Chapter Nine

FORT AND TOWN
FORT AND THE TOWN

For the English East India Company defence assumed the highest priority in their relationship with Indian and other European powers in Indian subcontinent for security of their trade and settlements. The sovereignty of Bombay was of vital necessity as this entre-port held an important position in terms of security vis-à-vis native and European powers. Bombay's position throughout this period under review was a delicate one whose need for defence to combat piracy, fierce trade, conflicts of times were apparent. So the need for force and fortified settlements was required from the beginning for the security of this island. It becomes more evident from Gerald Aungier's argument: "The great force you maintain on the island for its defence and more encouragement will you give to merchants and all nations and conditions entrust their estates and families..."\(^1\)

Although the English in India evolved distinct attitudes towards the use of force and fortified settlement yet this was not a new innovation. The Portuguese had earlier set up this model, which admirably suited the purpose of both D.E.I.Co and E.E.I.Co. The only significant difference was that these two organizations were determined firstly as traders and then as the territorial rulers. Force was to play only a calculated role in their overall strategy. It was the means to an end and the end was to maximize the commercial profits.

K.N. Chaudhuri in analyzing early Anglo-Indian relationship stated that "Force was an implicit part" of European trade with Asia. The reason he gives is "that Profit from armed trading were higher than in the case of Peace full commerce."\(^2\) Further, according to Chaudhuri, force was profitable when the sale of Protection\(^3\) became an economic transaction, when redistribution enterprise could be effectively utilized by the Europeans, the possession of independent territorial basis yielded revenue through

---

\(^1\) E.FI, 1668-69, 254
\(^2\) K.N. Chaudhari, Trading world of Asia... 113-114.
\(^3\) Sale of protection was under the system of licenses or 'Cartez system' for indigenous shipping by European plying in Indian Ocean.
customs and taxes, when commercial concessions could be gained from ruling elites and when the maritime passes was working well.\textsuperscript{4}

Bruce Watson on the other hand posits that development from factory to fort was an economic necessity for the English in India. It was based upon the power of maritime traders to enforce their demands at sea. Defence and offence are regarded as the symbiosis which revealed either pacific or offensive attitudes in response to given threats, and or situations where an advantage could be gained flexibility was the defining characteristic of the relationship.\textsuperscript{5}

About the utility of force and fortification we find the conflicting views in E.E.I.Co's policy at various times. Early in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century Sir Thomas Roe opposed the fortification but on the other hand he was a committed advocate of the use of force against anybody who checked English aspiration in Indian Ocean.\textsuperscript{6} A second view came during Josiah Child's governorship, which in many ways represented a break from the previous tradition of peaceful trading. He advocated the aggressive and forward policy after 1682 'Bantam revolution'. His policy was aimed at winning a formal recognition, from the Mughal empire, of the Company's right to trade as a sovereign power as in his views by becoming a territorial power the Company would be in a position to raise revenues. This in turn would make the English a nation in India. Therefore, he stressed on the need of forts in every region in which Company settled its trade.\textsuperscript{7}

During this period, in the Company's defence strategy there were three important segments viz., Forts, Army, and Marine. Forts were an important segment, and the first great work, which Bombay had to accomplish, was to fortify herself. Therefore successive governors urged the fort to be strengthened due to its inherent weakness in its location. Its ability to withstand an external siege was limited by the lack of adequate supplies of water, though there were provisions for water storage, the nearest spring of freshwater lay outside the walls. In an emergency, water supplies had to

\textsuperscript{4} For Detail see K.N. Chaudhri op. cit., Ch. Politics of trade.
\textsuperscript{6} W. Foster, \textit{Embassy of Thomas Roe...} op. cit., p. 303-04.
\textsuperscript{7} Khan, op. cit., 201.
come from brackish wells within the fort. More disturbing was the situation of the Dongri hill, adjoining the fort and dominated it. From here the Sidi had bombarded the castle and the town.  

In the Early 18th Century, even the newly erected walls did not eliminate the possibility of another such attack. Even when outworks were constructed around the hill, the danger was not entirely eliminated as outer works were not easily defended and if they fell to an enemy could again occupy the hill and dominate the town. Finally the effectiveness of the defences was hampered by lack of adequate space on the landward side where huts, houses, coconut plantations spread around the base of the walls and prevented clear line of fire for the cannon within.

Apart from the inherent weakness of location an important theme recorded in Company’s account was the appropriation of funds for the fortification and other purposes of the island. As the cost factor was important, throughout the records we find examples of Company’s demand for greater economy in the settlements. One of the important themes, which run in factory records of this period, was “Profit not grandeur, which is our end in trading.” The point to remember here is that profit was an operative factor; grandeur was acceptable as long as it did not interfere in accumulation of profits. This case was not different for the Bombay Island, since the period of Cooke and successive governors the settlement was running short of money.

The Bombay government as noted above always felt deficit of money and supply, due to the policy made by Court of Directors and political and secret committees. Its repercussion was thus felt on marine and army of Bombay. Therefore their history becomes one of alternating requirement and reduction, depending upon the threat of the dreaded enemy attacks or on the lull between such spells. The island was very vulnerable since the fortification was inadequate but the Court of Directors was disagreeably opposed to sending money on defence. Instead they constantly complained about the expenditure, commending frugality until such time as the islands trade reflected an improvement in Income. It thus becomes imperative to deal

---

8 Hamilton, op. cit., 222-223.
9 Bombay Diaries, 4th April 1737, F.H.S.I, 70.
with each section of defence (Fort, Army, Marine) in detail to have a comprehensive and broader understanding in analyzing the importance of defence in providing security to the island and shaping its Diplomatic altitude towards its neighbours. Another aspect which will be dealt along the fort was of town planning. Since town planning was also associated with the defences of the island and for the future growth of the island which cannot be over looked.

TOWN AND FORTIFICATION UNDER CROWN: EFFORTS OF COOKE

In theory the location of Bombay was ideal for trade, its possession was critical for the Company’s goals. By the Company’s early accounts, it was “reputed to be one of the most famous havens of all Indies.”\(^{11}\) It was the only British held port in India that had docks to repair and later to build ships. Therefore from the outset the need of defence and town planning was evident and continued to be so.

The earliest account of the physical appearance of Bombay Island or its various settlements dates from 1626, when it was described as “a smalle towne or village”, containing a “great howse, which was both a warehowse, a frierry, and a forte” (presumably the manor house), and “many other good howses.”\(^{12}\)

John Fryer visited Bombay in 1670’s, found the initial British settlement situated around a large Portuguese Manor house and garden. He described its transformation into Fortress in the following terms: “…On Cookes landing in Bombay, He found the Pretty well Seated, but ill fortified house (on the Site of present arsenal); four basis guns being the whole defence of the island… loves artillery, than to make resistance against an invading foe…, and those slender fences only designed to oppose the sylvian herd, are thrown down to erect others to more warlike force. But all this not in one day…”\(^{13}\)

When Humphrey Cooke took the charge of Bombay, it was wholly unfortified and was a very insignificant place. The principal port was at Mahim, with a smaller and under developed port at Bombay Island proper near Bombay harbour. Cooke therefore

---


\(^{12}\) Khan, op. cit., 421-22.

\(^{13}\) Thomas Roe and John Fryer, op.cit, 232-233.
began to take steps to make Bombay safe against any attack. He wrote to Lord 
Arlington on 3rd March 1665, that if the English were to be the absolute masters of the 
Bay and Port, there must be a fort with 10 to 12 goods guns and 100 men to examine 
vessels going in or out of it, that mastery over Trombay was essential for great trade 
as well as security.14 He made it clear to Lord Arlington that the fortification would 
cost at least £ 5,000, but felt confident that it would definitely pay its costs and profits 
within short time.15 Since funds were low, he wrote to the Surat president, George 
Oxinden, and his Council to supply the money for fortification, but got little 
encouragement.16 Despite this Cooke built a fort round an old square house, which 
had served the Portuguese as a place of retreat.17 Thus he went on to prepare Bombay 
against possible attack.

