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Abstract

Upon his death, Count Jacobus Colyer (d. 1725), the Dutch Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, left his Greek wife Catterina de Bourg in a state of debt. The countess appears to have struggled to survive after a life of conspicuous consumption and extravagant luxury in the Ambassadorial palace. Possibly because of her seemingly proud attitude, she was often met with prejudice and malice by her husband’s relatives, travelers to the Ottoman Empire, the new Dutch Ambassador, other members of the foreign communities of Istanbul, and even her own servants. When she died in 1730, an inventory of her remaining possessions was drawn up, and most of her belongings were auctioned off to cover her debts. The records of her possessions and their auction as well as her private correspondence offer a rare glimpse into the ‘world’ of this Dutch-Greek countess. These records bear witness to her exquisite taste in commodities brought to Istanbul from all over the world, but also of her destitute situation after the demise of her husband.
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İstanbul’da Gurur ve Önyargı:
Bir Hollanda-Yunan Kontesinin Kişisel Eşyaları (1730)

Marloes CORNELISSEN (*)

Öz
Hollanda’nın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu elçisi Kont Jacobus Colyer, 1725’teki ölümü üzerine Yunan esi Catterina de Bourg’u borç içinde bıraktı. Sefaret sarayında geçirdiği gösterişçi tüketme dayalı lüks ve müsrif bir hayatın ardından, kontesin ayakta kalmak için mücadele etmek zorunda kaldığı anlaşılıyor. Eşinin akrabaları, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’na gelen seyyahlar, Hollanda’nın yeni sefiri, İstanbul’un diğer yabancı topluluklarının üyesi ve hatta kendi hizmetçileri bile, kontese, muhtemelen mağrur görülen tavırlarından ötürü genellikle önyargı ve kötü niyetle yaklaşıyorlardı. 1730’da öldüğünde, kalan eşyaların tereke kaydı tutuldu ve borçlarını kapatmak için eşyalarının çoğu açık artırmaya çıkarıldı. Eşya ve müzayede kayıtları ile özel yazışmaları, bu Hollanda-Yunan kontesinin ‘dünyasına’ ender ele geçen türden bir başka fırsat sunuyor. Bu kayıtlar, dünyanın dört bir yanından İstanbul’a getirilmiş eşyalar konusundaki seçkin zevkine olduğu gibi kocasının ölümünden sonra yaşadığı zorluk haline de tanıklık ediyor.
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Introduction

On 12 May 1730, Dutch-Greek Countess Catterina (or Catherina) de Bourg died as the widow of Count Jacobus Colyer, Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul. Through her husband, the countess had become a member of the small community of the so-called Dutch ‘nation.’ ‘Nation’ in its usage for European foreigners in the Ottoman Empire, referred to “communities of merchants and diplomats living abroad under the aegis of a particular city or state.”1 Thus, the meaning of ‘nation’ denoted a community of people with a shared place of origin. The Dutch ‘nation’ was a community of diplomats, merchants, and other individuals who enjoyed Dutch protection in Ottoman realms. This small community was quite inclusive, and, in the eighteenth century at least, was gladly extending protection—even to people of ambiguous identity or profession, who were sometimes excluded from protection by other nations—in return for a small tax. Such inclusivity is how individuals of Italian, Hungarian, Portuguese, or German descent were also part of the Dutch ‘nation’ and had become ‘Dutch by choice.’2 Birthplace and religion were easily overlooked when a business opportunity or personal ties were involved. Identity in the Mediterranean in the early modern period was fluid and multi-layered.3

A portrait of the ‘world’ of this early modern woman with cosmopolitan ambitions can be painted, when the material objects of a person are understood as the setting or frame of the world in which an individual lived.4 If possessions are not seen as symbolic artefacts, but rather, when studied within their context, as indicators of identities that were adopted, forged, or aspired, we can get a step closer to her identity through a study of the inventory records, auction record of the sale of her belongings, and personally written petitions and statements.

Inventory records are extremely useful historical sources for a variety of topics ranging from the study of material culture, daily life, wealth, and demography to fashion, taste, and the consumption of goods.5 An inventory can be understood as an opening into a set of relationships

---

1 Eric R. Dursteler, Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 15.
2 Ibid.
3 Eminegül Karababa, “Ethnicity,” in A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Renaissance, ed. Elizabeth Currie (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017), 135–152.
4 Daniel Miller, Stuff (Cambridge: Polity, 2009), 50; Tim Dant, Materiality and Society (Maidenhead; Berkshire, 2005), 25.
5 Inventory records have been used as sources for the study of material culture and consumption on a worldwide scale. This paper incorporates research based on such inventory records from fields of study that deal with Europe, America, and the Ottoman Empire. For Europe and America, see for instance: H.A. Enno van Gelder, Gegevens Betreffende Roerend en Onroerend Bezit in de Nederlanden in de 16e Eeuw (‘s Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973); Wilfried Steeghers, De Staten van Goed van Ambacht Maldegem (Gent: V.V.F., 1977); Ad van der Woude and Anton Schuurman, eds., Probate Inventories: A New Source for the Historical Study of Wealth, Material Culture and Agricultural Development (Wageningen: Hes & De Graff Pub B V, 1980); Carole Shammas, The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Lorna Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain 1660–1760, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 1996 [1988]).
and a style of living. There are, however, various drawbacks to the usage of such inventory records. They are fixed in time and static; they provide a snapshot in time or represent only a moment in the life cycle of an individual. Nevertheless, they are excellent sources for the study of material culture, which can be understood as “that world of goods as it exists, is used, and is given meaning by the inhabitants of that world.”

In contrast to material culture, consumption is “a typically dynamic phenomenon: objects are acquired, used, alienated, etc., in a never-ending process.” Consumption is used to classify oneself and others too: “it is used to commit oneself to a social group striving for social identification and at the same time to preserve personal identity. This tension between striving for identity and commitment, between competition and solidarity, is one of the main forces of changes in ownership patterns and lifestyles.”

Therefore, while the study of consumption overlaps considerably with that of material culture, it requires a different approach in the sense that it deals with the significance of products for people and cultures, or the consumption of identity and consumption within consumer culture. Taking that into account, to research taste or preferences as a part of behavioral patterns of consumption, secondary documentation should also be consulted.

Various scholars also agree that meaning or value is given to objects through ‘interaction’ with objects, as people have the opportunity or desire to acquire the object. It is difficult to understand these meanings or values by just counting the objects; instead, meaning can be deduced from the objects’ location, their relation to or combination with other objects, and

---

6 Peter N. Miller, Deborah Krohn, and Marybeth de Filippis, eds., *Dutch New York between East and West: The World of Margrieta van Varick* (New York; New Haven and London: Bard Graduate Center: Decorative Arts, Design History, Material Culture; The New-York Historical Society and Yale University Press, 2009), 118.
7 Annik Pardailhé-Galabrun, *The Birth of Intimacy: Privacy and Domestic Life in Early Modern Paris* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 3–7; Ann Matchette, “To Have and Have Not: The Disposal of Household Furnishings in Florence,” in *Approaching the Italian Renaissance Interior: Sources, Methodologies, Debates*, eds. Ajmar-Wollheim, Marta, Flora Dennis, and Ann Matchette (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 83.
8 Jan de Vries, “Between Purchasing Power and the World of Goods: Understanding the Household Economy in Early Modern Europe,” in *Consumption and the World of Goods*, eds. J. Brewer and R. Porter (London: Routledge, 1993), 102.
9 Renata Ago, “Denaturalizing Things: A Comment,” in *Early Modern Things: Objects and Their Histories, 1500–1800*, ed. Paula Findlen (New York: Routledge, 2013), 366.
10 A.J. Schuurman, “Materiële Cultuur en Levensstijl. Een Onderzoek naar de Taal der Dingen op het Nederlandse Platteland in de 19e Eeuw: De Zaanstreek, Oost-Groningen, Oost-Brabant,” (PhD diss., Agricultural University Wageningen, 1989), 447.
11 Many scholars focusing on the study of material culture and consumption confirm that the most effective method is to combine various sources ranging from archival documents (private and official correspondence, diaries, marriage contracts, final wills) and physical evidence of buildings, to artifacts and images or art works. For example, Richard Grassby, “Material Culture and Cultural History,” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 35, no. 4 (2005): 602.
12 Grassby, “Material Culture and Cultural History,” 594–595; Daniel Miller, *Material Culture: Why Some Things Matter* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Daniel Miller, ed. *Materiality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Miller, *Stuff;* Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood, *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996 [1979]), 72.
qualifying or evaluating adjectives that are used in the inventories to describe them.\textsuperscript{13} The consultation of such additional sources offers the possibility to comprehend the meaning ascribed to or the significance of goods. Now through the study of the inventory, auction record, and various other primary sources, an attempt is made to come closer to the ‘world’ of an early modern woman who appears to have navigated between a multiplicity of contexts and identities.

