Filología y Lingüística XVII(1-2): 29-38, 1991

THE KILIMANJARO KALEIDOSCOPE: A SOCIOCRITICAL APPROACH TO *RETORNO AL KILIMANJARO*

Karl Meyers Skredsvig

ABSTRACT

Sociocriticism is a particularly apt instrument for analyzing Duran's short novel. This approach examines the full complexity of the intertextuality through which the novel develops. Analysis of the literary and religious discourses reveals that the novel's delightful whimsy is only surface deep, an amusing facade for the black humor of its core.

> Un texto, cualquiera que este sea, es tributario de dimensiones mayores cual es el texto general de la cultura, en el cual se inscriben polifónicamente todos los saberes de los que irremisiblemente es deudor.
>
> Maria Amoretti (*Debajo del canto*)

Amid the continuous, dynamic interaction of contemporary critical approaches and theories of literature, there is one fundamental constant: literature cannot be divorced from language. Although attempts to define literature can be traced back thousands of years, until the twentieth century there appears to have been a consensus that the concept of literature rests on its "elevated" use of language, where language is taken as a static given. From Plato and Aristotle, through the Renaissance distinction between reason and imagination to hermeneutics, literature has been insistently dealt with as art, imagination, creation, the Word. As such, it is deified and attributed a universality and authority no longer considered tenable. From this perspective, the author is seen as a privileged individual whose gift with words, combined with divine and/or aesthetic inspiration, somehow provides him with unique access to "Truth", while his works enable average mortals to participate in the authorial boon. The tenacity with which this idea has persisted in the Western world is undoubtedly related to its articulation in the Christian Bible: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."[1] In this light, God is not only the Creator, but because of His absolute right to bestow names and to choose the means of articulation by which order is established, He also holds the power of language. Thus, language becomes synonymous with both right and might; those who manipulate it are seen as mystic vessels of truth, and their writings acquire a nearly sacred dimension in the eyes of the beholders.

In the twentieth century, innovations in four radically different areas contribute to undermine these traditional concepts. Physics is revolutionized by Einstein's concept to relativity, the impact of which goes far beyond its immediate field of study. Psychology undergoes radical changes with the emergence of Freud's theories of human sexuality and the unconscious. Marx opens new perspectives in political, social, and economic theories, while linguistics achieves recognition as a science whose object of study ineluctably relates to all human activity. For the purposes of the present

analysis, it is expedient to review key linguistic milestones briefly. Although by no means unique in the importance of his ideas, Saussure merits special mention as the founder of modern structural linguistics. Central to his contribution are the following premises: 1) language is a system of signs which should be studied synchronically, 2) each sign consists of a signifier (image) and signified (meaning), and the relationship between the two is arbitrary, 3) each sign has meaning by virtue of its difference from the others. While Saussure's ideas clarified the relativity of language, they ignored the social aspects of communication. Jakobson's analyses of the basic elements of communication and the distinction between metaphor and metonymy are also significant. By positing the importance of a shared code and a communication context, among others, he helped change the traditional view of language as mere reflection of an external reality. From these early linguists, the field of semiotics, the study of signs, developed. Application of semiotic principals to literature lead to the view of language as a code, a system, and language use -including literature- as a practice, which by definition cannot exclude its social nature. Language loses its individuality, in the sense of "belonging" to a single person, and publicly takes on its intrinsic social dimension.

Building on this structuralist foundation, the Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin goes further in establishing the relativity of signs in terms of their social conditions by emphasizing the ideological charge inherent in all language use. For Bakhtin, all language is enmeshed in definite social relationships, which in turn are part of broader political, ideological, and economic systems; all signs are material, and human consciousness depends on the subject's semiotic intercourse with others.[2] Besides viewing language as a material means of production, Bakhtin analyzes how the sign is transformed through a process of social conflict and dialogue. The concept of dialogue is central to Bakhtin's theories and to their impact on modern literary criticism, where he is considered by many to be the founder of pragmatics, as the term is used today in critical circles[3]. Language is not the only dialogic element, however. Kristeva's reading of Bakhtin credits the latter with situating the text within history and society by revealing the dynamic dimension of the literary word, which derives from his premise that "each word (text) is an intersection of words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read."[4] Kristeva coins the word "intertextuality" to elucidate the insight that "any text is the absorption and transformation of another."[5] Expounding upon this, Edmond Cros and Antonio Gómez-Moriana include interdiscourse as a fundamental complement to intertextuality, emphasizing the sociality of the process.[6] Thus, for modern critics, "meaning" can never be innate, just as it cannot be unique or universal. Rather, significance is the product of the dynamic tension between what "has been," what "is," and what "can be."

