CHAPTER FIVE

José Ángel Valente’s Lectura de Paul Celan: Translation and the Heideggerian Tradition in Spain

Escribir es como la segregación de las resinas; no es acto, sino lenta formación natural. Musgo, humedad, arcillas, limo, fenómenos del fondo, y no del sueño o de los sueños, sino de los barros oscuros donde las figuras de los sueños fermentan. Escribir no es hacer, sino aposentarse, estar. (Valente, Material memoria 115)

(Writing is like the secretion of resins; it is not an act, but a slow natural formation. Moss, humidity, clays, mire, phenomena of the depths, and not of sleep or of dreams, but of the dark soils where the figure of dreams ferment. To write is not to act, but to settle, to be.)

The career of José Ángel Valente (1929–2000) took shape slowly and organically over the course of several decades. As he himself suggests in this prose-poem from Mandorla, his writing is an unhurried process of development analogous to the formation of natural substances. Ultimately, the process by which his work assumed its definitive identity, especially in the final two decades of his life, was both prolonged and coherent, yielding a poetic work of enormous seriousness and depth.

Valente emerged in the 1950s as one of several poets subsequently included by literary historians in the so-called “Generation of the 1950s.” However, in the 1980s, during Spain’s transition to democracy, he increasingly distanced himself from his generational contemporaries. At the time of his death on July 18, 2000, he was identified primarily as the standard-bearer of a belated although still very powerful “High Modernist” tradition in Spanish poetry. The shift from the socially oriented poetry of his first books to the “essentialist” modernism of the 1980s and 1990s took place gradually, in a series of books published in the 1960s and 1970s, so that it is impossible to establish a clear line of demarcation between the early and the late Valente. It is clear, however, that Valente’s unique role within recent Spanish poetry was to be the intellectual leader of those poets championing the belated avant-garde/modernist tradition in contemporary Spain.

In this role, Valente became a fierce and intransigent critic of the so-called “poetry of experience” of the 1980s—a movement purporting to revive the
“realist” poetics of Valente’s own generation, and even, as its alternate name “nueva sentimentalidad” suggests, those of the towering figure of Spanish modernism: Antonio Machado. According to poet Juan Bonilla,

Se distinguió Valente, el último Valente, por una desabrida y violenta denuncia de la perezosamente denominada poesía de la experiencia, acusando a los poetas principales de esta tendencia de ser representantes del Poder y la Oficialidad, caricaturizando sus versos y rebajándoles la calidad con opiniones contundentes que parecían proceder más del rencor que de un examen ajustado de sus obras. (5)²

(Valente, the late Valente, was notable for a harsh and violent denunciation of what is lazily called the poetry of experience, accusing the main poets of this tendency of being representatives of power and officialdom, caricaturing their poetry, and denigrating their quality with extreme opinions that seemed to stem more from rancour than from a judicious examination of their works.)

While Valente’s later poetry is genuinely powerful, I would contend that his public role as defender of High Modernist standards is at least as significant as his actual poetic works in establishing his pre-eminent position. Claudio Rodríguez is arguably a more gifted poet than Valente; yet Rodríguez was not inclined (or able) to become an influential literary critic or public intellectual. Valente, by contrast, developed a coherent (almost single-minded) and intransigent poetic philosophy that won him a small but unified group of adherents, along with a host of enemies. The same intransigence decried by Bonilla and other supporters of poetic “realism” was a quality to be admired by poets and intellectuals like Jaime Siles and Juan Goytisolo. Goytisolo and Valente, in fact, tend to employ an almost identical “take-no-prisoners” tone in their public pronouncements. Valente’s career is closely parallel to that of Goytisolo. Both men came to see themselves as intellectual lone wolves on the margins of literary and political institutions.³ Both lived large portions of their adult lives outside of Spain, and identified completely with the Spanish traditions of exile and dissent, which go as far back as to José María Blanco White (self-banished in England in 1810 and soon converted to Anglicanism) and the circle of liberal intellectuals (e.g., Antonio Alcalá Galiano, Ángel de Saavedra [Duke of Rivas], José de Espronceda) who followed him shortly afterwards, during the so-called Ominous Decade of Spanish absolutism (1823–1833). It is difficult to evaluate the positions adopted by such figures without taking into account the rhetorical vehemence at work in their writings, which is at the same time necessary and contradictory: the prophetic tone is inherent in the message; yet intransigence implies a dogmatism that is at odds with the anti-dogmatic spirit these writers claim to represent.

What exactly, then, is the poetic tradition with which Valente identified himself? It would be easy to establish the connections between Valente and
European writers like Paul Celan, Samuel Beckett, Edmond Jabès, and René Char, or fellow Spaniards like María Zambrano, Juan Goytisolo, and Antonio Gamoneda, the subject of Chapter 6. Valente also admired Cuban poet José Lezama Lima, and enjoyed a close friendship with Catalan painter Antoni Tàpies. The writers in Valente’s pantheon reflect a particular understanding of the poetic tradition, one that has its roots in German Romanticism and that conceives of poetry in philosophical terms, as a form of thinking, rather than as a genre of mere “literature.” One key to understanding this tradition is Maurice Blanchot, who, beginning in the 1940s, synthesized German and French versions of poetic modernity. Blanchot was introduced to the works of Martin Heidegger before the Second World War by his friend, the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas. Blanchot’s enormously influential essays on key figures such as Mallarmé, Rilke, and Char employ distinctively Heideggerian concepts: “One of the greatnesses of René Char, one that is unequaled in our time, is that his poetry is a revelation of poetry, poetry of poetry, and, as Heidegger almost says of Hölderlin, poem of the essence of the poem” (Blanchot 100).

