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Following the life and movements of a well-connected Ottoman Orthodox in the Russian Empire, this article seeks to contribute towards an understanding of the ways in which individuals and groups from the Black Sea region were incorporated into the business and statecraft of empire. Alexander Levantinos, a technician from Gümüşhane, in the Pontus or Black Sea region of Anatolia, serves as a characteristic example of Pontic iterant miners, moving within the Russian and Ottoman Empires and the territories in-between in search of new veins to exploit. Initially intending to search for copper in Russia, Levantinos was eventually granted permission to move to the region of Nerchinsk, where he established silver mines and transferred the necessary skills for silver mining to local workers. Simultaneously, he was engaged in trade with China. Levantinos’ biography demonstrates the overlap between state service, craftsmanship, and trade in Russia of the early eighteenth century. The tension between the transfer of skills and commercial transaction as an autonomous sphere, and transfer and exchange as embedded in a range of power relationships is central to Levantinos’ achievement. This tension should serve to underline the degree to which actors such as Levantinos contributed to the expansion of the simultaneously “minimalist” and “activist” Russian state, an expansion from which they benefited.
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Research on the Orthodox of the Ottoman Empire (often referred to as “Greeks” in Russian documents, or the “Romioi” or “Romaics,” with its broader connotations, as they denoted themselves) who migrated to Russia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has thus far focused on members of the clergy and the religious and cultural ties that were a consequence of their wanderings. There have, of course, been exceptions; for example, the story of Marinos Harvouris (1729-1782), who engineered the transportation to St. Petersburg of the granite thunder rock on which Peter I’s statue by Étienne Maurice Falconet was set.2 This short article will focus on the case of Alexandros Levantinos, migrant, technician and mining engineer from the Ottoman Empire.

Alexandros Levantinos should in no way be considered unusual. An
unquantifiable number of Orthodox Ottoman subjects either moved between or migrated to Russian regions from at least the mid-seventeenth century on, often for reasons of trade. The thrust of much recent scholarship has tended to play up the autonomy of trade and traders vis-à-vis other groups and the states in which they operated. Still, as described throughout Erika Monahan’s groundbreaking analysis of commercial life in Siberia in the seventeenth century, one consequence of the development of Russia from a ‘domain state’ to a ‘tax state’ was “the recognition that the effectiveness of the state’s regulation, mediation and participation in commerce in large measure determined its fiscal well-being.”

Through following the life and movements of a well-connected Ottoman Orthodox in the Russian Empire, this article seeks to contribute towards an understanding of the ways in which individuals and groups from the Black Sea region were incorporated into the business and statecraft of empire. The tension between the transfer of skills and commercial transaction as an autonomous sphere, and transfer and exchange as embedded in a range of power relationships is central to Alexandros Levantinos’ achievement. This tension should serve to underline the degree to which actors such as Levantinos contributed to the expansion of the simultaneously “minimalist” and “activist” Russian state, an expansion from which they benefited.

**From the region of the Pontus through Georgia**

Alexandros Levantinos, son of Paul, was a technician from Gümüşhane, in the Pontus or Black Sea region of Anatolia. Unusually for the time, our sources include not only Alexandros’ patronymic, but also a surname “the Levantine,” suggestive of status, earlier mobility and perhaps contacts with the West.

The mountainous, amphitheatric inland city of Gümüşhane or “Kan” (in the Eparchy of Chaldia, not far from today’s city of Gümüşhane) was translated into the Russian of the time as the “Silver city” (gorod serebrianny). This translation may indicate that the current Greek name for Gümüşhane, “Argyroupolis,” had been in partial use before 1846, contrary to the predominant view. With its four stone bridges, its many baths and Hans, its fountains, school and religious edifices, Gümüşhane was an urban centre, for the most part inhabited by Orthodox Pontic peoples. The city also incorporated a parish of Armenians who had fled Persian lands in 1698 and a significant Muslim minority. The region of Chaldia as a whole was associated in accounts of the time with the “crypto-Christians,” populations who had supposedly converted to Islam but retained Christian beliefs and rites, a phenomenon which may have been connected to Ottoman concessions regulating the mining economy.

Gümüşhane flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries through the extraction of lead, and, from the lead ore, a little gold and, particularly, silver. It was populated by itinerant miners, charcoal bearers and burners. Its air must have been
thick with the stench of burning ores, and the mountain slopes around increasingly bare. Gümüşhane had its own mint, and it supplied the imperial treasury with some seven thousand kilograms of silver each year. The city was characterized by the cross-fertilization of Armenian and Greek metal craftsmanship, and the production and exchange of highly prized objects: chalices, reliquaries, sprinklers, icons and gospel books with silver-gilt covers, enameled crosses and other items such as gold embroideries, silks.

