

EBHA

Conference

Bergen

21-23 August 2008

«Transactions and Interactions.

The flow of goods, services and information»

*British Entrepreneurship and Family Strategy in a Levantine Context: the
Abbott of Salonica (18th-19th century)*

Despina Vlami
Centre of Medieval and Modern Greek Studies
Academy of Athens

A. Introduction

One of the key ports of South Eastern Mediterranean and the principal port to the Balkans, Salonica or the city of ghosts according to a recent best seller by Marc Mazower, had a long urban history and one of the most varied societies in Europe.¹ Mazower masterfully depicts the city's multicultural distinctiveness through the centuries: the Byzantine capital city, the Ottoman administrative and commercial center, the Greek port, destination of people from all over the Balkans and place of residence of one of the biggest communities of Sephardic Jews in the Mediterranean; in other words a Christian, Muslim and Jewish city that was Balkan and Mediterranean at the same time.

Salonica remained an important maritime and commercial center through Ottoman times: as an intermediary station in the complex network of commodity transport routes that interweaved the Ottoman Empire linking the Middle East with

¹ Mazower, M., *Salonica. City of Ghosts. Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430-1950*, New York 2007.

Rumelia, the Balkans, the Black Sea and North Africa, as a depôt of the agricultural production produced in its vast fertile hinterland, and finally, as a maritime city that was directly linked with Central Europe – the Habsburg Empire in particular – through a system of popular and well trodden inland routes. Although it never surpassed Smyrna (Izmir), the major Ottoman emporium in terms of traffic and bulk of activity, Salonica maintained its position as an important port of call both in the long distance and the coastal trade.²

French and Dutch had been established in Salonica since the seventeenth century.³ Until the late eighteenth century Venice, Ragusa, Denmark, Sweden, Austria, Spain and Prussia were represented in the city.⁴ In 1726 the Russian monk Barskii who visited the city was impressed by the number and the variety of people who arrived there “from Constantinople, Egypt, Venice, France, by English trading vessels and by land” to trade.⁵

Salonica became one of the favorite outposts of French trade in the Mediterranean and it remained so until well into the 19th century. French business and ways outshined all other western European presence in the city and elevated Salonica to a frequent stop over of western European vessels loaded with textiles, luxury and colonial products that were exchanged with grains, cotton, tobacco, silk and wax.⁶ French business on a considerable scale drew English attention and in 1715, the English Levant Company⁷ sent to Salonica Richard Kemble, an English merchant

² See N. Svoronos, *Le Commerce de Salonique au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris 1956. Also for the 19th century see Emilie Themopoulou, *Salonique, 1800-1875: Conjoncture économique et mouvement commercial*, Thèse de Doctorat de l' Université de Paris I, t. 4, 1994. Also C. Vacalopoulos, “To emborio tis Thessalonikis (1796-1840) simfona me anecdotes ekthesis Evropaion proxenon” (Le commerce de Salonique 1796-1840 d' après les rapports inédits des consuls européens), *Makedonika*, 16, 1976, pp. 73-173. For a concise history of the city, see M. Mazower, *op.cit.* and A. Vacalopoulos, *History of Thessaloniki*, Thessaloniki 1978. For a history of the Jews in Salonica see J. Nehama, *Histoire des Israélites de Salonique*, 7 v., Paris 1936. For the commercial relations between Salonica and Smyrna in the 18th century see N. Svoronos, *op.cit.*, p. 244 and Elena Frangakis-Syrett, *The commerce of Smyrna in the Eighteenth Century (1700-1820)*, Athens 1992, p. 33.

³ N. Svoronos, *op.cit.*, p. 170, 210.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 167-239. Also S. Lambros, “To en Thessaloniki Venetikon proxeneion kai to meta tis Makedonias emborion ton Veneton” (The Consulate of Venice in Thessaloniki and the Venetian trade in Macedonia), *Makedonikon Imerologion*, 1912, pp. 227-241.

⁵ K. D. Mertzios, *Mnimeia Makedonikis Istorias* (Monuments of Macedonian History), Thessaloniki 1947, p. 453 cited by M. Mazower, *op.cit.*, p. 120.

⁶ N. Svoronos, *op.cit.*, pp. 336-338.

⁷ For the history of the Levant Company see M. Epstein, *The early history of the Levant Company*, London 1908 and the classic opus of Alfred Wood, *A History of the Levant Company*, London 1935. Also G. Ambrose, *The Levant Company, 1640-1753*, unpublished PhD, University of Oxford, 1935. On the organization of the Levant Company see Lipson, E. *Economic History of England. The age of mercantilism*, vol. II, London 1931, pp. 335-344. For an early history of Anglo-Ottoman relations see D. Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire 1642-1660*, Washington 1998.

from Smyrna, to represent English interests on the spot and engage in the organization of a factory.⁸ It is worth-noting that the Salonica factory of the Levant Company was found many years after the Company had founded factories in Constantinople, Smyrna and Aleppo.⁹

For English traders Salonica became important as an intermediate maritime station in the complex network of maritime and inland routes that developed around and through Smyrna; it was also a common itinerary when crisis in the Mediterranean prevented transport and necessitated the location of alternative routes to continental Europe.¹⁰ A picture of the British trade in Salonica in the late 18th century is provided by the French diplomat Felix de Beaujour who in his *Tableau du Commerce de la Grèce formé d' après une année moyenne, depuis 1787 jusqu'en 1797* criticizes the organization of the Levant Company sustaining that its monopoly prevented the free development of British commerce.¹¹ According to Beaujour two British factors resided in Salonica in the late 18th century importing textiles (mostly woolen *londres* and mohair, cashmeres, linen, and muslins), lead, tin plates, watches, jewelry and colonial goods such as sugar, coffee, indigo, pepper and ginger.¹²

Britain's participation in the French Wars from 1793 and the beginning of a fierce antagonism between the two European maritime powers in the Mediterranean marked the commencement of a period of serious difficulties for maritime transports and economic transactions. The Levant Company and its members had to rethink their strategy and adopt a more flexible model of business organization. They also had to find alternative sea routes to evade the ports blockaded by the French in north Mediterranean. During the last phase of the Napoleonic Wars and throughout the Continental Blockade, Salonica offered the best solution to British merchants who

⁸ See Despina Vlami, "British Trade and Diplomacy in Eastern Mediterranean; the Levant Company in Salonica, 1792-1825", *Mesaionika kai Nea Ellinika*, v. ***, 2008, pp. 143-268, forthcoming.

