

1989

Writer-Speaker? Narrative and Cultural Intervention In Mario Vargas Llosa's *El hablador*

Maria Isabel Acosta Cruz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti>



Part of the [Fiction Commons](#), [Latin American Literature Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Poetry Commons](#)

Citas recomendadas

Cruz, Maria Isabel Acosta (Primavera 1989) "Writer-Speaker? Narrative and Cultural Intervention In Mario Vargas Llosa's *El hablador*," *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica*: No. 29, Article 12. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti/vol1/iss29/12>

This Estudio is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Providence. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica* by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Providence. For more information, please contact dps@providence.edu.

**WRITER-SPEAKER? SPEAKER-WRITER? NARRATIVE AND
CULTURAL INTERVENTION IN MARIO VARGAS LLOSA'S
*EL HABLADOR***

María Isabel Acosta Cruz
Clark University

Mario Vargas Llosa's novel *El hablador*, "The Storyteller," unfolds his obsessions with the relationship between fiction and reality, and about Peru, present in his earlier novels. It expands the narrative strategies that appeared in *Aunt Julia and the Scriptwriter* and uses them to explore the situation of Amazonian Indians featured in *The Green House*. *El hablador* and *Aunt Julia* are alike in their use of postmodern problematics of writing; in both novels Vargas Llosa examines the "death of the author" motif, but here, instead of an autobiographical game, he critiques the problematic link between fiction and reality in order to examine important questions of marginality and social problems that remain hopelessly unresolved. Like *The Green House*, *El hablador* is a study of marginality that examines the terrible situation of the Peruvian Amazonian tribes. It presents Western encroachment and cultural intervention on the Machiguenga tribe and the precarious existence its people live, enclosed as they are in an ever-

tightening triangle of conflicting factions representing government, religion and the alliance between terrorists and drug lords. The novel represents marginality through the creative "voice" of the *hablador*, — literally "speaker" or "one who talks" — a tribal bard or storyteller who is marginal because he is both a Machiguenga and a Jew.

El hablador is divided into two distinct narratives:¹ one told by an anonymous narrator who is a Vargas Llosa persona and tells of an obsession with a writerly figure (the *hablador*). This narrative tells the story of how the narrator, while at college during the 1950s, met Saúl Zuratas, an anthropology student and admirer of Franz Kafka, whose nickname was Mascarita due to a disfiguring birthmark on his face. The Western narrator, writing in Florence, recalls the times spent with Saúl and the latter's obsession with the fate of the Machiguenga tribe.

The other narrative — chapters III (36-68), V (107-40), and VII (183-224) — presents the tales "written" by a nameless Machiguenga *hablador* who turns out to be Saúl. This narrative features, on its surface, tales of tribal history, mythology, didactic lessons, and stories about the everyday life of the tribe told by the *hablador* to a native audience. Its inner discourse, however, shows the narrator, Saúl, caught between the Western and Machiguenga cultures and telling stories in order to change certain tribal customs.

Because of its narrative structure this novel is a "sequel" of sorts to *Aunt Julia*. But *El hablador's* two narratives are asymmetrical, not placed in alternating chapters as they are in *Aunt Julia*. This is because the newer novel deals with a much more complex social situation in which there can be no easy positioning of two terms in hopes of coming up with a solution or synthesis. Yet both novels contain a postmodern view of writing as a problematic mixture of fact and fiction. The definition and positioning of the novels' two voices are a means of enacting a questioning of the function of narration itself.

Aunt Julia problematizes the relationship between reality (autobiography) and fiction (the radio scripts) which leads some critics to consider the novel perfectly bimodal.² The bipolar narratives are linked by one narrator, Marito, who is aware (to a certain extent) of the other writer's production — even if he does not actually read the radioscripts, he knows what is happening in the soaps. In *El hablador* the two narratives are fairly independent, assuming the reader does not totalize the two by assigning a transcendental authorial power to the Vargas Llosa persona writing in Italy.

