CHAPTER—FIVE

PORTUGUESE IN MADRAS: FROM RESIDENTS TO RETRIBUTION, 1710-1750

We have noted in the previous chapter how Portuguese became refugees in Madras and later acquired the status of permanent, peaceful and indispensable citizenship of the town. Their role in the trade and economy as well as in the defence of Madras was undoubtedly commendable. It was because of these indispensable services to the English government that the Portuguese gained much sympathy and in fact a strong support from the Company's servants and gentlemen of Madras despite the fact that the home Directors and its social milieu were against the presence of large Catholic inhabitants in England as well as in their overseas colonies. But the changing atmosphere in England after the Glorious Revolution in 1688 and the amalgamation of the Old and New English Companies into United East India Companies in 1708 coincided with the comparative peaceful environment in the Coromandel Coast. This new changes brings about drastic changeover in the notion of English government over the presence of Catholic inhabitants in Madras. First, the comparative peaceful environment after 1710 till 1740 led to the declining importance of the Portuguese inhabitants as protectors of Madras not only in the militia forces but also in the Madras Army as well. Secondly, this changing environment was coincided with the new policy of the Company who, as we noted earlier, was seriously thinking to relieve themselves from depending upon the strength of the Catholic population and that the new local Protestant converts were now looked upon to depend on in future. Although this new converts does not come very soon the shifting of opinion from the Catholics population to the local Protestants must have adversely affected the erstwhile pre-eminent position held by the Portuguese inhabitants. Their members in the Madras garrison were gradually pruned, they were no more summoned for a militia formation and finally they were left to themselves in their religious and social affairs under the comparative atmosphere of toleration. The only sphere where the Portuguese continued to play important role was in the trade and commerce of Madras which was also seen to be gradually in the declining trend. Therefore, in the following
pages an attempt is made to look into the various facets of the Portuguese affairs in Madras such as in trade, defence and some social aspects in the context of their declining importance under the Company until they were finally expelled from the ‘white town’ in 1749.

THE PORTUGUESE SOCIETY AND SOME SOCIAL ASPECTS
We have noted some socially related aspects of the Portuguese community in the previous chapter. But the period under study is precarious for the absence of socially related accounts in the contemporary literature. However, it should be remember that the Portuguese community of Madras continued to remains in peace as much as they were before. Being settled inhabitants by now they resorted to various means of livelihood under the English merchant government. By picking up the several employments provided by the urban set up of Madras under the English merchant government they seems to have subsisted quite peacefully although not without wants. Their predominant employment was in Madras Army as soldiers, gunroom crews and others. Trade was chiefly carried by the bigger merchants in partnerships with other poorer folks through the system of respondentia so that many of them have also reaped the fruits of the flourishing trade directly. Therefore, it is possible that although the Portuguese community did not form as the most affluent section of the Madras population they certainly must have been quite contented with their reasonable income they could made out of the flourishing trade and commerce. But the declining opportunities in trade and also in the military services due to some unfavourable notion of the English company must have gradually lead many of them into penury during the later period of our study. In the following pages an attempt is made to bring out some important facets of the Portuguese society in Madras.

One important fact that attracts our attention was the absence of some important merchants in the list of shipping or otherwise. While there would have been certainly some newcomers in the town during this period some Portuguese must have also migrated to other places. The absence of some big business houses in the list of shipping or otherwise can be easily notice from the records although we do not have specific account on their migration. For instance, the erstwhile big business house, the Pereiras family, was missing both in the shipping list as well as in the ‘white town’ settlement.
One rich Portuguese merchant and ship owner, Senr. Aleixa Pessao, who was sued by another Portuguese of Macao at the Mayor’s Court in 1715, was also ‘an old inhabitants’ of Madras who migrated to other place. But despite this some more business houses came up, they were either the wholly new merchant family or have been the scion or relatives of the erstwhile business magnates. Perhaps marriage was considered to be one important sources of making fortunes during this time. And in this respect, the big business houses of Madras at this time were seen to be more so in that context.

We have already cited the marriage of one fidalgos with the daughter of one rich Portuguese merchant Lucas Luis. Here, it may be added that some of the big Portuguese business houses of Madras such as the Carvalhos and the Madeiros must have probably began their business from the dowry of their wives. The famous Lewis (Louis) de Madeira’s Father, Cosmos Lorenzo de Madeira, was married to the daughter of the then famous Portuguese business magnate, John Perera de Faria, and he must have probably accumulate huge fortune later due to this connection. Similarly, another big business house of this time, the Carvalhos must also have initially begun their business through their connection with the said John Perera de Faria family. This is said because of the family title held by the grand-daughter of John Perera, Antonia de Carvalho da Silva, to whom he bequeathed his garden, the ‘Perera’s Garden.’ The same is true to the Barnevalls family. Anthony Coyle de Barnaval, an Irish by decent, married Antonia de Carvalho, (the grand-daughter of Pera Faria?). He began his career as commander of ship and later made huge fortune. His son Francis Barnevall, married Vincens, the daughter of Madame Dupleix by her first husband. His daughter Catherine married one French Supercargo de la Matrie who also made his fortune through such marriage. In this way some of the big business houses of Madras were related by marriage in one way or the other.

However, the sanctity of such marriage was generally floated by some. One interesting case came in 1718 account. In this year one Francisco Ferera, ‘a pretended Doctor’ was arrested on suspicion of spying for Dairam, the local ruler during the
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quarrels. He was later released when Francisco Gregorio give a security of 1000 pagodas for good conduct. He was said to have pretended to be Jews in Italy and Constantinople, and at Grand Cairo he turned a Turks and married and got some children who resided there. Later he came to India and turned Christians and married a Portuguese woman of Madras. As he got the liberty to go to Bengal, Francisco Gregrio later asked for the return of his security bond and he was accordingly give back. Another case may be added here.

In the last Wills of Francisco Gonsalves it becomes clear that he was the son of one Francisco Gonsalves and Johanna Pereira and he was first married to one Leonora Acert with whom he got two daughters Johanna and Christina who were already married. Later he married to another woman called Dona Manucha de Souza Rodaolho whom he appointed as his heiress. Beside his present resident, he got two houses, one in the Petta and another at the Great Mount. He got one ‘grand child and godchild’ named Anna Maria to whom he bequeathed his house in the Petta. His house in the Great Mount was bequeathed to Francisca, his ‘God daughter’, the daughter of the late Anthony de Souza and Johanna Lebrum. Besides, he also got two ‘god sons’, Bento and Domingos, to whom he left 50 pagodas each to be given after 12 years of age. He also got four slaves, three girls and one boy, to whom he bequeathed their freedom and liberty. A part from the marriage network that might have probably brings about family fortune; this account is interesting as far as our earlier issue of children’s custody after the death of their parents or in case of the bastard children is concerned. Here, Gonsalves was obligated over four children which would have made him so worried about their welfare during his life time and also after his death which is apparent from his last wills. Francisco Gonsalves was the Coast merchants who used to go overseas for trade. In 1727, he commanded Brigantine St. Francis to Mergy (Tenassery). His wealth can be estimated from the properties he possessed in Madras: three houses and others effects. He gave his daughter Johanna in marriage for 1000 pagodas and Christina for 750 pagodas to whom later he added 160 pagodas. This is huge money by the standard of the time. Another
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3 D&CB, 12 May 1718, p.83.
important fact that can be concurred from the above account is that it was fashionable at that time to keep a house slaves among the richer section of the society. Gonsalves have four named: Maria, Luzia, Lucretia (girls) and Timor Joseph (boys).

In the earlier chapter we noticed how extramarital lives of the Portuguese men have brings about many ‘bastard children’ in the society leading to certain social problems in the local society such as the problem of custody and so on. One important case may be taken up here. It was concerning the affairs of Sebastian Texeira’s ‘bastard daughter’, aged nineteen. In March 1729, the said Sebastian complained to the Council against Mayor John Roach, the military paymaster (and earlier Commander) and one of the Justices of peace who ‘had enticed his daughter to run away from the house where he had placed her in St. Thome.’ Sebastian told the Board that before leaving for Manila he left his ‘maiden daughter’ under the care of Mrs. Maria Elveira at St. Thoma. But after his return from Manila he was told that his daughter had been, in the middle of the night, taken by Palanquin and conducted to Mayor Roach’s house in the white town in which she remain since after that. He also said that as the incident was an ‘insult and dishonour done to the [Portuguese] people in general,’ Revd. Padre Thomas represented the case to Mayor Roach after 8 days but he was told that ‘there was no occasion for so much trouble’ as the said Roach knew whose she was. Mayor Roach also told the Padre that the said Child was not Sebastian’s daughter but of Mr. Robert Raworth and she was now under his protection as he had a power of Attorney and committed to give her five or six hundred pagodas in marriage so that he would not entertained anyone further in the affair. He was also told that the girl has also declared that she was not his daughter. Sebastian, therefore testify that the said girl was his daughter and ‘she has been known to all people as his child.’ As far as her mother is concerned he said that she left Madras for St. Thome more than 15 months before her delivery and the girl was not at all concerned to the said Raworth, nor did he take any interest in her while he was in Madras for nearly about five years after she was born. Further, Sebastian complained that Mayor Roach had devastated his daughter’s modesty by throwing her in ‘such an excess of shame and scandal’. He also contended that she was seduced through ‘flattery and other means’ by Roach for it is not possible for ‘a child brought up in the close manner as is customary to bring up children of the Portuguese in India without any acquaintances of knowledge of the world’
would dare to go out in the middle of the night and went to the others house. Therefore, he requested the Board to redress his grievances.\footnote{7} He also transmitted his complaint to the Company in England later when the girl continued to remain in Roah’s house in the Great Mount.

The instance went up into such a proportion that not only the whole Portuguese inhabitants of Madras but also the Portuguese of St. Thome came up in protest against such insult to the community. As a form of protest the ‘Bishop and inhabitants of St. Thome’ also wrote to the President and Council of Fort St. George to immediately bring Justice to the ‘Scandalous affair of Sebastian Texeira de Britto’s daughter, who privately in the night went out of an honest house standing in St. Thome where her father according to his constant custom, had left her.’ Besides terming the incident a great insult to the Portuguese community in generally, they were also concern that such ‘pernicious’ act was ‘injurious to the community for in future these will be no house secure, however honest it may be, this excess having opened a way to many other, as if there was not Justice to be found to punish actions so pernicious to the good and quiet of the public.’ Therefore, they requested the Madras govt. to ‘find out some remedy for what is past and to prevent such enormities in future.’ They also informed that the case will be transmitted to the ‘Supreme Court of the Hon’ble Company’ and another to Portugal to be taken by the Envoy of Portugal in England.\footnote{8}

Considering the enormity of the tense situation in which the whole Portuguese community of Madras and St. Thome demanded justice and expressing their concern for the ‘insult’ to the Community in general the Fort St. George Council, under such great pressure, was compelled to circumvent the normal process of law by acting immediately upon the case against Major Roach. This was to prevent any unforeseen mischief that may go out of proportion. Therefore, Major John Roach was immediately charge sheeted as such action was considered ‘highly derogatory to the Honour of the Company’ and to the post which the said Roach hold in the Company’s service. To this charge, Major Roach answer that the contents of the complaint was untrue ‘excepting the receiving the woman which he confess he did so as believing it a part of his duty as a Justice of Peace,

\footnote{7} D&C\&B, 10 March 1729, pp.26-28.  \footnote{8} D&C\&B, 10 March 1729, p.28.
she coming to him and claiming protection.' But he accepted guilty of 'an indiscretion in not acquainting the governour of it and submits himself to the censure of the board for the same.' Without further examination, Major Roach was fined 300 pagodas for his 'indiscreet conduct.' The said girl ordered to leave the English bound 'under penalty of Publick Punishment' as she came to Madras 'under pretence of asking protection' without making her application to the Governor. She was given few days to 'reconcile to her friends on account of her elopement.' Such a hurry decision was taken in order to prevent any ill consequences out of an action that 'manifestly tends to the disturbance of the Public peace and good order' in Madras.

It is not known how far the decision of the Madras Council was carried out as there was no further account in this respect in the Diary. But as per the complaints received by the Directors from the said Sebastian Texiera it appeared that the Council's sentences to the woman 'was shamefully eluded.' The said woman was 'forcibly detained in the Major's House at the Mount' after the Council sanctioned her to depart from Madras. But the proceeding of the Council was not to the liking of the Company who considered the case 'very extraordinary' and accordingly directed the Madras Council to reverse the decision. The Directors, without considering the merit of the tense circumstances under which the Madras government took such decision, deplore the proceedings lacking legal norms and considered the fine 'arbitrary and illegal' which turn out to be 'so dark and mysterious an affair' as it was unabashedly floated by Major Roach. Therefore, they insisted to make an enquiry 'into the facts and put the plaintiff in a method of obtaining justice according to the law.' To this the Madras Council replied in defend of their decision and the procedure involved in it. They refuted that Sebastian Teixeira could not behave ignorant to the 'proper way' of the Council's preceding in the case. This shows that no further deliberation was taken in the Council and it seems likely that the said woman continued to remain in Major's house.

This incident is significant for several reasons so far as the social condition of the Portuguese community is concerned. We have noted in the previous chapter that it was
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9 D&CB, 19 March, 1729, p.31.
10 Records of Fort St. George Dispatches from England (hereafter DFE), 1730-33, 12 Feb. 1713, para. 75.
11 DFE, 1730-33, 12 Feb.1731, p.75.
the common practice amongst the Portuguese inhabitants of Madras in keeping illegitimate partners especially by the richer section of the society. We have also noted that such practices bring about certain social problems in the society such as the custody of such illegitimate or 'bastard children'. The instance that we have just cited pointed to one aspect of such social problems. It is not clearly known about the exact relationship of Sebastain Texeira de Britto and the mother of his 'Maiden daughter' but it plainly occur to us that the child was born out of those illegitimate affairs. The fact that Sebastain live in Madras (we don't know with his family or alone) and the mother of the said girl in St. Thome pointed to this conclusion.

The petition also made it clear that the girl got some brothers and sisters. He claimed that as all of them were 'baptized and educated' as his children since their childhood and that he took great pain in bringing them up and he worked so hard even at the fag end of his life 'to get them fortunes to set them forward in the world and to give them in marriage.'\(^{13}\) However, it is not clear where did he put his other children when he went out overseas and why she was all alone left with Mrs. Maria Elveira at St. Thome. It occur to us that she must have been his only 'bastard children' which he always left with the said person 'according to his constant custom' which seems to have become a constant problem for him. Adding to his woe, she was picked up from the said house in the middle of the night and conducted to Major Roach house where she lived thereafter in the full knowledge of the whole townsman.

