

ADALYA

27 2024



AKMED

KOÇ UNIVERSITY

Suna & İnan Kırac

Research Center for

Mediterranean Civilizations

27 2024

ISSN 1301-2746

ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Center
for Mediterranean Civilizations

(OFFPRINT)



ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kırac Research Center
for Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED)

Adalya, a peer reviewed publication, is indexed in the A&HCI (Arts & Humanities Citation Index) – CC / A&H (Current Contents / Arts & Humanities), Social Sciences and Humanities Database of TÜBİTAK / ULAKBİM Tr Index, ERIH PLUS (European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences), Scopus, and Index Copernicus.

<i>Mode of publication</i>	Worldwide periodical
<i>Publisher certificate number</i>	18318
ISSN	1301-2746
<i>Publisher management</i>	Koç University Rumelifeneri Yolu, 34450 Sarıyer / İstanbul
<i>Publisher</i>	Metin Sitti, President, on behalf of Koç University
<i>Editor-in-chief</i>	Oğuz Tekin
<i>Editors</i>	Tarkan Kahya and Arif Yacı
<i>English copyediting</i>	Mark Wilson
<i>Editorial advisory board</i>	(Members serve for a period of five years) Emanuela Borgia, Università di Roma Sapienza (2021-2025) Ian Hodder, Koç Üniversitesi (2023-2027) Nevra Necipoğlu, Boğaziçi University (2023-2027) Fatih Onur, Akdeniz University (2023-2027) Christopher H. Roosevelt, Koç University (2021-2025) Mustafa H. Sayar, İstanbul University (2023-2027) M. Baha Tanman, İstanbul Research Institute (2024-2028) Peter van Alfen, American Numismatic Society (2023-2027)
©	Koç University AKMED, 2024
<i>Production</i>	Zero Production Ltd. Abdullah Sok. No. 17 Taksim 34433 İstanbul Tel: +90 (212) 244 75 21 • Fax: +90 (212) 244 32 09 info@zerobooksonline.com; www.zerobooksonline.com
<i>Printing</i>	Fotokitap Fotoğraf Ürünleri Paz. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti. Oruç Reis Mah. Tekstillent B-5 Blok No. 10-AH111 Esenler - İstanbul / Türkiye Certificate number: 47448
<i>Mailing address</i>	Barbaros Mah. Kocatepe Sok. No. 22 Kaleiçi 07100 Antalya / Türkiye Tel: +90 (242) 243 42 74 • Fax: +90 (242) 243 80 13 https://akmed.ku.edu.tr
<i>E-mail address</i>	adalya@ku.edu.tr

Contents

F. Gülden Ekmen <i>A Vaulted Figurine from İnönü Cave: A New Link between the Balkans and Northwestern Türkiye</i>	1
Duygu Akar Tanriver – Serhat Foça <i>Archaic and Early Classical Trade Amphorae from Old Smyrna</i>	17
Utku Arınç – Fatma Bağdatlı Çam <i>The Heracles-Melqart Head from The Hatay Museum</i>	49
Candemir Zoroğlu – Ertekin M. Doksanaltı – D. Ozan Tozluca <i>The “Winged Woman of Burgaz”: A New Archaic Sculpture from the Territory of Knidos</i>	65
Uğurcan Orhan <i>A Group of Phaselis Type 3 Amphorae by the Base of the Phaselis Central Tower: A New Pottery Dumpster (Bothros) and Amphora Production Area</i>	85
Özlem Vapur – Abdulkadir Baran <i>An Underground Chamber Tomb with Serpent Relief in Ula, Muğla</i>	117
Gonca Cankardeş-Şenol – Oğuzhan İleri – A. Kaan Şenol <i>Stamped Amphora Handles from Kedreai</i>	145
Pınar Özlem Aytaçlar <i>New Funerary Monuments from Aizanoi</i>	169
Fatma Avcu – Hüseyin Uzunoğlu <i>New Inscriptions from Rough Cilicia</i>	193
Noah Kaye <i>In Search of Ancient Antalya (Attaleia): A First Approach</i>	211
Şevket Aktaş – Mustafa Koçak – Andrew Lepke – Feyzullah Şahin <i>Localizing and Reconstructing the Gymnasion of Patara. An Interdisciplinary Approach</i>	247
Nevzat Çevik <i>Kelbessos: A Military Settlement as Termessos’ Peripolion</i>	293
Hüseyin Köker – Esra Tütüncü <i>Coin Finds from the Surveys of Northern Pisidia and the Excavations at Timbriada and Zindan Monastery</i>	313

Güray Ünver	
<i>A New Thiasos from Mylasa: Thiasitai Heroistai of Ouliades, Son of Euthydemos</i>	335
Hava Keskin – Serdar Hakan Öztaner	
<i>Some Thoughts on the Julio-Claudian Period of Nysa ad Maeandrum in the Light of a Private Portrait from the City</i>	347
Zeki Mete Aksan	
<i>A House Type Tomb in Sinope: A Neglected Burial from Paphlagonia</i>	363
Günder Varinlioğlu	
<i>Quarry Industry in Rough Cilicia: The Cases of Dana Island and Kesiktaş</i>	383
Mustafa Yıldızlı	
<i>Bricks and Roof Tiles of Alanya Castle: Evaluation of Animal Footprints from an Ichnoarchaeological Perspective</i>	409
Fatma Şimşek – Damla Ayoğlu-Duman	
<i>The French Consulate and Trade in Antalya in the 17th Century</i>	429

The French Consulate and Trade in Antalya in the 17th Century

FATMA ŞİMŞEK – DAMLA AYOĞLU-DUMAN*

Abstract

Our knowledge of Antalya's foreign trade both in the 17th century and in the periods before and after this century is quite limited. In this century, Ottoman maritime trade was concentrated in ports such as Izmir and Alexandria, which had better equipment and commodity diversity capacities compared to Antalya. However, Antalya was one of the first consulates opened in the Levant by France, which replaced Venice in the Eastern Mediterranean trade. Except for a ten-year period (1644-1655), which remains uncertain despite its commercial weakness, this study focuses on the French efforts and justifications for establishing a foothold in Antalya throughout the 17th century. In the light of consular correspondence, other French sources, and Ottoman archival documents, commercial activities, items of manufactured goods, and raw materials exported from the city's port have been identified. Documents containing especially commercial records of a limited number of ships departing from the port of Antalya allow us to observe the commercial traffic between France and Antalya during this period. In addition, the size and volume of this trade can be determined greatly through the cotime tax imposed on the cargo of French ships. All these efforts of France, which almost monopolized the foreign trade of the city, will be examined in detail and comprehensively in terms of both the institutional

Öz

Antalya'nın gerek 17. yy. gerek ise bu yüzyıl öncesi ve sonrası dönemlere ait dış ticaretine ilişkin bilgilerimiz oldukça sınırlıdır. Zira bu yüzyılda Osmanlı deniz ticaretinin Antalya'ya nazaran donanım ve emtia çeşitliği bakımından kapasiteleri daha yüksek olan İzmir ve İskenderiye gibi limanlarda yoğunlaştığı görülmektedir. Oysa Doğu Akdeniz ticaretinde Venedik'in yerini alan Fransa'nın Levant'ta açtığı ilk konsolosluklardan biri Antalya'dır. Bu çalışma ticari zayıflığına rağmen belirsizliğini koruyan 10 yıllık bir dönem (1644-1655) istisna olmak üzere 17. yy. boyunca Fransızların Antalya'da tutunma çabaları ve gerekçeleri üzerine odaklanmıştır. Başta konsolosluk yazışmaları olmak üzere diğer Fransız kaynaklar ve Osmanlı arşiv belgeleri ışığında ticari faaliyetler ve kentin limanından ihraç edilen mamul ve hammadde kalemleri belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Özellikle Antalya Limanı'ndan hareket eden sınırlı sayıda gemiye ait ticari kayıtları ihtiva eden belgeler, bize bu dönemde gerçekleşen Fransa-Antalya ticari trafiğini gözlememize imkân tanımaktadır. Ayrıca, Fransız gemilerindeki kargolara uygulanan kotime vergisi aracılığıyla da bu ticaretin boyutları ve hacmi büyük ölçüde belirlenbilmektedir. Şehrin dış ticaretinde adeta monopolleşen Fransa'nın tüm bu çabaları gerek kurumsal yapı ve gerek ise giriştiği ticari bağlantılar bakımından ayrıntılı ve kapsamlı

* Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatma Şimşek, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Yeniçağ Tarihi Anabilim Dalı, Antalya, Türkiye. E-mail: fsimsek@akdeniz.edu.tr ; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8173-971X>

Res. Ass. Dr. Damla Ayoğlu Duman, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, İktisat Bölümü, İktisat Tarihi Anabilim Dalı, Antalya, Türkiye. E-mail: ayoglu@akdeniz.edu.tr ; <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0256-9025>

structure and the commercial connections it undertook. A determination of Antalya's commercial place and importance in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 17th century will be attempted.

Keywords: Antalya French Consulate, Kotime tax, Antalya Port, Ottoman-French trade, Marseille

bir şekilde irdelenerek, Antalya'nın 17. yy.'da Doğu Akdeniz'deki ticari yeri ve önemi belirlenmeye çalışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Antalya Fransız konsolosluğu, kotime vergisi, Antalya Limanı, Osmanlı-Fransız ticareti, Marsilya

One of the last political achievements of Ibrahim Pasha, achieved just before his execution, was the establishment of permanent relations with France. As a result of the diplomatic and military relations developed against their common enemy, the Habsburgs, the French managed to extend the privileges they enjoyed in Egypt during the Mamluk period to the entire Ottoman Empire.¹ The Capitulations granted by the Ottoman Sultan to France in 1569, confirmed in 1604, enabled the French to supplant the Venetians in the Levant trade, particularly from the time of the Cyprus War that lasted from 1570 to 1573. French consulates were set up in a number of ports in the region to protect and defend the interests of the French merchants who traded in the Levant, attracted primarily by spices and silks. We know that until 1610 the French only had five consulates in the Levant: Syria, Alexandria, Chios, Zante and Satalie (today's Antalya). However, we also know that trade in this *écbelle* (or port of trade) was never really significant and that this *écbelle* was abandoned by the French at the end of the 17th century; before being reestablished for a time in the second decade of the 18th century.

More than a century after Auguste Boppe's note² and almost a century after the work of Jean-Reynaud and Paul-Martin Bondois,³ we wish to return to this question because we can now provide more information on the history of the French consulate in Antalya and on the importance of French trade in this *écbelle*. The result will give a less impressionistic picture than that painted by our predecessors, as well as provide a better understanding of the causes that led to the abandonment of the *écbelle* and the concentration of French trade in the ports of the Levant with far greater commercial weight, such as Izmir and Alexandria. Above all, we will be able to better understand why a French consulate was maintained for almost a century, despite the low importance of the trade.

We will therefore begin by indicating which products from Antalya and its region were of interest to French traders. Next, we will look back at the history of the French consulate in Antalya, which demonstrates France's determination to maintain it throughout the 17th century to protect French trade. Finally, we will try to give as accurate an idea as possible of the weakness of French trade in Antalya and the possible reasons for this weakness. These reasons led to the closure of the consulate in this *écbelle*, despite the interest of the port as a stopover in the maritime caravan, an interest which could counterbalance the weakness of the trade of the *écbelle*.

¹ Basque-Grammont 1995, 1:187.

² Boppe 1902.

³ Bondois 1936, 29-34; Reynaud 1928, 221-32.

French Interest in Products from Antalya and the Surrounding Region

In the 17th century, French merchants trading with Antalya were interested in a number of local products, which can be classified into five types: textiles, products needed in the craft industry, wax, foodstuffs, and, finally, perfumes and medical products. Textile products clearly played the leading role in this group, to which we will return after looking at the other types of products.

