

mind, finally, was with the men. Sympathy can only go so far, under such circumstances.

E. D. BLODGETT

WORKS CITED

- Brown, Russell. *Borderlines and Borderlands in English Canada: The Written Line*. Orono, ME: Borderlands Project, 1990.
- Grove, Frederick Philip. *It Needs Be Said*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1929.
- La Bossière, Camille. "Of Words and Understanding in Grove's *Settler's of the Marsh*." *A Stranger To My Time: Essays by and about Frederick Philip Grove*. Ed. Paul Hjartarson. Edmonton: NeWest Press, 1986.



Zohreh T. Sullivan. *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. pp. ix, 199. \$49.95.

To pose Kipling thoroughly and effectively as a site of inquiry for a decolonizing cultural critique, a scholar must recognize, I think, Kipling's complex multifacetedness as a writing subject, his inscription of a multiplicity of interdependent yet incommensurate subject positions and perspectives. Kipling represents and, to an appreciable degree, constitutes what Edward Said describes as modern imperialism's "consolidated vision"; he writes "from the perspective of a massive colonial system whose economy, functioning, and history had acquired the status of a virtual fact of nature" (Said 134). Yet Kipling is also the writer who registers and represents the imperial project—most particularly the British imperial project in India—as an emotionally and psychically fraught, deeply personal concern; he is the writer formed in and by that project, one who, in his nonage, prattled Urdu to Indian attendants by day and dutifully lisped English "Good Nights" to parents, who suffered the all-too-typical, mid-childhood "abandonment" of solitary repatriation to England, and who, duly submitted to the complex trials of English schooling, returned in late adolescence to an India at once strange and familiar. To state the case more concisely, Kipling envisions his "empire" from a totalizing, synoptic perspective and, at the same time, from various, shifting, unstable perspectives of subjective engagement. Very aptly, then, Zohreh T. Sullivan considers the quintessential British imperial author as "the quintessentially divided imperial subject" (6), whose writing manifests "the competing forces of imperial representation and domination" (9) and "gives voice to the full fragmentation of the colonizer's many subject positions and ambivalences" (11).

Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling opens with the observation that Kipling's fiction "is haunted by a variety of familial configurations" (1), which coincide with yet problematize British colonial discourse's generalized inscription of "[t]he metaphor of empire as

'family' (3). Affiliating her work with the critical and theoretical initiatives of Lacan, Althusser, Deleuze and Guattari, and (most notably) Homi Bhabha, Sullivan undertakes a psychoanalytic and poststructuralist critique, oriented by the family metaphor, that aims to reveal "how Kipling reproduces and complicates the ideological structures that determined imperial patterns of thought," how his work unsettles imperial notions of authority and subjectivity by manifesting "deeply fragmented moments of hybridity where the self articulates the Other out of similarity and difference" (3-4). For Sullivan, Kipling's richly and ambivalently invested Other is "India," the India of alienated desire and troubled remembrance, the constitutive yet intractable matrix of his familial empire.

Drawing upon an impressively diversified and extensive array of Kipling sources, Sullivan offers focused, detailed readings of selected texts. Of these, the first, an analysis of the posthumously published autobiography *Something of Myself*, is perhaps most noteworthy. Sullivan interrogates Kipling's attempt to constitute himself as "author" of his life, to draw and securely define the boundaries and territories of his "selfhood," demonstrating, in the process, that the autobiography amply rewards sustained critical attention (which it very seldom receives). In this "final fiction" (25), as in the tales of colonial India she subsequently considers, Sullivan finds that Kipling's production of the tropologies of "family" is doubly compromised. First, it is compromised by its articulation within the uneasy interplay of frame narrative and embedded tale; secondly, by its contingent relation with the unstable dualisms of imperial ambivalence—crisis and game, chaos and control, blindness and sightedness, adventure and limit, involvement and alienation, margin and centre, India and England—the signal dualisms that inform Kipling's fictional stagings of British imperial subjectivity in confrontation with Indian otherness. The examination of the "Indian" tales of the 1880s and 1890s, to which Sullivan devotes three chapters, is consistently engaging and produces particularly insightful and compelling readings of "The Strange Ride of Morrowbie Jukes," "The Man Who Would Be King," "The Bridge-Builders," and "The Brushwood Boy." In each case, Sullivan's criticism clearly elucidates Kipling's reproduction and, at the same time, his perturbed and perturbing reconfiguration of British imperial ideology's ordering structures and lines of force.

