politically-rigorous and theoretically-current attention. Ultimately, scholars of women’s writing produced in postcolonial contexts are likely to find in this book less than they would hope for or reasonably expect. For this reason, *Rites of Passage in Postcolonial Women’s Writing*—a collection that is more disappointing than inspiring—should be approached with caution and concern.

Lisa Grekul


The image of the turn as a metaphor for disciplinary transitions has become almost commonplace in recent years, perhaps even ascending to the status of cliché. In Paul Jay’s recent study of the “transnational turn,” however, the turn is an apt image in both its reference to a figurative intellectual shift and a literal geographic expansion. Taking as his topic the displacement of rigidly national and at times nationalist models of literary studies, Jay historicizes and illuminates the genesis and development of the titular turn in the book’s introduction and first four chapters. He makes another turn to model the reading practices he promotes in the five chapters that comprise part two of the text.

A key plank in Jay’s analysis of the transnational turn is his adherence to the “long view” of globalization, which argues against the notion that current cultural and economic formations represent a wholly new and unprecedented moment in the development of a transnational or global culture, as Arjun Appadurai, Anthony Giddens, and David Harvey have all notably (though distinctly) asserted. Instead, Jay follows the path of writers such as Roland Robertson, Amartya Sen, and Janet Abu-Lughod, who argue that the shifting nature of global interconnections is best understood as a product of both continuity and change. This expanded view of the history of transnational linkages incorporates European colonialism and imperialism, and has the added analytical strength of acknowledging historical linkages beyond that scope, such as links colonial and otherwise between the contemporary Middle East and South Asia. As Jay notes, “[to] see globalization as a recent eruption is to mistake not only the date but the nature of its emergence, for it leads us to miss the extent to which earlier world systems outside the West produced forms of knowledge and technology integral to later phases of globalization” (39), such as the printing of the world’s first book (39).
Jay is careful to avoid the simplistic assimilation of current global processes and practices to their historical antecedents. He further argues against the school of thought that considers the transnational turn a “mere” re-entrenchment of colonial logic, pairing the insight (perhaps even the truism) that “we create the areas we study” with a useful acknowledgment of the role of material changes in the North American academy—namely, its shifting demographics in the wake of various civil and minority rights movements from the 1960s to the present day—and their corresponding effect on the theoretical currents dominating the discipline itself. This welcome historical narration of literary studies, offered in the first chapter, “Difference, Multiculturalism, and the Globalizing of Literary Studies,” resists the easy triumphalism so often found in celebrations of multiculturalism, and instead gives credit where it is due: to the students and scholars whose work deserves the praise of having reshaped the areas we study and the “we” who study them.

While an emphasis on this relationship might seem so intuitive as to warrant only a passing mention, it is a refreshing acknowledgement that greater scholarly breadth and depth accompanies and emerges from an increased diversity in the producers of that scholarship; indeed, it is a particularly timely point in light of budget crises, soaring tuition rates, and increased securitization measures that threaten to claw back many of the gains Jay identifies as exactly those that have produced the transnationalist focus he heralds. Moreover, the text’s emphasis on changes in both academe and the literary marketplace supports and is supported by Jay’s refusal to privilege the cultural or economic dimensions of global interconnectivity, a position mirrored in the literary analyses offered in part two of *Global Matters*.

As models of transnational literary criticism, Jay reads texts whose roots and routes (to follow Jay’s use of Paul Gilroy’s terms) spans South Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, the United States and the former colonial centres of England. Arundhati Roy’s *The God of Small Things*, Vikram Chandra’s *Red Earth and Pouring Rain*, Mohsin Hamid’s *Moth Smoke*, Kiran Desai’s *The Inheritance of Loss*, Zakes Mda’s *The Heart of Redness*, Zadie Smith’s *White Teeth*, and Junot Díaz’s *The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao* are well-chosen to illustrate the values of an approach unconstrained by national boundaries, which often prove limiting. Though the geographic span of Jay’s chosen novels accords well with the broader aim of *Global Matters*, the readings themselves can seem relatively brief, and the sacrifice of a chapter or two in favour of more time spent excavating the richness of, for instance, Roy’s or Smith’s works, or foregrounding the comparative focus that is limited to chapter five, might have been worth considering. In particular, the text would have benefited from a deeper examination of the shifting nature of Anglo identity in *White
Teeth; mention of Marcus Chalfen’s Jewish background, crucial to his position as a representative of British whiteness, is notably absent. However, significant ground is covered in the relatively limited space of a chapter; Jay’s reading of Díaz, which extends the hemispheric approach advanced in chapter four, “Border Studies: Remapping the Locations of Literary Study,” to trace the relationship between the novel’s narrative juxtaposition of migration, violence, and masculinities, is an especially welcome critical take on a much-discussed novel.

Jay’s careful recapitulation of the relevant scholarly debates about how best to historicize globalization, and whether to understand its logic and effects as primarily economic or cultural, acknowledges the necessity of these theoretical divergences for the development of rigorous analysis while suggesting that the most useful answer is more likely “both/and” rather than “either/or”. In particular, both chapter two, “What is Globalization?” and chapter three, “Economies, Cultures, and the Politics of Globalization,” have clear pedagogical value thanks to their lucid style and ability to synthesize divergent theoretical strands while offering a clear, forcefully argued position without the distraction of polemics.

Miriam Novick


The India International Centre at Delhi, a non-profit and autonomous non-government body, was founded almost fifty years ago. In its charter, the I.I.C. declares its purpose as “promoting understanding and amity between the different communities of the world by undertaking or supporting the study of their past and present cultures, by disseminating or enhancing knowledge thereof and by providing such other facilities as would lead to their universal application.” The I.I.C. launched the I.I.C.-Asia Project in the nineteen-nineties for reviving and strengthening the historic, cultural and intellectual linkages among the countries of Asia. Dr. Kapila Vatsyayan, the Chairman of the I.I.C., invited Professor Malashri Lal and Professor Sukrita Paul Kumar to compile an anthology of Asian women’s writing. The editors have mentioned the difficulties they faced in this endeavour. Bookstores and libraries in Asia are poor in literature from Asian countries. They had to turn to the West to