
ARTICLES

The Economic Significance of the Archangel Route (from the late 16th to the late 18th century)

Hermann Kellenbenz
University of Erlangen - Nurnberg

I.

For some centuries the history of the economic relations between the Russian lands and Western Europe was centred on a few isolated spots.

In the Black Sea there was Kaffa in the Crimea, then Cetatea Alba (Weissenburg) at the mouth of the River Dniester, some other places of lesser importance at the mouth of the Dnieper, and Tana at the mouth of the River Don, which served as points of entry in the Middle Ages, until the Ottomans took possession of the Northern coast up to the regions under Tartar domination.

On the mainland Kiev and Smolensk remained the most important meeting points, while in the Baltic Novgorod, with its ports Riga and Narva, dominated the entry to Russia. The closure of the Petershof towards the end of the 15th century made relations between the Hanseatic towns and the principality of Muscovy more complicated than before, but there were other possibilities. This changed following Chancellor's voyage to the White Sea in 1553. The economic motive for this voyage is well known. Chancellor was seeking a new route to Cathay (Kitay), that is to China, in order to compete with the Portuguese and Spanish monopoly of trade

with the East and the Americas. Of course Chancellor did not find China, but he discovered a new route for Russian trade.

The aim of this study will be to trace the development of this route in the period between the mid-16th and the late-18th centuries. This subject has been studied for some time, yet there is no monograph in existence which takes into account all the conclusions that have been drawn. Russian research apart — of Lumi-menko, Gromyko and Šaskol'skij for example¹ — there are contributions by British,² Dutch,³ German,⁴ Scandinavian,⁵ and Ame-

¹ INNA LUBIMENKO, *The Struggle of the Dutch with the English for the Russian Market in the Seventeenth Century*, London 1924; Id., *Les Relations commerciales et politiques de l'Angleterre avec la Russie avant Pierre le Grand*, Paris 1933; J. KULISCHER, *Russische Wirtschaftsgeschichte I*, Jena 1925; M. M. GROMYKO, *Russko-niderlandskaja torgovlja na Murmanskom beregu v XVI v.*, in «Srednie Veka» 17, 1960; I. P. ŠASKOL'SKIJ, *O vozniknovenij goroda Koly*, in «Istoričeskije Zapiskj» 71, 1961, pp. 270-279; Id., *Ekonomičeskije svjazj Rossij s Daniej i Norvegej v IX-XVII vv.*, in «Istoričeskije svjazj Skandinavij s Rossij IX-XX vv.», Leningrad 1970, pp. 9-63.

² R. HAKLUYT, *The principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, vol. 3, Glasgow 1903; W. R. SCOTT, *The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish and Irish Joint Stock Companies to 1720 I-II*, Cambridge 1910, 1912; T. S. WILLAN, *The Muscovy Merchants of 1555*, Manchester University Press 1953; M. WRETTS-SMITH, *The English in Russia during the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century*, «Transactions of the Royal Historian Society» 4, VII, London 1924.

³ D. S. VAN ZUIDEN, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van de hollandsch-russ. relaties in de 16^e-18^e eeuw*, Amsterdam 1911; S. MULLER Ez., *Geschiedenis der Noordsche Compagnie*, Utrecht 1874; E. C. G. BRÜNNER, *De ontwikkeling van het handelsverkeer van Holland met Oost-Europa tot het einde der 16^e eeuw*, in «Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis» 71, 1926; T. S. JANSMA, *Olivier Brunel te Dordrecht, De Noord-Oostelijke Doorvaart en het West-Europeesch-Russisch contact in de zestiende eeuw*, in «Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis» 59, 1946; SIMON HART, *Amsterdam shipping and trade to Northern Russia in the Seventeenth Century*, in «Mededelingen van de Nederlandsche Vereniging voor Zee-geschiedenis» no 26, 1973, pp. 5-30 and pp. 105-116; cf. too, note 25.

⁴ E. ZWEIF, *Die Entstehung und Organisation der englisch-russischen Handelsbeziehungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, in «Th. Schiemann-Festschrift», Berlin 1907; GEORG VON RAUCH, *Zur Geschichte des russischen Handels und der kolonialen Expansion im 17. Jh.*, in «Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte» 40, 1953, pp. 119-145; ERIK AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis, Studien zur russischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Giessen 1957; CHRISTOPH FRIEDRICH MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland im 18. und frühen 19. Jh.*, phil. Diss. Göttingen 1959.

⁵ ARTUR ATTMAN, *Den ryska marknaden i 1500 — talets baltiska politik 1558-1625*, Lund 1944, p. 411 seq.; Id., *The Russian and Polish markets in international trade 1500-1650*, Göteborg 1973; SUNE DALGÅRD, *Det Petsoriske Kompagni af 1619*, Copenhagen 1955; Id., *Dansk-norsk hvalfangst 1615-1660, En Studie over Danmark-Norges Stilling i Europeisk merkantil expansion*, Copenhagen 1962; JORMA AHVENAINEN, *Some Contributions to the Question of Dutch Traders in Lapland and Russia at the End of the Sixteenth Century*, «Acta Lapponica Fenniae» No. 6, Rovaniemi 1967.

rican⁶ scholars. Our study of the topic will be divided into several periods, the first up to the mid 17th century, the second from the mid 17th century to the foundation of St. Petersburg, while the third terminates with the Continental Blockade by Napoleon I.

II.

During the first period it was the English who dominated the route on the mouth of the River Dvina where the monastery of St. Nicholas was situated. First they settled on the 'Island of Roses' and went by boat to the town of Cholmogory, which was 40 km away from the river mouth.⁷ Later, in 1591, they were obliged to move to Novye Cholmogory, a port near the monastery of St. Michael which was founded in 1584 and later (after 1637) called Archangel. There is no doubt that the number of ships was always limited. A normal voyage lasted about a month, and the same amount of time was necessary for the return journey. Sometimes the voyage could be completed in 18 to 20 days. The voyage was generally made in convoy for safety, for it was rather dangerous. Those ships that left Archangel too late, that is in October or at the beginning of November, or sometimes even in the second half of September, ran the risk of encountering winter storms or 'maelstrom' near the North Cape. Otherwise it was necessary to spend the winter ice-bound, either in this region or in the White Sea. It was only in May that the route was reopened so that they had to wait until July or August to make the return journey. The merchants, who were organized from 1555 in the Muscovy Company, were able, thanks to the ability of their diplomats, like Chancellor, Jenkinson and Randolph, to obtain privileges granting them a certain kind of monopoly of the trade on the Northern

⁶ E. V. VAUGHN, *English Trading Expeditions into Asia under the Authority of the Muscovy Company 1577-1581*, New York 1912; RAYMOND H. FISHER, *The Russian Fur Trade 1550-1700*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1943; WALTER KIRCHNER, *Commercial Relations between Russia and Europe 1400-1800*, Bloomington Indiana Univ., 1966.

⁷ LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques de l'Angleterre avec la Russie* p. 231.

route, because other foreigners were forbidden to come to Cholmogory and such other places as Kola, Mesen, Petchenga, the Island of Solowki, the Petchora, the Ob and even to Warehouse (Vardøhus).⁸ The privilege conceded to Jenkinson in 1557 gave him permission to trade with Kazan and Astrakhan on the Volga and with Persia by way of Russia. They exported cloth, cotton goods, fine materials, metal (such as copper, lead), arms and munitions, wine, salt, medicaments and East Indies' products, while they bought flax, hemp, cables, wax, tallow, fish oil, furs, skins, hides and masts. At the beginning the hemp was exported in untreated form, but soon there were factories in Russia and consequently the export of ropes gained in importance. The trade in wax was also of considerable size, and the company had the intention of monopolizing the entire wax trade.⁹ As a result of their access to the Dvina the English established trading posts at Moscow, Vologda and elsewhere.¹⁰

The voyages made by Anthony Jenkinson and others on the Volga in Tartary gave rise to the hope of establishing contact by way of Russia with not only Persia but also with India, thus competing with the Portuguese. The English were encouraged by the fact that the port of Narva was in Russian hands between 1558 and 1581, and because of this it could be said that the English gained a certain supremacy in trade with Northern Russia during those years, and it was only trade with the East that did not develop beyond the initial tentative stage. At the end of the century the Dutch were already proving to be more powerful rivals, the political situation changed, and there were internal difficulties in the *Smuta*.¹¹ After the «*smuta*» Czar Mikhail Feodorovich again granted privileges to the English, in 1614. During these years the English sent only a few ships, and the number of active merchants

⁸ That is as far as Lapland was under Russian influence.

⁹ SCOTT, *The Constitution and Finance of English... Joint Stock Companies II*, p. 27 seq. and p. 37; LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques de l'Angleterre avec la Russie*, p. 33 seq., ATTMAN, *The Russian and Polish markets*, p. 84 seq.

¹⁰ One of the successful merchants was Christopher Hoddeston: G. RAMSAY, *English Overseas Trade during the Centuries of Emergence*, London 1957, p. 107.

¹¹ DALGÅRD, *Dansk-norsk hvalfangst*, p. 11.

fell considerably. In 1555 the Company comprised 191 members, and ten years later there were probably 400. During the early 17th century there were 60-70 Russia merchants among these, but the list of 1633 names only 39.¹²

At the beginning the enterprise was organized as a joint-stock company. Among the partners were to be found such famous names as William Cecil and Walsingham and the brothers Thomas and John Gresham. The Queen herself participated, while others were notaries, jewellers, cloth merchants and widows. Many of them were members of other companies like the Levant Company, the Indies Company, the Frobisher expedition company and others. The majority of them lived in London.¹³

The capital invested rose in 1564 to 48,000 pounds sterling and in 1617 it was 64,000 pounds. With the decline in trade debts increased and attempts were made to abandon the joint stock for a regulated company, while the Czar, hoping to profit from this change, wished to impose a tax on them, but in 1626 he granted separate trade rights without tax payment to 22 Englishmen. In 1634 21 English merchants were residing in Moscow.¹⁴

There was growing opposition to them and their collaborators (for example Hollanders, Brabanters and Hamburgers) on the part of the Russian middle class and the troubles in Moscow in 1648 offered the opportunity to divert them of their privileges. Henceforth their trade was restricted to Archangel, while in the interior they were conceded only a small colony at Moscow. Cromwell's revolt against the King of England was only a pretext for this.¹⁵

The most active rivals of the English were the Dutch, the Brabanters and Zealanders and particularly the Hollanders. The Hollanders probably visited the coast of Kola as early as the 1550s.¹⁶

¹² SVEN-ERIK ASTRÖM, *From Cloth to Iron, The Anglo-Baltic Trade in the late Seventeenth Century*, in « Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum » XXXIII, 1, part 1, Helsingfors 1963, p. 233.

¹³ For their names see T. S. WILLAN, *The Muscovy Merchants of 1555*, Manchester 1953, p. 750.

¹⁴ LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques de l'Angleterre avec la Russie*, p. 183 seq.

¹⁵ VON RAUCH, *Zur Geschichte des russischen Handels*, p. 820 seq.

¹⁶ DALGÅRD, *Det Petsoriske Kompagni af 1619*, p. 11.

