

“The Dutch Merchants and their activities between the Atlantic and Levant during the mercantilist ages”
Paper for IEHA Congress, Helsinki 2006, Session 16 (Merchants Settlements as Intermediaries for European Influences in the Baltic North 1650-1850, or elsewhere).

By Mehmet Bulut
Baskent University, Turkey

I

Freight contracts reveal that thanks to Dutch business there were strong commercial connections between the Baltic, Atlantic and the Western and Eastern parts of the Mediterranean. Most ships transported bulky goods like wheat, along with other cereals such as rye and barley to the French, Italian and Spanish ports¹. These ships also transported salt, fish, wood, tin, tar, wax etc. Some freight contracts also included remarks about sugar, cheese and salted meat². One cannot be sure whether all these products arrived in Ottoman ports. The contracts indicate that some Dutch ships unloaded the grain in the West Mediterranean and sailed with silver to the eastern ports of the Mediterranean. Then mostly luxury goods, but also bulky commodities were loaded on these ships. The main imports from Ottoman areas were textile products, such as cotton, mohair yarn, raw wool, and silk, but there was also grain, especially from North African coasts.

According to the freight contracts, grain was the main commodity transported in the beginning by Dutch merchants to the Mediterranean ports³. During the first decade of the seventeenth century, the carriage trade from Northern Europe to the Mediterranean was probably of more importance for the Dutch merchants who had settled in that area than their carriage services in the Mediterranean itself. But the latter should not be overlooked, since earning money by these services, merchants could restore the negative trade balance with the region. Silver Spanish reals were especially very useful in trade with the Levant⁴. Spanish silver was minted in the Republic as the Dutch *leeuwendaalders* (lion dollars).

During bad harvest years export of grain from Ottoman lands was prohibited in the Empire, but its import was encouraged⁵. In spite of the ban on grain exports, the

¹ AGA, NA 98/151v, 97/142 (September 1604), NA 97/187-220v (October 1604), NA 102/ 103 (October 1605), NA 103/105v (July 1606), NA 103/145-146 (August 1606), NA 105/33-34 (October 1606), NA 112/ 152-153 (October 1608), NA 113/ 62-63, 87-89 (August 1608), NA 132/200v (October 1613), NA 378/158 (March 1615), NA 148/34 (April 1617).

² AGA NA 87/185, NA 97/142, NA 148/34, NA 170/1, NA 201, 220, 251, NA 227/52v, NA 381, NA 631/68-70v, NA 679, 759, NA 878, 899, NA 941-951.

³ AGA NA 89/225, NA 97/187, NA 100/228, NA 112/138v-140v, NA 112/ 152-153, NA 113/62-63, NA 144, NA 200, 201, NA 225, 226, NA 378, 381, NA 679.

⁴ Attman 1989, 65.

⁵ BBA MD 107, 22; 39; 64; 99.

Ottoman sources indicate that grain smuggling intensified throughout the Levant from the last decade of the sixteenth century, especially during the years of poor harvests in Europe⁶. It continued in the following century too. Both freight contracts in Amsterdam and the Ottoman archives reveal that like other Westerners, Dutch merchants traded in grain between the East and the West Mediterranean⁷. This situation continued till 1630s, even later⁸. Since the Porte encouraged the import of cereals, there is no doubt that the Dutch merchants were also active in the import of grain to the Ottoman Empire from the European side⁹. However, the price of grain was the main factor in this traffic and most transportation took place from the Empire in a westward direction¹⁰.

In the vast Ottoman Empire the annual grain harvest was poor in some regions, while in the others it was usually good. According to Güçer, the Ottomans began to manage the sale and distribution of grain because of the frequent problems posed by grain scarcity, not only in large cities but also particularly in areas where drought, locusts, or other natural disasters had struck. This practice became an important element of Ottoman economic policy¹¹. Although the East Mediterranean had a sizeable grain surplus, the Sublime Porte forbade the export of grain to foreigners, on account of domestic needs. According to Aymard, the Ottomans' policy was frequently implemented until the end of the sixteenth century¹². Braudel believes that "in good years", the Ottoman territories had "plenty of grain to sell" to Italy, where the price of grain was two or three times higher¹³.