In the Spanish context, María Zambrano’s essays are an indisputable point of reference for Valente as well. Zambrano’s theory of “la razón poética,” not coincidentally, is heavily indebted to Heidegger, as Chantal Maillard explains:

Al poeta le corresponde abrir, desentrañar aquel fondo de donde surge el ser: el lugar de lo sagrado. Por ello afirma Heidegger que el poeta habita cerca del origen. Los poetas señalan la apertura, “consagran el suelo,” abren en la tierra el lugar común de lo sagrado, esto es, permiten la extrañeza y el asombro ante lo inexistente; y, por ello, su penetración: su acceso al ser. (51)

(The poet’s task is to open, bring out into the open, those depths from which being arises: the place of the sacred. That is why Heidegger affirms that the poet dwells close to the origin. Poets signal the opening, they “consecrate the ground,” they open in the earth the common place of the sacred, that is, they allow for strangeness and astonishment in the face of the nonexistent; and, therefore, its penetration: its access to being.)

It was not only her Heideggerianism, but also her interpretation of Spanish mysticism that influenced Valente. Zambrano does not herself reveal the full extent of her debt to Heidegger. In an article entitled “Apuntes sobre el lenguaje sagrado y las artes,” for example, she explains the concept of aleteia as unveiling (or unconcealment) but fails to mention the German philosopher by name: she even concludes this essay by evoking Hölderlin (221–36). Such omissions are significant because they obscure the lines of transmission: Heideggerian ideas have permeated European thought, from the 1920s to the present day, to such a degree that a writer like Valente could have absorbed them from many sources, from Heidegger himself as well as from Spanish thinkers like Ortega y Gasset and Zambrano.
Valente, like Blanchot, is primarily a *synthesizer*, bringing together Zambrano’s “razón poética” with the conception of poetry and the canon of writers that took shape in Blanchot’s essays. His poetic achievement resides in a kind of distillation, or *translation*, of a Heideggerian tradition of poetic modernity, in a specifically Spanish context. This is not to minimize in any way the value of his poetry and essays: his reading of the mystical tradition is distinctive, and his later poetry—on which most of his stature depends—has already achieved canonical status. I am not totally convinced, however, that a European reader already familiar with the writers in Valente’s pantheon would see Valente’s own work as equally indispensable to the modern tradition of which he forms a part. Valente is not an originator of the modern tradition: he is, rather, the quintessential *late* modernist, putting the pieces together in brilliant but belated fashion.

Valente’s connection to the German-language poet Paul Celan (1920–1970), while acknowledged in the critical literature, has yet to be explored in any depth or detail, despite the publication of *Lectura de Celan: fragmentos*, in 1993, and Claudio Rodríguez Fer’s recent edition of Valente’s complete translations. 6 This neglect is surprising in light of Valente’s open acknowledgment of his most significant literary affiliations: Paul Celan is undoubtedly one of the postwar European poets who best exemplifies Valente’s own literary ideals. 7 Valente’s translations of Celan, along with his essays on the Jewish poet, provide the perfect test case for an examination of the way in which Valente attempts to assimilate the major texts of Heideggerian modernism into his own poetics, using them to bolster his own defense of poetry. More specifically, Valente uses his readings of Celan to work out an intellectual justification for his move away from the Sartrean *engagement* of the 1950s toward the poetic “essentialism” of his later work, grounded both in Spanish mysticism and the works of Heidegger.

Valente’s inward turn in the 1980s, his seeming abandonment of socio-political commentary, poses a problem for critics of his poetry. Does his development of a poetics of the sacred simply supplant his earlier social engagement, or does his historical meditation take a different, less recognizable shape? What is the relation between the emphasis on the poet’s usefulness, in Valente’s earlier poetry, and his subsequent rejection of instrumental uses of language? *Lectura de Celan* provides some possible answers to these questions. Celan is a notoriously difficult poet, whose work often challenges the very possibility of poetic communication. Valente’s reading of the Jewish poet, however, demonstrates that this apparent denial of communication points to a different model of dialogue, one that attempts to bridge the real gaps among radically different subjects. This acknowledgment of difference, then, provides an ethical and historical justification for conceptions of poetic language that are often characterized as simply “intransitive” or “hermetic.”
According to Rodríguez Fer, Valente’s first translations of Celan appeared in 1978 in the magazine *Poesía*: “El impacto de Celan en la poesía de Valente fue simultáneo al período de sus primeras versiones tal como evidencia, desde el título y desde el primer poema, su libro *Mandorla*, iniciado con una cita del autor rumano tomada precisamente de su poema ‘Mandorla’” (The impact of Celan on Valente’s poetry was simultaneous with the period of his first translations, as is evident in the title and first poem of his book *Mandorla*, which begins with a quote from the Romanian author taken precisely from his poem “Mandorla” (*Cuaderno de versiones* 21–22). Valente’s translation of Celan thus coincides with his inward turn of the 1970s, evident in books like *Material memoria* (1979), *Tres lecciones de tinieblas* (1980), *La piedra y el centro* (1982), and *Mandorla* itself. This is an especially rich period in Valente’s career. While his interest in mysticism is already evident in earlier works, like his edition of Miguel de Molinos (1974), it is in the late 1970s and early 1980s that he publishes the works that redefine him as a poet.

The hermeneutic model that Valente finds in Celan brings him into the orbit of Heideggerian hermeneutics. In some sense, however, Valente was already under the influence of this body of thought before he read and translated Celan. Hölderlin’s question “Wozu Dichter in dürftiger Zeit?” (what are poets for in a destitute time?) frames an important group of poems in *La memoria y los signos* (1966). Heidegger had asked himself the same question in an essay on Hölderlin entitled “What are Poets for?” (*Poetry, Language, Thought* 91–142). Valente, in the 1960s, contextualized this question in utilitarian terms, irreconcilable, perhaps, with the German philosopher’s meditation on the essence of poetry. It is Celan who re-historicizes the Heideggerian ontological conception of poetry. In Celan’s rebuttal to Adorno’s notorious pronouncement that poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric, Valente finds confirmation for his own continued effort to justify the poet’s “usefulness.”

