

WORK IN PROGRESS, PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE.

“Quia Armeni commode ex mari Balthico merces in Hollandia emtas per Volgam in Persiam transferre possunt, hinc Russi hoc iter nemini concedunt, nisi qui ex Persia per Russiam ad mare Balthicum venit. // Baneanes ex India olim Moscuam usque veniebant; nunc ilis ultra Astracanam proficisci non licet. // Ex China afferunt factitium, (...) quod Temzui vocant (...). Buchartzi mahumetani, quorum metropolis Samarcand, frequenter Siberiæ metropolim Tobolsk adeunt. (...)“¹

Introduction

The ideas of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, one of Europe’s leading thinkers in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and author of the previous citation, were prototypical for the perception of the changing role of Muscovy in transit trade from Persia, India and China to Western Europe. Leibniz’ concise note outlines the main elements of the changing role of Muscovy and their impact on the role of the Baltic in commercial exchange between Europe and Asia. At the same time, these elements are put in a context of emerging knowledge about the Baltic’s vast Eurasian hinterland: its main border regions (Persia, India, China, the Khanates), routes (Volga) and centres of exchange (Moscow, Astrakhan’, Samarkand, Tobol’sk) are highlighted alongside the main protagonists (Armenians, Russians, Bucharians, Kalmuck Tartars) and – to some extent – commodities (bananas, *temzui*, horses, children) of this trade.

The geographical scope of Leibniz’ writings and the increasing awareness of a vast Eurasian space that tied Western Europe and China may be seen as a sublime account of the innovations that took place in the European mind. From now on, the world was encompassed, not only by sea, but also by land, because of Muscovy’s eastern expansion during the seventeenth century. The central role of the Russian Empire in this novel constellation, which found expression in Leibniz’ writings and was acknowledged in the rapid intensification of Western Europe’s diplomatic and political interaction with the Russian Empire, marked the beginning of a new era in world history, in which the Baltic would play a significant role. Now that one of the driving forces of Eurasian exchange had gained a strong foothold on its shores, a North-Eurasian system of commercial exchange emerged, not only in the minds of political leaders and economic thinkers, but also in the operations of the system’s actors. The Carpathian, Caucasia, Tien-Shan and Altay mountain ranges divided the northern ‘continental’ part of Eurasia from the ‘maritime’ South². Consequently, the Baltic as well as the Black and White Seas became border and conflict zones in the North-Eurasian system of commercial exchange.

These maritime border and conflict zones also served as gateways for the importation of overseas commodities to Central Europe and - by extension – to North-Eurasia. The volume

¹ A. Foucher de Careil, *Oeuvres de Leibniz, publiées pour la première fois d’après les manuscrits originaux avec notes et introductions, Tome Septième: Leibniz et les Académies. Leibniz et Pierre le Grand*, Paris 1875: 461.

² About the distinction, though formulated in slightly different terms, see extensively in: David Christian, Inner Eurasia as a Unit of World History, in: *Journal of World History*, 1994, 5 (2): 173-211.

and geographical structure of these commodity flows can be reconstructed using transport statistics based on the Danish Sound toll registers. The Sound Toll Registers are the records of the toll levied by the king of Denmark on the passage of ships through the Sound, the strait between Denmark and Sweden, which connects the North and Baltic seas. They are housed in the Danish National Archives. More than 700 volumes of the Sound Toll Registers have been preserved, occupying about sixty metres of shelf space. There are data for about 300 of the 360 years between 1497 and 1857, when the Sound Toll was abolished, and include a practically uninterrupted series from 1574 to 1857. They contain information on about 1.8 million passages and approximately 4 million registered cargo items. For each passage, whether westward and eastward, the Sound Toll Registers give the date of passage, name of the shipmaster, his place of residence, port of departure and – from the mid-1660s – the destination, composition of the cargo and toll paid. The Sound Toll Registers are among the great serial sources of early modern history and the only ones with detailed information on European shipping and trade spanning almost three centuries. They are the main measuring point of commodity transport in Europe and contain vital evidence on trade, transport, production and consumption and the origins, lives and economic activities of a host of shipmasters from many countries. The Sound Toll Registers are a central source for social, economic and maritime history on the global, European, national, regional and local levels, but although they are widely known, their sheer volume and detail make them virtually impossible to handle without assistance. The database of “Sound Toll Registers Online” was designed to enable all conceivable searches, cross tabulations and statistical analyses based on the various data items in the original Danish registers. However, the database contains *only* the ‘raw’ data of the registers, in their original spelling. The necessary prerequisites for effective searches in the Sound Toll Registers Online are met solely insofar as names of places are concerned. To overcome the limitations that working with ‘raw’, unstandardized data pose to the researcher, in 2013, the Chair of Social and Economic History of the University of Leipzig engaged in the homogenization, standardisation and conversion to metric tonnes of the approximately four million cargo data entries in the Sound Toll Registers Online. Several papers address the methodological aspects of these data manipulations as well as the preliminary results of their analysis³. In the meantime, the further advancement of the homogenization, standardisation and conversion of the Sound Toll Registers Online has made possible the production of historical transport statistics, a type of statistics that – until now – has been largely unavailable in pre- and early industrial economic history.

