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Introduction

Tsarist expansion against the Ottoman Empire and commercial access to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean broadened the parameters of Russian influence in the Near East in the nineteenth century. For Imperial Russia, the Eastern Question became a complex and multi-faceted issue, encompassing the pursuit of strategic and diplomatic aims in Istanbul, the Straits, and the Balkan peninsula, the protection of Eastern Orthodoxy, and the extension of trade in the Black Sea and the Levant. Commerce and consuls provide windows on Russia’s interaction with the Near East and illuminate the variety of interests which comprised Russia’s Eastern Question.

Russia’s relations with the peoples and regions of the Near East are best studied by tapping the rich and extensive records available in archives, manuscript collections, and libraries of Russia, Ukraine, and other successor states of the Soviet Union. This guide identifies and describes some of the holdings on commerce and consuls housed in Moscow’s Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire (AVPRI), the single most important and largest repository for the investigation of tsarist Russia’s diplomacy and foreign affairs. With its unmatched resources of 373 fondy (collections) and 500,000 documents, AVPRI contains abundant and assorted details on virtually every aspect of Imperial Russia’s involvement in the Eastern Question, including diplomacy, military and naval strategy, trade, religion, and philanthropy.

Western scholars have only gained full access to AVPRI since 1990, and the sources for this work were examined during three weeks of research in 1993. Using this archive has many of the same obstacles and frustrations that scholars face in most other archival and manuscript depositories of Russia. Perhaps most noteworthy is the palpable sense that more records on any given topic probably exist, but accessing them is problematical for reasons ranging
from time constraints to the perennial remont (restoration) that closes specific holdings, and in some cases entire archives, for long periods of time. One advantage for scholars who plan to work in AVPRI is the comprehensive Putevoditel’ (guidebook) published in the United States in 1995, considerably larger than the typescript version available for consultation in the archive’s main reading hall, a spacious and comfortable room on Bol’shaia Serpukhovskaya ulitsa (Serpukhovskaya and Dobryninskaia metro stations) in Moscow. The well-organized and extensive Putevoditel’ promises to become an indispensable directory of archival resources on Imperial Russia’s foreign affairs.¹

For scholars of Mediterranean, Slavic, and Eastern Orthodox studies, in particular Russia’s interests in the Near East, AVPRI offers a goldmine of information. Specific collections encompass the lands and peoples of the Ottoman Empire, including Greece, Moldavia, Wallachia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Albania, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Turkey. Imperial Russia had embassies, diplomatic missions, and consulates in Athens, Piraeus, the Cyclades, Saloniki, Adrianople, Istanbul, Smyrna, Jassy, Bucharest, Belgrade, Sofia, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Beirut, Cyprus, Gallipoli, Sinope, and many other places in the Near East and the Balkan peninsula. Records in these and related fondy treat such topics as Russia’s protectorate in the Danubian Principalities; foreign trade and shipping in the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, and the Suez Canal; requests from Eastern Orthodox clergy, churches, and monasteries for Russian financial aid; the Russo-Turkish wars; Ottoman administrative reforms in Macedonia and Kosovo; and activities of the Russian Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society. Numerous fondy detail the organization, training, staffing, and correspondence of the Foreign Ministry’s Asiatic Department, which supervised and implemented tsarist policy in the Balkans, the Ottoman Empire, Central Asia, and the Far East.²

Since 1960 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR has published sixteen massive volumes of AVPRI documents on Russian foreign affairs in the period 1800-1830, and many of these items cover Russian designs in the Balkans and the Ottoman Empire.³ A number of Russian historians have utilized AVPRI in their publications on the Eastern Question, the Balkans, and the Near East, and it is hoped that they continue to mine these resources.⁴ Grigorii Arsh deserves special mention for his many studies on Russian-Greek relations, all of them based on investigations in AVPRI and in other archival and manuscript collections. Indeed, Arsh was one of the first scholars to examine Russian consular reports as a source for delineating social, economic, and political conditions in the Morea, the archipelago, and other areas of the Ottoman Empire.⁵ A few Western specialists have relied on AVPRI holdings in their exploration of specific subjects in the Russian-Near Eastern field.⁶ The select documents on Russian commerce and consuls which are presented here supplement the published guide to AVPRI materials on Russia’s religious interactions with the Greek East, in particular Russian aid for Eastern Orthodox shrines, churches, and monasteries.⁷ Because Western scholars have only recently been granted unimpeded access to this archive’s treasure trove, identifying some of the actual documents can serve as a crucial research tool for subsequent scholarship in the field.
This work is based on AVPRI’s largest single fond, entitled “Sankt-Peterburgskii Glavnyi Arkhiv” (f. 161), consisting of five razriady (categories), 173 opisi (inventories), and 91,712 edinits khraneniia (storage units), the vast majority of which detail tsarist diplomatic and consular activities in the Balkans and in the Near, Middle, and Far East. Within this ocean of records only 128 dela (files) are identified in this study, all of them dealing with Russian trade and consulates in the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. A description and summary are provided for the documents in the 62 files examined. For the remaining 66 files, which were not investigated thoroughly, only titles are cited. The 62 annotated files are arranged in sections I-III, and the 66 file titles are listed in sections IV-X. Each Roman numeral denotes a particular razriad and opis’ from fond 161. Archivists have dated each file by the year of the earliest document or record enclosed therein and have assembled the contents of files in chronological order. While this method of organization has been retained in the guide, several files contain items which pre-date the year marked on the file cover. In transliterating the Russian titles of all 128 files, every effort has been made to remain faithful to the titles used by AVPRI archivists. The documents investigated consist primarily of consular reports, consular service records, shipping registers, memoranda and correspondence from state officials, petitions from Black Sea merchants, and edicts issued by the tsarist and Ottoman governments. While neither exhaustive nor comprehensive, these findings remind scholars of the wealth of resources on the Eastern Question available in AVPRI.

The Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji (1774) gave Russia the right to appoint consuls in the Ottoman Empire, and by the 1820s consular officials had been posted to such places as Bucharest, Jassy, Athens, Patras, Saloniki, the Dardanelles, Smyrna, Alexandria, Aleppo, Jaffa, Cyprus, and many of the Aegean islands. One of the commerce-related duties of consuls was to gather information on trade and shipping in their geographic regions and to send these records to the Foreign Ministry’s Asiatic Department, which in turn passed along the commercial reports to the Finance Ministry’s Department of Foreign Trade. Vedomosti (shipping registers) listed the numbers and names of foreign vessels, the flags they sailed under, the numbers and names of captains and sailors on most of the ships, the types and total value of cargoes, and the points of origin and departure for most of the carriers. Vedomosti were compiled not only by consuls but by the Commercial Office at the Russian embassy in the Ottoman capital on a monthly, quarterly, or annual basis and were sent to the Asiatic Department with a cover letter reviewing their specific contents. Some of the files retain copies of these commercial registers; in other files the vedomosti have been removed, most likely when they were forwarded to the Department of Foreign Trade, but are summarized in consular correspondence with the Asiatic Department.

