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"Thou hast begun well, Roe, which stand well to,

And I know nothing more thou hast to do."

-Ben Jonson, Epigrammes, XCVIII (1616)
Chapter I

Anglo-Indian Relations Prior To Roe's Embassy

1. English arrival in India. The London East India Company was formed in order that England might partake in the spice trade of the Malay Archipelago. At its inception in 1600 the Portuguese had already been a century in India. The Pope had granted them the sovereignty of the East. This sovereignty was maintained by the Portuguese until their power at sea began to decline in the latter part of the sixteenth century. Portugal had been united with Spain in 1580, and this involved the former in the defeat of the Armada. Repercussions from this defeat were clearly noticeable in the Eastern waters and made the Portuguese vulnerable to attack by the Dutch and English in the last decade of the sixteenth century. The Dutch were the earliest invaders. They made conquests, in this last decade, of several Portuguese settlements in the East Indies, first becoming rivals and ultimately the subverters of Portuguese sovereignty in Asia. In the early years of the seventeenth century the Hollanders expelled the Portuguese from the Islands of Amboyna, Tidore, the Moluccas, and, little by little, engrossed the whole trade of the Spice Islands. After they had overwhelmed the Portuguese, the Dutch claimed the right to keep every other power out of the Spice Islands. Thus, the Dutch were to become the forbidding monopolizers in
the East Indies, their position assured when the English
dared to impinge into the Eastern waters.1

Despite the strong rivalry of the Dutch, the English
established a factory at Bantam in Java in 1602. The following
decade was filled with struggle between these two North-
European powers in the East Indies. The Dutch whole-heartedly
supported their spokesman, Grotius, in his argument for
freedom of the seas to all nations, but applied it only to
themselves. By 1613 the English were losing ground and
the Hollanders were gaining a mastery in the Archipelago.

With their greater force they threatened to punish any
islanders who dared to trade with the English.2 The English
factor, John Jourdain, wrote to the East India Company in
1613 declaring that the Dutch "in their trade are our mortal

1 John Bruce, (ed.), Annals of The Honorable East India
Company, 1600-1708, (London, 1810), (hereafter cited
as H.E.C., Annals), I, 5, 26; Edward Grey, (ed.), The
Travels of Pietro della Valle in India, Hakluyt Society,
Series I, No. 64, (London, 1892), I, 87; Shafat Ahmad
Khan, The East India Trade in the XVIIth Century, (London,
1923), 57; W.W. Hunter, The History of British India.
(London, 1899), I, Ch. IX passim; A. Wyatt Tilby, Britain
In The Tropics, (London, 1912), 285; John Talboys Wheeler,
Early Records of British India, (London, 1878), 18;
H.C. Rawlinson, British Beginnings in Western India,

2 Radhakamal Mukerjee, The Economic History of India, 1600-
1800, (Allahabad, 1945), II; Khan, 24, 56. All dates,
unless otherwise indicated, have been modernized.
When the London East India Company ventured its first fleets into the Eastern seas England was formally at war with Spain and Portugal. However certain may have been the fact that the Portuguese at that time were already showing signs of weakness, it was not manifested on the coasts of India in 1600. For these reasons, then, the English chose to go into the Archipelago region, where the Dutch had supplanted the Portuguese, to seek a share in the rich trade of the East Indies. As a result of their unfavorable reception by the Dutch in the East Indies and the fact that the state of war between England and Spain was terminated by the Treaty of London, 1604, the East India Company merchants considered it propitious to make an attempt at breaking the monopoly held by the Portuguese in India. There was much less danger of Dutch rivalry in India as the Dutch considered the Indian trade purely subsidiary to that of the East Indies.

---


The port town of Surat, on the west coast of India one hundred and eighty miles north of Bombay, was the most important center of export trade in Western India in the first half of the seventeenth century. It was towards this port that the English turned from their reluctance to challenge the Dutch in the Archipelago. But the Portuguese, of course, denied the English access to Surat; they hated the English as heretics as well as competitors and urged the Indian Governor of Surat to believe that the English were pirates. In 1608, the Portuguese were possessed of adequate strength in the Indian waters to be able to command as prize all ships which sailed therein without their pass. In 1609, the Portuguese wielded sufficient strength on the west coast of India to make trade for the English practically impossible. The English were not permitted to enter Surat's port when the Portuguese were in it, and when the Portuguese were absent from port the Jesuits on land instilled fear into the minds of the natives "threatening fire, faggot, and utter desolation, if they received any more English thither." 

6 Wheeler, 18. Mukerjee contends that the English entry into the Indian trade has been considerably white-washed. "Like their compers, the Portuguese and the Dutch, the English came to the East Indies not as mere merchants, as is so often believed, but also as pirates, buccaneers and conquerors". Mukerjee, xii.

The Indians were quite willing to trade with the English merchants, but because of Portuguese strength and desire to monopolize the Indian trade, the English trade had to be carried out with the utmost caution. In 1609, the Governor of Surat met a party of English merchants outside the walls of Surat and informed them that he feared having them near the town. He pleaded that the Portuguese in Surat had threatened to take Surat ships coming out of the Red Sea if the English were allowed in Surat.\(^8\)

Although the number of attempts by the English to establish trade in India had mounted by 1611, the Portuguese still controlled Surat. Sir Henry Middleton, of the East India Company, recorded in his Journal in September, 1611, that his ship was headed for Surat but that "the Portuagals long before our coming thither, had intelligence that we were in the Red Sea, and bound for this place, [Surat] so that these Frigats were purposely sent to keep us from Trade at Surat, or else-where, upon that Coast." At the time, any ship which did not have a Portuguese pass was liable to seizure and confiscation.\(^9\)

---


His plan to trade at Surat having been frustrated by the Portuguese fleet which barred his entrance, Sir Henry Middleton, on this occasion, was forced to seek markets further south.\(^10\) The English merchants persisted in the attempt to land on the Indian coast long enough, at least, to exchange their cargoes. Earlier, in January, 1611, they had tried to get permission to establish a factory at Surat, but their request had met with absolute refusal. The reason then given had been intimidation by the Portuguese, for the Jesuits in Surat had warned that if the English were permitted privileges, the Portuguese would come in force and burn Indian coastal towns and confiscate all Indian ships richly laden with Red Sea commodities.\(^11\)

The domineering manner of the Portuguese in India was sufficient reason for their dislike by the Indians. The English were welcomed by the Indians as a counter-poise to the Portuguese in India. The Portuguese had come to India as crusaders as well as traders and their religious zeal often made them prone to commit acts of cruelty on infidels.

---


11 Nicholas Downton, Journal, (1611), Purchas, III, 269, 270-71. This threat could have easily been carried out. Downton observed in his Journal the proximity of a Portuguese fleet containing "neere five hundred sailes". (Ibid., 270).
The English came to India seeking neither colonies nor converts, but simply as merchants. Until the Indians had clear evidence that English strength was comparable, if not superior, to the Portuguese, they were unwilling to risk suffering at the hands of the Portuguese for having committed themselves too far to the English. The Indians did consent to trade with the English at sea. One of the favorite places where this barter took place was in the Red Sea port of Mocha. Captain John Saris of the East India Company reported in his Journal a receipt he had received in August, 1612, for the purchase of sundry Indian commodities from the Captain of a Surat ship. Though early in 1612 the English found it "impossible to have any trade at Surat, by reason of Portugall Frigats in the Rivers mouth", they were successful in landing north of Surat at Swally "without danger".

In November, 1611, the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa, in a letter

12 W.H. Moreland and Atul Chandra Chatterjee, A Short History of India, (London, 1936), 237; Rawlinson, II-17. cf. fn. 8 above.


15 Nicholas Withington, Tractate, (1612), Purchas, IV, 163.
to a Surat official, congratulated him for "conserving our
amitye, in nott consentinge trade and commerce with those
English ships that are there".16

It was Sir Henry Middleton's hope in 1612 that
the English would have a better opportunity to substantially
rival the Portuguese if they could somehow secure an Indian
alliance. In May of that year, Sir Henry wrote to the Great
Mogul in India hoping to gain assurance of trade privileges
for the English. He emphasized to the Mogul that it was
"a disgrace to the greatness of your monarchie" to permit the
Portuguese to monopolize the Indian trade.17 His request
seeming to be of no avail, Middleton, while in the Red Sea,
decided to force the Indians to respect the English by making
a forced levy on all Indian vessels he found in the Red Sea.18

2. English victories of 1612 and 1615. In 1612,
early three years before Sir Thomas Roe's arrival in India,
Captain Thomas Best led the London East India Company's fleet

16 Ruy Lorenço de Tavera, Letter to Surat, Nov. 28, 1611,
17 Sir Henry Middleton, Letter to the Great Mogul, May 18,
18 Thomas Kerridge to the East India Company, September 20th,
1611, Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, East Indies,
1513-1616, (London 1902-70), (hereafter cited as State
Papers, East Indies), 321; William Foster, England's
Quest of Eastern Trade, (London, 1933), (cited hereafter
as England's Quest), 234-35.
to Surat. The arrival of that small fleet affected the beginning of the English challenge of the Portuguese in India. The Portuguese challenged the fleet when it neared Surat in November, 1612. Captain Best was not only able to survive the attack, but eventually routed the larger Portuguese force. Much of the battle was near the shores and Captain Best's superior naval tactics were observed in wonder by "thousands of country people." The English victory was related to the Indian Moghul "to his admiration, which thought none like the Portugalls at sea". English prestige was immediately enhanced by the victory; the long-held Portuguese domination had been challenged in her last strong-hold of Asiatic empire. Best's victory destroyed forever the Indian legend of Portuguese supremacy over other Europeans.19

In 1611, James I of England had given Captain Best a letter of authorization to negotiate a treaty with the Indian Moghul.20 The English were now in a position to make requests of the Indians, and since the English had shattered Portuguese domination of the port of Surat, the


Indians had the opportunity to manifest their avowed preference for the English. Within a month after his victory, Best obtained from the Governor of Surat a set of articles, shortly afterwards confirmed by the Great Moghul, which provided that the English could settle factories in the towns of Surat, Cambaya, Anadavat, and Goga in India. The English were formally permitted to trade in "other places" within the Moghul's dominion. The English immediately landed some broad-cloths, lead, iron, and quicksilver, and in exchange for them procured Surat cloths and goods suitable for the purchase of pepper and spices at Acheen.

Captain Best left behind a handful of men under the direction of Mr. Thomas Aldworth. Aldworth seemed satisfied with their reception at Surat, and nearly two years after Best's victory he reported to the East India Company that he and his men had "as much liberty as ourselves can with reason desire, and all these people here generally much more affecting us than the Portingalls, and showing us kindness in what they may". But only three

23 E.I.C. Annals, I, 163.
months after Aldworthes wrote, shortly after the arrival of
the first joint-stock fleet in Indian waters, the position
of the English at Surat seemed considerably altered. Factor
Thomas Kerridge at Surat wrote to Captain Downton, commander
of the newly-arrived fleet, "none here will take
notice of the articles".

Captain Nicholas Downton's English fleet of four
ships anchored at Swally Hole in the middle of October, 1614. In mid-January, 1615, Downton's fleet was sought out and
attacked by the Portuguese forces. The English were far
out-matched by the Portuguese whose superior forces on that
occasion consisted of six galleons, three lesser ships,
sixty frigates, and two galleys. Downton's position in
Swally Hole, however, gave his fleet natural protection
against the enemy; there were sandbanks between the bay of
Swally Hole and the open sea which prevented entrance of the
larger Portuguese vessels. The Portuguese, therefore,
failed in their attempt to ward off the English merchants. It would appear that Downton's staying in Swally Hole rather
than meeting the Portuguese in battle on the open sea was a
result of his strict adherence to King James's commission


26 Thomas Kerridge to Downton, Nov. 22, 1614, E.I.C. Letters
Received, II, 180.

27 Nicholas Downton, Journal, (1614-15), in Purchas, IV, 216,
229, 230, 234, 241-45. See also Thomas Elkington, Letter
to John Oxwicke, Jan. 23, 1615, E.I.C. Letters Received,
II, 303. Also Hunter, I, 320-27.
against fighting unless first attacked. 28

The failure of the Portuguese was received by the Indians as a victory for the English, and it gained for them added confidence and respect of the Indians at Surat. Indian fears of the Portuguese decreased and the Moghul expressed satisfaction toward the English when he learned that the English had successfully withstood the Portuguese. 29

Shortly after Downton's victory Mr. William Edwards, an English factor, was sent over-land to negotiate with Jahangir, the Great Moghul. The Moghul had learned of the English victory very shortly before Edwards arrived at the court. He informed Edwards that he was indebted to the English for defending his port of Surat, and urged the English to set down in writing whatsoever they should require for furthering their business in his dominions and he would grant it. 30

Jahangir directed commands to "all governors of his dominions and their successors" to respect the firmaen which he granted Mr. Edwards. Edwards considered the

28 Nicholas Downton to the East India Company, Nov. 20, 1614; William Edwards to idem, Dec. 2, 1615 (received), E.I.C. Letters Received, II, 149, 168.

29 Nicholas Downton, Journal, (1615); Nicholas Withington, Tractate, (1615), Purchas, IV, 164, 244-46.

30 Thomas Mitford to the East India Company, March 25, 1615, E.I.C. Letters Received, III, 85.
firmaen to be "very effectual to the purpose of our trade and fair entertainment". Branch factories were soon established at Cambay, Broach, Baroda, Ahmedabad, and Agra.  

3. Portuguese weakening. Between Best's victory over the Portuguese in 1612, and the arrival of Captain Downton in October, 1614, the Portuguese were far from ineffective in thwarting English establishment of trade. The Viceroy of Goa, in a letter written to the Moghul, disparaged the English nation and merchants, threatening "an end of peace" between Portuguese and Indians, and "all possible prejudice" if the Moghul received the English. Prior to Captain Downton's arrival in 1614, the Portuguese had been ordered, and were preparing, to drive the English out of India by force.

In 1614, before Downton's arrival, an incident occurred which bitterly offended the Moghul. The Portuguese seized and plundered a Surat ship, the Hassaneic, which carried treasure to the value of one hundred thousand pounds


32 Rawlinson, 73.

33 Thomas Kerridge to the East India Company, Jan. 20, 1614, E.I.C. Letters Received, II, 298.

34 Moreland, From Akbar, 22.
sterling. The Moghul discarded his religious tolerance and retaliated by closing down the Portuguese Catholic church at Agra. The most influential Jesuit at the Moghul's court, Father Xavier, lost his favor. During 1614 the Portuguese further antagonized the Moghul by carrying on marauding attacks down the west coast of India. These offences forced the Moghul to unite his forces for war, and the struggle was in progress when Captain Downton arrived in the same year. 35 The opening of this war between the Moghul's forces and the Portuguese afforded the English an opportunity to ingratiate themselves still more firmly with the Indians, if they were willing to ally themselves with the Moghul against their rival, the Portuguese. 36 In August, 1614, two months before Captain Downton's fleet arrived, the East India Company's factors, Aldworth and Biddulph, wrote, "They [the Indians] all here much wish for the coming of our English ships, not only for trade but to help them, for as they say the coming of our ships will much daunt the Portingalls". These factors emphasized that the Portuguese were weakening because at that time they had many enemies to encounter in

35 Thomas Aldworth & William Biddulph to the East India Company, August 19, 1614, E.I.C. Letters Received, II, 96; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1516, 316; Kerridge to idem, Sept. 20, 1611, ibid., 321. See also, Nicholas Downton, Journal, (1614), Purchas, IV, 215-16; Rawlinson, 56-9; Wheeler, 4.

36 Moreland, From Akbar, 35-7.
India, namely, "the Decanyes, the Flemings, and the Moors and Guzerats, besides our English". They reckoned the Portuguese to be "weak, when they are at best". 37

37 Thomas Aldworth & William Biddulph to the East India Company, August 19, 1614, in E.I.C., Letters Received, II, 96-7; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1610, 316.
Chapter II

The Need For An Ambassador To India; Roe Is Chosen.

1. Inadequacy of previous ambassadors. Prior to Sir Thomas Roe's going to India in 1615, the East India Company had delegated merchants to act as ambassadors at the court of the Indian Moghul. Because the strength of the Portuguese resistance to the English at the Moghul's court continued up to the eve of Roe's embassy, none of the early ambassadors met with success in realizing the aspirations of the Company to secure a permanent trade treaty.