⁹ Wood, A. *op.cit.*, p. 15. For the Aleppo factory see Davis, R., *Aleppo and Devonshire Square: English Traders in the Levant in the eighteenth century*, London 1967, for the Smyrna factory see Sonia P. Anderson, *An English Consul in Turkey: Paul Rycaut at Smyrna, 1667-1678*, Oxford 1989 and extensive references in the Frangakis-Syrett, E. *op.cit.*,

¹⁰ Despina Vlami, *op.cit.*, pp. 47-49, Svoronos, N. *op.cit.*, pp. 195-198 and Emilie Themopoulou, *op.cit.*, pp. 135-143.

¹¹ Many British shared this opinion and it was the ideas of free trade that ultimately brought to the dissolution of the Company in 1824, see Despina Vlami, *op.cit.*, p. 163. For an interesting comparison between the Levant Company and other similar chartered companies founded between the 16th and the 17th century with modern multinational enterprises of the 19th and 20th centuries see Ann M. Carlos-St. Nicholas, «Giants of an Earlier Capitalism: the Chartered Companies as Modern Multinationals», *The Business History Review*, v. 62, n. 3 (autumn 1988), pp.398-419.

¹² Beaujour, Felix de, *Tableau du Commerce de la Grèce, ..., 1787-1797*, v. II, Paris 1800 (translation in Greek, Athens 1974, pp. 169-189)

sought to reach the markets of the vast Habsburg Empire: the city-port became a major trade junction in the London–Malta–Vienna passage. On that occasion, the until then undersized factory of the Levant Company became the focal point of an intense commercial activity operated by its members together with independent British, Greek, Jewish, French and Italian commercial houses.¹³ “The great trade of Salonica...”, as the occasion was described by a Levant Company high official, had a strong impact upon the volume of goods exchanged and the ways of transacting. It also affected the factory’s operation and exposed some serious deficiencies in the organization of the Levant Company, deriving mostly from an inefficient and slow system of communication between administration and factories.¹⁴

The Levant Company dissolved in 1825 and its license was transferred to the British state. The last years of its operation coincided with the political turmoil caused by the Greek Revolution breaking out in 1821. In many areas of the vast Ottoman Empire commerce was brought to a standstill and transports were deeply affected forcing many international operators to transfer capitals and expertise elsewhere. Crisis hit the British factory in Salonica as well and in 1824 in one of his last letters addressed to the British Consul Francis Charnaud¹⁵ the Company’s Secretary George Liddell referred to the “almost total absence of Trade at Salonica...”¹⁶

The English merchant Bartholomew Edward Abbott arrived to Salonica from Constantinople in 1770s according to an unconfirmed source.¹⁷ In 1777 he received from London twenty ballots of cotton loaded on the vessel *Resolution* of Captain Currie.¹⁸ Founder of a rich and famous merchant family that dominated the economic and social life of the Ottoman city-port from the 18th century to the early 20th

¹³ The Salonica factory comprised five members until the end of the 18th century but it seems that many British merchants operated independently in Salonica at least during the first ten years of the 19th century, see table I. After the annexation of the Ionian Islands by the British in 1815, many Ionian citizens residents of Salonica sought and found protection by the British Consulate in the city, see Despina Vlami, *op.cit.*, pp. 175-176.

¹⁴ Despina Vlami, *op.cit.* p. 207..

¹⁵ Francis Charnaud served as British Consul in Salonica from 1792 to 1825. He was a merchant and he was appointed to the post by the General Court of the Levant Company.

¹⁶ N(ational) A(rchives), S(tate) P(apers) 105/125, pp. 147-150.

¹⁷ C. A. Vacalopoulos, “Contribution à l’histoire de la colonie européenne de Thessalonique vers la fin du XVIII siècle”, *Makedonika*, 12 (1972), pp. 183-200 also Aggeliki Metallinou, *Palaia Thessaloniki (Old Thessaloniki)*, v. 1, Thessaloniki 1939, p. 46, pp. 170-172. On the Abbott family see also A. Vacalopoulos, “Historical elements from the life of the Abbott family in Thessaloniki...”, *Makedonika*, 22 (1982), pp. 214-221.

¹⁸ NA, SP 105/137 p. 205-205a.

century¹⁹, Abbott was considered the “father of the Levant Company” in Salonica by his contemporary traveler Daniel Edward Clarke.²⁰

In the Levant Company’s archive kept in the National Archives in London, documents concerning the life, activity and assets of the British merchant are held in an individual file under the heading “Various Documents relative to Disputes between Mr. Consul Charnaud of Salonica and the Heirs of the late Mr. Abbott. Held at the disposal of Mr. Charnaud. His letter answered 6 May 1819”.²¹

These documents are revealing in many ways. Some very interesting aspects of the family life and business activity of one of the Levant Company’s Freeman²² are brought to the light. Incidentally, this was a man that was deeply involved in the life of the local factory and had repeatedly been assigned various tasks and operations by the Company’s officials in London. The Abbott documentation uncovers the personal business strategy of a British merchant operating in the Levant from the late 18th century to the first decades of the 19th century. The organization of his enterprise, his operations and the business networks that supported them are depicted. Some of his methods and tactics, legitimate or disputable, are also revealed. Finally, through the Abbott case it is possible to gain a better understanding of the connection between the overlying mechanism of the Levant Company and its members. To have a close look and investigate the existence of barriers that distinguished the activity of a Freeman from that of an independent merchant, the aspirations of a merchant from those of an officeholder of the Company.

B. “The father of the Levant Company”

The man whom Daniel Edward Clark named “father of the Levant Company” in Salonica gave the oath of a Freeman in 1794 and yet he participated in the life of

¹⁹ M. Mazower, *op.cit.*, pp.155-158. According to Mazower Jackie Abbott the grand son of Bartholomew Abbott was the real architect of the family’s rise in the mid 19th century. Jackie who was British by nationality and Greek by religion became a famous money lender and Sadik Pasha’s chief local banker.

²⁰ D. E. Clarke, *Travels in various countries of Europe, Asia and Africa, Part the Second, Greece, Egypt and the Holy Land*, Section the First, London 1812, p. 364 and ...

²¹ NA, SP 105/137 f. 148r - 306v.

²² The Levant Company’s members.

the British factory as an active member.²³ Bartholomew Edward Abbott remained until the end of his life very engaged in the Company's affaires, and yet he was never offered the post of the local British Consul.²⁴ However, every time the position remained vacant, Abbott was invited to provide service to the Company and was nominated Pro-Consul or interim Consul.