The issue of Ottoman control of trade in grain began to be integrated, after a certain delay, into the so-called 'capitulations' granted to foreign merchants. The first such capitulations, granted to France in 1569, contains no mention of grain trade. The second capitulation granted to France in 1597, still permitted the export of grain¹⁴. The third, granted in 1604, contained several clauses extending certain immunities to French merchants. It allowed them to purchase and ship certain specific items but yet permission was withheld to trade in other banned commodities which were not specified. As mentioned above, prior to 1612 the Dutch traded under French and English flags. In this respect, the following Goffman's statement¹⁵ gives an impression on the grain trade in the Levant.

"The combined Ottoman prohibition and Baltic penetration did not halt international commerce in Levantine grains. It simply forced business underground. During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, disruptions along commercial routes and diversions from the capital city occurred with alarming regularity. Since the market in Europe was almost insatiable, Ottoman consent for the export of certain grains and other restricted goods led to these crops finding their way not only into the hold of 'enemy infidels', i.e.

⁶ BBA MZD 6, 8.

⁷ BBA MD 90; 91; 333; 364; 599; 1143; MZD 6; 8. According to a notarial record in Amsterdam, in 1608, a Dutch ship *Sampson* was loaded to North Africa with wheat, rye and barley (AGA, NA 113/62-63).

⁸ BBA MD 90, 333, 364.

⁹ Mantran 1988, 691-97.

¹⁰ Raymond (1984) has shown clearly how the price of wheat fluctuated greatly from year to year in the early modern period.

¹¹ Güçer 1964, 38.

¹² Aymard 1962-3, 229.

¹³ Braudel 1972, 583, 591, 1090.

¹⁴ İnalçık 1974.

¹⁵ Goffman 1990, 37-38.

probably Venetian vessels, but even into friendly Dubrovnik and French' ship bottoms in quantities greater than agreed upon in the capitulations. Both the merchants of the city state of Dubrovnik, which enjoyed singular trading arrangements with the Ottomans because of its tributary status, and France, which, despite Dutch and English pretensions, retained its most-favoured-nation status due principally to its longstanding and acrimonious opposition to the Hapsburgs, strained Ottoman relations by routinely abusing their privileges".

II

As stressed above, Dutch merchants were very active in grain trade between the Baltic and the Mediterranean. They were also very active in this trade between the Ottoman Empire, Italy and Spain. One of these merchants was Abraham Aerts in Sayda, who was sent to the Levant by Jonas Witsen in 1622 to organise grain trade from Palestine. The other Dutch merchants involved in Levant grain trade were Abraham De Ligne, Jacob Stalpert and Jan Van Peenen in Aleppo, and Daniel Van Steenwinckel in Cyprus¹⁶. In the first decades of the seventeenth century, most of the time Mediterranean grain was not as cheap as Baltic grain. In the Mediterranean region, grain could be obtained from Sicily, Apulia, Egypt, Asia Minor, Salonica, Macedonia, Syria and the Barbary region. In fact, from the beginning of the century, the export of grain from the different parts of the Ottoman realm had only been possible with special permission. Often Dutch seamen in the service of Italian merchants tried to circumvent the measures of the Sultan. In the second decade of the seventeenth century the grain trade was facilitated by Fakr-ad-Din, the son of a Lebanese emir- who, after the conquest of Syria by the Ottomans, had freely submitted to the Ottoman Sultan. He allowed the export of grain to Tuscany, although this was officially forbidden¹⁷. Therefore, the export of grain from Syria flourished during the 1620s. Dutch ships were regularly involved in transporting this commodity from the Ottoman area to Tuscany during that period¹⁸.

The continuation of the Dutch exporting Ottoman cereals to its enemies led to complaints in Istanbul. Their transport activities came to be seen as the main reason for high grain prices in the city in the 1630s. Ottoman authorities put the blame entirely on the Dutch. In a letter dated 23 December 1630, the Dutch ambassador in Istanbul, Haga, asked his government in Holland to warn the merchants and shippers not to violate Ottoman rules¹⁹. The ambassador was asked to ensure that such activities involving the export of grain from territories of the Empire such as Lebanon, the Aegean archipelago and the Dardanelles be halted²⁰.