In both novels Vargas Llosa (re)invents himself in the narrators. Many confluences of people and places in *El hablador* link the narrator to the historical Vargas Llosa. One pointer is the television program "La torre de Babel" which Vargas Llosa produced in Peru. The novel also presents

descriptions of Vargas Llosa's contemporaries and of his trips into the Amazon.³

The main narrator in *El hablador* (like Marito in *Aunt Julia*) is a frustrated producer of narratives for social consumption. When he sees the elusive figure of the hablador captured in a photograph, he tells how for many years he has tried to capture this figure on paper. In *Aunt Julia* Marito is frustrated because he is not prolific like Pedro Camacho; the Western narrator in *El hablador* is frustrated because he does not have as vital a social role as he believes the hablador has in the tribe. He dwells on what he perceives as the difference in literary "production" in an urban and capitalistic society as opposed to the communal and "natural" transactions of the hablador with his primitive society. For the Western narrator the habladores have a vital and concrete social role (teacher, historian, storyteller) that has been forgotten in the West. Hence, he identifies with them as a writer and because he admires their social vitality.

The narrator's need to emulate a socially relevant producer of narratives comes from an impulse similar to Marito's admiration for Pedro Camacho's productivity and accessibility to the public. The theme of the frustrated author links the narrator in *El hablador* with Marito in *Aunt Julia*, but in the more recent novel this theme entails metaliterary elements not present in that earlier portrait of the artist as a young man. One difference is that *El hablador's* narrator never understands Saúl's conversion into an hablador or even sees his texts while the grown-up Don Mario at the end of *Aunt Julia* knows what happened to Pedro Camacho, has control over his sad story and is explicitly in a privileged position above the "escribidor."

The Western narrator's reluctance to write foregrounds a metaliterary problem: the insufficiency of realist narrative. The narrator feels he cannot write about the hablador because to do so he would have to be a Machiguenga, *¿Cómo se podría escribir una historia sobre los habladores sin tener un conocimiento siquiera somero de sus creencias, mitos, usos, historia?* (102). He believes in a one to one relationship between representational sign and referent. This problem of verisimilitude leads to his continued frustration in writing about the habladores. His assertions constantly link writing to inventing, something he does not believe possible in the realistic portrayal of the hablador that he wants to write, so he does not write because, according to his ideal of realism, he can only write by getting rid of his Western mentality and becoming an hablador.

The frustration of representing the hablador through a traditional mode of realism is an echo of the clash between Western and Indian cultures in the Amazon. The narrator makes this representational frustration explicit when he talks about wanting to capture the "voice" of the hablador (cf. 152). The narrator wants this voice to coincide with his view of the

hablador as a primitive, shamanistic mentality free not only of Western literary models but also of Western logocentric *esquemas intelectuales lógicos* (152). He feels he must write of this shadowy figure without falling into a condescending, encyclopedist, "noble savage" mode. Yet, by trying to accommodate his portrayal of the hablador to the requirements of a traditional realistic mode, he guarantees his defeat in doing so for over twenty-three years since he himself never becomes a Machiguenga.

The obstacle of recreating the "realistic" "voice" of a Machiguenga hablador is overcome by the historical Vargas Llosa through the creation of an hablador who is purely a writer, who is not a Machiguenga and thus brings about a problematic, moving and unresolved meeting of Indian and Western culture by incorporating certain personal and cultural subtexts into his discourse. He is able to do this because the hablador's stories by definition blur the difference between reality — in this instance tribal history — and fiction. His stories have no pretensions to traditional historical objectivity, since Machiguenga history evolves from a mixture of the personal (hablador) and the communal (myth). The final product is an hablador as narrative and narrating entity. The novel substitutes the "real" yet inaccessible Machiguenga narrative that the Vargas Llosa persona has never and will never hear with an invention; the end result is fiction.

The character of Saúl-Mascarita (this is true also of Pedro Camacho), is centrally positioned for the critique of reality and fiction, and is extremely important because of his marginality. A careful comparison of the similarities and differences between this writer and Pedro Camacho is valuable because Saúl differs in an important way. Both are physically very odd (Cf. *Aunt Julia* 157 and *El hablador* 37) as well as hyperbolic and marginal, but Saúl is less caricature, he is a more "human" figure in that he is not two-dimensional and his marginality is more complex. Saúl is marginal because he and his discourse remain caught between differing and deferred identities: Peruvian-Jew-Machiguenga, anthropologist-speaker-writer; he is all and none of these.