The relationship between her mother and Mr. Robert Raworth is also interesting. Major Roach claimed that he was authorized by Mr. Raworth to take care of the girl as the latter's daughter. Texiera, however proved that she was not Mr. Raworth's daughter by citing that she was born fifteen months after her mother lived in St. Thome but did not mentioned that she was his wife by that time. Therefore, it is assumed that she must have been born out of the illegitimate affairs with him. On the other hand it must be possible that the said mother must have an illicit affair with the said Raworth before going to St. Thome and might have continued to do so even after that. Whatever may be the cases this instances pointed out the fact that such illicit affair, as we have also noted earlier, was the

\(^{13}\) D&CB, 10 March 1729, p.28.
reality of the time and the corresponding problems of bring up such ‘bastard children’ has been a constant source of problems in the urban space of Madras.

As far as the Portuguese children are concerned we know that they were generally brought up ‘in the close manner as is customary to bring up of the Portuguese in India.’ This applies to both legitimate and ‘bastard’ children. What is interesting about the Portuguese society at that time was that such illegitimate children were also allowed an equal space in their father’s house and property. They were also recognized by the Church to be legitimate members of the house. The only hurdle could be the legitimate wife of his father who may not allowed them to live with them. This was the reason why they were usually kept in the care of someone for which their father is obligated to pay for it. They were also baptized and educated in the manner all the legitimate children were done which was ‘close’ and conservative in the true sense of the evidence just cited. However, despite such close environment, elopement of women with their love one or otherwise according to their own wishes also seems to have been a common feature. It was apparent from the final account of the Council that she went to Major Roach ‘under pretence of asking protection’ probably on her own or had been allured by the said Roach. It is not clear what her real motive was, but it was apparent that she must have gone for another sort of illegitimate relation. By declaring that she was not the daughter of the said Texeira she bought her own freedom from doing anything she wishes. Had this not been the case she could have easily leave Major Roach’s house when her father intervene. We don’t have further account on her affairs in the available records at our disposal but it seems that she continued to remain in the house of Major Roach thereafter.\textsuperscript{14}

This account of freedom enjoyed by Portuguese women was further substantiated by another instance. In 1718, one Portuguese woman Flora was accidentally shot dead by a soldier William Briget. While they were talking pleasantly Briget was playing his gun mockingly towards Flora and unfortunately the pistol went off and shot trough Flora’s head. The woman was said to have been bringing victuals to one of the guard Richard Shirman.\textsuperscript{15} The comparative freedom the Portuguese women enjoyed in the town was in

\textsuperscript{14} DTE, 19 Jan.1730, para 85
\textsuperscript{15} D&CB, 6 March 1718, pp.40-42.
fact the reality of the urban lifestyle in which many women were seen to have come out from their close door to take up several jobs provided under the colonial merchant government of Madras.

Again, this instance also clearly spelt out the socially close and egalitarian set up of the Portuguese inhabitants in Madras. We have already noted how the Portuguese inhabitants reacted towards any insult made to their community people, especially to their women. We know that in 1694 the whole Portuguese inhabitants of Madras was taken into great confusion when one of their women complained that she was ‘ravished’ by the one Lt. Seaton, who was also the Commander of the Garrison.\(^{16}\) Similarly, in this case there was also much indignation throughout the two towns of Madras and St. Thome amongst the Portuguese inhabitants when such insult was made on their woman. Interestingly, Major Roach was also previously the Commander of the Madras Garrison. Therefore, the Portuguese must have a prior ‘peake against’ Major Roach in the same way they had with Lt. Seaton. The present confusion could also have been due to the ‘effect of their spike’ they formerly had with the said Major. As the Portuguese always constituted the major part of Madras Army they must have great indignation towards any Military Commander who always exploit and discriminate them. Perhaps, the role of Major Roach in the discharge of many of the Topass soldiers in 1724 must also have occasioned for their ‘spike’ against him now.\(^{17}\)

Under the comparative environment of toleration towards the Roman Catholics the change in policy concerning the administration of Wills and Probates notice our attention. We have noted that in 1704 the English government arrogated to itself the custody and administration of the Portuguese Wills and Probates. Despite several representations made by the Portuguese to reverse such policy so that they could continue to make their wills in the Portuguese Church the government was adamant. Therefore, they applied to the Company in London. In 1728, the Directors wrote to Madras Council that they received an application ‘on the behalf of many of the Portuguese and other Christian inhabitants of Fort St. George’ for ‘making and proving their wills in their own Church.’ They ordered that the Mayor’s Court was not given power to ‘compel and

\(^{16}\) See D&CB, 19 April, 1694, p.40.

\(^{17}\) D&CB, 4 Sept. 1724, p.139. He was the Paymaster by this time.
oblige people to sue for probates of wills’ so that if any native die ‘leaving estates not intermixt with any of the King’s subjects’ the probates of their wills or the granting administration or other authority usually amongst themselves ‘should be left entirely to them and to the methods they have been accustomed to and the Mayor’s Court is not to interfere there in.’ But if any native has mixed concern with any of the King’s subjects the case may be decided at the Mayor’s Court of it was requested for the same. Therefore, the Mayor’s Court can allow any of such case who voluntarily came to it but cannot ‘force anybody to came’ for it. This mean that any person have the liberty to make their wills as they wishes, say, either in the Mayor’s Court or otherwise. The Directors also insisted that the delay in Mayor’s Court and the hefty fees should be reduced as much as possible which they found them to be one of the main grievances of the compliant.\textsuperscript{18}

After receiving such order from home the Madras government issued a notice declaring that 1) ‘Any person of the Romish Communion is at liberty to take out probates of wills or letters of Administration in that Church but that they are not compelled to do it’; 2) that, in so doing in that Church ‘they are not entitled to a right of suing any subject of England or other person who is not of that Communion’; and 3) that, the priests of that Church ‘have no authority to examine or decide any controversy between man and man, or to do or execute any other Judicial Act whatsoever.’\textsuperscript{19} Therefore, the long struggle for proving wills in their Church was finally won although in somewhat modified form. This instance also shows the changed notion of the Company towards the Roman Catholics. Perhaps, they have already instructed the Madras Council in their earlier dispatch in 1726 in which they asked them not to ‘intermeddle’ in any of such affairs. This was mainly due to the fear of ‘the unforeseen mischief that may arise if their old customs are broke into.’\textsuperscript{20}

Socially, this incident pointed out the fact that the Portuguese would do anything to protect and preserve their social compact from any insult. The taking away of their rights to make wills in their Church was in fact an insult to the sanctity of their customary rights. By letting their customary way of life in the hands of others, the Mayor’s Court in this case, was humiliation for the Portuguese. Apart from the exposure of their late wills in

\textsuperscript{18} DFE, 1728-15, 21 Feb. 1728, para. 100.
\textsuperscript{19} D&CB, 10 Oct. 1729, P. 97
\textsuperscript{20} DFE, 17 Feb. 1726, para. 22.
public deliberation at the Court, there were several insecurities that affront them such as the slowness of the Court's proceedings and the charge thereto. However, what concern most to the Portuguese inhabitant was the preservation of their close social compactness although it was not specifically expressed. This is shown by the fact that such representations were always made on the behalf of the whole community who subscribe it. In the name of slow proceedings and high fees the Portuguese tried to convince the Company to let them have the wills made in their Church. Thus, such earnestness to make their wills in their Church was mainly to preserve their time honoured custom, the sanctity of which, it may be presumed, must have harmed them greatly.

In fact, the economic benefits accrued by the Portuguese Church for making such Wills cannot be altogether discarded as certain nominal fees charges for the same might have formed part of its income. Therefore, great service was done to the church by making such wills. However, of equally important was that the Portuguese seems to have great distrust upon the Mayor's Court for administering their estate after death. We have already mentioned briefly how the Court and Council decided dispute in Madras that depended chiefly upon the favours of the one who holds power, not much on Justice. In this respect, the account of Hamilton is relevant. Hamilton said that the Mayor's Court was 'but a farce, for by experience I found that a few pagodas rightly placed could turn the scales of Justice to which side the Governor pleased, without respect to Equity or Reputation.\(^{21}\) Perhaps, such negative image must also have been the case with the Portuguese who also pointed out indirectly by citing delays and high fees to be paid for it. Therefore, for the Portuguese, it may be supposed that, true justice can be had only in their Church. Now, by the new decree, they got what they want most although they can still make and must make them in the Mayor's Court in case any non-Catholic was involved in their assets.

In continuation to the previous chapter few lines may be added on the question of Wills and Probates. In 1712, one Francisco de Sylva petitioned against the priests of the Portuguese Church 'for seizing and taking into their possession the effects of his deceased sister' to whom he claimed to be the heir.\(^{22}\) The Padres were sent for a reply to


\(^{22}\) D&CB, 3 April 1712, p.65.
the complaint. Accordingly, the Padres produced the last will of the deceased woman in which it appears that ‘all things complied with the rumours of the said will.’ Therefore, the petition was rejected.\textsuperscript{23} Therefore, the new decree was substantial for the case like this in which the executors become the accused of the wills. Several cases of controversy over the wills kept coming at the court even after the 1729 order as the Padre was not given any authority to decide on such issue.

PORTUGUESE IN THE ‘COUNTRY TRADE’ OF MADRAS

We have already noted in the previous chapter that Portuguese had formed considerable parts of the English ‘country trade’, especially with Manila, Macau, Siam, Pegu and the Spice Islands. They continued to play important role in these sectors during our period of study. However, their pre-eminent position in these sectors had gradually declined for various reasons which we will take up subsequently in the following pages. In terms of volume and value, trade picked up continuous growth in general but the share of Portuguese merchants seems to have diminished gradually if we take the number of Portuguese shipping as a yardstick for it. Nevertheless, the Portuguese merchants of Madras especially to those of individual seafarers and peddlers took large amount of goods in the bottoms of other’s ships, including the Company’s one. Besides, many more of them, who were but constant inhabitants of the town, took to trade through the system of respondentia, an investment made in oversea trade. In the following pages an attempt is made to see into the trade of the Portuguese inhabitants of Madras with the various overseas ports such as Manila, Macao, Pegu and several ports of the South East Asia.

The Manila Trade

We have noted that Manila trade was one of the most prolific country trade route for the Madras especially due to its bullion trade which was in great demand in India. This route continued to register growth during the period under discussion with a few periodic fluctuations. In the previous chapter we learned that Portuguese played a crucial role in this sector as English or other Protestants merchants were not allowed to trade with Manila, a Spanish control territory. They mainly played a ‘cover’ for the English goods besides trading with their own stuff. However, this pre-eminent role they used to enjoy

\textsuperscript{23} D&CB, 7 April, 1712, p.68 & 14 April 1712, p.73.
had gradually decline during this period of study under the new wind of change. First, since the 1690’s the Armenians came in the scene as a potential player in the Manila sector and gradually took over the task of carrying English goods to the said ports. Secondly, the pre-dominant role of the Company’s servants in the country trade was now taken over by the increasing English free merchants. By the 1720s, nearly all the trade with Manila was being handled by the free merchants licensed by the English Company. These free merchants went themselves there through certain cover. Thirdly, the erstwhile clandestine and ‘cover’ trade was now firmly established by the practice of certain subterfuges to circumvent the Spanish restrictive commercial policy. This subterfuge was made by recruiting Armenians, Tamils or Moors as ‘dummies’ in Manila trade. Portuguese Commanders or supercargoes were hired at times to ensure safe delivery of English owned goods. Bribing the Spanish officials or the constant urge for self-enrichment by these officials, by certain dubious method also facilitate the continuous growth of Manila trade for the English. Thus, the changing circumstances adversely affected the role of the Portuguese. Nevertheless, the Portuguese of Madras did not completely abandon this sector. In fact, in terms of their own private trade, they also continued to registered growth.

As far as their role in carrying the English goods the Portuguese continued to become important as commanders and supercargoes of the English ships. Some of the Portuguese captains or supercargoes in the Madras services were John Carvalho, Domingo Carvalho, Alexander Carvalho, Francisco Carvalho, Sebastian Texiera, Mathew Periera, Lewis de Madeira, etc. It should be noted that by being the commander of English ships they were allowed certain privileges to pursue a private trade on their own account free of freight charges, but they were not allowed ‘to carry woolen goods, camblets and warlike stores.’ The commander was entitled to a ship space of twenty feet or 56 – ½ tons of goods for his private trade in addition of the right to carry out £3,000. Besides, these privileges the commander could also buy more space in the Company’s

24 SD Quiason, English “Country Trade” with the Philippines, 1644-1765, University of the Philippines Press, Quezon City, 1966, p.62.
26 See for instance, the list of the supercargoes in the service of Madras, D&CB, Dec. 1730, p.157; Dec. 1740, p.227.
27 Quiason, English ‘Country Trade’, p. 83.
ship in order to transship his trading goods. This was mainly because the Company usually sent only about 50 bales annually until the 1740s. 28 This means that large space in the ship was usually filled up by the private traders in the yearly average voyages of three ships to Manila. 29

Besides plying the Company's ships as supercargo or commander, the Portuguese merchants of Madras also usually chartered other ships including the Company one. Some Portuguese ships were also seen to have occasionally visited Manila. In this capacity, as we noted earlier, the Portuguese merchants, as was also the case to others, collaborated with others or took the capital from others at respondentia in order to filled the chartered ship. For instance, in 1712, one Francisco Andrada Portuguese, entered a contract with Captain Edward Bell of ship Chindadre for 130 bales of goods which he tried to would do with the money borrow from others at respondentia. But no one lent him money for the said stock as the said ship was 'not fit to perform the said voyage.' 30 Again, in 1712, one Andrian Williboorts petitioned to the Governor saying that Capt. Roman de Costa had a debt due to him from his goods he shipped for Manila but he died during the voyage. But when the ship returned safely he was not given any dividends from it which President Pitt told him was due to Cojah Sature. He asked if he can have rightful claim to the said Sature. 31 These two accounts show that ships were generally chartered by the Portuguese and money, belonging to others, was taken at respondentia to purchase goods for Manila. In this way the Portuguese made the Manila trade sailing and in the ensuing business several people were involved in the trade either in partnership with the several merchants of the town. Further accounts in this case of respondentia will be taken up in much detail later in this chapter. The incessant trade with Manila by the Portuguese merchants of Madras can be seen from the annual shipping list in the following table.

