

Pastiche in Contemporary Latin American Literature

Jean Franco
Columbia University

Many novels published in Latin America over the last few years can be described as pastiche novels. They include Roa Bastos' *Yo el supremo* (1893), Elena Poniatowska's *Querido Diego* (1987), Juan José Saer's *El entenado* (1988) Edgardo Rodríguez Juliá's *Las aventuras del héroe Baltasar* (1989) and *La noche oscura del niño Avilés* (1989), Mario Vargas Llosa's *El hablador* (1987) and Silviano Santiago's *Em Liberdade* (1981). Many other novels—including *El otoño del patriarca* (1975) by García Márquez and the novels of Manuel Puig incorporate imitations of other styles without this necessarily being parody.

The dictionary defines pastiche as both imitation and a melange of styles. Unlike the older term parody, the word pastiche only entered the vocabulary in the eighteenth century even though non-satiric imitation was common before this. Pastiche is a relatively modern term and needs the notion of originality as its counterpoint. Pre-romantic culture more easily accommodated mimicry and, indeed, regarded it as a form of homage. Sor Juana's "imitation" of Góngora (which was also a subtle form of differentiation) was considered an achievement rather than a defect.¹ When the "new" became the absolute criterion for great art and especially with Modernism imitation was the sign of lack of originality although, as Theodor Adorno has pointed out, the Modernists' emphasis on originality quickly come up against limits.² As a result of the exhaustion of high culture's search for originality, there occurs, according to Fredric Jameson, "the moment of pastiche in which energetic artists who now lack both forms and content cannibalize the museum and wear the masks of extinct mannerisms."³

Yet critics are far from agreeing on the usefulness of the term pastiche, and many disregard it altogether. Gérard Genette, who attempted to systematize all forms of palimpsest or "second degree"

literature, described it as “non-satiric imitation” thus distinguishing it from parody.⁴ On the other hand, Linda Hutcheon has used the term “modern parody” to describe novels such as James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, which incorporate that very non-satiric imitation that Genette attributes to pastiche.⁵

Meanwhile, Bakhtin, who is centrally concerned with all forms of imitation, ironic inversion, and parody, hardly uses the term pastiche at all, preferring “stylization” or, more generally, “double-voicing.” Stylization is, however, not a substitute for pastiche, for it refers rather to the conflation of certain conventions into a recognizable epochal style. Nevertheless, Bakhtin’s theory of double voicing is also applicable to pastiche. As is well-known, this theory is based on everyday speech situations from which literary language is often derived. For Bakhtin, the repetition of words can never be reduced to mere parroting (imitation). When two people say, “beautiful weather,” these are two utterances belonging to different voices, though they may be “linked by dialogic relations of agreement.”⁶ Not only literature but also everyday speech is, for Bakhtin, full of other people’s words: “with some of them our voice is completely merged, and we forget whose words they were; we use others that have authority, in our view, to substantiate our own words; and in yet others we implant our different, even antagonistic intentions.” The “stylizer” works with “someone else’s point of view.” When “the author uses “someone else’s discourse for his or her own purposes by inserting a new semantic intention into a discourse which already has (and which retains) an intention of its own” then “two semantic intentions appear, two voices.”⁸ In parody, in contrast to stylization, opposing intentions come into conflict; a second voice, “that having lodged in the other speech, clashes antagonistically with the original, host voice and forces it to serve directly opposite aims.”⁹

Even though Bakhtin does not use the term pastiche, he, however, clearly differentiates between an antagonistic relationship to a “host voice” and other kinds of double voicing. Yet, as I propose to argue and as Bakhtin suggests, an echo of the voice of the other is inevitably a displacement or a substitution. There is no innocent relationship between discourses.

Bakhtin was of course primarily interested in the eruption of popular voices into the literary languages. But there are forms of double-voicing that shade into mimicry and that acquire deep significance within a colonia¹ or “peripheral” context such as obtains in