Caravans would arrive at the marketplace (not fair, as this was permanent) here from as far away as Baghdad. Gümüşhane was also a center for learning with its own school. It was connected both to the influential Monastery of Panagia Soumela in Trebizond, and through the supply of alms, and religious, scholarly, artistic and commercial exchange to more distant Moldavian and Wallachian lands.9

Though there is no indication as to Alexandros Levantinos’ position in the highly inequalitarian Ottoman mining hierarchy - he is not mentioned in documents related to Gümüşhane as a chief metallurgist (“madenci usta basi”) or indeed serving in any other senior capacity in dependent areas - it is clear that he specialized in the construction of mines.10 Alexandros’ brother and close associate, Benjamin Levantinos, was recorded even before 1694 as a resident of Nezhin (Nizhyn in Ukrainian, Niza in Greek) in north-eastern Ukraine. From this center for migration and exchange, where a large number of Ottoman Orthodox merchants were to settle during the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Benjamin Levantinos traded in association with other Orthodox Christians from the Ottoman Empire, including Athanasios, son of Matthaios of Tarnovo (located in Macedonia according to the source, but today in north-central Bulgaria), in an area that stretched from Bucharest to Brasov, Lviv, and up to Moscow.11 In 1704, Benjamin Levantinos was resident in the Monastery of Saint Nicholas in Moscow where many of his fellow Ottoman Orthodox merchants and members of the clergy also rented cells. At that date he provided surety before the officials of the Posolskiy Prikaz (the Ambassadorial Chancellery) for the Hieromonk Pangratios who had arrived in Moscow from Constantinople. “I, Benjamin Levantinos, have taken the priest Pagrati [under my surety] so that he should not leave Moscow for anywhere else, and I place my hand.” As this is Benjamin’s own hand, it is clear that he knew how to write, indicative, once more, of status.12

Alexandros Levantinos and his brother Benjamin had both accompanied Archil of Imereti (1647-1713), the son of Vakhtang V Shahnawaz, as part of the Georgian prince’s mission to Moscow. The prince’s entourage, comprising some sixty-five members, arrived in Moscow in August 1684.13 There were a number of other Ottoman Orthodox (or Greeks) in the service of Archil of Imereti, among them Dimitris Konstantinov, who is recorded as living in the Georgian prince’s residence in Moscow in 1708, as well as a certain Iuri Konstantinov, who travelled in the entourage along with another three apprentices or assistants (the Ukrainian term...
“cheliadnik” was used to describe such people). As the mobility of members of the clergy between the regions indicate, contacts between the Georgian principalities and the Pontus region were extensive, and remain understudied.\textsuperscript{14}

**To the mines of Nerchinsk**

Alexandros Levantinos’ skills were in demand and he moved throughout Russian controlled regions. Initially, he intended to search for copper in the area of Nizhny Tagil in the Urals just north of today’s Ekaterinburg.\textsuperscript{15} But Peter I ordered him to travel on to Tomsk to locate and process silver, a metal in which the Russian state was deficient. Peter I desperately needed silver to finance his military and other projects. Alexandros’ efforts to locate silver in Tomsk were unsuccessful, and he was granted permission to relocate to the region of Nerchinsk to continue his investigations.

The Cephalonian Athanasios Skiadas, an instructor at the Slavo-Greko-Latin Academy from 1722 and one of the foremost Greeks in the Russian Empire during the early eighteenth century, remains an important source for the activities of other Ottoman Orthodox in the Russian Empire. In his historical work on Peter I, Skiadas notes that the Russian Emperor: “[...] dispatched practical people to investigate the coastal extremes of Tartary of Siberia, and to locate the veins of metals”.\textsuperscript{16} Alexandros Levantinos was thus a pioneer. In August 1700, once settled in remote Nerchinsk, he composed a report addressed to the “Great Sovereign” in Moscow, stating that in 1697 he had requested permission to travel to China for his “trade” (\textit{kupechestvo}).\textsuperscript{17} He had been ordered to travel to Nerchinsk, to the fortified post of Argunsk for the creation of silver mines. On arrival in Nerchinsk, Levantinos visited the Stolnik and Voevoda Ivan Samoilovich Nikolaev and was granted twelve workers and fifteen Cossacks from Argunsk as helpers.\textsuperscript{18}

Alexandros Levantinos wrote his references to the \textit{Sibirskiy Prikaz} (the Siberian Chancellery) in Greek. In this case, and possibly in others, their translator into Russian was the state official Fedor Konstantinov.\textsuperscript{19} It is worth pointing to the long lapse between the dispatch of the letters from Nerchinsk and their receipt in Moscow. This petition was written on the 1 August 1700. However, the translator received the letter in Moscow only in April 1702, more than twenty months after it had been written. However strict Levantinos’ instructions may have been, distance rendered him a partly autonomous actor once established in the Sino-Russian borderlands.\textsuperscript{20}

In Argunsk, Alexandros Levantinos and his workers explored the mining areas “deep in the mountains” where excavations had previously been attempted. The traveler Corneille Le Brun referred to such mines when he passed through the area in 1695: “It is a half-day’s drive from the fortification of Argoun through the mountains. There you can find a full silver mine, where you can still see several shafts [...]”, constructed by locals in the area.\textsuperscript{21} Alexandros Levantinos noted that
These mines “had been opened up in the old days by the Mongols,” but these latter “did not know how to operate [a mine] at depth.” And he proceeded with his report:

Then, as time pressed on me, since the speed of our actions was significant, I ordered the workers to dig in two new places and a third that already existed. And the Cossacks started shouting that we would find nothing there. But I, wishing to perform Your Ukaz, Great Sovereign, stepped up my efforts and dug into the depths to five or six sazhen [approximately eleven or twelve meters] and found a vein, and from the new mine I extracted three types of ore, about twenty pud in all [approximately 328 kg] [...].