This happened in 1786 when the British Consul in Salonica Olifer announced to the Company that he desired to resign the Consulship and referred to "Mr. B. E. Abbott" as the proper person to succeed him. The Company's reaction was cautious and mindful – after all Abbott had not yet been accepted as its member. Some months after Olifer's resignation the Company's General Court chose the merchant George Moore to take his place.²⁵ Following the accidental death of Moore some years later, the British Ambassador in Constantinople Sir Robert Ainslie sent to Bartholomew Edward Abbott a commission to act as pro Consul until the nomination of a new British Consul in Salonica. Abbott's commercial enterprise, the Bartholomew Edward Abbott & Peter Chasseaud was also assigned to carry out the liquidation of Moore's private business affaires "to the satisfaction of all the parties concerned in them".²⁶

During the long and agitated term in the office of Moore's successor Francis Charnaud, Abbott was once again invited by the Company to take over the British factory.²⁷ In 1803 Charnaud himself appointed B. E. Abbott as Pro Consul for a period of three months and headed to Constantinople on business.²⁸ Abbott acted as Pro Consul at least two more times during Charnaud's term in office, in 1811²⁹ and then in 1814 when Charnaud was temporarily suspended from the Consulship.³⁰

Abbott's commitment with the Company's affaires was sometimes expressed in a most paternalistic manner, something that very often brought him in direct confrontation with the factory's officeholders. The apparently well-connected merchant did not hesitate to put into question the factory's operation, to discredit the Company's officials, to quarrel with and plot against some of them and even

²³ NA, SP 105/121 p. 514-515.

²⁴ For the organization of the Levant Company and its representation in the Ottoman Empire by Consuls see A. Wood, *op.cit.*, pp. 205-228.

²⁵ NA, SP 105/121, p. 168, p. 170.

²⁶ NA, SP 105/121, p. 302-304.

²⁷ Francis Charnaud was British Consul in Salonica from 1792 to 1825 when the Levant Company ceased to exist.

²⁸ NA, SP 105/122, p. 360-361.

²⁹ NA, SP 105/123, p. 249.

³⁰ Charnaud was restored to the office in 1815. See NA, SP 105/123, p. 415-416.

correspond directly with officials in London when he wished to present his requests or ideas. Oddly enough, the Company's administration never let him down; on many occasions stood by his side and put pressure upon its officials in Salonica to satisfy his requirements or come to a compromise with him.

Hence in 1787 in the middle of George Moore's office, Abbott conveyed to the Levant Company's administration in London a Memorial representing that some Factors at Smyrna had consigned British products to foreign houses at Salonica and that a certain George Perkins who had loaded 6 ballots of shalloons on the *Ephrates* under his own name to have been received by M. J. L. Frugier & C. had defrauded the Company as the shalloons had been instead received by a Greek named Pari Venrasi.³¹ His direct interference in the factory's affairs most likely made Consul Moore nervous and in the years that followed their relation got tense and bitter. Soon their conflict was exposed when Abbott together with ex Consul Olifer presented to the Company a protest complaining for Consul Moore's conduct respecting an application presented to him by Abbott in order to obtain possession of a house on behalf of Olifer. The situation had a follow-up as in return Abbott refused to pay an ad Valorem Consulage for a cargo of St. Martha's wood that was not at the time rated in the British Tariff.³² Another reason for resentment between the two men was Abbott's friendly connection to ex Consul Olifer. During his office in Salonica's factory Olifer had obtained – with the Levant Company's consent - the vice Consulship of Sweden. Once he resigned he transferred the post to Bartholomew Edward Abbott and not to his legitimate successor in the British Consulate George Moore. Moore complained to the Company but his principals in London made clear that Olifer's personal decision was irrevocable.³³ In the months that followed, both sides continued to undermine the one the other with the Company often assuming the role of the mediator. Abbott and his partner Peter Chasseaud sent a petition to the Company presenting their reservations for the persons appointed by Moore in the positions of Chancellor and Dragoman of the British Consulate.³⁴ Moore replied to the provocation by accusing the commercial enterprise of Abbott & Chasseaud of

³¹ NA, SP 105/121, p. 190-191.

³² NA, SP105/121, p. 210-212. On the Tariff determining the amount of tax advanced by the British merchants on imported and exported goods see Despina, Vlami, *op.cit.*, pp. 199-200.

³³ N. Svoronos, *op.cit.*, p. 212. Between 1790-1792 Abbott took over the Consulate of Venice in Salonica. *Ibid*, p. 203.

³⁴ NA, SP 105/121, p. 244-246.

trying to evade the payment of 1% Consulage on the value of goods that had been exported by them «on Foreign Ships to Foreign ports on account of Foreigners».³⁵ On that occasion Moore was made clear by the Company that he should advert to the Company's printed Orders according to which no Consulship should be levied on goods exported to foreign ports in foreign ships by British subjects on account of foreigners.³⁶ The Company once again was quick to back the British merchants against its appointed officer when Abbott & Chasseaud complained for the fees charged by the factory's Chancellery for the provision of various services to the factors. On that occasion the Company advised Moore to establish specific and fixed fees so as to prevent any further complaints. In 1790 in one of his letters to the Company Consul Moore made allusions that B. E. Abbott & P. Chasseaud had made their entries of Consulage at the end of the year and not at the time of receiving or shipping goods. This was against the rules of the Levant Company and suggested fraudulent manipulation of the duties the enterprise had to pay to the Levant Company through the British Consulate.³⁷ This uncomfortable and controversial situation went on until the accidental death of Consul Moore in 1790. Moore together with the captain of a British vessel was attacked by strangers during an evening walk.³⁸

Bartholomew Edward Abbott's relation with Moore's successor, Francis Charnaud, was not uncomplicated either. It reached its lowest moment during the period Charnaud was temporarily suspended by the Levant Company having failed to produce to the Company's Secretary the accounts of Consular revenues he had collected in Salonica for more than ten years.³⁹ Charnaud's dubious negligence was absolved after he sent to London all necessary documentation and with the interference of some of his powerful «friends» in the British capital. However, when the time came for Abbott to hand over to Charnaud the Consulate the two men got involved into a bitter disagreement on economic returns. Their dispute was complicated: who of the two was entitled to the Consulage upon the cargoes of two vessels who had begun to be loaded during Abbott's administration and had finished

³⁵ NA, SP 105/221, p. 255-256.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ NA, SP 105/121, p. 264.

³⁸ NA, SP 105/121, p. 282-283.