In the following sections, a survey of commodity flows between the Americas, Asia and Central Europe is pursued, which is based on statistics derived from the Danish Sound toll registers online, on one hand, and novel statistical data about the structure of Russia’s foreign trade, on the other. The focus of the survey lies on the commodity flows between the vast Russian hinterland (stretching all the way to Kyakhta on the Russo-Chinese border) and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth before and after the partitions of Poland. The survey has a preliminary character and several important limitations apply.

Commodities from the ‘New World’ cannot easily be identified in the sources. Therefore, the present survey is limited to indigo and sugar as Atlantic overseas goods, on one hand, and

³ See, for example: Werner Scheltjens, French imports to the Baltic, 1670-1850: a quantitative analysis, in: *Revue de l’Observatoire Français des Conjonctures Économiques*. Special issue „Eighteenth-century international trade statistics: sources and methods (edited by Loïc Charles and Guillaume Daudin), 140: 137-173; Werner Scheltjens, Maße und Gewichte: Konvertierungsmöglichkeiten am Beispiel der Sundzollregister, in: Peter Rauscher, Andrea Serles (eds.), *Wiegen – Zählen - Registrieren: Handelsgeschichtliche Massenquellen und die Erforschung mitteleuropäischer Märkte (13. – 18. Jahrhundert)*, Innsbruck / Wien / Bozen 2015: 455-479; Werner Scheltjens, *Dutch Deltas: emergence, structure and functions of the first modern transport system*, Leiden / Boston 2015, 334 pp. (Brill’s Studies in Maritime History, 1).

cottons, silks and tea as Asian goods, on the other. Cotton and silk manufactures pose particular problems: they were imported to the Baltic from several European ports, but the location of production is unknown, which makes it impossible to identify them as overseas goods. Therefore, the present survey only takes into account the overland importation of Chinese cottons, silks and tea. Moreover, in the course of the nineteenth century, European sugar beet production started to complement sugar imports from the Caribbean. Insofar as sugar imported to ports in the Baltic originated partly from European ports, it becomes hard to distinguish between the two. In short, this preliminary survey is limited to the following commodity flows: the maritime importation to ports in the Baltic of sugar and indigo and the overland importation of cottons, silks and tea. Only the most significant ports in the Baltic are observed: Danzig and Stettin, on one hand, and St. Petersburg and Riga, on the other.

The available data on overland trade from Persia and China to Central Europe is scarce. Nevertheless, one of the earliest trade statistics of the Russian Empire⁴, covering the year 1764⁵, makes it possible to provide at least some basic indications about the directions and intensity of relevant overland commodity flows between Asia and Central Europe. The trade statistics of 1764 comprise detailed accounts of imports to and exports from the Russian Empire as registered at the toll stations within and at the borders of the Russian Empire. According to these statistics, the total value of exports from the Russian empire was 8.695.845 roubles. For the purpose of this paper, only the most relevant commodities originating from China (cottons, silk or tea) and Persia (silk) are surveyed. Depending on the kind of cotton or silk manufacture that was imported to the Russian Empire via the fair of Kyakhta or via Astrakhan, these commodities obtained different names: the cotton manufactures *kitajki* are known in English as *nanking* or *nankeen*; the less expensive *daba* are described as a sort of calico⁶. Silk fabrics come in a larger variety and – according to Foust – include *kamka* (damask), *atlas* (satin), *barkhat* (velvet), *fler* (gauze), *fanza* (foulard), *parcha* (brocade), *krep* (crepe), *solemenka*, *baiberek*, *svistun*, *lanza* and *grosdetur* (Gros de Tours)⁷.