At least from the '60s onwards the Hollanders had contacts with the Russian market on the Kola coast, and from 1578 they visited the Dvina estuary directly¹⁷ and soon their tonnage considerably exceeded that of the English.¹⁸ The Hollanders' plans in the North must be seen in the context of the initiative taken by the great merchants of Antwerp, who were annoyed by the chaos caused by the years of trouble and were seeking new fields of action. Thus two well-known figures in Antwerp — and later Hamburg — trade, Simon van Salingen and Cornelis de Meijer, travelled around the Kola Peninsula towards the White Sea and continued their journey by land to Moscow.¹⁹ It was another Belgian, Olivier Brunel from Brussels, who came to Kola in 1565 with the first boats from Enkhuizen, fell into the hands of the English shortly afterwards and was sent as a spy to the Czar's court. The Czar held him prisoner at Jaroslavl for several years. He was released thanks to the intervention of the brothers Jakob and Grigorij Anikiev of the great Stroganoff company at Sol-Vyshegodsk. Soon he was travelling, as the Anikievs' agent, to Kola, where a Dutch colony had been established, and to the Netherlands to obtain other outlets for Russian goods. Another house, the della Faille, was also engaged in this business. The della Faille established relations with the monastery at Soloveskij, from which contacts were made with Moscow.²⁰ Adria van Adrichen, a merchant from Delft, sent ships «after Noorwegen in Muscovien».²¹ In 1577 Brunel and Jan de Walle left Vlissinghe with a ship belonging to Gillis van Eyckelen-

¹⁷ MULLER, *Geschiedenis der Noordsche Compagnie*, p. 21; JANSMA, *Olivier Brunel te Dordrecht*, p. 337.

¹⁸ WRETTS-SMITH, *The English in Russia during the second half of the Sixteenth Century*, p. 77, n. 1; LUBIMENKO, *The Struggle of the Dutch*, p. 48; FISCHER, *The Russian Fur Trade*, p. 191.

¹⁹ MULLER, *Geschiedenis der Noordsche Compagnie*, p. 24; HERMANN KELLENBENZ, *Unternehmerkräfte im Hamburger Spanien- und Portugalhandel 1590-1625*, Hamburg 1954, pp. 201, 217, 218, 305, 328.

²⁰ E. C. G. BRÜNNER, *De ontwikkeling van het handelsverkeer van Holland met Oost-Europa tot het einde der 16^e eeuw.*, in «Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis» 44, 1926, p. 357; WILFFRID BRULEZ, *De firma della Faille en de internationale handel van Vlaamse in de XVI^e eeuw*, Brussels 1959.

²¹ Brünner gives the years 1567 and 1570; AKSEL E. CHRISTENSEN, *Dutch Trade to the Baltic about 1600*, Copenhagen-The Hague 1941, p. 116, mentions the voyage of Lenert Pietersz van Schiedam in 1568.

berg or Hooftmann, one of the great Antwerp merchants who was established at Middleburg.²²

Among the ships arriving in Russia at the same time was one belonging to another great Antwerp merchant, Balthazar de Moucheron, who had fled to Middleburg;²³ one of his relatives, Melchior de Moucheron, settled at the mouth of the River Dvina as Balthazar's agent, and it is not surprising that Moucheron and Brunel were trying, like the Chancellors and other Englishmen, to find the Cathay route in these regions.

In the same year Moucheron and Mealson sent two ships, the *Swane* from Veere and the *Mercurius* from Enkhuisen, to the White Sea with François de la Dale, one of Moucheron's relatives, as midshipman, which reached the Petchora and Vaigatch. In 1582, apart from the nine English ships, six Hollander vessels arrived at Archangel.²⁴ The notarial archives in Amsterdam, thanks to Dr. S. Hart's initiative, contain the first of a series of «*bevrachtingscontracten*» which were used until 1700 for voyages to Archangel and Lapland.²⁵ There are 2,082 contracts in all, and according to Dr. Hart's view, these represent 50% to 60% of the total sea traffic at Archangel. He claims that about 35 ships a year made the voyage to Archangel but there were of course great differences from year to year. According to these conclusions the freight charge on the Amsterdam-Archangel-Amsterdam route rose to between 19 and 27.50 fl. per *lest* in the years from 1594 to 1644.

²² MULLER, *Geschiedenis der Noordsche Compagnie*, p. 28; BRÜNNER, *De ontwikkeling van het handelsverkeer van Holland met Oost-Europa*, p. 361.

²³ MULLER, *ibid.*, p. 28; I. H. DE STOPPELAAR, *Balthazar de Moucheron, Een bladzijde uit de nederlandsche handelsgeschiedenis tijdens den Tachtigjarigen oorlog*, s'Gravenhage 1901, p. 25 seq., 61 seq., 103 seq.

²⁴ BRÜNNER, *De ontwikkeling van het handelsverkeer van Holland met Ost-Europa*, p. 361.

²⁵ SIMON HART, *De handelsbertrekkingen van Amsterdam met Archangel en Lappland (Kola) in de 17^e eeuw, Een verkenning in de Amsterdamse notariale archieven (ms)*; ID., *Handelsbetrekkingen zwischen Amsterdam und Archangelsk/Lapland (Kola) im 17. Jahrhundert (ms)*, a paper delivered to the conference of the *Hansischer Geschichtsverein* in Amsterdam on 28th May 1969. Cf. also J. M. IJZERMAN, *Amsterdamse bevrachtingscontracten 1591-1602*, I, *De vaart op Spanje en Portugal*, in «*Economisch-Historisch Jaarboek*» 17, 1931, pp. 206, 262, 263 (three contracts); AHVENAINEN, *Some Contributions to the question of Dutch Traders in Lapland and Russia*, p. 170.

There were of course variations in price for different merchandise; in 1634 the cost of barley per *lest* was 19 fl., for rye it was 20 fl. and for corn 21 fl. One of the most interesting conclusions is that a new war between Spain and the Dutch Republic in 1621 led to a rise in cargo prices only in 1626 and the years following.

The ships leaving for Lapland were generally smaller than those visiting Archangel. For the ships going to Lapland Hart claims an average tonnage of 72 to 107 *lest*, while for the Archangel route he found an average tonnage of 95½ to 119½ *lest*.

In general the catalogue of goods exported from the Netherlands to Archangel may have been similar to that of the Muscovy Company, and among the goods imported from Archangel we find those which have already been mentioned, potash and caviar not omitted. The export of grain from Archangel depended on the market situation in the Netherlands. Prices were extremely high around 1630, when the supply from the Polish hinterland was stopped by the Swedes.²⁶ Most of the ships made the return journey to Holland, while others, although fewer in number, returned to Germany, England, France, Spain and Portugal. A considerable number of voyages were made to Italy at the beginning of the 17th century. Hart has counted 36 ships of an average of 125 *lest*. We come back to the fact that during the « *smuta* » between 1605 and 1613, when Russia was at war with Poland and Sweden, the number of voyages to Archangel was greater than before or after the troubles. Hart, and I am in agreement with him here, comes, with the aid of figures on the tonnage of the ships, to the conclusion that even at the end of the 16th century the trade of the Hollanders, that is mainly of Amsterdam merchants, had surpassed that of the Muscovy Company whose ships were smaller. One must also bear in mind that on average the ships going to the Baltic ports were smaller than those going to Archangel.

As for the ship-masters, Amsterdam was able to draw on a large number of experienced sailors in the various ports of Northern

²⁶ MARIA BOGUĆKA, *Zboże rosyjskie na rynku amsterdamskim w pierwszym połowie XVII wieku*, in « *Przegląd historyczny* » LIII, 1962; ATTMAN, *The Russian and Polish markets*, p. 87 seq.

Holland (55%). Between 11% and 21% came from Friesland, while the number of men from the islands of Texel, Vlieland and Terschelling rose from 2% to 28% between 1691 and 1700; in this period the number of Frisian ship-masters was 35%. The most important home ports were Amsterdam, Akersloot, Zaandam, Enkhuisen, Medemblik and Hoorn in Northern Holland, Hindelopen, Stavoren and Warns in Friesland, and Vlieland and Terschelling on the islands. In 1591 a company «van handel op Moscovia» was established in Amsterdam. Its members were Jacques van de Walle, Pompeius Dircksz Occo, Gert Pietersz. Coulsart, Ghert and Cornelius-Peereboom, all from Amsterdam, and Martin Jansz. Moel, a citizen of Gouda; in 1593 Abraham Verbeek appeared in connection with this group.²⁷ The names of those acting as «*bevrachter*» continue to show the influence of the great groups of merchants from Antwerp. In the early years from 1594 to 1600 the company of Isaac le Maire, Dirck van Os and Pieter Pulle was the most powerful. Le Maire was a merchant who traded simultaneously with France, the Iberian peninsula and Italy, and was also involved in banking and insurance operations. His trade with the North formed only a small part of his total activities. His ships visited Archangel as often as Lapland; six of them went from Archangel to Italy. A ship of 120 *lest* left Amsterdam for Setubal, thence carrying salt to Archangel and returning to Amsterdam. In 1607 Le Maire loaded 28 more ships for Italy, but then his name disappears from the registers. We know that he had a disagreement with the OIC (Oost-Indische Compagnie) which forced him to withdraw from Amsterdam.²⁸ Le Maire left his children an inheritance of 1½ million florins, according to the epitaph on his tomb. Dirck van Os was also one of the most representative merchants of the OIC; in 1608 he was in a position to make an advance of 200,000 florins, together with three other merchants.²⁹

²⁷ BRÜNNER, *De ontwikkeling van het handelsverkeer van Holland met Ost-Europa*, p. 361 seq.

²⁸ J. G. VAN DILLEN, *Het oudste aandeelhoudersregister van de Kamer Amsterdam der Oost-Indische Compagnie*, s'Gravenhage 1938, p. 111 seq.

²⁹ *Id.*, p. 110 seq.

Like Le Maire, van Os and Pulle, Marcus de Vogelaer was also from Antwerp. He also traded with Russia, Italy and the Levant at the same time and was a member of the OIC. His son, Marcus de Vogelaer, carried on this business.³⁰ One of the most interesting figures in Russian trade, Georg Everhard Klenck, had been employed as Vogelaer's agent in 1607 and then in 1623 established a separate house. Like Vogelaer Klenck had the monopoly of the purchase of hemp and copper for some years.³¹ One must also mention Simon Lus who was known as the owner of a lending bank, first at Dordrecht, Leiden, Den Haag and Amsterdam, then later at Breda. He loaded 30 ships between 1599 and 1605. In 1607 he obtained «opene patente» from the States General, that is, privileges for trade with Russia, and he sent his son Abraham with 5 other men to Russia. Among his agents were men from the Southern Netherlands, Nicolas van Breusegem³² and Samuel Bernart, but later financial difficulties arose. One very enterprising merchant was Dirck Wouters from Enkhuisen. Between 1599 and 1611 he made some 20 contracts and left a fortune of 250,000 florins on his death. Nor should we forget a group that was formed around Duarte Ximenes, the leading representative of the Portuguese refugees.³³ Other merchants engaged in this trade were Jean le Brun, Gommer Sprangers,³⁴ Pieter and Selio Marselis,³⁵ Jan and Daniel Bernart, Arend Schuyt, Jean Andrea, and Ottavio Tensini,³⁶ Jacob Teunisz van Stralen and Thomas de Swaen, who collaborated

³⁰ *Id.*, p. 110.

³¹ LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques de l'Angleterre avec la Russie*, p. 190 seq.

³² For the van Breusegems cf. KELLENBENZ, *Unternehmerkräfte*, p. 294.

³³ For his participation see BRÜNNER, *De ontwikkeling van het handelsverkeer van Holland met Oost-Europa*, p. 361 seq.; The Ximenes: HERMANN KELLENBENZ, *Sephardim an der unteren Elbe*, Wiesbaden 1958, p. 105 seq.; *Id.*, *Die Geschäfte der Firma Ferdinand Ximenes und Erben des Rui Nunes in Köln*, in «Ricerche storiche ed economiche in memoria di Corrado Barbagallo» a cura di LUIGI DE ROSA, II, Naples 1970, p. 121 seq.

³⁴ Cf. HERMANN KELLENBENZ, *Die wirtschaftlichen Beziehungen zwischen Amsterdam und Brasilien in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jhs.*, in «Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte» 55, 1969: Gommer Sprangers was one of those engaged in the Brazilian wood trade, p. 459.

³⁵ See p. 12.

