

## South Asian Cosmopolitanisms:

### Sources, Itineraries, Languages (16th-18th Centuries)

#### Introduction

In April of 2012, we invited Kumkum Chatterjee to give a series of lectures at the Center for South Asian Studies in Paris on the cultural foundations of political power in early modern South Asia (16th -18th centuries). Two of her planned lectures specifically addressed the question of cosmopolitanism. In her first lecture, entitled “Europeans and South Asian Cosmopolitanism in the Early Modern Era”, she wanted to “engage with ways in which Europeans in India, particularly in the 16th, 17th centuries sought to cultivate aspects of Mughal courtly cosmopolitanism”, and then to “compare the Orientalist scholarship of the British in the late eighteenth century with earlier European engagements with Indian culture and scholarship”. In her second lecture, “Cultural Cosmopolitanism and Constructions of the Past in Mughal India”, she wanted to show “how the perceived need to conform to a cosmopolitan Mughal culture shaped the manner in which family and dynastic histories of landed aristocrats and chieftains in Eastern India were re-shaped and recast during the 16th and 17th centuries”. Since we counted on her luminous presence, her intelligence and excellent scholarship, we decided to organize a workshop around the topic of cosmopolitanism, a project that also grew out of earlier discussions of the role of dialogue and dialogical forms in South Asian history.<sup>1</sup> Kumkum Chatterjee, to our great regret, never came. She fought courageously her illness, but the illness prevailed. She passed away on December 13, 2012. The workshop, however, took place in spite of this initial loss of a valuable and inspiring member, and turned out to be so successful and raised so many interesting questions that we organized another one a year later in Florence.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lefèvre, Corinne and Županov, I. G. (ed.), *Cultural Dialogue in South Asia and Beyond: Narratives, Images and Community (sixteenth-nineteenth centuries)*, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 55/2-3, 2012.

<sup>2</sup>The first conference took place in Paris : *Cosmopolitismes de la première modernité: Le cas de l'Asie du Sud (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles)*. *Sources, itinéraires, langues* (24-25 mai 2012), organized by C. Lefèvre, I. G. Županov, J. Flores. It was jointly supported by Centre d'Études de l'Inde et de l'Asie du Sud (Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique/Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales), and Vasco da Gama Chair and Europe and the World Forum; Department of History and Civilization (HEC), European University Institute (Florence). The second conference took place in Florence: *Modern Cosmopolitanisms: Europe and South Asia*, org. J. Flores, C. Lefèvre, A.B. Xavier, I. G. Županov, European University Institute, Florence, 6-7 December 2013, jointly funded by Vasco da Gama Chair and Europe and the World Forum; Department of History and Civilization (HEC), European University Institute (Florence), Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa (Lisbon), Centre d'Études de l'Inde et de

We were, of course, aware that our workshops were a contribution to ongoing debates and effervescent discussions going on for quite some time in the social sciences. At the very dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, a foursome of South Asianist intellectuals wrote that cosmopolitanism, as practiced, “is yet to come, something awaiting realization” (Pollock, Bhabha, Breckenridge, Chakrabarty 2002: 577). In a word, it was still a “project”. The battle cry proposed in their introduction entitled “Cosmopolitanisms” was to pluralize the concept itself in order to avoid falling into or reproducing *ad infinitum* Western universalizing definition that somehow lurked behind contemporary issues and thinking about globalization, modernization, subjectivization, liberalism and multiculturalism. If the overall impression of the collection of articles the editors included in their *Public Culture* volume is, as they were aware, somewhat disparate and heterogeneous, the effort was worthwhile because they brought in “new archives” and so too inspired a quest for other types of cosmopolitanism.

In spite of this valid effort, South Asian historiography did not immediately build upon these mostly theoretical insights, in addition to clearly tilting the emphasis to late modern and contemporary history.<sup>3</sup> In particular, the British colonial context seemed to have been the only framework in which to think about cosmopolitanism, and a perhaps unintended result was that the discussion of cosmopolitanism appeared as at every moment a Europe-centered phenomenon – disseminated from Europe, incarnated by European actors who used their South Asian experience to sharpen their intellectual tools for thinking about the world and labeled it, in the long run, “modernity”.<sup>4</sup>

This presumption that “cosmopolitanism” is a child of modernity, that is, of Western modernity, of course, the starting point of which can be located in the Enlightenment and with Kant’s essay *Toward Perpetual Peace* (1795), has deeply affected contemporary debates in the social sciences, in particular.<sup>5</sup> True, some of the most recent compendia on cosmopolitanism (Delanty 2012, Delanty and Inglis 2011, Rovisco and Nowicka 2011) recognize the necessity of engaging “the Eurocentric underpinnings of cosmopolitanism while calling for the recognition of multiple cosmopolitanisms” (Rovisco and Nowicka, 2011: 3), but none of them live up to expectations, and this is largely because current “cosmopolitan studies” seem to be unable to shed their “presentist” orientation and concerns with rising nationalism and xenophobia, especially in India.

---

l’Asie du Sud (Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique/Ecoles des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales).

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Bose, S. and Manjapra, K. (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Thought Zones: South Asia and the Global Circulation of Ideas* (Houndmills; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010). An important exception to this pattern is, however, GANERI, J., *The Lost Age of Reason; Philosophy in Early Modern India 1450—1700*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.

<sup>4</sup> For a more nuanced approach, see Seema Alavi, *Muslim Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Empire* (Harvard University Press, 2015).

<sup>5</sup> Modernity, according to these views, can be summed up as a world in constant movement, recreating itself without certainty about where it is going, and cosmopolitanism would be its accompanying *Weltanschauung*, characterized by intense self-reflexivity and eventually leading to a form of governance of the world and of the self.

A refreshing exception is a recent volume on cosmopolitan ethics and politics in the Middle Ages, including non-European sources and attitudes, from Baghdad and its multilingualism to the travel literature of Ibn Battuta (Ganim and Legassie, 2013). In a similar way, Roxanna Euben calls for a “countergenealogy of cosmopolitanism” - in her “Cosmopolitanisms Past and Present, Islamic and Western” (Euben, 2007) - which is in her mind essentially Islamic. Building on this insight, already implicit in the work of Marshall Hodgson, the renowned Chicago scholar who was the first to provide an interpretative history of premodern Islamic cosmopolitanism in his three-volume *The Venture of Islam* (1974), a recent edited volume by Derryl N. MacLean and Sikeena Karmali Ahmed explores a range of cosmopolitan experiences in the early modern and contemporary Islamic world, from the Middle East to South Asia and Eastern Africa (MacLean and Ahmed, 2012).

Without intending to exclude the West from the picture, we claim that it is necessary to cast our archival and analytical net wider and deeper in order to make visible homegrown South Asian ideas and practices of cosmopolitanism before the British and even without European intervention. Ideally, the larger goal would be to identify alternative genealogies and moments of cosmopolitanism, and from this perspective early modern South Asia is an ideal ground. This is so for a number of reasons.

#### *Sources/Resources*

First of all, although historically speaking South Asia has always been open to interaction with the world, it is in the period we are focusing on, between the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> and the early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, that it became the playground of diverse and competing imperial projects, all of which were both cosmopolitan and universal: cosmopolitan in the minimal sense, that is, incorporation of a wide variety of ethnic and religious groups; universal in that they all built on ideals of world domination.<sup>6</sup> The Mughal, Portuguese and British empires, in addition to the Maratha kingdom and the presence of the French, Danish, and Dutch East India merchant companies, provided in different ways a fertile ground for both successful and failed cosmopolitan projects.

The Mughal Empire is probably the best example of homegrown South Asian cosmopolitanism, employed both as an ideology and a technique of governance; and practiced in everyday life.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Zoltan Biederman, “Empire and the Cosmopolitan Self: Connecting Portugal and South Asia,” paper presented at the conference in Florence; *Modern Cosmopolitanisms: Europe and South Asia*, org. J. Flores, C. Lefèvre, A.B. Xavier, I. G. Županov, European University Institute, Florence, 6-7 December 2013.

<sup>7</sup> For different approaches to and aspects of Mughal cosmopolitanism, see *inter alia*: Muzaffar Alam, *The Languages of Political Islam in India c. 1200-1800* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004); Rajeev Kinra, “Secretary-poets in Mughal India and the Ethos of Persian: the Case of Chandar Bhān Brahman”, PhD diss, University of Chicago, 2008; Kumkum Chatterjee, “Cultural Flows and Cosmopolitanism in Mughal India: The Bishnupur Kingdom”, *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 46/2, 2009, p. 147-182; Aditya Behl, “Pages from the Book of Religions: Comparing Self and Other in Mughal India,” in *Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern Asia: Explorations in the Intellectual History of Indian and Tibet, 1500-1800*, ed. S. Pollock (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), p. 312-67; Muzaffar Alam and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Writing*

Attached to the idea of universal empire, inherited partly from the dynastic projects of their predecessors, Genghis Khan (d. 1227) and Tamerlane (d. 1405), the Mughals, who arrived on the scene at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, creatively responded, on different levels, to ethnic and religious diversity in the Indian peninsula. Besides attracting “men of the pen and of the sword” from neighboring Iran and Central Asia, they first incorporated local administrative and military elites from the population they subjected, a strategy already applied by the Delhi Sultanate, but brought it to a new level of organization and efficiency.<sup>8</sup> As a next step, they went further than their Indo-Muslim predecessors and provided a shrewd ideological justification for the all-Indian empire they, in the last instance, wanted to create and effectively control.