Saúl's discourse is marked throughout by repetitive signs of hesitation through the constant use of words like "parece," "tal vez," and "quizá." The ending to his first two narratives which is *Eso es, al menos, lo que yo he sabido* reinforces the hesitations and expresses his ambiguous feelings about the two cultures with which he is struggling. His linguistic hesitancy magnifies the imprecisions of the Machiguenga language in which numbers are indeterminate and nonsequential (81) and the distinctions between the past and the present blurred (91). This ambiguity is magnified in his last narrative when he loses control in his proliferative use of intertextuality.⁴ By using Kafka and the Bible as subtexts in his last story, he mixes Western culture with their myths. This kind of cultural intervention is precisely the aggression he had tried to avoid by joining the tribe.

The final intertextual intervention constitutes a rewriting of Machiguenga mythology in violation of the given specificities of this type of speech which should communicate wisdom as a reaffirmation of tribal prohibitions. Saúl wants to preserve the tribe's culture, yet his discourse in many ways destroys their comfortable notion of the *hablador* as a source of cultural truths. Saúl's tales are supposed to be pure speech, yet they can be regarded as a written narrative. The novel deconstructs what has been called the "speech-writing dyad"⁵ by identifying the *hablador* as a speaker-writer; the *hablador*'s stories are textual discourses. It is very significant that the "speech" is a written text because its intent is transformative. The *hablador*'s last narrative questions their ways, it does not affirm tradition. The *hablador*'s style blurs the "lesson" and the truth of the myths by means of hesitancy, indeterminacy, and intertextuality.

To determine how the *hablador*'s stories constitute a discursive narrative, which transforms as it records its subject, one must consider the radical indeterminacy of certain key words such as "andar"-hablar"-sabiduría", which are some of the most complex signifiers in his discourse and not subject to closure. The metaphor of "andar" is used to identify the Machiguengas themselves who are *los hombres que andan* because of their nomadic life. Walking is identified as *nuestra obligación* (65) as well as *instinto* (102). "Andar" has a lateral meaning of talking, narrating or writing *Si no, no estaría aquí andando* (49), or *aquí estoy. Hablando. Andando* (127). Man and Nature unite when the *hablador* says the land and all in it can also talk: *Todos tienen algo que contar* (128). One of the versions of Machiguenga cosmogony says that language created the world:

Nacieron hablando, o, mejor dicho, del hablar. La palabra existió antes que ellos. Después, lo que la palabra decía. El hombre hablaba y lo que iba diciendo, aparecía. Eso era antes. Ahora, el *hablador* habla, nomás. Los animales y las cosas ya existen. Eso fue después (128).

This creation myth is linked to Pachakamue, the first *hablador*,

El que, hablando, naciera a tantos animales. Sin darse cuenta, parece. Les daba su nombre, pronunciaba la palabra y los hombres y las mujeres se volvían lo que Paschakamue decía. No quiso hacerlo. Pero tenía ese poder (128).

Just as the power of the word creates all things so too it causes disorder, because Pachakamue creates unwittingly; the power belongs not to him but to the language he utters, to the words which are not bound to authorial intentionality. For that reason, the cosmogony goes from creation

to chaos. This process is analogous to the progressive loss of control in the *hablador's* last narrative.

"Sabiduría" is another important signifying cluster in his stories — in them it is sometimes identified with "andar." Wisdom is sometimes seen as a totality, though this is just as often contradicted by the assertion that wisdom is particular or case-specific (for example the questioning of wisdom on p. 49). Wisdom can be memory, *El que sabe todas las historias tendrá la sabiduría, sin duda* (128); or it can be the cunning of the whites (134); it is also linked to causality *El que sabe las causas y las consecuencias tiene la sabiduría* (195), but this is said while admitting that the speaker does not have ultimate knowledge of causality, so that this form of wisdom is beyond human control. One source of tribal wisdom are the "seripigaris" or witch doctors, but they gain their knowledge through "mareadas" or drug-induced hallucinations. By presenting all these versions of wisdom, *hablador's* discourse implicitly challenges the tribe's comfortable notions of authority and truth.

The *hablador's* focus on "caminar" as the goal of the nomadic tribe is fueled by his conviction that the only way to save them is through a rejection of Western influences; this makes his discourse subject to a critique mediating his prejudices against the West. "Andar-hablar-sabiduría" and their lateral connotations are part of Saúl's propaganda-like efforts to keep the culture pure by retreating from the whites; paradoxically, he reacts as a Westerner by questioning their culture and writing against their attitude toward women and the drowning of deformed infants.

