caution when interpreting them in our study. The links between poetry and the world here detailed reveal their complex and ever-changing nature. At the same time, we have been able to corroborate that only respecting this mutability in our object of study it is possible to comprehend and systematize his works. By choosing an open methodology that revealed the difficulties and pitfalls of finding a connection between poetry and world, we could approach his work in a useful and even rigorous way. We have been able to take into account the conflicts present in his poems, as well as the ones the poet faced in his works. We have avoided a reading that would have lead us to synthesize his poems, and we have focused instead in approaching the difficulties of the tasks of the writer, a man in the friction zone between word and reality. Our approach has revealed as well the eternal concommitance of these two worlds of language and reality, as well as the dialectic that links them without an univocal resolution.

The works of this forty-year writing period studied in this paper are defined by the constant need of the poet to focus on the most problematic area of the poem. This is the battlefield of collision and confrontation, born from the disconformity and non-compliance of the poet against the forces trying to push his texts towards a well-defined and simplified position. There are several currents in poetry, from the receptive but also from the productive forces themselves, that advocate that poetry should reject its heterogeneous nature in order to adapt to a simplistic and credulous model, to become comprehensible. As we have been able to check, Eduardo Milán is against these reductionist discourses. This situation has forced us to adopt an approach to analysis focused on the main questions of the relationship between poetry and the world, and to tackle this problem in all its complexity, in particular in the topics related to text configuration. We have seen how the procedures of Eduardo Milán are far from conventional, and this circumstance has demanded us to employ diverse materials to answer all the questions posed by the text.

The starting point of our research was the necessity to give a context to the works of Eduardo Milán. To achieve this, we studied the relevance of classifying the poet within three different contexts. This way, we avoided the temptation of pigeonholing him in a single category, so we could tackle the issue in a more open-ended way. This kind of procedure has been necessary to avoid any kind of reductionism that could interfere with the comprehension of his poetry works, that cannot be contained in a single perspective. As a consequence, the diversity of approaches and traditions mentioned have been a better tool to answer the question of where the poetry of Milán stands in respect to other poetries. However, none of the backgrounds mentioned has been dominant over another, because we have always aimed to highlight the individual importance of each one of them in a literary project as rich and varied as Miláns'.

In the first place, we have studied his *ur*-background, the Uruguayan, discussing the pertinence of including the author in a national system typically dominated and shaped by conditionings other than the strictly literary. Although his poetry works cannot be classified within a national literary model, we were able to point the main links of his works with the Uruguayan literary tradition. We also went more in-depth in the relationships, both political and social, established from within the texts. Despite his works not being classifiable according to an Uruguayan approach, their importance in the post-dictatorship system is indisputable. In the second place, following our line of starting from the small details and working towards the big picture, we worked on the relationship with another Latin-American poetry works. The same way the approach from the Uruguayan perspective was difficult, the consideration of his works from a pan-Latin-American perspective has allowed us to establish connections with another Latin-American poetry traditions, as well as with the cultural backgrounds of other languages, such as Italian, French, or English. From the perspective of poetry in Spanish, it has a marked trans-oceanic style that reaches beyond geographic and political borders. Because of this, we had to project a different connection of his poetry with the rest of Latin-American poetry, because other of our objectives was, precisely, to classify the works of the poet without recurring to the usual resources of canonization and formation of the literary system. This way, we chose to avoid a definition based on geographical or territorial characteristics. Also, and precisely because of this need, we could corroborate that both the poet and his works did not respond properly to the values and mechanisms of exegesis regulated by these systems, and instead they aimed

to re-define some of the constants usually employed in order to find a more convenient link with the different literary and cultural traditions. For these reasons, the very aspects that no subject can give up, such as writing in a certain language, or occupying a certain position in a social context have been essential to analyze in which degree it was possible to analyze his works and his place in the poetry nowadays. In this context, the Spanish language as a system of poetic reflection has been key for classifying his writing.

For this very reason, part of this study has been dedicated to the problems developed around language, beyond its obvious communicative quality and from the point of view that drove the poet to look for a compromise between ethics and aesthetics. After the research described in the first chapters, the importance of placing Milán in a trans-national context was proved without a doubt. This framework, organic, open-ended, and in constant transformation, has been necessary to respond to the demands of his own creations. The situation of language in contemporary society, as well as the role played by poetry in the latter, have been key for understanding the writings of the poet, because they have generated richer and more complex interpretative possibilities that we could not have reached had we not abandoned the national point of view. For this, we have tried to prove that the poetry of Eduardo Milán does not fit within the political and cultural discourses that aim to describe literature as a homogeneous whole, based only in the common characteristics of each facet, and very easy to exploit for economic gain.

