

empleadas por los directores para negociar cuestiones de identidad y exilio.

“Modos narrativos: géneros y temas”, la última parte de la antología, reúne ensayos sobre la *road movie* latinoamericana (Verena Berger, y también Michael Chanan), la infancia en coproducciones hispanoamericanas (Sophie Dufays) y la relación entre coproducciones europeas y el cine *queer* latinoamericano (Deborah Shaw). Los trabajos de Berger y Chanan forman parte de una constelación de trabajos recientes sobre el género como *The Latin American Road Movie* (eds. Verónica Garibotto y Jorge Pérez, 2016) y *The Latin American (Counter-) Road Movie and Ambivalent Modernity* (Nadia Lie, 2017). Es notable la inclusión del ensayo de Shaw, “Cine *queer* latinoamericano y las coproducciones europeas”, una traducción de un artículo que fue publicado en inglés en la revista *Transnational Cinemas*, porque posibilita nuevas lecturas sobre un aspecto clave de la transnacionalidad del cine contemporáneo.

Nuevas perspectivas sobre la transnacionalidad del cine hispánico refleja la situación actual de los estudios de índole transnacional. Más allá de la tensión de pretender esquematizar un acercamiento teórico-crítico cuyas manifestaciones polifacéticas se resisten a la sistematización, algo que los editores reconocen, los ensayos representan contribuciones importantes al análisis de sus diversos objetos de estudio. En este sentido, los colaboradores (principalmente europeos) tal vez contribuyan más a sus debates específicos que la transnacionalidad del cine hispánico en términos más amplios. No obstante, como volumen editado, nos hace cuestionar el modo en que el giro transnacional se ha manifestado en la crítica cinematográfica del mundo hispánico.

NICOLAS POPPE
Middlebury College

LUIS OTHONIEL ROSA. *Comienzos para una estética anarquista: Borges con Macedonio*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Cuarto Propio, 2016. 235 pp.

At times it seems as if as many people are writing about Macedonio Fernández as reading his works, and as Luis Othoniel Rosa implies, this impression is fitting. Macedonio was more interested in dialog than he was in the dispensation and consumption of his texts, and more disposed to absenting himself while provoking such dialog than to establishing an authorial identity. For this reason, Macedonio’s relationship with Jorge Luis Borges is seen as simultaneously productive and frustrating. Borges furthered Macedonio’s campaign to engage in the exchange of ideas

without legitimizing the status of author, but in doing so perpetuated the notion that anecdotal accounts of Macedonio's philosophy carried more weight than his writing. Rosa, in this excellent contribution to the study of both writers, examines this legendary relationship in terms of its anarchist context – a context with deep philosophical, ideological and personal implications for both men.

The paradox of Rosa's approach – a paradox suited to two writers who together virtually reoriented the very concept of paradox – is his observation that anarchism has a defining presence in Argentine cultural and political history yet itself disallows historical materialism. The essence of anarchism as received by both Macedonio and Borges, Rosa argues, is the rejection of a reality that can be objectified, categorized, preserved and accounted for by economic, political, aesthetic or personal practices.

Rosa's argument is highly convincing because he synthesizes copious, carefully researched material on the history and philosophy of anarchism – with a cogent focus on the philosophy of Piotr Kropotkin – with insightful close readings of Borges's and Macedonio's works, together with detailed knowledge of the extensive scholarship on both authors. Combined with his comprehensive knowledge of Macedonio's and Borges's corpus, these components come together to form a remarkably clear picture of the importance of anarchist thought in their respective works and in their relationship to each other.

The foundation of this argument is the persuasive observation that Macedonio in particular regards literature – both writing and reading – strictly as a collaborative and open-ended endeavor. By extension, this means that Macedonio rejects all forms of attribution, including authorship, genius, copyright and private property. This absolute refusal of ownership is corollary to Macedonio's complete negation of selfhood – of the Cartesian autonomous individual – since the materiality of the self relies on the specious existence of an objective reality. In that vein, Macedonio also rejects all form of mimesis, since representation requires some objective or Platonic reality to be symbolized or recreated in aesthetic form. In what is perhaps Rosa's central, and most perspicacious, observation, the Macedonian project to expunge representation from aesthetics has its counterpart in his political philosophy: representative government, like mimetic art, is a mistake based on the belief in objective, material reality. In all of these respects, Rosa points out, the lens of anarchist thought enables us to see the consistency of Macedonio's method throughout his writing: on aesthetics, on politics, on his urban and national context and even on his personal circumstances.

Rosa's account of the two writers' participation in this anarcho-aesthetic project is especially significant where it sheds light both on

Borges's relation – philosophical, artistic and personal – to Macedonio and on Borges's own peculiar history of political commentary. Rosa's reading of a fairly late Borges story, "El Congreso del mundo," helps one discern the importance of anarchist thought in both respects. Among other explanations, Rosa affirms that for Borges, political figures, such as the detested Juan and Eva Perón, are to be regarded as representations of a collective imagination rather than as agents of representation of a public will (98). The State is essentially a chimera consequent to that collective imagination.

In tracing these detailed analyses, Rosa also helps to better delineate the critical differences between Macedonio's and Borges's adaptation of anarchist thought. These differences in large measure owe to Borges's hesitancy to completely embrace Macedonio's negation of self. In his extensive examination of their "self-portraiture," Rosa argues that while Borges's obsessive examination of the myriad permutations and implications of self is in one respect a betrayal of his mentor's outright "selfless soul-ism," it is more arguably an adherence to Macedonio's radical project of remaking the individual as the function of a collective performance (149). This difference also reflects the ultimate demarcation between the two writers – between Macedonio's work as a gesture of openness to all prospective readers to whom he cedes all possession of narrative production, and Borges's equivocating but ultimate concession to writing as an accumulation of cultural capital (27).

Throughout this book, however, Rosa makes an excellent case for a deep and complex affinity between Borges and Macedonio, an affinity rooted in their common bond to anarchist thought as well as in the dialogic nature of their friendship. In his close examination of Macedonio's unchained humor, in contrast to Borges's infamous devotion to narrative detail; Macedonio's self-suppressing *Presidente* versus Borges's self-examining narrator; Macedonio's utter repudiation of the State against Borges's struggle to elucidate its dangers; Macedonio's city as a collective experience of pain, at variance with Borges's secret pain as evidence of the labyrinthine connectedness of human experience, Rosa finds in their divergences rich evidence of a fundamentally common aesthetic rooted in anarchism.

This is a fine piece of scholarship – lucid, thorough and provocative – of interest to any student of Borges, Macedonio or the cultural implications of anarchist thought in Argentina.

TODD S. GARTH
United States Naval Academy