In 1609, Captain William Hawkins of the East India Company went to the Moghul's court at Agra to meet Jahangir. He carried a letter for the Moghul "from His Majesty of England...who is desirous to have league and amity...that his subjects might freely goe and come, sell and buy, as the custome of all Nations is". Hawkins claimed to have been sent to the Moghul's court by the King of England "as his Embassadour". He was well received in India, being offered a pension and any concessions he liked to ask relating to the establishment of an English factory. His favorable reception by the Moghul was ephemeral. The jealous Portuguese reported the English presumption to

1 Supra, Ch. I, passim.
PART II.

Portuguese menaced to turn the Mogul's
such intrepidity the Portuguese managed to turn the Mogul's
not sent immediately from the King of Portugal.
introduced themselves that cannot was necessary a memorandum which was
at court, knowing the Mogul's general dislike of merchants;
cannot. It was not long, however, before the Jesuits
introduced received letters. Glued the appendix of
Jenner's, with the same emphasis with which he had
Jenner's, I carry the letter issued by Dames I to the Mogul.
Portuguese at Surat, Captain Best detached his cruiser, &
Mogul's. In 1673, after the English victory over the
the Mogul's allegiance to negotiate a treaty with the Mogul.
In 1671, James I give Captain Best a letter granting
berthing power with the Mogul.

Portuguese power on the Indian coast to prevent the English and
Portuguese were stopped too well established in the Mogul's
of merchants in the capital as ambassador. In 1609, the
the Portuguese fleet. The Jesuit, Jenner, took no notice
country, he was able to take retaliatory measures from
warning that if the English were granted a footing in the
their territory, who, in turn, dispatched a letter to Jenner.
amicableness into contempt. 4

In November, 1614, a council of East India Company merchants decided to send one of their men to the court of the Moghul under the title of "a messenger sent by our king to the Great Mogore", and chose Mr. William Edwards to represent them at the court in that capacity. 5 The merchants expected success from Edwards' mission to the Moghul insofar as he carried with him "a letter with other great presents from our King's Majesty's own hand for the Moghul". They expected, therefore, to be "respected thereafter". 6 In March, 1615, Edwards was successful in obtaining general privileges for the English to trade in the Moghul's dominions. 7 At the same time, however, it appears that Edwards' new position had alienated him from the other English merchants at Surat and Agra. He not only conducted himself arrogant-ly towards the other factors, gaining their enmity, but was also accused of profiting privately at the court. He was

4 Rawlinson, 56; Thompson and Garratt, 10.

5 Council of Merchants at Surat, Minutes, Nov. 28, 1614, E.I.C., Letters Received, II, 136-37.


judged by the chief Surat factors as having "impaired the reputation of so honorable [an] employment". 8 Nicholas Downton, fleet-commander, wrote to Edwards in March, 1615, reproofing him sharply for "many abuses general and particular", and warned that he should "take measure of himself with reformation". In letters to Sir Thomas Smythe, Governor of the London East India Company, Downton complained that he could "never see cause to like neither his [Edwards'] carriage nor his husbandry", and that since his going to the Moghul's court his bearing towards the other merchants had become "unfit and imperious". 9 One year later, in March, 1616, after Roe's arrival at court, Downton consulted with the council of merchants at Surat and concluded to order Edwards' return from court. They decided that he was to answer to the objections exhibited against him by the greatest part of the English factors in the Moghul's dominions, or be suspended from service and returned to England.

Edwards was judged guilty and "was by joint consent suspended

8 Kerridge to Roe, Oct. 10, 1615 (o.s.), British Museum: Additional Manuscript 9366, f.13; Roe to the East India Company, Jan. 25, 1616, E.I.C., Letters Received, IV, 17; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 455-56; John Brown to E.I.C., Feb. 10, 1617, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 16; Rawlinson, 74. See also Appendix II.

9 Downton to Edwards, March, 1615; idem to Smythe, Feb. 28, 1615, E.I.C., Letters Received, II, 185; III, 14, 27, 72, 89.
From the service of the Honourable Company, and ordered to take his passage for England.\(^\text{10}\)

Sir Thomas Roe pointed out to the East India Company officials, in a letter written shortly after his meeting with Edwards at the Moghul's court, that nearly every factor was certain of Edwards' guilt in obtaining private profit during his stay at the court. Though Roe did not condemn Edwards outright, he stressed that "he in one year will return with more gain than I shall do in my whole time, and it were as strange if all others should maliciously join to accuse him falsely without some ground."\(^\text{11}\) However, when Edwards was found guilty of profiting from private trading at court, the factors saw fit to confiscate this profit before he was sent back to England.\(^\text{12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Factors at Surat to the East India Company, March 10, 1616, E.I.C., Letters Received, IV, 295; idem to Roe, Feb. 23, 1615 (o.s.), B.M.; Additional Manuscript, 9366, f. 56.

\(^{11}\) Roe to the East India Company, Jan. 25, 1616, E.I.C., Letters Received, IV, 17; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 455-56. It might be well to point out that Factor Joseph Salbank, in a letter to the East India Company, Nov. 1616, defended Edwards against the condemnation "by many of the factors after his recall from the Moghul court". He believed that much of the scandal against Edwards was fabricated, and he hoped that the Company officials would "redress his wrongs"; Letters Received, IV, 231; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 480-81.

\(^{12}\) Factors at Surat to the East India Company, March 10, 1616, Letters Received, IV, 295.
Etched authority of their sovereignty. 13

that the English were trading in India without the decree
English ambassador, they complained to the Moghul, meant
representative to the Moghul's court. The lack of a formal
they made the most of Cannings's distrust as a menace-

Indians complained that during these periods of supremacy
were trading in another ease or on route to England with
our court. These periods occurred whenever the English fleet
returned their dominance over the Moghul's
victory over the Portuguese at Surat, when the Portuguese
were periods of time, after Cappain Besill's
court.

The majority of their colonies for trading privileges at
these despaired of the Moghul, and as such had also engaged
and, that, the fact that they had also been mechanisms (a
the English representatives at court had not imbued
opposition at the Moghul's court seen, the fact that
their failure included; first, the strength of Portuguese
wedded permanent treaty. Second, Portugal's reasons for
found failed to obtain for the East India Company a much
125, the English representatives at the Moghul's court
2. The need for a formal ambassador. Up to
By 1614, it was becoming obvious to the London East India Company officials that no formal settlement of trade privileges with India could be reached through the negotiations of the merchant-ambassador type of representative previously delegated to the Moghul's court. The factors at Surat had clearly perceived the need for a non-merchant ambassador if any progress was to be made in determining a treaty with the Moghul. In late 1614, when Edwards was chosen to represent the English at the court, the factors named him "messenger to the Mogore", knowing that "anyone who should go up to the Moghul under the title of merchant should not be respected, for merchants generally are not regarded by the Moghul". 14 The East India Company was informed of the situation by Thomas Aldworth of Surat who wrote, in 1613, that it was necessary "that a sufficient man be sent in your first ships, that may be resident in Agra with the King, and such a one whose person may breed regard, for they here look much after great men". 15 This letter was written in November, 1613, and was probably

14 Council of factors at Surat, Minutes, Oct. 18, 1614, E.I.C., Letters Received, II, 133; W. Foster, England's Quest, 281-82; Thompson and Garrett, 10.

15 Thomas Aldworth to the East India Company, Nov. 1613, E.I.C. Letters Received, I, 307. None of the ambassadors prior to Roe were able to 'breed regard'. Egerton in Cambridge Modern History, IV, 741.
received in London prior to the East India Company's decision to send Sir Thomas Roe to India as ambassador. Perhaps a more influential recommendation received by the East India Company from Thomas Aldworth was that "Indian goods sold more cheaply inland than at Surat— but, that in order to establish such a trade, a stock of from £12,000 to £15,000 should be constantly in the hands of the factor, and it would be expedient to fix a resident at the King's Court at Agra, to solicit the protection of the Moghul and his ministers."

Thomas Kerridge wrote to the East India Company in September, 1614, regarding the need and qualifications of a new ambassador. He stressed the need for a formal ambassador who would be "appointed for that business, which will cause his esteem the better here", and who would "be continually resident" at the Moghul's court. In October, 1614, the council of factors at Surat was unanimously agreed

16 Aldworth to the East India Company Court, Nov. 13, 1613, cited in E.I.C. Annals, I, 167-68. Bruce claimed the importance of these letters from Aldworth in influencing the Company to choose a formal ambassador in 1614. (I, 174). Foster claims that the 1613 letters from Aldworth were not received at the time the Company was considering Roe, but that the equivalent of their content had reached them from Aldworth through Captain Best. W. Foster, (ed.), The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to the Court of the Great Moghul, 1615-1619, (London, 1899), (hereafter cited as Embassy), I, 111.

17 Kerridge to the East India Company, Sept. 20, 1614, E.I.C. Letters Received, II, 108.
that there should be a formal ambassador permanently resident at the Moghul's court. They declared that he should be a
man "of good respect for preventing and righting of any
wrongs that may be offered". In November, 1614, they went
on record as agreeing that if the new ambassador "should
proceed ... a resident with the king, under the title and
profession of a merchant, it were better that he went not
at all".18 At that same time, the East India Company
officials in London had come to the conclusion that they
should delegate an ambassador to India who would serve as a
personal representative of the King of England. This would
provide royal sanction to their Indian trade, and thus cir-
cumvent the Portuguese and Indian opposition to Merchants at
court. In their selection of a formal ambassador the
Company officials hoped for the fulfillment of a trade
agreement with India.19

3. Roe chosen ambassador; his qualifications.

Thomas Aldworth's requests for a formal ambassador to be

---

18 Council of factors at Surat, Minutes, Oct. 17 and Nov.

19 Royal Commission to Sir Thomas Roe from James I, Jan. 8,
1615, in Foster, Embassy, II, 549-51; J. Allan, Sir T.
Wolseley Haig, H.H. Dodwell, The Cambridge Shorter
History of India, (Cambridge, 1934), 513; Marguerite
Eyer Wilbur, The East India Company, (New York, 1945),
62; Stanley Lane-Poole, Medieval India under Moham-
medan Rule, (New York, 1903) (cited hereafter as
Medieval India), 305.
sent to India induced the East India Company officials in London to apply to the King to grant his royal sanction that an ambassador should proceed, in his name, to the Great Moghul. 20 It is probable that Sir Thomas Roe was nominated for the position by the Governor of the East India Company, Sir Thomas Smythe. Though the Company officials considered others for the position, in the end "none were esteemed so suitable for that service as Sir Thomas Roe, if hee may bee had". 21 King James I readily acquiesced in the project of sending Sir Thomas Roe as his representative to the Moghul Court. 22 The new ambassador, though sent by the authority of the king, and to serve in his name, was completely financed by the East India Company. 23

Sir Thomas Roe was born in 1580 or 1581, the son of a merchant, and grand-son of a Lord Mayor of London. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and in 1597 entered as a student of law in the Middle Temple. He took

20 E.I.C. Annals, I, 174.

21 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 7, Oct. 7, 1614, State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 318, 326; Foster, Embassy, I, iv.

22 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Nov. 2, 1614, in State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 332; Rawlinson, 78.

23 Chamberlain to Carleton, Nov. 24, 1614; Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 260.
an interest in theology and traveled to the continent to
debate with Dutch divines in Latin. He was made an Esquire
of the Body to Queen Elizabeth shortly before the end of her
reign, and in 1604 was knighthead. In his relationship with
the English court Roe gained close friendship with Prince
Henry and his sister Elizabeth. 24

In 1609, Roe was sent under the patronage of
Prince Henry to lead an expedition to South America. He
explored the entire coast from the Orinoco to the Amazon
and established a small settlement near the latter river.
Exploring the Amazon as well as the coast, Roe spent a year
in South America. 25 He returned to England either in 1611
or 1612 without finding any trace of gold, which was reputedly
found in the region. 26 He was informed, however, in
1617, that some of the men he had left in the Amazon

24 Stanley Lane-Poole, "Sir Thomas Roe", in The Dictionary
Foster, Embassy, I, v; Roe's theological disputations
with Dr. T. Wright were published by Wright under the
title of Quatraro Colocuta, (Mechlin, 1614).

25 Stanley Lane-Poole, "Sir Thomas Roe", Loc. cit., XVII,
89-90; George L. Beer, The Origins of the British Col-
onial System, (New York, 1908), 13; Carew to Roe, March,
1617, In John Maclean, (ed.), Letters from George Lord
Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, 1615-1017, Camden Society, First
Series No. 70, (London, 1830), (cited hereafter as Carew
Letters), 98; Commons Debate (Anonymous), April 13,
1621, Wallace Notestein, Frances H. Relf, Hartley Simpson,
(eds.), Commons Debates, 1621, (New Haven, 1935), (here-
after cited as Commons Debates, 1621), IV, 224.

settlement had returned rich with tobacco and gold.\textsuperscript{27}

It appears that Sir Thomas Roe's next important occupation was to serve his friend Princess Elizabeth, now Electress Palatine, and her husband, Frederick, the Elector Palatine, in Heidelberg. In 1613, Roe was resident in the "hall of the Prince Palatine at Heidelberg".\textsuperscript{28} He had gained the fullest trust of Elizabeth, who, in August, 1613, wrote from Heidelberg to Sir Ralph Winwood, English ambassador in the Netherlands, that she had "fully instructed Tom Roe with it \[a letter concerning the Electress' business, about which she sought Winwood's counsel\], from whom I pray receive it to your care".\textsuperscript{29} In September, 1613, Roe was in Holland and communicated "her Highness's letter" to Winwood along with "some particulars of Heidelberg".\textsuperscript{30}

In December, 1613, he was still in Holland and

\textsuperscript{27} Carew to Roe, March, 1617, Carew Letters, 98.


\textsuperscript{29} Elizabeth \[Electress Palatine\], Letter to Sir Ralph Winwood, Aug. 28, 1613, Buccleuch MSS., (H.M.C.), I, 246.

\textsuperscript{30} Sir Thomas Roe, Letter to Winwood, Sept. 22, 1613, Buccleuch MSS., (H.M.C.), I, 145.
it appears that he was planning to go on another expedition
with a Captain Floods' Company which seems to have been
abortive.\textsuperscript{31} Returning to England from the continent,
probably in the winter of 1613-1614, Sir Thomas was elected
Member of Parliament for Tamworth in 1614. As a member of
the 'Added Parliament', Roe came into intimate association
with such East India Company officials as Sir Thomas Smythe
and Sir Dudley Digges who were also members.\textsuperscript{32}

When the parliament was suddenly dissolved by
James I, Roe felt that his hopes for usefulness at home
were finished. His financial position was not at all
secure, and the offer from the East India Company to serve
as an ambassador in India, he reported, was what he needed
"to sett me right".\textsuperscript{33} In 1614, when asked to serve as
ambassador, Roe was still a young man. At thirty-five he
was a true Elizabethan gentleman, with all of the capacities,
tempered with a broad experience, to fill the highest kind

\textsuperscript{31} Throgmorton to Robert Lord Viscount Lisle, Dec. 3, 1613,

\textsuperscript{32} Journal of the House of Commons, (London, no date,), I,
455-506; Stanley Lane-Poole, "Sir Thomas Roe", \textit{Loc.cit.},
XVII, 89-90; Rawlinson, 77.

\textsuperscript{33} British Museum, Harl. MS., 1576, f.51r, cited in Foster,
Embassy, I, vi; Samuel R. Gardiner, History of England,
(London, 1883), II, 311. According to the Court Minutes
of the East India Company, Nov. 11, 1614, Roe borrowed
on his salary in order to pay debts before leaving for
India. \textit{State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616}, 335.
of office. "He combined the business capacity of the great merchant with the urbanity and address of the courtier." 

Probably Sir Thomas Smythe's personal acquaintance with Roe, gained in the 1614 parliament, was an instrumental factor behind Smythe's nomination of Roe for the ambassadorship. It also appears that perhaps Roe was supported by the influential wife of the fifth Earl of Huntingdon. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Roe was deserving of all the support he had won. He is described in the Court Minutes of the East India Company as being "a gentleman of pregnant understanding, well spoken, learned, industrious, of a comely personage, and one of whom there are great hopes that he may work much good for the Company." 

4. Roe's Mission. On November 16, 1614, articles of agreement between the Company and Roe were concluded. Roe was to receive a salary of six hundred pounds per year,

34 Lane-Poole, Mediaeval India, 306-07; Gardiner, II, 311.

35 Journal of the House of Commons, I, 457; Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 7, 1614, in State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 318.


