


Relocating Modern Science

Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge
in South Asia and Europe, 1650–1900

Kapil Raj



Relocating Modern Science


This page intentionally left blank

Relocating Modern Science

Circulation and the Construction of
Knowledge in South Asia and Europe,
1650–1900

Kapil Raj

palgrave
macmillan



© Kapil Raj 2007

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2007 978-0-230-50708-1

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No paragraph of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP.

Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The author has asserted his right to be identified as the author of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2007 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010

Companies and representatives throughout the world

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN 978-0-230-23850-3 ISBN 978-0-230-62531-0 (eBook)

DOI 10.1057/9780230625310

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Raj, Kapil.

Relocating modern science : circulation and the construction of
knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650–1900 / Kapil Raj.
p. cm.

1. Science—South Asia—Historiography. 2. Science—Europe—
—Historiography. 3. Science—Historiography. I. Title.

Q127.S64R36 2007

507.2'2—dc22

2006047820

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
16	15	14	13	12	11	10	09	08	07

For Anasuya and Arjoun

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>List of Illustrations</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
Introduction	1
1 Surgeons, Fakirs, Merchants, and Craftsmen: Making L'Empereur's <i>Jardin</i> in Early Modern South Asia	27
From a Forgotten Codex in a Paris Archive . . .	31
. . . to Eastern India in the Seventeenth Century	34
The Origins of the <i>Jardin de Lorixa</i>	35
Making the <i>Jardin de Lorixa</i>	40
The <i>Jardin de Lorixa</i> and the <i>Hortus Malabaricus</i>	44
L'Empereur's <i>Jardin</i> Comes to Paris . . .	52
. . . And Gets Anonymized in the <i>Jardin du Roi</i>	54
2 Circulation and the Emergence of Modern Mapping: Great Britain and Early Colonial India, 1764–1820	60
Early Modern British and Indian Geographical Practices	65
The Emergence of Large-scale Surveying in India and Britain	73
The Emergence of the Map as an 'Objective' Geographical Representation	82
3 Refashioning Civilities, Engineering Trust: William Jones, Indian Intermediaries, and the Production of Reliable Legal Knowledge in Late-Eighteenth-Century Bengal	95
A Day in the Life of a Calcutta Judge	95
Trust and Civility in Knowledge Production	102
Science and the East India Company	107

The Making of an Orientalist	114
Jones in India	119
The Jonesian Legacy Revisited	134
4 British Orientalism in the Early Nineteenth Century, or Globalism <i>versus</i> Universalism	139
Britain and the French Revolution	140
India, Britain, and France at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century	143
A College to Counter the French	146
The College in the Context of British Institutions	153
5 Defusing Diffusionism: The Institutionalization of Modern Science Education in Early-Nineteenth-Century Bengal	159
A College for the Instruction of Modern Science	159
Modern Science and the Self-fashioning of the <i>Bhadralok</i>	165
Learning among the British in the Early Nineteenth Century	169
Indigenous Representations of Science: Two Examples	173
6 When Human Travellers become Instruments: The Indo-British Exploration of Central Asia in the Nineteenth Century	181
Kashmir, 1863	181
Eastern Turkistan, 1863–4	187
Tibet, 1864–6	192
High Asia, 1868–82	198
Tibet, 1904	202
Instruments, Travel, and Science	202
Conclusion: Relocations	223
<i>Bibliography</i>	235
<i>Index</i>	265

List of Illustrations

Fig. 1:	The frontispiece of the <i>Jardin de Lorixa</i>	33
Fig. 2:	The frontispiece of van Reede's <i>Hortus Malabaricus</i>	46
Fig. 3:	The banana tree in the <i>Jardin de Lorixa</i>	47
Fig. 4:	The banana tree in the <i>Hortus Malabaricus</i>	48
Fig. 5:	<i>Nux vomica</i> as represented in the <i>Jardin de Lorixa</i>	49
Fig. 6:	Van Reede's representation of <i>Nux vomica</i>	50
Fig. 7:	Early-eighteenth-century painted tent panel from eastern India	51
Fig. 8:	Major James Rennell	74
Fig. 9:	James Rennell's <i>Map of Hindoostan</i> , 1782	76
Fig. 10:	Cartouche to James Rennell's <i>Map of Hindoostan</i> , 1782	78
Fig. 11:	Sir William Jones by Arthur William Devis	97
Fig. 12:	'An European Gentleman with his Moonshee, or Native Professor of Languages'	113
Fig. 13a:	The Public Exchange and Coffee-House Building, behind Tank Square, where the College of Fort William was first housed before being shifted . . .	150
Fig. 13b:	. . . to the Writers' Building on the other side of the Square	151
Fig. 14:	The Hindu College, Calcutta	162
Fig. 15:	A Student of Hindu College	163
Fig. 16:	Captain Thomas George Montgomerie	184
Fig. 17:	Khirgiz tribesmen from the Oxus region holding the severed head of a European intruder	186
Fig. 18:	Measurement of the Calcutta baseline in 1831	189
Fig. 19:	Map of the summer route between Leh and	

	Yarkand compiled by Montgomerie from Mahomed-i-Hameed's notebooks	191
Fig. 20:	Pundit Nain Singh or 'Number One'	194
Fig. 21:	Tibetan prayer wheel as drawn by Pundit Sarat Chandra Das	195
Fig. 22:	Self-portrait of Sarat Chandra Das returning on a yak from Tibet in 1879	200
Fig. 23:	Pundit Kishen Singh	201
Fig. 24:	Map of Tibet based on the information culled by the Pundits	204–5
Fig. 25:	Survey perambulators of the Survey of India	213
Fig. 26:	Portrait of Colin Mackenzie by Thomas Hickey	218

Acknowledgements

Few books, even singly authored ones, are really the work of just one person. This book is no exception.

