Building

Emily Mann

Far beneath the busy Reading Rooms of the British Library in London, where manuscript and printed sources do the rounds, assorted artefacts hang side by side and one above the other in the quiet gloom of high-security vaults. Here lies a material and visual record that both complements and competes with the documentary archive. Among the artworks in the library's India Office Records, the repository of the archives of the English East India Company (1600–1858), is a series of six oil paintings that were commissioned in 1730 for display in the newly remodelled East India House on Leadenhall Street—a well-inhabited “great Thorough-fare” and “Place of a great Trade,” according to John Strype's survey of the globalising City in 1720.¹ The East India Company's updated and enlarged headquarters, located a few minutes from the Royal Exchange to the west and the Royal African Company's offices to the east, faced the outside world with a proudly Palladian-style street frontage. The symmetrical and balanced composition of classical giant pilasters in the Doric order (associated with serious purpose and sobriety), between a rusticated base and rooftop balustrade, was designed by the merchant turned architect Theodore Jacobsen to make a statement of authority and autonomy, suggesting fiscal order as well as fashionability to all who visited or passed by—or saw the print.² Inside, the six large canvases had pride of place on the walls of the Court Room, and it was in this room that the company directors, according to the minutes of their meeting on 1 November 1732, “Ordered that the Secretary do pay Mr. George Lambert £94.

1 John Strype, *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster* (London: Printed for A. Churchill et al, 1720), 1, iv, 82.

2 The company decided to adopt the “ground plat and front presented by Theodore Jacobsen” in 1726 and, on the building's completion in 1729, thanked him with a piece of plate worth 200 guineas. The surveyor was John James, surveyor to the fabric of St Paul's and clerk of works at Greenwich, among other eminent positions. See Howard Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, 1600–1840*, 3rd edn (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 533–35. It's interesting to consider that the design was apparently criticised for not being sufficiently grand to reflect the activities inside.

10s for Six Pictures of the Forts &ca [...] at fifteen Guineas per Picture as per agreement.”³ The same year, the engraver and antiquary George Vertue remarked in his notebook on the “six pictures of the principal Forts & settlements belonging to the East India Company having lately been set up in their house in Leadenhall Street.”⁴

Shifting in a single sentence from overseas settlements to one of the nation’s chief commercial streets, Vertue’s jotting emphasises the spatial reach of the corporation’s transnational constitution and operations—in particular its building projects—and provides an insight into their public nature and noteworthiness. His use of the word “belonging” points to how buildings manifested and served to secure the company’s claims of sovereignty over space in distant lands; and while fortifications formed borders of sorts as and when required (varying with conditions and over time, even opening and closing from day to night), the company’s interests, clearly delineated by the series of artworks, stretched beyond multiple borders and across jurisdictions to form a transoceanic framework. The “Forts &ca” depicted in the paintings lay dispersed across more than 7,000 miles, from the island of St Helena in the South Atlantic to Calcutta (now Kolkata) in Bengal; the four other canvases feature the Cape of Good Hope in southern Africa (in fact under Dutch control, but the gateway for the English company’s monopoly of trade over all areas east of this point), Bombay (Mumbai) and Tellicherry (Thalassery) on India’s western coast, and Madras (Chennai) to the east. At the centre of each view is the fortified coastal settlement, painted by Lambert, while the marine specialist Samuel Scott filled the watery foregrounds with company ships. In their content and original context in East India House, through which they linked London with both the Atlantic and Asian worlds—an illustration of the corporation’s capacity to integrate local and global—the paintings do more than demonstrate, as Geoff Quilley has observed, the company directors’ awareness of the value of the visual in corporate conduct and publicity; more specifically, they draw attention to the powerful significance of building for an early modern trading company and

3 British Library IOR/B/62. Brian Allen sets out what is known about the commission and discusses the paintings in “The East India Company’s Settlement Pictures: George Lambert and Samuel Scott,” in *Under the Indian Sun: British Landscape Artists*, ed. Pauline Rohatji and Pheroza Godrej (Bombay: Marg, 1995), 1–16; and “From Plassey to Seringapatam: India and British history painting,” in *The Raj: India and the British 1600–1947*, ed. C. J. Bayly (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1990), 26–37.

4 George Vertue, “Notebooks,” *Walpole Society* 22 (1933–34), 37.

(now as then) invite consideration, comparison and connection of its global sites and sights.⁵

With these canvases suspended like thought bubbles just above the directors' heads as they deliberated business matters in the purpose-built Court Room, the company men evidently had building(s) on their minds. For the English East India Company, as for its European competitors and for other British-based companies with their own trading and historical trajectories, the construction of settlements as well as ships had become fundamental for the creation and control of corporate profit and identity on both a national and an international level. In the diverse built environments that the companies inhabited, established and shaped, in many cases through negotiation with and use of local peoples and resources, European and non-European peoples came into contact and conflict. Buildings were more than mere background to events: they were instrumental in the processes of encounter and exchange. Investigation of corporate initiatives and investment in building—and, more generally, the construction and experience of corporate spaces—is therefore a strong line of enquiry when seeking to identify and understand the global agency of early modern trading companies, and their multilevel, multidirectional activities and relationships.

Corporations and Construction in a Global Perspective

Despite interest in the history of corporations such as the English East India Company and its Dutch counterpart, little attention has been focused on the role of these multinationals in building overseas settlements. However, the direction of scholarship on commerce and culture more generally in the early modern world both confirms the potential and provides foundations for further enquiry into corporations as global protagonists through the theme of building. The study of early modern trade has been transformed in recent years through the combined effect of spatial, global and material turns.⁶ The

5 Geoff Quilley, "Signs of Commerce: The East India Company and the Patronage of Eighteenth-Century British Art," in *The Worlds of the East India Company*, ed. H. V. Bowen, Margarette Lincoln and Nigel Rigby (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2002; repr. 2006), 183–99 (184).