This ideological glue has been identified by scholars in Emperor Akbar’s (r. 1556-1605) promotion of *ṣulḥ-i kull*. Usually taken to mean the “universal peace”, a translation that immediately brings to mind Kant’s “perpetual peace”, it refers more precisely to a politico-religious ideology that required full submission to the temporal and spiritual supremacy of an emperor who, in the millenarian spirit of the time, claimed to be the renovator of Islam.<sup>9</sup> Contrary to received wisdom, *ṣulḥ-i kull* should not be mistaken for an *esprit de tolérance*, for its overarching principle was the Mughal’s spiritual hegemony: every religion had a place in the empire as long as its adherents recognized the monarch as the saint of the age and abided by his laws—both temporal and spiritual. However, the ambiguity inherent in this expression can be detected in European reaction and comments on its most visible manifestation, which is the imperial patronage of major religious institutions (both Muslim and Hindu) and a certain *laissez-faire* attitude to the plurality of religious practices, in addition to the emperor’s personal interest in different religious canonical texts and participation in a number of rituals and practices deriving from various religious traditions present in India (Hinduism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity) such as sun worship and vegetarianism.

Therefore, the observed practice of *ṣulḥ-i kull* has attracted the attention of European visitors to the Mughal court and has been interpreted in various ways. In his *Voyage to East-India*, originally published in 1655, Edward Terry—chaplain to Sir Thomas Roe, the first English ambassador to the Mughal court (1615-1618)—has this to say on the subject:

In that empire, all religions are tolerated, which makes the tyrannical government there more easy to be endured. The Mogul would speak well of all of them; saying, that a man might be happy and safe in the profession of any religion; and therefore would say that the Mahometan religion was good, the Christian religion good, and the rest good; therefore the ministers of any religion find regard and esteem among the people. I shall speak something of this, from my own

---

*the Mughal World. Studies on Culture and Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); Corinne Lefèvre, “The *Majālis-i Jahāngīrī* (1608-1611): Dialogue and Asiatic Otherness at the Mughal Court”, in C. Lefèvre et I. G. Županov (ed.), *Cultural Dialogue in South Asia and Beyond: Narratives, Images and Community (sixteenth-nineteenth centuries)*, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 55/2-3 2012, p. 255-286.

<sup>8</sup> For a much needed historiographical reassessment of the Delhi Sultanate, see Sunil Kumar, *The Emergence of the Delhi Sultanate, 1192-1286* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2007)

<sup>9</sup> On Mughal millenarianism, see A. Azfar Moin, *The Millennial Sovereign. Sacred Kingship and Sainthood in Islam* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

particular usage there (...). I never went abroad amongst that people but those that met me, upon this consideration, that I was a Padrae, (for so they call'd me) a father or minister, they would manifest in their behavior towards me much esteem unto me (Terry 1777: 418-9).

Although the word “cosmopolitanism” is of course not used by Terry in this excerpt, his statement echoes (anachronistic as it may be) Diderot’s definition of the “cosmopolitan” as a “stranger nowhere in the world”.<sup>10</sup> The central idea that the chaplain Terry conveys to his readers in this passage is the ability of the Mughals to make no one feel a stranger in their empire. In addition, it is important to note that Terry’s translation of *ṣulḥ-i kull* in terms of religious tolerance was to have a lasting impact in the West. As two publications have recently underscored (Stevens and Sapra 2007, Kinra 2013), Terry was only one among many Europeans who were both amazed and impressed by the Mughal model of religious freedom in India, especially when contrasted with the violent sectarianism and religious discrimination prevalent in contemporary Europe.

Back in Europe, this kind of imported model was readily used by the Europeans as a critique of the existing situation of persecution of religious minorities, and to promote a new type of tolerance both religious and secular. If for some Europeans Mughal religious pluralism was a tool to reflect on and relativize their own religious arrangements, others profited from the cosmopolitan atmosphere *in situ* by way of which they were also able to access intellectual products that were financed by the Mughals in order to shore up the *ṣulḥ-i kull*. In the process, they also promoted the study and the dissemination of non-Muslim religious traditions and knowledge.

François Bernier was certainly among those who learnt a lot in the company of Mughal elites. A stash of manuscripts that he collected and that found their way into the Royal Library in Paris became, as Blake Smith showed in his article in this volume, intellectual sources for orientalists such as Anquetil Duperron, and Enlightenment thinkers of all stripes. The *Sirr-i akbar*, a Persian translation of the Upanishads commissioned by the prince Dārā Shukoh, emperor Shah Jahan's eldest son, was part of Mughal efforts to assimilate these Hindu philosophical-mystical texts into the fold of Islam through the Sufi doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd* (“Unity of Being”) first elaborated by Ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 1240).<sup>11</sup> In the chain of transmission, the reception of the same text translated into Latin by Anquetil Duperron, eliminated this mid-17<sup>th</sup> century Mughal and

---

<sup>10</sup> On Diderot’s cosmopolitan musings see Margaret Jacobs, *Strangers Nowhere in the World: The Rise of Cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) and Pratap Bhanu Mehta, “Cosmopolitanism and the Circle of Reason”, *Political Theory*, vol. 28, No. 5 (Oct. 2000), p. 621.

<sup>11</sup> For an introduction to *waḥdat al-wujūd* in Mughal India, see Muzaffar Alam, *The Languages of Political Islam in India c. 1200-1800* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004): chapter 3. On Dārā Shukoh’s mystical personality and engagement with Hinduism, see Rajeev Kinra, “Infantilizing Bābā Dārā: The Cultural Memory of Dārā Shekuh and the Mughal Public Sphere”, *Journal of Persianate Studies*, 2, 2009, 165-193; J. Ganeri, *The Lost Age of Reason: Philosophy in Early Modern India, 1450—1700*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011, 22-30; and the introduction by Svevo D’Onofrio and Fabrizio Speziale (eds.), *Muḥammad Dārā Šikōh – La congiunzione dei due oceani (Majma‘ al-Baḥrayn)*, Milano, Alephi, 2011.

Sufi rendition of Brahmanical learning, and reformulated the Upanishads in terms of Christian monotheism, which in turn fed into Enlightenment and Romantic philosophies.

In addition to its often invisible afterlife in European philosophy and political theory, Mughal cosmopolitanism persisted on the Indian peninsula in spite of the decline of central authority and through the existence of the regional successor states, all of which imitated, in one way or another, the Mughal model. This is in particular salient in the durbar rituals, courtly culture and its material manifestations in late Mughal Bengal, as well as under the new Maratha dispensation, analyzed in this volume by Kumkum Chatterjee and Sumit Guha respectively. The same holds true for Jai Singh's cosmopolitan astronomical project in early eighteenth-century Jaipur, as discussed in Dhruv Raina's article.

On the peripheries of the Mughal Empire and along the coast, very different kinds of imperial cosmopolitanism were also being put in place, that of the Portuguese, Dutch, English, German, Danish, French. While the Mughals, arriving from Central Asia, conquered the large peninsular hinterland, the Portuguese, arriving from the Indian Ocean, conquered a few specks of land on the coast. The Franks (Firanguis), as Mughals called these Iberian newcomers, came with a similarly universalist ideology of empire fuelled in the beginning by a combination of Christian millenarianism and the expansionist zeal of the medieval Reconquista.<sup>12</sup>

Just like the Mughal Empire, the Portuguese were faced with social and cultural diversity and their heroic narratives of conquest and violence inflicted on the infidels (Muslim) and heathens (Hindu), real and imagined, were in fact quickly eclipsed by the necessity of governing and administering the discontinuous territories (enclaves) in their possession along the coast. The lack of crown officials and administrators was compensated by the introduction of ecclesiastical and missionary endowments and personnel. It is through aggressive and insistent Christianization that the Portuguese empire managed its own survival in the region. However, historians of Catholic missions in South Asia have amply shown that the map of the Portuguese empire and the network of Catholic missions did not overlap. In fact, the missionaries advanced, in small bands of at most four or five people at any time, into the hinterland all the way to the Mughal court, to the seat of the rump Vijayanagara state, of the Nayaks in the heart of the Tamil country, to Tibet, Bengal and even along the coasts. Some of the missions survived longer than the official Portuguese settlements.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> See in particular the article by Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Du Tage au Gange au XVIe siècle : une conjoncture millénariste à l'échelle eurasiatique," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 56e année, N. 1, 2001. pp. 51-84.

