Strategies of the Frontier in Spanish-American Modernismo

Praise of Spanish-American Modernismo is now more a luxury than an obligation. The movement was once seen as a continent's literary coming-of-age, a general and unqualified artistic success, and even a revolutionary discovery legitimated by both its influence on Spain and Spanish reluctance to recognize the influence. More recently, however, the shadows of later and apparently more substantial flowerings of Spanish-American literature have made Modernismo appear little more than a belated Romanticism (Shaw), a passing illusion of identity (Cândido), an absurd abandonment of regionality (Coulthard), or an idealism related more to an age in decline than to cultural progress (Pérus). This change in historical perspective appears to have reduced the movement to an unfortunate but necessary false start. Spanish-American avant-gardes have been more prepared to cite their European contemporaries and myths of the pre-Columbian past than any problematic legacy of Modernismo. If Borges, in El oro de los tigres, declared himself indebted to Lugones and to Rubén Darío, the Neruda of the Canto general showed little sympathy for the “poetas celestes” who preceded him, and surprisingly few researchers in this field have attempted to establish any substantial aesthetic continuity from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries. It would seem that a more recent literary identity needs to preserve its integrity by blocking the problem of an anterior identity. In so doing, it refuses to consider the possibility that, then as now, literary regionalism may derive not from the native soil, but from international cultural regimes. Both positive and negative attitudes to Modernismo flirt with the Romantic model of
identity as a biological development leading to self-discovery. Neither approach really confronts the fact that cultures are not children and that substantial independence is not possible in a world of omnipresent interdependence. Methodological reconsideration of the problem must thus start not from the illusion of spontaneous identity, but from the frontier as the site where a regional culture may identify itself within an international context.

Spanish-American Modernismo was by no means a unique case of late-nineteenth-century literary regionalism. As Roberto Fernández Retamar has observed, its problematic unity was related to regional underdevelopment. But the theory of unity in underdevelopment would appear to be too powerful for Fernández Retamar’s limited frames of reference. The influence of European expansion, together with the depression of the 1890s, produced widespread cultural reactions to underdevelopment: Italy, Greece, Catalonia, Portugal, Belgium, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Ireland, Australia, and Japan all had literary movements paralleling, at least in part, the problems and aspirations of Modernismo. In all these countries, more recent writers and researchers have wondered what should be done with the strange decadent and bohemian poets who, generally under the influence of Paris, wrote a few beautiful verses, detested various bourgeoisies, declared the noble superiority of art, and habitually died of poverty, alcohol, or both. But just as the numerous literary movements of the fin-de-siècle came and went without any clear vision of the global network of which each was a part, so those who now look back on their national pasts do so with little appreciation of the extent to which their history is shared by others. There are very few large-scale comparative studies of this period and little evidence of any conceptual framework able to address the problems of broad historical internationality. Traditional comparative methods have tended to fragment into countless studies of fortunes and influences; although these offer glimpses of international networks, they tend to convert minor domains into mere receptors for the masters of major literatures. In the case of Modernismo, this process began with Valera’s and Rodo’s reactions to Rubén Darío’s “galicismo mental”; ever since, Spanish-American modernists have received little or no credit for originality. Nor can the study of parallelisms really account for regional specificity. One could, for example, compare Pérez Bonalde’s much-praised 1887 translation of The Raven with Bal’mont’s 1893 Russian translation of the same text. The fact that the two contemporaries tackled the same task and achieved comparable results is indeed remarkable.
But having noted this, we are no closer to understanding why and how the raven should have flown to Spanish America and to Russia at approximately the same time. Simple textual comparison fails to reveal the essentially asymmetrical relations in which both translators were engaged, not with respect to each other, but with regard to a distanced European culture. An age of incipient regionalisms can only properly be understood in terms of the frontiers across which influences pass, frontiers where writers deploy strategies to incorporate and transform foreign elements.

Brief consideration of three such strategies should demonstrate the general import of this approach as applied to a broad history of Modernismo. The first strategy, found in José Martí, belongs to the movement’s beginnings as a transformation of prose. The second, represented by Julián del Casal, is more specifically a strategy of the “celestial poets.” The third, deployed in Dario’s Canto errante, returns from transcendent poetic spheres to confront the problems of regional specificity.