It was extremely hard to ban exports grain trade outside the Dardanelles in 1600s, partly because the trade was only fragmentarily recorded, and partly because by its very nature this trade was irregular. Dutch and English ships were used by Genoese, Leghornese and Greek merchants to take wheat from Greece and the archipelago and rice from Egypt throughout the seventeenth century. It seems that these cargoes

¹⁶ Engels 1997, 204.

¹⁷ Güçer 1964.

¹⁸ Engels 1997, 203-205.

¹⁹ ARA LB 6900, 6901.

²⁰ The letters of Cornelis Haga from Istanbul show that the Dutch merchants were very active in grain export from the Empire in the first decades of the seventeenth century. These letters also indicate that the Dutch merchants caused a conflict due to their smuggling and corruption in grain trade (ARA, LB 6900, 6901, letters sent by Haga in 1630).

helped the northern captains to fill their slack season. These exchanges often involved wheat from mainland Greece and perhaps sometimes from the Anatolian shore as well²¹.

Certain freight contracts contained special stipulations which prohibited going to the Ottoman archipelago for grain²². A number of Dutch ships and crews, trading under foreign flags were caught in that area, and Dutch sailors were imprisoned²³. This situation clearly indicates that in spite of Ottoman prohibition on the export of grain, Dutch ships were engaged in grain trade in the Aegean Sea archipelago during the first decades of the seventeenth century.

Starting in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, merchants from Antwerp also traded luxury commodities with the Ottoman Empire. And later on they imported raw textile materials like mohair yarn, cotton, wool, silk etc., and exported Dutch manufactured textile products to the Ottomans. But when did the combination of luxurious and bulky goods traded change? According to Van Dillen, this happened towards the middle of the seventeenth century. He is of the opinion that military and political factors were possibly decisive in shaping the patterns of trade, and that the Dutch role in the Mediterranean entered its most flourishing period only after 1645²⁴. According to Israel, for the Dutch, the balance between 'bulky-carrying' and 'rich trades' changed and consequently the importance of 'rich trades' increased in the seventeenth century²⁵. After 1645, the Dutch Republic emerged much more strongly in the international arena as a producer of industrial products than before²⁶.

In the first decade of the seventeenth century, the Dutch had lacked the textiles and spices needed for a more significant role and had been greatly impeded by the Spanish embargoes and high freight costs in the Levant trade. In the second decade Dutch enterprise in the Mediterranean continued to flourish²⁷. They returned to Spain in large numbers, began servicing transports between Spain and Italy, used more silver and shipped a much wider range of fine goods, including for the first time large quantities of pepper, spices, Ibero-American dyestuffs, Swedish copper, and munitions. Consequently, carrying Baltic grain and timber to the Mediterranean ceased to be the driving force behind Dutch enterprise in the region²⁸.

Therefore, in the western and eastern parts of the Mediterranean political conditions played an important role in the activities of the Northwestern merchants. The policies of the Pope, Spain, Persia and the Ottoman Empire affected commercial networks and businesses. Because of that, the capitulations of 1612 were very important for the Dutch community involved in the Levant trade. It can be said that due to the regulations by the capitulations, luxury commodities became more important than the bulky ones for the Dutch in the Levant trade. However, Dutch bulk carrying and their

²¹ Masson 1896, 463.

²² AGA NA 140/232v-233v (October 1615), NA 145/130 (October 1616), NA 155/67v (September 1619) and NA 200/378 (July 1619).

²³ AGA NA 2/187 and NA 1500/54.

²⁴ Van Dillen 1970.

²⁵ Israel 1995, 315-17; 1989, 10, 406-11.

²⁶ Israel 1989, 197-270, 409-10.

²⁷ As the main reason for this development, Israel stresses the importance of the 1609-1621 Truce between Spain and the Dutch Republic (Israel 1989, 80-85).

²⁸ Israel 1989, 81-101.

grain trade continued to be important in the first three decades of the seventeenth century²⁹.

As Braudel stresses, in the beginning, trade in bulk commodities such as grain, salt, fish, copper etc. was very important for the Dutch Mediterranean trade. In the region, the Dutch trade in luxury commodities such as silver, silk, spice, cotton etc. flourished as well. The end of the Spanish embargo's in 1609³⁰ and the Ottoman capitulations in 1612 presented fresh possibilities for the Dutch in the West as well as in the East Mediterranean. Therefore, from the last decade of the sixteenth century, the Dutch merchants brought bulk commodities to the Western Mediterranean ports and from there they brought silver to the Levant. The silver was used to buy luxury commodities such as cotton, linen, silk, mohair, wool, gallnut etc. in the Ottoman ports. After obtaining capitulations, they also continued to trade in bulk commodities but these had a smaller share in the total Dutch Levant trade than that of the luxury goods. However, since the commodities transported were highly valuable, the 'rich trade' was also more exposed to the attacks of commercial rivals or corsairs.