6 See Anne Gerritsen, "From Long-Distance Trade to the Global Lives of Things: Writing the History of Early Modern Trade and Material Culture," *Journal of Early Modern History* 20 (2016): 1–19; and Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello, eds, *The Global Lives of Things: The Material Culture of Connections in the Early Modern World* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2016), 1–28.

concepts of mobility and connectivity have helped to dismantle both national and European frameworks, or at least bypass and blur them, producing studies focused on the movement and relationships of people or on the circulation and exchange of objects “as part of wider stories that crossed geographical and chronological zones.”⁷ Studies of “things,” tracing the journeys of goods from places of production to places of consumption, and revealing the layers of meaning that accumulate around objects over space and time, have greatly enriched understandings of the material practice of trade and helped to widen the subject’s appeal.⁸

Given the intensifying interest in materiality, studies of early modern trade and corporations in particular still devote surprisingly little attention to the built infrastructure that facilitated and structured the movement of people and goods, and which may provide greater insights into the material impact as well as practice of companies and wider trade.⁹ Most related discussions touching on building, apart from the study of what is commonly called early American architecture, have been focused on questions of legal possession and sovereignty—of fundamental importance but often largely theoretical.¹⁰ Charles Parker’s overview of global interactions in the period, which broadly reflects the direction of scholarship in recent decades, discusses the “global integration of space” with barely a mention of the built spaces that underpinned the integration; “empire building” with no explicit reference to material processes and expressions; the destruction of ecological systems but not the construction of physical environments that were a contributory factor; and religion without the creation of places of worship.¹¹ He evokes economic but

7 Gerritsen and Riello, *Global Lives of Things*, p. 13. On the movement and relationships of people see, for example, Alison Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560–1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) and Charles H. Parker, *Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age, 1400–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), esp. “The Movement of Peoples and Diffusion of Cultures,” 110–45.

8 The appeal traded objects and their stories was amply demonstrated in the exhibition “Asia in Amsterdam: The Culture of Luxury in the Golden Age,” organised by the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (October 17, 2015–January 17, 2016) and Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, MA (February 27–June 5, 2016), and accompanying catalogue of the same name (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015).

9 Liam Haydon and Tristan Stein turn attention to the subject through the concept of corporate space in “‘A House by way of a Factory’: Delineating the Corporate Space” (forthcoming). See also Tim Riding’s research on the East India Company’s Western Presidency (forthcoming).

10 Ken MacMillan discusses fortifications and mapping in *Sovereignty and Possession in the English New World: The Legal Foundations of Empire, 1576–1640* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), esp. 121–77.

11 Parker, *Global Interactions*, esp. 1–12, 146–81, 182–221.

not physical infrastructure, referring generically to the “factories” constructed by English, Dutch, French, Danish and Swedish companies along the Indian coastline in the 1600s and 1700s.¹² Parker is clearly not concerned with buildings, but the lack of references to any in his synthesis of diverse scholarship suggests a common neglect. The question raised by Carole Shammas—“To what extent did European-based empires of trade invest in their offshore enterprises and colonies in this period and what did they build?”—remains underexplored, let alone the critical questions of how and why, and specifically what role trading corporations played.¹³

There are manifold reasons why building lingers in the shadows of global stories of corporations and the early modern age. One reason is that, while global and “networked” studies of architecture are gradually emerging, relatively few architectural historians have entered this scholarly scene; while being specially equipped to tackle questions of materiality and spatiality, they have been slow to look beyond national frameworks, especially in this period.¹⁴ The remit of European Architecture Beyond Europe, a collaborative initiative that ran from 2010 to 2014 but whose agenda of understanding architecture in its global capacity continues through *ABE Journal* (*Architecture Beyond Europe*), is currently confined to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹⁵ A more practical reason is that architectural historians, like others, can be put off (misled even) by a scarcity of identifiable material remains. Just as economic historians may struggle to work beyond or between the archival records, the discipline of architectural history still favours surviving buildings, individual patrons and named architects, all of which are rare in the world of early modern trade.

12 Parker, *Global Interactions*, 2, 93. As Haydon and Stein note, the term “factory” in the seventeenth century referred to a commercial community “as much or more than it did to a specific building or set of buildings”; modern historians tend to use it in a similar way.

13 Carole Shammas, ed., *Investing in the Early Modern Built Environment: Europeans, Asians, Settlers and Indigenous Societies* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 18.

14 Attempts at global surveys giving equal weight to western and non-western architecture include Francis D. K. Ching, Mark Jarzombek and Vikramaditya Prakash, *A Global History of Architecture*, 2nd edn (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2011); and Kathleen James-Chakraborty, *Architecture Since 1400* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2014), whose starting point is influenced by John Darwin's *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire* (London: Allen Lane, 2007). A recent contribution with a global scope, yet within the frame of a single empire (and also predominantly focused on the late eighteenth century onward), is G. A. Bremner, ed., *Architecture and Urbanism in the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

15 For a report on this EU COST Action, see G. A. Bremner, Johan Lagae and Mercedes Volait, “Intersecting Interests: Developments in Networks and Flows of Information and Expertise in Architectural History,” *Fabrications* 26, no. 2 (2015): 227–45.

Only slowly is corporate patronage becoming the subject of sustained study. Some would simply place the infrastructure of trade beyond their definition of architecture, and so the subject falls between stools.¹⁶ The very success of the concept of mobility may contribute to buildings being overlooked by other historians. In global histories, the movable has been given greater emphasis than the immovable; as our gaze follows the moving person or object, it is led away from “things” such as buildings that were ostensibly static (never mind that they were in fact, in most respects, far from fixed). A more deeply embedded explanation is the historiographic bifurcation of early modern European empires geographically (east and west) and chronologically (first and second ages), which, although increasingly challenged, has left lingering dichotomies between trade and territory, commercial and colonial, seafaring and settlement, mobile and fixed, impermanent and permanent.¹⁷ This, in addition to the greater presence of surviving buildings (plus a few unhealthy dashes of British nostalgia), helps to account for the much more considerable literature on recognisably imperial architecture after 1750, which largely approaches the subject through the unit of single empires or select regions.¹⁸

The nascent field of Atlantic architectures (which has been correspondingly slow to emerge in response to Atlantic history) is pushing the conventional boundaries of chronology and geography, reaching back to 1600 and ranging