**Ottoman material culture and consumption studies**

An elaborate discussion of Catterina’s material culture at the time of her death enables us to (re)create her world, or rather, to portray the setting or the frame of the Dutch-Greek Countess’s life through her relationship with her possessions. This frame is filled with additional information from her final will, official and private correspondence, and travel accounts. Overall, Catterina seems to have possessed a combination of goods from a variety of backgrounds or origins. Some of these goods must have become old and were used by the time of her demise. Only a few items were new. On the other hand, she had a taste for goods from other parts of the world. She specifically appreciated tea equipment and chests, cabinets, and cases from China. Her mirror came from England, while her walking stick was made in India. Fabrics and textile goods came from Ottoman grounds, Moscow, the Dutch Republic, and possibly India or France. Her books were written in Greek. The portraits in her collection depicted not only herself and her husband but also the king of Poland.

Before looking further into these items, the countess’s material possessions should be analyzed in the light of material culture and consumption in the Ottoman Empire. The study of material culture and consumption through the analysis of inventory records has been the focus of a number of studies since the 1950s.\textsuperscript{14} Halil İnalcık and Lajos Fekete set the trend and used inventories as a source for Ottoman economic and social history.\textsuperscript{15} In the 1960s, Ömer Lütfi Barkan presented a major study on the inventory records of Edirne.\textsuperscript{16} Around the 1980s, another group of scholars focused on the wealth of pashas and local magnates (ayan)

\textsuperscript{13} Mark Overton et al., *Production and Consumption in English Households, 1600–1750* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 8–9.

\textsuperscript{14} For a brief overview of the historiography, see Hülya Canbakal, “Barkan’dan Bu Yana Terke Çalışmaları,” *Vefatı’nın 30. Yıldönümünde Ömer Lütfi Barkan: Türkiye Tarihçiliğine Katkıları ve Etkileri Sempozyumu* (İstanbul: 12 Aralık 2009), 1–7.

\textsuperscript{15} For example: Halil İnalcık, “15. Asr Türkiye İktisadi ve İctimai Kaynakları,” İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası 15, no. 1-4 (1953–54): 51–75 (this article was later translated into English and republished: Halil İnalcık, *Sources for Fifteenth-Century Turkish Economic and Social History,* in *The Middle East & the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy & Society*, ed. İlhan Başgöz (Indiana University Turkish Studies and Turkish Ministry of Culture Joint Series: Bloomington, 1993), 177–193; Lajos Fekete, “XVI. Yüzyıl Taşralsı bir Türk Efendisinin Evi,” *Belleten* XXIX, no. 115-116 (1965): 615–638; Lajos Fekete, “Das Heim eines türkischen Herrn in der Provinz im XVI. Jahrhundert,” *Studia Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 29, no. 5 (1960): 3–30.

\textsuperscript{16} Ömer Lütfi Barkan, “Edirne Askeri Kassamına Ait Tereke Defterleri (1545–1659),” *Belgeler* III, no. 5-6 (1966): 1–479.
and the phenomenon of confiscation (müsâdere) particularly in the late eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{17} Material culture and consumption, then, became the topics of study with the use of inventories especially for a number of international scholars, such as Colette Establet and Jean-Paul Pascal, Tülay Artan and Suraiya Faroqhi.\textsuperscript{18} Other important studies on (conspicuous) consumption, 

\textsuperscript{17} For specifically the first half of the eighteenth century: Jülidle Akyüz, “XVIII. Yüzyılın bir Müteşebbis: Musa Ağa,” Ankara Üniversitesi Türkçülük Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi 26 (2004): 247–261; Necmettin Aygün, “XVIII. Yüzyılda bir Osmanlı Valisi: Üçüncüoğlu Ömer Paşa ve Mühallefät,” Uluslararası Karadeniz İnceləmər Dergisi 7 (2009): 39–77; Meryem Kaçan Erdoğan, “Mültecı bir Macar Prensi ve Terekesi: Rakoczi Jozsef,” SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi: Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 23 (May 2011): 81–102; Özer Küpeli, “Yenişehir (Bursa) Ayâni Sarıcaoğlu Osman Ağa ve Muhallefât/Sarıcaoğlu Osman Aya the Ayan of Yenisehir (Bursa) and His Inheritance,” History Studies 3, no. 3 (2011): 245–263. Mainly in the late 1970s and 1980s Gilles Veinstein published various articles on material culture through the study of inventory records. For example: Gilles Veinstein, “Les pèlerins de la Mecque à travers quelques inventaires après décès ottomans (XVII – XVIII siècles),” Revue de l’Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée 31, no. 1 (1981): 63–71; Gilles Veinstein, “Note sur les inventaires après décès ottomans,” in Quand le crible était dans la paille, Hommage à Pertev Naili Boratav, eds. M. Nicolas and R. Dor (Paris, 1978), 384–395; For an explanation of müsadere, see: Tuncay Öğün, and Cengiz Tomar, “Müsadere,” TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi Vol. 32 (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2006), 65–68. Christoph Neumann explains the concept well in “Birey Olmanın Alameti Olarak Tüketim Kalıpları: 18. yüzyıla Ait Örnek Vakalar,” Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar 8 (2009): 7–47. Also see, for example: Mehmet Karataş, “18–19. Yüzyıllarda Osmanlı Devleti’nde Bazı Müsadere Uygulamaları,” Ankara Üniversitesi Osmani Tarihi Araştırmaları ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi 19 (2006): 219–237; Mihai Maxim, “The Institution of Müsâdere (Confiscation) in the Ottoman-Romanian Relations: An Inventory of Constantin Brâncoveanu’s Property Seized to the Ottoman Public Treasury,” in Romano-Ottomanica. Essays & Documents from the Turkish Archives, Analecta Iisiana (İstanbul: İspı Press, 2001), 173–197; Tahir Sevinç, “Seyyit Fethi Efendi’nin Şam Defterdarlığı ve Muhallefatının Müsâderesi (1728–1746),” History Studies 4, no. 4 (November 2012): 347–372.

\textsuperscript{18} In various publications, Colette Establet and Jean-Paul Pascal focused on material culture in Damascus in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In English: Colette Establet and Jean-Paul Pascal, “Damascone Probat Inventories of the 17th and 18th Centuries: Some Preliminary Approaches and Results,” International Journal of Middle East Studies 24, no. 3 (1992): 373–393 and Colette Establet, and Jean-Paul Pascal, “Cups, Plates, and Kitchenware in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century Damascus,” in The Illuminated Table, the Prosperous House, eds. Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann (Würzburg: Orient-Institut, 2003), 185–198. More recently, Establet also published: “Consuming Luxurious and Exotic Goods in Damascus around 1700,” in Living the Good Life: Consumption in the Qing and Ottoman Empires of the Eighteenth Century, eds. Elif Akçetin and Suraiya Faroqhi (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017), 236–256.

Examples of her work are: Tülay Artan, ‘Aspects of the Ottoman Elite’s Food Consumption: Looking For ‘Staples,’ ‘Luxuries,’ and ‘Delicacies’ in a Changing Century,” in Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922: An Introduction, ed. Donald Quataert (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000) 107–200; Tülay Artan, “Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Princesses as Collectors: Chinese and European Porcelains in the Topkapı Palace Museum,” Ars Orientalis (Globalizing Cultures: Art and Mobility in the Eighteenth Century) 39 (2010): 113–146; Tülay Artan, “Objects of Consumption: Mediterranean Interconnections of the Ottomans and Mamluks,” in The Companion to Islamic Art and Architecture, eds. Gülru Necipoğlu, Dana Arnold and Finbarr Barry Flood (New York NY: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017), 903–930; Tülay Artan, “Terekesler İçişinde XVIII. Yüzyıl Bağlantıları Eyyûp’te Yaşam Tarzı ve Standartlarla bir Bakış: Orta Halliliğin Aynası,” in XVIII. Yüzyıl Kadi Sicilleri İçişinde Eyyûp’te Sosyal Yaşam, ed. Tülay Artan (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 1998), 49–64.