Shipping registers, as well as their elaborate summaries in consular dispatches, amply document several aspects of Russia’s commercial exchange in Istanbul, Smyrna, and other ports in the Near East. Many of the captains and sailors on Ottoman- and Russian-flagged vessels were of Greek or Italian descent; many of the merchants and shipowners who handled Russia’s trade in the Levant were Greeks or Italians based in Odessa, Kherson, Taganrog,
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Feodosia, Nikolaev, Evpatoria, and Nezhin. *Vedomosti* further reveal that Russia’s mercantile networks in the Mediterranean extended from the northern shores of the Black Sea to Alexandria and from Toulon and Marseilles to Smyrna and Beirut. Virtually all of Russia’s consuls, vice-consuls, interpreters, and commercial agents cited in the archives have names that indicate Greek, Balkan, or Italian descent, in line with the tsarist diplomatic corps’s practice of appointing persons who knew Greek, Turkish, French, or Italian, the main languages of trade in the Levant, and who were familiar with Ottoman society and institutions.

Some of the archival files substantiate the precariousness of Black Sea commerce during the Eastern crisis of the 1820s, when political tension over the Greek revolt, the Danubian Principalities, and further issues fueled the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29. That exchange between belligerents did not necessarily have to become a casualty of war is suggested by the research of several scholars, who have shown that during the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-12 trade channels remained open and Odessa’s maritime exports to the Levant actually increased. But in the 1820s commerce was disrupted by naval clashes between Greek and Ottoman forces, Ottoman restrictions and seizures of grain exports on Russian-flagged carriers, and a drop in the numbers of Ottoman vessels entering Black Sea markets.

This guide to select materials in *fond* 161 evinces the variety and value of AVPRI holdings for scholarship on Russian concerns in the Near East in the nineteenth century. Topics such as commerce in the Black Sea and the Mediterranean and consular activities in the Levant can profitably draw upon documents not only in *fond* 161 but in the sundry *fondy* on consular posts in the Balkans and the Near East. AVPRI richly complements collections on Russian-Near Eastern relations in repositories such as the Russian State Historical Archive and the Manuscript Section of the Russian National Library, both in St. Petersburg. Examining the contents of AVPRI’s countless *fondy* and files may not dramatically alter our perspective on the various issues that shaped Russia’s Eastern Question, but meaningful details will invariably deepen our knowledge, suggest the nuance and complexity of policy, and prompt scholarly exploration of the multiple facets of Imperial Russia’s interaction with the Near East.

**Annotated Files**

I. F. 161, “Sankt-Peterburgskii Glavnyi Arkhiv,” II-3, op. 34, 1783-1869

1. 1802, d. 1, “O dostavlenii vedomostei ob obrashchaishchikhsia mezhdou Konstantinopolem i Chernomorskimi portami Rossiiskih i prochih kupecheskikh sudakh i passazhirakh; o sostoianii Rossiiskoi torgovli v Konstantinopole i o torgovom balanse za 1800, 1801, i 1802 gg.,” ll. 1-85.

Russia’s envoys to the Porte in the opening years of the nineteenth century, Vasilii Tomara (1798-1802) and Andrei Ia. Italinskii (1803-06), compiled elaborate summaries of Russo-Turkish trade in Istanbul and in various Black
Sea ports of the Russian Empire. Registers were prepared monthly and recorded the following data: numbers and names of ships engaged in commerce in Istanbul, Odessa, Taganrog, Kherson, and Nikolaev; numbers and names of captains and sailors on each vessel; and total value of imports and exports (cited in both rubles and piasters) on Russian- and Ottoman-flagged carriers. Though the title on the delo cover reads "trade balance for 1800, 1801, and 1802," the file contains commercial registers and related information for 1803 (ll. 65-83). Based on the documents in this file, it is clear that many of the captains, sailors, and crews on Russian- and Ottoman-flagged ships were of Greek or Italian descent and that by 1803 Odessa had surpassed Taganrog as Russia's principal Black Sea port.


Three ship captains of Italian or Greek descent, released from tsarist naval service after participating in the Russo-Turkish War of 1787-91, requested permission to conduct trade in the Black and Azov Seas with Russian passports and under the protection of the Russian flag. Their petition, written in Italian and translated into Russian, was addressed to the Russian envoy in Istanbul, Tomara, and made reference to Catherine II’s decree which had allowed Greek and other foreign captains to fly Russia’s flag on their vessels.


The major document in this file is a memorandum drafted by Nikolai P. Rumiantsev, minister of commerce (1804-10) and minister of foreign affairs (1807-14), entitled “O svobodnom plavanii anatol’skih sudov” (ll. 1-5a). The proposal, examined and endorsed by the Committee of Ministers in May 1810, advocated unrestricted passage for Russian and Ottoman merchant vessels in the Black Sea. No delays or confiscations should obstruct the exchange of non-military cargoes between the two empires that straddled the Euxine. Rumiantsev identified as Greek and Anatolian the merchant ships that would play a major role in expanding the trade activity of Sinope and Trebizond, ports well situated along the northern coast of Anatolia. Sinope and Trebizond were linked commercially to the interior Anatolian towns of Angora, Amasia, Tokat, and Erzerum, the latter a strategic frontier post near the source of the Euphrates and a key point on caravan routes from Turkey to Persia and India. Sinope and Trebizond were also long-standing commercial hubs, in particular the latter which, as capital of the Greek Kingdom of Trebizond (1240-1461), became a center of trade and Byzantine learning before its conquest by the Ottoman Turks.

According to Rumiantsev’s memorandum, the mercantile promise of Sinope and Trebizond made them natural locations for the placement of permanent Russian consulates, whose duties would entail abiding by Russo-Turkish trade agreements, expediting commercial transactions, protecting Russian subjects, and preparing regular reports on trade, shipping, and local economic conditions. The Rumiantsev proposal formed part of his wider strategy of imperial expansion in the Near East, as he pressed for Russia to annex the Danubian Principalities and to assert control over the Straits and Istanbul.

A rough draft note from an unidentified source in Istanbul informed the governor general of New Russia, Armand-Emmanuel du Plessis, duc de Richelieu, of insufficient grain supplies in the Ottoman capital. This shortage was partly caused by the tsarist government’s attempt to ban grain exports from Black Sea markets to the Ottoman Empire in 1809, a prohibition precipitated largely by the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-12.


Russia’s envoy in Istanbul, Andrei Ia. Italinskii (1812-16), turned down the petition of ship captain N. Kefalas, a native of Cephalonia, to fly the Russian flag on his craft. Italinskii based his refusal on information from the British embassy that Kefalas had an unsavory reputation and a criminal past. The chief accusation against the Ionian captain, who was currently serving on a French-flagged ship in Navarino, was that he had abducted a boat from Zante which was carrying some of his merchandise. The envoy decided that Kefalas’s misconduct made him ill-suited for the trade protection that would have been granted him had he received the right to sail under the Russian flag.


Echoing the Rumiantsev proposal outlined above (1810, d. 1), Russia’s consul on Chios, Nikolai Milonas, penned a report in 1816, “Mémoire sur le commerce que l’Asie fait avec l’Europe par la voie de Smirne” (ll. 1-4a), which called for the extension of Russian trade into various parts of Anatolia. While the memorandum emphasized the prominence of Smyrna as a mercantile and consular focal point, it detailed the trade prospects of Trebizond, Sinope, and Erzerum, and the advantages of establishing permanent consular posts in these towns.