-
- 16 Nicholas Taylor's brief survey in *Monuments of Commerce* (Feltham, Middlesex: Country Life Books, 1968) includes warehouses, but grand ones from the industrial revolution and all within Britain.
 - 17 On this “bifurcation,” see Philip J. Stern, “Neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth: Early Modern Empire and Global History,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 1 (2009): 113–26; also “British Asia and British Atlantic: Comparisons and Connections,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 63, no. 4 (2006): 693–712. Patrick Griffin raises questions of “west v. east; global v. Atlantic; America v. Asia; free trade v. colonization” and suggests a more “seamless worldview” in his review of Peter Mancall's *Hakluyt's Promise: An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007): “Richard Hakluyt, Chicken Little, and the Ends of Atlantic History,” *Reviews in American History* 35, no. 3 (2007): 325–34 (330–31; see also 328).
 - 18 See, for example, Thomas R. Metcalf's (non-nostalgic) *An Imperial Vision: Indian Architecture and Britain's Raj* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989; Oxford India Paperbacks, 2002). Metcalf attempts to locate architecture in British India within an expanded regional context in *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860–1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007). Earlier literature includes Philip Davies's *Splendours of the Raj: British Architecture in India, 1660–1947* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1987; John Murray, 1985), which deals very lightly with the period before 1800. Sten Nilsson broke the single imperial frame but focused on one region in *European Architecture in India, 1750–1850* (London: Faber, 1968).

from Puritan meeting houses in America to slave forts in West Africa.¹⁹ Bringing together the tools and perspectives of art and architectural history, archaeology, historical geography, environmental history, material culture, cultural history and economic history, and more, and giving attention to diverse spaces from the domestic to defences, the field is also pushing the conventional boundaries of the study of architecture. Indeed, architecture and the built environment is proving a convincing medium for exploring the connectivity that Atlantic approaches propose. As Alex Bremner argues: "The built environment may be seen as providing a great deal of concrete evidence one way or the other concerning how ideas, knowledge, and material culture were carried around the Atlantic basin, affecting the physical landscapes of the various locations involved. Moreover, through such an exploration, continuities and differences can be drawn out and compared in a way that gives substance to claims of continuity and connectedness through time and space."²⁰

The field of Atlantic architectures is vulnerable to the same criticism as Atlantic history for its oceanic limits, and for privileging (so far) an English/British frame. However, as Bremner notes, it has already made a powerful case for the built environment as primary evidence for transcontinental and trans-colonial history.²¹ This potential provides encouragement to push Atlantic architectures (as with Atlantic history more generally) further and wider around the globe, but existing global studies of architecture expose the challenges of such ambition.²² The early modern trading company is a valuable lens through which to gain an expanded view, given its transnational, global nature, and the focus on building reflects light back on to the characteristics of the corporation. What, where and how companies decided to build—or indeed when they didn't, or were prevented from doing so—provides insights into their agendas, priorities and ambitions; how they saw themselves and wanted to be seen. Bremner in effect makes the case in his study of the architecture of the opium

19 For an introduction to the field, see Daniel Maudlin and Bernard L. Herman, eds, *Building the British Atlantic World: Spaces, Places, and Material Culture, 1600–1850* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016). A significant example is Louis Nelson's *Architecture and Empire in Jamaica* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016).

20 G. A. Bremner, review of *Building the British Atlantic World: Spaces, Places, and Material Culture, 1600–1850* (ed. Daniel Maudlin and Bernard L. Herman), *Britain and the World* 10, no. 1 (2017): 115–18 (116).

21 Bremner, review of *Building the British Atlantic World*, 116. Bremner also notes how building provides a valuable means of exploring reverse flows of ideas and influence in an imperial context (117).

22 See Murray Fraser's review of James-Chakraborty's *Architecture Since 1400*, *ABE Journal* [Online], 9–10 (2016): <http://abe.revues.org/3090>, accessed 19 April 2017.

trade in nineteenth-century Asia.²³ Just as the “infrastructure” created by Jardine, Matheson & Co in Canton (Guangzhou) is important for understanding the corporation in its private and imperial roles, so the buildings constructed and occupied by the English East India Company were crucial aspects of the older corporation’s agency on local and global levels.

Recent studies of corporate building projects in colonial contexts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries show the advantages of focusing on one enterprise, but also the potential for exploring the networks that connected different companies.²⁴ The same may be said of new research on the building (and rebuilding) activities of London’s livery companies through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both within the City and in the colonial settlement of northern Ireland, as well as Audrey Horning’s comparative archaeology of the colonial projects in Ireland and Virginia.²⁵ These growing areas of study confirm the rich potential of, and provide useful models for, approaching multiple trading corporations through the theme of building. Bremner and Diego Caltana even suggest (albeit implicitly, by insisting on the broad definition of what constitutes a “corporation”) that commercial companies should be considered in relation to other corporate bodies whose activity “sustained European imperial projects,” such as missionary organisations and the institution of the church.²⁶ The early modern trading corporation, through its

23 G. A. Bremner, “Black Gold: Opium and the Architecture of Imperial Trade in Nineteenth-Century Asia,” *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* 33 (2016): 66–74. Bremner’s paper marks the beginning of a bigger project on the subject. For a similarly useful take from a nineteenth/twentieth-century perspective, see Wendy Roberts, “Company Transfer: The Architectural Dialect at the Edges of Empire,” *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* 31 (2014): 591–600.

24 For example, Roberts on the Van Diemen’s Land Company (chartered in England in 1825), in “Company Transfer,” esp. 591, 594.