Gervase Lucas, Governor of Bombay in 1666-67 found the fortification of the island 
in very ruinous condition. Moreover he submitted his observation to Lord Arlington 
before sailing from England and he pointed out: “it appeared that fortification on the 
island were in ruinous condition and by no means suited, either for its defence or for 
the security of the troops.”18 Nothing substantial action on the report of Lucas was 
taken on the pretext of increasing expenditure of Bombay. Only solace was that for 
fortifications a credit of 1500 could be drawn from Surat factor by a bill of exchange 
on England at 30 day’s sight at the rate of 65 per rial of eight.19

During this period we found minimal reference about the town planning on the island 
whatever information we gather is through the Court despatches of 1668-69. In 1668, the 
first dispatch of the Company contained orders for the building of a regular town. The 
houses, streets stretching from the custom house to the fort (that is the Castle) were to 
be built. This was done to encourage weavers especially from Chaul to come and 
settle at Bombay. To build these houses timer and chunam were arranged from
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14 Khan, op. cit., 479
15 EFI, 1665-67, 67-68; Cooke wrote to King that in his work of fortification he was taking help of 
native inhabitants without paying them or at most by giving them drinks. Ibid.
16 Ibid, 41-42.
17 A. Hamilton, op. cit., 183; Hamilton also criticises Cooke for choosing the particular place for 
building the fort. But it would be wrong to think on Cooke’s part in choosing site, as the place where 
still Bombay port and Castle existed still called the Fort area and continues to be economic hub in 
Bombay.
18 Bruce Annals,II, 169.
Shivaji’s ports. In order to avoid the resentment of the inhabitants in case of cutting their trees, wharfs and dry docks were deferred until the island was fortified.

The Company dispatch of 1668-69 again laid out instructions for the town. The Company advised the Bombay authorities to plan town which would be well fortified and could easily command fort and citadel. They also asked them to acquire the land suitable for the purpose and compensate the person concerned. The acquired land was to be divided into plots and to be rented to those who wish to build the house there. The letter further directed Bombay authorities to have town with proper rules and regulations with the usage of stone and brick. For this purpose Bombay government was sent the city regulations of London. However, the town planning for Bombay was taken on earnest scale during Aungier’s governorship.

FORTIFICATION UNDER COMPANY: OXINDEN AND AUNGIER

In the wake of Mughal-Shivaji struggle in 1660’s Bombay government was afraid of its repercussions on the coast and Henry Gary confessed that “All country is like to be full of trouble again” as Shivaji had escaped from Agra. Thus he also stressed the need of fortification. Meanwhile, Bombay was transferred from the Crown to the Company in March 1668, for the rent of £10 per annum and the President George Oxinden took possession of it in September 1668. Commissioners from Surat, who took over Bombay from Henry Gary, requested for the immediate defence of the island and for this a large quantity of iron work of every kind, should be sent from England; the engineers would be required to plan and direct the fortification. On 5th Jan 1669, Sir George Oxinden arrived at Bombay from Surat and announced the military regulation for the Garrison: These regulations were founded on the powers vested in the Company by their Charter for levying, embodying and entertaining the Military force for the defence of their factories or settlements. These regulations prescribed the duties of the commanding officers of the Garrison and enacted strict

20 Bruce Annals, II, 226, 244.
21 Campbell, II, 431.
22 EFI, 1668-69; 237.
24 Bombay to Surat Dated 8th December 1668, Bruce Annals, II, 242.
discipline under severe penalties, the neglect or breach of duty for inferior officers or soldiers was declared to be punishable to death, for Superior Officers, with deprivation of rank only. These regulations suited to new circumstances in which Bombay was placed. They prescribed the duties and punishment to commanding officers of the Garrison. In 1669 Aungier began the work of fortification.

In 1669-70, the Court of Directors in response of Surat presidency’s demand for engineers appointed Captain Smith and Captain Toldery. These two officers commanding the military at Bombay were to act as engineers, who were to employ under them such persons in the garrison as might be qualified, to assist in constructing and repairing the fortifications. Court of Directors was of the opinion that professional men could not be obtained in England, without large salaries and that they probably might expose the Company to heavy charges. The Company also expressed their opinion that, “They will be sufficient to perform the work in the regular manner being now more generally understood than formerly and for their help there in have sent you books of fortification”.

The work of fortification that began in 1669 progressed with great vigour under Aungier’s persuasion. He asked Deputy Governor, Henry Gary to give special attention to fortification. Accordingly on 3rd February 1670 orders were passed to reward those who had shown special ‘assiduity, care and pains’ on the work of fortifications, including John Cooper, the Company’s gunner, who had acted as overseer of the work.

In 1670, in view of the defenceless state, the paramount need was to complete the work of the fort which started in 1669. Later in the year Aungier during his visit to

25 Ibid, 243
26 Ibid., 255.
27 His name appears as one of the two gunners mates on the roll of the Bombay garrison in September-October 1668. He served as chief gunner till his death in 1694. EFI, 1670-77, fn., 3.
28 EFI, 1670-77, 3.
29 Ibid., 5. The plan on which the fortification was being extended was apparently drawn by Captain Samuel Smith (E.F.I, 1668-69,100) and was not the one prepared by Cooke in 1665. In his letter of 23rd December 1665, Cooke says “It’s all done with turrflle and cocernutt trees, 14 foot high round... wee have been about it upwards of three months”(EFI, 1665-67, p.68). Such a work would probably have been little more than a rough stockade, needing constant repair to keep in good order; and two years later Captain Gary found the old fortifications ‘irregular, scarce capable of rectifying, the wet season in Sir Gervase[ Lucas] his time prohibiting his intended endeavours therein’.(E.F.I, 1668-69,300). Gary
Bombay urged the Deputy Governor to give fort a special attention. However, its progress was hampered by the deficiency of building materials such as facing stones though some had even dug out of an old ruin — and chunam (lime), which could not be made locally during the rains. Timber also was difficult to procure. An attempt by Aungier to send a consignment from Surat was also frustrated by the Governor prohibiting its export. An effort to get some from Kalyan also failed. Eventually leave was obtained from the Portuguese Captain of Bassein ‘for the passage of 110 pieces of timber from Buinde (Bhiwandi), paying the customs of Thana. Only 88 pieces had, however, arrived by 27 August, and though the rest was ultimately obtained, the Captain seized and confiscated 20 pieces that had been purchased in excess of the licensed quantity.³⁰

There was also difficulty in getting the usual supply of firewood from the ‘Maine’. The boats that went for it were sent back empty and were told that there was ‘an absolute order forbidding it’. This hindered the manufacture of chunam until a remonstrance succeeded in removing the difficulty. However in spite of such impediments the work progressed. On 12th May Gray reports: “Wee have done more then expected, having carryed both inward and outward wall, from the Gate by the Moodyes ³¹(sic) house down towards the sea, so farr as the ground where on the bastion is to be raised, and on the other side are raising the outward wall of the platform from the north bastion to the staires...it will be as high as the bastion now is.”³²

³⁰Ibid., 6.
³¹House steward.
³²EFI, 1670-77, 7.
During this year rains unfortunately stopped the main work (as they appeared early than usual), but 200 men were employed in ‘breaking the rocks and carrying the stones near the work’ and in other preparations for its resumption. Giffard, shortly after becoming the Deputy Governor, called a General Council, which among other things, decided that special additions to the work were necessary, in case ‘any enemy should appear’. This would by no means a remote contingency. With the approval of the Surat Council, a breastwork was to be erected upon the walls to landward, and two big gates were to be set up, for the protection of the incomplete fortifications. By the middle of December 1670 the work was almost completed, and Giffard was able to say, ‘thanks be to God, wee are in soe good a position of defence that wee feare not any Indian enemy whatsoever’. At the end of the year he told the Company that three bastions and two curtains had been raised 18 out of the 25 feet required to make them ‘finished battlements’, and that about half of the two platforms to seaward had been completed.33

In 1671, Aungier appointed Colonel Herman Blake, a German, as the engineer in charge of the construction of the bastion and surveyor general at Bombay.34 In 1672, the work of completing the fort went on steadily, with the erection of bastions and curtains, and digging of a trench, on the landward side. Giffard was so satisfied on this that he successfully resisted the proposal of the Surat Council to take workmen off it for building houses for the accommodation of Company’s servants and new settlers.35 Even the bricklayers were sent down to begin the houses, were put on the work of fortification. Giffard also got the other pending project postponed till Aungier’s arrival. On 1 May 1672, he reported that the north-east bastion and the front curtain were completed, except for the former’s battlements, and the remainder of the curtain-work would be finished that month.36