1764

The volumes of indigo imported to Danzig and Stettin in 1764 were relatively small; most of it arrived from Bordeaux, some indigo from Amsterdam. Remarkably, the volumes of indigo imported to St. Petersburg were almost as large as those that went to Danzig and Stettin taken together, but the main suppliers were Amsterdam and London rather than Bordeaux. Imports of indigo to Riga were negligible. More significant than indigo – at least insofar as volumes are concerned – was the importation of sugar to the Baltic. In 1764, European ‘middlemen’ dominated the importation of sugar to ports in the Baltic. Sugar was imported to Danzig mostly from London, Amsterdam and Hamburg. Quite differently, Stettin’s major supplying ports were Bordeaux and Nantes; London ranked only third.

⁴ Earlier attempts to compile trade statistics for the Russian Empire were made between 1758 and 1760, but their level of detail cannot be compared to the short series of statistics for the years 1764-1766. For a brief survey of early Russian trade statistics, see: Werner Scheltjens, Russia 1758-1766, in: Loïc Charles & Guillaume Daudin (eds.), *Eighteenth-century international trade statistics: Sources and methods* (Special Issue of the Revue de l’OFCE 140), 2015, 343-344.

⁵ Rossiyskiy Gosudarstvennyy Arkhiv Drevnikh Aktov (RGADA), F. 277, Op. 3, Delo 626; The import and exports statistics of St. Petersburg in 1764 have been published in: A.V. Demkin, *Vneshnyaya Torgovlya Rossii cherez Peterburgskiy port. 1764 god. Vedomost’ ob importe inostrannykh tovarov*, Moskva 1996; Ibidem, *Vneshnyaya Torgovlya Rossii cherez Peterburgskiy port. 1764 god. Vedomost’ ob eksporte inostrannykh tovarov*, Moskva 1996.

⁶ Clifford M. Foust, *Muscovite and Mandarin: Russia’s trade with China and its setting, 1727-1805*, Chapel Hill 1969: 355-356.

⁷ Foust, *Muscovite and Mandarin*, 1969: 356-357.

Table 1: Indigo and Sugar imports to Danzig, 1764, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Aalborg		0,25
Amsterdam	6,65	331,84
Bordeaux	15,99	17,57
Hamburg	0,11	211,97
Liverpool		5,11
London	2,08	578,22
TOTAL	24,82	1.144,96

Table 2: Indigo and Sugar imports to Stettin, 1764, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Amsterdam	3,36	12,42
Bordeaux	9,58	2.172,95
London	0,07	187,17
Nantes	0,16	375,78
Portsmouth		0,32
TOTAL	13,17	2.748,63

The import pattern of St. Petersburg – which received less sugar than Stettin or Danzig – was different again: most of the sugar supplied to the Russian capital arrived from Hamburg, Amsterdam and Bordeaux; some 50 tonnes, however, were imported directly from overseas, from the port of Monte Cristi in the French colony Saint-Domingue. Around the mid-eighteenth century, maritime overseas commodity flows to ports in the Baltic were firmly in the hands of the major ports of the colonial powers France, Great Britain and the Dutch Republic⁸.

Table 3: Indigo and Sugar imports to St. Petersburg, 1764, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Amsterdam	27,69	216,57
Bordeaux	5,64	115,37
Hamburg	0,82	287,87
London	7,48	37,91
Monte Christi	0,05	50,13
TOTAL	41,68	707,85

Table 4: Indigo and Sugar imports to Riga, 1764, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Amsterdam	0,39	4,21
Hamburg		0,58
TOTAL	0,39	4,79

⁸ Parallel to these commodity flows, a largely autonomous circuit of sugar imports to Copenhagen and Stockholm existed, which were supplied by their own overseas colonies.