Using the above as a base, the following discussion attempts to approach Fernando Durán's *Retorno al Kilimanjaro* from a sociocritical perspective. Sociocriticism differs from other, though related, critical sociological movements in that it concentrates on the mediation between the literary text and reality on the basis of the semiological import of its forms, their relation to the social context from which the text evolves. By viewing style in terms of ideology, sociocriticism constructs the "poetics of sociality."[7] Within the myriad of options this approach provides, our emphasis will be on basic elements of intertextuality in this novel and how they contribute to significance. Because a literary work, in attempting to re-present the raw material of lived experience, is necessarily the product of elaboration, there is a gap, a dialogic space, between the two which both mediates and manifests the autonomy of the text and its ideological matrix.[8] Sociocriticism examines this space in its pursuit of the signifying process within a given text. *Retorno al Kilimanjaro,* under this type of scrutiny, belies the cross-cultural whimsy of its plot.

In writing this story, Durán draws upon the writing of Ernest Hemingway and Ray Bradbury both explicitly and implicitly. The essential point of convergence lies in their use of Mount Kilimanjaro, which figures prominently in the titles of all three stories. Hemingway's tale, which takes place in Africa, presents the final hours of a has-been writer

who mentally reviews his life as he awaits a plane that will get him to a hospital before he dies of gangrene from an uncared for scratch on his leg, a minor safari mishap which has grown far out of proportion. Hemingway introduces his story with the following brief explanation:

> Kilimanjaro is a snow covered mountain 19,719 feet high, and it is said to be the highest mountain in Africa. Its western summit is called the Masai "Ngâje Ngâi," the house of God. Close to the western summit there is the dried and frozen carcass of a leopard. No one has explained what the leopard was seeking at that altitude .[9]

The writer, having resigned himself to his fate, admits to himself (although not to his rich companion-lover) that he has wasted his talent: "instead of using it, he had traded on it" (SK, p.11) by prefering the nondemanding, complacent life of the rich to the personal commitment required by his writing. He is even relieved: "Now he would never write the things that he had saved to write... but he would not have to fail at trying to write them either" (SK, p.5). The story ends with Hemingway deliberately cajoling the reader into believing the plane has arrived to take the man away to his destination: "...ahead, all he could see, as wide as all the world, great, high, and unbelievably white in the sun, was the square top of Kilimanjaro. And then he knew that there was where he was going" (SK, p.27). Meanwhile, back at the camp, his lover awakes to find him dead.

Critical readings of Hemingway's story vary dramatically. Some choose to fit this story within the framework of Hemingway's entire literary production to support the veracity of their interpretations, whether positive or negative. The idealists see this story as the epitome of Hemingway's "tragic vision," in which lost causes are a given but individuals redeem themselves through their willingness and faithfulness in confronting ordeal .[10] Others give a contrary reading: if Hemingway's main concern is with integrity, then this story juxtaposes the immortalized aspirations of the leopard with the protagonist's betrayal of himself and of his art.[11] The concern with integrity is clearly marked in the content of Hemingway's story, for example when the protagonist chides himself that "If he had lived by a lie he should try to die by it" (SK, p.11). Well-known Hemingway biographer and critic Carlos Baker suggests that the leopard and the mountain in this story represent "those things that do not decay," and that Psalm 121 could serve as Hemingway's motto: "I will lift up mine eyes to the hills from whence cometh my help."[12] Whether or not one considers Kilimanjaro as apotheosis or simply aspiration, its significance centers around the mountain as inspiration, goal, achievement, transcendence. Durán's dedication to Hemingway expresses it as a triumphant legacy: "To Ernest Hemingway, for having written that man may be beaten but not destroyed."[13] Clearly, the thrust of this judgment is one of admiration and optimism.