33 Ibid.
34 Bruce Annals, II, 294-295.
35 There was a great want of such accommodations, and the hospital appeared to have been temporarily delivered for housing Company’s servants. EFI, 1670-77, fn., 40.
36 On the other hand Captain Shaxton considered that the fort had been so badly designed that it would take two years to complete it properly. EFI, 1670-77, fn. P.40.
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Before Aungier’s arrival in June 1672 at Bombay, fortification that was originally
designed by Captain Smith was too narrow a scale for the defence of the island.\textsuperscript{37} In
December 1672, there was the news of arrival of Dutch fleet being on its way to
attack Bombay, it was resolved to start work immediately on an outwork to the fort
designed to enclose the tank of fresh water that lay about 200 yards outside it. For this
purpose 1,000 toddy trees were to be cut down and their owners to be compensated.
Orders were also passed for laying in a stock of provisions and for the constant
exercising of the Militia. They and all other available people were to be ready to assist
in erecting the outwork, and work on the new frigate was temporarily stopped.\textsuperscript{38}
Though John Shaxton estimated that the completion for fort would take two more
years, Aungier was able to accomplish the task in six months.\textsuperscript{39} This is evident from
the way Dutch invasion under Ricolffe Van-Goen was beaten off in February 1673.\textsuperscript{40}

In 1673, the work of fortification was on good progress despite the Company’s
warning to their factors in Bombay not to be extravagant on the work. During this
year three of the forts four bastions, as well as two seaward curtains, or platforms,
were completed and furnished with fifty pieces of ordnance.\textsuperscript{41} In December 1673 the
extent and magnitude can be judged from the information that already one hundred
pieces of cannon were mounted.\textsuperscript{42} To meet the expenditure of fortification an
additional duty of 1\% on imports and exports was levied.\textsuperscript{43}

In 1674 the work of completing the fort proceeded during the first part of the year,
and by the end of May the north-east bastion towards the sea had been finished and
provided with a stone platform for guns and a large rain water tank. In March and July
the Council sanctioned Aungier’s proposals for improving accommodation inside the

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, 319.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 54. Aungier afterwards reported that the country people on the island worked cheerfully on this
outwork, realising that it designed for the common good, and that he, his Council, the commissioned
officers, and the soldiers set them a good example by working at it with their own hands. EFI, 1670-77,
fn., 54. The prompt preparations were made for the expected attack but Aungier pointed out to the
Company that the garrison lacked enough English soldiers for the proper defence of the island. Spies
were also employed down the coast to give speedy information of any approaching fleet. Ibid., 55.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 61-63.
\textsuperscript{40} Hamilton, op. cit., 186.
\textsuperscript{41} EFI, 1670-77, 72.
\textsuperscript{42} Bruce Annals, II, 343.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 376-377.
fort, but afterwards the proposal was laid aside for want of money.\textsuperscript{44} Aungier however proceeded with the defence work, despite directives by the London directors to cut expenditures.\textsuperscript{45} During this year Aungier also advised the Company: “To enclose the town from Dungree to Medam point for securing the people from the insults of their troublesome beggarly neighbours on the continent; but his proposal were rejected and necessary piece of work was reserved for Mr. Boone also……”\textsuperscript{46}

In 1675, a new and safer landing place for the fort was built of rough stone, sea-mud, and sand, thus saving the expense of \textit{chunam} and bricklayers, but the Surat Council questioned its solidity. Inhabitants were encouraged to build, and stone or brick houses, with tiled roofs, were now purchasable within the town limits.\textsuperscript{47}

In 1675 Giffard showed the keenness to complete the fort by preparing to start work on its fourth bastion. But the fourth bastion went so far into sea that work on its foundations could only proceed at new moon spring tides, and then for not above two or three hours a day during four or five days, as several spring tides did not so much as leave the ground dry. The work also had to stop during rains. For most of the year little more was done than to collect \textit{chunam} and stones for getting on to high water mark. However, the third bastion was paved with stones in March.\textsuperscript{48}

In 1676 the fort was still incomplete as there were difficulties about it. The first was that the foundations had laid in sea, so that work on it carried out at low water. Then labourers were not coming to Bombay as they did formerly, and all the available workmen had to be employed on it. Thirdly there was lack of \textit{chunam} (lime) at Bombay. However only little progress appears to have been made, and the foundations had not reached high water mark over a year later.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{44} EFI, 1670-77, 102.
\textsuperscript{45} In 1676, Bombay was again urged to reduce expenditure as the Company would not approve expenditure on 40 men in peace time same request was again made in 1677 to Bombay Government; F.H.S.I, 97.
\textsuperscript{46} A. Hamilton op. cit., 186.
\textsuperscript{47} EFI, 1670-77, 128-29.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 156-57.
\textsuperscript{49} EFI, 1670-77, 141.
By the end of the year in 1676 the work of fortification had been established to
perfecting the sea bastion and horn works\textsuperscript{50}, this occupied the attention of Colonel
Blake, but his sudden death and difficulty of finding a qualified person to succeed him
had checked this undertaking.\textsuperscript{51} In 1677 John Child took the charge as the engineer;
however 1% duty to meet heavy fortification continued to be levied.\textsuperscript{52} Bombay
Council while reporting about the fort in October 1677 wrote to Surat that they are
putting the Bombay fort in best posture of defence possible in case of any accident,
fitting all guns with shot and partridges, ready filling their grenades and making 200
or 300 powder shots and stink pots and getting all other necessaries in readiness that
they may not be taken unprovided.\textsuperscript{53} Unfortunately after Aungier’s, London stopped
further expenditure for fortification.\textsuperscript{54}

Other buildings were, encouraged by the receipt of the Company’s approval of
Aungier’s proposal that its factors and other servants might receive payment of their
full salaries in India for five years, to the extent of the money expanded by them in
building houses or warehouses at Bombay, instead of receiving only one third of them
in India, as was the ordinary rule. Aungier not only gave orders for \textit{chunam} wanted

\textsuperscript{50}Horn work, a single fronted outwork, the head of which consists of two demi-bastions connected by a
curtain and joined to the main body of the work by two parallel wings. Burnell, op.cit, fn.6, 16-17;
Aungier in his report to Bombay gives a detailed description of two horn works which would defend
the two bays on each side of the fort: “for quicker dispatch and to save charge they are only made of
earth to be covered with turf, which rain in time will settle and render as strong against any battery as
the wall of the forte itself.” Burnell, op.cit, fn.5, 16-17; Fryer twice referred to them. He thought them
“of greater undertaking and expence than ever to endure accomplishment by the Company.”, Fryer,
op.cit, I, 171; whether that remark referred to the mud and turf horn makers or to the later and stouter
works was not apparent. But the turf works were not a success and led a quarrel between Aungier and
Saxton, “the first ground of this quarrel being upon unnecessary appendices to the Fort, as palisades’
(fortification consisting of a strong fence made of stakes driven into the ground) in mud, so contrived,
that they were rather a means to take than defend it, which afterwards all washed away by the rains”,
Fryer, I, 304; It is possible that part of the horn work mentioned by Burnell (probably ‘hornworm
without’ the fortress which Sir Nicholas Waite ordered to be completed in 1704) was discovered in
1927 when the new foundations of the new G.I.P. railway long- distance terminus were being dug. A
wall of 6 ft. thick wide 140 ft. long was discovered 4 ft. below the surface, and leading to it tunnel 6 ft.
wide and 8 ft. high was traced for a length of 24 ft. A teak door at the end of the tunnel was removed
in excellent condition. Burnell, op.cit, fn.6, 16-17.

\textsuperscript{51}Presidency of Surat to Court, 22 January, 23 January 1677, Bruce Annals, II, 400; In 1676 Bombay
was apprehensive of Portuguese attack. To counter this Bombay was told to build the breastwork of
toddy trees. Also, John Petit took an armed force to Mahim composed partly of Militia of Bombay

\textsuperscript{52} In 1676 customs and revenues was raised to 2 \(\frac{1}{2}\) % besides 1% was devoted to outwork of fort.
G.B.C.I., II, Fn.3, 437.

\textsuperscript{53} F.H.S., I, 139.

\textsuperscript{54} Bruce Annals, II, 400.
for bastion to be sent to Bombay, but also ordered a large quantity of bricks, tiles, timber, and *chunam* to be sent on his own account for building houses in the town.\(^{55}\)

**FORTIFICATION AFTER AUNGIER**

In 1678, the fortification remained with no improvement due to a financial crunch.\(^{56}\) In 1679 the episode of Khanderi and Underi islands took place. This incident had severe repercussions on economic life of Bombay. Apart from affecting trade, it created a sense of fear and insecurity in the inhabitants. The unhappy part of the episode was the heavy expenditure incurred on account of war. The expenditure was so great that there was no money to pay the soldiers. According to Child the excess cost amounted to Xs. 500 a month. Thus for a sake of economy, the Surat Council decided to suspend the work of fortification that started in 1675.\(^{57}\)

In the year 1683, in spite of the provision of arms and ammunition the fort was not completed. In a letter to Bombay the Court wrote in August 1683 “we would have you with all manner of thrift and good husbandry finish that bastion and trench which are not yet completed. We shall recommend it to our President and Council at Surat to order such ship(s) of ours that have been or shall be freighted to stay sometime in the country to ride in Bombay road when they shall find in exigency of our affairs and your security to require it.”\(^{58}\) Subsequently in their letter to Surat in April 1684 the Court added that care must be taken concerning the workmen employed in building or repairing the bastion.\(^{59}\)

In this decade the Western Coast became the theater of coastal politics among various players including both regional and European powers. The situation was further aggravated with the coming of Mughal’s in Deccan. In 1684 in view of these conditions the Company urged Surat to improve the defences of Bombay and proposed to allow half of shipping to load from Bombay instead of Surat and Swally.