And now there are ten workers and three craftsmen [i tri mastera], but the workers do not have the necessary supplies. Each kiln requires a large amount of raw material; so, especially now at the beginning, twenty additional workers are required to dig the ores and to find charcoal for the kilns at the factory. Also, let me tell you, Great Sovereign, that the laborers here are expensive and hard to find, and the people in general are few and wild and they do not want this work [...]. Workers must therefore be sent from other parts.22

Alexandros Levantinos further complained that many of the workers were drunkards. Thus, in Nerchinsk, Alexandros worked continuously ensuring a steady supply of charcoal for the forested area and setting up a processing facility for the extraction of silver from lead. At the same time, in a notable case of technology transfer and the transplantation of working methods from the Ottoman Black Sea littoral to the border regions of China, he trained local craftsmen, providing them with the necessary knowledge to continue in his task.23

From Siberia, Alexandros, Benjamin his brother, and other Greeks with whom they worked kept up a lively correspondence. Their trans-imperial communication spanned the breadth of the Russian and Ottoman states, drawing disparate regions together. Some parts of letters have been preserved, composed in an idiosyncratic vernacular Greek mixing and melting local dialects, Slavic and Ottoman words. Thus, Benjamin Levantinos, Symeon/Simon Grigoriou (alternatively Grigoriev) and Dimitrios Theodori (all such names are preserved in multiple versions) composed a joint letter to a certain Christodoulos in Moscow in July 1706.24 Then, in November of the same year, they wrote again from Tobolsk:

[…] however you know that up until today we are in Tobolsk [Tobolla] and with us the merchant [kouptzenos] with all his company and God willing we move on in the following days [...].

They then requested that Christodoulos convey “much reverence from our part” (the Greek proskynemata conjures up connotations of worship and pilgrimage) to a number of Russians and Ottoman Orthodox; they sent Christodoulos information on merchants heading towards Moscow; and also the regards of a member of the
clergy who was well-known to Christodoulos and was also in the area of Tobolsk. One should perhaps imagine the letter being read aloud to those gathered in the Monastery of St. Nicholas in Moscow. The reverences performed in this epistle served the purpose of re-enacting in writing, and re-creating in fact, the network of relations which provided some of the protection that rendered movement and exchange possible. Finally, Benjamin and his companions enquired what they should do with Christodoulos’ possessions and all his merchandise that they were transporting with them: “as we don’t have any letter telling us what to do with your retail goods, and so we’re writing to inform you of this; for the moment, according to the oath we are asking you for your proper letter concerning all these things”. The brief letter by Benjamin Levantinos and his companions in Tobolsk ended with the following:

Should you wish to learn about the lord and prince Mikhail Yakovitzi [Knyaz’ Mikhail Yakovlevich Cherkasskiy], may God grant him health, as he took care of our bread for every day that we spent there. He provided us with all the carts we required for the road and he granted each one of us a piece of fur and one dog-coat, and may God grant him many years, as He wishes it.25

In other words, this group travelling eastwards were provided not only with provisions, but also with means of transport (podvody) and cheap clothing and fur, their mobility very much sponsored by the Russian authorities.

Other Ottoman Orthodox (or Greeks) who worked with Alexandros Levantinos in Siberia were the traders and miners of Spyridon and Dementis Marinou who were also listed in the catalogues of Greeks of Moscow as merchants resident in the Monastery of Saint Nicholas in Moscow.26 The documents also mention a Gregory son of Paul, who traveled with Benjamin Levantinos from the Ottoman Empire via Georgia (the extent of their kinship is uncertain, but they do have the same patronymic), and an assistant or apprentice named Philip.27 And there were other cases of those traveling independently of Alexandros Levantinos to work in Russian mines.28

Alexandros Levantinos’ plant produced wrought silver in 1704 and operated up until at least 1709. However, as appears from their correspondence, Levantinos and his assistants continued their trading activities during the time that they found themselves in Siberia.

Deeper into China?

Alexandros Levantinos was a servant of the Russian state, but he was also a merchant. In summarizing his brother’s activities, Benjamin Levantinos explained:

[...] for his faithful service, Great Sovereign [za ego k Vam, Velikomu Gosudaryu, vernyuu službu], for discovering silver ore in the Siberian mountains, and especially in Netchinsk, and for setting up factories there, and even training some of the locals, for his many troubles, you rewarded and – at his request – ordered
him to trade, according to the example of others who have rendered services to Your Majesty the Tsar in the Russian state [...].

In Siberia, Alexandros Levantinos sought and obtained permission to trade within China, searching for possible new sources of silver and other precious metals on route. As a colleague of Alexandros Levantinos, Konstantinos Yakovlevos, who had traveled from Nerchinsk to Moscow and then returned, informs us:

[...] and from these factories [from Nerchinsk] Alexandros and Konstantinos joined with trader Grigori Bokov and with other traders to trade in China, transporting their wares with them. And in China Alexandros and the merchants sold squirrel fur [...] and ermines [...].

Nerchinsk was border territory, at times described during this period as being within China. And, in any case, Alexandros Levantinos was not the first “Greek” to travel deeper into the country. The Moldovan Nikolaos Spatharios / Nikolai Gavrilovich Spafarii / Nicolae Micleușu Spătaru (1636–1708) had traveled in 1675 via Nerchinsk en route to Beijing, a journey that lasted some three years. His entourage included various Ottoman Orthodox merchants, including Konstantinos Ivanov and Theodoros Pavlov. Spyridon Ostafiev and Ivan Yuriev, Macedonian Greeks who accompanied the same mission, were traders in precious stones. Returning through Persian territories, they were accused of selling a significant portion of their goods for personal gain, and of not returning amounts owed to their creditors; they were, however, eventually acquitted by a Russian court.

