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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This dissertation analyzes business and administrative communication to demonstrate how composing ability is rhetorically figured and incorporated. Using rhetorical theory, this dissertation studies the rhetorical tropes present in documents from Early Modern English business and administrative communication.¹ It considers how these tropes are central to the hegemonic compositional techniques, which is believed to be the ability to compose. Through textual analysis of early modern business documents, this dissertation shows how these tropes enable the production of business and administrative communication. Of the variety of business and administrative communication produced during the early modern period, this dissertation specifically considers the letters of merchants as a generic form of business and administrative
communication. Studying the generic situation of these merchant letters demonstrates how the hegemonic tropes become central to composing ability. The generic situation, substance, style, and situation, establish the contours of these tropes.

As Campbell and Jamieson write in “Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism,” a genre “does not consist merely of a series of acts of a constellation of recognizable forms bound together by an internal dynamic,” it also “fuses” characteristics of substance, style, and situation to respond to rhetorical demands. Campbell and Jamieson pose the possibility of a genre occurring historically: “The critic who classifies a rhetorical artifact as generically akin to a class of similar artifacts has identified an undercurrent of history rather than comprehended an act isolated in time.” Thus, this dissertation analyzes the fused triad of substance, style and situation in Early Modern English business and administrative communication to locate both genre and to begin the process of deciphering an act isolated in time that may also represent an undercurrent of history. In terms of selecting the historical text itself, this dissertation has steered away from controversies over history, and it has chosen what is available with neither a specific purpose nor a specific audience, selecting material that may appear historically arbitrary but which, in its very chance nature, underscores the recurrent elements of this genre.

In chapter two, this dissertation examines closely the substance of Early Modern English business and administrative communication by closely analyzing a business letter to determine how this first element is generically figured. The
first element of the generic situation, substance, can be generally described as
“trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail
figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is expressed through
cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing
ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Trivial prolixity
establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and
administrative communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of
time consuming reading. To establish the substance of trivialization, this chapter
will closely analyze one of the most prolific early modern business letter writers,
Sir Thomas Roe. By paying particular attention to his correspondence with
Thomas Kerridge, a business associate, this chapter demonstrates this generic
substance of business and administrative communication.

This chapter concludes by multiplication and amplification, inconsequential
details are expressed through tropes such as baublization, pretense, and trash.
A core component of this substance is the constant repetition of details that
signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and
inconvenient endeavor. These details both create and call for imaginary help
with an imagined community of those that are trustworthy, the letter write and
sometimes, the letter receiver. The final trope that conveys this substance of
trivialization is the continual insistence upon the ability to discern shadows from
truth. This is the perspective of the master, a status Roe continually must
reinforce through his repetition of his superior knowledge and powers of
circumvention. This repetition of details seeks to instantiate his own authority, but
even more, his very physical presence in the letter. He creates himself as author
and authority through his superior perspective, one that is above all others. His
existence depends on such a perspective, since there is no reason to write
unless he adopts this perspective and seeks to persuade himself and his reader
that his letters matters and that he himself matters within the environment of
mistrust, double-dealing, pretense, trash, and bauble-heads in which he finds
himself.

In chapter three, this dissertation examines the second element of the
generic triad, style, by layering the analysis of style upon the analysis of
substance. It claims that the second element of the generic situation, style, is
intimacy, expressed through the rhetorical trope of the direct address figured as
loving and caring. Intimacy is also expressed through cumulative structure and
prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of
production, or development. Just as trivial prolixity establishes the claim to
credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication,
by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading, the
claim to intimacy establishes the claim to engagement, or pathos, of early
modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is
alienating and forbidding as close and dear. To establish the style of intimacy,
this chapter pays close attention to syntax and grammar, so that this generic
style reveals itself. Revisit the analysis of substance permits this chapter to show
how style emerges to form the rhetorical message. By layering style upon
substance, a fuller picture of this genre emerges.
As this chapter demonstrates, to construct both the emotional affect and the appeal to pathos, Roe uses stylistic devices, including sentence structure, variation in person, connotative language, and syntax, to create a relationship that is both a conspiracy, a family bond, and a signification of an imagined community held together by the always and already present betrayal of trust in that most important of relationships, the trader and money. In addition, Roe uses style to insert the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication. Friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with saving money. Finally, the two primary emotional appeals are to debt and martial law, both emotional arousal and emotional relief. By pursuing a debt relentlessly, Roe sets the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting over and worth emoting about. His repeated use of references to martial law is a reference to violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of the debt and casting the reader in the role of both captive and captivated participant.

The fourth chapter examines the final component of the fused triad of substance, style, and situation to complete the generic analysis, focusing on the situation so that an even fuller picture of the genre emerges. By layering the situational analysis upon the analysis of substance and style, this genre in all its rhetorical complexity emerges. The analysis of situation is itself three-pronged, a
consideration of speaker, audience, and purpose. Attempting to analyze these three prongs within the entire previous analysis is unwieldy and complex, and so this chapter focuses on the rhetorical logic of the situation, claiming that the situation is produced and reproduced by its own logic. The analysis of situation, implicit in the early analysis of substance and style, is drawn out in this chapter to show more clearly how this single example is both unique and yet an exemplar of business and administrative communication. By paying close attention to speaker, audience, and message, the contours of this genre emerges.

This fourth chapter concludes that the audience is the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that both chides and corrects. This audience needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities. This role is enforced through violence. The speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal. To enforce violence is simply being a good husband. The message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and
the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience becomes master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority, thus, both the imposition of violence and the execution of violence are always and already part of the message.8

Composing ability within this genre is thus both the repetition of this particular substance as well as the emotional inflection that renders this substance captivating and capable of emotional effect. The variation in the use of stylistic devices both enforce and underscore the need to assert mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, which must work to enfold the reader within business intimacy. The switch in person, coordinate and subordinate sentence structure, and use of connotative language work to enfold the reader within the emotionally saturated relationship, and yet convey that relationship as one of both reason and business. To compose such an emotionally saturated relationship as business-like requires the frontloading of metonyms for “money,” and the discounting of other possible relationships through pejorative language figured within balanced equivocations using the second-person. The recursive use of debt and martial law as stylistic devices reinforce the emotional affect of mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, critical to achieving the semblance of an intimate relationship within a discursive environment of deep mistrust. The audience, the
good friend, and the speaker, the good husband, are in master to master and master from master relationships. Any message that did not focus on the trust implicit in the always and already present betrayal would be a betrayal in and of itself to be executed and enforced though violence.

Thus, one stylistic element of the generic situation for business and administrative communication is coercion figured as the familial. This coercion is present in the rhetorical situation that produced this dissertation. The “speaker” of this document is required to turn this document over to the university to be distributed, not in a copy in the library, but through an electronic database that is the property of another business entity. This creates a new audience, since electronic reproduction is not a singular reproduction, but one that is potentially infinite. By claiming intellectual property rights in this document, the university also claims the right to both share and withhold this dissertation, to make it publicly available or not. Currently, an author can petition to have the document withheld, but what is really critical about this claim to intellectual property is that the university could, if it wished, withhold the document without such a petition, just as it could, and does, disclose the document even if it does not serve the author’s interests. The right of publication, the right to disclose, contains within it the right to withhold, the right to destroy. Of the bundle of rights that comprise intellectual property rights, the right of publication (or not) is a paramount right.
Thus, even though the other rights are preserved, this claim by the business entity swallows them up, and it swallows them up regardless of the value of the dissertation to the author in later years. As I will show, this coercion is similar to the coercion present in the generic situation of merchant letters.9

Employees today might be required to turn over the writing produced in the course of their employment to the business entity. It would be considered a “work for hire.” But this document was not produced as a “work for hire.” Thus, the requirement that it be turned over to the university because the university owns intellectual property rights to it is not only a legally circular argument, but expands the generic situation of business and administrative communication. It is simply enforced, not through legal processes, but through sheer coercion: this is the requirement for this speaker to receive her degree. But knowing this is coercion does not end the coercion, although this coercion changes the very pedagogical goal of a dissertation and reshapes what can be said, converting a scholarly project into a business project.

But the note I would like to end on, more than the coercion present that reshapes what can be “spoken” here and also negatively inflects my experience as a student and a scholar, is how this coercion perpetuates a four-hundred year old silence. Any research I might find that would enhance this dissertation is owned by other business entities. These business entities own the right of first publication of any previously unpublished documents in these archives. One might think a letter, four-hundred years old, would now be free from the claims of a business entity. But, it is not. The letter continues to pass from one business
entity to another until that entity grants permission to publish it. It is not in the public domain by virtue of age alone. The same holds true if an individual held this letter, and perhaps the letter would not have even been preserved but for the business entity’s zealous appropriation of what might be of value.

However, a doubly coercive silencing occurs when two business entities compete for the same intellectual property. If such a letter existed, and I sought to publish it, I would first need to request permission from the business entity. The business entity would then decide not only if I could use it, but the extent of my use and the charge for the use. These letters are not valueless to the business entity. It can publish from its letters and sell its intellectual property in many forms: books, postcards, posters, decorated artifacts like book totes, electronic reproductions that can be seen but not owned online. It can sell manuscripts of particular interest to archives as well. The scope of publication is vastly increased when one asks to publish material that will be available, not in one copy that might be request through interlibrary loan, but in the potentially infinite copies available through electronic submission. Not only is the scope of publication vastly increased, but also the permission to publish is granted not to an individual scholar in a limited capacity, but passes to another business entity, the university, which claims the rights to publish (or withhold) this letter owned by another business entity. There is more here than simply the medium of electronic publication reshaping my message; there is an actual, real, coercive prohibition on what can be said or released in this message. Such a letter, if one existed, could not “speak” here, and only the ghost of the letter writer or the
ghosts of the letter writer’s immediate family might have standing to challenge this silencing now. Ghosts, of course, do not have legal standing. Thus, to the extent that a haunting is what is materially suppressed, this is, then, a haunted dissertation.¹⁰

Thus, enfolded within this dissertation is a situation similar to that found through a generic analysis of Early Modern English business and administrative communication. Within this substance and style, the situation amplifies and explicates the genre. The audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, is a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities.¹¹ This role is enforced through violence. The speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal. To enforce violence is simply being a good husband. The message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its
substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority, thus, both the imposition of violence and the execution of violence are always and already part of the message.


3 Campbell and Jamieson, supra, at 26.


CHAPTER 2

SUBSTANCE

The first element of the generic situation, substance, can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading. To establish the substance of trivialization, this chapter will closely analyze one of the most prolific early modern business letter writers, Sir Thomas Roe. By paying particular attention to his correspondence with Thomas Kerridge, a business associate, this chapter demonstrates this generic substance of business and administrative communication.
This substance is established in the very opening of such letters. In his letter dated December 6, 1617, Sir Thomas Roe writes to Thomas Kerridge at Surat in response to a previous letter he was claimed to have received:

MR. KERRIDGE, Yours now received of the 21st November mentioneth one of the 9th that never came to me; with this the copy and note in English and Persian of what delivered to Asaph Chan’s servant, the weight of gold and prices as by invoice, this last unagreed for, the former sold and the specie rated and concluded upon; but I suppose this in Persian but a copy, and not chopped by him, whereby not authentical if any difference, and the original lost may move question; he not yet arrived, and his reports (like a Moor) cold; but the money or goods I shall receive, and serve Agra with. I refuse always to take any beforehand, because I would not be tied by courtesy to inferior prices, nor appear so hungry as to borrow on account. His payment is better than any man’s though his prices hard made. By this I am sure I have saved custom, contented a friend, and not borne the hazard of portage.

Through the direct address, Roe establishes the importance of his document and the terms of relationship between Kerridge and himself. In so establishing his ethos, he underscores the very importance of the information to follow. He specifies that the invoice was “unagreed for,” and, in addition, not signed. But these two details are unimportant, since the original is lost. Thus, he adds details of no importance to establish his weight to complain and his weight in refusing to be tied by “courtesy” to inferior prices. Rather than a form of cultural rudeness, this is just another one of the “details” as important as the fraudulent invoice. Fraudulent in fact, perhaps, but most importantly, fraudulent because it is too cheap. He refuses to “appear so hungry” to borrow on another person’s account. His insignificant details about a fraudulent but lost invoice make him fat with dignity and imperiousness. Nonetheless, the most significant detail comes at the
end, the hard bargained for deal, which will be paid, the most important detail, but will, as well, saved him the customs charge, the costs of freight and then, of course, “contented a friend.” Details do double-duty for business and administrative communication, and here, friendship is bound up with savings. A friend is another type of debt to satisfy or pay. Trivialization serves to both anchor his importance and serve to establish his credibility as author.

Such use of trivialization also gives weight to his particular rendition of reality, of the bargain, or of the deal. He then writes:

In the letters sent you there was some mistaking, for I excepted particularly the Standish, as a neat thing, not of great price; and in the note to Mr. Browne I desired the gloves of 8l. might be sent to Mocreb Chan, as being likest to buy anything that is not requested here, and so perceive he had, refusing nothing; and being kept will find a worse market; if given, taken as of no use and disrespected. I hope all comes up (mentioned to be reserved) according to all later letters, that I may make a riddance, and put off to that fantastical man whatsoever the wiser will not like; for we must fit ourselves according to the humours of buyers, some that love things of use, others that will buy every bauble.

As a seller of baubles, Roe is a speaker in bauble-talk. Here he is baubling over Kerridge’s purchase of an inkstand Roe had specified, detailed, was not to be bought. He directs the bauble to be sent to a purchaser who will buy anything, a bauble-head, “refusing nothing.” Chan, if sold to, will buy, but if given, like a true bauble-head, will “take as of no use and disrespected.” Roe seeks to give to that “fantastical man” whatsoever the non-bauble head will buy, the “wiser” merchant,
and so make a “riddance” of those baubles that no one else will buy. Trivializing Chan’s desire for the new or unusual shows how the substance of this genre shows disrespect as a matter of weight. To respect the bauble-head is not the mark of a wise and weighty merchant.

Yet not withstanding the slight to Chan the bauble-head, Roe continues to bauble on himself, mentioning other letters he had written:

Since your last received by me, I have written two, one of the 17th past, for dispeed of presents and goods, with advice requisite, the latter of the 2nd present, by it Mr. Fettiplace his accounts or journal missing, desiring it may be sent for England, to which I remit you in answer of these. The firmaen received was it seems according to understanding, and such as I hoped sufficient till a full trial.

These trivial details, adding to his importance, also signify the busy-ness of this business man: his constant exhortations and diligence. Regardless of whether they are acted upon or not, they were written and sent, the key substance. In addition, they contained “advice requisite,” included the busy suggestion to Mr. Fettiplace to send his missing accounts or journals to England. “To which I remit you in answer of these,” a key trivial detail, asking Kerridge to be accountable for the execution of letters he never received but that were sent. The detail of the sending itself the most important of all, establishing the trivial nature of the exact letters, but expanding upon the responsibilities of Kerridge, who must now figure out what the letters contained and follow through on them. The ending detail, that the firmaen was received “according to understanding” underscores the
trivial nature of the letters: in spite of his constant directives that are apparently
mislaid or ignored, all goes well anyway. Each trivial detail carries with it moral
weight. The detail of the letters carries within itself the economic weight of the
cloth itself seemingly received well.

Likewise, such detailed conflation of morality and economy is given in his
very instructions to Kerridge in the following paragraph:

Mamud Hussen is within one day’s journey, the master very
well satisfied, he in great danger to be blamed, for I had laid a fault
on him, for refusing the rest [of the] gold; and made known his
unthankfulness and your courtesy, which is well taken by Asaph
Chan, and thankfully by me. His Moorish trick to take away the
trunk his brother desires to conceal, for doubtless his master is
honourable in that point, and would turn him away. It shall be
redelivered within two days, and if possible sent to Amadavaz to fit
the owner. What he hath done in bullion I know not, but I hope Mr.
Browne would stand upon ready money; which I advised as soon
as I heard of it, and because I saw some pretended difficulty in the
sale, as if somebody should rest for next year, I ordered all can be
invested now; I hope performed.

The detail of “one day’s journey” is bound up with the satisfaction of the master,
followed by the reference to refusing of the gold, the denial, satisfaction, and
logistical detailed twined together into a trivialization of the circumstances.

“Courtesy” on one hand, what is given by Kerridge, is recompensed by
“unthankfulness,” on the other hand, canceling each other out in the racism of the
“Moorish trick.” The detail of “Moorish” before “trick” indicates this is no mere
bargaining strategy, but a specific raced strategy in the bargaining, a trick where
something is fraudulently concealed. By taking away the trunk his “brother
wishes to conceal,” there is a double movement of negation, a negation of the
bauble and a negation of hiding the bauble, which gives it value. The
trivialization of the brother’s hiding of the trunk, for whatever reason, is another
detail swallowed up by the recurring detail of gold: “What he hath done in
bullion I know not, but I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money; which I
advised as soon as I heard of it.” Again, the gold is bound up with secrecy,
hiding, fraud, and doubt. The one key detail is the lack of knowledge behind the
loss of the gold – “I know not.” This lack of knowledge, which presumes fraud, is
duplicated in this passage again: “which I advised as soon as I heard of it, and
because I saw some pretended difficulty in the sale, as if somebody should rest
for next year, I ordered all can be invested now; I hope performed.” Roe advised,
of course, against the delaying of the sale, and his advice becomes
substantialized by the detail of foreseeing some “pretended difficulty” with the
sale. His advise hinges on the fraud of others; in detailing possible fraud, he is
able to create not just the fraud, but his own sagacity. The pretended fraud that
surrounds the dealings is thus job security but also the very substance of the
genre the business and administrative communication genre is calculated to
uproot, reveal, and make clear.

Thus, another core component of this genre is the recurrence of
“pretense,” a recurrence that is exemplified in the repetition of details that signify
fraud and untrustworthiness. Pretended difficulties are created by Roe
throughout his correspondence, but especially in the details he gives that trivialize the actual relationships between the traders. From his perspective, they are bauble-heads, and any complaints they make are “pretended,” “fantastical pretenses.” He continues in this letter:

I reply to your second. Your bills for Agra our received, and money almost all invested; two hundred camels on the way this thirteen days; cloth bartered; credit for about 25,000 rup[ees] three months; the proceed much enlarged, double to former years, as they write, in best commodity, and all things there performed much to my content and (I hope) their credit and . . . profit; the number of semians enlarged (a new sort of cloth), and carpets not yet gotten, but in hand. Their day I will not fail on, nor have they found difficulty, as we supposed, in trust, nor prices hoised out of reason; and I make no question, by this year’s and the next’s practice, to enter so into good opinion as to buy on time for a leecke of goods, by which the ship shall be supplied in time, and, if care taken to preserve the foundation, it shall prove an adventure of better use meant to be so good husbands as to venture nothing.

He begins, again, with pointed details – the reply to the second, the bills received, the money paid, the cloth bartered. He then continues that the sales are much enlarged and “all things” performed to his “content” and “their credit,” the credit and content balancing each other out, the “hope” inserted as a type of equivocation in exchange, the added interest to “their credit,” bolstered by his personal wishes.

The new cloth is enlarged and carpets ordered: brief details establishing the ethos of the author, his busyness, but again, the same substance is repeated and amplified, the presumed pretense of the bauble-heads: “Their day I will not fail on, nor have they found difficulty, as we supposed, in trust, nor prices hoised out of reason.” His credibility and reliance is drawn in reliance upon the imagined
but ever present possibility of fraud. He will not fail, nor have “they found
difficulty” as they had supposed and imagined, in “trust.” Trust anchors the
details. All the details hinge upon this recurring theme, what has been done at
this end but is speculative at their end. He may sell baubles to a fantastical man,
but the breach of trust comes from their raising the prices out of reason. What is
reasonable is what Roe will pay, and the definition of “reason” hinges upon the
ability to cast the relationship in the same terms as money paid, cloth ordered.
Trust and reason are conflated to support the substance of this business details,
conveying that the performance as expected by one side is the definition of
“trust” and “reason.” Any other performance, a performance that hinders the
abrupt details of money paid, cloth ordered, is a trick, or worse yet, a “Moorish
trick,” unaccountable and unacceptable as beyond trust and reason. The simple
acts of buying and paying reveal the trivialization of the entire relationship. It is
this, and only this, that accounts for the relationship. And it is these details, and
no other, that will establish the credibility of the other side, a credibility constantly
undercut in order to provide the very substance of this letter.

Duration is another detail that both comprises the substance and that is
critical to trivialization. In one brief paragraph, Roe writes: “The certainty of the
King’s purpose, and my desires, is long since with you. I hope you shall be
despached and ready for the adventure. I must bear it, and have cast the
worst.” Certainty, the core component of the weighing of detail, the stacking of
minutiae that comprise the substance of the letter, is enfolded within the reader
and the writer. The simple long-standing knowledge of what is to be done,
similar to the two letters Kerridge is supposed to know about and execute, add weight to the demands of the letter. Here, Roe has cast himself into the King’s purposes, which is also “his desire.” Two double motives that propel this short paragraph and cast the weight of action on Kerridge, who must be “dispatched” and “ready.” Although Kerridge bears the brunt of this action, Roe absorbs the costs of it, a key detail that surfaces through this letter. He must bear it, and bear it notwithstanding he has “cast the worst,” that is, foreseen the failure implicit in his desires, not because they may actually fail, but because the failure of his desires is a detail that both gives this letter its credibility but that sets the background for the perspective on every action preformed by others. Failure is enfolded in the details that weigh upon each other, one failure upon another: baublization, Moorish tricks, and raising prices. Roe both absorbs the failure and the action to be performed by Kerridge. He, thus, takes the credit for the forecast failure to himself. He is the one performing because he is the one who has foreseen the risk and advised against it.

This forecasting of failure as a way to add “interest” to success is predicted in the ending of the paragraph before this short paragraph with his declaration of casting “the worst”:

[And I make no question, by this year’s and the next’s] practice, to enter so into good opinion as to buy on time for a leecke of goods, by which the ship shall be supplied in time, and, if care taken to preserve the foundation, it shall prove an adventure of better use meant to be so good husbands as to venture nothing.
Roe’s predictive ability allows his to be certain, to “make no question,” that notwithstanding the lack of trust and reasonableness that characterizes the other side, he will prevail. He will not only provide, but specifically “buy on time” the goods, which will, in turn, supply the ship “in time.” Time has the quality of being not only reasonable, but certain. The detail is critical to the substance of this genre, constantly referring back to itself to establish the key detail that must be executed promptly and business-like. The wise use of time, of “husbanding” of time, is not only the substance of the genre, but the very substance of the “foundation” of their business. By taking care to do all “in time,” the foundation will be preserved, and in so preserving, prove to be of “better use” than having attempted or “adventured” nothing. By enfolding timeliness into duration, a double movement of both length and urgency is provided in the substance. Urgency is a recurring element of the duration, busy-ness folding upon itself over and over and creating a duration that must be acted upon promptly and “in time.”

The intervention into time that these details insist upon is the trivialization of other concerns that might intercede, as well as the discounting of the relational difficulties inherent in casting the other side as untrustworthy and unreasonable.

Even money itself must be performed “in time,” and the duration between debt and payment is an interminable duration not to be accepted but to be constantly repeated in its smallest detail, a reminder that duration is unacceptable on the part of the other side, and the repetition amplifying the debt, giving it “interest,” making the detail its own matter through sheer prolixity. As a detail, it must begin the next paragraph:
Zulphekarcon's and Shaw Hussens's debts are at a stand. The latter is alive, and here; to-day Mr. Biddulph with him, who offers the Mancepdares⁹ all at present at Court, but I will not accept them. Of that make no question; the other until presents, cannot be moved by me; but I will not lose it; let that comfort you.