A few of her numerous contributions to the field are collected in: Suraiya Faroqhi, Stories of Ottoman Men and Women: Establishing Status, Establishing Control (İstanbul: Eren, 2002); Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann, eds., The Illuminated Table, the Prosperous House (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2003) and Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann, eds., Ottoman Costumes. From Textile to Identity (İstanbul: Eren, 2004). See also: Suraiya Faroqhi, “The
theories of consumer culture, and material culture often come in the form of edited volumes.\textsuperscript{19} More recently, inventory records have also been used in the study of the spread and distribution of wealth, and demography.\textsuperscript{20} One of the most recent topics that are studied with the help of inheritance inventories is dignitaries, and with it, the focus of study also turned to the capital of the Empire.\textsuperscript{21} A whole group of key publications is available in Turkish too.\textsuperscript{22} Nevertheless, there is still not much published to make proper comparisons with, as many studies until now have dealt with a single or a few inventories only, and very few of these studies deal with foreigners on Ottoman grounds. Research on the material culture of foreign communities in the Ottoman Empire is still in its infancy.\textsuperscript{23}
A Perfect Mad Woman

Remarkably little is known about Catterina Colyer. It is evident that the countess was of Greek descent, and according to one scholar, she was a Greek-speaking Catholic ‘Levantine.’ Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, the wife of the British Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire who stayed in Istanbul between 1716 and 1718, refers to her as ‘the Dutch Madam’ who was ‘a perfect mad woman’. Montague continues:

I sent a jeweller to her to offer her the money for her pearls and she would not take it, which she is very much in the right, for they are worth more, but ‘tis very strange she should get a good bargain and complain of it. But she cheats the ambassador. Her own vanity caused the discovery of her secret, which I kept very faithfully, and now he is, I suppose, angry at her laying her money out in ornaments. She would make him believe she did it to oblige me, and would seem glad to get rid of them, at the same time she won’t part with them.25

Southern-Dutch Pierre-Lambert de Saumery (also known under his pseudonym Monsieur de Mirone), a visitor of the Dutch Ambassador and his wife in the early 1720s, had a similar impression of the countess, as he remarked that the Ambassador was ruining himself trying to satisfy the whims of his Greek wife.26 De Saumery was frank about his impression of the Ambassador’s wife, as about many other experiences he had on Ottoman grounds. He referred to her as a lady of ‘Grecque de Religion & de Nation,’ whom Colyer loved so desperately that nothing was too much for him to captivate her, even though she was of very low descent.27

Interestingly, De Saumery mentions that she used to be Colyer’s ‘concubine,’ and that Colyer was forced to marry her after twenty years of being lovers. It is quite possible that she had been a slave who had come to the Ottoman Empire by the end of the seventeenth century. Perhaps

Emrah Saña Gürkan and Feridun M. Emecen, (İstanbul: 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015), 623–650; Marloes Cornelissen, ”From Bern with Love. The spy with a taste for the exquisite in early modern Istanbul,” in The Power of the Dispersed, Early Modern Global Travelers beyond Integration, ed. Cornel Zwierlein (Leiden-Boston: Brill 2022), 408–443; Suraiya Faroqhi, ”Representing France in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire: A Wealthy French Dwelling in the Peloponnesus, 1770,” in The Illuminated Table, the Prosperous House: Food and Shelter in Ottoman Material Culture, eds. Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2003), 255–274; Deborah Howard, ”Death in Damascus: Venetians in Syria in the Mid-Fifteenth Century,” Muqarnas 20 (2003): 143–157; Serap Yılmaz, ”İranlı Ermeni bir Tüccarın Terekesi ve Ticari Etkinliği üzerine Düşünceler,” Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi 7, no. 1 (1992): 191–215; Cornel Zwierlein, ”Dispersed Things: European Merchant Households in the Levant,” The Power of the Dispersed, Early Modern Global Travelers beyond Integration, Intersections 77, ed. Cornel Zwierlein (Leiden-Boston: Brill 2022), 444–494.

24 B. J. Slot, “Zwischen Diplomatischer Spielerei und Ernsthaftener Mitlung: Holland in den Türkenkriegen,” Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich 5, no. 2 (1983): 19.

25 Mary Wortley Montagu, The Turkish Embassy Letters, ed. Malcolm Jack (London: Virago Press, 1994), 123 (Letter XLIII, 23 March 1718).

26 Nicolae Iorga, Les Voyageurs dans l’Orient Européen: Conférences Faites en Sorbonne: Extraites de la Revue des Cours et Conférences (Paris, 1928), 99.

27 De Mirone (pseudonym of Pierre-Lambert de Saumery), Memoires et Avantures Secretes et Curieuses d’un Voyage du Levant II (Liege: Everard Kints, 1732), 195.
they met or Colyer had redeemed her, but it is puzzling that De Saumery would call her a ‘concubine,’ rather than a slave.

De Saumery adds that the countess completed Jacobus Colyer’s ruin due to terrible expenses. He states that one should not be surprised if an ambassador’s wife wished to show off with clothes, jewels, a large retinue of slaves, and a sumptuously laid-out table with ten to twelve different dishes. Because she was of a religion that involved much abstinence, she could not eat at the table of a reformed person. These habits resulted in affreuses dépenses (awful expenses), De Saumery claims. Because of her compassion towards those who were captured during the Second Morean War (also known as the Seventh Ottoman–Venetian War, 1714–1718), Catterina de Bourg made her husband redeem them all. De Saumery observes that the costs of redemption were too high for a simple ambassador, and this was what reduced Colyer to great poverty or scarcity. Probably he is exaggerating when he states that she reduced Colyer to such perplexity that sometimes he could not even afford dinner.28 Furthermore, he describes the countess as over fifty years of age, but despite her age, still very fresh and beautiful. When he paid her a compliment in French, he soon realized she did not understand the language at all. Colyer confirmed that his wife was indeed completely ‘ignorant’ of the language. However, De Saumery confesses that she had an extraordinary wit and was engaging beyond any expectation.29 It is not clear which language Catterina and her husband used in their communication, but judging from the letters that were written by Catterina to the Dutch authorities, it could have been Italian.

It appears that our countess had struggled to survive after a life of supposedly conspicuous consumption and extravagant luxury in the Ambassadorial palace. De Saumery saw her as a blemish on the memory of her husband (une tache à la memoire de ce Seigneur) and the reason for his towering debts. Her taste for exquisite commodities, such as chests and cabinets from China to a walking stick from India, and from Moscovian sheets to Florentine flasks, is reflected in her (Italian) inventory. The buyers at the auction of her goods, who were at the same time her creditors, equally testify of her international connections throughout her life. Personal petitions and letters echo her wit and fierce character, and her final will reveals her compassion for others through liberating her four female slaves and arranging for their pensions.

In Ottoman documentation, Catterina de Bourg (or de Boury) is referred to as a nasraniye (Christian) and not zimmi (non-Muslim Ottoman subject), which suggests that she was of Greek descent but not necessarily an Ottoman subject.30 It is likely that she was captured

28 Ibid., 195–196.
29 De Mirone (pseudonym of Pierre-Lambert de Saumery), Mémoires et Avantures Secretes et Curieuses d’un Voyage du Levant III (Lieu: Everard Kints, 1732), 51–52. Although it is clear De Saumery must have spoken of Catterina de Bourg, he calls her Jeannete. In another situation, he also calls Caterina Volo, the wife of the Ambassador’s nephew Pietro de la Fontaine, by another name: Sophie. Perhaps the name Caterina was an adopted name by both women, or otherwise the author either deliberately or unintentionally changed them.
30 In one Ottoman archival document, she is called Katerina de Buri, daughter of De Bur (“Katrina de Buri veled-i de Bur nâm Nasraniye”). İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi (İSAM), Şer’îye Sicilleri Arşivi, Galata Şer’îye Sicilleri (GŞS), 266, fols. 87a–88a, 3 Ra. 1140 (19 October 1727).
from one of the (former) Venetian islands such as Crete, or came from the Morea peninsula in modern-day Greece, which had been seized by Venice by the end of the seventeenth century. A last probability is that she came from the area of Dalmatia, as she was particularly interested in the redemption of slaves from that area during the Second Morean War.31

In 1713, the preacher of the embassy, Petrus Harenc, according to his own statement, had finally been able to convince Colyer of legal marriage to bring an end to een onrustig leven (an unedifying life), which had lasted twenty-two years.32 As far as is known, the couple did not have any children. It also appears that they married with a prenuptial agreement. The fact that several marriage contracts—sometimes including dowries given by the bride’s families—were registered in the chancery books of the Dutch Chancery of Istanbul, makes it very plausible that the ambassador and his wife had a similar agreement. Whether this arrangement is influenced by the Ottoman legal system regarding notions of property division between husband and wife remains unclear, because it was not uncommon in the Dutch Republic to register such contracts at the notary before couples married.