³⁶ See p. 12.

with Elias Trip,³⁷ most of these names originate from the Southern Netherlands. One of them, Jan de Nocquer, later settled at Trondheim.³⁸

How was it possible for these Dutchmen to conquer the market of Northern Russia so quickly? Hart sees one of the most important reasons in the fact that, for the Russians, trade with the Dutch was more advantageous than their trade with the English. The English did not pay duties and they passed freely into Russia thanks to their privileges. Those who were not English paid duties in silver coin and they were also in a better position to pay for the goods they bought in ready money. This was because there was a greater flow of silver to Amsterdam and the other ports of Northern Netherlands in about 1600 than to London and the other English ports. It was also forbidden in England to export English currency. On the other hand the Russians prohibited trading outside the Russian customs area to prevent the English from cheating the Russian customs office. One can agree with Hart that it was above all the lack of «specie» that robbed the English of their position in the Russian market, in spite of the privileges they held. They had probably already been outstripped by the Dutch by the end of the 16th century. The Dutch were certainly not such good diplomats as the English but the Dutch groups were in competition with each other whereas on the English side there was only the single company. Furthermore they had a wider range of luxury goods than the English, which was always an attraction in the eyes of the Muscovy court. The Hollanders did not become active as diplomats until after 1615, and by the mid-century they were able to obtain 10 privileges for 15 people to trade in the interior. Later this number was raised, but it was impossible to exceed the number of 23 stipulated in the privilege held by the English. Some of the Hollanders were particularly privileged as «gosti».³⁹ So there were

³⁷ P. W. KLEIN, *De Trippen*, Assen 1965.

³⁸ VAN DILLEN, *Het oudste andeelhoudersregister*, p. 207; DALGÅRD, *Dansk-Norsk hvalfangst*, p. 148.

³⁹ LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques entre l'Angleterre et la Russie*, p. 190 seq. On the «gosti»: ERIK AMBURGER, *Zur Geschichte des Grosshandels in Russland: die gosti*, in «Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte»

Hollander houses at Moscow, Vologda, Jaroslavl, Novgorod and Pskov as well as those at Cholmogory, Archangel and Kola.

In England itself the Muscovy Company had competitors in the «interlopers» who showed no hesitation in collaborating with the Dutch and using the privileges of the company to their advantage. Through the freight contracts which they drew up at Amsterdam we know some of their names. One of them was Peter Allen, a London merchant who later settled in Amsterdam. Another was John Chadley of Hull who despatched ships for Lapland as well as ships for fishing.

Between 1612 and 1619 he loaded 10 ships, some of which returned to Hull. During the 1620s and 1630s the Hollanders' advantage over the English became more and more evident. The rise in grain prices and difficulties in the Baltic market gave impetus to the grain trade via Archangel, and it was the great Dutch merchants who dominated this trade, first the Marselis, who were represented in Amsterdam by Gabriel and Selio, the sons of the elder Gabriel. Klenck, Cousaert, du Moulin, Winius, Niekerke and Trip were others who took part in exporting grain. Isaak Massa and David Ruts were their experienced agents in Russia. Wooden masts were another article which was highly prized after 1630. The trade in tar was contracted for 5 years by a Hollander in 1641. Amsterdam also became the centre of the fur trade. During the 1640s trade at Narva increased, however business at Archangel was going so well that the Hollanders had probably about «200 factories» there.⁴⁰

Compared with the Dutch neither the French nor the Hansa or Baltic merchants or Scandinavians offered any competition. The French, in fact, preferred the Baltic route.⁴¹ In 1581 Dançay suggested negotiating with the Czar in order to obtain privileges for

46, 1959. For the fur trade: FISHER, *The Russian fur trade*; S. V. BACHRUSIN, *Očerki po istorii kolonizacii Sibiri v XVI i XVII vv.*, in «Naučnye trudy» III, Moscow 1955.

⁴⁰ Which was probably an exaggeration: HENDR. C. DIFEREE, *De Geschiedenis van den nederlandschen handel tot den val der Republiek*, Amsterdam 1908, p. 188; LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques entre l'Angleterre et la Russie*, p. 194 seq.; AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 72 seq.

⁴¹ WALTHER KIRCHNER, *The Beginning of Franco-Russian Economic Relations 1550-1560*, in «Commercial Relations between Russia and Europe 1400 to 1800», p. 95 seq.

French merchants at St. Nicholas to export wax, skins and fabrics in competition with the English. The merchants of Dieppe seem to have been the most interested. Dançay negotiated with the Danish Government to obtain permission to pass through the Vardøhus customs, but the Danish requested the sum of 6,000 thalers a year. It was too much. This obstacle, and others, prevented the French from using the new route. However in 1583 a French ship-master obtained a passport and Jean Sauvage, a Dieppe merchant, made a voyage to Archangel in 1586 where he exchanged his goods for skins, fabrics, wax, tallow and hemp.⁴² Other Frenchmen who made the voyage in the same year used forged passports to escape the Vardøhus customs and were arrested by the Danish customs officers. In 1586 François de Carle obtained the Czar's authority for the port of Cholmogory to be opened to the French, and in the following year privileges were conceded to the company of Jacques Parent. These French efforts must be seen in the light of the Swedish conquest of Narva in 1581. But the results were not of great importance in view of the fact that with the reign of Czar Feodor in 1584 sea traffic between the Baltic and Russia took on new life.⁴³

The Iberian Peninsula had no direct, active sea traffic with Archangel but the ports were included in the network of ship-routes that also included Dvina. For some time Philip II had been interested in the Russian port and hoped for an expedition against Archangel to assist his Polish allies.⁴⁴ As cargoes of Russian grain were arriving in Italian ports it was hardly surprising that during years when there was a shortage of grain various Venetian ships sought the White Sea route.⁴⁵

On the North Sea coast the Germans and the Hanseatic merchants from Bremen and Hamburg shared Dutch interest in Russian

⁴² NINA BANG F. ELLINGER, *Til Narva-Handelens Historie i det 16de Arrhundrede*, in (dan.) « Historisk Tidsskr. » 7. R., 2, 1899/1900, p. 557.

⁴³ WALTHER KIRCHNER, *The Role of Narva in the Sixteenth Century*, in « Commercial Relations between Russia and Europe », p. 590.

⁴⁴ HOLGE ALMQUIST, *Sverige och Ryssland 1595-1611*, Uppsala 1907; SVEN ULRIC PALME, *Sverige och Danmark 1596-1611*, Uppsala 1942, p. 611.

⁴⁵ ADAM ANDERSON, *An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origins of Commerce etc.* II, 1801, Reprint p. 194.

trade and many cooperated closely with them; unfortunately Hagedorn makes no mention of Frisian shipping to Archangel.⁴⁶ He mentions only that the port of Emden was named in insurance policies as one of the ports on the return voyage. Little is known of the trading activities of the Bremen merchants at Archangel in this period. They were to be found there, together with Hamburg merchants, from the beginning of the 17th century.⁴⁷ In 1608 Jean Clamp and Hermann Muller, Bremen merchants, were named as freight owners in Amsterdam.⁴⁸ In a maritime insurance agreement the premium for Archangel to Holland was 3½% and was the same for Hamburg, Bremen and Emden. Heinrich von Staden mentioned in the 1570s that before his own expeditions Hamburg sailors among others had visited the coasts of the Glacial Sea but it was only at the beginning of the 17th century that regular, direct traffic between Hamburg and Archangel⁴⁹ began, immediately after the Czar had granted privileges to the town of Lübeck in 1603. From the following year ships returning from Archangel entered the port of Hamburg. In 1606 there were 10, in 1612 11 returning ships. In 1615 a ship returning from Lapland berthed in the port. The number of ships leaving for Archangel was more or less the same, sometimes more, which meant that first they went to Archangel and only later called at another port in Western Europe or in the Mediterranean.⁵⁰ The traffic between Hamburg and Archangel during and after the Thirty Years' War was slightly

⁴⁶ BERNHARD HAGEDORN, *Ostfrieslands Handel und Schifffahrt im 16. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1910; *Id.*, *Ostfrieslands Handel und Schifffahrt vom Ausgang des 16. Jhs. bis zum Westfälischen Frieden (1580-1648)*, Berlin 1912: Hagedorn mentions neither Archangel nor Russia.

⁴⁷ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert*, p. 112.

⁴⁸ HEINRICH VON STADEN, *Aufzeichnungen über den Moskauer Staat*, ed. by Fritz Epstein, Hamburg 1930, p. 151; HART, *De Handelsbevekkingen van Amsterdam met Archangel en Lapland*, p. 11; for both of these see: KELLENBENZ, *Unternehmerkräfte*, pp. 302, 305

⁴⁹ WINKLER, *Die Deutsche Hanse in Russland*, p. 126; ERNST BAASCH, *Hamburgs Schifffahrt und Warenhandel vom Ende des 16. bis zur Mitte des 17. Jhs.*, in «Zeitschrift des Vereins für Hamburgische Geschichte» IX, 1893, p. 308.

⁵⁰ During the '40s several Hamburg ships visited the Mediterranean coming from Archangel: LUDWIG BEUTIN, *Der deutsche Seehandel im Mittelmeergebiet bis zu den napoleonischen Kriegen*, Neumünster i. H. 1933, p. 44.

greater than it had been before the war and showed an increase during the '30s.⁵¹

Rye, less often wheat, millet, as well as bacon, meat, hams (in 1629 1,800 were imported) hemp (in competition with hemp from Reval, Riga and Memel), flax (also in competition with the Baltic ports), rabbit skins, Elen, « *sael* » (seals), hides (particularly « Juchten » or Russia leather), minever, matting (particularly for wrapping the « Juchten » — in 1628 8,800), ropes, cables, dried cod, sturgeon's eggs, and salmon were imported. The imports were generally agricultural or forestry products, or else game.⁵²

The merchants trading from Archangel were either immigrants, for example the Englishman Peter Garradt who imported Spanish wines to Archangel during the '80s,⁵³ or more often Dutchmen from Antwerp. Some of their names appear among the freight-owners mentioned in the Amsterdam contracts: from 1605 to 1608 the merchant Jan Thijsz Vleushower loaded ships for Alessandro (della) Rocca⁵⁴ and Walrave Hilliger⁵⁵ at Hamburg, and also for Giovanni Battista Ghinucci.⁵⁶ In 1607 Gissbrecht van Dalen and Caspar Wolf are named.⁵⁷ Other names are Paul Berenberg and consort, Silvio Tensino, Jacques Budier, Otto Brüggemann, Heinrich Schmidts d. J., and Zimpert Jenisch.⁵⁸ They were to some extent represented in Moscovy by David Ruts who acted for some time as a « *résidant* » for the King of Denmark and the Duke of Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorf, and was later succeeded by Peter Marselis.⁵⁹ The most important group was probably the Marselis family, with Gabriel in Hamburg and his sons Gabriel and Selio in Amsterdam and Peter in Moscow, then there was also Albert Baltzer Berns at Copenhagen who soon moved to Hamburg. They were

⁵¹ BAASCH, *Hamburgs Seeschifahrt und Warenhandel*, p. 328.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 333 seq.

⁵³ KELLENBENZ, *Unternehmerkräfte*, p. 98.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 259-263.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 95, 98, 144, 264.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 259 seq.

⁵⁷ For the van Dalens see KELLENBENZ, *Unternehmerkräfte*, p. 211.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 98, 131, 173; BEUTIN, *Der deutsche Mittelmeerhandel*, p. 184, Hamburg, Town Archives, Reichskammergerichtsakten B 39.

⁵⁹ AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 70 seq.; KELLENBENZ, *Sephardim an der unteren Elbe*, p. 153.

among the leading exporters of grain and saltpetre.⁶⁰ In 1634 Berns became the representative of the Danish king. Similarly we find merchants from Stade⁶¹ and Glücksstadt.