As Hemingway acknowledges in his epigraph, his mythification of Mount Kilimanjaro is not unique. Surely the mystique surrounding this mountain is at least partly due to early explorations and speculations concerning it, most of which relate to centuries of persistent attempts to encounter the source of the Nile River. According to Alan Moorehead's account of the search for the source of the White Nile,[14] among the earliest attempts to penetrate the interior of Africa was one made by Herodotus around 460 B.C., which was unsuccessful. According to one persistent legend, a Greek merchant by the name of Diogenes claimed that in the middle of the first century A.D. he had come upon "the snowy range of montains whence the Nile draws its twin sources," which was duly represented by Ptolemy in his famous map of mid-second century A.D. This map identifies the high range of mountains as the Lunae Montes, the Mountains of the Moon. Although the incredible idea of snow-capped mountains so close to the equator drew ridicule and rejection for nearly 2000 years, by the mid-1850's early missionaries provided new evidence which eventually led to the exploration and discovery of the African interior. The association of Mount Kilimanjaro with the moon and the Nile confers special status upon it as a participant in primal life source and substance. Perhaps it is this quality, along with the glaciers which appear to defy nature, which prompted Hemingway to employ it as he did.

Bradbury honors that choice and Hemingway himself in "The Kilimanjaro Device." In this story, the narrator, a Hemingway fan, goes in search of the writer, at the town where he had committed suicide, in order to rectify what he considers a serious error: the undignified and inappropriate death of Hemingway. Upon being questioned by another hunter what can be done about "wrong graves," he responds, "Treat them as if they didn't exist... And maybe they'll go away, like a bad dream."[15] The narrator feels the "right" time and place would be to end Hemingway's life in an airplane accident the writer had been part of in Africa in early 1954, and he offers to take the author there in his time-travel vehicle, the Kilimanjaro Device. Hemingway apparently agrees his death could be improved upon, and explicitly suggests Kilimanjaro as appropriate (next to the leopard, of course). The story ends, like Hemingway's own, in flight toward the mystic crest, en route to immortality and glory. Durán follows suit by acknowledging and glorifying both authors, Hemingway for being worthy of their recognition and Bradbury for his homage to Hemingway and his personal merit. Durán pays tribute to Bradbury in the dedication "for having written that death is not a defeat" (KD, p.5). He also defends Bradbury's worth as a writer, which we will discuss shortly. Before continuing, however, it is important to note that Bradbury uses Kilimanjaro both in the sense of Hemingway's original story and as a concept appropriated by humans and redevised as a tangible means of controlling time and of reducing death to simply another dimension. The mystique is thus translated into terms more easily dealt with; by employing the elements of science fiction, both Bradbury and Durán interpellate their readers through imagination rather than mysticism.

The craft of the author leads to one of the major discourses in all three stories: literary discourse. It is significant not only because these stories are written both by and about authors, but because one result of this is that they lead to examination of literature as an institution, fiction as a mediator, and the borders between fiction and reality. If we define institution as an organization which systematizes a given area of society (and which, in so doing, necessarily protects and foments the interests of the dominant ideology, according to Althusser), then the institution of literature is that which determines the forms, content, production, and consumption of "literature," which itself is defined by institutional practices.[16] This helps explain why Hemingway's skeletal, journalistic style is not only accepted as, but extolled as literature; both the objectivity which that style presupposes and the traditional values he promotes (patriotism, self-reliance, independence, machismo, to name a few) reinforce predominant interests and ideology of the culture. It is an example par excellence of the "myth of cultural identity as cultural reality."[17] It also suggests an explanation for the reluctance of literary critics to grant Bradbury full status as a serious writer: he is suspect simply because he continuously questions and challenges "givens." Thus, Hemingway's works are labelled "fiction," while Bradbury's are "sci-fi" or "fantasy." Durán is both aware of and victim of the repercussions of such official name-calling. (Is he to be a chemist who writes, or a writer who is a chemist?) Perhaps because of this, he is quick to defend Bradbury's literary honor while not missing the opportunity to poke fun at the seriousness with which the literary institution takes itself.

The role the institution of literature plays in modern society leads us to question the nature and effect of literature, in particular fiction, as mediator. As Cottom points out, not only is everything culturally relative, but culture itself is relative: "meaning is historical... [History] signifies the political constitution of a meaning: the materiality of all rhetoric and the rhetoricity of all signifying practices."[18] Thus, he asserts that there are forms of universality constituted through groups of people, rather than a universal form of meaning. It is in this same sense that Foucault asserts that one "cannot speak of anything at any time,"[19] because both meaning and voice are historically determined. Gómez-Moriana expresses a similar idea in different terms: "every utterance is incomplete because it presupposes more information than is given... [it] initiates an entire context... a totality much greater and more complex, that of the representations and memories it is capable of evoking in the subject toward which it is directed."[20] Because of this, literature

-like all communication- depends on a communal code, be this explicit or implicit, what Gómez-Moriana designates "a common patrimony... which inseparably unites the linguistic and cultural codes."[21] To the extent that the text appears "natural" we have assimilated its politics, which sociocriticism prefers to identify as "ideological formation." In view of the preceding premises, intertextuality is essentially the assumption of the cultural discourse of the given texts. This brings us back to the central idea upon which sociocriticism is built: we do not have direct access to reality, rather it always reaches us in mediated form.[22] Literature is simply one type of mediator, the object of sociocriticism's scrutiny in seeking social significance.