<sup>13</sup> Literature on Catholic missions in South Asia is immense. See, for example, Rubiés, Joan-Pau, 'The Jesuit Discovery of Hinduism; Antonio Rubino's Account of the History and Religion of Vijayanagara (1608)', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 3 (2001), 210-256; Županov, Ines G., *Missionary Tropics, The Catholic Frontier in India (16th-17th centuries)* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005); Lorenzen, David, 'Marco della Tomba and the Brahmin from Banaras: Missionaries, Orientalists, and Indian Scholars', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 65/ 1 (Feb., 2006) 115-143; Campos, Arnulf, *Studies in Asian mission history, 1956-1998* (Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill, 2000).

The missionaries brought with them European books, paintings and instruments, all in the service of Catholic conversion. Perhaps even more valuable at times were “local”, non-European products such as manuscripts of the Bible translated into Persian by Jewish scholars that Jerome Xavier, a Spanish Jesuit, and Giovanni Battista Vecchietti, a Florentine traveler and collector, compared and exchanged in Agra in 1604.<sup>14</sup> Fueled by Christian universalism, which grew in intensity after the post-Tridentine reform, a certain kind of Catholic cosmopolitanism also emerged from the encounter, as the debate on Jesuit accommodation from the early 17<sup>th</sup> to the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century bears witness. Still far from religious toleration, in the missions that were unprotected by the Portuguese army or government, the missionaries engaged in intercultural dialogue and observed the way in which religious plurality was locally tolerated and incorporated into political units and larger polities. The Jesuit response after 1575, coinciding with the arrival of the Jesuit Visitor Alessandro Valignano, provisionally accepted the definition of non-Christian “customs and rites” as belonging to the domain of civility, not religion, in the context of conversion. This “permissive” attitude triggered two centuries of debates.<sup>15</sup> Famously known from the 18<sup>th</sup> century as the Malabar and Chinese rites quarrel, it divided both Catholic and Protestant theologians and widened the gap between what was considered a religious domain and what a secular domain in general. It also cleared the space for the attack on not only Catholicism but also any kind of institutional religion.

The Portuguese empire, the major sponsor of the Catholic missions in South Asia served as a facilitator of various cosmopolitan endeavors, not all consciously embraced from the start, but which ended up going in that direction. In particular, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, as Giuseppe Marcocci argues in his article, the routes and sea-ways opened by the Portuguese were populated by other European actors, some of whom had already experience cosmopolitan ways of being at home in Italian cities such as Florence and Venice. Some of their reports and books became European bestsellers and were translated into other languages and published in the collections of “travel writing” that increasingly flourished as a literary genre. The Portuguese also travelled and, often against the ubiquitous spirit of national glory and pride, fostered by the political empire, conceived of an even larger empire of knowledge, as Garcia de Orta, a 16<sup>th</sup> century physician in Goa, tried to convey in his *Colóquios*.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> See the doctoral dissertation by Jorge Flores, *Firangistan e Hindustan : O Estado da Índia e os confins meridionais do Império Mogol*, Universidade Nova, Lisbon, 2004, pp. 287-288

<sup>15</sup> On Valignano and on accommodation see, Rubiés, Joan-Pau, *Travel and Ethnology in the Renaissance: South India through European Eyes, 1250-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). Rubiés, Joan-Pau, ‘The Concept of Cultural Dialogue and the Jesuit Method of Accommodation’, *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 74/147 (2005): 237-280 ; Županov, Ines G, ‘Le repli du religieux: Les missionnaires jésuites du XVIIe siècle entre la théologie chrétienne et une éthique païenne’, *Annales HSS*, 6 (1996), 1201-1223.

<sup>16</sup> Orta, G. de, *Colóquios dos Simples e Drogas he Cousas Medicinai da India*, (Goa, 1563; reprint, Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1987). See also, Carvalho, Teresa Nobre de Carvalho, *O mundo natural asiático aos olhos do Ocidente. Contribuição dos textos ibéricos quinhentistas para a construção de uma nova consciência europeia sobre a Ásia* (University of Lisbon, 2013, unpublished dissertation). See also Županov, I. G. and Xavier, A. B., “Quest for

Even if Portuguese colonialism in South Asia - found in concentrated form only in Goa, besides the short-lived Northern Provinces - appears as an antithesis to cosmopolitanism, especially in its support of Inquisition, it was also a hub where “strangers” from all parts of the world could meet. Almost in spite of various universalist desires built into it by the Portuguese kings and by the official inhabitants, it remained an uneven terrain of cultural porosity and of both cosmopolitan and parochial grain. The peripheries of the Portuguese empire in South Asia were on the other hand, by the nature of their implantation in the local political structures, always ready to bend and compromise on various issues – religious, political, economic. When they did not, it was usually at their own loss. Whether or not we can call it a “strategic” cosmopolitanism is another question.

To what extent was the Portuguese haphazard cosmopolitan experience similar, or not, to the Catholic cosmopolitanism of the missionaries, both those commissioned by the Portuguese royal patronage (*padroado*) of the missions and the rival papal envoys sent by the Propaganda Fide? This question is too important to be answered without proper research, which is still lacking, and it cannot be answered without widening the net to include other Christian, albeit not Catholic, cosmopolitan experiences in South Asia. Jos Gomans, in this volume, touches upon certain aspects of the Dutch involvement in the South Asia, more specifically in Cochin, a former Portuguese enclave which they conquered in 1663.

All of the 17<sup>th</sup>-century European trading companies - Dutch, French, Danish and English – arrived in South Asia by following Portuguese ships. And not only ships. The sources of their knowledge of Asia, from maps to ethnographies, to botanical and mercantile information had been bought, stolen, or borrowed from their Iberian predecessors, but except for the French they were also part of freshly constituted Protestant states and staunch enemies of Catholicism. Perhaps as haphazardly cosmopolitan as the Portuguese upon arrival, the encounter with the Mughal Empire and the coastal societies had an important impact on their own sense of “mission”, importance and tasks in the tropics.

### *Itineraries/Practices*

At this point it is important to shift the scale of our analysis if we want to understand the different shades of early modern cosmopolitanism on the ground in South Asia, which is a way also of questioning the diffusionist and elitist model, according to which cosmopolitanism trickles down from the top level agencies (royal courts, ecclesiastical institutions, philosophical ideas).<sup>17</sup> Of course in our volume as well we were able to trace only those voices that were present in the archives and thus privileged more middle and elite agents. Only Claude Markovits

---

Permanence in the Tropics: Portuguese Bioprospecting in Asia (16th-18th Centuries)”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 57 (2014), 511-548.

<sup>17</sup> For a severe, but useful, critique of the elitism informing the historiographical treatment of cosmopolitanism in Middle East studies, see Will Hanley, “Grieving Cosmopolitanism in Middle East Studies”, *History Compass* 6/5 (2008): 1346–1367.



tried to read against the grain the colonial sources concerning the Indian sepoys in order to tease out subaltern forms of cosmopolitanism.<sup>18</sup>

One of more useful analytical insights for historians of the early modern period came from a recent sociological intervention and effort at redefining cosmopolitanism - in what they call a “cosmopolitan turn” in the social sciences. By approaching cosmopolitanism as a *social* and not merely as a *political* category, the questions of agency, class and caste, ethnicity, sociability, conviviality and power relations on a micro- and macro- level of analysis came to play an important role. Of course, sociological analysis is primarily rooted in contemporary concerns, such as the rise of global interdependence and connectedness with its advantages and attendant risks (Beck, 2004). The central question remains the same: how to handle otherness, diversity, and boundaries in transnational, migratory, and diasporic flows. However, the problem for contemporary sociologists lies in the undesired “side effects” of globalization and cosmopolitanism. For historians of the early modern period, the effects of cosmopolitanism are still incomplete and often desirable. In fact the argument is usually based on finding an unexpected cosmopolitan place with accidental cosmopolitans often only *malgré eux*.

For the most part, the articles in this volume focus on the empirically grounded aspects of cosmopolitanism: some on mundane practices and sociability, others on literary/political projects. The historical agents under the spotlight are both ordinary and extraordinary, but mostly they are little or insufficiently studied individuals and groups. None, however, consciously or programmatically claimed that they were cosmopolitans. Some of them may appear as unlikely candidates to be considered as cosmopolitans from the point of view of even the most open and generous historiography in which they appeared under other names and as other categories of actors: intermediaries, go-betweens, strangers, aliens.

“The art of being in-between”, a lapidary quote from Michel de Certeau and a title of Yanna Yanakakis’s book on native intermediaries in colonial Mexico, could equally apply to many of the historical actors whom we designated in this volume as cosmopolitan.<sup>19</sup> The recent flurry of books on the topic opened the way to thinking about the conditions, motivations, and actions of go-betweens in particular in the construction of colonial knowledge.<sup>20</sup> It is in looking into the actors of the emergent early modern colonial world that the project of mercantile globalization and planetary connectedness, with all advantages and horrors included, such as slavery and forced migration (if not extermination), that we can discern the appearance of both cosmopolitan practice and theory. Desiderius Erasmus, Jean Bodin, but also Guillaume Postel and Richard

---

<sup>18</sup> For an overview of “subaltern cosmopolitanism” in the social sciences, see Minhao Zheng, “Subaltern Cosmopolitanism: Concept and Approaches”, *The Sociological Review*, 62, 2014, p. 137-148.

