are rather artless presentations of factual information with little attempt to market, sell, or promote goods or services, by the 1780s a variety of appeals to consumers to invest credit in products or services are evident. Most ingenious of these is the attestation by a signed witness to the efficacy of a product or service in an open letter, for the open letter allows one to advertise without being seen to advertise. Mathison offers a fascinating analysis of vocabulary and tropes of advertising and the subtle ways in which they seek to obscure and redefine relationships of patronage. Poems that satirize the practice and content of such oblique advertising through open letters, however, indicate the readers' recognition of this advertising ploy. So along with the developing sophistication of advertising strategies comes a more sophisticated reading public. Mathison's method offers an example of interdisciplinary ambidexterity at its best, though his conclusions about the transparency of advertising practices appear rather belied by his earlier convincing analysis of their obliquity.

As a whole, then, the volume chronicles the emergence of broader and more specialized reading publics, and the expansion of commercial possibilities for financing news publication through selling books, medicines, and a variety of goods and services in periodicals. A glossary of terms from the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century book trade would be a valuable addition to the volume to ensure clarity of reference and consistency of usage. In addition, more cross-referencing of the essays — especially the final five — would flag the larger, overarching implications of the volume. As it is, the volume presents empirical research which has implications for a revision of the Habermasian paradigm, but does not yet replace that paradigm with a coherent master narrative.

JENNIFER L. ANDERSEN, *California State University, San Bernardino*

Balachandra Rajan. *Under Western Eyes: India from Milton to Macaulay*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999. Pp. 267.

According to Linda Colley, "by 1820, Britain claimed dominion over some 26 percent of the world's population. A century later, and far more insecurely, it exercised some kind of authority over close to a quarter of the world's land surface" ("Britishness and Otherness," *Journal of British Studies* 31 [1992]: 323). These numbers are startling, but then again a spacious and heavily populated Indian subcontinent was part of the British empire, if not the jewel in the imperial crown. Work on imperial India tends to focus on the 1900s; it should come as no surprise, then, that most of the chapters in Balachandra Rajan's *Under Western Eyes* are devoted to nineteenth-century writers: Mill, Hegel, Elizabeth Hamilton and Sydney Owenson, Southey, Shelley, and Macaulay. What may come as a surprise, and what makes this book especially appealing to this journal's readers, is Rajan's attention to the early modern beginnings of English imperial discourse on India, and the

crucial role literary representations of India played in these beginnings. The book's first three chapters focus on texts that appeared when England was making its presence felt on the subcontinent, when an incipient English discourse on India was emerging: Camões' *Lusiads* (translated into English in 1655), Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Dryden's *Aureng-Zebe* (1676). This review focuses on these three chapters, though in doing so it really fails to do justice to a book the author characterizes as "a historical study with its center of gravity in the romantic era, carried out from a postcolonial perspective" (p. 10).

Under Western Eyes opens with thirty pages of "preliminary navigations." This wide-ranging introduction offers rich theoretical reflections on an over-determined India as seen through the eyes of English imperialism, and these reflections shed valuable light on the various ideological and literary sites — "no genre is unreceptive to the imperial spirit" (p. 23) — that gave voice to early modern imperialism. Indebted to Edward Said's *Orientalism*, Rajan admits that "imperial energy is simplistic, given to obliterating nuances and to making its ideological and rhetorical investments in discourses that are powerfully polarized" (p. 15). By no means, however, does Rajan's ground-breaking work on early modern Orientalism place India in simple opposition to English imperialism. One of the many valuable lessons to be learned from these introductory pages is just how entangled nascent English imperialist articulations are within a web of "multiple othernesses" (p. 3). Although Rajan redirects scholarly attention away from Ireland and the New World and toward England's/Britain's Eastern empire, he never loses sight of Atlantic and Continental contexts. Early modern English discourse on India must be viewed within the context of a cultural other in Ireland, an imperial other in Spain, and a theological other in Rome. As the imperial gaze turned eastward, it did so with the baggage of various cultural encounters.

The first chapter focuses on Camões' *Lusiads*, a text Rajan rightly describes as "crucial in the genealogy of English imperial discourse" (p. 7). Countering the "nostalgically Eurocentric" (p. 32) commentary that has gathered around *The Lusiads*, Rajan re-evaluates the Portuguese epic and its representation of Asia from an "Asian viewpoint" (p. 33). The result is a radical rereading of Camões' text, a reading fully attentive to the constitutive power of literature. To appreciate Rajan's postcolonial reading of *The Lusiads*, it is necessary to contrast it with a section of a chapter in Richard Helgerson's *Forms of Nationhood*. Helgerson is interested in how *The Lusiads*, which celebrates Vasco da Gama's voyage to India, forges a Portuguese-European identity, and, in turn, how this process compares with Elizabethan writings of England, in particular the commercial ethos of Hakluyt's narratives of primarily Elizabethan voyages. Helgerson's account of the aristocratic-heroic ethos of the Portuguese epic is descriptive; Rajan's is evaluative. Refusing to cleanse commerce from Camões' text, he invites literary historians to take into account "not only heroic identities but also their exploitative consequences" (p. 47). This is a wonderfully refreshing reading of *The Lusiads*, one that seeks less to recuperate a canonical text than to relocate it within the context of its

multinational reading communities, one that brushes against the grain of the text by reminding us that “Asia was the soil on which glory and fame displayed their banners” (p. 35).