³⁹ See Despina Vlami, *op.cit.*, pp. 184-185. In 27 April 1814 Abbott was invited by the General Consul in Constantinople Isaac Morier to take over the British Consulate in Salonica as interim Consul. NA, SP 105/134, f. 164r. Charnaud claimed that his negligence was due to the long illness of one of his sons and produced documents that proved his argument, in NA, SP 105/134, f. 168r-169r.

loading after Charnaud's restoration to the office. Abbott also protested that Charnaud had not paid him the entire amount of one year's salary – this was 2.000 piastre -, but he had advanced him piastre 1.844 37/120 which corresponded to eleven months and two days service.⁴⁰ The dispute was brought to the General Court of the Levant Company which resolved that the whole Consulage upon the cargoes of the two vessels should be awarded to Abbott while Charnaud should pay to Abbott a whole years' compensation for his services.⁴¹

This was not the end of the story. The rupture between the two men was fierce and was accompanied by allegations from both sides of irregularities in the management of the factory. Abbott accused Charnaud that he had mismanaged consular duties while Charnaud blamed Abbott for having charged illicitly non British subjects with the payment of a 2% duty on the value of their merchandise. Charnaud presented to the Levant Company the testimony of an Austrian subject, the merchant G. Vianello owner of the association G. Vianello Sons & C., who accused Abbott that he had charged him with the 2% duty.⁴² Charnaud went on accusing Abbott's son George Frederic that he had contravened the Company's regulations and had formed the G. F. Abbott & C. in association with an Ottoman subject, the Greek merchant Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou.⁴³ At that point the Levant Company decided to intervene as the situation had gone too far and the good name of the British factory in the city was at stake. In a letter that was sent to both adversaries it expressed its annoyance and asked that «all the animosity which it produced will cease, and that both of you Gentlemen, will return to such habits of peace and good neighbourhood with respect to each other as may secure the tranquillity of the Factory at large and prevent further injury to the reputation of the parties concerned in the Quarrel».⁴⁴

And yet, some years later, following the passing away of the head of the family Bartholomew Edward Abbott, both Francis Charnaud and his son James who by that time served as Chancellor in the Consulate, got involved in a dispute that brought the Abbott sisters - Annetta Abbott Parsy and Canella Abbott Gliubik – against their brother and administrator of their father's assets, George Frederic

⁴⁰ NA, SP 105/137, f. 302r-302v.

⁴¹ NA, SP 105/123, p. 485-487.

⁴² NA, SP 105/123, f. 197r-198r.

⁴³ E. Hekimoglou, "Ioannis Gouta Caftangioglou...", *Grigorios Palamas*, 758 (1995), pp. 407-464.

Also M. Mazower, *op.cit.*, p. 130.

⁴⁴ NA, SP 105/123, p. 488-489.

Abbott. G. F. Abbott and his mother Sarah Abbott had been nominated representatives of B.E. Abbott and administrators of his assets two days before his passing away, on the 16th March 1817.⁴⁵ G. F. Abbott renounced his father's attorney but later on changed his mind and demanded from Charnaud to be reintegrated to his former divested functions as Administrator of his father's assets.⁴⁶ By that time James Charnaud as Chancellor of the British Consulate had assumed the role of the administrator of the Abbott inheritance according to the Levant Company's directions. Francis Charnaud refused to accept G. F. Abbott's demand and the issue was brought to the Ecclesiastical Court of England that was competent to judge the case. The Court's verdict was notified to the parts and yet Consul Charnaud refused to administer the oath of Executor to George Frederic Abbott as it had been requested by him by the Ecclesiastical Court of England. On the 6th May 1819 the Company expressed its entire disapprobation of Charnaud's behaviour and emphasized that it was compelled to attribute his refusal «to perform an obviously necessary Act of public duty to private motives, as the affair had become merely personal». The Company referred to the long dispute between the Abbott and Charnaud families and finally stated that if George Frederic Abbott had conducted himself unworthily it would by no means be Charnaud to judge him but it would be in the power of his sisters, coheirs with himself, to call him to account before a competent Tribunal.⁴⁷

The last act of this long-lasting controversy between the two families implicated the third generation of the Abbott in the person of Robert Abbott son of George Frederic who at the time was employed as Treasurer of the British Embassy in Constantinople. This time the Abbott complained to the Levant Company that Consul Francis Charnaud had shown a suspicious tardiness that equalled negligence in coping with an important financial matter that affected directly their interests. Infringing hierarchy one more time, the Abbott had referred the case to the British Ambassador in Constantinople.⁴⁸ On the 25th November 1824 George Frederic Abbott accused Francis Charnaud for not having reacted swiftly enough to constrain George Carissi

⁴⁵ NA, SP 105/137 f. 150r-150v.

⁴⁶ NA, SP 105/137 f. 157r-158r.

⁴⁷ NA, SP 105/124 p. 208-211.

⁴⁸ In his letter to the Levant Company in London Robert Abbott stated that his family had specific demands upon Mr. George Carissi and Lysimaco Caftangioglou heirs and administrators of the deceased Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou's assets. He claimed that the two men had a debt of 130.000 piastre towards the Abbott family but the bills handed them were not valid. NA, SP 105/142 f. 183r-184v and f. 186r-187v.

and Lysimaco Caftangioglou to pay their debt towards him. If Charnaud had been more efficient the whole issue would have been closed and «it would have been a triumph for our nation», Abbott sustained, instead of being transferred to be resolved by the British diplomatic authorities in Constantinople.⁴⁹ For the last time the Levant Company's administration readily supported his argument and in a letter sent to Francis Charnaud on the 3rd August 1824 invited him to dedicate all his efforts and time to the positive and final conclusion of the case.⁵⁰

When Clarke referred to Bartholomew Edward Abbott as the “father of the Levant Company” in Salonica he might have been predisposed by the man's imposing and influential personality, his extended network of social and business connections, the volume and the amplitude of his activity, his propitious and well-established relation with the Levant Company's officials. Clarke might also have noted his paternalistic manner that ultimately defined his ambiguous and troubled relation with the residents of the British Consulate in Salonica. However, as David Goffman has shown, similar incidents between members of the Levant Company were common since early in the Company's history revealing antagonistic relations and the prevalence of personal strategies. The clash between two factors in Smyrna or the fierce antagonism between contenders of the post of the General Consul in Peloponnesus, the heart of the currant trade in south Greece⁵¹ - two 17th century incidents described by Goffman - put into question theories on the existence of a powerful network of Freemen that functioned under the institutional umbrella of the Company and was based on Company affiliation and common economic interests.⁵² The long correspondence of Consuls Olifer, Moore and Charnaud with the Levant Company's officials back in London proves that rather than one single Company network one can ascertain the existence of individual centers of power that operated around influential personalities of social and economic status. These individuals often held positions of eminence in the Company's administration and influenced decisions

⁴⁹ As Abbott claimed, all his acts towards the British Chancellery were nullified: his sequestration and his protests had been refused, the Magazzino and his House that had been taken in mortgage had been recovered by the Procurators of Mr. Carissi and finally the nine trunks sequestrated by him had been taken by the Austrian Chancellery and had been consigned to Mrs Dudu Choida, NA, SP 105/142 f. 188r-189v.