25 On London see, for example, Jasmine Kilburn-Toppin, “Crafting Artisanal Identities in Early Modern London: The Spatial, Material and Social Practices of Guild Communities c.1560–1640” (doctoral thesis, Royal College of Art, 2013); Sarah Ann Milne, “Merchants of the City: Situating the London Estate of the Drapers’ Company, c.1540–1640” (doctoral dissertation, University of Westminster, 2016); and Anya Matthews, “The Architectural Development and Political Uses of London’s Livery Halls, 1603–1684” (doctoral thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2016). On northern Ireland, see James Stevens Curl, *The Londonderry Plantation 1609–1914: The History, Architecture, and Planning of the Estates of the City of London and its Livery Companies in Ulster* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1986) and *The Honourable The Irish Society and the Plantation of Ulster 1608–2000* (Chichester: Phillimore, 2000). Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

26 G. A. Bremner and Diego Caltana, “Corporations, Corporate Identity, and Imperial Architectures?,” *ABE Journal* [Online] 2 (2012): <http://abe.revues.org/352>, accessed April 19,

economic, social and political connectedness on a national level, and competition (sometimes collaboration) on an international level, lends itself well to cross-corporate study.²⁷

Connections and Competition through Building

Lambert and Scott's paintings of English East India Company forts are highly suggestive of how the theme of building not only has much to tell us about the company's own operations, deliberations and ambitions, and its relations with the state and other agencies, but may facilitate and feed a cross-corporate approach on both local and global levels, as well as over time.

The commission for the artworks—and indeed the rebuilding of East India House in London after it had reached quite a decrepit state—came at a time of intense public and parliamentary scrutiny of the company's affairs and role. Two contemporaneous pamphlets represent just the latest polemical publications in a decades-long dispute between those who supported the company's monopoly and those in favour of free trade. The author of *Some Considerations on the Nature and Importance of the East India Trade* (1728) asserted the trade's "great Importance" to the nation and the "vast Benefit the Public reaps" from the company, the company being necessary to build "strong Forts and Magazines [...] an Expence that private Men can't possibly support."²⁸ Meanwhile, in *A Collection of Papers Relating to the East India Trade* (1730), the company was accused of keeping "Forts abroad, at a great Expence to colour the Necessity of such Monopolies, and to oppress and rob the Natives there with security."²⁹ Later the pamphlet insisted the forts, in any event, were not worthy of the name: "the Forts of St George [Madras], Bencoolen [Sumatra], and St David's [south of Madras, near Cuddalore] were never of any Use, more than

2017. See also G. A. Bremner, "The Corporatisation of Global Anglicanism," *ABE Journal* [Online] 2 (2012): <http://abe.revues.org/357>, accessed April 19, 2017.

27 On connectedness on a national level, see Edmond J. Smith, "The Networks of the East India Company in Early Modern London, c.1599–1625" (doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2015); and Aske Laursen Brock, "The Company Director: Commerce, State, and Society" (doctoral thesis, University of Kent, 2017).

28 *Some Considerations on the Nature and Importance of the East India Trade* (London: Printed for John Clarke, 1728), 2, 6, 8.

29 *A Collection of Papers Relating to the East India Trade: Wherein are Shewn the Disadvantages to a Nation, by Confining any Trade to a Corporation with a Joint-Stock* (London: Printed for J. Walthoe, 1730), ix. The compiler of the collection is here citing a 1722 essay from *Cato's Letters*.

as Warehouses; and as such, Fort St George and Bombay are not very serviceable.”³⁰ The publication of the *Collection of Papers* was no doubt timed in connection with the renewal of the East India Company’s privileges the same year (which was passed by Parliament, but only for a further decade and a half), and the paintings of apparently well-fortified and frequented settlements served to counter claims that the forts, and thereby the company, were unnecessary to uphold the trade. The same year, with England’s Royal African Company similarly under attack and especially vulnerable, a series of prints showing off the forts under the company’s control on the coast of West Africa was advertised as “At this Time very proper for all Members of Parliament.”³¹ Both sets of images—Royal African Company and East India Company (which were likewise widely disseminated in two series of prints)—were evidently interventions in the political-economic debate and reveal, through their focus on fortified settlements, the significance of building in creating a corporate image of strength and creditability: very basically, in showing the company’s worth.³²

Building signified both history and assets on which trust depended, not just in negotiations with the British state, but with overseas rulers and communities too. As Jonathan Eacott notes of the old East India Company in its dispute with the new company between 1698 and 1708: “The directors [...] had their servants impress upon Indian leaders that the company’s forts and warehouses backed its credit, in contrast to the new company, which had no history and no significant assets in India.”³³

Events a century earlier established expectations that a chartered company (or proprietorship) should, as per its charter’s provisions, invest in building

30 *Collection of Papers Relating to the East India Trade*, 68.

31 *London Daily Journal*, February 5, 1730. For a full discussion of the prints of Royal African Company forts in the context of contemporary political debates, see Emily Mann, “*Thirty different Drafts of Guinea: A Printed Prospectus of Trade and Territory in West Africa*,” in *Court Country, City: British Art and Architecture, 1660–1735*, ed. Mark Hallett, Nigel Llewellyn and Martin Myrone (New Haven and London: Yale Center for British Art and Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2016), 411–32.

32 For useful discussions of the role of visual culture in the construction of corporate identity, see Victoria Barnes and Lucy Newton, “Constructing Corporate Identity before the Corporation: Fashioning the Face of the First English Joint Stock Banking Companies” (discussion paper, Henley Business School, University of Reading, 2014); and, on building specifically, Joseph Giovannini, “The Grand Reach of Corporate Architecture,” *New York Times*, January 10, 1985.

33 Jonathan Eacott, *Selling Empire: India in the Making of Britain and America, 1600–1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 84.

in the pursuit and protection of trade.³⁴ In Virginia, as in Ireland, companies were given responsibility to build fortified settlements and were judged on their performance in this task. Concerns about progress in building and fortifying were shared on both sides of the Atlantic and, as Horning has pointed out, the year 1622 proved significant in the fortunes of each project.³⁵ Under a royal commission that year, Thomas Phillips and Richard Hadsor undertook a survey of the Londonderry plantation, with maps by Thomas Raven.³⁶ Phillips conducted his survey with the intention of highlighting the London companies' failings in their responsibilities, and it was through their buildings—or rather the half-built or unbuilt—that he sought to demonstrate the weakness of the enterprise in northern Ireland in general. Petitioning James I in 1624, he declared that “their towns and fortresses are rather baits to ill-affected persons than places of security.”³⁷ The same criticism of the Virginia Company contributed to the loss of its charter that year. Returning from Virginia after several months leading attacks against native peoples in 1622–23, Nathaniel Butler laid before the Privy Council an indictment entitled “The Unmasked Face of Our Colony in Virginia.”³⁸ The houses, Butler wrote, were generally the worst he had ever seen, “the meanest Cottages in England beinge every way equall (if not superior) with the most of the beste,” and they were even more vulnerable because situated “improvidently and scatteringly.” The meaning of “cottages” was pointed: a particular concern for authorities in Elizabethan England, which tried to legislate against their proliferation, “cottage” signified a “habitation of poor men, without any land belonging unto it” and therefore lacked legal as well as symbolic power in the possession of land.³⁹ Moreover, Butler found “not the least peece of Fortification.”