It was at Glücksstadt that Christian IV, the king of Denmark, had the «Denninge» coined by the minters of Alvaro Dinis in order to export them to Russia.⁶² Some of this business, like that at Stade, was carried out in cooperation with the Hamburg merchants.⁶³ Ships from the ports of Holstein and Schleswig, which were under Danish rule, were given preference when they applied for passports for the North. There were merchants from Krempe and Flensburg who obtained passports,⁶⁴ but there were also others from Hadersleben, Sonderburg and Altona. According to the Norwegian registers the greatest number of passports was given in 1596.

The ports of destination were Vardøhus, Malmis, St. Nicholas, Kjernevege (=Kerwage) and Kolmogra (=Cholmogory). The most common formula was: *paa Nordland at segle om Vardøhus...*⁶⁵

Of course it is impossible to distinguish very clearly between those who were fishing for herrings and other fish and those who were trading with Russia.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 68 seq.

⁶¹ In 1607 Elias Petit; for the Petits or Lepetits in Hamburg, see KELLENBENZ, *Unternehmerkräfte*, pp. 210, 215 seq.

⁶² KELLENBENZ, *Sephardim an der unteren Elbe*, p. 363 seq.; GERT HATZ, *Denninge*, in «*Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*» 11, 1962, p. 1 seq.

⁶³ Cf. the Bacheracht family in Hamburg and Glücksstadt: AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 75 (David Bacheracht); KELLENBENZ, *Sephardim an der unteren Elbe*, p. 270 (Carol and Embrecht Bacheracht).

⁶⁴ ADOLF JÜRGENS, *Zur schleswig-holsteinischen Handelsgeschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts und des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1914, p. 15 seq.

⁶⁵ JÜRGENS, p. 240 seq.; cf. also «*Norske Rigsregistrarer*» II, III, and IV; «*Kancelliets Brevbøger*» IX. Jürgens gives the following figures concerning the passports given to ship-masters from Schleswig and Holstein:

1589	6	1594	6	1599	4	1607	4	1615	6
1590	7	1595	6	1600	4	1609	3	1616	7
1591	3	1596	9	1601	8	1610	4	1617	2
1592	2	1597	7	1602	8	1613	6		
1593	3	1598	2	1603	1	1614	8		

⁶⁶ VAGN DYBDAHL, *Handel og Skibs fart*, in «*Flensborg Bys Historie Udgivet af Graenseforeningen og Historisk Samfund for Sønderjylland*» I, Copenhagen 1953 (does not mention the port of Archangel).

Relations become more clear if one takes 1614 as an example. In the course of the year passports were given to

- 11 Danish ship-masters
- 8 Schleswig and Holstein ship-masters
- 5 Hollander ship-master
- 2 Hamburg ship-masters
- 1 English ship-master.⁶⁷

The merchants' names are not well known. The Flensburg merchants included the Lorck and Nansen families.⁶⁸ But apart from the merchants and ship-masters of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, the other subjects of the King of Denmark's Empire must also be considered, that is the Danes and the Norwegians. Danish ships made the voyage from the White Sea from the '80s onwards, and those taking part in these voyages were predominantly natives of towns of the Öresund, of Copenhagen, Helsingfors, Malmö, Landskrona and Køge.⁶⁹ The King took a very keen interest: of this the expeditions to Greenland, Novaja Semlja and the access to the «*Karische Meer*» are proof. In the years 1607-1609 and 1610 the passport system worked very well and even the Danes themselves had to purchase passports if they wanted to pass through the Vardøhus customs station. The organization of the «*Petsoriske Kompagni*» in 1619 provided for a certain concentration of such affairs. Among the king's partners there were merchants from Copenhagen, for example Mikkel Vibe, one of the burgomasters of the capital, who took part in trade with Russia «*nord om Vardøhus*» from 1596.⁷⁰ Others were the *rådman* Thomas Lorck, Vibe's son-in-law, who worked in the «*Nordlandhandel*» from 1607,⁷¹ and also Jan Willem, a Dutchman who had emigrated to

⁶⁷ ADOLF JÜRGENS, *Zur schleswig-holsteinischen Handelsgeschichte*, p. 239 seq.

⁶⁸ Cf. p. 14.

⁶⁹ DALGÅRD, *Det Petsoriske Kompagni af 1619*, p. 18 seq.

⁷⁰ «*Norske-Rigs-Registranter*» III, Christiania 1865, pp. 403-404 and ASTRID FRIS, MIKKEL VIBE, in «*Dansk Biografisk Lexikon XXV*, Copenhagen 1943, pp. 484-485.

⁷¹ O. NIELSEN, in «*Dansk Biografisk Lexikon*», Copenhagen 1896, p. 373; «*Norske-Rigs-Registranter*» IV, Christiania 1870, index; A. FABRITIUS, in «*Dansk Biogr. Lexikon*» 14, 1938, p. 448.

Hamburg. His brother, Paul de Willem, the king's agent, lived in Amsterdam and it was he who obtained passports for Northern trade in 1618, 1621 and 1623.⁷²

Yet others took part in the trade with Russia, among them Johan Post, a master minter⁷³ who coined new «*Russiske Denninger*», which were needed to pay for their purchases. In the same year a ship was loaded which apart from these *denninger* had a consignment of thalers in *specie* on board. The merchant who was in charge of the commercial side of the expedition was a man from Flensburg, Clemendt Blom eller Blomme, who had experience of this route.⁷⁴ In 1616 he had been master of a ship belonging to the Flensburg merchant Herman Hoë which had made the voyage to Northern Russia, and was a man who knew Russian. Blomme was accompanied by two «*underkobmaend*», an Englishman called Marmadike and Hans Nansen from Flensburg, who was more experienced than any other in the trade of Northern Russia. It was in 1614 that he, aged 15, had made his first sea voyage to Russia, accompanying his uncle of the same name, and he stayed on Kola for a year in order to learn Russian. Other voyages followed, one of them for the burgomaster of Elsinore, Peder Svendsen, in 1618.⁷⁵ Unfortunately the ship, the 'St. Michael', which left Copenhagen in June 1619, did not reach the Petchora region but had to winter on Kola where the merchants were arrested. Another expedition of the 'St. Michael' in 1620 also failed, and the ship only reached Archangel. In the meantime the xenophobic attitude of the Russians increased, and the Siberian sea route was not only forbidden to foreigners but in 1623 even to Russians themselves. The Petchora company was obliged to disband. King Christian tried to compensate himself by arranging an expedition to the coast of Lapland which robbed the Danes of any further chances.⁷⁶ Nevertheless business continued. An important and active merchant in the Russian trade was Albert Baltzer Berns from Copenhagen who

⁷² Rigsarkiv, Copenhagen, Registrant over søpasser 1618-1653, pp. 5, 11, 17.

⁷³ Cf. DALGÅRD, *Det Petsoriske Kompagni*, p. 36 seq.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 48 seq.

⁷⁶ DALGÅRD, *Det Petsoriske Kompagni*, p. 58 seq.

had a partnership with Gabriel Marselis, whose daughter he married. Thanks to the political *rapprochement* between Denmark and Russia, Berns was able, with Danish protection, to take part in the export of Russian grain for several years after 1627. In 1631 Berns settled in Hamburg to strengthen his partnership with the Marselis.⁷⁷

It is very difficult to obtain a clear impression of the extent to which the Norwegians, who were the nearest to the Dvina estuary, participated in its trade. We know from the history of Bergen and Trondheim that the Norwegians themselves took part in this navigation which was for them no more than an extension of the Northern routes which they had been using for generations.⁷⁸ and so we find traces of them in Russian trade very soon after the advent of the English.⁷⁹ In 1629 a company for Russian trade was founded at Bergen. Its most important members were Crijn Hooft, Rasmus Lauritzen and Sander Jansen. The company was founded specifically to trade in grain and in fish from Finnmark, to supply provisions for Vardøhus and other Norwegian ports and to exploit the market in Western Europe. David Ruts, an experienced representative of the Dutch houses, was the agent of the company and the business continued for some years. As the name Ruts indicates, this Bergen group must have been in close collaboration with the Marselis and Berns.⁸⁰ The Dutch interest in these Norwegian ports was very great.⁸¹ Like Hooft, Jan de Noquer settled in Trondheim. He also came from Amsterdam where he had loaded ships for

⁷⁷ Holland-Danmark, Forbindelserne mellem de to lande gennem tiderne, under redaction af Knud Fabricius, L. L. Hammerich og Vilh. Lorenzen II, Copenhagen 1945, p. 403 seq.; AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 71 seq.

⁷⁸ JOHAN SCHREINER, *Hanseaten og Norge i det 16. århundre*, Oslo 1941, pp. 18, 64 seq.

⁷⁹ Cf. the contract between Antonius Nilsson of Bergen and Kristoffern Robertus of London (1557): OSCAR ALBERT JOHNSEN, *Et traek af den dansk-norske regjerings handelspolitik under Kristian III og Frederik II*, in « Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandlinger for 1903 », No. 3. Heinrich von Staden knew Severin and Michael Falcke of Bergen, whom he had met at Novye Cholmogory: HEINRICH VON STADEN, *Aufzeichnungen über den Moskauer Staat*, ed. by Fritz Epstein, Hamburg 1930, p. 151 seq.

⁸⁰ Cf. p. 12 and AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 72 seq.

⁸¹ DAGNY JØRGENSEN, *Cryn Crynsh. Hooft, En storkjøpmann i Bergen på 1600-tallet*, in « Bergens Historiske Forening », Skrifter Nr. 53, 1947, Bergen 1948, p. 227 seq.

Archangel.⁸² One must also remember that the Norwegian ports, like Archangel, formed part of the network of routes used by the whaling fleets.⁸³

Let us summarize the first phase of sea traffic at Archangel. The new route soon became the gateway for Russian trade with the West, particularly after the Swedes had left Narva in 1581. The number of ships calling at the port of Archangel rose constantly. In 1582 there were 9 English and 6 Hollander ships, in 1618 43 ships arrived, among them only three English, while in 1630 100 Hollander ships and some English ships came from Archangel, and in 1638 the number rose to 80 Hollander and 4 English ships.⁸⁴ The traffic reached a peak during years when there was a good market in Western Europe for cereals, as there was towards the end of the 16th century, in the years around 1610, and during the period from 1630 to 1650.⁸⁵ To these can be added a few Scottish ships,⁸⁶ the ship-masters from France, Bremen, Hamburg etc. In the mid 17th century, according to Russian claims, 75% of Russian foreign trade passed through the port of Archangel,⁸⁷ so the new route flourished to the disadvantage of previous Russian communications with the Baltic. On the route between Moscow where trade was centred and the port on the White Sea, other centres in

⁸² BJØRN SOGNER, *Trondheim Bys historie II, Kjøpstad og Stiftsstad 1537-1807*, Trondheim 1962, pp. 65, 93; DALGÅRD, *Dansk-norsk hvalfangst*, p. 273.

⁸³ Cf. LUDWIG BRINNER, *Die deutsche Grönlandfahrt*, Berlin 1913, and the works of WANDA OESAU: *Schleswig-Holsteins Grönlandfahrt auf Walfischfang und Robbensschlag vom 17.-19. Jh.*, Glückstadt 1937, and *Hamburgs Grönlandfahrt auf Walfischfang und Robbensschlag vom 17.-19. Jh.*, Glücksstadt 1955; HERMANN KELLENBENZ, *Die westeuropäische Konkurrenz in der Nordmeerfahrt bis ins 17. Jh.*, in « Vierteljahrschrift f. Sozial- u. Wirtschaftsgeschichte » 47, 1960, pp. 474-497.

⁸⁴ PER NYSTRÖM, *Mercatura Ruthenica*, in « Scandia », 1937, p. 249 seq.; ATTMAN, *The Russian and Polish markets*, p. 86, gives a list which gives a different figure for 1582.

⁸⁵ ARNE OHBERG, *Russia and the World Market in the Seventeenth Century; a discussion of the connection between prices and trade routes*, in « The Scandinavian Economic History Review » III, 1955; « Očerki istorii SSSR », XVII v., Moscow 1955, p. 131 seq.