If fiction mediates reality, any reading becomes an act of determining the degree of that mediation (on the understanding that each new reading is also a mediation). Part of the specificity of literature derives from the manner in which it manipulates language beyond literal meaning, so the process of language is an elusive interplay of fiction and reality. Just as Gómez-Moriana asserts that science "is not defined by its object, but rather by its point of view in approaching that object,"[23] fiction -as Perus point out- is simply an imaginative rendering of one's perception of the reality of experience. One Bradbury critic asserts that "imagination, for Bradbury, is what allows us to connect one reality with another in a meaningful way."[24] Expressed in terms of the "poetics of reverie," fantasy "enables written words to... assume a multiple referentiality" and serve as "transformative acts of consciousness."[25] The unique importance and power of language in this context is obvious: as Todorov affirms in *The Fantastic,* "language alone enables us to conceive what is always absent: the supernatural."[26] Thus fiction, like culture and reality, is relative; to the degree that we accept a perception as within our personal parameters of "real" or allow its plausibility, it "is." To the degree to which we choose to and/or are able to suspend our notion of "reality," we escape from the historical specificity of our outlook. In *Retorno al Kilimanjaro,* the question of belief is developed through religious discourse as well as through literary discourse.

The religious discourse runs parallel to the literary discourse in the novel, providing neclei of significance for a sociocritical reading. As mentioned earlier, Kilimanjaro has long evoked images of a higher spiritual dimension and a source of life, both of which are exploited in the three stories at hand. The issue of creation is fundamental in Durán's novel. To begin with, there is the authority invested in authorial word. The narrator's initial comments disclose how carefully regimented and jealously guarded this resource is, to the point that "the pedantry of literature professors makes serious study of an author like Bradbury unlikely" (RK, p. 8-9). At the same time, however, the narrator appropriates the criteria for such literary judgments to use as an instrument of power himself. He describes Bradbury as "one of the best writers of our time," inspired in his Kilimanjaro story by the "deliberate style" of Hemingway which was so "moving." He belittles the immigration officials by saying they were not science fiction fans and therefore did not recognize or trouble Bradbury on his way through customs. He has Bradbury claim "The Kilimanjaro Device" as "one of his best" stories. He is moved to quote long sections from the story both in the narration and in the dialogue. Finally, and most significantly, Manuel Rivera identifies himself to Bradbury as "one of the flock." "Flock" has two very divergent but equally applicable connotations. It designates a group of sheep, which are characterized by their docility and manipulability. It is also traditionally used to designate a group of followers of a religious leader. Thus, by using this characterization, Bradbury's importance is increased, while that of the user diminishes to that of an inferior position.

However, the issue goes beyond the power position of any author. Bradbury's power is established not only through the adulation of his public, but also through the language in which he writes. The importance of this is clearly seen in its being given priority in establishing the situation. Having stated the necessary fact that Rivera had read a Bradbury story (identified only by its English title), the narrator proceeds to belittle the Spanish version of the same "whose translation was as

defective as the selection of its title;" in case the point is not clear, he bemoans the fact that "at any rate, outside the English language, the story must lose a good part" of its "polished" style (RK, p.7). Apparently as a precaution against totally ignorant readers, he then quotes the entire first paragraph. Throughout the novel, English is employed time and again in crucial moments to convey crucial points, as though to remind the reader of the primacy of this language and, by association, the importance of the narrator in direct proportion to his ability to manipulate it. This insistence becomes more comprehensible when Bradbury, in a long, detailed speech unparalleled in the rest of the novel, identifies his fellow citizens as long-time vendors of "a million... necessary or useless, valuable or harmful things" and himself as part of that "caravan of peddlers." However he differentiates himself from the masses on two counts: because of the "sweet, mysterious, high-quality product" he sells, he considers himself "one of the most worthy vendors in the United States of America," able to guarantee his product, which is nothing less than "the stuff that dreams are made of" (RK, p.33). The tremendous success of his marketing adventure is tribute to the power of the dream he sells, success so complete it prompts his missionary friends to claim he is "a source of pride for the United States" (RK, p.33) and deserved the Nobel Prize for Literature, success so great his sales include "millions of copies" all over the world.