My first thanks go to Sanjay Subrahmanyam without whose encouragement and prodding this book would never have seen the light of day—at least not in this form. Numerous discussions with him during his Paris years triggered many of the themes that run through it. Simon Schaffer has, over our twenty-year friendship, been an extraordinary source of inspiration and ideas. His help in conceiving and shaping the historical, anthropological, and imperial perspectives developed here has been invaluable. A long-standing intellectual exchange based on deeply shared perspectives and values with my friend and colleague, Yves Cohen, enabled me to thematize the role of circulation in knowledge construction.

Other close friends and colleagues have also played a huge role in the making of this book. Along with my family, they were willy-nilly subjected to my first oral and written attempts at making sense of the material of each case study. Muzaffar Alam, Marie-Noëlle Bourguet, Michel Callon, Soraya de Chadarevian, Sudhir Chandra, Gérard Chevalier, Jean-Marc Drouin, Volker Eismann, Caroline Ford, Norman Gritz, Serge Gruzinski, S. Irfan Habib, Eivind Kahrs, John Krige, Maneesha Lal, James McClellan III, Claude and Piyali Markovits, Gyanendra Pandey, Pascale Parlant, Dominique Pestre, Dhruv Raina, Antonella Romano, Carmen Salazar-Soler, Maurice Sépaser, Neelam Sethi, Geetanjali Shree, Otto Sibum, Susan Gross Solomon, Emma Spary, Stéphane Van Damme, and Rama, Anasuya and Arjoun have patiently listened to my stories, or read drafts of many chapters. Their comments and critiques helped shape my narrative.

Material from some of the chapters was delivered in the form of papers in various academic seminars or international conferences, notably at the Department of History and Philosophy of Science of Cambridge University; Cornell's Science and Technology Studies Program

and Modern European History Seminar; and Acadia University. Thanks once again to Simon Schaffer, Peter Dear, and Jan Marontate for inviting me. Almost all the chapters of this book were presented in one form or another in the 'Asie-Amérique' seminar at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales which I co-organized with Serge Gruzinski, Carmen Salazar-Soler, Sanjay Subrahmanyam, and Nathan Wachtel, or else in the 'Localités et Circulations' seminar which I still run with Yves Cohen. Jean-Marc Drouin and Pietro Corsi gave me the chance of trying out my hypotheses on early modern natural history before the specialized audience of their seminar at the EHESS's Centre Alexandre Koyré for the History of Science. I thank all my colleagues as well as the participants of these seminars for their insightful remarks and challenges, which helped hone the central theses of the book. In addition, a number of colleagues have read individual chapters; some have braved the whole manuscript. Discussions with Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann helped sharpen my notion of circulation and better distinguish it from their 'histoire croisée'.

Amina Okada of the Musée Guimet in Paris and Rosemary Crill of the Victoria and Albert Museum in London generously shared their immense knowledge of Indian painting techniques and styles on paper and textiles in order to help me identify the provenance of the L'Empereur manuscript which is the subject of the first chapter. I would also like to thank Father Gérard Moussay of the Missions Étrangères de Paris, and Andrew Cook and Timothy Thomas of what are now the Oriental and India Office Collections of the British Library for immense help in directing me to the relevant sources, and even at times for suggesting new ones.

Earlier, or shorter, versions of some chapters have appeared in print: 'Surgeons, Fakirs, Merchants, and Craftspeople: Making L'Empereur's Jardin in Early Modern South Asia' appeared in Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan, eds, *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), pp. 252–69; 'Circulation and the Emergence of Modern Mapping: Great Britain and Early Colonial India, 1764–1820' in Claude Markovits, Jacques Pouchepadass and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, eds, *Society and Circulation: Mobile People and Itinerant Cultures in South Asia 1750–1950* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003),

pp. 23–54; ‘Refashioning Civilities, Engineering Trust: William Jones, Indian Intermediaries and the Production of Reliable Legal Knowledge in Late Eighteenth-Century Bengal’ in *Studies in History*, vol. 17, no. 2 (2001), pp. 175–210; and ‘When Human Travellers become Instruments: The Indo-British Exploration of Central Asia in the Nineteenth Century’ in Marie-Noëlle Bourguet, Christian Licoppe and Heinz Otto Sibum, eds, *Instruments, Travel and Science: Itineraries of Precision from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century* (London & New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 156–88. I thank the publishers for permission to reuse this material.

A final word of thanks and appreciation to Rukun Advani for his careful reading of the manuscript and insightful comments.

Introduction

Modern science is widely considered a purely West European creation, originating in the ‘scientific revolution’ of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and owing nothing to other cultures or times. Accordingly, academic interest in the relationship of modern science to the rest of the world has traditionally focused mainly on two sets of issues.

