

◆ **Introduction:**

## **Modern Scenes/Modern Sceneries**

*David R. Castillo and Bradley J. Nelson*

The modern secularization or “disenchantment” of the social sphere that accompanies the rise of capitalism has been chronicled in classic works of social and cultural theory going back to Max Weber’s foundational treatise *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904). More recently, social historians have traced the roots of the economic and sociopolitical dynamics that we associate with modernity to the “expansive crisis” of the late Middle Ages and the early Renaissance. They have pointed out that some of the most significant developments of the 1400s and 1500s are the direct result of the increase in large-scale commerce and the emergence of the monetary economy. The modern city is both a consequence and a catalyst of economic, political, and social change. Urban spaces are fundamental contributors to the erosion of traditional systems of interpersonal relations allowing for the rise of the bourgeoisie (literally inhabitants of the burg), as well as the social type of the “uncoupled” or “unattached” (“desvinculado” according to José Antonio Maravall).<sup>1</sup> The geographical discoveries of the period, including the lunar explorations of Galileo Galilei and Giordano Bruno’s speculations on the theoretical existence of the cosmic vacuum, as well as the Columbian encounter and the imperial dreams

and nightmares that came with it, further eroded the economic, political, and cultural structures inherited from antiquity.<sup>2</sup>

Cultural historians have tied the modern *objectification* of the world to the disintegration of the Aristotelian universe. For James Burke, for example, the debunking of the Scholastic-Aristotelian cosmos resulted in the de facto emergence of a de-essentialized *world of objects* that would be subjected to direct human control. The objectification of the natural world would find a correlate in the rationalization of the sociopolitical sphere, insofar as the political order was thought to be grounded in the natural order. Thus, the progressive acceptance of mechanistic principles would end up reshaping natural philosophy, as well as the fields of political theory and moral thought in the works of seventeenth-century thinkers such as Descartes, Bacon, Boyle, Hobbes, and Gracián, among others.

The New Science's mechanistic conception of nature as passive, inert matter is considered central to the consolidation of the structures that continue to drive the global economy today. Carolyn Merchant (1980) has referred to the seventeenth-century shift in natural philosophy as "the death of nature" (193). Teresa Brennan (1993) focuses on the intersection between natural philosophy and economics in theorizing modernity as an era defined by a fundamentally psychotic drive "to dismember nature" in order to control it. She links this social psychosis to the exploitative practices of global capitalism aligning its "exploitation and alienation of humans with that of nature" (215n11).<sup>3</sup> Both Merchant and Brennan argue that the natural philosophers of the seventeenth century, who are considered the founders of the New Science, redefined man's interaction with nature as a Subject-Object dialectic in which the Subject aims to achieve absolute mastery over the Object. Merchant quotes from Francis Bacon's *Novum Organum*: "'By art and the hand of man,' nature can then be 'forced out of her natural state and squeezed and molded.' In this way, 'human knowledge and human power meet as one'" (171).<sup>4</sup>

For their part, art theorists and historians have argued that the *modern episteme* (to use the expression coined by Foucault) is rooted in a visually oriented structure of thought that privileges the single-point perspective. This is what Martin Jay has called "Cartesian perspectivalism," which he considers to be the dominant scopic regime of modernity. Erwin Panofsky and Philip Braunstein are also among the scholars who have underscored the role played by Renaissance perspective (the single-point perspective, in particular) in the appearance of the new sense of "self" that we associate with the *modern subject*. Braunstein is very explicit about this, noting that "self-consciousness is born when the individual can see himself in perspective" (536). Yet for all the

attention scholars have paid to the primacy of the visual, as a structuring principle of modern subjectivity that is grounded in an objectifying view of the world, it is rare to find scholarly works that focus on the *spectaclist* dimension of modernity in connection with the “transformation of worldview from cosmos to landscape [which] came to mean a prospect seen from a specific standpoint” (Tuan 133).