The standing debts are specified by name. In addition, the status of the second debtor is specified, he is live and present, and accompanied by another business associate, Mr. Bidduplh. By being so accompanied, the debt is secured. The person is substituted for the debt. In fact, the person is simply a metonym for the debt. It is the debt itself that is of primary interest, the presence of the person of interest only to the extent it provides security for the debt.

The offering of sureties is unacceptable to Roe. He will have the body of the debtor himself, and "will not accept them." The debtor is, thus, a prisoner, but the imprisonment is never made specific. That detail is without interest. Instead, "make no question," that is, have complete certainty, that the debt will be paid: "the other until presents, cannot be moved by me; but I will not lose it; let that comfort you." Until payment is made, until "presents," Roe cannot be moved. His solidity is cast as reasonable and wise, a form of intransigencies that is the substance of every small detail he recounts. His emotional intransigencies bolster the foundation of the business. And his refusal to let it be "lost" is a source of comfort to other associates, or rather, cast as a source of comfort. Dogged pursuit of the debtor regardless of the offering of sureties or other
guarantees, relationality and cultural means to establish relationships of trust, are unreasonable because they delay the debt, broaden the relational duration, and create a relationship that is interminable to Roe because it is the duration of a debt both unreasoned and untrustworthy.

Comfort in pursuing a debt relentless and without “being moved” by personal circumstances sets both the standard of credibility and the standard of emotional behavior itself. What is “compassion” is understood in specific reference to what is “debt,” and Roe’s own authority in relieving or pursuing a debt. He states this in the next paragraph, detailing the moral quality of the good business letter:

What I resolve on in the way of compassion Captain Pring (as concerning him) knows. A firmaen from Bengala cannot me had while the Prince hath Suratt, unless we will quit it and rely on the other only. He pretends that all our find good shall come thither and his port bear the burthen of trash, and hinder others. But of this and new changes at Court at the end of my letter.

Only Captain Pring is privy to what compassion, if any, Roe will extend to the debtor. This proclamation includes the name of his secret adviser, and enfolds the threat implicit in this detail into secrecy. Captain Pring could take action against the debtor. But how could such an action be executed when Roe is clearly outnumbered at the foreign Court, and when the foreign court has conveyed courtesies to him and his and permitted them to engage in relations with it? In addition, this specific detail of complicity and threat is conveyed to Kerridge, a detail Kerridge is not specifically privy to but which casts Roe, again, as a debt pursuing without compassion who knows how to take care of business.
Abruptly introducing the threat of violence when the debtor’s is present with the trades and offers all types of guarantees for his debt is a detail that trivializes the debtor and the guarantees the debtor seeks to make. The debtor is predicatively cast as violent and requiring physical intervention. Roe himself makes an indirect apology: “A firmaen from Bengala cannot me had while the Prince hath Suratt, unless we will quit it and rely on the other only.” Regardless of the debtor, the entire success of the venture depends on a foreign prince, and as long as this Prince holds this area, no trade can be had with the other. Implicit in this apology is that bad relations would have no long-term ill effects; the traders would simply move on to a more profitable area. In fact, the implicit violence is a good reason in itself since trade is so bad.

The detail of violence is simply a trading detail, adding to baublization, Moorish tricks, and the always and already unreasonableness of the other side, the pretense of the other side, the expendability of the area and the debtor. Roe makes this clear by repeating again this detail: “He pretends that all our find good shall come thither and his port bear the burthen of trash, and hinder others.” The Court is pretending to be a good port, it is not, Roe alludes, in fact any good at all. Rather, the port would bear the “burthen of the trash, and hinder others.” By casting what comes along with the good as “trash,” Roe specifies what he has already repeated several times, the discounting of the baubles and the debtors, plus a further discounting of what can not be sold reasonably. But in “hindering others,” another pretense, Roes stakes out the competitive level of his relationship with the Court. The Court has pretended it will favor this relationship,
but Roe casts this as “pretense.” It is the burden of the trash alone that bears the weight of the substance of this genre. Trash, what is not only without value but also possibly already used, is a metonym for the entire casting of the relationships between debtor, Court, and traders.

Thus, the third element in this generic substance, in addition to baublization and pretense, is the specification of details that work as metonyms for “trash.” By amplifying and repeating these details, which stand in for the whole, the whole of the relationship is cast as illusory, a relationship to be both created through details and then manipulated. This manipulation is specified by Roe in his short ending to the paragraph on trash: “But of this and new changes at Court at the end of my letter.” It is, through the continual deferral of specification, which also requires yet more specification, an anticipated gossip that is also business to come at the end of the letter, a firmly established perspective that imposes itself upon Kerridge, the reader. By keeping the “trashed” relationship constantly in mind as a disclosure to be anticipated, perhaps eagerly, this detail informs the rest of the text, a sub rosa text against which every other detail is to be weighed with “interest.”

Roe maintains this interest with his switch to yet another inconsequential detail given more weight by following upon this anticipated disclosure of “trash” at Court, establishing as the only detail that matters and that must be repeated infinitivally along with the debts, to be the inconvenience of the entire endeavor:
For the procuring freight or waffage\textsuperscript{10} into the Red Sea, I desire trial may be made, and keep my opinion to myself. I can cast and discover the probabilities, losses and inconveniences; but that is not the question. I would into that trade without them. The reasons are many, and you feel the main, the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you. Let us not dispute against it, but do or utmost, and if [it?] fail, it is not ours, but the projector’s. Yet the voyage I would not forsake for missing an imaginary help. I have been large in this to Captain Pring, laid down the foundation, reasons, and hopes, and what ways I would execute it. If I proceed not, I am innocent.

A trial is to be made of the costs of freight, and Roe, once again, keeps his opinion to himself, just as he keeps secret the trash at Court and the threat implicit in his compassionate reliance on Captain Pring. Again, his predictive ability is detailed: “I can cast and discover the probabilities, losses and inconveniences; but that is not the question.” Of course, that is precisely the question, and the motivating reason behind the disclosure of such detail.

Probabilities, losses and conveniences are exactly what Roe casts in this letter and is forever “forecasting” in the details he mentions. The probabilities are only as important as they indicate “loss” and “inconvenience,” the two terms balanced so that a loss is an inconvenience and nothing is so inconvenient as a loss. That he would “trade without them” signals his resolve to continue his business, but this resolve is established only through this prior predicate of loss/inconvenience. The loss/inconvenience that centers the substance of this letter is implicit in every detail made of baubles, unpaid debts, and false pretense. These are the losses/inconveniences, invented by Roe both to establish his busy-ness but also to establish the relationship is ultimately one of “trash,” of loss and inconvenience. Again, this is a matter of reason: “The
reasons are many, and you feel the main, the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you.” There are many unmentioned reasons why loss/inconvenience is implicit in the trade, but those unwritten reasons are enfolded with the trivialization of the letter. The main one, Kerridge knows, is the ship alone, which Roe again, had urged to Kerridge in his forecasting ability.

That Roe was not followed or that reasonable people might differ on this detail alone Roe uses as an occasion to declare peace with Kerridge: “Let us not dispute against it, but do or utmost, and if [it?] fail, it is not ours, but the projector’s.” Thus, once again, the execution of the endeavor is Kerridge, but the fault in execution is now cast upon the projector’s, who were so short-sighted they did not forecast the need to use only one ship. Even the projector’s are, in many ways, trashed, a projection of his own detailed complaints: “Yet the voyage I would not forsake for missing an imaginary help.” The “imaginary help” is both imagined and illusory, yet again a pretense, a detail specified so as to be “trashed.” A detail specified also to create an imaged community between Roe and Kerridge – they will do their best and resolve differences against the pretense at home and in Court.11

Yet within this detail loss/inconvenience is Roe’s own exculpatory detail: “I have been large in this to Captain Pring,” he writes. He repeats this again in the next clause, “laid down the foundation, reasons, and hopes.” And yet again repeats this is the third clause: “and what ways I would execute it.” These three gestures towards exculpatory excuse, Roes repetition of his reasonable forecasting, the straightforwardness of this advise, the specification of
“foundation, reasons, and hopes” that are unamplified but would give the impression of being weighty and detailed all in themselves, maintain the use of detail to trivialize the endeavor while establishing the weightiness of it. Roe concludes: “If I proceed not, I am innocent.” A contradictory detail after so many excuses, yet one to be predicted as well in the loss/inconvenience never specified but the cause for concern and warnings to both Captain and Kerridge. Roe has already excused himself by the giving of advice, the inconsequential nature of the enterprise, its nature of “trash” fully explained through the omission of his advice to Captain Pring. If he does not perform, he is innocent because of his great busy-ness in endeavoring to ensure the success of the enterprise. The loss/inconvenience that he writes would not dissuade him may nonetheless dissuade others. If he does not perform, it is due to the lack of performance by others, a lack already established through baublization, false pretenses, and the already discounted nature of the area and its Court, its “trash.”

Predictably, after so profound a confession and penance, Roe returns to the theme of debtor, and details yet another debtor who presumably will contribute to the loss/inconvenience that is the substance of each looming detail so painstakingly rendered:

Our debtor Groo is so long agreeing with his that I get nothing but “to-morrow”; but it rests upon Asaph Chan, who I know takes it to heart, and is the umpire for our sakes.

I suppose no time lost in staying for any order from me, wherein, as I have approved what you did, taking out the moneys by consultation, so I would not slyly have any hindrance cast upon respect to me, which in that point was none, nor needed any. I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.
As with his specification of the earlier debt, this money itself must be performed “in time,” and the duration between debt and payment is an interminable duration not to be accepted but to be constantly repeated in its smallest detail, a reminder that duration is unacceptable on the part of the other side, and the repetition amplifying the debt, giving it “interest,” making the detail its own matter through sheer prolixity. The debtor is “ours,” possessed and shared by the business associates, a debt of common concern and alarm. In addition, Groo is “so long agreeing with his,” that is, in complicit and unreasonable agreement with his fellow associates that Roe should not be paid. Roe casts this as a conspiracy to show how the debtors are against him, work in concerted action to prove their false pretenses, already assumed and needing only one small dereliction of duty to be proved. Groo, not given a full name either, cheats roes of his time in giving him nothing but “to-morrow,” the tomorrow the worst part of the deal, demonstrating that the specification that is critical is not simply the debt but the duration of time. Chan understands the severity of this trash of time, he takes it “to heart” and will be “umpire,” arbiter, judge, executor of the debt. This is the mark of a trusted associate, that all debtors belong to each other and each one will look at after the other’s debtor.

That the debtor Groo is a fraud but Roe is not is intertwined in the passage immediately following, where Roe writes, “I suppose no time lost in staying for any order from me.” Recalcitrance is doubly enfolded within this passage: Kerridge becomes the debtor, who uses duration not to delay a debt
but to quickly executive what needed to be done without orders, just like a good
debtor pays without being asked. “Staying” for any order is a dereliction of duty
at the same time that the orders must be followed. Kerridge, like the debtor, is
bound within a twinned notion of time, in which the performance must both follow
and anticipate the written order. Failure to both follow and anticipate an order is
the very definition of loss/inconvenience that Roe rails against, and to avoid this
loss and inconvenience, subterfuge and conspiracy are enfolded within his
details, the “imaginary help” that creates an imagined community of trustworthy
and reasonable traders. Immediately following this passage he specifies so:

I have approved what you did, taking out the moneys by
consultation, so I would not slyly have any hindrance cast upon
respect to me, which in that point was none, nor needed any. I
agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz],
and have written to that effect.

Kerridge is to understand that everything he does in prediction of what roe would
have advised it approved. Kerridge is by proxy the execution of roes’ “imaginary
help.” Roe would not have “slyly” any hindrance cast upon him: Kerridge need
not wait for direct orders for what must obviously be done in Roe’s “imaginary”
directives. To so wait when the action is obvious casts a hindrance upon Roe,
and he must painstakingly specify that no order was needed by him, and none
given. Thus, the absence of the order is presumed to be evidence of the
continual order for “imaginary help.”
This is all understood through the details that trivialize his own orders at the same time they cast more weight upon them. Kerridge needs authority for many things, but not for the things that are truly important, knowing in advance that Roe will agree: “I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.” In effect, Roe relies upon earlier letters, but also relies upon the weight of the detail that amplifies inconvenience and loss. If an imaginary order is needed to avoid inconvenience and loss, it is presumed to exist and his agreement already implied.

Thus, within the topecs of baublization, false pretenses, and imaginary help, there is always and already enfolded the primary substance of this genre, the continual deferral of orders, of information, and of advise. Instead, Roe repeats the details of debts and gold, shipments to be received and shipments to be made, as if the details themselves create the trade. These details become flesheed out through the loss/inconvenience each predicts and inscribe within the substance of this genre. Performance in anticipation of predictive and “imaginary” orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks to instantiate through the substance of his letters.13
Thus, the fourth core component of this substance is the constant repetition of details that signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and inconvenient endeavor. In a lengthy passage, Roe alludes to the profound mistrust in several different circumstances and against a host of people, so that only Kerridge and himself occupy that privileged imagined community of imaginary help:

The ship to return referred to the Commander; what I can propound is done. Indigo of Jambuzar I cannot judge of; a former signified my mistrust that might be that sort which . . . mention not worth 12d. per lb. and not distinguished from Serquese, because of a making and passed with it. I must refer it to your judgment.  

Perdap Shaw’s firmaen was sent to Mr, Banggam, who moved for it and knows the use.

For private trade you know my orders, and I hope the . . . pleasure. The prime commodity no man, I hope, will deal in upon any pretence; cloth, if they do, and consent to acquaint the factors with it and remit it to their masters, it may pass, and by your and my advice may be favoured; but for all such as are obstinate I require execution of commission to the utmost, notice of their names, and I will use my credit to bring them to repentance by losses. They that trust their masters deserves the issue of trust, faith and grace; but they that dare not, know themselves unworthy of any. I am persuaded no man can deal so privately (though the Customer join) but you may know it, and I am sure it cannot come aboard and be stowed, and cloud; such take, seize and mark, or rather forbid shipping if unmarked; or if [it?] cannot be done till I come to Suratt, you shall find I find many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.

This litany of mistrust is fostered against both the trade commodity itself, indigo, and every person occupied in the endeavor in this area. That this litany is bolstered by the authority of war is indicated in its very first sentence: the ship is in the authority of the Commander, an order that Roe had already, presumably, dictated or advised. With such mistrust, the only authority that is trustworthy,
aside from Kerridge’s own judgment, is the threat implicit in consigning the ship to the Commander. This is the predicate for his entire mediation on the essential untrustworthiness of every person involved in the trade, all of whom are presumed to be eagerly interested in private trade, a subject of so great mistrust Roe details it at excruciating and time-consuming length.

The primary trope again, is pretense: “The prime commodity no man, I hope, will deal in upon any pretence.” There are exceptions of course, “cloth, if they do, and consent to acquaint the factors with it and remit it to their masters, it may pass.” Cloth, being not of the central mission, may be traded in privately by persons involved with the endeavor, but only to the extent that they both notify the factors of it and remit something to the masters, establishing the chain of hierarchy that will permit the implicitly untrustworthy to become trustworthy. Likewise, this trade is permissible “by your and my advice may be favoured, “ thus enfolding both Roe and Kerridge within this chain of hierarchy, indeed, placing them at the very top of the chain as being the ones who favor it within the prescribed limits of what is reasonable.

Again, the favor of Roe and his imagined helper Kerridge is discounted by his claim to compassion, the same compassion he details as a threat from Captain Pring earlier: “but for all such as are obstinate I require execution of commission to the utmost.” That is, he requires execution of the commission of martial law, and to the utmost, his compassion and favor being weighed by his ability to extract the extreme degree of marital law. In addition, he would require not just execution to the utmost, but “notice of their names, and I will use my
credit to bring them to repentance by losses.” His credit, that is, his compassion and favor, weighs against those who abuse his favor. The sin committed by those who do not follow the chain of hierarchy is explicit and severe, Roes casting of himself as the final authority and a person who is both reasonable and businesslike: “They that trust their masters deserves the issue of trust, faith and grace.” A good employee knows their place, and their place is to follow orders.

Anything less is not just disobedience, it is the fulfillment of the lack of trust already implied and awaited by Roe, the lack of trust implicit in the hierarchy. He makes this clear: “but they that dare not, know themselves unworthy of any.” The lack of trusting of their masters make the employees unworthy of trust. However, they are already unworthy of trust, so now they are doubly unworthy and to be watched. This of course, is a detail that Roe must include since this is the detail that characterizes his letters, his profound mistrust of any and all save his imaginary help. Taken to its logical conclusion, Roe is not to be trusted either, should be a subject of marital law, having so profoundly mistrusted all. The difference is in degree and status. He is the master of all, and thus to be trusted by all while he is permitted the profound privilege of mistrusting and casting the behavior of others as presumptively untrustworthy and just intended to cause him loss and inconvenience.

Roe explains in detail the rationale behind his golden rule of “trust your masters if you want to be trusted by them, by rationalizing, "I am persuaded no man can deal so privately (though the Customer join) but you may know it, and I am sure it cannot come aboard and be stowed, and cloud; such take, seize and
mark, or rather forbid shipping if unmarked; or if [it?] cannot be done till I come to
Suratt, you shall find I find many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.”
Roe has persuaded himself and seeks to persuade Kerridge that the reason
behind this golden rule is that the employees will be caught. No man can deal
privately, even in complete conspiracy with the customer, but Kerridge will know
it. Kerridge is thus super-surveillancer as well as once again enfolded within not
only the golden rule of trusting one’s masters but again, “imaginary” help.
Kerridge will know it has come aboard, where it is stowed, and where it is
clouded or hidden. Kerridge knows all. Roe instructs the all-knowing Kerridge to
take such goods, seize them – more than a taking, but a stealing of the goods –
and to mark them. And if they cannot be marked, to forbid the very passage of
such goods. And Roe once again, with utter aplomb and confidence, asserts that
if Kerridge cannot do this, or fids it difficult, then he can just wait for Roe, who will
see this matter through, demonstrating that Roe finds “many things easy thought
impossible; for I will do it.” If Kerridge finds it impossible to be all-knowing and
cruel, Roe will find it easy. If Kerridge cannot steal from the employees and mark
their goods, Roe will have no problem.

This is a critical detail in the substance of this genre, a detail that amplifies
the prolixity of Roe. This detail urges Kerridge to anticipate and predict what Roe
will find when he comes abroad, and to anticipate and predict exactly what it is
Roe will do when he asserts “I will do it.” Again, the imaginary help is itself a loss
and inconvenience. If Kerridge cannot perform, Roe will do it, and it will inure to
his credit as well, his creation of the imaginary help he needs through the threat
of him actually doing something besides doling out advice that may or may not even be read. The gesture of anger and impotence is profound, especially in a letter as lengthy as this one, a letter that may or may not have reached its intended recipient at the time Roe wrote it. Once again, performance in anticipation of predictive and “imaginary” orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks to instantiate through the substance of his letters. In this passage, he inserts himself within this instantiation of the absence.\textsuperscript{15} He has become the imaginary help that will avert both loss and inconvenience.

As mentioned earlier, the first element of the generic situation, substance, can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. By multiplication and amplification, inconsequential details are expressed through tropes such as baublization, pretense, and trash. A core component of this substance is the constant repetition of details that signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and inconvenient endeavor. These details both create and call for imaginary help with an imagined community of those that are trustworthy, the letter write and sometimes, the letter receiver, Kerridge. The final trope that conveys this substance of trivialization is the continual insistence upon the ability to discern shadows from truth. This is the perspective of the master, a status Roe continually must reinforce through his repetition of his superior knowledge and
powers of discernment. This repetition of details seeks to instantiate his own authority, but even more, his very physical presence in the letter. He creates himself as author and authority through his superior perspective, one that is above all others. His existence depends on such a perspective, since there is no reason to write unless he adopts this perspective and seeks to persuade himself and his reader that his letters matters and that he himself matters within the environment of mistrust, double-dealing, pretense, trash, and bauble-heads in which he finds himself.

Thus, the fifth and final trope recurring through the repetition of inconsequential details is the perspectival recasting as Roe, just one of many, as Roe, omnipresent and omnipotent giver of true advice and wisdom. Immediately following his strict compassion for the employees, he makes his wisdom self-evident in a lengthy passage to the reader:

Mr. Steele hath satisfied him easily that loves not contentions; but I can discern words and shadows from truth and substance. I hope well of all men, of him, and would not put my finger to the ruin of any. I cannot so soon help a man as destroy him: it is a tender thing in a man’s conscience. Yet I am not so easy as to be abused much. You shall see I see both ways and will choose the best.

It is strange that you should be the worse used for Asaph Chan’s servant’s presence. I hope he will testify it to his master, to sharpen him against them. But I am sure the firmaen or letter or licence, or what you please call it, imported to pass all our fine goods custom-free; which I mislike not, and the stream will turn again.

Your Governor is recalled, as by my last advised, perhaps for our sake; but I will prove a more active friend to him than he was to us, when he arrives. Abulhassan pretends to be sorry for the Prince’s usage of us; says he dare not stir in his own prigony, but if
he were removed, would make a new Surratt for us at Swally. To- 
night I will question with him of that dissimulation; but I know, the 
complaint came to the Prince, by him to the King, and disputed 
before my face not long since; to which Abulhassan said nothing 
nor seem to be concerned in it. The King was not pleased at the 
folly, but after his manner gave us no satisfaction, but only bade his 
son use strangers better.

This entire passage centers around Roe’s superior knowledge and wisdom, his 
ability to “discern words and shadows from truth and substance.” Although those 
who dislike contention might be satisfied by shadows and words, Roe knows 
better, being of the mettle to contend with both words and shadows. Although 
there are multiple ways to determine a fact, Roe uses his recurring tropes as the 
“facts” from which the reader is to deduce the “truth” from the “shadows.” He 
does not state “facts” so much as imply them, allowing his reader to believe that 
what he discerns is the truth, and the rest of it dissimulation, deceit, and fraud. Roe is, thus, the ultimate arbitrator of the trading relationship and its reasonable 
and trustworthy nature. He is the one willing to contend with shadows and 
words.

Yet he contends with his own words, one the one hand profoundly 
detailing his mistrust of all, yet at the same time asserting: “I hope well of all 
men, of him, and would not put my finger to the ruin of any.” The contradiction 
between his earlier sentence and this statement is almost untenable. At the 
same time he threatens ruin several times in this letter, drawing upon his “credit” 
to enforce his imaginary orders, he doublebacks and disclaims, “I hope well of all 
men, of him, and would not put my finger to the ruin of any.” He contends with 
words, but the words also contend with him, asking him to both consider and
reconsider his threats and promises. His “finger,” signifying also his writing, he would not put to “the ruin of any.” Predictably enough, though, that is precisely what he repeats again and then withdraws in his next three sentences: “I cannot so soon help a man as destroy him.” Again, he writes, “it is a tender thing in a man's conscience.” One would think the discerner of shadows and words had made a statement. But not so: “Yet I am not so easy as to be abused much.” Again, his discernment is cast as the ability to avoid loss and inconvenience.