<sup>19</sup> Yanna Yanakakis, *The Art of Being In-Between: Native Intermediaries, Indian Identity, and Local Rule in Colonial Oaxaca*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

<sup>20</sup> Recent historiography in the past two or three decades on cultural brokers is indeed quite rich: (Metcalf, 2005), (Richter, 1988), (Raj, 2007), (Osborn, 2003), (Poirier, 2004), (Rothman, 2006), (Dirks (1993), (Alam and Subrahmanyam, 2004), (Neild-Basu, 1984), (Pearson, 1988), (Karttunen, 1994), (Das Gupta, 1991), (Cronin, 2002), (Simon Schaffer et al., 2009), (Simon, Roberts, Raj, Delbourgo, 2009).

Hakluyt used the word itself,<sup>21</sup> but many others, such as Fernão Mendes Pinto, Akbar, Dārā Shikūh, Isaak of Cairo, Joseph of Cranganore, Georges Pakalomaṭṭam, Nūr al-dīn Rānīrī, Jai Singh Sawai, Filippo Sassetti and others experienced it in one way or another.

Somewhat ironically, therefore, colonialism and empires in the early modern world, and globalization in the contemporary moment, are primary fabricators of cosmopolitans, who are most of the time both rooted in basically exploitative political and economic systems and capable of thinking or acting beyond the bounds of the very projects from which they arose or in which they even thrived. The willingness - hand in hand with enhanced reflexivity – to engage creatively with new situations and peoples has also been understood in historiography as the condition of modernity. This concept has been much debated, especially in the historiography of South Asia in the last two decades of the twentieth century, and was crystalized in the approach that is by now well-known as Subaltern Studies, and in the subsequent reaction and at times dissenting rejoinders from historians of the early modern period.<sup>22</sup>

Questions such as whether the subaltern can speak (or ride) and whether or not it had (if only in part) what Europe-centered historiography called subjectivity and historical consciousness -- which can be taken as a measure of cosmopolitan condition and imagination -- has been mercifully turned around and asked differently, with more interesting results.<sup>23</sup> In a series of articles on clerical self-fashioning and ethical preoccupations of early modern scribes or munshī's in Mughal and Maratha polities, a fertile ground has been opened recently for testing, among other things, cosmopolitan ways of being in South Asia. Historians such as Alam and Subrahmanyam (2004), Guha (2004), K. Chatterjee (1998), O'Hanlon (2010; 2013), Washbrook (2010), Minkowski (2008), Kinra (2010), to mention some of them, have shown that some dramatic changes occurred in South Asia in the early modern period through the introduction of elaborate systems of paper administration developed in the Islamic world.<sup>24</sup> The scribal elites recruited from a variety of social and cultural milieus - Muslims and Hindus, Persian elites and those coming from Sanskrit literary culture – devised different ways of adapting to a new situation in which they had to compete for service to new kings and royal states. The role and status of Brahman literati, who had to accommodate their ritually elevated status to their employment with non-caste kings, has been admirably studied by Minkowski and O'Hanlon, and in a slightly later period, under the British rule, by Mantena (2009), and Venkatachalapathy (2011), and Raman (2009). Not all of the scribes fit in all aspects the definitions of cosmopolitan – mobile, self-conscious, prone to self-fashioning, socially and culturally open to alterity in terms

---

<sup>21</sup> For instance, in 1598 Richard Hakluyt used the term “cosmopolites” to mean “a citizen and member of the whole and only one mysticall citie universal” (Alistar Bonnet, *Left in the Past: Radicalism and the Politics of Nostalgia*, London, Bloomsbury Academic, 2010, p. 116). On Jean Bodin and Guillaume Postel, see the contribution by Giuseppe Marcocci in this volume.

<sup>22</sup> For the development of the ideas of Subaltern Studies see various articles by Partha Chatterjee (1993) and Dipesh Chkarabarty (2000, 2011). For a critique and a view from the early modern perspective see Rao, Shulman, Subrahmanyam (2001)

<sup>23</sup> For a heated debate concerning the subaltern approach to agency see the debate between Gyan Prakash (1990, 1992) and Rosalind O'Hanlon and David Washbrook (1992).

<sup>24</sup> See in particular Rosalind O'Hanlon and David Washbrook (2010) and Bhavani Raman (2012).

of marriage, conviviality, in addition to often being obsessive self-describers - but they were certainly not parochial. Jorge Flores, in this volume, addresses some of the identity issues and strategies of self-promotion practiced by the Brahmans who were employed as Persian translators for the Portuguese viceroys. Similarly, within the same context of Portuguese empire, Ângela Barreto Xavier has studied the “identity debates” among the converted Christian and non-converted Brahman elites. Their ability to refer to and to plead with different centers of authority, such as the Mughal court, Brahman maths in Varanasi, and the Portuguese court in Lisbon, in order to have their Brahman ritual and social status confirmed or in order to gain and preserve employment, certainly points to the historical actors with multiple cosmopolitan skills – knowledge of different languages and different social and literary habits (Xavier, 2012 and Xavier and Županov, 2015).

Crossing boundaries, if not “critical border thinking” in today postcolonial jargon and blueprints for a future ideal society, was not simply a matter of choice in early modern South Asia and in the larger world (Mignolo, 2000), but of necessity. To travel, to re-imagine ‘home’ on the basis of an experience ‘abroad’, and to be (or not to be) ‘curious’ – another elusive idea in the pre-modern world – along that process, was an integral part of the cosmopolitan equations of the period. The Malabar Christians described by Istvan Perczel in his article had to go all the way to West Asia to find bishops for their community. Nūr al-dīn Rānīrī, born into a Hadrami diasporic family in Gujarat, traveled to Aceh, as shown by Paul Wormser, to earn his living as a religious advisor of the reigning sultan, but failed to address his cosmopolitan experience in his writings and translations from Arabic and Persian into Malay.<sup>25</sup> Even those who proclaimed the “desire” for the Indies and were carried on the wings of religious universalist ideologies, such as the Catholic missionaries sponsored by the Iberian empires or later on directly by the Papacy and by French kings were often unconvinced cosmopolitans (Roscioni, 2001). Some complained about food, about idioms difficult to master, and about horrible climate and dangerous roads and seas. On the other hand, others “went native” for strategic reasons and when it suited them. The method of accommodation practiced by the Jesuits (and not only them) was a particular kind of cosmopolitan strategy devised to put into being and practice a global Catholic world. The practitioners of missionary cosmopolitanism were therefore open and willing to consider and understand (not necessarily to tolerate) cultural and religious otherness while being deeply rooted in the *orbs/urbs christiana*. From the early 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards, Protestant missionaries, first based in South Indian missions proceeded in a way similar, though not identical, to Catholic missionary strategies - especially in their expertise in local and classical languages and literatures (Sweetman, 2014).

Parallel to missionary cosmopolitans were travelers, adventurers, renegades, soldiers and merchants who also crossed borders in different guises and with different intentions. Some in fact also crossed over and converted to Islam or Christianity or married local women, others lived to tell their story upon return to Europe. Even if many of them correspond to the general description of an ideal category of cosmopolitan (polyglot, moving among different religious and cultural spheres, self-conscious), it is neither clear nor certain that they were valued as such in the historical contexts in which they acted.<sup>26</sup> The legitimate question, from the methodological

---

<sup>25</sup> On Nūr al-dīn Rānīrī’s work see Paul Wormser (2012).

<sup>26</sup> This is the doubt expressed by Subrahmanyam (2011, 22).

point of view, is also how cosmopolitan the dissimulation was that was practiced by those who strategically converted to Islam or Christianity, or those who hid their “true” religion in the manner of the Nicodemites.<sup>27</sup> Should we discard those who do not resemble in the minutest detail to the ideal category of the Renaissance citizen of the world created on the basis of their own thick autobiographies and the plethora of documents, or should we create a more spacious category to contain also those whose life stories come from other sources and in small anecdotal fragments?

The fact is that in the early modern period, in Renaissance Rome, colonial Goa, and in the courts of Bijapur or Fatehpur Sikri, or elsewhere for that matter, all candidates for the title of cosmopolitan on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century definition prove inadequate. This is so mostly because the nation and the state were still not the most important categories defining individual identity. A cosmopolitan capacity has to be measured against its obstacles, and these were different in different historical periods and historical sources. One way to identify a cosmopolitan is as “a stranger”, an alien, as did Sanjay Subrahmanyam (2011). However, the strangers he collected in his book had one thing in common: they knew who they were. In that sense they were “rooted” strangers, some of them even eager to define their origins and lineage (Subrahmanyam, 1011, 22). In fact, the “diasporic” communities, such as Armenians, the subject of early modern European ethnographies were defined by ethnicity, coming very close to the modern category of a “nation”, although without a state (Maccabe, 2008; Aslanian, 2011).