When dividing his work in periods, we found difficulties similar than the ones we had to face when classifying the poet within a single literary system, and we had to take decisions fitting to the needs of this study. We decided to make out two defined periods, one between the years 1975-200, and the second one between 2001-2015, the latter divided in two sections, the second and the third of this thesis, respectively. Already in the first phases of the project we decided to leave out the two first publications of the author, for being "learning" texts, and because the author himself considered *Estación, estaciones* (1975) his first "worthwhile" book. The first period ends with the compilation of his poetry works in a single volume in the year 1999. His following book was published on 2001, and thus we decided to close the first period at the round number of 25. On the other hand, the works published in the new century have different and much more marked motivations as the ones from the previous ones.

Following the aforementioned division, the two parts of this study have demanded us to adopt different approaches in order to carry out the pertinent analyses, in order to fit the particularities of each one. The first part, composed of the second and the third chapters, contains the study of the concepts of allegory and symbol in order to understand the poetic proposals of Eduardo Milán. In this sense, these two concepts have been very useful tools to tackle the study of his poetic production, for they have been key both to understand the contraposition of poetry and world and to understand and study his writing. Because of this, in the second chapters we have traced a conceptual itinerary containing the main derivations and shapes of these two concepts, in order to give us the framework necessary to interpret the material. In this chapter, the complexity of both allegory and symbol as writing procedures and epistemological perspectives, as well as the necessity of writing a preliminary run-down of the evolution of the concepts along history, became patent. Just like with any other aesthetic concept, they both contain several implications that make them impossible to ascribe to a simple field of action, and end up modifying and influencing the bases of several knowledge bases. For this reason, in order to make a coherent use of the terms, we had to accept their diversity. Because of this, we offered a general view of both terms, trying at the same time to define the related components and approaches that became necessary in the ulterior analysis. Describing this itinerary has also been useful to stress the overlap of poetry and world within the space of our object of study.

At this point, our motivation was to fulfill the main purpose of this research, namely the analysis of the confluences of these concepts in the works of Eduardo Milán, and the study of the permanent conflict between down as the main axis of his poetry. In this sense, the change in the forms of acting, and the tension between language and reality, have been the main approaches adopted by the analysis of the work, because this was precisely the response demanded by the original material. For this reason, our analysis has started from the texts themselves, in order to give a perspective that respected the heterogeneity and the changeability of his poems, that avoid classification, and thus preventing the overlook of some of their facets.

The third chapter starts from this set of reflections and conclusions, and develops in more detail the analyses of the texts that, in the first point, made us think that the writings of the first period had to be looked into with more detail and understood from the aforementioned approaches. This way, we have tried to show how the reading of the texts confirms the variety of possible interpretations of the

connections between reality and language. Rather than having an univocal sense, these links establish complex semantic relationships that in term demand an approach in accordance with these properties. In this sense, we have observed how, since his very first publications, more self-referent, to his latests, he shows a marked tendency towards the exterior. At no point he excludes any of these two poles, nevertheless with time is easy to notice a change in the balance of poetry and world. Despite of this, and despite the fact that they occupy different spaces, these two stances are based on the same idea of conflict.

And precisely in these two perspectives have the concepts of symbol and allegory been useful for understanding the estragies of the poet to connect poetry and world. This way, in the line of some of the ideas developed by the first German Romantics, with the defense of the ambiguity of the symbolic and the plurality of meanings of the allegorical, the poet aims to give a multiple meaning to his writings with these procedures, faced with the impossibility of representing reality. The symbols in the poetry of Milán become terms of extraordinary semantic capacity, for which the chasm between representation and content, rather than an obstacle, is seen as an opportunity to find new interpretative possibilities for the world. Moreover, his symbols, apparently conventional (bird, rock, desert, fish, etc.) demand to be referred to a codified literary traditions, but also to the position arisen from the tension of these and the world of the poets himself for their total comprehension.

Allegory, on its side, aims to go outside, to go beyond, in order to show the *errant* nature of the poet. The poems become more fragmentary, and they come and go between what really is here and the mark left by the absent. This compelled us to classify this procedure of Milán as melancholic, for he tries to establish a durable connection between writing and reality that he knows impossible but that does not abandon, and to achieve this he keeps creating meanings in the space of the poem.