37 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Oct. 4, Sept. 7, 1614, State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 313, 324; See also Arthur Collins, (ed.), II, 541n.
half of which was to be paid him in India, while the other half was to be "yearly put into the Joint stocke to be employed for his benefit proportionably with all other adventures". He was also granted a bonus of five hundred pounds before sailing. In the agreement Roe's mission was declared to be "for the better establishing and setlinge an absolute trade in any partes within the Dominions of the greate Mogore". Roe was instructed to forbear from trading privately himself and to discourage such practices by the merchants in India. The practical matters of trade were to be under the control of the factors, and Roe was forbidden "to have to doe with any parte of there merchandize". By royal commission, Sir Thomas was given full authority to make treaties with the Moghul or his deputies. If he should be prevented from landing in the Moghul's country, or, once landed, suddenly discharged, he was instructed by King James and the Governor of the East India Company to lead some of the ships "for further Discovery

38 The East India Company's Agreement with Roe, Nov. 16, 1611, Foster, Embassy, II, 547-48; Court Minutes of the East India Company, Nov. 16, 1614, in State Papers East Indies, 1513-1616, 338. In the King's instructions to Roe, Dec. 29, 1614, Roe was instructed to "use all the means you can to advance the Trade of the East India Company and to procure them all Commodities of safety and profit that you may". Foster, Embassy, II, 552; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 361-62.
into the Red Sea or any other Places elsewhere". 39 James
I emphasized to Roe the importance of maintaining constant
dignity and honor, and insisted that the Great Moghul should
be kept constantly aware of "our power and strength at Sea,
which giveth us not onelie reputation and autORITY amongst
the Greatest Princes of Christendome, but Maketh us even a
Terrour to all other Nations; ... that Wee be not onelie
absolutelie obeyed but universally beloved and admyrad of
all our People". 40

39 Royal Commission to Sir Thomas Roe, Jan. 8, 1615, in
Foster, Embassy, II, 550.

40 Letter of Instructions to Roe from King James I, Dec.
29, 1614, Foster, Embassy, II, 552-53; State Papers,
East Indies, 1513-1616, 361-62.
Chapter III

Problems Which Confronted Roe As Ambassador, 1615-1619

1. Portuguese Problem. As noted above, the Portuguese had been the chief rivals of the English in India prior to 1615, obstructing English success in establishing firm trade relations with the Indians. However, by the time of Sir Thomas Roe's arrival in India in September, 1615, the Portuguese had met English opposition at sea and in trade, and had felt the full strength of the English challenge for trade with India. The Indian traders, too, and the Moghul himself had come to witness and duly respect English power at sea. 1 In a letter to the East India Company dated November 24, 1615, Roe reported: "An Armenian Christian Merchant told me that the Moghul had answered "Regarding a question as to what conditions concerning the English were contained in a recently-made truce between the Moghul and the Portuguese he could not put out the English, being powerful at sea, but he left it to the Portugalls to doe what they pleased and to endure likewise their fortune". 2


At the same time, in this letter to the Company written just two months after his arrival in India, Roe pointed out the need for peace with the Portuguese: "Besides, unless the peace may be made with the Portugall (which I have endeavored), the Roade is unsafe at Swally, and you must alway maynteyne a fleete four monethes for the safety of one ship". 3 In January, 1616, he informed King James that the Portuguese were still acting insolently towards the English on the west coast of the Indian peninsula. Their Armado had twice assaulted the English but had been successfully repulsed. 4 Sir Thomas repeatedly offered them peace, but continued to be met with evasion. The Portuguese were still able to bribe important officials serving the Moghul, and so were favored with trading privileges for which they were much envied by the English ambassador. 5 In a letter to Sultan Coronne, one of the Moghul's most important officials, Roe sought to persuade him of the greater benefit to be derived from exclusive trade with the English:

3 Roe to the East India Company, Nov. 24, 1615, Foster, Embassy, I, 94.

4 Idea to King James, Jan. 29, 1616, ibid. I, 120.

if your highnes suppose that the Portugall
hath or would bring eyther more raretyes or
more profitt to your port, I dare affirme
your highnes hath received wrong enformation.
First, for curious and rare toyes, presents
for the Mogul and his subordinates, we have
better means to furnish your highnes than
any other. ... Secondly, for profitt, our
kingdome is Naturally the most fructfull in
Europe and the most abundant in all sorts
of armes, cloth, and whatsoever is necess-
ary for mans use; ... and we bring into your
Port in ready mony 50,000 Rials of Eight,
for which we only carry away Gallieoes and
Indieoes, to the enriching of your highnes
kingdomes with silver.

It is evident, in spite of the fact that it was
beginning to ebb, that the Portuguese strength constituted
a definite problem for the English upon Roe's arrival.
The English fleet which came to India in 1616 under the
command of Captain Joseph met with, and were attacked by,
a huge Portuguese carrack off the Comora Isles. The vessel
was badly damaged and drifted to shore, where her crew set
her afire. The Reverend Mr. Edward Terry, en route to India
with the fleet (he came to be Roe's chaplain) related how the
English won the victory over the Portuguese: "shortly after
this distressed ship wanting her wings, was forced by the
wind and waves upon the adjacent Island Gazidia, where she

6 Roe to Sultan Coronne, May 1, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, 210; E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 101-03; State Papers,
East Indies, 1572-1617, 455; Roe exaggerated the capas-
ties of the English, as they were not able at first to
compete with the richer Portuguese. Cf. Roe to Keeling,
Jan. 13, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, xvii. The value of
the Rial of Eight was 4d. 6d., W. Foster, Embassy, I, 153n.
stuck fast between two Rocks: those that were left alive in her by their Boats got upon the shoare, which when they had all recovered, willing (it should seeme) to consume what they could not keepes, they set her on fire to make a coale, rather then we should make her a Prize. The English ambassador, in a letter shortly after the incident, estimated the English victory over the Portuguese carrack to be "one of the greatest disgraces and losses that ever happened to the Portugall in these Parts--the reward of their owne Insolency". The victory not only damaged Portuguese prestige but put Goa—Portuguese headquarters in western India—in jeopardy.

Roe's confidence of English success in establishing trade in India over the waning competition of the Portugese mounted after the defeat of the carrack. Immediately after the incident Roe wrote that the Portuguese had been "brought so low in vailow, that it is grown into a Proverbe (one Portugall to three Moores, one Englishman to three Portugalls), so that the best foundation of their greatnes

---

7 Edward Terry, A Relation of a Voyage to the Eastern India, 1616, Alexander Child, Journal, 1616, Purchas, IV, 502-04; IX, 9; Captain Henry Pepwell to the East India Company, March 7, 1617, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 20-21; E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 116-43; Hannay, 135-8; See also Appendix IV.

8 Roe to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Oct, 30, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 311; Rawlinson, 63.
is absolutely mined and blown up". In another letter, to Sir Ralph Winwood, Secretary of State in England, he reported on the Portuguese defeat at Comora in terms which reflected his confidence in ultimate English dominance in the India trade. Roe stated that the great carrack which had been scuttled on the Comora Isles "was the succor of India this yeare; ... This is the greatest disaster and disgrace ever befall them, for they never mist their fleete in September, nor lost any such vessell as this, which was esteemed invincible; and without supplyes [To have been brought to Goa], they perish utterly". However, he was perceptive enough to realize that the English could not merely rest upon their laurels and expect dominion over the crafty Portuguese, "for our reception here stands on the same ground from which wee have Cast them downe, which is Peare, an Honororable but uncertayne base of so great Charge".

Just how unsteady this base really was becomes clear when it is recalled that the English were forbidden by their king to wage offensive war against their avowed, though not declared, enemies in the East India trade.


11 Royal Commission to Sir Thomas Roe from James I, (1615), Foster, Embassy, II, 550-51.
However, great Roe judged the decline of Portuguese strength to be, he was quite aware that the English could not win out in the India trade unless they were given permission to move aggressively and vigorously against the enemy. In analyzing the English position in India one year after his arrival, Roe stated that in "all these considered [All fortunes of the Portuguese] mee thinkes the Heavens Conspire the fall of the Portugall in this quarter, if his Maiestie would be pleased to bend only his Royall Countenance". Roe emphasized to the East India Company the need to press openly against the Portuguese if they hoped to establish a secure basis for trade in India.\(^1^2\)

Because permission to take the offensive against the Portuguese was withheld, the problem of their insulance lingered on during all of Roe's embassy. Never really solved, its importance simply waned as time went on. In August, 1617, Sir Thomas still regretted that interruptions to English trade had not been halted. He advised the newly-arrived fleet commander, Martin Pring: "the Portugalls I need not any way mention; their Injuries and your own

---

12 Roe to Winwood, Nov. 30, 1616; \textit{idem} to the East India Company, Nov. 24, 1615, Foster, \textit{Embassy}, II, 359, 342-44. One year earlier, Roe had advised that "one prosperous assault upon them \textit{i.e.}, the Portugalls would more disharte them, bring them to better terms (when they saw your resolution to prosequte them), give you more reputation and good booty, then twenty repulses ever in your owne defense". \textit{idem} to \textit{idem}, Nov. 24, 1615, Foster, \textit{Embassy}, I, 99.
He realized that in spite of his efforts, the King had not withdrawn his refusal to permit any but defensive fighting against the Portuguese. His own simple solution to Portuguese arrogance—to drive the enemy from the seas—Roe was not free to urge upon Captain Pring. He could only hope that the English would "in time teach them to know their superiors; and if they will not give us trade, we can yet choose whither they shall enjoy it or no". He considered that the best advice he could give the fleet commander was merely to intimidate the Portuguese, and endeavor to force respect through fear.

As late as February, 1618, Sir Thomas reported to King James that "the Portugall is not yet wise enough to know his owne weaknesses, who rather enviously hinder us then like noble enemies hurt us". He was still confident that the Portuguese could readily be brought to terms of peace,

13 Idem to Pring, Aug. 30, 1617, Foster, Embassy, II, 410-11; Salbanke to the East India Company, November, 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 236. The Portuguese interfered with the English when the latter traded between Surat and Persia (Infra, Ch. IV, p. 79), E.I.C. Annals, I, 198; Connock to the East India Company, Aug. 4, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 36-37; Roe to Factors in Persia, Feb. 4, 1618, W. Foster, (ed,), The English Factories in India, 1618-1621, (Oxford, 1926) (cited hereafter as Factories), 2.

14 Idem to Pring, Aug. 30, 1617, Loc.cit., 410-11. Roe pointed out to the new commander what he considered to have been the poor naval tactics of Captain Downton, who fought the Portuguese in "the hole at Swally" (Supra, Ch. I, 11). Roe suggested a more aggressive and open 'defense', i.e., meeting the Portuguese on the open sea.
and thus assure a more successful trade, if only he could
gain the King's consent to strike an offensive blow. He
subtly made another bid for this power when he wrote, "let
your Maestie bee pleased to give mee leave to enforce want
of peace with them [the Portuguese] (which by your royall
authoritie were easely commanded) makes all these trades of
Indya and hopes of Persia heavy and dangerous to the under-
takers".15

2. Portuguese rivalry at court. The fact that
English fleets in East Indian waters had been ordered by
the King not to fight except in defense had afforded the
Portuguese officials at the Moghul's court an opportunity
to ridicule the English. They boasted, according to Roe,
"that the King of England is so afraiyd of the King of
Portugall, that he dares not warrant an assault, but only
to defend".16 Indeed, the Portuguese problem confronted
Roe on land as well as on sea. The Portuguese Jesuit
Mission in India was headed by Father Jerome Xavier who
was an implacable enemy of the English. Father Xavier
was held in good stead by Jahangir and continuously strove to
turn the Moghul's favor against the English merchants.

It was indeed fortunate for the English that Father

15 Idea to King James, Feb. 15, 1618, Foster, Embassy,
II, 197; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 121.

16 Idea to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Jan. 29, 1616,
Foster, Embassy, I, 124.
Xavier demised his position in January, 1617, to Father Corsi. Father Corsi headed the Jesuit Mission at Jahangir's court during the remainder of Roe's embassy. He proved to be considerably more tolerant and cooperative in his concern with the English than his predecessor had ever been. In his journal entry for November 13, 1617, Roe noted that he had given to Corsi a present as a token of gratitude for some courtesy rendered to him by the Jesuit. Father Corsi worked hard, though unsuccessfully, for a peace between the Portuguese and the English. Roe related early in 1618, that "the Jesuit here, [Corsi] who much affects an agreement, wisely foreseeing they [The Portuguese] may not soyne it more by stubbernes then reason, hath often moved lately to mee a Peace, and to that end hath written to his superiors in Goa, but received no direct answer". Father Corsi was not able to arrange a formal peace between his country and the newly-established and more powerful English, but it appears that his endeavor to cooperate with the English at the


18 Edward Terry, Journal, cited in Foster, Embassy, II, 315n; Rawlinson, 56.


Mogul's court was sincere. 21

3. Dutch rivalry. Although the English found their chief rival in India to be the Portuguese, they did not escape competition from the Dutch. The Dutch recognized the value of the cottons of Gujarat (north of Surat on the west coast in their own trade with Meluza). About a year after Roe's arrival in India the Dutch won permission from the Moghul to establish a temporary factory at Surat. 22 As soon as Roe learned that the Dutch had arrived in Surat, he went directly to the Moghul to endeavor to arouse "doubts and suspicions" concerning them. The English ambassador and the factors at Surat feared the rivalry of the Dutch in the Indian trade "where they would both out-present, out-bribe, and out-buy us in all things, either of which would be very prejudicial to our proceedings." 23 To the Moghul's questions regarding the Dutch traders, Roe answered "that for their trade they could bring nothing but Eastern Comodities, from China or the Islands, for that their own land yielded nothing fitt for


22 Factors at Surat to Roe, July 23 & 26, 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 332-33; idem to idem; idem to Biddulph, Aug. 11, 1616 (o.s.); idem to Roe, Sept. 7, 1616 (o.s.), B.M.; Additional Manuscript 9366, ff. 95, 95b, 96, 112b; Popwell to the East India Company, March 7, 1617, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 20-21; P. Geyl, "The Dutch in India", The Cambridge History of India, V, 39.

these parts". Kerridge, head of the English factory at Surat, communicated to Roe his anxiety over the Dutch rivalry in that port. He expressed the strong hope that the expected fleet from England would take the offensive against the encroaching Hollanders. Roe's reply to this was reassuring. "Concerning the Hollander I have received instructions from England how to deal—not by force, as you intended".

The English ambassador worked through the Moghul's court to secure the expulsion of the Dutch from India, but he was careful to avoid overt hostility. He well realized how distasteful to the Moghul was the idea of any European power's obtaining a permanent foothold in India. Consequently, he informed the Moghul of the Dutch practice of building forts for "defense" whereby, little by little, they became masters of the port wherein they were established. Roe was by no means completely successful in turning the Moghul and, in consequence, the Governor of Surat against the Dutch traders. It does appear, however, that his

---

24 Ibid., I, 229. Roe, of course, was not telling the Moghul all that he knew about the Dutch, i.e., they had traded commodities from the southern Islands of the Indies for gold at Mocha in the Red Sea, and were prepared to trade this gold for the much-wanted Gujarat cottons. Ibid., I, 228-29.

25 Ibid., I, 229n.

26 Ibid., I, 229n-230; See Supra, 41.
representations had some effect in that though the Dutch were given permission to trade, they were restricted from having a permanent factory and were merely granted a warehouse.27

The Dutch position in India during the early part of Roe's embassy was anomalous. They were rivals not only of the English but also of the Portuguese. Their attacks upon the Portuguese were welcomed at the time by the English. Roe, in the early part of 1616, reported to James I that the Hollander was assisting the English insofar as he had recently "planted below Goa, the seat of the vice-roy, and beaten him [the Portuguese] in late sea fights, and dayly wynnys ground upon him".28 The Dutch successes over the Portuguese ultimately gave them a position by which they could be even more formidable rivals of the English than the Portuguese had ever been. By 1618, the Hollanders had encroached upon the Indian trade to such an extent that they were nearly equals of the English in Surat. Roe reported that "The Flemingis is planted at Surat, [and] hath obtained a firmaen upon as good tesarmes almost as wee. I did my endeavour to


28 Roe to King James, Jan. 29, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, 120; John Tucker to Smythe, Feb. 11, 1616; Richard Cockes to the East India Company, Feb. 25, 1616; idem to Richard Wickham, July 12, 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 27, 47, 130.
Crosse him, but they come in upon the same ground that wee began, and by which wee subsist, \textit{\textit{I.e.} feare". Sir Thomas pointed out to the East India Company that the Dutch had become a greater menace to Company interests in the Indian trade than the much talked about Portuguese.