The first pertains to the reasons for the putative emergence of modern science within the narrow boundaries of West Europe, a subject on which a plethora of writings by historians of science celebrating the epistemological, sociological, and economic uniqueness of the West has continued to appear ever since the establishment of the domain as a full-fledged discipline at the turn of the twentieth century.¹ Indeed, of all the questions dealt with by the history of science, this is probably

¹ Although European autarky has always underpinned history of science writing—see, for instance, Pierre Duhem, *Le système du monde*, 10 volumes (Paris: A. Hermann, 1913–59)—the *locus classicus* for this question is Herbert Butterfield, *The Origins of Modern Science* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1949). See also Alexandre Koyré, *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe* (New York: Harper, 1958); idem, *Metaphysics and Measurement: Essays in Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968); A. Rupert Hall, *The Scientific Revolution 1500–1800: The Formation of the Modern Scientific Attitude* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1954) published in its second edition as *The Revolution in Science* (Harlow: Longman, 1983); Robert S. Westfall, *The Scientific Revolution in the 17th Century: The Construction of a New World View* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); and Marcus Hellyer, ed., *The Scientific Revolution: The Essential Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003). For a critical appraisal of this quest for origins, see Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams, ‘De-centring the “Big Picture”: The Origins of Modern Science and the Modern Origins of Science’, *British Journal for the History of Science*, vol. 26, no. 4 (1993), pp. 407–32; and Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

the one for which the discipline is generally best known. Perhaps the least hubristic—certainly among the most comparativist—reflections on the origins question have come from Joseph Needham. Like many intellectuals of his generation, Needham was convinced of the universality of science as a human enterprise—as the expression of an innate curiosity fundamental to human nature throughout time and space.² Intrigued by the momentous scientific and technological achievements of China till the fifteenth century, he asked why modern science did not rise there rather than in Europe. The answer to what has come to be called Needham's 'Grand Question' lay, according to him, in the resilience of China's agrarian bureaucratic culture which hindered the emergence of mercantile and industrial capitalism, a *sine qua non* for the emergence of mathematical rationality, the bedrock of modern science. Thus, Chinese, like Indian, or Arab, science was based on local, 'ethnic-bound', categories which allowed the diffusion of technical innovations but prevented that of their underlying theoretical systems. On the other hand, modern science, because it is founded on mathematical reasoning, can be completely appropriated by all humans and is thus 'ecumenical'. Yet, despite its uniqueness, modern science was not created *ex nihilo*. Rather, it subsumed the medieval learning of both West and East 'like rivers flowing into the ocean of modern science'.³ For Needham, then, while modern science is uniquely Western in origin, it is culturally universal.

The second set of issues takes for granted the Western origins of modern science and is instead concerned with the modalities of its spread from West Europe to the rest of the world. George Basalla's are

² For the *Zeitgeist* of Needham's generation, see Gary Werskey, *The Visible College. A Collective Biography of British Scientists and Socialists in the 1930s* (London: Free Association Books, 1988).

³ Joseph Needham, 'The Roles of Europe and China in the Evolution of "Ecumenical Science"', in idem, *Clerks and Craftsmen in China and the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 397. Although Needham never did arrive at a definitive answer to his 'Grand Question', fragments of it are strewn in a number of passages of his magnum opus, *Science and Civilisation in China*, 7 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954–2005) and in various essays, in particular Joseph Needham, *The Grand Titration: Science and Society in East and West* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1969). For a critique of Needham's theses, see Nathan Sivin, *Science in Ancient China: Researches and Reflections* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995).

probably the best known, and undoubtedly the most controversial, thoughts on this question. In an epoch-making paper that appeared almost forty years ago, Basalla proposed a three-stage model of evolutionary progress for the globalization of what he simply called 'Western Science'.⁴ A preliminary period of scientific exploration, where non-European (i.e. 'non-scientific') societies serve as passive reservoirs of data, leads to a second one of colonial dependence in which European scientific institutions encourage Western scientific activity outside Europe—by European colonists or settlers, or else by acculturated indigenes. Eventually, colonized societies gain maturity, a phase characterized by a struggle to establish independent, national scientific traditions based nonetheless upon Western professional standards. Basalla's model is a typical product of the Cold War era and echoes Rostow's anti-communist, five-stage model for economic development based on the American ideal. It has, thus—not surprisingly—attracted much critical response.⁵

The problems set out by both Needham and Basalla have, in their own way, dominated thinking among most historians and sociologists of science working on topics outside the West. Such scholars have in recent years loosely constituted themselves as an academic community

⁴ See George Basalla, 'The Spread of Western Science', *Science*, no. 156 (5 May 1967), pp. 611–22; and idem, 'The Spread of Western Science Revisited', in Antonio Lafuente, Alberto Elena, and María Luisa Ortega, eds, *Mundialización de la ciencia y cultura nacional* (Aranjuez, Madrid: Doce Calles, 1993), pp. 599–603.