The works of Eduardo Milán in this period have been classified as singular proposals, with an organic and ever-changing relationship towards literary tradition. This way, his poetry builds on one of the few constants it contains: a great attention to language and its friction with the world. Also, this approach to writing makes him adopt an innovating attitude, in which his main aspiration is to find new semantical relationships between poetry and the world.

As we mentioned in the introduction, in the third part of this research, that encompasses the fourth and fifth chapter, we have used a different methodology than in

the other ones. The new motivations and work procedures take over the former ones, displacing but not substituting them, and become determinant for the analysis. Therefore, rather than a breaking point or a paradigm shift, there has been a change of priorities. The aesthetic commitment makes room for the social commitment, that, not being absent before, takes a more prominent role. In the first chapter of this section, the fourth of our work, we have described the diverse models of comprehension on the different possibilities offered by literary language on its relationship with the world. Here, we tried to offer a general view of several capital questions and stances that have shaped the relationship and the conflicts in this binomial. In the previous sections, we wanted to showcase the communication problems in the connection between poetry and world, and its presence in the works of Eduardo Milán, even if the former only appeared in subordination to other problems. Over and above, in this period for the author the question of literary communication goes to the forefront, and it is tackled in a direct and motivated way. Because of this, it has been necessary to analyze several poetic manifestations in different contexts that base its foundations on a communicational horizon. Moreover, we have tried to understand in more detail the stance of Eduardo Milán about this questions. He shows a markedly antagonistic attitude towards the kind of poetry that tries to impose a simplistic archetype for creation and for the study of the different writing proposals. Starting from this conscious choice, in which the poet refuses to accept the hegemonic models, Milán stays away to the clarifying aspect of language as a mere communicational tool, and he stresses the importance on working on our codes as a problem, rather than as a simple vehicle or transmitter of ideas, because he considers poetry as a very complex terrain.

In order to investigate this, we have looked for the stances that privileged this models of linguistic behavior in the Spanish-speaking literature and poetry of the 20th century. One of the most fruitful nodes we found has been the discussions that took part in three separate moments of recent history: the communicating poets in Latin-America; the quarrel of "knowledge vs. communication", and the program of "poetry of experience", this latter two in Spain. In all of them, communication is defined as the key element of creation in poetry. This approach allowed us to see the problems of this stance at the moment of exerting criticism on literature, as well as the implications it presupposes. The attitudes promoted in these three cases have in common their way to face the pitfalls inherent to literary creation, and could be summarized this way: on one side, they start from the confidence on the communicative capacities of language; on the

other side, it presupposes objectivity in language that avoids the question of ideological biases. Faced with these questions, Eduardo Milán chooses to not avoid the uncertainty of the communicative process. In his approach, he chooses to take in account the obstacles he faces when writing, facing the impossibilities and difficulties of the relationship between the word and reality. When the poet approached other poetry works that deliberately avoid the problems posed by the act of creation, he does not hesitate to express his disagreement with them, with the reductionist approach that only aim to communicate with the reader, that does not pay attention to creation and the complexity of its mechanisms, and they only allow a delimited, linear, and utilitarian reading. The poet justifies his stance with the dialectic between representation and represented, that, in literature as well as in other arts, is opposed to the world order and questions it. The stance of Eduardo Milán allows him to represent in his poems the tensions between life in common language.

For these reasons, in the following chapter, the second of this section and the fifth of this work, we have described how these attitudes prompt a response from Milán, and make him aware of the best options for poetic creation of ways of being in the world, understanding the latter as social commitment. This has made us highlight the constant mistrust of the author when associating several poetry currents with the different power structures. This connivance is a homogenizing factor for the creative spectrum, that favors an inalterable status in which the different aesthetic proposals only differ in superficial variants. They are born from legitimacy, and they neutralize every discrepancy or variable not contemplated from the beginning, and they show a common and reductionist approach to language. This literary system stifles criticism and variety of traditions that could have otherwise appeared. This prompted us to stress how in his works Eduardo Milán has always called for every artistic representation to be conscious, not only of its own formulation, but also of art in general, in order to avoid any kind of coercive positioning respect to the other proposals of the moment. This way, creation could also encompass its ideology, in order to surpass its reductionism and allow to have a critical approach towards language and the world. This is the starting point from Milán: to leave behind the legitimizing system of his time to take a stand for what we have named "politics of saying". This proposal takes place in the margins, and it does not accept the current norms or try to become part of the general framework of consensus or the accepted linguistic behaviors. This means that it does not only stays out of the system, but it refuses to follow its logic. It is worth mentioning that this