Destroying another person is permissible if he is much abused, and the abuse takes the figure of what Roe perceives as abuse from his superior perspective: “You shall see I see both ways and will choose the best.” Like a double-headed Janus, Roe can see both ways, good and bad, forward and backward, trust and distrust. He is equally versatile and multi-perspectival when it comes to ruining people, and will only do so in the “best.” This claim to superior knowledge and morality, to the utmost wisdom and impeccable discernment that is the trope that circulates through these small details is repeated again: “It is strange that you should be the worse used for Asaph Chan's servant’s presence.” To Roe, discerner of shadows and words, this misuse complained of by Kerridge is “strange.” From his perspective, a mistake must have been made: “I hope he will testify it to his master, to sharpen him against them.” Again, from his superior perspective, even the misuse of Kerridge can turn a loss or inconvenience into an occasion for profit.
By suggesting the servant testify to his master, Roe is suggesting that Kerridge complain of this treatment as “strange” rather than as deserved or as a cultural difference. The complaint alone will inure to the benefit of both. Within the superior perspective is, as well, a constant discounting of the actual circumstances experience by Kerridge. They are “strange and to be used. Likewise, precision in terminology is beneath Roe: “But I am sure the firmaen or letter or licence, or what you please call it” signaling that the words themselves are unimportant as long as the profit is made, the goal to gain whatever it is created by this area that is necessary to import the goods, the “fine” goods, not the trash: “imported to pass all our fine goods custom-free; which I mislike not, and the stream will turn again.” Despite Kerridge’s abuse, the result Roe “mislike[s] not,” and from his perspective of superior and untouchable wisdom, he concludes with a platitude, “and the stream will turn again.” Kerridge can rest in knowing his abuse will pay off, and will be recompensed to the abuser when the stream turns again.

To shore up his claim to wisdom, the discernment of shadows and words from truth, Roe takes credit for actions that he advised, imaging himself as in control of the entire enterprise: “Your Governor is recalled, as by my last advised, perhaps for our sake.” Roe takes credit for an action he had advised, and even center the action around his and Kerridge’s personal status, for “our sake.” The presumptive and imperious claim to well-executed action is bolstered by another Roe claim to severe compassion: “but I will prove a more active friend to him than he was to us, when he arrives.” When the governor arrives,
Roe, the person who claims to be responsible for his removal, in fact, the very reason for his removal and job loss, will prove a “more active friend.” Superior wisdom casts this as compassion rather than condescension. The superior wisdom that runs throughout this passage makes Roe a “bigger” man for befriending a person who has lost his job because of Roe.

That this is imaginary does not deflect the overall trope recurring here: roes as supreme arbitrator and wisdom. Again, he uses this superior wisdom to discern yet more shadows: “Abulhassan pretends to be sorry for the Prince’s usage of us.” Although his condolences are real and substantial, those of others are, of curse, pretense, especially because they cannot be “active friends”: Abulhassan “says he dare not stir in his own prigony, but if he were removed, would make a new Surratt for us at Swally.” The pretender, although not able to help Roe now, would create an entire new trading province for him if he could. Roe, enticed by this suggestion, again asserts his powers of discernment, writing, “To-night I will question with him of that dissimulation.” Enfolded within this questioning is the implicit wisdom of Roe: he will get to the truth, this discerner of shadows and words.

What helps him is his constant surveillance and chewing over pieces of gossip that establish his superior wisdom. He writes, “[B]ut I know, the complaint came to the Prince, by him to the King, and disputed before my face.” That they might be performing for Roe is beyond question, but the performance, for him, has the quality of the shadows he is so careful to spy upon. Pretense and false pretense are intertwined: “Abulhassan said nothing nor seem to be concerned in
it.” Again, this is Roe’s superior perspective assigning weight to the performance. But Roe, as the master, places himself within the status of king, enfolding himself within the king’s displeasure: “The King was not pleased at the folly, but after his manner gave us no satisfaction, but only bade his son use strangers better.” The folly of the court, in Roe’s perspective, should dictate an “active friend.” The failure to give “satisfaction” by the king roe can only sum up as the characteristic quality of the king. It is “his manner.” The discerner of shadows and words thus because caught in his own discernment, required to summarize the king’s stance without any inclination of what “folly” occurred or what the king thought.

These are all attributions of Roe to the court, and as attributions, claiming the very discernment he seeks to persuade Kerridge he already exits, that discernment that would enable him to find stolen hidden goods on the ships that Kerridge himself might miss. Yet the king’s words, “bade his son use strangers better,” could be the very satisfaction the relational quality required, the folly being discounted by the king, although not by Kerridge, as pranks or mistrust of Roe himself. How gently he and Kerridge are abused is not the subject of this letters, though, rather, to prove his discernment, he must find and unearth the very severe compassion that he himself claims to himself.19
Although Roe’s letter could be considered another genre within the broad frames of empiric travel writing, he is writing an exemplary of composing ability.\textsuperscript{20} Through his continual tropes framed within the broad element of trivialization, Roe establishes a method of problem finding, framing, and solving guided by the classical principles of the commonplaces, the \textit{topoi}, literally, the places one goes to find the material, the substantive element, of argument, that is, the means for inducing belief.\textsuperscript{21} Aristotle divides the commonplaces into two: the general and the specific. The general commonplaces are those within common knowledge. The specific commonplaces belong to particular disciplines or particular discourse communities.\textsuperscript{22} For Roe, the “facts” come after the results; they justify the results. His understanding of facts leads the reader, naturally enough, to accuse Roe of result-oriented decisions, as if results (or consequences) were not a legitimate concern of trading.\textsuperscript{23} Through the tropes he composes, he incorporates ability within the narrative structure of the letter.\textsuperscript{24} His narrative incorporates also his own suspicion, as the analysis of style reveals.\textsuperscript{25} In addition, through his continual use of these tropes, a linear casual relationship is imbricated into this genre, so that “fact” looms large and functions as the Will to Truth.\textsuperscript{26} The ability incorporated or subsumed within composing ability reframes the material conditions of the embodied experience to give an anchor in materiality of abstract notions of who has composing ability and who can exercise it.\textsuperscript{27}
As the next chapter will show, the second element of the generic situation, style, is intimacy, expressed through the rhetorical trope of the direct address figured as loving and caring. Intimacy is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Just as trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading, the claim to intimacy establishes the claim to engagement, or pathos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is alienating and forbidding as close and dear.28 Thus, the pathos of the genre is established through a fundamental contradictory mixture of substance and style, creating composing ability as both a distant and near ability.


5 According to Foster’s notes, neither of these letters still exists. *Id.* at 213 n. 2. Also according to Foster, this letter is printed “with a few omissions” in *The Embassy,* p. 447. *Id.* at n.1.

6 According to Foster’s notes, “chopped” means “stamped,” similar to signing a document. *Id.* at n. 3.

7 “Raised,” according to Foster. *Id.* at 214 n. 2.


9 According to Foster, “Mansabdars” or “officers” that were “of course” offered as sureties. *Id.* at 215 n. 1.

10 This is a payment for “convoying native vessels.” Foster, *id.* n. 4.


19 For an analysis of how the travel writers seek to persuade themselves, see, e.g. Fuller, Mary C. Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576-1624. Cambridge, GB: Cambridge UP, 1995.


22 Id.

23 Aristotle classifies witnesses as athechnic pisteis, that is, nonartistic or extrinsic proof, in judicial rhetoric. As extrinsic proof, they are used rather than invented. Aristotle on Rhetoric at I.2.3, 37: I.15.1-32, 108-118.

24 Cicero, for example, recommends combing through the narration to find the commonplaces. de Inventione, II.xiv.45-46, 207.

26 See, e.g., Foucault, Michel, *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972. 235 (“a day came when truth was displaced from the ritualized, efficacious, and just act of enunciation, towards the utterance itself, its meaning, its form, its object, its relation to its reference”).


CHAPTER 3

STYLE

As established in the previous chapter, the first element of the generic situation, substance, can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading. The second element of the generic situation, style, is intimacy, expressed through the rhetorical trope of the direct address figured as loving and caring. Intimacy is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Just as trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is
incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading, the claim to intimacy establishes the claim to engagement, or pathos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is alienating and forbidding as close and dear.\(^1\) To establish the style of intimacy, this last chapter closely analyzes one of the most prolific early modern business letter writers, Sir Thomas Roe, paying particular attention to his correspondence with Thomas Kerridge, a business associate, to demonstrate this generic style of business and administrative communication. By paying close attention to syntax and grammar, this generic style reveals itself. In this chapter, I revisit the analysis of substance to show how style emerges to form the rhetorical message. By layering style upon substance, a fuller picture of this genre emerges.

As this chapter will demonstrate, to construct both the emotional affect and the appeal to pathos, Roe uses stylistic devices, including sentence structure, variation in person, connotative language, and syntax, to create a relationship that is both a conspiracy, a family bond, and a signification of an imagined community held together by the always and already present betrayal of trust in that most important of relationships, the trader and money. In addition, Roe uses style to insert the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication. Friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with
saving money. Finally, the two primary emotional appeals are to debt and martial law, both emotional arousal and emotional relief. By pursuing a debt relentlessly, roe sets the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting over and worth emoting about. His repeated use of references to martial law is a reference to violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of the debt and casting the reader in the role of both captive and captivated participant.

This style is established in the very opening of such letters. In his letter dated December 6, 1617, Sir Thomas Roe writes to Thomas Kerridge at Surat in response to a previous letter he was claimed to have received:

MR. KERR[IDGE], Yours now received of the 21st November mentioneth one of the 9th that never came to me; with this the copy and note in English and Persian of what delivered to Asaph Chan’s servant, the weight of gold and prices as by invoice, this last unagreed for, the former sold and the specie rated and concluded upon; but I suppose this in Persian but a copy, and not chopped by him, whereby not authentical if any difference, and the original lost may move question; he not yet arrived, and his reports (like a Moor) cold; but the money or goods I shall receive, and serve Agra with. I refuse always to take any beforehand, because I would not be tied by courtesy to inferior prices, nor appear so hungry as to borrow on account. His payment is better than any man’s though his prices hard made. By this I am sure I have saved custom, contented a friend, and not borne the hazard of portage.

Through the direct address, Roe establishes the relationship between Kerridge and himself as one of intimacy, permitting the abrupt and direct address. In so establishing his pathos, he underscores the personal importance of the information to follow. He specifies that the invoice was “unagreed for,” and, in addition, not signed. But these two details are unimportant, since the original is
lost. However, his syntax indicates that these two details are of importance, each balanced within the sentence and of equal weight. Thus, he adds details of no importance framed syntactically significant to establish his weight to complain and his weight in refusing to be tied by “courtesy” to inferior prices. Rather than a form of cultural rudeness, this is just another one of the “details” as important as the fraudulent invoice in establishing the intimacy between the writer and reader. Fraudulent in fact, perhaps, but most importantly, fraudulent because it is weighed of equal value in the syntax, and thus, valuable. He refuses to “appear so hungry” to borrow on another person’s account, and thus, establishes the pathos of his situation through metaphor, using the refusal to “appear hungry” to conjure up the hungriness and desperation of his situation. His insignificant details about a fraudulent but lost invoice make his relationship with Kerridge fat with detail, establishing the intimacy between the reader and writer. Nonetheless, the most significant detail comes at the end, the hard bargained for deal, which will be paid, the most important detail, but will, as well, saved him the customs charge, the costs of freight and then, of course, “contented a friend.” By structurally adding “contented a friend” sandwiched between customs and freight, Roe inserts the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and
administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication. Here, friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with saving money.

Such use of intimacy, like the use of trivialization, also gives weight to his particular rendition of reality, of the bargain, or of the deal. The appeal of pathos allows him to both chide the reader and correct him:

In the letters sent you there was some mistaking, for I excepted particularly the Standish, as a neat thing, not of great price; and in the note to Mr. Browne I desired the gloves of 8l. might be sent to Mocreb Chan, as being likest to buy anything that is not requested here, and so perceive he had, refusing nothing; and being kept will find a worse market; if given, taken as of no use and disrespected. I hope all comes up (mentioned to be reserved) according to all later letters, that I may make a riddance, and put off to that fantastical man whatsoever the wiser will not like; for we must fit ourselves according to the humours of buyers, some that love things of use, others that will buy every bauble.

As a seller of baubles, Roe is, of course, a speaker in bauble-talk. But here, his baubling also serves to draw the reader into his trials, using the passive form to draw the accusation away from Kerridge and place it on some unseen and unknown mistaker. The reader is already excused and forgiven for the mistake, a gentle chiding and baubling over Kerridge’s purchase of an inkstand Roe had specified, detailed, was not to be bought. Roe corrects the mistake itself, gently insisting that the bauble to be sent to a purchaser who will buy anything, a bauble-head, “refusing nothing.” Chan, if sold to, will buy, but if given, like a true bauble-head, will “take as of no use and disrespected.” In this parallel structure, the immense respect shown to Kerridge in the passive voice is deflected and
underscored through the use of the direct voice in describing that “fantastical man,” who will buy whatsoever the non-bauble head will buy, the “wiser” merchant. Kerridge is thus both implicated and exculpated as the “wiser man,” proving himself even wiser by making a “riddance” of those baubles that no one else will buy. Trivializing Chan’s desire for the new or unusual shows how the substance of this genre shows disrespect as a matter of weight, while the syntax of intimacy shows how the style of this genre both undercuts that disrespect and uses it to shore up respect for the letter reader. To respect the bauble-head is not the mark of a wise and weighty merchant, and to insist that the reader is not a bauble-head through syntax underscores the wisdom of this statement.

Yet not withstanding the respect shown to Kerridge contrasted with the slight to Chan the bauble-head, Roe continues to bauble on himself, mentioning other letters he had written as a way of establishing the long-term and studiously cultivated relationship between himself and Kerridge:

Since your last received by me, I have written two, one of the 17th past, for dispeed of presents and goods, with advice requisite, the latter of the 2nd present, by it Mr. Fettiplace his accounts or journal missing, desiring it may be sent for England, to which I remit you in answer of these. The firmaen received was it seems according to understanding, and such as I hoped sufficient till a full trial.

On the one hand, as a matter of substance, these trivial details, adding to his importance, also signify the busy-ness of this business man: his constant exhortations and diligence. On the other hand, as a matter of style, these trivial details seek to endear Kerridge to Roe, enfolding Kerridge within the importance of Roe’s busywork, the urgency of his exhortations and diligence. Regardless of
whether they are acted upon or not, they were written and sent, the key substance. Reminding Kerridge of this is a key structural device, the use of memory to persuade Kerridge that this work is important and requires constant follow-up. In addition, they contained “advice requisite,” included the busy suggestion to Mr. Fettiplace to send his missing accounts or journals to England. “To which I remit you in answer of these,” a key intimate detail, enfolding Kerridge within the enterprise as well as deferring to his judgment. “I remit you” is both courteous and direct, a submission and an order at the same time. This style encourages Kerridge to be accountable for the execution of letters he never received but that were sent. The detail of the sending itself the most important of all, establishing the trivial nature of the exact letters, but also encouraging Kerridge to imagine what the letters contained, and in imaging the letters, identifying himself with the writer and what the writer would have wanted. The ending detail, that the firmaen was received “according to understanding” underscores the intimate nature of the style: in spite of his constant directives that are apparently mislaid or ignored, all goes well anyway, but it goes well in the passive voice, creating an imagined community that both he and Kerridge have satisfied. Each trivial detail carries with it moral weight, yes, but also affectionate weight, underscored by alternating the direct address with the passive voice, allowing Kerridge to be both charged and not charged with additional responsibilities, as he imagines them to be.
Likewise, such detailed conflation of morality and economy, given in his very instructions to Kerridge in the following paragraph, are also balanced by the alternation of courtesy to Kerridge and the ungratefulness of the other:6

Mamud Hussen is within one day’s journey, the master very well satisfied, he in great danger to be blamed, for I had laid a fault on him, for refusing the rest [of the] gold; and made known his unthankfulness and your courtesy, which is well taken by Asaph Chan, and thankfully by me. His Moorish trick to take away the trunk his brother desires to conceal, for doubtless his master is honourable in that point, and would turn him away. It shall be redelivered within two days, and if possible sent to Amadavaz to fit the owner. What he hath done in bullion I know not, but I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money; which I advised as soon as I heard of it, and because I saw some pretended difficulty in the sale, as if somebody should rest for next year, I ordered all can be invested now; I hope performed.

The detail of “one day’s journey” is bound up with the satisfaction of the master, followed by the reference to refusing of the gold, the denial, satisfaction, and logistical detailed twined together into a trivialization of the circumstances. Yet this substance, as trivial as it is, carries great emotional weight in the way Kerridge is enfolded within these details, his personal statute thus used as a way to give resonance to these trivial details, to make them important. The “courtesy” on one hand, what is given by Kerridge, is recompensed by “unthankfulness,” on the other hand, canceling each other out in the racism of the “Moorish trick,” seeking to create through the appellation of “Moorish” identification by Kerridge with the writer of the letter.7 The detail of “Moorish” before “trick” indicates this is no mere bargaining strategy, but a specific raced strategy in the bargaining, a trick where something is fraudulently concealed. Kerridge, by being placed in structural opposition, is thus honestly open. The “Moorish trick,” in taking away
the trunk his “brother wishes to conceal,” is a double movement of negation, a negation of the bauble and a negation of hiding the bauble, which gives it value. Kerridge, courteous, honest, and open, is the double positive of this trick, by the appeal to pathos understood as both revealing the trunk and revealing the true value of the bauble. Kerridge is figured, in anticipation, as the opposite of the trick, an appeal to pathos that encourages Kerridge to act as he is figured in action. This openness is also confession to Roe: “What he hath done in bullion I know not, but I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money; which I advised as soon as I heard of it.” Again, the gold is bound up with secrecy, hiding, fraud, and doubt, but the contrast between the secrecy, hiding, fraud, and doubt and Mr. Browne is the key syntactical appeal. “But I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money” establishes trust, forthrightness and readiness, qualities Kerridge is to identify with in contrast to the hider of gold. The one key detail in the lack of knowledge behind the loss of the gold – “I know not” – encourages confession and openness. This lack of knowledge, which presumes fraud, and structurally encourages identification with openness, is duplicated in this passage again: “which I advised as soon as I heard of it, and because I saw some pretended difficulty in the sale, as if somebody should rest for next year, I ordered all can be invested now; I hope performed.” Roe advised, of course, against the delaying of the sale, and his advice becomes substantialized by the detail of foreseeing some “pretended difficulty” with the sale. The appeal of his advice hinges on the fraud of others and the honesty of the reader; in detailing possible fraud, he is able to create not just the fraud, but his reader as an honest
person. The pretended fraud that surrounds the dealings is thus job security but also the very substance of the genre the business and administrative communication genre is calculated to uproot, reveal, and make clear. The identification of the reader with courtesy, thankfulness, and honesty encourages the reader to take action to uproot, reveal, and make clear all dealings.⁹

Thus, style bolsters another core component of this genre, the recurrence of “pretense,” a recurrence that is exemplified in the repetition of details that signify fraud and untrustworthiness and that are syntactically structured to enfold the reader into that which is not “pretense.” Pretended difficulties are created by Roe throughout his correspondence, but especially in the details he gives that trivialize the actual relationships between the English traders and the other, a trivialization that encourages the English traders to form relationships in contrast to the “pretended” ones. From Roe’s perspective, the “foreign” traders are bauble-heads, and any complaints they make are “pretended,” “fantastical pretenses.” As he continues in his letter, the “fantastical pretenses” of the other served to make the relationship between reader and writer even more credible and full of integrity:

I reply to your second. Your bills for Agra our received, and money almost all invested; two hundred camels on the way this thirteen days; cloth bartered; credit for about 25,000 rup[ees] three months; the proceed much enlarged, double to former years, as they write, in best commodity, and all things there performed much to my content and (I hope) their credit and . . . profit; the number of semians enlarged (a new sort of cloth), and carpets not yet gotten, but in hand. Their day I will not fail on, nor have they found difficulty, as we supposed, in trust, nor prices hoised ¹⁰ out of
reason; and I make no question, by this year’s and the next[‘s] practice, to enter so into good opinion as to buy on time for a leecke of goods, by which the ship shall be supplied in time, and, if care taken to preserve the foundation, it shall prove an adventure of better use meant to be so good husbands as to venture nothing.

He begins, again, with pointed details in the direct address – the reply to the second, the bills received, the money paid, the cloth bartered. This is a gesture of courtesy, the summary of what Kerridge needs to know, that his letter was received, read, and acted upon. In its very brevity, this sentence establishes the importance of Kerridge’s desires and wishes. His orders are summarily and without question followed. In terms of substance, Roe then continues that the sales are much enlarged and “all things” performed to his “content” and “their credit,” the credit and content balancing each other out, the “hope” inserted as a type of equivocation in exchange, the added interest to “their credit,” bolstered by his personal wishes. His hopes, thus inserted immediately after his response to Kerridge’s wishes, thus permits identification of his wishes with Kerridge’s wishes; his hopes become Kerridge’s hopes, his increase in “credit” an increase in Kerridge’s “credit.”

The new cloth is enlarged and carpets ordered: brief details establishing the pathos of the author, his busyness in service of Kerridge, but again, the same substance is repeated and amplified, the presumed pretense of the bauble-heads: “Their day I will not fail on, nor have they found difficulty, as we supposed, in trust, nor prices hoised out of reason.” His credibility and reliance is drawn in reliance upon the imagined but ever present possibility of fraud, and it is conveyed through the use of a structurally complex sentence that repeats two
negatives, binding up the pretense in the very tortured structure. The active voice is followed by the passive voice – “I will not fail” by “have they found difficulty.” Thus, he identifies himself, but casts the others as unknown agents, and as unknown agents, even more suspect and untrustworthy. “As we supposed” creates a community between him and Kerridge, their joint thoughts, their conspiracy that is one aspect of the intimacy Roes creates between the two of them. This conspiracy interrupts the passive sentence, inserting itself between their difficulty and their trustworthiness. Trust anchors the details, but it is not the trust of the “foreign” traders, it is the trust between Roe and Kerridge. All the details hinge upon this recurring theme, what has been done at the honest end, but is speculative, a subject of speculation, at the end of the “foreign” traders. He may sell baubles to a fantastical man, but the breach of trust comes from their raising the prices out of reason, a breach presumed in the very structure of the sentence, in the breach of the “we supposed”. What is trustworthy and, thus, reasonable, is what Roe will pay, and the definition of “reason” hinges upon the ability to cast the relationship with the “foreign” traders in the same terms as money paid, cloth ordered. Trust and reason are conflated to support the substance of this business details, stylistically conveying that the performance as expected by Roe and Kerridge is the definition of “trust” and “reason.” The simple acts of buying and paying reveal the trivialization of the entire relationship, even the relationship between reader and writer, but the conspiracy that is conveyed as intimacy gives this trivial relationship both its value and its affectionate appeal. And it is these details, and no other, that will establish the
credibility of the other side, a credibility constantly undercut in order to provide not only the very substance of this letter, but the conspiracy between Roe and Kerridge, that tie of affection that permits the conspiracy to continue.