⁵ Walt Whitman Rostow, *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960). For critiques of Basalla's model, see, in particular, Roy M. MacLeod, 'On Visiting the "Moving Metropolis": Reflections on the Architecture of Imperial Science', *Historical Records of Australian Science*, vol. 5, no. 3 (1982), pp. 1–16; Ian Inkster, 'Scientific Enterprise and the Colonial "Model": Observations on the Australian Experience in Historical Context', *Social Studies of Science*, vol. 15, no. 4 (1985), pp. 677–704. See also various essays in Nathan Reingold and Marc Rothenberg, eds, *Scientific Colonialism: A Cross-Cultural Comparison* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1987); Deepak Kumar, ed., *Science and Empire. Essays in Indian Context* (Delhi: Anamika Prakashan, 1991); Patrick Petitjean, Catherine Jami and Anne-Marie Moulin, eds, *Science and Empires: Historical Studies about Scientific Development and European Expansion* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1992); and Lafuente *et al.*, eds, *op. cit.*

called 'Science and Empire' studies.⁶ Historical studies of science outside the West, particularly in India, have thus mainly centred on bringing to light the contributions of non-Western cultures to the 'ocean of modern science' on the one hand, and on the diffusion and response to modern science on the other.⁷

With Needham and Basalla, these studies share the belief that science is the embodiment of the basic values of truth and rationality, the motor of moral, social, and material progress, the marker of civilization itself. It is not surprising then that the history of science has become the site of controversy, with nationalist historians pressing the claim of scientificity for their indigenous knowledges and ways of

⁶ The name 'Science and Empire', however, is as unsatisfactory as it is Euro-centric. Regions like China or Persia, or even the Ottoman empire, which were empires in their own right, are not the subject of investigation for this domain—they become so only when and inasmuch as they come into contact with modern West Europeans. Both the terms, 'science' and 'empire', are taken to apply only to modern West European enterprises. However, for an interesting attempt to study the Chinese scientific endeavour in an imperial context in its own right, see Laura Hostetler, *Qing Colonial Enterprise: Ethnography and Cartography in Early Modern China* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

⁷ See, for instance, Morris F. Low, *Beyond Joseph Needham: Science, Technology, and Medicine in East and Southeast Asia*, *Osiris* (2nd series), vol. 13 (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1998). For South Asia, see in particular Devendra Mohan Bose, 'History of Science in India: How it Should be Written', *Science and Culture*, vol. 29, no. 4 (1963), pp. 163–6; David Kopf, *British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance: the Dynamics of Indian Modernization 1773–1835* (Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1969); Devendra Mohan Bose, Samarendra Nath Sen and B.V. Subbarayappa, *A Concise History of Science in India* (New Delhi: Indian National Science Academy, 1971); Deepak Kumar, ed., *op. cit.*; idem, *Science and the Raj, 1857–1905* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995); Ahsan Jan Qaisar, *The Indian Response to European Technology and Culture (1498–1707)* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999; orig. publ. 1982); and Pratik Chakrabarti, *Western Science in Modern India: Metropolitan Methods, Colonial Practices* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004). For other regions, and more generally, see Roderick Weir Home, ed., *Australian Science in the Making* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Lewis Pyenson, 'Science and Imperialism', in Robert C. Olby, Geoffrey N. Cantor, John R.R. Christie and M.J.S. Hodge, eds, *Companion to the History of Modern Science* (London & New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 920–33; Petitjean, *et al.*, eds, *op. cit.*; S. Irfan Habib and Dhruv Raina, eds, *Situating the History of Science: Dialogues with Joseph Needham* (Delhi: Oxford

knowing. In the hands of religious and political extremists, this has led to a lot of chauvinistic gerrymandering, if not pure historical falsification.⁸

We are then presented with the following dilemma. Are we to understand modern science purely as an emanation out of West Europe, constituting the Great Divide between the West and the Rest, and reaching non-European peoples only as they come into contact with Europeans and capitalism? Or are we to think solely in terms of competing nationalist narratives claiming precedence in scientific reasoning for their respective societies?

One way out of this predicament has been to question the moral and political values of modern science. Indeed, there have been plenty in recent times who have sought to denounce science—and all other institutions of modernity—as alienating and dehumanizing, and, in certain cases, to open up alternative visions of what science might be.⁹

University Press, 1999); and Roy M. MacLeod, ed., *Nature and Empire, Osiris* (2nd series), vol. 15 (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2000). There are, of course, a few exceptions to this admittedly schematic presentation: see, notably, James E. McClellan III, *Colonialism and Science: Saint Domingue in the Old Régime* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).

⁸ For a sample of such work in the Indian context, see K. Ramasubramanian, M.D. Srinivas and M.S. Sriram, 'Modification of the Earlier Indian Planetary Theory by the Kerala Astronomers (c. 1500 AD) and the Implied Heliocentric Picture of Planetary Motion', *Current Science*, vol. 66 (1994), pp. 784–90; Saroja Bhate and Subhash Kak, 'Panini's Grammar and Computer Science', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, no. 72 (1993), pp. 79–94; Subhash Kak, 'Computational Aspects of the Aryabhata Algorithm', *Indian Journal of History of Science*, vol. 21, no. 1 (1986), pp. 62–71; idem, 'The Astronomy of the Vedic Altars and the Rgveda', *Mankind Quarterly*, vol. 33 (1992), pp. 43–55; idem, 'Early Theories on the Distance to the Sun', *Indian Journal of History of Science*, vol. 33 (1998), pp. 93–100; B.N. Narahari Achar, 'On the Astronomical Basis of the Date of Satapatha Brahmana: A Re-Examination of Dikshit's Theory', *Indian Journal of History of Science*, vol. 35, no. 1 (2000), pp. 1–19. For a critique of nativist positions, albeit from a narrowly scientific perspective, see Meera Nanda, *Prophets Facing Backward: Science and Hindu Nationalism* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2005).