Latin America. The implications go beyond the literary. One has only to think of a society such as Japan, which for so long was defined as a mere imitation of the West. In the context of the struggle for national autonomy in Latin America, originality and emancipation were key words, whilst “imitation” “copying” and “repetition” were slurs.¹⁰ This explains the gleeful force that avant-garde movements like *Ultraísmo* in Argentina or Modernism in Brazil brought to their parodies of prior traditions, their insistence on the originality of America and its art. Yet significantly parody existed alongside pastiche; both functioned as declarations of cultural affinities by introducing new sets of canonical texts. Since pastiche does not set out to satirize prior texts, however, it can constitute a sympathetic relation with the past which may act as a pointed critique of the present. When Juan Montalvo wrote *Capítulos que se olvidaron a Cervantes* (1892), he was attempting to introduce the humanistic values represented by Cervantes into an atmosphere of authoritarianism and terror. In the poetry of Rubén Darío, nostalgia for the gracious aristocratic style of eighteenth-century France (itself a pastiche of classical style) is an implied judgment on the vulgarity of the times. Clearly this “non-satiric” imitation includes all manner of appropriation, expropriation, “cannibalization” and celebration, and requires more extensive exploration than is possible here. For the purpose of this essay, I shall limit my discussion to those texts in which pastiche marks a subtle displacement of hierarchy, especially the hierarchy that privileges the present over the past, the near over the remote.

The ur-text of contemporary Latin American pastiche is Borges’ story, “Pierre Menard autor del Quijote,” which was written in the thirties.¹¹ It is not without significance that this is the story crucial to Borges’ own career as a writer, one which exorcised the ghosts of his own past.¹² In describing the efforts of the twentieth-century author, Pierre Menard, to create an exact replica of Cervantes’ text, Borges introduces a protagonist who is indifferent to originality and yet can never reproduce the seventeenth-century novel even though he uses the same words, since four centuries of history inevitably intervene. Words change their meanings and become loaded in ways that Cervantes would never have dreamed of. Because all that is archaic in Cervantes’ text leaps to the reader’s notice, pastiche draws attention to changes in meaning, to what Bakhtin calls the speech of the other.¹³

There is an interesting example of the double-voicing that occurs through historical change in Gabriel García Márquez' novel, *El otoño del patriarca*. (*The Autumn of the Patriarch*). This is an episode in which the Papal Nuncio, while riding over the mountains on his mule to investigate claims that the dictator's mother is a saint, is shot by the dictator's men and falls down a deep ravine. The description of the fall is composed of citations from school geography text books, travel books and from nineteenth-century fiction:

One heard the endless wail of fright of the tumbling mule as it went on falling dizzily and endlessly from *the peaks of perpetual snow* through *successive and instantaneous climes* out of natural-history prints of the precipice and the birth trickle of *great navigable waters* and the high cornices up to which the learned doctors of the botanical expedition had climbed on Indian back with their herbal secrets, and the steppes of wild magnolias where warm-wooled sheep grazed the ones *who give us generous sustenance and cover and good example* and the mansions of the coffee plantations with their paper wreaths on solitary balconies and their endless invalids and the perpetual roar of the turbulent rivers *of the great natural boundary lines* where the heat began. . . .

The italicized lines clearly belong to the discourse of the other, to a discourse that belongs, in fact, to a secular and positivistic culture that was introduced in the nineteenth century, replacing the hitherto hegemonic Catholic culture. What is particularly interesting is the intersection of two different literary plans—that of action, the movement of characters, what Barthes refers to as the proairetic code and, on the other hand, the geography (and the cultural code) into which this protagonist falls, thus suggesting both the fall of the Church to the secular order and the fact that this order is constructed out of a bricolage of imported clichés.¹⁴ The significance of the pastiche here is precisely to underline the imitation and copying which, in nineteenth-century Latin America, passed for progress. Although it could be argued that in this episode the line between parody and pastiche is a fine one, nevertheless the skillfully interwoven melange foregrounds not only textual citation but also a reference to a larger text—that of “Latin America” itself, as a pastiche.

I shall now turn to two different and more extended examples—

Mario Vargas Llosa's *El hablador* and Silviano Santiago's *Em liberdade*, both of which could be described as pastiche novels.¹⁵

In the first of these, *El hablador*, pastiche of indigenous lore and legend are interwoven with chapters that relate several journeys made by a narrator (Mario Vargas Llosa) to the Amazon rain forest. The novel thus juxtaposes modern and primitive, the individualized subjectivity of the contemporary writer in contrast to the community-based storyteller, the jet-age global view (from Florence, to Lima, to the jungle) and the circumscribed view of a man whose territory is covered by walking.