Ethnic definitions were also applied to the Portuguese and to those who traded and travelled through their networks. They were also called "Franks" all over Asia, and visually depicted with hats or long noses, with balloon trousers or black cassocks.<sup>28</sup> However, these essential aliens became indigenized in Asia and in local classificatory definitions - pronounced variously as "Paranguis", "Frangues", "firangī", etc.- they took different forms and inspired local imagination (Flores, 2013). These representations and names were also appropriated or applied to Portuguese client communities and converts. In 18<sup>th</sup> century Tranquebar, the Parava Catholics were often referred to in the Pietist missionary letters as Portuguese (Libau, 2011). Domestication of an alien individual or community was parallel to “othering” those who changed sides or allegiances. In the Deccan sultanates, in particular, as Roy Fischel shows in his article, the definition of who is native and who is foreign was always important and hard to establish, feeding into faction politics and rivalries. Itself products of “foreign” conquest, the Deccan sultanates were continuously forced to rethink their local rootedness, depending on external and internal threats.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Ginzburg (Turin, 1970). About the king of Tanor see (Županov, 2005)

<sup>28</sup> On the cultural representations of Europeans in early modern South Asia, see Sanjay Subrahmanyam, “On the Hat Wearers, Their Toilet Practices, and Other Curious Usages”, in *Europe Observed. Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters*, ed. K. Chatterjee and C. Hawes (Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont Publishing and Printing, 2008), p. 45-82.

<sup>29</sup> On the tensions between “Westerners” (*gharbiyan* or *afaqis*)—i.e. Persianized immigrants—and local notables in the elite of 15<sup>th</sup>-century Deccan, see the recent account by Burton Stein, *A Social History of the Deccan 1300-1761: Eight Indian Lives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 59-77. The idea that such binary division remained the dominant feature of the

In such cases a cosmopolitan condition may be something that only occurs fleetingly in a transition phase during radical social and cultural transformations. The category of the provisional or transitional cosmopolitan could apply to all those who chose or were forced to be uprooted before settling down in another position, status, or place. The notion of belonging in an unstable and ever-changing world of the advancing commercial and colonial interconnectedness of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries in particular becomes problematic, since everybody could be potentially in the “wrong place”. This is why the notion of the cosmopolitan acquired in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century a negative moral charge of someone who in his nomadic practices lacks moral and social commitment.<sup>30</sup>

Although slavery is a condition directly opposite to being a “citizen of the world”, those who survived to tell the story were some of the most cosmopolitan minds of the period, for example Olaudah Equiano (Carreta, 2007).<sup>31</sup> The relation between a slave and a cosmopolitan is (literally) central in Voltaire’s *Candide, ou l’optimisme* (1759). The unnamed Surinamese “black” [*nègre*] is a one-legged slave who is unfree to move, but who has a panoramic vision of the injustice of the global economic system. His is the dark side of a cosmopolitan existence. He is a human being transformed into an object of commerce, just like sugar, tobacco and cotton, and filliped into global networks of exchange. As is well known, *Candide* ends in celebration of a closed, peaceful and autarchic existence – “il faut cultiver notre jardin”.<sup>32</sup> End of cosmopolitanism.

### *Languages/Translations*

In spite of the well-known definition of a cosmopolitan as a stranger nowhere in the world, the spatial dimension is inevitable and raises an interesting debate when combined with the language question. It is precisely by following itineraries of Sanskrit and Persian that scholars first identified cosmopolitanism, inscribed in different literary genres, in the service of different political formations, but at the same time bringing up or addressing a common set of ethical and aesthetic projects. Sanskritist Sheldon Pollock and the historian of the Mughals, Muzaffar Alam,

---

political history of the Deccan throughout the early modern period is, however, in need of revision.

<sup>30</sup> For the negative portrait of the philosophers who consider themselves cosmopolitan see, Charles Palissot de Montenoy’s comedy, *Les Philosophes* (Paris: Librairie Duchesen, 1760).

<sup>31</sup> Equiano’s self-narrative was published in London by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. See Olaudah Equiano, *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African. Written by Himself* (London, 1789). For an example of an earlier, somewhat more silent ‘cosmopolitan slave’, see James Sweet, *Domingues Alvares, African Healing, and the Intellectual History of the Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill: Univeristy of North Carolina Press, 2011)

<sup>32</sup> If Voltaire’s treatment of the Surinamese slave “anticipates a cosmopolitan notion of human rights”, although it is well known that the famous writer was no anti-slavery advocate, Anquetil Duperron has been celebrated in the historiography as a learned and enlightened critique of European colonialism, a “cosmopolitan egalitarian”. According to Lynn Hunt, the notion of human rights emerged in parallel with the new concept of concept of the autonomy of the human body which becomes the locus of empathy (Hunt, 2012). On Anquetil Duperron see Siep Stuurman’s article (2007).

have both explored the way in which languages travel and how they function as cosmopolitan or local, and what this means for political and religious communities.

In the work of Pollock on Indian literary cultures, the terms of the debate were cast in terms of a relationship between “Sanskrit cosmopolis” and “cosmopolitan vernacularization”. Although the political imagination that Pollock tracks down through Sanskrit kavya and later, in the second millennium, through vernacular literature, may concern a relatively small literary elite, their texts were powerful political weapons of legitimation. As Pollock insists, his was the inquiry into “the specific contours of culture’s place in power” (Pollock, 2006, 8). The merit of his work for the study of cosmopolitanism is in bringing into discussion premodern (or in his terms pre-European) forms of cosmopolitanism that accompanied the “quasi-global” or “little global” “imperial” and translocal extension, in particular to Southeast Asia, of Sanskrit culture and aesthetics.

By the time the Mughals and the Europeans arrived with very concrete intentions to rule or to make profit at the dawn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, according to Pollock, South Asian Sanskrit cosmopolis was already superseded by (although it remained, in a way, parallel to or “superposed on”) “vernacular cosmopolitanism”. “Vernacularization”, in Pollock’s definition is “the historical process of choosing to create a written literature, along with its complement, a political discourse, in local languages, according to models supplied by a superordinate, usually cosmopolitan literary culture” (Pollock, 2006, 23).

More importantly, however, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century another language, chosen by the Mughal emperors to be the language of culture and governance, added another layer to the cosmopolitan configuration. Audrey Truschke, in this volume, highlights one among the many ways in which Sanskrit and Persian engaged one another in the Mughal court in the texts of literary elites. This brings up the question of whether we can have two (or more) cosmopolitan languages at the same time, each of which has its own sphere of influence and authority, and what kind of discursive modalities may be created in their interaction. It may either lead to the obliteration of another, or, on the contrary, it may both facilitate the process of assimilation through translation and widen and sharpen the space of negotiation.

The history of the Persian language in South Asia, admirably studied by Muzaffar Alam (Alam, 2004) clearly brings out the political function of a cosmopolitan language. Roy Fischel follows his lead in discussing how late 16th- and early-17th-century Deccan sultanates were able to legitimate their rule by integrating and manipulating elements taken from the Persianate cosmopolitan idiom. The need for a transregional language was one of the reasons that made Mughals choose Persian too, a language that was not their mother tongue at the beginning, nor ever after. From the Chaghatāy Turkish of Bābur, in the long run it was Persian that Akbar promoted as the administrative language of the empire. This choice was made at the expense of Hindavi, which had been used earlier as the semi-official language of the Afghan dynasties in Delhi and continued to be important for the Mughals as well (Alam, 2004, 123). From around the time of Jahāngir, it was not only used by the emperors in the private sphere, but also increasingly became a subject of imperial patronage and a literary medium of expression for non-Indian elites of the empire (Busch, 2011).

The existence of a strong and widely used cosmopolitan language, preferred by the rulers as a tool of political domination and assimilation, may not lead to the exclusion of all other languages. Not everybody had to rewrite and translate their letters into Persian, as Mahamati Pran-nath did in order to reach the ears of the Mughal emperor Aurangzeb, as Vikas Rathee describes in his paper. On the contrary, many scholars have shown that cosmopolitan languages stimulate the rise of vernaculars (Pollock, 2006). In particular the translations between two cosmopolitan languages were often mediated by way of vernaculars, as has been argued by scholars working on translations from Sanskrit into Persian, via Hindavi (Truschke, 2012). In the long run these local intermediary languages can become cosmopolitan as well, especially by manipulating the politics of translation, but may not necessarily claim universal status.