To permit the conspiracy to continue, and to bind the pathos more closely to the reader, duration surfaces as another detail that comprises the substance of the genre, that is critical to trivialization, but, perhaps more importantly, creates longevity in the conspiracy itself. Duration is expressed in brevity, a contradiction that underscores the duration by using simple brief reminders of both patient waiting that is also long-term intimacy: “The certainty of the King’s purpose, and my desires, is long since with you. I hope you shall be despatched and ready for the adventure. I must bear it, and have cast the worst.” Certainty, the core component of the weighing of detail, the stacking of minutiae that comprise the substance of the letter, is enfolded within the reader and the writer. The simple long-standing knowledge of what is to be done, similar to the two letters Kerridge is supposed to know about and execute, add pathos to the demands of Roe. Here, Roe has cast himself into the King’s purposes, which is also “his desire.” Two double motives that propel this short paragraph and cast the weight of action on Kerridge, who must be “dispatched” and “ready,” are emotionally executed through the very brevity of the parallel structure, a pointed brevity that lens its weight to the short clause, “is long since with you.” Kerridge is the subject of this sentence and Kerridge bears the brunt of this action, but Roe emotionally absorbs the costs of it, a key detail that surfaces through this letter and that makes his claim to emotional endurance also a claim upon the
reader’s sympathy. He must bear it, and bear it notwithstanding he has “cast the worst,” that is, foreseen the failure implicit in his desires, not because they may actually fail, but because the failure of his desires is a detail that both gives this letter its emotional appeal as well as its credibility but that sets the background for the perspective on every action preformed by others. “Long since with you” is enfolded within failure, failed details that weigh upon each other, one failure upon another: baublization, Moorish tricks, and raising prices. Roe both emotionally absorbs the failure and ascribes the long-awaited redemption of his emotional costs upon Kerridge. He, thus, takes emotional credit for the forecast failure to himself and is the one performing because he is the one who has foreseen the risk and advised against it; but this risk is cast as “long since” with Kerridge. Kerridge is implicated by duration alone to accept the burden of redemption

By so structurally implicating Kerridge in the emotional redemption, the forecasting of failure adds “interest” to success both substantively and stylistically and binds Kerridge to the familial endeavor, the second core stylistic element. He predicts this double interest in the ending of the paragraph before this short paragraph with his declaration of casting “the worst”:

[A]nd I make no question, by this year’s and the next[‘s] practice, to enter so into good opinion as to buy on time for a leecke of goods, by which the ship shall be supplied in time, and, if care taken to preserve the foundation, it shall prove an adventure of better use meant to be so good husbands as to venture nothing.
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Roe’s predictive ability allows his to be certain, to “make no question,” that notwithstanding the lack of trust and reasonableness that characterizes the other side, he will prevail. This certainty is bolstered by his simply declarative structure. He will “enter so into good opinion,” using the active voice to predict his certain success. He will not only provide, but specifically “buy on time” the goods, which will, in turn, supply the ship “in time.” As opposed to the “long since with you” time that casts Kerridge as emotional redeemer, the buying time is the active voice is reasonable, a matter of intellect, and certain. The detail is critical to the substance of this genre, constantly referring back to itself to establish the key detail that must be executed promptly and business-like, but the style of this detail is also critical, the use of the short sentence and active voice to convey not just mastery, but absolute certainty that could also be considered arrogance. The wise use of time, of “husbanding” of time, is the “foundation” of their business, the stylistic use of metaphor converting a business enterprise into a family enterprise, the “good husbands” those who venture something rather than, as the term suggest, those who wisely husband their resources. The “good husbands” also creates, within the conspiracy, a familial-like relationship, encouraging the reader to identify not only with the “good husband” but also with the wide social structure the “good husband” represents. By enfolding timeliness into duration, a double movement of both length and urgency is provided in the substance and evoked through the appeal to the good husband that is also an emotional redeemer of long-borne costs. The enterprise becomes the wife of the good husband, and an urgent wife as well, busy-ness folding upon itself over and over
and creating a duration that must be acted upon promptly and “in time” and yet is “long since with you.” The intervention into time that these details insist upon is not simply the trivialization of other concerns that might intercede, as well as the discounting of the relational difficulties inherent in casting the other side as untrustworthy and unreasonable, it is the emotional style of this genre, a style that interpellates the reader into the position of “good husband” without time for reflection upon what has been “long since with you.”

Money, especially, must be performed “in time,” and the duration between debt and payment is an interminable duration, a painful duration “long since with you,” one that is not to be accepted but to be constantly repeated in its smallest detail, an emotional reminder that duration is unacceptable on the part of the other side, although to be expected from the side of reader and writer, who are both “long since with each other” and reminded of their familial relationship through texts that are “long since with you.” Good husbands accept one duration, the familial tie, but seasonable intervene in the other, seasonableness determined through the repetition of the debt, giving it emotional “interest” and resonance. The shared “interest” in debt is understood; it must begin the next paragraph:

Zulph[ecarcon’s] and Shaw Hussens[‘s] debts are at a stand. The latter is alive, and here; to-day Mr. Biddulph with him, who offers the Mancepdares all at present at Court, but I will not accept them. Of that make no question; the other until presents, cannot be moved by me; but I will not lose it; let that comfort you.
The standing debts are specified by name, but the person’s are not the subject of this sentence, their debts are. The debts are “at a stand,” a personification that brings the debts alive as if they were living, animate beings capable of standing and of resistance to the reasonable demands of the good husbands. In addition, the status of the second debtor is specified, but as cast by the sentence structure, it is not the second debtor that is alive and present, it is the second debtor’s debt itself that is “alive and here.” Not only is the debt itself alive and palpably present, but it is accompanied by another business associate, Mr. Biddulph. By being so accompanied, the debt is secured. The person is substituted for the debt, substantively, but structurally, the debt is the person. In fact, the person is simply a metonym for the debt, which gives the person that is the debt emotionally depth and physical presence. The debt is alive; it breathes.

As a breathing debt, it is thus collectable on its own right. The offering of sureties, the substitution of living human beings for the living debt, is unacceptable to Roe. Substantively, he will have the body of the debtor himself, and “will not accept them.” Stylistically, he will have the living debt. His emotional insistence on collecting this living debt is amplified by repetition directed towards Kerridge: “Of that make no question. By addressing Kerridge as if Kerridge himself might question Roe’s determination to collect the living debt, he presumes some lack of faith on Kerridge’s part, as if the temptation to mistake the living debtor by accepting sureties for the debt that is alive and will not be bound by sureties is a serious temptation, a common mistake. Roe’s resolve is thus a reminder and a gentle chiding to Kerridge, who might make this
common mistake or possibly fault Roe for not accepting what guarantee of payment is made. In addition, this interlocutory statement: “Of that make no question,” apparently even accusatory, is actually intended to be a source of emotional solace to Kerridge, who is to have complete certainty that the debt will be paid: “the other until presents, cannot be moved by me; but I will not lose it; let that comfort you.” Until payment is made, until “presents,” Roe cannot be moved. The weaving structure of this sentence, the demand for payment along with the triple refusal: “cannot be moved,” “but I will not lose it,” “let that comfort you,” enfolds Kerridge within the emotional demands of Roe at the same time it seeks to satisfy Kerridge’s emotional demands by “comforting him.” Insisting that a debt is alive and then capturing it has great appeal to pathos: it is the satisfaction of their desires, the very source of their status as “good husbands,” that gives emotional meaning to their enterprise. Without the emotional relief of capturing living debt, the letter fails as an intimate gesture calculated to secure the familial ties that bind. Other relational and cultural means to establish relationships of trust are emotionally empty because they delay the debt, broaden the relational duration with the living debt, and create a relationship that is interminable to Roe because it interrupts the relationship of the “good husbands” to each other.

The emotional relief provided by pursuing a debt relentlessly and without “being moved” by the person of the debtor sets the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting over and worth emoting about. Stylistically, capturing the alive debt is the center of emotional affect, the center of what is a source of
comfort and also the source of compassion. To achieve this construction of emotional affect, “compassion” is understood in specific reference to what is “debt,” and Roe’s own appeal to pathos is in relieving or pursuing a debt, which is relieving or pursuing an emotional affect. He states this in the next paragraph, detailing as the moral quality of the good business letter as stylistically, the creation and satisfaction of emotion appeals:

What I resolve on in the way of compassion Captain Pring (as concerning him) knows. A firmaen from Bengala cannot me had while the Prince hath Suratt, unless we will quit it and rely on the other only. He pretends that all our find good shall come thither and his port bear the burthen of trash, and hinder others. But of this and new changes at Court at the end of my letter.

Although only Captain Pring is privy to what compassion, if any, Roe will extend to the debtor, and this proclamation includes the name of his secret adviser, and enfolded the threat implicit in this detail into secrecy, the structure of it declares Roe to be a source of compassion as well as comfort: “What I resolve,” he states in the active voice. Following immediately upon the following paragraph, with its structural emphasis on comfort, Roe uses alliteration to align his comfort to Kerridge with his compassion to the debtor. The secret threat has its own emotional quality, qualified by the parenthetical reference “(as concerning him),” thus appealing to the shared intimacy between Kerridge and Roe. What has been entrusted to Captain Pring, the parentheses both emphasizes and elides, is to the emotional arousal signified by his military status. Implicit is the reference to violence, and in the reference to violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of this debt. This specific detail of complicity and threat is conveyed to
Kerridge, a detail Kerridge is not specifically privy to but which casts Roe, again, as a comforting and compassionate debt pursuer who knows how to take care of business. The compassion is ironic, foregrounding the quality of the true “comfort” he seeks to give Kerridge. Abruptly introducing the threat of violence when the debtor is present with the trades and offers all types of guarantees for his debt is a detail that trivializes the debtor and the guarantees the debtor seeks to make, but this abrupt introduction also firmly casts the reader in the role of captive audience, one who awaits the delivery of Roe’s compassion via Captain Pring.

The emotional arousal of the abrupt introduction of military violence cast as “compassion” is further heightened by another abrupt stylistic gesture, the transition from violence to the trade itself. The compassionate violence is thus a commonplace, one that functions to emotionally anchor the meditation on trading: “A firmaen from Bengala cannot be had while the Prince hath Suratt, unless we will quit it and rely on the other only.” The use of the passive voice again, with the “firmaen” as the object placed syntactically in the role of the subject, works to underscore how the debts or articles of finance take on a life of their own.14 In addition, the transition from the first person to the third person abruptly shifts the imagined audience from spectator to participant; from watching and applauding Roe’s compassion to being complicity intimate with the consequences of that violence. Implicit in this apology is that bad relations would have no long-term ill effects; the traders would simply move on to a more profitable area, the “we” here underscoring the joint movement and joint immunity
from the consequences of violence. The use of the third person is yet another source of comfort, as all benefit from the implicit violence. The implicit violence is not just a good reason in itself since trade is so bad, but an appeal to pathos that comforts the reader who joins in the “moving on.”

This detail of violence, rendered as a trading detail, adds to baublization, Moorish tricks, and the always and already unreasonableness of the other side, to convey the emotional substance of the dry details as a vivid and moving enterprise. To the degree the other side is expendable, so are the English traders even more comforted and cherished. Roe enhances this emotional affect again through one of his favorite stylistic devices, the repetition of the same matter in different phrases: “He pretends that all our find good shall come thither and his port bear the burthen of trash, and hinder others.” The pretense, once again, underscores the reader’s honesty and openness. The Court is pretending to be a good port, and is not, in fact any good at all. Instead, it is emotionally constructed as being the very nemesis of what is “good” to the trader in that the port would bear the “burthen of the trash, and hinder others.” The phrase “burthen of the trash” is rich in connotative appeal, and the doubling over the speaker, the doubt as to whom characterizes it as “trash,” further heightens the emotional affect. On the one hand, the “trash” is the trashing of the good trade; on the other hand, the “trash” are the non-English traders the English must contend with. Thus, “trash” serves to underscore the very emotional discount of the other he has established already several times, the discounting of the baubles and the debtors, plus a further discounting of what can not be sold
reasonably. Roe makes the speaker of these words unclear, giving the foreign Court a vocabulary putatively offense, a vocabulary justifying his hostile relationship with the Court. By using this language, the Court affronts the reader, discounts the reader, and thus arouses the pathos of indignation. In “hindering others,” another pretense, Roes stakes out the level of this indignation, a pretense that hinders and insults the reader. The Court has pretended it will favor its trading relationship with the English, and in pretending, insults the entire relationship and the validity and integrity of the English. The “new changes” that end this paragraph punctuate this false choice; details on the true choices available will come later, serving to heighten the reader’s anticipation of the trading betrayal to come, a trading betrayal that has all the emotional depth of a romantic betrayal.

Thus, the third element in this generic style, in addition to conspiracy and familial ties, is the repetition of details strategically inserted that function as metonyms for emotional betrayal. By amplifying and repeating these details, which stand in for the whole, the whole of the relationship is cast as not only illusory, but relationship to be both sustained through cunning, deceit, and manipulation. The reader is enfolded within this manipulation specified by Roe in his short ending to the paragraph on trash: “But of this and new changes at Court at the end of my letter.” It is, through the continual deferral of the true state of the relationship, which also requires yet more metonyms, an anticipated betrayal of such magnitude that it must be dealt with finally and conclusively at the end of
the letter. This firmly established emotional perspective imposes itself upon Kerridge, the reader, by keeping the “trashed” relationship constantly in mind as a disclosure to be anticipated, perhaps eagerly, this every present betrayal of the deal informing the rest of the letter, so that every action is suspect, can be read with jealousy and anger, the added “interest” which with every other detail is read and weighed.

Roe maintains this interest in the anticipated betrayal with his switch to yet another inconsequential detail given more weight by following upon this anticipated disclosure of “trash” at Court, establishing as the only detail that matters and that must be repeated infinitively, along with the debts, to be the inconvenience of the entire endeavor. The “inconvenience” of the entire endeavor, a substantive element, is stylistically portrayed in a paragraph that telegraphs its message, overburdened by the inconvenience to speak fully of it:

> For the procuring freight or waffage\(^{15}\) into the Red Sea, I desire trial may be made, and keep my opinion to myself. I can cast and discover the probabilities, losses and inconveniences; but that is not the question. I would into that trade without them. The reasons are many, and you feel the main, the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you. Let us not dispute against it, but do or utmost, and if [it?] fail, it is not ours, but the projector’s. Yet the voyage I would not forsake for missing an imaginary help. I have been large in this to Captain Pring, laid down the foundation, reasons, and hopes, and what ways I would execute it. If I proceed not, I am innocent.

Roe, once again, keeps his opinion to himself, just as he keeps secret the trash at Court and the threat implicit in his compassionate reliance on Captain Pring, beginning this sentence with a business matter then personalizing it with the use of the “I” and “desire.” Although he writes that he keeps his “opinion” to himself,
there is no doubt of what his opinion is, another double gesture that both conceals and reveals, and in this double gesture establishing the intimacy between reader and writer. He details his predictive ability: “I can cast and discover the probabilities, losses and inconveniences; but that is not the question.” Of course, that is precisely the question, and with another double movement, displays his reasons while hiding them, using the parallel form to both reveal and conceal. The structural emphasis is on the “probabilities, losses and inconveniences” demonstrate their importance, while the equal weight placed upon “probabilities” as well as “losses and inconveniences” renders the probabilities as bad as a loss or an inconvenience. In addition, not only are the probabilities important to the extent they indicate “loss” and “inconvenience,” but the stylistic device of cloaking them while revealing them appeals to the shared secrecy between reader and writer. Following this complex structure, he again inserts himself into the equation through the active voice: “I would into that trade without them.” His double play on his resolve to enter the trade without the bad probabilities and to enter the trade in spite of the bad probabilities further heighten the emotional appeal of his intimate gesture, that these bad probabilities are not “the question.” He also heightens his resolve in emotional reliance on the prior predicate of loss/inconvenience. The loss/inconvenience that centers the substance of this letter is implicit in every detail made of baubles, unpaid debts, and false pretense, but the emotional appeal is invented through Roe’s style of evasive erasure of himself alternating with direct representation of himself. These losses/inconveniences, invented by Roe to establish his busy-ness, also convey
his pathos as a man ultimately put upon, a man who alternates between courtesy and self-effacement with indignation at the treatment of the others implicated within the loss/inconveniences. Roe, is, thus, a humble and unwilling hero, or rather servant, side-stepping his own losses/inconveniences for the greater good of the reader. Although cast as reasonable, the reasons behind his resolve are emotional reasons: “The reasons are many, and you feel the main, the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you.” He focuses on the reason “felt” by Kerridge, “you feel the main,” using the direct address to interject Kerridge into the emotional quandary as well as to enfold roe’s own “reasonable” advice into one short sentence: “the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you.” The relationship is between “in all mind” and “urged to you,” another reference to the repeated duration that casts the relationship between writer and reader as one that is familial and never-ending. “In all mine” demonstrating the completeness and exhaustive nature of the relationship between traders. The other details, unmentioned, Roe kindly focusing on the one of primary emotional interest to Kerridge, give this emotional quandary more weight. In his predictive ability, Roe is also a master of respecting the feelings of his audience on several levels, which he demonstrates by not even including all those different emotional reasons. The reader is assured he has “cast” them.

That Roe was not followed in all that he urged upon Kerridge “in all mine” does not indicate that reasonable people might differ on this detail alone, but rather heightens Roe’s avuncular status within the familial relationship. He uses it to condescendingly suggest peace with Kerridge: “Let us not dispute against it,
but do or utmost, and if [it?] fail, it is not ours, but the projector’s.” Thus, although the execution of the endeavor is Kerridge’s, and the fault is putatively Kerridge’s as well, who ignored all that was urged upon him, the fault in execution is now cast upon the projector’s in two ways stylistically. First, by switching to the third person again, so that Roe as well as Kerridge shoulders the blame: “it is not ours.” Second, by placing the true fault at the end of the sentence, so that attention is drawn from first Kerridge, to their complicit relationship, to the final arbiters in this familial relationship, the projector’s. Thus, in the imagined community created between reader and writer, the other is not only the foreign Court, but also the projector’s themselves, a detail that heightens the intimacy by closing its circle of associates. Thus, projector’s are “trashed,” an emotional projection of loss/inconvenience: “Yet the voyage I would not forsake for missing an imaginary help.” Substantively, the “imaginary help” is both imagined and illusory, yet again a pretense, a detail specified so as to be “trashed.” Yet stylistically, the sentence is set up to emphasis the final result, the return voyage itself, which Roe would not, in the first person, “forsake.” His loyalty is emphasized by the immediately following term, “for missing.” Although the one is missing, Roe will not forsake the return voyage. His steadfastness is emphasized by what is both missing and imaginary; Roe is present and substantial.

Yet, even then, Roe expand the gesture of intimacy by including within this detail of loss/inconvenience his own exculpatory detail: “I have been large in this to Captain Pring,” he writes. He repeats this again in the next clause, “laid down
the foundation, reasons, and hopes.” And yet again repeats this is the third clause: “and what ways I would execute it.” These three gestures towards exculpatory excuse, Roes repetition of his reasonable forecasting, the straightforwardness of this advise, the specification of “foundation, reasons, and hopes” that are unamplified but would give the impression of being weighty and detailed all in themselves, maintain the use of the first person to emphasize Roe’s steadfast, present, and substantial nature in opposition to the “imaginary help.” “If I proceed not, I am innocent.” This is a contradictory detail after so many excuses, yet one to be emotionally predicted as well in emphasizing the loss/inconvenience and in appealing to the lack of pretense that underlies this entire confession, a confession of concern and warnings to both Captain Pring and Kerridge. Roe has already excused himself by the giving of advice, the inconsequential nature of the enterprise, its nature of “trash” fully explained through the omission of his advice to Captain Pring, and yet it is through this excuse that not only his steadfastness is maintained, but the anticipated betrayal heightened. If he does not perform, he is innocent because of his great busy-ness, substantively, but also because it is in the betrayal of all those others he has urged and exhorted, as well as the betrayal of the others at Court, that lay behind his inability to proceed, a betrayal further cheapened by his connotative use of baublization, false pretenses, and the already discounted nature of the area and its Court, its “trash.”
After so profound a confession and penance, so detailed an anticipated betrayal and his continued steadfastness, Roe returns to the theme of debtor, and adds yet another layer of emotional arousal after this wave of confession in both the loss/inconvenience that is the substance of each looming detail so painstakingly rendered and the lovingly captured detail of an alive debt to be captured. This is yet another from of his “comfort”:

Our debtor Groo is so long agreeing with his that I get nothing but “to-morrow”; but it rests upon Asaph Chan, who I know takes it to heart, and is the umpire for our sakes. I suppose no time lost in staying for any order from me, wherein, as I have approved what you did, taking out the moneys by consultation, so I would not slyly have any hindrance cast upon respect to me, which in that point was none, nor needed any. I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.

Following immediately after his confession of innocence, this third-person evocation of the debtor, “our debtor,” reestablishes the intimate tone of the correspondence, folds his confession into the work of business itself, so this his confession is Kerridge’s confession as well. As with his specification of the earlier debt, this money itself must be performed “in time,” and the duration between debt and payment is an interminable duration not to be accepted but to be constantly repeated in its smallest detail, a substantive reminder that duration is unacceptable on the part of the other side, and the repetition amplifying the debt, giving it “interest,” making the detail its own matter through sheer prolixity. But the duration is also figured here stylistically as a common bond, “our” debtor agreeing “with his,” creating in the balanced phrase two communities at odds. In addition, Groo is “so long agreeing with his,” that is, in complicit and
unreasonable agreement with his fellow associates that Roe should not be paid. Roe casts this as a conspiracy to show how the debtors are against him, work in concerted action to prove their false pretenses, already assumed and needing only one small dereliction of duty to be proved, conveying through the style all that is no the dereliction of duty his own action, pursuing the alive debt. As a matter of style, the debtor, another “fantastical” man, is never given a full name, the shortened name, like an appellation of fraud or moniker of deceit, establishing the intimacy of the trading community and the otherness of Groo. Groo cheats both Roe and Kerridge of their time in giving them nothing but “tomorrow,” the tomorrow the worst part of the deal, demonstrating that the specification that is critical is not simply the debt but the duration of time itself, stylistically giving him worse than nothing since he is prolonging the emotional capture of the debt. To enfold Kerridge within the ongoing drama that has all the “interest” of a romantic relationship, Roe underscores that Chan understands the severity of this trash of time, he takes it “to heart” and will be “umpire,” arbiter, judge, executor of the debt. The mark of a trusted associate is that a debt is taken “to heart,” understood to be at the emotional core of the business concern, the reason it exists and the excitement it generates. In the world of the traders, all debtors belong to each other and each one will look at after the other’s debtor, a comforting and exciting appeal to emotional.

In a move both contradictory and yet evocative, Roe immediately inserts himself after his short appeal to the emotional arousal of debt collection. That the debtor Groo is a fraud but Roe is not is intertwined in the passage immediately
following, where Roe writes, “I suppose no time lost in staying for any order from me.” His first person use of “I,” followed by the equivocating and yet informal “suppose,” doubly enfold both Groo, Roe and Kerridge in this sentence. Who exactly has been recalcitrant? A “Grooish” “nothing but “to-morrow” permeates this passage. Kerridge becomes the antithesis of the debtor and the uberGroo, who uses duration not to delay a debt but to quickly execute what needed to be done without orders, just like a good debtor not only pays without being asked, but pays even before the debt is due. The very best debtor, like Kerridge, the antithesis of uber Grooish “nothing but tomorrow,” actually pays the debt before it is even owed, refusing to “stay” payment simply because no debt, like no order, exists. Kerridge, like the debtor, is bound within a twinned notion of time, in which the performance must both follow and anticipate the written order, but the Grooish connotation is clear. Kerridge is both another Groo and the anti-Groo, since failure to both follow and anticipate an order is the very definition of loss/inconvenience that Roe substantively rails against. The pressure to perform anit-Groo is explicit, the emptiness of “nothing but tomorrow” emptying out the very life of those who would dare to follow the Grooish example of delay, the plaintive evocation of a MacBethian loss of wife parodied here in the minutiae of debt collection.
To avoid this loss and inconvenience, subterfuge and conspiracy are enfolded within his details, the “imaginary help” that creates an imagined community of intimacy between Roe and Kerridge. Immediately following this passage he specifies so, thus emphasizing the felt need to be even more anti-Groo:

I have approved what you did, taking out the moneys by consultation, so I would not slyly have any hindrance cast upon respect to me, which in that point was none, nor needed any. I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.