34 On the case of the Virginia, Bermuda and Barbados, see Emily Mann, “To Build and Fortify: Defensive Architecture in the Early Atlantic Colonies,” in *Building the British Atlantic World*, ed. Maudlin and Herman, 31–52.

35 Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea*, 276.

36 Lambeth Palace Library, Carew MS 634.

37 Thomas Phillips cited by Henry Jones Ford in *The Scotch-Irish in America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1915), 124.

38 Nathaniel Butler, “The Unmasked Face of Our Colony in Virginia as it was in the Winter of the Yeare 1622,” in *Records of the Virginia Company of London, 1622–24*, ed. Susan Myra Kingsbury, 4 vols (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906), II, 374–76.

39 The definition of a cottage is from *Les Termes de la Ley, Or, Certaine Difficult and Obscure Words and Terms of the Common Lawes and Statutes of this Realme Now in Use Expounded and Explained* (London: John More, 1636), fol. 96v, an “inlarged and augmented” edition of John Rastell’s *Exposiciones terminorum legum anglorum* (London: John Rastell, 1523), the first English law dictionary. Cottage was a new entry in the 1636 edition, but the definition cites the first statute made in 1275.

The fortification of Bermuda under company control since 1612, strengthened under Butler's governorship from 1619 to 1622, stood in stark contrast with Virginia to judge by the image printed in Captain John Smith's *Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England and the Summer Isles*, published in 1624.⁴⁰ A map of the archipelago based on a survey completed by Richard Norwood in 1616–17 is surrounded by views of ten stone forts, along with the great cedar frame of "Riches Mount" ("the warneinge peece of the fortes," designed for both "strength and hansomenesse") and three bridges that allowed communication between islands; visually incorporated into this military system is the State House and the town of St George, dominated by the church and governor's house flanked by guns. The timing of this image was critical on both a national and international level: the activities of leading company figures was under investigation by a royal commission; and, as war with Spain loomed, English settlement of Bermuda in the face of Spanish claims was in the spotlight. In print, Bermuda doesn't much look like the nest of pirates that critics described. If, as Karsten Harries has argued, building is the "domestication of space" in order "to tame it," here we are presented with the fortification of space in order to domesticate it.⁴¹ The threatening collection of rocks and reefs that Spanish sailors had called the "isle of devils" is tamed into an English stronghold—the Summer Isles, as Smith's image calls the islands, in the inset above the map. Showing as it does the division of the land, this map affirms the comprehensive occupation and ownership of the islands. The formal familiarity of the built fortifications offered reassurance of protection. With company men's names imprinted both on the land and in the names of the forts, the image declared the company's investment in administering and defending the island, and therefore the company itself as a safe investment.

The contrasting cases of Bermuda and Virginia provide a picture of the multiple negotiations involved in corporate building and wider business, both with peoples and environments. The governor, council and assembly in Virginia, responding to Butler's scorn for their weakness, stressed that different conditions on the ground on the mainland demanded an alternative architectural strategy. The houses were "most built for use, not ornament," they insisted, proudly professing themselves to be chiefly "labouring men."⁴² As for "artificiall Fortifications," they argued that almost every plantation was palisaded

40 John Smith, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* (London: Michael Sparkes, 1624).

41 Karsten Harries, "Building and the Terror of Time," *Perspecta* 19 (1982): 59–69 (59).

42 "The Answers of Divers Planters That Have Long Lived in Virginia," in *Records of the Virginia Company*, II, 381–85 (383).

and many had trenches; a captain had just been sent out to dig these defences. James City, Flowerdew Hundred, Newport News, Elizabeth City, Charles City and Henrico were mounted with “great ordinance.”⁴³ Nonetheless, the Virginia Company had failed to build a visibly and visually strong defence of the interests of its investors back in England. The problem is suggested by Smith’s reuse, in his *Generall Historie*, of a map of the territory that he dated 1606 and first published in 1612, on which the anglicisation of native place names fails to overcome the sheer scale of the land.⁴⁴ A series of crosses, difficult to discern between the hills, trees and native houses, demarcates the “discovered” and the vaster unknown, thus exposing the limits of knowledge and control. The stark difference between the two maps illuminates why the Crown revoked the Virginia Company’s charter and allowed the Bermuda Company to carry on.

The strong, arguably pivotal, presence of building in the debates and negotiations of the 1620s within companies, and between company and Crown, sets down seventeenth-century understandings of the significance of building as both physical process in corporate activity and idea in corporate identity and reputation—a reputation that extended far and wide (Bermuda’s forts were to be seen by the Spanish as well as the English). The images introduced in this chapter are complex sources, not to be taken as straightforward evidence of actual structures, but nonetheless crucial testimony of both the material and the ideological instrumentality of building for early modern corporations in their local and global roles. The images themselves, as with textual representations, should be considered as agents in the expansive project of building; they did not describe a reality, but sought to create one.⁴⁵

It was common—indeed, perhaps the norm—for representation to differ from reality. Governor Butler, although proud of the “very fair shewe out to sea” made by his building work at Southampton Fort in Bermuda, acknowledged that without sufficient munitions even the best forts “are little better than scare-crows.”⁴⁶ The same was echoed a century later of the forts occupied

43 Ibid., 383.

44 John Smith, *A Map of Virginia, With a Description of the Country, the Commodities, People, Government and Religion* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1612).

45 On the complexity of images as sources, see Peter Burke, *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001; repr. London: Reaktion, 2006).