The full import of Saúl's texts emerges when the reader understands him within his marginality. Because he is a Jew and has a disfiguring birthmark, he has always been marginal, in Lima as in the Machiguenga communities (themselves marginal societies). The narrator thinks Saúl identified with the tribe because of his birthmark, *que lo convertía también en un marginal* (30). His birthmark is a metonymy for his marginalities. The narrator speculates (233) that all these reasons lead Saúl to join the Machiguengas, while recognizing that they do not explain his becoming an *hablador*. The narrator understands Saúl to a certain extent, but he is unable to reconcile the gap between a Westerner and an *hablador*.

The narrator's Western mind can understand the retreat in time that becoming a Machiguenga involves and the consequent rejection of Saúl's first culture, but he cannot comprehend the total immersion in Machiguenga culture that he assumes comes with the *hablador's* trade (cf. 233-34). The narrator's lack of comprehension of Saúl's transformation comes once again from his search for verisimilitude. As the last tale he intertextually mixes Western elements with the tribal content. In fact, the non-recuperable paradoxes in his discourse come from his marginality.

The nexus of the semantic complications comes with Saúl's transgression of his own theory of non-acculturation which he violates with his use of intertextuality in his last narrative. This transgression contradicts what Saúl says in Chapter IV when he tells the narrator his opinions on the situation of the Peruvian tribes and their exploitation by Westerners.⁶ He believes that the Indians should be left alone (96-97 or 28) since Western culture is too strong; to civilize is to exploit.

Saúl objects principally to the interventions of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (69), an American Protestant missionary institution based in Huntington, California. A secular twin of Wycliffe Bible Translators, it is committed to translating the Bible into the Indian dialects in many parts of the world and has been operating in Peru since the 1940s. Its role in Latin America is highly controversial: for leftists, it is an arm of imperialist neocolonialism disguised as religion.⁷ For the Catholic Church, the Institute represents Protestant encroachment. Anthropologists accuse it of occidentalizing the tribes; nationalists condemn it as a foreign presence in Peru.⁸ David Stoll best summarizes the climate of controversy by saying that *Much of the debate over SIL has been waged at the level of mutual McCarthyism* ("The Controversies" 346).

The novel presents different kinds of Western intervention. The main example are the Institute's missionary couple, the Schneils, who present the argument in favor of intervention. The missionaries' way imposes a cultural (linguistic and religious) intervention and thus presupposes a transformative action.⁹ In another sense, the Western narrator is intervening by privileging (and romanticizing in a Western, nostalgic and condescending way) the role of the hablador from a Peruvian-Western perspective — precisely the devalued coin that the tribe rejects.

Saúl wants no one to influence them. Yet, his belief in leaving the Indians alone is contradicted by the praxis of the hablador's last text. By becoming an hablador he already transgresses his theory of nonintervention, and by his use of intertextuality he betrays his intent of preserving the Machiguenga culture with his insistence that they see the error of their ways regarding women and infanticide.

By making the hablador, the supposed representative of pure native culture, an example of cultural intervention the novel makes clear that there are no easy solutions, perhaps no solutions at all to the problems of cultural intervention in the case of the Machiguengas.¹⁰

The hablador not only transgresses in order to keep the tribe away from white culture, as his last narrative makes clear, he is also trying to alter specific facets of their way of life. His opinions on the negative aspects of their culture are voiced in the beginning of the novel in conversations with the narrator. He is appalled by certain brutalities in their way of life: infant mortality, women's subjugated position,

polygamy, lack of industry and crafts (cf. 26-8). That is why he narratively intervenes by problematizing women's roles in their society and the practice of "perfeccionismo" or infanticide. His text questions the role of women in the tribe by portraying them as silent second-class citizens who are either ignored or openly abused and brutalized by the men and thus are more marginal. If a child dies it is the mother's fault (47); tribal mythology features devils who take women's forms; the text displays the isolation created by the menstrual prohibition; it is no wonder then that women are also more susceptible to suicidal impulses. In Saúl's stories the most striking feature of the women is that they don't have any name, and while it is true that the men do not have proper names either, they at least share the common name "Tasurinchi." The women only have a description, they are the wife of Tasurinchi (possession in a communal sense). Their position in a value context would be that of exploited possessions.¹¹

Saúl's stories continually display odd, off-centered women who do not fit any tribal behavioral pattern. Such is the case of a strange girl on page 59 who seems to fit the traits of an hablador, and perhaps she commits suicide because she cannot possibly be an hablador. Another exceptional case is a foreign woman stolen by one of the men who does not adapt to the tribal ways because she defends herself, hunts and carries heavy loads (109). These examples of difference are meant to open up the tribe to new ways of perceiving women.