⁸⁶ BANG, *Til Narva-Handelens Historie i det 16de Aarhundrede*, p. 557: A Scotsman in 1584.

⁸⁷ A. G. HASSO, *Den danske Regering og Koffardifarten nord om Norge i det 16. Aarhundrede*, « Hist. Tidsskrift », 10. R., 2, 1932-34, p. 59; A. C. MERZON and J. A. TICHONOV, *Rynok Ustjuga Velikogo v period skladyvanija vserossijskogo rynka (XVII vek)*, Moscow 1960, p. 30 seq.; W. V. CEREPNIN, *Russian 17th-Century Baltic Trade in Soviet Historiography*, in « The Slavonic and East European Review » 43, 1964/65, p. 3.

Northern Russia gained in importance, for example Jaroslavl, Vologda, Ustjuk and Cholmogory. The King of Denmark showed no hesitation in compensating for his losses in customs duties collected for the passage through Öresund from the '80s of the 16th Century onwards by requiring passparts from foreigners who passed « *nord om Vardøhus* ». An agreement drawn up between Denmark and the Muscovy company in 1583 stipulated an annual sum of 100 rosenobles payable by the company to the King of Denmark.⁸⁸ It seems that the French paid 2 rosenobles for each ship, while the price varied for the Danes and other nations.⁸⁹ However probably only part of the total sea traffic was controlled by the Danes.⁹⁰

The Swedes were also interested in these new shipping activities and even in gaining possessions in Lapland. The King of Denmark successfully opposed the claims of Jean III and Charles IX to blockade Archangel and to share the sovereignty over the coast of the Glacial Sea.⁹¹ Plans for a Swedish expedition to pass the Northern coast of Norway in 1607 came to nothing.⁹²

Some time later Charles granted immigrant Hollanders a privilege with regard to the new settlement at the mouth of the Göta-älv, Göteborg, which allowed them to trade in Lapland and to sail beyond-Norway and Vardö to Archangel and also to fish in the Northern Sea.⁹³

These privileges aroused the anger of the King of Denmark, since they served to damage customs revenue at Elsinore.⁹⁴ Little is known of Swedish shipping at Archangel, but in any case it happened that in view of the staple policy practised by the town of Reval, the only gateway to Russia on the Baltic, the Swedes were obliged to import Russian grain by the Archangel route for

⁸⁸ SVEN ULRIC PALME, *Sverige och Danmark 1596-1611*, Uppsala 1942, pp. 425 seq., 479 seq.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 87 seq., 425 seq., 479 seq.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 535.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 536.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 538.

⁹³ NYSTRÖM, *Mercatura Ruthenica*, p. 261.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 606; NINA F. ELLINGER BANG, *Til Narva-Handelens Historie i det 16de Aarhundrede*, in « *Historisk Tidsskrift* » 7. R. 2, 1899/1900, p. 556.

some time.⁹⁵ This also had its political significance. After the peace of Lübeck, Moscow's interest in Denmark as a partner cooled while Gustav Adolf of Sweden obtained new opportunities, as he was now the opponent of the Habsburg group. Thus between 1628 and 1630 the Swedish king became a major purchaser of Russian grain. He made use of the assistance of Hollander merchants and of his commissaire Johann Möller, who resided at Archangel and later settled in Moscow.⁹⁶

The failure of their policy in the Glacial Sea and the difficulties caused by the policy practised by Reval, which strengthened its position by ensuring the closure of customs houses at Reval, Narva, Helsingfors and Borgå led the Swedes to adopt a new policy.⁹⁷ They decided to attract the merchants of Western Europe, the Hollanders and the French, by issuing privileges for trading with Russia through Narva, Nyen, a recently discovered port on the Neva, and Reval. During the '40s Narva and Nyen were consistently protected as well as Reval in order that the great merchants might gather there; in 1648 they obtained the right to trade on a large scale for the whole year with these townsmen, on the basis of «*gast mit gast*» trade. A new customs tax completed these measures. Henceforward Reval again lost her monopoly of Baltic trade with Russia.⁹⁸ Such experienced persons as Isaac Massa and Antoni Bröijer acted as propagandists for Sweden. A collection was also made of documents on Archangel trade. The first document in a series of collections of statistical material on Archangel trade is preserved in the Swedish State Archives and dates from the year 1642. It was probably written by the Swedish resident in Moscow Peter Krusebjörn and sent to the Swedish Privy Council. Another from 1653 was made by the Swedish agent Johan de Rodes. Attman analysed them recently. He showed that more than half of Archangel's exports consisted of leather, skins and furs. Then

⁹⁵ «*Očerki Istorii SSSR*», XVII v., p. 131.

⁹⁶ AMBURGER, *Die Familie Marselis*, p. 73 seq.

⁹⁷ NYSTRÖM, *Mercatura Ruthenica*, p. 262 seq.; ARNOLD SOOM, *Die Politik Schwedens und die baltischen Städte im 17. Jahrhundert*, in «*Verhandlungen der Gelehrten Estnischen Gesellschaft*» 30, Tartu 1940; Id., *Der Handel Revels im 17. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden 1969, p. 160 seq.

⁹⁸ NYSTRÖM, *Mercatura Ruthenica*, p. 264 seq.

came tallow. Attman stresses that these goods considerably declined in the Sound's customs accounts after 1570. Wax played a minor part, hemp declined and then disappeared, as did flax. These goods came now from the Baltic ports. Grain was only exported when prices were high in Western Europe. An interesting transit good was silk from Northern Persia, especially when there were difficulties on the Aleppo-route or on the part of the Dutch East India Company.

On the import side de Rodes mentioned « cloth, silk, damask, velvet, gold and silver thread, gold and silver lace, « posamenten », wool shagreens, fancy goods from Nuremberg, groceries, dyes (indigo, brasil), copper, brass, iron wire and sheet-iron. But we must not omit other goods of the rich Western European warehouses such as paper, spices, wine, sugar, pearls and precious stones, and coins, not only Western European coins, but denigi, too, which were made, for instance, at the lower Elbe. This leads us to the problem of the balance of trade. From the information of de Rodes it can be seen that « a balance was reached in the trade of Archangel through the import of precious metals ».⁹⁹

The Russians themselves attempted, during a certain period when the Dvina route was open, and Narva was in their possession, to open up direct trade with the West, but these attempts were brought to an end by the loss of Narva.¹⁰⁰ The technical standard and commercial experience of the Russian merchants were

⁹⁹ ARTUR ATTMAN, *Den ryska marknaden i 1500- talets baltiska politik 1558-1595*, Lund 1944, p. 58 seq.; Id., *The Russian and Polish markets*, pp. 84 seq., 151 seq.; W. GREIFFENHAGEN, *Archangel als Handelconcurrentin Revels*, in « Beiträge zur Kunde Ehot-, Liv-, und Kurlands » IV, Reval 1894, p. 164 seq; KULISCHER, *Russische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, München und Berlin 1929; G. HATZ, *Denninge...*; N. N. REPIN, *K vo-prosu o svjazi vnešnego i vnutrennego rynka Rossii vo vtoroj polovine XVII- pjervej četverti XVIII v. (po materialam Archangelskogo porta)*, in « Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta » IX, Istorija 1970, 6, p. 58 seq.; A. SOOM, *Die Politik Schwedens bezüglich des russischen Transithandels über die estnischen Städte in den Jahren 1636-1656*, Dorpat 1940; E. D. RUCHMANOVA, *Russko-švedskaja trgovlja na Baltike v seredine XVII veka*, in « Skandinavskij sbornik » II, Tallin 1957. Silk through Archangel: on the 15th of December 1635 N. Jacobsz. Overschie wrote to the Dutch East India Company from Ispahan that 60 carga of silk were sent « via Astrachan and Archangel »; H. DUNLOP (ed.), *Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis der Oostindische Compagnie in Perzië*, I, 'sGravenhage 1930, p. 546 seq.

¹⁰⁰ WALTHER KIRCHNER, *Über den russischen Aussenhandel zu Beginn der Neuzeit*, in « Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte » 42, 1955, p. 49 seq.

not sufficient to maintain such activities successfully. Or perhaps they thought it was much more advantageous to await the merchants in their own country, as the Northern kings had done throughout the Middle Ages, because these foreigners brought all they needed and bought everything they wanted to sell.¹⁰¹ One section of the catalogue of goods bought and sold at Archangel by the great Russian merchants shows us the example of the *gost* Vassiliji Šorin for the years 1645 and 1646.¹⁰²

III.

We shall now trace the second phase which began in about the mid 17th century and continued up to the foundation of St. Petersburg, Russia's new gateway to the Baltic Sea. For some decades the English had really bad luck. We have mentioned that in 1649 the English lost their positions in the interior of Russia¹⁰³ and suffered great material losses. But the *ukas* of 1649 was not too strictly observed and several of the Englishmen were able to adapt themselves. In 1678 Hebdon obtained authority for 10 English merchants to come to Moscow to trade. But in any case the «*novotorgovij ustav*» of 1667 with its 94 paragraphs favoured the «*gosti*», among them several Hollanders and Germans, while the steady decline of the English was emphasised. The Muscovy Company which had had the English monopoly ceased activity in 1660, and the joint stock was abandoned in 1669 to continue as a regulated company.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore the loss of 1666 was very harmful. As in Baltic trade, raw materials were sought at Archangel, particularly

¹⁰¹ ARSEL E. CHRISTENSEN, *Danmarks Handel i middelalderen*, in «Nordisk Kultur», XVI: 'Handel og samfaerdsel', Copenhagen 1934, p. 123 seq.; TOM SÖDERBERG, *Sveriges handel under medeltiden*, *ibid.*, p. 157 seq.; ELI F. HECKSCHER, *Svensk arbete och liv, från medeltiden till nutiden*, Stockholm 1941, p. 85 seq.

¹⁰² JOSEF KULISCHER, *Russische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Jena 1925, p. 340.

¹⁰³ RAMSAY, *English Overseas Trade during the Centuries of Emergence*, p. 114; LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques entre l'Angleterre et la Russie*, p. 257 seq.

¹⁰⁴ SCOTT, *The Constitution of English, Scottish, Irish Joint-stock Companies to 1720*, II, pp. 36-39; E. V. ČISTIJKOVA, *Novotorgovij ustav*, in «Archeografičeskij čžegodnik za 1937 god», 1958.

ship building materials: hemp, tar, masts, twine and also potash,¹⁰⁵ while the export of cloth stagnated. To buy such goods it was necessary to liquidate the unfavourable balance of trade with hard cash, dollars and ducats and jewels. Although the sum increased during the '80s the relative percentage was low in terms of the total volume of exports.¹⁰⁶ In this sense Russian trade was always peripheral to the payment system operating in Western Europe. The custom of drawing bills of exchange on one of the great credit centres (Amsterdam, Hamburg, London) appeared in Moscow and Archangel only during the 18th century.¹⁰⁷ In 1666 Richard Graunt attempted, in the name of Jean Hebdon, the most important merchant of the whole group, to purchase the monopolies in masts and tar, but he came up against competition from the Hollanders. The number of English ships remained restricted; in 1658 there were only 4 English vessels among 80 ships of other nationalities.¹⁰⁸ A document of 1667 mentioned 32-35 foreign boats at Archangel, 9 of which were from Hamburg and Bremen and the rest from Holland. In 1669 there were only 2 English merchants in Moscow and 4 ships visited Archangel. In 1673 and 1674, 2 and 3 English ships respectively returned from Russia; in the following year English trade was said to be in complete decline.¹⁰⁹ The merchants contented themselves with 2 routes: London - Archangel; London - Archangel - Leghorn.

By 1681 the number of members of the company had fallen to 31; in 1698 there were only 20.¹¹⁰ One of the shortcomings of the company was its exclusive policy, refusing admission to those who had not served members of the company as apprentices. These « Outsiders » had permission to visit Narva, but not the port of Archangel. Their opponents said that the company had

¹⁰⁵ OHBERG, *Russia and the World Market in the 17th Century*, pp. 129-132, 145, 149.