Oscar Wilde’s lecture tour of the United States brought him to Chickering Hall, New York, where, in 1882, his audience included a Cuban exile, José Martí. The encounter, related by Martí in an article dated January 1882, should be taken as a confrontation between equals. Although Wilde, then 28, had been in Paris the previous year, he had little French gossip to bring to New York: he praised Gautier, but had surprisingly little knowledge of the works and names that were to be introduced to a wider public through Huysmans’s A rebours in 1884 and then grouped under a shaky Symbolist banner in 1886. At the time of his arrival in the United States, Wilde was in fact little more than the author of one slim volume of quite Parnassian verse with an Impressionist twist; his most valuable work was yet to come. The Cuban had no reason to feel inferior: he himself had been in France three years previously and was about to publish his own collection of Impressionist-inspired verse, Ismaelillo. Wilde could thus impress him neither with talk about himself nor with knowledge of the literary capital of the age. Instead, what he brought to New York was praise of Keats and Shelley, a summary of the Pre-Raphaelites and Morris, and the notion of an aesthetic renaissance in England. More importantly, he brought his own physical presence, and with it the then-outrageous image of the aesthete and dandy.

Martí’s response was not to a body of texts, but to the body of Wilde and its peculiar trappings: “... hiere los ojos ver a un galán gastar chupilla de esta época, y pantalones de la pasada, y cabello a lo
Cromwell, y leontinas a lo petimetre de comienzos de este siglo” (119). The problem, says Martí, is that “el arte exige en todas sus obras unidad de tiempo” and Wilde’s raiding of the past had thus transgressed a sacred aesthetic law. But the question of time was not a simple problem of eternity: “Ya enuncia su traje el defecto de su propaganda, que no es tanto crear lo nuevo, de lo que no se siente capaz, como resucitar lo antiguo” (119). Two aesthetic unities were thus challenged by Wilde’s appearance: that of tradition, and that of the new. For Martí, the English were in neither one place nor the other: “Es cierto que yerran los estetas en buscar, con peculiar amor, en la adoración de lo pasado y de lo extraordinario de otros tiempos, el secreto del bienestar espiritual en lo porvenir” (125). Aesthetic ideals must be of a substantial time and place, for without such fixity they could not hope to serve the higher humanistic finality of the future. Such was the basis of Martí’s revolutionary regionalism.

It is peculiar to see Martí criticizing Wilde in much the same way that Rodó would later criticize Dario and more recent generations have criticized Modernismo as a whole. Martí had perceived precisely the aesthetic that was to dominate the years to come: replacing both tradition and innovation, Wilde had begun to develop the aesthetic of arrangement that was to inform Art Nouveau and, through techniques of literary and painterly montage, much of Surrealism. Martí objected, correctly, that the artist as ensemblier created nothing substantially new. But Martí also saw, correctly, that Wilde was attempting to remain apart from the new. In visually separating his own stunning singularity from what was considered a drab modernity (a term Wilde always used in a negative sense), the aesthete effectively espoused the same criterion of transcendent beauty by which Martí sought to condemn him. Martí had somehow to distance Wilde’s placeless novelty and yet agree with his universalist ideals, rejecting with one hand and accepting with the other. The Cuban’s resulting strategy incorporated the adversary’s singular ideal as remembrance of the collective self: “¿Será maravilla para los demás lo que ya para nosotros es código olvidado?” (124-25).

As use of the other in order to achieve definition of the self, the strategy of the forgotten code deserves at least some admiration. Its reference to cultural memory solves the post-Romantic problem of how to make creative individuality compatible with artistic fraternity. Whereas Baudelaire had based his solution on the possibility of extreme resemblance between poets (concretely between himself and Poe), Martí’s receptive strategy avoided having to construe the other as a mirror of the self: for him, the foreign artist need only serve as a
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reminder of that which had been forgotten. It was thus in the presence of the other—Wilde, but also Longfellow and Emerson—that Martí effectively managed to define his own identity and produce a discourse on regionality.

The strategy of the forgotten code was not peculiar to Martí. Nor was it entirely without historical justification: it is at least partly true that the European influences absorbed by Modernismo allowed a reappraisal of forgotten codes such as the language of Góngora and the mystic tradition of Juan de la Cruz. But it is easier to claim the existence of a forgotten code than to remember exactly where it should be found. Unamuno and Ganivet would of course struggle with this same problem in Spain, but Martí, at least in the essay on Wilde, does not rely on merely Hispanic tradition. He refers instead to “los que hablamos lengua castellana, llenos todos de Horacio y de Virgilio” (116); he projects his forgotten code as undoubtedly classical, and more particularly Latin in origin.