Athanasios Skiadas emphasizes precisely this relationship between diplomatic missions and trading activities within China: “[...] they would send ambassadors to the rulers there on a number of occasions, both to preserve good relations [...] and to accompany the traders who engaged in commercial activities there.” Among the various writings of Nikolaos Spatharios, his Book in which the journey through the kingdom of Siberia from the city of Tobolsk, up until the boundaries of the kingdom of China is told, in the year 7183 is worth mentioning here. So too his transfer of Jesuit astronomical texts from China back to Moscow. Spatharios’ description of the journey was one of several texts about China that were reformulated by the future Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos Notaras (1655/60-1731), who journeyed to Moscow between 1692 and 1694. It is worth noting the number of surviving copies of these Greek-language manuscripts on China.

Unlike the Greeks who had been in the entourage of Spatharios’ embassy, another, Dimitris Konstantinov from Constantinople, had benefited from some kind of a collaboration with a merchant of Bukhara, and was engaged in trading within Chinese lands, without (it would seem) having followed an official embassy. He journeyed into China at least twice. Thus, in 1685, he imported Chinese fabrics worth more than four thousand rubles into Russia. This example of a high-value commercial transaction without formal authorization constitutes only one example
of the authorities’ inability to control trade across the vast territories nominally under their control, and, at the same time, of the inability of extant official sources to convey the full extent of cross-frontier contacts in these regions.\textsuperscript{36} The ledgers of Greek merchants operating from Nezhin include mention of some products of Chinese provenance.\textsuperscript{37}

Just a few years after Alexandros Levantinos, Savva Raguzinsky (1669-1738), merchant of Constantinople, a Serb originating from the region of Ragusa (Dubrovnik), and one-time confidant of Peter I, led a further official Russian expedition to China (1725-1727). Raguzinsky noted the Chinese authorities’ belief that a full fifty official Russian caravans had reached their capital thus far. The Russian authorities could count only fourteen.\textsuperscript{38}

The Russian authorities sought to prevent the theft of silver from Russian mines and its resale in China, a fairly common phenomenon, since the (usually) camel caravans destined for China passed through Nerchinsk, at times following a course parallel to the Amur River into Manchuria. In many but not all cases the final destination of caravans was Beijing.\textsuperscript{39} Nikolaos Spatharios too had been accused of marketing furs for personal gain, and not only for the enrichment of the Russian treasury. Alexandros Levantinos was forced to defend himself against the similar accusation that he was expropriating silver. Such accusations may be considered standard given that the system of \textit{kormlenie}, or feeding, blurred the boundaries between state service and personal enrichment, and also the suspicions that resulted from the lack of control exerted by Moscow over such a distant periphery.\textsuperscript{40}

Although the Orthodox of Ottoman provenance journeying to China were undoubtedly very few, their presence so far from the Black Sea littoral from which they embarked on their journey is indicative of their status as a group with the privilege of movement and therefore of their large dispersion within Russian territories. No additional information has been found regarding Alexandros Levantinos’ points of call and activities within China, but it should be noted that on this particular journey he was following a route followed by others of similar provenance who had been trading in the area.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{Privileges and networks}

Upon completion of his mission in Siberia and his return to Moscow, Alexandros Levantinos recorded the difficult economic situation in which he found himself. As was standard practice for supplicatory letters of the time, he sought to present his plight in the most distressing way possible. In his appeal, preserved in the third person, he notes that during his absence, his wife and children, who had remained more than ten years without him in their Black Sea homeland, had been fed on borrowed money. As a result, their debts greatly increased, debts that he did not have the means to repay. In order to cover these debts, Alexandros Levantinos requested permission to trade freely in goods throughout the Russian
state, following the example that had been set by a number of other “brothers,” each of whom had received “a Gramota of his Majesty the Tsar” in return for their services.\textsuperscript{42} In particular, Alexandros Levantinos had in mind the inhabitant of Nezhin Paraskevas Theodorov, originally a captain from the Black Sea port of Sinop or Sinope, also in the Pontos, who benefitted from his connections to both Ottoman and Russian courts,\textsuperscript{43} and the aforementioned Sava Raguzinski.\textsuperscript{44}

Alexandros Levantinos’ petition turned out a success, and on 11 March 1710, he was granted a Gramota allowing him the same trading conditions that were granted to Russian subjects of up to two thousand rubles trade annually throughout the Russian state:

\begin{quote}
\textit{[...]} As a reward for his labors, he should be granted the right, according to the example of his brother Greeks and of Paraskevas Theodorov, to trade non-banned products worth up to two thousand rubles within the Russian state of His Majesty the Tsar, and to pay customs duties in accordance with the Trading Charter according to the example of Russian traders [...] and that he should be provided with a Gramota and a passport, allowing him to travel up to the borders, as well as from the borders to Moscow.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

In other words, Alexandros Levantinos was to pay the same customs duties as the Russian merchants of the time, considerably less than other foreign merchants, primarily (it would seem) in order to trade between Russia and the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{46} It was no coincidence that the Tsar confirmed the privileges of the Nezhin Brotherhood at the same time that he granted this Gramota to Levantinos. The context for conceding these privileges was the preparation for renewed conflict with the Ottoman Empire, and the consequent need to ensure the loyalty of those border peoples that could aid Russia through contacts with the Orthodox populations of the Ottoman Empire, and also through information and supplies, during the course of the conflict.\textsuperscript{47}