Kerridge is to understand that everything he does in prediction of what Roe would have advised is approved in advance, in the first person, no questions asked, particularly if “money” is involved. The emotional resonance of “money” is unmistakable. Kerridge is by proxy the execution of Roe’s “imaginary help” in that most emotionally saturated of relationships, the trader and his money. Roe would not have “slyly” any hindrance cast upon him: Kerridge need not wait for direct orders for what must obviously be done in Roe’s “imaginary” directives, and emphasizes this by “slyly” repeating the same lack of obstruction not once, but three times: “any hindrance,” “that point was none,” and “nor needed any.” The multiple equivocations structurally hinder Kerridge’s autonomy, making it clear that the proxy’s imagined anticipation of orders is one that is strictly constructed and always in doubt even when right. It requires repetition: “I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.” Again, the emotional weight is upon “moneys,” and because this emotional saturated relationship is involved, it must be carefully phrased both to
increase surveillance of Kerridge and to cover any surveillance of Roe himself.

Thus, the absence of the order is presumed to be evidence of the continual order for “imaginary help,” directed towards an imaginary audience outside writer and reader.

Thus, within the substantive tropes of baublization, false pretenses, and imaginary help, there is always and already enfolded the primary substance of this genre, the continual deferral of orders, of information, and of advise, the deferral creating both the need for the relationship and the emotional appeal of the relationship: more is always to come. Instead, Roe repeats the details of debts and gold, shipments to be received and shipments to be made, not simply because as if the details themselves create the trade, but also because of the emotional arousal of these much-loved details, creating the emotional appeal of a letter otherwise empty and full of nothing but to-morrow. These details become fleshed out through the loss/inconvenience each predicts and inscribe within the substance of this genre, as performance in anticipation of predictive and “imaginary” orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks to instantiate through the substance of his letters. 17 The emotional appeal of this absence, as constructed through the style, is through the emotional evocation of the need for his presence, which is layered upon the emotionally saturated appeal of the intertwining of his presence with the capturing of the alive debt
Stylistically, the constant betrayal of the alive debt structures the mediation that is the fourth core component of this substance, the constant repetition of details that signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and inconvenient endeavor. In a lengthy passage, Roe alludes to the profound mistrust in several different circumstances and against a host of people, so that only Kerridge and himself occupy that privileged imagined community of imaginary help, creating an appeal to Kerridge that is avuncular, forensic, and ecumenical:

The ship to return referred to the Commander; what I can propound is done. Indigo of Jambuzar I cannot judge of; a former signified my mistrust that might be that sort which . . . mention not worth 12d. per lb. and not distinguished from Serquese, because of a making and passed with it. I must refer it to your judgment. Perdap Shaw’s firmaen was sent to Mr, Banggam, who moved for it and knows the use.

For private trade you know my orders, and I hope the . . . pleasure. The prime commodity no man, I hope, will deal in upon any pretence; cloth, if they do, and consent to acquaint the factors with it and remit it to their masters, it may pass, and by your and my advice may be favoured; but for all such as are obstinate I require execution of commission to the utmost, notice of their names, and I will use my credit to bring them to repentance by losses. They that trust their masters deserves the issue of trust, faith and grace; but they that dare not, know themselves unworthy of any. I am persuaded no man can deal so privately (though the Customer join) but you may know it, and I am sure it cannot come aboard and be stowed, and cloud; such take, seize and mark, or rather forbid shipping if unmarked; or if [it?] cannot be done till I come to Suratt, you shall find I find many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.

This litany of mistrust is fostered against both the trade commodity itself, indigo, and every person occupied in the endeavor in this entire geographical region: the scope of his mistrust is comprehensive, an ecumenical disbelief is evoked in this
passage. That this litany is bolstered by the emotional appeal to violence is indicated in its very first sentence: the ship is in the authority of the Commander, an order that Roe had already, presumably, dictated or advised, thus enfolding himself within that emotional appeal that is cast as protective and avuncular. With such mistrust, the only authority that is trustworthy, aside from Kerridge’s own judgment, is the threat implicit in consigning the ship to the Commander, the appeal to the forensic, to the past judgment of a crime, heightening the emotional appeal of this passage. This is the predicate for his entire mediation on the essential untrustworthiness of every person or object involved in the trade, all of whom are presumed to be eagerly interested in private trade, a subject of so great emotional “interest” that Roe details it for his reader, signifying what is of “interest” to them both.

The primary trope again, is pretense, but the style is to foreground the metonymic substitutes for “money” so that the pretense evokes that emotionally saturated relationship and evokes the betrayal of the alive debt: “The prime commodity no man, I hope, will deal in upon any pretence.” The “prime commodity” leads this sentence, juxtaposed with “no man,” emphasizing the vacuum of the man within the commodity. The commodity leads the following clause as well: “cloth, if they do, and consent to acquaint the factors with it and remit it to their masters, it may pass.” Cloth, again, the metonymic substitute for money, precedes the subject, “they,” the verb “do” hanging in this syntax, so that “doing” is hindered by the “consent” to acquaint the factors and remit to the masters; double actions that bind the subject. The verbal chain of hierarchy
follows the organizational chain of hierarchy, from lowest to highest: “they” to “factors” to “masters.” Such an organizational chain is also an emotional chain hinging upon the “consent,” permitting the implicit betrayal consented to by the “they” to be consented to by the entire hierarchy and thus, nullifying the emotional effect of “private trade.” Likewise, this trade is permissible “by your and my advice may be favoured, “ thus enfolding both Roe and Kerridge not simply within this organization chain, but as consenters to the emotional betrayal that Roe has established is always and already present when it comes to “money” or its substitutes.

Nonetheless, the favor of Roe and his imagined helper Kerridge is both discounted by his claim to compassion and underscored by his syntax, a move similar to his use of threat from Captain Pring earlier to heighten emotional arousal: “but for all such as are obstinate I require execution of commission to the utmost.” That is, the entire consent and favor is modified by this coordinating subordinate clause, which carries the weight of this sentence. He requires execution of the commission of martial law, and to the utmost, his compassion and favor being inflected by the extracting the severest penalty “to the utmost.”18 His list of how he would extract this penalty to the “utmost” appeals to the violence he uses earlier as a way of both constructing emotional affect and appealing to pathos. He would require not just execution to the utmost, but “notice of their names, and I will use my credit to bring them to repentance by losses.” “Notice of their names” uses alliteration to give it emotional appeal, and such notice carries the connotation that they are all, like Groo, not only Groolike
and untrustworthy but that in naming them the alive debt can be captured. It is his “credit,” another metonym for money, that gives him both emotional resonance and authority. The sin committed by those who do not follow the chain of hierarchy is explicit and severe, and Roe demonstrates the religious fervor of his mission in bringing them to “repentance” as severely as possible, “by losses.” Loss/inconvenience, one of the central substantive tropes in this letter, is understood emotionally to be the most severe penalty possible.

But the most striking emotional appeal follows, the rationalization for his severity and the crusading-like fervor with which he will pursue the money-sinners of private trade: “They that trust their masters deserves the issue of trust, faith and grace.” Anything less than total trust is not just disobedience, it is the fulfillment of the lack of trust already implied and awaited by Roe, an already and always present emotional betrayal that must be presumed in advance to exist and require an act of faith on the part of private traders to evade. He makes the emotional construct of unquestioning loyalty clear, so that this loyalty implicates the reader and creates the anxiety of misunderstanding the imaginary orders dictated by the “masters”: “but they that dare not, know themselves unworthy of any.” The lack of trusting of their masters not only makes the employees unworthy of trust, but they both know this and because of this knowing dare not trust their masters. The lack of trust emotionally signifies betrayal has already occurred. Not to trust the masters is self-inflected and self-inflicted. The emotional appeal to Kerridge is clear: both he and Roe are worthy of unswerving and unquestioned loyalty by virtue of their very existence as
“masters,” the interpellation of both of them within the category “master” a profoundly exculpatory gesture that at the same time gestures towards the lack of trust not only anticipated by Roe, but continually reinforced through the very construction of these entities as worthy of unquestioning trust. This litany of mistrust assumes the centrality of the “masters,” a self-revolving and self-emptying gesture that is mindless but emotionally appealing within the chain of hierarchy constructed by Roe. This is an appeal similar to his appeal for and to “imaginary help.” Taken to its emotional conclusion, neither Roe nor Kerridge should be trusted either, having so profoundly mistrusted all. Thus, the self-referential nature of betrayal structures his entire litany of mistrust, and only becomes a representation of anything if Roe is, indeed, the master of all.

That this emotional appeal is to an imagined community of writer and reader who are “master of all” is stylistically bolstered by Roe’s detailed rationale behind his golden rule of “trust your masters if you want to be trusted by them:”

I am persuaded no man can deal so privately (though the Customer join) but you may know it, and I am sure it cannot come aboard and be stowed, and cloud; such take, seize and mark, or rather forbid shipping if unmarked; or if [it?] cannot be done till I come to Suratt, you shall find I find many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.

Roe has persuaded himself and seeks to persuade Kerridge that the reason behind this golden rule is that the employees will be caught; the emotional appeal to the superior wisdom and all-encompassing surveillance that inures to Roe’s “credit.” No man can deal privately, even in complete conspiracy with the customer, but Kerridge will know it, and Kerridge is thus, substantively, super-
surveillancer as well as once again enfolded within not only the golden rule of trusting one’s masters but again, imaginary help. The emotional appeal is contradictory: Roe in the first-person is persuaded, but his persuasion hinges on the second-person “you.” In addition, this emotional appeal contradicts the rationale of the “master of all,” whom by virtue of existence is to be trusted. Trust, in fact, depends on execution as Roe instructs the all-knowing Kerridge to take such goods, seize them – more than a taking, but a stealing of the goods – and to mark them. Thus, the golden rule of trusting the master is directed towards Kerridge, who must trust Roe, and enfolds Roe himself, who must trust Kerridge, the executor of the privilege. But if Kerridge does not trust Roe, Roe will enforce trust through is own execution, another threat that implicitly appeals to the emotional arousal of violence. Roe asserts that if Kerridge cannot do this, or finds it difficult, then he can just wait for Roe, who will see this matter through, demonstrating that Roe finds “many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.” Roe, the ultimate master of all, will easily execute this himself, implicating Kerridge as less than ultimate master if this surveillance should prove impossible. The threat is also an emotional appeal of a challenge to superiority. If Kerridge cannot steal from the employees and mark their goods, Roe will have no problem, being the master of all, an avuncular, ecumenical, and forensic appeal.

As mentioned earlier, this is a critical detail in the substance of this genre, a detail that amplifies the prolixity of Roe. This detail urges Kerridge to anticipate and predict what Roe will find when he comes abroad, and to anticipate and
predict exactly what it is Roe will do when he asserts "I will do it." Again, the imaginary help is itself a loss and inconvenience. If Kerridge cannot perform, Roe will do it, and it will inure to his credit as well, his creation of the imaginary help he needs through the threat of him actually doing something besides doling out advice that may or may not even be read. The gesture of anger and impotence is profound, especially in a letter as lengthy as this one, a letter that may or may not have reached its intended recipient at the time Roe wrote it. Once again, performance in anticipation of predictive and "imaginary" orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks to instantiate through the substance of his letters. In this passage, he inserts himself within this instantiation of the absence. He has become the imaginary help that will avert both loss and inconvenience.

That this imaginary help” is figured as the work of the “master of all” is an emotional claim to superiority within the organizational chain and the emotional appeal to the superior wisdom and all-encompassing surveillance that inures to Roe’s “credit.” Roe multiplies his credit substantively through the first element of the generic situation, substance, which can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. By multiplication and amplification, inconsequential details are expressed through tropes such as baublization, pretense, and trash. A core component of this
substance is the constant repetition of details that signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and inconvenient endeavor. These details both create and call for imaginary help with an imagined community of those that are trustworthy, the letter write and sometimes, the letter receiver, Kerridge. The final trope that conveys this substance of trivialization is the continual insistence upon the ability to discern shadows from truth. This is the perspective of the master, a perspective that Roe must reinforce through his repetition of his superior knowledge and powers of discernment. This repetition of details seeks to instantiate his own authority, but even more, his very physical presence in the letter and his emotional appeal. His existence depends on such a perspective, since there is no reason to write unless he adopts this perspective and seeks to persuade himself and his reader that his letters matter emotionally and that he himself matters within the emotional vacuum of mistrust, double-dealing, pretense, trash, and bauble-heads in which he finds himself.

To construct both the emotional affect and the appeal to pathos, Roe uses stylistic devices, including sentence structure, variation in person, connotative language, and syntax, to create a relationship that is both a conspiracy, a family bond, and a signification of an imagined community held together by the always and already present betrayal of trust in that most important of relationships, the trader and money. His firmly established emotional perspective imposes itself upon Kerridge, the reader, by keeping the “trashed” relationship constantly in mind as a disclosure to be anticipated, perhaps eagerly, this every present betrayal of the deal informing his powers of discernment, so that every action is
suspicious, can be read with jealousy and anger, the added “interest” which with every other detail is to be anticipated, read, and relished. In addition, Roe uses style to insert the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication. Friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with saving money.

The two primary emotional appeals are to debt and martial law. The emotional relief provided by pursuing a debt relentlessly and without “being moved” by the person of the debtor sets the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting over and worth emoting about. Stylistically, capturing the alive debt is the center of emotional affect, the center of what is a source of comfort and also the source of compassion. Roe’s repeated use of references to martial law is a reference to violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of the debt. Roe, a comforting and compassionate debt pursuer who knows how to take care of business, is both ironic and self-enforcing, casting the reader in the role of captive audience, one who awaits the delivery of Roe’s compassion via Captain Pring, and one whose attention is captivated by the abrupt transitions and introductions to and from marital law weaved throughout this business letter.

Composing ability within this genre is thus both the repetition of this particular substance as well as the emotional inflection that renders this substance captivating and capable of emotional effect. The variation in the use
of stylistic devices both enforce and underscore the need to assert mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, which must work to enfold the reader within business intimacy. The switch in person, coordinate and subordinate sentence structure and use of connotative language work to enfold the reader within the emotionally saturated relationship, and yet convey that relationship as one of both reason and business. To compose such an emotionally saturated relationship as business-like requires the frontloading of metonyms for “money,” and the discounting of other possible relationships through pejorative language figured within balanced equivocations using the second-person. The recursive use of debt and martial law as stylistic devices reinforce the emotional affect of mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, critical to achieving the semblance of an intimate relationship within a discursive environment of deep mistrust.

Although Roe’s letter could be considered another genre within the broad frames of empiric travel writing, he is writing an exemplary of composing ability.21 Through the tropes he composes, he incorporates ability within the narrative structure of the letter.22 His narrative incorporates also his own suspicion, as the analysis of style reveals.23 The ability incorporated or subsumed within composing ability reframes the material conditions of the embodied experience to give an anchor in materiality of abstract notions of who has composing ability and who can exercise it.24 As this chapter has shown, the second element of the generic situation, style, is intimacy, expressed through the rhetorical trope of the direct address figured as loving and caring. Intimacy is also expressed through
cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Just as trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading, the claim to intimacy establishes the claim to engagement, or pathos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is alienating and forbidding as close and dear.25 Thus, the pathos of the genre is established through a fundamental contradictory mixture of substance and style, creating composing ability as both a distant and near ability. As the next chapter will show, the final component of the fused triad of substance, style, and situation completes the generic analysis, focusing on the situation so that an even fuller picture of the genre emerges. By layering the situational analysis upon the analysis of substance and style, this genre in all its rhetorical complexity emerges. The analysis of situation is itself three-pronged, a consideration of speaker, audience, and purpose or message. The analysis is further complicated by the existence of an exigency or urgency in the rhetorical situation that is addressed.26 Attempting to analyze these three prongs within the entire previous analysis is unwieldy and complex, and so this next chapter will focus on the rhetorical logic of the situation, claiming that the situation is produced and reproduced by its own logic. The analysis of situation, implicit in the early analysis of substance and style, is drawn out in this next
chapter to show more clearly how this single example is both unique and yet an exemplar of business and administrative communication. By paying close attention to speaker, audience, and message, the contours of this genre emerges.

As this next chapter will show, the audience is the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtieses to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities. This role is enforced through violence. The speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal. To enforce violence is simply being a good husband. The message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority, thus, both the imposition of violence and the execution of violence are always and already part of the message.


4 According to Foster’s notes, neither of these letters still exists. Id. at 213 n. 2. Also according to Foster, this letter is printed “with a few omissions” in The Embassy, p. 447. Id. at n.1.

5 According to Foster’s notes, “chopped” means “stamped,” similar to signing a document. Id. at n. 3.


7 In A Rhetoric of Motives, Kenneth Burke writes the “characteristic invitation to rhetoric” begins when “identification and division” are put “ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and the other begins.” Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: U. of Ca. P., 1969. 19-27. “To identify A with B is to make A ‘consubstantial’ with B.” Id. at 21.

This may be the very function of the low style. See, e.g., Kallendorf, Craig and Carol Kallendorf. “Careful Negligence: Cicero's Low Style and Business Writing.” *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 41:1/2 (1987): 33-49.

“Raised,” according to Foster. *Id.* at 214 n. 2.


According to Foster, “Mansabdars” or “officers” that were “of course” offered as sureties. *Id.* at 215 n. 1.


This is a payment for “convoying native vessels.” Foster, *id.* n. 4.


Cicero, for example, recommends combing through the narration to find the commonplaces. *de Inventione*, II.xiv.45-46, 207.


CHAPTER 4
SITUATION

As established in the previous chapter, the first element of the generic situation, substance, can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading. As established in the third chapter, the second element of the generic situation, style, is intimacy, expressed through the rhetorical trope of the direct address figured as loving and caring. Intimacy is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. Just as trivial prolixity establishes the claim to credibility, or ethos, of early modern business and administrative
communication, by producing what is incredulous as a matter of time consuming reading, the claim to intimacy establishes the claim to engagement, or pathos, of early modern business and administrative communication, by producing what is alienating and forbidding as close and dear. This chapter examines the final component of the fused triad of substance, style, and situation to complete the generic analysis, focusing on the situation so that an even fuller picture of the genre emerges. By layering the situational analysis upon the analysis of substance and style, this genre in all its rhetorical complexity emerges. The analysis of situation is itself three-pronged, a consideration of speaker, audience, and purpose or message. The analysis is further complicated by the existence of an exigency or urgency in the rhetorical situation that is addressed.\(^1\) Attempting to analyze these three prongs within the entire previous analysis is unwieldy and complex, and so this chapter focuses on the rhetorical logic of the situation, claiming that the situation is produced and reproduced by its own logic. The analysis of situation, implicit in the early analysis of substance and style, is drawn out in this chapter to show more clearly how this single example is both unique and yet an exemplar of business and administrative communication. By paying close attention to speaker, audience, and message, the contours of this genre emerges.
This audience is established in the very opening of such letters.\textsuperscript{2} In his letter dated December 6, 1617, Sir Thomas Roe writes specifically to Thomas Kerridge at Surat in response to a previous letter he was claimed to have received:\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{quote}
MR. KERRIDGE, Yours now received of the 21\textsuperscript{st} November mentioneth one of the 9\textsuperscript{th} that never came to me; with this the copy and note in English and Persian of what delivered to Asaph Chan’s servant, the weight of gold and prices as by invoice, this last unagreed for, the former sold and the specie rated and concluded upon; but I suppose this in Persian but a copy, and not chopped by him,\textsuperscript{5} whereby not authentical if any difference, and the original lost may move question; he not yet arrived, and his reports (like a Moor) cold; but the money or goods I shall receive, and serve Agra with. I refuse always to take any beforehand, because I would not be tied by courtesy to inferior prices, nor appear so hungry as to borrow on account. His payment is better than any man’s though his prices hard made. By this I am sure I have saved custom, contented a friend, and not borne the hazard of portage.
\end{quote}

Although the audience is specified as Kerridge, this audience is not Kerridge as he might think of himself, but Kerridge as constructed through the logic of the direct address, and both the substance and style that comprises this direct address.\textsuperscript{6} Through the direct address, Roe establishes the relationship between Kerridge and himself as one of intimacy, permitting the abrupt and direct address. In so establishing his pathos, he underscores the personal importance of the information to follow. He specifies that the invoice was “unagreed for,” and, in addition, not signed. But these two details are unimportant, since the original is lost. However, his syntax indicates that these two details are of importance, each balanced within the sentence and of equal weight. Thus, he adds details of no importance framed syntactically significant to establish his
weight to complain and his weight in refusing to be tied by “courtesy” to inferior prices. Rather than a form of cultural rudeness, this is just another one of the “details” as important as the fraudulent invoice in establishing the intimacy between the writer and reader. Fraudulent in fact, perhaps, but most importantly, fraudulent because it is weighed of equal value in the syntax, and thus, valuable. He refuses to “appear so hungry” to borrow on another person’s account, and thus, establishes the pathos of his situation through metaphor, using the refusal to “appear hungry” to conjure up the hungriness and desperation of his situation. His insignificant details about a fraudulent but lost invoice make his relationship with Kerridge fat with detail, establishing the intimacy between the reader and writer. Nonetheless, the most significant detail comes at the end, the hard bargained for deal, which will be paid, the most important detail, but will, as well, saved him the customs charge, the costs of freight and then, of course, “contented a friend.” By structurally adding “contented a friend” sandwiched between customs and freight, Roe inserts the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication. Here, friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with saving money, and the audience is constructed as the good friend interested in the good deal.}
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Such use of intimacy, like the use of trivialization, also gives weight to his particular rendition of reality, of the bargain, or of the deal. The appeal of pathos allows him to both chide the reader and correct him, constructing an audience that is obedient and subservient:

In the letters sent you there was some mistaking, for I excepted particularly the Standish, as a neat thing, not of great price; and in the note to Mr. Browne I desired the gloves of 8l. might be sent to Mocreb Chan, as being likest to buy anything that is not requested here, and so perceive he had, refusing nothing; and being kept will find a worse market; if given, taken as of no use and disrespected. I hope all comes up (mentioned to be reserved) according to all later letters, that I may make a riddance, and put off to that fantastical man whatsoever the wiser will not like; for we must fit ourselves according to the humours of buyers, some that love things of use, others that will buy every bauble.

As a seller of baubles, Roe is, of course, a speaker in bauble-talk. But here, his baubling also serves to draw the reader into his trials, using the passive form to draw the accusation away from Kerridge and place it on some unseen and unknown mistaker. The reader is already excused and forgiven for the mistake, a gentle chiding and baubling over Kerridge’s purchase of an inkstand Roe had specified, detailed, was not to be bought. Roe corrects the mistake itself, gently insisting that the bauble to be sent to a purchaser who will buy anything, a bauble-head, “refusing nothing.” Chan, if sold to, will buy, but if given, like a true bauble-head, will “take as of no use and disrespected.” In this parallel structure, the immense respect shown to Kerridge in the passive voice is deflected and underscored through the use of the direct voice in describing that “fantastical man,” who will buy whatsoever the non-bauble head will buy, the “wiser” merchant. Kerridge is thus both implicated and exculpated as the “wiser man,”
proving himself even wiser by making a “riddance” of those baubles that no one else will buy. Trivializing Chan’s desire for the new or unusual shows how the substance of this genre shows disrespect as a matter of weight, while the syntax of intimacy shows how the style of this genre both undercuts that disrespect and uses it to shore up respect for the letter reader. To respect the bauble-head is not the mark of a wise and weighty merchant, and to insist that the reader is not a bauble-head through syntax underscores the wisdom of this statement. Thus, the audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, is also obedient and subservient, standing to be flattered by the attention that both chides and corrects.

The audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, is also logically constructed as a long-standing audience, thus, there is no need for extensive formalities or courtesies. Not withstanding the respect shown to Kerridge contrasted with the slight to Chan the bauble-head, Roe continues to bauble on himself, mentioning other letters he had written as a way of establishing the long-term and studiously cultivated relationship between himself and Kerridge:

Since your last received by me, I have written two, one of the 17th past, for dispeed of presents and goods, with advice requisite, the latter of the 2nd present, by it Mr. Fettiplace his accounts or journal missing, desiring it may be sent for England, to which I remit you in answer of these. The firmaen received was it seems according to understanding, and such as I hoped sufficient till a full trial.

On the one hand, as a matter of substance, these trivial details, adding to his importance, also signify the busy-ness of this business man: his constant exhortations and diligence. On the other hand, as a matter of style, these trivial
details seek to endear Kerridge to Roe, enfolding Kerridge within the importance of Roe’s busywork, the urgency of his exhortations and diligence. Regardless of whether they are acted upon or not, they were written and sent, the key substance. Reminding Kerridge of this is a key structural device, the use of memory to persuade Kerridge that this work is important and requires constant follow-up. In addition, they contained “advice requisite,” included the busy suggestion to Mr. Fettiplace to send his missing accounts or journals to England. “To which I remit you in answer of these,” a key intimate detail, enfolding Kerridge within the enterprise as well as deferring to his judgment. “I remit you” is both courteous and direct, a submission and an order at the same time. This style encourages Kerridge to be accountable for the execution of letters he never received but that were sent. The detail of the sending itself the most important of all, establishing the trivial nature of the exact letters, but also encouraging Kerridge to imagine what the letters contained, and in imaging the letters, identifying himself with the writer and what the writer would have wanted. The ending detail, that the firmaen was received “according to understanding” underscores the intimate nature of the style: in spite of his constant directives that are apparently mislaid or ignored, all goes well anyway, but it goes well in the passive voice, creating an imagined community that both he and Kerridge have satisfied. Each trivial detail carries with it moral weight, yes, but also affectionate weight, underscored by alternating the direct address with the passive voice, allowing Kerridge to be both charged and not charged with additional responsibilities, as he imagines them to be. Thus, the audience, the
good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that both chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities.

Nonetheless, although needing no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, the audience is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities. Thus, Roe’s detailed conflation of morality and economy, given in his very instructions to Kerridge in the following paragraph, are also balanced by the alternation of courtesy to Kerridge and the ungratefulness of the other:

Mamud Hussen is within one day’s journey, the master very well satisfied, he in great danger to be blamed, for I had laid a fault on him, for refusing the rest [of the] gold; and made known his unthankfulness and your courtesy, which is well taken by Asaph Chan, and thankfully by me. His Moorish trick to take away the trunk his brother desires to conceal, for doubtless his master is honourable in that point, and would turn him away. It shall be redelivered within two days, and if possible sent to Amadavaz to fit the owner. What he hath done in bullion I know not, but I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money; which I advised as soon as I heard of it, and because I saw some pretended difficulty in the sale, as if somebody should rest for next year, I ordered all can be invested now; I hope performed.

The detail of “one day’s journey” is bound up with the satisfaction of the master, followed by the reference to refusing of the gold, the denial, satisfaction, and logistical detailed twined together into a trivialization of the circumstances. Yet this substance, as trivial as it is, carries great emotional weight in the way Kerridge is enfolded within these details, his personal statute thus used as a way to give resonance to these trivial details, to make them important. The “courtesy”
on one hand, what is given by Kerridge, is recompensed by “unthankfulness,” on the other hand, canceling each other out in the racism of the “Moorish trick,” seeking to create through the appellation of “Moorish” identification by Kerridge with the writer of the letter. The detail of “Moorish” before “trick” indicates this is no mere bargaining strategy, but a specific raced strategy in the bargaining, a trick where something is fraudulently concealed. Kerridge, by being placed in structural opposition, is thus honestly open. The “Moorish trick,” in taking away the trunk his “brother wishes to conceal,” is a double movement of negation, a negation of the bauble and a negation of hiding the bauble, which gives it value. Kerridge, courteous, honest, and open, is the double positive of this trick, by the appeal to pathos understood as both revealing the trunk and revealing the true value of the bauble. Kerridge is figured, in anticipation, as the opposite of the trick, an appeal to pathos that encourages Kerridge to act as he is figured in action. This openness is also confession to Roe: “What he hath done in bullion I know not, but I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money; which I advised as soon as I heard of it.” Again, the gold is bound up with secrecy, hiding, fraud, and doubt, but the contrast between the secrecy, hiding, fraud, and doubt and Mr. Browne is the key syntactical appeal. “But I hope Mr. Browne would stand upon ready money” establishes trust, forthrightness and readiness, qualities Kerridge is to identify with in contrast to the hider of gold. The one key detail in the lack of knowledge behind the loss of the gold – “I know not” – encourages confession and openness. This lack of knowledge, which presumes fraud, and structurally encourages identification with openness, is duplicated in this passage
again: “which I advised as soon as I heard of it, and because I saw some pretended difficulty in the sale, as if somebody should rest for next year, I ordered all can be invested now; I hope performed.” Roe advised, of course, against the delaying of the sale, and his advice becomes substantialized by the detail of foreseeing some “pretended difficulty” with the sale. The appeal of his advice hinges on the fraud of others and the honesty of the reader; in detailing possible fraud, he is able to create not just the fraud, but his reader as an honest person. The pretended fraud that surrounds the dealings is thus job security but also the very substance of the genre the business and administrative communication genre is calculated to uproot, reveal, and make clear. The identification of the reader with courtesy, thankfulness, and honesty encourages the reader to take action to uproot, reveal, and make clear all dealings. Thus, the audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as an honest peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities.

The speaker is presumably the signer of this letter Roe, but it is not Roe himself as an actual entity, but Roe as he constructs himself throughout the letter. The speaker is intricately bound up with style, and is constructed through a core component of this genre, the recurrence of “pretense,” a recurrence that is exemplified in the repetition of details that signify fraud and untrustworthiness
and that are syntactically structured to enfold the reader into that which is not “pretense.” Pretended difficulties are created by Roe throughout his correspondence, but especially in the details he gives that trivialize the actual relationships between the English traders and the other, a trivialization that encourages the English traders to form relationships in contrast to the “pretended” ones. From Roe’s perspective, the “foreign” traders are bauble-heads, and any complaints they make are “pretended,” “fantastical pretenses.” As he continues in his letter, the “fantastical pretenses” of the other served to make the relationship between reader and writer even more credible and full of integrity:

I reply to your second. Your bills for Agra our received, and money almost all invested; two hundred camels on the way this thirteen days; cloth bartered; credit for about 25,000 rup[ees] three months; the proceed much enlarged, double to former years, as they write, in best commodity, and all things there performed much to my content and (I hope) their credit and . . . profit; the number of semians enlarged (a new sort of cloth), and carpets not yet gotten, but in hand. Their day I will not fail on, nor have they found difficulty, as we supposed, in trust, nor prices hoised out of reason; and I make no question, by this year’s and the next’[s] practice, to enter so into good opinion as to buy on time for a leecke of goods, by which the ship shall be supplied in time, and, if care taken to preserve the foundation, it shall prove an adventure of better use meant to be so good husbands as to venture nothing.

He begins, again, with pointed details in the direct address – the reply to the second, the bills received, the money paid, the cloth bartered. This is a gesture of courtesy, the summary of what Kerridge needs to know, that his letter was received, read, and acted upon. In its very brevity, this sentence establishes the importance of Kerridge’s desires and wishes. His orders are summarily and
without question followed. In terms of substance, Roe then continues that the sales are much enlarged and “all things” performed to his “content” and “their credit,” the credit and content balancing each other out, the “hope” inserted as a type of equivocation in exchange, the added interest to “their credit,” bolstered by his personal wishes. His hopes, thus inserted immediately after his response to Kerridge’s wishes, thus permits identification of his wishes with Kerridge’s wishes; his hopes become Kerridge’s hopes, his increase in “credit” and increase in Kerridge’s “credit.” The speaker is thus the trustworthy man of credit.11

The new cloth is enlarged and carpets ordered: brief details establishing the pathos of the author, his busyness in service of Kerridge, but again, the same substance is repeated and amplified, the presumed pretense of the bauble-heads: “Their day I will not fail on, nor have they found difficulty, as we supposed, in trust, nor prices hoised out of reason.” His credibility and reliance is drawn in reliance upon the imagined but ever present possibility of fraud, and it is conveyed through the use of a structurally complex sentence that repeats two negatives, binding up the pretense in the very tortured structure. The active voice is followed by the passive voice – “I will not fail” by “have they found difficulty.” Thus, he identifies himself, but casts the others as unknown agents, and as unknown agents, even more suspect and untrustworthy. “As we supposed” creates a community between him and Kerridge, their joint thoughts, their conspiracy that is one aspect of the intimacy Roes creates between the two of them. This conspiracy interrupts the passive sentence, inserting itself between their difficulty and their trustworthiness. Trust anchors the details, but it is not the
trust of the “foreign” traders, it is the trust between Roe and Kerridge. All the
details hinge upon this recurring theme, what has been done at the honest end,
but is speculative, a subject of speculation, at the end of the “foreign” traders. He
may sell baubles to a fantastical man, but the breach of trust comes from their
raising the prices out of reason, a breach presumed in the very structure of the
sentence, in the breach of the “we supposed”. What is trustworthy and, thus,
reasonable, is what Roe will pay, and the definition of “reason” hinges upon the
ability to cast the relationship with the “foreign” traders in the same terms as
money paid, cloth ordered. Trust and reason are conflated to support the
substance of this business details, stylistically conveying that the performance as
expected by Roe and Kerridge is the definition of “trust” and “reason.” The
simple acts of buying and paying reveal the trivialization of the entire relationship,
even the relationship between reader and writer, but the conspiracy that is
conveyed as intimacy gives this trivial relationship both its value and its
affectionate appeal. And it is these details, and no other, that will establish the
credibility of the other side, a credibility constantly undercut in order to provide
not only the very substance of this letter, but the conspiracy between Roe and
Kerridge, that tie of affection that permits the conspiracy to continue. The
speaker is thus the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy.

To permit the conspiracy to continue, and to bind the pathos more closely
to the reader, duration surfaces as another detail that comprises the substance of
the genre, that is critical to trivialization, but, perhaps more importantly, creates
longitivity in the conspiracy itself. Duration is expressed in brevity, a
contradiction that underscores the duration by using simple brief reminders of both patient waiting that is also long-term intimacy, “The certainty of the King’s purpose, and my desires, is long since with you. I hope you shall be despatched and ready for the adventure. I must bear it, and have cast the worst.” Certainty, the core component of the weighing of detail, the stacking of minutiae that comprise the substance of the letter, is enfolded within the reader and the writer. The simple long-standing knowledge of what is to be done, similar to the two letters Kerridge is supposed to know about and execute, add pathos to the demands of Roe. Here, Roe has cast himself into the King’s purposes, which is also “his desire.” Two double motives that propel this short paragraph and cast the weight of action on Kerridge, who must be “dispatched” and “ready,” are emotionally executed through the very brevity of the parallel structure, a pointed brevity that lens its weight to the short clause, “is long since with you.” Kerridge is the subject of this sentence and Kerridge bears the brunt of this action, but Roe emotionally absorbs the costs of it, a key detail that surfaces through this letter and that makes his claim to emotional endurance also a claim upon the reader’s sympathy. He must bear it, and bear it notwithstanding he has “cast the worst,” that is, foreseen the failure implicit in his desires, not because they may actually fail, but because the failure of his desires is a detail that both gives this letter its emotional appeal as well as its credibility but that sets the background for the perspective on every action preformed by others. “Long since with you” is enfolded within failure, failed details that weigh upon each other, one failure upon another: baublization, Moorish tricks, and raising prices. Roe both emotionally
absorbs the failure and ascribes the long-awaited redemption of his emotional costs upon Kerridge. He, thus, takes emotional credit for the forecast failure to himself and is the one performing because he is the one who has foreseen the risk and advised against it; but this risk is cast as “long since” with Kerridge. Kerridge is implicated by duration alone to accept the burden of redemption. The speaker is thus the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption.

By so structurally implicating Kerridge in the emotional redemption, the forecasting of failure adds “interest” to success both substantively and stylistically. He predicts this double interest in the ending of the paragraph before this short paragraph with his declaration of casting “the worst”:

[A]nd I make no question, by this year’s and the next[‘s] practice, to enter so into good opinion as to buy on time for a leecke of goods, by which the ship shall be supplied in time, and, if care taken to preserve the foundation, it shall prove an adventure of better use meant to be so good husbands as to venture nothing.

Roe’s predictive ability allows his to be certain, to “make no question,” that notwithstanding the lack of trust and reasonableness that characterizes the other side, he will prevail. This certainty is bolstered by his simply declarative structure. He will “enter so into good opinion,” using the active voice to predict his certain success. He will not only provide, but specifically “buy on time” the goods, which will, in turn, supply the ship “in time.” As opposed to the “long since with you” time that casts Kerridge as emotional redeemer, the buying time is the active voice is reasonable, a matter of intellect, and certain. The detail is critical to the substance of this genre, constantly referring back to itself to establish the
key detail that must be executed promptly and business-like, but the style of this
detail is also critical, the use of the short sentence and active voice to convey not
just mastery, but absolute certainty that could also be considered arrogance. The
wise use of time, of “husbanding” of time, is the “foundation” of their business,
the stylistic use of metaphor converting a business enterprise into a family
enterprise, the “good husbands” those who venture something rather than, as the
term suggest, those who wisely husband their resources. The “good husbands”
also creates, within the conspiracy, a familial-like relationship, encouraging the
reader to identify not only with the “good husband” but also with the wide social
structure the “good husband” represents. By enfolding timeliness into duration, a
double movement of both length and urgency is provided in the substance and
evoked through the appeal to the good husband that is also an emotional
redeemer of long-borne costs. The enterprise becomes the wife of the good
husband, and an urgent wife as well, busy-ness folding upon itself over and over
and creating a duration that must be acted upon promptly and “in time” and yet is
“long since with you.” The intervention into time that these details insist upon is
not simply the trivialization of other concerns that might intercede, as well as the
discounting of the relational difficulties inherent in casting the other side as
untrustworthy and unreasonable, it is the emotional style of this genre, a style
that interpellates the reader into the position of “good husband” without time for
reflection upon what has been “long since with you.” Thus, the speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance.\textsuperscript{12}

Money, especially, must be performed “in time,” and the duration between debt and payment is an interminable duration, a painful duration “long since with you,” one that is not to be accepted but to be constantly repeated in its smallest detail, an emotional reminder that duration is unacceptable on the part of the other side, although to be expected from the side of reader and writer, who are both “long since with each other” and reminded of their familial relationship through texts that are “long since with you.” Good husbands accept one duration, the familial tie, but seasonable intervene in the other, seasonableness determined through the repetition of the debt, giving it emotional “interest” and resonance. The shared “interest” in debt is understood; it must begin the next paragraph:

Zulph[ecarcon’s] and Shaw Hussen[’s] debts are at a stand. The latter is alive, and here; to-day Mr. Biddulph with him, who offers the Mancepdares\textsuperscript{13} all at present at Court, but I will not accept them. Of that make no question; the other until presents, cannot be moved by me; but I will not lose it; let that comfort you.

The standing debts are specified by name, but the person’s are not the subject of this sentence, their debts are. The debts are “at a stand,” a personification that brings the debts alive as if they were living, animate beings capable of standing and of resistance to the reasonable demands of the good husbands. In addition, the status of the second debtor is specified, but as cast by the sentence
structure, it is not the second debtor that is alive and present, it is the second debtor’s debt itself that is “alive and here.” Not only is the debt itself alive and palpably present, but it is accompanied by another business associate, Mr. Biddulph. By being so accompanied, the debt is secured. The person is substituted for the debt, substantively, but structurally, the debt is the person. In fact, the person is simply a metonym for the debt, which gives the person that is the debt emotionally depth and physical presence. The debt is alive; it breathes.

As a breathing debt, it is thus collectable on its own right. The offering of sureties, the substitution of living human beings for the living debt, is unacceptable to Roe. Substantively, he will have the body of the debtor himself, and “will not accept them.” Stylistically, he will have the living debt. His emotional insistence on collecting this living debt is amplified by repetition directed towards Kerridge: “Of that make no question. By addressing Kerridge as if Kerridge himself might question Roe’s determination to collect the living debt, he presumes some lack of faith on Kerridge’s part, as if the temptation to mistake the living debtor by accepting sureties for the debt that is alive and will not be bound by sureties is a serious temptation, a common mistake. Roe’s resolve is thus a reminder and a gentle chiding to Kerridge, who might make this common mistake or possibly fault Roe for not accepting what guarantee of payment is made. In addition, this interlocutory statement: “Of that make no question,” apparently even accusatory, is actually intended to be a source of emotional solace to Kerridge, who is to have complete certainty that the debt will be paid: “the other until presents, cannot be moved by me; but I will not lose it;
let that comfort you.” Until payment is made, until “presents,” Roe cannot be moved. The weaving structure of this sentence, the demand for payment along with the triple refusal: “cannot be moved,” “but I will not lose it,” “let that comfort you,” enfold Kerridge within the emotional demands of Roe at the same time it seeks to satisfy Kerridge’s emotional demands by “comforting him.” Insisting that a debt is alive and then capturing it has great appeal to pathos: it is the satisfaction of their desires, the very source of their status as “good husbands,” that gives emotional meaning to their enterprise. Without the emotional relief of capturing living debt, the letter fails as an intimate gesture calculated to secure the familial ties that bind. Other relationality and cultural means to establish relationships of trust are emotionally empty because they delay the debt, broaden the relational duration with the living debt, and create a relationship that is interminable to Roe because it interrupts the relationship of the “good husbands” to each other. Thus, the speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt.

The speaker, a good husband adding to one’s credit by capturing debt, provides emotional relief as well in pursuing a debt relentlessly and without “being moved” by the person of the debtor, setting the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting over and worth emoting about. Stylistically, capturing the alive debt is the center of emotional affect, the center of what is a source of comfort and also the source of compassion. To achieve this
construction of emotional affect, “compassion” is understood in specific reference to what is “debt,” and Roe’s own appeal to pathos is in relieving or pursuing a debt, which is relieving or pursuing an emotional affect. He states this in the next paragraph, detailing as the moral quality of the good business letter as stylistically, the creation and satisfaction of emotion appeals:

What I resolve on in the way of compassion Captain Pring (as concerning him) knows. A firmaen from Bengal cannot me had while the Prince hath Suratt, unless we will quit it and rely on the other only. He pretends that all our find good shall come thither and his port bear the burthen of trash, and hinder others. But of this and new changes at Court at the end of my letter.

Although only Captain Pring is privy to what compassion, if any, Roe will extend to the debtor, and this proclamation includes the name of his secret adviser, and enfolds the threat implicit in this detail into secrecy, the structure of it declares Roe to be a source of compassion as well as comfort: “What I resolve,” he states in the active voice. Following immediately upon the following paragraph, with its structural emphasis on comfort, Roe uses alliteration to align his comfort to Kerridge with his compassion to the debtor. The secret threat has its own emotional quality, qualified by the parenthetical reference “(as concerning him),” thus appealing to the shared intimacy between Kerridge and Roe. What has been entrusted to Captain Pring, the parentheses both emphasizes and elides, is to the emotional arousal signified by his military status. Implicit is the reference to violence, and in the reference to violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of this debt. This specific detail of complicity and threat is conveyed to Kerridge, a detail Kerridge is not specifically privy to but which casts Roe, again,
as a comforting and compassionate debt pursuer who knows how to take care of business. The compassion is ironic, foregrounding the quality of the true “comfort” he seeks to give Kerridge. Abruptly introducing the threat of violence when the debtor is present with the trades and offers all types of guarantees for his debt is a detail that trivializes the debtor and the guarantees the debtor seeks to make, but this abrupt introduction also firmly casts the reader in the role of captive audience, one who awaits the delivery of Roe’s compassion via Captain Pring.

The emotional arousal of the abrupt introduction of military violence cast as “compassion” is further heightened by another abrupt stylistic gesture, the transition from violence to the trade itself. The compassionate violence is thus a commonplace, one that functions to emotionally anchor the meditation on trading: “A firmaen from Bengala cannot be had while the Prince hath Suratt, unless we will quit it and rely on the other only.” The use of the passive voice again, with the “firmaen” as the object placed syntactically in the role of the subject, works to underscore how the debts or articles of finance take on a life of their own. In addition, the transition from the first person to the third person abruptly shifts the imagined audience from spectator to participant; from watching and applauding Roe’s compassion to being complicity intimate with the consequences of that violence. Implicit in this apology is that bad relations would have no long-term ill effects; the traders would simply move on to a more profitable area, the “we” here underscoring the joint movement and joint immunity from the consequences of violence. The use of the third person is yet another
source of comfort, as all benefit from the implicit violence. The implicit violence is not just a good reason in itself since trade is so bad, but an appeal to pathos that comforts the reader who joins in the “moving on.” Thus, the speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion.\textsuperscript{14}

This detail of violence, rendered as a trading detail, adds to baublization, Moorish tricks, and the always and already unreasonableness of the other side, to convey the emotional substance of the dry details as a vivid and moving enterprise. To the degree the other side is expendable, so are the English traders even more comforted and cherished. Roe enhances this emotional affect again through one of his favorite stylistic devices, the repetition of the same matter in different phrases: “He pretends that all our find good shall come thither and his port bear the burthen of trash, and hinder others.” The pretense, once again, underscores the reader’s honesty and openness. The Court is pretending to be a good port, and is not, in fact any good at all. Instead, it is emotionally constructed as being the very nemesis of what is “good” to the trader in that the port would bear the “burthen of the trash, and hinder others.” The phrase “burthen of the trash” is rich in connotative appeal, and the doubling over the speaker, the doubt as to whom characterizes it as “trash,” further heightens the emotional affect. On the one hand, the “trash” is the trashing of the good trade; on the other hand, the “trash” are the non-English traders the English must
contend with. Thus, “trash” serves to underscore the very emotional discount of the other he has established already several times, the discounting of the baubles and the debtors, plus a further discounting of what can not be sold reasonably. Roe makes the speaker of these words unclear, giving the foreign Court a vocabulary putatively offense, a vocabulary justifying his hostile relationship with the Court. By using this language, the Court affronts the reader, discounts the reader, and thus arouses the pathos of indignation. In “hindering others,” another pretense, Roes stakes out the level of this indignation, a pretense that hinders and insults the reader. The Court has pretended it will favor its trading relationship with the English, and in pretending, insults the entire relationship and the validity and integrity of the English. The “new changes” that end this paragraph punctuate this false choice; details on the true choices available will come later, serving to heighten the reader’s anticipation of the trading betrayal to come, a trading betrayal that has all the emotional depth of a romantic betrayal. Thus, the speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal.
The message is neither the stated words nor necessarily their interpretation, but what substantively and stylistically is conveyed between the particular speaker to the particular audience. Here, from the particular speaker that is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to show both comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal. The message is between this particular speaker to this particular audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that both chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities. Thus, the third element in this generic style, in addition to conspiracy and familial ties, is the repetition of details strategically inserted that function as metonyms for emotional betrayal to convey the overall message. By amplifying and repeating these details, which stand in for the whole, the whole of the relationship is cast as not only illusory, but relationship to be both sustained through cunning, deceit, and manipulation. The reader is enfolded within this manipulation specified by Roe in his short ending to the paragraph on trash: “But of this and new changes at Court at the end of my letter.” It is, through the continual deferral of the true state of the relationship, which also requires yet more metonyms, an anticipated betrayal of such magnitude that it must be dealt with finally and conclusively at the end of
the letter. This firmly established emotional perspective imposes itself upon
Kerridge, the reader, by keeping the “trashed” relationship constantly in mind as
a disclosure to be anticipated, perhaps eagerly, this every present betrayal of the
deal informing the rest of the letter, so that every action is suspect, can be read
with jealousy and anger, the added “interest” which with every other detail is read
and weighed. Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger
and jealousy.¹⁵

Roe maintains this interest in the anticipated betrayal with his switch to yet
another inconsequential detail given more weight by following upon this
anticipated disclosure of “trash” at Court, establishing as the only detail that
matters and that must be repeated infinitivally, along with the debts, to be the
inconvenience of the entire endeavor. The “inconvenience” of the entire
endeavor, a substantive element, is stylistically portrayed in a paragraph that
telegraphs its message, overburdened by the inconvenience to speak fully of it:

For the procuring freight or waffage¹⁶ into the Red Sea, I desire trial
may be made, and keep my opinion to myself. I can cast and
discover the probabilities, losses and inconveniences; but that is
not the question. I would into that trade without them. The reasons
are many, and you feel the main, the use of one ship up on this
stock, which in all mine I urged to you. Let us not dispute against it,
but do or utmost, and if [it?] fail, it is not ours, but the projector’s.
Yet the voyage I would not forsake for missing an imaginary help. I
have been large in this to Captain Pring, laid down the foundation,
reasons, and hopes, and what ways I would execute it. If I proceed
not, I am innocent.