It is this same classical code that Rodó, like Martí, opposed to the baser wanderings of the English-language intellect. His Ariel, published in 1900, is a didactic invocation of a rationalist beauty that supposedly transcends Caliban, “la tendencia a lo utilitario y lo vulgar,” exemplified in the deceptive democracy of North America (44). Following Martí in seeing the finality of art from a humanist and moralist perspective, Rodó was opposed to specialist dilettantisme as “el peligro de las civilizaciones avanzadas” (18). His Prospero lectures to coming generations; his concern is for the future; but his voice is from a past that, although cast in a mold borrowed from Renan and ornamented with predominantly French citations, is supposed to represent the traditional substance of Spanish America.

What is surprising in both Martí and Rodó—and indeed in later strategists like the founders of Indoamericanismo—is that programs directed toward the future should be constructed from such a vague and oppositionally-constructed past. Their assumption of identity became inseparable from a need to remember something forgotten. And yet it could not be said that Martí and Rodó sought an isolationist regionalism; their forgotten codes were not hidden solely in their own lands. The codes in question were wide trans-national notions that, although nebulously located as classical Latinity, were strategically opposed to the contemporary presence of non-Latin cultures. It is significant that, since praise of the immediate Hispanic past was blocked by memories of colonialism, Spanish-Americans accepted French culture as a distancing of English-language influence on their territory. (Similar uses of post-colonial blocking are to be found else-
where in these same years, curiously enough in the Australian paint-
ers and poets who rejected their English-language past and turned to
France in search of cultural leverage.) However, the Spanish-Ameri-
can acceptance of French influence was itself subject to the strategy
of the forgotten code. The France of the Modernistas was not of their
own epoch, but of a past that even the French risked forgetting. Close
inspection of the Third Republic might have found it guilty of the
same crimes as Spanish and British colonialism or North American
mercantilism. But no Spanish-American was at this stage prepared to
make such an inspection. France came to Modernismo in the form of
books, and from books Spanish-Americans learned to fear the sup-
posed historical decline they had yet to experience. In Spanish
America, the same classical past that had supported decadentist
Parnassianism functioned as a guarantee against decadence.
Gutiérrez Nájera was at least aware of this contradiction and the dan-
ger of decline through forgetfulness: “Bebamos una copa de
Borgoña con Teodoro de Banville, pero conversemos luego mucho
rato con los griegos y latinos, ¡los grandes sobrios!” (“Tristissima
Nox” 328). Forgotten codes had to be remembered.

Modernista prose (Martí, Rodó, Gutiérrez Nájera, Silva, the Darío
of the 1890s and indeed all those who needed prose to explain their
art), this ornate, colored prose that initiated and supported what is
remembered as a poetic movement, rarely justified itself in terms of
the new. In keeping with the didacticism of “ensayista” tradition, it
constantly sought legitimation through precedents. Time, the justifi-
cation of aristocracies, was also the justification used by a culture
attempting to distance itself from decadence and pretension: Darío,
in Los raros, insisted that Poe, before being American, was of noble
Irish stock; Manuel Ugarte listed “antigüedad de familia” among the
prime values of Modernista writers (9); Amado Nervo claimed that
the Mexican Modernistas were no more “extraviados” than “Isaías,
Daniel y San Juan Evangelista . . .” (342). Almost anything could be
justified in terms of a past dimly remembered, or even invented.

The importance of the forgotten code lay in the fact that its pre-
sumed existence guaranteed that the new could not really be new,
and that progress should thus be based on the order of the past. In its
use of this strategy, Modernismo clearly indulged in the artistic re-
production of an oligarchic ideology. But the codes that could
vaguely be assumed in prose were more difficult to find for verse.
Modernista poetry, finding its immediate tradition lacking in speci-
city, vigorously exceeded its aristocratic mandate by seeking
precedents not in the past, but in the foreign.
In 1885, three years after Wilde’s lecture in New York, one year after publication of *A rebours*, but still one year before the founding of French Symbolism as a movement, Aniceto Valdivia returned to Havana from a European tour, bringing with him a trunk full of “nouveautés françaises” (Faurie 181; Villena 111). Presumably from this trunk Julián del Casal, a journalist for *La Habana Elegante*, learned of Heredia’s sonnets, Gustave Moreau’s paintings, Baudelaire’s and Verlaine’s verses, and how such objects had been received by Huysmans Des Esseintes.