They \textit{The Dutch} wrong you in all Parts and grow to insufferable insolencies. If wee fall foule here, the Common enemy \textit{The Portuguese} will laugh and reap the fruit of our Contention... they rob in English Costors to scandal his \textit{James I}'s subjects... You must speedely looke to this Haggat; els we talk of the Portugall, but these will eate a worme in your sides... If they keepes you out of the Moluceses by force, I would beat them from Surat to requite it.

Perhaps the pleas for action against the growing might and rivalry of the Dutch which Roe sent to England in 1618 had some effect. Thomas Mun, in his \textit{Discourse}, pointed out that English ships "have been heaped thither \textit{to the East Indies} these three last yeares \textit{1618-1620} together without returne, save onely five shippes in all that time; the rest have beene kept there to oppose the furie of the Dutch".\textsuperscript{30}

\textit{4. Need of money to carry the trade.} The Indians had welcomed the English as a counterpoise to the generally

\textsuperscript{29} Roe to the East India Company, Feb. 14, 1618, Foster, \textit{Embassy, II}, 469, 481; \textit{State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621,} 118-21; Khan, 14, 50; Regarding the robbing in English colors, \textit{i.e.}, under the claim of being English, see H.B. Morse, \textit{I}, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{30} Thomas Mun, \textit{A Discourse of Trade from England unto the East Indies}, (hereafter cited as \textit{Discourse}), Purchas, \textit{V}, 269.
disliked Portuguese. The first English merchants that traded in India had no difficulty in finding a demand for their cloth. That demand proved to be only for the novelty of the cloth, however, as there existed no real need for it in India. The English were forced, therefore, to provide bullion in exchange for Indian commodities. The problem of continuing to accommodate that taste for bullion in order to sustain the Indian trade proved to be one of the most important which confronted Sir Thomas Roe during his embassy. Throughout his embassy the East India Company was denounced in England for exporting bullion to India. Though Thomas Mun’s Discourse, in which he endeavored to answer the objections to the India trade, was not published until 1620, there can be no doubt that it reflects the trade situation during Roe’s embassy. In spite of Mun’s arguments that the India trade did not waste money, and that money was actually returned to England in greater quantities than the amounts exported, many economists of the time, including the English ambassador, regarded the drain of

31 Supra, 6.

32 Factors at Surat to Biddulph, Aug. 11; idem to (addresses illegible), Oct. 18, 1616 (c.s.), E.I.; Additional Manuscript 9366, f. 95b, 126; Francis Fettiplace to the East India Company, Sept. 1, and Nov. 26, 1616, E.I.C., Letters Received, IV, 242-44; E.I.C. Annals, I, 164; Moreland and Chatterjee, 237; Moreland, From Akbar, 53; See also Appendices II, III.
It was important for him to choose the better solution.

The purpose of the British opposition to the maintenance of British rule in India was to prevent the establishment of a trade relation with India.

In the case of the East India Company, the measure of success achieved by the East India Company was to succeed in east Asia.

The measure of success achieved by the East India Company was to succeed in east Asia.

Emphasize into the East as a serious goal to the state.

33

The measure of success achieved by the East India Company was to succeed in east Asia.
At the time of his arrival in India, Roe was aware of the exclusion of English cloth, one of England's chief exports, and immediately set out to secure permission to bring the cloth into India. In a letter to the factors at Surat, he analyzed the problem and suggested a solution:

"Regarding the venting of our own Commodities, though I have no skill in particular merchandise yet I universally discerne they will sooner and faster weaken us here than the want of priviledges, for I see no Comoditye that will prove staple and certaynly vendedable, able to returne a ship yearely. Our Cloth will not off in many yeares; here I am perswaded twenty will not sell; the King is Glutted with the last, and no man regardea it. Swoordes are worse then lead and teeth, if they will vent, yet will they lade faster out than home. For one yeare gold or silvered velvettes, Grogrames, Chaletts and silk stuffes may serve us, but constantly noething. So that my opinion is, brefly, seeing our state cannot beare the exportation of many, except some new trade be discovered from the East to serve this Kingdom, it must fall to ground by the weakness of its owne legs."}

35 Roe, Journal, Oct. 21, 29-31, 1615, Loc. cit., I, 79, 84-86; Kerridge to Edwards, Oct. 23, 1616 (o.s.), B.M.; Additional Manuscript 9369, f.20; The cloth market in India was glutted before Roe's arrival. Thomas Aldworth and William Biddulph to the East India Company, 1614; Surat Factors to idem, February 26, 1617, E.I.C., Letters Received, II, 97, V, 117.

36 Roe to the Factors at Surat, April 26, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, 165. By 1617, the English merchants not only could not find markets for their cloth in India, but found that their cloth was being ruined by cloth-eating worms. Trade was further depressed because of a plague in western India during 1610 and 1618; Factors at Surat to Roe, July 23; idem to idem, Nov. 29; idem to idem, Dec. 12, 1616 (o.s.), B.M.; Additional Manuscript 9369, f.32b, 145, 155; Joseph Salbanke to the East India
Sir Thomas Roe's problem of how to secure the Indian trade in face of Indian desire for bullion instead of English cloth, and the English opposition to the export of bullion, was thus given a plan for solution when he suggested the new trade which would serve India. However, this plan itself was to give rise to a new and broader aspect of the problem, for Roe was then confronted with the task of determining where the new trade was to be found, and when found to guide it to fruition.

In June, 1616, Roe noted a suggestion given to him respecting the sort of commodities that would sell more readily than English cloth in India. The suggestion was that the English should bring rare types of goods from China and Japan to India, "which were more acceptable here [India] than Gould". The silk and spices from China, however, were very much in demand in England and the factors in the Far East were finding it difficult even to supply the home market.37 During the years immediately preceding Roe's embassy to India, the East India Company merchant seamen had been active in exploring the potentialities of the East for trade with England. Reporting on his visit with the

Ambassador of Siam in 1608, Captain William Keeling pointed out that that country was a good market for English cloth, and that it could be exchanged for gold, which was abundant there. In 1614, Mr. Richard Cocks, Capo-Merchant, expressed the hope of procuring trade with China. In 1611, Captain William Adams reported from Japan that the Hollanders were obtaining Japanese gold and silver for their commodities; two years later Captain John Saris confirmed the report of Dutch success in trading with Japan and urged that English commodities might also be sold for Japanese silver. Saris observed that the Dutch were selling English broadcloths to the Japanese for handsome profits. Later in the same year Captain Saris won the right to trade in Japan. The East India Company, established in Japan shortly before Roe went to India, could not compete with the overwhelming strength of the Dutch and soon was forced to close its factory. Consequently, Roe's need for bullion could not be gratified from that quarter.

In November, 1615, scarcely two months after his

arrival in India, Roe had proposed to the East India Company
officials another means by which they could exchange their
products for bullion, and in turn make a stronger bid for
the Indian commodities which could be obtained only in ex-
change for bullion:

there is no such place [Persia] for the bene-
fitt of our Nation to settle a trade for
venting cloth and buying silke, and for good
justice toward all men; ... and what you vent
may be should for silkes (which are very vend-
ible here) or ready mony, whereby these parts
may be furnished and the exportation of monyes
saved from England. 42

Roe's suggestion was based upon fact, for English merchants
had completed a number of voyages to Persia in recent years.
In 1609, Captain Joseph Salbanke had voyaged into the Persian
ports and had done some trading. He wrote to Sir Thomas
Smythe advising him of the particular English commodities
which were in demand in Persia. His list included cloth in
the form of kerseys for the common people, broadcloth for
the merchants, finer dyed cloth for the richer people as
well as copper and tin and manufactured products such as
swords, daggers and shirts of mail. 43 In January, 1614,
two East India Company factors, Richard Steel and John
Crouther, were commissioned by the chief factor at Surat
"to explore trade potentialities in Persia." By November,

42 Roe to the East India Company, Nov. 24, 1615, Foster,
Embassy, I, 96.

43 Joseph Salbanke to Smythe, 1609, Purchas, III, 86.
1614, the merchants at Surat had received a report from Steel that the opportunity for trade in Persia was favorable. 44

The English ambassador's suggestion for opening trade with Persia for silks was well received in London by the merchants and the Lords of the Privy Council, as there appeared to be a "madness in England after silk rather than cloth". Nevertheless, objections to the proposal were raised by those who feared that the English traders would not be strong enough to defend themselves against the whims of the Grand Seignior, the Turkish leader at war with Persia. It was supposed in London, furthermore, that the Persians would trade only for money, and that £600,000 a year would be needed to carry on the proposed trade. 45

A year later, by November, 1616, Roe had come to consider the proposed plan for trade with Persia as worthless. He warned Sir Thomas Smythe of two things in regard to the projected Persian trade: that the necessary overland transportation of goods at the expense of the English would consume the profits, and that the port of Ormus, from which a good share of the Persian goods would be secured, would be

44 Commission to Steel and Grouther from East India Company Merchants at Surat, Jan. 2, 1614; Council of Merchants at Surat, Nov. 28, 1614, E.I.C. Letters Received, II, 208, 266-68, IV, 335n; E.I.C. Annals, I, 173.

45 Carew to Roe, Jan. 18, 1617, Carew Letters, 77-78; Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 428; Pettipiece to the East India Company, Nov. 28, 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 244.
more costly to defend than the Indian port of Surat. At the same time, Roe revealed that he had given further consideration to other opportunities for the English to eliminate the exportation of bullion. In November, 1616, he suggested to the East India Company a seemingly more practical means by which the Indian trade might be sustained: "It the traffic into the Red Sea is more important than all other projects. My counsell is that one of your smallest shipes, with the fittest English goodes and such other as this Country yeildes, yearly goe in Company of the Guzerattes [Indian traders north of Surat] and trade for them selves for mony, which is taken in abundance, and returne in September with them, to supply this Plase [India]. The Profitt exceeds all the trades of Indya and will drive this alone". Captain Henry Pepwell reported to the East India Company that the Dutch had been trading in the Red Sea under the pretense

---

46 Roe to Smythe, Nov. 27, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 353; E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 245-49; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 482-83; E.I.C. Annals, I, 186-87; Thomas Mitford to the East India Company, March 25, 1615; Biddulphs to idem, Dec. 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, III, 84, IV, 288-89. Later events proved Roe's advice wrong, as the Persian trade did prove profitable and subsequently saved the Surat factory from bankruptcy. Ingra, Ch. IV, 87; Hawlinson, 83n.
of being English and had met with considerable success.47

The most important problem which arose as a result of Roe's plan to open trade relations with the Red Sea ports was the opposition it received from the Indian merchants. They considered the Red Sea trade as an important part of their trade, and opposed vigorously Roe's plan to trade in that area. The advantages of the trade to the English ultimately outweighed the threatened boycott by the Indians of English goods, and Roe advised the factors at Surat to "further the project of Moha [Red Sea port] as you may".48

5. Problem of Securing a Treaty with the Moghul.

One of the important objects of Roe's embassy was to negotiate a reciprocal treaty with the Moghul which would assure the English of a secure position in the India trade. The great

47 Roe to the East India Company, Nov. 21, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 313; idem to Pepwell, Jan. 14, 1617, idem to Smythe, Jan. 16, 1617, Pepwell to the East India Company, March 7, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 154, 329, 332; Factors at Surat to (addresssee illegible), Oct. 18, 1616 (o.s.), B.M; Additional Manuscript 9366, f.127; Moreland, From Akbar, 644. Captain Sharpeigh, East India Company, was reported to have been at Aden and Moha in the Red Sea in 1609 where he sold all of his goods. Sir Henry Middleton's visit to Moha in 1610, however, was less profitable. He and his men suffered ill treatment. Sir Henry Middleton, Journal, 1610, Purchas, III, 122, 126ff.; E.I.C. Annals, I, 161; Hunter, I, 289.

48 Roe to the Factors at Surat, Nov. 8, 1617, idem to the East India Company, Jan. 25, 1616, idem to Kerridge, Dec. 18, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 13, VI, 151, 227; Foster, Factoriae, xi-xii; Moreland, From Akbar, 644.
difficulty confronting the English ambassador in attempting to secure such a treaty was that the Moghul and his counsellors considered such a treaty beneath their dignity and thought that Roe should be satisfied with temporary privileges provided by firmans. The firman was preferred by the Moghul because it could be completely under his control and subject to change at his will. Roe's bargaining position in 1615 was far too weak to permit him to negotiate a favorable treaty with the Moghul. Nevertheless, the fact that he was a formal ambassador and not a merchant seemed to be one substantial factor in his favor. From the time of his arrival at Surat, Sir Thomas meticulously acted the part of the ambassador, justifying his conduct in the journal entry: "if it seem to any that shall heare of my carriidge that I was eyther too stiff, to Punctuall, too high, or to Prodigall, lett them Consider I was to repayre a mynd house and to make streight that which was crooked."  

Immediately after his arrival in India, Roe complained to the Governor of Surat that the privileges granted to Best in 1612 were not being strictly respected by the


Indian officials. He requested speedy amends, informing
the Governor that the English king "is able to revenge what-
soever is dared to be done against his subjects". Seeing
that the abuses were not readily halted, Roe decided to
present the problem directly to the Moghul at their first
meeting.51

In March, 1616, Sir Thomas presented to the Moghul
his proposals for a treaty. The Moghul received them and
informed Roe that he should receive his answer from Asaph
Chan, the brother of the Moghul's favorite wife and one of
his most eminent administrators.52 In April Roe received
from Asaph Chan the answer that his demands were unreason-
able and could not be accepted.53 Four months later Roe
was still hoping that the Moghul might agree to the terms.
When he inquired of Asaph Chan what the prospects might be,
he was answered "with many Compliments of friendship and love,
but [Re?] delayed me with sentences and morality: that kings
were to be attended, and that things must come of them of

51 Roe to the Governor of Surat, Oct. 12 and Oct. 19, 1615;
Roe's List of Abuses to the English at Surat, April, 1616;
Joseph Salbanke to the East India Company, November, 1616,
E.I.C. Letters Received, III, 182-84, 196-97, IV, 83-85,
234; State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, L32, L36;
Richard Baker to Roe, Dec. 25, 1615, 1616, 151-52;
Factors at Surat to idem Oct. 30; Kerridge to idem
Oct. 27, 1615 (o.s.), E.K; Additional Manuscript 9366,
f.12, 12b, 22. See also Appendix I.

their owne mynde, without importunity: that patience would bring all to pass." 54 Finally, in September, 1616, the English ambassador received from Asaph Chan further criticism of his proposals. Roe was told that he should not seek such a treaty, but rather be content to receive a firman. Roe's disappointment crept into his journal: "7 months I had promise from weke to weke, from day to day, and no exception". 55 But his patience was not yet exhausted. He managed to discover that his proposal had been criticized because of its length and great detail. Hopefully he re-drafted it. The abbreviated proposal, containing the essentials of the former, provided that the English should be permitted to land their goods in peace and to sell them free of duty other than the port customs which they expected and agreed to pay. The English, also, were to be granted freedom to buy any goods in India. 56

The short version of Roe's proposition to the Moghul received no more sympathy than had his earlier offer. Very shortly after it was presented to Asaph Chan, Roe was notified that the most that could be given to him was a firman. He read the firman, decided that it contained "all the clauses required" even though it was not guaranteed to be permanent;

56 Ibid., I, 260-62.
and accepted it.57

A constant problem for the English ambassador in
his relationship with the Moghul and his court was the
paucity of his stock of presents. Early in 1616 he wrote:

For presents, I have none, or so means that
they are worse than none; so that I have
resolved to give none, for the last years
liberality and provision of the Company
was such ... as I can no way equal. Referr-
ing, no doubt, to presents brought out by
Edwards in 1615. Therefore I answer all
the Great ones: I come from Kyng to Kyng,
not to present every man, but to demand
Justice for the Injuries and insiglenes
offered his Majesties Subjects.58

In spite of his inability to compete with the Portuguese in
either amount or quality of presents, Roe seemed to be able
to gain the Moghul's attention and favor. He noted the
Moghul's weakness for red wine and advised the East India
Company to send several cases "that will be more welcome
than the richest Jewell in Cheapsyde". Amongst the larger
gifts provided by the East India Company at Roe's request
was an ornamented English coas.59

---

57 Roe, Journal, Sept. 11 & 8, 1616, Loc.cit., I, 262-64; Robert Hughes to the East India Company, Dec. 28, 1616; Roe to the English Ambassador at Constantinople, Aug. 21, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 281, VI, 298.