It is possible, of course, that Valente would have become a “Heideggerian” without Celan. His engagement with the hermeneutic tradition and with María Zambrano predates his translations of the Jewish poet, since his landmark essay “La hermenéutica y la cortedad del decir” and his first essay on Zambrano were published in *Las palabras de la tribu* (1971). Valente had also read Blanchot and other writers influenced by Heidegger. I don’t mean to imply that Celan provides Valente with the only possible route back to Heidegger, only that Valente himself uses Celan—along with Zambrano—as one of his points of entry. Heideggerian terms and concepts are ubiquitous in the critical discourse of Spanish poets and critics who champion Valente as the alternative to the realist discourse of the “poetry of experience.” José Manuel Cuesta Abad’s *Poesía y enigma*, for example, contains studies of Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Borges, Celan, and Valente, along with theoretical reflections on the hermeneutic tradition. The journal *La alegría de los*
naufragios, edited by Amalia Iglesias and Galician poet César Antonio Molina, is devoted to the work of Valente and Gamonedo, and often includes Heideggerian essays by Cuesta Abad and like-minded critics and poets.

It is clear, then, that Valente is affiliated with other poets and critics within the Heideggerian orbit. More concretely, his work can be called Heideggerian in its insistence on the role of the sacred. In a well-known exegesis to which I cannot do justice here, the German philosopher explains Hölderlin’s famous question—”Wozu Dichter in dürftiger Zeit?”—in terms of the poet’s responsibility to forge a poetic language that will be the dwelling place of the sacred, in the wake of the gods’ disappearance: “To be a poet in a destitute time means: to attend, singing, to the trace of the fugitive gods” (Heidegger, Poetry, Language, Thought 94). This is the idea that underlies Valente’s 1989 Al dios del lugar. After the death of the gods, the only sacred presence is an absence, the deus absconditus (“hidden God”) of Isaiah 45:15. In the opening poem of this book, Valente evokes a communion rite in which the sacred presence has difficulty making itself known:

El vino tenía el vago color de la ceniza.
Se bebía con un poso de sombra
oscura, sombra, cuerpo
mojado en las arenas.

El insidioso fondo de la copa
esconde a un dios incógnito.

Me diste
a beber sangre
en esta noche.

Fondo
del dios bebido hasta las heces. (Al dios del lugar 14)

(The wine was the vague color of ash.
It was drunk with a sediment of shadow
dark, shadow, body
wet in the sands.

The insidious bottom of the cup
hides an unknown god.

You gave me
blood to drink
in this night.

Bottom
of the god drunk down to the dregs.)

This is the task of a poet in a destitute time: to create a dwelling-place, in language, for this divine presence/absence, and thus reveal the truth of humanity’s existence on the earth. The word morada, which occurs frequently in Valente’s poetry and
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is a master trope in Teresa de Ávila’s mystical writings, resonates strongly with Heidegger’s concept of “dwelling” (Wohnen) in “Building Dwelling Thinking” and “… Poetically Man Dwells” (Poetry Language Thought 143–62; 211–29).

While Valente’s poetry is suffused with identifiable Heideggerian themes, I would argue that the presence of such leitmotivs is less significant than Valente’s Heideggerian conception of the hermeneutics of poetry. The issue that Valente chooses to emphasize in the theoretical texts that accompany his versions of Celan’s poems is the related issue of communicability. This is not communication, or the transmission of information, but rather the possibility of creating a true communion (intersubjective understanding) between human beings. Valente’s point of departure is Celan’s notorious difficulty: How could so hermetic a poet conceive poetry as a form of communication?

La materia de la poesía es materia obscura [sic]. El hermetismo contemporáneo poco o nada tiene que ver con el hermetismo barroco. Celan con Góngora.

La palabra obscura [sic] del poeta contemporáneo no hace concesiones a lo formal; por el contrario, entra más adentro en la espesura, en la propia obscuridad de la experiencia, acaso vivida, pero no conocida.

El poema es para Celan botella echada al mar que, algún día, en algún lugar, va a ser recogida por un tú invocable. Como la mano tendida puede encontrar otra mano y engendrar la salutación.

Negarse a esa palabra obscura es cerrar los oídos—y los ojos—a la voz que canta, a la palabra poética.

Mano, botella sin destino y cargada a la vez de destino como infinitamente multiplicada posibilidad. Hay otra mano que espera en una playa, en el límite móvil de las aguas, cuyo encuentro perfecciona el acto jeroglífico de la escritura. Raíz de la comunicabilidad, pero no comunicación en sí misma, como tan trivialmente se ha querido. (21)

(The material of poetry is “materia obscura.” Contemporary hermeticism has little or nothing to do with the Baroque, Celan [has little to do] with Góngora.

The dark word of the contemporary poet makes no concessions to formality; on the contrary, it enters deeper into the thickness, into the darkness proper to experience itself, perhaps lived, but unknown.

The poem is for Celan a bottle thrown into the sea which, some day, somewhere, will be picked up by an invocable you. Just as an extended hand can find another hand and engender salutation.

To deny this word is to close one’s ears—and eyes—to the voice that sings, to the poetic word.

A hand, a bottle without destination and at the same time charged with a destination as a possibility infinitely multiplied. There is another hand that waits on a beach, at the mobile limit of the waters, whose act of finding perfects the hieroglyphic act of writing. The root of communicability, but not mere communication, as some have so trivially insisted.)