The novel is both the story of a search and the story of the elusive object of that search, but the search itself is a dual one. While living in Florence, Vargas Llosa comes across an exhibition of photographs of Machiguenga Indians who inhabit the Amazon basin and whom the author had visited under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. One of the photographs captures a shadowy figure who Vargas Llosa believes is the legendary Machiguenga storyteller whom outsiders rarely if ever see. The photographs trigger Vargas Llosa's recollections of his visit to the Machiguengas and also his memories of a school and college friend and member of a Jewish family, Saúl Zuratas, who had first spoken to him of the Machiguenga tribes and of his intention to become an ethnographer. The time frame of the story covers a period of some thirty years, from the period when the young Vargas Llosa befriends Saúl (who is nicknamed Mascarita because of a disfiguring birthmark on his face) to the story's present in Florence. Vargas Llosa's own reminiscences are told in chronological order, but these are interrupted from time to time by the voice of the storyteller whose narrative is a pastiche without any apparent chronological order and who weaves together autobiography, history, story and myth. Clearly Vargas Llosa wishes to bring out the differences between traditional storytelling and the modern author though, as I will show, it is by no means clear that he is necessarily valorizing the latter. One of the ways in which this difference becomes apparent is in the constant recourse to referentiality in the telling of the autobiographical story, for not only are there references to well-known Peruvian historians and ethnographers, to his own visits to the Amazonian jungle when doing research for his novel, *La casa verde* (*The Green House*)—there are references as well as to his work on a television show for which he interviewed missionaries of the con-

troversial Summer Institute of Linguistics. The autobiography is not only a foil for the pastiche; it is also written in a style that suggests an engaging frankness, that persuades us that Vargas Llosa is a reasonable man who is just going about his work like everybody else. Yet this reasonable air is something of a smokescreen, allowing the author to pass off dubious political positions as if they were common sense. The most egregious example of this is his references to the missionaries of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. While Vargas Llosa does not disguise the fact that the Summer Institute is controversial, he portrays the missionaries as essentially benign and carefully skirts the murkier aspects of the Institute's relationship to both national governments and indigenous groups. Yet, in the fifties (more or less the time that the novel begins) the Institute was gathering data on about 30 tribes. What appeared to be a worthy scholarly activity, writing down indigenous languages, was also a form of information retrieval, the aim of which was conversion. Ever since the time when the founder of the Summer Institute was first invited to Mexico by Lázaro Cárdenas, it has been a constant source of controversy. It was expelled from Peru in the early seventies and later from Ecuador. The missions thus come into conflict with national policies and have been criticized for destroying the delicate balance of life in the region. A Venezuelan film-maker, Carlos Azpurúa, who did work on the New Tribes Mission in Venezuela, commented that conversion destroys the tribes' belief system: "And when you destroy that, material aspects are affected. When material aspects are affected, it affects patterns and ways of life. . . . It is no coincidence that they (the indigenous) have lived and survived in this region, ecologists by nature, for 30,000 years."¹⁶ Thus, as is often the case in Vargas Llosa's novels, the insertion of autobiographical "fact" authenticates ideological positions and, indeed, disguises them.

The intercalated chapters, on the other hand, are told by a second storyteller who can gradually be identified as Saúl Zuratas, the student who had disappeared from Lima apparently to go back to Israel but who (it turns out) has become the storyteller of the Machiguenga tribe. References to a parrot (Saúl had a pet parrot) and to a birthmark make this identification of Saúl with the storyteller possible. These personal references, in contrast to the Vargas Llosa chapters, are buried in mythic stories recounted in the formulaic style of the traditional storyteller. Thus, for instance, a new episode often begins with formulae such as "this was the the story of Kachiborerine. That was in

olden times.” It is, perhaps, no accident that the man who becomes the storyteller of the vanishing tribe is Jewish. He is nicknamed “Little Mask” (Mascarita) because of the giant birth mark that disfigures his face and makes him an outcast. By disappearing into the forest and becoming the tribal storyteller, he buries his name, his ethnic origin, and his ambition in the anonymity of oral tradition. Yet the stories he tells are not only reproductions of Machiguenga lore—for instance stories of outwitting the devils, the story of the primal pair, the story of Pareni, and the transformation of Kachiborerine into a comet (all Machiguenga foundation myths)—they are also tales of his own induction into shamanism and historical episodes that refer to the rubber boom, to the influence of the white fathers (the Dominicans) who pass on their sickness to the Indians and the constant flight of the Machiguenga from civilization. Although it is possible to read Vargas Llosa’s pastiche as a response to the movement known as “indigenismo” and the representation of the Indian by urban and non-indigenous writers, the novel does not register the contemporary indigenous movements in any way. There is no reference to contemporary battles and antagonisms, the political protests and the international network of indigenous organizations which have sprung up over the last few years.