The documents in this file illuminate the complementary roles of Odessa merchants and government officials to augment the commercial exchange of Russia’s leading Black Sea port. In 1819 a delegation of Odessa traders petitioned Aleksandr F. Langeron, city chief of Odessa and governor general of New Russia, requesting trade data from Russian consuls in the Near East. The merchants expected to expand their business enterprises in the Mediterranean and the Aegean with the help of regular information on ship cargoes, their volumes and prices, harbor facilities, customs regulations, and related matters. Langeron communicated the petition to Foreign Minister Karl V. Nessel’rode, who endorsed the proposal and authorized Russia’s envoy to the Porte, Grigorii A. Stroganov (1816-21), to apprise consuls of their new assignment. Stroganov in turn instructed Russia’s consular officers to prepare reports on trade and shipping in their regions of jurisdiction and to dispatch the information directly to Langeron in Odessa.

Foreign trade vessels were required to stop at Istanbul to obtain a *firman* (Ottoman imperial edict) allowing passage through the Straits and other Ottoman waters. The file contains records of *firman*s which granted unimpeded navigation to Russian-flagged ships from the Baltic, White, and Black Seas during the period 1818-20. The Commercial Office at the Russian embassy in the Ottoman capital compiled the data, and Ambassador Stroganov sent them to the Foreign Ministry’s Asiatic Department.


This file deals with Russian trade in the Levant from 1820 to 1826; especially useful are records and commentaries prepared by Matvei Ia. Minchaki, director of the Russian embassy’s Commercial Office (1816-19) and special envoy to the Porte during Russo-Turkish diplomatic and trade disputes (1824-27). Minchaki’s jottings included shipping registers for Russian-flagged vessels that left the Ottoman capital and sailed to ports in southern Europe and Russia. Registers, such as “État de la navigation depuis le 1 juillet au 31 décembre 1824” (ll. 6-23), identified names of ships and captains, types of merchandise, and points of origin and destination for selected carriers. Several of the lists provided data on Russian merchant ships entering and leaving the port of Alexandria in Egypt. Minchaki dispatched these records to the Asiatic Department, which in turn sent the registers to the Finance Ministry’s Department of Foreign Trade. In those places where registers are missing, most likely because they are in the holdings of the Finance Ministry’s archive (Russian State Historical Archive, RGIA, St. Petersburg), the cover letters recapitulated the information delineated in the registers.


The missives in this file were written by Russia’s consul-general in the Morea, Ivan Vlassopulo, and were attached to the shipping registers he compiled for the Asiatic Department. The *vedomosti* are missing, but the cover letters summarize the trade activity of Russian-flagged carriers which entered and departed from the port of Patras in 1820.


While *firman*s were issued to many Russian ships from the Baltic, White, and Black Seas, difficulties could arise. For example, in September 1823 an Odessa shipowner, Iosif Verani, wrote to Foreign Minister Nessel’rode that two of his ships failed to obtain the requisite edicts to sail the Straits, a refusal probably attributed to commercial setbacks caused by the Greek War of Independence. The sultan’s government suspected tsarist support if not incitement of the Greek uprising in view of Russia’s claim to protect Eastern Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman and Greek naval clashes in the Aegean led to Ottoman violations of Russo-Turkish trade accords and reinforced the Porte’s suspicion that Russian-flagged ships were transporting provisions and arms to Greek rebels or were owned by insurrectionist Greek shipowners from the islands of Hydra, Spetsae, and Psara. These events
disrupted Russia’s Black Sea interchange and eroded profits of Odessa merchants and shippers who relied on Ottoman *firman* for their commercial success.


The Trade Office at the Russian embassy in Istanbul successfully petitioned Ottoman authorities for *firman* allowing some of Russia’s ships to sail the Straits during the years 1824-27. Greek names for vessels, such as the *Hercules*, suggest the prevalence of Greek ownership and/or operation of ships which comprised Russia’s merchant marine in the Near East.


These written communications from the Commercial Office in Istanbul accompanied the shipping registers which were sent to the Foreign Ministry’s Asiatic Department. The registers are missing from the file, probably because they were passed along to the Finance Ministry, but the cover letters recount the names and numbers of Russian-flagged vessels which traded in Egypt’s ports of Alexandria and Damietta in 1825.


The documents in this file shed light on the downward turn in Russia’s Black Sea trade during the years 1825-27. Although commerce continued, a drop in shipping and Russo-Turkish traffic occurred as a result of the uncertainty and unrest spawned by naval clashes between Ottoman and Greek rebel forces in the Aegean.

Odessa merchants, Feodosiia port authorities, and consular officials at Russia’s Commercial Office in Istanbul were among the groups who complained about trade reversals and business losses in their correspondence with Foreign Minister Nessel’rode and Finance Minister Egor F. Kankrin. Based on a report he had received from the city chief of Feodosiia, Kankrin notified Nessel’rode in July 1825 of the plummeting numbers of Ottoman vessels entering Black Sea trade centers and asserted it would be impossible “to hope for an improvement in the trade of our Black Sea ports until there is a complete cessation of the Greek disorders.” In correspondence with Foreign Minister Nessel’rode in September 1825, Russia’s special envoy to the Porte, Minchaki, cited what he thought were the actual reasons for the difficulties experienced by Ottoman ships bound for the Euxine: tension and friction in Russian-Ottoman official relations; a decline in Ottoman revenues, public order, and social well-being, all aggravated by the turmoil that began in 1821; and the likelihood that any Ottoman vessel in the archipelago would be abducted and held captive by Greek naval forces. Nessel’rode summarized Minchaki’s views in a communiqué of October 1825 to Finance Minister Kankrin. The last document in the file, Kankrin’s missive of August 1827 to Nessel’rode, conveyed the following objections which the finance minister had received from Odessa’s customs officials and merchants: falling revenues from Black Sea shipping, mounting freight and insurance rates for Russian-flagged vessels bound for the Straits, and at least one case of an Odessa trader who had to declare bankruptcy. According to Kankrin, these circumstances and their ramifi-
cations for business in Black Sea ports should be kept in mind by the Foreign Ministry during the current round of Russian-Ottoman diplomatic negotiations in Istanbul.


The Commercial Office in Istanbul informed the Asiatic Department that a Russian-flagged vessel, the Neos-Makedon, had arrived in Alexandria from Kronstadt and would return shortly to St. Petersburg with a cargo of paper and other merchandise.


Even before the Russo-Turkish War of 1828-29, grain exports on Russian merchant ships had been subject to Ottoman restrictions and confiscations. To prevent the likelihood of continued trade damages and shipping disruptions during hostilities between the belligerents, the tsarist government issued an ukaz (imperial edict) in August 1828 which banned shipments of grain from Russia’s Black Sea harbors to any place in the Ottoman Empire for the duration of the war. The prohibition, sent to the governor general of New Russia and Bessarabia, Mikhail S. Vorontsov, encompassed not just Russian-flagged but all foreign-flagged cargoes set to sail from Black Sea trade centers to the Ottoman Empire. The edict instructed Governor General Vorontsov to enforce the ban, guard against contraband, and notify foreign consuls in Russia’s southern seaports of the order.