III

After the establishment of direct contact between the Dutch entrepot and the commercial centres of the Levant, Dutch business flourished in Ottoman ports. According to freight contracts, Amsterdam elite merchants such as Jan Corver, Jan Munter, Paulo de Willem, Gerard Reynst and Pieter Bas, chartered large, heavily armed ships to sail to the Levant ports. The contracts also indicate that the ships were loaded with luxury goods and bulky commodities transported from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, starting in Amsterdam via Venice, Crete, Zante, then to Cyprus, Alexandria, and the other ports of the Levant³¹.

From the cases recorded in the Amsterdam freight contracts from the beginning of the century, we have ascertained that the merchants from the Netherlands, in shipping from North to South, first called at West Mediterranean ports and then transported silver and merchandise from there to Ottoman ports³². Certain Ottoman archival registers reveal that along those routes, Dutch merchants calling at ports of Cyprus, İzmir, Istanbul, Tripoli, Alexandria, or Iskenderun had to pay customs duties because they had come from outside the boundaries of the Empire³³.

What can be established about the number of Dutch ships sailing to the East and West Mediterranean? It is impossible to ascertain from the freight contracts how many Dutch ships sailed to the Levant. According to Israel, a much larger number of ships were involved in the trade to the East and West Mediterranean than Braudel

²⁹ Masson 1896; Aymard 1962-3; Braudel 1972; Goffman 1990.

³⁰ The first general embargo was imposed against both the English and the Dutch in 1585. In the 1590s, Philip II decided to lift the embargo on the Dutch, but in 1598, Spain decided to revert to an embargo against the Republic, and a full embargo was reimposed in September 1604. It continued till the Twelve Years' Truce in April 1609. For more information on the effects of the political conditions and the Spanish embargo on the Dutch Mediterranean trade in the seventeenth century see Israel 1989 and 1990a.

³¹ AGA NA 89/225 (1601), NA 97/220v (1604), NA 195/169 (1607), NA 112/185v (1608), NA 116/174 (1609), NA 212/74 (1617) and NA 200/378 (1619).

³² AGA NA 87/185 (1600), NA 95/50v (1603), NA 98/151v (1604), NA 106/58v-60v (1606) and NA 116/174 (1609).

³³ BBA ED 20; 22.

supposed. He believes for example that a hundred ships or more from Amsterdam alone set sail to Italy in 1591. Israel cites Velius' Chronicle that no less than four hundred large ships went from Holland to Italy in that year³⁴. However, according to the calculations of Hart and Van Royen, Dutch shipping to the West Mediterranean was substantially less frequent than this³⁵.

Van Royen discusses Israel's interpretation of the first phase of the Dutch *Straatvaart*³⁶. He shows that for the period between 1571 and 1605, Braudel has underestimated the Dutch shipping to the Mediterranean, while Israel has overestimated it³⁷. Van Royen, who also used evidence presented by Hart³⁸, goes on to say that the volume of Dutch shipping to Italy was much less than Israel thought during the first phase of the Dutch *Straatvaart*. He also states that Braudel hardly made use of data concerning Dutch trade and shipping to the Mediterranean, and furthermore did not use (for which he is not at fault) books and articles published after 1966, the year of the second revised French edition of book the 'Mediterranean' was published³⁹. Van Royen does not mean that Braudel's representation of the Dutch role and shipping in the Mediterranean is totally correct⁴⁰. Probably Braudel underestimated the quantity and quality of the Dutch shipping to the Mediterranean, because he labelled only ships coming from Amsterdam as Dutch. But notarial records indicate that Dutch ships also traded from other ports of Europe such as Hamburg, Danzig, Lübeck, Emden and even Rouen. Especially Hamburg and Danzig were very important. In the transport of commodities from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, all these ports were used by Dutch traders.