Sustaining Rajan’s approach to the beginnings of English discourse on India is the intersection of the first phase of postcolonial thought — namely, a critique of “the coercive strength of imperial discourse” — with current concentration on imperialism’s “self-dismantling propensities.” By bringing these two critical phases together, this book seeks “to study literature as the deeply conflicted locus of the interplay of both sets of forces” (p. 20). Colonial critique underpins the chapter on Dryden’s *Aureng-Zebe*, the first English literary work on an Indian subject. Rajan exposes Dryden’s (mis)appropriation of India, in particular of Mughal history, and in doing so highlights the devaluation of the culture and history of the Orient in the wake of its economic exploitation. This chapter traces the unfolding of a discourse of dominance, one that represents India “as desirable yet dangerous, as welcoming but also unpredictable” (p. 77), as a submissive, feminized land awaiting the rule of masculine, imperial English masters. Turning to “Milton’s multiple construction of India” (p. 58) in *Paradise Lost*, Rajan examines the poem’s Satanization of the Orient, paying particular attention to Book IX’s Banyan Tree. Unlike Dryden’s play, Milton’s dialogic poem calls for a reading attentive to the complex and often contradictory ideological work literature performs: what Rajan eloquently calls “the articulating strength and the dismantling energy” of literature (p. 24). Not unlike David Quint, who in his *Epic and Empire* valorizes a republican Milton, Rajan acknowledges a contestatory Milton, a poet at odds with empire. Unlike Quint, however, Rajan is troubled by Milton’s “insistence that subjected people deserve their own misfortunes” (p. 64). Milton’s imperial, but not necessarily imperialist, poem will, as the following chapters on the romantic era attest, play a formative role in the rhetoric of imperialism: “*Paradise Lost* is the work of a totalizing energy by which dreams of empire cannot but be nourished” (p. 65). Paradoxically, Milton’s poem also includes a vision of Christian heroism that sustains the liberation politics in *Prometheus Unbound*, that inspired the nonviolent strategies that gave India its independence. The canon, as Rajan reveals again and again, “can be instrumental in its own dismantling” (p. 66).

Like the chapters on Camões and Dryden, the chapter on Milton bears witness to Rajan’s desire to take seriously the “modern” in “early modern.” While Rajan delivers a brilliant reading of *Paradise Lost* in its cultural moment (this brilliance will come as no surprise to those who have been reading Rajan reading Milton for more than fifty years), this chapter, indeed this book, does a remarkable job of tracing what Rajan calls the Miltonic “migration of metaphors” (p. 202): that is, how Milton, for better or worse, gets appropriated by modernity and inscribed in modern imperialist and anti-imperialist pronouncements. Rajan’s ability to look both backward to early modernity and forward to modernity is exemplary. “The Renaissance preliminaries to the decisive articulation of an imperial discourse on India,” he points out, “are not merely preliminaries; they also carry into that

discourse the structures, perplexities, and self-examinations of Reformation religious thought" (p. 14). Among this book's many intelligent insights is precisely this insistence on the early modernity of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Moreover, this book never lets us forget the fundamental early coloniality of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Any book that ranges so widely in its scope cannot but reveal its author's profound knowledge of literature. What struck me as I was reading *Under Western Eyes* was just how much its author has learned from literature. This is particularly evident in this book's endeavour "to steer a course that keeps the contest [between discourse as hegemonic and discourse as self-interrogating] alive instead of collapsing it into either of its terms" (p. 117). While Rajan can be amusingly dismissive of canonical and near-canonical texts (*The Lusiads* is not afforded the respect that Helgerson gives it), his invigorating investigation of literature's ability to make things happen shows a deep understanding and appreciation of "the power of literature to flow around ideologies, to acknowledge and even propitiate their powerful presences but to interrogate them through circumvention rather than through the simpler forms of protest" (p. 9). Of course, it takes an exceptional critic to tease out literature's interpellative, interrogative power. We are greatly indebted to Rajan for doing such critical work.

CHRISTOPHER IVIC, *State University of New York — Potsdam*