This may be due, at least in part, to the fact that, as James Elkins has noted, Renaissance perspective was more about the correct representation of objects than the construction of a homogeneous space in which these objects would move: “The Renaissance artists had no conceptual equivalent for our term *space*, and when they juxtaposed *prospettiva* and *spazio* (or *perspectiva* and *spatium*), they usually had something decidedly scholastic or humanistic in mind” (14).<sup>5</sup> Elkins’s 1994 study stands as an important corrective to works like those of Jay and Panofsky, which have insisted on the simultaneous development of the “correct” representation of objects and a homogeneous, mathematically organized space. Elkins provides copious textual and visual examples of how diverse perspective techniques are brought to bear on different objects and mathematical proofs, with or without an accompanying pyramidal grid. He also follows the parallel development of myriad perspectival techniques and an analogous proliferation of mathematical techniques motivated by different navigational, optical, astronomical, architectural, and military problems. In other words, “the Renaissance had things the other way around in regard to space and . . . artists and writers thought first of objects and second about what we call perspective space or fictive space” (15). From here it is but a short jump to our suggestion that space is itself an object that can be approached from an infinite number of perspectives, which, when understood according to Elkins’s notions, are simultaneous with the plurality of spaces they configure. The places in which objects are displayed are not prior to, or the condition for, the communication of the meaning of objects but rather complex objects responding to a number of social, economic, political, and aesthetic tensions and desires.

Building on the work of Yi-Fu Tuan’s *Topophilia* (originally published in 1974), and among the most intriguing contributions within the field of cultural studies of space, Denis Cosgrove has recently signaled the existence of an early modern link between theater and landscape: “[In the sixteenth century,] theater not only had the architectural meaning, derived from the ancients, of a playhouse and the performances staged there, but also meant a conspectus: a place, region, or text in which phenomena are unified for public understanding” (101). In his contribution to this volume, David Castillo takes note of this

meeting place between scene and scenery in the spectacular panoramas that are characteristic of modern mass culture, going back to the theatrical productions of the Spanish Golden Age. These observations point in the direction of a path of inquiry into the *spectaculist* structuring of space in modern times that has yet to be mapped. Our collection of essays is aimed at sketching such a path within the fields of Hispanic studies. We believe that an exploration of the intersection between available theorizations of the modern spectacle—from José Antonio Maravall’s conceptualization of the spectacular culture of the baroque to the Frankfurt School’s theorization of mass culture, to Baudrillard’s notion of the simulacrum, to Guy Debord’s understanding of the society of the spectacle—and the findings of the emerging fields of urban studies, landscape studies, and, generally speaking, studies of space, will contribute to a better understanding of the cultural and sociopolitical configurations that continue to structure our perception of the world in the age of global communications and virtual selves.

The study of space, landscape, and place has recently gained currency in a wide range of fields, including physical and human geography, anthropology, architectural theory, sociology, cultural history, philosophy, and literary studies. The growing bibliography on the subject may be attributed, at least in part, to what Philip Sheldrake has called “a crisis of place in Western societies—a sense of rootlessness, dislocation or displacement” (2). It seems reasonable to attribute the current interest in our spatial surroundings, whether we think of them in physical or cultural terms (or a combination of the two), to contemporary anxieties about our place in the world. Indeed, at the very root of the *postmodern condition* (to use Lyotard’s well-known expression) we can see a “decline in traditional systems of values and symbols—religious, ethical and social [that] tends, among other things, to inhibit a clear world-view” (Sheldrake 2). While the current “crisis of place” may, in some ways, be specific to our own time, we can nonetheless draw parallels between the “postmodern” sense of rootlessness and earlier experiences of dislocation and displacement beginning with the “European discovery” of America, the sixteenth-century split of Christianity followed by decades (or indeed centuries) of religious strife, and the scientific and cultural revolutions of the 1500s and 1600s. This connection between the epistemological crises of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the modern and postmodern anxieties about rootlessness and emptiness (*horror vacui*) is at the heart of the present volume.

Recent scholarship on landscape and place may be said to stem from the phenomenology of Martin Heidegger (his concept of dwelling) and the work of postmodern thinkers such as Michel de Certeau, as well as the anthropologists Mircea Eliade and Victor Turner. Other important voices in place studies are

Marc Augé, Gaston Bachelard, Henry Lefebvre, Paul Ricoeur, John B. Jackson, Simon Schama, and the above-mentioned Yi-Fu Tuan and Denis Cosgrove, to provide a short list of foundational figures. They have pointed out that landscapes are composed of relational places that embody interpersonal emotions, perceptions, and memories. The places that form our landscapes are rooted in individual and communal memories that provide us with a sense of belonging. The memories attached to a place give historical meaning to our lives. This is why narratives are integral to our sense of place. Insofar as places are sites of competing memories within historically conditioned *systems of spatialization*, they are intricately connected with the dynamics of power (Lefebvre). In other words, human places are not just sites of interpersonal and communal encounters, but also sites of political, social, religious, and cultural conflicts.