The function of pastiche in the novel is to present a contrast not between the primitive and the modern but between the contemporary writer’s search for material and the tribal storyteller’s relation to tradition. In this case, it should be added, however, that the tradition on which Vargas Llosa draws is not an oral tradition as such, but the documentation of that tradition by both Protestant and Catholic missionaries.¹⁷

It is likely, therefore, that Vargas Llosa was not primarily interested in the Machiguenga but rather in the motif of the “storyteller.” For the pastiche clearly betrays nostalgia—not for tribal life, but for the storyteller’s relation to a community. Hence too, the significance of those autobiographical episodes, in which Vargas Llosa represents himself as a novelist engaged in a lonely struggle with his material or researching on his novel, *La casa verde*, and as a television producer struggling with the technological complexities of putting on a show. In contrast to print culture, television reporting involves team work; yet, as described by Vargas Llosa, it is more a question of management than of creation. His program is called “The Tower of Babel” and it consists mainly of interviews. The novel is thus centrally concerned

with the different technologies that transpose “reality” into fiction and it also describes the different forms of reception—the small family group listening to the storyteller in the jungle and bonded through him with other family groups, the separation of the modern novel writer from a public (Vargas Llosa’s isolation in Florence), and finally the global reach of the television team which, however, meets the public only through technology. In other words, Vargas Llosa’s novel puts Benjamin’s “storyteller” into the age of mechanical reproduction. In his well-known essay on Leskov, Walter Benjamin describes storytelling as a dying art and points out that the secular productive force of history has been removing narrative “from the realm of living speech and at the same time is making it possible to see a new beauty in what is vanishing.”¹⁸ In this light, it is possible to read *El hablador* as a desire not to return to primitive storytelling, but only to capture the moment of its disappearance and its replacement with the “magic” of television.

Read in this way, pastiche is what allows the contemporary author to appropriate indigenous culture for his or her own use, rather as the photographs of the Machiguenga are decontextualized and put on display in an art gallery in Florence. In *El hablador*, the photographs of the Machiguenga and the shadowy figure of the storyteller are disturbing only to the narrator and only because he has direct knowledge of the tribe. What makes him tell the story to others is his curiosity about Saúl’s regression into primitive life, which is transposed into his curiosity for a form of storytelling that is disappearing from the modern world. Pastiche is therefore a form of nostalgia, but one which hardly subverts the experience of the novelist or reader. In addition, there is the important fact that the storytelling tradition is kept alive by the universal outsider, the Jew, a device that drains all particularity from the American indigenous experience.

A completely different use of pastiche is illustrated by the *Em Liberdade*, a Brazilian novel by Silviano Santiago, in which recent history is used to interrogate the present. *Em Liberdade* appropriates the name and style of a well-known Brazilian writer, Graciliano Ramos who, in March 1936, was imprisoned by the government of Getulio Vargas as a political detainee. Before his detention, Ramos had worked in the office of Public Education in the provincial town of Alagoas and had been somewhat marginalized from the cultural centers of Brazilian life in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Bahia. He was released in January 1937, but it took him ten years

before he could undertake the writing of his prison memoirs. It was, in fact, after completing a translation of Camus' *L'Etranger* that he began what turned out to be a long and somewhat truculent narrative.¹⁹ It is possible that one reason for the delay was his reluctance to use the first person singular, though (possibly with Camus' example in mind) he eventually conquered his distaste and wrote what is now considered a classic of Brazilian letters. *Em Liberdade* purports to be written by Graciliano Ramos immediately after his release from prison, that is during the period when he felt unable to compose his prison memoirs. It is also supposedly a text that Ramos had ordered destroyed.

What induced Santiago to write a pastiche of this well-known text? In the first place, as he himself explains in his essays, he believes that the notions of purity and coherence have always been challenged by Latin American writing, that Latin American writing is always "speaking against" or "responding to" other writing.²⁰ Barthes once asked what he should read in order to write (and re-write). Santiago points out that reading in order to write has long been a practice among authors in dependent cultures where "reading is understood as a search for a writable text, a text that can stimulate them to work and serve as a model in the organization of their own writing." Santiago argues that "The Latin American writer plays with the signs of another writer and another text. The words of the other present themselves as objects that fascinate his eyes, his fingers, and the writing of a second text is in part the story of his sensual experience with the alien sign."²¹ Santiago thus dispenses with any notion of originality and regards all Latin American literature as pastiche, parody or translation, as always a deliberate meditation on other texts rather than a spontaneous production.

