

El último capítulo, el quinto, ofrece un panorama general de la novela de traductor contemporánea. Ubicándola en su contexto histórico, Gaspar observa en él que en los años 90 un sector de la ficción latinoamericana escribió enfocado en el presente, opuesto a la memorialización insistente que había caracterizado a los años ochenta. En ese contexto, señala, surgen las novelas con protagonistas traductores que no demuestran interés por la historia nacional y sus alegorías ni por la perspectiva histórica. Se ocupan de un sujeto individual protagonista, en gran medida aislado del entorno social, un sujeto que se ve impactado sin mediaciones por el contacto con el mundo que irrumpe (202). Tendientes al retraimiento, los personajes internalizan los mecanismos de traducción que se hacen temperamento melancólico (203).

Más allá de esta cuidadosa lectura de Gaspar que revela la importancia de un corpus tan contemporáneo como central a nuestra experiencia de principios de siglo, *La condición traductora* nos regala un excelente apéndice, más sociológico, como lo denomina Gaspar mismo, dedicado al “traductor desconocido” (221), el que nos diera la maravillosa colección Robin Hood.

La publicación de *La condición traductora* debe ser ampliamente celebrada en el campo de estudios latinoamericanos pero fundamentalmente en el campo de los estudios de traducción para los cuales constituye una pieza fundamental en la necesaria relectura de la tradición traductora en América Latina.

FERNANDA MACCHI
McGill University

ANTONIO GÓMEZ. *Escribir el espacio ausente. Exilio y cultura nacional en Díaz, Wajzman y Bolaño*. Santiago de Chile: Cuarto Propio, 2013. 185 pp.

Antonio Gómez offers a comparative examination of displacement and exile, navigating the difficulties of reconciling the individual exilic experience with “exile” as a collective process. The author views exile as a type of “cultural training” (15), which has allowed for a specific way to question and reformulate national and regional identity. In contrast with other cultural studies that emphasize the traumatic effects of exile on the national body, this study looks at how the narrative of political exile has been replaced beginning in the 1990s by a broader discourse around “diaspora” as a defining element of Latin American cultural identity. According to Gómez, exile has become a privileged perspective, precisely because it does not have a stable location from which to enunciate. The

author focuses on three artists that have explicitly written on social processes from the 1970s to the beginning of the twenty-first century. The Cuban writer and filmmaker Jesús Díaz takes two very different views on the Cuban Revolution - from initial support to subsequent repudiation in exile - but with a strong interest in preserving a concept of “the national,” albeit in a redefined form. On the other hand, for the Argentinian Paula Wajsman the idea of national identity has lost its capacity to define collective experience. In the case of Roberto Bolaño, Gómez asserts that the Chilean writer has been able to establish a new paradigm - “a logic of displacement” - from which to understand the relationship between the national, the political, and writing in the context of Latin American literary history (22). These seemingly disparate artistic projects are unified by the revision of left wing militant projects of the 1970s into a “multicultural utopia” that allows for a contemporary renewal of the earlier political impulse (20). A second unifying aspect is the idea of thinking oneself in relation to history rather than in relation to national or regional space.

In its theoretical framing, the book offers a rereading of Frederic Jameson’s controversial article “Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capital” (1986), highlighting how the dynamic of reading national literatures in the international context allows for an articulation of the distance between production and reception. In this instance, the works of Latin American writers exiled to metropolitan spaces uncomfortably straddle the so-called first, second, and third world, eking out a locus of enunciation out of that unstable intersection in order to question the pertinence of the term “national.”

The case of Jesús Díaz becomes important in this context: on the one hand, the artist initially supported the Cuban Revolution but later denounced Fidel Castro’s policies from exile; on the other hand, he rewrote his own 1985 Cuban film, *La lejanía*, into an exilic novel titled *La piel y la máscara* (1996). Gómez interprets this re-writing as an effort to re-make a text, but also his own public persona. This action, made possible by his exile, embodies the desire to “rewrite the past as a means to produce the future” (43). This desire, however, produces a “retrospective utopia” (72), where the exiled writer re-writes a national allegory from outside the national space as a means to reconstruct the national life. For Gómez, Díaz’s insistence on the re-making of the nation as a category while writing from exile is undercut by the disavowal of responsibility that such perspective implies.

In contrast with Díaz, Paula Wajsman’s writing is framed by nostalgia for a sense of national identity. *Informe de París* (1990) signals not only the dismantling of the nation in exile, but also the loss of hope in the possibility of national re-articulation. Gómez observes a paradox between the

perceived impossibility of the political in the wake of national disarticulation and the text's desire to recuperate the political in a "Post-Argentinian Paris" (92). In the same spirit as Díaz, Gómez notices Wajzman's effort at re-writing, this time Julio Cortázar's *Rayuela*, with an aim to redefine the symbolic relationship between Paris and Latin America - focusing here on the financial and legal aspects of daily life. While national identity is disarticulated throughout the text, there are feeble moments of recognizing marginality in the metropolis as a possible defining characteristic of a new group, a new politics, but one that is invariably post-national.

While Díaz and Wajzman rethink ways in which one is connected to the national, Gómez contends that Roberto Bolaño has created a new discursive paradigm, where one's extraterritorial condition becomes the identifying trait, disarticulating the notion of "the national" in the Latin American context. Instead, he invokes Bolaño's declaration that a writer's country is his language. This also implies and allows for a sustained faith in the act of writing. Bolaño's uneasy relationship to the *Boom* generation and the militant ideals of the 1970s take precedence over national identity to signal a type of writing that privileges its historical references over its spatial belonging. Gómez offers summary readings of some parts of *Detectives Salvajes* (1998) and *2666* (2004) to show Bolaño's "logic of displacement" (143). An interesting observation in this regard is Gómez's focus on how the writer disrupts the usual binaries of center-periphery, Europe-Latin America by introducing a third point - the "non-Latin American third world," Africa (144). While Gómez's treatment of this aspect of Bolaño's work is light and it might inadvertently underscore a certain prejudice in Bolaño's work, he detects in this third point the existence of an impulse of recuperation of the political.

Ultimately, Gómez reads in these texts an extraterritorial impulse that operates not on a national or post-national space, but on historical events both political (left-wing militancy during the 1970s) and literary (especially the *Boom* novels). With this focus, the author succeeds in sketching a shift in the academic study of exilic cultural production. While this reviewer would have preferred a more thorough discussion of the academic debates on Latin American exile, as well as a broader range of exilic writers, Gómez's book has the potential to inspire more sustained studies that could strengthen the arguments presented here.

ANDREEA MARINESCU
Colorado College