Looking at the years immediately following 1711, the sources examined provide some information on the interconnection between the two brothers Alexandros and Benjamin with Orthodox Ottoman merchants in both Nezhin and Moscow. Alongside others, including Nikolai Konstantinov, they can be traced trading from Moscow through Astrakhan into the territories of today’s Georgia, Persia and the Ottoman Empire, even, in 1712, as far as Constantinople.\textsuperscript{48}

Alexandros Levantinos returned to his homeland to accompany his wife, children, nephews and other assistants on their journey to Russia through Georgia (a family reunion, and migration). Alexandros’ brother, Benjamin, who resided in the Monastery of St. Nicholas when in Moscow, married a Georgian girl, with whom he settled permanently in Russia.\textsuperscript{49} Benjamin was in Moscow on the 1\textsuperscript{st} February 1713. According to the goldsmith Iuri Konstantinov, Benjamin spent that night in a cell of the monastery of St. Nicholas drinking alongside Paraskevas Theodorov and others, cursing and generally causing turmoil.\textsuperscript{50} The sources that have been
examined do not shed any further light on the subsequent life and works of Alexandros Levantinos and his brother Benjamin. The lack of scholarly attention accorded to the Levantinos brothers must be considered surprising, given their early, albeit relatively small-scale, attempts to establish silver mines in the Russian state.51

Trade and service to the Tsar
Alexandros Levantinos was a craftsman, a trader, a servant of the state, and also a prominent “Greek” or Orthodox of the Ottoman Empire who had acquired a range of commercial privileges for himself in the Russian Empire.52 He and his brother Benjamin are described as “mining technicians” and also “goldsmiths” in texts of the time, and they should be considered characteristic examples of a Pontic iterant miners, moving within the Russian and Ottoman Empires and the territories in-between in search of new veins to exploit.53 As an expert in metals, Benjamin proved himself particularly helpful to the Russian authorities whenever they wished to ascertain the value of metals dispatched to Moscow from mines being developed throughout state territories. Thus, in 1702 he had estimated that a particular raw ore “was not silver but magnesium.”54

Alexandros Levantinos, dispatched by the Russian state to develop the mines of Nerchinsks, also constitutes a characteristic example of the overlap between state service, craftsmanship and trade in Russia of the early eighteenth century.55 As many documents of the time reveal, the terminology of service was expanded to cover other activities, including craftsmanship and market exchange. State institutions, the military and royal or imperial courts, contributed to reducing the marginal costs and thus allowed for profitable commercial transactions to take place alongside service. Opportunities for certain Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman world to prosper and move rapidly up the social scale – the lucky ones that survived that is – resulted.56

Alexandros Levantinos augmented his status at considerable personal risk. The social status of such privileged movers, however, was either directly or indirectly bound to the Russian Court: experienced miners, craftsmen and tradesmen such as Alexandros Levantinos were “Court Greeks” to borrow a term used primarily for the Jews of the Courts of Central Europe.57 Such entrepreneurship as Alexandros Levantinos and other pioneers like him exhibited, bridged the divide between craftsmanship, market exchange and politics. Thus, if the case of Alexandros Levantinos and his associates fits with most of Erika Monahan’s analysis, it is worth adding that the networks that offered Levantinos opportunities were still for the most part based on services provided to, and the protection and privileges afforded by, the Russian and other courts. Extreme political risk rendered both craftsmanship and market exchange dependent on a range of other power relationships.
About the author

Iannis Carras received his doctorate from the Faculty of Political Sciences of the John Capodistrias University of Athens in 2010 for his dissertation on “Trade and Brotherhood: Balkan Merchants in Russia 1700–1774.” Carras’ BA (MA Oxon) was from the University of Oxford (Lincoln College). He holds an MA in Russian Studies and Transition Economics from the School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins University (Bologna and Washington DC). His articles include: “Godparenthood, Surety and Migration: Greeks to the Russian Empire in the 18th and early 19th centuries”, “Understanding God and tolerating humankind: Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment in Eugenios Voulgaris (1716-1806) and Platon Levshin (1737-1812)” and “Orthodoxe Kirche, Wohltätigkeit und Handelsaustausch: Kaufleute und Almosensammler entlang der osmanisch-russischen Grenzgebiete im 18. Jahrhundert [Orthodox Church, charity and trade: merchants and alms-collectors along the Ottoman-Russian border in the 18th century], Erfurter Vorträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Orthodoxen Christentums, 19, Universität Erfurt, Erfurt, 2020.” He has worked as part of The Black Sea Port-Cities research program, and is currently a post-doc at the University of Macedonia in Thessaloniki and Senior Lecturer at the IES EU Center in Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany.
Endnotes

1 The research for this paper was supported by the European Social Fund (ESF) of the European Union and the Greek National Funds through the operational Programme “Education and Lifelong Learning” of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) – Research Funding Programme: Thales, investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund. This paper has been published in a considerably different version in Greek. Iannis Carras, “Μετανάστευση και υπηρεσία στον Τσάρο: ένας Ρωμιός στη Ρωσία και Κίνα των αρχών του 18ου αιώνα” [Trade and service to the Tsar: a Romaic in Russia and China of the early 18th century], in Σλάβοι και Ελληνικός Κόσμος. Πρακτικά Α’ Επιστημονικής Ημερίδας Τμήματος Σλαβικών Σπουδών [Slavs and the Greek World: Proceedings of the First Scholarly Conference of the Department of Slavic Studies], ed. Πάνος Σοφούλης [Panos Sofoúlis] (Athens: Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν Πανεπιστήμιον Αθηνών, Department of Slavic Studies], 2014), 169–82.