This situation is common to writers in all colonial and dependent cultures. Commenting on Borges' story, "Pierre Menard," Santiago points out that freedom for Pierre Menard "is controlled by the original text [i.e. *Don Quixote*], just as the freedom of citizens in colonized societies is monitored by metropolitan forces."²² At the same time, he values pastiche over parody, for "pastiche does not reject the past in a gesture of mockery, contempt or irony. Pastiche accepts the past as it is and the work of art is nothing more than a supplement. . . . I would not say that pastiche is reverence towards the past, but I would say that it assumes [endossa] the past, contrary to parody which always ridicules it."²³

Santiago's own description of *Em Liberdade* is that it is "a false diary of the moment in which he left prison, a diary that he never had the courage to write, for the prison experience is the experience of martyrdom, the experience of suffering and pain. There is no criticism of this. But exactly what I wanted was to write a supplement to this, to supplement what is already complete. . . . Notice that I was appropriating the voice and style and even the life, of another."²⁴ The mention of "supplement," of course, immediately evokes the Derridian supplement, that is the power of substitution that undermines all essentialisms. We must assume then that Santiago's "supplement" is intended to unsettle Ramos' text, which is itself an account of disorientation.²⁵ From familiar surroundings, he is taken as a prisoner by train to a prison in which he is no longer a middle-class bureaucrat but part of an undifferentiated mass. From now on he has to try and preserve a distance not only from the seductions of the powerful within the prison society, but also from the seductions of the Communist party organization within the jail. *Em Liberdade* reverses this situation, by depicting the estrangement of freedom, his difficult relationship with his wife and other writers, and with a reading public whose expectations threaten to close "successive doors to freedom." For Santiago's Ramos, "the real mark of courage is to refuse the medal"—that is to refuse the role of martyr, or heroic example.

Out of prison, Ramos can only earn his living by journalism, which for him is the equivalent of silence as a writer. The journalist simply produces according to fixed conventions: "I shall become a professional able to do a job whose place and function is already predetermined before my entry onto the stage. I shall perform as a great actor. My knowledge of the Portuguese language (my "direct and dry style" as they say), resembles the way in which the builder of the cathedrals used the artisan who could work in stone. I do anonymous service. We are all artisans constructing the cathedral of Vargas' authoritarian government."

Now Ramos' dilemma speaks not to the thirties—the age of the personality cult and of martyrdom for a cause (anti-fascism, the Spanish Civil War)—but rather to the seventies and eighties, to generations that had to reconcile everyday life and its small pleasures, with authoritarian government. For this generation self-sacrifice in the name of a cause cannot achieve anything. In Ramos' words, "If I could believe in self-sacrifice as an ethical salvation, half

of my problems would be solved. I would attain the tranquility of a whole man, prisoner of an unjust legal system, persecuted by an authoritarian society." But this is precisely what is unacceptable to him, and why he chooses to "err": "I err in order to attain my authenticity. I would be right if I denied my will to live. I err to negate my slow suicide. I would be right if I pleased other people. I err to stop the opposition from falling into the panacea of martyrdom. I err in order to affirm that the condition of persecuted and massacred cannot serve as an example."

Such comments on the position of the writer in the thirties caught between his love of life and the externally imposed duty to risk his life for a cause cannot but be read in the light of the military regimes of the late sixties and the early seventies and the literature of heroic guerrilla resistance.²⁶ For the ethics of the Brazilian opposition to military government was based on the mystique of sacrifice. Survival, on the other hand, inevitably constituted a form of silent collaboration.

This problem is familiar to readers of contemporary Latin American literature. Manuel Puig's *The Kiss of the Spider Woman* formulates it as a dialogue between a homosexual dedicated to survival within the prison system and a guerrilla bent on sacrifice. Santiago's pastiche is, in contrast, a dialogue in which the past speaks, as it were, to the present, to a generation for whom the memoirs of guerrillas such as Fernando Gabeira became best-sellers. By concentrating not on heroism and martyrdom, but on the problems of freedom—on modest pleasures, on personal frictions and on problematic relationships—*Em Liberdade* both provides a supplement to Ramos' prison memoirs and allows the silences of the prior text to speak.