17. 1829, d. 1, “Po prosheniiu Odesskikh i inostrannykh negotsiantov o dozvolenii im vyvoza za granitsu pshenitsy,” ll. 1-5.

Archival documents register the predictable response of at least some Black Sea traders to the tsarist trade ban. A group of about twenty-five Odessa merchants petitioned Governor General Vorontsov in October 1829, requesting his intercession with the imperial government to revoke the edict against grain exports to the Ottoman Empire. Appealing to Vorontsov’s “protective and fraternal authority,” the traders protested several repercussions of the year-long ban: their own personal business losses, the adverse impact on Black Sea shipping, and the expenses incurred by Odessa’s municipal government and merchants for storing over 400,000 chetverts of unshipped grain. Even without Russian grain exports, argued the petitioners, Ottoman urban centers such as Istanbul and Smyrna maintained sufficient provisions due to shipments from Livorno, Trieste, Alexandria, and other Mediterranean ports. The concerned traders expected that Russia’s resumption of unrestricted exchange with the Ottoman Empire would quickly reverse the setbacks caused by the edict.


The end of the Russo-Turkish conflict, as well as petitions from Black Sea merchants, prompted Governor General Vorontsov to urge the central government to lift the trade ban and to allow the resumption of grain exports to Ottoman Turkey. Vorontsov’s memorandum asserted that traders in Black Sea markets should be permitted to benefit from the “fruits of peace,” most
importantly the restoration of unimpeded commerce between the former belligerents.


Odessa merchants and local government officials often cooperated to stimulate business and urban growth in Russia’s foremost Black Sea port. This file, evoking the dusty streets of Pushkin’s Odessa, documents the street-paving endeavor of Governor General Vorontsov. Given the contributions of Odessa traders and shippers to that city’s mercantile rise, Vorontsov understandably solicited their help in delivering foreign stone so that Odessa could pave its streets, bridges, and walkways and thus improve the flow of goods, services, and people. Printed and handwritten copies of an 1831 proclamation (in Russian, Italian, and French) requested shippers, traders, and sea captains who conducted trade in the Mediterranean to use granite or other types of hard stone as ballast on their Odessa-bound vessels. Port authorities promised to furnish barges and labor for unloading foreign stone in harbor and to expedite quarantine procedures for stone-carrying vessels and crews. The city government pledged to pay a monetary reward to ship captains for each cubic sazhen of acceptable stone they transported. Ships with ballast of sand, earth, porous stone, or other substance deemed unfit for street-paving would receive no financial reward and would have to remove the ballast with their own crews and on their own barges.

The urban improvement project did not succeed, as we learn from Vorontsov’s enclosed announcement of January 1838 which halted the shipment of foreign stone. Although various kinds of stone were conveyed to Odessa from abroad, most were considered unsuitable for street-paving. Already in 1837, according to Vorontsov, the municipal government had declared that henceforth only stone from Trieste and cobblestone from other foreign lands would be accepted. Yet even vessels that continued to bring the preferred stone encountered difficulties, such as being unable to unload the ballast as quickly as the shippers had expected or to fulfill all of the quarantine regulations. In addition, state officials now anticipated that adequate paving stone could be procured in Bessarabia and the Crimea. These factors compelled Odessa authorities to terminate the delivery of all types of stone, even from Trieste. So that captains and traders would not suffer losses for stone ballast on ships already en route to Odessa, Vorontsov announced that the stoppage would take effect after a six-month period, that is, in July 1838.

20. 1831, d. 7, “Po otnosheniui tainogo sovetnika Druzhinina o pravakh grecheskih pereselentsev na proizvodstvo zagranichnoi torgovli,” ll. 1-3.

Iakov A. Druzhinin, director of the Department of Manufacturing and Internal Trade, wrote to the head of the Asiatic Department, Konstantin K. Rodofininikin, contending that Ottoman Greeks who settled in Russia and engaged in Black Sea commerce should have no special privileges. Like their counterparts from other lands, Greek merchants should enlist in the first guild, comprised of those traders who participated in foreign exchange, and pay the required first-guild dues.

Russia’s consul-general in Patras, Ivan Vlassopulo, prepared these commentaries on the Morea’s trade and shipping from 1832 to 1836 and dispatched them to the Asiatic Department. As the consul-general noted in the letters which accompanied the shipping registers compiled by his staff, consuls’ duties included the submission of regular reports (every four months) to the Foreign Ministry on commerce, shipping, and economic conditions in their regions of jurisdiction, data which the Asiatic Department then relayed to the Department of Foreign Trade.

In correspondence from the months of January and August 1832, the consul-general lamented the sharp decline of commerce in the Morea which he attributed to the political factionalism, civil war, brigandage, and absence of order which prevailed in the newly independent Kingdom of Greece after President Kapodistrias’s assassination in 1831. Military and political disorders gravely weakened the Morea’s merchant marine, decimated the population of the region’s maritime towns and most productive villages, and forced peasants to defend their homes and families rather than harvest and sow their fields. The virtual stoppage of foreign trade in the Morea, according to Vlassopulo, explained why he was unable to provide the Asiatic Department with the requisite information on commerce and shipping.

In narratives from April and August 1833, Russia’s consul-general recognized the gradual improvement in foreign trade in the ports of Patras and Navplion. The arrival of the Bavarian royal regency and the attempt to introduce domestic order were positive steps toward the resumption of trade, but customs and quarantine procedures were still capricious and brigands remained a threat to villages and farms. Vlassopulo correctly predicted that many Greek captains and merchants who had formerly been active in Russia’s Black Sea merchant fleet would now sail under the protection of the Greek national, as opposed to the Russian, flag. Yet he anticipated opportunities for expanded trade ties between Greece and Russia. Attached to the consul-general’s accounts were registers identifying the names and types of merchant craft which traded in Patras and Navplion, the flags they sailed under, their cargoes, and the exchange rates of European and Ottoman currencies. Based on this evidence, the vast majority of ships entering and leaving Morea ports flew the Greek national flag, followed by carriers with the Austrian, English, Ionian, Neapolitan, Papal, Ottoman, and Russian flags.

In subsequent reports from 1834 to 1836, Vlassopulo continued to send specific information on foreign trade and shipping in the Morea’s main ports. He also voiced growing concern about the royal government’s apparent inability or reluctance to promote commerce either by encouraging merchant and industrial enterprises or by establishing more orderly customs and quarantine regulations.

22. 1833 (sic, 1843), d. 8, “Svedeniia o torgovle v Gretsii,” ll. 1-96.

Vlassopulo and his consular staff in Patras depicted the state of foreign trade in the Morea in their correspondence with Russia’s diplomatic mission in Athens. These accounts, as well as the attached commercial records and shipping registers, provided data on Greece’s traffic with various European states and the Ottoman Empire during the years 1843-56. Among the file’s more revealing documents is a detailed memorandum from Vlassopulo, “Aperçu du
l'état actuel du commerce de la Russie avec la Grèce et des moyens de lui donner de l'extension” (ll. 15-42, June 1845), reviewing the status of Russian-Greek trade and suggesting ways by which Greece’s merchant marine could become a cooperative (and profitable) channel for Russian grain exports to the Mediterranean. The report’s supporting tables and registers cited the types of merchandise exchanged between Russia and Greece, the volume and monetary value of these transactions, and ruble-drachma exchange rates. Russia’s ships traded not only with the mainland ports of Patras, Navarino, and Piraeus, but also with the Aegean islands of Syros, Santorini, Kea, Mykonos, and Skopelos. Even though Russian carriers remained active in these various places, their numbers had clearly fallen from the pre-1821 era, as many Greek captains and merchants who had previously raised Russia’s flag on their craft were now sailing under the protection of the Greek national flag.