This text, given here in its entirety, aims to disambiguate comunicabilidad from
the more commonplace notion of comunicación. Communication was the watchword for postwar poets who adopted Vicente Aleixandre’s slogan “poesía es comunicación” (poetry is communication). It was Valente’s own generation, in fact, that called this shibboleth into question, vindicating the role of poetic conocimiento. Valente’s disparaging of mere communication, then, is consistent with a long-standing position that predates his deep engagement with Celan’s poetry. Valente contrasts communication to a seemingly synonymous but more abstract concept: “communicability” is a paradoxical concept, in that it entails the negation of “communication” itself, as the latter concept is commonly understood. An admittedly superficial view of some of Celan’s (and Valente’s) poetry regards it as a solipsistic discourse that looks inward to the poet’s own psyche rather than reaching out to its potential readers. Miguel García-Posada, for example, describes Valente’s later development in the following terms: “Apareció así un poeta hermético, intransitivo, fragmentario, que alumbraba versos de tan incandescente como misteriosa belleza, abismado en su propio ensimismamiento, que hacía de la palabra poética un absoluto” (7).

Valente’s “communicability,” however, cannot be understood as a negation of communication or as a turn toward poetic “hermeticism.” The shipwreck on a desert island consigns his message to the sea in a hopeful attempt to establish communication with other human beings. The obvious question, then, is why the poet would aspire to so chancy a mode of communication. Stated another way, why must communication—the poet’s ultimate aim—be both affirmed and problematized? The image of the message in the bottle (Flaschenpost) is taken from Celan’s address at Bremen, which Valente also translates in his Lectura de Paul Celan:

El poema, en la medida en que es, en efecto, una forma de aparición del lenguaje, y por lo tanto de esencia dialógica, puede ser una botella arrojada al mar, abandonada a la esperanza—tantas veces frágil, por supuesto—de que cualquier día, en alguna parte, pueda ser recogida en una playa, en la playa del corazón tal vez. Los poemas, en ese sentido, están en camino: se dirigen hacia algo. ¿Hacia qué? Hacia algún lugar abierto que invocar, que ocupar, hacia un tú invocable, hacia una realidad que invocar. (18)

(The poem, to the extent that it is, in effect, a form of apparition of language, and thus essentially dialogic, can be a bottle thrown into the sea, abandoned to the hope—so often fragile, of course—that some day, somewhere, it can be picked up on a beach, on the beach of the heart perhaps. Poems, in this sense, are on the road: they address themselves toward something. Toward what? Toward some open place which they can invoke, occupy, toward an invocable you, toward a reality that they can invoke.)

On one level, the metaphor of the message in the bottle, which Celan in turn borrowed from the Russian poet Osip Mandelstam (Felstiner 116), reflects the
very real situation in which the poet, or any other writer for that matter, must work. Unlike a face-to-face dialogue, the communication from poet to reader depends on several contingencies. The poet does not know who his or her potential readers are; these readers may come across the poet’s book by sheer chance, picking it up in a friend’s house or stumbling across it in a second-hand bookstore. Furthermore, even such a chance encounter is not sufficient, since the potential reader may not be prepared to attend to the poet’s words.

Why, then, does the poet problematize communication even further by cultivating a deliberately difficult mode of writing? Valente conceives the difficulty of modern poetry as essential rather than accidental, distinguishing Celan from the baroque poet Góngora. Arguing, implicitly, against widespread but superficial understandings of “la poesía de la experiencia,” he stresses “la propia obscuridad de la experiencia, acaso vivida, pero no conocida” (the intrinsic obscurity of existence, perhaps lived but not known). If experience itself is inherently mysterious, unknown even if lived, there can be no appeal to the unproblematical communication of such an experience. As Valente explained in a much earlier essay, “Conocimiento y comunicación,” “Precisamente sobre ese inmenso campo de realidad experimentada pero no conocida opera la poesía” (Poetry operates precisely on this immense sphere of reality that is experienced but not known) (Las palabras de la tribu 6; emphasis added).

Communication, then, is under threat on several fronts at once: by the tenuous connection between the poet and the reader, by the inherent difficulty of the message, and by the enigmatic nature of experience itself. Yet communication remains the stated goal for both Valente and Celan. The “hermeticism” of their poetry is counterbalanced by its efforts to reach “el tú invocable.” The more profound mode of communication it proposes depends, paradoxically, on an initial thwarting of ordinary channels of communication. In yet another text prefatory to his translations of Celan, Valente warns against a certain overconfidence in the subject’s apprehension of other subjects:

Dar por cierto el conocimiento del otro es ignorar que este presunto conocimiento es una mera proyección de nuestro yo. Suprimida esa proyección ocultante, el otro sólo puede ser percibido como esencialmente desconocido: la faz misteriosa del otro. Y también, sólo en la medida en que es percibido como un misterio, puede el otro ofrecérsenos como fuente posible del conocer y del amar. Con el yo así percibo como otro y con el que así como otro a mí mismo me percibe puedo construir un mundo, una relación o un espacio de fluido intercambio de la diferencia con la diferencia. El misterio está en la diferencia misma; y, en ella, la raíz del conocimiento y del amor. Pensamiento, éste, que no traiciona su estirpe: la del pensar, la de la radical heterogeneidad del ser. Su naturaleza esencialmente dialógica. (14)

(To take as a truth the knowledge of another is to be unaware that this presumed knowledge is a mere projection of our self. When this concealing projection is
suppressed, the other can only be perceived as essentially unknown: the mysterious face of the other. And also, only to the extent that the other is perceived as a mystery can this other be offered to us as a possible source of knowing and loving. With the self I can thus perceive as other, and with the other who likewise sees me as other, I can construct a world. A relation of a space or of fluid interchange of difference with difference. The mystery lies in difference itself, and in it, the root of knowledge and love. A thought (this last) that does not betray its category: that of thinking, of the radical heterogeneity of being. Its essentially dialogic nature.

Interestingly enough, it is the presumption that we already understand the other that leads to egotistical or solipsistic projections. Valente’s line of argument (indebted to Levinas’s ethical theory) turns the accusation of solipsism, made so often against certain forms of contemporary poetry, back upon the accuser. True dialogue only becomes possible once true difference, “la radical heterogeneidad del ser,” has been fully acknowledged.