Both the estimates of Hart and Van Royen are based on the available freight contracts in Amsterdam. However, some Amsterdam notarial records were lost over the years; it is difficult to accept the present records as complete. This means that the number of Dutch ships sailing to the Levant or to Italy is an unsolved issue. But all historians agree that in the East and West Mediterranean, Dutch shipping began to increase from the last decade of the sixteenth century and continued to rise in the following century.

Some data are available to give an impression of the number of ships that were involved. A message from Aleppo indicates that nine of the Republic's ships sailed to the Levant in 1612⁴¹. During the period between 1614 and 1616, a yearly average of ten large ships were involved in trade in Aleppo⁴². Between 1617 and 1625, 200 Dutch ships came to Algeria to trade⁴³. From September 1615 to December 1616 at least 85 Dutch ships arrived in Italy. About 43 ships whose cargoes we know carried grain from Southern Italy, seven Castilian wool from Seville, five had come from Alicante with wool and salt, one from the Aegean with raw silk, two from Istanbul with wools and yarns, two from Cyprus with cottons, two from Tunisia with hides, wool and

³⁴ Israel 1990b, 136.

³⁵ Hart 1978; and Van Royen 1990.

³⁶ Van Royen 1990.

³⁷ Ibid, 99.

³⁸ Hart 1978.

³⁹ Because this edition was used by Israel (1989).

⁴⁰ Van Royen 1990, 73-75.

⁴¹ ARA LB 6889.

⁴² Heeringa 1910, 486-87.

⁴³ Ibid, 1042, note 451.

amber, one from Lisbon with sugar and the remaining 17 came from Holland with goods like pepper, spices, fish, metals and naval stores, such as tar⁴⁴. Seven of them came from the Ottoman Empire of the total 85 ships.

In Dutch shipping to the Levant, the transportation rate, or freight charge, was another important issue. The independent merchant had little control over the matter. The risk and the length of the trip were the two main factors in the freight charges. For Dutch ships, it took between three and twelve months to sail to Ottoman ports⁴⁵. But the time of visiting other ports in the western part the Mediterranean is included in this.

The risks in the Mediterranean were also a major factor in driving up freight charges for Dutch Levant ships. Wars and political conditions adversely affected the prices of imported commodities to the Levant as well as insurance rates. The risks led to high prices for commodities and insurance rates⁴⁶. It means that these risks led to lower profits for Dutch merchants in the Levant. The importance of corsair activities was discussed before. In addition to these hazardous conditions, freight and insurance rates were also dependent on the sailing season. During the spring and summer the rates were lower than sailing in the winter. It can be said that in the destination of the Levant shipping the freight charges were changed between 700 and 1000 guilders per month⁴⁷. Especially in the war times freight charges were increasing⁴⁸.

Table 1 Tonnage of Dutch Ships which freighted from the port of Amsterdam to Ottoman ports, 1600-1650 (last)*.

	0-49	50-99	100-149	150-199	200-249	250-299	
1600-1650	1	6	85	76	18	1	

Source: GA Amsterdam card index of Notarial Archive, 'Levant'.

Table 1 gives an impression about the size of the Dutch ships sailing to the Levant. The size of most ships was between 100 and 200 lasts. However, there was also a ship of 20 last (40 tons), but this happened before the establishment of the Levant Directorate.

⁴⁴ Israel 1989, 100-1; Heeringa 1910, 61-2.

⁴⁵ AGA NA 108/ 151-152 (for three months), NA 220/176 (for seven months), NA 3330/353 (for nine months) and NA 200/378 (for twelve months).

⁴⁶ Israel pays a special attention to the Spanish embargo and rise and fall of Dutch trade in the Mediterranean and their freight and insurance rates to the region. He argues that the freight charges to the Mediterranean for the Dutch merchants declined after 1609 by being affected to the Twelve Years' Truce (Israel 1989, 80-3, 87-91).

⁴⁷ AGA NA 126/31-33 (750 guilders per month in 1611) and NA 121/25-26 (800 guilders per month in 1610).

⁴⁸ For example, in the 11th September 1623 as loaders of the ship Elias Trip, Nicolas Schier and Jacob Bicker paid 2.200 guilders per month (AGA NA 179/1).

* 1 last = 2 ton (weight).