The power of the English language here derives from its equation with "success," the success being clearly shown as material success. The dream Bradbury sells is none other than the classic American Dream, the belief that in that land of equality and opportunity, hard work and determination will inevitably lead to the achievement of one's goals. This dream is a direct descendent of the Puritan work ethic, in which each believer is directly responsible for himself in God's eyes, and it is the individual's responsibility to make as much of himself as possible. The crucial point here is that God rewards those who work hard to help themselves, and prosperity is seen as a sign of divine collaboration and recognition of one's effort. Prosperity confers upon its beneficiaries the obligation of a humanitarian effort to help others, which Bradbury acknowledges by saying it gives him great joy to hear the "echo of the tintinnabulation" of the sales, which is "after all, my just pay," as he "shared dreams with each man, each woman, and each child" (RK, p.26). Within the pride of his accomplishment, however, Bradbury belies both the paucity and the true nature of that "achievement" when he admits to having constructed the others' dreams around his own, and in particular when he calls himself a peddler, which by definition implies concerning oneself with trifles. This apparently is either unperceived or ignored by his "flock," who eagerly emulate him.

Since literature is creation, the author is godlike. Sabatés reminds Bradbury that he "taught them that a man can transform his memory into Macbeth, Don Quijote, Moby Dick, Gregor Samsa, Aureliano Buendía, Nick Adams, Ulysses, or Moses" (RK, p.28). The list of "heroes" is as cosmopolitan as Bradbury's flock, adding to the universality of the dogma. Bradbury feels a great responsibility not to "defraud" Rivera; it goes against his ethical code, a sin as great as Hemingway's protagonist surrendering his writing. Bradbury sees himself as author-Savior, both able and morally obligated to help those who require his assistance. Rivera's creation of a son as a thread of immortality cannot compare with the spiritual/material wealth propagated by Bradbury. Bradbury's ability to exploit Rivera's creation is evidence of his skill and power. As he realizes the extent of his manipulation of Rivera, however, Bradbury has a moment of insight: "a writer, even the best in the world, has no right to play God with men" (RK, p.83). This potentially redeeming factor, however, is undermined in two ways. The first subversion is found in the word "decided": Bradbury "decided" he did not have the right to play God, but by his confiscating the right to decide, the decision itself loses its impact. The second instance is the fact Bradbury is so adept at manipulating illusion that he falls into his own trap and is caught by a fantasy. Like the American Dream, the means has transformed into an end, cutting short any hope of redemption.

The interpolation of religious and literary discourses in Durán's novel reveals a depth of significance far removed from the playful surface intertextuality of science fiction and cross-cultural fantasy. On the surface, the novel is a game of optical and lexical illusions.

Its playfulness is reinforced through the use of caricature and stereotypes. Manuel Rivera is presented as a pathetic, pretentious has-been, ill-equipped to deal effectively with the suave Sabatés or the overwhelming Bradbury. The fact that the entire plot evolves from his desire not to disappoint a lover less than half his age is ample proof of the superficial spoof. His son, Juan Manuel, is caricatured even more viciously as a lazy, alcoholic opportunist. These are supported by a cast of characters - the prostitute, the idealized girl- friend, Coronel Zamora- who are less important to the plot but equally significant in their contribution to the general negative stereotyping of Latin characters and the implication that every one of them is in need of help of some kind. Other techniques purporting a humorous bent-which include repetition, exaggeration, and even jokes-reinforce the attempt to convey levity and nonchalance. The mixture of a living celebrity with fictitious nonentities, the invention of a pseudo-subversive religious sect, and the flights in and out of science fiction all contribute to the whimsy and plain fun of the text. It is (although never stated explicity) all part of the fanciful, leg-pulling sense of humor Costa Ricans so often direct both at others and at themselves.

