



FOREIGN TRADE IN ANCIENT INDIA

DR. SUJATHA

Assistant Professor of History VCBES Arts and Commerce College, Lingasugur, Karnataka
Contact: 9036166552

ABSTRACT

Foreign trade in ancient India developed through linked land and maritime networks rather than a single route or period. This paper examines the early historic era, especially c. 300 BCE–500 CE, through the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, archaeological evidence from port sites, and recent historical scholarship. Indian textiles, pepper, pearls, precious stones, and other products moved through Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal circuits, while metals, wine, and other goods entered Indian markets. Monsoon navigation, inland production networks, coastal intermediaries, and merchants from several regions made this exchange possible. The surviving evidence is uneven: a Mediterranean account describes selected ports in detail, whereas material finds reveal more complex and longer lived local histories. Foreign commerce contributed to port growth and cultural contact, but cannot alone explain ancient India's economy.

KEYWORDS: ancient India; foreign trade; Indian Ocean; Periplus; Arikamedu; monsoon

INTRODUCTION

India's position between the western Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal gave its producers and merchants access to western Asia, northeast Africa, the Mediterranean world, and Southeast Asia. The coast was connected to agricultural and craft producing hinterlands by rivers and roads. This paper asks how these links operated and what the available evidence permits us to conclude. Its emphasis is the early historic period, when written descriptions and excavated imports can be read together. References to earlier contacts are necessarily more cautious because evidence for their scale and organization differs substantially.

SOURCES AND METHOD

This is a qualitative historical review of textual and archaeological evidence, not a quantitative reconstruction of trade volume. The anonymous Periplus, commonly dated to the mid first century CE, was a practical guide to Red Sea and Indian Ocean ports. It names destinations and commodities, but reflects the concerns and geographical knowledge of a merchant writing in Greek [1]. Archaeological work at Arikamedu documents Mediterranean amphorae and fine wares within a longer local sequence [2, 3]. These sources are read alongside scholarship that emphasizes South Asian merchants and wider Indian Ocean connections [4]. A coin or imported pot demonstrates movement of an object; by itself it does not identify the ethnicity of a merchant or the annual value of trade.

HISTORICAL SETTING

Long distance exchange preceded the first century CE. Contacts with western Asia and the Persian Gulf have deeper histories, but the forms of movement visible in different periods should not be merged into a single continuous trade system. From roughly the middle of the first millennium BCE, urban growth, coin use, specialized craft production, and expanding routes within the subcontinent created conditions in which external commerce could develop. The Mauryan and post Mauryan centuries supplied different political settings for these routes; the best documented maritime exchanges belong to the centuries around the beginning of the Common Era. This periodization prevents a first century merchant text from being projected back onto all of ancient India [1, 5].

The expression “foreign trade” is useful but modern. A cargo could cross many political and cultural boundaries before reaching a final consumer, while merchants in a port might regard neighboring coastal communities as familiar partners. Identifying the origin of a commodity and the identity of the person who last carried it are separate questions. The historical problem is therefore to reconstruct a network of exchanges, not merely a list of exports and imports [4, 6].

ROUTES PORTS AND NAVIGATION

Western routes linked Indian ports to Arabian and Persian Gulf entrepôts and to Egyptian Red Sea ports such as Berenice. The Periplus describes Barygaza, generally identified with Bharuch, as an important outlet for products from the western Indian hinterland. It also records trade along the southwest coast, including the pepper producing region associated with Muziris [1]. Eastern coastal routes connected peninsular ports with Sri Lanka

and the Bay of Bengal, while inland roads carried goods between production areas and the seaboard [3, 4]. Thus a port was a point of collection and redistribution as much as a place where foreign ships arrived.

Seasonal winds shaped the timing of voyages. Southwest monsoon winds aided crossings towards India; northeast winds supported return journeys towards the Red Sea. This predictable cycle shortened some sea passages and helped merchants plan cargo, finance, and departures [1]. Direct crossings did not eliminate coastal shipping or intermediary markets. Nor should the older claim that one Greek sailor “discovered” the monsoon be treated as proof that Indian Ocean sailors lacked prior knowledge of its rhythms.

WESTERN INDIAN OCEAN AND RED SEA NETWORKS

The western coast linked ports to inland commercial regions and to the Arabian Sea. Barygaza illustrates the importance of access to the hinterland: the *Periplus* describes difficult approaches to the port as well as a varied market for imports and exports. The author’s attention to navigation and saleable goods indicates a working merchant guide, rather than an impartial survey of every settlement. On the Malabar coast, the text associates the pepper trade with ports including Muziris. These entries are evidence for commercially significant links, although the exact location and scale of each ancient harbor remain subjects for archaeological investigation [1].