46 [Nathaniel Butler], *The Historye of the Bermudaes or Summer Islands*, ed. J. H. Lefroy (London: Hakluyt Society, 1882), 279. Vernon A. Ives, ed., *The Rich Papers: Letters from Bermuda 1615–46* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 229.

by the Royal African Company on the coast of West Africa, giving a sense of how rhetorical devices and positions involving building were formed through corporate experience over time as well as across corporate entities. As Liam Haydon shows in this volume, the idea of the fort was harnessed by both sides in the battle of the monopolistic joint-stock versus free trade (which involved the Hudson's Bay Company as well as the Royal African and East India companies), signalling through its purported condition either strength and permanence and a worthy investment, or weakness and pointlessness and a disastrous waste of money.⁴⁷

A company's decisions over how much to invest in building and what to build were influenced not just by national concerns, but also by physical and political conditions overseas; indeed, geopolitical contingencies and diplomatic negotiations with external agencies could in practice hold far greater sway. Each construction project overseas involved a complex process determined by shifting relationships between Europeans and non-Europeans that were at once local and global in their influence and effect. Difficulties and obstacles presented by local constituencies might encourage a degree of subterfuge and stealth in building. For example, one of the "Rules for Fortifications and Settlement at the Coast of Guinney, observed by all that trade thither," printed in *The Golden Coast* in 1665, directed that the King of Haban "bee moved about the building of some forts, so as that hee may not understand our meaning."⁴⁸ The meaning of this line is itself not straightforward to understand. To "bee moved" likely means to be persuaded. Yet the wording in the original source for the *Golden Coast's* rules, articles "touching a voyage to Guinea" drawn up in 1561 and printed in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* in 1599, suggests a more physical movement or separation had also been the initial intent: "To moove the king of Haban a farre off, for the making of a fort, and to note how he will like it; but use your communication so, that although there might fall out good cause for the doing of it, yet he do not understand your meaning."⁴⁹ Local rulers were sometimes willing to help with the construction, as at Makassar in Indonesia, and supposedly strong, solid walls dividing European and non-European space could prove pliant and porous (officially or otherwise). By contrast, suspicion of European intentions

47 See chapter 4 in this volume.

48 *The Golden Coast, or A Description of Guinney* (London: Printed for S. Speed, 1665), 52.

49 "Certaine Articles delivered to M. John Lok [...] the 8 of September 1561, touching a voyage to Guinie," in *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation*, ed. Richard Hakluyt the younger, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London: Printed by George Bishop and others, 1598–1600), II, Part 2, 52–53 (52).

meant decisions were made for the East India Company by local officials in Surat in the early seventeenth century. As William Foster wrote, on the basis of English archival documents, there was “much friction regarding the house which served as the English factory at Surat.” Local officials, fearing that “the strength of the building and its proximity to the castle and the principal mosque” risked an English attempt to seize Surat, or at least the castle, ousted the company servants from the house and obliged them to relocate to three different sites—a clear attempt to divide and rule—which the English might have opposed by force had they not been distracted by the outbreak of hostilities with the Dutch in the Far East.⁵⁰

Rivalry between the English and Dutch companies was as great in their architectural and artistic endeavours as in their commercial enterprises. Further examination of Lambert and Scott's paintings for the English East India Company suggests the influence of ten oil paintings delivered to East India House in Amsterdam in 1663 (seven of which survive in the Rijksmuseum). Produced in the studio of Johannes Vingboons and displayed in the meeting room of the Heren XVII and other rooms of the Dutch East India House, the canvases depict Cochin (Kochi), Cananor (Kannur) and Raiebagh in India, Canton in China, Ayuthaya in Thailand, the lodge at Lawec in Cambodia, Banda Neira in the Moluccas, Bijapur, the bay of Sualy near Surat, and the town and castle of Surat (the latter three paintings now lost).⁵¹ Referring to Dutch displays of force—forged, as we have seen, in paint as well as brick or stone—the English council at Surat wrote to the directors in London in 1668: “we have by the Dutch proceedings largely Experimented it is better in Trade to be feared, then beloved, if faire means will not prevayle.”⁵² Several of the prints of Royal African Company forts in West Africa pointedly show competing Dutch fortifications, which often lay within gunshot of the English settlements. The text beneath the prospect combining the Dutch headquarters at Elmina and the English castle at Cape Coast remarks pointedly that the Dutch forts “are far better armed and manned than the English, who have not such good encouragement to support a trade of so great importance to their

50 William Foster, *The English Factories in India, 1618–1669: A Calendar of Documents in the India Office, British Museum and Public Record Office* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), xvi–xvii.

51 Kees Zanvliet, *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion during the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Amsterdam: Batavian Lion International, 2002), 220–27.

52 BL IOR G/40/2, f. 24r. On Dutch claims of territorial possession see Adam Clulow, “The Art of Claiming: Possession and Resistance in Early Modern Asia,” *American Historical Review* 121, no. 1 (2016): 17–38.

nation." On the coast of West Africa, Dutch and English forts neighboured others occupied by the French and Danes (as also in India), as well as Germans and Portuguese.

Multinational Spaces between Land and Sea

The force of the *idea* of the fort in early modern (and indeed modern) imaginations—whether their image of the fort was robust or flimsy—has not only confused debate about the utility of fortifications in global trade, as Ian Bruce Watson observed in the case of the English East India Company, but also, through centring attention on that very debate, hindered broader investigation of corporate investment in building (including occupying and repurposing buildings, as in Surat) and building's material impact.⁵³ Questions of labour, construction materials and costs, form and function remain, all of which have implications for the corporation's local and global character and role. On the ground, company buildings, and forts especially, came in a great variety of forms, as the East India Company paintings in fact suggest. The "development from factory to fort," to borrow Watson's words, suggests a trajectory that didn't exist in any clear or coherent way.⁵⁴ These were from the start, and enduringly (some to the present day), entangled and multifunctional spaces, as recent research on the European fortifications scarring West Africa's coast convincingly shows.⁵⁵

The force of the idea of the fort has also forged a false dichotomy, then and now, between the architectures of land and sea. Thomas Roe and others opposed fortifications on the basis that ships were far more efficient means of controlling trade.⁵⁶ Ships were "floating castles" to contemporaries, and thousands of pounds were invested in the construction and maintenance of company ships.⁵⁷ The movable ship could provide greater security than the immovable fort. Nonetheless, they were dependent on each other, parts of

53 I. Bruce Watson, "Fortifications and the 'Idea' of Force in Early English East India Company Relations with India," *Past and Present*, no. 88 (1980): 70–87 (71).