Hence, in his contribution to this volume, David Castillo focuses on the construction of national spectacles and monumental landscapes. He draws from Tuan's exploration of the ideological structuring of topophilic sentiments in the context of nationalized landscapes and, simultaneously, from Guy Debord's theorization of the *society of the spectacle*. Castillo shows how national landscapes and monumental sites can become "landscapes of exclusion" (to use Sheldrake's expression [21]) structured by and imbued with the memories and values of hegemonic groups. He also explores alternative ways of marking the land and imagining human connections to and through place in his analysis of examples of anamorphic restructurings of highly symbolic places such as Rome and New York in works by Cervantes and García Lorca. Castillo links this type of anamorphic perspective with Sheldrake's call to rethink historical places as *multilocalities* and *multivocalities*.

William Childers offers an illuminating illustration of this notion in his exploration of the intersection between race and place in early modern Spain. He examines the different meanings that were attached to the place name "Granada" in the context of a multiphased colonial project that started in the 1400s and reached its zenith with the expulsion of the *moriscos* in the early seventeenth century. Childers studies how a complex, often antagonistic group of players, including the state, the population exiled from Granada, the new inhabitants of the city, and ecclesiastical hierarchs came into contact in the space, both imagined and real, of the cityscape: "In this complex process of negotiation, certain people and things associated with the place name 'Granada' were preserved as part of 'Spain' and others were cut off, lost, or destroyed" (29). The results of these encounters point to the exclusionary logic behind many of the pseudo-historical chronicles of the late Middle Ages and early Renaissance. While political genealogies flourished all over Europe in the fifteenth

and sixteenth centuries, the cultural environment of Imperial and Counter-Reformation Spain was especially fertile for the proliferation of pseudohistorical legends and other historiographic myths of origin. These mythical chronicles (including those of Ruy Sánchez, Fabricio de Vagad, Margarit i Pau, Annus de Viterbo, Antonio de Nebrija and Florián de Ocampo, among others) attempted to redefine Spain as an essentially Christian nation, tracing its Christian origins to antiquity and even further back to the biblical times of Noah and his immediate descendants. As Robert Tate pointed out in his informative article “Mythology in Spanish Historiography of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance” (1954), the proclamation “Hispania tota sibi restitute est,” with which Nebrija and his followers greet the conquest of Granada, implies in its context “not only the ejection of the Moors but also a reconstitution of the totality of the Peninsula, a recovery of self, a purification from external encroachments and alien influences” (14–15).<sup>6</sup> In this context, the work of cultural dissidents, such as the *morisco* doctor Miguel de Luna (author of *Historia verdadera del rey don Rodrigo* and mastermind, along with his relative Alonso del Castillo, of the famous Lead Book forgeries of Granada), must be understood quite literally as a desperate fight for historical time and space.

Cervantes seems to understand what is at stake in the cultural wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In his references to the 1609 expulsion of the moriscos in *Don Quixote II*, and also in his posthumous *Persiles*, Cervantes holds to a different view of Spain as a *multilocality*, while striving to construct fundamentally polyphonic or multivoiced narratives. Childers has recently discussed Cervantes’s countercultural views of the sociopolitical, religious, and racial landscapes of Imperial Spain in *Transnational Cervantes* (2006). In the book, as well as in his essay included in this collection, Childers draws simultaneously from archival sources and postcolonial theory, as he reexamines the Spain of Cervantes as a historical site plagued by conflicts that are in many cases tied to processes of internal colonialism.

In his chapter, Moisés Castillo also places Cervantes in a transnational context, albeit a Mediterranean one, adding to our view of the author as a critical voice in Golden Age Spanish literature. Castillo builds on the information provided by critics such as Jean Canavaggio, Michael McGaha, and María Antonia Garcés, among others, on the subject of Cervantes’s experience of captivity in Algiers and its possible impact on his literary treatment of this theme in *Don Quixote*, *Persiles*, and several of his plays. Beyond the work of these critics, however, Castillo underscores the significance of the *oriental space* of Agimorato’s garden in *Los baños de Argel*. He reinterprets this Cervantine *locus amoenus* and its metaphorical extension (the freedom boat) as a *hetero-*

*topian place* (Foucault) that reflects, as in an anamorphic mirror, Cervantes's own humanistic ideals of justice and human brotherhood. The Cervantine ideals of human bonding, compassion, understanding, and love are projected onto the landscape in this *place without limits* (one of the meanings of the Greek “outopos”) symptomatically located in the space of the Other. As Moisés Castillo explains, this heterotopian drive has nothing to do with the regressive utopianism that José Antonio Maravall has rightfully attributed to pastoral literature, Chivalric and Christian romances, and mainstream Golden Age theater.<sup>7</sup> While conservative utopianisms uphold traditional nobiliary values and official Christian beliefs, the theatrical heterotopia that enables the *felice fin*, or happy ending, at the conclusion of *Los baños de Argel* is a place without (internal) limits or frontiers in which dramatic characters from different cultural and religious backgrounds rediscover their common humanity and their shared dreams of freedom.