⁵⁰ NA, SP 105/142, f. 188r-189v.

⁵¹ D. Goffman, *Britons in the Ottoman Empire 1642-1660*, Washington 1998, p. 45-67.

⁵² See, for example Maria Fusaro, “Commercial Networks of Cooperation in the Venetian Mediterranean: the English and the Greeks, a Case Study”, in D. R. Curto & A. Molho (eds), *Commercial Networks in the Early Modern World*, EUI Working Paper, HEC No 2, Florence 2002, p. 145.

taken by the General Court. Around these centers of power assembled members of the Company of equally important social and economic standing, similar economic interests, related by kin and sociability; in the Company's jargon they were often referred to as "friends" and "friends of friends" and they were always ready to use their name, their connections and their money to guarantee for and assist the members belonging to their circle. Often they took sides supporting each other against other members of the Company or in front of the General Court.⁵³ This reality was not unrelated with the Company's procedure of selecting members: the aspiring Freemen had to be proposed by a number of active members who as real "friends" would support warmly their candidacy. However, outside these groups of "friends" – groups that inevitably intersected and overlapped - friendship, trust and affiliation were not self-evident notions, as collaboration and partnership were not uncomplicated practices. This is what the Abbott case seems to suggest.

C. The Abbott enterprises: transactions and interactions

Bartholomew Edward Abbott together with his friend and relative Peter Chasseaud were associated in the Abbott & Chasseaud; two thirds of the company's capital was allotted to Abbott and one third to Chasseaud.⁵⁴ The company imported textiles, cotton yarn, sugar, earthenware, silverware, and other British products and exported tobacco, sponges, grains.⁵⁵ It collaborated with the George Frederic Abbott & C., the enterprise set up by Abbott's son together with the Greeks Theodore Choida, Niccola Zade and Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou. Abbott & Chasseaud had transactions with Lee & Brant of London and Smyrna, Roux Frères & Cie of Marseille, Edward Hayes & C.,⁵⁶ Fletcher & C.,⁵⁷ M. Flitoker and J. L. Gout in Malta.⁵⁸

⁵³ See for example the long friendship between Francis Charnaud and John Theo. Daubuz , one of the members of the Company's General Court, NA, SP 105/122 p. 371-372 and NA, SP 105/123 p. 385-387, or the Olfier-Abbott connection mentioned above.

⁵⁴ See also below the reference to the liquidation plan of the firm.

⁵⁵ NA, SP 105/134 f. 31r-58r, SP 105/136, f. 119r-121v.

⁵⁶ The company had offices in London, Malta and Smyrna. It traded oil, grain, wine, rice, currants, tobacco, soap, shawl and Indian textiles. In 1812 John Charmont was the director of the Malta office, Mirella D' Angelo, *Mercanti Inglesi a Malta 1800-1824*, Milano 1990, pp. 63, 64, 75, 79.

⁵⁷ This was one of the most important British enterprises in Malta until 1820. Mathew Fletcher and Alexander Grant were two of the associates. The company traded carpets, wool, pepper, cinnamon, nutmeg, salted meat and even women's hats, paper flowers, books and opium. Mathew Fletcher

1. Brothers and Sisters

Business was part of the everyday life of the Abbott family. The forty pages inventory of the family house drawn up by the British Chancellor James Charnaud following the death of Sarah Abbott is an unmistakable testimony of the extent to which trade had infiltrated in the Abbott's life. The house let to the family by the merchant Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou for 1.500 piastre per year was filled with merchandise and commodities, in particular woolen, silk and cotton textiles, cotton and silk yarns, shawls of all different types and fabrics, furs, curtains, earthenware, silverware and cutlery all kept in trunks, closets and cases.⁵⁹

The members of the family had invested money in the Abbott & Chasseaud and were beneficiaries of the interests. When Bartholomew Edward Abbott passed away his succession by his heirs-at-law set off a very interesting as much as long dispute. In the heart of the argument, which was fed by distrust, suspicion and greed, laid the question of who would get first the money he/she had invested in the company after the Abbott assets had been liquidated. Annetta Parsy Abbott claimed her 10.000 piastre dowry invested in the company by her and her husband, while George Frederic called for the reimbursement of a credit of 36.570 56/120 piastre he had made to his father. This credit was repudiated by his sisters.

Another argument arose from George Frederic's administration of his father's assets and enterprise as his unique representative following his mother's death; his sisters Annetta and Canella refused to accept his reintegration in his former function as administrator of their father's assets and were very distrustful of his operations and manipulation of the company's documents. Together with their husbands Antoine Parsy and Pierre Gliubik requested through the French Consulate that represented them the deposit in the British Chancellery of all the books, documents, bills and letters concerning Bartholomew Edward Abbott's inheritance, an official copy of the inventory of their paternal house and all the books, registers, documents and effects

together with Swinton C. Holland and William Higgens were associated in the Holland & C. Mirella D' Angelo, *op.cit.*, pp. 66, 92.

⁵⁸ J. L. Gout arrived to Malta between 1807-1808 and remained there for some years. He traded flour, Mirella D' Angelo, *op.cit.*, pp. 63-64, 79.

⁵⁹ NA, SP 105/137 f. 196r-216v.

belonging to the Abbott & Chasseaud. They finally claimed from their brother a number of valuable items that as they sustained they were "found in his hands".

The row between the brother and the sisters was fierce and assiduous. It lasted at least two years (1817-1819) and comprised an exchange of numerous long letters, acts of protest, appeals, petitions, ex officio and acts of sequestration.⁶⁰ Francis Charnaud the British Consul, the Chargé d' Affaires of the French Consulate Bottu, the French Chancellor Marcescau, and Count de Choch the Austrian Consul, were implicated in the dispute on whether G. F. Abbott had in fact advanced a credit of piastre 36.570 56/120 to his father. The case was ultimately brought to a British Magistrate and a committee of merchants including Consul Francis Charnaud and the merchants Athanasio Miliaresi, Leone Morpurgo, Gregorio Ioanni Kiriakkou and Theodore Choida conveyed its sentence on the 12^{ve} March 1819.⁶¹ The Magistrate's unanimous judgment justified George Frederic Abbott as it considered his credit to his father valid. However, as the committee sustained, George Frederic could not claim the payment of the entire amount of his credit from the heirs of Bartholomew Edward Abbott. Once the liquidation of his father's assets had taken place Abbott would be paid a proportion of his credit that would correspond to the ratio of assets versus liabilities. The sentence of the Magistrate was renounced by both sides. George Frederic Abbott appointed the law office of John William Lubbock & Coresidents to represent him in the competent British Tribunal in London.⁶²

2. Partners and Creditors

The documentation concerning the Abbott inheritance comprises a number of documents that reveal the Abbott's strategy and transactions. In this category of documents belongs an arbitrary sentence emanated on the 28th November 1811 by a Magistrate set up by the Consul of Austria Giuseppe de Choch following a petition of Peter Chasseaud⁶³ and a liquidation plan of the same company signed by Bartholomew Edward Abbott and Peter Chasseaud on 31st December 1816.⁶⁴ Very interesting information on the family's transactions is also provided by two acts of

⁶⁰ NA, SP 105/137 f. 148r-306v.