3 For migration from the Ottoman Empire to the Russian, including difficulties in distinguishing between the peoples of the Ottoman Empire and the problem of quantification, see Iannis Carras, “Connecting Migration and Identities: Godparenthood, Surety and Greeks in the Russian Empire (18th-Early 19th Centuries)”, in Across the Danube. Southeastern Europeans and their Travelling Identities (17th-19th C.), ed. Olga Katsiardi-Hering and Maria A. Stassinopoulou (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 65–109.

4 Jarmo Kotlaine, for example, has provided much needed information on seventeenth-century trade, south and east. J. T. Kotlaine, Russia’s Foreign Trade and Economic Expansion in the Seventeenth Century: Windows on the World (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 411–90 and passim.


6 RGADA f. [fond] 52, Snosheheniya Rossi s Gretsey [Russian-Greek Relations] op. [opis’] 1 d. [delo] 25 (1694) l. [list / listy] 7. See also RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 36 1706 l. 3v. Alexandros is referred to as coming from the city “Kana of Anatolia,” a reference to the usual name of Gümüşhane in the Greek of the time, “Kan.” As is the case with most of the Orthodox merchants travelling to Russia in the early eighteenth century, Alexandros Levantinos and his brother Veniamin refer to themselves, on occasion, as Constantinopolitan, this being a characteristic of itinerant populations and also a mark of higher social status. Another Orthodox Christian from Gümüşhane who travelled to Moscow was Ivan Anastasov, his guarantor in Moscow being Veniamin Levantinos. RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 2 1708 l. 4v.

7 RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 2 (1708) l. 4v. See the discussion of the issue in Anthony Bryer with David Winfield, Selina Balance and Jane Isaac, The Post-Byzantine Monuments of the Pontos: A Source Book. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002), 324–50.


For information on the chief miners of Gümüşhane, see Χρυσόστομος Μυρίδης [Chrysostomos Myridis], “Η οικογένεια των Σαρασιών και ο Γερβάσιος Σαρασίτης” [The Sarasites family and Gervasio Sarasites], Αρχείον Πόντου [Pontic Archive], vol. 17, Athens, 1937, pp. 1-82.

RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 25 (1694) ll. 3-4.

RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 24 (1704) l. 2.

RGADA f. 52 op. 1d. 36 (1706) ll. 3-4. See also RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 2 (1708) ll. 11-11v.

RGADA f. 124 Malorossiyiskye dela [Little Russian Affairs] op. - d. 12 (1711) ll. 5-6. For the movement of Hierarchs of the Church between Georgian lands and the Pontos, including Gümüşhane, in the seventeenth century, see the final book of the history of the future Patriarch Dositheos Notaras, in which he describes his journey collecting alms through Georgian and Pontic lands, including Kan, in 1678. Δοσιθέου Νοταράς Πατριάρχου Ιεροσολύμων [Dositheos Notaras Patriarch of Jerusalem], Ιστορία περί των εν Ιεροσολύμων πατριαρχευσάντων [History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem], (Bucharest: n.p., 1715), book 12, chapter 2, 1203 and book 12, chapter 9, 1229–1230. The miners of Gümüşhane were repeatedly invited to Georgian territories to establish mining operations there, and some were to migrate to the paşalık of Ahiska (Akhaltsikhe or Ahtirskagia) in the 1730s. For the history of this region (where other Greek miners were active in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), see Donald Rayfield, Edge of Empire: A History of Georgia, (London: Reaktion Books, 2012), esp. 216.

The miners of Gümüşhane were repeatedly invited to Georgian territories to establish mining operations there, and some were to migrate to the paşalık of Ahiska (Akhaltsikhe or Ahtirskagia) in the 1730s. For the history of this region (where other Greek miners were active in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), see Donald Rayfield, Edge of Empire: A History of Georgia, (London: Reaktion Books, 2012), esp. 216.

RGADA, f. 1111 Verkhovnny uezdnyy sud [High Uezd (County) Court] op. 1. chast’ 3 d. 147 (1694-1695) l. 390. RGADA f. 1111 Verkhovnny uezdnyy sud [High Uezd (County) Court] op. 1. chast’ 4 d. 158 (1698) l. 189.

The reference is to the year 1720. Αθανάσιος Σκιαδάς [Athanasios Skiadas], Γένος, Ήθος, Κίνδυνοι, και Κατορθώματα Πέτρου του Πρώτου Πατρός Πατρίδος Αυτοκράτορος Πάσης Ρωσσίας, και τα εξής. Ενετίησιν, ψλζ΄ [Lineage, Character, Perils, and Achievements of Peter the First, Emperor of All Russia, and so on] (Venice: n.p., 1737, 445. For the regulations that provided a framework for the activities of miners in the Russian state, see Alexander Kursky and Andrei Konoplyanik, “State Regulation and Mining Law Development in Russia from the 15th century to 1991,” Journal of Energy and Natural Resources Law 24, no. 2 (2006): 222–232.

The term kupechestvo can be translated in a number of ways, from “craft” to “trade.” “Great Sovereign” is a translation of Velikiy gosudar’. For the terminology of trade, see N. V. Kozlova, “Nekotoryye cherty lichnostnogo obrazta kuptsa XVIII veka (k voprosu o mentalitete rossiyskogo kupechestva),” in Mentalitet i kul’tura predprimiateley Rossii XVII-XIX vv., ed. L.N. Pushkarev (Moscow: Institut rossiyskoy istorii, 1996), 43–57, esp. 44.

