

important figure for Irish writing in English. Whereas many readings of the poet have regarded him as a minor figure, MacCarthy insists on his literary value, seeing him as a complex writer in his use of humour and his capacity to hide behind multiple masks. As a way of illustrating this, she takes a close look at the different manifestations of Mangan's identity and organises them into two main groups: Mangan the Romantic and Mangan the Augustan. Mangan the Romantic, the eccentric writer whose life is reflected in his work, fits nicely into the Romantic tradition. But problems arise when Mangan the Augustan, who proposes classical virtues such as clarity or self-restraint, subverts Romanticism. It seems that only when the writer adopts a Romantic identity is he considered of literary worth. However, as MacCarthy endeavours to highlight, not having a fixed literary identity does not necessarily lead to a mediocre literary output. On the contrary, it is a good example of an author's way of controlling his craft.

In this carefully-structured and well-argued book, MacCarthy offers a new and revealing study of the poets Edward Walsh and James Clarence Mangan. No single critic has so far examined their joint significance for Irish literature in English. Hence, the need for this full-length critical study. Written with elegance and great scholarship, the book is a painstaking account of two important figures who, in their own unique way of understanding translation, contributed to the creation of a new literary tradition. By rethinking the criteria for the establishment of a literary canon, an issue of major concern to critics today, MacCarthy hopes to open up the canon of Irish writing in English to new voices who have been rendered mute for so many years. And one of the book's greatest strengths is precisely this new treatment of the two writers. Certainly, the volume deserves to be read not only by students of Irish literature in English but also by those interested in translation. Irish literary studies will surely be enriched by such an impressive contribution.

Works Cited

LEFEVERE, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.

LONDON IN LITERATURE: VISIONARY MAPPINGS OF THE METROPOLIS.

Susana Onega and John A. Stotesbury (eds.)

Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2002.

(by Christian Gutleben. University of Strasbourg, France)

Because London is an ever-potent muse and writers ceaselessly endeavour to capture her on paper, it appears regularly necessary to reassess the literary treatment of the metropolis. This volume takes stock of London writing up to the very end of the twentieth century; it comprises both diachronic approaches showing the evolution of London as a literary phenomenon and synchronic analyses highlighting the multi-layered nature of the transhistorical cosmopolis. The undeniable assets of this collection of academic papers are its unity and its diversity.

The city as a promise and a threat, a longed-for paradise and a potential inferno, a locus of human aspiration to perfection and a place of alienation, the epitome of civilisation and the embodiment of ruthlessness, the centre of cultural exchanges and the site of miscommunication: this tension between a utopian and dystopian representation of London lies at the heart of all the papers. Interestingly, certain literary movements (and hence certain papers studying these movements) privilege one polarity over the other; romanticism and modernism thus seem to present disenchanted visions of the metropolis, even if the nineteenth-century poems insist on a sense of loss and nostalgia, whereas the early twentieth-century novels dwell on the contemporary alienation of the individual. Just as interestingly, the studies of the postmodern depictions of the metropolis clearly demonstrate that the problematic tension between utopia and dystopia is not to be solved but is a fundamental aspect of the contradictory nature of the pluralistic urban tissue.

Another unifying device of the papers in this volume is the treatment of "space as a modality of time" (as Jean-Michel Ganteau puts it). The spatial dimension of the city inevitably reveals a temporal dimension whereby the traces of history are made visible. London then appears as a place of permanence, a place of intercourse between the past and the present, the living and the dead, tradition and modernity. To quote Patrick Parrinder's perspicacious oxymoron, London is a city of "living phantoms", in other words a city where temporalities are mixed and combined, where time is synchronic—and not successive. Naturally, the idea of a temporal synchronism—just like the tension between utopia and dystopia—is not specific to London but applies to the metropolis in general. This remark is not intended deprecatingly, on the contrary it wishes to draw attention on the wide scope of this volume: any scholar interested in the structuring metaphors of the city (the city as labyrinth, palimpsest, auditorium, living body, spiritual being, archaeological site, or geological field) will find rich food for thought in these papers. This does not mean that the specificity of London is not taken into account: John Stotesbury analyses London as a trope of the crisis of the British empire in Graham Greene's fiction and Susana Onega tackles the Englishness of the visionary mappings of London through the intertextual study of the dialogue between Peter Ackroyd and William Blake.

The diversity of the papers is not only historical (covering the literatures from the sixteenth to the late twentieth centuries), but is also generic since poetry, fiction, biography and autobiography are all carefully construed. It may perhaps be regretted that Peter Ackroyd and Ian Sinclair should so often be taken as key examples when so many other postmodern London writers could have provided fascinating objects of study, notably Salman Rushdie, Angela Carter, Martin Amis and Graham Swift. But a collection of eleven papers can hardly be expected to deal with all of one's favourite authors and rather than finishing on a note of regret I would like to conclude by praising the structure of the volume. The chronological disposition of the papers allows the reader to very well perceive the evolution in the characterisation of London in the various literary movements, and sometimes even within the same tradition—I am thinking here of the changing representations of London within modernism. This panorama through time and genre is aptly framed by an introduction which presents the contents, scope and purpose of the following contributions and by a penetrating final paper which proposes a critical synthesis of London literature and suggests that, if the myth of London has fostered much literature, it is equally valid to state that it is literature that has created the much profitable myth of London.

**ADDRESSING THE ASIAN DIASPORA:
ENCOUNTERS: PEOPLE OF ASIAN DESCENT IN THE AMERICAS.**
Roshni Rustomji-Kerns, Rajini Srikanth, and Leny Mendoza Strobel (eds.)
Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

IDENTIDAD ÉTNICA Y GÉNERO EN LA NARRATIVA DE ESCRITORAS CHINOAMERICANAS.

Begoña Simal González
La Coruña: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de La Coruña, 2000.

NEGOTIATING IDENTITIES: AN INTRODUCTION TO ASIAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S WRITING.

Helena Grice
Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002.

THE CHUTNEYFICATION OF HISTORY: SALMAN RUSHDIE, MICHAEL ONDAATJE, BHARATI MUKHERJEE AND THE POSTCOLONIAL DEBATE.

Mita Benerjee
Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2002.
(by Rocío G. Davis. University of Navarra)

Some of the most creatively innovative and critically challenging writing of the past few decades is arguably the literature of the diasporas, the domain of transcultural and transnational identity politics and poetics. The fact of globalization has radically expanded the study of modern diasporas, creating the opportunity for plurality, and for a new kind of literature, that engages the story of diaspora on both a socio-cultural and aesthetic level. The texts I will analyze in this review, in different ways, prove how the transcultural subject's engagement with cultural production necessarily limns oftentimes problematic classifications such as *exilic*, *ethnic*, or *immigrant*, which do not do justice to the nuances of writing between histories, geographies, and cultural practices. Many of these texts explore the paradigms for understanding the relationship between displacement, languages, history, memory, and borders, as parameters of self-identification and self-representation. Diasporic literatures remind us that culture is, ultimately, a dialogue, and that the artifacts produced by subjects located in diasporic positions signify substantially on a discursive level. Specifically, the cultural production of the Asian diaspora has been obliging critics to revise some of the previously uncontested paradigms of postmodernism, ethnic studies, and postcolonialism, and re-negotiate the broader cultural history of Asian immigration. Intimately connected to cultural memory, it provides a translation of semiotic behavior of dislocation and resettlement, offering renewed versions of the phenomenological