---

\(^{55}\) EFI, 1670-77, 141.

\(^{56}\) Bruce Annals, II, 423; only two gunners, four matrosses were allowed for batteries.

\(^{57}\) EFI, 1678-84, 56.

\(^{58}\) Campbell, II, 271.

\(^{59}\) Ibid.
For this reason they were also asked to hasten building the necessary bastion and make other improvements and to send any of the guns not in use to Bombay.\textsuperscript{60}

In 1684, Keigwin's rebellion took place, but still in 1685-86 the Bombay fortification required repairs and the garrison needed a supply of recruits to render it efficient that the island might become a centre of trade. But unfortunately all improvement measures were taken on paper than in practice.\textsuperscript{61}

In 1686, Mahim house was converted in to a fort, and Lieutenant Barbor was appointed to command the garrison there.\textsuperscript{62} To counter such situation, in 1686 several surveys of the island was conducted and it was reported: "Principally the want of building some forts and outworks that must be effected before we can give any repulse to any enemy landing upon us, and will cost at least Xs 60,000 the principal Bastion and curtain being unfinished, the remainder of the fort so much out of repair and additions to be made proper there unto besides these of Mahim and other outworks required in case of invasion."\textsuperscript{63}

In 1687, Bombay became the main seat of Company in place of Surat on West Coast.\textsuperscript{64} But unfortunately for Bombay, it again passed into a bad phase in 1689-90 i.e. the phase of Mughal Sidi aligned war on Bombay. This proved once more that British did not always even control the harbour and town was certainly not impregnable.\textsuperscript{65} In 1694, Surat Council and President, after Sidi's had vacated Bombay, wrote that it was ruinous and neglected state of fortification that had encouraged the Sidi' to invade Bombay.\textsuperscript{66} Such was the defenceless condition of Bombay that its complete conquest was prevented more by the jealousy and fear of Mukhtiyar Khan of the Sidi power than because of the power of the garrison to defend

\textsuperscript{60} David M.D., op. cit., 267.
\textsuperscript{61} Bruce Annals, II, 564.
\textsuperscript{62} F.H.S, I, 145-46.
\textsuperscript{63} Bombay letters, dated 29 December 1686, Ibid., 148.
\textsuperscript{64} Bruce Annals, II, 585-586, 612, 615, 616.
\textsuperscript{65} In 1689 Sidi occupied the island and bombarded town from adjacent Dongri Hill left 'Marks of ruin and destruction so deeply engraven' as to remembered well in to the following country; Hamilton, op. cit., 222-223.
\textsuperscript{66} Bruce Annals, II, 639-641.
To prevent such a situation once again, George’s Weldeon, Deputy Governor pointed out the need of fortification and for a wall around Bombay castle, which could be built at no great cost. As the inhabitants might be made to pay for it and it would bring in ground rents that might revive the cost in seven years.68

**TOWN AND ITS BUILDINGS (1670-1710)**

Aungier took several steps for town planning in spite of the snail’s pace of fortification on the island owing to many difficulties such as shortage of funds, rainfall, war and difficulty in procuring timber and chunam. The nucleus of town was still Old Portuguese Manor House which had been converted into a Castle, surrounded by a moat connected to the sea.

The Castle was described by Aungier as follows: “The Castle of Bombay lies upon a neck of land between two bays; a quadrangular Fort whereof three points command the port and the two small bays, the fourth with the two others commands the town and the plain before the castle. It is of small circumference and irregularly built, owing to the ignorance of the engineers...Three bastions are finished, mounted with 50 pieces of ordnance; the seaward bastion is incomplete. The powder rooms inside will contain two thousand barrels of powder. In the middle of the fort is the Governor’s house built formerly by the Portugals...But since it came into the Company’s hands it hath been much repaired...Under the walls are raised lodgings for the soldiers with the corps on guard.”69

In this period the town was not built on a regular plan. And little is known about the plan of the town or the architecture of the houses of this period. Some of the institutions, however, like the courts of law and meeting houses, were typically European were located in the bazaar.70 Another British architectural feature of the town was the protestant church, planned in the late 1670’s, but completed as late as 1718.

---

67 Campbell, I, 103; Ovington also criticises John Child due to his neglect on the part of fortification i.e. “his neglect of fortifying the island till the Sidi was upon it the Company had frequently required from it”; Ovington, op. cit., 93-94.
68 Ibid., 103-104.
69 G.B.C.I., II, 67-68.
70 Campbell, III, 3.
According to Fryer in town there lived various communities i.e., English, Portuguese, Hindus, Muslims and Koli Christians. The town was full mile in length, with Houses thatched with oleas of the coconut tree and was low in height. Fryer in his account also suggested residential segregation in the town when he said “…town in which confusedly live the English, Portugueze, Topazes, Gentues, Moors, Cooly Christians, most Fishermen.” The town was surrounded by green fields in a semicircle, which were later to become the Esplanade, and in the southernmost part of this area lay the British cemetery called Mendham’s Point.

Bombay during this period did not have many buildings and rooms to accommodate its servants. Aungier decided to build convenient house or two between the custom house and the fort similar to the size of custom house. The houses were to be fair and large and were to be completed soon by drawing workers from fort. Bricklayers and Mistri to make the lime were also sent from Surat to complete the aforesaid houses.

By 1672 few buildings were built to accommodate the servants of the company. This was evident from Surat Council letter that to construct no more buildings for the servants since present buildings were sufficient enough to accommodate them, but asked them to built two large stone ware houses behind the custom house or at the same place near it. The said buildings were to be large enough to receive three to four ships. The other buildings of concern to Bombay were judicature, mint and hospital.

---

71 Fryer, op.cit, 66-67.
72 Ibid. Also see Burnell, op.cit, 27.
73 Ibid., 66.
74 Ibid., 67.
75 F.H.S., I.57.
76 Ibid., 59. The name of these bricklayers were Kalyan at Rs.10 a month, Mahmud, Somji, and Dhanji at Rs.9, and Lahori at Rs.4/1/2. Campbell, II, 432.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid., I. 64. Fryer in 1674 talked about buildings on the island like Custom-house and Warehouses. Ibid., 67.
79 For the details of these buildings refer the chapters of judiciary, health and trade respectively.
In 1676, the Directors ordered that uncultivated land was to be lent out on rent, after being surveyed. Since the Directors were not keen to invest Xs. 600, Aungier sought the permission to buy the land along the waterside himself, on the lease of 61 years, to build houses, along with street which could then be rented.\textsuperscript{80}

In 1680, the Court of Directors decided to provide equal funding to the buildings belonging to both civil and military establishments. For this purpose they asked the Bombay government to value all the houses with proportionate tax imposed on each, to survey the uncultivated land, houses let out on rent and the marshy grounds drained and rendered fit for agriculture.\textsuperscript{81}

By 1684 Bombay had warehouse, hospital, large house called East India house, and great stables. The letters of the period however finds no revenue generation from them. On the contrary it was found to be used by the Sidi during their stay at Bombay in the rainy season which had cost a lot to the Bombay exchequer. The Court thus advised the Bombay government to make better use of these buildings so that they can earn revenues for the island.\textsuperscript{82} In 1689 we further find that During the Sidi war (1687-90) the Sidi Yakub Khan made use of these buildings to put their guns and ammunitions.\textsuperscript{83} For this Surat President was asked to visit Bombay and organize the state of affairs of the town.