58 Roe to Keeling, Jan. 13, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, xvii.

The Moghul's court was a nest of vanity and hypocrisy, to which Roe refused to conform. Perhaps it was because of his self-respect that he won the regard of the Moghul, although he received fewer privileges than other envoys at court. At times, however, he was unable to stand aloof from the venality which surrounded him. In 1617, he found it necessary to bribe Asaph Chan with a very valuable pearl in order to gain his cooperation in securing a new fiamaen applicable to the next fleet to arrive from England.60

Unlicensed trading by English merchants in India was forbidden by the East India Company, but was practiced on a scale sufficient to constitute a lasting problem for Roe. In 1617 he pointed out that he could instance some English merchants that only employed their own stock, and did no other business, who had returned to England "and live now at home in pleasure". Richard Steel was one of those guilty of the practice, and Roe did not hesitate to condemn the Company for sending that trader to India.61

60 Roe, Journal, Oct. 6, 1617; idem to Winwood, Nov. 30, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 358, 526-28; idem to the English Ambassador at Constantinople, Aug. 21, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 298.

61 Roe, Journal, Nov. 2, 1617, Loc. cit., II, 442-43; See ibid., II, 439n. for a brief account of Richard Steel and his plans; E.I.C. Annals, I, 131; Salbanke to the East India Company, November 1616; John Browne to idem, Feb. 10, 1617; Surat Factors to idem, Feb. 26, 1617; Popwell to idem, March 7, 1617; Roe to Kerridge, Dec. 6, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 228, V, 3d, 118, 160-61, VI, 216. It should also be noted that condemned criminals
came hither expecting to command us all, ever mentioning his deserts and credit with you; but I have a little humbled him. The great wages you gave him made all your factors eager to return; who say they travel here and a light-brayed man that goes home and fills your ears with fables shall returns in better estate then they for paynfull service". Roe, distrustful of Steel, cited an occasion when Steel acted as an interpreter between the Moghul and the ambassador and took the opportunity to interpolate and twist the words to his own selfish advantage.62 Throughout his embassy, the ambassador's effectiveness at the Moghul's court was reduced by the rivalry of this private trader. Steel had the capacity to attach himself to the Moghul, gaining his support by suggestions of various high-sounding but impractical plans, such as that to provide

Agra with a water-works. 63  "He Steel was much condemned for his unworthy carriage abroad, having performed nothing that was intended and resolved of at his departure, but hath brought home a great private trade ... and wronged my Lord Ambassador Roe by a false and surmised contestation and arrogating a higher title and place to himself then ever was intended." 64 Roe bitterly complained of Steel in a letter to Sir Thomas Smythe: he stressed that Steel had so firmly established himself with the Moghul that it would impair Roe's cordial relations with the ruler if he complained about Steel. Roe further surmised that "he surely either hopes to supplant mee, and to succeed (for so some tyme his vanetye Pretendieth)." 65

The state of Roe's health during his stay in India was not the least of his difficulties. His illness gave him some concern, especially when he was forced to travel over-land in India well over 1500 miles while following the nomadic Moghul court. Writing to Sir Thomas Smythe only a

63 John Brown to idem, Feb. 10, 1618, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 118; Roe to idem, Feb. 14, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 476-77; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 118-21; Kerridge to idem, Feb. 19, 1619, Foster, Fostories, 60.

64 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 17, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 296-97; Foster, Embassy, II, 518n.

few months after his arrival in India, Roe complained of ill health in the new environment. He continued to suffer from the strain of moving about India, often tolerating the most primitive living conditions. His personal difficulties and sufferings were brought to the attention of the Company: "I was not borne to a life smooth and easy; all my actions have been mingled with crosses and rubbes, that I might rather say I wrestled then walked toward my Grave".

66 Roe to Smythe, 1616, Foster, *Embassy*, I, 119n., Wheeler, 10. For a map of Roe's travels in India, see *ibid.*, I, 272. For various references to Roe's illnesses, see *ibid.*, I, xv, 99, 100, 105, 119n, 134, 168; II, 319n, 335n, 438.

Chapter IV

Achievements Effect during Roe's Embassy.

1. Extension of Trade. In February, 1616, John Crouther returned to India from his mission to Persia. He delivered to Sir Thomas Roe copies of letters of instruction from the King of Persia to his viceroy and governors of ports which directed them to extend privileges of trade to the English that they might freely enter any ports of his dominions. Roe promptly despatched a letter to the King of Persia in which he expressed his gratitude for the invitation to "entertayne the trafique of our nation with frendship and amitye". He went on, however, to assert that he had information that the King of Persia had sent to Spain an ambassador instructed to contract to sell all Persian silks to that country, and insisted that Persia's invitation to the English merchants would be meaningless if the Spanish secured a monopoly of the silk trade. Roe argued that Persia would be more able to profit in trade if she refrained from granting monopoly contracts and opened her ports to all

1 Roe to the King of Persia, Feb. 14, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, 132; Factors at Surat to the East India Company, Nov. 2, 1616; Crouther to Idem, March 1, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 334; V, 131; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 19.
nations. He concluded the letter by threatening to establish trade with Persia by force against the Spanish, if their contract to monopolize the trade was approved. Sir Thomas apparently hoped that the English factors would stand by on the Persia venture until he had determined the final outcome of the Persian-Spanish trade proposal, for when he learned that the Surat factors had resolved to send a ship to Persia, independent of his counsel, he was incensed.  

The factors at Surat, under the direction of Thomas Kerridge, realizing that Roe would not give authorization to open trade with Persia until he was informed of the outcome of the Persian-Spanish negotiations, believed that such a postponement was senseless. They were confident, in view of recent defeats of the Portuguese, that the risk of attack by them was small. The factors, also, were quite aware of the lagging market for English commodities in India, and were anxious to move the surpluses that were not saleable there. The factors had selected Edward Connock to act as


4 Consultation of East India Company Factors, Oct. 2, 1616; Roe to the English Ambassador at Constantinople, Aug. 21, 1617, *E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 189-93; VI, 300; Factors at Surat to (addressee illegible), Oct. 18, 1616 (c.s.), B.M.; Additional Manuscript 9366, f. 126b, 127. See also Appendices V, VI, VII, VIII.
chief of the voyage to Persia. In November, 1616, the
James embarked from Surat for Jasques in the Persian Gulf. When Roe learned that the cargo of the James was composed of the surpluses of merchandise not wanted in India, he criticized the factors for sending such a cargo of goods which he considered strictly second-rate. He claimed that such a class of goods would prejudice the King of Persia against the English and "force him to favor the Spaniard and Portugall" with their better class of merchandise.
Reporting to the Governor of the East India Company, in London, Roe remarked skeptically that if the newly inaugurated trade to Persia was successful, "I shall rejoice against my judgment".

Four months after its departure from Surat, the James returned from Persia. Roe's pessimism proved to be unjustified as the returned ship provided the factors with "good hope of a fair trade". In a relatively subdued letter to the factors at Surat, shortly after the return of the James

5 Commission to Edward Cennock from the Factors at Surat, Nov., 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 220-24; See also Appendix V.

6 Roe to the English Ambassador at Constantinople, Aug. 21, 1617, idem to Smythe, Jan. 16, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 300; V, 329; Biddulph to the East India Company, Dec. 31, 1616, State Papers, East Indies, 1513-1616, 487. John Crouther, who had brought the letters to Roe from the King of Persia in 1616, agreed with Roe about the rashness of the factors' decision. Crouther to idem, March 1, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 132; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 19.
in March, 1617, Roe expressed satisfaction at its safe return. Edward Connock had been successful in securing a firman from the King of Persia. It provided that the English would be charged no extra customs, that they would not be hindered from buying victuals and munitions in Persia, that they would be free to buy and sell as they wished, and that they might live in Persia under their own laws and religion. One of Connock's subordinates in Persia reported to London: "the general report here [in Persia] is that we can demand nothing of the King in reason that will be denied us." Sir Thomas Roe was not apparently displeased to learn of Connock's success, but when he learned that Connock had assumed the title of ambassador he became severely critical, forecasting ill consequences of such misrepresentation.

Possessing a firman from the Persian King, the East India Company merchants were now prepared to project a new trade. They proposed to take away from the Turks their long-established silk trade with Persia. The fact that Turkey was at war with Persia meant that there was a surplus

7 Bickford to Smythe, March 4, 1617; Roe to the Factors at Surat, March 10, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 135, 336.

8 Pettus to Middleton, June 2, 1617; King of Persia's Firman granted to Connock, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 208; VI, 293-97.

9 Roe to the Factors at Surat, April 7, 1617; idem to Kerridge, April 25, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 342, 200-05; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 25.
of silk awaiting export in Persia, and a co-existing demand in Persia for English cloth and swords for their army. Connock reported that the advantages in the Persian trade were unparalleled. There was a market for the immediate sale of all the English cloths and kersies which might be sent. He also claimed a demand for "100 tons of English tin, and some quicksilver". In August, 1617, Connock added sugar and spices to the list of marketable commodities. The crafty Connock saw no reason why English commodities, supposedly cloth and swords, could not be sold to Turkey also, "in an indirect manner through Persia". He informed the East India Company that he reckoned that Persia would be able to supply Surat with four or five hundred bales of raw silk yearly.

The prospects for trade in Persia were considered so good by Connock in the Spring of 1617 that he wrote to the

10 Connock to the Factory at Surat, May 15, June 8, 1617, cited in E.I.C. Annals, I, 198; Almoro Nani, Venetian Ambassador at Constantinople to the Doge and Senate, April 29, 1617, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating To English Affairs, Existing In The Archives And Collections Of Venice, And In The Other Libraries of Northern Italy, 1615-1617, (hereafter cited as Calendar of State Papers, Venetian), (London, 1908), 498-99; Connock to the East India Company, June 2, 1617; idem, Aug. 4, 5, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 201; VI, 35, 44; E.I.C. Annals, I, 183-85.

11 Connock to the East India Company, Aug. 4, 1617, in Foster, Letters Received, VI, 49.

12 Connock to the East India Company, June 2, 1617, in Foster, Letters Received, V, 280.
factors at Surat requesting them to send all of the next
English fleet to Persia for the purpose of contributing to
and protecting the newly-established trade. The new trade
with Persia seemed to be an adequate compensation if not a
substitute for the deteriorated trade with India. In
October, 1617, Roe received from James I a letter in which
he expressed approval of the Persian venture and authorized
him to conclude "or cause to be perfected and concluded" a
treaty between the King of Persia and the English.

Though still critical of Connock's presumption in taking the
title of ambassador, Roe had begun to support the trade with
Persia. In October, 1617, Roe received a commission from
the East India Company granting him authority over all the
factors in the India region. Though he then had the author-
ity to recall Connock from Persia, he did not do so.

Instead, he authorized Connock to negotiate a permanent
treaty which would lend stability to the intercourse between
"the English and the subjects of the Shabas of Persia.

---

13 Roe to Factors at Surat, April 7, 1617; Factors in
Persia to Factors in Surat, May 15, 1617, E.I.C. Letters
Received, V, 341, 238.

14 King James to Roe, Feb. 4, 1617, Foster, Embassy, II,
556-57; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 15.

15 This commission is not extant, but is referred to in:
A consultation aboard the James Royal, Oct. 2, 1617,
E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 95; State Papers, East
Indies, 1617-1621, 591; E.I.C. Annals, I, 197-98;
Cambridge Modern History, IV, 742.
specifically instructed Connock that the goods imported into Persia by the English should consist of two-thirds part in English goods and southern spices and of one-third part in money. 16

In 1616, a treaty was concluded between the English factors in Persia and the Persian court. It incorporated the provisions of the 1617 firmaens and established those provisions on a more permanent basis. In London the agreement was welcomed as a means of securing the rich silk trade "which will ruin the Turks and much enrich England". Under the provisions of the treaty, it was agreed that the English would exchange spices, English goods, and money in equal quantities of value for the Persian silks. 17 Though Roe did not go to Persia to conclude the treaty with that country, he sent a list of requests to the King of Persia and issued very detailed instructions to the factors there, on the basis of which the treaty was drawn. 18

16 Commission from Roe to the Factors in Persia, Oct. 6, 1617; Roe's Instructions to Connock, October, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 107, 110; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 61.


18 Roe to Robbins, Jan. 17, 1617, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 10; E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 50-53; Foster, Embassy, II, 374; idem to Pring, Oct. 5, 1617; idem to Barker and Monnoz, Feb. 4, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 422.
In February, 1618, Roe reported to the East India Company that the conclusion of the trade agreement with Persia offered the "best trade of all India and will yield you most certeyne Profitt". Writing to King James at the same time, he declared that the treaty with Persia contained "divers lardge and ample Priveledges granted unto your Maisties subjects for their acceptance and quiett Commerce". By October, 1619, Roe was back in London and the Persian trade was thriving. Kerridge reported that, insofar as the Company had sent out a large supply of money and goods in the 1619 fleet, "it has been resolved to order the whole fleet thither [to Persia]". In 1619, after Roe's departure from India, the main occupation of the Company's servants on the west coast of India was to improve the trade with Persia under the treaty which had been concluded the previous year.

19 Roe to the East India Company, Feb. 14, 1618, idem to King James, Feb. 15, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 474, 496; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 159-60.

20 Kerridge to the Bantam Council, Oct. 9, 1619, Foster, Factories, 128; Marioni to the Doge, Sept. 20, 1619, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1619-1621, 14-15.

21 E.I.C. Annals, I, 214. According to the Company's records, the attention of the Company's factors was drawn even more to the trade with Persia during the years 1620, 1621 and 1622. Ibid., I, 228.
In November, 1617, Roe consulted with Fleet Commander Martin Pring about inaugurating trade with the Red Sea ports. They believed that the Portuguese would not prove to be an insurmountable threat in the Red Sea waters. Roe planned to enter the Red Sea trade by either establishing a direct trade from England, or by carrying into the Red Sea goods of the Guzerattes of India, who were incapable of defending themselves against the Portuguese.²² In February, 1618, Roe issued instructions that a ship be sent into the Red Sea, and a month later, the Anne Royall embarked from Swally for the Red Sea port of Moha. Captain Andrew Shilling was authorized by Roe to "begin a trade" and to seek a firmaen for the "safe conducte for a Merchant to come ashoare ... for the free sale of our goodes".²³ Captain Shilling was successful in obtaining a firmaen from the Governor of Moha by which the English were allowed "freedom of trade, and protection to their persons and property". The firmaen was not issued merely for the benefit of that particular voyage, as it was applicable "to anye of ther nations hereafter to come and goo to this porte [Moha] or any other portes within

²² Roe to Kerridge, Oct. 21, 1617; idem to Pring, Nov. 8, 1617; Pring to the East India Company, Nov. 12, 1617; Roe to Kerridge, Dec. 2, 1617; E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 129, 153-54, 176, 210; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 66, 73, 81-82.

our government”. To the English request to establish a factory in Moha, the Governor replied that they should be as welcome "as to any place in our owne Countrey" and vowed that they should be as secure "as in our owne Land". The firmaen signed by the Governor of Moha also provided that the English might bring goods in and out free of customs duties.

Though the profits from the sale of English commodities in Moha was not as high as had been hoped for, the spices and Indian commodities found a ready and profitable market. The English cloth found its best market in the city of Sinan and its adjoining country where the colder climate stimulated a demand for woollens. Sinan was about a five-days journey from Moha. In 1619, the factors at Moha calculated that they had profited nearly "a hundred per cent". On the success of the Red Sea venture, Kerridge expressed the belief that "This trade is too good to be lost, and they will further consider the means of persecuting [prosecuting] it".

---

24 E.I.C. Annals, I, 205; Firmaen from Pasha of Sana, July 1, 1618, in Foster, Factories, 35-36; Roe to Governor of Moha, Feb. 16, 1619, Foster, Embassy, II, 515; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 245-47.