The products used for crafts are very limited in number, as we have only recorded tragacanth and sendarac, the latter obviously of negligible importance compared with the former. As early as the 13th century, Cypriots, Florentines, and other merchants obtained gum tragacanth from Antalya.⁴ This is made from the sap of a plant in the astragalus family. It was used in medicine but, above all, in a variety of craft activities, notably by leather workers, who used it in the preparation of their leather.⁵

For the period in question, we find mention of French purchases of gum tragacanth in Antalya in a well-known report from 1633 by Henri de Séguiran, Seigneur de Bouc; addressed to Cardinal de Richelieu, the prime minister between 1624-1642,⁶ and in a memorandum from 1675 written by François Mazerat, a merchant and owner of the French consulate in Antalya, which he had run by vice-consuls. This report was drawn up at the request of the Intendant of Provence, Jean Rouillé, Comte de Meslay.⁷ As for sendaraque, a fragrant grape derived from a species of cypress, it was undoubtedly used as a varnish in woodworking, and is mentioned in the 1675 report under the name sendarasse.⁸

Let us now turn to the next type of product encountered in the purchases of French merchants in Antalya: products used in perfumery and in the pharmacopoeia of the time. Storax seems to be the most important. This resinous substance, extracted from plants of the styrax genus, was used as incense as well as in medicine and cosmetics. In the 18th century, for example, it was used in an ointment to combat scurvy and gangrene.⁹ It was of interest to French merchants from at least the very beginning of the 17th century,¹⁰ and features in Mazerat's memoir of 1675.¹¹ Later, Paul Lucas, referring to Antalya where he arrived on 8 November 1706, described the surrounding region as being abundant in everything and having "the privilege of producing storax in quantity."¹²

Adragante was used by tanners to prepare leather but could also be used in electuaries to treat eye diseases.¹³ Finally, the purchase of opium by the French is mentioned in Séguiran's report. It was probably used as a sedative or even as a sleeping drug.¹⁴

⁴ Depping 1830, 111, 141, 300.

⁵ Masson 1896, xxviii.

⁶ Sourdis 1839, 3:227.

⁷ Bondois 1936, 33.

⁸ Bondois 1936, 33.

⁹ Savary Des Bruslons 1741, 3:221-22; Masson 1896, xxxiii.

¹⁰ Reynaud 1928, 223; Masson 1896, 395. However, this product has been popular for use in various fields since antiquity; see Durak 2022, 181-90.

¹¹ Bondois 1936, 33.

¹² Lucas 1712, 312-13.

¹³ Masson 1896, xxviii.

¹⁴ Savary Des Bruslons 1726, 2, col. 901.

The main food product, indeed practically the only one, that could be extracted from Antalya was the currant – a sultana. It appears in the list in the 1675 memoir,¹⁵ as well as in an undated anonymous memoir written around the beginning of the 18th century.¹⁶ It is possible that prior to the 1670s the export of this product was strictly forbidden, like all food products from the Ottoman Empire. Towards the end of the century, the rule was relaxed, but even then the export of this type of product was more tolerated than permitted.¹⁷ We can also imagine that the quantities exported were modest or relatively modest, depending on the case. The three main food products exported from the Ottoman Empire were coffee, oil,¹⁸ and wheat. Although the export of these products was strictly forbidden, from the end of the 17th century it became possible to export them due to dearly paid for indulgences.

French sources give no examples of wheat imported from Antalya by the French. At the end of the century during the War of the League of Augsburg (1688-1697), which we know weighed heavily on the French government in terms of demand for grain at a time of great scarcity and even famine in France, the minister Pontchartrain expected du Roure, the vice-consul of Antalya, to make efforts to obtain permission to export wheat for France.¹⁹ On the basis of an Ottoman document dated 1693, we find that permission was granted at the request of the French ambassador for the sale of wheat to be extracted from the island of Meis and the surrounding islands.²⁰ In addition to currants, we can mention purchases of acorns (only one shipment recorded) and honey (also only one mentioned) by the French in the Antalya region.²¹

Wax was one of the products from Antalya that attracted the interest of French merchants. This prompted ambassador Savary de Brèves to install in this port a temporary French consul, René Fuzibée, from the very beginning of 1600, as we shall see later.²² This product is high on the list of things mentioned in Séguiran's report²³ and at the top of the list of those mentioned by Mazerat. The two authors do not establish any hierarchy between the products mentioned; however, Mazerat specifies that currants and *chevron* wool can only be removed by express order of the Sultan.²⁴ This implies *a priori* that the sale of these two products was very limited, which was not the case for wax. And in his political testament, Richelieu even limited his list of products imported from Antalya to cottons, maroquins, and wax.²⁵ This article, which probably consisted mostly of raw wax called yellow wax,²⁶ was clearly one of the main products exported from Antalya throughout the 17th century and beyond. The short anonymous memoir

¹⁵ Bondois 1936, 33.

¹⁶ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 5.

¹⁷ Masson 1896, 504.

¹⁸ Coffee produced in Yemen was exported only from Egypt, oil from the Peloponnese, the Aegean islands, and Crete, and wheat from the granaries of the Levant; see Masson 1896, 504. For the coffee trade in Ottoman Levant, see Bostan 2019, 169-218; Hattox 1998.

¹⁹ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter from Du Roure, vice-consul in Satalie, to Mayor, Alderman Chevins, and Députés du Commerce à Marseille.

²⁰ *BOA.*, AE. SAMD. II, 1 / 3, 19 Ra 1105 (18 December 1693); Şimşek 2022a, 668.

²¹ In 1677 and 1679; see *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 377, Command to the Satalie authorities authorizing a cargo of glands to be loaded on a French vessel; Constantinople, 1 Şaban 1088 (29 September 1677). *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 78. 293.

²² Reynaud 1928, 223; Masson 1896, 395.

²³ Sourdis 1839, 3:227.

²⁴ Bondois 1936, 33.

²⁵ Richelieu 1688, 141.

²⁶ The product appears under this name in Mazerat's memoir; see Bondois 1936, 33.

mentioned above, which clearly dates from the first or second decade of the 18th century, includes wax among the coveted products of Antalya. This trade had been abandoned by the French for a number of years and who no longer had a French consulate,²⁷ likewise we will return to this.

Finally, textiles, as mentioned above, appear to have been the most important item exported from Antalya. Leather, cordovan, and *maroquins* attracted the interest of French merchants from at least the very beginning of the 17th century.²⁸ Henri de Beauveau, who visited Antalya in 1605, noted that the French came to Antalya to load up on leather and carpets from Caramania.²⁹ At that time, leather seems to have been a leading item in the *écbelle* trade. In the same year, Savary de Brèves stated that “the inhabitants [of Antalya] are rich because of the trade in cordovan leather and the manufacture of carpets called of Caramania.”³⁰ Séguiran specified that the cordovans were white *maroquins* cordovans, while Richelieu stated that the French brought back all kinds of *maroquins* from Antalya.³¹ In his memoir dated 1675, Mazerat mentions red and yellow *maroquins* as exportable products from Satalie, as well as leathers, probably meaning raw skins.³² Finally, the author of the anonymous memoir from the early 18th century mentions only cordovans, without any further details.³³

Cotton was another important textile product. In his report, Séguiran mentions woollen cotton, but also what he calls “filets” undoubtedly spun cotton.³⁴ For Richelieu, cotton was, alongside waxes and *maroquins*, the main products purchased by the French in Antalya.³⁵ Mazerat mentions cotton and spun cotton among the products that could be exported from Antalya,³⁶ cotton that, around the same epoch, the French could also buy in Alanya.³⁷ The author of the anonymous memoir mentions spun cotton and woollen cotton, in all likelihood the latter meaning raw cotton.³⁸

In his *Nouvelle description de la France* first published in 1718, Piganiol de la Force suggests that much of the spun cotton of Antalya was not appreciated by merchants. He wrote: “It is a little more tortuous, & more difficult to spin & and to use; it is not even as white as that of the other Echelles, because the local people who spin it, only burn wood instead of oil during the winter, & the smoke that comes out blackens the cotton; which means that there is a great difference between Satalia cotton, spun in winter, & that which is spun in summer.”³⁹ Cotton material called *escamites* was also bought by the French, at least towards the end of the 17th century,⁴⁰ if not earlier.

²⁷ A.N., Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5.

²⁸ Reynaud 1928, 223; Masson 1896, 395.

²⁹ Beauveau 1615, 86.

³⁰ Breves 1628, 23; our translation as are all the other passages in the French sources quoted.

³¹ Sourdis 1839, 3:227; Richelieu 1688, 141.

³² Bondois 1936, 33.

³³ A.N., Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5.

³⁴ Sourdis 1839, 3:227.

³⁵ Richelieu 1688, 141.

³⁶ Bondois 1936, 33.

³⁷ Karakoyun 2014, 247-48; BOA, MAD. d. 2747, 78.293.

³⁸ A.N., Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5.

³⁹ Piganiol de La Force 1722, 115-16.

⁴⁰ A.N., Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5; Anonymous 1770, 504.

Alongside leathers and cotton, raw or prepared, was wool. There is no mention of the French trade in raw wool in Antalya until the last decades of the 17th century, when it is mentioned in Mazerat's memoir.⁴¹ Mazerat mentions sheep's wool in particular, but also *chevron* wool, which was used to make hats and required authorization from the sultan to be exported. According to Masson, what was known as *chevron* wool was camel hair. However, the author of the anonymous memoir mentions camel and goat hair among the products sought by the French in Antalya. Were both types of hair used to make hats? It's possible. These hats were undoubtedly what were also known as "camelots" which, if Séguiran is to be believed, could have been made locally in Antalya and then exported, since he mentions camelots in his list of products sought after by the French.⁴² At this stage, it seems that these hats were produced in Antalya and exported. However, it seems more likely to us that Séguiran used the term "Camelot" to refer to the type of material used to make these hats.

As for silk, it had been exported from Antalya in small quantities since at least the last third of the 17th century.⁴³ This was clearly "silk of the country's own growth," as Mazerat notes, and not silk imported from Persia for re-export. However, according to the anonymous author of the early 18th century, "all the caravans that come from Persia on their way to Smyrna" pass through Antalya.⁴⁴ However, there was no record of Persian silk being exported from Antalya.

Carpets, on the other hand, were a finished article and of interest to the French since at least the beginning of the 17th century. We saw above that in 1605, Henri de Beauveau and Savary de Brèves made them a very important trade item.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, we find no further mention of them after Séguiran's report dated 1633.⁴⁶

To summarize, Antalya offered local and hinterland products to the French trade. These products consisted mainly of raw materials from agriculture and livestock husbandry, or semi-finished products such as fabrics. Carpets were an exception, but they no longer appear in our lists of exported products after 1633. We have listed here the products bought by the French in Antalya for export and seen that some were more important than others in the purchases. Nevertheless, the quantities of products exported from Antalya, as well as their value, cannot be known with precision, except for a few short periods only, to which we'll return later.

Maintaining a Consulate Throughout the Century to Protect French Trade

Thanks to the now dated notes of Boppe, Reynaud, and Bondois, we are well informed about the origins of the French consulate in Antalya. Until 1610, as we mentioned at the beginning of our study, the French had five consuls – Syria, Alexandria, Chios, Zante and Antalya – in the Levant. These consuls were appointed by the King of France. Marseilles exercised a virtual

⁴¹ Bondois 1936, 33; *A.N.*, Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5.

⁴² Bondois 1936, 33; Masson 1896, 503; *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 5; Sourdis 1839, 3:227. For information on the export of this wool, known as "hüsür" among the nomads, which is mohair obtained from the base of the hair of the black goat and used in the production of hats, especially in Marseille, see Ak 2021, 274; Fontanier 1829, 289-90.

⁴³ Bondois 1936, 33; *A.N.*, Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5. The purchase of silk by the French in Antalya is mentioned in a Sultanian order of şaban 1090 / sept.-oct. 1679. *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 78.293.

⁴⁴ Bondois 1936, 33; *A.N.*, Paris, Affaires Etrangères BI 1008, fol. 5.

⁴⁵ Reynaud 1928, 223; Masson 1896, 395.

⁴⁶ Sourdis 1839, 3:227.

monopoly over trade in the Levant, although the City Council (*Conseil de la Ville*) only intervened to register the letters of provision issued to the consul, who was generally of Marseilles origin.⁴⁷

Before the arrival of an agent in Antalya with consular functions, probably as early as 1600, this *écbelle* was dependent on the Syrian consulate, as was the whole of Caramania. The consuls closest to the city were therefore the Syrian consulate, generally based in Aleppo, and the Chios consulate in the Archipelago, both several hundred kilometers away. This made it very difficult to protect French interests in the region.⁴⁸

Savary de Brèves, the ambassador of King Henri IV (1589-1610) to Constantinople who had just obtained the renewal of the Capitulations, had been approached with the question by several of his countrymen. He gave them partial satisfaction, as he himself informed the consuls of Marseille in a letter dated 18 January 1600:

“Some of your fellow countrymen have made it known to me that they would like to go and trade on the *écbelle* of Satalie and do some good business there because of the convenience of the leather, cordovan, wax, carpets, storax and other small goods that can be found on this little-frequented *écbelle*. This is why, in order to further demonstrate the care, I take to ensure their profit and satisfaction, I have had powerful orders issued and in fifteen or twenty days will send one of my own with a copy of the Capitulation to reside there as a consul, while waiting for His Majesty to provide for this. You can therefore advise the merchants who wish to make this journey that they will find a protector from here on.”⁴⁹

The man sent to Antalya by the ambassador was René Fuzibée,⁵⁰ who belonged to a family that supplied France with dragomans, chancellors, and consuls for the Levant until the French Revolution. He held this position until 1607.⁵¹ Henri de Beauveau therefore found him, without naming him, when he visited Antalya in the summer of 1605.⁵² In 1610, Fuzibée was butler to the ambassador who succeeded Savary de Brèves in Istanbul, Jean-François de Gontaut Biron, baron de Salignac (1607-1611).⁵³

It should be noted that between 1600 and 1607, the Antalya consulate did not officially exist, and Fuzibée was only a temporary representative of the French nation appointed by the Ambassador, pending a royal decision. The temporary period lasted seven years. Does this mean that there was opposition to the opening of a consulate in this *écbelle*?⁵⁴ We do not know. Be that as it may, it was in a letter patent dated 26 March 1607 that Henri IV appointed the Marseillais Mathieu Grosson, on condition of survivorship of another Marseillais, Thomas Gaillard, to the post of French consul in Antalya, with authorization for Grosson and Gaillard to be represented in Antalya by a simple vice-consul. This was the custom at the time. Until the end of the 17th century, consulate holders, even then referred to as owners who saw their

⁴⁷ Reynaud 1928, 222.