The Polluted Shades of the Ambassador’s Palace

When they married, Catterina de Bourg was probably aware of Colyer’s complicated financial situation. When her husband died in 1725, Catterina demonstrated that there were parts of the Ambassador’s residence and the goods that were found in the house that belonged to her, rather than to her husband. She had not allowed for an inventory to be drawn up of the goods in her apartments in the Ambassador’s residence. Her husband’s sister, Clara Catherina de Hochepied, could not understand her objection, as ‘(...) dat al wat ‘er in ‘t paleis van zyne Exc: is overgebleeven, zij het zelve daer niet gebragt heeft, of haer in ‘t partial iets toekomt, gevolgelyk geen pretentie van ygendom kan koomen maeken’ (“whatever was left in the palace of His Excellency, was not brought there by her, nor was she entitled to anything and therefore could not make any pretenses of ownership”).33 Catterina had replied that the goods of value were handed over; while a few other goods were not reserved, as they were rather ordinary pieces of furniture.34

During a court hearing, Catterina was charged with having taken a diamond belt (yedi yüz guruş kıymetli iki parçalı bir elmas kuşak) from her husband’s estate. She was not supposed to hold on to it, seeing that her husband had died in debt; therefore, his estate could not automatically be transferred to his heirs. Her husband’s former steward, Petro Baron, who was appointed by Colyer as her representative and procurator, stated that Catterina had been promised the selamlık (the public section) of the palace and the diamond belt in return for a debt of 6225

31 De Mirone, Memoires II, 195–196.
32 J.H. Hora Siccama, “Het Geslacht Colyear,” De Nederlandse Leeuw 20 (1902): 15 (referring to a letter kept in the National Archives in The Hague from Sir Petrus Harenc, preacher in Istanbul, Pera, dated 13 January 1713.
33 Clara Catherina Colyer to Bastiaen Fagel. Izmir, 12 August 1725. Nationaal Archief, The Hague (NL-HaNA), Legatie Turkije, entry number 1.02.20, inventory number 1063, 56.
34 NL-HaNA, Legatie Turkije, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1063, 105.
kuruş and 10 akçe that Colyer owed his wife. When four years later Colyer had not been able to repay the debt, he gave her the diamond belt to cover the interest of the debt. This is one of the examples that demonstrate that Colyer and his wife kept at least some of their possessions separate, probably to protect Catterina, rather than Colyer.

The countess was given 1200 lion dollars by merchants Dionis Houset and Pietro Leytstar, and secretary Bastiaen Fagel. The sum was provided for her to live decently after her husband’s demise. The money Catterina had received from them was borrowed from Luka Chirico, the dragoman of the English Embassy, and English merchant Robbert Constantine, and in return, the hücet (title-deed) of the house in Belgrade was given as pawn. Part of the debts to Chirico was an obligation of 840 lion dollars and a hücet concerning the location of the kitchen of Imperial resident Baron Talman, which was to be turned into a vakıf/waqf (pious endowment) for a particular mosque. Later on, the three merchants decided to refrain from this decision, as they did not want the house to fall prey to strangers. They preferred to keep the money transactions within the Dutch nation. Catterina was to refund the sum with the revenues of the mortgage on the Ambassador’s palace. She rented out a section of the palace to English Ambassador Abraham Stanyan. When Chirico needed to be paid back, Catterina gave Chirico a golden watch and two German carriage horses. Catterina claimed that she did not have any

35 Armenian Petros Baron (also referred to as Petros Baronian or Bârûn) had worked as a steward or groom for the Dutch Ambassador for nearly four years, also appears to have been the translator of a French publication on geography into Ottoman. In Leiden University Library a manuscript is kept that is an Ottoman-Turkish translation or, rather, adaptation of Jacques Robbe’s Méthode pour apprendre facilement la géographie (originally published in Paris in 1678) by Petros Baronian (Bârûn) (Manuscript Cod. Or. 12.366). Baron appears to have been involved in various other scholarly and scientific publications. See Marloes Cornelissen, “The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer: Material Culture of the Dutch ‘Nation’ in Istanbul During the First Half of the 18th Century” (PhD diss., Sabancı University, 2016), 186–87. For further information on Petros Baron, see Thoralf Hanstein, A comparative view of Baron’s Qibla Finder (Berlin: EB-Verlag, 2021).

36 İSAM, GŞS 266, fol. 87a–88a, 3 Ra. 1140 (19 October 1727). This happened three and a half years before Colyer passed away. The witnesses called by Petro Baron were Christians Pamin (?) son of Dimitris and Konstantin son of Dimitris.

37 By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Dutch lion dollar (leeuwendaalder, also known as aslanlı/esedi kuruş) ceased to be produced as currency, but, apparently, it was still used in trade particularly in the Eastern Mediterranean, even if only in theoretical calculations. 1 lion dollar (‘leeuwendaalder’) officially equaled 120 akçe by the end of the seventeenth century and therefore had the same value as 1 kuruş. But in the years 1725 and 1731 (being closest to the year of demise of the countess (1730), 1 lion dollar actually equaled 144 akçe. Şevket Pamuk, A Monetary History of the Ottoman Empire (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 144. For comparison, the nominal daily wage of a skilled worker in the year 1730 was 44.8 akçe. Süleyman Özmucur and Şevket Pamuk, “Real Wages and Standards of Living in the Ottoman Empire, 1489–1914,” The Journal of Economic History 62, no. 2 (2002): 301. Then, taking into consideration the yearly wage of a skilled worker of 16,352 akçe (equal to ca. 113.5 lion dollars) and varying living standards, the countess’s allowance of 1200 lion dollars (equal to 172,800 akçe) may still be considered quite generous.

38 Because the supervision of the Dutch nation was temporarily taken over by the English Ambassador, solutions were found mainly by these three merchants through the involvement of the English ‘nation.’

39 NL-HaNA, Legatie Turkije, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1106 (among others, letter from Petros Baron to Abraham Stanyan, dated 2 June 1729).

40 Ibid.
money to fully repay the debts. Therefore, Fagel, Leytstar, and Houset asked Cornelis Calkoen, Colyer’s successor as Ambassador, to control her money until she had refunded Chirico. Calkoen accepted their request in 1729.41

Several sections of the Ambassador’s residence in Pera which had been built in 1714 (a few years after Jacobus Colyer had married Catterina) were sold upon the Ambassador’s demise. Ambassador Cornelis Calkoen was left with the mess of Colyer’s debts, because the first appointed chargé d’affaires, Colyer’s nephew Pieter de la Fontaine, had died within weeks after Colyer. Additionally, the new secretary, Bastiaen Fagel, who had taken over some of De la Fontaine’s tasks, had not managed to deal with all the affairs until Calkoen’s arrival. When Calkoen arrived in Istanbul, he first had to wait until English Ambassador Stanyan would vacate the palace. For twenty days, Calkoen remained with the Imperial resident. According to Calkoen, Stanyan left it in a ‘grossly dirty’ state.42 Calkoen managed to obtain the title deeds both to the grounds and to the buildings from the reluctant widow by 1729, and he was able to buy the other sections as well.43 In the same year, at Calkoen’s request, the entire compound was valued at 12,500 lion dollars by the mimarbaşı (the head architect).44 In March 1747, the palace was bought by the Directors of the Levant Trade from Calkoen for 23,940 guilders (enforced by resolutions of the States-General of 13 April 1747), to be rented out to the next ambassador for a yearly sum of 2000 guilders. The building was used for another twenty years until it burned down on the night of 26 September 1767.45

Besides the palace in Pera, the couple, or at least Catterina’s husband, owned a waterfront mansion along the Bosporus in Kuruçeşme, a country house near Istanbul in the Belgrade

---

41 NL-HaNA, Legatie Turkije, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1043: Pieter Leytstar, Dionis Houset and Bastiaen Fagel to Cornelis Calkoen. 1729. Request accepted on 17 September 1729, signed by Romuldus Rombouts.