27 Idem to John Brown, Oct. 19, 1619, Ibid., 130.
Upon his return to London in 1619, Sir Thomas Roe reported to the East India Company Court upon the status of the Red Sea trade:

And this trade in tyme may be enlarged by the English as other commodities may be gotten from sundry other places of the Indies, and wilbe the life of the Surat and Persia Trade to supply both those places with monye. 28

Prior to Roe’s embassy the wealth of Bengal was relatively unknown to the East India Company. In 1616 the English ambassador reported to the Company’s factors at Surat that he had been promised a firman entitling the English to trade with Bengal. There was a good deal of discussion between Roe and the factors regarding the possibilities of that trade. The factors were not anxious to undertake it, thinking that there would be little demand there for English products. Both Roe and the factors were aware that the Dutch and Portuguese controlled the coastal region and ports of Bengal, and that if the trade was to be developed, it would be necessary to approach the peninsula by land, which they considered would be “more hazardous and chargeable than the bennefitt by the sale of a smale quantety can answer”. 29 The fact that the Portuguese and Dutch were

---

28 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Oct. 6, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 300-01; Foster, Embassy, II, 524n.

29 Roe to the Factors at Surat, May 26, 1616; idem to the East India Company, Nov. 24, 1615, Foster, Embassy, I, 218n., 99; Roe, Journal, March 26, 1616, Loc. cit., I, 152; Roe to Kerridge, Dec. 8, 1617, Foster, Embassy, II, 449; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 102-34; Factors at Surat to Roe, May 23 & July 23, 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 315, 326-27; Wilbur, 242-43
so dominant on the coast of Bengal—the only place in the country "where there is any hope of benefit"—was no doubt the principal deterrent to the opening of trade relations with Bengal. 30 Another factor which caused the English to hesitate in opening trade there was the objection raised by the Governor of Surat that the English would send their better goods to Bengal to the neglect of Surat. 31

Though the projects for trade with Bengal were not carried into realization during Roe's embassy in India, "a foundation had been laid" upon which trade was begun after Roe's departure. In 1620, an English agent was sent to Patna, a market town, on the outskirts of Bengal away from the Portuguese dominated coast. By 1621 the English had established a factory there and had begun a trade for Bengal silk. 32

While Roe opposed the export of bullion from Europe into Asia, and declared it his policy to keep such

30 Roe to the Factors at Surat, May 26, Nov. 12, 1616, April 7 and June 6, 1617, Foster, Embassy, I, 218; II, 349n-50n; idem to the East India Company, Feb. 14, 1618, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 118-21; Foster, Embassy, II, 458; Mukerjee, 136.

31 idem to Kerridge, Dec. 6, 1617; idem to the East India Company, Feb. 24, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 447, 468; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 182-84.

32 Idem to Kerridge, Oct. 21, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 128; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 86; E.I.C. Annals, I, 197; Roe, Journal, Loc.cit., II, 437; Mukerjee, 110; Wilbur, 21,3.
movements of bullion at a minimum, he was not able to maintain that policy. Though the Persian trade proved to be a thriving market for English commodities, it soon became obvious to the factors participating that the trade, if it were to continue, required bullion as well as English goods. The Governor and officials of the East India Company in London expressed their satisfaction if the Persians would accept at least one-half of the total English export to that country in English commodities. Roe was informed by the Persian ambassador in India that the English could not hope for success in establishing trade with Persia "unless we resolved to bring two thirds money". Sir Thomas had hoped to reduce much of the movement of bullion into India from Europe. However, this proved to be impossible, for the need for bullion from Europe increased during Roe's embassy, and the continued movement of bullion into the East sustained the trade. In 1600, the East India Company was permitted, under its original charter, to carry out of England £30,000 of foreign bullion "in any one voyage". In the first year of Roe's embassy the sum was changed to £60,000 per annum, and in 1618, the East India Company received a royal grant which empowered them to export foreign

bullion to the value of £100,000 yearly.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1619, James I was persuaded by the East India Company that he would not "revoke or discharge any liberty which the East India Company had, or ought to have by the lawful use and exercise of their charter". In the years 1615 to 1619, inclusive, the period in which Roe was in India, the East India Company exported £376,747 in bullion. From 1600 to 1614, inclusive, the Company exported £170,879 in bullion.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{34} The East India Company's Patent, December, 1600, is in Purchas, II, 362-83. See also Lipson, II, 277-78, and E.I.C. Annals, I, 137; Letters Patent to the East India Company, July 11, 1616 & Jan. 16, 1618, E.I.C. First Letter Book, l89, 500; Ibid., 163 et seq. for the East India Company Charter; Licence to the East India Company to export bullion, July 5, 1616, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 379.

\textsuperscript{35} Ruding's Annals of The Coinage, II, 216, cited in Khan, 5; Bal Krishna, Commercial Relations Between India and England, 1600 to 1757, (London, 1924), 282; See also Appendix V in Khan, 16-17; In 1621, a "Committee of Grievances" was appointed in the House of Commons to investigate the reasons for the scarcity of money in England. It is interesting to note that there was much condemnation of the East India Company's policy of exporting bullion in the Commons' debates of that year, but that the aforesaid committee concluded that there was a total of twenty-four causes for the "decline of money" of which the East India Company's policy was only one. Commons Debates, 1621, II, 212-13; IV, 499-50; V, 491-93; Cobett's Parliamentary History of England (London, 1805), I, 1187-89, 1194-98.

Khan, in his East India Trade in the Seventeenth Century, did not take account of the fact that the Committee of Grievances determined that there were other reasons for the shortage of money in England. He refers to the Committee's conclusion, but cites the East India Company's policy as the only reason for the shortage, neglecting to mention that there were many other reasons. Khan, 52.
Another factor must be examined in determining the effects of Roe's embassy. Doubtless the fact that the East India Company was increasing the size and number of its ships during Roe's embassy contributed to the success of its venture in India. Sir Dudley Digges noted that in 1615 the East India Company was building larger ships, such as "one of 1100 Tuns, the other of 900 Tuns". In October, 1615, the fleet sailing from London to India was said to be "three large ships". In February, 1616, the number of the fleet for India from London was "six large ships, excellently provided with everything necessary".

In July, 1616, Sir Thomas Smythe, in behalf of the East India Company, received a bounty for building "three large ships". In 1617, the East India Company christened "seven ships, all new", for the East India trade. They were judged "the finest that have ever been seen at sea".

In January, 1618, the East India Company sent out "nine strong vessels" for India. Six months later, the Company was paid a bounty "for building two ships, the Palagrave and the Elizabeth of London". Late in that year,

---


37 Poscarini to the Doge, Oct. 9, 1615; Barbarigo to idem, Feb. 19, 1616; Lionello to idem, Feb. 17, 1617, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1615-1617, 39, 131, 1443; Warrant to Sir Thomas Smythe, July 10, 1616, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 383.

38 Chamberlain to Carleton, Jan. 31; Warrant to the East India Company, July 12, 1618, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 518, 553.
the Venetian ambassador in London reported that the East India Company "have forty-five fine galleons, of more than 2,000 butts each, built for war, and so well constructed and armed as to cause amazement". The total tonnage of ships that sailed into Indian waters from England between 1615 and 1619, inclusive, was 23,009 tons. That five-year period showed an increase of 3,619 tons over the total tonnage of ships that sailed to the East Indies from England, 1601 to 1614, inclusive.

Thomas Mun claimed that the East India Company had sent "more Wares" to India in the years 1617-1619, inclusive, "then in the sixtene yeeres before". In February, 1617, the trade of the East India Company was considered to be flourishing and its prospects sound; £1,400,000 was "adventured for the next four years". In September, 1617, two English ships returned to London, "very rich" from India.

---

39 Piero Contarini, Relation of England, December, 1618, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1617-1619, 415. A "butt" is a measurement of capacity, usually containing two hogsheads. Khan, in The East India Trade in the XVII Century, utilized this same reference, and substituted tons for butts, which is clearly an error, as the largest East India Company ships in this period were slightly over 1000 tons. See Bal Krishna, 334-37.

40 Ibid., 323, 334-37. Krishna based his account on facts derived from official records in the British Museum, India Office, and the Public Record Office.

41 Thomas Mun, Discourse, Purchas, V, 275; See also John Pym, Diary, April 15, 1621, Commons Debates, 1621, IV, 229; Chamberlain to Carleton, Feb. 8, 1617, Calendar
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commission to the ship bound for Persia from Surat, in which
the principle of fighting only in defence seems to have been
neglected. The commission stated that if the English ship
met with any Portuguese ships, the English captain was to
"use [your] ... best endeavour to take and surprise them
[of the Portuguese], for the better satisfaction of the Honour-
able Company". When Roe dispatched a ship to trade in the
Red Sea in February, 1618, his instructions to its captain
reflected rather a lack of literal obedience of the King's
regulations against offensive fighting. Roe declared that
"if you meete any shippes or junckes freighted by the Por-
gallers or the goodes of any Moore or Banian, ... of all [such]
ships and goodes you shall make prise, signifying to all
persons that you proceed in this Course with the Porongallers
and their Subjects only to Compell them to suffer the Seas
to be free and Comerce open". This change in policy was
reflected also in Roe's strict control of trade in the Red Sea
ports. He issued a statement to all ship commanders in

---

44 Pring, Commission to John Hatch, Master of the Bao, Nov.
8, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 158; State Papers,
East Indies, 1617-1621, 73; In 1618, James I continued
to issue orders to the East India Company fleet command-
ers against fighting except in defence: See Rymer,
Foedera, Conventiones, Literae, et ejuscunquae generis
acta publica, (London, 1717), (hereafter cited as Foedera),
XVII, 57.

45 Roe, Instructions for the Ship Intended for the Red Sea,
Feb. 14, 1618, Poster, Embassy, II, 493; Pring to the
East India Company, Nov. 12, 1617, State Papers, East
Indies, 1617-1621, 76-77.
January, 1618, informing them that he had issued a pass to an Indian ship which guaranteed it safe conduct into a Red Sea port. He informed Kerridge that he saw no reason why the English should not take money for passes issued to ships traveling into the Red Sea, "for we are lords of the ports; the Portugalls dare not appear in them". Sir Thomas claimed that in entering the Red Sea trade the English aimed to "open the ways" for free exchange of commodities. He warned the English seamen to have "especiall regarde that you ceaze nothing into your full possession but only such goodes as you are assured belongeth properly to the Portingalls or theyr Subjectes".46 Captain Shilling, master of the Anne going into the Red Sea, wrote that if the goods he carried "be nott veriable and that an honest trade upon equall termses Cannot be procured, [with the Portugese], then I hoop Powder and shoot, Sir Henery Middeltons Commodity, will passe".47 Another measure taken by Roe in opposing the remaining vestiges of Portuguese rivalry was an


47 Shilling to Smythe, March 12, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 495n.

To the American Ambassador at Constantinople, April 21,


and their agent the official

terrorism of the request was contained in the
the company was in the momentary position of being asked to
mean suitable to the intention products from the Easteem trade.
offertaries revealed, however, that the plan would ultimately
 Anglo-Pacific control in the East. The East India Company
appeared to James as a peculiar means of setting the
the plan
hold complete monopoly of the Easteem trade.

that if their proposal was approved they would ultimately
Dutch East India Company. The Dutch appeared to set themselves

for a union of the English East India Company with the
the Dutch, between 1910 and 1916, the Dutch persisted in
asserted the right to the Portuguese in Hindustan

During the early part of 1909, a dispatch of the Mogul;

Portuguese-Indian port of Goa. dispatched. Hy
the Anglo-Indian port of Surat, displayed prosperity unlike the
end of 1909, Embassy in India. By the time he left India
were the Portuguese treaty was necessary, to defend the
Indian ports from the Portuguese while the English fleet was
provided that the Portuguese might use Indian ports to protect
attitude with Sultan Coromme, a deputy of the Mogul,
of the East India Company a well-reasoned argument against the proposal to unite with the Dutch company. He claimed that "their [The Dutch] garrisons, Chargges, losses by Negligence will engage you to beare Part of their follyes for no Profitt". Roe went on to say that he had sent his recommendation against the proposal to "Master Secretary [Winwood] and some of the Lords [of the Privy Council] that they may have feeling of the Injuries and bee assistant to you". Roe's opinions had long since won the respect of the king, and the project was soon dropped.50 The competition of the Dutch in India grew into a vigorous opposition by the latter part of Roe's embassy. When both companies realized that they were suffering losses because of the intense rivalry, they expressed hopes that their leaders might negotiate a treaty. Shortly before his departure from India, Sir Thomas Roe visited with Van Ravesteyn, the Dutch leader at Surat. He asked Van Ravesteyn to write home requesting the settlement of the troubles between the Dutch and English in India. Van Ravesteyn judged Roe to be a "peace-loving man" who would "gladly see an agreement arrived at". In July, 1619, the disputes between the Dutch and the English were composed. The general provisions of the treaty provided for the mutual restitution of ships and goods and freedom of trade

50 Roe to the East India Company, Feb. 14, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 443; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 118-21; Durham, loc.cit., 223; Khan, 63-64.
for the two nations in the East. The fleets of each company were to furnish ten ships of war, a total of twenty, for common defence, and the charges for keeping garrisons were to be shared.\footnote{Van Raveystyn to the Dutch East India Company, Feb. 14, 1619, I.O. Records; Hague Transcripts, Series I, vol. iii, No. CXV, cited in Foster, \textit{Embassy}, II, 516n; Privy Council Register, June 30, 1619, Acts of the Privy Council, 1617-1619, (London, 1929), 491-93; Declaration from the East India Company to the King, 1618, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 607; Edward Grey, (ed.), \textit{The Travels of Pietro Della Valle}. I, xxvi; Durham, \textit{loc. cit.}, 225; Lipson, II, 275; A.D. Innes, \textit{The Maritime and Colonial Expansion of England Under the Stuarts}, (London, 1931), 76.} The makers of the treaty felt sure that the unified defence of Dutch and English interests in Indian waters would choke the last breath of Portuguese resistance, which, of course, it did.\footnote{De Confirmatione Tractus, July 16, 1619, Rymer, \textit{Foedera}, XVII, 170-74; Marioni to the Doge, July 19, 1619, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1617-1619, 574; E.I.C. Annals, I, 212-13; Khan, 64-66; Hunter, I, 368-70; Moreland, \textit{From Akbar}, 81-82.}

In October, 1617, Roe was informed that two unlicensed English ships had been seized by East India Company ships as the interlopers were about to attack an Indian vessel. Roe strongly advised resolute action with the intruders. He reckoned that if the East India Company's Letters Patent prohibited such practices, "it consequently giveth power to execute such prohibition". Upon Roe's recommendation, Captain Pring confiscated both the ships and their cargoes for the use of the Company. Though Roe
was aware that the ships were the property of the wealthy
Sir Robert Rich, a personal friend of his, he asserted
"I am now a Publique minister, and cannot see anything with
those eyes [of a friend]." 53 In his next letter to the East
India Company, Roe warned that "these Seas beginn to bee full
of Rovers, for whose faults wee may bee engaged". He
emphasized that unless interloping were suppressed the East
India Company's goods and "our persons" would have had to
answer to the damage, and advised that if the East India
Company did not take action against the guilty "you will have
the seas full and your trade in India utterly lost". 54

3. Privileges won by Roe. Though Sir Thomas Roe
was not able to conclude a permanent treaty with the Indian
Moghnul, it cannot be judged that his mission to India was a
failure. No ambassador could have been more highly esteemed
by the Moghnul. When he was at the court he was honored with

53 Roe to Pring, Oct. 5, 1617, Foster, Embassy, II, 422-23; John Hatch, Journal, 1617, Purchas, IV, 537; Monnox to
the East India Company, Dec. 28, 1617; Pring to idem,
March 18, 1618, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 94,
139; Pery to Carleton, Oct. 25, 1618, Calendar of State
Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 587; Wynn to Carleton, Jan.
23, 1619, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1619-1623,
6; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 241.