⁴⁸ Reynaud 1928, 223.

⁴⁹ Reynaud 1928, 223; Masson 1896, 395.

⁵⁰ The name is also spelled Fouzibée and Fonsibée; see Reynaud 1928, 226; Bordier 1888, 150.

⁵¹ Reynaud 1928, 223-26.

⁵² Beauveau 1615, 86.

⁵³ In his will of 17 September 1610, he wrote that Fuzibée owed him nothing; see Bordier 1888, 149-50.

⁵⁴ Reynaud 1928, 224.

office solely as a source of income, would only very exceptionally reside in a foreign city. We know nothing about Grosson and Gaillard other than that they were sea captains.⁵⁵

From 18 November 1611, Grosson and Gaillard were succeeded by François Beaulan and Jean Mazerat. They had the option of appointing vice-consuls in their place, to whom they entrusted the exercise of the consulate for only three years. Once this time had expired, they sub-delegated others, as appears from a ruling by the Parliament of Provence on 15 April 1639, given at Mazerat's request against a man named Léonard Gravier, who claimed to continue in office beyond the three years stipulated in his commission.⁵⁶ One other vice-consul's name has come down to us from this period, that of Garnier, of whom only one letter survives from this post which he occupied in 1633. In the letter he indicated that he would endeavour to apply the decree prescribing that those who refused to pay the three per cent duty on the goods they loaded should be forced to do so.⁵⁷ That same year, 1633, the post was deemed sufficiently important for a Capuchin missionary station to be set up in Antalya, founded by Reverend Father Michel de Rennes.⁵⁸

We also know that Vincent Stochove, during his trip to the Levant in 1630-1631, found a French consul in Antalya, a vice-consul in all likelihood.⁵⁹ Gilles Fermanel, who travelled with Stochove, also mentions him.⁶⁰ At the same time he gives us a description of the consular house, where he spent a pleasant stay.⁶¹

We also know that in 1638 the French had a Jewish interpreter by the name of İsak Darin, according to a Sultanlic firman instructing the governor and qâdhî of Teke not to hinder the activity of this interpreter who had some enemies.⁶² This was not the only problem encountered by the French in Antalya at this time since, let us repeat, the following year the holder of the consulate, who must then have been Jean Mazerat, was confronted with Léonard Gravier's refusal to leave his post as vice-consul.

The years 1639-1655 in the history of the French consulate in Antalya would have remained in total obscurity if some Ottoman documents that we have used had not thrown some light on it. One of the few pieces of information obtained from French sources is that, on 15 June 1643, a certain Nicolas Faure took possession of the consulate.⁶³

During these troubles concerning the French consulate and the French nation of Antalya, in the years 1654-1655, other documents, four in Ottoman and one in French, enable us to

⁵⁵ Reynaud 1928, 225-28; Bondois 1936, 29.

⁵⁶ Bondois 1936, 29-30; Masson 1896, 92, n. 2.

⁵⁷ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541; Boppe 1902, 29.

⁵⁸ *Capucins missionnaires*, 30.

⁵⁹ Stochove 1650, 231-32.

⁶⁰ Fermanel 1670, 233.

⁶¹ "Nothing could have been more pleasant than the house where we were staying, which was the Consul's residence; it is all carved out of the rock, with all the necessary conveniences cut into it with the point of a chisel. There were three fountains that came down from the top of the mountain, and with a gentle murmur ran through the whole house. The view from this house is very pleasant, because it overlooks the whole town, the beautiful gardens and the sea: the view from the rock is solitary, but it is steep because of the water that continually gushes down from it. It is lined in many places with pleasant greenery, so that one cannot imagine a more pleasant and solitary hermitage than this one. Such a pleasant place kept us there for four days, during which we walked everywhere"; see Fermanel 1670, 234.

⁶² Genç 2014, 172-73; *BOA*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 12.23.

⁶³ Bondois 1936, 30.

understand a little of what happened between 1639 and 1655. In the Ottoman documents, the French names are distorted, but we can sometimes establish concordances. A document dated mid-November 1655 says that Leyomar Arni (Léonard Gravier, obviously) had been appointed consul, in fact, vice-consul, at an unknown date in the 1630s, according to us, but probably after 1632. His job was to protect the activities of French merchants in Antalya and Alanya, and was then dismissed by the King of France, probably the ruling of 15 April 1639. After him, a certain Mare Veledon, for whom we have not been able to find a correspondent in French spelling, was sent to Antalya as consul with the *berat* of the sultan. He was succeeded by Piro de Laroche (Béraud de Laroche?).⁶⁴ In the meantime, a certain Anton Varile (also difficult to identify) had claimed to be consul of France, without any *berat* or authorization from the king or the ambassador. Laroche was in charge of arresting him and his supporters and sending them to Istanbul.⁶⁵ The Antalya authorities were instructed to recognize only Laroche and to allow him to appoint a replacement if he had to move.⁶⁶ In all likelihood, Veledon and Laroche were vice-consuls and not consuls, since the consulate belonged to Jean Mazerat, then Nicolas Faure, from 1643.

This being said, according to François Mazerat's above-mentioned memoir dated 1675, in 1655 it had been more than ten years, that is, since 1644, that the *écbelle* had been abandoned by the French nation because of an unpaid debt of 12.000 piastres including interest, a debt contracted by the French on the *echelle*.⁶⁷ Did this abandonment concern the whole nation, including the consul, or just the French who came to trade in Antalya? It is difficult to answer. In any case, an Ottoman firman (early June 1654) confirms that, due to problems with the local official authorities (ehl-i örf), French ships no longer frequented the *echelle*.⁶⁸ Another document, dated December 1655, tells us that a certain sum (was it the 12.000 piastres?) had been lent to Consul Narnir (was it Gravier?) and that this sum was now being claimed by creditors from Consul La Rosa (was it Laroche?) and the ships going to Antalya. The Sultan forbade this sum to be claimed from the French and announced that the matter would be dealt with by the French ambassador's dragoman, who would act as La Rosa's deputy in Istanbul.⁶⁹

In 1655 the consulate of Antalya changed hands in Marseille. It was bought by François Mazerat, son of Jean.⁷⁰ It was undoubtedly he who sent Laroche to Antalya to take charge of the vice-consulate. The author of the anonymous memoir of the early 18th century is probably mistaken by one year in noting that the King of France granted the consulate of Antalya to Favre and Mazarat in 1656.⁷¹ Moreover, the name Favre appears nowhere else in our sources.

An Ottoman document dated May 1662 mentions a certain Reboli, a deputy for French merchants, whose petition complained that the local authorities in Antalya had confiscated sails and rudders from merchants. But we know nothing more about this person. Was he the vice-consul? We don't know. What we do know is that in 1664 the consulate still belonged to François Mazerat. That year, as the minister of King Louis XIV (1661-1715), Colbert (1661-1683)

⁶⁴ Genç 2014, 383-85; BOA., A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 150-51, 406.

⁶⁵ Genç, 2014, 293, BOA., A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 86.248.

⁶⁶ Genç, 2014, 383-85; BOA., A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 150-51. 406.

⁶⁷ Bondois 1936, 32.

⁶⁸ The French obtained this firman, prohibiting the local authorities from obstructing their trade; see Genç 2014, 274; BOA., A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 73.215.

⁶⁹ Genç 2014, 291; BOA., A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 85.243.

⁷⁰ Bondois 1936, 30-32, and extract from the Chancellery deed of September 1655; see A.C.C.M., J 1647.

⁷¹ A.N., Paris, BI 1008, fol. 5.

was reorganizing the consulates, and Mazerat presented him with supporting documents. In 1667 Mazerat still owned the consulate and had it run on his behalf by a certain Verquigny. This was no doubt already the case in 1664, as Mazerat's report of 1675 states that Verquigny had probably been vice-consul of Antalya for more than ten years or, with greater certainty, that he had been living there for more than ten years.⁷² In 1669 François wrote to the minister from Marseille to assure him of his devotion. In 1675 he was still in possession of the consulate when he wrote the report he sent to Rouillé.⁷³ According to the memoir from the early 18th century, he died in 1677.⁷⁴

The report to Rouillé is undoubtedly associated with a Council ruling inspired by Colbert. This ruling first recalled that, despite the rulings of 1664 and 1665, consulate holders had continued to send clerks to the *écbelles*. This regulation then

“cancelled and annulled the commissions given by the so-called owners of the consulates of Smyrna, Nafplio (Napoli di Romania), Aleppo, Cyprus, Satalia, Saida and their dependencies, very expressly inhibited and forbade the said consuls or subdelegates from interfering in the future in the exercise and functions of the said offices, on pain of a fine of 10.000 livres [pounds]...., enjoined His Majesty the Marquis of Nointel to ensure the execution of the present decree, reserving His Majesty the right to provide for the said consulates with capable people.”⁷⁵

Despite this ruling, and apart from Aleppo and Smyrna, the clerks continued to be in charge of the consulates in the Levant.⁷⁶ Boppe notes that from 1676 the consuls of Antalya were appointed by the king.⁷⁷ In reality, they never ceased to be so, and the problem facing Colbert was that of the leasing of the consulate, not the royal attributions.

In 1676 Esprit Bérard succeeded Verquigny as vice-consul of Antalya. A letter written by him from Antalya and dated 20 July 1680 shows that he was still in the post at that time.⁷⁸ He undoubtedly remained so until the beginning of 1682 when an Ottoman document and another French document record the death of the [vice]consul in Antalya. In an Ottoman document dated January 1682, the correct reading of the deceased consul's name seems to be Asilrad,⁷⁹ very vaguely close to the real name. As for the letter from the French ambassador in Istanbul, Gabriel Joseph La Vergne, Comte de Guilleragues, addressed to the minister Seignelay and dated Péra, 14 January 1682, we only find mention of the death of the [vice]consul (unnamed) and two merchants.⁸⁰

During the years of Esprit Bérard's vice-consulship, the consulate had been held by Rimbaud and Reimondin since 1677, according to a memoir published at the beginning of the

⁷² Bondois 1936, 30-33.

⁷³ Bondois 1936, 30-32.

⁷⁴ *A.N.*, Paris, BI 1008, fol. 5. It is difficult to interpret an Ottoman document referring to a statement by the French ambassador in Istanbul, Charles François Olier, Marquis de Nointel, dated in early 1088 (spring 1677). The ambassador states that Sevenkan (?), who was the previous consul in Antalya, was dismissed and replaced by the Beğzade Rafia (Rako?) Fransuva Mazarta; see Karakoyun 2014, 237; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 72.263.

⁷⁵ Masson 1896, 150.

⁷⁶ Masson 1896, 150 and 151-52, n. 5.

⁷⁷ Boppe 1902, 29.

⁷⁸ Boppe 1902, 29; *A.C.C.M.*, J 541.

⁷⁹ Karakoyun 2014, 256; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 83.320.

⁸⁰ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 378, fol. 283.

18th century. These Marseilles merchants “continued, at the King’s pleasure, to exercise the aforementioned consulate and trade until 1694, when they withdrew.”⁸¹

After the death of Esprit Bérard, the current vice-consul was Claude Blancon from 1682 to 1691.⁸² An edict of 19 March 1683 issued by Sultan Mehmet IV (1648-1687) refers to a consul serving in Antalya, stating that local authorities should not forcibly demand traditional gifts from the consul.⁸³ Two letters written by Claude Blancon while posted in Antalya have come down to us, one dated 2 April 1687 and the other dated 1 May 1688. Both are addressed to the Aldermen and deputies of the Marseilles Trade.⁸⁴ In the first, he states that he has no debt other than that of 192 and a half piastres owed since 13 March 1683, a sum taken from the funds of the boat *Notre Dame du Mont* captained by André Géraud.⁸⁵ This is a relatively modest sum, but it shows the fragile balance of Blancon’s consular budget, since it has still not been repaid four years after the debt was incurred.