marginality of the works of Milán does not mean that it does not take part in events or become autonomous and essencialist, rather that he rejects the perspective, motivations, formalities and models of homogenizing and expansive procedures. Using language, Milán aims to create a space, a space of writing in which he takes responsibility both of his poetry and of the relationship of poetry with the world, letting aside its interpretation or adherence to a model or an ideology. These coordinates have been for us the base to decipher the poetry works of Eduardo Milán in this second period. He does not try to give the poem a definite shape, nor to find the *mot just*e for what he tries to communicate, or even find solutions for the problems posed by these compositions. Instead, he lays out an individual, personal critical stance; a social and aesthetic commitment; and an open mind that contemplates the possibility of common good. In this sense, his voice does not represent society nor is an agglutinating factor. However, he believes that he can obtain benefit for the others making conflicts visible, giving new perspectives on them, or simply uncovering the manipulation of language from the structures of power.

This way, politics are something happening in his texts, rather than a topic or a reference, even if the conflicts are named in the poem. They are an unavoidable fact in the poems that only aspire to talk about themselves, and about something else beyond them. This consciousness is the source of the poetry of Eduardo Milán, and the starting point of his stance of dissent. To dissent means to not adjust to the feelings or ordeals of the others. In the case of Eduardo Milán, it is a reference of his attitude towards the current poetry, towards the world order or the presence of it in society. For him, the socio-politic and linguistic aspects are not separated, but they are two faces of the same consciousness.

At this point, we can assert that the goals set at the beginning of this work have been developed along the aforementioned path. The *leitmotiv* of this chapter has been the study of the different relationships between poetry and world, as well as between language and reality, established by Eduardo Milán in his poetry. This has allowed us to look into his poetry and to define the mechanisms used by the poet to connect poetry and reality. This way, we have been able to stress the particularity of his procedures and topics, as well as the singularity and innovation of all of them within the context of the Spanish language at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. This has allowed us to offer an alternative systematization for the object of study, more appropriate than the usual historiographical or theoretical-literary discourses. We have

also been able to account for the vinculation of the poet with different traditions that for him define poetry. Moreover, we have focused on his links with the *avant-garde* and the revisiting of the aesthetic principles demanded by the author within the framework of his critical stand towards writing. Also, starting as well from the connections between poetry and world, we have been able to place the works of Milán in a diachronic tradition in which the ideals of the *avant-garde* still play a key role in the reflection about strategies and content tackled in literary and aesthetic approaches more ample and complete. We have always tried to keep the extra-textual elements subordinated to the actual contents of the poem, to avoid a biased or partisan interpretation of the text. On the other hand, in this necessary step, we had to evaluate the conceptual bases of other poetry subgenres in Spanish about the representational conflict, in order to understand the response of the poet to them, as well as the stance taken in his publications along his career. This allowed us to obtain the analytical coordinates to organize and structure his poetry, and, at the same time, to clarify the role of poetry in the different societies in which Eduardo Milán moved. All these factors have allowed us to propose a first systematization of the different conflicts in the relationships between language and world in the writings of the poet. In our study we wanted to represent the challenges of the poet from an integral perspective, avoiding simplifications. In conclusion, in this work we have tried to describe all the procedures used by the author in his poems, as well as his ethical stand, based on *a poetry of saying,* that demands a link between poetry and world, between language and reality. The problems that arose in this friction zone have been our main area of work. Our study, based on this approach, aims to account for the motivations and poetic procedures used by Eduardo Milán.

Undoubtedly, our approach does not exhaust the possibilities of analysis of the object of study, nor does it deplete its richness. Despite having gone upon his essays and critic works, there is the possibility of undertaking a study on the works of Milán focusing entirely on the latter. This way, several pathways of analysis could be defined, in order to study more in-depth his interpretative proposals and his visions of another kinds of poetry according to referents closer to the genre. Also, and in line with future research, the closeness between poetry and essay, and the classification of essay as poetic texts in the context of this author, could be a fruitful field of study. Another facet worth studying for approaching his work is his condition of exiled. Despite having mentioned this condition when it has been necessary, for the aforementioned reasons in this work we have not focused on this interpretative lens, focusing rather on another

options. However, exile could be interpreted as a key element to understand the identity of the writer, as well as his formulation of "exile of language" (opposed to the "language of the exiled"). In short: with our proposal we hope to contribute to future studies of the inexhaustible and current works of Eduardo Milán.