RGADA f. 151, Delo o gornykh zavodakh i promyslakh, op. 1 d. 48 l. 22.

In a later document he signs in his own hand in Russian, but he uses the Greek alphabet in doing so. RGADA f. 214 Sibirskiy prikaz op. 5 d. 1553 (1709) l. 6v.

RGADA f. 151 op. 1 d. 48 l. 22.

RGADA f. 214 op. 5 ll. 8-25, 144-159, esp. ll. 22-23. A sazhen’ corresponds to 2.13 meters. A pud to 16.38 kg.

RGADA f. 214 op. 5 d. 1553 (1709) ll. 4-4v, 7v. He notes that at the same time he
set up an iron processing unit. RGADA f. 214 op. 5 d. 1553 (1709) ll. 1, 9v-10. For mining techniques and problems associated with the supply of charcoal for the smelting and extraction of silver ore from the argentiferous (galena) lead as practiced in the mines of Gümüşhane in the eighteenth century, see Χαρά Λιουδάκη-Κυπραίου [Chara Lioudaki-Kypriaiou], Μετάλλεια της Μικρασίας και του Πόντου: Η Συμβολή τους στην Επιβίωση και Ανάπτυξη του Μικρασιατικού Ελληνισμού [Metals of Asia Minor and of the Pontus: Their contribution to the survival and development of the Greeks of Asia Minor] (Athens: private publication, 1982), 75–90. Also see: A. Bryer, “The question of the Byzantine mines in the Pontos: Chalybian iron, Chaldian silver, Koloneian alum and the mummy of Cheriana,” in Peoples and Settlement in Anatolia and the Caucasus 800-1900, ed. Anthony Bryer, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1988), 138–39 [reprint of Anatolian Studies no. 33 (1983): 133–50]. For the mines of Nерchinsk, see I. Bogolyubskiy, Istoriko-statisticheskiy ocherk proizvoditel'nosti Nerchnskogo gornogo okruga s 1703 po 1871 god (St. Petersburg: tip. V. Demakova, 1872).

See, for example, the case of a certain Nikephoros from the Monastery of Prophet Elijah in Ioannina. RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 16 (1712) l. 7. For a further case of an Ottoman Orthodox miner who arrived in Russia in 1709 accompanied by a “Yianni the Greek”, see Peter I, Pis’ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikago, vol. 9, 1709, (Moscow: Akad. Nauk SSR, 1950), 635. One might add that Alexis Zorbas of Nikos Kazantzakis’ famous novel is one who followed in the footsteps of Alexandros Levantinos. As Zorbas narrates it: “On another occasion I found myself in Russia; because I even went there, again for metals, for copper.” Zorbas claims to have been in the Black Sea region of Novorossiysk. Νίκου Καζαντζάκη [Nikos Kazantzakis], Βίος και Πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά [Life and Times of Alexis Zorbas] (Athens: Kazantzakis publishers, 1981), 84. The novel was translated into English as Zorba the Greek.

RGADA f. 159 op. 2 d. 1553 (1709) ll. 1–2. For Konstantinos Yakovlevus who, in response to this inquiry, I the Romaic Konstantinos Yakovlevus, see: RGADA f. 151 op. 1 d. 48 ll. 8-9.

See, for example, the case of a certain Nikephoros from the Monastery of Prophet Elijah in Ioannina. RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 16 (1712) l. 7. For a further case of an Ottoman Orthodox miner who arrived in Russia in 1709 accompanied by a “Yianni the Greek”, see Peter I, Pis’ma i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikago, vol. 9, 1709, (Moscow: Akad. Nauk SSR, 1950), 635. One might add that Alexis Zorbas of Nikos Kazantzakis’ famous novel is one who followed in the footsteps of Alexandros Levantinos. As Zorbas narrates it: “On another occasion I found myself in Russia; because I even went there, again for metals, for copper.” Zorbas claims to have been in the Black Sea region of Novorossiysk. Νίκου Καζαντζάκη [Nikos Kazantzakis], Βίος και Πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά [Life and Times of Alexis Zorbas] (Athens: Kazantzakis publishers, 1981), 84. The novel was translated into English as Zorba the Greek.
then Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, and Chrysanthus Notaras’ reworking was dedicated in 1694 to prince
Constantin Brancoveanu of Wallachia. Nikolai Milescu Spatharii, Sibir’ i Kitay, ed. V. Solov’ev, A.

35 For the journey of Nikolai Spatharios to China in 1675, for which there is a considerable
bibliography, see also: Καισάριος Δαπόντες [Kaisarios Dapontes], “Ιστορικός κατάλογος ανδρών
επισήμων (1700-1784)” [Historical catalogue of prominent men (1700-1784)], in Μεσαιωνική
Βιβλιοθήκη [Medieval Library], vol. 3, ed. K.N. Σάθας [K.N. Sathas] (Venice: Τύποις του
Χρόνου, 1872), 71–200, esp. 93; Émile Picot, “Nicolas Spatar Milsceu” in Bibliographie
Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-septième
siècle, ed. Κ.Ν. Σάθας [K.N. Sathas] (Venice: Τύποις του Χρόνου, 1872), 21, 60, 157, 194–95; É. Legrand,
Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire III, (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1881), 337–441. See also: Florin Marineskou,
“Νικόλαος ’Μιλέσκου’, ενας ελληνορουμάνος λόγιος του 17ου αι. και το ταξίδι του στην Κίνα” [Nikolaos ‘Milescu’, a Greek-Romanian scholar of the