42 J.G. Nanninga, Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis van den Levantschen Handel 1590–1826 III (’s-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1952) 3 (Calkoen to the States-General, 9 May 1727, and to Grand Pensionary Gaspar Fagel, 7 June 1727. NL-HaNA, Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 6940).

43 NL-HaNA, Legatie Turkije, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1047: Extra aanwinsten 1748. 22: “A hüccet or title-deed in which Countess Colyer sells her share of the Palace to Ambassador Calkoen.” And further on pages 22–23: “1733: A hüccet in which Sir Pieter Leijtstar sells the kiosk (kiosk) and the fire-proof warehouse underneath to Sir Bohnes for 600 lion dollars. 1733: a hüccet issued concerning the sold chapel and its appurtenances by Sir Pieter Leijtstar to Sir Arnold Bohnes for 500 lion dollars. 1735: a hüccet concerning the sold Palace for 13,000 lion dollars by Sir Pieter Leijtstar, as authorized by Sir Arnold Bohnes to Sir Rombouts, authorized by Sir Calkoen. 1743: a hüccet concerning the sold chapel by Sir Juhlet to Sir Magrini, authorized by Sir Calkoen for 1000 lion dollars. 1743: a separate hüccet concerning the sold garden of Sir Juhlet to the authorized of his Excellency Calkoen” (my translations).

44 Marlies Hoenkamp-Mazgon, Palais de Hollande in Istanbul. The Embassy and Envoys of the Netherlands since 1612 (Amsterdam; Istanbul: Boom; Kültür Sanat Yayınıcılık, 2002) S2. 12,500 lion dollars equalled 15,000 kuruş (1.8 million akçe).

45 O. Schutte, Repertorium der Nederlandse Vertegenwoordigers, Residerende in het Buitenland 1584–1810 (The Hague, 1976), 302. For lack of exact figures for the year 1730, the amount the building was sold for was around 11,400 lion dollars or 13,680 kuruş (1.6 million akçe). These figures are based on the information that in 1652 the lion dollar was worth 42 stuivers, whereas the guilder was worth 20 stuivers. H.W. Jacobi, “Het geld van de Republiek,” Leidschrift: The Republic’s Money 13, no. 2 (1998): 118.
village, and a farm in Zekeriyaköy. The latter was immediately sold after Colyer's death when Catterina had, apparently, managed to have the land deeds transferred to her name by paying a few hundred piasters (lion dollars) to the court of Galata.

**Sincerity and Frankness**

Catterina took the opportunity to show her discontent with her situation and the little help she had received with the payment of the debts after her husband's demise. In various letters to the new Ambassador, she cried out against her unfavorable fate, which had turned her into a destitute widow. She was not pleased with the mockery she had to endure and the oppression by the domestics of her household, who pressed her for money and various other promises. Already earlier she had told him that her entire fortune of roughly ten to twelve thousand lion dollars had become part of the inheritance of her husband.

After Colyer's demise, his family members shunned Catterina and believed she had no right to claim the goods in the women's quarters (the harem section) of the Ambassador's residence. It is clear from all sources that her husband, nevertheless, had been very fond of her, and she equally was very attached to the Ambassador; she called him *de kroon van mijn hooft, maer ook een waerd en lievend man* (the crown on my head, but also a tender and loving man). Clearly, his relatives thought differently of Catterina.

One day prior to her death on 12 May 1730, Catterina prepared her final will. Chancellor Rumoldus Rombouts was called for on that evening around eight o'clock, who found her sick in bed in her house in Pera, but sound of spirit and mind. In her final will, Catterina stated that she wished to be buried in the St. Dimitrios Church. She took into consideration the miserable state she was in and thereby referred to her debts. She, nevertheless, hoped that

---

46 NL-HaNA, *Legatie Turkije*, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1043: a compiled report by Secretary Rigo, 19 February 1728.
47 NL-HaNA, *Legatie Turkije*, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1043: a compiled report by Secretary Rigo, 19 February 1728 and NL-HaNA, *Legatie Turkije*, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1063, 107. Note: the terms “leeuwendaalder” and “piaster” were both used instead of *kuruş*, while the term “asper” was used instead of *akçe*.
48 ‘V.E. mi permetta la supplico di potere esclamare contro l’infamata mia sorte, che avendomi resa vedova derelitta, e senza assistenza carica di debiti, non contenta di tutto questo, m’ha constituito in tale ludibrio, che sino li più infimi domestici di casa mia vadino inventando modi per maggiormente vessarmi.’ NL-HaNA, *Legatie Turkije*, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1043. Letter from Catterina Countess Colyer to Cornelis Calkoen, dated 17/6 March 1728.
49 NL-HaNA, *Statzen-Generaal*, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 6939. Widow Colyer (Veuve Colier) to the States-General, 9 July 1725.
50 NL-HaNA, *Statzen Generaal*, 1.01.02, inv. nr. 6939. Catherina Widow Colyer to the States-General, 20 March 1725.
51 There were a few St. Dimitrios Churches in Istanbul in 1730, most notably in Kuruçeşme, Kurtuluş (Tatavla) and Ayvansaray. Upon my inspection, neither her grave nor any record was found. Often the records were burned; graves were replaced by other constructions or moved elsewhere and gravestones no longer readable. When looking for the countess’s grave in 2015, it turned out that records prior to 1800 at the Greek Patriarchate were being classified, and this process was said to take up several years. The earliest graves connected to these churches that still exist today date to the early nineteenth century. Although there are two more churches that carry the same name on Büyükada and in Sarmaşık, Edirnekapı, these are not likely to have been the mentioned church, as the first was established later and the latter had burned down and was rebuilt in the year Catterina de Bourg died. Most likely, it was the Dimitrios Church in Tatavla, as it was close to Pera and even referred to as “Saint Dimitri Village” on the 1741 map of Philip Franz Gudenus, where it is indicated with no. 60:
something would remain after her possessions were sold and, in that case, wished to bequeath a sum of money to the four slaves she had redeemed prior to her death. She had set aside one hundred piasters each for Margareta and Bettina, and Helenetta and Anasta fifty piasters each. Additionally, she desired that her former slaves were not harassed by anyone; therefore, she had already given them their pensions. Among the creditors, we find her servant Costantin and a cook. When she died, she was indebted to several service providers such as shopkeeper Farin, the (late) baker Giorgio Massot, fur-maker Christodula, and tailor Ciahin (Şahin). Among her other creditors were her brother-in-law and his son, a dragoman, the Secretary of the Dutch Embassy, surgeon Francesco Bremond, three Janissaries called Abdilla Bascia (Abdullah beşè) the butcher, Ahmed Bascia and Mehmed Bascia Arpagi (arpacı: barley-seller), and, furthermore, a lumberman, a bricklayer, and the superior of the Greek monastery of Mount Sinai in Balat.

A Scandalous Falsehood

Catterina’s relationship with goods is often subject of the available documentation. After the death of her husband, she was able to repay some of her debts to the English Dragoman Luka Chirico with a golden watch and two German carriage horses. There was also a claim from capiggi (kapıcı: footman) Apostoli for a trousseau he was promised on 17 September 1727 by Catterina for his marriage to a figlia (young girl) of Catterina’s household. It appears that he is referring to a girl (servant or slave) in Catterina’s household, rather than an actual daughter. The trousseau was to consist of 200 piasters and three sets of garments with accessories for his future wife and two garments for Apostoli himself. It appears that the marriage took place, but one year later, the trousseau had not been transferred. Apostoli also claimed that he had not received his salary of 120 piasters. Catterina replied to the claim that she was hoodwinked by her servant Apostoli. According to her, Apostoli had helped a Moldovan slave escape from an Ottoman or Muslim household, and on her expenses, she had Dutch Dragoman Manolaki Agha redeem the slave. She claimed to have repaid Apostoli part of the sum. She added that she could have dissuaded the girl from marrying Apostoli, but she did not. She promised to provide some clothes, cushions, and other things out of charity. She could not understand how he dared to claim the promised trousseau, as he actually deserved to be punished instead.
The Countess’s Possessions

An inventory of the perambulation-type was made of Catterina’s goods on 15 and 16 May 1730. The goods in each room were recorded by the Secretary of the Dutch Embassy, Jean Louis Rigo. Although the inventory is quite elaborate, Catterina’s dwelling in Pera appears to have been small. One of the rooms upstairs looked out over the sea, while the other faced the road. The floors of both rooms were covered with mats. A third room was plainly called the upper hall (sala di sopra). Downstairs there were two additional rooms, one of which faced the road, while the other room functioned as a salon or drawing-room. The kitchen was probably outside, accompanied by several smaller storage facilities, which were possibly shed-like structures. Finally, there was a köşk or kiosk-like building (la casa á discoperta verso il Mare).