Brad Nelson's contribution to the present volume is also anchored in an understanding of Imperial and Counter-Reformation Spain as a conflictive space, traversed by multiple vectors of historical meaning and desire. Nelson underscores the importance of the emblematical tradition in the context of modern and postmodern attempts to reimagine the place of humanity in an ever-expanding universe. In doing so he questions the traditional view of Golden Age Spain as culturally singular or “peculiar” in the context of early modern Europe, taking issue with Fernando R. de la Flor's interpretation of Counter-Reformation culture, especially Juan de Borja's emblems, as a nihilistic, anti-Cartesian critique of instrumentalist schools of thought accompanying early capitalism. In contrast to this focus on an exclusively Hispanic expression of unreason, one that R. de la Flor uses to place Spanish thought in a paradoxically postmodern position with respect to a hegemonic “European” modernity, Nelson reads Borja's use of the emblem as a “middle space or medium” in which conflictive definitions of reason (specifically Aristotelian natural philosophy versus Copernicus's mathematically based astronomy) are brought to bear on epistemological and ontological deadlocks that accompany early modern scientific discoveries.

One of the most volatile spaces that both produced and were subjected to these conflicting scientific ideologies was earth itself or, more properly, the cosmos. In his analysis of the vigorous debates concerning the status and validity of mathematical and geometrical modes of thought, Nelson argues that current developments in the genre of science fiction offer a useful frame for considering scientific debates in the baroque. Not unlike the 1982 sci-fi noir film *Blade Runner*, the baroque debates revolved around contradictory notions

of free will, and the question of whether a mathematically based understanding of physical causes and effects results in knowledge that is hypothetical or real. It is noteworthy, for example, that Galileo's discovery of the moons of Jupiter and his explanation of the technical obstacles and meaning of the discovery in the *Sidereus Nuncius* become early modern sensations because of Galileo's emblematic framing of the discovery as a marvelous proof of the political legitimacy of the Medici dynasty (Biagioli).<sup>8</sup> Thus, not only is the nascent scientific community populated by contradictory fictions concerning the place of man in the cosmos, but its discourse is inexorably framed by aesthetic considerations as well as the political demands of courtly spectacles. In the end, given the multinational status of both absolutist alliances and predominant religious orders, it is impossible to map a singular profile of an emergent Hispanic identity, let alone do so in scientific terms.

One need look no further than the historical persistence of multiple national traditions and identities on the Iberian Peninsula itself for confirmation of the modern tension between the colonizer and the colonized that colors virtually every narrative of national space in the Hispanic world. Colleen Culleton's essay moves through a constellation that includes the 1375 *Atlas of Cresques*—a monumental *mappamundi* composed by an Aragonese Jew living in Mallorca—a 1975 scholarly volume dedicated to the study of this same artifact, a 1998 novel by the Catalan author Alfred Bosch *L'atles furtiu*, and a 2003 civic exposition called *Barcelona Conectada*. Culleton traces the tensions occasioned by the politically motivated desire of the three postmodern mappings of the 1375 artifact in order to frame the relation between the Jewish cartographer and his world map as a forerunner, or prototype, of the marginalized Catalan subject, as well as to recognize the resistance of any historical artifact to this kind of emblematization. If the map itself, even a monumental specimen like the *Atlas of Cresques*, provides but a partial perspective on a historically contextualized and thus contradictory worldview, then what are we to make of repeated attempts to fix the meaning of the absence-saturated text according to equally conflictive and contradictory definitions of cultural identity?

One is reminded of Merchant's and Brennan's notions concerning the early modern subject's need to master all objects *in sight* at the very moment in which a firm grasp on the meaning and place of Man in the cosmos is slipping away. Another image that occurs to us is that of the continual retracing of maps on an infinite series of palimpsests, each one motivated by the gaps and silences in the precursor and, just as importantly, leaving its own lacunae and deadlocks for the next cartographer to unravel. Since the mapmaker is hard-pressed to account for his own ideological unconscious in the expression of

his cartographical desire, a notion such as Walter Mignolo's "border thinking" helps bring into greater relief the colonizer-colonized dialectic at the heart of modern attempts to map the national space.