⁶¹ NA, SP 105/137 f. 305v-306v.

⁶² NA, SP 105/137 f. 169r-169v.

⁶³ NA, SP 105/137 f. 160r-163r.

⁶⁴ NA, SP 105/137 f. 255r.

sequestration against George Frederic Abbott. The one was presented by Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou⁶⁵ and the other by Joseph David Fernandez Diaz.⁶⁶

On the basis of a first evaluation of this material it is possible to articulate some general assumptions concerning first, the operation of the Abbott enterprises and second, the existence of a network of individuals that functioned outside the British factory and comprised a large number of merchants who depended on each other mostly through credit and joint operations.

As it has already been mentioned, Abbott participated in the Abbott & Chasseaud with two thirds of the capital and Chasseaud with one third. According to the association's contract signed by the two partners, Abbott would have taken over the management of the enterprise. Abbott's family members were creditors of the company; the major among them was Sarah Abbott, Bartholomew Edward's wife. In 1816 the capital of Abbott & Chasseaud amounted to piastre 222.893 49/120. Piastre 69.904 111/120 of this amount had been advanced by Sarah Abbott. Sara's credit had been divided among the two partners: a sum of piastre 46.943 20/120 was allotted to her husband and piastre 22.961 91/120 was allotted to Peter Chasseaud. In the liquidation plan of the company George Frederic Abbott and Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou figured prominently as two other important creditors of B. E. Abbott; they had advanced to the company piastre 36.570 56/120 the first, and piastre 22.624 24/120 the second. Abbott's daughter Annetta Parsy had deposited to the company her dowry amounting piastre 10.000 while well-known members of the Jewish and Greek merchant community of Salonica had invested to the company minor sums, namely Bohor Covo (piastre 15.374 113/120), Anastasi Giovanni (piastre 6.760), Mose Namias (piastre 2.563 57/120), Sahula Salem, the wife of a well-known merchant (piastre 3.018 40/120), Haggi Gusho (piastre 1.500).

The credits allotted to Peter Chasseaud were more modest. Sarah Abbott, members of his family and members of the Adritti family had advanced the largest sums (G. Chasseaud piastre 11.983 99/120 and the Adritti piastre 16.237). Abram Namias had granted Chasseaud piastre 750, Salomon Frances piastre 600 and Yuran Yenegelis piastre 5.000.

⁶⁵ NA, SP 105/137 f. 177r-184v.

⁶⁶ NA, SP 105/137 f. 189r-190r.

The origin of the Abbott & Chasseaud capital and the credit circuit upon which it relied were not exactly those of a traditional British enterprise that operated under the institutional shield of the Levant Company. The same was true for the George Frederic Abbott & C. A sequestration act presented by Ioanni Gouta Caftangioglou in 1818 proves it. Caftangioglou put a sequestration upon «whatever may be the amount or portion of Mr. G. F. Abbott from his father's estate».⁶⁷ With this act registered in the British Chancellery, Caftangioglou claimed to be creditor of the G. F. Abbott & C. for the sum of piastre 70.000. As he maintained he had lent a sum of piastre 1.000 to G. F. Abbott and another of piastre 7.000 to Theodore Choida, another partner in the association. After Choida had retired, this money had been transferred to the account of Abbott and Niccola Zade who was the third partner. The rest of the money had been invested in the company and had ended up in the current account of G. F. Abbott. Caftangioglou insisted that George Frederic had made personal use of an amount of piastre 38.835 100/120 from the company's capital when his own capital in the company amounted only to 15.000 piastre. He also accused George Frederic for presenting a false balance according to which the company's profits in 1817 had been a mere 1.235 108/120 piastre. This money, Caftangioglou sustained, had also been usurped by G. F. Abbott who in that way contravened the association contract he had signed with his partners. Caftangioglou sequestered George Frederic Abbott's revenue that would be produced by the liquidation of his father's assets until a sum of piastre 36.750 would have been paid to him. Abbott refused Caftangioglou's sequestration maintaining that as a Greek Ottoman subject he had no right to sequester the property of a European subject unless a «Frank» would guarantee for him. This man was found in the person of the merchant Mattatia Abram and Caftangioglou renewed the act of sequestration.⁶⁸ Caftangioglou's allegations were grave as he insinuated that G. F. Abbott & C. had been utilized by the Abbott family as a cover up to collect credits that they usurped making easy, quick and illicit profits.

Some days later two other creditors of George Frederic Abbott, lady Bona Fernandez Diaz and lady Flor Fernandez, represented by Joseph Fernandez Diaz, their son and husband respectively, presented an act of sequestration of George Frederic's revenues in order to recover a credit of piastre 18.000. The sum had been advanced in

⁶⁷ NA, SP 105/137 f. 177r-178r.

⁶⁸ NA, SP 105/137 f. 179r-179v.

three bills of piastre 7.000 (10/1/1817), piastre 5.500 (25/1/1817) and piastre 5.000 (8/2/1817). Except for Caftangioglou and Fernandez Diaz family, the merchant Spandoni Hatzi Gusho, the François Masse & Cie and the Consul of Austria in Salonica Count Giuseppe de Choch participated in the group of trade operators who exchanged credit and favors with the Abbott family.⁶⁹

The arbitrary sentence emanated by an Austrian Magistrate in 1816 following a petition of Peter Chasseaud offers some unexpected glimpses inside the operation of the Abbott & Chasseaud. The merchant committee of judges arbiters set up by de Choch comprised the British merchant John Pyburn, the French François Masse and Giuseppe de Choch himself. It had the important duty to convey its judgment upon the argument that had arose between the two partners and was communicated in a four point protestation by Peter Chasseaud. Chasseaud questioned Abbott's management and George Frederic Abbott's involvement in economic transactions with his father.