Chinese goods entered the North-Eurasian system of commercial exchange via the fair of Kyakhta at the Russo-Chinese border, from where they were transported to Central Russia via a complex system of rivers and overland routes⁹. Some of the Chinese goods that were imported to the Russian empire, were exported subsequently to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth via the toll stations of Vasil'kov, Dobryansk (Dobryanka) and Nezhin, an important market place on the left bank of the Dnepr (the so-called *Levoberezh'e*), which had become part of the Russian Empire in 1654. Furthermore, Chinese goods also left the Russian Empire via the toll stations of the Shelegovskaya *zastava*¹⁰, which probably bordered White Russia in the vicinity of Smolensk, and the Boevskaya *zastava*, which bordered with White Russia near Vitebsk. Finally, small quantities of Chinese goods were also exported to Central Asia via Astrakhan and to Western Europe via St. Petersburg¹¹. The largest quantities of Chinese goods were exported from Vasil'kov and Dobryansk, two toll stations that were strongly connected to the commodity flows passing through Nezhin. The total value of exports of Chinese goods via the toll stations of Vasil'kov, Dobryansk, Shelegovskaya and Boevskaya *zastavy* was 77.684 roubles, or just under 1% of total exports from the Russian empire in 1764 (0,89% to be precise).

Table 5: The value of Chinese goods exported from Russia to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Based on: RGADA, F. 277, Op. 3, Delo 626.

	<i>Kitajki</i> (in roubles)	tea (in roubles)
Dobryansk	8090,80	544,54
Vasil'kov	19786,80	6549
Shelegovka	37338,25	1430,90
Boevskaya	3303,50	130,6

The 1764 toll registers of Dobryansk reveal that small quantities of damasks (*kitajki*) in different colours were sent from Nezhin to Danzig and Zelva, a White Russian place on the way to Grodno, and from Borzna, east of Nezhin, to Bogdaniec, which could refer to a Polish settlement on the Warthe, located west of Landsberg, or in the vicinity of Bialystok¹². Furthermore, some high-quality Chinese green tea (*dzhulan*) was exported from Nezhin to Danzig via Dobryansk¹³. Exports of Chinese goods to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth via the toll station of Vasil'kov, located South of Kiev, not only served a different region, they were of a different magnitude as well. Chinese goods had a 45% share in the total value of exports from Vasil'kov in 1764, which clearly indicates that this toll station was located on a specialist route between China and the southernmost parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The variety of Chinese goods exported via Vasil'kov was similar to that of

⁹ About Russo-Chinese trade in general, see: Foust, *Muscovite and Mandarin*; Michal Wanner, First Russian-Chinese diplomatic relations and business relationship 1689-1728, in: *Prague Papers on the History of International Relations*, 2013, 17 (2): 66-76; Michal Wanner, The Russian-Chinese trade in Kyakhta, its organisation and commodity structure, 1727-1861, in: *Prague Papers on the History of International Relations*, 2014, 18 (2): 35-49.

¹⁰ *Zastava* means frontier post.

¹¹ In 1764, no cotton and silk manufactures were exported from Archangel. The only 'Chinese good' exported from Archangel in 1764 was tea, but its quantity was negligible: 1 pud and 12 funt worth 75 rubles and 50 kopecks. From the port of Riga, 6 *kitajki* were exported. From St. Petersburg 81 pud of green tea with a total value of 4071 rubles and 87 kopecks were exported to London (28 pud), Lübeck (24 pud), Amsterdam (9 pud), Stettin (7 pud) and other ports on the Baltic and North Seas. See: RGADA, F. 277, Op. 3, Delo 626; Demkin 1996: 112.

¹² RGADA, F. 277, Op. 3, Delo 626.

¹³ RGADA, F. 277, Op. 3, Delo 626.

Dobryansk and included different kinds of *kitajki*, which for the most part were sent from Nezhin, Kiev and Romna to Brody and Berdychiv. Similarly, green (*dzhulan*) and other ,simple‘ tea was sent from Kiev and Nezhin mostly to Brody and Berdychiv.

Chinese goods were also exported to Poland-Lithuania from Central rather than Southern Russia, in particular via the toll stations of the *Shelegovskaya zastava* (Shelegovka) and the *Boevskaya zastava*. The latter was a relatively small toll station through which Chinese goods were exported from Moscow and Toropec to Nevel‘, Velizh, Shklov and Vitebsk. Besides the obligatory *kitajki*, green tea was transferred via *Boevskaya* as well, leading to a 40%-share of Chinese goods in the total value of exports. Finally, at Shelegovka, the share of Chinese goods in the value of exports to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was even greater than in Vasil‘kov, but the volume was only half as large. Chinese goods constituted more than 60% of the total export value at Shelegovka. *Kitajki* dominated the exports, but in contrast with the Southern Russian toll stations, the share of Chinese tea was much larger at Shelegovka. Chinese goods came in via Moscow, Smolensk and Toropec and left Shelegovka mostly for Shklov, an important fair on the River Dniepr in the Mohylew district.