An “Antecomienzo,” added to the 1995 edition of *Lectura de Paul Celan*, makes it clear that Valente conceives of his own relation to Celan as a “demorado diálogo”:

Las presentes versiones son resultado breve—fecundamente frustrado—de un largo periodo de frecuentación de un lenguaje nuevo, de una paralela desfrecuentación de lenguajes gastados o vacíos, de un demorado diálogo, de un movimiento de irremediable aproximación o *philia*.

En la medida en que alguna parte de estos textos corresponde a momentos en que mi propia relación con el existir era una leve línea débil, su estructura es fragmentaria. Son sólo apuntes de una conversación titubeante, apenas ya posible. En ese sentido, me parecen ahora señal o signo de mi no extinción. Salvificas señales. O milagrosos restos de un naufragio feliz.

Se ha tendido una mano. La tensión de la mano tendida marca una dirección: la realidad. “La poesía no es mimesis, no es simple representación, se convierte en realidad. Realidad poética, texto que ya no sigue a la realidad, sino que se configura y funda como realidad,” escribe a propósito de Celan Peter Szondi.

El lenguaje ha descendido a las zonas infernales de la historia y ha vuelto, ha reaparecido para hablar, para ir hacia algún lugar nunca hallado, hacia el otro, hacia ti, hacia un tú invocable. (9)

(The present versions are the brief result—productively frustrated—of a long period of frequenting a new language, along with a corresponding lack of frequenting of worn out and empty languages, [the result] of a prolonged dialogue, of a movement of irremediable approximation or *philia*.

To the extent that a part of these texts corresponds to periods of my life when my own relation to existence was a weak, faint line, their structure is fragmentary. They are but notes to a faltering conversation, now barely possible. In this respect, they seem to me now as a signal or sign of my non-extinction. Salvational signs. Or miraculous remains of a fortunate shipwreck.

A hand has been extended. The tension of the extended hand marks a direction: reality. “Poetry is not mimesis, it is not simple repetition, but is transformed
into reality. Poetic reality, a text that no longer follows reality, but is configured and founded as reality,” writes Peter Szondi à propos of Celan.

Language has descended to the infernal zones of history and has returned, has reappeared to speak, to go toward some never encountered place, toward the other, toward you, toward an invocable you.

This text works through, once again, the key concepts and images of Celan’s Bremen address. Once again, the possibility of communication is at once problematized and affirmed: Valente’s dialogue with his precursor is fragmentary, interrupted, hesitant, “apenas ya posible,” but at the same time profound, inevitable, and redemptive.

Quoting from Szondi, a close friend of Celan as well as an important hermeneutic theorist in his own right, Valente also makes his own Martin Heidegger’s ontological conception of poetic language as foundational rather than mimetic of reality. Many of the elements of Celan’s poetics that Valente emphasizes have, in fact, a Heideggerian source. While the pairing of Heidegger and Celan, the former Nazi and the Holocaust survivor, may seem counter-intuitive, this kinship is in fact well established in the critical literature. Felstiner recounts Celan’s visit to Heidegger in the Black Forest in 1967 (244–47) and points out that “patent Heideggerianisms marked Celan’s Bremen address” (149). Celan was reading Heidegger as early as 1953: “He underscored the philosopher’s remarks on Hölderlin’s elegy ‘Bread and Wine,’ especially that poem’s question, ‘what use are poets in a destitute time?’ (wozu Dichter in dürftiger Zeit)” (Felstiner 72).

The number of “Heideggerians” (in the broadest sense of the term) who have also been drawn to Celan’s poetry is striking: Gadamer, Szondi, Lacoue-Labarthe, Derrida, Steiner, Levinas, and Bruns come to mind.11 Perhaps Valente belongs to this category as well. It should not be surprising that the most influential twentieth-century “continental” philosopher and the most significant poet of postwar Europe, both writing in German, should attract the attention of the same writers and theorists. More to the point, the problem of “communicability,” or intersubjective understanding, lies at the heart of contemporary hermeneutics in the Heideggerian tradition. Celan’s poetry poses a crucial challenge to this tradition. Hans-Georg Gadamer’s approach to some of Celan’s late, cryptic poems is instructive. The author of Truth and Method proposes a deliberately non-specialized approach to this poetry: “Generally, I think it is a sound principle not to view poetry as an arcane cryptogram for scholars, but rather as a something intended for the members of a shared language community” (192). This position does not entail a total rejection of the specialized scholarly apparatus needed to decipher some of Celan’s more difficult work. Gadamer himself makes use of scholarly material to correct and modify his readings in subsequent revisions of his essay on Celan. It would be more accurate to affirm that Celan’s work constitutes a limit case for Gadamerian hermeneutics, given

Celan’s extremely problematic relation to the “shared language community” of German speakers. Even with a poet as difficult as Celan, Gadamer insists on the value of slow, attentive, but dictionary-free reading: “I had no lexicon at hand. I lay in a sand-pit in the Dutch dunes and mulled the verses over, ‘listening earnestly in the wind,’ until I thought I understood them” (149–50).

This method of reading Celan, while philologically “naïve,” exemplifies the optimism characteristic of Gadamer’s hermeneutics. For Gadamer, understanding and interpretation are linguistic acts; a corollary is that linguistic messages are ultimately comprehensible. A slow and attentive reader, then, will succeed in understanding even the most difficult poetic text. The title of Gadamer’s essay on Celan, “Who Am I and Who Are You?,” refers to a Celan poem also translated by Valente:

IN DEN FLÜSSEN nördlich der Zukunft
werf ich das Netz aus, das du
zögernd beschwerst
mit von Steinem geschriebenen
Schatten.

EN LOS RÍOS, al norte del futuro,
tiendo la red que tú
titubeante cargas
de escritura de piedras,
sombras. (58–59)

(In rivers, to the north of the future,
I extend the net which you
stammering load
with writing of stones,
shadows.)