Table 2 A Report of the Levant Directorate in Amsterdam for ships sailing to the Levant and their payments, 1625-1658.

Year	Number of Ships	Receipts(in guilders)
1625	34	3.484
1626	61	5.556
1627	23	1.792
1628	33	3.752
1629	8	832
1630	28	2.767
1631	40	4.104
1645	46	5.086
1646	66	8.458
1647	80	8.857
1648	80	8.730
1651	53	6.625
1656	39	4.405
1658	24	1.975

Source: Heeringa (1910, 152) and Oldewelt (1958, 5).

IV

Although Venetian, French, and English merchants were also active in the Levant, Ottoman-Dutch commercial relations rapidly developed in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Wars and political conditions in the eastern part of the Mediterranean also influenced the relations. From the middle of the twenties, due to the Persians' effort to change the trade route from the East to the West, the commercial activities of the Dutch merchants moved to the Persian Gulf or to Moscow. Thus, in the 1630s, the English and Venetian merchants became more important in the Levant than the Dutch. However, this does not mean that Dutch trade in the Levant *totally* collapsed from 1620 to 1640. There was a relative decline between 1625 and 1635 in the Dutch Levant trade. But, one cannot claim that it was only a result of the Spanish embargo. Moreover, after the middle of the 1630s, the commercial relations between the Ottomans and the Dutch started to flourish again, thanks to the new goods traded.

Dutch merchants traded various commodities in the Levant in the first half of the seventeenth century. In the beginning both bulky and luxury commodities were important in the commercial relations between the two nations. Our study confirmed that the Dutch merchants were active both in the trade of bulky goods and luxury commodities. The main products traded between the Dutch and the Ottoman merchants were: linen, muslin, quilts, blankets, carpets, wool, mohair yarn, silk, indigo, cotton, gallnuts, cochineal, coffee, sugar, pepper, spice, lead, tin, copper, steel, coral, grain, wheat, etc. The greatest volume of trade was in textiles. The Ottoman exports consisted mostly of raw materials for textile production, such as cotton, silk, wool, and mohair yarn and manufactured products such as blankets,

quilts, muslin, carpets, and a variety of cloth, in addition to other goods such as foodstuffs. They imported raw materials used in war and weapons from the Western Europe and colonial goods such as coffee, sugar, spices, and dyestuffs, grain, rye, rice, fish, alum, etc. The Dutch merchants were active not only between the Empire and the Republic but also in the relations between the Empire and the other places of Europe.

In the beginning both bulky and luxury commodities were important. In the following years, especially from 1630s onwards the nature of the goods traded between the Dutch and the Ottomans changed. The Dutch began to become the main importer of mohair yarn and the main exporter of lakens and camlets, which will be discussed in the following sections. It meant that the nature of the import and export commodities began to change after the 1630s. Due to the new products, the commercial relations flourished towards the middle of the century and reached their peak in the third quarter of the century. During the same period, mohair yarn from the Empire became the main Dutch import product for Holland's textile industry. The other manufactured good, sugar, also became an important export item to the Ottoman Empire in that period.

The merchants who traded in Ottoman areas in the first half of the seventeenth century, were also active in other trading areas like the Baltic and the VOC and WIC. Dutch merchant companies and consuls in the Levant played an important role in the increase of the merchants' activities there. Dutch merchants preferred to establish commercial companies and strong organisations to improve their overseas trade. Moreover, the commercial network among the Dutch merchants in Holland and the merchants in the Mediterranean facilitated their trade in the Levant. It means that the important position of the Dutch merchants in the Levant was not only a result of the friendly approach of the Ottomans towards them, but it was also the result of their commercial strategies.

APPENDIX I

Origins and names of some shipmasters who sailed to Ottoman ports in the 17th century