According to Boppe, during the years 1690 and 1691 a certain François Fabre from the Fabre family of Marseille was consul, by which he probably meant vice-consul.⁸⁶ But this was not the case, and this person does not appear in our sources. On the contrary, a statement of consular expenses for the period from 10 March 1690 to April 1691 is signed by Blancon. In addition, we read in a document in the same collection, as well as in a document held by the French National Archives, that Du Roure was Blancon’s successor.⁸⁷ Moreover, Boppe is not quite right when he writes that Du Roure, Blancon’s successor, was consul at Antalya from 1691 to 1695.⁸⁸ Although he was indeed in office until 1696, the year in which the French consulate closed, Du Roure was unaware (or perhaps pretended to be unaware) that the Antalya consulate had been abolished by the French government in 1691.

To conclude this point, let us look at the years 1691-1696, which were only a long prelude to the effective abandonment of the consulate of Antalya by the French. This abandonment was not definitive, but nevertheless lasted until 1717, that is, more than twenty years. We are certain that François du Roure occupied his post as vice-consul in Antalya as early as 1691, for it was to the vice-consul that the French ambassador in Istanbul, Pierre-Antoine Castagner, Marquis de Châteauneuf, wrote from Pera in letters dated 21 and 25 August 1691. With the second, he sends him his consul’s patente and specifies:

“Sieur Du Roure wrote to me from Satalie that he had been sent there by Mrs of the trade of Marseille to relieve Sir Blancon and asked me for a patente [license] which I sent him with a command from the G. Seigneur [the Sultan] to exercise the consulate of this *échelle* until he has received the King’s orders. I am convinced, Sir, that he would not commit me to this if he did not hope to be acknowledged for it.”⁸⁹

⁸¹ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 5.

⁸² And not 1690 as Boppe notes; see Boppe 1902, 30.

⁸³ Karakoyun 2014, 263-64; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 88.341.

⁸⁴ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541.

⁸⁵ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541.

⁸⁶ Boppe 1902, 30.

⁸⁷ *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647 ; *A.N.*, Paris, BI 381, letter of Châteauneuf [to Pontchartrain], Péra, 25 August 1691, fol. 56.

⁸⁸ Boppe 1902, 30.

⁸⁹ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, Castagner de Châteauneuf à Du Roure, Péra, 21 August 1691; *A.N.*, Paris, Affaires étrangères BI 381, Châteauneuf [à Pontchartrain], Péra, le 25 août 1691, fol. 56.

Du Roure seems to have been appointed on the proposal of Joseph Rimbaud, who was undoubtedly the holder of the consulate and may have been his son-in-law at the time.⁹⁰

Du Roure's correspondence provides us, for the first time in the century, with fairly detailed information on the French consulate in Antalya. We will therefore dwell on it in greater detail because of the insights it sheds on the role of this consulate and the management difficulties it encountered. The documents in our possession are detailed enough to give us a more precise idea of the composition of the consular staff at the time. There was also a French trading company operating in the *écbelle*, which was clearly the main justification for maintaining a French consulate there. We will discuss this company in more detail below. For the moment, let us note that the company, no doubt due to insufficient traffic or losses, decided to withdraw from Antalya during the first half of 1694, and ordered the consul to do the same, claiming that this order came from the Chamber of Commerce of Marseille.⁹¹ As we shall see, the trading company was responsible for some of the consulate's expenses. The withdrawal of the company immediately put the consul in debt, making it impossible for him to maintain the consulate and the consular staff with the means at his disposal, and therefore to remain in office. This led him to ask to be replaced and what is behind the closure of the consulate two years later, for a period of more than twenty years.

Two detailed statements of consular expenditure in Antalya, one for the year 1692 and the other for the period from 16 July 1694 to 31 January 1696, give us an idea of the composition of the consular staff in Antalya at that time. Apart from the consul, there was a chaplain, a dragoman, a surgeon, a cook, a janissary to guard the consular house, and a boy (probably a factotum).⁹² Several statements of consular expenses are comprised of expenditures for the running of the consulate (including the rent of the consular house, as well as expenses for the upkeep of the chapel) and ordinary presents made to Antalya authorities, to other dignitaries, to servants, and to some employees in the service of these same Antalya authorities, notably on the occasion of religious celebrations or Bayram. These totals are: 1293 piastres for the year 1692, more than 911 piastres from 12 April 1692 to 11 March 1693, more than 1283 piastres from 11 March to September 1693, and 2088 piastres from 16 July 1694 to 31 January 1696.⁹³ These sums are not excessive and bear witness to the rather low importance of the Antalya consulate and French traffic in the place. However, the consul was unable to cover all these expenses with the money sent to him by the Marseilles Chamber of Commerce as a salary, that is, 1500 livres per year.⁹⁴

Rimbaud asked the consul to withdraw from his post in the spring of 1694. It was made clear to du Roure that he must first obtain a command from the Ambassador.⁹⁵ In a letter dated 26 June 1694 addressed to the Marseille Chamber of Commerce, du Roure explained his difficulties:

⁹⁰ Document from October 11, 1696, signed Lebret; see *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647.

⁹¹ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of Du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce, Satalie, 26 June 1694.

⁹² *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, Du Roure, 21 August 1692. Péra, Duplicata; J 1647, Du Roure, à Alexandrie, 22 March 1696; Masson 1896, 447, n. 2. We find no trace of a chancellor, apart from the mention of Blancon as chancellor of the nation, in a document dated by himself on 2 June 1670; see *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 3 v^o-4. Does this mean that the Chancellor was responsible for his own expenses?

⁹³ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, Du Roure, 21 August 1692. Péra, Duplicate; J 1647, Du Roure, Satalie, 19 September 1693; *Idem*, à Alexandrie, 22 March 1696.

⁹⁴ *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647, Request from the Chambre de Commerce to the intendant, October 1696; Masson 1896, xi.

⁹⁵ *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647, Extract from a letter from Srs Rimbaud to sieur du Roure, document dated Marseille, 14 May 1694.

“The expenses incurred here are exorbitant, however much care is taken to avoid them; and since Messieurs [of the Chamber of Commerce] and the Company of this *échelle* have absolutely resolved to abandon it, having even given us orders to withdraw, and that this was with your consent, I declare to you that I cannot reside there any longer (...).”

Then he added: “The cessation of trading on this *échelle*, the high costs involved, and finally all that I am telling you, made me decide, gentlemen, to send an express to my lord ambassador to grant me my leave and obtain my freedom by a command from the G.S. so that the ministers here would not oppose my embarkation. It would be very easy for me to leave without such precautions, but I found them extraordinarily necessary for the honor of our nation and without very positive orders I could not undertake my departure without leaving my place occupied by someone (...).”⁹⁶

In a letter to Pontchartrain dated 8 July, the ambassador confirmed that du Roure had asked him for authorization to withdraw:

“Sr du Roure, Consul of Satalie, wrote to me on the 20th of last month to ask me for a commandment by which he could withdraw to France with the whole nation of Satalie without any impediment being given to them. His request is based on the fact that as the Satalie trade is no longer advantageous, those involved in this trade had resolved to abandon it entirely and that this resolution had been approved by Mrs du Commerce de Marseille. I replied to Sr du Roure that I could not request the command he asked for unless I had received an order from His Majesty [...].”

The ambassador considered that, since the trade in Satalie had brought great benefits in the past (but he is the only one to say so), the King might wish to maintain a French presence there.⁹⁷

The situation did not change that year and in a letter dated 4 March 1695, the ambassador wrote to du Roure that he could borrow to meet his obligations.⁹⁸ At the same time, in a letter dated 11 March 1695, the ambassador wrote to Pontchartrain that du Roure should not leave Antalya.⁹⁹ It is possible that when the ambassador wrote, du Roure had already been appointed to the post of French vice-consul in Alexandria and that the ambassador had been informed of this.¹⁰⁰ However, the vice-consul absolutely had to settle the nation's debts before leaving his post. This is what appears in a letter from the same to the same dated 26 December 1695. The ambassador reported that du Roure had written to him to say that, since the departure of the French nation (as he put it) from Antalya, he had received no salary from the Chamber of Commerce, nor money to cover the expenses of the *échelle*. He therefore requested an advance from the ambassador who granted him 600 *livres*, a sum which was certainly insufficient

⁹⁶ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce, à Satalie, 26 June 1694.

⁹⁷ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 381, from Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Andrinople, 8 July 1694, fol. 433. See also *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, from du Roure to Mrs les Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce de Marseille, Satalie, 3 July 1694.

⁹⁸ Letter from François du Roure, after 31 January 1696, *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647.

⁹⁹ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Andrinople, 11 March 1695, fol. 23.

¹⁰⁰ Boppe only states that he was appointed consul in Alexandria in 1695, without specifying the day or month; see Boppe 1902, 4.

but which should have enabled the consul to meet pressing expenses. In the same letter, the ambassador noted that the King had appointed du Roure to the vice-consulate of Alexandria, that the latter was ready to go there but could not do so without freeing himself from his creditors and without leaving a man to replace him in Antalya. The ambassador ordered him not to wait but to go and leave a Frenchman in his place; “until His Majesty has appointed another consul of Satalie in case she still intends to keep this Echelle.”¹⁰¹

When did du Roure find himself in debt? Until the French merchants withdrew from Antalya, his only debt seems to have been 250 asselanis, which he had to take from the boat belonging to the shipowner Simon Dailhot to settle a dispute with the shipowner Audibert, who was insolvent.¹⁰² It was the withdrawal of the merchants around May 1694, and therefore the disappearance of the income needed to run the consulate, that put du Roure in a position to take on more debt. In a letter obviously dated early in 1696, he wrote that he had had to make the necessary expenditure since 16 July 1694, “as if trade had always continued [...]”¹⁰³ The consul must have spent 6264 livres between this date and 1 January 1696, a sum he will claim back when he arrives in Alexandria¹⁰⁴ on 19 March 1696,¹⁰⁵ having left Honoré Mouret in Antalya to replace him.

Mouret was only there to await a royal decision concerning the future of the Consulate of Antalya. Mouret, who might perhaps have believed that the King of France would confirm him in his position, soon found himself in the position of preparing his withdrawal. This can be deduced from a letter from Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain dated Pera, 20 June 1696, in which the ambassador writes that he must obtain a command to allow the vice-consul in Antalya to withdraw.¹⁰⁶ At this point, the ambassador was perhaps already aware that the French government had abolished the consulate in Antalya several years previously. Indeed, in a letter to Pontchartrain dated 19 April 1697, he states: “I only learned in June last year from your letter of 11 April that the King had abolished the consulate of Satalie.”¹⁰⁷

According to several authors, the consulate was abolished as early as 1691, when the consulates were reorganized. Masson asserts that, as the *échelle* was not prospering, the Chamber of Commerce had the consulate of Antalya abolished during the reorganization of 1691 and combined it with that of Aleppo.¹⁰⁸ Boppe states that the consulate was abolished

¹⁰¹ Then he continued: “As for the other proposal that he made to me to send him money to release him from his debts, I found it more difficult because, although he has the reputation of a man of probity, it could happen that *Mrs du Commerce* would dispute his claim. I therefore decided to have the money advanced to him by the deputies of the French nation in Smyrna, who are the custodians of the funds of *Mrs du Commerce de Marseille*, giving a guarantee by Sr de Roure to return the sum that would be provided to him in the event that *Mrs du Commerce de Marseille* was not obliged to reimburse him. I was all the more willing to accept this expedient because the friends that Sr du Roure has on this scale think that it would suit him”; see *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Péra, 26 December 1695, fol. 86.

¹⁰² *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter from du Roure dated Satalie, 8 May 1692.

¹⁰³ *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647.

¹⁰⁴ Several documents in the Archives de la Chambre de Commerce de Marseille J 1647. These expenses included modest sums to pay for the consul’s withdrawal formalities.

¹⁰⁵ *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647, Request from the Chambre de Commerce to the intendant, October 1696. Du Roure did not leave Satalie in 1695 as Masson and Boppe claim; see Masson 1896, 396. Boppe states that he arrived in Alexandria in March 1696, without specifying the day; see Boppe 1902, 4.

¹⁰⁶ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Péra, 20 June 1696, fol. 147.

¹⁰⁷ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Andrinople, 19 April 1697, fol. 268.