1834

The differences between 1764 and 1834 were significant, both from the maritime perspective and from the perspective of overland trade. In 1834, London had become the almost exclusive supplier of much declined quantities of indigo and sugar to Danzig. Contrastingly, the volume of sugar imports to Stettin had increased by almost 38%. At the same time, the suppliers of Stettin had radically changed as well: Bordeaux did not deliver any sugar to Stettin in 1834; in its place, London had emerged as its major supplier, followed by Antwerp, Liverpool, Hamburg and Bremen. Like before, European ports controlled the sugar imports to Danzig and Stettin. Imports of indigo were negligible.

Table 6: Indigo and Sugar imports to Danzig, 1834, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Amsterdam		5,11
Antwerpen		38,56
London	1,77	321,18
TOTAL	1,77	364,85

Table 7: Indigo and Sugar imports to Stettin, 1834, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Amsterdam		153,83
Antwerpen		604,31
Bremen		202,25
Glasgow		78,87
Hamburg		281,86
Liverpool		347,92
London	1,65	2.114,70
New York		4,77
TOTAL	1,65	3.788,51

The situation in Stettin and Danzig differed radically from that of St. Petersburg and – to a lesser extent – Riga. The volume of indigo and – before all – sugar imports to both Russian ports in the Baltic had boomed. In 1834, more than 383 tonnes of indigo were imported from London, Liverpool and Amsterdam, but small quantities were imported directly from the North-American ports of New York and Boston as well. Direct trans-Atlantic commodity flows were much stronger for the sugar imports to St. Petersburg and Riga. The manifold increase in the volumes of sugar imported to both Russian Baltic ports was accounted for by the Cuban ports of Havana and Matanzas as well as Pernambuco in Brazil.

Table 8: Indigo and Sugar imports to St. Petersburg, 1834, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Amsterdam	9,01	
Bideford	0,39	
Bordeaux	0,56	
Boston	5,78	5,59
Havana		12.281,26
Hull	4,59	
Liverpool	12,60	
London	347,77	414,71
Matanzas		5.237,94
New York	1,92	
Pernambuco		842,45
Rotterdam	0,99	
TOTAL	383,61	18.781,95

Table 9: Indigo and Sugar imports to Riga, 1834, in tonnes. Source: STRO.

	Indigo	Sugar
Bremen		327,96
Hamburg		64,02
Havana		362,01
London	7,22	277,89
Matanzas		362,44
TOTAL	7,22	1.394,33

The annual trade statistics, which the Russian government had started to publish in a regular series since 1812, reveal the significant differences in the value of indigo and sugar. In 1834, 25.602 pud¹⁴ of indigo was valued at 4.825.896 roubles or 188,50 roubles per pud, whereas sugar had become a product of mass consumption with a value of only 14,16 roubles per pud, based on imports to the Baltic amounting to 1.537.733 pud valued at 21.774.293 roubles¹⁵. Sugar now accounted for more than 10% of the total value of Russian imports.

¹⁴ One pud is 16,38 kg.

¹⁵ Gosudarstvennaya vneshnyaya torgovlya v raznykh eja vidakh za 1834 god, St. Petersburg 1835.

Table 10: Import and export of sugar and tea in the Russian Empire, 1834. Source: Gosudarstvennaya vneshnyaya torgovlya v raznykh eja vidakh za 1834 god, St. Petersburg 1835.

	via	volume (in pud)	value (in roubles)	
TEA				
import	Black Sea	1.219	282.795	
	Kyakhta	172.143	7.012.516	
	Khanates	755	50.698	3,37%
export	White Sea	1	250	
	Baltic Sea	9	5.960	
	Western land border	45	20.159	
	Black Sea	21	5.510	
	Georgia/Caucasus	2	1.032	
	Caspian Sea	96	21.342	
	Khanates	112	18.421	
export to	Kingdom of Poland	734	266.643	4,53%
transit	from Austria to Odessa	1.160	249.838	
SUGAR				
import	White Sea	51.094	496.884	
	Baltic Sea	1.537.733	21.774.293	
	Black Sea	4.847	72.705	
	Georgia/Caucasus	465	12.601	10,25%
import	TOTAL		218.093.352	
export	TOTAL		230.419.880	