It is interesting to see, as Paolo Aranha remarks in his article, that some sort of Hindavi was seen by the French Capuchin François-Marie de Tours, as a possible universal vernacular language (“lingua vulgaris seu universalis”) of communication in South Asia. However, more wishful thinking than fact, Catholic missionary obsession with finding universal languages into which to translate the “universal” Christian message was at work all over Asia and beyond. At one point both Persian and Sanskrit were proposed by the Jesuit missionaries as the appropriate languages for celebrating the Mass.<sup>33</sup> For this reason they translated their catechetical texts into these languages and into other vernaculars, such as Tamil, Konkani, Malayalam, etc. However, in order to find the right words and expressions in the foreign language, the missionaries had to first master these idioms. Those who acquired a high level of proficiency in their target language(s), often became themselves “converts” to and enraptured by the literary traditions they encountered. Such was, among others, the case of two Jesuits: Costanzo Giuseppe Beschi (d. 1747?), a Tamil scholar in his own right, and Johann Ernst Hanxleden (1681-1732), who famously composed a Sanskrit grammar.<sup>34</sup>

All missionaries, those with the talent and stamina to learn these “infidel” or “pagan” languages and those who learnt these languages only superficially, relied at all times on indigenous translators. Usually called by the Portuguese and the Europeans “língua”, “dubashi”, or “topaz”, they were cultural mediators with a great deal of knowledge of both sides. While Xavier presented ‘Abd al-Sattar bin Qasim Lahori (d. after 1619) as his “língua” who assisted him in translating for example *The Life of Christ* or *The Mirror of Holiness* (Mir’āt al-Quds) into Persian, from the point of view of ‘Abd al-Sattar it was the other way around. Solicited by Akbar to master Latin in order to be able to read Frankish books, ‘Abd al-Sattar used Xavier as his intermediary for learning not only the language, but also the history and the culture of the West

---

<sup>33</sup>On discussion among the Jesuits of the languages suitable for celebrating the Mass see Županov (2009, 231).

<sup>34</sup> A proper study of Costanzo Giuseppe Beschi’s life and work is still lacking. Some information can be found in Stuart Blackburn, *Print, Folklore, and Nationalism in Colonial South India* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003). He was also much admired by the Madras school of British Orientalists, see Thomas Trautmann, ed., *The Madras School of Orientalism: Producing Knowledge in Colonial South India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009). On both Beschi and Hanxleden see Angela Barreto Xavier and Ines G. Županov, *Catholic Orientalism, Portuguese Empire, Indian Knowledge (16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries)*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2015, chapters 6 and 8.

(Alam and Subrahmanyam, 2009). Purporting to be a history of the great kings and philosophers of antiquity, his *Samarat al-Falāsifa* is an erudite rendition of *Summa Historialis* of Saint Antoninus of Florence (1389-1459).<sup>35</sup>

The question is to what extent the act of translation is already a cosmopolitan act, in the sense that it seeks to understand the other's point of view in the context of early modern catechistical literature. By definition, these kinds of translations are made to convert in the first place, while a basic understanding is both a precondition and may be an important result. In a similar way, different translations between South Asian elite and vernacular languages were equally partisan and served various political, religious and personal agendas.<sup>36</sup> In the long run, however, all of these texts became sources and they filled and fueled Orientalist knowledge-making. By effacing the traces of the cosmopolitan conditions of production of the translations they used, the European Orientalists in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries in particular were then able to present themselves as pioneers in both discovering and disseminating South Asian literary traditions.

In fact, already in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, some of the European cosmopolitans mentioned in Giuseppe Marcocci's article were already Orientalist pioneers. Not necessarily having direct access to elite literature in Persian and Sanskrit, Filippo Sassetti analyzed non-European languages with humanist philological tools, and clearly observed the similarities and connections between Indic and European languages. From the offhand analogies between Italian, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit by both Sassetti and the English Jesuit Thomas Stephens in the 1580s, by the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century Gaston-Laurent Coeurdoux brought the similarity between these languages closer to the Indo-European hypothesis, later associated with William Jones and the British Orientalists in Calcutta, and with Franz Bopp's comparative linguistics.<sup>37</sup>

Nor were European "proto-Orientalists" such as Sassetti in any way pioneers in this field. Indo-Persian poets and scholars had tried their hand at comparative philology as early as the 13<sup>th</sup> century, when the Delhi sultanate became one of the major sources of patronage for Persian-speaking intellectuals (Kinra, 2011). The Mughals' eagerness to establish India as the new leading pole of Persian culture and language further stimulated philological interest and reflection, and in part motivated the translations from Sanskrit commissioned by the dynasty. This is a good example in which we can glance how a language, transplanted to a new setting, in this case Persian to South Asia, may become a privileged subject of study and of philological

---

<sup>35</sup>For preliminary reflections on this text, see Alam & Subrahmanyam (2009): 472-475 and Lefèvre (2012b): 131-137.

<sup>36</sup>For an overview of these agendas in the case of translations into Arabic and Persian, see Carl Ernst, "Muslim Studies of Hinduism? A Reconsideration of Arabic and Persian Translations from Indian Languages", *Iranian Studies* 36/2 (2003): 173-195.

<sup>37</sup>See Gaston-Laurent Coeurdoux, 'Réponse au mémoire de M. L'Abbé Barthélemy (c. 1768)', Bibliothèque National, Paris, NAF 8871. It was published in *Supplément* to Abraham Hyacinthe Anquetil-Duperron's, 'Le premier fleuve de l'Inde, le Gange, selon les anciens, expliquée par le Gange, selon les modernes', *Mémoires de littérature, tirés des registres de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions des Belles Lettres*, vol. 49, 1784-93 (Paris: L'Imprimerie impériale, 1808), 674-712. For Thomas Stephens, see Georg Schurhammer (1963).



reflection. As a matter of fact, it was in South Asia that all but one major Persian dictionary were composed, from 1600 to the late 19th century. Interestingly, both native speakers of Persian and those who learnt it as an official language participated in this scholarly effort.<sup>38</sup> As established almost two decades ago by Muzaffar Alam, it was also in the Indian peninsula that Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Khān Ārzū (1687–1756) “earned the distinction of being the first to discover and point out the correspondence (*tawāfuq*) between Persian and Sanskrit” (Alam, 1998: 341), a correspondence that William Jones, building on the insights of both earlier South Asian and European scholars, was to elaborate later on.<sup>39</sup>

Cultural translation, closely connected to cosmopolitan attitudes, also took place outside of the scholarly world, in everyday life in South Asia. Multilingualism, even within the family, was a feature of early modern South Asia, as it is today. Different visual languages and registers are also evident and at work on the level of material culture. The appropriation of Christian and European iconography by Mughal art studios has been long noticed and well researched (Bailey, 1998 and Koch, 2001). Even before the arrival of the Europeans, as Finbarr Barry Flood brilliantly argues, material production had been imprinted by mutual engagement between Hindus and Muslims. The “translated objects” he studied highlight the processes of appropriation and exchange invisible in the textual evidence (Flood, 2009).

By focusing on material culture, Philip Wagoner and George Michell, on the other hand, emphasized the fact that the Vijayanagara’s rulers and elites mastered the Islamicate political and culture idiom to a high degree and made a sophisticated use of it.<sup>40</sup> This is at its most visible in the areas of architecture and clothing. For example, the buildings housing court rituals or used for administrative purposes bore the stamp of Islamic architecture. Similarly, Vijayanagara monarchs and courtiers wore traditional South Indian garb when engaged in Hindu religious activity or in a domestic setting, but opted for an Islamic style of dress during the formal public audiences. In her study of Persianization of Bengali courts and elite culture during the Mughal period, Kumkum Chatterjee uncovers the same dichotomy between a public space dominated by

---

<sup>38</sup> On the production of Sanskrit lexicons and grammars by Brahman pandits, see S. R. Sarma, "Persian-Sanskrit Lexica and the Dissemination of Islamic Astronomy and Astrology in India," in G. Gnoli & A. Panaino (eds.), *Kayd: Studies in History of Mathematics, Astronomy and Astrology in Memory of David Pingree* (Rome: Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente, 2009) 129–150; Audrey Truschke, “Defining the Other: An Intellectual History of Sanskrit Lexicons and Grammars of Persian”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40 (2012): 635–668.

<sup>39</sup>For Jones’s intellectual connections to the work of Persian and Sanskrit philologists, see Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and Historiography* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001): chapter 2; Kapil Raj, *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), chapter 3; Arthur Dudley, “A Desire for Meaning: Khān-i Ārzū’s Philology and the Place of India in the Eighteenth-Century Persianate World”, Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2013, 123-31.

<sup>40</sup> Philipp Wagoner, "Sultan among Hindu Kings: Dress, Titles, and the Islamicization of Hindu Culture at Vijayanagara", *Journal of Asian Studies*, 55, 4 (1996): 851–80; George Michell, *The Vijayanagara Courtly Style: Incorporation and Synthesis in the Royal Architecture of Southern India, 15th–17th Centuries* (Delhi: Manohar, 1992).

Persianate etiquette and a domestic setting permeated with Sanskritic/Brahmanic culture (Chatterjee, 2009, 235).

Cross-dressing was a common strategy when it was seen necessary or useful by the actors. The Portuguese tried to resist sartorial permeability as much as possible and even tried to “portugalize” their Indian subjects, as was the case of the king of Tanor who was dressed in a European way for his Goan visit.<sup>41</sup> However, when outside of their colonial dominion, the Europeans also had to adapt to local conditions and dress when necessary. As for Jesuit missionaries, it is well known that they were perfect sartorial mimetists, sometimes donning a Brahman *saṃnyāsī* garb, other times dressed as Muslim or Armenian merchants, or playing the role of “themselves” in black cassocks at the Mughal court.