Examination of the intertextuality of the text, however, transforms the surface slapstick into black humor, as manifested in the dream episodes of Juan Manuel's alcoholic stupors. He dreams he is sought by three celestial messengers who come to save him from being demolished in a "modern Sodom" populated by the authoritative women in his life and his job, personified as a train. These guardian angels offer him an opportunity to escape to better things: a beautiful young woman who will adore him and a large quantity of money. Rivera, with his "limited education and apparently disordered life," agrees, ironically, that he has nothing to lose by following their lead. Bought and paid for, he cheerfully walks out on his identity, assuming one not his own, while his father vanishes into nothingness. In such a way does one country's dream gone sour turn into another's nightmare. Unsuspecting, uncaring, "a Latin American country" reaches out to steep itself in a foreign creed, embracing the "tropical garb" of foreign "power," feeling uncomfortable in its own "used gray suit and plaid tie" (RK, p.71-2). The giant from the north does not hesitate to exploit the financial plight, moral turpitude, and agonizing doubts laid bare in an initial plea for assistance, and before the year is out, the winds of change have become a veritable storm.

There are many clues throughout the novel which indicate the significance underlying the actual plot. The cumulative effect of these word choices leads to inevitable conclusions which are fundamental to understanding the text, but which are concealed at the explicit level; they are evidence of the social conflicts at work within the text, discernable only in the tension between what is said and how it is said. Rivera gets Bradbury's address after claiming his dilemma is "a matter of life or death," an exquisite irony. When he first writes to Bradbury, he closes with "Your... impenitent reader." He describes Amelia's suffering as "exalted" and her life without him as a "hell." The procreation of his son is described as the one stain or blemish ("mácula") in his life, as though it were a sin. Sabatés boasts that whatever else can be said, he can surely "predict... that this story will somehow end in disaster" (RK, p.45). Young Rivera sees Bradbury and his friends as "angels" who have come to "save" him, and warns them that "sermons" will have no effect on him. As the tale nears its end, Rivera is described as a "prisoner" of excitement, followed by the final representative irony of Rivera as he "daba ínfulas" of comprehension, with its double meaning of religious implication and of putting on airs. The sequence provides a skeleton of the development of significance. The kingdom of the U.S. is vast and its power omnipresent, buy they belong to the material rather than the spiritual world. Such a false god brings emptiness and alienation, not assistance. Pitted against such a Goliath, the third world country, bereft of even the symbolic slingshot, has no hope of being a David. The inequity is also shown through the number of times the Latins are unable to finish a sentence, whether because of interruption or difficulty in articulating their ideas forcefully. The verb use also indicates both power and perspective: the Latins tend to use compound tenses, subjunctive, imperfect and past tense, while the English speakers in the novel employ

mainly simple constructions which tend to be present or future oriented. The Latins in the story consistently qualify their statements with phrases like "one might," "perhaps," "but," "I meant to say," "in my opinion," "unless", "in spite of," which also bring to light the uncertainty and, at times, weakness with which they face their existential dilemma.

Durán's narrative ends with the winds of December dispersing the juggler, his audience, and finally, Manuel Rivera himself. The whirlwind from the north obliterates the tradition and tranquility of that Latin American country. The issue in question is obviously not the fate of a retired bank clerk. As the analysis reveals, the issue is the suffocating, terminal influence of the United States upon third-world countries which in naive good faith look north for help, unaware of and unprepared for the Pandora's box they are opening. The technological advances, sophisticated mass media, and relentless pursuit of profits of the United States are both the attraction and the downfall of those third world countries, who can no more fail to succumb than they can fail to be attracted by the superficial charms of the system. The double bind is lovely and lethal. The "return" to Kilimanjaro is necessarily ironic, since the aspirations and the free will are illusions. Sabatés encourages Juan Manuel to "vivir como la gente" ("live like the people"), assuring him that this implies remaining "the same as always, except..." (except he loses the part of his identity which links him to his past), insisting Rivera will end up with "something much like what you have dreamed" (RK, p.62). Ironically, this turns out to be very true. However, coming at the cost of identity and independence, the dreams are shown for what they are: delusions of grandeur, imported nightmares. The game is deadly serious, the fun merely a distraction, the return an empty promise, and the entire situation a tragicomedy.