Somewhat less satisfying is the final chapter's reading of *Kim*, which, despite the originality of its scholarship, reveals the limitations of Sullivan's critical strategy. While enabling the analysis of the novel's homosocial economy, its deployment of various father figures, its precarious, intricate, intersubjective configurations of desire, devotion, deception, and domination, Sullivan's focus upon familial figures and structures impedes her critical access to the Great Game of imperial espionage. Sullivan reads the Game as a plot trajectory antithetically

paired with the lama's Search. Employing Lacanian theory, she argues that the Game represents, for Kim, a "fall into the Law of the Father, into the Symbolic order of colonial civilization, [which] circles around the problem of unconscious desire by appropriating desire into the field of power" (170). Kim's marvellous India is thus remade as "a space to be colonized and mapped into knowledge" (171). Notwithstanding the accuracy and validity of these comments, they stop well short of accounting for the full complexity of the Game's textual deployment. When Sullivan briefly notes that the Game entails "a mode of human interaction . . . determined by isolation, uniformity and 'statistical anonymity'" (171), she evokes something more than a Symbolic dimension of plot structure—she evokes a sophisticated, disciplinary, depersonalizing, sociopolitical power-machine, which submits its subjects to manipulation by technique, which, in effect, circumvents the very thickness of subjective experience Sullivan's psychoanalytic critique must emphasize. Despite the homosocial fraternity that attends (but does not determine) its functioning, the Game is not simply, nor even predominantly, a "family affair." Its salient, encompassing presence in Kipling's text therefore tends to place Sullivan's critical process at odds with itself: to remain true to her commitment to the family metaphor Sullivan must sidestep square and direct confrontation with an explicit, detailed inscription of systemic imperial domination, of the very apparatus her work is also committed to delineating and deconstructing. As Sullivan compellingly argues, Kipling typically represents the massive and complex imperial system (Said) as a "family matter." Yet one cannot ignore the fact that he also, on occasion, represents it *as apparatus*, as a complexly articulated machinery of containment and constraint, as the Great Game of administrative surveillance or, alternatively, as that invention of a Utilitarian and "analytical positivist" imagination, the pragmatic, expedient Jungle Law.

The aptly chosen cover illustration of Sullivan's book, William Strang's *Rudyard Kipling* (1901), renders pictorially, with very fair precision, the Kipling her text presents to its readers. A titanically proportioned Kipling embraces—paternally and constrictingly, yet fondly and protectively—three childlike figures, a "Tommy," a naval serviceman, and a Sikh sepoy. Surrounding Kipling are several embodiments of imperial exotica, which fall within his ken, even within his reach, but outside his close embrace—an elephant, a roaring tiger, a colonial adventurer confronting serpent and crocodile (both gaping-mawed), an Indian couple in traditional garb. In the background, one discerns the masts and rigging of a ship. Most arresting, however, are the strings that attach each of the various foregrounded figures, each member of Kipling's imaginative "extended family," to some unseen structure or presence outside and above the upper-left corner of the frame. As suggested by the background ship, these strings may be read as the rig-

ging of “the ship of empire” (as Sullivan remarks, a noteworthy Kipling metaphor). They also suggest the strings of an unseen puppeteer, of the imperial apparatus as puppeteer. In either case, Kipling’s imposing centrality and his posture of quiet authority are ironized: Kipling does not hold or control the strings that bind, move, and manipulate his figures. Like Strang’s illustration, Sullivan’s book presents, most saliently and compellingly, the family metaphor, which it calls into question, though perhaps not thoroughly enough. The metaphor organizing so many of Kipling’s narratives orients and energizes, yet ultimately constrains the criticism to which these narratives are submitted. None the less, Sullivan’s treatment of Kipling and “family” clearly renders the “strings” of empire and makes manifest their various, often unpredictable forces and effects. As an acute, deconstructive, and defamiliarizing critique of familial configurations, both in Kipling’s work and in imperial ideology more generally, *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling* is a valuable and original contribution to postcolonialist cultural studies.

DON RANDALL

WORK CITED

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.



Graham Huggan. *Territorial Disputes: Maps and Mapping Strategies in Contemporary Canadian and Australian Fiction*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994. pp. 198. \$40.00.

Canadian George R. Parkin’s British Empire map of 1893 used Mercator’s projection to emphasize the significant areas of pink on the globe. The Dominion of Canada was particularly impressive as the Mercatorial projection disproportionately enlarged lands in higher latitudes. Graham Huggan’s *Territorial Disputes: Maps and Mapping Strategies in Contemporary Canadian and Australian Fiction* takes up the question of how the postcolonial settler cultures of Canada and Australia are dealing with this colonial cartographic legacy.

The map topos, Huggan argues, has fascinated contemporary Australian and Canadian writers because it is iconic of colonial attitudes. It is a tool in the exercise of control, a method of denial/erasure of previous inhabitants and a way of organizing the disbursement of land to the settlers. But perhaps more than any other device, maps are prone to metaphorization; they occur in writing as metaphors of control and imposed order. Or, as in the more optimistic vision of Wilson Harris, maps can function as agents of change (27-29). Huggan is sensitive to the way in which literature adopts and modifies the map, using it as icon, motif, and metaphor. The impressive aspect of this work is that Huggan has not ignored the critiques of mapping that a few brave car-