⁹ Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialektik des Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente* (Amsterdam: Querido, 1947); Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (London:

More recently, in the wake of Foucault-inspired arraignments of modern science, the latter is now seen in some quarters as a hegemonic 'master narrative' of Western power, a discursive formation through which the rest of the world was simultaneously subjugated and relegated to the role of Europe's binarily opposed Other. The spread of Western science is, in this view, achieved by means of the often violent imposition of 'rationality' on cultures originally endowed with 'another reason'. However, far from replicating those in Europe, the resulting practices are, according to this view, but hybrid or pale copies of the former, valid only locally, in contrast to the supposed universality of the original—a mere travesty of Western knowledges.¹⁰

Their political appeal notwithstanding, these critiques tell us nothing of the nature of putative non-Western 'reason(s)' which, if only through the Manichaean thrust of their argument, are assumed to have preserved a pristine innocence through the millennia preceding contact with Europeans. More importantly, they share with the more optimistic earlier positions the widely accepted idea that there is something essential and unified called modern science which, like modernity itself, originated in West Europe and subsequently spread to the rest of the world. But does historical investigation bear out these assumptions?

Recent scholarship tends to belie these commonly considered articles of faith. Indeed, in the past two decades the claimed unity of modern knowledge practices across European space has been convincingly

Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964). See also Daryl E. Chubin and Ellen W. Chu, eds, *Science off the Pedestal: Social Perspectives on Science and Technology* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1989); and, for a more constructive critique, Jeet Pal Singh Uberoi, *The Other Mind of Europe: Goethe as a Scientist* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984); and idem, *The European Modernity: Science, Truth and Method* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2002). See also Ashis Nandy, *Alternative Sciences* (Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1980).

¹⁰ A typical example is Gyan Prakash, *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999). See also David Arnold, *Science, Technology and Medicine in Colonial India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and, in a more nuanced form, Christophe Bonneuil, 'Mettre en ordre et discipliner les tropiques: les sciences du végétal dans l'empire français, 1870–1940', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris VII, 1997.

demolished. In place of a unique 'modern science', it is now accepted that there are many national and local knowledge traditions and dynamics spread across most of North and West Europe, with diverse, and at times contradictory, intellectual agendas and influences throughout the early-modern and modern periods.¹¹

Furthermore, a number of prominent imperial historians, although focusing primarily on the British empire, have called into question the concept of a simple diffusion to the rest of the world of the fundamental values of modernity—values such as democracy, justice, and the welfare state. They have argued that modernity and its institutions are not simple emanations from a pre-existing centre, but are rather the result of 'a complex saga of the collisions, compromises, and comings together' of England with the many countries it came to dominate, including Ireland, Scotland, and India. By focusing on the processes of construction, they thus imply that Great Britain, its modern institutions, and its empire were co-constituted.¹²

In an unrelated but parallel tendency, colonial historians too have widened the focus of their studies from 'the colonized' to the contingent and shifting political terrain on which the very categories of colonized and colonizer have been shaped and patterned at different times and spaces through a dialectic of contestation and refashioning of European claims to superiority.¹³ Although more sensitive to the

¹¹ See Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich, eds, *The Scientific Revolution in National Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); and idem, eds, *The Enlightenment in National Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

¹² I refer here to David Washbrook, 'From Comparative Sociology to Global History: Britain and India in the Pre-History of Modernity', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, vol. 40, no. 4 (1997), pp. 410–43; various writings of Burton Stein, David Cannadine and, most notably, Christopher Alan Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World, 1780–1830* (London: Longman, 1989). The quotation is from Linda Colley, 'Clashes and Collaborations', *London Review of Books* (18 July 1996), p. 8.

¹³ For a critical review of recent literature on the impact of intercultural encounter on both colonizers and colonized, see Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, 'Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda', in idem, eds, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1997), pp. 1–56.

politics of power, this trend in colonial studies finds a sympathetic resonance in recent and growing scholarship in the history and anthropology of encounter, the central underlying theme of which is that implicit understandings influence every culture's ideas about itself and others. These understandings, however, are changed by experience in a constantly shifting process in which both sides participate, and that makes such encounters complex historical events and moments of discovery.¹⁴

Finally, historians, sociologists, and philosophers of science have in the past decades radically undermined the traditional understanding that modern science has its own logic of development based on rigorous, immutable, explicit, and empirically tested rules and methods which lie beyond the pale of social and historical analysis. Moving away from a conception of science as a system of formal propositions or discoveries, these recent studies seek to understand the making, maintenance, extension, and reconfiguration of scientific knowledge by focusing equally on the material, instrumental, corporeal, practical, social, political, and cognitive aspects of knowledge. Systematically opting for detailed case studies of the processes through which knowledge and associated skills, practices, and instruments are created in preference to grand narratives or 'big-picture' accounts, they have demonstrated the negotiated, contingent, and situated nature of the propositions, skills, and objects that constitute natural knowledge.