In his study of Argentine modernism, Justin Read foregrounds Mignolo's notion of border thinking, which emphasizes the constitutive relationship between modernity and colonialism, while underlining the historicity of an ideology that misrecognizes itself as universal. Like Culleton, Read brings into dialogue the efforts of a number of seminal thinkers to define and redefine a liminal *habitus*. In this case, the artistic and philosophical writings of Victoria Ocampo, Jorge Luis Borges, and Alberto and Raúl Prebisch are brought together within a national space informed by the concept of "total theater" as articulated by Walter Gropius: "the Total Theater envisioned both the creation of multiple chronotypes and the collapse of distinct chronotopes into one another" (101). The problem, as Read sees it, is that none of the Argentine thinkers whose work he analyzes can imagine the future of Argentina without first leaving behind the untidy residue—ethnic, architectural, economic, political—created by its dependency-rooted relation with Europe. Just as modernity seeks to cut its ties with the violence, both symbolic and real, produced in the colonial encounter at the heart of capitalist "advances," so, too, does Borges turn a blind eye to the more unseemly aspects at the heart of Buenos Aires's transformation into a quasi-European metropolis. This is not unlike Culleton's observation concerning the desire of modern Catalonia to become an inclusive, which is to say noncolonial, cosmopolitan space through the self-same gesture that posits Barcelona's constitutive centrality for imagining such a project. In Read's words, "this topophilic spectatorship is also a monumental act of misrecognition" (111).

David Foster continues this discussion of the relation between topophilia and misrecognition in his study of Horacio Coppola's urban landscape photography of 1930s Buenos Aires. Where Borges misrecognizes both the rapid modernization and accompanying ghettoization of Buenos Aires's port and peripheral shantytowns in his search for an appropriately masculine and epic national figure, Coppola's photography neatly cuts both of these untidy spaces completely out of his action-packed portraits of the ultramodern skyscrapers and bustling streets of an upscale financial and retail district and its accompanying governmental center. What is ironic about the photographs is that when Coppola is taking them, Buenos Aires's period of rapid growth and modernization had already been cut short by the 1929 stock market crash. Foster observes that "the objects of Coppola's photographic gaze in 1936 were more like a reflex of the more halcyon period of the 1920s (the so-called '*años de las va-*

cas gordas’)” (120) in much the same way that Borges’s focus on the *gaucho* reflects the author’s desire for an Argentina that had already disappeared. Foster’s thesis that urban photography works to bridge Tuan’s topophilic extremes of *the abstract* and *the specific* moves in two directions at once: on the one hand, Coppola’s focus on a very specific microcosm of Argentinian modernity evokes a more abstract understanding of how Latin American dependency can be transformed into an energetic leap into the future; on the other, this narrow focus of the photographer’s gaze, like Borges’s bracketing of modern demographic and economic “progress,” leads to an abstract ideal that turns a blind eye to internal dependency and poverty, a move that allows the Buenos Aires elites to set themselves apart from the regressive material conditions of their own affluence. Indeed, this willful misrecognition would seem to identify them as completely modern. If the rapid economic growth and expansion of Buenos Aires is what allowed the modern cityscape to take shape, then these photographs constitute a baroque-like simulacrum behind which lies Giordano Bruno’s terrifying vacuum.

This quixotic disconnect between the desire to relive a bygone era of glory and an impoverished and conflict-ridden present is at the heart of Catherine Vallejo’s study of the diverse receptions and interpretations of the spectacles that revolved around Spain’s two royal delegates to the 1893 Chicago World Exhibition: the duke of Veraguas, Columbus’s direct descendant; and Princess Eulalia, the young aunt of the future King Alfonso XIII. The exhibition’s theme was the four hundredth anniversary of Columbus’s discovery of America, and, as such, Spain would have a leading role in the fair, although the meaning of this role would be open to conflicting interpretations. Vallejo approaches the study of the fair through Mieke Bal’s narratological apparatus and Tuan’s proposal that an outsider’s perspective on a cherished space offers the potential for critiquing the latter’s shortcomings or contradictions. This is an intriguing conceptual pairing, in that Spain’s narrative of its own historical importance and its desire that the former colony recognize her historical debt to Spanish imperialism collide head-on with the emerging imperialist narrative emanating from rapid US economic and political expansion. If the Spanish government’s goal was to reassert its historical importance as well as its continuing imperial presence, the US hosts were more interested in showing how far they had come in the last four hundred years, including, of course, their own imperial aspirations regarding Cuba and Latin America. The desire of the Spanish dignitaries to strike a heroic, imperial pose is also undercut by the impoverishment of Spain’s pavilion, located in the Agricultural Building alongside its former and soon-to-be-former colonial possessions in Latin America. According to the