23. 1834, d. 1, “O dvizhenii Rossiiskogo torgovogo moreplavaniia v Konstantinopol’skom portom v techenie 1833 g.,” ll. 1-129.

The Commercial Office at Russia’s embassy in the Ottoman capital assembled two elaborate registers on Russian vessels which entered and departed from Istanbul in 1833: “État des arrivages des navires marchands Russes au port de Constantinople dans le courant de l’année 1833” (ll. 2-73) and “État des départs des navires marchands Russes du port de Constantinople dans le courant de l’année 1833” (ll. 74-129). The lists detailed the name of each ship, its captain and owner, its merchandise, and its point of origin and destination. In 1833 a total of 494 Russian-flagged carriers entered the port of Istanbul and 487 left. The vast majority of vessels were owned by Greek or Italian merchants based in Odessa, Kherson, Taganrog, Feodosia, Evpatoria, and Nezhin, and their commercial networks encompassed the Mediterranean world, the Aegean archipelago, and the Black Sea. Russian-flagged ships arrived in Istanbul from Marseilles, Malta, Trieste, Livorno, the Ionian Islands, Saloniki, Kavala, Navplion, Patmos, Andros, Cyprus, Alexandria, Smyrna, Odessa, Evpatoria, and other Black Sea towns.


The consular jottings in this bulky file deal with trade, shipping, and economic conditions in the Danubian Principalities, the Morea, and the Cyclades from 1833 to 1840. Some of the documents, such as “Tableau du commerce général de la Morée” for 1833 (ll. 33-75), offer rich detail on a particular region’s imports and exports, merchant marine, and general economic situation. By far the most comprehensive of the commentaries are those from consular officials posted to the Cyclades; for example, “Coup d’oeil topographique, administratif, et commercial de l’île de Syra et des principales Cyclades” (ll. 101-158, dated 1840) examines virtually every facet of life on Syros, Santorini, Paros, Tinos, Andros, Ios, Naxos, Mylós, Serifos, Syfnos, Mykonos, and other Cycladic islands. Topics addressed include climate and topography, trade and shipping, agriculture and manufacturing, customs and quarantine facilities, health and postal services, religion and churches, government administration and law courts, schools and hospitals, and population statistics on native and foreign inhabitants, males and females, adults and children, and types of occu-
pations. By 1840, based on these consular records, Syros and other islands of the Cyclades chain had become a prominent trade hub for vessels flying under many different flags: Greek, Ottoman, Ionian, Russian, English, Austrian, Sardinian, French, Papal, and American. The wealth of information on the Cyclades indicates that consular materials hold not only shipping data but valuable, and in some cases detailed, narratives on specific regions.


These summaries of commerce and shipping in Saloniki during the years 1841-43 were composed by Russian consul A. Mustoxidi. The file documents that Saloniki was a significant Ottoman trade center, not only connecting regional markets in Macedonia and Thessaly (Kavala, Serres, Volos) but also conducting an active exchange with major ports in the Black Sea (Odessa), the Levant (Istanbul, Smyrna), and the wider Mediterranean world (Marseilles, Trieste, the Ionian Islands). Most of the ships entering and departing the region of Mustoxidi’s consular authority sailed under the Greek, Ottoman, and Russian flags, followed by vessels using the Austrian, Sardinian, English, Ionian, French, and Neapolitan flags. The reports from Consul Mustoxidi specified the total value of Saloniki’s imports and exports as well as the numbers of merchant carriers in this bustling port.


Russia’s consular officials in various parts of the Ottoman Empire compiled this information on trade, manufacturing, and other facets of the economy for the years 1841-50. The consul-general of Beirut, Konstantin Bazili, reviewed trade, shipping, agriculture, and manufacturing in Ottoman-ruled Syria in 1841, 1849, and 1850 (“Zapiska o vneshnei torgovle Sirii,” ll. 2-21). Consular surveys from Crete, Adrianople, and the Dardanelles delineated the climate, topography, farming, trade, and shipping of these particular regions. In addition to economic and commercial data, the consul-general in Adrianople recounted the disorders and unrest in Ottoman-ruled Rumelia, Bulgaria, and Bosnia. The file also contains consular records on Trebizond (“Quelques observations sur le commerce de Trévizond,” 1849, ll. 99-104) and Erzerum (“Note sur le commerce d’Erzeroum,” 1849, ll. 76-81). The latter document states that Erzerum was prominently situated not only along the caravan route linking Anatolia, Persia, Afghanistan, and Central Asia, but also on the pilgrimage trail for worshippers who traveled to Mecca and Jerusalem.


The file includes notes and information from 1842-46 on the commercial activities of a Nezhin Greek, Anastasii Averov, who engaged in trade in various ports of the Black Sea and the eastern Mediterranean.

II. F. 161, II-20, op. 65, 1802-1835

The following twelve files for the years 1805-27 have the same title, “Ob iskhodataistvovanii ot Turetskogo pravitel’stva firmanov dla korabli i pro-chikh sudov”: 
1. 1805, d. 1, ll. 1-69.
2. 1814, d. 1, ll. 1-29.
3. 1815, d. 1, ll. 1-53.
4. 1816, d. 1, ll. 1-28.
5. 1818, d. 4, ll. 1-135.
6. 1819, d. 1, ll. 1-97.
7. 1820, d. 1, ll. 1-110.
8. 1821, d. 1, ll. 1-36.
9. 1824, d. 4, ll. 1-91.
10. 1825, d. 1, ll. 1-90.
11. 1826, d. 1, ll. 1-117.
12. 1827, d. 1, ll. 1-86.

All of these files hold Russian and French translations of Ottoman fir-mans which granted Russian-flagged ships safe passage in the Straits and other Ottoman waters, for the years 1805-27. The Russian vessels sailed from ports in the Baltic and White Seas, such as St. Petersburg, Riga, Vyborg, and Archangel, and received Ottoman protection from corsair attacks off the coasts of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. The ships were captained by Russian subjects or, in several cases, Prussian subjects authorized to sail under the Russian flag; all of the carriers were owned by first-guild merchants, those traders who were allowed to conduct foreign exchange. The files also contain correspondence on the firmans from Russian diplomatic officials in Istanbul to the Foreign Ministry.

13. 1817, d. 2, “Po proektu Odesskogo kuptsa Karla Sikarda, o postroenii dvukh maiakov pri ust'iah Konstantinopolskogo proliva,” ll. 1-5.

The French merchant Charles Sicard settled in Odessa, became a first-guild trader and a Russian subject, and served as Russia’s consul-general in Livorno. This file includes Sicard’s proposal that Ottoman authorities should construct lighthouses near the Turkish Straits. His memorandum explained that lighthouses would improve commercial navigation at night, prevent maritime accidents, and increase the volume of trade between Black Sea harbors and Istanbul. Sicard’s recommendation was endorsed by Governor General Langeron and Tsar Alexander I, and the Foreign Ministry instructed Russia’s ambassador to the Porte, Stroganov, to tender the plan to Ottoman officials in Istanbul.