Catterina died in the room upstairs that looked out over the sea. It had a green door curtain and a matching green carpet with fringes. Silk wall hangings decorated the walls, while the windows were covered with indienne curtains. There were seven matching cushions of indienne. The other room upstairs facing the street appears to have been the largest room, and it was probably used for the reception of guests. The dominant colors of this room were red and white. One of the door curtains and the cover of an old armchair were made of red damask, while two old cushions were made of crimson velvet. The seven large sofa cushions were decorated with white and yellow flowers and covered with three white spreads, called ihram. Probably the three cushions (minder) were also part of the Ottoman sofa. There were two armchairs clad with leather and three normal chairs, and the windows were hung with indienne curtains. Three devotional paintings were placed over the door.

Catterina kept various documents and letters in a small basket, and a few Greek books were safely put away in a red wooden chest, together with a tortoiseshell snuffbox and a gilded box. The large basket was predominantly filled with small pieces of fabric, and a few of the limited pieces of clothing that were recorded: three camisoles and two purple cloaks, referred to as feredgé (ferâce); one of which was made of plain fabric or camlet, and the other of tabby. These were wrapped in an old bohtza (bohça). Among the goods in the basket were two velvet purses with coins and game tokens, a hammam textile set (hamam rachti: hamam rahtı), an old kerchief (jemeni: yemeni), a seal of her late husband, cushion covers of Dutch linen, a goblet of leoncorno

---

56 It is noteworthy that Catterina Colyer, alongside the Venetian bailo, had served as witness at the wedding of Rigo to Willem Theyls’ daughter Clara in 1723. Rosanne Baars, “Constantinople Confidential. News and Information in the Diary of Jean-Louis Rigo (C. 1686–1756), Secretary of the Dutch Embassy in Istanbul,” Lias, 41, no. 2 (2014): 156.

57 These colours were among the most common ones used in the furnishing of the homes of common Istanbulites of the 18th century. Hoşgör, “Changes in the Consumption of Ottomans.”

58 Purple and blue were the colours indicated to be worn by non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. Hoşgör, “Changes in the Consumption of Ottomans,” 104. As a non-Muslim but also a non-Ottoman, she most probably did not have to adhere to this regulation. Foreign ‘nations’ in Istanbul were basically exempted from the Ottoman sumptuary law on dress. For this point, see Daniel Goffman, Britons in the Ottoman Empire, 1642–1660 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 34–35. Nevertheless, according to Matthew Elliot, during the countess’s lifetime, sultan Ahmed III (r. 1703–1730) “attempted to reimpose dress discipline upon Europeans and their protected agents.” Matthew Elliot, “Dress Codes in the Ottoman Empire: The Case of the Franks,” in Ottoman Costumes: From textile to Identity, eds. Suraiya Faroqhi and Christoph K. Neumann (İstanbul: Eren, 2004), 114.
(a type of horn) in its case, and a small waistband of ‘Terra Sancta.’ ‘Terra Sancta’ must have been the Custodia di Terra Sancta, a religious Franciscan institution once under Venetian protection, but under Dutch protection in the late seventeenth century and eighteenth centuries.59

A wardrobe in the room contained a wooden chest made in China. Additionally, a small cabinet with drawers was made in China as well. Secretary Rigo had placed a few precious items in the drawers, such as a silver inkstand, a silver spoon and a knife with a silver hilt, a pair of small pearl earrings with diamonds, a steel belt with silver flowers and a wooden chest with two tea caddies. An expensive chamber clock was placed in the cabinet together with a single porcelain shallow cup. The room supported a permanent closet, which contained two small mirrors with gilded frames and additional sleeping equipment, such as four decorated blankets embroidered with figures and flowers, cushions of red damask, mattresses, head (bed) pillows, a bolster, and three small old carpets or embroidered rugs, which were referred to as (prayer) rugs (sezzadé: seccade) in the auction record. Would she have used these for decorative purposes, or rather for Muslim visitors?

Twice the inventory refers to a (round) piece of leather or hide that was used to cover the sofra, an Ottoman-style low tray on a stand that served as a dining table. She kept a walking stick from India with a silver knob in the same closet. Perhaps it was one of the walking sticks from her late husband’s collection, who had owned several extraordinary walking sticks. Below in the closet, another mattress was stored, together with two fur pelisses and a green velvet kalpak rimmed with sable fur. One of the pelisses was made of black damask lined with squirrel fur (gingiap: sincab), while the other pelisse was green and lined with lambskin (fur). This entry is the only reference in all the Dutch nation’s inventories to lambskin, and the auction record actually refers to the same pelisse as an ermine (kakum) fur. There were a few odd items, above or in the top part of the closet, such as horsehair whisks and brooms, spinning bobbins, and a small marble or alabaster Triton figurine.

The upper hall appears not to have been of great importance and featured only two portraits, a single table, a wardrobe, and a chest or trunk. One of the portraits depicted the king of Poland, while the other featured tre di domestici Buffoni (three of the household jesters). Perhaps these were depictions of the Sultan’s jesters. Besides a small walnut Dutch table, all goods were kept in the chest and wardrobe. The chest contained only textiles, such as a bag of linen, a mosquito net of gauze, and tablecloths (some of linen from the Aegean Islands, others of damask and linen from Milo), cushion covers, napkins, and cloths for sitting. Five of these cloths for sitting were made of Ottoman linen, while the sixth was made of linen of bombazine. The wardrobe contained mainly trifles, and a few other precious items: a porcelain plate and cup and several red pewter coffee cup holders (porta flingiani).

Most rooms downstairs were void of (free-standing) furniture and decoration; the floor appears to have been used for storage of goods and as work and living quarters of the servants.

59 Alexander H. de Groot, The Netherlands and Turkey: Four Hundred Years of Political, Economical, Social and Cultural Relations: Selected Essays (Istanbul: Artpres, 2007), 79; Johan van Droffelaar, “Flemish Fathers in the Levant: Dutch Protection of Three Franciscan Missions in the 17th and 18th Centuries,” in Eastward Bound: Dutch Ventures and Adventures in the Middle East, eds. Geert Jan van Gelder and Ed de Moor (Amsterdam-Atlanta GA: Rodopi, 1994), 81–113.
or attendants. The room downstairs facing the road also appears to have been rather empty. The room did not feature any curtains; nearly all goods were kept in large baskets, a closet, and a wardrobe. There was one Ottoman sofa. Furthermore, there was one large cushion without a cover, two large baskets, and a wardrobe, which was perhaps a free-standing piece of furniture. Again, the baskets contained mainly textile items, such as extra cushion covers and a white ihram spread, as well as a red cloth to cover the carriage, yellow pelts from Ankara, and material that was used for the sedan chair: leather skins and old uniforms for its bearers. Even old pieces of fur coats were too precious to be thrown away, as they were also kept safely in a bag inside the basket. The other basket contained three flat yellow copper candlesticks, a new ewer that was referred to as an *ibrik*, and a mangala (mancala) game-set.

The fitted closet (*yüklük*) contained a strange combination of goods: two portraits of Catterina and her husband, a small painting of flowers, a used warming-pan, and two large cushions without covers. The inventory-taker, Secretary Rigo, added a few more items to the closet, which were perhaps scattered around the room, such as a few iron curtain rods, a skewer, and two commode chairs. Underneath and over (or rather in the lower and upper compartments of) the closet a few more items were kept, such as three old chairs without covers, a pipe from Lille in its wooden case, an enema syringe, and a pewter vessel with holes that was used for washing salad, with inside, apparently, a black dandelion (*un soffiene negro*). The wardrobe mainly contained equipment for the preparation and serving of food and beverages, such as three coffee pots, a large tray called *sini*, a cauldron with its lid, cooking pots, a casserole, a small food warmer, a small skewer, a rasp, three majolica plates, and an oil and vinegar-set.