Across the sea, Egyptian Red Sea ports fed goods into overland desert routes toward the Nile and Alexandria. This was one segment of a longer chain that could end in Mediterranean markets. Scholarship on the western Indian Ocean also draws attention to Arabian and Persian Gulf intermediaries, whose role is easily obscured if all western imports are simply called “Roman.” Imported containers at Indian sites have been interpreted with greater attention to different origins, including Mesopotamian connections [7]. A Mediterranean object in India thus need not imply a single uninterrupted voyage from its place of manufacture.

The Muziris papyrus, a document concerning a cargo and financial arrangements associated with Indian Ocean trade, offers a rare glimpse of the credit and obligations behind a voyage. It is evidence for the organization of a particular transaction, not a statistical sample of all Indian commerce. It nevertheless shows why ships, merchants, lenders, and carriers must be considered together when discussing the economic system [6].

EASTERN ROUTES AND REGIONAL CONNECTIONS

The eastern seaboard linked the Tamil coast, Sri Lanka, the Andhra region, Bengal, and places farther across the Bay of Bengal. Knowledge of this side of the network comes from different combinations of excavated ceramics, settlement archaeology, and textual references. Arikamedu provides the clearest widely discussed example of a

coastal site with Mediterranean imports, yet its local sequence also makes it relevant to exchanges that were not confined to Rome [2, 3]. These ports and road or river links moved goods between coastal markets and the interior.

The Bay of Bengal should not be treated as a secondary appendage of the Red Sea route. Networks could connect South Asia with Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia through stages and intermediaries; goods might change vessels or owners more than once. The distribution of materials across this broad zone establishes contact, but individual objects rarely disclose the full route they followed. Any claim that one civilization unilaterally carried culture to another oversimplifies reciprocal, locally shaped encounters [4, 5].

COMMODITIES AND COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATION

The Periplus lists textiles, pepper, gemstones, aromatics, and other commodities among goods available at Indian ports, and describes imports such as metals and wine at Barygaza [1]. The pattern varied by region: pepper had particular importance on the southwest coast, whereas textile production drew on multiple inland centers. Trade therefore depended on growers, spinners, weavers, transport workers, brokers, ship crews, and local rulers as well as long distance merchants. Surviving sources do not justify reducing commerce to an exchange of Roman gold for Indian luxury goods.

Commercial organization was diverse. Ports operated within political territories and required arrangements for storage, exchange, and collection of dues, but the surviving record does not establish one uniform customs system for all ancient Indian states. Recent research cautions against depicting South Asian participants as passive suppliers to Mediterranean demand. Merchants and sailors from the subcontinent took part in movement across the ocean, alongside Arabian, African, and Mediterranean participants [4]. This matters because the network's direction and initiative cannot be inferred solely from Greco Roman texts.

MERCHANTS STATES AND INSTITUTIONS

Producers and transporters formed the base of the trade system. Pepper had to be cultivated and collected; textiles required fibers, labor, and skilled finishing; stones, pearls, and metal goods passed through extraction or craft processes. Merchants negotiated among these local producers, political authorities, shipowners, and buyers. Inland and maritime transport could involve different specialists. Evidence for an overseas commodity therefore connects a rural or urban production landscape with port facilities and distant consumers, even when the names of most participants are lost [4, 6].

Political authorities had reasons to protect routes and draw revenue from exchange, while merchants needed predictable access to ports and markets. Yet the evidence is too varied to posit one ancient Indian policy toward foreign trade. A ruler might oversee customs and harbor arrangements in one region, while commercial relationships elsewhere depended on local powers and private negotiation. Ports also changed political context over time. Institutional claims should therefore be tied to a dated place and source instead of applied across the subcontinent.

Recent scholarship has reconsidered whose agency is visible in the evidence. The older label “Indo Roman trade” can usefully identify a particular Mediterranean connection, but risks making the Roman side the only active one. Indian merchants and sailors appear in evidence associated with the western Indian Ocean, while inscriptions and material culture around the Red Sea suggest a socially mixed trading world [4, 6, 8]. The circulation of goods was sustained through cooperation among people with different languages, religions, and legal expectations.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE AND ITS LIMITS

Arikamedu, near present day Puducherry, offers material evidence of Mediterranean connected commerce through amphora fragments and imported fine pottery. Later reassessment of its stratigraphy shows activity extending beyond the narrow Roman trading station model proposed in early excavations [2, 3]. Imported objects testify to exchange, yet they may have passed through several hands. The chronology of individual layers and the purpose of individual buildings require care. Similar caution applies to Roman coin finds: coins could circulate, be stored, or be converted into metal. Their presence does not directly measure a balance of payments.

READING TEXTS COINS AND OBJECTS TOGETHER

The Periplus provides place names and commodity lists, but its author had practical interests and unequal knowledge of different coasts. The archaeological record has its own filters: objects survive unevenly, excavation samples only a fraction of a settlement, and a vessel may be reused far from its original cargo. Written and material sources can correct one another when they address the same period and location. They cannot be combined mechanically to turn every named port into an excavated harbor or every imported sherd into a known merchant transaction [1, 3].