The buildings of the island were requiring great repairs in 1686. This is evident from the Bombay letters of the period that stated "...Houses in this island, which are very much out of repair. Some of them are dropt down to the ground, others will cost more to make them tenantable than the houses and ground-rent is worth but many of them that are in town, when occasion shall serve, will make good warehouse and godowns. The new Deputy Governor, Sir John Wyborne, has made the house in the fort much more commodious than ever it was, having fitted up a very convenient chapel out of two rooms situated in the middle of the house, where there is room enough for four times the number of people that we have on this island."\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{80} F.H.S., I. 98.
\textsuperscript{81} Bruce, Annals, II.436.
\textsuperscript{82} Campbell, II, 435.
\textsuperscript{83} Hamilton, op.cit, 226.
\textsuperscript{84} F H.S., I.149.
The situation however did not change in coming years as reflected in the letter of Court of Directors in 1709 which clearly stated that the houses of factors, soldiers and writers were too old and damaged and situation was more worse in rainy season that 'people cannot keep dry within doors whereby they get distempers'.

FORTIFICATION AND TOWN PLANNING IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Towards the close of the 17th century the necessity of erecting a strong fort at Mahim occupied the attention of Government. But, in consequence of the troubles at Surat, Sir John Gayer had to leave Bombay for Surat. As a result the Deputy Governor Mr. J. Burnistons and Council at Bombay forwarded the Mahim fort scheme to Surat. In November 1701, Bombay was further threatened by an invasion of Sidi’s and Marathas. It was against this threat, the Deputy Governor, Burniston was ordered to complete the Mahim fort. Burniston was obliged to enlist an additional number of Topasses to strengthen the garrison and requisition men from the Company’s ship to man the little fleet to protect the island. Lieutenant Shaw who was in command of the Mahim fort was ordered to complete the work with speed. Mr. Van Duren and a master bricklayer were sent to dig the foundation. Mr. Boone was sent with Xs.200 to defray the charges. Lieutenant Shaw was also told to send the Hindu and other soldiers from Worli and other places under his command to bring stones for the work of Mahim fort.

85 Campbell, III, 435.
86 Campbell, II, 273.
87 Bombay to Surat 26/28-3-1701. In March 1701, Sidi’s laid siege to the fort of Kolaba, but was forced to retreat with great loss. He accused English of helping the Marathas with Ammunition. The savages of the Marathas on land, their piracies on sea and the attitude of Sidi so alarmed the Bombay that a strict guard was kept to prevent an invasion of the island by either of them. Campbell, I, 133-134.
88 Bombay to Lieutenant Shaw 25/26-11-1701, F.H.S.I., 167-168; In Nov. 1701, a large Maratha fleet appeared near Bombay, orders were at once issued to patrol the coast and the militia was kept in readiness to resist any landing of the enemy; But the Marathas did not disturb the island. Campbell, I, 135.
89 Anderson, The English in Western India., 352-354. On the 2nd August 1701 the Bombay Government issued the following order to Lieutenant Shaw at Mahim: “By the bearer hereof Mr. Charles Boone we send you Xeraphin 200 (about Rs. 145) to defray charges on account of the designed new fort. You must keep an exact account how, when, and to whom you dispose thereof. You must also send for half the Gentus and other soldiers (Europeans and Topassese excepted) from Warli and other places under your direction to bring stones and other materials for the use of the said designed fort. On Monday next we design to send you from hence half of our Gentus and other soldiers from Mazagoan for the same intent; and also two stone cutters. The two boats you are to keep constantly employed. Notwithstanding the lascars are down here, we suppose some of the fore mentioned soldiers can carry the stones from Darvye (Dharavi) to Mahim and back again as well as lascars.”, Campbell, II, 273.
90 Campbell, II, 273-74.
The fortifications at Mahim, begun about the close of 1700, continued in progress during the next two years. Besides at Mahim, about the middle of the same year 1702, Government ordered a small fort to be erected at Sion and the breach caused in the Worli Fort by the early heavy monsoon to be built up.\(^{92}\)

In 1702 the Company sanctioned Xs. 3000 for the Mahim fort but the lost incurred on this fort was Xs. 3397. The Company was surprised as not more than one sixth of the work was done. Moreover, the Bombay Council was apprehensive of Portuguese and Moors attack and of sea waves and floods, which would wash away the entire work done till date.\(^{93}\) In 1704, when local security was threatened, London permitted Bombay to spend on fortification. Finally walls were thrown up around the town. By the end of century, we see Bombay’s fortification went on by fits and starts.

By the end of century, Manor House had been considerably altered, now strongly fortified; it was the residence of General or Governor and other members of his factory. Outside the ‘Castle’, there was a township containing barracks for soldiers, a warehouse by the shore of the Company’s goods and an unfinished church, forming the hub of a distinctive European quarter.\(^{94}\)

To know about the township in early 18th century, John Burnell, a British visitor, gave us good information. He noted in 1710 “...Two district limits, the English and (the) black. The English town lieth to the Southward of the fort on a large spacious green, mostly struggling. It consists not of many buildings and those but one story (sic)...The Black town is divided in to several streets and lieth on the north side of the fort. The houses are mostly cajand (thatched) and the buzar indifferent large and well supplied. In it is a house of the clerk of the Market to sit; to deliver out his chops (seal or stamp) sand hath the gallows behind it...”\(^{95}\)

Burnell also refers that the Bombay Castle in 18th century is a square of four bastions, whereof one had two batteries of cannon. They are not equally proportioned, those

\(^{92}\) Ibid., 274.
\(^{93}\) Consultation in Surat, 12 June 1702, F.H.S.I, 241.
\(^{94}\) Burnell J., op. cit., 20-22.
\(^{95}\) Ibid, 20-27.
towards land, termed the tank and plumtree bastion96 being larger than those towards
the sea. It is founded on the point of rocks so close to the water that sea constantly
washes the walls of one half of the Castle quite from the flag staff to the tank
bastion.97 The house wherein the general and the all factory reside stood upon the
ground before the Castle was erected, being a large Portuguese fabric and belonged to
the family of Sozes,98 but now it has been sufficiently altered by its inhabitants.99

Its ramparts are large and regular, having a broad teraplain100 mounted with a hundred
and twelve pieces of cannon. It has two large tanks that contain twenty months water
for a thousand men, and likewise a strong magazine, casens101 for the small arms and
lodgment for the soldiers102, of which one of the Companies is constantly upon
guard.

Since the Castle was built, they designed to dig a ditch103 on those two sides that were
towards the land, which they began and flung up the ground, leaving a torn land still
visible about the plumtree bastion, which being a prodigious mass of earth and stone,
finding itself weakened as they flung up the earth out of the ditch, cracked in three
places and sunk several foot. This accident and the impenetrable rocks made them
leave that design and fall to work for the securing of the aforesaid bastion. They flung

96 The bastion of this name is often mentioned in the account of invasion of Bombay by the Sidi, but the
name seems to have been changed later. It is possibly identical with the flower tree or grab bastion on
the west side of castle. Burnell, op.cit, fn.1, 15.
97 The repair of the "terrass upon the house and curtains adjoining to the flag bastion" was one of the
recommendations of the Sir Nicholas Waite when he assumed office in November 1704. In the letter of
25 March 1708, the Bombay Council informed the Court that 'a Flagg of the Castle' was to be made.
Burnell, op.cit, fn.2, 15.
98 Details see Burnell, op.cit, fn.3, 15-16.
99 Ibid., 15.
100 Teraplain a variant terrplein, strictly, the level place on which the guns are mounted between the
banquett and the inner tauls, Burnell, op.cit, fn.1, 16.
101 Casens, i.e, caserns, small (temporary) buildings between the ramparts and houses of a fortified
town for the accommodation of troops. Ibid. fn.2, 16.
102 The erection of the barracks for the soldiers had been recommended by Sir Nicholas Waite in 1704,
and in their letter to the Company of 31st January 1709/10 the Bombay Council reported that there was
then accommodation for 1,000 soldiers. Ibid., fn.3, 16.
103 Augier in his report on Bombay comments on the errors made by the first builders of the Fort in
leaving the tank outside the wall and in not sinking a ditch or moat from which they could have
obtained stone and earth from a far greater distance at vast expense of money and time. Ibid., fn.4, 16
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out a large angular covered way with banquets\textsuperscript{104} by the islanders called a horn work and likewise there is a good counterscarp.\textsuperscript{105}

Close by the sea and even with the Flagstaff Bastion is another battery, but the most to be noted is the curtain between the flagstaff and double bastion, which lay so low and is well mounted with cannon that no shipping in the bay durst without a fire, and is a sure defence for all the vessels who put themselves under its protection. It has but one port [i.e. gate] (though formerly it had two), being in the center of the front towards the land. It is large and spacious, well lined with soldiers who stand with their arms ordered at the (bank) of any gentlemanlike person who comes armed into fort. To conclude in a word 'it is pretty, neat, regular fortification, well governed, well gunned, well manned and well disciplined; the strongest hold our nation are masters of in India, witness the still durable marks of the enemies cannon legible in its wall, the actions of: 8 8/9 [1688-89] of which as followed'. \textsuperscript{106}

In 1716, walls were added which enclosed both Indian and European areas. This enclosed area came to be known as 'Fort' while the original and better-defended section, with the harbour ward aspect, retained the name of 'castle'. Together Fort and Castle constituted the Bombay town. Its wall demarcated clearly the divisions between the town and countryside, the hinterland of the remainder of Bombay Island with their fields, forests and villages.

