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NOTES

The following abbreviations are used in the notes:

ADLA  Archives départementales de Loire Atlantique, Nantes, France
ADN  Archives de Nantes, Nantes, France
AMEP  Archives, Missions étrangères de Paris, France
AN  Archives nationales de France, Paris, France
ANOM  Archives nationales d’outre-mer, Aix-en-Provence, France
BC  Bibliothèque franciscaine des Capucins, Paris
BNF  Bibliothèque nationales française
COL  Fonds des colonies
DPPC  Dépôt des papiers publics des colonies
FM  Fonds ministériels
GR  Greffes
INDE  Fonds territoriaux, Établissements français de l’Inde
MAR  Fonds de la Marine
MF  Manuscrits français
NAF  Nouvelles acquisitions françaises
NAIP  National Archives of India, Puducherry Record Centre, India
Vanves  Archives Jésuites, Vanves, France

Introduction

1. “Journal de bord de navires le Mercure, le Jason et la Vénus, formant une escadre envoyé aux Indes orientales sous le commandement de M. Guimont du Cordray, pour aller faire la course puis la traite, commencé en 1712 et fini en 1714.” ADLA, série C, 875.

2. The writer of the journal, one M. Robert, unfamiliar with Indian names, wrote the name phonetically as “Aniaba” but references him as the company’s chief agent, the role filled by Nayiniyappa in this period. The description of his influence and the phonetic similarity of the name’s rendering make clear that the man in question was Nayiniyappa.

3. The ship’s journal is not paginated, but the entries describing the marriage celebrations are for May 30, 1714; May 31, 1714; and June 1, 1714. “Journal de bord de navires le Mercure, le Jason et la Vénus.”

4. This description of Guruvappa’s baptism is taken from a memoir written in the latter half of the eighteenth century by one of his relatives. NAIP, eighteenth-century documents, folder 20.
5. Guruvappa is referred to by this name in a record of a 1724 commercial transaction in Pondichéry, held in ANOM, FM, DPPC, GR/675.


7. Both Indian and Hindu are anachronistic categories that do not appear in the French sources of this period. The French sources refer to practitioners of local religions, who today would be glossed as Hindu, as “gentiles,” “pagans,” or “idolaters.” I use “Hindu” occasionally when not quoting French actors to dispense with the pejorative stance implicit in these designations. “Indian” is just as anachronistic. The sources most often use “malabar,” and occasionally “blacks” (noirs) to refer to Pondichéry’s residents with origins in the Tamil region. I also use “Tamil,” which does appear in French sources (tamoul) albeit rarely.


25. Emily Erikson and Valentina Assenova, “Introduction: New Forms of Organization and the Coordination of Political and Commercial Actors,” in *Chartering*


28. Sixteen percent of the initial capitalization came from merchants; 45 percent from the royal family; 19.5 percent from the nobility in the court, parliamentarians, and ministers; and 8.5 percent from financiers. Philippe Haudrère, La compagnie française des Indes au XVIIIe siècle (Paris: Indes savantes, 2005), 1:25. For a detailed account of the difficulties Colbert encountered in raising sufficient capital and the recurrent liquidity crises faced by the Compagnie des Indes, see Käppelin, La Compagnie des Indes Orientales et François Martin, esp. pt. 1, chap. 1.

29. On charter companies, see Erikson, Chartering Capitalism.


33. Historians of maritime trade in the Indian Ocean have charted the long-standing networks of exchange that connected ports such as Goa, Aden, and Aceh. More recent work has focused on how Indian Ocean communities were constituted by relationships forged both in and beyond the commercial sphere. For the importance of kinship and genealogy in Indian Ocean trade, see Engseng Ho, The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility across the Indian Ocean (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006). For linguistic exchanges in the Indian Ocean, see Pier Larson, Ocean of Letters: Language and Creolization in an Indian Ocean Diaspora (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). For the binding power of religious community, see Sebastian R. Prange, “The Social and Economic Organization of Muslim Trading Communities on the Malabar Coast, Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries” (PhD diss., University of London, 2008). On the quotidian contours of Islamic networks connecting India and Middle East, see Gagan Sood, India and the Islamic Heartlands: An Eighteenth-Century World of Circulation and Exchange (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