The question raised in this poem is, as Gadamer suggests, the relation between the I and the you (Gadamer 83–86). In Gadamer’s nuanced reading of this poem, the I of the poem is the poet in his search for words. If the I is a poet, however, the you could also be the reader, whose enigmatic response to the poet’s hopeful gesture is to load this net with shadowy words, weighted down like stones. Alternatively, the I could be a reader casting a net into the water in the hope of retrieving a Flaschenpost from the enigmatic poet: the interpreter of Celan’s poetry is placed in the position of casting a net into the water and being rewarded with cryptic “stone-written shadows.” In any case, the dialogue between the first and second persons of the verb is both prolonged and titubeante, as Valente characterizes his own dialogue with Celan.

In a poem from his 1997 collection Nadie, Valente takes up once again some key images from his Lectura de Paul Celan:
A Coral

AL NORTE
de la línea de sombras
donde todo hace agua,
rompientes
en que el mar océano
se engendra o se deshace,
y el naufragio inminente todavía
no se ha consumado, ciegamente
te amo. (“SOS,” Nadie 17)

(To the north
of a line of shadows
where everything becomes water,
breakers
in which the ocean sea
is engendered or comes apart,
and the imminent shipwreck has not yet
been consummated, blindly
I love you.)

The first two lines evoke “En los ríos al norte del futuro,” with its stone-written shadows, while the parenthetical title “SOS” and the reference to an imminent shipwreck define the poem’s communicative situation as a cry for help, perhaps a message in a bottle. The poem is addressed to a “tú invocable,” a female addressee whose name, “Coral” (Valente’s wife), is suggestive of fertile underwater riches.

The hermeneutic model of communication that emerges from this reading of Lectura de Celan is already implicit in Valente’s poetry in the 1960s. The degree to which the poems of the 1950s lend themselves to “reader-response” criticism is one indication of this (Debicki, “José Ángel Valente: Reading and Re-reading,” Poetry of Discovery 102–22). Valente’s essay “La hermenéutica y la cortedad del decir” is a classic statement of the relation between text and reader. Still, quite a few of his poems from the 1950s and 1960s put forward “utilitarian” views of poetic language, leading many critics to insist on the distinction between the later, “mystical” Valente and the historicist Valente of the earlier period (García-Posada). The hermeneutic model, already present in his poetry, comes into view rather gradually, becoming fully explicit only in later books such as Mandorla and El fulgor.

Valente’s early calls for poetic usefulness echo the Sartrean concept of engagement, which was enormously influential in Spain in the 1950s. Sartre, however, had posited a notorious division between poetry and prose, transitive and intransitive writing: “Poets are men who refuse to utilize language” (Sartre 29; original emphasis). This definition reflects Sartre’s acquaintance
with the modern French tradition that includes Mallarmé as well as the Surrealists. A young Spanish poet of Valente’s generation, then, inherited a potentially disabling opposition between political commitment and poetry itself. Instead of accepting the terms of this dichotomy, however, Valente, from a fairly early date, attempted to formulate a pragmatic justification for poetic autonomy. In the 1971 essay “La hermenéutica y la cortedad del decir,” he associates Hölderlin’s question “wozu Dichter?” with Mallarmé’s struggle with language (Las palabras de la tribu 61). The title of the collection where this essay can be read puts an unusual spin on a line from Mallarmé’s homage to Poe: “donner un sens plus pur aux mots de la tribu.” Valente associates poetic purity with its apparent opposite, usefulness, since he believes that the purification of language is something useful in and of itself.

The “later Valente,” however, moves from Sartrean engagement toward a Heideggerian distrust of instrumental language. The conviction that poetic language is foundational rather than mimetic, which Valente shares with Heidegger, can lead to a sort of mystification of poetic language, so that the poet (or the philosopher) remains disengaged from the Hölderlinian “dürftiger Zeit,” from historical reality in any literal sense. Heidegger remains vulnerable to the charge of mystification on (at least) two levels. The fact that he placed his own philosophy at the service of Hitler’s Third Reich, as Rector of Freiburg, is horrific in itself. A second problem is that Heidegger’s characteristic mode of argumentation does not lend itself to paraphrase, except on its own terms. The result can be the problematic notion of philosophy (or poetry) as a truer, “ontological” language—superior to other forms of discourse, but in an ultimately mystified and inexplicable way.

Valente, however, derives his Heideggerian poetics from Celan, and perhaps other post-Heideggerians such as Blanchot, Levinas, and Zambrano, rather than directly from Heidegger. He is thus able to preserve the link between poetic autonomy and ethical commitment, effectively making his own Celan’s solution to the apparent dichotomy between pragmatic and ontological conceptions of poetic language. Since Celan’s poetry bears witness to the Holocaust, but in a poetic language that refuses any reduction to facile communication, he becomes a natural model for a poet, like Valente, who has been struggling for decades to reconcile historicity with poetic autonomy. In one of his longer, more discursive poems, Valente echoes Celan’s answer to Adorno’s well-known statement that poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric:

Y cómo, preguntaron, cómo
escribir después de Auschwitz.

Y después de Auschwitz,
y después de Hiroshima, cómo no escribir.
José Ángel Valente’s Lectura de Paul Celan

¿No habría que escribir precisamente después de Auschwitz o después de Hiroshima, si ya fuésemos, dioses de un tiempo roto, en el después para que al fin se torne en nunca y nadie pueda hacer morir aun más los muertos? (*Al dios del lugar* 97)

(And how, they asked, how to write after Auschwitz?

And after Auschwitz, after Hiroshima how can we not write.

Wouldn’t it be necessary to write precisely after Auschwitz or after Hiroshima, if we already existed, gods of a broken time, in the aftermath so that finally it might become never and nobody could make the dead die even more?)