But Saúl's stories not only question women's position by the use of different role examples, they openly challenge the received wisdom as regards women:

¿Por qué los hombres pueden plantar y recoger la yuca en el yucal y no las mujeres? ¿Por qué las mujeres pueden plantar y arrancar el algodón en la chacra y no los hombres? Hasta que, una vez, allá por el río Poguintinari, escuchando a los machiguengas, lo entendí. *Porque la yuca es macho y el algodón hembra, Tasurinchi. A la planta le gusta tratar con su igual, pues. Hembra con hembra, macho con macho. Esa es la sabiduría, parece. ¿Cierto, lorito?*

¿Por qué la mujer que perdió a su marido puede ir de pesca y, en cambio, no puede cazar sin que peligre el mundo? Cuando flecha a algún animal, la madre de las cosas sufre, dicen. Sufrirá, tal vez. En las prohibiciones y en los peligros pensaba mientras venía. (126)

Everything he says is a meditation on those prohibitions and he clearly wants to change some of them.

Saúl's last narrative is a clear violation of the role of the hablador because he mixes Western subtexts with the tribal myths and because the last tale progressively questions their customs. Part of the last story

follows the plot lines of Kafka's *The Metamorphosis*, especially in relation to the Samsa family. But Kafka is re-written into a pattern of Machiguenga adventures; for example, Tasurinchi-gregorio dies when a lizard, symbol of death, attacks and eats him. The interweaving of this subtext into the tale shows that Saúl's obsession with Kafka is more powerful than the tribal wisdom and his "conversion" into a Machiguenga is still problematic and unfinished.

The identification of the hablador with Gregor Samsa in the last tale brings a conjunction of exclusion, monstrosity and marginality in the hablador. It is the most obvious link between the unnamed hablador and Saúl, who knew *The Metamorphosis* by heart. Here is where he interweaves his private and public concerns; Saúl's autobiography becomes the cultural text. Saúl's text problematizes the tribe's "perfeccionismo" or infanticide because his birthmark would have condemned him at birth. That is why he betrays his beliefs by intervening and trying to change the tribe's attitudes.

In this passage the reader has more direct access to the audience. The hablador's two preceding narratives are "pure" stories, with no report of audience participation. When the hablador intervenes through intertextuality to change the tribal custom of infanticide, his narrative reports that the audience laugh and then get angry, *Calma, calma, no se enojen. ¿De qué gritan?* (200). The reaction of the audience is important here because they resist his intervention. This exchange puts the book's discussion of Western intervention on a more complicated level. Most of the discussions about the Summer Institute of Linguistics mentioned above assume that the Indians are merely passive receptors; here their reactions show the Indians as active (and somewhat hostile) participants.

The full intent to change the custom of infanticide comes when the hablador questions their rejection of imperfection because popular wisdom decrees that the god Tasurinchi only creates perfect men and women. In order to justify his views he uses himself as an example: *Aunque ustedes no lo crean, a mí no me volvieron así los diablillos de Kientibakori. Monstruo nacl. Mi madre no me echó al río, me dejó vivir.* (204). Here the listeners again laugh at him.

He augments his argument by referring to the souls of the children killed and positioning them at the bottom of the river Gran Pongo *ahí donde viven los monstruos* (205). This narrative strategy designed to tug the heartstrings of his listeners is later associated with the sound of the river: *Gemidos y llantos de niños ahogados... Estarán gimiendo, tristes. Los monstruos de Kientibakori los maltratarán, tal vez. Les harán pagar con tormentos el estar ahí. No los creerán impuros sino machiguengas, quizás* (206). While talking about his birthmark he questions another part of received wisdom:

¿No dice el seripigari que todo tiene su causa? No he encontrado la de mi cara todavía. Algunas cosas no tendrán, entonces. Ocurrirán, nomás. Ustedes no están de acuerdo, ya lo sé. Lo puedo adivinar sólo mirándoles los ojos. Sí, cierto, no conocer la causa no significa que ella no exista. (201)

This suggestion is the hablador's particular use of the cosmogony to justify his deformity and break the tribal prohibitions by making the audience re-examine their cultural notions. This angers the listeners since they do not accept deformity as a "natural" fact.