spatial organization of the fair, Spain has already been downgraded to a third-world by(gone) way. What is more, the US retinue surrounding the duke of Veraguas initiates a subscription campaign to help the duke recover financially from a disastrous series of investments, which made for a rather pathetic spectacle in a nation that prided itself on “lifting itself up by its own bootstraps.” As for Princess Eulalia, in addition to offending exhibit organizers with her regal haughtiness and chronic tardiness, she dishonors her own country when she refuses to attend a ceremonial cannon salvo organized in her honor by the captain of the replica of the *Santa María*, which Spain had sent to the exhibition. In a moment reminiscent of Don Quixote’s refusal to test his newly repaired helmet during his self-transformation from impoverished country gentleman to heroic knight errant, “Eulalia insisted on removing herself from the area as she did not trust the cannons. Indeed, there was an accident in which two sailors were wounded by shrapnel flying from the exploding cannon” (Vallejo 137).

This notion of a “crash” that explodes idealized narratives, and either launches the avant-garde subject into a futuristic nonspace (Augé) or returns the national subject to its inescapable rootedness, is at the center of Robert Davidson’s study of Eduardo Zamacois Quintana’s 1922 novel, *Memorias de un vagón de ferrocarril*. Davidson analyzes the Spanish avant-garde’s celebration of European cosmopolitanism and concomitant deconstruction of narratives of Spanish national identity tied to the Castilian landscape by tracking the biography of the protagonist of Zamacois’s novel, a railcar named Cabal. At issue is the conflict between the desire of the cosmopolitan subject to move freely through the disruptive changes brought about by modernity and the modern subject’s love of particular, homely spaces. The novelist’s decision to explore modern subjectivity through the construction, movement, and destruction of a luxury dining car shows, on the one hand, as Cervantes states—three centuries before Heidegger—that the subject is “made like this thing they call a place” (*Los trabajos II*, 12.363), and, on the other, that the movement of the subject through space shapes its experience in time and, thus, defines its contours and limits. Davidson follows the work of Díaz-Plaja on modern cosmopolitanism, which “acknowledges a more transcendent dimension to the concept by pointing to the way that the dynamic comes into tension with a nationalism ‘confined by borders’” (148). Rather than focusing on Spain’s idiosyncrasy vis-à-vis European modernity, so often metaphorically evoked by the inability of Spanish trains to travel outside of the Peninsula because of the distinct gauge of the tracks, Davidson studies how avant-garde cosmopolitanism becomes exhausted by its own dialectical relation with that which it rebels against and the accompanying ideological contradictions. In the end, the avant-garde subject,

however cosmopolitan he or she desires to be, must always enunciate the break with tradition and history from an identifiable place in space and time and, as a result, constitute a new “literal and metaphoric center of the state that it had once traversed” (155).

Goretti Ramírez takes the notion of modernist exile one step further in her study of Luis Cernuda’s poetic representation of urban, garden, and Spanish historical landscapes. Returning to the *topos* of “landscapes of exclusion” (Sheldrake) introduced by David Castillo and further developed by Childers, Ramírez focuses on the ways in which the Spanish exile dialectically engages Francoist attempts to link representations of Spanish monumental and natural landscapes to “a quest for *order* . . . an assertion of *authority* . . . and . . . a project of *totalisation*” (160). In contrast to Franco’s identification of the fall of the Republic as the point of origin of Spain’s heroic, epic, and *true* return to imperial triumphs and glory, Cernuda characterizes the lost Second Republic as an edenic space to which the Spanish nation should strive to return after the fall of the *true* Spain to the fascists. Like Childers’s complex treatment of *maurophilia* in the context of the expulsion of the *moriscos*, Ramírez’s analysis of Cernuda’s landscapes demonstrates how “exiles resort to the creation of other atemporal myths to connect their existence to that of other exiles of history” (166). Similar to Américo Castro’s notion of a “morada vital,” the assemblage and erection of a historical space simultaneously constitutes a historical subject: “*un nosotros de la historia*” who inhabits the newly renovated historical landscape and defends its borders from incursions from other “mnemonic communities” (Beckwith xv). Seen in this light, Franco and Cernuda become rivals who engage each other in a fight to the death on and over the blood-stained terrain of Spain’s imperial and modern history.