54 Watson, "Idea of Force," 71. On the diversity of factories, see Paul Mackenzie Mason, "The Early English Factories of South-West India: A Historical Archaeology Perspective" (masters dissertation, Durham University, 2014).

55 John Kwadwo Osei-Tutu and Victoria Ellen Smith, eds, *Shadows of Empire in West Africa: New Perspectives on European Fortifications* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018). See also Haydon and Stein on the integration of EIC forts with their surroundings.

56 Watson, "Idea of Force," 71.

57 National Archives, CO 388/25, f. 322r. Eacott, *Selling Empire*, 159.

the same international infrastructure. The ships are the crucial link between the six sites depicted on canvas in the Court Room at East India House, and indeed between those sites and London's docks. As Bremner stressed after asserting the importance of company-constructed docks, warehouses, offices and so on in an "extended network or 'system' of critical relations," ships, "as moving spaces of containment and transfer, were an extension of the factory spaces into which they off-loaded and up-lifted their cargoes. The existence and operation of the one was almost entirely dependent upon that of the other."⁵⁸ Through studying the multiple, multinational points of contact between land and sea created by early modern trading companies, blue and green histories, as Glen O'Hara vividly colour-codes the usually separate scholarship on sea and land, may be blurred and a major barrier to truly global history broken down.⁵⁹

Conclusion

By examining corporate initiatives and investment in the construction and maintenance of fortified settlements on three continents—America, Africa and Asia—through the long seventeenth century, this chapter has demonstrated how in each case the corporation, like the built spaces it created, was a process of negotiation between its internal constituencies, within states, and between communities (and other corporations) around the globe. The connected, comparative approach over space and time has hopefully illuminated how the experience of one company influenced not only the attitudes and activities of commercial counterparts, but also the ideas and expectations of shareholders and the state. In particular, the chapter has considered the corporate/colonial business of building in the context of the emerging fiscal-military state and its global frame. At the same time, we have enhanced understanding of the material impact that trading corporations had on overseas territories and their inhabitants, and of the impact that building and maintaining fortifications overseas had on the development of corporate and state constitutions. In and around these entangled spaces, corporate cultures came into contact with others, and European practices and ideas were challenged and reshaped by non-European customs and conditions. The chapter's focus on fort-building

⁵⁸ Bremner, "Black Gold," 80.

⁵⁹ G. O'Hara, " 'The Sea Is Swinging into View': Modern British Maritime History in a Globalised World," *English Historical Review* 124, no. 510 (2009): 1109–34 (1128).

facilitates discussion of the corporation's operations on local and global levels, and across commercial, state and transnational spheres, and in so doing sharpens awareness of the interactions and tensions between them.

Bibliography

- Allen, Brian. "The East India Company's Settlement Pictures: George Lambert and Samuel Scott." In *Under the Indian Sun: British Landscape Artists*, edited by Pauline Rohatji and Pheroza Godrej, 1–16. Bombay: Marg, 1995.
- Allen, Brian. "From Plassey to Seringapatam: India and British history painting." In *The Raj: India and the British 1600–1947*, edited by C. A. Bayly, 26–37. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1990.
- Barnes, Victoria, and Lucy Newton. "Constructing Corporate Identity before the Corporation: Fashioning the Face of the First English Joint Stock Banking Companies." Discussion paper, Henley Business School, University of Reading, 2014.
- Bremner, G. A. "Black Gold: Opium and the Architecture of Imperial Trade in Nineteenth-Century Asia." *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* 33 (2016): 66–74.
- Bremner, G. A. Review of *Building the British Atlantic World: Spaces, Places, and Material Culture, 1600–1850*, edited by Daniel Maudlin and Bernard L. Herman. *Britain and the World* 10, no. 1 (2017): 115–18.
- Bremner, G. A. ed., *Architecture and Urbanism in the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Bremner, G. A. "The Corporatisation of Global Anglicanism." *ABE Journal* [Online] 2 (2012), <http://abe.revues.org/357>, accessed April 19, 2017.
- Bremner, G. A. and Diego Caltana. "Corporations, Corporate Identity, and Imperial Architectures?" *ABE Journal* [Online] 2 (2012), <http://abe.revues.org/352>, accessed April 19, 2017.
- Bremner, G. A. and Diego Caltana. Johan Lagae and Mercedes Volait. "Intersecting Interests: Developments in Networks and Flows of Information and Expertise in Architectural History." *Fabrications* 26, no. 2 (2015): 227–45.
- Brock, Aske Laursen. "The Company Director: Commerce, State, and Society." Doctoral thesis, University of Kent, 2017.
- Burke, Peter. *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001; repr. London: Reaktion, 2006.
- Butler, Nathaniel. *The Historye of the Bermudaes or Summer Islands*, edited by J. H. Le-froy. London: Hakluyt Society, 1882.
- Ching, Francis D. K., Mark Jarzombek and Vikramaditya Prakash. *A Global History of Architecture*, 2nd edn. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2011.