¹⁰⁶ ÅSTRÖM, *From Cloth to Iron*, I, pp. 82, 110.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 105 seq.

¹⁰⁸ « Očerki Istorii SSSR », XVII v., p. 132.

¹⁰⁹ LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques entre l'Angleterre et la Russie*, p. 266 seq. The situation at that time cf. S. KONOVALOV, *England and Russia: Two Missions, 1666-1668*, in « Oxford Slavonic Papers » 13, 1967.

¹¹⁰ ÅSTRÖM, *From Cloth to Iron*.

sent only 6-9 ships to Archangel during the latter years while the Hollanders sent 10 to 50, the Hamburgers 6-8 and merchants from Lübeck and Bremen some others.¹¹¹

It was only towards the end of the century that English shipping to Archangel began to increase again, when attempts were made to conquer the Russian market for American tobacco.¹¹² A new interest was shown in articles exported from Archangel, masts for example, but this was late compared with the Hollanders and others who were in possession of contracts giving them a monopoly over all ship-masts.¹¹³ There were long discussions, which first collapsed in 1698, occupying Parliament and the House of Lords as well as the Board of Trade. But in any case the group began to send tobacco to Archangel (making a detour by way of Holland, 110,000 lbs.) and to Narva (180,000 lbs.) the Swedish port.¹¹⁴ In the meantime another Parliament, in which 5 members of the group were represented (instead of the 2 in the «House» of 1695-1698) helped to pass an Act «to enlarge the trade with Russia» in 1699.¹¹⁵ On the 14th April 1699 73 individuals were admitted to the Muscovy Company: some were the holders of contracts for trade in «Virginia tobacco», and some were members of the Eastland Company. The Heathcote brothers, Nathaniel Gould and William Dawson were its leaders. In spite of the appearance of these new members the former governor, Sir Benjamin Aglaffe, was able to keep his position and the merchants who had dominated the Archangel trade were not ousted from their influential position in the import of hemp. Unfortunately the documents of the «Russian Tobacco Company» have not been preserved. In any case we know that the exports were to the value of 1,450,000 livres in 1700. The most attractive business became the combina-

¹¹¹ JACOB M. PRICE, *The Tobacco Adventure to Russia: Enterprise, Politics and Diplomacy in the Quest for a Northern Market for English Colonial Tobacco, 1676-1722*, «Transactions of the American Philosophical Society», N.S. vol. 51, part 1, p. 28 seq.; LUBIMENKO, *Les relations commerciales et politiques entre l'Angleterre et la Russie*, p. 196, speaks of 2-3 ships.

¹¹² PRICE, *The Tobacco Adventure to Russia*, p. 39.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46; ASTRÖM, *From Cloth to Iron*, I, p. 185.

tion of such exports with the importing of 'naval stores', especially hemp. Archangel remained the main port for this commodity, while flax was exported in greater quantities through the Baltic ports. It was only from 1702 that flax was exported through Archangel. Pitch and tar came predominantly from Scandinavia and the Baltic together, with masts and other wooden articles. Russian exports of pitch, tar and potash remained on the whole in the hands of the Hollanders and of one English merchant, Henry Stiles, who was a member of the Muscovy Company before its reform; he now became associated with the Hollander merchants and directed his ships exclusively to Holland on their return journey.

After the beginning of the Northern War English trade with Russia changed direction and was no longer carried through the Baltic but to Archangel. During the following years the 'tobacco contractors' assumed an important role in the hemp trade, particularly Edward Haistwell & Co.¹¹⁶ According to Marperger the number of English ships leaving for Archangel annually rose to 20 or 30; in 1701 33 of the 103 ships at Archangel were English. According to Le Brun 68 English ships arrived at Archangel in 1708, protected by 5 convoy ships.¹¹⁷ 3/8 of the hemp exported through Archangel was controlled by members of the company; the 'Navy Board' was one of their important purchasers.¹¹⁸

After the English privileges had been revoked in 1649 the predominance of the Hollanders in the trade with Archangel was ensured for decades, and we have seen, thanks to the studies by Price and Hart, how large a number of Hollander ships left for Archangel every year. There were, of course, fluctuations: Cromwell's «Navigation Act», the wars between England and Holland, and between France and Holland, created great difficulties. With the new regime of 1667 the situation changed little, but certainly

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 49. Concerning hemp: there is some contradiction between PRICE and ASTRÖM, *From Cloth to Iron I*, p. 39 seq. and ATTMAN, *The Russian and Polish markets*, p. 92.

¹¹⁷ LE BRUN, *Voyage par la Russie*, II, Amsterdam 1718, p. 431.

¹¹⁸ MARPERGER, *Moscowitischer Kaufmann*, p. 50.

the number of vessels fell from about 60 to 22 in 1669. The Hollanders made the voyage in two squadrons, one in June with 5-6 ships, the other in July with about 30 ships. Competition from the English and French had almost totally ceased. Some of these ships also traded directly with Italy. The reign of Czar Feodor brought some difficult years (1676-1682) and in 1681 only 26 ships visited Archangel.¹¹⁹ According to Marperger the number of ships averaged between 30 and 40 a year.¹²⁰ They now carried the following articles to Archangel: silk and woollen materials, fine linens, paper, haberdashery, copper, lead, tin, wine, brandy, sugar, syrup, oil, vinegar, spices, salted herrings, dyes, glass, gold and silver thread, passementerie, fine cloths, guns and other goods. Furthermore, they brought a great deal of money with them because Russia exported increasing quantities of goods needed by Western mercers. Like the English, the Hollanders bought hides ('*Juchten*'), furs, tallow, hemp, flax, caviar, wax, beaver skins, potash, honey and salted meat.¹²¹ The Savary documents give us some idea of French trade. He mentions among French goods exported to Muscovy: salt, Bordeaux and Anjou wines, brandy and vinegar, syrups, cider vinegar, confectionery, dried plums and pears, saffron, white and grey paper, bleached linens, fustians, thick cloth and other medium-weight materials from Rouen and Caen, beaver skins from Canada, rings, trinkets (of low value) and worked gold and silver. The most common of all the goods carried from France to Moscovy was Canadian beaver. The Muscovites spun the beaver wool which they then resold to the Hollanders and English who sold them in France. Paper was also a major French commodity; more than 8,000 reams were sold every year not counting the paper brought in from Germany, which was not however of such good quality. Other goods sold were indigo, chemicals, spices, household and work utensils, dried plums and other dried fruits. Savary also reproached the French for their caution in Nordic trade. In his opinion, if the French had seriously

¹¹⁹ DIFEREE, *De Geschiedenis van den nederlandchen handel*, p. 375 seq.

¹²⁰ MARPERGER, *Moscowitischer Kaufmann*, p. 217.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

wanted to trade with the North and with Muscovy, they could have done so as successfully as the Hollanders and the English, and even better, for most of the goods carried there came from France itself, while most of those purchased were sold and consumed in France, too.¹²²

In October 1674 J. Lillienhof sent an account to the Swedish Board of Trade. According to it in the first years of the 1670's 45 ships sailed from Archangel, 30 of them were from Amsterdam, 8 from Hamburg, 2 from England and 2 from Emden. According to Savary the merchants of Hamburg and Bremen traded at Archangel, but by no means to the same extent as the Hollanders. The former sent only 4 or 5 ships there a year, and the latter 1 or 2.¹²³ According to Witzendorff, trade between Bremen and Archangel was very limited, and in 1665 they were still importing only small quantities of rye from Archangel to Bremen, although it was a year of shortage.¹²⁴

By the late 17th century the term « *Grönland- und Moscowienfabrer* » used at Bremen referred to those who undertook voyages toward the North, but they were not organized on a regular basis.¹²⁵ There is more information available on Hamburg's participation in shipping at Archangel in this period. To safeguard this shipping the Hamburg merchants obtained the protection of a convoy that was established in 1662 (similar to that used by those travelling from the Iberian Peninsula and the Mediterranean) paying ½ to 1% as convoy charges. It appears that they used this protection for the first time in 1675.¹²⁶ This convoy also accompanied ships going on whaling expeditions to Spitzbergen. After waiting for one or two months in that area they would return again together. To avoid the inconveniences involved in this system, the ships companies bound for Archangel formed their own association in

¹²² SAVARY, *Le parfait négociant*, p. 105 seq.; cf. also WALTHER KIRCHNER, *Franco-Russian Economic Relations in the Eighteenth Century*, in « Commercial Relations between Russia and Europe », p. 157 seq.

¹²³ SAVARY, *ibid.*

¹²⁴ WITZENDORFF, in « *Bremisches Jahrbuch* » 44, 1955, p. 145.

¹²⁵ BRINNER, *Die deutsche Grönlandfahrt*, p. 379 seq.

¹²⁶ ERNST BAASCH, *Hamburgs Convoysschifahrt und Convoywesen*, Hamburg 1896, p. 121 seq.

1704. In periods of war, especially in the nineties, Buxtehude as well as Stade served the Hamburg merchants, and masters from Hamburg used Swedish, that is, neutral ports for their expeditions to Archangel. Mostly these ships went from Archangel to Italy, especially Leghorn or Genova, and then returned to the Elbe or went to the Baltic.^{126a}

During this period Claes Wild, Jürgen Greve, Frans van Som, Lucas Beckmann, Johann Hinning and Arnold Verpoorten were the most active of the group.

Some of the ships' companies at Archangel were also owners of ships bound for Greenland and merchants trading with the Iberian Peninsula and the Mediterranean, as in Holland. Among them the Mennonites, some of whom lived at Altona, formed a special group.¹²⁸

The most remarkable people were the Roosens.¹²⁹ Hermann Roosen (1627-1696) made his first voyage to Archangel at the age of 15 in 1642 and on subsequent voyages travelled as far as Vologda and Moscow. His son Paul lived at Archangel for several years after 1701, probably as the agent or representative of his brother Hermann (1672-1736). The great fire of Altona destroyed much of the latter's property. In any case his sons Berend (1705-1788) and Salomon Roosen (1717-1759) also became great Russian merchants.

Because of difficulties in the Baltic during the Northern War shipping in the White Sea increased; in 1701 there were 20 ships from Hamburg, Denmark and Bremen among the 103 ships calling at Archangel. The following year there were 18 from Hamburg. In 1708 18 ships from Hamburg again arrived at Archangel and were protected by a Hamburg convoy.¹³⁰ It was precisely these

^{126a} CLAUS TIEDEMANN, *Die Schiffahrt des Herzogtums zur Schwedenzeit (1645-1712)*, Stade 1970, pp. 49, 128, 129, 135, 136, 137, 140, 141, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹²⁸ B. C. ROOSEN, *Geschichte der Mennonitengemeinde zu Hamburg und Altona*, 1886/87; OESAU, *Hamburgs Grönlandfahrt auf Walfischfang und Robbenschlach*.

¹²⁹ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland*, p. 244 seq.; B. C. ROOSEN, *Geschichte unseres Hauses*, 1905.