While for the Jesuit missionaries the crossdressing was part of their “job description”, others, such as the Marathas in the article of Sumit Guha, staged it for fun and recreation. The young Peshwa, Mādhavrāo Nārāyaṇ, ordered one of his Brahman attendants to wear a hat and coat in order to act as a European valet, probably not without comic effects.

Comedy and satire certainly points to the limits of cosmopolitan being in the world. This issue is addressed by most of the papers in the present volume, as it is impossible to define the core of cosmopolitanism without taking into account the boundaries surrounding it. They are multiple, and as much as there was cosmopolitanism, there was also its opposite – xenophobia.<sup>42</sup> The tension between religious pluralism and sectarian and orthodox movements, between persuasion, dialogue, and downright violence, between political integration of the other and advocacy for discrimination and exclusion, may have been contained at times, but nevertheless continued to exist.

## REFERENCES

ALAM, M. and Sanjay SUBRAHMANYAM. "The Making of a Munshi," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24, 2 (2004): 61-72.

ALAM, M. and Sanjay SUBRAHMANYAM, "Frank Disputations: Catholics and Muslims in the Court of Jahangir (1608-11)," *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 46, 4 (2009): 457-511.

ALAM, M. and Sanjay SUBRAHMANYAM, *Writing the Mughal World: Studies on Culture and Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

---

<sup>41</sup> For a striking parallel with Tokugawa Japan, see Ronald Toby, “The ‘Indianness’ of Iberia and changing Japanese iconographies of Other”, in Stuart B. Schwartz, ed., *Implicit Understandings, Observing, Reporting and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 323-352.

<sup>42</sup> Gjis Kruijtzjer, G., *Xenophobia in Seventeenth-Century India* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2009).

ALAM, M., *The Languages of Political Islam in India c. 1200-1800* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004).

ALAM, M. "The Pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal Politics", *Modern Asian Studies*, 32/2, (1998): 317-349.

ALAVI, S. *Muslim Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Empire* (Harvard University Press, 2015).

APPIAH, Kwame, A., *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: Norton, 2006).

ASLANIAN, S. D., *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean: The Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

BAGHDIAANTZ-MACCABE, I., *Orientalism in Early Modern France: Eurasian Trade, Exoticism, and the Ancien Régime* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008).

BAILEY, G. *The Jesuits and the Grand Mogul: Renaissance Art at the Imperial Court of India, 1580-1630* (Washington D. C.: Freer Gallery of Art, Arthur M. Sackler Gallery & Smithsonian Institution, 1998).

BECK, Ulrich, "The Truth of Others: A Cosmopolitan Approach," *Common Knowledge*, 10, 3, (Fall 2004): 430-449.

BEHL, A., "Pages from the Book of Religions: Comparing Self and Other in Mughal India," in *Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern Asia: Explorations in the Intellectual History of Indian and Tibet, 1500-1800*, ed. S. Pollock (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 312-67

BONNET, A., *Left in the Past: Radicalism and the Politics of Nostalgia* (London, Bloomsbury Academic, 2010).

BOSE, S. and MANJAPRA, K. (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Thought Zones: South Asia and the Global Circulation of Ideas* (Houndmills; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

BRECKENRIDGE, C.A, POLLOCK, S., BHABHA, H. K., and CHAKRABARTY, D. eds., *Cosmopolitanism* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.)

BUSCH, A., *Poetry of Kings. The Classical Hindi Literature of Mughal India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

CAMPOS, Arnulf, *Studies in Asian Mission History, 1956-1998* (Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill, 2000).

CARRETA, V., "Oludah Equiano: African British Abolitionist and Founder of the African American Slave Narrative", in *The Cambridge Companion to the African American Slave Narrative*, ed. Audrey Fisch (Cambridge University Press., 2007), 44-60.

CARVALHO, Teresa Nobre de Carvalho, *O mundo natural asiático aos olhos do Ocidente. Contribuição dos textos ibéricos quinhentistas para a construção de uma nova consciência europeia sobre a Ásia* (University of Lisbon, 2013, unpublished dissertation)

CHAKRABARTY, D. "The Muddle of Modernity ", *American Historical Review*, 116, 3 (2011): 663-675.

CHAKRABARTY, D. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, ADD REF.

CHATTERJEE, K. *The Cultures of History in Early Modern India. Persianization and Mughal Culture in Bengal* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009).

CHATTERJEE, K, "Cultural Flows and Cosmopolitanism in Mughal India: The Bishnupur Kingdom", *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 46, 2 (2009): 147-182.

CHATTERJEE, P., *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

COHN, B. S. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India, Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996).

CRONIN, Michael. "The Empire Talks Back: Orality, Heteronomy, and the Cultural Turn in Interpretation Studies," in *Translation and Power*, ed. Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 45-62.

DELANTY, G. and INGLIS, D., eds., *Cosmopolitanism. Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences*, 4 vols (London: Routledge, 2010).

DELANTY, G. (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitan Studies* (London: Routledge, 2012).

D'ONOFRIO, S. and SPEZIALE, F., (eds.), *Muḥammad Dārā Šikōh – La congiunzione dei due oceani (Majma' al-Baḥrayn)* (Milano: Alephi, 2011).

DUDNEY, A., "A Desire for Meaning: Khān-i Ārzū's Philology and the Place of India in the Eighteenth-Century Persianate World", Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2013.

EQUIANO, O. *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African. Written by Himself* (London, 1789).

ERNST, C. "Muslim Studies of Hinduism? A Reconsideration of Arabic and Persian Translations from Indian Languages", *Iranian Studies* 36, 2 (2003): 173-195.

EUBEN, R., "Cosmopolitanisms Past and Present, Islamic and Western," paper presented at the Cornell Political Theory Workshop, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. April 27, 2007.

FLOOD, F. B., *Objects of Translation. Material Culture and Medieval “Hindu-Muslim” Encounter* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009)

FLORES, J., *Firangistan e Hindustan : O Estado da Índia e os confins meridionais do Império Mogol*, Universidade Nova, Lisbon, 2004, Ph.D. diss.

FLORES, J., “Floating Franks; The Portuguese and Their Empire as Seen from Early Modern Asia”, in *The Routledge History of Western Empires*, eds., Robert Aldrich and Kirsten McKenzie (London: Routledge, 2013), 33-45.

GANERI, J., *The Lost Age of Reason; Philosophy in Early Modern India 1450—1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

GANIM, J. M. and LEGASSIE, Shayne Aaron, *Cosmopolitanism and the Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013).

GINZBURG, C., *Il nicodemismo: Simulazione e dissimulazione religiosa nell’Europa del’500* (Turin, 1970).

HANLEY, W., “Grieving Cosmopolitanism in Middle East Studies”, *History Compass* 6, 5 (2008): 1346–1367.

HODGSON, M., *The Venture of Islam*, 1974 ADD REF

HUNT, L., *Inventing Human Rights: A History* (New York: Norton, 2007)..

KARTTUNEN, F. E. *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides, and Survivors* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994).

KINRA, R. “Handling Diversity with Absolute Civility: The Global Legacy of Mughal sulh-i kull,” *The Medieval History Journal* 16 (2013): 251-295.

KINRA, R., “This Noble Science: Indo-Persian Comparative Philology, ca. 1000-1800 CE,” in *South Asian Texts in History: Critical Engagements with Sheldon Pollock*, ed. Yigal Bronner, Lawrence McCrea, and Whitney Cox (Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Asian Studies, 2011), 359-85.

KINRA, R., “Secretary-Poets in Mughal India and the Ethos of Persian: the Case of Chandar Bhān Brahman”, Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2008.

KOCH, E., *Mughal Art and Imperial Ideology. Collected Essays* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001).

KRUITJZER, G., *Xenophobia in Seventeenth-Century India* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2009).

KUMAR, S., *The Emergence of the Delhi Sultanate, 1192-1286* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2007).

LEFÈVRE, C. and ŽUPANOV, I. G. (eds.), *Cultural Dialogue in South Asia and Beyond: Narratives, Images and Community (sixteenth-nineteenth centuries)*, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 55, 2-3 (2012) PGS.

LEFÈVRE, C., “The *Majālis-i Jahāngīrī* (1608-1611): Dialogue and Asiatic Otherness at the Mughal Court”, in C. Lefèvre et I. G. Županov (ed.), *Cultural Dialogue in South Asia and Beyond: Narratives, Images and Community (Sixteenth-Nineteenth Centuries)*, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 55, 2-3 (YEAR?): 255-286.

LEFÈVRE, C. “Mughal India—Muslim Asia—Europe: Circulation of Political Ideas and the Instruments in Early Modern Times,” in *Structures on the Move. Technologies of Governance in Transcultural Encounter*, ed. A. Flüchter and S. Richter (Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2012), 127-145.

LIBAU, H., *Die indischen Mitarbeiter der Tranquebarmission (1706-1845)*, *Katecheten, Schulmeister, Übersetzer*, Hallesche Forschungen, 26 (Tübingen, 2008).

LORENZEN, David. ‘Marco della Tomba and the Brahmin from Banaras: Missionaries, Orientalists, and Indian Scholars’, *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 65, 1 (February: 2006): 115-143.