George Frederic appeared to have advanced to Abbott & Chasseaud a credit of piastre 5.500 that, as Chasseaud maintained, should be allotted to his father's personal account and not to the company's as it had never been utilized for the benefit of the enterprise or been deposited to the company's treasury. Chasseaud also called into question George Frederic's appointment as secretary of the company with an annual salary of piastre 500 plus interests. His appointment, Chasseaud claimed, was completely unnecessary and contravened the association's contract that determined the number of employees necessary for the company's operation. Chasseaud contested finally the payment by the company of an annual pension of piastre 3.500 to George Frederic for the maintenance of his family and personnel. The money had been advanced to George Frederic annually for a long period after his marriage. Chasseaud requested as well, the transfer from the company's account to the personal accounts of Bartholomew Edward Abbott and John Pyburn of the sums of piastre 772 96/120 and 226 respectively. These, he claimed, was money owed to George Frederic by the two merchants for «things» they had purchased from him for their personal use.⁷⁰

Bartholomew Edward Abbott's response to his partner's allegations was simple, acid and unsatisfactory. As he sustained, articles 15 and 16 of the

⁶⁹ Bills carrying their names were found deposited together with the rest of the company's papers in the British Chancellery.

⁷⁰ NA, SP 105/137 f. 160r-163r.

association's contract gave him priority over the company's management. Abbott denied that his son had been receiving an allowance by the company and expressed his curiosity for Chasseaud's late reaction – eight years after George Frederic's appointment as a secretary in the company. He also referred sarcastically to Chasseaud's appropriation of capitals from the company treasury to pay for the renovation of his house some years before.⁷¹ Giuseppe de Choch, John Pyburn and François Masse, after having considered all the relevant documents brought to the Magistrate by the two sides in the dispute, adjudicated that the credit of piastre 5.500 advanced by G. F. Abbott to the company was valid however it should be allotted to his father. They also acknowledged the appointment of George Frederic as secretary in the company and invited the partners to advance him his salaries. Finally they estimated the allowance George Frederic had been receiving by the company to piastre 2.000 per year and they sustained that the money he had received should be returned to the company.⁷²

2. Witnesses, Judges and Arbiters

Between 1817 and 1819, the British, French, Austrian and Swedish Consulates in Salonica were implicated into an exchange of petitions, protests, decrees, ex officios, appeals, acts of sequestration, and requests made mostly by the heirs of Bartholomew Edward Abbott but also by members of the Ottoman, British and other European merchant communities with an interest in the Abbott inheritance. Around them assembled other merchants who acted as witnesses and representatives, guarantors, creditors, and judges, individuals who along with their trade operations had undertaken diplomatic offices, or where picked up by the Consuls for their credentials, good name and/or their connection to the Abbott family in order to assist into various procedures.

Hence Philip Lafont medical doctor in Salonica and Rafaele Mordo were present when Bartholomew Edward Abbott named as his representatives and administrators of his assets his son George Frederic Abbott and his wife Sarah Abbott.

⁷¹ NA, SP 105/137 160v-161v.

⁷² NA, SP 105/137 f. 162v-163r.

Abbott had invited the Austrian Chancellor deputy Michele Piazza to draw up the act and a copy of the document was sent to the British Chancellery.⁷³ Michele Piazza (Austrian Chancellor deputy) and Giacomo Piazza together with Pietro de Choch (Austrian Consul deputy) and Lorenzo Badetti signed as witnesses petitions and protests presented by G. F. Abbott in the British Consulate between 1817-1819.⁷⁴ The Austrian Count Giuseppe de Choch, the British John Pyburn and the French François Masse (of the François Masse & Cie) were nominated judges arbiters in the Magistrate called by de Choch to resolve the dispute between Bartholomew Edward Abbott and Peter Chasseaud in 1811.⁷⁵ In 1819 Theodore Valette and Spiridon Monti were signed as witnesses the appeal of George Frederic Abbott against the sentence emanated by the British Magistrate in Salonica concerning his dispute with his sisters and co-heiresses.⁷⁶ Philip Aliotti and J. J. Odds were witnesses in the act of sequestrate presented by Joseph David Fernandez Diaz in the Austrian Chancellery on the 9 March 1818.⁷⁷ Cesar Odds together with Francesco Castelli and Ignazio d' Andrea were present and signed as witnesses the inventory of the Abbott house drawn up by James Charnaud the British Chancellor. Odds was also entrusted the keys of the house that had been sealed following the death of Sarah Abbott.⁷⁸ The above mentioned J. J. Odds together with Lorenzo Badetti and Emmanuel Ioanni Kiriakkou were witnesses in the liquidation of the B. E. Abbott & P. Chasseaud while Philip Aliotti together with Leon Morpurgo, Athanasio Migliaresi and Gregorio Ioanni Kiriakkou were nominated by the British Consul Francis Charnaud judges arbiters in the case of George Frederic Abbott's credit.⁷⁹ Aliotti's place was taken by Theodore Choida, following an appeal of the Abbott sisters who sustained that George Frederic Abbott was a relative to Philip Aliotti with his marriage.⁸⁰ Two other merchants Theodore Valletti and George Vianello were witnesses in the presentation in front of G. F. Abbott and his mother Sarah Abbott of the appeal of the Abbott sisters against

⁷³ NA, SP 105/137 f. 150r-150v.

⁷⁴ NA, SP 105/137 f. 157r-158v.

⁷⁵ NA, SP 105/137 f. 160r-163r.

⁷⁶ NA, SP 105/137 f. 169r-169v.

⁷⁷ NA, SP 105/137 f. 190r-190v.

⁷⁸ NA, SP 105/137 f. 195v-216v.

⁷⁹ NA, SP 105/137 f. 301r-306r.

⁸⁰ Among others NA, SP 105/137 f. 281r-282r.

them⁸¹ while Ignazio d' Andrea and Giuseppe Funck signed as witnesses another appeal of the Abbott sisters against their brother.⁸²

This was a world of merchants in action, not the usual action of buying and selling in the central market, waiting for the arrival of cargos in a busy port, packing and storing goods in warehouses or stockrooms in the back of mansions, negotiating prices with offices in London, Marseille, Livorno, Malta and Smyrna. On this occasion the merchants were invited to assist in the settlement of differences that so often arose in the life of a busy merchant community, to provide social service with guarantee their good reputation and dignity, to contribute to a resolution of conflicts and a quick restart of business. This kind of social action brought them together for their common good and bound them into relations of interdependence and sociability.

Epilogue

Bartholomew Edward Abbott was considered the “father of the Levant Company” in Salonica by his contemporary traveler Daniel Edward Clarke⁸³ and not unduly: his life and business activities were irretrievably connected with the Salonica factory since its first days; even before he gave the formal oath of a Freeman and was accepted as a full member in the grand company of «friends»,

The powerful and ambitious English merchant belonged to an institution which by itself constituted a formal but loose network. Similar economic interests, common social origins, kinship relations and a growing sense of national pride were seemingly not enough to build a strong identity that would bound the Company's Freemen together and would diminish ambitions, antagonisms and the lust for profits. As many other members of the Levant Company Bartholomew Edward Abbott was also involved into independent activities and operations, usually in collaboration with his son George Frederic Abbott. Sometimes these operations had an essence of illegality other times they contravened the Levant Company's rules. The two men belonged in business networks that comprised merchants and individuals from within the local society. These networks were based on reciprocal relations of interdependence. Credit, partnership, alliance, friendship, manipulation, kin, ethnicity,

⁸¹ NA, SP 105/137 f. 220r-221r.