Roe, once again, keeps his opinion to himself, just as he keeps secret the trash
at Court and the threat implicit in his compassionate reliance on Captain Pring,
beginning this sentence with a business matter then personalizing it with the use
of the “I” and “desire.” Although he writes that he keeps his “opinion” to himself, there is no doubt of what his opinion is, another double gesture that both conceals and reveals, and in this double gesture establishing the intimacy between reader and writer. He details his predictive ability: “I can cast and discover the probabilities, losses and inconveniences; but that is not the question.” Of course, that is precisely the question, and with another double movement, displays his reasons while hiding them, using the parallel form to both reveal and conceal. The structural emphasis is on the “probabilities, losses and inconveniences” demonstrate their importance, while the equal weight placed upon “probabilities” as well as “losses and inconveniences” renders the probabilities as bad as a loss or an inconvenience. In addition, not only are the probabilities important to the extent they indicate “loss” and “inconvenience,” but the stylistic device of cloaking them while revealing them appeals to the shared secrecy between reader and writer. Following this complex structure, he again inserts himself into the equation through the active voice: “I would into that trade without them.” His double play on his resolve to enter the trade without the bad probabilities and to enter the trade in spite of the bad probabilities further heighten the emotional appeal of his intimate gesture, that these bad probabilities are not “the question.” He also heightens his resolve in emotional reliance on the prior predicate of loss/inconvenience. The loss/inconvenience that centers the substance of this letter is implicit in every detail made of baubles, unpaid debts, and false pretense, but the emotional appeal is invented through Roe’s style of evasive erasure of himself alternating with direct representation of himself. These
losses/inconveniences, invented by Roe to establish his busy-ness, also convey his pathos as a man ultimately put upon, a man who alternates between courtesy and self-effacement with indignation at the treatment of the others implicated within the loss/inconveniences.

Roe, is, thus, a humble and unwilling hero, or rather servant, side-stepping his won losses/inconveniences for the greater good of the reader. Although cast as reasonable, the reasons behind his resolve are emotional reasons: “The reasons are many, and you feel the main, the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you.” He focuses on the reason “felt” by Kerridge, “you feel the main,” using the direct address to interject Kerridge into the emotional quandary as well as to enfold Roe’s own “reasonable” advice into one short sentence: “the use of one ship up on this stock, which in all mine I urged to you.” The relationship is between “in all mind” and “urged to you,” another reference to the repeated duration that casts the relationship between writer and reader as one that is familial and never-ending. “In all mine” demonstrating the completeness and exhaustive nature of the relationship between traders. The other details, unmentioned, Roe kindly focusing on the one of primary emotional interest to Kerridge, give this emotional quandary more weight. In his predictive ability, Roe is also a master of respecting the feelings of his audience on several levels, which he demonstrates by not even including all those different emotional reasons. The reader is assured he has “cast” them. Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance.
That Roe was not followed in all that he urged upon Kerridge “in all mine” does not indicate that reasonable people might differ on this detail alone, but rather heightens Roe’s avuncular status within the familial relationship. He uses it to condescendingly suggest peace with Kerridge: “Let us not dispute against it, but do or utmost, and if [it?] fail, it is not ours, but the projector’s.” Thus, although the execution of the endeavor is Kerridge’s, and the fault is putatively Kerridge’s as well, who ignored all that was urged upon him, the fault in execution is now cast upon the projector’s in two ways stylistically. First, by switching to the third person again, so that Roe as well as Kerridge shoulders the blame: “it is not ours.” Second, by placing the true fault at the end of the sentence, so that attention is drawn from first Kerridge, to their complicit relationship, to the final arbiters in this familial relationship, the projector’s. Thus, in the imagined community created between reader and writer, the other is not only the foreign Court, but also the projector’s themselves, a detail that heightens the intimacy by closing its circle of associates. Thus, projector’s are “trashed,” an emotional projection of loss/inconvenience: “Yet the voyage I would not forsake for missing an imaginary help.” Substantively, the “imaginary help” is both imagined and illusory, yet again a pretense, a detail specified so as to be “trashed.” Yet stylistically, the sentence is set up to emphasis the final result, the return voyage itself, which Roe would not, in the first person, “forsake.” His
loyalty is emphasized by the immediately following term, “for missing.” Although
the one is missing, Roe will not forsake the return voyage. His steadfastness is
emphasized by what is both missing and imaginary; Roe is present and
substantial.

Yet, even then, Roe expand the gesture of intimacy by including within this
detail of loss/inconvenience his own exculpatory detail: “I have been large in this
to Captain Pring,” he writes. He repeats this again in the next clause, “laid down
the foundation, reasons, and hopes.” And yet again repeats this is the third
clause: “and what ways I would execute it.” These three gestures towards
exculpatory excuse, Roes repetition of his reasonable forecasting, the
straightforwardness of this advise, the specification of “foundation, reasons, and
hopes” that are unamplified but would give the impression of being weighty and
detailed all in themselves, maintain the use of the first person to emphasize
Roe’s steadfast, present, and substantial nature in opposition to the “imaginary
help.” “If I proceed not, I am innocent.” This is a contradictory detail after so
many excuses, yet one to be emotionally predicted as well in emphasizing the
loss/inconvenience and in appealing to the lack of pretense that underlies this
entire confession, a confession of concern and warnings to both Captain Pring
and Kerridge. Roe has already excused himself by the giving of advice, the
inconsequential nature of the enterprise, its nature of “trash” fully explained
through the omission of his advice to Captain Pring, and yet it is through this
excuse that not only his steadfastness is maintained, but the anticipated betrayal
heightened. If he does not perform, he is innocent because of his great busy-
ness, substantively, but also because it is in the betrayal of all those others he has urged and exhorted, as well as the betrayal of the others at Court, that lay behind his inability to proceed, a betrayal further cheapened by his connotative use of baublization, false pretenses, and the already discounted nature of the area and its Court, its “trash.” Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself. After so profound a confession and penance, so detailed an anticipated betrayal and his continued steadfastness, Roe returns to the theme of debtor, and adds yet another layer of emotional arousal after this wave of confession in both the loss/inconvenience that is the substance of each looming detail so painstakingly rendered and the lovingly captured detail of an alive debt to be captured. This is yet another from of his “comfort”:

Our debtor Groo is so long agreeing with his that I get nothing but “to-morrow”; but it rests upon Asaph Chan, who I know takes it to heart, and is the umpire for our sakes.

I suppose no time lost in staying for any order from me, wherein, as I have approved what you did, taking out the moneys by consultation, so I would not slyly have any hindrance cast upon respect to me, which in that point was none, nor needed any. I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.

Following immediately after his confession of innocence, this third-person evocation of the debtor, “our debtor,” reestablishes the intimate tone of the correspondence, folds his confession into the work of business itself, so this his confession is Kerridge’s confession as well. As with his specification of the earlier debt, this money itself must be performed “in time,” and the duration
between debt and payment is an interminable duration not to be accepted but to be constantly repeated in its smallest detail, a substantive reminder that duration is unacceptable on the part of the other side, and the repetition amplifying the debt, giving it "interest," making the detail its own matter through sheer prolixity.

But the duration is also figured here stylistically as a common bond, "our" debtor agreeing "with his," creating in the balanced phrase two communities at odds. In addition, Groo is "so long agreeing with his," that is, in complicit and unreasonable agreement with his fellow associates that Roe should not be paid. Roe casts this as a conspiracy to show how the debtors are against him, work in concerted action to prove their false pretenses, already assumed and needing only one small dereliction of duty to be proved, conveying through the style all that is no the dereliction of duty his own action, pursuing the alive debt. As a matter of style, the debtor, another "fantastical" man, is never given a full name, the shortened name, like an appellation of fraud or moniker of deceit, establishing the intimacy of the trading community and the otherness of Groo. Groo cheats both Roe and Kerridge of their time in giving them nothing but "tomorrow," the tomorrow the worst part of the deal, demonstrating that the specification that is critical is not simply the debt but the duration of time itself, stylistically giving him worse than nothing since he is prolonging the emotional capture of the debt. To enfold Kerridge within the ongoing drama that has all the "interest" of a romantic relationship, Roe underscores that Chan understands the severity of this trash of time, he takes it "to heart" and will be "umpire," arbiter, judge, executor of the debt. The mark of a trusted associate is that a debt is
taken “to heart,” understood to be at the emotional core of the business concern, the reason it exists and the excitement it generates. In the world of the traders, all debtors belong to each other and each one will look at after the other’s debtor, a comforting and exciting appeal to emotional.

In a move both contradictory and yet evocative, Roe immediately inserts himself after his short appeal to the emotional arousal of debt collection. That the debtor Groo is a fraud but Roe is not is intertwined in the passage immediately following, where Roe writes, “I suppose no time lost in staying for any order from me.” His first person use of “I,” followed by the equivocating and yet informal “suppose,” doubly enfold both Groo, Roe and Kerridge in this sentence. Who exactly has been recalcitrant? A “Grooish” “nothing but “to-morrow” permeates this passage. Kerridge becomes the antithesis of the debtor and the uberGroo, who uses duration not to delay a debt but to quickly execute what needed to be done without orders, just like a good debtor not only pays without being asked, but pays even before the debt is due. The very best debtor, like Kerridge, the antithesis of uber Grooish “nothing but tomorrow,” actually pays the debt before it is even owed, refusing to “stay” payment simply because no debt, like no order, exists. Kerridge, like the debtor, is bound within a twinned notion of time, in which the performance must both follow and anticipate the written order, but the Grooish connotation is clear. Kerridge is both another Groo and the anti-Groo, since failure to both follow and anticipate an order is the very definition of loss/inconvenience that Roe substantively rails against. The pressure to perform anit-Groo is explicit, the emptiness of “nothing but tomorrow” emptying out the
very life of those who would dare to follow the Grooish example of delay, the plaintive evocation of a MacBethian loss of wife parodied here in the minutiae of debt collection. Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal.

To avoid this loss and inconvenience, subterfuge and conspiracy are enfolded within his details, the “imaginary help” that creates an imagined community of intimacy between Roe and Kerridge. Immediately following this passage he specifies so, thus emphasizing the felt need to be even more anit-Groo:

I have approved what you did, taking out the moneys by consultation, so I would not slyly have any hindrance cast upon respect to me, which in that point was none, nor needed any. I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.

Kerridge is to understand that everything he does in prediction of what Roe would have advised is approved in advance, in the first person, no questions asked, particularly if “money” is involved. The emotional resonance of “money” is unmistakable. Kerridge is by proxy the execution of Roe’s “imaginary help” in that most emotionally saturated of relationships, the trader and his money. Roe would not have “slyly” any hindrance cast upon him: Kerridge need not wait for direct orders for what must obviously be done in Roe’s “imaginary” directives, and emphasizes this by “slyly” repeating the same lack of obstruction not once, but three times: “any hindrance,” “that point was none,” and “nor needed any.”
The multiple equivocations structurally hinder Kerridge’s autonomy, making it clear that the proxy’s imagined anticipation of orders is one that is strictly constructed and always in doubt even when right. It requires repetition: “I agree that all moneys and means to be employed at Amad[avaz], and have written to that effect.” Again, the emotional weight is upon “moneys,” and because this emotional saturated relationship is involved, it must be carefully phrased both to increase surveillance of Kerridge and to cover any surveillance of Roe himself. Thus, the absence of the order is presumed to be evidence of the continual order for “imaginary help,” directed towards an imaginary audience outside writer and reader. Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption.

Thus, within the substantive tropes of baublization, false pretenses, and imaginary help, there is always and already enfolded the primary substance of this genre, the continual deferral of orders, of information, and of advise, the deferral creating both the need for the relationship and the emotional appeal of the relationship: more is always to come. Instead, Roe repeats the details of debts and gold, shipments to be received and shipments to be made, not simply because as if the details themselves create the trade, but also because of the emotional arousal of these much-loved details, creating the emotional appeal of a letter otherwise empty and full of nothing but to-morrow. These details become
fleshed out through the loss/inconvenience each predicts and inscribe within the
substance of this genre, as performance in anticipation of predictive and
“imaginary” orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks
to instantiate through the substance of his letters. The emotional appeal of this
absence, as constructed through the style, is through the emotional evocation of
the need for his presence, which is layered upon the emotionally saturated
appeal of the intertwining of his presence with the capturing of the alive debt

The message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and
jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present
vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the
emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary
redemption. This imaginary redemption is conflated with the stylistically constant
betrayal of the alive debt, which structures the mediation that is the fourth core
component of this substance, the constant repetition of details that signify the
untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and
inconvenient endeavor. In a lengthy passage, Roe alludes to the profound
mistrust in several different circumstances and against a host of people, so that
only Kerridge and himself occupy that privileged imagined community of
imaginary help, creating an appeal to Kerridge that is avuncular, forensic, and
ecumencial:
The ship to return referred to the Commander; what I can propound is done. Indigo of Jambuzar I cannot judge of; a former signified my mistrust that might be that sort which . . . mention not worth 12d. per lb. and not distinguished from Serquese, because of a making and passed with it. I must refer it to your judgment.

Perdap Shaw’s firmaen was sent to Mr, Banggam, who moved for it and knows the use.

For private trade you know my orders, and I hope the . . . pleasure. The prime commodity no man, I hope, will deal in upon any pretence; cloth, if they do, and consent to acquaint the factors with it and remit it to their masters, it may pass, and by your and my advice may be favoured; but for all such as are obstinate I require execution of commission to the utmost, notice of their names, and I will use my credit to bring them to repentance by losses. They that trust their masters deserves the issue of trust, faith and grace; but they that dare not, know themselves unworthy of any. I am persuaded no man can deal so privately (though the Customer join) but you may know it, and I am sure it cannot come aboard and be stowed, and cloud; such take, seize and mark, or rather forbid shipping if unmarked; or if [it?] cannot be done till I come to Suratt, you shall find I find many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.

This litany of mistrust is fostered against both the trade commodity itself, indigo, and every person occupied in the endeavor in this entire geographical region: the scope of his mistrust is comprehensive, an ecumenical disbelief is evoked in this passage. That this litany is bolstered by the emotional appeal to violence is indicated in its very first sentence: the ship is in the authority of the Commander, an order that Roe had already, presumably, dictated or advised, thus enfolding himself within that emotional appeal that is cast as protective and avuncular.

With such mistrust, the only authority that is trustworthy, aside from Kerridge’s own judgment, is the threat implicit in consigning the ship to the Commander, the appeal to the forensic, to the past judgment of a crime, heightening the emotional appeal of this passage. This is the predicate for his entire mediation on the
essential untrustworthiness of every person or object involved in the trade, all of
whom are presumed to be eagerly interested in private trade, a subject of so
great emotional "interest" that Roe details it for his reader, signifying what is of
"interest" to them both.

The primary trope again, is pretense, but the style is to foreground the
metonymic substitutes for "money" so that the pretense evokes that emotionally
saturated relationship and evokes the betrayal of the alive debt: "The prime
commodity no man, I hope, will deal in upon any pretence." The "prime
commodity leads this sentence, juxtaposed with "no man," emphasizing the
vacuum of the man within the commodity. The commodity leads the following
clause as well: "cloth, if they do, and consent to acquaint the factors with it and
remit it to their masters, it may pass." Cloth, again, the metonymic substitute for
money, precedes the subject, "they," the verb "do" hanging in this syntax, so that
"doing" is hindered by the "consent" to acquaint the factors and remit to the
masters; double actions that bind the subject. The verbal chain of hierarchy
follows the organizational chain of hierarchy, from lowest to highest: "they" to
"factors" to "masters." Such an organizational chain is also an emotional chain
hinging upon the "consent," permitting the implicit betrayal consented to by the
"they" to be consented to by the entire hierarchy and thus, nullifying the
emotional effect of "private trade." Likewise, this trade is permissible "by your
and my advice may be favoured, " thus enfolding both Roe and Kerridge not
simply within this organization chain, but as consenters to the emotional betrayal
that Roe has established is always and already present when it comes to "money" or its substitutes. The message is the "interest" in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through "money" or its substitutes.

Nonetheless, the favor of Roe and his imagined helper Kerridge is both discounted by his claim to compassion and underscored by his syntax, a move similar to his use of threat from Captain Pring earlier to heighten emotional arousal: "but for all such as are obstinate I require execution of commission to the utmost." That is, the entire consent and favor is modified by this coordinating subordinate clause, which carries the weight of this sentence. He requires execution of the commission of martial law, and to the utmost, his compassion and favor being inflected by the extracting the severest penalty "to the utmost."18

His list of how he would extract this penalty to the "utmost" appeals to the violence he uses earlier as a way of both constructing emotional affect and appealing to pathos. He would require not just execution to the utmost, but "notice of their names, and I will use my credit to bring them to repentance by losses." "Notice of their names" uses alliteration to give it emotional appeal, and such notice carries the connotation that they are all, like Groo, not only Groolike and untrustworthy but that in naming them the alive debt can be captured. It is his "credit," another metonym for money, that gives him both emotional resonance and authority. The sin committed by those who do not follow the
chain of hierarchy is explicit and severe, and Roe demonstrates the religious fervor of his mission in bringing them to “repentance” as severely as possible, “by losses.” Loss/inconvenience, one of the central substantive tropes in this letter, is understood emotionally to be the most severe penalty possible.

But the most striking emotional appeal follows, the rationalization for his severity and the crusading-like fervor with which he will pursue the money-sinners of private trade: “They that trust their masters deserves the issue of trust, faith and grace.” Anything less than total trust is not just disobedience, it is the fulfillment of the lack of trust already implied and awaited by Roe, an already and always present emotional betrayal that must be presumed in advance to exist and require an act of faith on the part of private traders to evade. He makes the emotional construct of unquestioning loyalty clear, so that this loyalty implicates the reader and creates the anxiety of misunderstanding the imaginary orders dictated by the “masters”: “but they that dare not, know themselves unworthy of any.” The lack of trusting of their masters not only makes the employees unworthy of trust, but they both know this and because of this knowing dare not trust their masters. The lack of trust emotionally signifies betrayal has already occurred. Not to trust the masters is self-inflected and self-inflicted. The emotional appeal to Kerridge is clear: both he and Roe are worthy of unswerving and unquestioned loyalty by virtue of their very existence as “masters,” the interpellation of both of them within the category “master” a profoundly exculpatory gesture that at the same time gestures towards the lack of trust not only anticipated by Roe, but continually reinforced through the very
construction of these entities as worthy of unquestioning trust. This litany of mistrust assumes the centrality of the “masters,” a self-revolving and self-emptying gesture that is mindless but emotionally appealing within the chain of hierarchy constructed by Roe. This is an appeal similar to his appeal for and to “imaginary help.” Taken to its emotional conclusion, neither Roe nor Kerridge should be trusted either, having so profoundly mistrusted all. Thus, the self-referential nature of betrayal structures his entire litany of mistrust, and only becomes a representation of anything if Roe is, indeed, the master of all. Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all.

That this emotional appeal is to an imagined community of writer and reader who are “master of all” is stylistically bolstered by Roe’s detailed rationale behind his golden rule of “trust your masters if you want to be trusted by them:"

I am persuaded no man can deal so privately (though the Customer join) but you may know it, and I am sure it cannot come aboard and be stowed, and cloud; such take, seize and mark, or rather forbid shipping if unmarked; or if [it?] cannot be done till I come to Suratt, you shall find I find many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.
Roe has persuaded himself and seeks to persuade Kerridge that the reason behind this golden rule is that the employees will be caught; the emotional appeal to the superior wisdom and all-encompassing surveillance that inures to Roe’s “credit.” No man can deal privately, even in complete conspiracy with the customer, but Kerridge will know it, and Kerridge is thus, substantively, super-surveillancer as well as once again enfolded within not only the golden rule of trusting one’s masters but again, imaginary help. The emotional appeal is contradictory: Roe in the first-person is persuaded, but his persuasion hinges on the second-person “you.” In addition, this emotional appeal contradicts the rationale of the “master of all,” whom by virtue of existence is to be trusted. Trust, in fact, depends on execution as Roe instructs the all-knowing Kerridge to take such goods, seize them – more than a taking, but a stealing of the goods – and to mark them. Thus, the golden rule of trusting the master is directed towards Kerridge, who must trust Roe, and enfolded Roe himself, who must trust Kerridge, the executor of the privilege. But if Kerridge does not trust Roe, Roe will enforce trust through is own execution, another threat that implicitly appeals to the emotional arousal of violence. Roe asserts that if Kerridge cannot do this, or finds it difficult, then he can just wait for Roe, who will see this matter through, demonstrating that Roe finds “many things easy thought impossible; for I will do it.” Roe, the ultimate master of all, will easily execute this himself, implicating Kerridge as less than ultimate master if this surveillance should prove impossible.
The threat is also an emotional appeal of a challenge to superiority. If Kerridge cannot steal from the employees and mark their goods, Roe will have no problem, being the master of all, an avuncular, ecumenical, and forensic appeal.

Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority.

In conclusion, the audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities. The speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal. The message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and
the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority.

That this message is imaginary first and foremost is revealed in the critical detail in the substance of this genre, a detail that amplifies the prolixity of Roe. This detail urges Kerridge to anticipate and predict what Roe will find when he comes abroad, and to anticipate and predict exactly what it is Roe will do when he asserts “I will do it.” Again, the imaginary help is itself a loss and inconvenience. If Kerridge cannot perform, Roe will do it, and it will inure to his credit as well, his creation of the imaginary help he needs through the threat of him actually doing something besides doling out advice that may or may not even be read. The gesture of anger and impotence is profound, especially in a letter as lengthy as this one, a letter that may or may not have reached its intended recipient at the time Roe wrote it. Once again, performance in anticipation of predictive and “imaginary” orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks to instantiate through the substance of his letters. In this passage, he inserts himself within this instantiation of the absence. He has become the imaginary help that will avert both loss and inconvenience.