¹⁰⁸ Masson 1896, 263, 396.

in 1692.¹⁰⁹ As for Bondois, he writes that the consulate was, if not abolished, at least reduced around 1691.¹¹⁰ We can only be astonished by the fact that neither the ambassador nor the vice-consul in Antalya were aware of this abolition. Châteauneuf notes, again in his letter of 19 April 1697:

“It had been a long time since I had sent Sr du Roure his Barat for the vice-consulate of Alexandria on the request he had made to me and the need for him to go there promptly. Not knowing then that the Consulate of Satalie had been abolished, I ordered him to leave a vice-consul there because it had appeared to me from your letter of 24 November 1694 that you considered that trade on this *Echelle* could be reestablished.”¹¹¹

The explanation for this misunderstanding is still beyond our reach. Did the French government consider that the difficulties arising from the war of the League of Augsburg made it necessary not to apply the government’s decisions to the letter and to temporarily maintain the post at Antalya, in case wheat could be bought there for the armies operating in the Mediterranean theater and the populations facing famine?

There was talk of Honoré Mouret’s withdrawal as early as June 1696. However, the withdrawal order did not arrive until four months later, as can be seen from two letters dated from Pera on the same day, 31 October 1696, and addressed by Châteauneuf to the Marseille Chamber of Commerce and Pontchartrain respectively. In these letters he announced that he had received the order allowing Sr Mouret to withdraw as soon as the order had been registered with the local *cadi*, and that he had also had the order sent. “This precaution was necessary to prevent any difficulties that might arise if we wanted to reestablish trade on this *Echelle*,” he said. Since Du Roure’s departure, Mouret had received no salary and was unable to demand any dues from the ships coming to Antalya. The ambassador therefore had no doubt that he too was in debt. He therefore had 150 ecus sent to him which, by his order, the deputies of the Istanbul *échelle* had advanced, deputies who, apart from this advance, had paid other expenses of the Antalya consulate. Reimbursement of the total amount was to be claimed from the Marseille Chamber of Commerce.¹¹²

We can consider that Mouret’s withdrawal and the effective closure of the Antalya consulate occurred at the end of 1696. However, this did not completely put an end to French activity in Antalya. According to Masson, a few merchants remained there. When quarrels arose between them in 1701, it was decided whether they should be subject to the jurisdiction of the consul of Aleppo or that of Cyprus, a question which, therefore, does not appear to have been definitively settled by the reorganization of 1691. The *échelle* was placed under the dependence of Cyprus, and the consul appointed one of the merchants to collect the duties due to the Chamber of Commerce on his behalf without, however, giving him the name of vice consul because of the minor importance of this establishment.¹¹³ It is in a letter from Charles de Ferriol to Pontchartrain, dated Pera 1 September 1701, that we find mention of these disputes

¹⁰⁹ Boppe 1902, 30.

¹¹⁰ Bondois 1936, 33.

¹¹¹ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Andrinople, 19 April 1697, fol. 268.

¹¹² *A.C.C.M.*, J 1647, extract of a letter of Mr de Castagnere, dated Péra, 31 October 1696; *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf [to Pontchartrain], Péra, 31 October 1696, fol. 223.

¹¹³ Masson 1896, 396.

between French merchants in Antalya. Ferriol's comments clearly show that this was a consequence of the closure of the consulate: "There have been several quarrels in Satalie between French merchants; since there is no consul, they think they can do whatever they like."¹¹⁴

This lengthy discussion on Du Roure's vice consulate and the closure of the Antalya consulate has brought to light at least two important facts. This consulate was created, above all, to protect French trade on the *écbelle*, which led to the consulate's closure when the trading company that had been trading there decided to withdraw. This itself did not end the attractiveness of the place for French merchants, but the absence of a consulate made any French commercial activity there highly problematic and clearly doomed to failure.

A French consulate in Antalya was not reestablished until 1717 with the appointment of Curraud.¹¹⁵ In the meantime, Paul Lucas, who spent nine days in the city in November 1706, found neither a consul nor a resident.¹¹⁶ This was clearly the case until 1717. At the end of this historical overview of the French consulate in Antalya, more complete than those sketched at the beginning of the last century, we can affirm that the French authorities were keen to maintain a French consulate in Antalya throughout the 17th century, above all, to protect French trade through this *écbelle*.

A Sustained Presence Despite Small-Scale Trade

From the time of the Crusades until the 17th century, Europeans in the Levant were mainly interested in precious products from the "Indies," primarily spices. The products sought and acquired by Europeans along the Levantine coasts were therefore primarily re-exported products. The discovery of new sea routes by the Portuguese gradually diverted a large proportion of these products from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and this trade was stimulated by the influx of metals from America. This did not mean the end of trade in high-value products in the Levant. Silk replaced spices in the 17th century, and the Persia-Levant coast route continued to be used extensively for trade, with the Ottoman Empire retaining a central position in the re-export of silk to Europe. However, the Levantine terminals that benefited from this activity were Aleppo and Izmir, not the smaller towns such as Antalya. We demonstrated this in the first part of the article by highlighting the fact that it was local products that were purchased by the French in this *écbelle*.

By the end of the 16th century, some French captains realized the resources that Antalya offered smugglers. The trade was considered all the more attractive because there was little to fear from competition. There was therefore no danger of outbidding each other on local products, as was the case in other areas where the French, English, Dutch, and Venetians hindered each other.¹¹⁷

It should be remembered that in 1600, Savary de Brèves obviously installed a provisional consul in Antalya in the person of René Fuzibée so French traders could be protected there.

¹¹⁴ *A.N.*, Paris, AE BI 383, letter of Ferriol [to Pontchartrain], Péra, 1 September 1701, fol. 283. He added: "I obliged Sr Calaman, a French merchant on his way to Aleppo, to go there. I made him a commissioner to inform me of all disputes, with orders to send me the information as soon as possible. I am convinced that it would be necessary to put a consul back in this *écbelle* or to remove all the merchants who indulge in all sorts of excesses, not having anyone to watch over their conduct and who can have them punished."

¹¹⁵ Boppe 1902, 30.

¹¹⁶ Lucas 1712, 312-17.

¹¹⁷ Reynaud 1928, 222-23.

We only know, according to Savary de Brèves, that it was this trade in leather and carpets (without specifying the identity of the buyers, whether local or international) that made the Sataliotes rich. We have also seen that Henri de Beauveau reported in 1605 that the French mainly bought leather and carpets there, but he gives us no information on the extent of this trade.

A period of seven years, between 1600 and 1607, without the consulate being made official by the King of France, suggests either a notable lack of interest in its scale, or resistance to the opening of a new consulate to the detriment of the jurisdiction of Aleppo. In the letter patent of Henri IV, given in Paris on 26 March 1607 and countersigned by Neufville, there is not the slightest trace of any concern about the jurisdiction of the consulate to be created. There is no allusion to the consulate of Aleppo, of which the consulate of Antalya was to become a detriment. Reynaud sees this silence as an indication of the scarcity of trade relations with Caramania, a veritable new country, which the French consuls in Aleppo never seem to have bothered with.¹¹⁸ It remains certain that, even if in 1607 Antalya officially became the location of one of France's few consulates in the Levant, it was only on a small scale compared to Aleppo, Tripoli, or Alexandria.¹¹⁹

That said, we have no information on the importance of French trade in Antalya in the 1610s and 1620s. Our first informant is Séguiran in 1633. He noted that every year, four or five boats (barques) brought back from Antalya a quantity of cordovan, wax, raw or spun cotton, opium, gum tragacanth, camelots, and carpets.¹²⁰ This figure of four to five boats a year should be borne in mind, as it was clearly a maximum for the century, with trade being conducted on a smaller number of boats from the middle of the century onwards.

French trade suddenly disappeared from the *écbelle* from 1644 to 1655. In his report of 1675, Mazerat explained that French ships no longer dared to go and trade in Antalya because of what he described as the *avani*s suffered by the nation in 1644 and 1645, which had resulted in a debt of 12.000 piastres including interest. He claims that it was he, François Mazerat, who managed to reduce the debt to around 4000 piastres and open up trade to the French once again, after acquiring the consulate of Antalya in 1655, "which he acquired with his own money."¹²¹

We have no further details on the origin of this debt of 12.000 piastres. However, the admittedly awkward interpretation of an Ottoman document dated early December 1655¹²² (awkward because of the spelling of French names in this type of document, a problem we mentioned earlier), leads us to the following hypothesis: when King Louis XIII terminated Léonard Gravier's vice-consulship in 1639, Gravier was in debt in the place. Another person took over from Gravier as consul, but without possessing a *berat* from the Sultan.

Was he in the post from 1639? We do not know. Whatever the case, he was probably judged to be severally liable for the debt, and in 1644 things went from bad to worse with regard to the debt, which had in the meantime been swollen by interest payments, as a result of which French trade was interrupted. When François Mazerat acquired the consulate in 1655, he sent Laroche, who was in charge, to arrest the illegitimate consul and his accomplices and

¹¹⁸ Reynaud 1928, 225.

¹¹⁹ Masson 1896, xv, 78; Bondois 1936, 32.

¹²⁰ Sourdis 1839, 3:227; Masson 1896, 131.

¹²¹ Bondois 1936, 32; see also Genç 2014, 274; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 73.215.

¹²² Genç 2014, 291; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 85. 243.

send them to Istanbul to be heard by the ambassador. Furthermore, the problem of debt was resolved, and activity could resume with the support of the Sultan.

The problem of the debt was only half solved, since it was Mazerat who advanced the sum of 4000 piastres, thereby agreeing to charge the debt to the French nation. He therefore expected to be reimbursed. To this end, in 1656 the King of France authorized the levying of a *cottime* (*cottimo*) on the *écbelle* of Antalya, which was to be used to repay this sum.¹²³ The complex issue of the *cottimo* fee has given rise to a number of explanations since the eighteenth century,¹²⁴ which we will not go into here. Suffice it to say that this duty dates back to at least the sixteenth century. In reality there was not just one *cottimo* duty but several *cottimos* imposed on merchants for various purposes. As a general rule, this duty was used to repay debts contracted by French nations abroad.

In the case we are dealing with here, that of Antalya in the mid of 17th century, the French consul was allowed to levy this duty from 1656 on French merchant ships loading at Antalya, so Mazerat could recover the sum he had paid to clear the debt of the *écbelle*. The King of France gave the consular authorities the choice of levying a duty of either three hundred piastres per sail or two per cent on the cargo.¹²⁵

It is the imposition of this duty that explains why we had in our hands a document of exceptional importance, since it has no equivalent, as far as foreign trade in Antalya in the 17th century is concerned. It is a list of the ships that had to pay the *cottimo* duty in Antalya from 7 May 1656 to 2 June 1670.¹²⁶ This enables us to assess the importance of this trade over fifteen consecutive years and the approximate value (we would even say, minimum value) of this traffic, as well as other important details: types of vessels used, names of the vessels, and their captains or owner captains (*patrons*). An analysis of the document shows that the method adopted by the French consuls in Antalya for collecting the *cottimo* was to deduct two per cent from the merchandise rather than to levy 300 piastres per sail.

From 7 May 1656 to 2 June 1670, 23 ships owed the right of *cottimo* in Antalya, according to the following annual distribution: in 1656, 2 ships; in 1657, 2; in 1658,¹²⁷ 1; in 1659, 1; in 1660, 2; in 1661, 1; in 1662, 3; in 1663, 1; in 1664, 1; in 1665, 1; in 1666, 2; in 1667, 1; in 1668, 2; in 1669, 1; and in 1670, 1. Thus, during this period, one or two ships a year (and exceptionally three in 1662), all French except one presented as Flemish, owed the right of *cottimo* in Antalya. These figures should be compared with those of Séguiran, who stated in 1633 that four or five boats a year came to trade at Antalya. The number of vessels trading on the *écbelle* had therefore halved.

The value of the *cottimo* to be collected is more than 5208 piastres,¹²⁸ which, at a rate of two per cent of the value of the cargo, gives a total value of 260.400 piastres of goods in fifteen years of traffic, or 17360 piastres per year, on average. This figure should be taken as a minimum, if we are to take into account the possible propensity to conceal the real value of the cargo in order to reduce the amount of duty to be paid.

¹²³ Bondois 1936, 32.

¹²⁴ See Teissier 1878, 246, 364-67; Masson 1896, vii-viii, xviii-xix.

¹²⁵ Bondois 1936, 32.

¹²⁶ A.N., Paris, Affaires étrangères BI 1008, Chancelier Blancon, Satalie, 2 June 1670, fol. 3 v^o-4.

¹²⁷ One of the buildings is dated 1668, but this is a mistake for 1658; see A.N., Paris, Affaires étrangères BI 1008, fol. 4.

¹²⁸ A.N., Paris, Affaires étrangères BI 1008, fol. 4.