For the building of Town-wall, which was completed in 1716, the Court in 1710 allowed a special tax to be levied.\textsuperscript{107} It was hoped that the proceeds of the special town-wall tax together with contributions from the people would in a few years reimburse the Company for the great cost of the town wall. On this subject the Court wrote on the 21\textsuperscript{st} February 1717 "We take notice that you have the inhabitants' assurance of raising fifty thousand Xeraphins toward the charge of the town wall. We also find that the merchants have taxed themselves to pay an additional duty of two percent on all goods imported in boats or vessels, three-mast ships excepted. The

\textsuperscript{104} Banquet, banquette, a raised way running along the inside of a rampart or parapet, on which soldiers stand to fire at enemy, Burnell, op.cit, fn.5, 16.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 16-17
\textsuperscript{106} Burnell, op.cit, 17.
\textsuperscript{107} Campbell, II, 277
land-men will pay a tax sufficient to complete one bastion to be raised in a term of years. That these contributions will in about fourteen years reimburse or charge and the buildings will want no repairs in many years. We recite these things to keep them in you and our own minds that we may yearly hear from you what is received thereupon towards this additional great charge. 108

During the following seven years (1717-1724) the expense of raising and repairing fortifications continued increasing till in the opinion of the Court it had swelled into an enormous sum. In consequence of this in 1724 the local authorities were forbidden to start such works without the Court's previous sanction. 109 This becomes more evident from the Court letter of March 1724 in which the Bombay Council was advised not to begun any building without their permission, proper survey of estimates and not to bend the general charges together. They were also asked to keep separate the accounts of each repair and of each work done. The Court further directed that if the work of any new building begun without their permission, they expect the President and Council to reimburse and repay into cash whatever is expended thereon. 110

In April 1737 the President acquaints the Board about the defenses of the island which was in the precarious condition. He along with the Board was of the opinion of cutting down the coconut trees which lie along the town wall. It was because of these trees it was easy for the enemy to lodge and with little difficulty secure themselves in such a manner as not to be wounded by the guns from the town wall. Therefore the President along the Board decided to cut down all trees within point-blank shot that is within 120 yards of the wall and thinning them for such farther distance as shall be found necessary. A survey thus made by the fazandars and the landholders and elders showed that about 3200 trees might be cut down. This, for the reasons before mentioned, it was agreed without delay to cut the trees. 111

In another consultation again the President acquaints the Board about the faulty ramparts and the problem arising because of coconut trees along the town wall that

108 Ibid.
109 Ibid.
110 Ibid, 27.
111 F.H.S. II, 70.
might be the cause of trouble to the island in case of the possible attack on the island. He told the Board that the parapets round the town wall were not more than 16 or 17 inches thick, and can easily be penetrated, especially on the more exposed part facing the hill of Dongri. He therefore proposed to remedy these inconveniences by driving coconut trees into the ground at a suitable distance within the wall, and filling the space with earth. The Board unanimously agreed to it.\textsuperscript{112}

The state of defence of the island was also weak in several areas where there were fords for instance from Salsette lying between Sion and Siwri. For the protection of this ford a cost of about Rs. 2000 had been proposed to raise a small fortification capable of being defended by 12 or 15 men. There were also several fordable places in the river between this island and Salsette which were not commanded by any fortifications or batteries. Further their deep draught prevents any of the island vessels being brought near enough to those passes to defend them. The safety of island thus greatly depended upon preventing an enemy's landing. For it they once landed it becomes difficult to remove them as our neighbours. The President brought these things to the Board which unanimously agreed to work for the safety of the island.\textsuperscript{113}

The Consultation of 1st September 1737 further notices that a great part of the mortarless peir runs out towards the sea from the old custom house bastion of the town wall being tumbled. The President acquaints the Board that he had asked for the estimates of the expenses of repairing it. But the engineer had represented to him that as the town wall on the north side of the fort was entirely open and not well commanded, a number of hostile boats might land there, and the enemy at once be in the town. Such an evil result might cost little greater than the repair of the custom house peir. He prevented this by raising a breast work and two small bastions from the custom house bastion to the fort along the said bay. It is accordingly resolved that the breast work and bastions be set about with all convenient expedition.\textsuperscript{114}

The same Consultation further notices that there is also a pass opposite to Dharavi between Sion and Mahim where at low water, the depth is not more than one foot.

\textsuperscript{112} Campbell, II, 279.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid, 280.
\textsuperscript{114} P.D.D. 10 of 1736-37,362-63.
There is indeed a breast work over against the said pass but did not have sufficient security as even a small number of the enemy from here could easily drive their men from this breast work and there is nothing behind them for their security. Therefore it is esteemed necessary to raise a small square work of stone there for the security.\(^{115}\)

In 1739 it was found that the great opening at the Breach was defenceless and required a fortification. But the outposts were found sufficiently manned. President thus appointed a committee under Charles Rigby to look after this and to acquaint the Board with the state of such out-posts and part of the island. Mr. Rigby reported accordingly that the several posts appear to him sufficiently manned, but that some of the canon were either of unfit sizes or might be better mounted. He further reported that the great opening at the Breach was at present defenceless and found the outposts sufficiently manned but suggested some fortification for the safety of that part of the island to be considered as soon as possible.\(^{116}\)

The questions of raising a fort at the Breach and of fortifying Dongri were also considered. Dongri was considered because of the defenceless condition from which the Castle had been so much troubled in the Sidi war (1689-90), and was still liable to troubled. Thus it appeared essential for the safety of the town and castle that the Dongri post should be put into a state of defence and a redoubt be raised at the Breach to defend that opening.\(^{117}\)

A survey made in April 1739, showed the necessity of a ditch round the town wall. In May 1739 the President laid before the Board the necessity of making some immediate provision for fortifying and further securing the town wall, which on a survey appears to be in a most defenceless condition. For this purpose a ditch round the town wall is immediately required.\(^{118}\) In regard to the expenses of the ditch it’s proposed that stated measure of ground be opened in a fitting place to the calculated depth and breadth, and a report of its charge be made to estimate the whole by a

\(^{115}\) Ibid.
\(^{116}\) P.D.D. No. 12 A/1739, 204-05.
\(^{117}\) Ibid., 214.
\(^{118}\) Ibid., 262-63.
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mean. The Board agreeing thereto resolved that considering the danger of further
delay, no time be lost in testing the cost of the proposed ditch.\textsuperscript{119}

The President next month again remarked to the Board that in present situation it’s not
advisable to delay the construction of a ditch round the wall. He further acquainted
the Board that the principal merchants have agreed to contribute the sum of thirty
thousand rupees towards the expense of this work. The President appreciating the
effort of the merchants further told the Board that this in fact is a good contribution
seeing the low level of trade largely because of the wars going in the neighbourhood
between the Marathas and Portuguese. He also lamented that due to rain they could
not calculate the length and breadth of the ditch, and there was a necessity to recourse
to the other methods of computation, which admitting the ditch to have fifty feet in
breadth, fourteen in depth and thus require about eighty to ninety thousand rupees.\textsuperscript{120}

In June 1739 the merchants came forward with a voluntary subscription to aid
Government in fortifying the wall. The reason given by the merchant community was
the great happiness they enjoyed under the English Government in the perfect security
of their property and in the free exercise of their respective ways of worship, leads
them to be very desirous of continuing the same advantages to their posterity.
According to them Marathas had subdued the neighbouring country and as the
invasion of this island is threatened, they could not avoid being anxious that such a
defence may be secured as may tend to disappoint their evil designs. As the town
wall was intended for the security of the merchants and to the protection of this
Government, they believe that the said wall may be fortified with a ditch and such
other additions made to it as may on an emergency secure them and their families.
Towards defraying the expenses merchants proposed that a duty of one percent be laid
and collected until the amount of thirty-thousand rupees be raised which is as much as
they can offer, considering the present decay of trade and the want of substantial
merchants.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 384.
\textsuperscript{120} P.D.D. No. 12 B/1739, 384-385.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 404-405.
However, Mr. Geekie's one of the factors however dissented from the above resolution regarding the ditch. As according to him it will be impossible to finish the ditch in time and there are many works already in hand, and there was great complaint for want of people. This work according to him requires much labour at the same time their neighbours are endeavouring by all means to draw these men from them. This problem of labour will be more pronounced as treaty with the Marathas now on foot therefore all recent immigrants who are willing shall have liberty to go back to their own country. 122