Similarly, the salon downstairs was void of furniture and decoration. No curtains or carpets were recorded; only three old chairs without covers and a large chest filled the room. Perhaps this room belonged to her slaves, as the chest contained two rods for wringing out the laundry as well as a painted pewter (*faras: faraş*) or dustpan. There appears to have been a fireplace in this room because the chest also contained two pairs of bronze tongs, a shovel, and firedogs besides various kitchen utensils. Two ewers for tea, a pewter teapot, and a teapot stand together with a bronze chafing dish were found in the same location. The slaves had requested a bag with linen from the chest to be shared as charity. The location of this bag confirms that this salon was probably the slaves’ room. Secretary Rigo also added other kitchen equipment to the chest. Most were used in the preparation or serving of food, such as twelve plates, sixteen dishes, and a waffle iron, frying pans, casseroles, a cooking pot, cooking choppers called *sattir* (*satır*), copper shallow plates with lids (*sahan*), two grates or grills (*scarre: izgara*) and five trivets for cooking. There was also a pastry tray, which was called a burek tepsisi (*börek tepsisi*), and a covered kettle or bucket called (*bakeratz: bakraç*).

Subsequently, the kitchen was recorded as the next space in the inventory. It was probably a separate structure but located right next to the previous room downstairs, for easy access. In the kitchen were only two tables, an old chest or case, a marble mortar, and a *ghiughum* (*güğüm*) or water jug. The appraiser then must have continued outside on the grounds. In front of the gate was a shed of some kind, in which the old sedan chair was kept, together with felt covering mats called *ketzé* (*keçe*) and bits and bobs like silk fringes, bottles or flasks from Florence, and four hair bags (*harar*). The kiosk facing the seaside contained another basket and three foot-
warmers or tandoors with two old mats. The two storages, probably shed-like structures, or the spaces below staircases, held a few goods like a large iron brazier, which was referred to as a mangal, two old French tables, a Turkish table (probably a tray with a low stand), and wooden tubs for washing and preparing bread.

Catterina had stored various goods in two basket trunks (sepet-sanduk) and a large basket in the storage of a certain Madam Vittoria, who was a local inhabitant of Pera. Among the goods in the basket were red hangings, sheets and cushion covers of Dutch linen, and three small cushions, all meant to furnish a bed. There were six window curtains of plain indienne, and nine small cushion covers of Dutch linen, tablecloths, and napkins wrapped in other curtains. Additionally, two large red ihram spreads and a small old silk Persian carpet with fringes were stored with Madam Vittoria. One of the basket trunks contained a mixture of goods ranging from red pewter cases from China for powder from Cyprus and a pewter urinal to satin and indienne blankets and corsets.

Catterina's debts turned out higher than the proceeds of the auction of her possessions, which took place in the morning and evening of 7 and 12 July 1730. The auction was organized in cooperation with the bailiff or kâhya of the kadi (judge) of the Ottoman court in Galata. Catterina's creditors had appealed to the Ottoman court to have her possessions auctioned. The auction was then executed by the Dutch Ambassador's order on behalf of her creditors, who were nearly all Ottoman subjects. The auction attracted many Ottoman subjects as well - not only Muslims but also members of Greek and Armenian communities. When the buyers' names are cross-checked with the names of her creditors, they often appear the same. The auction was most likely organized to clear the debts of Catterina by letting her creditors 'buy' or rather choose from among her belongings. They had to settle for roughly one-third of the original debts.60

Not all goods recorded in Catterina's inventory were sold at the auction. Particularly many of the textile goods were not among the items sold. These goods were either not up for sale or just not sold. Over twenty cushions and two bolsters are missing, together with a few mattresses. Furthermore, a number of cushion covers of Dutch linen and two of the cushions that were referred to as coltuk jastighi (koltuk yastığı) and a few others specified as minder were not among the sold goods either. A few Ottoman textile items were not sold, such as an old Ottoman kerchief (jemeni: yemeni) and a bundle (bohtza: bohça). Two corselets and the small old waistband of the Terra Sancta were similarly not recorded in the auction record.

Some of Catterina's letters and documents were taken to the Secretary of the Dutch Embassy. A choice of pieces of furniture, such as baskets, chests, boxes, a ‘Turkish-style’ table, and two French tables were not sold either. Several rare items were also not mentioned in the auction record: the pipe from Lille in its wooden case, the enema syringe, the walking stick from India with a silver knob, and the seal of her husband the Ambassador. The two portraits of Catterina and her husband were probably not expected to be sold, but rather bequeathed or given to a relative.

60 NL-HaNA, Legatie Turkije, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1043. Declaration by Chancellor Romulds Rombouts dated 22 January 1731.
Pride or Prejudice

The auction of Catterine’s possessions was one of the at least sixteen public sales organized by or in cooperation with the Dutch Chancery between 1725 and 1750 and thereby formed a part of a lively second-hand market of commodities. The records of the auction of her goods, then, demonstrate a small but significant part of material exchange in the early modern world. Although a few goods she possessed are missing from her auction list, the record gives a good overview of the monetary value and state of her belongings. Table 1 illustrates the value of Catterina’s auctioned possessions. It confirms that textiles formed the most expensive and the best-represented category of goods upon her demise; her cushion covers, blankets, and clothing had a total value of 780 lion dollars and 79 aspers. Interestingly, the most expensive item in this category was 733 okka of wool sold for 109 lion dollars and 111 aspers, at 18.5 aspers per okka. Quite a few textile items were deemed old or used, such as ‘5 old velvet cushion covers’, ‘an old squirrel pelisse’, or ‘the old bed hangings of red damask’. Many of her tablecloths were new, though. Actually, only a handful of her other possessions were indicated as new. For instance, she owned various new sheets, a ‘brand new’ bronze lantern, and a new pewter inkstand.

| Auctioned possessions               | Value in lion dollars: aspers | Percentage of total value |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Clothing, Textiles, Carpets         | 780:79                       | 64.9%                     |
| Kitchenware & Hygiene               | 160:102                      | 13.4%                     |
| Decoration                          | 91:116                       | 7.6%                      |
| Furniture & Storage                | 71:15                        | 5.9%                      |
| Illumination & Heating             | 36:16                        | 3.1%                      |
| Jewellery                           | 32:01                        | 2.7%                      |
| Reading & Writing Culture           | 18:10                        | 1.5%                      |
| Tools, Metal & Gardening           | 5:54                         | 0.4%                      |
| Games                               | 2:00                         | 0.2%                      |
| Tobacco & Smoking                   | 1:54                         | 0.1%                      |
| Weaponry & Hunt                     | 0:81                         | 0.1%                      |
| Other                               | 1:30                         | 0.1%                      |
| Total                               | 1202:7864                    | 100%                      |

61 For a discussion of the other auctions of the possessions of the Dutch community, see Cornelissen, “The Trials and Tribulations of a Dutch Merchant in Istanbul.”

62 Okka is also referred to as kıyye. 1 okka equals 1,283 kg.

63 Kitchenware and hygiene have been combined as a category as due to lack of precise description or lack of differentiation in language, it is often unclear whether certain items were used for personal hygiene or in the kitchen when washing up, for cleaning or washing oneself, the house or goods, for drinking water or for pouring water.

64 The total value of the auctioned goods is 1202 lion dollars or piasters (kuruş) and 78 aspers (akçe).
Catterina’s kitchen was mainly filled with Ottoman cooking equipment, but it also appears to have featured a bronze-plated chimney or English fireplace. Goods related to cooking, serving hot beverages, and hygiene were worth nearly 161 lion dollars, and thereby formed the second-largest source of revenue from the auction. Like with the textiles, these results are quite similar to those of the other members of the Dutch ‘nation’. Catterina also appears to have participated in the rising coffee-culture trend of the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire. Coffee consumption in the home became a daily ritual for many Ottoman women by that time. The fact that she owned various items related to coffee culture, namely a total of five coffee ewers (ibrik) and a few coffee cups and their holders, is somewhat different from observations done among non-Muslim women in eighteenth-century Galata, who did not own any coffee cups or other related equipment. Besides coffee, she also drank tea. Although by the mid-seventeenth century, Ottoman traveler Evliya Çelebi had heard of tea, Ottomans did not start their culture of tea-drinking until the late nineteenth century. Nevertheless, it was very popular among the members of the Dutch ‘nation’ in Istanbul in the eighteenth century.

