

Moldavian Towns in the Political Context of the 17th-18th Centuries -General aspects-

*Ștefan Șchiopu**

*Universitatea Valahia din Târgoviște, Facultatea de Științe Umaniste, Str. Lt. Stancu Ion, nr. 34-36, 130108, Târgoviște, jud. Dâmbovița, e-mail: stefan.schiopu@yahoo.com

Abstract: The 17th and 18th centuries have fundamentally modified the coordinates of the Romanian society evolution. The imposing of some increasing obligations, often unbearable, until the second half of the 18th century, slowed down the natural course of the production processes and prevented the capital accumulation, which caused the emphasizing of the difference in comparison with other European areas. Despite the continuation, in the 18th century, of the effort to establish commercial relations with other areas, the quasi-agrarian character of the Moldavian economy left its mark on the early development of the bourgeois (middle-class) elements. Only around the end of the 18th century, once with the limitation of the obligations towards the Porte, after the loss of the force balance with Russia, the Moldavian society will meet the first signs of the beginning of the capitalist relations. We could say that the evolution of the internal and external policy in the 17th and 18th century gave an advantage to the consuming and conservative feudalism, the active classes from the urban area being permanently prevented from defining a position proper for their aspirations.

Résumé: Les villes Moldave dans le contexte politique du XVII^e – XVIII^e siècles-Aspects général. Les XVII^e -XVIII^e siècles ont change fondamentalement les coordonnées de l'évolution du société roumaine. L'imposition des obligations de plus en plus, souvent insupportable, jusqu'à la deuxième moitié de XVIII^e siècles, a ralenti le développement de la nature des procès de production et a empêché l'accumulation de capital, d'où résulte même l'augmenté du décalage en rapport avec d'autres zones européennes. Malgré la poursuite même dans le XVIII^e siècles, a l'effort pour établir des relations commerciales avec d'autres espaces, le caractère cvasiagrarr de l'économie moldave il a mis fortement l'empreinte sur l'affirmation précoce des éléments bourgeois. À peine vers la fin de XVIII^e siècles, avec la limitation des obligations vers la Porte, après la déséquilibracion du balance des forces en rapport avec Russie, la société moldave connaîtra les premiers signes d'improvisé des relations capitalistes. On pourrait dire que l'évolution politique interne et externe des XVII^e – XVIII^e siècles a avantaagé la féodalité consummation et conservatrice, la couche sociale active d'ambiance urbaine étant empêchée permanent en definition d'une position qui corresponde leurs aspirations.

Keywords: boyars, Moldavia, urban residents, town, war, Ottoman Empire, Russia, Austria, 17th and 18th centuries, court;

Mots-clé: boyards, Moldavia, citadines, ville, guerre, Ottoman Empire, Russie, Autriche, les XVII^e – XVIII^e siècles, regne;

The present study will try to emphasize a few elements concerning the difficulties met by the Moldavian citizens during the 17th and 18th centuries. Thus, according to the new judgments introduced into discussion we can draw some

conclusions related to the development level of the Moldavian centers, which could be a different one. The presence of some facts at a certain moment is justified by the intention to extrapolate the phenomenon and to project it on a larger background. It's more and more present the need to analyze the multiple aspects which involve the external political factor (the change of the juridical statute and the increasing dependence towards the Porte, and we insist here, not so much on the immediate changes, but more, on the indirect or collateral changes which, one way or another, influenced the town life) and internal (the interests of the laic and clerical feudalism and, of course, the interests of the court).

Adopting the idea of the medieval town's role micro-representative centre of all the social spheres, we accept, maybe easier, the beginning of a discussion about including other exponents, some of them with a predominant political role that took contact with the active part of the urban space. By "the active part of the urban area" it was intended the naming of the traders and crafters, although at first sight the collocation can seem far-fetched, which could be right if we respected strictly the semantic value of the term "active", and in comparison with the other social components of the urban area it would receive the attribute of "inactive". Such an approach would be totally wrong if we didn't explain the goal of this association of words and which has as a priority the enforcing of the traders and crafters' role in the urban society, considering the fact that a medieval town, no matter the epoch, can't be imagined or perceived without the existence of the two socio-professional categories named above. In other words, the collocation

"active part" was only used to offer more substantiality to the idea of "productive part".

We must follow the involvement of the laic and clerical feudalism, of the representatives of the local and central administration (usually recruited from the upper boyars) or the involvement of the court, elements which activate and relate in a forced circumstance, referring, almost always, to an external factor. To make it simpler, we can say that the main research directions refer to the effects on the urban inhabitants, namely traders and crafters, the interaction with the interests of feudalism, the nature of this interaction, as well as the court's attitude and of its direct representatives. The attempt to give a plausible answer to these question it's not an easy thing to do, especially if we consider the other related aspects, which are related themselves to the effort to establish the exact way in which the components of the Ottoman domination regime influenced the urban economy in Moldavia.

Although we want an integrated treating of the subject, when we talk about the evolution of the dominant class on the background of the foreign involvement, some issues become minor for the initiated debate. Therefore, the themes concerning the consolidation of the great nobility between the 17th and 18th centuries, the aspects of the relationship between the court and the feudalism, the ratio of power between them, these are subsidiary aspects of the main idea. Moreover, the so often met lately and legitimate tendency to establish a balance regarding the vision expressed in time on the dominator class, which was presented sometimes as a negative prototype through an excessive social polarization on antagonistic and irreconcilable principle (S. Columbeanu, C. Șerban, 1962; A. Oțetea, 1960) out of

imposed reasons and away of the scientific criteria, can't find its place here. We only should show the changes that appeared in the feudal relations and underline the many contradictions, in fact emblematical for the whole European Middle Ages, which existed and manifested itself, no doubt, in the time and at the level of the Romanian urban centers.