In a briefer poem from the same collection, Valente glosses Celan’s phrase “Singbarer Rest” (“singable remnant”) (*Celan* 100–01), the first line of a poem from *Atemwende* (Breathturn):

*Singbarer Rest*  
Paul Celan

QUEDAR en lo que queda después del fuego, residuo, sola raíz de lo cantable. ("Fénix,” *Al dios del lugar* 25)

(To remain in what remains after the fire, residue, only root of the singable. ["Phoenix"])

The residue that remains in the wake of the destructive event becomes, paradoxically or not, the only true source for poetry: “sola/ raíz de lo cantable.” As in the myth of the Phoenix, negation leads to affirmation (López Castro 124–25). It is precisely after the disaster that poetic language, in all of its hermetic complexity, becomes most necessary.

To read Valente alongside of Celan is, in some sense, to bring to light the former’s own characteristic concerns, which are revealed in even more explicit form in his intertextual dialogue with the German-language poet. The proper context for accounting for Valente’s interest in hermeneutics, poetic autonomy,
and historical engagement is the wider European tradition with which he has consciously affiliated himself: Heidegger, Sartre, Blanchot, and Celan provide more clues to his work than, say, Blas de Otero, José Hierro, or Gloria Fuertes. While Valente clearly deserves to be read in this “European” context, he also tends to resist overt stylistic echoes of other poets, making the question of influence difficult to determine.

What of Valente’s actual versions of Celan? He translates fewer than twenty poems, including only five from Celan’s late period. The fact that he does not translate more of Celan is consistent with his approach to other authors in his personal pantheon: when synthesizing the work of other poets, he is usually concerned with a few essential concepts that confirm his own obsessions. In this respect, the theoretical apparatus in *Lectura de Paul Celan*, the translation of the Bremen address and Valente’s commentaries on Celan, are as significant as the translations themselves. Valente is often attracted to writers, like Celan or Lezama Lima, who push language to the limits of comprehensibility. Yet he himself favors a more contained, austere style, writing extremely short poems in a restricted and almost transparent lexicon. In comparison to Celan, with his complex *logopeia*, his trademark knots of compound words and his violent distortions of the German language, Valente is an almost transparent writer. His writing is difficult for some readers, it is true, but this difficulty tends to be more conceptual than linguistic. In this Valente follows modern French poets like René Char and Yves Bonnefoy, who favor flatter, less complex linguistic surfaces, much more than he resembles Celan.

When translating Celan, Valente tends to be fairly literal, closely following word order and line-breaks as well as semantic sense. His translation of “Erblinde schon heut” exemplifies his method:

Erblinde schon heut:
    auch sie Ewigkeit steht voller Augen—
    darin
    ertrinkt, was den Bildern hinweghahf
    über den Weg, den sie kamen,
    darin
    erlischt, was aus dich aus der Sprache
    fortnahm mit einer Geste,
    die du geschehn liesst wie
    den Tanz und Seide und Nichts.

Ciégate para siempre:
    también la eternidad está llena de ojos—
    allí
    se ahoga lo que hizo caminar a las imágenes
    al término en que han aparecido,
    allí
se extingue lo que el lenguaje
también te ha retirado con un gesto,
lo que dejabas iniciarse como
la danza de dos palabras sólo hechas
de otoño y seda y nada. (*Cuaderno de versiones* 281)

(Blind yourself for all time:
eternity too is full of eyes—
there
is drowned what made the images walk
to the limit where they have appeared,
there
is extinguished what language
has also taken away from you with a gesture,
what you allowed to begin like
the dance of two words made only
of autumn and silk and nothing.)

The word *allí* echoes the sound of the German *daran*. (Pierre Joris achieves a similar effect with the English word *wherein*; my own translation, more modestly, aims to give the literal sense of Valente’s translation, rather than to reproduce the effect of Celan’s poem.) Given Valente’s commitment to literality, however, the translation *Weg* as *término* is surprising. *Weg* [way] is, of course, a quintessentially Heideggerian word. The word *término*, on the other hand, is evocative of Valente’s predilection for limits, boundaries, and thresholds. This subtle shift shows that Valente is making the text his own, even when he appears to be following Celan quite closely.

Since Valente drew on multiple, overlapping sources to develop his mature poetics, it becomes extremely difficult to gauge the exact degree to which his poetry is indebted to Celan, except when he cites Celan directly. Even a poem like “Mandorla,” which takes its title from Celan, is—to my mind—more evocative of María Zambrano than of Celan himself. Like many of Valente’s other poems from this period, it contains contrasting images of darkness and light and “concave” interior spaces identified with the female body:

Estás oscura en tu concavidad
y en tu secreta sombra contenida
inscrita en ti.

Acaricié tu sangre.

Me entraste al fondo de tu noche ebrio
de claridad. (“Mandorla,” *Material memoria* 81)

(You are dark in your concavity
and in your secret shadow contained
inscribed in you.)
I caressed your blood.
You entered into the bottom of your night drunk
with clarity.)

This is not to say that Valente’s poetry would have been the same without Celan: clearly Celan meant a great deal to the Spanish poet, and constituted a central point of reference during the crucial years in which he was formulating his mature poetics. Valente’s pared-down, essential language resembles that of Celan on the less frequent occasions when the latter avoids the extreme density for which he is best known. The translation of “Erblinde...” analyzed above, for example, could almost pass as an original poem by Valente. The translation presents no lexical problem, no obstacle to the reader at the level of vocabulary, although the conceptual difficulty remains high.

The significance of Valente’s translation of Celan is best understood in the total context of the Spanish poet’s Heideggerian roots: a critic looking only at the translations themselves, comparing Valente’s Spanish with Celan’s German, would come up with a useful but much more limited analysis. Translation, then, is best understood as a process of cultural transmission, in which the linguistic process of recasting a message in another language is only a part. Valente’s main purpose in translating Celan is to affiliate himself with a European modernist tradition, or, more precisely, to situate himself within the Spanish literary tradition as the most exemplary representative of modernist poetics. Valente enjoyed a unique and privileged role in the Spanish literary politics of the last two decades of the twentieth century. Celan served Valente well, since the latter was able identify himself with one of the most prestigious poets of postwar Europe while also using Celan’s theory of communicability to denounce the “realist” poetics of his own time. In this respect, Lectura de Paul Celan: fragmentos is a key work for understanding Valente’s place in recent Spanish poetry as well as his deep engagement with the Heideggerian tradition.