54 Roe to the East India Company, Feb. 14, 1618, Foster,
Embassy, II, 480-81; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-
1621, 110-21; Wynn to Carleton, Jan. 28, 1619, Calendar
of State Papers, Domestic, 1619-1621, 8; State Papers,
East Indies, 1617-1621, 241; Greer, Merchant Venturers,
194; Cf. Appendix VII for an earlier account of inter-
loping activities and precautions against the same.
a place "so near unto the King that the great men of this Court doth envy him and would not have it so". Roe attributed his failure to make a treaty with the Moghul to the fact that the latter would not "descend to article or bind himself reciprocally to any prince upon terms of equality". Such self-esteemed omnipotence had to be disproved before it could recognize equality, and the English were in no position to argue. Roe had to be satisfied with the Moghul's firmaens. The privileges granted by the firmaens being revocable at the Moghul's will, Roe was forced to keep him contented with the English by the judicious use of presents and the force of his own personality.55 At his first meeting with Jahangir, Roe was promised that all abuses committed upon the English by the Governor of Surat would be redressed. The Moghul granted two firmaens which provided for the restitution of sundry sums of money "fraudulently purloined and violently extorted from the factors". Zulfikar Khan, Governor of Surat, was recalled in disgrace from Surat after Roe recovered from him the greater part of what he owed the factors. In November, 1616, Roe reported to the East India Company that he had "recovered all bribes, extortions, debts made and taken before my tyme till

55 Nicholas Bawgham to the East India Company, Jan. 18; Roe to the English Ambassador at Constantinople, Aug. 21, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, V, 55; VI, 298-99; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 12; The Great Moghul to King James, Feb. 26, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 551-58; W. Foster, (ed.), Letters Received, IV, xi.
this day". 56

When the English fleet rescued the Indian ship from the English interlopers in October, 1617, Roe wrote to the commander of the English fleet that nothing more kindly taken at court than the knowledge of the Company's rescue of that ship. At that time Roe was confident that "no reasonable thing will be denied me by the King". Roe's hopes proved to be too high because even with the possession of firmans, the English often found their provisions neglected. The fact that Jahangir was such a dissipate nurtured the rumor that he would not live long; consequently, the Moghul's deputies relaxed discipline. Having long since given up hope for a treaty, many of the factors were losing hope in the effectiveness of diplomatic processes. Joseph Salbank advised the East India Company that they should break off diplomatic relations with India, "and make ourselves a way for traffic by mere force, as others do". Another factor informed the Company that he believed that Roe's energy and efforts were being wasted at the Moghul's court. Edward Monnox wrote that "his [Roe's] worth deserves more honourable employment" and advised the Company to "seize

56 Factors at Surat to the East India Company, March 10, 1616; idem to idem, Nov. 7, 1616, E.I.C. Letters Received, IV, 294, 235; idem to Sultan Coronae, May 1, 1616; idem to the East India Company, Nov. 24, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, 209; II, 346; Purchas, IV, 467; W. Foster, (ed.), Letters Received, IV, xxix, xxxii. Cf. Appendices II and III.
their "the Indian junks" believing that it "would breed better blood in them towards us than ever my Lord [Roe] shall do by following the court". 57

In October, 1617, Roe obtained a renewal of the firman granted a year earlier. 58 He advised the East India Company in February, 1618, that they could not expect to trade in India under a permanent treaty. The firmans, he pointed out, depend upon the "present will" of the Moghul, which he considered to be "just and gracious". 59 It appears that the final firmans secured by Roe were issued in February, and in August, 1618. The firman granted in February was from the Moghul. It ordered "all the kingdomes and ports ... to receive all the merchants of the English nation; ... that in what place soever they choose to live they may have reception and residence to their own content and safety, and what goods soever they desire to sell or buy, they may have free libertie without any restraynt; ... and in what

57 Roe to Kerridge, Oct. 11; Pinch to the East India Company, Nov. 12; Salianske to idem, Nov. 22; Monnok to idem, Dec. 28, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 116-17, 125, 192-93, 276-77; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 63, 94; E.I.C. Annuals, I, 196, 203, 67.

58 Roe to Kerridge, Oct. 21, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 133; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 66. For the provisions of this firman, see Supra, 56.

59 Roe to the East India Company, Feb. 11; idem to King James, Feb. 15, 1618, Foster; Embassy, II, 1659, 197; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 116-21, 124.
Cytty soever they shall have residence». 60

The firman granted in August from the Prince of Surat, Sultan Gourme, provided privileges, requested by Roe, mainly applicable to the English at Surat. Though not so complete as Roe's drafted requests, it gave reasonable facilities for trade. It provided protection to the English, gave them the right to land with arms for their defence against the Portuguese, and assured good treatment and housing facilities for the English ambassador. Company merchants were to have the freedom to land any sort of goods and buy and sell according to their will, as well as the freedom to live among themselves according to their own religion and laws. All English disputes, amongst themselves, were to be settled wholly by their own President (the chief factor at Surat); other disputes were to be settled by the Governor of Surat. Finally, the interpreters and brokers serving the English were to have complete liberty to speak and deliver anything. 61

60 The Great Moghul to King James, Feb. 20, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 558; idem to idem, Aug. 8, 1618, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 179.

61 Roe to Sultan Gourme, Aug. 15, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 506-14; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 179-82; Sir Richard Burn, "Jahangir", The Cambridge History of India, IV, 163. Raymond F. Stearns, In his Pageant of Europe, (New York, 1948) has presented this final firman received by Roe in 1618, and has included one provision in the firman which was not approved, viz., "That it should be lawful for the English to buy or hire any house in his ports, where they might quietly dwell and no man
At his departure from India in 1619, Roe had left the factors in India with those two firmens, one from the Mogul and the other from the Prince of Surat. Thomas Kerridge considered the first "generall, for our reception and Continuation in his [the Mogul's] domynyons", and the second "particular for this porte of Suratt". 62

4. Roe's advice to the Company. Roe was anxious to learn from the errors of the earlier-arrived European powers in the East. He believed that one of the main errors committed by both the Dutch and Portuguese was the building of forts and garrisons, and insisted that if the Mogul "would offer mee ten [forts]" he would not accept one. He advised against the maintenance of garrisons because of the exorbitant costs involved, which would "ente the Profitt" derived from the India trade. Sir Thomas saw also that if the English built forts it would increase the enmity and rivalry between themselves and the Portuguese and cause land fighting. He advised that "warr and trafique are incompat-ible", and that the East India Company should profit most "in quiett trade ... without controversy". Roe was probably

---

62 Kerridge to the East India Company, Feb. 9, 15, 1619, Foster, Factories, 59; Factors at Surat to idem, March 12, 1619, Foster, Embassy, II, 516-17.
aware, in offering that advice, that it would be the better way to gain the Mogul's favor inasmuch as the Indians had become disrespectful of the Portuguese because of their militant domination of India. The Company adhered to Roe's advice, and nearly forty years of their existence as a Company passed before they owned any land in India.63

Complaining of his lack of authority to direct the activities of the factors in India, Roe wrote to Secretary Winwood late in 1616 that his employment in India seemed worthless and "if I were at home tenn days, I could doe them better service then here now in ten years".64 In October, 1617, Roe received from the Company a commission authorizing him "to instruct, direct and order all the factors in the Mogull's country in all the affairs and business of the said Honourable Company". That commission added to his duties as ambassador those of trade adviser. Kerridge, the chief factor at Surat, hearing of Roe's new powers, expressed his resentment by announcing his intention to resign and return

63 Roe to the East India Company, Nov. 23, 1616, Purchas, IV, 461; idem to idem, Nov. 24, 1616, Feb. 14, 1618, Foster, Embassy, II, 304, 468; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 118-21; Gairdner, II, 312; Harold Stannard, "Pioneers of the East", Hugh Cunn, (ed.), Makers of the Empire, (New York, 1924), VIII, 183; Sir Charles Lucas, The British Empire, (London, 1917), 213; P.E. Roberts, "India", Cambridge Modern History, V, 698. Mukerjee, incidentally, emphasizes that it is dangerous to argue from Roe's "peaceful beginings", "no fortification", etc. that India was "unintentionally" conquered by the English later. Mukerjee, xv.

64 Roe to Winwood, Nov. 30, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 358.
to England. Roe recognized Kerridge's abilities and his value to the Company, and when he learned of the factor's intentions he wrote "that if Master Kerridge think his authority is any way lessened, that he be persuaded to the Contrary, for that both his deserving and experience will protect him from any such matter". Referring to the newly-granted authority, Roe wrote to Kerridge: "you shall see I will use [the authority] with all modesty (or rather never lett you see but in case of Necessitie), hoping you will suffer mee to advise, and either follow it or show mee a good reason wherein I err, which for mee is very easie".

He assured the factors at Agra that they were to look to him "as a counsellor to help, not to command". 65 Because of his exceptionally sensible attitude in managing his new authority, Roe was able to convince Kerridge not to leave the Company's service. Although the delegation of the added authority to Roe was criticised by many other factors in India, it came to no consequence. No doubt much of their criticism grew from their fear of being surtailed in private-trading practices.

65 The letter of authorization is not extant; it is quoted in A Consultation aboard the James Royal, October 2; Roe to the Factors at Agra, Oct. 6; Kerridge to the East India Company, Nov. 10, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 95, 105, 164; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 59, 60; Roe to the Factors at Surat, Oct. 8; Idem to Kerridge, Nov. 8, 1617, Foster, Embassy, II, 128, 428n; Kerridge to the East India Company, Nov. 10, 1617, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 73.
which were so prevalent. Private-trading, or interloping, had grown to such proportions by 1618, that few factors did not participate. Many of the English merchants, after five or six years in India, carried home estates to the value of one thousand pounds without having carried any stock out of England.

After Roe was given authority to supervise trade, not the least in importance of the advice he gave the Company was that concerning the types of goods which would sell in India. Roe also soon recognized the need for a system of accounting in the handling of the Company's money by the factors. In providing such a system, he was able to eliminate "the opportunity to deceive the Company of great sums".

66 Roe to the Factors at Surat, Nov. 8, 1617, Foster, *Embassy*, II, 426n; State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 71-73; E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 145-50; Factors at Surat to the East India Company, 1617, E.I.C. Letters Received, VI, 95-96; Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 25, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 298; Foster, *Embassy*, II, 522; Eddlethorp and Willoughby to the East India Company, Dec. 25, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 334-35.

67 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 25, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 298; Foster, *Embassy*, II, 522-23; Krishna, 61. Krishna states that the estates gained through private trading varied from £5,000 to £30,000 per man, which seems extravagant in comparison to the £1,000 per man estimated in the Court Minutes.

68 Roe to the East India Company, Feb. 1617, Foster, *Embassy*, II, 435-87; Court Minutes of the East India Company, Oct. 18, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 310; Foster, *Embassy*, II, 523; Rawlinson, 68.
Before he left London for India Roe apparently promised to make a map of the Moghul's territory. By January, 1616, he had already made sufficient observations to correct the existing maps of India, and was thanked "for his description of the Mogul empire, in which cosmographers are much mistaken". Roe sent to England a brief but important geographical account of the Moghul's territories, as it was known to the English in 1617. While he succeeded in making several corrections of existing maps of India, Roe's failing health deterred him from making an entirely new map.69

5. The end of the mission. Roe left India for England on February 17, 1619, and arrived in England early in September the same year.70 During his stay in India Roe had many opportunities to enrich himself either at the Moghul's court or in private trade. It is noteworthy that he did not. In November, 1616, he reported to Winwood that he would "not returne a rich man ... I will trust to the Company, and to my merit". Upon his return to England it was discovered that

69 Carew to Roe, Jan. 20, 1617, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1611-1618, 424; Roe to Carew, Jan. 17, 1616, Foster, Embassy, I, 112-13; Carew to Roe, Sept. 1617, Carew Letters, 123. For Roe's geographical account of the Moghul's territories, see Foster, Embassy, II, 531-46.

70 Factors at Surat to the East India Company, March 12, 1619, Foster, Embassy, II, 516; Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 15, 1619, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 296; Marioli to the Doge, Sept. 29, 1619, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1619-1621, 14; Rawlinson, 89.
he had "little for himself", having relied upon the Company for any reward.71 The East India Company Court decided to reward Roe for services rendered with a bounty of £1500. He remained in the employ of the Company in an advisory capacity during 1620, for which he received £200.72 In his appearance before the East India Company Court, Roe reviewed the activities of his embassy. He informed the court of the establishment of trade at Surat, Persia and Mocha, and that he had recovered all the extortions and debts made by Governors of Surat prior to his arrival. The court, "having duellie weighed his carriage and behaviour from the beginning", judged Roe as being a man that "hath hunderd things exceedingly well and very moderate in his expenses and one that by his modestie, honestie and integritie hath given good satisfaction."73

71 Roe to Winwood, Nov. 30, 1616, Foster, Embassy, II, 358; Chamberlain to Carleton, Oct. 2, 1619, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1619-1623, 82.

72 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Nov. 12, 15, 1619; April 3, 1620, State Papers, East Indies, 1617-1621, 322, 365; Foster, Embassy, II, 528, 530.

73 Court Minutes of the East India Company, Sept. 2, Oct. 6, Nov. 12, 1619, loc. cit., 294, 300-01, 320; Foster, Embassy, II, 519-20, 524, 527-28.
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Kerridge to Roe, December 31, 1615, British Museum: Additional Manuscript 9366, Letter Book of the English Factory at Surat, Fols. 43b-50:

Tells of an incident in which the factors at Surat contracted for several parcels of indigo of a certain grade. When it was delivered it was found to be of inferior quality. The factors sent it back and refused to pay for it. The Indian merchant attacked the factors' broker, and sent for Kerridge, whom he attacked with blows and violent speech. Kerridge petitioned the Governor of Surat for redress, but the Governor answered with charges that the English set their own price for goods, turned back what they did not want (all of which was true but according to agreement) and that they drank wine in their house, etc., "with divers other falsities". The Governor then referred Kerridge to the Adell (or his Justice), who upon hearing of the business told us he could do us no good, for that the Governor was our enemy and our opposite's favorer [i.e. favorer of the Indian merchant], and so in conclusion our remedy was to pay the money or leave our broker still prisoner, and for a fine to pay 5,000 rupees to the Governor, which in the end fell to 500 and must be paid, or I remain their prisoner, notwithstanding my resolution (for divers respects) was thought unfit and so we were robbed of so much money besides the bargain forced upon us, 3 or 400 rupees too dear, which on purpose to deceive us was brought to the house of the said Lareen and the fine raised for the deluding their hopes in Mr. Aldworth's death, of whose estate (for so they conceived the Company's goods to be) they thought to have made purchase. Of these things the 6th of this present (knowing your Lordship to be in Brampore?) I certified Mr. Edwards, craving his opinion (our residency here considered) whether fit that your Lordship make ample complaint or no, as fearing the Governor's future enmity. Wherein I refer me to your approved judgment. The copy of my petition unto him I have here enclosed. Upon the despatch of these and other goods to the number of 273 churles we were molested by the Governor's deputy of Cambaya by means of a firmaen granted unto his Master from the King (whose intent therein was to prevent a transportation of goods to [Illegible], a port in the government of Jama Raja bordering on the King's territories) that all goods from this town shall pay custom and be shipped from Cambaya whereupon they would force our goods to

*Throughout these Appendices, spelling has largely been modernized, for reasons of clarity; all dates are old style.*
pass that way, which to avoid I promised such satisfaction as should by their Master be required, and wrote unto him about it and thereunto received a favorable answer, with order enclosed forbidding his said deputy our future molestation, and for excuse of the past, alleged the King's firmains, which notwithstanding few days after came another order countermanding the former, and demanded for all our goods 4 per cent, whereof I again wrote unto him who in his answer required the performance which for that present, being the Allegible current, our goods from Agra by them stayed, I promised satisfaction. Yet after I purposing farther trial, they fell to 2 per cent, including therein a duty of Baroch of 1½ per cent, making that their color and demand contrary to our Allegible - should be agreement. When in the interim we had made in readiness 373 churals of indigo, which being laden in carts they 3 days detained, and for their dispced the 27th ditto, forced me to account and to bribe them underhand with 100 rupees, in consideration whereof they have concluded at 1½ per cent. Which amount eth to 7½ rupees, which sum I have deposited, pretending the customers of Baroch will not condescend to this agreement, or repay moneys by them already received for the passed goods. The difference in conclusion is not so great or prejudicial as their abuses, hindering our proceedings and detaining our goods hath been. Of these things, so much as till then was passed, the 14th present, I certified Mr. Edwards, requiring his speediest means for relief in the premises, advising withall that our goods were not permitted transportation with especial licence, i.e., without especial licence, nor ourselves passage to and from the city without an escrito from the Cotwall, both which (in regard Serqueze, the chief place for our indigo investments, is three courses distant from the City, are very inconvenient to our affairs and therefore desired him (in your Lordship's absence) to procure the King's firmain directed unto this Governor in our behalf.

Vizt., for free liberty to buy and sell without interruption in the cities of Amadabad, Serqueze, Cambaya and all other places convenient. That we may have free agress and regress for our goods and persons to and from Amadabad, Serqueze, etc., without stay or hindrance and that we may be free from all demands, customs and impositions of Amadabad, Cambaya, Baroch, etc., save only the port where the goods shall be landed or laden; for the better procuring whereof, the 22nd ditto I sent a copy of the Governor's (demanding) answer with the Cassio, his form for testimony (which if not already effected) I refer to your lordship's more serious consideration.