The Board however overlooked Geekie's objection and proceeded to consider the most proper method of raising the voluntary contribution of Rs. 30,000 toward the said work of the ditch from the body of merchants as set forth in the Consultation of the 29th June, 1739 and the Board was unanimously of opinion that one per cent duty be levied additionally upon the trade which was subjected to pay two per cent contribution to the town wall until the amount be cleared. The proceeds of that new duty would be carried to a head of contribution to the town ditch and it was ordered that the custom master would collect and distinguish the same accordingly. 123

On the 13th November 1739 Government appointed the following sixty-one European gentleman to the several bastions. 124 In 1740's with the outbreak of war with France,

123 Ibid., 418.
124 Campbell, II, 286. The list of the officers is:

Bombay seemingly again in jeopardy established a new post, of a Chief Engineer of Bombay Presidency, to advise on fortification. Another measure to ensure defence of the town and the security of the inhabitants in the fort was by closing the town gates viz. Appolo gate and Church gate were closed at sunset while the Bazaar gate half an hour after sunset.125

In November 1741, the President Mr. Stephen Law laid down before the Board instructions necessary for the better conducting of the working of the town ditch as well as for preventing any fraud or imposition on the part of the Purvoes, subhedar, and other supervisors. These instructions are given below. The rules for the works carrying on at the town ditch and Moody's Bay, were namely.126

1. That each subhedar attends his assigned business every morning early for bringing the labourers together. Each subhedar to have a list of the men entrusted to his care, noting the pay of every man and the muster to be taken in the presence of the paymaster's officer and also that to be appointed by the subhedar. At the close of the evening the said subhedar must sign the list ascertaining the number that day at work under him, which must serve as a voucher to the payment to be made by the paymaster's officers and such vouchers to remain on register for producing when the monthly accounts are to be passed.

>
>
>
>
>
>

125 Consultation 20th Jan 1740-41, F.H.S.I, 175-176.
126 Campbell, II, 289.
2. Engineer or master director of the works, or his assistant will be given the abstract of people working. He has moreover a liberty to be present at the muster satisfying himself that justice is done to the Company. When he is at such muster, he should also sign with the subhedar as a testimony that the muster is right.

3. In order to regulate the chops (chhaps meaning seals) necessary to be issued at each division, there must be immediately an account taken of all chops that are distributed. These must be called in and paid for. Then the whole chops ascertaining their number with exactness must be lodged in a good chest under two locks, each subhedar, where the division is, to have one key and the paymaster's officer another, the chops thence to be issued, a daily account to be kept therefore and seen to it that the Company to injure for which end the chops should be called in and discharged every day. For distinguishing to which Company the chips belong, Daji Naik's must be numbered 1, Gun Naik's No. 2, Guni's No. 3, Sen Naik's No. 4, Mahmud Naik's No. 5, and the chips to be confined to the division assigned.

4. To prevent every instance of abuse the accounts of the subhedar respecting each division, as well as the same kept by the paymaster's officer, must be lodged in a good chest with two locks, each subhedar to have one key and the paymaster's officer another and the accounts to be adjusted and finished every day at each post and there also signed.

5. That the subhedar at each division do indent to the paymaster's storekeeper for everything wanted. As it may not be possible to comply entirely, such storekeeper is to send with the things a note to the subadar, expressing the quantity so sent and in whose charge. When the note is brought to the Subhedar, he is to examine if the articles which come to him agree with the note. If not, he is to make the bearer answerable for any deficiency. And such bearer should count the things so delivered by the storekeeper at the dar is to sign his name to the note as a voucher. This note, with all others that come within the month, must be given to the paymaster for regulating the account with his storekeeper. He is also to keep the notes by him for proving his accounts when delivered into the accountant's office. The same caution and method to be used when the subhedar send any old
stores to the storekeeper by signing a note. This note the storekeeper is to
preserve and sign, on finding the contents to answer.

6. That regard be had in dividing the people to every part of the work in such
proportion as the business to be done freely requires. When the musters are
taken according to the rules precited, none of the people shall on any
pretence be suffered to leave the works, saving in case of sickness, without
and express command to be given by the Governor or in his absence by the
second member in Council and no one else.

7. All the materials wanted for the works must be duly laid in by the
paymaster so that no stop or hindrance ensues. At the end of every month
the paymaster must give in an abstract to the President of what then remain
with their true value and he may see to the getting what shall be requisite
for future service. In case the works be not properly supplied, the subhedar
must report the want to the engineer, the paymasters, or to the President at
such times as the latter takes his round for visiting the works.

8. The subhedar are to have a true regard that the people employed whether
as purvoes or otherwise be faithful and qualified, no more than wanted to
be kept in service. On any failure in this material article, they are required
to make a report to the President.

9. Whatever mortar be brought for the works must be measured and taken in
an exact manner at the places assigned for receiving it. The subhedar so
receiving is to pass a receipt for the quantity, inserting the name of the
seller. This receipt is to serve as a voucher to the paymaster and at the end
of every month is to be sent with the others in the accountant's office with
his accounts.

10. That the subhedar do report to the President anything they have to offer for
the benefit of the service. The works to be lined out by the director of the
same and to be afterwards inspected by Ramji and Gumbaji Purvoes, who
are to be apprised of the number of men of every denomination on work
every day.

11. For delivering out chops it is apprehended that the militia subhedar with
the approval of our subhedar may serve instead of the Purvoes now
employed. By this means the pay of twenty or more Purvoes may be saved
the Company every month. This therefore must be tried and continued until solid reasons are offered to the President for altering it.

In 1743, the ditch was completed. The President acquainted the Board that the several persons employed by the ditch paymaster had been discharged by his directions except two Purvoes who are to be kept for this month only to bring up and close the several accounts.

In 1750 Grose notices: The fortified house (the Castle) built on the site of the residence of Portuguese Government ought to have been taken down and built at Mendham's Point. The present site is commanded by Dongri hill. The castle was well built with regular gradients of strong hard stone. One of its bastions was called the tank bastion. In it was a large quantity of water. There is also a well within the fort, but the water is not extremely good, and liable to be dried up in the heats. The town wall ought to have included Dongri as the hill commanded both the town and the castle. The curtain of the wall between the bastions was very frail. A ditch had been made at great expense and flooded. The fort was one of the strongest of the Company's places.

In March 1753 Court appointed two officers i.e. Caroline Frederick Scott Esquire; Engineer General of all the settlements in India, the other Chief Engineer Jaques de Funck Esquire also to be Captain of the Company of artillery at Bombay Presidency. Captain de Funk was assigned to take an exact survey of all fortifications and works, and give his thoughts upon the nature and condition of them. Apart from this he was to give suggestion and estimates of repair if any alternations, additions or amendments are necessary to be made. In 1754 the Court remarked over the state of fortification and gun carriages of Bombay and said that these were in a very bad state and asked the Bombay Council to take appropriate action to improve the state of fortification, and gun carriages for the security of the island.
In the beginning of 1755 the Court complains of the want of a report by Captain de Funck on the survey he was to make of the fortifications. The Court further said it is impossible for them to form any idea of the conditions so as to give any particular directions thereupon but it again reiterated to take steps for the security of the island. In response to the Court's complaint Captain de Funk promises to submit to Government his first full report of his survey of the fortifications on this island, their present condition, together with the alterations and in July 1755. The report was submitted by him on 23rd September 1755.

The report describes the Bombay town bearing south of Bombay Island, is situated on very lay ground close to the water opposite to the harbour, and fortified with castle and other irregular walls in form of bastions, surrounded with a wet ditch, and commanded by a hill called Dongri. This town encloses a spot of ground about 739,400 square yards, the most part of which is taken up by a number of small houses and gardens with their streets, formed according to this country method in an irregular manner.