¹³⁰ LE BRUN, *Voyage par la Russie*, II, p. 432.

difficult years in the Glacial Sea during the Nordic War that led a group of Hamburg merchants to form, in 1703, a «*Gesellschaft der auf Archangel (or 'nach Moscowien') handelnden Kaufleute*». Of these the most important was a group of about 30.¹³¹

The assistance of a convoy ship was necessary for defence against the French and Swedish pirates who harrassed shipping. The necessary condition for the association was the financing of such a ship. Thus the association concluded a contract with the convoy organizers in 1704 in order to obtain the protection of a warship for the sum of 10,000 thalers. During the years that followed the sum varied between 5,000 and 8,000 thalers.¹³²

Marperger mentions that ships from Hamburg, like those from Lübeck, carried cloth, guns, brass articles, fine linens, silver plate from Augsburg, gold and silver thread from Milan, Nuremberg and Hamburg, wigs, articles from Nuremberg, mirrors, paper, wines, indigo, Italian taffeta, damask and satin to Archangel.¹³³

Little more is known about Lübeck trade. Marperger calls the Lübeck merchants participants,¹³⁴ and according to him they despatched their goods on Hamburg ships. In 1655 a ship went directly from Lübeck to Archangel¹³⁵ and in 1657 the registers of the Sound mention a ship returning from this Nordic port. Another ship made the voyage in 1708 and returned two years later from the direction of Bergen. Of course the Baltic route, and especially

¹³¹ Philipp Bartels, Lucas Beckmann, Jürgen Behrens, Peter Bostel, Ebert Joachim Deginck, Hans Paul Dimpfel, Hinrich Matthias Ferber, Philipp Matthias Ferber, Hermann Goverts, Gerd Goverts, Berend Greve, Peter Greve, Philipp Hinrich Kugelmann, Jean de Lannoy, Lütken & Dunte, Thomas Mancken, Franz Poppe, Hinrich Prehn, Philipp Schreiber, Hinrich von Som, Lorenz Thiele, Johann Thomas, Arnold Verpoorten, Jan Karel & Bernhard de Vlieger, Michael Vess et Peter Wolers. The others, of lesser importance, were according to Menke, p. 241: Ulrich Ackermann, Joh. Jakob Cohrs, Georg Forster, Claes Hintz, Johann Hönig, Daniel & Hans Ludwig Iselin, Dominicus von Jerusalem, Hans Philipp Manegold, Joachim Marzburg, Carlo Matti, Nathanael Remington, Pieter et Dominicus Riga, Cord Rohde, Georg Schröder, Heinrich Schwartz, Franz Straatford, Abraham de Veer, Claes Wold.

¹³² BAASCH, *Hamburgs Convoyschifahrt*, p. 133.

¹³³ MARPERGER, *Der Moscovitische Kaufmann*, p. 219 seq.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ ELISABETH HARDER, *Seehandel zwischen Lübeck und Russland*, p. 81; NINA ELLINGER-BANG and KNUD KORST, *Tabeller over Skibsart og Varetransport gennem Oresund 1661-1783*, Copenhagen 1930; WALTHER VOGEL, *Beiträge zur Statistik der deutschen Seeschifahrt im 17. und 18. Jhd.*, in «*Hansische Geschichtsblätter*», 1928.

the Narva route, was of much greater importance than that of Archangel,¹³⁶ and only very rarely was a ship from Wismar or Danzig to be found.¹³⁷ Danes also continued to visit Archangel, but were few in number. In 1708 there were 3.¹³⁸ According to the registers of the Öresund there were 4 ships from Copenhagen.¹³⁹ Obviously the Norwegians, and particularly those from Bergen and Trondheim, always benefitted from their favourable position. In Bergen the Company for Russian trade, which was established in 1629, and disbanded probably in about 1640, was re-established in 1649, at a time when there was a good market for grain.¹⁴⁰

In the second half of the 17th century the enterprising merchants of Trondheim, like Lorents Mortensen Angell, Albert Angell, Jens Hansen Collin and « *borgermester* » Hagerup, sent their ships to Archangel. In 1714 an « *Archangelsk Handels-Compagnie* » was established at Trondheim and one of its members made a voyage to Archangel. During the following 8 or 9 years 4 or 5 ships regularly made the voyage.¹⁴¹

During the second half of the 17th century shipping fluctuated between about 47 and 80 ships,¹⁴² because of various wars. During the Northern War there was a remarkable increase in this figure. The Hollanders dominated shipping increasingly. Apart from the direct routes between London-Amsterdam or Hamburg-Archangel there was always the additional opportunity to visit an Atlantic port, be it in Spain, Portugal or in the Mediterranean on their return from Archangel.¹⁴³ During the second half of the 17th cen-

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, passim.

¹³⁷ NINA ELLINGER-BANG and KORST, *Tabeller over Skibsstart og Varetransport* (1664, 1665: Wismar; 1699: Danzig).

¹³⁸ LE BRUN, *Voyage par la Russie*, II, p. 432.

¹³⁹ NINA ELLINGER-BANG and KORST, *Tabeller over Skibsstart og Varetransport*.

¹⁴⁰ JØRGENSEN, *Cryn Crynsh. Hooft*, p. 227.

¹⁴¹ HENRY BERG, *Trondhjems sjøfart under enevældet 1660-1814*, Hefte Trondheim 1938 (Trondhjems Sjøfartsmuseums Arsskrift 1938), p. 108.

¹⁴² TEÓFILO GUIARD Y LARRAURI, *Historia del Consulado y Casa de Contratación de Bilbao y del comercio de la villa*, II, Bilbao 1914, p. 277. Next to Riga, Libau and St. Petersburg « aparece mencionada excepcionalmente, primer tercio del siglo XVIII, la procedencia Arcangel ». « En despacho de 2 de Enero de 1714 se lee registrado un navio que bino del puerto de Arcangel en la Russia de Moscovia ».

¹⁴³ « *Očerki Istorii SSSR* », XVII v., p. 132.

tury, too, Archangel could maintain its positive trade balance. On the line of de Rodes' report J. Ph. Kilburger published extracts from the customs books in Archangel for the years 1671, 1672 and 1673. Among the imported goods we find, besides pearls, precious stones, articles in gold and silver, considerable sums of ducats and riksdalers in specie as well as Russian coins. At that time the customs duty had to be paid in ducats or riksdalers. Moreover Savary mentions that Western Europeans paid half in goods, half in money. According to Oddy in the years 1691-1700 Archangel imported from England on average £58,881 and exported £112,250.^{143a}

IV.

The third part of our study begins with the end of the great Northern War, when the Russian government made great efforts to attract shipping to St. Petersburg; from 1713 measures were taken to attract trade to the Neva. In 1721 Peter the Great made all foreigners transfer their banking accounts to St. Petersburg. For some decades the Archangel route declined to the advantage of the Baltic.

In 1724 the number of ships leaving St. Petersburg and Riga rose to 102 and 197 respectively, while only 22 left Archangel. The corresponding figures for 1755 are 302, 361 and 48; for 1760 they are 205, 342 and 37. In the following year only 44 ships arrived at Archangel and 40 left the port.¹⁴⁴ But in 1762 Archangel obtained all the advantages conceded to St. Petersburg;¹⁴⁵ consequently the number of ships visiting the port rose again. In 1763 55 ships left the port; while in 1770 there were 72, in 1766 126. In 1780 the number rose to 143, in 1794 there were 207 and in

^{143a} « Očerki Istorii SSSR », XVII v., p. 132; ATTMAN, *The Russian and Polish markets*, pp. 152 seq., 173; J. J. ODDY, *European commerce*, London 1805, p. 94.

¹⁴⁴ BUSCHING, *Neue Erdbeschreibung*, p. 31. Cf., too: HERMANN KELLENBENZ, *Marchands en Russie aux XVII^e-XVIII^e siècles*, in « Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique », vols. XI, 1970, pp. 576-620, and XII, 1971, pp. 76-109.

¹⁴⁵ SAMUEL RICARDS, *Handbuch der Kaufleute oder allgemeine Übersicht und Bereicherung des Handels der vorschunsten europäischen Staaten etc.*, übersetzt von Th. H. Gadebusch, I, 2, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, Greifswald 1791, p. 304 seq.

1802 the number of ships leaving the port was 236. However at the same time one must not forget the growing attraction of the ports of St. Petersburg and Riga. During the same period the number of ships leaving St. Petersburg and Riga rose from 205 to 1,053 (in 1798) and from 487 to 1,128 (in 1802) respectively.¹⁴⁶

The English were among those who did not hesitate to abandon the Archangel route for the Baltic. In 1734 they again obtained a privileged position by means of a treaty. Unfortunately the published sources on English trade with Russia generally give very little detail on Archangel. Its share remained modest compared with the importance of English activity at St. Petersburg and the other Baltic ports,¹⁴⁷ and of the 24 houses established at Archangel in 1764 only a few were English.¹⁴⁸

The Hollanders maintained their supremacy in the port of the Dvina longest. Of the houses that had factors at Archangel the van Brienen house should be mentioned.¹⁴⁹

Until 1770 the number of ships returning from Archangel was generally lower than the number from St. Petersburg. From 1770 Archangel won a new supremacy which reached a peak in 1772 (63 as against 36), but some years later St. Petersburg regained its position (1779: St. Petersburg 71, Archangel 20).¹⁵⁰ Like the English, the French preferred the Baltic to the Archangel routes after 1721, but only a few of the great commercial houses, like Godin & Cie of Rouen, were involved in Russian trade. At St. Petersburg and Moscow French houses, like de Vernezobre & Cie,

¹⁴⁶ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte in Russland*, p. 118.

¹⁴⁷ DIETRICH GERHARD, *England und der Aufstieg Russland*, Munich and Berlin 1933; J. JEPSON ODDY, *European Commerce showing new and secure Channels of Trade with the Continent of Europe*, London 1805; H. STORCH, *Historisch-Statistisches Gemälde des russischen Reiches am Ende des 18. Jhds.*, 1-8 and a supplementary volume, Leipzig and Riga 1797-1803; DOUGLAS K. READING, *The Anglo-Russian Commercial Treaty of 1734*, New Haven 1938; I. A. NIKIFOROV, *Russko-angliiskie otnošenija pri Petre I*, Moscow 1950, p. 106 seq.

¹⁴⁸ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland*, p. 115.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹⁵⁰ VAN BRAKEL, *Staatistische gegevens betreffende onzen handel en scheepvaart op Russland*, p. 385 seq.

Baudouin, Petit & Cie as well as the Michel and Raimbert Company were to be found and were described by W. Kirchner.¹⁵¹ But there were only a few French ships making the voyage and the number destined for French ports rose only to 40 in the 1740s. In 1773 of the 682 foreign ships arriving at St. Petersburg 75 came from France, while of the 674 which set sail only 34 were bound for French ports,¹⁵² but generally the French sent hardly 20 ships a year to the Russian ports. The total cargo despatched from France to Russia on French ships is estimated at 162,000 *livres* for 1787, while that on ships of other nations reached 1,105,600 *livres*; in 1784 only two ships left Archangel for French ports, carrying a cargo of some 113,549 *livres*.¹⁵³ The main consular agent was at St. Petersburg; there was also a consular agent at Archangel, as at Riga, Moscow, Kronstadt, Reval, Pernau, and other places, and of the goods exported from Archangel salt beef seems to have been one of the most sought after items, as it was much cheaper than that of Cork.¹⁵⁴

Among the Hanseatic towns Bremen does not seem to have been in a position during the first half of the 18th century to sell the quantities of fish or whale oil available at Archangel. In 1739 however a group to which Georg Löning and Lüder Tidemann belonged, drew up a contract through Kühn, their Petersburg agent, with Baron Schafirov to purchase 600 tons of oil for the sum of 2,400 roubles. Unfortunately Schafirov died before the contract was effected.¹⁵⁵ During the second half of the 18th century Russia became an important exporter to Bremen,¹⁵⁶ although ships leaving Bremen normally carried only ballast. Between 1769 and 1806 however 5 or 6 vessels made the journey, that is to say

¹⁵¹ WALTHER KIRCHNER, *Franco-Russian Economic Relations in the Eighteenth Century*, in «Commercial Relations between Russia and Europe», p. 157 seq.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 167.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹⁵⁵ HERMANN ENTHOLT and LUDWIG BEUTIN, *Bremen und Nordeuropa*, Weimar 1937, p. 109 seq. To this group belonged Daniel Weitzel, Henricque Oftrichs, Georg Töning (=Löning), Johann Wienholt, Dionis Schombart, Sehl. Bernhard Biskamps Wittwe, Johann Nonnen and Lüder Tidemann.

¹⁵⁶ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland*, p. 179 seq.