**Tab 5.1: Portuguese shipping with Manila (1710-1750)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Capt/ Supercargo/ owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Trevitore</td>
<td>Senr. Lewis Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>St. Jeran</td>
<td>Senr. Ignace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinapatam</td>
<td>Senr. Calacto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 D&CB, 12 June 1712, pp.118-119; 16 June 1712, p.120; and 19 June 1712, p.125.
31 D&CB, 16 June 1712.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Captain/Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Brampore</td>
<td>Senr. Lewis Madeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>St. Anna de Boa</td>
<td>Esperance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Trivitore</td>
<td>Francisco Cardoso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Jesus Maria Joseph</td>
<td>Augustin Basilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Jesus Maria Joseph</td>
<td>Augustin Basilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Jesus Maria Joseph</td>
<td>Augustin Basilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Jesus Maria Joseph</td>
<td>Augustin Basilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triplicane</td>
<td>Joao Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Jesus Maria Joseph</td>
<td>Augustin Basilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arcot</td>
<td>Sebastian Taxiera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Arcot</td>
<td>Sebastian Taxiera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Brampore</td>
<td>Joao Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Trivitore</td>
<td>Joao Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Brampore</td>
<td>Joao Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Brampore</td>
<td>Joao Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Triplicane</td>
<td>Joao Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Brampore</td>
<td>Alexander Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Samsunderest</td>
<td>Alexander Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Samsunderest</td>
<td>Francisco Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Samsunderest</td>
<td>Francisco Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Samsunderest</td>
<td>Francisco Carvalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Sta, Ana &amp; San Jose</td>
<td>Joseph Coelho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See footnote.\(^{32}\)

The above table shows also the declining trend of Portuguese shipping with Manila as supercargoes or master of various Company ships. Until the 1732 more or less members of Portuguese were employed as supercargoes or otherwise in several of the Company ships quite continuously, but this felt in the subsequent period. This can be also seen from the annual list of the ‘Supercargoes in the Madras service.’ Since the middle of the 1720s the Portuguese supercargoes in the services of Madras were entirely the Carvalho family: Joao Carvalho, Domingo Carvalho and Francisco Carvalho. Besides the Carvalhos, another Portuguese merchant Senr. Jeronimo D’Hitas occurred in the list of supercargoes in 1730.\(^{33}\) By 1740s only Carvalhos or Coelhos were employed besides other Catholics like De La Lemetrie (French) and the Barnevalls (Irish).\(^{34}\)

Despite this diminishing role under the Company services the Portuguese merchants continued to trade their goods with Manila either in their own ship or in the bottoms of several other ships. Their ships like Senhore Pera de Francia, San Carlos, Brampore and later Sta. Anna, occasionally visited Manila. In fact, by 1730, the Madras

\(^{32}\) See D&C, 1710-1750. The gap years signify no Portuguese shipping or were not recorded.

\(^{33}\) D&C, 1730, p.157.

\(^{34}\) Quiason, English 'Country Trade' p.67.
government still reported home that ‘the trade to Manilha is carried on by Portuguese or Armenians or Moors, no Europeans of our Church can go thither,’ so that the complaints against the Armenians engrossing wholly of the Manila trade was not so well founded.\(^{35}\) They also informed that Manila trade was open to all inhabitants. Thus, the Portuguese and Moors also still played crucial role in that sector. The role of Portuguese became further engendered by the declaration of war between England and Spain in 1739. The Company stopped sending any English vessels to Manila, but the Portuguese and Armenians were encouraged to continue the trade uninterruptedly. For instance, in 1740, one Portuguese ship *Sansunderest* was known to trade with Manila and the same ship also went in 1742.\(^{36}\) We also know that in 1743 the Armenians petitioned to the Council that they should be allowed to freight their goods in the Portuguese Macao ship bottom which was going to Manila.\(^{37}\) Again, they applied to freight in another Portuguese ship *San Carlos* which was ‘much more reasonable rate, and greater safety’ than the said Macao Ship.\(^{38}\) The petition was summarily granted as the Company did ‘not send a ship.’ Manilla trade was greatly affected by the war and even the Company’s China trade was suffered by the Spanish patrol vessels in the China Sea which was planted ‘to intercept all English shipping bound into Canton.’\(^{39}\) The Portuguese trades with other ports were also greatly affected or perhaps almost came to a standstill after the occupation of Madras by the French in 1746.

Thus, it can be said that the Portuguese continued to form the greater part of Manilla trade despite the coming of the Armenians in the sector as a major player. The importance of Manilla trade, as we have noted earlier, was mainly due to the imports of bullion. Madras merchants could make annual sales of cotton goods worth 300000 to 350,000 Spanish dollars, a sum which they brought back to Madras.\(^{40}\) This means that about 45% of Madras silver supply came from Manilla trade.\(^{41}\) Even the price of silver in the Coromandel Coast was dictated by the Manilla market.\(^{42}\) Sizeable quantity of silver


\(^{36}\) See table of the list of shipping to Manila.

\(^{37}\) D&CB, 7 April 1643, pp. 73-74.

\(^{38}\) D&CB, 25 April, pp.82 & 85.

\(^{39}\) D&CB, 9 Jan 1745, p.6.

\(^{40}\) Quisason, *English *Country Trade*’p.74.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., p.75.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p.80.
and gold shipped to Madras from Manila was partly destined to Bengal and another part coined at Madras and still another part was channeled to China to maintain the flourishing Canton trade.\textsuperscript{43} Silver and gold items from Manila also formed valuable presents/gifts to the local rulers of high political standing.\textsuperscript{44} Besides, Manila trade in general occasioned for the increase/decrease of Madras revenues, both land and sea customs. For instance, sea customs on goods dropped for the years 1725-26, which was chiefly ascribed to the 'great decay in the trade to Manilla.'\textsuperscript{45} In 1737-38, the land customs marked and increased 'owing chiefly to a ship that went to Manilha in July 1737 and another in February 1738.'\textsuperscript{46} Again in 1742, the great increase of customs was ascribed to the heavy exportation of 'painting and cambays' to Manila.\textsuperscript{47} Further, the decrease in customs for the year 1743 and 1744 was ascribed to the decline of trade to Manila and Pegue.\textsuperscript{48}

However, the importance of Manila trade compelled the Company to control the sector in various forms so that it could make uninterrupted voyages. First, in order to control the merchants from floating respondentia in various places which was regarded to be the cause of overflowing Indian goods in Manila markets, all respondentia was made to register with the Major's Court since 1727.\textsuperscript{49} Secondly, only licensed merchants were allowed to ply in the sector. Every caution was taken up to conceal the Company's identity at Manila, a 'cover' made through Armenians, Portuguese or Moors and fled the Muslim flags and passes.\textsuperscript{50} Besides, when the Armenians became two dominant and behave adversely to the Company's interest they were forbidden to ship their cargoes in their own ships. They were also prohibited from shipping in any foreigner's ships until the Company's bottom was filled.\textsuperscript{51} As the trade to Manila became the more crucial for the Company, the Directors, in 1738, ordered not to let 'the private traders interfere in

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., p.81.
\item\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., p.73.
\item\textsuperscript{45} D&CB, 1726, p.167.
\item\textsuperscript{46} D&CB, 1740, p.1.
\item\textsuperscript{47} D&CB, 1743, p.16.
\item\textsuperscript{48} D&CB, Jan. 1745, p.25.
\item\textsuperscript{49} D&CB, 3 Jan. 1727, pp.18-19.
\item\textsuperscript{50} Quaisson, \textit{English 'Country Trade'}, pp. 96-101.
\item\textsuperscript{51} DTE, 1719-27, 13 Oct. 1724, p.100; DFE, 1724-27, Dec. 1, 1725, para. 51; Quaisson, \textit{English 'Country Trade'}, p.89.
\end{itemize}
Company investment. As such by 1740s the Company’s investment in Manila trade multiplied by more than eight times to it’s export levels in 1735, i.e. 3700 pagodas to 40000-47,100 pagodas.

It may be mentioned here that most of the eminent Portuguese merchants of Madras were in one way or the others involved in Manila Trade. Among those duly licensed by and registered with the Company were John Carvalho, Alexander Carvalho, Francisco Carvalho, Sebastian Texeira, Mathew Perreira, Lewis de Madeira, John Madeira, Augustino Basilio, Joseph Carvalho, etc. The eminent Portuguese merchants have considerable stakes in the Manila trade. The famous Carvalhos family was closely related in one way or the other by marriage with other big business houses such as the Barnewalls, the Powneys and de la Mettries. It should be noted that these famous business houses were also closely related by their religion, Roman Catholic, who went together in the same church at St. Andrews. Due to their close understanding with the French of Pondicherry the Carvalhos, Barnewalls and de la Matries were first to be expelled from Madras after the re-occupation in 1749. The house of Francisco Carvalho (in Charles Street), De La Matrie (in St. Thomas street and Middle gate street) and that of Francis Barnewall (in Charles Street) were confiscated as per the order of the Council.

We have already noted in length about the Madeira family in the earlier chapter and need not be repeated here.

The Portuguese Manila merchants have amassed huge fortunes from their flourishing trade. Some of them have also owned ships either individually or jointly with others. For instance, ship Jesus Maria Joseph was first owned by the Macao based Portuguese Francisco Laite Pereira which was later bought by Senr. Aleixa Pereira. This ship later came in the possession of another Portuguese merchant Augustino Basilio who continuously took it to Manila. Ship Brampore also belonged to the Portuguese, first in possession of Lewis Madeira family and later to the Carvalhos. The Carvalhos have also owned ship Samsunderest. We have also noted that ship Senhora Pera De Francia

---

52 DFE, 25 Oct. 1738, para. 50  
53 Quiason, English ‘Country Trade’ p. 95.  
and *San Carlos* were also belonged to the Portuguese. In 1750, Joseph Coelho (Carvalho) and Miguel Pedro Heytor bought a Brigantine *Sta Anna* which was renamed it as *Sta. Anna & San Jose*, from one Dominican Friars of Manila for 16,000 pagodas. Gregory de Jocob, an Armenians, was also invited to join them as part of the ownership. Ship *Sta. Catharininha* was owned jointly by Portuguese, Armenians and Moors as it appeared from Petrus Usca complaint letter to the English government when it was seized in 1748. Thus, we can see that the prolific trade of Manila was sources of fortunes for some of the Portuguese merchants of Madras.

**The Macao (China) Trade**

Portuguese shipping to Macao and China also registered growth during the period under study. The Portuguese of Madras continued to send one or more ships to this port annually. For instance, there were three ships in 1711 and two in 1712 belonging to the Portuguese arriving and departing for Macao. It is difficult to precisely identify whether such ships belonged to the Portuguese of Madras or Macao, but it was most probable that those ships were owned jointly by them. In any case the Portuguese of Madras have large stakes in almost all ships trading with Macao. The fact that in much of the cases those ships were commanded by the Portuguese of Madras pointed out that they have more stakes on the ships and its cargoes. Certain Portuguese ships can be identified regularly on the Madras—Macao route during our period of study. Ships like *Boa Novis, Nossa Senhora de Fema (Pema), St. Pedro St. Paul, Nossa Senr. de Consecao, Nossa Senr. de Rosaira, St. Antonio*, etc. were seen to have regularly visited China. Some eminent Portuguese merchants of Madras such as Francisco Tores, Lewis de Madeiras, Francisco Carvalho, Antonio Cruz, Antonio Periera, Segn. Joao Constantino, Agostinho de Plexiera, Antonio Corea, Manuel Correa, Andrew Correa de Souza, etc. were seen to have traded with China. However, China trade did not picked up much to its deserved state due to the restrictive policy of the English Company. As we noted earlier Madras trade to China was largely preserved for the Company especially the import of tea from
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57 D&CB, 1743, pp.73 and 85.
59 DTE, 26 Jan. 1749, para. 68.
60 See table below.
61 See table below.
China and Spices to its port. Nevertheless, several trading items ranging from copper, quicksilver, tuteney, alum, vermilion, chinroot, chinaware to bullions were allowed to be traded with Madras. By the first half of eighteenth century the exports of bullions from China gradually declined as the exports of tea grew. The Company had to use much of its Manila silver for investment in China. The flourishing trade with China can be had from the following shipping list of the Portuguese in Madras.

**Tab 5.2: Portuguese shipping list with Macao (1710-1740)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Master/Owners/Supercargoes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Nossa Sanr. de Fema</td>
<td>Francisco Torres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Boa Novis</td>
<td>Ignatio Vera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos Senr. de Rosairo</td>
<td>Antonio Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messiah</td>
<td>Lewis Madera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Nos. Senr. de Fema</td>
<td>Francisco Torres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Boa Novis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Segn. John Constantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Rosera</td>
<td>Agostinho de Plexiera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sta. Rosa</td>
<td>Antonio Corelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Segn. Joao Constantino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Anthony</td>
<td>Nicholao Fieunes/ Senr. De Villas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sta. Rosa</td>
<td>Anthony Carrari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Peidade</td>
<td>Manoele de Leme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Black Boy</td>
<td>Francisco George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Pema</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nossa Senr. De Conceptao</td>
<td>Monsr. De la Fontaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Sta. Cruce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galera</td>
<td>Madre de Deo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Pema</td>
<td>Santa du Marp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Antonio</td>
<td>Lewis Roderic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. De Pema</td>
<td>Antonio Periera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Nossa Senhora de Pema</td>
<td>Francis Coelho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Pema</td>
<td>Manuel Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Consecao</td>
<td>Pedro Remano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>St. Antonio</td>
<td>Mathew de Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Pema</td>
<td>Vincente de Matta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Pema</td>
<td>Manuel Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Consecao</td>
<td>Monsinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Pema</td>
<td>Andrew Correa de Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nossa Senr. de Consecao</td>
<td>Manuel Correa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invocation Antonio</td>
<td>Varella</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** See footnote.  

The above table registered the thriving Portuguese trade in the Madras-Macao route throughout the period under study with few exceptions. The trade was presumed to be taken mostly by the partnership of the Portuguese of Madras and the Macao. As the

---

[^62]: D&C, 1710-1740. The gap years signify the absence of shipping or were not recorded.
number of shipping shows the volume and value of trade must have been quite considerable. The round trip of Manila-Madras-Macao-Madras was regarded to be the most prolific country trade by that time. By becoming the main player in this triangular trade the Portuguese merchants must have amassed huge wealth. The involvement of some Portuguese merchants in both the sectors can be established. For instance, one of the eminent Portuguese merchants of Madras Lewis de Madeira was seen to have taken ship Trivitore to Manila in 1710 and in the next year he took another ship Messiah to Macao. Back from Macao in 1712 he set sailed for Manila again in 1713 in ship Brampore. However, the thriving Portuguese shipping declined after the 1740, probably due to the changing political situation such as the wars between Spain and England and later joined by the France. In fact, it was the Macao and Manila trade routes which registered resilience in trade undertaken by the Portuguese of Madras through out our period of study.