Roman coins found in South India attracted early explanations in terms of a western “drain” of precious metal. Such finds demonstrate movement and possible use of coin or bullion, but hoarding, remelting, and later deposition complicate interpretation. The coins alone cannot establish an annual surplus or the total number of ships. Likewise, exotic goods in an elite burial may speak to status and consumption as well as commerce. The

more defensible approach asks when and where an object was deposited, what other materials accompanied it, and whether independent written evidence points to a compatible exchange [5, 7].

Chronology is essential. A port may have remained occupied after a particular imported ware disappeared, and a foreign object may date to a later phase than the text commonly associated with that port. Begley's reconsideration of Arikamedu challenged the idea that the site can be understood only as a short lived Roman trading station. This example illustrates how new excavation and revised dating can alter the historical narrative without denying that Mediterranean exchange occurred [2, 3].

ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL EFFECTS

External demand could stimulate production and support settlements associated with ports and routes. Connections also carried techniques, objects, languages, and religious ideas, although a particular cultural change cannot automatically be assigned to commercial contact alone. The benefits were distributed unevenly across regions and social groups. Agricultural production and internal exchange remained central to livelihoods, while overseas trade formed an important and variable part of the wider economy. The strongest conclusion is one of interdependence: maritime commerce rested on inland labor and markets, and those inland networks gained additional outlets through the ports.

DISCUSSION

The evidence supports three related conclusions. First, foreign trade relied on internal networks of production and distribution; maritime voyages were the most visible final leg of much longer movements. Second, no single external partner defined the entire system. Arabian, Persian Gulf, African, Mediterranean, Sri Lankan, and eastern connections operated with different intensities in different centuries. Third, the people of South Asia participated as organizers, carriers, producers, and consumers, even when a surviving Greek text records the network from its own viewpoint [1, 4, 6].

There are limits to broader economic claims. No complete series of port accounts survives for the subcontinent, and the available sources do not permit a reliable national estimate of the value of ancient exports. It is possible to identify products, routes, and some commercial practices, while the relative importance of foreign exchange to different local economies remains open. Future comparative work should link dated production centers, port excavations, and documents from both ends of a route. This would help show when a change in overseas demand affected inland employment, settlement, or political revenue rather than assuming that it always did.

CONCLUSION

Foreign trade in ancient India was a set of connected regional systems shaped by geography, seasonal winds, production, political authority, and merchant initiative. The Periplus identifies key western routes and commodities; archaeology demonstrates exchange and the longer histories of Indian ports. Read together, the sources reveal active Indian participation in an interconnected ocean, while leaving trade volumes and many institutional details uncertain. Future work that combines securely dated excavation contexts, inscriptions, and comparative port studies can clarify how exchange changed across places and centuries.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anonymous. (c. mid first century CE). Periplus of the Erythraean Sea. University of Athens Periplus project. https://periplus.arch.uoa.gr/texts/peripl_erythr/intro_en.html
- [2] Begley, V., et al. The Ancient Port of Arikamedu. École française d'Extrême Orient. https://publications.efeo.fr/en/livres/380_the-ancient-port-of-arikamedu
- [3] Begley, V. (1983). Arikamedu Reconsidered. American Journal of Archaeology, 87(4). <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.2307/504104>
- [4] Cobb, M. A. (2023). Indian merchants abroad: Integrating the Indian ocean world during the early first millennium CE. Journal of Global History. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-global-history/article/indian-merchants-abroad-integrating-the-indian-ocean-world-during-the-early-first-millennium-ce/07C260E3C025C0203EA0E25A25242E69>
- [5] Oxford Handbook of Topics in Archaeology. The Archaeological Record of Indian Ocean Engagements: Bay of Bengal (5000 BC–AD 500). <https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/43506/chapter/364133129>
- [6] Simmons, J. A. (2023). Behind gold for pepper: The players and the game of Indo-Mediterranean trade. Journal of Global History. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-global-history/article/behind-gold-for-pepper-the-players-and-the-game-of-indomediterranean-trade/5DB9F1396903019D9F0133C7AC0D2098>
- [7] Tomber, R. (2007). Rome and Mesopotamia: Importers into India in the first millennium AD. Antiquity. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/antiquity/article/rome-and-mesopotamia-importers-into-india-in-the-first-millennium-ad/5C03182D74207F04BA23620DCB4F7B2C>

[8] Seland, E. H. (2013). Networks and social cohesion in ancient Indian Ocean trade: Geography, ethnicity, religion. Journal of Global History. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-global-history/article/networks-and-social-cohesion-in-ancient-indian-ocean-trade-geography-ethnicity-religion/D32B1FF1DCA90833C02C80E7B37B166E>