17% of the shipping between Bremen and the Russian ports. The articles favoured by the Bremeners were fish oil, matting, wax¹⁵⁷ and tar, and for some years rye as well. Colonial goods held a place of preference among the goods exported from Bremen, while the import of German manufactured goods was impeded by Russia's protectionist policy.¹⁵⁸ As we shall see again in the case of Hamburg, the Bremeners combined Archangel trade with their trade with St. Petersburg, Viburg and other ports such as Pernau, Reval, Narva, Arensburg and Riga. The number of ships visiting the Russian ports, or the cargoes coming from them, reached between 20 and 30. But much of the merchandise imported at Bremen passed through Lübeck.¹⁵⁹

Among the merchants we also find those who were involved at the same time in trade with France, Spain and the Mediterranean; that is to say who had sufficient capital to engage in long distance trade. One of these was the factor George Löning, widow and son. In 1772/3 this house was among the six principal rye importers. Another was the company formed by Lüder Tide-mann's sons and grand-sons.¹⁶⁰ Daniel Meinertzhagen, one of the greatest of the Bremen merchants in the later part of the century, provides some information on the combination of Baltic and Archangel trade.¹⁶¹

The Russian contacts of the Hamburg companies were however of much greater importance. Between 1764 and 1770 an average of 21 ships came from the Russian ports, and from 1771 to 1775 there was a total of 80, which shows a marked increase, while between 1778 and 1790 there was an average of 23 to 24, and in the good years¹⁶² between 1791 and 1802 the average was 46.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ ENTHOLT and BEUTIN, *Bremen und Nordeurope*, p. 112.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 112 seq. (*Denkschrift* for the year 1788).

¹⁶⁰ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland*, p. 233 seq.

¹⁶¹ ENTHOLT and BEUTIN, *Bremen und Nordeurope*, p. 25 seq.

¹⁶² RICARD, *Handbuch der Kaufleute*, III, p. 16. Cf. the exact figures: WALTHER KRESSE, *Materialien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Hamburger Handelsflotte 1765-1823*, Hamburg 1966, p. 76.

About one half of all the ships came from Archangel, a quarter from St. Petersburg, 18% from Riga, and 5 to 10% from Libau, Vindau, Reval, and other ports. In terms of tonnage more than three quarters of the Russian products came from Archangel. Ricard has provided an interesting example from 1791 when 25 vessels sailed for Hamburg from the Russian ports, 28% from Archangel, 50% from St. Petersburg, and 16% from Riga. The goods reached a value of 1.3 million *livres* and were divided between Archangel (62%), St. Petersburg (15%), and Riga (7.5%). The range of goods imported from Archangel was considerable, and among them we find agaric, bear and walrus skins, calf, seal and goat skins, cotton thread, pigs' bristles, fire-wood, butter, castaric, planks, beams, iron, ironmongery, ivory, barley, oats, rye, wheat, flax, meat, hemp, hemp oil, resin, stags' antlers, honey, *Juchten*, camel hair, haberdashery, salmon, cloth, linseed, candles, baskets, matting, flour, musk, ox tongues, pitch, furs, horse hair, potash, partridges, ox horns, rhubarb, sail-cloth, soap, tallow, rope, tar, turpentine, fish oil, tobacco, wax, wines, woollens and other goods.¹⁶³ Much greater quantities of goods such as iron came from St. Petersburg, while Archangel predominated in items such as candles, matting, tar and fish oil. The value of imports in 1790 was 492,927 marks *banco* of which 64.8% came from Archangel, 26.8% from St. Petersburg, and 8.4% from Riga. But this total accounted for only 0.92% of Hamburg's total imports by sea. In fact Hamburg's gross maritime imports in the same year reached 53,769,621 marks *banco*, of which 46.7% came from France, and 13.1% from England.^{163a} One must also take account of the Russian imports arriving via Lübeck however. According to Ricard, Hamburg imported in all goods valued at 986,000 *livres* from Russian ports. Between 1789 and 1791 Russian goods reached an average value of 1,267,000 *livres* (about 600,000 marks *banco*), while at the

¹⁶³ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland*, p. 235.

^{163a} P. JEANNIN, *Die Hansestädte im europäischen Handel des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in « Hansische Geschichtsblätter » 89, 1971, p. 52, gives an average of 114-115 Mill r.t for the years 1775-78.

same time goods to the value of 2,095,000 *livres* were imported at Lübeck.¹⁶⁴

We have used the information given by Menke from the registers of the *Admiralitätszoll* for 1776 to trace the companies engaging in this trade. In that year the following goods were exported, at a total value of 130,000 marks: sugar, French wines, fruit, dyes, incense, oil, lemon juice, building timber, glass products etc. 17 commercial houses took part in this export trade, but only five of them on a large scale: Puytelingh & Putens, Berend Joh. Rohde, Christian Diederich Borgeest, Friedrich & Johannes Carstens and Johann Karsdorp. In the same year goods from Archangel valued at 210,000 marks *banco* were imported by a group of 22 merchants. The largest quantities were shared between Friedrich & Johannes Carstens (75,500), Puytelingh & Putens (35,370), Berend & Rohde (23,700), Berend Roosen (10,600), Christian Diederich Borgeest (14,000), H. Hudtwalker (10,000) and Persent & Dorner (9,600). In 1793 the major importers were A. C. Becker, Roosen Erben, J. F. Mohn, F. Carstens, H. Teunis de Jager, D. Kirchenpauer, J. D. Rodde and Clausen.¹⁶⁵

One of the greatest of the Hamburg factors of the early half of the century was that of the brothers Cornelius and Lorenz Poppe, which had important branches at Petersburg and at Lisbon.¹⁶⁶ In 1760 however they went bankrupt with a sum of 3.5 million marks.

The most important merchant in the Russian trade was Berend Roosen, the son-in-law of Lucas Kramer. He was a great *Grönland* merchant and ship-owner, and began his career in 1736 as the factor of Lucas Kramer's widow; in 1759 he had his own firm. He was the most enterprising of the *Grönland* ship-owners and carried on trade with England, France and other countries.¹⁶⁷ Between 1765 and 1788 he loaded 163 ships bound for Archangel.

¹⁶⁴ RICARD, *Handbuch*, III, p. 316.

¹⁶⁵ MENKE, *Die wirtschaftlichen und politischen Beziehungen der Hansestädte zu Russland*, p. 238.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 238 seq.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 247; KRESSE, *Materialien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Hamburger Handelsflotte*, p. 179 seq.

His brother Salomon Roosen specialized in Russian, Polish and Swedish trade. In the early 19th century the Roosens, of a different generation, were amongst the richest families in Hamburg and Altona.¹⁶⁸

We have only very sketchy information on the other German ports such as Emden¹⁶⁹ and Papenburg.¹⁷⁰ Lübeck's great opportunity came from the Baltic routes.¹⁷¹ In 1752, 1754, and 1755 we find a vessel trading between Danzig and Archangel. In 1767 there was one from Stettin, in 1758 one from Sweden, in 1773 8 from Denmark and 7 from Copenhagen¹⁷². Some contacts however ceased, such as those between Bremen and Trondheim and Archangel, to be revived only in times of famine or during the English blockade.¹⁷³

There is little documentation to assess exactly Archangel's role in the trade of Russia during the 18th century. In any case it was active such as that of Russia's Baltic trade. In 1726 the imports of Archangel were 35,846 roubles, the exports 285,387. It was a little port compared with St. Petersburg (1,549,697 and 2,403,423 roubles and Riga (540,000 and 1,550,000 roubles).¹⁷⁴

¹⁶⁸ The *Jetzt lebende Kaufmannschaft*, published in Hamburg in 1743 mentions as merchants engaged in Russian trade: Gottlieb Bagger, Johann Friedrich Berend Borgeest & von Beseler, Elert Joachim v. Deginck, Hermann Goverts, Jobst Wilhelm Hetling, Hans Krochmann, Hans Tobias Neumann, Mund & Böhme, Cornelius & Lorenz Poppe, Daniel Poppe, Johann Georg Poppe, Lorenz Poppe, Karl et Jacob de Vlieger, Johann Jacob Warners; fifteen persons in all. Menke claims (p. 249) that this number is too low, and for the period after 1784 includes Lucas Beckmann, J. Kellinghusen, Berend Roosen, Michael Rowoth and Simon and Caspar Tamm.

¹⁶⁹ ANNEMARIE MÜLLER, *Emdens Seeschifffahrt und Seehandel von der Besitzergreifung Ostfrieslands durch Preussen bis zur Eröffnung des Dortmund-Ems-Kanals 1744-1899*, in « *Hansische Geschichtsblätter* » 55, 1930, p. 90 seq.

¹⁷⁰ HERMANN KELLENBENZ, *Der deutsche Aussenhandel gegen Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in « *Die wirtschaftliche Situation in Deutschland und Österreich um die Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert* », Stuttgart 1964, p. 22.

¹⁷¹ Cf. HARDER, *Seehandel zwischen Lübeck und Russland im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*.

¹⁷² ELLINGER-BANG and KORST, *Tabeller over Skibsfart og Varetransport*.

¹⁷³ BERG, *Trondhjems sjøfart*, p. 109 (Hans Hagerup in about 1730); OSCAR ALBERT JOHNSEN, *Norwegische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Jena 1939, p. 434.

¹⁷⁴ ATTMAN, *The Russian and Polish markets*, p. 174 seq.; cf. too: STORCH, *Historisch-statistisches Gemälde des Russischen Reichs am Ende des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, IV, p. 425 seq.; V, p. 401 seq.; VI, p. 438.

What, then, can be learned from a quantitative appraisal of shipping on the Archangel route?

Without doubt the documentation is rudimentary, but it does allow us to construct a series of graphs which can be compared with those for Baltic trade drawn up on the basis of the customs registers of Öresund and other Baltic sources.

V.

In the years after the opening of the Dvina route the traffic was dominated by the English. They enjoyed privileges due to the Czar's foreign policy and were able to export arms and munitions while also having a new market for their cloths. The only Russian port which had direct contact with the West after the Swedish conquest of Narva in 1581 was then on the mouth of the Dvina.

But even in those years the English had to compete with the Dutch who were masters of international shipping with a system based on multilateral trade, into which the trade with Archangel fitted well, particularly because it gave the opportunity of supplying grain to the Mediterranean and Iberian regions. It seems that the best years continued up to the '30s. Thereafter there was a distinct decline in Amsterdam's trade, while other Dutchmen who had played a smaller part took on an increasingly important role until the '50s and in some cases the '60s. Beside the Dutch the English and other westerners were not particularly important. This development however was always closely related to affairs in the Baltic, especially in the case of grain. From the mid '30s the Polish market was reopened through Danzig, and in the '40s the Swedes drew Western trade to Narva. Narva's position was maintained throughout the second half of the century, and improved greatly just toward the end. Traffic on the Archangel route never regained the scale of the early half of the century and fluctuated according to the political situation — when there were difficulties in the Baltic the Archangel route became more attractive. This was shown to an extraordinary degree during the Northern War when the figures — headed by those of the Hollanders — leapt to 150

and more, and is revealed by the reaction after 1721 when St. Petersburg became the new principal port of Russia.¹⁷⁵ A change becomes evident after the mid '60s, when Archangel obtained the same privileges as St. Petersburg. But the increasing figures in the following decades are only a fraction of those for the Baltic. In 1783 only 38.7% of Russian exports and 16.8% of her imports passed through Archangel. The shorter and quicker routes to St. Petersburg, Riga etc. remained the most attractive. But this also represented an interesting change; it was the English with their needs for raw materials for their industrialization who dominated there.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵ *Očerki istorii SSSR, period feodalizma, Rossija vo vtoroi polovine XVIII*, Moscow 1956, p. 122.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. also ELISABETH HARDER-GERSDORFF, *Handelskonjunkturen und Warenbilanzen im lübeckisch-russischen Seeverkehr des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in « Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte », Bd. 56, 1969, p. 1 seq.