34. The literature on South Asian merchant communities in the Indian Ocean and their relations with European trading companies is extensive. Some foundational studies are Ashin Das Gupta, Malabar in Asian Trade 1740—1800 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); Sinnappah Arasaratnam, Merchants, Companies, and Commerce on the Coromandel Coast, 1650–1740 (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986); Tapan Raychaudhuri, Jan Company in Coromandel, 1605–1690: A Study in the Interrelations of European Commerce and Traditional Economies (‘s Gravenhage, Neth.: M. Nijhoff, 1962);


41. G. B. Malleson, *History of the French in India, from the Founding of Pondicherry in 1674 to the Capture of That Place in 1761* (London: Longmans, Green, 1868), 33.


44. Each of the years 1712 and 1714 saw the export of nearly 150,000 pieces of cloth, with the number falling to 82,851 in 1715 and further still in 1716, the year of Nayiniyappa’s arrest, down to 67,813 pieces of cloth. Wellington, *French East India
Companies, 188. On growing investments, see Arasaratnam, *Merchants, Companies, and Commerce on the Coromandel Coast*, 203.

45. For example, the year prior to Nayiniyappa’s arrest, 1715, was a fairly typical one that saw thirty-eight Dutch VOC ships, twelve English East India Company ships, and only two French ships. Haudrère, *La compagnie française des Indes au XVIIIe siècle*, 2:845.

46. Ibid., 1:214. In that census, conducted only eight years after the English mostly razed the city in 1761, the town had 27,473 residents, of whom 971 were described as *blancs*. The census is published in Société française d’histoire d’outre-mer, “Le Recensement de la population de Pondichéry en 1769,” *Revue de l’histoire des colonies françaises*, 1927, 444–45.


55. Dernis, *Recueil ou collection des titres, édits, déclarations, arrêts, règlemens et autres pièces concernant la compagnie des indes orientales établie au mois d’août 1664* (Paris: Boudet, 1755). A tangible example of the company’s responsibility to support missionaries was the fact that missionaries were offered free passage to the east on company ships.

56. In North America, in both French and British cases, missionaries were, as a general rule, better integrated into the state’s agendas, with resettlement of the native population into colonial holdings, such as New England’s “praying towns” or New France’s missions, even if native converts found ways to shape their experiences. For examples of this dynamic, see Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004); Emma Anderson, *The Betrayal of Faith: The Tragic Journey of a Colonial Native Convert* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007). In Iberian empires, missionaries were important economic actors in ways not available to them in Asia, with large-scale agricultural holdings, as well as power exerted through institutions of the colonial state. See, for example, Irene Silverblatt, *Modern Inquisitions: Peru and the Colonial Origins of the Civilized World* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004). In India itself such variability was also evident within European enclaves: Goa was converted by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, and the state and church were well integrated there. On the other hand, missionary work was effectively banned from holdings of the English East India Company until the very end of the eighteenth century. Penelope Carson, *The East India Company and Religion, 1698–1858* (Suffolk, UK: Boydell Press, 2012).


58. The Conseil de la Marine, the body that supervised French colonial efforts during the Old Regime, was consistently involved in the struggle between missionary groups in Pondichéry, see for example AN, MAR, B1/14, fols. 2–5 verso and fols. 54 verso–58 verso.


62. Historians of the Indian Ocean have long reflected on this unresolved problem: how to tell a story that does not expose exclusively the European perspective while using European archives, especially the archives of the European trading companies. Examples of recent work that examines the Indian Ocean mercantile world by relying on sources produced by non-European merchant communities in the Indian Ocean are Dirks, The Scandal of Empire; Epstein, Scandal of Colonial Rule.