As these two novels demonstrate, pastiche goes far beyond copy or imitation for it involves the appropriation of another's style in order to make it say something else. It is a differentiation that emphasizes the interval between two narrative instances, between the individual writer and the communal storyteller whose language he borrows in *El hablador*, and between the writer living under authoritarianism in the eighties and the writer living in the thirties. The second voice indeed foregrounds the act of mimicry itself.

NOTES

1. See chapter 2 of my book, *Plotting Women. Gender and Representation in Mexico* (Columbia University Press, 1989), pp. 23–54.
2. Theodor Adorno, “Arnold Schoenberg, 1874–1951”, *Prisms. Cultural Criticism and Society*. tr. Samuel and Shierry Weber (London: Neville Spearman, 1967), pp. 147–72.
3. Fredric Jameson, “The Shining,” *Social Text*, 4 (Fall, 1981), p. 114.
4. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes. La littérature du seconde degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982).
5. Linda Hutcheon, “Modern Parody and Bakhtin”, in Gary Saul Morson and Caryle Emerson (eds.), *Rethinking Bakhtin. Extensions and Challenges* (Northwestern University Press, 1989), pp. 87–103.
6. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Essays*, tr. Vern W. McGee (University of Texas Press, 1986), p. 125.
7. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* tr. Caryl Emerson (University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 195.
8. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 189.
9. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 193.
10. Homi Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse,” *October* 28 (Spring, 1984), pp. 125–33.
11. Jorge Luis Borges, “Pierre Menard, autor del *Quijote*,” included in the collection *Ficciones*, first published in Buenos Aires in 1944.
12. Jorge Luis Borges, “An Autobiographical Essay,” *The Aleph and Other Stories*, tr. Norman Thomas Di Giovanni (New York:Dutton, 1970), pp. 240–42.
13. “Discourse in Dostoevsky, in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, pp. 181–269.
14. The quotation is from *The Autumn Of the Patriarch* tr. Gregory Rabassa (New York, Avon reprint, 1977) Barthes sets out his theory of narrative codes in his *S/Z*, tr. Richard Miller (New York: Hill and Wang, 1970). p. 142.
15. Page references are to Mario Vargas Llosa, *El hablador*, (Barcelona:Seix Barral, 1987) and Silviano Santiago, *Em Liberdade*, (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1981).
16. “In crusade against outside interference, Azpurúa documents Amazonian cultures” *The Daily Journal*, Caracas, (June 17, 1987), p. 18.
17. Mario Vargas Llosa mentions some of these readings in the course of the novel, the works of Padre Vicente Cenitagoya (1943) “y algunos artículos de otros misioneros sobre su folklore y su lengua, aparecidos en las revistas de la Orden (the Dominican Order)” p. 80. He also mentions the travels of Charles Wiener and some Summer Institute missionaries named Schniel, who were possibly based on the Snells who studied the Machiguenga language and whose studies have been published in *Studies in Peruvian Languages I*, Summer Institute of Linguistics (Mexico, 1963). See also P. Andrés Ferrero, *Los Machiguengas. Tribu selvática del sur-oriente peruano*. (Perú: Instituto de Estudios tropicales, 1966).

18. Walter Benjamin, "The Storyteller. Reflection on the Works of Nicolai Leskov," in *Illuminations*, tr. Harry Zohn, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970), pp. 83–109.
19. Graciliano Ramos, *Memórias do Cárcere*, 4 vols. (Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1956).
20. "O Entre-lugar do discurso latino-americano," *Uma literatura nos trópicos. Ensaaios sobre dependencia cultural*. (São Paulo: Editora perspectiva, 1976).
21. Santiago, *Uma literatura nos trópicos*, 23.
22. Santiago, *Uma literatura nos trópicos*, 26.
23. Silviano Santiago, "A permanência do discurso da tradição no modernismo," *Nas Malhas da letra. Ensaaios*, (São Paulo: Editora Schwarcz, 1989), pp. 94–123, especially p. 115. The translation is mine.
24. Santiago, *Nas Malhas da Letra*, 116.
25. George Yudice discusses Santiago's use of the Derridian term "supplement" in an unpublished article on Latin American postmodernism, to be published in a collection, *Contemporary Latin American Culture* by the University of Minnesota Press. Derrida discusses supplement in several places of his writing, but in particular in his discussion of Rousseau in *Of Grammatology*, tr. Gayatri Chakravorty-Spivak (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Press, 1974), pp. 242–55.
26. Fernando Gabeira, *O crepusculo do macho: depoimento*, (Rio de Janeiro: Codecor, 1980).