It is too easily forgotten that artistic movements—as distinct from the more Romantic notion of the artistic school—do precisely what the terminological change suggests: they move. They can in fact be transported quite simply. A trunkful of books and magazines could introduce Parnassianism to Havana, just as Huidobro’s suitcase would later be largely responsible for introducing Surrealism to Madrid. But when movements are displaced in the form of texts, they separate from the social context of their elaboration and become subject to often radical changes in function. For Julián del Casal, who was never to have any direct experience of France, almost anything in French could be equated with Paris as “la última ilusión,” and contrasted with Havana as an isolated and culturally empty social context.

Unlike Martí, Casal could not receive foreign elements on the basis of any presumed equality. The strategy of the forgotten code could still justify his preferences for Parisian models referring to the past, but it was complicated by the extreme geographical distance separating the ideal from the known. Martí had his object—Wilde—in front of his eyes, and his country—Cuba—at enough of a distance for it to be idealized through nostalgia. In the case of Casal, however, this situation was reversed: the artists he admired could not be criticized for their clothes, pretensions, or mundane quotidian lives, and his region was too immediate for it to be ideal. The resulting strategy was designed to create a transcendent aesthetic sphere similar to Martí’s, but based on spiritual alienation rather than classicist justification. Instead of the eternal presence implied by artistic codes, Casal’s aesthetic was to work through the material absence imposed by geographic necessity.

The second part of Casal’s *Nieve*, published in 1892, is a series of twelve poems of which ten are descriptions of paintings by Moreau. Such is his “Museo ideal.” There is a certain pathos in the gallery’s historical formation from canvases the poet had never seen. An aesthetic of absence requires contact without substantial presence; it
accepts influence through tangential touches. Casal had met Dario briefly as the latter passed through Cuba on his way to Spain, but it was no doubt Des Esseintes who told him about absent objects like Moreau’s *Salomé* and *Apparition*. Casal sought contact. He wrote to Huysmans and through Huysmans to Moreau. The correspondence with the painter was initiated toward the end of 1890 and continued for about two years. The Cuban had put himself in touch with a distant master, but the canvases he had learned to read were still absent. He asked the artist for reproductions of his paintings; monochromatic versions were sent; the ideal museum gained, if not an original text, then at least a pretext. This kind of museum, born of transportation, could itself be transported back to its sources: Casal sent his work to Moreau, Heredia, Verlaine, and Gutiérrez Nájera, who had it republished in Mexico in 1893, the year of Casal death at the age of thirty.

Poetry on paintings was by no means new. The fine arts were a dominant influence on most post-Romantic verse, and a line of poets from Gautier to Yeats began their careers as art students. Language had described canvases in the “salons” of Gautier and Baudelaire, in the latter’s poem “Les Phares,” in Rossetti’s *Sonnets for Pictures* and of course in *A rebours*. There is reason to believe that Casal was aware of these precedents (Villena 120). But whereas the European poets took the presence of canvases as their point of departure and depicted receptive subjectivities moving through concrete museums, Casal started with the mutual absence separating unseen paintings from the subjective source of their linguistic description. His aesthetic thus incorporated a problematic contradiction between the canvas as a unique object of limited mobility and the written text as a highly mobile and reproducible object. The result—to adapt the terminology of reception aesthetics—was a scission in the horizon of expectation: there was one enormous cosmic horizon for the language of absent ideals, and a minor linguistically implied location for the receiving subjectivity. Such a scission would have been difficult to reconcile with Romantic associations of the individual with the ideal, but was common in Modernist regionalisms. Its aesthetic implications may be appreciated by looking at the colors and perspectives of a few literary horizons.

The Romantic horizon might be typified as an infinite expanse of space seen from the heights of a mountain. Distance was a graduated negation of presence leading uniformly away from the central subject toward a transcendent ideal. Thus we find in a poem of 1799—significantly cited by Mario Praz (24) as typically Romantic—Campbell’s
use of a color that was to become quite important for the Modernistas:

’Tis distance that lends enchantment to the view,
And robs the mountain in its azure hue.