⁸² NA, SP 105/137 f. 221v-222v.

⁸³ D. E. Clarke, *op.cit.*

trust and doubt molded interdependence and a sense of identity. Participation in these networks presupposed acknowledgement of certain common values and practices and made collaboration and relationship necessary if the flow of trade between the merchants should continue.

TABLE I
*Commercial Houses in Salonica
from the British Consular Archives
1813-1818*

I. British, French, Italian, German and other Commercial Houses

Abbott & Chasseaud (1813-1814)
Abbott G. F. & C. (1813-1814)
Abbott G. F. & C. (1816)
Allamandas J. L. & M. J. Fazz (1813-1814)
André P.F. * (1813-1814)
Bacchi Giovanni (1813-1814)
Bachaloni Giuseppe (1813-1814)
Baciatori Stefano & C. (1813-1814)
Ballano & C. (1817)
Barker Edward & C. * (1813-1814)
Barxell & Faadt (1813-1814)
Bensusan Joseph (1816)
Bensusan Joseph & Sons (1816)
Benvenisti Vidal (1816)
Berard J. F. (1813-1814)
Bianco Claudio (1813-1814)
Brine William (1813-1814)
Brine William & Grabau & C. * (1813-1814)
Carasso Isaac Levi (1816)
Castelli Domenico (1813-1814)
Chabot, Routh & C. * (1813-1814)
Charnaud Francis (1813-1814)
Charnaud Francis (1817)
Chasseaud Peter (1818)
Cooper Samuel & C. (1813-1814)
Dalgas & Ott * (1813-1814)
Dalla Cozi * (1813-1814)
Dracopuli & De Marchi (1816)
Fazz John (1813-1814)
Fenech Giuseppe (1817)
Fernandez Diaz J. D. & C. (1816)
Fernandez Elia & Misrachi (1813-1814)
Fernandez Elia & Misrachi (1816)
Fletcher & C. * (1813-1814)
Flitoker M. (1813-1814)
Fouquier & Wailhem (1813-1814)
Garofallo Domenico (1813-1814)
Gategno Menahem & Isaac (1816)
Gategno Moise & Isaac (1816)
Gategno M. J. (1817)
Goffiero Carlo (1818)
Gout James L. * (1813-1814)
Grabau & Stresaw * (1813-1814)
Grabau C. & C. * (1813-1814)
Hausner & C. (1813-1814)
Hayes Edward & C. * (1813-1814)
Heimpel Christian (1813-1814)
Holland & C. * (1813-1814)
Hunter & C. * (1813-1814)
Jackson Thomas * (1813-1814)
Jalm J. & C. (1817)
Jannits Giorgio (1817)
Jannits George (1818)

Lachliy J. (1813-1814)
Lisag Elia Vita (1816)
Lutheroth Ascan (1813-1814)
Magnetti Ger. (1813-1814)
Marshall John * (1813-1814)
Masse J. & C. (1813-1814)
Mercado Jenni (1813-1814)
Mezzrini Fratelli (1816)
Morpurgo G. D. (1813-1814)
Mutti G. (1813-1814)
Namas Abraam (1813-1814)
Pellerano Gaetano (1816)
Premuda N. (1813-1814)
Pyburn John (1813-1814)
Reboul & Odds (1816)
Renal J. B. (1813-1814)
Reyman & Mayer * (1813-1814)
Richards George * (1813-1814)
Ross, Higgins & C. * (1813-1814)
Saja Moise & Juda Levi & C. (1813-1814)
Sarai Haggi Muhamed (1813-1814)
Sartorio G.G. (1813-1814)
Tarabocchia, Marco Giovanni (1813-1814)
Tarabochia M. M. (1813-1814)
Thomas R. M. & C. * (1813-1814)
Tichy Ant. (1813-1814)
Vernazza & Alliotti (1813-1814)
Vernazza & Alliotti (1816)
Vernazza & Alliotti (1817)
Vianello Ant. J. (1816)
Vianello G. Sons & C. (1813-1814)
Vianello Giovanni Sons & C. (1816)
Vianello Giovanni Sons & C. (1817)
Volger H. J. * (1813-1814)
Volger Henry * (1813-1814)
Vujstich Michele (1813-1814)

II. Greek Commercial Houses

Balis & Prasakakis (1813-1814)
Caftangioglou I. G. (1813-1814)
Caftangioglou I. G. (1816)
Castrizzis I. Ch. (1813-1814)
Chatzigiorgos Demetrios (1813-1814)
Chatzigiorgos Demetrios (1816)
Choida Theodoros (1816)
Christodoulos Demetrios (1813-1814)
Christodoulos Domenicos (1813-1814)
Constantinou Ioanni (1813-1814)
Costakis Andreas (1813-1814)
Costourousis Constantinos & C. (1813-1814)
Coundouris Andreas (1813-1814)
Dardaganis Dimitrios (1813-1814)
Dardaganis I. D. (1813-1814)
Dariotis Georgios (1813-1814)
Giannicopoulos Constantino (1813-1814)
Giannitisi Georgios (1818)
Giannitsis Georgios (1817)
Golopoulos Iatros (1813-1814)
Golopoulos Michail (1813-1814)
Golopoulos Nicolaos (1813-1814)

Hg. Grisso H. J. Panajiotti & C. (1816)
Ignatiou Ioannis & C. (1816)
Kiriakkou Ioanni & Sons (1816)
Kiriakkou Sons & C. (1816)
Kiriakkou I. & C. (1813-1814)
Manassis Panagis (1813-1814)
Menexes Christos Georgios (1816)
Mentzelopoulos Nicolaos (1816)
Michalis Pavlos (1813-1814)
Miliaresis Athanasios (1816)
Rizos Emmanouil (1816)
Sardilis Stavros (1813-1814)
Scambalis Constandinos Georgios (1816)
Thalassinos Pavlos & C. (1813-1814)
Thalassinos Pavlos (1813-1814)
Tosizza Bros (1818)

*: Commercial Houses represented in Malta

Source: SP 105/134, φ. 31^f-58^f, SP 105/136, φ. 119^f-121^v, SP 105/137, φ. 102^f-107^f.