

English Civil Wars. More than that, Pugh also makes a compelling case for pulling Fanshawe more fully onto the literary stage. After reading this work, I would not be surprised to find excerpts of Fanshawe's translations or the poem "Two Copies of Verses to the Prince upon severall occasions" in future anthologies. His inclusion would allow us to paint a fuller picture of the civil war experience.

Rahul Sapra. *The Limits of Orientalism: Seventeenth-Century Representations of India*. Newark:: University of Delaware Press, 2011. iv + 219 pp. \$65.00. Review by NAGENDRA RAO, GOA UNIVERSITY.

Edward Said's *magnum opus*, *Orientalism*, has influenced a considerable number of scholars, who have used Saidian doctrine to critique pre-modern societies of the East with an arsenal of broad generalizations. Colonial authors denigrated Indian culture as barbaric and uncivilized and produced a simplistic, dichotomy between East and West. This approach has placed all colonial scholars in one homogenous category and by implication all Indians in another. The aim of *The Limits of Orientalism: Seventeenth-Century Representations of India* is to show that a simplistic interpretation of eastern culture and civilization is unwarranted and undesirable, since it produces faulty readings of "colonial" texts. Some scholars have been sympathetic, consciously or unconsciously, to the native culture, which is not in itself homogenous but rather variegated. The argument that colonial authors perceived natives as belonging to one undivided or homogenous culture cannot be substantiated with any empirical evidence. *The Limits of Orientalism* analyzes English scholars who visited India during the pre-colonial and colonial period to show that travelers did understand the difference between Hindus and Muslims, as the latter were considered as foreigners like the Europeans, both belonging to an alien culture as far as Indians were concerned. At the same time, the book shows that later scholars realized the importance of Hindu culture and respected the vitality of Hindu civilization.

It is true that some scholars considered Indians to be "barbaric" and "uncivilized," but this does not mean that all English writers ac-

cepted this notion. It is true that Saidians had noted the existence of such writings, but they were ignored as they did not fit in the overall framework of post-colonial critique of Orientalists. In this sense, the author has challenged the view that Orientalists belong to one homogenous category while Indians to another. It is important to note that some English authors expected Muslim elites to collaborate with them, thereby leading to political alliance between the Muslims and the British.

One can discern that only a few scholars have questioned the broad framework of analysis provided by Edward Said. There is contradiction in the writings of Orientalists, as they on the one hand criticized Hindus and Muslims on the religious grounds, while on the other praised the Mughal civilization, thereby implying that achievement of elite sections was appreciated. It is important to identify reasons for such contradictions. In some situations, scholars were forced to criticize Indians in order to satisfy the authorities in London. At the same time, they appreciated the respect showed to them in the Mughal court.

It is also important to differentiate between pre-colonial and colonial English writings. This is because it is in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that the English became seriously engaged in the work of building an empire in India. In the seventeenth century, the Orientalists were not concerned with colonial ideology, as there was no empire to defend. In this sense, the seventeenth-century Orientalist writings can be considered as objective, even though one can find a few exceptions to this rule. It is true that scholars such as Gayatri Chakravarti Spivak have used Saidian doctrine while analyzing Indian society and culture, but they have also identified a few limitations in Orientalism theory as propounded by Said and his followers. There is a need to accommodate heterogeneity while analyzing Indian culture and civilization, and some scholars go so far as to demand an India-specific theory to suit the diversity of Indian culture. This shows that proper understanding of Indian culture does not emerge by using Saidian framework.

After identifying the heterogeneity of India, the author proceeds to demonstrate the heterogeneity among the different Europeans, such as the Portuguese, the English, and Dutch, which shows that monolithic generalizations do not work on the colonial side of the ledger

either. There is a need for more careful reading of the text, based on the analysis of contemporary social and economic developments. The English, for instance, were concerned with commercial interests, while the Portuguese, who had already established their colony in India, exhibited colonial ideology. In this way, it is important to differentiate between the Portuguese and the English writings.

The author suggests the need for invention of alternatives in order to counter the hegemonic discourse of Said. This can be achieved by discovering counter-hegemonic discourse within European literature, and by analyzing the dialogue between the West and the East. Such exercises enable historians to analyze the subject-object dichotomy. The author has showed that even though some English travelers criticized Indian culture, many other scholars have recognized vitality of Indian civilization, as they considered Indians worthy of trade partnership.

The European writings should be understood based on the compulsion of writers, as they were influenced by their religious philosophy, and this led to exaggeration of the *Sati* system in India. The author has identified the limitations of relying on only a single discourse while reading a text, thereby exhibiting the need for several discourses. In this sense, the author has succeeded in inspiring readers to confront authors who use simplistic notions and depend on a single discourse with a view to dissect the meanings of texts.

The book is an important addition to the understanding of Saidian Orientalism. The author has asserted that one should not establish relationship between Orientalism and colonialism as they belonged to different genres and suggested that seventeenth-century Orientalist discourse was not written with the purpose of founding the English empire in India. It is interesting to note that even in colonial times heterogeneity can be found in the English literature that analyzed Indian culture and civilization. The book has not only challenged the Saidian argument, but also presented alternatives, which can be used to achieve the desired result.