The post-Romantic transformation of graduated presence was, in France, a negation of the natural horizon in favor of the enclosed horizon of the room or museum. Hugo could still declare that “l’art, c’est l’azur,” but others, including Mallarmé’s Hérodiade, were aware that nature no longer supported the artistic horizon:

... clos les volets, l’azur
Séraphique sourit dans les vitres profondes,
Et je déteste, moi, le bel azur!

This fictively centralized Symbolist subjectivity—moi!—negated nature in order to control an enclosed space. But its displacement to distant lands, across material horizons, was destined to make such a centralized subjectivity rather more problematic and increasingly ironic. When one is traveling or would rather be somewhere else, it is difficult not to look out the window, at the sea, the sky, or simply the distance.

In founding the Revista Azul in Mexico in 1894, Gutiérrez Nájera seems to have been aware of the Mallarmean negativity in his selected horizon: “El azul no es sólo un color: es un misterio... una virginidad intacta” (Revista Azul 1:1). But as he looked out of his newspaper office in search of a natural correlative, the immediate view could not comply with all that language could evoke:

Quisíéremos que fuese un mirador espléndido desde el que se viera “bajo el pabellón claro del cielo veneciano el reluciente azul de los mares Adriáticos.” Pero es nada más un balcón abierto desde el que se divisa la copa de un árbol, el vuelo de la golondrina, los azulejos de la cúpula, la flecha de la torre... un girón de cielo!

The ideal museum, a desired horizon from which the viewer is necessarily separated, split the receiving subjectivity of journalists who, although they could write like poets and correspond with distant artists, were socially and geographically far from where they felt poets and artists should be. But if nothing worthy of naming could be seen, there was no reason why dignified names should not be invented. Based in Havana, Mexico, or Santiago, the Modernistas thus adapted the aristocratic forgotten code to a series of pseudonyms expressing their imaginative elevation to highly ideal positions: Gutiérrez Nájera wrote as “El Duque Job”; Aniceto Valdivia, when he arrived in Mexico in 1896, became “El Conde Kostia”; others posed as “El Duque Juan,” “El Conde Paul,” and, an element of fragility within the transcendent masquerade, “Petit Bleu.” The names convey scenes of young
señoritos amusing themselves with innocent games, but also the pathos of the genuine discontent felt by writers who could neither look down from mountains nor wholly close themselves off from the outside world.

Jean Franco has suggested that such involution may result from the influences of an expansionist age entering a situation where all geographical frontiers were closed: “What Europe saw as the unlimited horizon was for Spanish America the closed circle. There was nowhere for them to go” (13). But the hypothesis of the limited frontier does not really stand up to comparative analysis: the United States had run out of free space before the end of the nineteenth century, but little classicizing involution would appear to have accompanied the filling of the West. More importantly, toward the end of the 1890s and the beginning of the 1900s, the pseudonyms and the problematic distance characterizing the ideal museum were to fade away as Modernista poets—like James, Whistler, Merrill, Eliot, Pound, and the North American “Lost Generation”—left their native regions and found that they did indeed have somewhere to go. Many established themselves close to their sources of influence, in Paris and Madrid. In the process, the strategy of the ideal museum was to be turned back toward the region.

In 1907, Darío’s Canto errante depicted the poet reflecting on his past, in celebration of Momotombo, the mountain symbol of his native Nicaragua. He had first seen it at the age of fifteen, the same year Martí had seen Wilde in New York:

El tren iba rodando sobre sus rieles. Era 
en los días de mi dorada primavera 
y era mi Nicaragua natal. 
De pronto, entre las copas de los árboles, vi 
un cono gigantesco, “calvo y desnudo,” y 
lleno de antiguo orgullo triunfal.

The poet praises his region. But between the sudden vision and its significance as “ancient triumphal pride,” he cites the foreigner who had reminded him of the forgotten code: “calvo y desnudo” refers to Hugo’s “O vieux Momotombo, colosse chauve et nu,” a verse from La Légende des siècles. Darío makes no secret of his sources:

Ya había leído a Hugo y la leyenda 
que Squire le enseñó.