*** The consideration of the unfit payment of custom here Surat (for the many respects by you alleged) hath not a little hindered our proceedings, as in a former I partly
suggested to you, and since by daily sending for the broker from our business for delivery of the moneys in deposit which (being now an exigent) they will force us to effect, or permit no further goods to be laden, this instant denying license to lade carts ready at Serques, so I am compelled to effect their wills (for the customer of Baroch) and their opinions will be swayed by command of this other who hath now sent his letter to that effect.
APPENDIX II

Factors at Surat to Roe, May 3, 1616, British Museum: Additional Manuscript 9355, Letter Book of the English Factory at Surat, Fols. 68, 68b, 69:

... Since our last we have often required of the customer [i.e., officer of the customs] to audit our account, who notwithstanding he hath received express order (as we are credibly informed) from the Prince his Master to that end, yet he giveth little respect either to that or our importunities, daily delaying us with promises of performance each succeeding, yet hitherto hath effect nothing, except the delivery of some of those goods out of the custom house (not so usual or beneficial for himself) as were specified in the particulars sent unto your lordship, viz: currall, knives, looking glasses and hot waters, all which in the abstract now sent are not inserted, besides we fear he purposeth to return the greatest part of the cloth, so long detained by him, and will require the payment of our customs in ready money, wherein he shall offer us double injury, both in demanding the payment of such a sum of money as at present we are not furnished withall, and yet hath kept our goods in the customs house the space of eight months, whereby both hindering the sale thereof, as also by making them the less salable, being through want of care in the storage made ill conditioned, but we shall not be induced easily to condescend unto such his unreasonable requests, howsoever we have to make some speedy and fair end with him by the procurement of Ibram Chan, the new established Governor, who hath not only promised to assist us but hath counselled us how to proceed to whose promise we are the more prone to give credence for that we have had a late experience of his good affection to our nation in the transport of our lead and other goods for Brampore, by whose sole authority we purchased our license for despatch thereof, though the customer mainly opposed that, alleging that the transportation of lead so near the confines of the enemy's country was prohibited.

We beseech your lordship to consider what great quantity of English cloth remaineth unsold, as in all the particular factories in this kingdom, so especially at court, and what little expectation there is of the yente of the said cloth, except by your lordship's soliciting of the King in the behalf of the merchants, he might be procured to take some quantity at reasonable prices, the performance of which, as we are assured would prove exceeding beneficial, so we doubt not it would be very acceptable to the honorable company that the effecting thereof might not be disparageable
prejudicial to your lordship's more noble designs.

We may not but approve of your purpose for the sending of cloth to Agra, in regard of the great quantity with you, though we greatly doubt the number specified will hardly vent, at prices requisite, where Mr. Edwards hath left a very bad precedent by permitting Robt. Younge to sell at very low prices the last year, to the great embasing of that commodity, as we fear in future sales, for the re-advancing whereby we depend upon the careful endeavours of those appointed to that employment: whose diligence applied, we refer the success to God, who make it prosperous.

We perceive the King hath not taken any of your cloth as yet .../two words illegible/, but a very little, whereby it seems Mr. Edwards had but weak ground to advise for the quantity sent, performing so slenderly for the sale of it ..."...

... We are sorry Mr. Edwards disposed so ill of the Company's affairs as to leave their credits in question by the several engagements specified, though the general want of moneys this year hath brought us all behind hand and keepeth our business very backwards, which must be a spur to your endeavours for the vent of those commodities (as we for our parts are not wanting) that with the proceeds we may make all possible provisions, for the expected fleet whose lading we fear will be in slender forwardness before the coming ...
APPENDIX III


... Soon after the disped of our last, Ibrahim Chan, being returned, we prosecuted the effecting of our business, according to the intent of the Prince's firman, wherein we found the Governor very ready and willing to further us, and having proclaimed (according to the country's custom) the Prince's pleasure in the point of the continuance of our trade, a meeting for our other business was appointed at the customs house, where the Governor, Sallie Bey, and the customer being present, divers of our goods was valued and some things of small moment returned, and since at sundry times, though with much unwillingness, delays and much dishonesty in the customer, all our other goods both inward and outward are valued at reasonable rates ...

... We perceive all goods above [English cloth, lead, etc.] sell but slowly, and therefore were glad as by your lordship's second advice, of the King's officers taking a quantity of our cloth, which in regards of their accustomed delays in all other their actions, we hope their tardiness proceeded rather from their unsettled resolution than dislike of the commodities and consequently that those reserved will not be returned...

... we profess to be very confident of your honorable and careful endeavours in the procuring of whatsoever hath been by us desired or by yourself conceived fit for your employment or the Company's benefit ...

... Thus (if the trade cannot be continued but with base sufferance, we conceive to be the fittest for profit and safety, for honor we hold us to our first proposition, if you receive not content and satisfaction from the Prince, answerable your worthy employments and expectation, the stopping of his ship at the bar, if ours arrive first, will we doubt not compel him to much more than he will now harken unto, which after their instance to your lordship, satisfaction for wrongs, privileges, etc. confirmed, may be released, your approbation or contradiction we desire, lest through ignorance we persuade the expected commander thereto. ...

... Nothing the glut of trade, the factors mention that their quicksilver prices are low, because it is brought in from Portugal, China and the Red Sea. Lead still sells
at a good price but slowly and at a lower price than at Kerridge's first coming to India. The glut of the cloth market makes all but the finest and best-colored cloths "disesteemed". ... 

Our being members of Europe as citizens of England were a very good reason to consider our proportion of the general poverty; if the members of Europe were also citizens of England, who seeking their own benefit weigh not our loss, as the Dutch transporting a pound to our shilling, the Portingallis little less, besides the sums conveyed from many ports of Christendom into Turkey and more particularly the moneys sent this way if the trade were not, would be transporting into Turkey in greater sums to procure the commodities of this place, besides which we entreat your consideration that all the silver landed here this year amounteth not to above 4,000 pounds sterling, whereof the goods returned upon the Lion amounteth to four times the sum, the rest is proceeds of commodities, the custom whereof will bring more profit to the King's coffers than the want of a far greater quantity of silver to be coined in his mint, whereby you may be pleased to perceive the cry in this respect is without cause.
Factors at Surat to Roe, September 26, 1616:
British Museum: Additional Manuscript 9366, Letter Book
of the English Factory at Surat, Fols. 113, 113b:

... It may please you to understand that the 9th March past there departed from England 6 ships, viz.
[names them] under charge of Benjamin Joseph, chief commander. The last and least of the aforesaid ships lost company of the rest in foul weather the 20th March near the North Cape, whom since they neither have seen or heard of. By order from the Company she was to leave this fleet at Cape and thence to proceed alone for Bantam, but not coming thither in time of their refreshing, the consultation for performance of the business joined the former, disposed the Swan for Bantam. They arrived at Cape the 12th of June, where they met the Lion attending a fair wind to set sail, who came thither some 20 days before for refreshing and 2 days after their arrival departed thence in safety. The aforesaid ships having very little or no refreshing there, after 15 days stay departed thence the 27th ditto proceeding on their intents for this place with purpose to touch at Mohella.

About 30 days short of Mohella they descried a Portuguese carrack ahead them, to whom giving chase (or rather continuing their course) the Globe sailing best of the fleet, came up with her to windward and inquiring of each other, according to custom, the carrack commanded her to leeward, which she refused and willed the carrack to attend the coming up of the Admiral, but they expressing their apprehension and scorn of such an action discharged a piece of great ordnance for reply, all which (they being within pistol shot) passed through the Globe's sides, who in answer exchanged them 20 shot and fell astern for further direction from their admiral, who soon after with the rest of the fleet came up and sent his shallop aboard the carrack, requiring their captain to come aboard them, to give reason or satisfaction for the injury which he refusing, Capt. Joseph beginning the fight, first ended his life by an unfortunate shot of a great piece in their reply, which being the 6th August, they desisted to confirm some new commander, which by the Company's order was conferred on Mr. Henry Pepwell, captain of the vice admiral, who succeeding in command, fought with them the 8th from 9 in the morning till 4 in the afternoon, and plied them so hard, being then in the vicinity (?) of the island Comorro, that they fled to shore and whether by mischance or willfullness in themselves their ship
that night was fired and consumed about 2 leagues distant from the shore, their people as is supposed all burnt. Of ours, besides the general, were slain 5 men and 12 hurt, amongst which the present chief commander, with some splinters hath a dangerous wound in his forehead, lost one of his eyes, hurt one of his legs, and can scarcely go or stand, whereby in regard of the unwholesomeness of these climates he is still in danger of life.
APPENDIX V

Factors at Surat to Roe, October 22, 1616, British Museum: Additional Manuscript 9366, Letter Book of the English Factory at Surat, Fols. 122, 122b:

... The great store of goods in those ships [The recently arrived fleet (trebling the specie to be landed here), viz., 260 broadcloths, extraordinary quantities of lead, elephants' [teeth], quicksilver, etc. caused us to consider of some course for their disposal by transport-
ation into Persia, which after much labour (to avoid inevitable damage of their landing here) we have determined shall be sent upon one of these ships for Jayles [Jasques], wherein we were much discouraged by the contradiction in your letter to the expected commander, produced by Capt. Pepwell, yet having often and fully debated the premises, we could not desist from the attempt, except thereby also we would consent to the loss of so much cloth in its landing here, being nowhere else vendable to our knowledge, for which and many others we have sufficient causes, it is now fully con-
cluded that the James of burden 500 tons shall with all conveniency be dispeeded for the port aforesaid with all the cloth mentioned, a round quantity of lead, some elephants' teeth, quicksilver and of all our other commodities, as well quartered and in her; Edward Conoak for Cape, merchant of the fleet, to be the Company's chief agent for negotiation there; Thomas Barker, second, and four other factors of the fleet to assist and attend direction in the said business; the ship is only to land them and their goods at the said port, and to return hither (we hope in December) to attend the fleet or further direction for her proceeding. The many days spent before our full resolution to this attempt hath been some hindrance to our other affairs ...
APPENDIX VI


... We approve of your endeavour for the putting [i.e. selling] of your cloth, either in carter or for time [i.e. either trading it for Indian commodities or selling it on time]; only hope you will not much undervalue it, for that we intend not to land any this year, [i.e. sending this year's supply to Persia], which will be a means to advance the prices of the last year's remaining, and doubt not you will be careful to procure sufficient securities for those you sell at time.
APPENDIX VII

Factors at Surat to Roe, November 29, 1616,
British Museum; Additional Manuscript 9366, Letter Book
of the English Factory at Surat, Fols. 145, 145b, 146:

... For our undertaking the Persian employment
without either advice or knowledge of your lordship, we
allege that the reasons inducing us thereto as such and so many as we could not answer the neglect of our
masters' profit by its omission, or discharge the trust
(by God's providence) imposed on us, for first their orders
or our directions and their approbation encouraged this
action; Steele and Crowther's advice promise good and hope-
ful issue, and the Sophi's firman a sufficient protection,
the necessity to this attempt (besides the exceeding hopes
depending thereon) your Lordship knoweth full well, and
never to us contradicted, only yours [i.e., your letter]
to the General opposed [it] for the present, yet disallowed
not for the future, which if granted it only remains to give
reason why it was not longer deferred. The exceeding
quantity of cloth etc. of former years remains admitted not
the landing of divers commodities now sent, except we should
absolutely consent to pay custom for a greater damage by
their rating here and hindrance to the sale of the rest,
if not unrecoverable, disesteem to that commodity [i.e.,
cloth], disgrace to our trade, etc.

The present dispeeding whereof, [i.e., the ship to
Persia] as it doth not only advance the sale of that here and
give us hope of the vent of that sent thither [to Persia],
in regard of the winter season (which is not the least to be
considered) so it promiseth a whole year's advantage to the
Company's trade in those parts. The monsoon also threaten-
ing, the ship's return before the departure of the rest [of
the recently arrived East India fleet from England] from hence
may bring us intelligence of that affair and the discovery of
those seas for the secure proceeding of a greater supply the
ensuing year and happily save a year's time for that ship's
doubling the Cape Comorine [sic], which else might be held
doubtful, besides many other inconveniences and detriments
depending in case the expedition had been prolonged for your
lordship's advice and answer.

And lastly if we shall presuppose or doubt of the
success of this affair by want of fitting ports or peaceable
entertainment there, and thereby our people enforced to
return without the effecting of that design (which God forbid),
yet the loss in conclusion will prove little, since in effect
tis one and the same charge, the ship's remaining here or her employment thither.

And for that we are very desirous to clear all former doubts, disrespect or want of duty to your lordship and to free ourselves from discontent and distractions, which men's passions are object unto by sinister surmises and imputations to the hindrance of our affairs, especially proceeding from such eminency, we unfeignedly profess by him that knoweth the secrets of all hearts /that/ we are no way guilty or have willingly incurred your displeasure or the least occasions of these taxations, but that our sincerity, duty and affections are answerable in every respect to what in reason may be expected from us, at least our desires and true meanings are perfect to that degree of performance, having thus far these particulars, we come now to answer such parts of your lordship's former letter as either the brevity of our reply, by the occasion there alleged or our exceeding troubles at the writing of our last might cause us to omit.

Your lordship may further please to take notice that at my last being aboard, conferring with the General concerning these passages, he discoursed unto me of a ship and pinnace set forth from Brest in France, under the command of Sir John Ferne, who accompanied with divers English departed from thence in February last, designed for the Red Sea with intent to make a voyage by pilfering, which voyage the honorable Company endeavoured greatly to cross, but it being protected and patronized by the French King, they were prevented, for which cause they have procured unto the General a Commission from the King /James/ for their apprehension in case of their meeting together, which they the rather expected, in hope these people would have sought their conduct /I.e., convoy/ (for fear of the Portuguese) into those parts, but it being frustrate, we have thought it necessary to refer it to your lordship's consideration whether requisite to advise the King thereof, that hereafter if any violence or outrage by the said persons shall be committed on this people /I.e. Indians/ trading into those parts, neither your lordship, our masters' goods, or ourselves do here suffer or be liable to satisfaction of such damage, and thus having touched such needful points and businesses now thought on, we humbly pray, etc.
Factors at Surat to Roe, December 12, 1616.
British Museum: Additional Manuscript 9356, Letter Book of the English Factory at Surat, Fols. 155, 156b, 157:

[Reference to "the sickness", i.e., plague, at Agra.]

They note Roe's criticism of their sending the ship to Persia, and reiterate their reasons for sending it. … That you are not of counsel to this expedition is indeed our misfortune, since it makes the grounds weak by your constructions. The success we hope will warrant the laborers their hire, and the trade prove better than that of Virginia. Jasquesse [revised?] hath been a place of resort for shipping, and is inhabited. If silk be not made there, we hope both it and other commodities of the country in convenient time may be provided and brought thither.

That the port is not accessible within a league is contradicted by mariners of this place that have seen it, and is manifestly known Capt. Newport was never there. We deny not that cloth is brought through Persia into India, and think that ours will sell at less price there than here, [which was] an objection to [i.e., of] your lordship in some former. Yet reason tells us (if we shall not trust advice) Persia will vend greater quantities than India, which the Company more aim at than the exceeding price. He that procured the firmaen was desirous of more strings to his bow than one, having formerly by experience much cause to be doubtful of it, and knowing also his master's exceeding desire to entertain Christians, happily procured his firmaen, as well to express his service to him as his desire to our acceptance, which if effected before the conclusion of the Spanish Embassy (whereof are manifold uncertainties) may cause that project to be both less desired and esteemed, we ever held you worthy and should have been very glad of your consent, but the loss of so much time would have bred many unavoidable inconveniences, as in our last advised. By the same reasons, we have not injured John Crowther, who yet may reap the fruit of his labors, whereto we shall endeavor to assist him.

That your lordship would have set down a course strengthens our hopes you have already undertaken may prove successful, and though we have proceeded upon mature deliberation, we shall be glad of your treaty with the Persian
Ambassador, for its better confirmation or direction against the succeeding year, when by this first discovery we hope it may be seconded by the whole fleet. We acknowledge to have received the King of Persia's command, and Steele and Crowther's advice, jointly from you, yet could not be altogether ignorant before it was first enquired after in this place, almost four years since by Mr. Aldworth, seconded by me in Agra and Adgmore, whereto Steele's information added something coming thence, and Sir Robert Shirley coming thence gave great encouragements; from those informations (not without certain notice of the conditions of Fort Jasquess), Capt. Downton's consultation determined a farther discovery, all which and infinite other reasons (by God's mercy) we hope shall warrant the attempt against all misconception.