The fortification by the land side of this town is composed of seven polygons, formed irregular and constructed to different bastions, namely five bastions ordinarily called Marlborough, Stanhope, Church, Prince's and Mandvi bastions, and two bastions tronquer (or demi bastions) called the Moor's and Banian bastions, and one other half bastion, called the Royal bastion. All these bastions are joined together, with the same number of single walls or curtains, and the whole surrounded with a small wet ditch. This ditch is made passable at north, west, and south by three stone bridges, opposite to which are three gates, called the Bazaar, Church, and Apollo gates, as appears by the draft.

On the seaward side this town is fortified with a castle, and to the right and left of the castle some other walls and detached batteries. The castle is called Bombay Castle and is situated on a low ground, about the middle part of the town, close to a bed of
rocks in the sea opposite the harbour and is formed in the figure of a trapezoid which is construed into four bastions called the Flat, Brab-tree, Tank, and Cavalier bastions.\textsuperscript{137}

The town of Bombay is likewise by the land side surrounded close near the whole ditch with a great number of houses, pagodas, streets, gardens, hedges, and trees, inhabited and cultivated by the country people, those houses hedges and trees giving proper covered way for the enemy on any occasion. The defence of this town's fortifications cannot be otherwise than very indifferent and weak, as the construction of the works has not any connection or harmony one with another to be of equal strength and consequence. The fortifications cannot as they ought to make an equal defence overall, but give an enemy the opportunity to prefer the attack upon the weakest side.\textsuperscript{138}

Though the ditch makes the town walls more capable of defence it is neither deep nor broad enough nor sufficiently regular to the works. A covered way should be made round this work, and a retreat ravelin\textsuperscript{139} opposite each gate. The town would then be more respectable as the enemy in such case could not raise any battery opposite the gate as is now practicable. It is likewise necessary to have a drawbridge at each gate, there being none at present.\textsuperscript{140} The report also describes the market, houses, fort, barracks and Governor’s house etc.

The report also pointed out the works most necessary to be set about immediately is as follows\textsuperscript{141}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item The communication from Dongri Fort to the polygon opposite the bazaar gate and at the same time to put the fortification of Dongri in more defensible order.
  \item One low wall or fussebrave on the sea side of Bombay castle, and to make the parapets on the old works of this fort of a sufficient thickness.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid, 354-55.
\textsuperscript{139} A fortification outside a castle used to split an attacking force; composed of two faces, forming a salient angle whose gorge resembles a half-moon.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid, 362.
➢ One defensive work opposite the Royal and Marine Pier batteries likewise to amend the old work with a flanking line, to make it defensible, which it is not at present.

➢ Three drawbridges one for each gate of the town wall, which are absolutely necessary.

➢ Barracks for the military and artillery, and to put in order the battery magazine as fast as possible.

Captain J.de. Funck, the Chief Engineer thus suggested the series of costly changes unacceptable to Directors. Major J. Mace, who made even more expensive and extensive changes, replaced him; his recommendation too was squashed without qualm by London.142

Thus, throughout this period under review, the question of fortifying the town continued to be major concern of local authorities and notables. Its effectiveness in 18th century was limited by the state of walls and by the indiscriminate and largely uncontrolled expansion of the city around them. Even maintaining the distinction between those living within and without the walls soon became impossible. Attempts to do so by closing the town gates viz. Appolo and Church gates respectively at sunset in 1740’s were soon abandoned.143

The question arises, how did the Bombay government maintained its expenditure when funds were low? The answer can be seen in the taxes, which is levied on the inhabitants from time to time or in the voluntary contribution by the various merchants and inhabitants.

**MEASURES TAKEN TO MEET EXPENDITURE ON FORTIFICATION.**

In 1673, Inhabitants were making voluntary contribution towards its defence and to further meet the cost of expenditure, the Company levied 1% duty on imports and exports.144 In 1710 London permitted the levy of special tax for the proposed fort. In 1718, a ‘quit rent’ was imposed to reimburse the Company for the charges they invested for fortification. In the beginning it was imposed on every description of...
property within the town walls and was specially meant to meet the great expense and charge of fortifying and securing Bombay. The higher taxes on land and buildings in the fort raised a storm of discontent; thereupon the 'quit rent' was reduced by half but was applicable to those residing "within cannon shot of walls".

In 1739, after the fall of Vasai, Marathas captured adjacent Salsette Island from the Portuguese and invasion of Bombay seemed likely, London further permitted to strengthen Dongri hill and a digging of a moat around the wall. For this principal native merchants subscribed Rs. 30,000 towards the construction of a ditch all round the fort, which was finally completed in 1743 at a cost of 2 ½ lakhs.

The other regulation introduced in 1737 though opposed by inhabitants was to ensure a clear line of fire from the fort. The space within hundred and twenty yards of walls was to be totally cleared; within 400 yards trees were to be thinned out and buildings demolished where they interfered with a clear sight. Moreover no buildings were to be constructed within 400 yards; the limit was subsequently reduced to 300 yards. These regulations were issued by the Government, observing the irregular practice of planting trees and building houses within distance prescribed for the safety of all regular fortification. By this regulation no person could repair or build within the fort, walls without the permission upon Crown lands without authority, or without observing the rules prescribed in 1731 or in 1733.

In 1744, a set of orders were issued for the guidance of custom master and ordered a duty of 4½% on all Merchandise imported by European. Of this 1% was allocated to town ditch. Merchandise, when imported in smaller vessels by native inhabitants, had to pay an additional 2% for the cost of Town walls. However, in 1747, the Court wrote to Bombay that they did not think it reasonable that merchants should pay custom duties on goods that had not been landed, nor they be any longer charged for town ditch or walls. But from what dates duties were abolished is not known. In 1758 a tax of 10% was ordered to be levied on the produce of all the landed property belonging to the inhabitants of the island.

---

146 Dongri Hill which was converted into Prison in 1720's largely after Rama Kamati episode, was again strengthened as fort, Prison was demolished in the wake of Marathas invasion; Bombay Council proposed, 23rd April 1739; PDD 12A-1739, 262-263.
148 G.B.C.I., II, 322-324; F.H.S. II, 70, Bombay Castle 4th April 1737, Survey for Defence was Conducted.
150 G.B.C.I., II, 325.
SUMMING UP

In the forgoing essay the history of Bombay fort and castle had its beginning from the time of Cooke but it was in the period of Aungier the work of fortification gained momentum despite the policy of Court of Directors not to spend much on the fortifications and buildings. Fortification was of much importance for Bombay since it was surrounded by many hostile neighbours both Indian and European. In the seventeenth century the work of fortification went on a slow pace owing to lack of resources, engineers, labour and sometime building materials. It was because of this weak state of defences the Bombay has to face the wrath of its neighbour in the last decade of seventeenth century.

The lessons of the last decades of seventeenth century forced the British to take fortification on prime basis in the eighteenth century. Thus it was of no astonishment that the concept of town wall though mooted by Aungier was again started by Charles Boone. He emphasized on the defence considering island’s importance on the west coast politics.

In the Portuguese period there were hardly any buildings on the island apart from the manor house. English on their acquisition of island converted this manor house into a Castle. The Castle was a combined administrative-military-commercial centre. It was around this Castle, the town developed in the semicircular shape. In the seventeenth century there were few buildings on the island such as of hospital, mint, ware house and judicature. Since the island had been devoid of finances most of the time in seventeenth century, the buildings could hardly be maintained as evident from the letters and despatches of the period.

The situation however improved in the eighteenth century, town wall was revived as stated above. Several other developments also followed in this century. The old dockyard in the Fort was extended, the Marine was established, and in 1720 a bank was established. In 1731 a survey of all lands within the Fort was ordered for the first time, and an additional quit-rent imposed on both English and Indian population, with the exception that English were to pay only quit rent but no ground rent which was to be paid by the Indian inhabitants.

The internal security on the island also improved. A commodious lodge was also built for the troops at Sion, fortification was strengthened, and ditch was formed round the town wall through donations from the business community and powder mill was
constructed on the island. Reclamations of land which directly or indirectly caused the death of many inhabitants were also taken up at the earnest. A cause way was also built from Sion and Mahim on salt ground. Captain Bote's scheme of stopping the great breach was approved and measures were initiated to fill the breach as soon as possible. The work was however stopped in 1727.

Fortifying the town and strengthening the town wall acquired greater importance in 1730's with Marathas and Angria becoming Bombay's new neighbour, after their victories against the Portuguese at Bassein and Salsette. The importance of the security was not only realized by English against the Marathas but merchants of the town too realized it and volunteered Rs.30, 000 to the English for the town against the Marathas. Though the plan of fortification of town could not take the proper shape till the end of our period, but there is no denying of the fact that Bombay had moved beyond from fishing islands of 1670's to the early colonial fortified settlement.