This new scholarship has convincingly shown that scientific research is not based on logical step-by-step reasoning but on pragmatic judgement, much as in the practical crafts. More importantly, and perhaps more surprisingly, scientific knowledge turns out on this showing to be local everywhere. Indeed, locating knowledge making in precise contexts of time and place—typically in enclosed spaces like laboratories, observatories, museums, cabinets of curiosities, botanical and zoological gardens, libraries, and hospitals—has been one of the principal accomplishments of these recent studies of science.

¹⁴ See 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); Martin Dauntton and Rick Halpern, eds, *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).

Accounting for the mobility of natural knowledges beyond their site of origin—their spread and eventual universalization—has accordingly become another major concern. Scholars in science studies have convincingly shown that scientific propositions, artefacts, and practices are neither innately universal (because of their epistemological force) nor forcibly imposed on others. Rather, they disseminate only through complex processes of accommodation and negotiation, as contingent as those involved in their production. As one scholar has aptly put it, there is no ‘algorithmic recipe’ for successful replication.¹⁵

At the same time, mathematics and natural and experimental philosophy, long held to epitomize scientific knowledge, have progressively lost their pride of place to a host of other domains of natural knowledge, and now share increasing historical attention with subjects like navigational astronomy, natural history, medicine, and geographical exploration.¹⁶ And, although the laboratory still remains the predominant site of knowledge production for science studies, some scholars have recently turned their attention to knowledge-making activities outside the strict precincts of segregated spaces. Attention has thus

¹⁵ For an excellent introduction to these new approaches in the history, philosophy, and sociology of science, along with a substantial bibliography, see Jan Golinski, *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Emblematic of the field is Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle and the Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); see also Adir Ophir and Steven Shapin, ‘The Place of Knowledge. A Methodological Survey’, *Science in Context*, vol. 4, no. 1 (1991), pp. 3–21; and Steven Shapin, ‘Placing the View from Nowhere: Historical and Sociological Problems in the Location of Science’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 23 (1998), pp. 5–12. The quote is from Harry M. Collins, *Changing Order: Replication and Induction in Scientific Practice* (London: Sage, 1985), p. 143.

¹⁶ See, for instance, Nicholas Jardine, James E. Secord and Emma C. Spary, eds, *Cultures of Natural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); David Philip Miller and Peter Hanns Reill, eds, *Visions of Empire: Voyages, Botany and Representations of Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Marie-Noëlle Bourguet, Christian Licoppe and Heinz Otto Sibum, eds, *Instruments, Travel and Science: Itineraries of Precision from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century* (London & New York: Routledge, 2002); Pamela H. Smith and Paula Findlen, eds, *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe* (New York & London: Routledge, 2002).

turned to other sites of knowledge production, such as coffee houses, pubs, and breweries, albeit always within the European metropolis.¹⁷ However, knowledge production in non-European spaces of modernity has not been studied by the social studies of knowledge tradition, having been largely left to anthropologists and other area studies specialists.¹⁸

Armed with these new findings, scholars have attempted to reframe our understanding of scientific activity in its complex relations with society, the state, and the economy. Science is thus not only taken to refer to the production of knowledge, but also to that of instruments, techniques, and services used in the production of knowledge. It refers equally to research for industrial applications and national prestige, to teaching and training of future generations of practitioners, and to the improvement of the public understanding of knowledge-making activities.¹⁹

This book lies at the intersection of these recent historiographical developments and understandings. It is an attempt to re-examine the nature of scientific knowledge making in the globalized space of early modernity in the context of European expansion. In particular, it looks at the role of intercultural encounter in the circulation of the specialized knowledges that constituted science in this period. It addresses the following questions: What was the nature of the vectors of knowledge transmission? Who were the agents involved in the transmission and appropriation of knowledge and skills in the spaces of intercultural encounter? Was this a simple process of diffusion and acceptance or was there an active process of reception and reconfiguration of the circulating knowledges and skills? If the latter, where—outside of European metropolitan centres—was knowledge being reconstructed

¹⁷ See David E. Allen, *The Naturalist in Britain: A Social History* (London: Allen Lane, 1976); Anne Secord, 'Science in the Pub: Artisan Botanists in Early Nineteenth-Century Lancashire', *History of Science*, vol. 32, no. 3 (1994), pp. 269–315; Heinz Otto Sibum, 'Les gestes de la mesure: Joule, les pratiques de la brasserie et la science', *Annales HSS*, 53^e année, nos 4–5 (1998), pp. 745–74.

¹⁸ See, however, Simon Schaffer, 'Golden Means: Assay Instruments and the Geography of Precision in the Guinea Trade' in Bourguet *et al.*, eds, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–50.

¹⁹ See Michel Callon, ed., *La science et ses réseaux* (Paris: La Découverte, 1988).

and certified? What was the relationship of this knowledge with its metropolitan sibling? Were these knowledges transportable? If so, what happened in the process of displacement?

These questions are explored here by examining the historical record relating to one intercultural 'contact zone'—Europe–South Asia—between the late seventeenth and the late nineteenth centuries.²⁰ Given the range and duration of the encounter between South Asians and Europeans, as well as the existence of rich archival sources, this region provides the ideal opportunity to follow interactions between the different specialist cultures in the making of new knowledges.