Notes

1. "The Gospel according to John," *Holy Bible*, revised standard version (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1946), p.103.
2. Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), p.117.
3. Antonio Gómez-Moriana, "Bajtin y Adorno frente a la autonomía (relativa) de lo literario", *Revista de Occidente* #90 (Nov. '88), p.70.
4. Julia Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue, and Novel," in *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi. Trans. A. Jardine, T. Gora, and L. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p.37.
5. Ibid.
6. Oscar Montanaro Meza, "La intertextualidad y su evolución conceptual", *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica* Vol. XIV, No.1 (Jan.-July, 1988), p.14.
7. María Amoretti, *Introducción al socio-texto* (San José, Costa Rica: University of Costa Rica Press, 1989), p.158. Translation mine.
8. Francoise Perus, "Determinaciones y especificidad de las prácticas literarias," *Revista La Bufanda del Sol* No.11-12 (Quito-Ecuador, 1977), p.37.
9. Ernest Hemingway, "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," in *The Snows of Kilimanjaro and Other Stories* (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1964), p.3. All other references to this text will be indicated by SK and page numbers in parentheses.
10. Bradley et al., eds. *The American Tradition in Literature*, Vol. 2, 4th ed. (U.S.: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964), p. 1323.
11. Norman Foerster, ed. *American Poetry and Prose*, Vol. II, 4th ed. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962), p. 1495.
12. Carlos Baker, "The Two African Stories," in *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: Critical Essays*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1975), p.52.
13. Fernando Durán, *Retorno al Kilimanjaro* (San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Guayacán, 1989), p.5. Translation mine. All further references to this text will be indicated by RK and page number in parentheses.
14. Alan Moorehead, "Prologue" to *The White Nile* (Middlesex: Penguin, n.d.), pp. 13-17. See Ptolemy's map in Appendix.
15. Ray Bradbury, "The Kilimanjaro Device," in *I Sing the Body Electric* (New York: Bantam, 1969), p.5. All further references to this text are indicated by KD and page number in parentheses.

16. See Pierre Juentz's "El texto literario y sus instituciones" for a more thorough discussion of this issue.

17. Daniel Cottom, *Text and Culture: The Politics of Interpretation* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), p.74.

18. Ibid., p.85.

19. Quoted in Cottom, p.82.

20. Antonio Gómez-Moriana, "Especificidad del texto vs. vocación universal de la literatura", *Arte Poética* No. 3 (1981), p.219. Translation mine.

21. Ibid.

22. María Amoretti, course lecture, Sociocriticism II, Universidad de Costa Rica (May 11, 1990).

23. Gómez-Moriana, "Bajtin", p.71.

24. Wayne L. Johnson, *Ray Bradbury* (New York: Ungar, 1980), p.53.

25. William F. Touponce. *Ray Bradbury and the Poetics of Reverie* Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984), p.xvi.

26. Quoted in Touponce, p.xi.

Bibliography

Amoretti, María. *Debajo del canto*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica, 1987.

———— *Introducción al socio-texto*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica, 1989.

Baker, Carlos. "The Two African Stories." In *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: Critical Essays*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1975.

Bradbury, Ray. *I Sing the Body Electric*. New York: Bantam, 1969.

Bradley, Sculley, et al., eds. *The American Tradition in Literature,* Vol. II. 4th ed. U.S.: Grosset & Dunlap, 1974.

Cottom, Daniel. *Text and Culture: The Politics of Interpretation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Durán, Fernando. *Retorno al Kilimanjaro*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Guayacán, 1989.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Foerster, Norman, ed. *American Poetry and Prose,* vol. II. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.

Gómez-Moriana, Antonio. "Bajtin y Adorno frente a la autonomía (relativa) de lo literario." *Revista del Occidente* #90, Nov., 1988, pp.63-78.

————"Especificidad del texto vs. vocación universal de la literatura". *Arte Poética* No.3, 1981, pp. 207-226.

Hemingway, Ernest. *The Snows of Kilimanjaro and Other Stories*. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1964.

Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1946.

Johnson, Wayne L. *Ray Bradbury*. New York: Ungar, 1980.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." In *The Kristeva Reader,* ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Montanaro, Oscar. "La intertextualidad y su evolución conceptual",*Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica* Vol. XIV, No.1, Jan.-June, 1988, pp. 11-17.

Moorehead, Alan. *The White Nile*. Middlesex: Penguin, n.d.

Perus, Francoise. "Determinaciones y especificidad de las prácticas literarias". *Revista La Bufanda del Sol* No.11-12, 1977, pp. 32-36.

Touponce, William. *Ray Bradbury and the Poetics of Reverie*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984.

Appendix

1. The map of Africa taken from Ptolemy's Map of the World, c. A.D. 150