The fact that the category of decoration which included mirrors, a chamber clock (worth over 66 lion dollars), and various paintings, represents the third-highest source of revenue, seems to imply that Catterina gave importance to the embellishment of her house. Perhaps, like other women in eighteenth-century Istanbul, the countess used her home and thereby her material culture as a means to display her social status to visitors. It was particularly her possession of an abundance of textile comfort-related items, such as cushions and cushion covers with which she partook in an increasing comfort-related trend also witnessed in eighteenth-century Ottoman society. At the same time, Catterina furnished her house in many ways in a similar fashion to other members of the Dutch ‘nation’: she combined Ottoman sofas comprised of (velvet) cushions, sitting cloths, and ihram spreads, with chairs and tables from Europe. Freestanding or movable furniture, such as tables, chairs, and wardrobes, was at the time still uncommon in the Ottoman Empire.

Her inventory is rather silent about jewelry. The only items sold at the auction in this category are the pair of small earrings and the gilded belt mentioned earlier. It is very well

65 Debts Catterina had made in the year before she died included the purchase of a bronze-plated chimney or English fireplace, which was referred to as an ‘agiaklik’ [ocaklık] for Ld. 50. NL-HaNA, Legatie Turkije, 1.02.20, inv. nr. 1106 (letter from Petros Baron to English Ambassador Abraham Stanyan, dated 2 June 1729).
66 For further details: Cornelissen, “The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer,” 427.
67 Hoşgör, “Changes in the Consumption of Ottomans,” 121. This observation is based on the study of 500 18th-century non-Muslim households in Galata.
68 Faroqhi, “The Material Culture of Global Connections,” 428 (referring to Evliya Çelebi, Evliya Çelebi in Bitlis. The Relevant Sections of the Seyahatname, edited with translation, commentary and introduction, ed. Robert Dankoff (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990), 118–119.
69 Cornelissen, “The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer,” 216.
70 Hoşgör, “Changes in the Consumption of Ottomans,” 71.
71 Phillips, “A Material Culture: Ottoman Velvets and Their Owners.”
72 Cornelissen, “The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer.”
possible she had various precious pieces pawned at pawnshops, but it is equally possible that she had been forced to sell them due to her debts prior to her demise.

The countess's material culture reveals her participation in other trends that can be observed in eighteenth-century Ottoman consumption culture. The Ottoman capital witnessed an increased consumption of the elite in the Ottoman capital since the sultan returned from Edirne. Similarly, Catterina’s husband, the Dutch Ambassador, had died in debt, which was at least partially due to the high costs that were made to keep up with the expected level of display and conspicuous consumption that came with the function of foreign ambassador or resident at the Ottoman capital. Perfectly in line with eighteenth-century patterns of elite consumption, Catterina (or at least her husband) owned a mansion along the Bosporus, besides their ambassadorial palace in Pera and farm in Zekeriyaköy.

Besides overlapping material possessions and evidence of participation in consumption patterns observed among Ottomans, the countess’s material possessions also show similarities with the material culture of the Dutch community in eighteenth-century Istanbul. Her seemingly fluid, cosmopolitan, or hybrid identity and diverse mixture of belongings are actually rather typical of the small Dutch community in eighteenth-century Istanbul. Most of its members were not in Istanbul as merchants, because trade was rather more concentrated in the cities of Izmir and Aleppo. Most, then, worked for the embassy, and many lived in the Ambassadorial palace and formed a part of the ambassadorial household. Like the members of the ambassadorial household, the countess navigated between multiple consumption cultures and appears to have been a part of a cultural context created by such foreign communities in the Ottoman Empire of mixed European, Ottoman, and Asian material culture. It is then still to be debated how unique her ‘world’ was.

As elaborated upon above, it was supposedly also the countess’s own desire for an extravagant life that led her husband to his financial ruin. Judging from her personal letters,

---

73 See Cornelissen, “The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer.”
74 Artan, “Aspects of the Ottoman Elite’s Food Consumption,” 110; Suraiya Faroqhi, “Research on the History of Ottoman Consumption: A Preliminary Exploration of Sources and Models,” in *Consumption Studies and the History of the Ottoman Empire, 1550–1922: An Introduction,* ed. Donald Quataert (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), 38.
75 Güliz Ger et al., “Debunking the myths of global consumer culture literature,” in *The Sage Handbook of Consumer Culture,* eds. Olga Kravets et al. (Los Angeles, etc.: Sage, 2018), 86.
76 See Cornelissen, “The World of Ambassador Jacobus Colyer.” There it is suggested that a ‘cultural context’ (as introduced by Woodruff D. Smith, in *Consumption and the making of Respectability, 1600–1800* (New York: Routledge, 2002), was created by the Dutch community of Istanbul during the first half of the eighteenth century. A cultural context, according to Smith, is ‘an assembly of factors or traits that make ‘sense’ as an ensemble to people living in a particular time and area, as elements of their worlds are meaningfully linked to one another.’ It is argued that these men and women navigated between multiple consumption cultures and created a ‘cultural context’ of their own of hybrid or mixed European, Ottoman and Asian material possessions that mostly adorned their homes, but also their bodies. It was very likely that this ‘cultural context’ was created together with other foreign communities in the Ottoman capital. Whether the other foreign communities, or ‘nations’ residing in the Ottoman Empire are also part of such a cultural context is still to be researched.
her status and standards of living must have severely altered after the death of her husband. She appears to have held on to some of the possessions from the harem section of the Ambassadorial residence and was forced to live a more sober life in a small apartment in Pera until her demise. Interestingly, the Dutch States-General had not provided any funding for the embassy’s construction or purchase, nor did they offer any payment towards repair costs after fire, destruction, or confiscation of the buildings belonging, despite the building’s public function. Early modern embassies were professional, bureaucratic spaces, but at the same time also the domain of friendship and intimacy, and, above all, a household, and a domestic space in which business and residence came together. It was exactly this dual nature of the early modern embassy that appears to have led to the ‘creation of alternative affective communities’ that superseded ‘national’ cultures and their models of domesticity. These kinds of communities, such as the Dutch ‘nation,’ witnessed and often facilitated the interaction between multiple customs, norms, religions, and identities that brought varying designs, tastes, and patterns of consumption along with them. This mixture then results in the hybrid material possessions of the countess, who appears to have come from a slave background, and then entered the ambassadorial household. Catterina, it seems, was only grudgingly accepted as a part of such an alternative effective community as long as her husband the Ambassador was alive. After his death, she appears to have fallen from grace in the eyes of that same community. Although Catterina was forced to give up the Ambassadorial palace, she had a strong claim over other possessions that remained after her husband’s demise. Correspondence of her relatives and contemporary traveler De Saumery’s travelogue portray a rather prejudiced image of Catterina. On the other hand, her strong character and compassion for her loved ones and her possessions are conveyed in her final will, estate inventory, and her own correspondence.

77 Mark Netzloff, “The Ambassador’s Household: Sir Henry Wotton, Domesticity, and Diplomatic Writing,” in Diplomacy and Early Modern Culture, eds. Robyn Adams and Rosanna Cox (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 162.
78 Harriet Rudolph refers to the ambassadorial households and the diplomats involved in early modern diplomacy as a so-called diplomatic corps. She carefully suggested that elements of a diplomatic corps can already be discerned at a comparably early age in Istanbul, which she refers to as the early modern ‘diplomatic capital of the world’. This diplomatic corps refers to “a collective body of foreign diplomats and their staff at the capital of a given state, who increasingly developed the idea of belonging to a transnational social group serving supranational aims such as enforcing diplomatic privileged for its members”. Such a diplomatic corps is characterized by a similar social background, activities within a transnational network, shared professional norms and status, shared solidarity, and shared operating conditions. The operating conditions, she argues, can be influenced by local customs, attitudes towards diplomacy, modes of communication, religious conviction, and so on. Rudolph suggests that the interactions between these preconditions in Istanbul resulted in a specific Bourdieuan “habitus” of European diplomats (referring to Pierre Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)). She has discovered hints in travel reports and diplomats’ correspondence of such a habitus of European diplomats, but more research needs to be done. One way of researching this is through the material culture of this diplomatic corps. Harriet Rudolph, “The Ottoman Empire and the Institutionalization of European Diplomacy,” in Islam and International Law: Engaging Self-Centrism from a Plurality of Perspectives, eds. Marie-Luisa Frick and Andreas Th. Müller (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 161–183.
В предметы личного имущества машины Голландо-Грецкой княгини (1730)
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