By studying the construction of scientific knowledge in the contact zone itself, I hope not only to enlarge the scope of social studies of knowledge by bringing contact zones, along with novel historical source material, into their ambit as legitimate sites of scientific knowledge production, but also to show that important parts of what has been passed off as European, or Western, science were actually made elsewhere. This is part of the more general point that national and regional histories, especially since the first globalization of the sixteenth century, cannot be understood by limiting study to within their respective geographical boundaries.²¹

To be sure, this is not the first attempt to extend the locus of modern scientific knowledge construction beyond West Europe. In doing so,

²⁰ I take the term 'contact zone' from Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London & New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 6–7, as a convenient way to denote the space where peoples with different cultural and geographical origins and histories meet and establish ongoing relations, 'usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict'. As such, the 'contact zone' is an extension of the concept of the frontier in American historiography from a fixed geographical and temporal entity to a process of social, economic, and, sometimes, military intersection and interaction between different social and ethnic groups. See Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1999).

²¹ This point is forcefully made in Serge Gruzinski, *Les quatre parties du monde. Histoire d'une mondialisation* (Paris: Éditions de la Martinière, 2004).

I follow the lead set by a small but growing number of scholars who have begun to study knowledge encounters in the context of the New World and the Pacific.²² However, little attention has been focused on the other major contact zone, the Indian Ocean. And although inter-cultural scientific encounter in the South Asian context has recently been the subject of a major book, the discussion on science has been limited to debates *about* science and the status of scientific knowledge among learned South Asians and British in the nineteenth century—a second-order discussion and a step removed from the making of knowledge.²³

The kinds of scientific knowledge considered here cover natural history, terrestrial surveying, map-making, law, linguistics, and public administration. Eclectic though the choice may at first sight seem to be, the grouping of modern legal, political, and administrative practices with the natural sciences is not fortuitous: recent research in the history of science has persuasively shown that quantitative objectivity in the modern sciences was significantly shaped by bureaucratic practices.²⁴

Although none of its chapters addresses the subject directly, one of the aims of this book is to question the oft-used notion of ‘colonial science’ or ‘colonial knowledge’. Such notions have been used to designate the classificatory and delineating discursive practices of European colonists relating to indigenous populations, languages, and objects in regions which they had come to dominate, practices that rendered

²² See, for instance, Barbara E. Mundy, *The Mapping of New Spain: Indigenous Cartography and the Maps of the Relaciones Geográficas* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Merrell, *op. cit.*; Serge Gruzinski, *The Mestizo Mind: The Intellectual Dynamics of Colonization and Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2002; French original published 1999); and Carmen Salazar-Soler, *Anthropologie des mineurs des Andes: Dans les entrailles de la terre* (Paris: Harmattan, 2002). For the Pacific, see Nicholas Thomas, *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991).

²³ See Christopher Alan Bayly, *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

²⁴ See Theodore M. Porter, *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

colonial rule possible.²⁵ The knowledges thus acquired are said to have a local or geographically circumscribed status, inasmuch as they apply specifically to each region and are thus not part of supposedly universal, or mainstream, science. As much through its stress on intellectual and material practices—rather than just on discursive ones—as through the variety of domains (both in the natural and social sciences) it examines, this book aims to advance an alternative vision of the construction and spread of scientific knowledge through reciprocal, albeit asymmetric, processes of circulation and negotiation, a vision at odds with current post-colonial thinking. The examples presented here try and demonstrate that South Asia was not a space for the simple application of European knowledge, nor a vast site for the collection of diverse information to be processed in the metropolis, nor indeed ‘of complicated and complex knowledge created by Indians, but codified and transmitted by Europeans’.²⁶ On the contrary, South Asia was an active, although unequal, participant in an emerging world order of knowledge. As I shall endeavour to show, the contact zone was a site for the production of certified knowledges which would not have come into being but for the intercultural encounter between South Asian and European intellectual and material practices that took place here. In other words, although these knowledges had different trajectories in specialist communities in South Asia and Europe and were appropriated and integrated differently in the two regions (not least because of colonial domination), they partook of, and were constructed through, the same circulatory processes.

While drawing heavily upon the revisionist historiographies developed within recent imperial, colonial, and science studies, the perspective developed in this book nonetheless calls for a number of

²⁵ See, in particular, Bernard S. Cohn, *An Anthropologist Among the Historians and Other Essays* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987); and idem, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996). See also Emmanuelle Sibeud, *Une science impériale pour l'Afrique? La construction des savoirs africanistes en France, 1878–1930* (Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 2002).

²⁶ Bernard S. Cohn, ‘The Command of Language and the Language of Command’, in idem, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge*, *op. cit.*, pp. 16–56; this quote p. 16.

displacements and relocations concerning the institutions, agents, practices, and objects so far studied, as well as a change in historiographical approach to take account of knowledge making in the globally distributed spaces of modernity.