**Portuguese trade with Burma, Thai- Malay Peninsula and the Spice Islands**

By far the largest numbers of sailings in record were the round trips from Madras to the various ports of the South East Asia. In terms of volume of shipping to and from Madras in the first half of the eighteenth century, Pegu ranked first followed by Mergui, then Kedah and Phuket. Throughout the 1720s and the 1730s, between six and twelve ships usually left Madras for Pegu annually, but in 1720, 1722 and 1737 the incoming ships from Pegu rose to 13-14 and in 1739 there were 21 recorded arrivals from that port. However, Pegue trade began to decline abruptly in the 1740s and 1750s. Other places like Mergui (Tennasserim), Phuket, Kedah, Malacca, Johore, Aceh, etc. also registered regular sailings. While textiles formed the major export items from Madras, imported goods such as tin, lead, gums, ivory, gold and rubies featuring predominantly. Tin was bought for China trade, rubies for export to Europe and other places. Any empty space in
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63 Refer the two tables of shipping with Manila and Macao.
65 Ibid., p.636.
the ship was filled with rice, timbers and trade animals like elephants, etc. that always made good sales in Madras.\textsuperscript{67}

Like the Manila trade, the importance of ‘Pegue trade’ can also be seen from the point of Madras revenues: sea and land customs. For instance, in 1726, the Accountant reported to the Council that due to the ‘non-arrival of the Pegue Fleet the sea and land customs are decreased two thousand four hundred eighty four pagodas thirty fanams and forty three cash.’\textsuperscript{68} This flourishing trade decline in the 1740s due the ‘many affronts from the government there.’ In 1743, the English Resident at Syrian in Pegue asked for 20 or 30 European soldiers ‘to prevent any further ill usage from the government’ in order to continue the trade there. The Fort St. George government sent 20 Topasses with one English sergeant and a drummer due to the ‘great advantages’ which Madras had ‘formerly received from the Pegue trade and that the Export thither.’\textsuperscript{69}

The flourishing trade with Pegue also brings about another problem to the Company. Shipbuilding was mainly done in this port due to the availability of good quality timbers. Most of private ‘country ships’ in the Bay of Bengal were built here. By 1720s this country ship had becomes so numerous in the Coast that they overdrive the Company’s trade and revenues. Therefore, in 1728, the Directors at home wrote to Madras government to prohibit any further building of such ships or disallow any ships to be built in Pegue without their prior permission. They also ordered that if any carpenters did not complied with such order they should be immediately send home.\textsuperscript{70}

However, for wants of specific data it is difficult to reconstruct the extent of Portuguese trade and their possible stakes with the various ports of the South East Asia. We have already noted that many of the Portuguese inhabitants of Madras carried their trade with these ports. Certainly they must also have some shares in these sectors during this time especially in the trade of precious stones. Their participation can be best illustrated from their shipping list in Madras.

\textsuperscript{67} S. Arasaratnam, Merchants, Companies and Commerce on the Coromandel Coast, 1650-1740, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1986, p.179.
\textsuperscript{68} D&CB, 14 Jan. 1726, p.6.
\textsuperscript{69} D&CB, 5 Feb. 1643, p.39.
\textsuperscript{70} DFE, 1728-29, 14 Feb.1728, para. 40.
Tab 5.3: Portuguese shipping with Pegue (1721-1740)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Captain/supercargoes/owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Gienno de Franco</td>
<td>Manuel de Lemas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Rosairo</td>
<td>Lewis Deas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Brig. Anne</td>
<td>Andre de Sera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Brig. Cumberland</td>
<td>Senr. Duverger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Brig. Francis</td>
<td>Francis Gregorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>Joao Constantinho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Bon Sewasso</td>
<td>John Lopez de Cruz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: See footnote. 71

From the above table we have an apparently sporadic trade of the Portuguese with Pegue. It also pointed to the declining trade with it compare to the earlier period. This shipping also suggests that in this route most of the Portuguese must have carried their trade on the bottoms of other ships. As far as the whole South East Asia was concerned the period under study also represents a declining state of trade for the Portuguese as far as the shipping list is concerned. Besides Pegue, the Portuguese ships also occasionally visited other trading ports of the region such as Acheh, Mergy, Tenassary and Malacca. For instance, in 1726, one Francisco Gregorie, who commanded the ship St. Lewis, visited Acheh. In the same year Mergy (Tanessary) was also visited by ship Ruby, commanded by Joao Carvalho and ship Raheimi, commanded by Antony Perez. In the next year, 1727, another Portuguese ship St. Francis, commanded by Francisco Gonsalves visited Mergy/Tenassary again. In the same year (1727) ship St. Cruce, commanded by Matheus Carvalho, visited Malacca and another Portuguese ship Nossa Senhr. De Rosara, commanded by Agosto de Plexiera, was known to have visited Malacca in 1723 via on its way from Macao. 72 However, the complete absence of Portuguese shipping from Madras to these ports, apart from those mentioned above, is startling especially in the 1730s and 1740s. Although the Portuguese might surely have continued to trade on others bottoms the complete absence of their shipping certainly represents the declining trade.

The system of Respondentia

One interesting aspect of the trading system during this time was the system of Respondentia. It was certain stipulated money advanced to lincensed private traders at a
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71 See D&CB, 1721-1740. The gaps in the annual list during the period represent no shipping.
72 Extracted from the recorded shipping list of Madras D&CB, 1723, 1726 and 1727.
fixed rate of interest. Respondentia is an old legal term meaning a sum of money or capital borrowed at a certain maritime interest for limited periods on the goods of a trading vessel. The borrower was under obligation to repay the loan in the events of the safe arrival of the vessel which carried the merchandise overseas.\textsuperscript{73} Contrarily, the borrower was not under any obligation to repay his loan if the goods on which the borrowed money was invested were lost on the sea.\textsuperscript{74} In case of safe return from the voyage the principal and the corresponding interest should be repaid within certain agreed period, say 21 days to 12 months from the day of his returned, failure of which may incurred a Compound interest, say 10% or so upon the principal and interest.\textsuperscript{75}

The rate of interest depends upon the demands of the market for money and the scales of risk involved in a particular voyage. Due to the high demands of Manila markets and its flourishing trade with the Coromandel Coast the rate of interest for this sector registered the highest in Madras during the period of this study. In the early parts of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century the rate of interest at respondentia in ‘Manilha Trade’ was between 30-35%; that of China was 20-25% and Batavia was 25-40\%\textsuperscript{.76} From the beginning the Company desired to regulate the rates of interest on such loans and tried some means such as creation of banking system but all such attempts failed as the practice had become so entrenched and interwoven with the system of overseas trade in the region.\textsuperscript{77}

In fact, the system of respondentia was a unique device through which considerable amount of additional capital could be raised. Perhaps, without such system, the flourishing trade witnessed during this time might not have been possible. It was through this system of mobilizing capitals for the overseas trade that many of the Portuguese and other merchants could accumulate huge fortunes in Madras. Interestingly, the inhabitants of Madras had also accumulated large part of the prolific trade through this system by way of dividends. Here, it would be pertinent to infer some cases to show the working of the respondentia system. We have just cited the case of one Francisco Andrade briefly. He was requesting the Madras Council to relieve him from his earlier contract with Captain Edward Bell for chartering ship Chindradre for 130 bales of goods.

\textsuperscript{73} CR Boxer, 	extit{Fidalgos in the Far East}, 1550-1770, p.281.
\textsuperscript{74} Quiason, 	extit{English ‘Country Trade’} p. 84.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p.84.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., p.84.
\textsuperscript{77} Watson, 	extit{Foundation for Empire}, p.99.
He told the Council that he contracted the ship as the said Captain certified that it could carry ‘four hundred bales and she was of 133 tuns burden, and a good sailor, very proper for the voyage of Manilha.’ However, later he found that no one was willing to lend him money at respondentia for the said stock as the said ship was ‘not fit to perform the said voyages’ and that it could only carry 100 tones, a slow sailor, and that also ‘must be with a large wind.’ He also informed that people were willing to lend him money if he was allowed to charter ship St. John. A thorough survey was able to confirm his complaint. Hence, he was freed from the contract and was ‘not liable to any persecution hereafter on that account.’ This account is interesting in that for most of the merchant adventurers, it was not only prudent but also necessary to borrow money from others at respondentia in order to carry the overseas trade uninterruptedly. But it is also equally prudent for the lender to satisfied themselves that the voyage to be taken was safe and profitable as respondentia money is wholly a speculative money which can be lost altogether in case of sea disaster. Therefore, the ship has to be good enough and the markets to which he invested his money should be one of profitable one.

Few more case may be added here. In 1713, Captain Edward Bell requested the Council to prevail upon some Armenians from paying him certain amount of money. He said that he ‘took 3000 Dollars from Don Estevao Aquinta in Manila at respondentia at 35 percent for Madras and Manilha.’ This, he lent 1880 pagodas at 30% at respondentia to Awannes Avet, Jehoikim de Gregorio and Surhad, the two Armenians, payable to Don Estevao in Manila. Surhad died on the Voyages but the person who received his effects denied payment to Estavao until he was shown the bond later. Now Estavao deducted 800 dollars from his effects for the damages of delaying the payment when he sends one Barneval to adjust his account with Estavao. When he demanded this damage money from Jehoikim and Awannes they refuse. The matter was decided by the Mayor’s Court in favours of the Armenians. That is why he appealed to the Council to redress his grievances. After a long hearing, the Board decided that the Armenians must paid Mr. Bell an interest of 12% upon the principal and interest from the time of the St. Juans

78 D&CB, 12 June 1712, pp.118-119.
79 D&CB, 16 June 1712, p.120; 19 June 1712, p.125.
arrival to the day the money was paid.\textsuperscript{80} This shows that delay in payment of loans on respondentia will cost the borrower an interest of more than 10% upon the principal and interest together. The celebrated case of Hyeronimo Montero v/s Tomby Chitty can also be cited here. Montao borrowed 650 pagodas from Tomby Chitty in 1725 at respondentia and was countersigned by Senhora Estra Gregoria Perreira as guarantor. Eighteen years later, in 1743, Tomby Chitty demanded the said money from Estra Gregoria when Montao failed to pay him back. Mayor’s Court decided in favour of Tomby Chitty and Estra was compelled to pay 2211 pagodas, 25 Fanams and 31 Cash and also the cost of the suits. This amount was computed at 8% interest upon the Principal and respondentia i.e. Pagodas 910: 8 Fanams.\textsuperscript{81} However, the Court decision was later reversed by the Council when the defenders appealed.

This account is interesting for several reasons. First, it clearly pointed out the association of several persons in the ensuing trade: Bell, an Englishmen; Awannes and Jehoikim, an Armenians; Estavao, a Spanish(?) and Barnewall, an Irish. Secondly, Estavao appeared to be the agent of Bell in Manila, a practices which was quite necessary in all overseas trade. Thirdly, the working of respondentia system can be clearly understood from the above evidence. Fourthly, it may be possible to concur that the contradicting judgment of the Mayors Court and the Madras Council seemingly divulged the power relation between the two contending parties with the power structures of the two Company’s institutions. This is assumed as such power relations have been regarded to be important factor in the decision making process of the Company’s servants in Madras.\textsuperscript{82} We have already noted how the Portuguese distrust the Court to administer their Wills. It may be possible that Capt. Bell have close relation with the gentlemen in the Council and the two Armenians with the members of the Mayor’s Court. Similarly, Tomby Chetty must have better rapport with the Mayor’s Court and Estra with the Council. In most cases the merchants of Madras were plying the effects of the Company’s servants in their country trade, who in turn usually protect their associates in the Court as such decision will have an effect on them as well.

\textsuperscript{80} D&CB, 28 May 1713, p.75.
\textsuperscript{81} Quaison, English 'Country Trade' pp. 85-87.
The system of respondentia was so well entrenched that sometimes it worked averringly to the interest of the Company. In 1727, a long deliberation was taken up in the Council on the cause of the declining state of trade of Madras and its customs. The first reason was that many of Madras merchants such as French, Armenians and Moors have traded on the other bottoms and imports their cargoes into other settlements which they were enabled to do by the money taken up in Madras at respondentia and ‘without which they could not carry on so extensive a trade.’ Secondly, it was found that several of the Madras Supra Cargoes took up large sums of money from Madras inhabitants at respondentia and ‘afterwards proceed to Bengal where they take up as much more of persons who are ignorant of their engagement’ in Madras. So by virtue of this added capitals huge quantities of goods were taken overseas than those markets could possibly consumed. This forced those goods to lye there for two or more reasons for want of buyers. Hence, Madras revenues went down due to lack of shipping to those ports. To prevent this ‘evil’ and ‘clandestine’ practices—further the Council ordered that all Respondentia Bonds, Notes or Writing at Respondentia for money sent by the inhabitants of Madras, both the Company servants and others, upon all ships trading from Madras or any other English port in India, ‘shall duly and regularly registered in a book to be kept for that purpose.’ That such loans being registered ‘shall be accounted and deemed a preferable claim to such as are not.’ A nominal charge was made for registering such bonds and notes by the sub-secretary.\textsuperscript{83} Later it was transfer to the Mayor’s Court. By the 1740s, it was said that the Company’s servants in India had combined their previously illegal use of the Company’s Funds with the new respondentia indulgences and were lending the Company’s funds ‘to English Country Captains on respondentia.’ The Company, on there part, considered it wise to give ‘all possible encouragement to this kind of security’ as it would ‘tend greatly to increase and promote trade in India.’\textsuperscript{84}

The Practice was so pervasive that most of the Mayor’s Court’s Proceedings were, in one way or the others, related to respondentia bonds. Some of the cases in which involved the Portuguese of Madras can be gleaned from the following table.