For the year 1666, we have the figure for all *cottimos* collected in Marseilles, which reveals a traffic of 64 vessels operating in the Levant.¹²⁹ This means that only a little more than three per cent of the traffic took place in Antalya that year. The rate must have been very similar during the other fourteen years of our list. These figures are in line with Bondois's observation that things clearly did not improve from 1655 onwards, since in the meantime trade had taken a different route. It was very difficult to reestablish it, and for more than ten years, it was difficult to dispatch more than one boat a year with a fund of ten to twelve thousand piastres, he points out.¹³⁰ Bondois relied on documents drawn up by Mazerat, for in 1669 Mazerat wrote to Colbert that the Antalya trade would have been almost wiped out without the good care of the minister.¹³¹ In his report of 1675, he stated that the *écbelle* was so small and so lacking in goods that, without the great care he took through his intelligence and industry, it would not be possible to ship more than one boat there every year, since all goods were taken to Smyrna.¹³² Mazerat added that, apart from the French, no other nation had settled in Antalya. Bondois deduced from the report that the *écbelle* was not very prosperous, with only very mediocre trade in leather, cordovan, wax, carpets, and small goods.¹³³ Mazerat was therefore far from optimistic, since he wanted to obtain exemptions,¹³⁴ so the author's possible exaggeration must be taken into account. In an article on French trade in the Levant in the 17th century, Morineau evokes a customary catastrophic dialectic, summed up in the standard phrase: "our trade will soon be completely destroyed," which it would be unwise to fall for.¹³⁵ Having said that, if we focus on Antalya alone, trade appears to have been undeniably weak.

Apart from the list we have analyzed above, we have no documents of this importance for the rest of the century. But there are occasional references here and there, particularly when abuse is contested (in 1677, 1679, etc.), to a trade that continued in the 1670s.¹³⁶

A list of ships leaving Marseille bound for the Levant and Barbary, the Ponant, Italy, and Spain provides information on outbound traffic for the years 1680-1683.¹³⁷ Here are the figures for the Levant in descending order of numbers: Izmir, 31; Istanbul, 30; the Archipelago, 26; Candia, 26; Alexandria, 25; Saida, 25; Alexandretta (Iskenderun), 24; Chania, 3; Morea, 1; Cyprus, 1; "Setellier" (Antalya), 1. Thus, from 1680 to 1683, out of 193 departures for the Levant, only the ship (*barque*) *Notre Dame du Mont* from Marseille with a port of 40 tons (*tonneaux*), headed in September 1683 for Antalya.¹³⁸ This represents around one-half per cent of the total. This is further proof of the weakness of traffic in Antalya, and even of its probable deterioration since the 1630s.

¹²⁹ Morineau 1970, 140.

¹³⁰ Bondois 1936, 32.

¹³¹ Bondois 1936, 31.

¹³² Bondois 1936, 32-33.

¹³³ Bondois 1936, 33.

¹³⁴ Bondois 1936, 31.

¹³⁵ Morineau 1970, 163.

¹³⁶ *A.N.*, Paris, A. E. BI 377, fol. 233. For the text in Ottoman see *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 75.279; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 86.280; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 78.293.

¹³⁷ *A.C.C.M.*, I 1.

¹³⁸ Thanks to another archival document, the *Notre Dame du Mont*, after leaving the port of Antalya around March 1683 (obviously as part of the caravan trade), is seen returning to Antalya for a commercial operation. Out of necessity, 192 and a half piastres of the funds carried by the vessel, captained by André Géraud, had been borrowed by the vice-consul on the first voyage. This may have had something to do with the ship's rapid return to Antalya. See *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of Blancon to Echevins et Députés du Commerce, 2 April 1687.

However, at this time in the early 1680s, we find the first mention of a trading company operating in Antalya. Until then, we can consider that it was the consuls and vice-consuls who conducted commercial operations at a time in the 17th century when this was still authorized or tolerated. Through the death (for reasons that escape us) of the consul and two French merchants in Antalya around the beginning of 1682, we learn that three merchants made up the French trading company operating on the *écbelle*.¹³⁹

After this event, there seemed to be no company for a while, as the Dutch painter and traveller Cornelis de Bruijn noted in 1684 that the French consul was the only European resident in Antalya.¹⁴⁰ One company returned later at a date unknown to us. A document dated 11 October 1696 tells us only that a company was active during Blancon's vice-consulship,¹⁴¹ which, it should be remembered, lasted from 1682 to 1691. We should also remember that the company that was active in the 1690s decided to withdraw in May 1694, due to the mediocrity of the trade. Since then, trade ceased altogether.¹⁴² In June 1694 the vice-consul du Roure wrote that he did not receive any fee of *tonnelage*, that foreign nations had not traded in Antalya for many years, and that, finally, since the withdrawal of the company, trade had ceased altogether.¹⁴³ The following letters bear witness to the same cessation of trade until the consulate closed towards the end of 1696.¹⁴⁴ Between 1696 and 1701, there is not the slightest trace of French commercial activity in Antalya either, the disappearance of the consulate having this time weighed heavily on this cessation. The *écbelle* therefore appears to have been forgotten during these years. According to the first article of a fifteen-article regulation issued by Pontchartrain on 27 January 1700, only 31 vessels and 20 barques were to be used for the *écbelles* trade each year. Antalya is not included in the list of *écbelles* that will receive these ships.¹⁴⁵

The first evidence of the return of the merchants to Antalya comes to light because of the quarrels that arose between them in 1701, mentioned above.¹⁴⁶ A consulate was not re-established until 1717, as noted previously. As for the merchants, they seem to have been completely absent after the incident of 1701 (at least as residents). Paul Lucas, who spent nine days in Antalya in November 1706, does not mention any French consul or resident there.¹⁴⁷ The author of the oft-mentioned anonymous memoir (beginning of the 18th century) states that “as the King's intention is to increase the Levant trade in his kingdom, this is a favorable opportunity to reestablish that of Satalie de Caramanie, which has been abandoned for a long time.”

¹³⁹ A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 378, letter of Guilleragues [to Seignelay], Péra, 14 January 1682, fol. 283; Karakoyun 2014, 256; BOA., MAD. d. 2747, 83.320.

¹⁴⁰ Le Brun 1714, 391.

¹⁴¹ A.C.C.M., J 1647.

¹⁴² A.C.C.M., J 1647.

¹⁴³ A.C.C.M., J 541, letter of Du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce de Marseille, Satalie, 26 June 1694.

¹⁴⁴ Several letters in the bundle J 1647 des A.C.C.M., in the bundle 541 of the same collection, letter of Du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce de Marseille, Satalie, 13 July 1694. See also A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 381, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Andrinople, 8 July 1694, fol. 433; A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 382, letter of Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Péra, 26 December 1695, fol. 86; letter Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Péra, 31 October 1696, fol. 223; letter Châteauneuf to Pontchartrain, Andrinople, 19 April 1697, fol. 268. On the fact that the Antalya trade has been unable to flourish since the turn of the century, see Bondois 1936, 32-33; Masson 1896, 396.

¹⁴⁵ Masson 1896, 272-396. The ordinance of 6 June 1703 abolished this regulation.

¹⁴⁶ A.N., Paris, AE BI 383, letter of Ferriol [to Pontchartrain], Péra, 1 September 1701; Masson 1896, 396.

¹⁴⁷ Lucas 1712, 312-17.

After 1694, the author points out that the merchants of Marseille did not want to introduce a company there because they wanted to attract all the goods to Smyrna, where most of them traded. But according to the author, these merchants did not consider the fact that this would increase the cost of transport and the duties to be paid.¹⁴⁸

The author makes two proposals for the opening of a consulate in Antalya. The first is the appointment of a new consul with the king's approval, whose salary would be paid by the Marseille Chamber of Commerce. This consul, like the other consuls in the Levant, would provide protection and administration and would easily attract trade, which was very important for French producers. The second proposal was to create a company that would have the privilege of trading alone in this port and which, in return, would be obliged to bear the costs of the consulate. And he adds: "Although most of the merchants of the city of Marseille are opposed to forming companies in the *écbelles* of the Levant, there will nevertheless be people intelligent in commerce and [of credit] who would be able to form a Company for the aforementioned *écbelle* under the conditions set out above."¹⁴⁹ These proposals and projects were not put into practice, so it will be necessary to wait until 1717 to see the start of a new French consular and commercial period in Antalya. This also ended in a final failure, which we will not deal with in this article. However, we will now discuss the possible causes to explain the weakness of international trade in Antalya and even its final cessation in 1696.

Possible Causes of the Weakness of French International Trade in Antalya

Among the natural causes to explain this failure, geography is a factor because of the rather poor quality of the port of Antalya. Epidemics do not seem to have had a decisive effect, and we only encountered the plague in the form of a threat (although very real) in our sources.¹⁵⁰ Seasonal heat and its malarial corollary do not seem to disrupt trade too much either. Paul Lucas notes that the inhabitants of Antalya retreat to the mountains in the summer season to avoid danger.¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, of the 23 merchant vessels taxed with *cottimo* and having left Satalie from 1656 to 1670, at least five departed in July or August,¹⁵² which still constitutes a fifth of departures.

In the *Cosmography* of Alfonse de Saintonge (1545), the port of Antalya is presented as good.¹⁵³ Evliya Çelebi, an Ottoman traveler, describes the port of Antalya as an extremely convenient and large port that can accommodate 200 ships.¹⁵⁴ In reality, it was the opposite, as all the opinions from those who visited Antalya in the 17th and 18th centuries say. Based on some of these, Bondois, Reynaud, and Masson had already reported this.¹⁵⁵ In 1605 François Savary de Brèves noted that the coast was dangerous, and, moreover, "the port is very narrow, and good only for small vessels; the entry is very difficult, and perilous for those who are not used to it, there being only a small place through which one can pass, all the rest being filled with

¹⁴⁸ A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 1008, fol. 5.

¹⁴⁹ A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 1008, fol. 5 v.

¹⁵⁰ Breves 1628, 21-22; Fermanel 1670, 233-36.

¹⁵¹ Lucas 1712, 313.

¹⁵² A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 1008, fol. 3v^o-4.

¹⁵³ Alfonse de Saintonge 1904, 256.

¹⁵⁴ Dankoff 2006, 148. For a detailed spatial assessment of the harbor in the framework of foreign and Ottoman sources, see Şimşek 2022b, 243-46.

¹⁵⁵ Bondois 1936, 33; Reynaud 1928, 222; Masson 1896, 395-96.

ruins, almost at the water's edge so that even boats [*barques*] cannot navigate there without touching."¹⁵⁶ Fermanel and Stochove, who were there together in May 1631, both say the same thing, word for word, in their respective works: "The port is small, and only capable of receiving small boats [*barques*]; the beach there is poorly assured, especially since it is full of reefs, which is the reason that galleys and ships can hardly land there, and even less stay at anchor, as the sea is so ordinary rough."¹⁵⁷ In 1684 the painter Cornelis de Bruijn described a port of restricted dimensions with rocks covered in ruins at the entrance.¹⁵⁸ Lucas, who was there in November 1706, notes that the port of Antalya is small and can only accommodate small vessels, boats (*barques*), tartanes, and small caiques: "The harbor is still beautiful; but we are not safe there."¹⁵⁹ Of the 23 vessels that left Antalya from 1656 to 1670 and that we mentioned above, eight (almost a third) were vessels (but then we have to imagine that they dropped anchor in the harbor or that it were small vessels), there are twelve boats (*barques*) (more than 52% of the total) and three polaccas (around 13%).¹⁶⁰ As for the correspondence coming from Antalya in the 1680s and 1690s, it only mentions boats (*barques*) and tartanes, with the exception of one vessel, Captain Brué, who came from Cyprus.¹⁶¹ Like the English and the Dutch, whom Colbert always took as his model, for trade only the big Marseilles ships were sent to the big piers. However, the boats (*barques*) of Provence only went in the small *écbelles* of the Archipelago, the Morea, or the Maghreb, whose weak trade was sufficient to make up their cargoes. There was undoubtedly from the end of the 17th century a tendency among the French to abandon small *écbelles* for larger and safer ones. For them traffic conditions and profits were more advantageous, especially since significant expenses for maintaining French consular or commercial staff in the small *écbelles* were eliminated.

Conflicts also surely weighed on commercial relations, such as internal revolts, wars, and corsair activity. We know that the first third of the 17th century was marked by revolts which had a considerable impact in Anatolia, and Antalya was not spared.¹⁶² In June 1605, Savary de Brèves inquired about the situation related to epidemics and security in Antalya before disembarking. He feared that the city "was held by the rebels of Natolia [sic], who several times had surprised and sacked it."¹⁶³ In May 1631 Fermanel and his companions did the same because they were aware that a rebel named Helis Bacha was ravaging the entire country.¹⁶⁴ However, we do not have more information about these rebels and their activities and the effects of these revolts on the country.