In keeping with the shift from localities within the European metropolis to the contact zone without, attention needs to be turned away from the socially homogeneous enclosed spaces in which knowledges like pure mathematics and natural and experimental philosophy were formed, to the 'open air', where natural history and medicine, surveying and map-making, and linguistics and administrative sciences—domains characteristic of the extra-metropolitan context—were developed. I owe the expression 'open air' sciences to Michel Callon, who coined the term '*recherche de plein air*' to designate knowledge practices that necessarily involve negotiations between specialists and other heterogeneous groups in their very making and certification. These practices, as Callon stresses, are fundamentally different from 'field' sciences where practitioners simply take the world outside the confines of the laboratory to be an inanimate space for collecting data, which is then centralized and processed in the secluded calm of the laboratory.²⁷ Open air practices are, however, no less locally inscribed, inasmuch as knowledge constructed in one open air space has its specificities which distinguish it from others constructed in other open airs, in the same way as do knowledges constructed in different laboratories.

The areas of open air knowledge considered here, it is useful to remember, were often no less mathematically based than their indoor siblings and, with them, fed on a common core of material and social practices. Indeed, much important work even within European learned academies has focused on areas such as terrestrial surveying and mapping, for which institutions like the French *Académie Royale des*

²⁷ See Michel Callon, Pierre Lascoumes and Yannick Barthe, *Agir dans un monde incertain* (Paris: Le Seuil, 2001), p. 136 *et seq.* See also Henrika Kuklick and Robert E. Kohler, eds, *Science in the Field, Osiris*, (2nd series), vol. 11 (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1996); and Robert E. Kohler, *Landscapes and Labscapes: Exploring the Lab-Field Border in Biology* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Sciences was best known during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²⁸

However, it was not the learned academies and universities, the traditional loci of knowledge-making activity in Europe, which were directly involved in producing knowledge overseas, although they often planned and oversaw transcontinental, and trans-oceanic, exploratory expeditions. Our second displacement thus requires a shift in focus to overseas trading companies which, along with religious missions, accounted for the main European institutions involved in overseas encounters, in particular with South Asia. Surprising as this might at first sound, trading houses, like the various European East India companies, played a central role in the early-modern knowledge-making process.²⁹ It is useful to remember that Gresham College, the forerunner of the Royal Society, was founded by a group of traders—the Mercer's Company.³⁰ And recent research has clearly brought to the fore the important part played by trading companies—as patrons of technicians and philosophical demonstrators—in transporting natural philosophy from exclusive areas such as Gresham College into

²⁸ Josef W. Konvitz, *Cartography in France 1660–1848: Science, Engineering, and Statecraft* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

²⁹ The recognition of the importance of trading companies to modern scientific knowledge formation has been slow amongst historians. See, however, Johan Leonard Blussé and Ilonka Ooms, eds, *Kennis en Compagnie: De Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie en de moderne Wetenschap* (Amsterdam: Balans, 2002); and Richard W. Hadden, *On the Shoulders of Merchants: Exchange and the Mathematical Conception of Nature in Early Modern Europe* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994) which argues that the quantification of modern science evolved from commercial book-keeping and reckoning practices developed by merchants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and that the mechanistic view of nature grew out of day-to-day practices of social and economic relations. See also Steven J. Harris, 'Long-Distance Corporations, Big Sciences, and the Geography of Knowledge', *Configurations*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1998), pp. 269–304; and Frank J. Swetz, *Capitalism and Arithmetic: The New Math of the 15th Century* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1987).

³⁰ Christopher Hill, *The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 33–4; and Francis R. Johnson, 'Gresham College: Precursor of the Royal Society', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 1, no. 4 (1940), pp. 413–38.

the wider European metropolitan public space.³¹ Indeed, corporate commerce was quick to recognize that the continued existence and expansion of European overseas trade was largely dependent on scientific expertise and associated material practices. Thus, right from their inception, the trading companies supported and even employed mathematicians, practical astronomers, and hydrographers for navigation, and medics for treating crews and identifying commercially viable plants or derived products overseas.³² They were thus key actors in the early modern enterprise of knowledge making and use.

For all that, trading companies did not simply stand beside learned societies as agents for the spread of natural philosophy, natural history, and practical mathematics. Quite the contrary, the worlds of trade and learning were very closely intertwined. Men of science invested substantial sums of money in international commerce. To take the case of England once more, a number of eminent Fellows of the Royal Society, like Robert Boyle, Isaac Newton, and Joseph Banks, to name but some of the most well known, counted among the directors or major shareholders of the likes of the English East India Company (hereafter EIC)—the longest lasting and most powerful of the British trading groups—or the South Sea Company. Initially enticed by the attractive dividends, reaching up to 20 per cent, offered by these investments, such men also found in it a sure means of raising their credit.³³ This in turn led to a more structured and durable relation between corporate trading groups and learned societies. For example, the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, under the leadership of Joseph Banks (who was

³¹ Larry Stewart, 'Other Centres of Calculation, or, Where the Royal Society Didn't Count: Commerce, Coffee-Houses and Natural Philosophy in Early Modern London', *British Journal for the History of Science*, vol. 32, no. 2 (1999), pp. 133–53; and Jerry Brotton, *Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World* (London: Reaktion Books, 1997).

³² Harold J. Cook, 'Physicians and Natural History', in Jardine *et al.*, eds, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–105.

³³ Credit is taken here to refer to trust, authority or honour, and, at the same time, to the new social relations between the stockholder and the merchant. See Simon Schaffer, 'Defoe's Natural Philosophy and the Worlds of Credit', in John R.R. Christie and Sally Shuttleworth, eds, *Nature Transfigured: Science and Literature 1700–1900* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), pp. 13–44.