\textsuperscript{83} D&CB, 3 Jan.1727, pp.18-19
\textsuperscript{84} Watson, \textit{Foundation of Empire}, p.99.
### Tab 5.4: Cases on respondentia and others at the Mayor’s Court (1716-1719)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dated</th>
<th>Case between</th>
<th>Amount litigate for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1689:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18</td>
<td>Peter de Costa V/S Daniel Chardin</td>
<td>10000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bartholessuem Rodrigues &amp; co. V/S</td>
<td>1000 Pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Tver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Peter Gregory V/S George Paulien</td>
<td>4 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Andre Garmaxo V/S Francisco Henrique</td>
<td>1000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar. Rodrigues V/S Francisco de Lima</td>
<td>5000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; John Lopes de Figueiredo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bar. Rodeingues V/S John Lopes de Figuirado</td>
<td>4142 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rodrigue Videgal Salguado V/S Joseph de Fonseca</td>
<td>25 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2</td>
<td>Nichola Manuche V/S Manuel Gonsalvos</td>
<td>100 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Lireva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Servanam V/S Manuel de Souza</td>
<td>200 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2</td>
<td>Padre Miguel Anjo V/S Andre Gramaxo</td>
<td>12 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Antonio Volasso V/S Volerio Roulin</td>
<td>30 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 4</td>
<td>Senr. Lucia de Gama V/S Thome de Lima</td>
<td>350 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; John de Fonseca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peter Gregory v/s William Fowles</td>
<td>6 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1716:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 17</td>
<td>Coja George V/S Domingos Peirera</td>
<td>40 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lewis Melige V/S John Holm</td>
<td>90 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lawrence D’Lertiol, Gummattee Tessary, D’Sozas</td>
<td>1200 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wife and widow of Francisco Mendez V/S Francisco Mendez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1717:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23</td>
<td>Joseph Collet Esqr. V/S Capt. Edward de la Cloche</td>
<td>5000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Aleixa Pessoa D’Andrade V/S Francisco Leita</td>
<td>16000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bailed by Leus de Maderros)</td>
<td>(on the sale of a ship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>Manuel de Silva de Menezas V/S Issaya Guymar</td>
<td>150 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>Mathews Simone V/S Coja Doud Canon</td>
<td>2000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bastian Ferera V/S Francisco Xavier D’Fonseca</td>
<td>4000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bailed by Luis D’Maderos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jon De Matto de Aguirier &amp; Mer Mahomad saffer</td>
<td>822 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/S Abdul Cawdarar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coja Arton D’Missavalah V/S Simone Boutale</td>
<td>1600 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6</td>
<td>Louis Maligue V/S Catchdore</td>
<td>68 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 26</td>
<td>Thomas way V/S Francisco &amp; John D’Silva</td>
<td>68 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Requested to sell house &amp; gardens mortagaged to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Them)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 30</td>
<td>Ebbee Steenberg V/S Johan Baptista Alano</td>
<td>2000 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(bailed by Peter Balliue) [NB: on sale of ship]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1718</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29</td>
<td>Chinatambee V/S Francisco De Silva &amp; V/S</td>
<td>94 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John D’Silva</td>
<td>94 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>Richard Harden V/S Bernaldo Pachaco</td>
<td>150 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(bailed by Francisco Mendez Pereira)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domingos D’Riveria requested to sell Mortgagos house to him by Thome Lopess</td>
<td>200 pagodas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Ralpace Fereira D’Lemos V/S Luzia, the wife &amp; execurix of Francis Holt deceased (payment of respondentia) (as Francis Holt effect was with Francisco Mendez the court directed it to be given)</td>
<td>301:16:48 pagodas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 6  Manuel D'Silva V/S Tondawa Chittea  1000 pagodas
7     Tondewa Chittea V/S Manue1 D'Silva  2440 pagodas
June 17 Conneca Subba Chittea V/S Francisco Gregor:o  800 pagodas
July  18 Catharina V/S Dona Luzia Pereira  500 pagodas
Sept. 8  Dona Luisa Pereira V/S Catherine Broin  50 pagodas
Oct.  4  Iqncia Farrea V/S Louisa Perera  500 pagodas

Source: see footnote.85

The above table shows the wide range of litigation money at the court, say from a mere 40 pagodas to as much as 16000 pagodas to an average of about 1000 pagodas. This is important in seeing the economic situation of the Portuguese inhabitants at least to those merchant entrepreneur houses. The cases were predominantly a business/trade related money such as those of respondantia, sale or purchase of goods, ships and otherwise.

Another interesting aspect, as the Court minutes pointed out, was the callous litigation against one another when their partnership seems to have been in trouble, say, the case between Manuel D'Silva and Tondewa Chitter who filed against each other in 6th and 7th May, 1718, respectively. The case went on for quite sometime until both of them finally agreed to withdraw in October and November respectively. Another case, as we see, was between the trio-Catherine, Dona Luiza Pereira and Iqncia, whose differences can be easily discernable. When Catherina entered attachment against the money and effects of Luzia Pereira which was in the hands of Nathalia Leyes (500 pagodas) the latter responded by claiming the effects of the former which was in the hands of Mr. Daunis. It seems that Catherina now prevailed upon Iqncia to enter against Luiza Pereira. We were not able to make-up from the evidence concerning their relationship and that it is not known how the cases were decided in the Court. However, the general tenour can be seen from the above two incidents which make us believe that in the sprawling urban space of Madras, the business community resorted to any form of cut-throat competition against one another. Litigation against rivals or partners seems to have been resorted not only to remedied any conflicting interests but also to affronts ones rivals on any possible aspects. Some group rivalries were brought before the Court. As we noted elsewhere, many of the cases were floated in favours the person whom the justices have closer relation. This is the reason why many of the courts decision were quashed or reversed by the Appeal

85 Minutes of Proceedings in the Mayor's Court of Madraspatam, June to December 1689 and July 1716 to March 1719, Madras Govt. Press, 1915.
court, the Council whenever it was brought for its deliberation. Nevertheless, the existences of such institution have provided the business community a succor for many of their infirmities which might otherwise destroy the peace and tranquility of the place. Ultimately the beneficiaries of such institution remained the people.

Portuguese Diamond and Coral merchants of Madras
We have already noted in the previous chapter that many of the Portuguese merchants were involved in diamond and coral trade. It was known that many of the merchants who traded with Pegue and other South East Asian ports have traded their Indian goods with precious stones. In the absence of clear evidence in the Diaries it is difficult to reconstruct this prolific trade relation precisely. However, the volume and values of their trade can be indirectly glanced for their trade in the same items with England. An annual list of bullion and coral licensed for the purchase of diamond was sent to Madras. One of such dispatches may satisfy the flourishing diamond trade during that time.

Tab 5.5: List of bullion and coral for the purchase of diamond (1721)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Ship Fordwich:</th>
<th>In Ship Erfield:</th>
<th>In Ship Nightingale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avaraham Qsorio</td>
<td>Moses De Maira</td>
<td>Abraham Qsorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Mendes</td>
<td>3 chests</td>
<td>2 chests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon De Costa</td>
<td>2 chests</td>
<td>Moses Julian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocob de Costa</td>
<td>2 chests</td>
<td>Jacob Mendes de Costa Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mendes da Costa jesro</td>
<td>2 chests</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absaham Jacob Franco</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td>In Ship Nightingale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Mendes de Costa</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td>Abraham Mendes Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Costa</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td>Moses the Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Mendes de Costa</td>
<td>2 chests</td>
<td>Moses Julian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Treles Da Costa</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td>John Cooke Abraham Franco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Fraun</td>
<td>6 chests</td>
<td>Aloano Mendes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Salvador</td>
<td>2 boxes (coral)</td>
<td>John Mendes de Costa Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Farke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ship Devonshire:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 55 chests of bullion &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Meudas Sr.</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td>3 boxes of Corals (in one year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Julian</td>
<td>3 chests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antanio Mandis de Costa</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloano Mendes</td>
<td>1 chests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Franco</td>
<td>4 chests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Mendes Da Costa</td>
<td>1 box (coral &amp; beads)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: see footnote.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{86} DFE, 1721-24, 16 Feb 1721, pp. 7-9.
The above lists of bullions and corals sent out on the accounts of several of the Portuguese merchants for the purchase of diamond in Madras was not an exceptional list. Such lists were sent out annually from London. Thus the flourishing trade in diamond with the South-East Asian Countries and also with England/Europe by many of the Portuguese merchants, both Jews and Catholics and both the inhabitants of Madras and England, can be established by such lists.

THE PORTUGUESE IN MADRAS ARMY

In the earlier chapter we have noted in great details on the great deal of Portuguese participation in the defence of Madras and its subordinate factories. We have noted their important roles in local militia forces especially in times of danger during the successive threats from the local power potentate and also from their European rivals. However, the period under study was comparatively peaceful until 1740 which did not occasioned for any need of militia forces as it used to be in the earlier period. This was attributed to be one of the main reasons for the decline of the pre-eminent position the Portuguese townsmen used to enjoy until the first decade of the 18th century. The countryside remained comparatively peaceful under the Mughals until the mid-eighteen century, although there was an occasional Maratha threat in the neighborhood. On the sea front, there was no much trouble among the Europeans until war was declared between England and Spain in 1739 and with the French in 1744. The comparative peaceful environment had also acted aversey against the Portuguese interest. One can also observe the declining numbers of the Topass soldiers in Madras Army. In the following pages an attempt is made to identify the declining numbers of Topass soldiers in Madras Garrison and see how far this occasioned for the decline of their erstwhile pre-eminent position they used to enjoy before the merchant government.

To begin with, there was no direct assault on Madras settlement until the French attacked and occupied the town in 1746. The period of President Harrison was marked by considerable military activity in other English settlements. Swarup Singh, the ruler of the country about Gingee, captured Lt. James Hugonin and Ensign Reay, who he confined at Gingee and treated with great severity. In an attempt to retaliate by Fort St. David some fatalities occurred and open hostilities ensued. Robert Raworth (as Dy. Governor of Fort St. David) and Captain Roach as commander with reinforcement and stores were sent
from Madras. After some fatal actions matters were finally settled in April 1712 by the mediation of the French governor of Pondicherry and two British officers were released after two years of captivity. Again when the English were engaged with the Swarup Singh, there was also simultaneously arose a difference with the local governor of Vizagapatam, who invested the British factory. A small forces was dispatched from Madras in 1711, and some fighting ensued, in which Ensign Dixon was killed. Three years later (1714) a detachment was sent to aid the garrison of Tellicherry, who were closely besieged by the natives of Malabar. Again, the later month of 1713 was occupied by the revolt of Mr. Robert Raworth, Deputy Governor of Fort St. David which was resolved only in December. Apart from certain disorderliness in the garrison there were no serious problems hereafter.

The strength of the Madras garrison was continued to be strong since the augmentation during the trouble with Arcot respecting the five villages. By 1713/14 the numbers of soldiers in the garrison was 450 men and that of the gunroom crew 150. This figure remained, more or less, until 1719. In 1719, the Company ordered for the reduction of the garrison to its normal strength. The Council therefore directed the officers to reduce the strength to 3 Companies i.e. 360 men. However, the military officers represented the difficulty of finding men for the requisite guards if the garrison had to be reduced to that strength. They said that there will be great inconveniences by reducing the garrison 'to so low as three hundred and sixty' which was not sufficient for the guards even if all of them were put to guard at once. They also argued that there should be provisions for cases of death, sickness, or accidents and also be provided with dieter. Seeing such contention reasonable the President transmitted their complaints and also wrote himself to the Directors in that respect. The Madras government reported that they 'have reduced their garrison as ordered,' and 'disbanded many Topasses' and that they made the garrison into 3 Companies. But they also argued that the number of soldiers appointed for the garrison was 'not sufficient for daily guards in peace and can't be relieved in action'. Besides, many of them could not do their duty due to ill health and

87 D&C, 12 July 1711.
88 D&C, 19 Aug. 1711, 1 March to 30 March 1712.
89 See Love, Vestiges, II, p.131.
91 D&C, 20 July 1719.
many of them were always in the Hospital sometimes death toll rise to about 70 or 80 men. They also informed that it was impossible to 'hire Portuguese or Topasses on sudden occasion' as they must have to undergo training.\textsuperscript{92}

This account did not clearly specify the exact strength of Portuguese Topasses in the newly reorganized garrison. The discharge of 'many Topasses' must have considerably reduced the proportion of Portuguese in the garrison, perhaps into minority for the first time. However, the Portuguese again dominated the garrison in 1721. In a report of the commanders of the Companies in 1721, the Madras garrison consisted of 545 men, out of which, 245 were Europeans, 22 Topasses at Europe centinell pay 'for their former good services' and 278 other Topasses.\textsuperscript{93} This means that there were 300 Topass soldiers in Madras garrison by this time which was much bigger then their European (245) counterparts. Even the total strength of the garrison far exceeds the stipulated number ordered by the Company. What is interesting in this account is that the 'great part' of the European soldiers were 'infirm'. The reason for the augmentation of Topass soldiers, it was reported, was due to the fact that the Hon'ble Company was not sending out any recruits of Europeans in that year and there was 'no better to be had' than the Portuguese.\textsuperscript{94} They also reported that the increased strength as before was due to the addition of 8 guards outside the Fort wall. From this account it appeared that recruitment of soldiers for the garrison was mainly done by the military officers although it should be done in concurrence with the Governor. We know that from 1693 we have regular account of recruits recorded in the Consultation Book until about 1710 or beyond but it is not known when did such new system begins.

However, by the 1724, the garrison was once again reduced into two Companies on the stringent order of the Company. In November 1723, the Company ordered the Fort St. George government that the 'three Companys of soldiers be reduced to two consisting of 150 men each at most' and the number of Ensigns, Sergeants and Corporals 'to be reduced as near as possible to what they were before the war.'\textsuperscript{95} They also directed for the reversion of expenditure to the tune of 1707 which should involved the retrenchment
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of upwards to pagodas 20,000 from the total charge of about pagodas 57,000. Accordingly, in August 1724 the President had informed the Madras Council that ‘he had resolved to disband several of the worse of the Topasses forthwith.’\textsuperscript{96} He also ordered the Major for a list of the garrison. Randall Fowke, the paymaster was also ordered to contrive means of effecting economy as per the direction of the Company. In his report he suggested the reduction of certain officer posts in the garrison besides recommending that no officer or any soldiers be entertained ‘without first appearing in Consultation and an order entered for the same.’ As far as the Gunroom Crew is concerned he reported that there were 128 men of which 46 were Europeans, 52 Portuguese and 30 Lascars. He also reported that the gunroom crews were the ‘most seldom idle of all others’ and their increasing numbers were manly due to ‘many more outworks then in 1707.’ Overall, the Paymaster recommended to comply with the Company’s direction but expressed his opinion against the alteration of the existing arrangement and that in case of any emergency they ‘shall want great many more of that sort above their present strength.’\textsuperscript{97} Thus, we can see that the number of Portuguese in the gunroom crew was also still greater than others.