Correspondence from Governor General Langeron to Foreign Minister Nessel’rode discusses the participation of other foreign subjects besides the sultan’s in Russia’s Black Sea merchant marine. Envoy Stroganov issued passports and permits to captains of Spanish, Swedish, Danish, and Neapolitan ships, thereby allowing them to sail under the protection of the Russian flag. It is clear from this file that at least some foreign subjects used the Russian standard illegally, that is, without appropriate documents from the Russian embassy.

Harbor and quarantine officials in Feodosia released a detained Ottoman ship, the *Saint Nikolai*. The vessel was seized in port because its captain had presented false identification papers, a not uncommon occurrence in the amorphous world of the Russian and Ottoman merchant marines. These fleets regularly employed Greek sailors, shippers, and captains who conducted trade under the protection of various state flags, above all Russia’s, Ottoman Turkey’s, and Austria’s.


The file provides records, statements, and other testimony that many ships arrived in Russia’s Black and Azov seaports without proper documents and identification papers.

17. 1823, d. 1, “О турецком судне задержанном в Одессе и отправленном обратно в Константинополь,” ll. 1-9.

That trade in the Black Sea had unpredictable turns emerges from the story of an Ottoman vessel detained in Odessa because its sailors had killed their captain. Port officials allowed the ship to go back to Istanbul, thanks to the intercession of Governor General Langeron, who borrowed four thousand rubles from Odessa relief aid monies to finance the return voyage. The Odessa relief fund, set up to assist Ottoman Greek refugees who sought haven in Russia after the outbreak of the 1821 Greek revolt, received full compensation from the Ministry of Finance.

III. F. 161, IV-2, op. 119, 1808-1894


The Asiatic Department confirmed vice-consular appointments to four locations in the Aegean archipelago: Negroponte, Hydra, and Spetsae; Kydonies and Mytilene; Skala Nova; and Santorini.


The Odessa trader Charles Sicard served as commercial agent for the Asiatic Department, and this file includes his reports to the Foreign Ministry about ways to improve harbor facilities and mercantile navigation in the Black Sea and the Straits.


Service records of Ivan Paparigopulos, *dragoman* (interpreter) at the Smyrna consulate-general, document his expertise in Russian, Greek, and French, key languages for commerce and consular business in the eastern Mediterranean. The file further indicates that *dragoman* Paparigopulos accompanied the consul-general of Smyrna, Spyridon Destunis, to Venice in 1822 when anti-Greek and anti-Russian disorders erupted in Smyrna in response to the Greek War of Independence.

Dmitrii V. Dashkov, appointed as an adviser to the Russian envoy in Istanbul in 1817, requested a replacement in 1820 in order to complete his assigned inspection of Russian consular offices in the Levant. Sergei I. Turgenev replaced Dashkov as an embassy adviser, although Dashkov remained in Istanbul until 1823.

5. 1821-1865, d. 2, “O sluzhbe general’nogo konsula v Moree kollezhskogo sovetsnika Ivana Vlassopulo; o pomeshchenii syna ego v Rishel’evskii Litsei i ob opredelenii studenta Konstantina Vlassopulo dragomanom pri konsul’stve nashem v Sire; o prokhozhdenii im sluzhby i o naznachenii pensii emu,” ll. 1-256.

Russia’s consul-general in the Morea, Ivan Vlassopulo, penned elaborate accounts on the condition of this province for the Asiatic Department. Topics addressed include disorders and unrest precipitated by the revolt of 1821; Greek insurgents’ military and naval battles against Ottoman forces; strife and dissension among Greek factions after the assassination of President Kapodistrias in 1831; and the state of trade and shipping in the Morea and the Aegean archipelago both before and after the Greek War of Independence. The consul-general detailed the Morea’s topography, population, fortresses, and revenues, and envisioned that the establishment of an independent Greek state would benefit Russia’s grain trade in the region. The file also has material on Vlassopulo’s son, Konstantin, who followed his father in the diplomatic corps, serving as dragoman at Russian consular posts in the Cyclades, Athens, and Negroponte.


The file contains the service record of Ivan Gianni, a dragoman of Italian descent employed at Russia’s vice-consulate on Chios in the 1820s.


Documents on the service of dragoman Alvise Mustoxidi at the consulate-general in the Morea mention the Corfu native’s loss of savings when he fled Patras in the turmoil of 1821, his request for compensation, and the consulate’s financial assistance for his losses.


The file details the diplomatic activities of the consulate-general in the Danubian Principalities in the 1820s, in particular the reports and records of Matvei Ia. Minchaki, consul-general in Bucharest from 1822 to 1824.


Ivan Paparigopulo, former dragoman at the consulate-general in Smyrna, served as Russian consul in northern Greece and Negroponte for over thirty years after his appointment in 1828. The enclosed documents include
some of the consular dispatches he sent to Russia’s diplomatic mission in Athens.


The service record of Russia’s vice-consul in the Dardanelles region, Angelo Mustoxidi, discusses his unsuccessful bid to win compensation for his dragoman, who lost property both in Gallipoli and on the island of Chios in 1821. The vice-consul’s intercession failed, as the Asiatic Department ruled that his interpreter was not a Russian subject and thus not entitled to restitution.


The file briefly recounts the departure of Russia’s consul-general, G. Civigny, from Alexandria.

12. 1825, d. 1, “Po pros’be deistvitel’nogo statskogo sovetskа Konstantina Koronelli ob opredelenii ego k Konstantinopolskoi missii,” l. 1.

The file holds the transfer request of a diplomatic official, K. Koronelli, for placement at the Russian mission in Istanbul.


The long-time service career of Angelo Timoni, beginning in 1790 for the Foreign Ministry, included stints as dragoman at Russia’s embassy in Istanbul and as member and acting director of the Commercial Office. Among the materials in the file is a communiqué of 1827, from the head of the Commercial Office, Pavel Pizani, to tsarist envoy Aleksandr I. Ribop’er (Ribeaupierre), outlining the status, organization, and personnel of the embassy’s Trade Chancellery (ll. 40-48). Its multiple functions were to handle litigation of Russian subjects, expedite safe commercial passage for Russian ships, prepare inventories of Russian-flagged cargoes, dispense passports to Russian and foreign travelers, and provide notary services for deeds of purchase, wills, and other business. The office staff, consisting of a director and thirteen members, conducted transactions in Russian, French, Italian, Greek, Turkish, and Armenian, languages frequently used in commercial enterprises in both the Ottoman capital and the Levant.


Additional information on the diplomatic career of Angelo Timoni highlights his work at the Commercial Office in Istanbul.

15. 1827, d. 1, “Po predstavleniiu poslannika v Konstantinopole tainogo sovetskа Ribop’era o neobkhodimosti otravi’t konsulov v Levante,” ll. 1-2.