- Clulow, Adam. "The Art of Claiming: Possession and Resistance in Early Modern Asia." *American Historical Review* 121, no. 1 (2016): 17–38.
- Colvin, Howard. *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, 1600–1840*, 3rd edn. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Corrigan, Karina H. et al., eds. *Asia in Amsterdam: The Culture of Luxury in the Golden Age*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Curl, James Stevens. *The Londonderry Plantation 1609–1914: The History, Architecture, and Planning of the Estates of the City of London and its Livery Companies in Ulster*. Chichester: Phillimore, 1986.
- Curl, James Stevens. *The Honourable The Irish Society and the Plantation of Ulster 1608–2000*. Chichester: Phillimore, 2000.
- Darwin, John. *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire*. London: Allen Lane, 2007.
- Davies, Philip. *Splendours of the Raj: British Architecture in India, 1660–1947*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1987; John Murray, 1985.
- Eacott, Jonathan. *Selling Empire: India in the Making of Britain and America, 1600–1830*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.
- Ford, Henry Jones. *The Scotch-Irish in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1915.
- Foster, William. *The English Factories in India, 1618–1669: A Calendar of Documents in the India Office, British Museum and Public Record Office*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.
- Fraser, Murray. Review of *Architecture Since 1400* by Kathleen James-Chakraborty. *ABE Journal* [Online]: 9–10 (2016). Accessed April 19, 2017. <http://abe.revues.org/3090>.
- Games, Alison. *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560–1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Gerritsen, Anne. "From Long-Distance Trade to the Global Lives of Things: Writing the History of Early Modern Trade and Material Culture." *Journal of Early Modern History* 20 (2016): 1–19.
- Gerritsen, Anne, and Giorgio Riello, eds. *The Global Lives of Things: The Material Culture of Connections in the Early Modern World*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2016.
- Giovannini, Joseph. "The Grand Reach of Corporate Architecture." *New York Times*, January 10, 1985.
- Griffin, Patrick. "Richard Hakluyt, Chicken Little, and the Ends of Atlantic History." *Reviews in American History* 35, no. 3 (2007): 325–34.
- Harries, Karsten. "Building and the Terror of Time." *Perspecta* 19 (1982): 59–69.
- Horning, Audrey. *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.
- James-Chakraborty, Kathleen. *Architecture Since 1400*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2014.

- Kilburn-Toppin, Jasmine. "Crafting Artisanal Identities in Early Modern London: The Spatial, Material and Social Practices of Guild Communities c.1560–1640." Doctoral thesis, Royal College of Art, 2013.
- MacMillan, Ken. *Sovereignty and Possession in the English New World: The Legal Foundations of Empire, 1576–1640*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Mancall, Peter. *Hakluyt's Promise: An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Mann, Emily. "Thirty different Drafts of Guinea: A Printed Prospectus of Trade and Territory in West Africa." In *Court Country, City: British Art and Architecture, 1660–1735*, edited by Mark Hallett, Nigel Llewellyn and Martin Myrone, 41–32. New Haven and London: Yale Center for British Art and Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2016.
- Mann, Emily. "To Build and Fortify: Defensive Architecture in the Early Atlantic Colonies." In *Building the British Atlantic World: Spaces, Places and Material Culture, 1600–1850*, edited by Daniel Maudlin and Bernard L. Herman, 31–52. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.
- Mason, Paul Mackenzie. "The Early English Factories of South-West India: A Historical Archaeology Perspective." Masters dissertation, Durham University, 2014.
- Matthews, Anya. "The Architectural Development and Political Uses of London's Livery Halls, 1603–1684." Doctoral thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, 2016.
- Maudlin, Daniel, and Bernard L. Herman, eds, *Building the British Atlantic World: Spaces, Places, and Material Culture, 1600–1850*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.
- Metcalf, Thomas R. *An Imperial Vision: Indian Architecture and Britain's Raj*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989; Oxford India Paperbacks, 2002.
- Metcalf, Thomas R. *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860–1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Milne, Sarah Ann. "Merchants of the City: Situating the London Estate of the Drapers' Company, c.1540–1640." Doctoral dissertation, University of Westminster, 2016.
- Nelson, Louis. *Architecture and Empire in Jamaica*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Nilsson, Sten. *European Architecture in India, 1750–1850*. London: Faber, 1968.
- O'Hara, Glen. "The Sea Is Swinging into View': Modern British Maritime History in a Globalised World." *English Historical Review* 124, no. 510 (2009): 1109–34.
- Parker, Charles H. *Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age, 1400–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Pettigrew, William A., and Tristan Stein. "The Public Rivalry Between Regulated and Joint Stock Corporations and the Development of Seventeenth-Century Corporate Constitutions." *Historical Research* 90, no. 248 (2017): 341–62.
- Quilley, Geoff. "Signs of Commerce: The East India Company and the Patronage of Eighteenth-Century British Art." In *The Worlds of the East India Company*, edited by

- H. V. Bowen, Margarette Lincoln and Nigel Rigby, 183–99. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2002; repr. 2006.
- Roberts, Wendy. "Company Transfer: The Architectural Dialect at the Edges of Empire." *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* 31 (2014): 591–600.
- Shammas, Carole, ed., *Investing in the Early Modern Built Environment: Europeans, Asians, Settlers and Indigenous Societies*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Smith, Edmond J. "The Networks of the East India Company in Early Modern London, c.1599–1625." Doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 2015.
- Smith, John. *A Map of Virginia, With a Description of the Country, the Commodities, People, Government and Religion*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1612.
- Smith, John. *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles*. London: Michael Sparkes, 1624.
- Stern, Philip J. "British Asia and British Atlantic: Comparisons and Connections." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser., 63, no. 4 (2006): 693–712.
- Stern, Philip J. "Neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth: Early Modern Empire and Global History." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72, no. 1 (2009): 113–26.
- Stern, Philip J. *The Company-State: Corporate Sovereignty and the Early Modern Foundations of the British Empire in India*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Strype, John. *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, 2 vols. London: Printed for A. Churchill et al, 1720.
- Taylor, Nicholas. *Monuments of Commerce*. Feltham, Middlesex: Country Life Books, 1968.
- Veevers, David. "The Company as their Lords and the Deputy as a Great Rajah': Imperial Expansion and the English East India Company on the West Coast of Sumatra, 1685–1730." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41, no. 5 (2013): 687–709.
- Vertue, George. "Notebooks," *Walpole Society* 22 (1933–34).
- Watson, I. Bruce. "Fortifications and the 'Idea' of Force in Early English East India Company Relations with India." *Past and Present*, no. 88 (1980): 70–87.
- Zanvliet, Kees. *Mapping for Money: Maps, Plans and Topographic Paintings and their Role in Dutch Overseas Expansion during the 16th and 17th Centuries*. Amsterdam: Batavian Lion International, 2002.