From 1635 it was less revolts than wars that could perhaps have had an impact on trade. First of all, the war between France and Spain began that year and disrupted French trade in the Levant.¹⁶⁵ The situation worsened when this war was added to that of Candia which opposed Venice to the Ottoman Empire from 1645. The Ottomans learned very quickly that the

¹⁵⁶ Breves 1628, 22-23.

¹⁵⁷ Fermanel 1670, 233-34; Stochove 1650, 232.

¹⁵⁸ Reynaud 1928, 222.

¹⁵⁹ Lucas 1712, 315.

¹⁶⁰ A.N., Paris, A. E. BI 1008, fol. 3v^o-4.

¹⁶¹ A.C.C.M., J 541, letter of Blancon to Echevins et Députés du Commerce, Satalie, 2 April 1687; A.C.C.M., J 541, letters of Du Roure, 8 May 1692 and 26 June 1694.

¹⁶² It is recorded that at the start of the century Antalya was sacked by pirates; see Brome 1688.

¹⁶³ Breves 1628, 21.

¹⁶⁴ Fermanel 1670, 233.

¹⁶⁵ Morineau 1970, 147-48.

French supported Venice unofficially, since they were at peace with the Ottomans.¹⁶⁶ Things became even worse in the 1660s, notably with the French expedition against Jijel in 1664 under the pretext of repression of Algerian corsairs.¹⁶⁷ From 1660 to 1665 there was no French ambassador in Istanbul but a simple resident, Roboly.¹⁶⁸ Colbert, who only considered the interests of commerce and considered a break with the Sultan as disastrous, sought appeasement from 1665. But the aid granted to the Venetians continued.¹⁶⁹ This could not have been beneficial to French trade in Antalya that was maintained, as we have seen, but in a very limited way.

Corsair activity, endemic in the region particularly because of the numerous coves along the coast of Caramania that served as their shelter and points of attack, was also be a serious obstacle to trade. This danger is mentioned by Masson. He specifies that between Cyprus and Antalya the corsairs were watching for ships going to Alexandretta, Tripoli, or Saida.¹⁷⁰ On 8 June 1605, after passing Cape Gelidonya and leaving Finike behind, Savary de Brèves, on the ship which carried him to Antalya, saw two seagoing vessels which mistook his for a privateer. They fled under full sail towards the coast where their crews disembarked with a number of goods.¹⁷¹ They assuredly feared the Maltese corsairs, who were very active in the region. In September 1628, Maltese corsairs chased for two hours, somewhere between Rhodes and Saida, the vessel on which De Thou was embarked.¹⁷² Stochove notes that near Adresan, they were taken for privateers, and two boats flee with great diligence as the castle fired two cannon shots at them.¹⁷³ According to Fermanel, on 29 May 1631, they came across a tartane of corsairs, hidden behind a cape, located after Eski Adalya (in other words Side), starting from Antalya. The tartane fired a cannon and chased the vessel. By dint of oars, they managed to lose sight of the tartane after three hours. The next day, 30 May, they encountered nine sails of the Pâshâ of Rhodes at sea and some beys from Cyprus who were exasperated by the loss of more than a hundred men in a fight nine or ten days earlier against a ship from Malta commanded by the French knight Castelnove. Fermanel and his companions pretended to be Greeks to avoid the anti-French anger of the Turks. The next day, 31 May, they were pursued by corsairs a few dozen miles from Cyprus where they arrived on 2 June at the port of Cerines (Kyrenia?).¹⁷⁴

In the second half of the 17th century, it was the corsairs of the Maghreb who posed a problem for French trade, for the Maghreb States were often at war with France at that time. The French government suggested that merchant ships should travel in convoy, but the Marseillais refused ship escorts. According to them, a group of ships that suddenly approached an *écbelle* could have increased the cost of goods at that port and decreased the value of French goods. In addition, convoys every six months could have given an advantage to competitors.¹⁷⁵ But their attitude eventually changed in 1682 with the war against Algiers and Tripoli, then during

¹⁶⁶ Masson 1896, 6-7; Morineau 1970, 164.

¹⁶⁷ Masson 1896, 209.

¹⁶⁸ Masson 1896, 211.

¹⁶⁹ Masson 1896, 210-11.

¹⁷⁰ Masson 1896, 15-25; see also Quenot 2009, 395; Avity 1643, 163.

¹⁷¹ Breves 1628, 21.

¹⁷² De Thou 1835, 4:392.

¹⁷³ Stochove 1650, 230.

¹⁷⁴ Fermanel 1670, 240-41.

¹⁷⁵ Masson 1896, 219-21.

the War of the League of Augsburg.¹⁷⁶ Merchant losses must have been great. Another solution proposed by Colbert and later applied was to encourage anti-corsair squadrons. The cruises of Beaufort, Commander Paul, Marquis Centurion, Vivonne, Marquis de Martel, and Almeras caused many losses to Maghreb corsairs, and the squadron system cost nothing to trade, unlike escorts.¹⁷⁷ At an unknown date but probably at the end of 1684, the French ambassador, Count of Guilleragues, indicated the list of orders from the Sultan, which he obtained during his stay in Adrianople. Among these, three were designated for Antalya, one of which came in opposition to the activity of the North African corsairs who came to its port.¹⁷⁸ Another order from the end of January 1685 was sent to the governors of Chios, Izmir, Cyprus, Morea, Candia, and Antalya confirming the first: it is necessary to protect from Maghrebi pirates (*sic*), French vessels coming in the *écbelles*, castles, and Ottoman ports for trade, to return their property to the French in the event of an offense and to punish the guilty.¹⁷⁹

Another cause regarding limitations to French trade in Antalya comes from the fact that the consuls and vice-consuls were involved in it, which could lead to de facto monopolies. Since these consuls had limited financial means, they could not develop trade. This conflict of interest was not specific to Antalya, but to all the *écbelles*. Reynaud notes that Mathieu Grosson and Thomas Gaillard, illiterate sea captains, most often traded on their own account.¹⁸⁰ Jean Mazerat was a merchant from Marseille.¹⁸¹ His son François was also a Marseille merchant who was familiar with Turkey.¹⁸² The author of the anonymous memoir of the beginning of the 18th century indicates that Mazerat traded in Antalya. Rimbaud and Reimondin succeeded him in this activity.¹⁸³ When Colbert passed legislation opposing the exercise of commerce by consuls and their chancellors, Antalya's commerce was already in a situation of deep stagnation and on the eve of its extinction.¹⁸⁴

Another factor certainly weighing on Antalya's trading weakness was the weight of Colbertian bullionism,¹⁸⁵ a school of thought which, in reality, was already influential in France before Colbert. In the Middle Ages, Europeans managed to sell in Antalya a notable number of cloth from Châlons, Perpignan, Narbonne, or Lombardy.¹⁸⁶ However, in the 17th century, trade was mainly done in return for money. Séguiran already wrote this about Antalya in 1633: "every year four or five boats which each carry thirty thousand pounds, and bring back quantities of cordovan which are white *maroquins*, wax, spun, woolen cotton, opium, tragacanth gum, camelots and carpets."¹⁸⁷ Prime minister Richelieu undoubtedly relied on Séguiran's report by

¹⁷⁶ Masson 1896, 220.

¹⁷⁷ Masson 1896, 222.

¹⁷⁸ *A.N.*, Paris, A. E. BI 378.

¹⁷⁹ Karakoyun 2014, 295-96; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 150-51.406.

¹⁸⁰ Reynaud 1928, 225, 229, 232.

¹⁸¹ Bondois 1936, 29-30.

¹⁸² Bondois 1936, 31. A report dated 1693 places him in the list of bourgeois of Marseille living off their income, being neither noble nor living nobly; see Teissier 1868, 73.

¹⁸³ *A. N.*, Paris, A. E. BI 1008, fol. 5.

¹⁸⁴ *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of Du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce, Satalie, 26 June 1694.

¹⁸⁵ According to this economic school that deals with mercantilism in economic history, the wealth of nations depends on the stock of precious metals. It is thought that as gold and silver increase, prosperity will increase; see Magnusson 2003, 46.

¹⁸⁶ Depping 1830, 111, 141, 300. For detailed information on the trade of Europeans with Antalya in the Middle Ages, see Duggan 2022, 168.

¹⁸⁷ Sourdis 1839, 3:227.

noting about Antalya in his political testament: “The French only bring money there, and bring back cotton, waxes, all kinds of *maroquins*.”¹⁸⁸ These are the conditions of exchange that the French were unable to change during the Colbert era, according to Bondonis.¹⁸⁹

Apart from the *cotimo*, French merchants paid ordinary duties,¹⁹⁰ such as an exit duty of five per cent on goods (five per cent before the Capitulations of 1673).¹⁹¹ These duties weighed on trade but had become the norm. Presents to the Ottoman city authorities and certain employees were also part of the custom. Furthermore, their value was very limited. In 1692, out of 1293 piastres of expenses necessary for the functioning of the French consulate in Antalya, 207 piastres were devoted to gifts,¹⁹² or sixteen per cent. The value of these gifts was 241 piastres in 1695.¹⁹³

It was the abuses and *avanas* which were particularly felt by traders that had a greater impact on trade. These abuses were not specific to Antalya, but to the *écbelles* in general. Masson devotes long passages of his book to it.¹⁹⁴

François Mazerat presents the indebtedness of the French nation of Antalya in the amount of 12.000 piastres, counting interest, as damages suffered by the nation.¹⁹⁵ And this accumulated debt ended up stopping trade for a decade.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, the repayment of the debt, reduced to 4000 piastres, required the establishment of a *cottimo* duty, as we indicated above, which was not encouraging for trade. That being said, we have no information on the precise origins of this debt. On the other hand, numerous *avanas* or accusations of *avanas* against French commerce and the French nation of the *écbelle* can be noted for the century under study.

These *avanas* consist of extortion, undue taxes, supplies refused to merchant ships, interference in the internal affairs of the French nation, interference in the choice of personnel serving the consulate, and sometimes even physical violence.

An order from July 1656 was issued to the Antalya voivoda to return the sum of 240 riyals unjustly extorted from a French ship captain who came to the port.¹⁹⁷ After the death of the vice-consul and two merchants in Antalya towards the end of 1681, the governor of Antalya apparently took 300 piastres from the only remaining merchant and forcibly borrowed a larger sum with threats.¹⁹⁸ In 1683 new complaints came from the French and the order of Sultan

¹⁸⁸ Richelieu 1688, 141.

¹⁸⁹ Bondonis 1936, 32.

¹⁹⁰ Reynaud 1928, 227; Masson 1896, 50-51, 60, 68, 69, 95-117, 174, 177, 264, 282; Teissier 1878, 160; *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of Garnier, 1633; letter of Du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce, Satalie, 26 June 1694.

¹⁹¹ Masson 1896, 212, 216; Karakoyun 2014, 168-69; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 38.126; Karakoyun 2014, 231; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 70. 251; *A.N.*, Paris, A. E. BI 377, Command to cadis, musellim and emin of Satalie, sha'bân 1088, fol. 325; Karakoyun 2014, 242; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 75.279; Karakoyun 2014, 269-70; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 92.358.

¹⁹² *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, Du Roure, Duplicate, to Péra, 21 August 1692.

¹⁹³ Masson 1896, 449.

¹⁹⁴ Masson 1896, 1-23, 77-95.

¹⁹⁵ Bondonis 1936, 32.

¹⁹⁶ Bondonis 1936, 32; Genç 2014, 274; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 73.215.

¹⁹⁷ *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 85.245.

¹⁹⁸ *A.N.*, Paris, A. E. BI 378, letter of Guilleragues [to Seignelay], Péra, 14 January 1682, fol. 283. See also Karakoyun 2014, 259; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 85.328 ; *A.N.*, Paris, A. E. BI 378, letter of Guilleragues [to Seignelay], Péra, 30 June 1682, fol. 334.