Envoy Ribop’er wrote to Foreign Minister Nessel rode in 1827 on the need to post consuls and vice-consuls to ports in the Levant in order to protect Russian trade and navigation. The dispatch cited the “deplorable state” of Russian commerce in the region, the result of disorders and irregularities caused by the Greek revolt and Greco-Turkish fighting. Hostilities in the Morea and on several Aegean islands precluded the return of consular officials to these particular spots, but the envoy urged speedy appointments to the Dardanelles, Smyrna, Chios, Saloniki, Crete, and Cyprus. He further requested authorization to assign temporary agents, persons he deemed suitable
to safeguard Russian interests, to these places in view of what he considered delays in the Foreign Ministry's selection of permanent officials.


Russia’s ambassador to Lisbon, Baron Palents, interceded with Foreign Minister Nessel'rode on behalf of a staff member who sought a consular appointment in Greece or Turkey. The envoy certified that Sevastopol native Dimitrios Zhialiki knew Russian, Greek, Turkish, and Italian; had maritime experience as captain on Greek merchant vessels; and had an exemplary eleven-year record as Russia’s vice-consul in Belem (Portugal). The Asiatic Department agreed to consider the request, but the file does not reveal if, when, or where Zhialiki was transferred.


The file documents another request for consular placement in the Near East. Trieste merchant Spyridon Prevetto corresponded with the Asiatic Department about a possible position for his son, Georgii, in Russia’s diplomatic corps in either Europe or the Levant. The son knew Greek, Turkish, Italian, and other languages; belonged to one of the most prosperous and respected Greek mercantile firms in Trieste, where the family had resided for 82 years; and conducted his life on the basis of good morals and Christian principles. Numerous traders and town elders from Trieste’s Greek community endorsed the father’s petition and testified on behalf of Georgii’s character and abilities. The request and supporting documents were translated from Italian into Russian by the Ionian Greek Spyridon Destunis, who had served as consul-general in Smyrna before he left for Venice in 1822. Foreign Minister Nessel'rode approved the petition but concluded that there were no diplomatic service openings at the time for the younger Prevetto.


Envoy Ribop’er requested the Asiatic Department to appoint two diplomatic secretaries to his staff in Istanbul, one for correspondence in French and another for commercial and legal transactions.

File Titles

IV. F. 161, II-3, op. 34, 1783-1869

1. 1802, d. 2, “O zhahobe na kuptsov torguiushchikh v Patrase za nevypolnenie konsul'skikh poshlin.”

2. 1817, d. 2, “O ssude russkimi kuptsam, v Odese i drugikh Chernomorskikh portakh, imenami svoimi inostrantsev dla pokupki morekhodnykh sudov’i o proishodiyashchikh ot togo zhivotrebliia.”
3. 1819, d. 3, "O dostavlenii poslanniku baronu Stroganovu i vitse-konsulu v Dardanellakh Mustoksi i manifest ob uchrezhdenii v Odesse porto-franko i o prisylke pervomu neskol'kich ekzempliarov obshchego tarifa i tamozhennogo ustava."

4. 1840, d. 2, "Po predmetu torgovogo traktata Gretsei s Turtsieiu."

5. 1841, d. 5, "O prodolzhenii deistviya v Odesse porto-franko."

6. 1844, d. 7, "Ochty o sostoianii Grecheskogo Natsional’nogo Banka s 1843 po 1856 gg."

7. 1850, d. 3, "O vydache nagrady po sluchaiu traktata o torgovle i moreplavaniy s Gretsiei.

8. 1851, d. 3, "O dostavlenii Departamentu Vneshnei Torgovli svedenii o sudokhodstve i torgovle, soobshchayemykh Ministerstvu Inostrannykh Del konsulami nashiymi v Turetskikh vladieniakh."

9. 1857, d. 3, "Torgovye ochty Gretsei (v 12 chastakh)."

10. 1858, d. 2, "Ob okazanii posobia greku Koz’mi Kandioti."

11. 1858, d. 7, "Torgovy otchet za 1858-86 gg. general’nogo konsul’stva v Soluni."

12. 1861, d. 3, "Vitse-konsul’stvo v Salonikakh. Otchet o summakh, torgovle, i chisle russkih poddannykh."

V. F. 161, II-3, op. 35, 1869-1896

1. 1882, d. 6, "Zapiska general’nogo konsula nashego v Soluni o torgovle v Makedonii."

2. 1884, d. 3, "Torgovy otchet nashego konsul’stva v Sire s 1884 po 1896 gg."

3. 1886, d. 4, "Delo ob umen’shenii vvoznoi poshliny na grecheskie olivki."

4. 1888, d. 1, "O vystavke v Afinakh proizvedenii grecheskoi promyshlennosti."

5. 1888, d. 2, "Kommerchesko-statisticheskii raport neshtatnogo vitse-konsula nashego v Arte, Vartselli, za pervoe polygodie 1888 g."

6. 1889, d. 1, "Torgovy otchet nashego konsul’stva v Ierusalime ot-nositel’no promyshlennosti v Palestine i Iaffe."

7. 1891, d. 1, "Torgovy otchet nashego vitse-konsula v Bitolii."

VI. F. 161, II-4, op. 36, 1799-1869

1. 1846, d. 6, "Zapiska ob Odesskoi porto-franco."

2. 1855, d. 1, "O konfiskovaniy v Odesskoi tamozhne khlopchatoi bumagi, prinadlezhashchei grecheskomu poddannomu Ivanu Sagredosu."

3. 1856, d. 1, "O konfiskovannom u grecheskogo kuptsa Konstantina Tambakisa sakhare."

4. 1858, d. 2, "Konfiskatsiia Odesskoi tamozhnei tovarov, prinadlezhashchikh turetsko-poddannomu Dmitriiu Araboglu i nalozhenie na nego shtrafa."
Theophilus C. Prousis

VII. F. 161, II-23, op. 68, 1801-1843

1. 1804, d. 1, “Predstavlenie kantslera grafa Vorontsova kasatel’no vydan-nykh pasportov grecheskim sudam.”
2. 1805, d. 1, “O vydache v 1805 g. general’nym konsulom v Valakhii nad-vornym sovietnikom Kiriko pasportov inostrantsam na vyezd v Rossiiu.”
3. 1806, d. 4, “O vydache v 1806 g. general’nym konsulom v Iassakh kollezhskim sovietnikom Bolkunovym pasportov inostrantsam na vyezd v Rossiiu.”
4. 1813, d. 1, “Po prosheniui tituliarного sovietnika Raftopulo, komanduiu-shchego Rossiiским kupecheskim korabлем, vydat’ emu svidetel’stvo na vo-oruzhenie korablia ego.”
5. 1817, d. 1, “O vydache podorozhnoi grecheskomu poddannomu Argropulo.”
6. 1817, d. 2, “O vydache grecheskomu urozhentsu Nikolaiu Maruli pasporta na vyezd iz Rossii cherez fassy v Konstantinopol’.”
7. 1817, d. 7, “O vydache pasporta turetskomu poddannomu shkipere Antoniu Dimitri na priezd v Sankt-Peterburg.”
8. 1819, d. 3, “O vydache pasporta na vyezd v Rossiiu ieromonakhu Afonskoi gory Panteleimonu.”
9. 1819, d. 4, “O pasportakh vydat’em v Smirne na vyezd v Rossiiu v techenie 1819 g.”
10. 1819, d. 5, “O pasportakh vydat’em v Konstantinopol’skoi missii na vyezd v Rossiiu.”
11. 1823, d. 1, “O vydache pasporta Nikolaiu Mavromati na proezd v Ionicheskie ostrova.”