The last two essays of the volume reengage the question of the “historical *we*” through an examination of cinematic and media spectacles in Francoist Spain (Luis González) and in democratic Spain (Carmen Moreno-Nuño). González focuses on the Francoist reinvention of the rural landscape of Castile as the ancestral reservoir of Spanish values in the 1948 film *Un hombre va por el camino* (directed by Manuel Mur Oti) and the regime’s demonization of the city space that is apparent in *Surcos* (directed by José Antonio Nieves Conde), first released in 1951. González shows how these films reconstruct Spain’s historical landscape as the scene(ry) of a mythical struggle between the atemporal spirit of the nation and a soulless modernity that threatens to destroy it. While the urban center is often represented as an unredeemable space inhabited by monstrous crowds, the possibility of individual and communal salvation is still present in agrarian settings, which recall pastoral Arcadias. González’s descrip-

tion of the urban scenery of *Surcos* may be said to evoke the imaginary of horror fiction, in particular a scene in which the father of the immigrant family, Manolo, gives candy to a child who approaches Manolo after he has set up his (illegal) kiosk in a park. Soon Manolo is surrounded by a veritable urban mob, much like the dystopian portrait evoked by José Ortega y Gasset's paranoid account of the loss of civilization beneath a flood of suddenly entitled proletariat masses in *La rebelión de las masas*. As described by González, this scene is reminiscent of countless horror classics dealing with evil children and also, more generally, with vampires and zombies.

While the city breeds anonymous crowds of soulless parasites, the traditional family structure of the countryside shows restorative powers for individual men, women, and children. As González writes, "It is in the countryside, untouched by the effects of Modernity, where Franco's regime will look for, and will find, the ideal subject of the New Spain" (175). From this perspective, we can see that the Francoist project of national reconstruction has much in common with the theatrical formula of "alabanza de aldea," or praise of the countryside, that had inspired such popular seventeenth-century plays as *Fuentevieja*, *El caballero de Olmedo*, *Peribañez y el comendador de Ocaña*, *El villano en su rincón*, and *El alcalde de Zalamea*, among many others. Thus, González's discussion of the Francoist program of monumentalization of the rural landscape of Castile brings us full circle to the issues discussed in the first chapter.

The role that monumental sites and national spectacles play in rearticulating communal memories is also the theme of the final essay of the volume. Carmen Moreno-Nuño notes that the temptation of identity closure leads to political and cultural battles over national memories and their meaning. She quotes from Castiñeira: "Lo importante en la memoria nacional del pasado, no es su verdad, sino su significación" (66) (What is important about a nation's memory of the past is not its truth but its meaning). Hence, in her interpretation of critically-acclaimed films such as *Soldados de Salamina* and *La ciudad sin límites*, Moreno-Nuño underscores opportunities to reconstruct historical places as dialogic, problematic, and conflictive multilocalities. As she writes, "By turning memory into a project Spanish cinema seeks to narratively represent a new hermeneutics of the nation through the link between personal memory, collective memory and historical memory" (200). With regard to current efforts to recuperate the historical memory of Spain, Moreno-Nuño calls for a self-consciously critical approach to the reconstruction of places of memory while cautioning against the current media frenzy that has turned historical traumas into national spectacles. Her analysis suggests that public acts

of historical recovery and symbolic restitution must be accompanied by the recognition that places of memory do not have a single or univocal meaning but are subject to interpretation by individuals as well as small and large-scale communities. The essays included in this volume take this notion as their point of departure as they examine the politics and aesthetics of space and place in the *society of the spectacle* from early modern to postmodern contexts.

## Notes

1. See Maravall's *El mundo social de "La Celestina"* and *La picaresca desde la historia social*, especially the introductory section.
2. For an explanation of the impact of Giordano Bruno's discovery of the vacuum and especially Galileo Galilei's recording of his lunar explorations in the context of a discussion of the epistemological shift of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Andrea Battistini's "The Telescope in the Baroque Imagination." Aníbal Quijano and Walter Mignolo have offered an important corrective to Eurocentric versions of universal history. They have placed the conquest and colonization of America at the very center of the modernity debates in arguing that the modern age is inaugurated by an act of imperial aggression and that European modernity is directly enabled by colonial violence, slavery and genocide (Mignolo, *The Dark Side of the Renaissance*).
3. See also Brennan's *Globalization and Its Terrors* (2003).
4. James Bono has recently pointed out that there is an alternative "modern" tradition of natural philosophy that questions the dominant mechanistic principles. He links this tradition to William Harvey's view of nature as "living matter" and also to the twentieth century work of Alfred North Whitehead. Bono quotes from Whitehead: "We are now so used to the materialistic way of looking at things . . . that it is with some difficulty that we understand the possibility of another mode of approach to the problem of nature" (3).
5. On the same topic, Elkins cites Peter Collins: "It is a curious fact that until the eighteenth century no architectural treatise ever used the word space" (24).
6. Much of the overview of Spanish historiography presented here comes from Robert Tate's compelling article. Tate's discussion underscores the emergence of propagandistic notions of Spanish integrity in the context of the Absolutist monarchy.
7. See Maravall's *Utopía y contrautopía en "El Quijote."* See also David Castillo and Nicholas Spadaccini's "El antiutopismo en *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda: Cervantes y el cervantismo actual*."
8. For a discussion of Galileo's *Sidereus Nuncius* in the context of baroque aesthetics and, generally speaking, European baroque culture, see Andrea Battistini's "The