Ackersloot, Pouwels, Jacob Pouwelsen, Willem Amsterdam, Backer, Claes Arentsen Crul, Dirck Gerritsen Cornelissen, Hendrick Cornellissen, Pieter Floris, Agge Harmens, Jan Mertsen, Tonis Pool, Tomesz	Gisp, Ijpendam, Landsmeer, Medemblick, Purmerend, Randsdorp, Roosendal, Rotterdam, Schagen, Schellingwouw, Stavoren, Warns, Zaandam, <i>Origin unknown</i> Jansen, Wendel Kortsen, Arent Reyniers, Agge Schram, Cornelis Janss Sievertsen, Sijmen Venne, Cornelis van der	Ploeger, Cornelis Jacobs Claessen, Marten Swert, Dirck Cornelis Janss, Frans Pietersz, Meirnert Schellinger, Tonis Willemsen, Cornelis Claes, Hillebrant Holloch, Jan Classen Tonnis, Cornelis Classen, Cornelis Lievensen, Frans de Saskersen, Gerrit Pieersz, Rem Heeres, Floris Lubes, Albert Mertens, Scholte Sijbrantss, Evert Reijners, Gerrit Abbes, Sijbout Rinckes, Sijbout Cornelissen, Reijer Pieters, David
Enkhuizen, Broer, Willem Cornelis Claes, Windel Cornelis, Simon Jacobsen, Jan Janss, Heertgen Jelissen, Anne Loosken, Barent Pietersen Outgersen, Cornelis Remmetsen, Jan Segers, Frederick Vogelaer, Herman Janss Zeeuw, Cornelis Lievensen		
Hamburg, Oudekens, C. Cornelissen Hem, Lucassen, Cornellis Hoorn, Haen, Dick Pieters Jasperen, Cornelis		

Source: AGA, card index to Notarial Archive, 'Levant'.

APPENDIX II

The names of some Dutch ships sailing from the Ottoman ports to the Netherlands between 1671 and 1686

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name of the ship</u>	<u>Departure port</u>
1671	Isabella	İzmir
	Patriarch Isaac	”
	Juffrouw Maria	“
	Wapen van Amsterdam	“
	Munnik	“
	Suzanna	“
	Vergulde Son	“
1676	Stad Rotterdam	“
	Isabella	“
	Sint Andries	“
	Stad Leghorn	“
	Johanna	“
1677	Wapen van Amsterdam	“
	Sint Barbara	“
	Zeven Provinciën	“
1678	Sint Nicolas	“
	Charles	“
1679	Isabella	“
	Suzanna	“
	Sint Barbara	“
	Constantinopel	“
	Berg Calvaira	“
	Gouden Munnik	Istanbul
	Wapen van Nassau	Aleppo (İskenderun)*
1680	Stad Leghorn	İzmir
	Zeven Provinciën	“
	Sint Jan Evangelist	“
	Soriaansche Koopman	“
	Marechal de Turenne	Aleppo (İskenderun)
	Stad Constantinopolen	İzmir
	Isabella	“
	Wapen van Nassau	“
	Vergulde Munnik	Alexandria
	1681	America
Stad Leiden		Levant
Sint Francisco		“
1682	Generale Vrede	“
	Munnik	Aleppo (İskenderun)
	Soriaansche Koopman	İzmir
	Sint Nicolaas	“

* Iskenderun (Alexandretta) was the port of Aleppo.

	Stad Leghorn	“
	Sint Jan Evangelist	“
	Juffrouw Jacoba	“
1683	Anna	“
	Zeven Provinciën	“
	Constantinopolen	“
	Isabella	“
	Post	“
	Liefde	Aleppo (İskenderun)
	Hoofman Cornelius	Alexandria
	Sint Salvador	“
	Salmander	“
	Juffrouw Johanna	“
	Alepsche Koopman	Aleppo (İskenderun)
	Generale Vrede	İzmir
	Catharina	“
	Sint Franciscus	“
	Stad Leiden	“
	Munnik	Aleppo (İskenderun)
1684	Juffrouw Cornelia	İzmir
	Stad Amsterdam	“
	Held Jozua	“
	Jacoba	“
	Stad Haarlem	“
	Stad Leghorn	“
	Sint Jan Evangelist	“
	Smirnsche Koopman	“
1685	Constantinopelen	“
	Stad Doornik	“
	Erkenraad	“
	Europa	“
	Juffrouw Geertruyd	“
	Alepsche Koopman	Aleppo (İskenderun)
1686	Wapen van Spangien	“
	Fortuin Elisabet	“
	Mercurius	“
	Sint Simeon	“
	Anna Maria	“

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

A. Archival Sources

The Hague, *Algemeen Rijksarchief (ARA)*

Staten Generaal, numbers: 12593/ 34,35,38,57,61,63,64,72,76

Directie van de Levantse Handel (LH), numbers: 73,74,97,98,99,
100,101,102,121,122,123,124,125,126,127,128,161, 5028