63. This study owes a conceptual and methodological debt to the foundational works of microhistory situated in early modern Europe, such as Natalie Zemon Davis, The Return of Martin Guerre (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); Carlo Ginzburg, The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980). It also follows in the footsteps of historians who have used microhistorical methods as entry into the worlds of colonized and indigenous actors, such as Allan Greer, Mohawk Saint: Catherine Tekakwitha and the Jesuits (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Anderson, The Betrayal of Faith. On the need to bring together global history and microhistory, see Francesca Trivellato, “Is There a Future for Italian Microhistory in the Age of Global History?” California Italian Studies 2, no. 1 (2011), http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0z94n9hq.

1. The Elusive Origins of a Colonial Scandal

1. The logs are held at ANOM, FM, sous-série C² (Correspondance générale de l’Inde).

2. On French India in the 1931 Colonial Exhibition, see Danna Agmon, “Failure on Display: French India, the 1931 Colonial Exhibition, and a Forgotten Historiography of Empire,” in progress.

3. ANOM, INDE, série N.


5. On the durability of pre-European networks, see Sinnappah Arasaratnam, Maritime India in the Seventeenth Century (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994); Christopher A. Bayly, Rulers, Townsmen, and Bazaars: North Indian Society in the Age of British Expansion, 1770–1870 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Sugata Bose,


8. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 251 verso.


10. For example, ANOM, COL, C²/71, fol. 309.


12. These intermediaries, working in the ports of Bombay and Calcutta, were known as “ghat serang.” Shompa Lahiri, “Contested Relations: The East India Company and Lascars in London,” in The Worlds of the East India Company, ed. H. V. Bowen, Margaretté Lincoln, and Nigel Rigby (Rochester, NY: Boydell & Brewer, 2002), 171. Accusations of corruption against these maritime brokers were common, much as such accusations were frequently made against the dubashes (commercial brokers) in Madras in the late eighteenth century.


17. Ibid., 108–10.

18. Das Gupta, “The Broker at Mughal Surat.”


20. NAIP, eighteenth-century documents, folder 20, holds this family history, written in French by Nayiniyappa’s great-nephew (or great-great nephew).


23. French sources use a variety of spellings of the broker’s name, most commonly Nainiapa or Naniapa. The spelling I employ (Nayiniyappa) is a more accurate transliteration of the name in Tamil, as it appears signed by Nayiniyappa himself on a document held at ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 164 verso.
25. Ibid., 1:66–68.
26. On the use of the anachronistic category “Hindu,” see note 7 in the introduction.
27. Procès-verbaux des délibérations du Conseil Supérieur de Pondichéry, 1:139–44.
28. Ibid., 1:140.
29. Ibid., 1:141.
30. Ibid., 1:142, 144.
31. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/69, fol. 103.
32. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/69, fol. 103 verso.
33. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/72, fol. 53 verso.
34. Pillai, Private Diary, 3:9.
35. Ibid., 2:62.
37. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 200 verso.
38. Ibid.
39. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 201.
40. Ibid. The text offers another explanation for why Hébert might have turned against Nayiniyappa. When Hébert arrived in Pondichéry he was, in the broker’s words, “so poor and lost” that he had to borrow significant amounts of money from the broker on three different occasions. Putting Nayiniyappa in jail was also a way to avoid repaying the debt. This account would explain why Hébert did not renege on his supposed deal with the Jesuits once he was back in Pondichéry.
41. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 251 verso.
42. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 255 verso.
45. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 251 verso.
46. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/69, fol. 91.
52. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 208 verso.
53. ANOM, FM, C²/70, COL, fol. 209.
57. Pillai, Private Diary, 1:237.
58. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 103.
66. Ibid., p. 223.
67. For the letter appointing Hébert to the position, see ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fols. 239–240.
68. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/69, fol. 225.
69. ANOM, FM, C²/70, COL, fol. 221. Many of the complaints that Hébert and Dulivier sent to Paris complaining against each other also appear in AN, MAR, B¹/14.
70. AN, MAR, B¹/14, fol. 5 verso.
71. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 252 verso.
72. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 221 verso.
73. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 222.
Indes orientales was dealing with its own massive debt; in 1708, it carried a debt of 6,500,000 livres.