The import of Chinese goods underwent significant changes between 1764 and 1834. The share of tea imports in the total estimated value of imports to Russia in 1834 rose from 0,89% to 3,37%. Almost all tea was still imported via Kyakhta, though small quantities were imported via Odessa on the Black Sea and via Georgia as well. The volume of tea imports via Kyakhta to Russia continued to grow in the nineteenth century. In 1834, more than 172.000 puds were imported, which were valued at just over 7 million roubles. Small, but high-valued quantities were exported, mostly to the Kingdom of Poland. In contrast, the importation of *kitajki* and silk fabrics declined strongly in the nineteenth century. Whereas around the mid-eighteenth century, Chinese cottons accounted for 60% and more of all Chinese imports to Russia, their share started to fall markedly after 1800¹⁶. The massive importation of cotton and silk yarn and fabrics from Great Britain, the Hanseatic towns and Prussia to Russian ports in the Baltic and Russian cities along the Western land border¹⁷ as well as increasing textile manufacturing in Russia,

¹⁶ Foust 1969: 355.

¹⁷ Gosudarstvennaya vneshnyaya torgovlya v raznykh eja vidakh za 1834 god, St. Petersburg 1835: 40-41.

which had started exporting cotton manufactures to China as early as 1824¹⁸, seem to have caused this decline.

Preliminary conclusions

Even though an abridged survey like the above has many limitations, some preliminary conclusions can be formulated based on its findings. First of all, Leibniz' grand vision for Russia as the 'new empire of the middle' did not really come true. Overland trade from China to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was of limited volume and value in 1764 and 1834 – especially if compared to the massive growth of imports to the Baltic. European ports controlled the importation of indigo and sugar in 1764 and still had a significant share in 1834. However, sugar imports to Russian ports in the Baltic were now in different hands and direct trans-Atlantic connections between Cuba and Russia were established. Many questions require further research, however. The impact of the emerging sugar (beet) industries in Stettin, Danzig and other Baltic ports on the structure of commodity flows with the 'New World' will be analysed at a later stage.

Perhaps the most puzzling finding is that of the transit of tea from Austria to the port of Odessa, which went through the Radzivilovskaya toll station. From the late 1830s onwards, the overland transit from Austria to Odessa started to decline rapidly and by 1844, tea had completely disappeared as a transit item. Perhaps, the emergence of these commodity flows as well as their rapid decline resulted from the growth of Odessa. Indeed, several sources seem to indicate that, from the 1830s onwards, Odessa's advantageous location on the shores the Black Sea started to affect the existing overland connections between the West and the East, in particular the fairs of Leipzig and Brody. This change did not go unnoticed in Leipzig, where in a message from the Michaelis fair of 1842 it was mentioned that:

“Brody geht im Waarenhandel mehr und mehr zurück, so wie die Strenge der Maasregeln an der russischen Grenze und die Concurrenz der russischen Fabrikanten auf den Märkten des südlichen Rußlands (Roman, Charkow, Berditschef, etc.) zunimmt, welche sich sonst in ausländischen Waaren vorzugsweise über Brody versorgten. Auch der Handel nach Odessa über Brody nimmt in dem Grade ab, als die directen Verbindungen dieses Freihafens mit dem Auslande auf dem Seewege an Ausdehnung gewinnen”¹⁹.

The latter is substantiated by the example of a merchant of Ryl'sk in the Kursk District in 1834, who decided to send the goods bought in the Steiermark from Trieste to Odessa rather than over the land route via Brody²⁰. Further research will have to address what had initially provoked these novel strategies and how they changed the commodity flows between Central Europe and the New World as well as the structure of the North-Eurasian system of commercial exchange.

¹⁸ Wanner 2014: 44.

¹⁹ Cited from Bőrries Kuzmany, *Die Stadt Brody im langen 19. Jahrhundert – eine Misserfolgsgeschichte?* (Dissertation Universität Wien), Wien 2008: 92.

²⁰ Kuzmany 2008: 92.