In the meantime, the President had already ‘discharged several of the Topasses and incorporated the three Company into two’ and ‘had fixed them to the number ordered from England.’ The Council directed that all those surplus soldiers ‘be paid a part’ till they were send for Fort St. David or other places where they may be wanted. Likewise, 13 of the gunroom crew were also discharged of which 9 were Portuguese. The gunner was also told to see ‘what others he can possibly spare against next pay.’\textsuperscript{98} As per the order of the Council the first Company was reviewed on 5\textsuperscript{th} September 1724 which consisted of 1 major, 1 Lieutenant, 2 Ensigns, 10 Sergeants, 10 Corporals, 3 Drummers, 70 Europe Centinels and 65 Topasses.\textsuperscript{99} The Second Company was reviewed three days later which consisted of 2 Lieutenants, 2 Ensigns, 10 Sergeants, 10 Corporals, 3 Drummers, 70 Europe Centinels and 65 Topasses.\textsuperscript{100} Therefore, we have altogether 324 men of which there were 130 Topasses. It is not clear whether the Portuguese soldiers
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who were paid at the 'Europe Centinels pay' were also included among the 70 Europe Centinels. If this was the case, the number of Portuguese should come at 152 men. In any case we have the first clear account that shows the Portuguese soldiers much less dominating than Europeans in the garrison. This numbers kept declining until the 1740s when Madras security was under the threats of the Marathas and later the French.

The large constituents of the Portuguese soldiers in Fort St. David can also be seen from the report of the Paymaster in 17242. There were altogether 473 men of which 291 were Portuguese Topasses which were more than 60% of the total men in the garrison there.\footnote{D&C\&B, Oct. 1724, pp.158-160.} They were also directed to reduce into two companies in the same manner it was done at Madras. However, when the government found that many of the disbanded Topasses were entertained by the French they decided to wait until the French ships sailed out for Malabar.\footnote{D&C\&B, 19 Oct. 1724, p.168.} It seems that the Fort St. David was also later reduced to two Company. In December of that year they informed the Madras Council that many of the officers and the disbanded Topasses represented their remonstrance against the decision of the Company and asked for compensation. They were told that those discharged officers should be allowed ‘half pay’ but none of the discharged Topasses should be given any compensation except those who ‘lost any limbs or been really disabled by the service.’\footnote{D&C\&B, 4 Dec. 1724, p.215.} In 1 723, the Company was displeased over the addition of 6 Corporals and a ‘great number of Europeans, Portuguese, and Lascars in the Gun Room more than was necessary and more than the limit set for St. David.’\footnote{DFE, 1730-33, 6 Feb. 1732, para. 12.}

Even in other settlements, the strength of Portuguese was quite substantial during this time. For instance, in 1726, at Fort Marlborough there were altogether 135 men in the garrison of which 58 were Europeans, 29 Topasses, 13 Arabian Lascars, 33 Buggueses and 2 Lascars.\footnote{D&C\&B, 17 April 1726, p.50.} In Bencolen, the numbers of Topass soldiers were ‘between thirty and forty.’ They wrote to the Company in London that these Topasses ‘should be discharged because they are of no manner of service’ and requested to send 100 European soldiers to
secure the Company effects’ there. The Directors found no need of sending so much Europeans there and advice the Madras government to tell them accordingly.  

The period during the 1720s and 1730s was comparative peaceful in Madras although there was certain trouble in the countryside. The Company advised the Fort St. George Council to be very careful to keep those troubles ‘as far off yourselves as you can’ and ‘to give no occasion as far as possibly to be avoided for quarrelling with you’ and ‘to be constantly on your guard.’ Nevertheless, Madras and its subordinate factories were occasionally facing trouble from their undisciplined garrison. Governor Harrison, in 1712, was known to have asked the Company more power to punish the unruly soldiers especially for a power of death penalty. But this did not come soon. However, in 1726, the Company got the power to try all criminal cases by its overseas officials. This power was especially considered to be a ‘proper remedy’ for the various military ‘refractoriness, sometimes disserting, at other times running over to the enemy and joining them in attacking us and now and then killing one another in their drunken quarrels.’ Besides some disorderliness in the garrison, serious famine in 1729 had also caused great trouble to the Fort St. George government. They inform the Company the various ordeals faced by the people and many of Madras inhabitants also left the town. During this trouble time the whole garrison laid down their arms in protest for the shortage of rice. The Directors were displeased to the government for not procuring enough rice, and ordered to purchase two or three hundred garse of paddy in future. In 1732, another great famine visited Madras and ‘the country round about burnt for want of rain.’ This time the Madras government was well prepared by stocking enough grains for the garrison the same disorderliness was prevented.

As far as the strength of Madras garrison at this time was concerned we are confronted with the absence of any military rolls in our records. However, it seems that the strength of the garrison continued to remain constant at two companies without much increase or decrease. In 1729, the Madras Council had reported to the Company that ‘the whole of military was not increased’ but they always reserved the European Centinels at

---
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Madras ‘for any emergency’ and usually sent out the Topasses to their various subordinate factories.\textsuperscript{111} In 1732 the Gun Room Crew consisted of 71 men in all with 33 men on a constant duty.\textsuperscript{112} It is also possible that the number of Topasses continued to decline until fresh trouble begins in the early 1740s. By now substantial numbers of European recruits were sent out annually since the 1720s. For instance, in 1735, the Director wrote to Madras Council, referring the number of 100 European Centinels and 85 Topasses in the paymaster roll, to further disband the Topasses as they have sent 30 odd European soldiers.\textsuperscript{113} Even the languages used against the Portuguese soldiers had become quite unwelcoming. For instance, in 1742, the Madras government wrote to the Directors that they have very few Europeans in the garrison besides the large proportion of ‘Black Soldiers’ (Topasses) and they are ‘ashamed’ to turn out their guards when the ‘great men of the country come’ and that they are of ‘little to be depended on in case of action’.\textsuperscript{114} This kind of languages is not new to the English government but the intensity became more by this time probably for the sake of larger European recruits or otherwise.

The declining number of the Topass soldiers in the Madras garrison, as we have noted, was mainly due to the regular supply of European recruits. This can be seen from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Soldiers</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Source:} See footnote.\textsuperscript{115}
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The above table is extracted from the dispatches from the Directors in England to the Fort St. George government. The gaps were due to the non availability of data and not necessarily due to the absence of any dispatches of soldiers. For instance, in 1738, the Directors wrote that they have sent as many recruits they can procure every year.\textsuperscript{116} This annual supply mainly sufficed the requirements of Europeans in the Madras garrison at least for the peace time and it was because of this regular supply of new European recruits that the corresponding numbers of Topasses were reduced. However, for lack of evidence it is difficult to say precisely what proportion of the Madras Army was constituted by the Portuguese soldiers by this time.

England and Spain declared war on each other in 1739. But this doesn’t affect much on the security of Madras although its ‘country trade’ with Manila and China was greatly affected.\textsuperscript{117} However, the coming of the Marathas in the region posed great threat to Madras settlement. In early 1740, the Marathas have devastated the countryside and there was ‘no room to doubt now’ that they ‘may and will range over the whole province.’ The President immediately ordered the garrison to be upon their duty but he found that it was too weak even to all man the outposts. The guards were accordingly withdrawn from Egmore and the line of Choultries. All the guns at these posts were ‘nailed up’ to prevent any confusion among the inhabitants if carried over to the Fort. The Board also ordered that ‘as many Europeans and Topasses be entertained in the military and gunroom as can be procured.’\textsuperscript{118} As far as the gunroom crews were concerned there was two hundred guns and the number of men ‘not being above one man to two guns.’ Therefore, it was decided to entertain 200 Lascars, 100 peons and 200 Poligars.\textsuperscript{119} The English militia or trainband was embodied under Mr. William Monson and a marine detachment was sent ashore from the ships in the Madras roads.\textsuperscript{120} The wet ditch on the north and west side of the ‘Black Town’ was re-excavated.\textsuperscript{121} A number of houses lying to the northward of the Black Town within 14 foot of the walls were cleared to make
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space for the guns.\textsuperscript{122} Altogether 70 houses were removed and an estimate of 150.15 pagodas was recommended for compensation.\textsuperscript{123} An estimate number of gunroom crew that were necessary to guard the Fort was ensued at 188 persons out of which 100 will be Topasses, 35 Lascars, 1 Syrang, 2 Tindalls and the rest Europeans. Eight Topasses who were disabled or superannuated were pensioned off.\textsuperscript{124}

The garrison was already augmented this occasion from its very weak state. By September of 1740 the garrison consisted of 540 men and will remain about 480 men after draughts was made for Fort St. David and West Coast. As the establishment of only two companies was not sufficient to guard the Fort incase of any confrontation, it was agreed that ‘the superannuary men be formed into a Third Company’ under the command of Lt. Southby ‘for so long as it may be necessary to keep up a large forces.’\textsuperscript{125} The Topasses once again formed the larger proportion in the garrison.\textsuperscript{126} The Marathas again appeared by the end of 1740. Now not only the English civilians, but also the Portuguese and Armenians were called on to take up arms. More houses were cleared nearby the walls for about 200 yards to make a field for fire on the West and North sides of the Black town.\textsuperscript{127} About 400 inhabitants were evicted from the commonly called ‘Moratta Ground’. They were resettled at ‘Pereiras Gardens’ and ‘Maria Pois garden.’\textsuperscript{128} All these arrangement pleased the Directors and more recruits were sent out due to the volatile situation in the coast, say 128 in 1740 and 74 in 1741. Now the Directors also authorized the augmentation of Madras garrison to 600 men that will be divided into three companies besides the gunroom crew.\textsuperscript{129} In 1742, they again, ordered to increase the garrison to 600 Europeans in 4 companies and sent one Major Charles Knipe to command all the military in the Coast.\textsuperscript{130} The Fort St. George Council was very please with such change. At that time they have only 250 European soldiers in Madras and 160 in Fort St. David, the rest being Portuguese.\textsuperscript{131} Despite such urgency in Madras the
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Directors could not get enough recruits due to the wars in Europe. They asked the Madras government to encourage those soldiers whose contract had expired to re-enter into service ‘as one old soldier is worth two or three new raw raised men.'\textsuperscript{132} Therefore, it can be said that the number of Portuguese in Madras garrison was again substantially augmented until the wars in Europe was over. When large recruits came be sent out the Portuguese were gradually phased out and by the turn of our period their number became quite insignificant. Further account of the garrison will be taken up in the following sections.

**FRENCH ATTACK AND THE SURRENDER OF MADRAS**

The brief succor of Madras after the threats of the Marathas was soon doomed by the declaration of war between England and France in 1744 and their strong presence at Pondicherry. French declared war against England in March 1744 and the news of it reached Madras in September. The Council immediately arranged for the observation of Pondicherry and the establishment of rapid communication overland with Bengal and Bombay.\textsuperscript{133} In November, Mr. Dupleix, French governor of Pondicherry wrote to Fort St. George proposing peace in the eastern waters and demanded mutual agreement should be made between them. But Governor Morse politely replied that he was not authorized to enter into any such agreement but appreciate the intention of Mr. Dupleix.\textsuperscript{134} In England the Company immediately represented to the first Commissioner of the Admiralty the urgent need of a naval force in Eastern waters after the declaration of war. It was responded promptly and little more than a month after the declaration of war His Majesty squadron was secretly dispatched under the command of Commodore Curtis Barnett.\textsuperscript{135} This squadron first proceeded to Malacca and Sumatra where several of French merchantmen were taken as prize.\textsuperscript{136} With the squadron were two privateers *Fame* (56) and *Winchessea* (40).\textsuperscript{137}
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In October more warships were dispatched from England. With the orders of the Secret Committee, the Fort St. George Council fitted up the granary on the Islands as a naval hospital, ordered in supplies of provisions such as oxen, Hogs and 800 or 1000 bags of 'Jamboosier Wheat' from Bombay. At this time, Madras was also apprehensive over the news of the advance of Marathas with seventy thousand horses 'within four days march of the Kistna.' On the other side, they heard the news of the Spanish squadron cruising in the China Sea to intercept any English ship bound for Canton. The English squadron reached Madras on 30th August 1745.

The military situation at Madras in September 1744 was pathetic and for some months past there have been less than forty to fifty of the military on the sick Roll, which with the servants hitherto allowed the officers, reduces considerably the number of mounting men. Besides, in January of that year, 'several soldiers' also deserted to Pulicat, which the Dutch refused to deliver them back. Again, several of those Europe recruits perished on the way before reaching Madras. Therefore, Fort St. George Council were constantly urging for more and more supply of European recruits as most of the Topasses on which they mainly relied on for their strength were 'not to be depended on in time of action.' Again in February 1745 they wrote home for large recruits as Madras Garrison was 'too thin of Europeans and there is little dependence to be had on the Topasses either for defence of it or in Action in the field.' The Fort St. David and Vizagapatam also required large reinforcement. As a precautionary measures no further European draughts was made to any of their subordinate factories. Despite the urgent need for more recruits no enough reinforcement were sent out from England and the strength of Europeans in Madras Garrison remain weak.

The Company must have thought that the presence of His Majesty's squadron was enough to defend Madras and its subordinate settlements. However, in response to the
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urgent call of its servants abroad they started sending out large Europeans recruits. In
1746, while the Fort St. George Council was sending another representation for further
recruits, the Directors in London had already sent out soldiers ‘as many as are
procurable.’ Under the influences of the several letters from its servants in India who
continued to write that the Portuguese soldiers are ‘little to be depended upon, either for
the defence of the place or in action in the field’ the Directors now ordered that ‘if that is
really the case, no more of them should ever be kept in our pay than are necessary for
easing the Duty of the European soldiers.’ 147

In fact, the number of Portuguese soldiers in Madras Garrison was already very
low. For instance, the strength of Madras Garrison on 1st September 1946, the day La
Bourdonnais left Pondicherry for the attack of Madras, Portuguese consisted of only
about 25 men and Europeans constituted 200 strong ‘supposed to be good and effective,
British subjects and foreigners, Protestants and Catholicks, including commissioned
officers.’ But, it should be noted that these 25 Portuguese were not the Topasses we
usually referred to be the inhabitants of Madras. They were ‘vagabond deserters from the
military and ships of Goa, the worst men in the world for the service at that time.’ 148 As
far as the Portuguese Topasses, inhabitants of Madras, are concerned the same account
has mentioned that ‘The Topasses, of which the major part of the garrison consisted,
every one that knows Madras knows to be a black, degenerate, wretched race of the
ancient Portuguese, as proud and bigoted as their ancient, lazy, idle and vicious withal,
and for the most part as weak and feeble in body as base in mind. Not one in ten
possessed of any of the necessary requisites of a soldier.’ 149 Besides this, there was also
the Gunroomcrew, which numbered about a hundred including the lascars. The militias
and the peons had also substantiated the garrison of Madras. 150 However, in the absence
of enough European soldiers in the Fort, Madras felt an easy prey to 3,400 strong French
forces.
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Meanwhile, preparation at Pondicherry, which was really designed for an expedition to Karikal, was taken to be for the attack of Fort St. David in Madras. Therefore, Madras militia was embodied under Mr. Monson and 200 peons employed from the Poligars of nearby places. The Nawab was alarmed at the prospect of war and wrote to Madras and Pondicherry to refrain from any hostilities in his dominion and prepare for any dire consequences from him in case any of them break such warning. Morse, accordingly prevent Barnett from attacking Pondicherry, though he have every prospect of success by that time. Therefore, Barnett left for Mergui.