These liquidity crises put the French company in a markedly different situation from that of the English East India Company, which was in a position to extend significant loans to the state. H. V. Bowen, *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 30.


78. Haudrère, *La compagnie française des Indes au XVIIIe siècle*, 1:25. On the impact of John Law’s reforms on the Compagnie des Indes, see G. B. Malleson, *History of the French in India, from the Founding of Pondichery in 1674 to the Capture of That Place in 1761* (London: Longmans, Green, 1868), 39–61. On the newly organized company, see Haudrère, *La compagnie française des Indes au XVIIIe siècle*. In the existing scholarship on French India, the year 1719 acts as a watershed, with most studies devoted either to the period 1664–1719 (from the Compagnie des Indes’s creation to Law’s restructuring) or to the period beginning in 1719 to the end of the century. This study bridges that divide, since if the first three decades of the eighteenth century are viewed from the vantage point of Pondichéry, there is as much continuity as rupture. Most important, the same employees and relationships, Tamil and French, stayed in place and continued to inform decision making in the colony.

79. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/14, fol. 260 verso.

80. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/14, fols. 260 verso–261 verso.

81. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/14, fol. 260.

82. Ibid.

83. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/14, fol. 268.

84. AN, MAR, B¹/14, fol. 24 verso.

85. AN, MAR, B¹/15, fols. 514–514 verso and B¹/16, fols. 83–83 verso.

2. Kinship as Politics


3. Julia Adams and Mounira M. Charrad, eds., *Patrimonial Capitalism and Empire* (Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing, 2015). For an example of the diversity of French colonial approaches to local patrimonial power, the North African example is instructive. Mounira Charrad and Daniel Jaster have argued that in Algeria French officials tried to destroy patrimonial power and displace it with French institutions, while in Tunisia, the French tried to maintain and then co-opt these networks. Mounira M. Charrad and Daniel Jaster, “Limits of Empire: The French Colonial State and Local Patrimonialism in North Africa,” in Adams and Charrad, *Patrimonial Capitalism*, 63–89.


11. The scholarship on the French family under the Old Regime is too vast to review here, but Suzanne Desan and Jeffrey Merrick offer an excellent overview of the state of the field in their edited volume Family, Gender, and Law in Early Modern France (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), xi–xxvi. In South Asia, as the historian Indrani Chatterjee has noted, “the history of the family has long been the poor relation in the great household of South Asian history.” Chatterjee, Unfamiliar Relations, 3. Other scholarship that has attempted to address this lack can be found in Patricia Uberoi, Family, Kinship and Marriage in India (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993); Ákos Östör, Lina Fruzzetti, and Steve Barnett, Concepts of Person: Kinship, Caste, and Marriage in India (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982).

12. The category of caste technically encompasses that of family (castes are endogamous; members of the same kin group, as a general and widely practiced rule, belong to the same caste), but the reverse is not true (not all members of the same caste are related to one another). For an in-depth discussion of caste as a historical and particularly colonial phenomenon, see Nicholas B. Dirks, Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001); Sumit Guha, Beyond Caste: Identity and Power in South Asia, Past and Present (Leiden, Neth.: Brill, 2013). The category of caste did occasionally come into play in the course of the Nayiniyappa Affair. For example, Governor Hébert’s second interrogation of Nayiniyappa in 1716 includes a line of questioning that is premised on caste divisions: the official asks Nayiniyappa why he forced a man of the right-hand castes to go and eat in the house of a man of the left-hand castes, a charge the broker denied. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 54.


14. On the arrest of the sons, see ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 252. The arrest of sons along with their broker father had precedent in French India. In the late seventeenth century, the Compagnie des Indes employed an Armenian merchant, Marcara, to advance their interests in the Coromandel. When the Armenian fell out of favor with his French employers and was arrested in 1670, his two sons were arrested along-side him. Gabriel Ranpoandro, “Un marchand arménien au service de la Compagnie française des Indes: Marcara Avanchinz,” Archipel 17, no. 1 (1979): 108, 110.

15. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 201 verso.

16. A letter by La Morandière to the directors of the company, dated January 25, 1719, ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 58.


18. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 302.

20. Edgar Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras: Government Press, 1909), 1:84. During one of his interrogations, when Nayiniyappa was asked to name his caste, his answer is rendered in French as “of pastoral caste.” ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 84.


25. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 90 bis.

26. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fols. 90 bis-90 bis verso.

27. Here the translation of kinship terminology into French or English does not adequately reflect the Tamil terms. The term beau-frère, used to refer to Tiruvangadan in French sources, might have referred to Nayiniyappa’s sister’s husband, his wife’s brother, or a single individual who was both sister’s husband and wife’s brother. On Dravidian kinship terminology, see Thomas R. Trautmann, *Dravidian Kinship* (New York: Sage, 1996). On the general problem of describing South Asian kinship in English, with its relative paucity of kinship terminology, see Sylvia Vatuk, “‘Family’ as a Contested Concept in Early-Nineteenth-Century Madras,” in Chatterjee, *Unfamiliar Relations*, 161–91.

28. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/73, fol. 23 verso.


30. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/73, fol. 23. There is a bit of historical revisionism at play here, given that Nayiniyappa was appointed to the post in 1708 to replace Pedro’s father, who was deemed incompetent.

31. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 117.

32. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 116. Another witness who had prior disagreements with Nayiniyappa was one Pautrichecli, who was said to have quarreled with Nayiniyappa over tobacco dealings and then served as a certifier for one of the testimonies against the broker. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fols. 296–297 verso.

33. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 117 verso.

34. BNF, MF 6231, fol. 29 verso.
35. Nayiniyappa’s son Guruvappa did convert to Christianity, an issue discussed in chapter 5, but subsequent family members employed by the company were not Christians.


38. The fact that these claims repeatedly received favorable response by French authorities speaks to the widow’s position in the colony but also to the liminal status of widows in French society. In early modern France, widowed women could serve as heads of households and enjoyed the legal and economic benefits attendant on that position. Even if widows often found it difficult to take advantage of the benefits due to them in an intensely patriarchal society, as Julie Hardwick has shown, the conceptual and legal framework for their autonomy was in place. Julie Hardwick, “Widowhood and Patriarchy in Seventeenth Century France,” Journal of Social History 26, no. 1 (1992): 133–48.


40. There are at least two letters in which the widow uses the first person to make her claims: AMEP, Lettres, vol. 992, pp. 1–3; and ANOM, FM, COL, C²/73, fols. 29–30.

41. AMEP Lettres, vol. 992, p. 3.

42. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/73, fol. 29.

43. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/73, fol. 29 verso.

44. AMEP, Lettres, vol. 992, p. 2.

45. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/73, fol. 210 verso.

46. Ibid.


52. Colbert was responsible for the company in the period 1661–1683. The responsibility then passed to his eldest son, the Marquis de Seignelay (1683–1690). His successor was Louis Phélypeaux, Comte de Pontchartrain (1690–1699), who passed the position on to his son Jérome Phélypeaux (1693–1715).


56. For the Pondichéry notariat, see ANOM, INDE, série P. For the records of the Etat-civil, see Alfred Albert Martineau, ed., Résumés des actes de l’Etat civil de Pondichéry (Pondichéry: Société de l’histoire de l’Inde française, 1917).

57. Martineau, Résumés des actes, 1:77.

58. Ibid., 1:76.

59. Ibid., 1:93.


61. Martineau, Résumés des actes, 1:98.

62. Ibid., 1:108.

63. Ibid., 1:190.

64. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 96 verso.

65. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 201.

66. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 97.

67. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 101.

68. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 293 verso.

69. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 83 verso.

70. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 204.

71. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 57 verso.

72. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 299 verso.

73. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 58.

74. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 299 verso–300 verso.

75. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/67, fol. 272. Another account of this arrest appears in BNF, MF 6231, fol. 30.