From an American’s travel account Hugo had learned of Momotombo, the only volcano in Nicaragua that the Spanish colonizers had not been able to climb and had thus had not been able to
baptize. It appears in Hugo’s text as a symbol of resistance to the religion of the Inquisition. The legend retold by Hugo is repeated by Dario, but in terms of human duplication of the mountain’s resistance:

Tu voz escuchó un día Cristóforo Colombo;
Hugo cantó tu gesta legendaria. Los dos
fueron, como tú, enormes, Momotombo,
montañas habitadas por el fuego de Dios.

Dario’s receptive strategy with respect to Hugo is based on incorporation. Unlike Martí, he accepts the other’s role in the discovery of regional codes. Unlike Casal, he relates the mediations of his ideal museum to an aesthetic of presence. He unashamedly admits the moment of foreign influence in the formation of regionalism. In El canto errante (in many respects a first sketch of Neruda’s strategies in the Canto general, as indeed might be La Légende des siècles itself), Tutecotzimi, Columbus, and Momotombo enter an order of greatness alongside Hugo, without any radical distinction between the local and foreign names.

Dario’s naming of Hugo was, in 1907, the result of conscious selection. This could not have been true in 1882, when Hugo and the Romantics were the only French poets materially available in Nicaragua. Nor could it have been entirely valid in 1888, when the journalistic milieu of Santiago had pre-selected the Parnasse as the dominant influence on the contradicting horizons of Dario’s Azul. Dario had passed through all previous strategies of the frontier: the forgotten code had appeared in his positioning of poetry in “las cosas viejas” and his leaving of the rest to Whitman (“Palabras liminares” 763); the ideal museum was present in the aesthetic of Azul and in the figure of the poet who “detested the life and times fate had chosen for him” (“Palabras liminares” 763). But by 1907 Darío was a part of the Modernista milieu living on the Paris-Madrid axis. He was aware of the later developments of Symbolist poetry; he had written on Mallarmé; he was no longer subject to the transportational constraints of distance. There can be no suggestion that his citation of an 1859 text positioned him in any way 20, 30, or even 50 years behind progressive aesthetics. In returning to Hugo as an elective influence, he was participating in the trend of French poetry at the time, for the turn of the century had seen a reaction against isolationist Symbolism and a return to a poetry that sought direct participation in social life. Dario’s almost free-rhyming enjambment—the text cited above begins in the most prosaic of registers—was entirely in keeping with the aesthetic direction indicated by the major French poets of the 1910s:
Jammes, Claudel, Samain, and Gregh. At the same time as these poets turned to a re-evaluation of Hugo (Décaudin 151), Darío resurrected the influence of his youth. At the same time as this predominantly Catholic poetry turned to celebration of social life, Spanish-American Modernismo turned its strategies toward praise of the region. The moment of this transition was thus neither an overcoming of French influence nor an acceptance of Noventayochista positions. It was a development of ideas already found in Paris, the center of the international literary network.

Belated Romanticism was not the basis of Modernismo, nor indeed of any of the regionalist literary movements born toward the end of the nineteenth century. We have already referred to the Romantic horizon: Rousseau, Schiller, Novalis, Wordsworth, or Lamartine would have ascended the heights of Momotombo, or would at least have approached the mountain directly and on foot. But Darío’s subjectivity is not primordially centered; it does not seek to gaze outwards toward the sublime. Instead, the poet passes by the mountain, in a modern train, in a remembered country, and interprets all this through foreigners explicitly cited. This moment did not result from any spontaneous regionality. It was built on the strategies of the forgotten code and the ideal museum, strategies it surpassed, successfully, in its incorporation of the other.

I have briefly sketched three strategies of the frontier which, in their historical sequence, follow the development of Spanish-American Modernismo. The importance of these strategies is that, without any assumption of production from the native soil, they allow the artistic movement to be seen in terms of its regional specificity. They indicate that the problems of reception faced by Modernistas were by no means simple, and that their solutions were by no means naïve. These same problems have continued into the twentieth century and are still faced by regionalist literatures today. As Spanish-Americans look back on their literary past, they cannot afford to assume any radical discontinuity that might reserve for them more identity than was available at the end of the last century. The problems of the frontier are themselves the only continuity from which regional identity can nowadays be defined, and such definition must of necessity work from the leverage achieved by Modernismo.
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