That this “imaginary help” is figured as the work of the “master of all” is an emotional claim to superiority within the organizational chain and the emotional appeal to the superior wisdom and all-encompassing surveillance that inures to Roe’s “credit.” Roe multiplies his credit substantively through the first element of
the generic situation, substance, which can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. By multiplication and amplification, inconsequential details are expressed through tropes such as baublization, pretense, and trash. A core component of this substance is the constant repetition of details that signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and inconvenient endeavor.

These details both create and call for imaginary help with an imagined community of those that are trustworthy, the letter write and sometimes, the letter receiver, Kerridge. The final trope that conveys this substance of trivialization is the continual insistence upon the ability to discern shadows from truth. This is the perspective of the master, a perspective that Roe must reinforce through his repetition of his superior knowledge and powers of discernment. This repetition of details seeks to instantiate his own authority, but even more, his very physical presence in the letter and his emotional appeal. His existence depends on such a perspective, since there is no reason to write unless he adopts this perspective and seeks to persuade himself and his reader that his letters matter emotionally and that he himself matters within the emotional vacuum of mistrust, double-dealing, pretense, trash, and bauble-heads in which he finds himself.
To construct both the emotional affect and the appeal to pathos, Roe uses stylistic devices, including sentence structure, variation in person, connotative language, and syntax, to create a relationship that is both a conspiracy, a family bond, and a signification of an imagined community held together by the always and already present betrayal of trust in that most important of relationships, the trader and money. His firmly established emotional perspective imposes itself upon Kerridge, the reader, by keeping the “trashed” relationship constantly in mind as a disclosure to be anticipated, perhaps eagerly, this every present betrayal of the deal informing his powers of discernment, so that every action is suspect, can be read with jealousy and anger, the added “interest” which with every other detail is to be anticipated, read, and relished. In addition, Roe uses style to insert the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication. Friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with saving money.

The two primary emotional appeals are to debt and martial law. The emotional relief provided by pursuing a debt relentlessly and without “being moved” by the person of the debtor sets the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting over and worth emoting about. Stylistically, capturing the alive debt is the center of emotional affect, the center of what is a source of comfort and also the source of compassion. Roe’s repeated use of references to martial
law is a reference to violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of
the debt. Roe, a comforting and compassionate debt pursuer who knows how to
take care of business, is both ironic and self-enforcing, casting the reader in the
role of captive audience, one who awaits the delivery of Roe’s compassion via
Captain Pring, and one whose attention is captivated by the abrupt transitions
and introductions to and from marital law weaved throughout this business letter.

Within this substance and style, the situation amplifies and explicates the
genre. The audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and
subservient, is a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that chides and
corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of
imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge
of such imaged responsibilities. This role is enforced through violence. The
speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man
who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of
long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit
by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in
a discursive environment of every present betrayal. To enforce violence is
simply being a good husband. The message is the “interest” in betrayal
conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both
possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very
cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the
betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its
substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority, thus, both the imposition of violence and the execution of violence are always and already part of the message.

The composing ability incorporated within this genre is thus both the repetition of this particular substance as well as the emotional inflection that renders this substance captivating and capable of emotional effect. The variation in the use of stylistic devices both enforce and underscore the need to assert mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, which must work to enfold the reader within business intimacy. The switch in person, coordinate and subordinate sentence structure, and use of connotative language work to enfold the reader within the emotionally saturated relationship, and yet convey that relationship as one of both reason and business. To compose such an emotionally saturated relationship as business-like requires the frontloading of metonyms for “money,” and the discounting of other possible relationships through pejorative language figured within balanced equivocations using the second-person. The recursive use of debt and martial law as stylistic devices reinforce the emotional affect of mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, critical to achieving the semblance of an intimate relationship within a discursive environment of deep mistrust. The audience, the
good friend, and the speaker, the good husband, are in master to master and master from master relationships. Any message that did not focus on the trust implicit in the always and already present betrayal would be a betrayal in and of itself to be executed and enforced through violence.

This analysis of genre, admittedly an analysis by accretion, has chapter by chapter analyzed first the substance, then the style, then the situation of the genre of business and administrative communication represent by this letter. In analysis by accretion, the actual amount of the letter analyzed has become shorter and shorter, and at no time was the entire lengthy letter reproduced. To both test the analysis and give the text of the end of this letter, the conclusion will test the primary elements of the genre by working backwards from analysis to text to demonstrate how the ability incorporated or subsumed within composing ability reframes the material conditions of the embodied experience to give an anchor in materiality of abstract notions of who has composing ability and who can exercise it.21


4 According to Foster’s notes, neither of these letters still exists. Id. at 213 n. 2. Also according to Foster, this letter is printed “with a few omissions” in The Embassy, p. 447. Id. at n.1.

5 According to Foster’s notes, “chopped” means “stamped,” similar to signing a document. Id. at n. 3.


8 The “characteristic invitation to rhetoric” begins when “identification and division” are put “ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and the other begins.” Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: U. of Ca. P., 1969. 19-27. “To identify A with B is to make A ‘consubstantial’ with B.” Id. at 21.

8 Id. at 25.

9 Roe, Thomas, Sir. [1581?-1644]. The coppy of two letters from Sr. Thomas Rowe Lord Embassadour Extraordinary for His Majesty in Germany. One to the Earle of Holland. The other to Mr. Edward Waller, one of the Members of the House of Commons. Concerning the French Embassadors accusation against him in the House of Peeres., Printed at York : by Stephen Bulkley, 1642. Wing (2nd ed.) / R1777; Embassy to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615-1619. Vols I & II. Ed. William Foster. London: Hakluyt Society, 1899; A letter from the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Rovve, extraordinary embassadour for his Majestie at vienna To Edmond VValler Esquier one of the Members of the House
of Commons. Which letter was read in the said House, July 8, 1642., London: Printed for Abell Roper, 1642. Wing (2nd ed.) / R1778; Thomason / 669.f.6[46]; Steele / I, 2217; Sir Thomas Roe his speech in Parliament: wherein he sheweth the cause of the decay of coin and trade in this land, especially of merchants trade. And also propoundeth a way to the House how they may be increased., London: Printed for John Aston, 1641. Bib Name / Number: Wing (2nd ed.) / R1780; Thomason / E.198[31] (two copies, one in the British Library and one in the Thomason Collection. Also Wing / R1781 from the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery); Sir Thomas Rowe his speech at the councell-table touching brasse-money, or against brasse-money, with many notable observations thereupon, July, 1640., [London: s.n.], 1641. Wing / R1778A; Sir Thomas Rowe’s Speech at the councel table about the alteration of the coyn, in July 1640. With some observations thereon., London: printed for Sam. Crouch at the corner of Pope’s-Head-Alley over against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, 1695. Wing (2nd ed.) / R1779; A true and faithful relation, presented to his Maiestie and the prince, of what hath lately happened in Constantinople, concerning the death of Sultan Osman, and the setting vp of Mustafa his vncle Together with other memorable occurrents worthy of observation., Imprinted at London: [By F. Kingston] for Bartholomew Downes, and are to be sold at his house neere Fleetbridge [by B. Downes], and in Popes head Alley, by William Sheffard, 1622. STC (2nd ed.) / 18507.71a.

10 “Raised,” according to Foster. Supra. at 214 n. 2.


13 According to Foster, “Mansabdars” or “officers” that were “of course” offered as sureties. Id. at 215 n. 1.


This is a payment for “convoying native vessels.” Foster, *supra.*, n. 4.


CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

This analysis of genre, admittedly an analysis by accretion, has chapter by chapter analyzed first the substance, then the style, then the situation of the genre of business and administrative communication represent by this letter. In analysis by accretion, the actual amount of the letter analyzed has become shorter and shorter, and at no time was the entire lengthy letter reproduced. To both test the analysis and give the text of the end of this letter, this conclusion will test the primary elements of the genre by working backwards from conclusion to abbreviated text. Although this genre analysis relies on the classical triad, other methods are available, and the usefulness of this triad may rest on both its analytical and predictive precision.¹ There will admittedly always be elements that evade genre analysis, but in this conclusion will focus on how the genre analysis might work.²
To the extent this analysis is both predictive and descriptive, for what weight it carries in establishing the genre of business and administrative communication, it also requires the use of imagination to both predict and describe. Imagination, as Royster defines it in *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African American Women*, is “a critical skill . . . the ability to see the possibility of certain experiences even if we cannot know the specificity of them.” It requires the “commitment to making connections and seeing possibility” by questioning “a viewpoint, an experience, and event” and by “remaking interpretive frameworks based on that questioning.”³ By imagining this letter as a script, a performance, a play, the generic elements may reveal themselves to illustrate this possibly recurring thread of history.

The first way to proceed is to imagine the speaker as the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal.⁴ Such a speaker begins this performance so:

I complained of this new trouble before your letters arrived; and promised a letter down of new favour, but on the way of unpossible to solicit it. If that were the worst, to take away their weapons and restore them, except they were more governed, it matters not. Or if you would show them in a glass their folly, the General may disarm their boats and, being demanded reason, may say we doubt they are bound for the conquest of England and the taking of London.
From so imagining the speaker of this performance, the second step is to imagine oneself as this particular audience: Thus, the audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that both chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as an honest peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities:

Mesolapatan is a new question. I spot them so bare as they needed no ship to fetch any proceed. They speak of some on credit; I know not what it is, nor whether it be fit goods, much less two. In this point I wish are due consideration; for if the factory shall be continued as profitable, and that the . . . intent, some supply they must have, but whether from us or Bantam I know not custom. This I resolve of, if you send them money they have no indicoe (as they write) to buy, no commodity unbespoken, and I think it at this season unfit to scatter the money sent upon this fleet in hopes, when they shall need more at Bantam.

As audience, consider how this passage again enfolds an implicit appeal to “imaginary help” that is figured as the work of the “master of all,” an emotional claim to superiority within the organizational chain and the emotional appeal to the superior wisdom and all-encompassing surveillance that inures to Roe’s “credit.” Roe multiplies his credit substantively through the first element of the generic situation, substance, which can be generally described as “trivialization,” expressed through the rhetorical trope of inconsequential detail figured as loss and inconvenience. Inconsequential detail is also expressed through cumulative structure and prolixity, establishing a core component of composing ability as sheer volume of production, or development. By multiplication and
amplification, inconsequential details are expressed through tropes such as baublization, pretense, and trash. A core component of this substance is the constant repetition of details that signify the untrustworthiness that is the inflection cast upon the entire losing and inconvenient endeavor. These details both create and call for imaginary help with an imagined community of those that are trustworthy, the letter write and sometimes, the letter receiver, Kerridge. The final trope that conveys this substance of trivialization is the continual insistence upon the ability to discern shadows from truth. This is the perspective of the master, a perspective that Roe must reinforce through his repetition of his superior knowledge and powers of discernment. This repetition of details seeks to instantiate his own authority, but even more, his very physical presence in the letter and his emotional appeal. His existence depends on such a perspective, since there is no reason to write unless he adopts this perspective and seeks to persuade himself and his reader that his letters matter emotionally and that he himself matters within the emotional vacuum of mistrust, double-dealing, pretense, trash, and bauble-heads in which he finds himself:

The pearl makes me think they speak by rote, doubling the prices at guess, for who knows what a pearl of 4d. ob.\(^5\) can yield, or any that deals not by weight or size. I taken that pearl is brought often from thence hither, sold to profit, and I am almost sure the small sorts will not hear yield the price cost in England; I wish the greater may. But if you think these men know what they say I will do dispeed the sorts required by a post. Lead you can spare enough; but if this sale of it will bear a ship's charge, that is to be cast up. Elephants’ teeth may help, but if you suppose a good market may be found here, it is folly to venture it. . . . and I doubt not consider not, consideratis considerandis, to find it the best market, for all that can be said is that in the town it is often mingled, in the aldeas pure.
Using Roe’s own principle of interpretation, “consideratis considerandis,” consider how all three come together in this conclusion to his letter. Within this substance and style, the situation amplifies and explicates the genre. The audience, the good friend interested in the good deal, obedient and subservient, is a long-standing audience flattered by the attention that chides and corrects, needs no extensive formalities or courtesies to assume the charge of imagined responsibilities, but is constructed as a peer to assume the full charge of such imaged responsibilities. This role is enforced through violence. The speaker is the trustworthy man of credit that uses affection for conspiracy, a man who takes credit for emotional redemption, and in so doing, is a good husband of long-standing acquaintance. Good husbandry consists in adding to one’s credit by capturing debt and in using violence to both show comfort and compassion in a discursive environment of every present betrayal. To enforce violence is simply being a good husband. The message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become masters, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority; the imposition of violence and the execution of violence are always and already part of the message:
I answer: in the old, being come to perfection, it shows itself, and may sooner be discovered, if carefully chosen by men of experience, than in new. The price, if said it cheaper, I know the contrary; for if it prove a dry year, at the new cuts both were dearer than the old four months before. This year, that was very seasonable, the old West cheaper than the new, loss and weight considered; and it is ever fitter for us, because most [is?] ready packed fit for cart, whereas the new puts us to many expenses in travel, in lying abroad, in skins, and in carriage to a Agra and in a great time picked up.

Within these two passages, imagine as well the entire letter repeated before it, considering how the composing ability incorporated within this genre is thus both the repetition of this particular substance as well as the emotional inflection that renders this substance captivating and capable of emotional effect. The variation in the use of stylistic devices both enforce and underscore the need to assert mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, which must work to enfold the reader within business intimacy. The switch in person, coordinate and subordinate sentence structure, and use of connotative language work to enfold the reader within the emotionally saturated relationship, and yet convey that relationship as one of both reason and business. To compose such an emotionally saturated relationship as business-like requires the frontloading of metonyms for “money,” and the discounting of other possible relationships through pejorative language figured within balanced equivocations using the second-person. The recursive use of debt and martial law as stylistic devices reinforce the emotional affect of mastery, superior knowledge, and an all-encompassing perspective, critical to achieving the semblance of an intimate relationship within a discursive environment of deep mistrust. The audience, the
good friend, and the speaker, the good husband, are in master to master and master from master relationships. Any message that did not focus on the trust implicit in the always and already present betrayal would be a betrayal in and of itself to be executed and enforced through violence:

Your despatch for Persia I understand; but saw no cost to spare two factors to carry letters, both, it seems, so sufficient as to do all if the worst happened. All I shall farther add in it is to put you in mind it is to me His Majesty hath referred it and . . . entrusted it; I cannot answer for England until the return of this voyage to any satisfaction; that therefore I expect the first sight and receipt of all that comes, except your private letters and accounts of sales for the books’ perfecting: but relations, treaties, privileges, projects, and all of that quality are no man’s to judge of but mine, and I shall either receive them whole, or not meddle in them.

In addition, read the script with the following message specifically in mind, to determine how this message is or is not preformed by the ending words of this letter. Thus, the message is the “interest” in betrayal conveyed by anger and jealousy, an interest compounded by both possessiveness and ever present vigilance, but discounted by the very cheapness of the betrayal itself and the emptiness of the promise implicit in the betrayal, calling for an act of imaginary redemption through “money” or its substitutes. Through this imaginary act of redemption, both speaker and audience become master of all, and this act must be repeated constantly to maintain superiority:

Mr. Stelle’s words whatsoever can work no prejudice in me to any man. You have had some experience of me; believe the best, for that will follow. I have ordered his following the projects as his employment here; after, if you return not (which shall be his own seeking), the Red Sea; for I should be glad to let all men see I
would do good if I can. He yet complaineth that he is not admitted
to your consultations, and that you proceed without any. I confess
it is reason Mr. Kerr [idge] should direct all factors in his residence
their employments severally, but respectively to the estimation . . .
had of others.

Within this letter, imagine as well the particular emotional appeals being
made, the two primary emotional appeals to debt and martial law. The emotional
relief provided by pursuing a debt relentlessly and without “being moved” by the
person of the debtor sets the standard of emotional affect, what is worth emoting
over and worth emoting about. Stylistically, capturing the alive debt is the center
of emotional affect, the center of what is a source of comfort and also the source
of compassion. Roe’s repeated use of references to martial law is a reference to
violence, yet a compounding of the emotional “interest” of the debt. Roe, a
comforting and compassionate debt pursuer who knows how to take care of
business, is both ironic and self-enforcing, casting the reader in the role of
captive audience, one who awaits the delivery of Roe’s compassion via Captain
Pring, and one whose attention is captivated by the abrupt transitions and
introductions to and from martial law weaved throughout this business letter:

Neither see I how the rest are so requested as to ease the loss of
the other, unless those you call unvendible exceed not forty or fifty
pounds; but I am informed he hath dear glasses now not worth the
fourth of their price in England. The Venetians⁷ have sold here, two
foot square, cost 20l. sterling in Venice, for sixty rupies; besides
many pieces that will never yield money, and other suchlike stuff.
But if you think you can save, proceed: I will not warrant it. But if
you deal only in his cloth, jewel and arras and fit goods, I consent.
But the jewel should be well considered; he might have sold it to
Asaph Chan’s man and been eased. I desire not a profit of them,
but that their sales hinder not . . . by great returns, which I see he
expects.
To fully realize the rhetorical situation here, also consider how this letter constructs both the emotional affect and the appeal to pathos, how Roe uses stylistic devices, including sentence structure, variation in person, connotative language, and syntax, to create a relationship that is both a conspiracy, a family bond, and a signification of an imagined community held together by the always and already present betrayal of trust in that most important of relationships, the trader and money. His firmly established emotional perspective imposes itself upon Kerridge, the reader, by keeping the “trashed” relationship constantly in mind as a disclosure to be anticipated, perhaps eagerly, this every present betrayal of the deal informing his powers of discernment, so that every action is suspect, can be read with jealousy and anger, the added “interest” which with every other detail is to be anticipated, read, and relished. In addition, Roe uses style to insert the intimate relationship between the business relationships, asking his reader to do the same, to imagine contenting a friend as part of the purpose of the entire business, a bond of affection that binds the business and administrative genre and that appeals to pathos in reminding the reader that affection does double-duty for business and administrative communication.

Friendship is bound up with the good deal, saving affection with saving money:

I received a Mistress Hudson’s desires from herself.⁸ And for indicoes, she pleads Sir Thomas Smith’s consent; which, if in writing, private or public, I have yielded to; now I cannot. Her demand is like Martin’s, to have the . . . [indigo?] for money, or to invest it for her. Your answer must be as mine; the first is unreasonable and it cannot be answered; the second is too late and cannot be fulfilled.
Within this rhetorical situation, which is imaginary first and foremost, consider also what is revealed in the critical detail in the substance of this genre, a detail that amplifies the prolixity of Roe. This detail urges Kerridge to anticipate and predict what Roe will find when he comes abroad, and to anticipate and predict exactly what it is Roe will do when he asserts “I will do it.” Again, the imaginary help is itself a loss and inconvenience. If Kerridge cannot perform, Roe will do it, and it will inure to his credit as well, his creation of the imaginary help he needs through the threat of him actually doing something besides doling out advice that may or may not even be read. The gesture of anger and impotence is profound, especially in a letter as lengthy as this one, a letter that may or may not have reached its intended recipient at the time Roe wrote it. Once again, performance in anticipation of predictive and “imaginary” orders are Roe’s amplification of the very absence of what he seeks to instantiate through the substance of his letters. In this passage, he inserts himself within this instantiation of the absence. He has become the imaginary help that will avert both loss and inconvenience:

The note of factors’ wages sent sufficeth me. When you have considered of fit num[ber] to reside in all places, and fit persons, you shall receive my opinion and know to what end I desired them. Mr. Fettiplace is to be considered, and Mr. Martine, for both may take pains and understand their business, are frugal and honest, and have least means. Mr. Kerr[idge] need not doubt that I will do
all things that I may to satisfy him, whom I have persuaded to stay. According to a former, I desired a consultation, upon sight of which you shall find me so reasonable to all, so ready to show myself his friend, as doubt not will content . . . and them.

All I can say of Mesolapatan is done already. I can give no opinion but that I would not scatter the stock, but upon good ground, nor send a ship but to receive goods sufficient . . . .

Having imagined audience, speaker, and message through this text, consider this final passage through the lenses of composing ability, considering especially how he incorporates ability within the narrative structure of the letter.10 His narrative incorporates also his own suspicion, as the analysis of style reveals.11 In addition, through his continual use of these tropes, a linear casual relationship is imbricated into this genre, so that “fact” looms large and functions as the Will to Truth.12 The ability incorporated or subsumed within composing ability reframes the material conditions of the embodied experience to give an anchor in materiality of abstract notions of who has composing ability and who can exercise it, an ideology incorporated in the conclusion itself. 13

Thus I conclude answer to your letter, wherein I fall into consideration of the pains by mine own weariness. You may suppose I write not at ease in a house; remove every other day; forget to answer none; have much to prepare for England, and no help. Therefore what is written in haste must not be severely censured. I am long in some instances; it is to let you see my motions come not at adventure without consideration, though they bring not always their reasons.

Now I come to our estate here. I have re-complained; to-night visit the King with His Majesty’s letter translated (deferred till now for extremity of ways that made all in confusion); at which time I hope to dispute our own cause anew.
In conclusion, although this analysis is both predictive and descriptive, for what weight it carries in establishing the genre of business and administrative communication, the use of imagination can build upon this analysis to both predict and describe. Imagination, as defined above, is "a critical skill . . . the ability to see the possibility of certain experiences even if we cannot know the specificity of them." It requires the "commitment to making connections and seeing possibility" by questioning "a viewpoint, an experience, and event" and by "remaking interpretive frameworks based on that questioning." His conclusion suggests its own beginning in remaking interpretive frameworks: "Thus in new hopes I rest a time; and so I must from writing, for I am not able scarce to write my name." He then commits his signature: "I commit you all to God's mercy. Your loving friend, Tho. Roe." By imagining this letter as a script, a performance, a play, the generic elements may reveal themselves to illustrate this possibly recurring thread of history. Even with his own letter, Roe is unable to bring his performance to conclusion, adding a postscript, "The pearl I cannot advance to its own price; the model of the great, being of consequence in the sales, never sent, often required. Endorsed: To Mr. Kerr[idge] and assistants at Suratt, dat[ed] 6 December, 1617." Through this use of imagination, the composing ability incorporated in Early Modern English business and administrative communication may reveal itself as one of possibly many genres or as a recurring thread in history itself. One might question, for example, a post script that focuses on a pearl, possibly one of the initiating reasons for the entire letter, tucked in at the end as if an afterthought. The final act of imagination would be in
exploring this genre and making the commitment to making connections and reframing the interpretive framework so that his thread of history reveals itself or demonstrates its permutations in incorporating ability in contemporary business and administrative communication.


5 According to Foster, “Ob” is “obolus,” generally used for “a halfpenny.” Supra. at 219 n. 1.


7 Foster thinks this might refer to Venetian mirrors. Supra, at 223 n. 1.

8 Mistress Hudson “came as a friend of Mrs. Towerson” and was “another of the unwelcome visitors brought by Pring’s fleet.” Foster, id. at 223 n. 2.


10 Cicero, for example, recommends combing through the narration to find the commonplaces. de Inventione, II.xiv.45-46, 207.


12 See, e.g., Foucault, Michel, The Archeology of Knowledge. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972. 235 (“a day came when truth was displaced from the ritualized, efficacious, and just act of enunciation, towards the utterance itself, its meaning, its form, its object, its relation to its reference”).

14 Royster, *supra*, at 42-73.
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