For the Machiguengas there is no culture — that is to say, their notion of culture is transparent. There is only Nature. They believe that their customs and prohibitions are ordained by a confluence of human nature and divine will; natural or divine forces mediate all "instincts" and "obligations." The hablador interprets culture as a social construction so he attempts to change the tribe's views of infanticide and women's roles by attacking their concept of Nature and positing in its place a series of textual devices (hesitancy, different representations of ideas and people, intertextuality) that change the tribe's comfortable notions of how things should be, that is why he weaves himself into the last story to show that deformity at birth should not be condemned.

Intertextuality becomes more frenzied when the hablador takes up his life story, *Antes, yo andaba con otro pueblo y creía que era el mío. No había nacido aún. Nací de verdad desde que ando como machiguenga* (207), and weaves into his tale the Biblical story of the Jewish people. The story compares the Machiguenga's and the Jews' historical persecution (Cf. 209-10). Their similarity is reflected in their nomadic existence, *Igual que el pueblo que anda, tuvieron que separarse unas de otras las familias para ser aceptadas* (210). The moral of the story of the Jews is the acceptance of differences (cf. 211). What is complicated about the intertextual web is that at the same time the hablador is subtly trying to change some tribal customs, he is trying to preserve their nomadic existence to keep them away from white culture. He states that he once thought it was good to imitate the powerful, but he came to see his error and realized that one must keep one's obligations, *El que deja de cumplir su obligación para cumplir la de otro, perderá su alma. Y su envoltura también, quizás, como el Tasurinchi-gregorio que se volvió chicharra-machacuy en esa mala mareada* (212). The bizarre twist he gives to this assertion is that he links the obligation to walk with an implied threat of losing not only one's (cultural) soul but also deformity, of a transformation of the body, like Gregorio Samsa. His narrative problem comes because he cannot separate the nomadic obligation from the prohibition against birth defects.

In the last story the *hablador* also incorporates another Biblical story, Christ's, into the Machiguenga mode (cf. 209). The intertextual weaving of the New Testament into the story violently transgresses Saul's stated opinions on the negative impact of Western religion on the tribes (94). In this last part intertextuality reappears through the weaving of the Machiguenga common name and a Western name, in this case "Tasurinchi-jehová" (207). This new figure is important because like the *hablador*, it is caught between conflicting cultures. Also like the *hablador* this Tasurinchi-jehová *quería imponer nuevas costumbres, porque, según él, las que la gente practicaba eran impuras. Daño eran. Desgracia traían.* (207-8). Tasurinchi-jehová goes against tradition, and the seripiragis, along with the whites, condemn him.

In the final analysis, the *hablador's* contradictory impulses become texts that want to transform as well as protect the tribe; thus his narration undergoes its most powerful distortions in the last narrative where this intent is most evident. The novel itself questions the capabilities of all texts to portray cultural unity, as it questions the necessity of such authorial intents and of authority itself. *El hablador* evolves into a critique of the concept of culture itself.

NOTAS

1 Thus confirming René Prieto's assertion that *the use of two narrative voices... has become a stock component of Vargas Llosa's arsenal* (16).

2 Jonathan Tittler (312-315) says that *Aunt Julia* works within a "vaivén dialéctico" using the Hegelian model, a view that can be challenged through a close reading of the interdependency of the two narratives. Domingo Yndurain calls the novel's narratives *dos planos perfectamente diferenciados* (150). Malva E. Filer, on the other hand, states that Vargas Llosa's binary system is one in which *each object, event or person is both itself and its contrary* (113).

3 *Historia secreta de una novela* details these trips in 1958 and 1964. He mentions them in relation to their importance in the creation of *The Green House*.