In January 1746, Dupleix made a demonstration against Fort St. David but retreated hastily on the timely appearance of the English squadron. Before that, as soon as he heard of the English Squadron coming to the Eastern waters, Dupleix sent for help to Mahe de la Bourdonnais, governor of the Isles of France and Bourbon. He promptly responded to the call and he himself commanded the Squadron, consisted of 3,300 men and reached the Coromandel Coast in May. In the meantime, to the great predicament of Madras government, Commodore Barnett died of fever at Fort St. David after few day illnesses. Peyton, who substitute him, later secretly deserted the Coast leaving Madras government to its faith.

The surrender of Madras
De la Bourdonnais set out for Madras on the night of 1st September, 1746, with nine ships and two bomb vessels and reached St. Thomas road on the day break of 3rd September. A detachment of 600 men was immediately landed a few miles south of St. Thome and marched along the shore. At noon when the ships were opposite Mile End House, he disembarked the rest of the troops, batteries, and stores which were encamped at Triplicane. The Fort fired on the camp but to not much effect as the shot felt short of range. At Fort St. George, the women and children were lodged in the Portuguese church

---
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of St. Andrews as it was considered the safest spot and as the women refused to leave the town.\textsuperscript{157}

The Madras Council, in the presence of all the military officers, agreed (excepting captain Eckman), to withdraw the guards from the ‘Black Town’ and the guns and bastions were also nailed. This decision was taken as the garrison, even if its full strength, was not enough to guard the ‘White Town’. The number of soldiers, as we noted earlier, by this time was 200 Europeans and larger numbers of Topasses, besides the gunroom crew of about one hundred. \textit{Mr. Cole’s Narrative} gives the numbers of Europeans in the garrison ‘which did not amount in number to 200 or 250 English and Dutch,’ and the Topasses (Black Soldiers) to the tune of 400 to 500.\textsuperscript{158} Besides, the English militia was already on constant duty since the first appearance of the French in August. Now, all the Natives ‘that were able to bear Arms, such as the Portuguese and Armenians, were also trained in the militia, and served in the White Town.’\textsuperscript{159} But they were in no way enough to fight the well-disciplined 3,200 strong French contingents.

On 4\textsuperscript{th} September the disembarkation of the French troops and stores were over. The forces numbered about 1800 of which 1000 were Europeans and the rest sepoys and Africans. 1700 sailors and marines remained onboard the fleet. De la Bourdonnais planned to attack the Fort from the West. Accordingly, he occupied the Company’s garden where battery of ten mortars was constructed under cover of the houses. The first attack on the invaders was made by the Company’s peons at Triplicane but they were promptly repulsed and dispersed into the country.\textsuperscript{160}

Shelling from the French began on the 7\textsuperscript{th} September. It was replied by the guns from the Fort. The French bombardment from the land and sea went on until the articles of capitulation were finally fixed on the morning of 10\textsuperscript{th} September with few hours of rest on the night of 8\textsuperscript{th} September. All these shelling were later received with silence at the Fort.\textsuperscript{161} Cole said that between 1100 and 1200 bombs were fired upon the ‘white town’ and ‘not above a dozen’ felt in the ‘Black Town’ and although few people died ‘the
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houses and all parts of the town have suffered greatly.'

As per the conditions of capitulation de la Bourdonnais was to occupy the Fort town first and will restore the Fort to the English after the payment for a ransom was negotiated. Accordingly, De la Dourdonnais entered the Fort on the 10th September itself. The ransom was later fixed at pagodas 1,100,000, besides many other properties of the Company which was taken by the French. This treaty was not signed until the 10th October mainly due to the action of Dupleix, who was altogether opposed to the rendition of Madras, but signed later on the insistence of de la Bourdonnais. In any case, the Treaty was later repudiated by Dupleix after de la Bourdonnais left the Coast.

During the siege and bombardment there was great confusion within the Fort and ‘Black Town’ amongst the civilians as well as in the garrison. Cole said that ‘all the Black Jentoes left the Town, and so also, on the first day of Bombarding, all the Black Soldiers [Topasses], to the number of 400 to 500, leaped or let themselves down from the walls in the night and fled.’ He also said that all the house servants of the gentlemen and ladies, and most of their slaves, also leaped the walls and fled. Hallyburton also said that ‘most of the Blacks had left us’, and the ‘Boatfellows, Cooleys and other workmen,’ were also all disappeared.

Cole also mentioned that the gunroom crew members ‘being composed of Mustees or Portuguese, they, like the Black Soldiers, all deserted upon the first day of Bombarding the Town.’ He also said that although these Portuguese men and half cast were quite fit to fight against the local armies ‘they will not face or stand the fire of an European enemy.’ But what is confusing in the account of Cole was that the emasse desertion by the Portuguese and Topass soldiers and gunroom crews was not corroborate by the account of Mr. Hallyburton, who only mentioned about the Boatmen, Cooleys and ‘some sailors and others’ but not otherwise. He was the one who negotiated with de la Bourdonnais for the capitulation as interpreter and was incharge of
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guarding the line of guns. Therefore, being an eyewitness, his account is considered to be more authentic. He would have not missed to write had there been any such enmasse desertion on the part of the Portuguese soldiers. It was rather more possible that larger proportion of the Portuguese soldiers and auxiliaries continued to stand against the French on the side of their English master till the last. This is shown by the fact that they continued to constitute the larger proportion of the Fort St. David garrison to which, according to the conditions of capitulation, the Madras garrison was taken to that place.  

But what is interesting above all was the role of women during the siege and bombardment. Mr. Cole said that the continuous shelling of French mortars from land and sea sent everyone in confusion looking for place to avoid the bombs and it 'so harassed and fatigued, the gentlemen that they were ready to die for want of sleep on the third Day.' But within this larger state of confusion was the tireless Ladies of the Fort who 'were constantly employed in sewing cloth for cartridges for the Great Guns.' They were the fellows who refused to leave the town before the bombardment began when they were asked for. In fact, it was Mrs. Morse, the wife of Governor Morse, who was behind bringing all the women folks in helping their male counterparts during the great tribulation under the rains of shelling.

Another interesting account is that although the Madras Council was agreeing with the dictates of de la Bourdonnais in surrendering Fort St. George most of the English inhabitants were not with them. Hallyburton said that when Mr. Monson showed the Articles of capitulation none of the officials and other English inhabitatants approved and 'the town was in confusion and uproar.' He also said that 'many of the soldiers and sailors, on hearing the town was to be delivered up, got drunk, and all of them, drunk were for defending it.' Thus, Madras was given up without much fight and with much more regret from its soldiers and townsmen.

Dupleix's patriotic posture and his desire for political supremacy over the English in the region had caused him to repudiate the Treaty of ransom. On 30th October 1746 Pradis, who commanded the French occupation of Madras formally declared that the said

---

treaty was void and that Madras was the property of the French East India Company for the King of France.\textsuperscript{172} Hence, the French ruled over Madras until the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle, which brings peace between England and France and restored Madras to the English Company in 1749.

However, the attack and occupation of Madras by the French set spiral waves of conflicts in the region involving both the English and French powers in conjunction with the various local powers. The defiance of the Nawab’s order for keeping peace in his dominion earned Dupleix and the French Company the enemy of the Nawab. In October 1746, the Nawab sent his troops to Madras and fights with the French took places for several days. However, the re-enforcement from Pondicherry could finally repulse the Nawab’s army who withdrew towards Fort St. David to assist the English. The defeat of the Nawab’s army brings about a strong resolution in Dupleix. He first annulled the Treaty of ransom and possessed Madras for himself. It should be noted that Dupleix had earlier promised to the Nawab to handover Madras to him if he could succeeded in conquering it. This victory over the Nawab’s army was also an important event in the life of Dupleix in that he was now convinced that he got the potential to play crucial politics in the region. This conviction set him to begin a chain of war and diplomacy in the local courts which was also responded by the English accordingly. Thus, the beginnings of the later events of war and conflicts generally known as Carnatic Wars may be infer from its nascent event in the occupation of Madras by the French in 1746.

The defeats of the Nawab’s army in Madras transferred the vortex of contestation to Cuddalore or Fort St. David. Several land attacks were made by Dupleix on Fort St. David. The first occurred on 8\textsuperscript{th} December 1746 which was repulsed with loss.\textsuperscript{173} The Nawab keeps his army, under his sons Muhfuz Khan and Mohammad Ali, in the vicinity of Fort St. David for three months, after which he made terms with the French and then withdrew. The most important attack on English at Cuddalore was made on the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} of March 1747. While the English were hard pressed by the French, the good timing of Commodore Griffin’s squadron, rescued them by repulsing the French back.\textsuperscript{174} Re-
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enforcement also comes from Bombay (370) and Tellicherry in May.\textsuperscript{175} During the temporary absence of the squadron, the French again attacked on 16\textsuperscript{th} June 1748 but were again repulsed.\textsuperscript{176} Commodore Griffin was force to remain on the Coast till the monsoon of 1747 in order to protect Fort St. David. He was later relieved by Admiral Boscawen at the end of July 1748. Boscawen took the responsibility of taking Pondicherry for the English Company. On 4\textsuperscript{th} August he began to siege Pondicherry, which went on till October only to be deterred by the retreating monsoon. In the following month news arrive the Coast that peace treaty is to be signed in 1748. This prevents any further engagement between the two rivals.

As far as the numbers of the Portuguese soldiers are concerned we have very little account in the records. We have noted the large proportion of Topass soldiers in the Madras Garrison and presumed that many of them have been transferred to Fort St. David under the terms of Capitulation. The Topass soldiers have already constituted the larger proportion of Fort St. David garrison as our earlier evidence has pointed out. Therefore, the large number of Portuguese soldiers in Fort St. David can be established. In August 1747, the Fort St. David Council wrote to the Directors that they ‘have a large number of Topasses and Peons’ but it did not mention the exact strength.\textsuperscript{177} In September 1748, the number of Topass soldiers in the Fort St. David garrison was 529 men.\textsuperscript{178} This figure was ‘to exceed much the number of Protestants’ among the four Companies.\textsuperscript{179}

As far as their roles during the ensuing war with the French were concerned they were seen to have been quite courageous and well disciplined. This can be seen from the letter of the Fort St. David Council to the Directors in reply to the Company’s order that the Catholic Church and priests were to be expelled from the town.\textsuperscript{180} They expressed their inability to carry out such stringent orders citing various difficulties it could met with. Apart from mentioning the large proportion of Portuguese soldiers who would have immediately deserted incase such policy was carried out, they also said that the military officers have assured them that the Topass soldiers ‘behaved very well during the action
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against the enemy particularly in the last action with the French in Cuddalore.' They told the Directors, that Major Lawrence, the men behind the repulsion of the French attack was an eye witness and it was his opinion to retain them in the Company’s services as he found them ‘extremely well’ in action. Besides, they also reported that they ‘have not lost one by desertion which could not have been prevented had they been so inclined.’ Further, they said that in case of their expulsion ‘the enemy at Pondicherry would have gladly received them which could have distressed us very much.’ So they excused themselves not to be censured for their inability to be carried out the orders as to do such ‘would have proved of the highest ill consequences’ at that juncture when they were ‘so much in want of men’ and while the French were nearby. Such comments are rare instance in the English records throughout our period of study. In fact the circumstances of the time vis-à-vis the indispensability of the Portuguese soldiers occasioned for such comment.

RETRIBUTION OF THE PORTUGUESE COMMUNITY

The peace Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which was concluded in October 1748, was followed by the rendition of Madras in August 1749. Several changes took place after the English resume their possession of Madras on 21st August 1749. Of these several changes the concern of this work is on the question of the Roman Catholics and Portuguese inhabitants who have previously dominated the ‘White Town’ settlement. Even after the stoppage of selling any grounds within this Fort settlement to foreigners, not the subject of England, from August, 1743, the Portuguese and other Catholics continued to remain dominant in the ‘White Town’ because they were tolerated by the English government. We have noted that the Directors have already sent out, in 1748, a stringent order not to allow any Catholic church, or any of their priests and forbid to profess that religion openly in all English settlement. The reason for such strong reprehension against the Catholics was that the English have ‘suffered greatly by the [large] number of priests and Popish inhabitants at Madras, who have acted a very treacherous part to us continually in that place, especially when it was attacked.’ Such order was issued when the Company, through the various reports, found that some of the Catholic inhabitants had acted in
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complicity with the French leading to the occupation. Accordingly, the order of the Honourable Company was later stringently executed after the rendition of Madras: All Catholics were expelled from the ‘White Town’.