VIII. F. 161, IV-1, op. 117, 1800-1872

1. 1818, d. 7, “O sluzhbe general’nogo konsula v Smirne nadovorno go sovietnika Destuni.”
2. 1819, d. 18, “O novom obrazovanii Aziatskogo Departamenta pri Ministerstve Inostrannyykh Del.”
3. 1819, d. 20, “O naznachenii deistvitel’nogo statskogo sovietnika Konstantina Rodofinikina direktorom Aziatskogo Departamenta Ministerstva Inostrannyykh Del i o sluzhbe ego v sei dolzhnosti.”
5. 1830, d. 2, “Ob uvol’nenii ot sluzhby deistvitel’nogo statskogo sovietnika Aleksandra Sturdzy s nagrazhdaniem chinom tainogo sovietnika i pensieiu po 5,000 v gode.”
6. 1831, d. 9, “O sluzhbe deistvitel’nogo statskogo sovetnika Andreia Murav’eva v Aziatskom Departamente i po osobym porucheniiam po delam Vostochnoi tserkvi.”
7. 1832, d. 2, “O nagrazhdennii chinovnikov missii i konsul’stv v Turtsii i Gretsi.”

IX. F. 161, IV-4, op. 123, 1802-1875
1. 1813, d. 2, “O pribavke chinovnikov k Konstantinopol’skoi missii i o vozstanovlenii nekotorykh konsul’stv v Arkhipelage.”
2. 1820, d. 1, “Ob opredelenii i sluzhbe statskogo sovetnika Sergeia Tur-geneva vtorym sovetnikom pri Konstantinopol’skoi missii.”
3. 1824, d. 1, “O sluzhbe poslannika v Konstantinopole tainogo sovetnika Ribop’era i o poruchenii upravliat’ delami Konstantinopol’skoi missii statskomu sovetniku Dmitriiu Dashkovu.”
4. 1825, d. 1, “Ob otmene poezdki v Konstantinopol’skuiiu missiiu tainogo sovetnika Ribop’era.”
5. 1829, d. 1, “Ob uchrezhdennii Kommercheskoj kantselarii pri missii nashei v Gretsi i o naznacheni in upravliaushchim onoiu tituliarnogo sovetnika Lavizona.”

X. F. 161, IV-5, op. 123, 1800-1844
1. 1803, d. 1, “O predpisani konsulam nashim v Ottomanskoj imperii, daby oni s trebovaniiami o pribavke kantsel’arskykh chinov obrashchalis’ k poslanniku nashemu v Tsar’grade.”
2. 1805, d. 2, “Ob opredelenii konsulom v Prevezu nadvnornogo sovetnika Vlassopulo.”
3. 1805, d. 3, “Ob opredelenii general’nym konsulom v Smirnu kollezhskogo sovetnika Pini.”
4. 1805, d. 4, “Ob opredelenii i sluzhbe kollezhskogo assessora Nedoby general’nym konsulom v Moree.”
5. 1807, d. 1, “O zhelani nadvornogo sovetnika Minchaki, sluzhashchego na ostrove Kandii, opredelit’ sia v drugoe mesto.”
6. 1808, d. 1, “Doneseniia general’nogo konsula v Korfu Benaki.”
7. 1815, d. 3, “Doneseniia vitse-konsula v Korfu Papandopulo.”
8. 1816, d. 4, “Doneseniia vitse-konsula v Zante Sandrini.”
9. 1817, d. 1, “O pol’ze uchrezhdennii konsul’skogo posta v Sinope.”
10. 1818, d. 7, “O naznacheni nadvnornogo sovetnika Spiridona Destunisa general’nym konsulom v Smirnu.”
11. 1819, d. 2, “O sluzhbe vtorogo dragomana pri general’nom konsul’stve v Moldavii i Valakhii tituliarnogo sovetnika Levendi.”
12. 1820, d. 3, “O dostavlenii kantselarii Kollegii Inostrannykh Del svedeniia o konsulakh i agentakh v Levante nakhotiashchikhsia pri svoikh postakh.”
13. 1820, d. 5, “Doneseniia vitse-konsula v Korfu Papandopulo.”
14. 1821, d. 4, “Doneseniia general’nogo konsula v Aleksandrii Chivini.”
15. 1821, d. 5, “Doneseniia vitse-konsula v Korfu Papandopulo.”

NOTES

The author expresses gratitude to the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) for a Research Scholar Grant which made this work possible.


9. In addition to the 128 files I have identified, f. 161 holds many other items on commerce and consuls in the Near East. Examples include these *dela* in f. 161, 1-1, op. 12: 1838, d. 442, “O missii i konsul’stvakh v Gretsiii”; 1846, d. 569, “O kommerscheskikh snosheniiakh s Turtsiei”; 1856, d. 63, “Ob uchrezhdennii novykh konsul’stv v Evropeiskoi Turtsii”; and 1858, d. 92, “Ob ustroistve Rossisskogo imperatorskogo konsul’stv v Ierusalime.”


15. A *chetvert* was a Russian unit of weight and measurement, approximately equal to 2.099 metric kilograms (the equivalent of 5.7719 bushels in the United States). These figures are cited in Herlihy, *Odessa*, xviiii.

17. Bazli (1809-84) was a Greek native of Istanbul who was educated in Odessa and served in the Foreign Ministry’s Asiatic Department, including a fourteen-year stint as consul in Beirut (1839-53). His published travel reports on Greece, the Aegean archipelago, Istanbul, Syria, and Palestine are valuable primary sources on the topography, trade, customs, religions, culture, and history of these lands. See the references to Bazli and his works in the useful compendium by Theofanis G. Stavrou and Peter R. Weisensel, *Russian Travelers to the Christian East from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century* (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1986), 213-14, 217-20, 235-36.

18. Sicard penned several accounts of merchant life in the Russian South and Odessa, such as *Lettres sur Odessa* (St. Petersburg, 1812). Herlihy utilizes Sicard’s writings in *Odessa*, 23, 38, 41, 318, 320-21. Later, as commercial agent for the Asiatic Department, Sicard corresponded with Foreign Minister Nessel’rode on the state of shipping in Odessa. In a report on merchant vessels sailing from port between 1813 and 1823, agent Sicard provided data on the volume of shipping and briefly explained annual fluctuations in the numbers of carriers leaving Odessa: “Tableau des bâtiments chargés expédiés d’Odessa depuis l’année 1813 jusqu’au 12 septembre 1823,” in *VPR* 13 (1982): 216-17.

19. Ribop’er served as tsarist envoy to the Porte from 1827 to 1830; his personal papers, in RGIA, f. 1040, include several files on the Greek revolt, Black Sea commerce, the Danubian Principalities, and other contested issues in Russo-Turkish relations. From 1824 to 1827, before Ribop’er’s appointment, the Foreign Ministry posted Matvei Minchaki as special envoy to the Porte. Many reports, memoranda, and dispatches on the negotiations conducted by Minchaki and Ribop’er during the Eastern crisis are published in the Foreign Ministry’s documentary collection *VPR*, especially volumes 13 to 16.