77. Manuel is described in a letter Dulivier sent to the Marine Council as “the catechist who served as clerk” during Nayiniyappa’s interrogation. AN, MAR, B¹/27, folio 65.

78. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 292 verso.


80. Quoted ibid., 5.


82. Ibid.


85. Ibid., vol. 9, preface.

86. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/69, fol. 18 verso.


88. Ibid., p. 583.


90. Raman, *Document Raj*.

3. The Denial of Language

1. The description in these opening paragraphs is compiled from Nayiniyappa’s own account of his first interrogation, in ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 252, and from the official transcribed record of this interrogation prepared by the governor’s secretary, in ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fols. 48 verso–52.

2. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 252.

3. Even Marcara, the Armenian merchant who led the French efforts to establish commerce in Coromandel in 1699–1670 and had lived in Europe, was described by his employer, François Caron, as “not very well versed in French.” ANOM, FM, COL, C²/62, fol. 37. Cited in Gabriel Ranpoandro, “Un marchand arménien au service de la Compagnie française des Indes: Marcara Avanchinz,” *Archipel* 17, no. 1 (1979): 113n22.

4. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 302. The fact that Hébert spoke Portuguese fluently was also attested to in a letter sent by Hébert’s rival Dulivier. AN, MAR, B¹/27, fol. 65.


6. ANOM, INDE, Série M/25.

7. See, for example, the French-speaking dubash David Moutou, employed by a French officer in India. Mautort, *Mémoires du Chevalier de Mautort: Capitaine au régiment d’Ausrasie Chevalier de l’ordre royal et militaire de Saint-Louis* (1752–1802) (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1895), 207. Nayiniyappa’s nephew, Ananda Ranga Pillai, who was chief
commercial broker in Pondichéry in the mid-eighteenth century, also spoke French with his employers.

8. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 252.


11. BNF, NAF 6557, fol. 64 verso.

12. Ibid.


19. 1703 letter by P. Paul Vendôme, BC, manuscript 92, fol. 158 verso.


25. Ibid.

26. Ibid., 5:94.

27. Ibid., 5:93.


30. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 251 verso.

31. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 86.

32. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 88 verso–89.

33. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 129 verso.


38. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 255.

39. Only the French version would be archived. Manuel’s statement is cited here from ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 293 verso–294 verso. The same text is also reproduced in C²/71, fol. 82, as well as C²/71, fol. 156. The multiple appearance of the
testimony in the French archives is further evidence of the centrality of interpretation in the Nayiniyappa Affair.

40. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 293 verso.


42. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 293 verso.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid. Xaveri Moutou was likely the Christian who had been appointed co-broker with Nayiniyappa in 1714; see chapter 1.

45. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/70, fol. 255. The law in question appears in section 14, article II of the 1670 Criminal Ordinance, discussed in the next chapter. Nayiniyappa’s appeal cites here from Philippe Bornier, *Conférences des nouvelles ordonnances de Louis XIV roy de France et de Navarre, avec celles des rois predecesseurs de Sa Majesté, le droit écrit, et les arrêts*, Nouvelle édition revue, corrigée & augmentée (A Paris chez les associez choisis par ordre de Sa Majesté pour l’impression de ses nouvelles ordonnances. M. D C C. Avec privilege du roy, 1700).

46. For example, the testimony of Nicolas Piri was thus heard by the council in 1739. Diagou, *Arrêts du Conseil supérieur de Pondichéry*, 1:68.

47. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fols. 292 verso–293.

48. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 294 verso.

49. For mentions of Cordier and his biography, see ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 292 verso and C²/71, fol. 82. Cordier the elder arrived in India as a *sous-marchand* in 1686 and was the chief official of a small French presence in Caveripatam (Kaveripakkam). Paul Käppelin, *La Compagnie des Indes Orientales et François Martin: Etude sur l’histoire du commerce et des établissements français dans l’Inde sous Louis XIV (1664–1719)* (Paris, 1908), 252.

50. ANOM, FM, COL, C²/71, fol. 292 verso.
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