Mehmet IV to the Antalya authorities not to demand more presents (pişkeş) than what was regulated by the Capitulations (ahidname).¹⁹⁹

Complaints against the levy of undue taxes are quite common. Kharaj should not be required of French residents in Antalya recalls an order of June 1673.²⁰⁰ Imported goods intended to be used for the functioning of the consulate must not be taxed, for example, recalls a Sultan order of November 1655.²⁰¹ An order from February 1668 instructed the customs agent, Mehmet, not to inflate the price of goods brought by the French to demand more duties.²⁰² Another order, dated September 1670, requires the qâdhî of Antalya not to ask for more than 300 akçe of selametlik akçesi, the tax required for the departure of ships.²⁰³ An order from June 1676 recalls that apart from an exit tax of three per cent and the selametlik akçesi of 300 akçe, nothing else could be demanded from French traders.²⁰⁴ In the years that followed, other complaints were clearly brought to Istanbul about these unfair taxes, since other orders arrived in 1677, 1679, 1682, and 1684.²⁰⁵

Some avanias are other forms of barriers to trade, such as the ban on French ships being supplied with biscuits or their equivalent.²⁰⁶ The sultanian orders also remind us that nobody must interfere in the internal affairs of the French nation. For example, the *beytûlmalcı* should not take care of the succession of French merchants who died in Antalya.²⁰⁷ It was also reminded that the Sataliot authorities must not interfere in the choice of personnel recruited by the French. For example, the Jew Darin Isak was prevented from serving as interpreter for the consul and French merchants, a function he had held for a long time.²⁰⁸ In October 1679 an order forbade interference in the choice of the *yasakçı*, or janissary serving at the consulate.²⁰⁹ Finally, physical violence against the French was prohibited. In a document from November 1655, for example, an attack on the consular house was condemned.²¹⁰

Conclusion

All these avanias constituted, we see, serious obstacles to French trade in Antalya. Added to the small importance in itself of the Antalya trade, this could have led to a rapid abandonment of the *écbelle*, which did not happen until the very end of the 17th century. For the French judged that there was an interest in staying there. In addition to the trade in local products

¹⁹⁹ Karakoyun 2014, 263-64; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 88.341.

²⁰⁰ Karakoyun 2014, 137; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 41.175.

²⁰¹ Genç 2014, 383-85; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 150-51.406.

²⁰² Karakoyun 2014, 134; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 15.46. See also Karakoyun 2014, 168-69; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 38.126.

²⁰³ Karakoyun 2014, 153; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 30.96; *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* 1 s.v. "Ahidname"; Karakoyun 2014, 152; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 29.94.

²⁰⁴ In this order appear the various beneficiaries of the fees owed by the French; see Karakoyun 2014, 231; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 70.251.

²⁰⁵ Karakoyun 2014, 242; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 75.279; Karakoyun 2014, 242-43; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 86.280; Karakoyun 2014, 247-48; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 78.293; Karakoyun 2014, 257; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 84.322; Karakoyun 2014, 259; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 85.328; Karakoyun 2014, 269-70; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 92.358; *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of Beirard, Satalie, 120 July 1680.

²⁰⁶ Genç 2014, 165; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 12.23.

²⁰⁷ Karakoyun 2014, 256; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 83.320; see also Genç 2014, 383-85; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 150-51.406.

²⁰⁸ Genç 2014, 172-73; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 12.23.

²⁰⁹ Karakoyun 2014, 247; *BOA.*, MAD. d. 2747, 78.292.

²¹⁰ Genç 2014, 383-85; *BOA.*, A. DVNSDVE. d. 26, 150-51.406.

from Antalya and its region, the *écbelle* was a useful step not only for the partial loading of French ships with goods, but also in the caravan trade.²¹¹ Antalya therefore had an interest in terms of freight for French ships in the internal trade of the Empire, which was a significant aspect of maritime trade. Furthermore, despite the diversion of a large part of the trade in Indian and Indonesian products towards the Cape route, the *écbelles* of Syria and Egypt continued to receive products from these regions. These goods continued by land or sea towards Istanbul via the ports of Antalya and Alanya.²¹²

In conclusion, the trade in products from Antalya and its region, as well as the interest of the port in the internal trade of the Ottoman Empire, all the more pushed the French to keep commercial activity in Antalya. Although quite weak, they still had a de facto exclusivity among Europeans. The obstacles, quite numerous, contributed to limiting the importance of French trade in the *écbelle*, without annihilating it, except during a few years of the century discussed in this study. The conditions of French trade in Antalya still resulted in the cessation of the latter at the end of the 17th century. Instead, there was the concentration of merchant activities in the large *écbelles* of the Empire, such as Izmir or Alexandria or in the *écbelles* of greater strategic or economic importance, such as scala / ports supplying wheat, oil, or high-value products.

²¹¹ Masson 1896, 497-98; *A.C.C.M.*, J 541, letter of Du Roure to Maire, Echevins et Députés du Commerce, Satalie, 26 June 1694.

²¹² Masson 1896, 287; Mantran 1989, 223; Bondois 1936, 32.

Bibliography

Archival Documents

A.C.C.M. (Archives de la Chambre du Commerce de Marseille)

A.C.C.M. I 1.

A.C.C.M. J 1647.

A.C.C.M. J 541.

A.N. (Archives Nationales, Affaires Etrangères, Paris)

A.N., Paris, AE BI 377, fol. 233.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 377, fol. 325.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 378, fol. 283.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 378, fol. 334.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 381, fol. 5.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 381, fol. 56.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 381, fol. 433.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 382, fol. 23.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 382, fol. 86.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 382, fol. 147.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 382, fol. 268.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 382, fol. 223.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 383, fol. 283.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 3.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 4.

A.N., Paris, AE BI 1008, fol. 5.

BOA, T.C. Cumburbaşkanlığı Devlet Arşivleri Başkanlığı Osmanlı Arşivi / Turkish Presidency State Archives of Republic of Türkiye. Department of Ottoman Archives.

BOA, AE. SAMD.II, 1 / 3.

BOA, MAD. d. 2747.

BOA, A. DVNSDVE. d., Fransa Atik Nişan ve Ahkam Defteri 26.

Secondary Sources

Ak, M. 2021. "Batılı Gezginlerin Gözlem ve Değerlendirmelerinde Ankara Keçisi." *Akademik Bakış* 14.28:267-302.

Alfonse, S. (Fonteneau J.) 1904. *La cosmographie avec l'espère et régime du soleil et du Nord*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Anonyme. 1770. *Dictionnaire portatif du commerce contenant la connoissance des marchandises de tous les pays, ou les principaux & nouveaux articles, concernant le commerce et l'économie ; les arts, les manufactures, les fabriques, la minéralogie, les drogues, les plantes, les pierres précieuses, etc.* Vol. 2. Liège: C. Plomteux.

Avity, P. 1643. *Le Monde, ou La description générale de ses quatre parties*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Paris: Claude Sonnius.

- Basque-Grammont, J.L. 1995. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Doruğu: Olaylar (1522-1606)." In *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi*, Translated by S. Tanilli, edited by R. Mantran, 171-95. 2 vols. Istanbul: Cem Yayınları.
- Beauveau, H. 1615. *Relation journalière du voyage du Levant*. Nancy: Jacob Garnich.
- Bohun, E. 1688. *A Geographical Dictionary, Representing the Present and Ancient Names of all the Countries, Provinces, Remarkable Cities, Universités, Ports, Towns, Mountains, Seas, Streights, Fountains and Rivers of the whole World*. London: Charles Brome.
- Bondois, P.M. 1936. "Note sur l'échelle et le consulat de Satalie au XVII^e siècle." *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1715) du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, années 1934 and 1935. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Boppe, A. 1902. *Les consulats du Levant*. Vol. 1, *Smyrne (1610-1900), Satalie de Caramanie (1607-1814)*. Nancy: Imprimerie Berger-Levrault et C^{ie}.
- Bordier J. 1888. *Ambassade de Turquie de Jean de Gontaut Biron, baron de Salignac: 1605 à 1610*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Bostan, İ. 2019. *Osmanlı Deniz Ticareti*. Istanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- Breves, F.S. 1628. *Relation des voyages de Monsieur de Brèves, tant en Grèce, Terre Saincte et Aegypte, qu'aux Royaumes de Tunis et Arger [...]*. Paris: Chez Nicolas Gasse.
- Capucins missionnaires: Syrie, Liban, Turquie* (without lieu, without date).
- De Thou, F.-A. 1835. "Lettres de F.-A. de Thou, durant un voyage en Italie et dans le Levant, 1626-1629." In *Revue rétrospective ou Bibliothèque historique contenant des mémoires et documents authentiques, inédits et originaux, pour servir à l'Histoire proprement dite, à la biographie, à l'histoire de la littérature et des arts*. Vol. 4. Paris: Imprimerie H. Fournier aîné.
- Depping, G.B. 1830. *Histoire du commerce entre le Levant et l'Europe depuis les Croisades jusqu'à la fondation des colonies d'Amérique*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale.
- Duggan, T.M.P. 2022. "XIII. Ve XIV. Yüzyıllarda Antalya Limanı." In *Antalya'nın Denizcilik ve Deniz Ticareti Tarihi*, edited by F. Şimşek, 157-79. Istanbul: Zero Books.
- Durak, K. 2022. "The Sroy of Storax in the Byzantine World: A Fragrant Resin of International Fame from Southern Anatolia." *Adalya* 25:179-207.
- Dankoff, R., S.A. Kahraman, and Y. Dağlı, eds. 2006. *Evlıya Çelebi Seyabatnamesi*. 10 vols. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Fermanel, G. 1670. *Le voyage d'Italie et du Levant*. Rouen: Chez Jacques Herault, dans la Cour du Palais.
- Fontainer, V. 1829. *Voyages en Orient, Entrepris Par Ordre du Gouvernement Français de l'Annee 1821 a l'Annee 1829*. Paris: Librairie de P. Mongie Aine.
- Genç, N. 2014. "Fransa Ahkam Defteri (1634-1666) (İnceleme-Metin)." Master's thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Hattox, R.S. 1998. *Kabve ve Kabvehaneler*. Translated by N. Elhüseyni. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Karakoyun, E. 2014. "Fransa Ahkam Defteri (1666-1687) (İnceleme-Metin)." Master's thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Le Brun, C. 1714. *Voyage au Levant, c'est-à-dire dans les principaux endroits de l'Asie Mineure, dans les isles de Chio, Rhodes, & Chypre etc. de même que dans les plus considérables villes, païs, bourgs, & autres choses dignes de remarque, le tout dessiné d'après nature*. Paris: Guillaume Cavalier.
- Lucas, P. 1712. *Voyage du Sieur Paul Lucas fait par ordre du Roy dans la Grece, l'Asie Mineure, la Macedoine et l'Afrique*. Vol. 2, *Contenant la description de la Natolie, de la Caramanie, & de la Macedoine*. Paris: Nicolas Simart.
- Magnusson, L.G. 2003. "Mercantilism." In *A Companion to the History of Economic Thought*, edited by J.W. Samuels, J.E. Biddle, and J.B. Davis, 40-60. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- Mantran, R. 1989. *Histoire de l'Empire ottoman*. Paris: Fayard.
- Masson, P. 1896. *Histoire du commerce français dans le Levant au XVII^e siècle*. Paris: Librairie Hachette & Cie.
- Piganiol, D.F. 1722. *Nouvelle description de la France*. Vol. 4, *Contenante le Dauphiné, la Provence, le Languedoc, le Comté de Foix, la Navarre, le Béarn, la Guyenne et Gascogne*. 2nd ed. Paris: Florentin Delaulne.
- Quenot, Y. 2009. "Deux voyages de course en Méditerranée sur la galère du commandeur de La Romagne (1588): extrait d'un manuscrit inédit." *Annales de Bourgogne* 81.3:385-404.
- Reynaud, J. 1928. "Les origines du consulat de France de Satalie de Caramanie (1607)." *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie* 43:221-32.
- Richelieu, A., P. de Cardinal. 1688. *Testament politique*. Amsterdam: Chez Henry Desbordes.
- Savary Des Bruslons, J. 1726. *Dictionnaire universel du commerce*. Vol. 2, F-Z. Amsterdam: Chez les Jansons à Waesberge.
- Savary Des Bruslons, J. 1741. *Dictionnaire universel du commerce*. Vol. 3, L-Z. Nouvelle édition. Paris: Chez la veuve Estienne.
- Şimşek, F. 2022a. "Orta Çağ'dan Osmanlı Dönemine Dođu Akdeniz'de Rekabet Kiskacında Bir Ada: Meis." *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi* 37.2:657-85.
- Şimşek, F. 2022b. "Dođu Roma'dan Osmanlı Dönemi'ne Antalya Tersanesinin Lokalizasyon Problematiki." In *Antalya'nın Denizcilik ve Deniz Ticareti Taribi*, edited by F. Şimşek, 235-57. Istanbul: Zero Books.
- Sourdis, H.E. 1839. *Correspondance de Henri d'Escoubleau de Sourdis*. 3 vols. Paris: Imprimerie de Crapelet.
- Stochove, V. 1650. *Voyage du Levant du Sr de Stochove, Seigneur de Saint-Catherine*. Bruxelles: Hubert-Antoine Velpius.
- Teissier, O. 1868. *Etat de la noblesse de Marseille en 1693*. Marseille: Victoire Boy, Librairie.
- Teissier, O. 1878. *Inventaire des archives historiques de la Chambre de commerce de Marseille*. Marseille: Barlatier.
- Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* 1 Ahidname. M. Kütükođlu, s.v. Ahidname. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* 1988. Vol. 1, 536-40.