4 Like Pedro Camacho in the last chapter of his soaps.

5 Barbara Johnson says of this issue: *In the case of the much-publicized opposition between speech and writing, deconstruction both appears to grant to writing the priority traditionally assigned to speech and redefines "writing" as différance (difference/deferment) so that it can no longer simply mean "marks on a*

page" but can very well also refer to those aspects of spoken speech (nonimmediacy, the nontransparency of meaning, the gap between signifier and signified that are normally occulted by traditional notions of what speech is) (13). Derrida says that the speech-writing dyad is that view of language in which *the concept of writing exceeds and comprehends that of language* (8).

6 For a historical account of the treatment of Indians in Peru see Anthony Stock.

7 In fact, on Dec. 18, 1986 the Institute was attacked by the Peruvian terrorist organization Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Amaru. (Anderson, Annex no. 2). In Colombia a missionary was killed in 1981 by leftist guerrillas who charged that the Institute is a front for the CIA (see "Quito Ratifies").

8 For wide-ranging discussion of SIL's formative years as well as on the controversy surrounding the SIL's presence in Latin America see David Stoll's *Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire?*; also "¿Con qué derecho adoctrinan ustedes a nuestros indígenas?": La polémica en torno al Instituto Lingüístico de Verano"; "The Controversies over the Summer Institute of Linguistics" extends the overview to other evangelical groups in Latin America and summarizes government reactions to SIL in most of the countries. Also see the reviews of Stoll's book in *Evangelical missions Quarterly*.

9 See Stephanie Fins for an analysis of the impact of the missionaries (both Dominican and Protestant) on the Machiguengas in the Alto Urubamba river valley.

10 This problem was dealt with in *The Green House* as oppressive Western encroachment upon the Amazonian tribes. In that earlier novel the connection to religion was quite explicit; in *El hablador* the Catholic church has been superceded by American Protestantism.

11 The situation of the Machiguenga women in the cooperatives formed by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (see Stephanie Fins) could be analysed in the context of women's labor detailed by Spivak (79).

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, James. "Sendero Luminoso. ¿Un nuevo modelo revolucionario?" *Instituto de Estudios sobre Terrorismo*. Londres, 1987.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Trad. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Filer, Malva E. "Vargas Llosa, the Novelist as a Critic." *Marjo Vargas Llosa. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Charles Rossman and Alan Warren Friedman, eds. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1978. 109-19.
- Fins, Stephanie. "Los machiguenga y las empresas misioneras." *América Indígena* (México) 1. XLIV (1984): 101-110.
- Johnson, Barbara. *A World of Difference*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

- Kornfield, William. "Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire?" *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 19. 4 (1983): 308-315.
- Prieto, René. "The Two Narrative Voices in Mario Vargas Llosa's *Aunt Julia and the Scriptwriter*". *Latin American Literary Review*, 11. 20 (Spring-Summer 1983): 15-25.
- "Quito Ratifies Break in ties with Linguistics Institute." *New York Times* (May 31, 1981): 4 (section 1).
- Reapsome, Jim. "Missions Under Attack: Risking Hard Questions About our Empires." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 19. 4 (1983): 316-318.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *In Other Worlds. Essays in Cultural Politics*. Methuen: New York, 1987.
- Stocks, Anthony. "Indian Policy in Eastern Peru." *Frontier Expansion in Amazonia*, Marianne Schmink and Charles H. Wood, eds. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1984. 33-61.
- Stoll, David. *Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire?* London: Zed Press, 1983.
- . "¿Con qué derecho adoctrinan ustedes a nuestros indígenas?: La polémica en torno al Instituto Lingüístico de Verano." *América Indígena*. (México) 1. XLIV (1984): 9-24.
- . "The Controversies Over the Summer Institute of Linguistics." *Church and Society in Latin America*. Jeffrey A. Cole, ed. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1984: 343-359.
- Tittler, Jonathan. "La tía Julia (historia) y el escritor (ficción)." *Historia y ficción en la narrativa hispanoamericana*. Alejo Carpentier et al. Venezuela: Monte Avila, 1984: 309-329.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario. *El hablador*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1987.
- . *Historia secreta de una novela*. Barcelona: Tusquets Editor, 1971.
- . "Interview." With Manolo Salazar. Lima, Peru: July, 12, 1988.
- . *La casa verde*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1971.
- . *La tía Julia y el escritor*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1983.
- Yndurain, Domingo. "Vargas Llosa y el escritor." *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 370 (abril 1984): 150-173.