Lias Barbariye, numbers: 6889, 6898, 6900, 6901

Amsterdam, *Gemeentelijke Archief (AGA)*

Burg. Levantse Handel, I, II, V

Notarieel Archief (NA), numbers: 2, 87, 89, 95, 120, 121, 144, 150, 151, 187,
200, 201, 225, 226, 375, 381, 633, 759, 878, 899, 941, 951, 1088, 1112, 1500,
2219, 2755, 3658, 3688, 3794, 5494, 5529, 5884

B. Published References

Attman, A., (1983), *Dutch Enterprise in the World Bullion Trade, 1550-1800*, Goteborg.

(1989), "The Bullion Flow from Europe to the East: 1500-1750", in *Precious Metals, Coinage and the Changes of Monetary Structures in Latin-America, Europe and Asia (Late Middle Ages- Early Modern Times)*, Ed.: E.H.G. Van Cauwenberghe, Leuven, pp. 65-68

Aymard, M., (1962-3), "XVI. Yüzyılın Sonunda Akdenizde Korsanlık ve Venedik" in *İÜİFM* 23, pp. 219-38.

(1982), (Ed) *Dutch Capitalism and World Capitalism*, Cambridge Univ. Press.

Braudel, F., (1972), *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 2 vols., Trans.: S. Reynolds, New York.

Engels, M.C., (1997), *Merchants, Interlopers, Seamen and Corsairs, The 'Flemish' Community in Livorno and Genoa (1615-1635)*, Hilversum, Verloren.

Heeringa, K., (ed), (1910-17), *Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Levantschen Handel, (1590-1726)*, 3 vols., RGP: 9,10,34, The Hague.

Goffman, D., (1990), *Izmir and the Levantine World, 1550-1650*, University of Washington.

Güçer, L., (1964), *XVI- XVII. Asırlarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Hububat Meselesi*, Istanbul.

İnalçık, H., (1974), "The Turkish Impact on the Development of Modern Europe", in *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History*, Ed: K.H. Karpat, Leiden.

Israel, J.I., (1989) *Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585-1740*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

(1990a), *Empires and Entrepots, The Dutch, the Spanish Monarchy and the Jews 1585-1713*, London.

(1990b), "The Phases of the Dutch Straatvaart, 1590-1713: A

Chapter in the Economic History of the Mediterranean", in

Empires and Entrepots, The Dutch, the Spanish Monarchy and the Jews 1585-1713, Ed.: J.Israel, London, pp.133-162.

(1995, 1997), *The Dutch Republic, Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

- Mantran, R., (1988), "XVII. Yüzyılın İkinci Yarısında Doğu Akdenizde Ticaret, Deniz Korsanlığı ve Gemiler Kafileleri", in *Bellekten*, TTKY, Ankara, pp. 690-707.
- (1995), *XVI-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu*, Trans.: M.A. Kılıçbay, Ankara.
- Masson, P., (1896), *Histoire du commerce francais dans le Levant au XVIIe siècle*, Paris.
- Masters, B (1988), *The Origins of Western Economic Dominance in the East: Mercantilism and the Islamic Economy in Aleppo, 1600-1780*, New York.
- Oldewelt, W.F.H., (1958), *De Oudste Lastgeldrekeningen van Directeuren van de Levantse Handel, (1625-1633)*, Stadsdrukkerij, Amsterdam.
- Van Dillen, J.G, (1970), *Van rijkdom en regenten; Handboek tot de economische en sociale geschiedenis van Nederland tijdens de Republic*, 's Gravenhage.
- (1974), "Economic Fluctuations and Trade in the Netherlands, 1650-1750", in *Essays in European Economic History, 1500-1800*, Ed.: P. Earle, Oxford, pp. 199-211.
- Van Royen, P.C., (1987), *Zeevarenden op de koopvaardijvloot Omstreeks 1700*, De Bataafscheleeuw.
- (1990), "The First Phase of the Dutch Straatvaart (1591-1605): Fact and Fiction", in *IJMH* 2/2, pp. 60-102.
- Van Zanden, J.L., (1993a), *The Rise and Decline of Holland's Economy, Merchant Capitalism and the Labour Market*, Manchester University Press.