Notes
1 I hesitate to associate this movement with any concept of “postmodernism,” since it unproblematically evokes the authority of “Great Moderns” like Mallarmé, Rilke, and Juan Ramón Jiménez.
2 Some readers might find Valente’s particular version of literary modernity to be too “generic,” too self-contained and homogeneous. While there is much to admire in Valente’s later work, his influence has not been entirely benign, since his alternative to the facile revival of the “poetry of experience” is a narrowly conceived poetic essentialism in which poetry all too easily claims for itself the status of an arcane knowledge meant only for an elite interested in recapturing the spiritual horizon lost with the secularization of modern societies.
3 Goytisolo has acknowledged Valente’s help in the researching of Las virtudes del pájaro solitario, a novel inspired by San Juan de la Cruz, one of Valente’s key influences.
4 There are other writers, like Octavio Paz, whose positions closely parallel Valente’s, but who do not explicitly form part of the Spanish poet’s pantheon. Despite Paz’s defense of High Modernism and his shared interest in Asian mysticism, Valente maintained a distance from him, especially in later years when personal relations between the two writers became strained. I am indebted to Claudio Rodríguez Fer for providing background information on Valente’s problematic relation to Paz, and to José María Rodríguez García for suggesting the comparison between Valente and Paz. Rodríguez García also offered many helpful suggestions on an earlier version of this article.

5 See also “The ‘Sacred’ Speech of Hölderlin” (The Work of Fire 111–31). According to Claudio Rodríguez Fer, Valente was an assiduous reader both of Heidegger and of the secondary literature on the German philosopher (personal correspondence). Van Kelly, my colleague at the University of Kansas and a specialist in René Char, helped me to sort out the connections among Char, Heidegger, and Blanchot.

6 Valente’s translations have never attracted the attention of his exegetes. One factor contributing to this neglect is the inaccessibility of many of these texts. The two editions of his Lectura de Paul Celan are both difficult to find. All citations, unless otherwise noted, are from the 1995 volume; I wanted to preserve the sense that this work is a coherent book. Rodríguez Fer’s meticulous edition of Cuaderno de versiones contains all of Valente’s translations including Lectura de Paul Celan (although the work loses its title in this edition). I should mention, for the benefit of readers not familiar with modern Spanish poetry, that the Galician poet and Valente-scholar Claudio Rodríguez Fer is not the late Spanish poet Claudio Rodríguez, to whom I also allude in this chapter.

7 Benjamin argues that “Les fleurs du mal was the last lyric work that had a European repercussion; no later work penetrated beyond a more or less limited linguistic area” (192). Updating this affirmation, a similar case could be made for Celan, although the scope of his influence is obviously not confined to the European continent.

8 According to Claudio Rodríguez Fer, a letter written by Valente in 1974 reveals that he had already translated a few Celan poems by this date, although Celan’s name doesn’t begin to appear in published work until 1978 (personal correspondence).

9 I analyze this poem along somewhat similar lines in my chapter on Valente in The Poetics of Self-Consciousness, although I neglect to bring Heidegger into the picture.

10 The concept of community has been at the center of a theoretical discussion involving Georges Bataille, Jean-Luc Nancy, and Maurice Blanchot, among others. Nancy’s La communauté désœuvrée consists of a reading of Bataille’s thought in light of Blanchot’s concept of désœuvrement. (Blanchot’s La communauté inavouable is also relevant to this discussion.) What all three authors have in common is their questioning of teleological models of community (from communism and fascism to nationalism and liberal democracy) in which the feelings of belonging to a communal whole and communing with others are essentialized as historical destinies, thus precluding the possibility of a more fluid negotiation of identities, and even the ethical renunciation of identity.

11 Bruns’s Maurice Blanchot contains a revealing comparison between Celan and Blanchot, another theorist deeply influenced by Heidegger (81–101, 145–72). See also Lacoue-Labarthe’s Heideggerian reading of Celan in La poésie comme expérience.

12 Valente’s translation is fairly literal. He has, however, chosen to place “sombras” in apposition to “escritura de piedras,” rather than attempting to reproduce the characteristically German syntax of “mit von Steinem geschriebenen / Schatten,” “with stone-written shadows.” Joris translates “with shadows stones / wrote” (Celan, Breathturn 61). My own translation here is of Valente’s translation, not of Celan’s original poem.

13 To associate Valente with continental hermeneutics, as I have attempted to do here, confirms and extends Debicki’s approach. My approach also underscores the importance of Hart’s emphasis on dialogue in her articles on El fulgor and Al Dios del lugar.
In *Writing Degree Zero* Barthes questions Sartre’s *engagement* while retaining the Sartrean view of modern poetry as an intransitive language that cannot be reconciled with ethical or historical *écriture*. The question of Heidegger’s influence on Sartre is a relevant one. Unfortunately, I do not have the space to explore it here.

Valente was strongly drawn to the Jewish tradition represented by figures like Buber, Levinas, Celan, and Jabès. Levinas, himself heavily influenced by Heidegger, raises the question of whether Celan’s idea of the other draws him closer to Martin Buber than to Heidegger: “The poem ‘becomes dialogue, is often an impassioned dialogue, ... meetings, paths of a voice toward a vigilant Thou’—Buber’s categories! Would they, then, be preferred to so much brilliant exegesis majestically descending from the *Schwarzwald* upon Hölderlin, Trakl, and Rilke, portraying poetry as opening the world, the place between earth and sky?” (42).