MACLEAN, Derryl N. and Sirkeena KARMALI AHMED (eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms in Muslim Contexts: Perspectives from the Past* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012).

MANTENA, R. S., “The Kavali Brothers: Intellectual Life in Early Colonial Madras”, in *The Madras School of Orientalism: Producing Knowledge in Colonial South India*, ed. Thomas Trautmann, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009), 126-150.

METCALF, A. C. *Go-Betweens and the Colonization of Brazil, 1500-1600*. 1st ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005).

MICHELL, G. *The Vijayanagara Courtly Style: Incorporation and Synthesis in the Royal Architecture of Southern India, 15th–17th Centuries* (Delhi: Manohar, 1992).

MIGNOLO, W., “The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism”, *Public Culture*, 12, 3 (Fall, 2000): 721-748.

MOIN, A. A. *The Millennial Sovereign. Sacred Kingship and Sainthood in Islam* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

MONTENOY, Charles Palissot de, *Les Philosophes* (Paris: Librairie Duchesen, 1760)

NEILD-BASU, S. "The Dubashes of Madras." *Modern Asian Studies* 18, 1 (1984): 1-31.

O'HANLON, R. and MINKOWSKI, C., 'What Makes People Who They are? Pandit Networks and the Problem of Livelihoods in Early Modern Western India', *Indian Economic Social History Review*, 45, 3 (2008): 381–416.

O'HANLON, R. and WASHBROOK, D., "Introduction", *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 47, 4 (2010): 441–43.

O'HANLON, R. and WASHBROOK, D., "After Orientalism : Culture, Criticism, and Politics in the Third World", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34, 1 (1992): 141-167.

ORTA, G. de, *Colóquios dos Simples e Drogas he Cousas Mediciniais da India* (Goa, 1563; repr., Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1987).

OSBORN, E. L., "Circle of Iron: African Colonial Employees and the Interpretation of Colonial Rule in French West African," *The Journal of African History* 44 (2003): 27-49.

PEARSON, M. N. "Brokers in Western Indian Port Cities: Their Role in Servicing Foreign Merchants," *Modern Asian Studies* 22, 3 (1988): 455.

POIRIER, L. J. M. "Translators and Converts: Religion, Exchange and Orientation in Colonial New France, 1608-1680." Syracuse University, PhD in Philosophy, 2004.

POLLOCK, S., *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture and Power in Premodern India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).

PRAKASH, G., "Can the 'Subaltern' Ride? A Reply to O'Hanlon and Washbrook", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34, 1 (1992): 168-184.

PRAKASH, G., "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 32, 2 (1990): 383-408.

RAJ, K., *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

RAMAN, B., "Tamil Munshis and Kacceri Tamil under the Company's Document Raj in Early-nineteenth-century Madras", in *The Madras School of Orientalism: Producing Knowledge in Colonial South India*, ed. Thomas Trautmann, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009), 209-232.

RAMAN, B., *Document Raj: Writing and Scribes in Early Colonial South India* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2012).

RAO, V. N., SHULMAN, D., SUBRAHMANYAM, S. *Textures of Time: Writing History in South India, 1600-1800* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001).

- RICHTER, D. K. "Cultural Brokers and Intercultural Politics: New York-Iroquois Relations, 1664-1701," *The Journal of American History* 75, 1 (1988): 40-67.
- ROSCIONI, G. L., *Il desiderio delle Indie. Storie, sogni, e fughe di giovani gesuiti italiani* (Torino: Einaudi, 2001).
- ROTHMAN, N., "Between Venice and Istanbul: Trans-Imperial Subjects and Cultural Mediation in the Early Modern Mediterranean," University of Michigan, PhD, 2006.
- ROVISCO, M. and NOWICKA, M. (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Cosmopolitanism* (Ashgate, 2011).
- RUBIÉS, Joan-Pau, 'The Concept of Cultural Dialogue and the Jesuit Method of Accommodation', *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 74, 147 (2005): 237-280.
- RUBIÉS, Joan-Pau, 'The Jesuit Discovery of Hinduism; Antonio Rubino's Account of the History and Religion of Vijayanagara (1608)', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 3 (2001): 210-256.
- RUBIÉS, Joan-Pau, *Travel and Ethnology in the Renaissance: South India through European Eyes, 1250-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- SARMA, S. R., "Persian-Sanskrit Lexica and the Dissemination of Islamic Astronomy and Astrology in India", in G. Gnoli & A. Panaino (eds.), *Kayd: Studies in History of Mathematics, Astronomy and Astrology in Memory of David Pingree* (Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2009), 129–150
- SCHAFFER, S, ROBERTS, L.,RAJ, K., DELBOURGO, J., *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820* (Sagamore Beach, MA: Science History Publications, 2009).
- SCHURHAMMER, G., 'Der Marathidichter Thomas Stephens, S.I., Neue Dokumente', in *Orientalia*, ed. László Szilas (Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Históricos Ultramarinos, 1963), 377–91.
- STEIN, B., *A Social History of the Deccan 1300-1761: Eight Indian Lives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- STEVENS, P. and SAPRA, R. "Akbar's Dream: Moghul Toleration and English/British Orientalism", *Modern Philology*, 104, 3 (2007): 379–411.
- STUURMAN, S., "Cosmopolitan Egalitarianism in the Enlightenment: Anquetil Duperron on India and America," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 68, 2 (April, 2007): 255-278.
- SUBRAHMANYAM, S., " Du Tage au Gange au XVIe siècle: une conjoncture millénariste à l'échelle eurasiatique", in *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 56e année, 1 (2001): 51-84.



SUBRAHMANYAM, S., “On the Hat Wearers, Their Toilet Practices, and Other Curious Usages”, in *Europe Observed. Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters*, ed. K. Chatterjee and C. Hawes (Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont Publishing and Printing, 2008), 45-82.

SUBRAHMANYAM, S., *Three Ways to Be Alien: Travails and Encounters in the Early Modern World* (Waltham, Mass., 2011).

SWEETMAN, W. “Retracing Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg’s Path”, in *Beyond Tranquebar: Grappling Across Cultural Borders in South India*, eds. Esther Fihl and A. R. Venkatachalapathy (Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, 2014), 304-321

TAVAKOLI-TARGHI, M., *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and Historiography* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

TOBY, R. “The ‘Indianness’ of Iberia and changing Japanese iconographies of Other”, in *Implicit Understandings, Observing, Reporting and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era*, ed. Stuart B. Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 323-352.

TRAUTMANN, T. ed., *The Madras School of Orientalism: Producing Knowledge in Colonial South India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009).

TRUSCHKE, A., “Defining the Other: An Intellectual History of Sanskrit Lexicons and Grammars of Persian”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40 (2012): 635–668.

TRUSCHKE, A., “Cosmopolitan Encounters: Sanskrit and Persian at the Mughal Court”, Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2012.

VENKATACHALAPATHY, A.R., “ ‘Grammar, the Frame of Language’: Tamil Pandits at the College of Fort St. George”, in *The Madras School of Orientalism: Producing Knowledge in Colonial South India*, ed. Thomas Trautmann (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009), 113-125.

WAGONER, P., "Sultan among Hindu Kings: Dress, Titles, and the Islamicization of Hindu Culture at Vijayanagara", *Journal of Asian Studies*, 55, 4 (1996): 851–80.

WORMSER, P., *Le Bustan al-Salatin de Nuruddin ar-Raniri; Réflexions sur le rôle culturel d'un étranger dans le monde malais au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Cahier d'Archipel 41, 2012).

XAVIER, A.B., "Purity of Blood and Caste: Identity narratives in Goan Elites", in *Race and Blood in Spain and Colonial Hispano-America*, eds., María Elena Martínez, Max S. Herring Torres, and David Nirenberg (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2012), 125–49.

XAVIER, A.B., and ŽUPANOV, I.G., *Catholic Orientalism; Portuguese Empire, Indian Knowledge (16th–18th Centuries)* (New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2015).

YANAKAKIS, Y., *The Art of Being In-Between: Native Intermediaries, Indian Identity, and Local Rule in Colonial Oaxaca* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

ZHENG, M., "Subaltern Cosmopolitanism: Concept and Approaches", in *The Sociological Review*, 62 (2014): 137-148.

ŽUPANOV, I. G. and XAVIER, A. B., "Quest for Permanence in the Tropics: Portuguese Bioprospecting in Asia (16th-18th Centuries)", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 57 (2014): 511-548.

ŽUPANOV, I. G., "Orientalist Museum; Roman Missionary Collections and Prints (18th c.)", in *Ancient and Modern, Religion, Power and Community*, Ishita Banerjee-Dube et Saurabh Dube, eds. (New Delhi: The Oxford University Press, 2009), 207-235.

ŽUPANOV, I. G., "Le repli du religieux: Les missionnaires jésuites du XVIIe siècle entre la théologie chrétienne et une éthique païenne", *Annales HSS* 6 (1996): 1201-1223.

ŽUPANOV, I. G., *Missionary Tropics, The Catholic Frontier in India (16th-17th Centuries)* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005).

(We thank Justin E. H. Smith for Englishing this text, of which the final version is in French)