For a relevant bibliography and for information on the Jesuit and other sources for these texts on China
by Chrysanthos Notaras, see Michail Laskaris, “Ο Χρύσανθος Νοταράς και η Κίνα” [Chrysanthos Notaras and China], Ελληνική Δημιουργία [Greek Creativity], vol. 6 (1950), 433–
40; Πηνελόπη Στάθη [Pinelopi Stathi], “ΟΧΡΥΣΑΝΘΟΣ 
ΝΟΤΑΡΑΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ [Chrysanthos Notaras the Patriarch of Jerusalem], (Athens: Syndesmos ton en Athenais Megaloscholiton, 1999), 21, 60, 157, 194–95; É. Legrand, Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire III, (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1881), 337–441. See also the bibliography in Gerhard Podskalsky,
Η Ελληνική Θεολογία επί Τουρκοκρατίας 1453-
1821, Η Ορθοδοξία στη Σφαίρα Επιρροή των Δυτικών Δογμάτων Μετά τη Μεταρρύθηση [Greek
Theology under Turkish rule 1453-1821, Orthodoxy under the influence of the Western doctrines after

36 RGADA f. 214 Sibirskiy prikaz (1685) st. 935, ll. 8, 58-61. I’d like to thank Erika Monahan for first
drawing my attention to this merchant, and note that she has also referred to him and to other Greeks
in Ostafii Filat’ev’s and other Russians’ employment engaged in the China trade in her own work.
Dimitris and Constantine are very common Greek names, so one should not equate this Dimitri with
the one in the service of Archil of Imereti without corroborating evidence. Monahan, Merchants of
Siberia, 224. The Greek Dimitri Grigoriev and his factors were trading precious stones between
Russian and Chinese territories in the early 18th century. RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 16 (1718) ll. 1-2.
See also: V.A. Aleksandrov, Rossiya na dal’nevostochnykh rubezhakh (vtoraya polovina XVII v.)

37 Though ‘Chinese’ can also signify a style, for example, of sown clothing. RGADA f. 52 op. 1
d. 16 (1708) ll. 1-3. See also N.I. Pavlenko, “Torgovo-promyshlennaya politika pravitel’stva
During the final years of the eighteenth century the brothers Zosima also enjoyed extensive commercial
relations trading through Russia with China. G.L. Arsh, “Grecheskiye uchenyie i grecheskiye kuptsy–
pokroviteli natsional’nogo prosveshcheniya–v Rossii (XVIII–XIX vekov),” in Greki Rossii I Ukrainy,

38 Raymond H. Fisher, The Russian Fur Trade 1550-1700 (Berkeley: University of California Press,
1943), 222, 227; Mark Mancall, Russia and China: Their Diplomatic Relations to 1728 (Harvard:
Cambridge University Press, 1971), 168. For attempts by Peter I to establish companies that would
trade with China, see Hermann Kellenbenz, “Marchands en Russie Aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (II),”

39 RGADA f. 151 op. 1 d. 48 ll. 14v-15, 18v-19. For caravans see esp. l. 14v.

40 RGADA f. 151 op. 1 d. 48 ll. 151 156. Doklady i prigovory, sostoavshiesia v Pravitel’stvuushchem
Senate v tsarstvovanie Petra Velikogo, izd. Akademiı nauk / Pod red. N. V. Kalachova i N. F.
Dubrovina. SPb., 1880. T. 1, 124.
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RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 11 (1709) ll. 1-2.

Captain Paraskevas, as he was often called, had been granted a large part of his initial capital by Alexandros Maurocordatos (1636-1709), Dragoman to the Ottoman Porte. Ya.S. Grosul et al., eds., Istoriicheskiyi svyazii narodov SSSR i Rumyini [...] (Moscow: Nauka, 1970), 223.

RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 11 1709 ll. 2v-4.


In addition to family geography, this route may have been chosen to avoid areas of greater risk due to the Ottoman-Russian war of 1710–11.

RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 8 (1712) ll. 1-1v, 4v.

According to Benjamin, Iuri was the cause of the commotion. RGADA f. 158 Prikaznye dela novykhelet [Chancery Affairs from Recent Years] kniga 7 (1713) ll. 7v, 11-11v.


See Alexandros Levantinos described as a “specialized silver mine technician” in RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 11 (1709) ll. 1.

RGADA f. 52 op. 1 d. 36 (1706) ll. 3.

RGADA f. 151 op. 1 d. 47 l. 113, 176.

RGADA f. 151 op. 1 d. 48 l. 23.

See the discussion in David Sorkin, “The Port Jew: Notes Toward a Social Type,” Journal of Jewish Studies 50, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 87–97. The question of the role of Ottoman Orthodox traders such as the merchant, poet and cartographer Vasileios Vatatzis in the Caucasus, Central Asia and Persia has become a focus for contemporary scholarship, and can, I think, usefully be compared to developments outlined here. Marinos Sariyannis, “An Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Greek’s Travel Account in Central Asia,” in The Central Asiatic Roots of Ottoman Culture, ed. İlhan Şahin, Baktibek İsakov, and Cengiz Buyar (İstanbul: İstanbul Esnaf ve Sanatkârlar Odaları Birliği, 2014), 47–60. The latter work includes useful bibliographical material therein. Also see the ongoing research project Transottomanica based at the Justus-Liebig-Universität in Gießen.