Telescope in the Baroque Imagination.” Not unlike Nelson, Battistini establishes a precise link between the philosophical and aesthetic yearning of the baroque, which is everywhere present in Galileo’s reports, and the modern literary genre of science-fiction. As he writes, “the *Sidereus* provided an unintentional incentive for science fiction. . . . In reality, nothing at that moment was impossible, nothing incredible for those that, yearning for a freer and vaster world, were released from the laws of verisimilitude and able to reason in utopian terms” (27).

## Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor, and Max Horkheimer. *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Trans. John Howe. London: Verso, 1995.
- Battistini, Andrea. “The Telescope in the Baroque Imagination.” *Reason and Its Others: Italy, Spain, and the New World*. Eds. David Castillo and Massimo Lollini. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2006.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Beckwith, Stacy N. “Introduction: Al-Andalus/Iberia/Sepharad: Memory among Modern Discourses.” *Charting Memory: Recalling Medieval Spain*. Ed. Stacy N. Beckwith. New York: Garland, 2000. xiii-li.
- Biagioli, Mario. *Galileo, Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Blade Runner*. Directed by Ridley Scott. Warner Bros., 1982.
- Bono, James. “Perception, Living Matter, Cognitive Systems, Immune Networks: A Whiteheadian Future for Science Studies.” *Configurations* 13 (2005): 135–81.
- Braunstein, Philippe. “Toward Intimacy: The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.” *A History of Private Life*. Vol. 2 *Revelations of the Medieval World*. Ed. Georges Duby. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA: Belknap-Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Brennan, Teresa. *Globalization and Its Terrors*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- . *History after Lacan*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Burke, James. *The Day the Universe Changed*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1985.
- Castillo, David R., and Nicholas Spadaccini. “El antiutopismo en *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda*: Cervantes y el cervantismo actual.” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 20:1 (Spring, 2000): 115-32.
- Castiñeira, Ángel. “Naciones imaginadas.” *Casa encantada: Lugares de memoria en la España constitucional (1978-2004)*. Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 2005.
- Castro, Américo. “The Historical ‘We.’” *An Idea of History: Selected Essays of Américo*

- Castro*. Eds. Stephen Gilman, Edmund King, and Roy Pearce. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1977.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda*. Ed. Carlos Romero Muñoz. Madrid: Cátedra, 2002.
- Childers, William. *Transnational Cervantes*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Cosgrove, Denis. “Spectacle and Society: Landscape and Theater in Premodern and Postmodern Cities.” *Understanding Ordinary Landscapes*. Eds. Paul Groth and Todd W. Bressi. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. London: Rebel Press, 1995.
- Elkins, James. *The Poetics of Perspective*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Jay, Martin. “Scopic Regimes of Modernity.” *Modernity and Identity*. Eds. Scott Lash and Jonathan Friedman. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Maravall, José Antonio. *Culture of the Baroque: Analysis of a Historical Structure*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- . *El mundo social de “La Celestina.”* Madrid: Gredos, 1986.
- . *La picaresca desde la historia social*. Madrid: Taurus, 1986.
- . *Utopía y contrautopía en “El Quijote.”* Santiago de Compostela: Pico Sacro, 1976.
- Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Harper and Row, 1989.
- Mignolo, Walter. *Global History/Local Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Perspective as Symbolic Form*. Trans. Christopher Wood. New York: Zone, 1991.
- Quijano, Anibal. “Coloniality of Power: Eurocentrism and Latin America.” *Nepantla: Views from South* 1.3 (2000): 533–80.
- R. de la Flor, Fernando. *Barroco: Representación e ideología en el mundo hispánico (1580–1680)*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2002.
- Schama, Simon. *Landscape and Memory*. London: HarperCollins, 1995.
- Sheldrake, Philip. *Spaces for the Sacred: Place, Memory, and Identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Tate, Robert. “Mythology in Spanish Historiography of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.” *Hispanic Review* 22.1 (1954): 1–18.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitude, and Values*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Routledge Classics, 2005.