In fact, one of the first questions taken up by the Commissarie of Madras after the rendition was the policy to be adopted towards the Catholic priests and others who were believed to have played a treacherous part at the time of the surrender of Madras to the French. The Commissarie, in its first report to Fort St. David Council was of the opinion that: the Catholic churches and the properties of those who live under the French protection should be confiscated. As to the rest of those Catholics who did not live under the French protection, they should be allowed to dwell in some parts of Madras outside the ‘white town’ with a small church with Portuguese priest. But Mrs. Madeiros and Coja Petrus should be allowed to be continued in the white town ‘as they have been very serviceable to the Company by lending them large sums in times of necessity’.\(^{184}\)

Some individuals were particularly suspected of complicity with the French such as the four priests of the Portuguese church, Monsieur La Metrie and Mr. Barneval. The four Priests were charged with having ‘their affection and good will to the French and their having liberty to build two large churches.’ Monsr. La Metrie was charged with residing so long amongst the French both at Madras and Pondicherry, and Mr. Barneval acted as Quartermaster of la Bourdonnais soldiers together with the behaviours of his wife. Admiral Boscawen was extremely harsh in recommending the sending of ‘all those who have been Traitors to the Company’s interests’ to Europe.\(^{185}\)

In response to such report, the Fort St. David Council resolved that the house and others ‘belonging to those who remained under the French protection shall be confiscated to the Company; that all the other Catholics who did not reside under the French occupation shall not be permitted to reside within the ‘White Town’ but they ‘shall be paid the value of their properties.’ That the Armenians should also be expelled from the ‘White Town’ and nor be further permitted to purchase any house and godowns therein. Exception to this general order was Mrs. Antonia de Madenos and Petrus Uscan but their houses should be disposed off after their death. But as far as the four priests were
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concerned the Council suggested to be expelled from the English bounds as per the Company’s direction but not necessarily to Europe. However, Admiral Boscawen continued to insist the Board for the removal of the Priests to Europe by giving his further reasons. He said that he has no personal hatred towards them, but felt that if they are send out only to the English limit the Boatmen will follow them which ‘will greatly distress them’ and that Father Severini and Rene were ‘suspected of giving the French (before the attack of Madras) intelligence of the strength and condition of the garrison, besides their continual raising money for them at Respondentia.’ But he submitted that if they are to be expelled only from the English bound they should be given the possession of Luz Church as the Boatmen were settled nearby it and that it was close to the edge of the English bounds. As to La Matrie and Barneval he desired a letter empowering him to carry to Europe.

With this letter, the Council was at last convinced that the said four Priests should also be sent to Europe. Accordingly, they authorized Boscawen to carry them to Europe. Therefore, the Council ordered Major Lawrence to seize Father Sevenini and Rene, La Matrie and Barnrivall, and confiscated the houses of those who remain under the protection of French. Barnevall and La Matrie, were arrested on 11th October but were later release on bail by Mrs. Madeiros bonds of 20,000 for their appearance in January. However, it was not clear whose houses were particularly to be confiscated and who are only to be turned out from the ‘white town.’ Major Lawrence first asked for details of this before actually carrying out the order. Accordingly, the list of houses to be confiscated, belonging to persons who lived under French protection, was sent. This include house of Mr. Francis Carvalho, two houses of De la Matrie, the house of Francis Barnevall, one house of Jeronimo D’Itas, the house of Mr. Bailleau, the house and garden of Mr. Melon and one house of Signora Estra. It also directed that the Romish Church in the White
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Town, together with its bell and candle branches should be confiscated, but the images and others to be delivered to Rev. Father Severini.\textsuperscript{192}

This order of Fort St. David Council was accordingly read and order to be executed on the 13\textsuperscript{th} November 1749, the first Council sitting in Madras after the surrender. On this day a notice was also served to all the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the ‘White Town’ to depart the place within a week with the ‘liberty to take with them all their effects.’\textsuperscript{193} The order was accordingly executed by messenger Starke and Walsh and they reported on 18\textsuperscript{th} November that they confiscated the said houses and that of the ‘two churches’, except the house of Barneval who was at Pulicat. They also reported that Father Severini and La Mattrie demand a copy of such order and that the latter declared that his houses were mortgaged to the deceased Mr. Madeiros and the Company should be accountable to him in case of seizure. They further required clarification from Major Lawrence whether that part of the order ‘directing the exclusion of the Roman Catholics from the White Town extends to the Armenians, many of whom profess themselves of that Communion.’\textsuperscript{194} The matter was sent to Fort St. David Council who directed that ‘all Armenians but Cojah Petrus to quit the White Town, permitting the sale of their houses to any European Protestant.’ The only exception was Cojah Shawmier whom they ‘apprehend the Company may have occasion for.’ As Father Severini represented to Fort St. David Council whether the confiscation of the church include the houses adjoining it. The Council ordered that this should also be included among the confiscated houses. But the Capuchin Priests should be allowed to stay till the first of December as they requested for clearing their effects.\textsuperscript{195}

In the meantime, the Priests had also requested the Fort St. David Council permission to remain in the Vepery churchyard and likewise ‘the free exercise of their religion towards those of their communion as they have hitherto allowed.’ The Council decided that ‘as the Papers found in the House of Padre Antonio de Purification at St. Thome were evident proof of ‘their having a firmer regard for our interest than that of the French’ and ‘the Boat people who are of that communion, may probably be induced to
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leave us, should we expelled our limits’ the request to remain in Madras accepted and accordingly ‘the Romish Church situated at Mile End was ordered to be delivered.’\textsuperscript{196} This order was accordingly carried out at Madras on 18 December.\textsuperscript{197}

As far as La Mettrie and Barnwall were concerned they were at last expelled from the ‘the city of Madras and its Dependencies’ permitting to take all their effects and disposed off their houses to any European Protestant as they were proved to be mortgage.\textsuperscript{198} As far as the houses of Armenians are concerned we know that they were allowed to dispose off to European Protestants. But in case of the Portuguese and other Catholics, the houses were first given it for rent until the opinion of the Honourble Company was made known to them.\textsuperscript{199} This came very late in 1755 in which the Directors authorized the Coast government to make such compensation or allowance, ‘to the owners of all or any of the houses which were confiscated’ and as ‘to the best of your judgment be just and equitable.’\textsuperscript{200} As soon as this dispatch arrived at Madras, the Council resolved to restore the houses to the owner on condition that they disposed them off at once to European Protestants residing in the Fort.\textsuperscript{201}

Having completed the work of punishing all the Roman Catholics inhabitants in the ‘White Town’ the Council wrote to the Company informing that: ‘The Houses and others of such persons as remained under the French protection since the capture of Madras, we have confiscated to your Honours use.’ They also reported that: ‘to prevent the ill effects that may be apprehended from Foreigners and Roman Catholics being again masters of such large possessions in the White Town we have established an order that none shall be disposed off to any but European Protestants.’\textsuperscript{202} This means that no new land grants and houses will be sold to any one other than the European Protestants.

But what is surprising in all this affair was that the innocent Portuguese inhabitants of the ‘White Town’ were made unnecessarily the victims of the folly of few Catholic inhabitants. As per the list of suspected individuals one can easily concurred that none of them belonged to the Portuguese by nationality. Barnevall was an Irish, La
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Mattrie, Frenchmen, and the two Priests Saverini and Renetus were French. Severini was later found to be completely loyal to the English government. He went to Pulicat after the French occupation and remains there until the rendition of Madras in 1749. The various charges made upon these individuals was also seen to be quite weak and precarious. We have already seen the charges given on them by Admiral Boscawen. Here the report of Fort St. David Council to the Directors may be added for further information. Concerning to Padre Rene they wrote that he was suspected for furnishing intelligence and information about the military set up of Fort St. George as he used to always go outside the Fort to attend the several Catholic churches there. 203 But there was no proof. The second charge was that he remains under the French protection and assumed the headship of the Catholic Church in Madras. Barnevall had been convicted for treasonable correspondence with the French during the war and acted as quartermaster of la Bourbonnais before. La Matric was his accomplishment. He subsisted before the lost of Madras with his wife bounty but accumulated huge sum from the plunder of Madras of which he sent considerable quality to Bengal. 204

Perhaps the only strong case that the Coast government could tell the Directors against those houses were confiscated was that these people remain to live in Madras under the French protection against the order of the Company. Even in this case, as per the list of those who remained there after the occupation we have just seven of them, excluding father Renetus 205 No Portuguese, except those mentioned the list, were named anywhere that they acted treacherously or remain under the French Protection. Perhaps these people must have gone to other places such as in the nearby St. Thoma or Publicat probably in compliance to the Company's order. As we noted earlier, many of them especially the families of the Company soldiers must have gone to Cuddalore and Fort St. David. Despite all this and in spite of their loyal services in the Company garrison they were not spared for the folly of few Catholics that too not belonging to the Portuguese nation. However, because of such incessant loyalty they were allowed to remain in the town although in a humiliated situation.
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The Portuguese also equally suffer in other respects. Here, the changes made in the military set up may be taken up. For instances, in 1749, the Director sent out the new regulation for the Company of Artillery which would substitute the erstwhile Gunroom Crew. Besides others, the new regulation forbid any foreigners, deserters and any Roman Catholics to be employed in the company of Artillery as well as in the laboratory or any of the military magazines. Even those people whose wife belonged to Roman Catholics should not be employed and if such marriage took place during the service in Artillery he should be dismissed.\textsuperscript{206} This means that no Portuguese would now have any access to the Artillery in which they always dominated till then. Now, the only employment they can hope for was in the military as soldiers. Fortunately, the new military regulation sent out in 1748 does not debarred the Catholics from joining it.\textsuperscript{207} However, the Portuguese gradually found difficulty in enlisting themselves in the Army due to the increasing number of European recruits being sent out from Europe.

In fact, the Directors have already instructed the Madras Council to get rid of Topass soldiers unless it was necessary. In November 1749 the Fort St. David Council wrote to the Company that after the squadron left the Coast they enlisted what they could get for the garrison but difficulty got only 56 persons and in their second attempt only eight person.\textsuperscript{208} They also informed that as Major Lawrence insisted to the continuation of the Topass soldiers in the garrison to relieve the Europeans and upon consideration of the small garrison, they were compelled to take in more Topasses to ‘deviate from your honours direction wherein,’ at the rate of 10 per dicem\textsuperscript{209} Besides, they also reported that due to the smallness of the garrison in Madras the merchants and other inhabitants were planning to seek protection elsewhere. In order to ease the apprehension of the merchants at the smallness of the garrison, they wrote, four companies with 500 men in total were formed. They urgently requested to sent more ‘men of war’ to protect their interest in the face of the French who planted their colours round about all the English settlements.\textsuperscript{210}

In the 1748 military regulation the headquarter of the Coast settlement should have 7 companies with one captain, one Lieutenant, one Ensign, four sergeant, four
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corporals, three drummers and seventy private sentinels in each company.\textsuperscript{211} Accordingly, several recruits were sent out from Europe. From the 1750s onwards, the Company resorted to recruits their required soldiers from the military markets of Europe. Therefore, many Swiss, German and others were sent out to its various settlements in the eastern seas. For instance, in 1752 alone there were 138 Swiss soldiers being sent out for Madras out of the huge European recruits of 415 men including 71 artillery soldiers.\textsuperscript{212} Again in 1753 alone 201 soldiers were sent out for Madras Garrison and another 72 Swiss and 65 other soldiers were also dispatched in 1754.\textsuperscript{213}

This increasing number of the European recruits had an adverse effect on the erstwhile pre-eminent position the Portuguese used to enjoy in Madras. First, the increasing number of European soldiers diminished the opportunity of employment for the Portuguese population in the Coast. This would have certainly ruined the Portuguese society to a great extend as most of them belonged to the poorer section of the society and rely chiefly on the employment of the Company as soldiers, auxiliaries and seamen. Secondly, by being an indispensable part of the garrison in the region they have been tolerated and in fact taken care of by the Company for their various needs. Hence, the lost of such employment would render the Portuguese for nothing in the eyes of the Company leading to the lost of all privileges they used to enjoy under the merchant government. Therefore, the occupation of Madras by the French in the 1746-49 was disastrous for the whole Catholic community of the town. This was especially so for the dying Portuguese community. This event marked the final onslaught to the declining position they used to enjoy in Madras and its subordinate settlements as the backbone of its defence and security. The occupation first dispersed the peaceful community to various places and even when they came back after the rendition they faced the more harsh treatment from their erstwhile master to whom they always tried to maintain an utmost loyalty. Their sprawling settlements within the ‘white town’ were confiscated and they were forcibly expelled from the Fort only to become again another refugee in their own home. No compensation was given immediately to rebuild their houses nor was any ground allotted to them to live. Then the erstwhile defenders and protectors of the English interests in the
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region suddenly become a ‘traitors’ because of few others follies and been punished to the extent they did not deserve. Their thriving trade and business have also come to a standstill after this event from where they could not rise up again.

CONCLUSION

In the nutshell, it can be said that from the second decades of the eighteenth century the Portuguese trade and their erstwhile eminent position they used to enjoy in the defence of Madras gradually declined and met its final assault after the occupation of Madras by the French. We have seen that in terms of trade with Manila, Macao, Pegues and with other ports of South East Asian ports evidences have suggested the declining scale of trade in general for the Portuguese inhabitants of Madras. Factors such as the coming of Armenians, local Muslims and Hindu merchants to a great extent played adversely to the role of Portuguese as dominant players in the overseas trade during the previous period. The migration of some eminent Portuguese merchants from Madras must also have contributed to the declining Portuguese shipping to the various ports of the region. But this does not mean that the trade undertaken by the Portuguese merchants comes to complete end. We have seen many more Portuguese merchant houses come into prominent position and they traded to various overseas ports especially with manila and Macao. Besides, we also learned that the sort of peddling trade undertaken by several small merchants continued to registered growth. The respondentia system, in fact, made it possible that many Portuguese of Madras who were but constant inhabitants of the town have also received some dividends from the flourishing trade of the place. As far as their role in the defence of Madras and its subordinate factories were concerned the important role of the Portuguese in the militia forces comes to an end under the comparative peaceful environment until 1740. During the attack of the French the Portuguese militias were ensued but as the Fort was surrendered virtually without a fight they were rendered useless. In the Madras Army they continued to registered dominant proportion until it was reduced into two Companies in 1724. They continued to register a minority in the garrison and were neglected until the garrison was again augmented in 1740/41 under the threat of the Marathas and later the French. Although they made a strong front against the French on several occasions during the war they were thrown out of the employment once the Company got enough European recruits from home which rendered them into
penury. Although they rendered an indispensable services in the defence of Madras and its subordinate factories in the region through out the century long services the Portuguese suddenly become a 'suspect' as they were Catholics. Accordingly, they were thrown out of their sprawling 'white town' settlements just because of the folly committed by few others and just because they were Roman Catholics in complete disservice to their important contribution. Due to such inconsiderate behaviour of the English government the Portuguese once again become refugees in their home settlement which rendered them to their ruins from where they could rise up again later. In fact the occupation of Madras by the French not only rendered the Portuguese as unnecessary victims but also gave a final exit to the dying community of Madras. In other words, the French occupation of Madras gave the English government the anxiously awaited the 'just occasion' to expelled all the Roman Catholics from the core of the English settlement and to do away with them in their services.