Generally, the Romanian historiography accepted that the second half of the 16th century represented the stage of gradual introduction of the Ottoman domination regime over the Romanian Countries, the next century marking its consolidation, although there were signs of capitulation, at least in Moldavia's case, from the middle of the 15th century (V. Panaite, 1997). Leaving aside the issues of the essence of the Romanian Countries' dependency on the Porte in judicial terms, or the reasons for keeping their autonomy, (M. Maxim, 1993; P.P.Panaitescu, 1947) it is proper to write a few phrases to define the deterioration of the political climate along the 17th and 18th centuries. If the economic effects are less countable (this is because the written information is poor and relative), as a paradox, the political consequences are more visible, and so, they are easier to be followed.

At the internal level, it's the moment when the involvement of the Porte becomes present in all the compartments of Moldavia's estate life, beginning with the court that is more and more unstable. The relations with the great nobility are influenced by the constant pressure of the Ottoman state (Ioan D. Condurachi, 1920) which imposed a "condominium" of power where the lack of balance and the diverging tendencies, which could modify the existing situation, are rapidly eliminated. The pressure was formerly exercised through the hostages and later

through diplomatic representatives of Romanian princes at the Porte.

The imposing of the Ottoman regime led to a reconfiguration of the relation between the court and the great nobility. In the new situation, on the background of the court authority corruption, the feudal class strengthens its position, being advantaged by the aspects of the commercial movement, too, the boyars' parties taking over the central institution. The episode of the endless fights between the Costinești and Rusetesti from the end of the 17th century it's a good example. The princes, who are no longer interested in assuring a solid material base, in order to defend themselves from internal or external dangers, give away (by legacy or safe) important parts of the great seigniorial manor to the laic or clerical feudalism. The reasons were connected with the political or material support, (money from the sales or forced loan) to obtain and keep the throne. The importance of the court council rises dramatically in this period (C. Cihodaru, 1964) the princes being convinced of the necessity of establishing good relations with the boyars from the council, relation which are conditioned by granting some privileges over the mills, woods, customs, mines, mills from the towns, private towns, etc. (D.Ciurea, 1964) In fact, in this period we find frequently information about tax-exempt for the boyars or churches (N. Grigoraș, 1974, N.Grigoraș, I, 1977, N. Grigoraș, II, 1981; Ion I. Nistor, 1943-1944), while for the townsfolk the tax-exempt is a rare thing (V. Mihordea, 1969). This is the moment when the great feudal estate begins, by a intensifying the process of enslaving the free peasants beginning from the 17th century (N.Corivan, I, II, 1956). The hard situation of the peasants (D. Ciurea, 1975, D. Ciurea, 1977) and the strengthen of the great nobility's position (D.Ciurea, 1980),

especially the Greek (many of the boyars had high-offices, which made easier for them to commit abuse) (N. Grigoraș, 1942, N. Grigoraș, 1971) generated violent reaction from the Moldavian population (V. Neamțu, 1956, V. Neamțu, 1963; C. Cihodaru, 1968).

On this background, the townsfolk's problems, some of them old, but which became acute in the period we are talking about, some of them new problems, become more and more numerous. Giving away by the central power the villages from the court perimeter was an often met practice in the 17th century (D. Ciurea, 1969, D. Ciurea, 1987). As agriculture, was still a base occupation for a part of the urban residents (Gh. Sibechi, 1979) we can declare that, this way, their interests were directly hurt. So, those who cultivated the ground in the towns had to pay taxes just like the peasants (D. Ciurea, 1956).

Following the line of the gradual obstruction of the urban residents' rights, which evolves till abolition, (having as a base the particularity of the foundation of the urban centers on a "court's ground") through the massive absorption by the boyars and churches of the properties inside the towns centers (but not to contribute to the productive life, but to get a maximum profit from rents and other taxes, under the court's protection) the activity of the local crafters and traders was disturbed and, in the same time, their ties with the European markets was put in danger (C. Șerban, 1968).

The phenomenon of giving the land and estate properties from the town centers to the boyars and churches affected badly the inhabitants (N. Grigoraș, 1970). Once they became the owners, with the help of the prince, the new owners, gave the buildings for rent to the crafters and traders (stalls, houses) or the land (where they could build) for which they got a tax. If the

traders couldn't pay the tax on time, the building would be taken over by the owner of the land (I. Antonovici, 1912). The bad thing is that the churches could benefit from partial or full tax-exempt for the buildings and other commercialized goods. And even worse is the fact that, a good part of the sums received by the churches, to the urban producers' detriment, went abroad, because most of the churches around the towns were yield to a foreign eparchy or patriarchate, either to the Jerusalem, Mount Athos or Sinai (Gh. Cronț, 1960). The princes from Transylvania took protective measures, forbidding the Greek traders to take the money out of the Principality and forcing them to buy goods from the same place, but in Moldavia there was a whole different situation. Through the princely court, which needed cash (requested from urban residents, the Empire's subjects or yielded churches) huge amounts of money leave the internal circuit of Moldavia.

The townsfolk confronted with the disloyal competition of the boyars and the church and were also subjected to the Ottoman subjects' abuse. Taking advantage of their privileged status, the Turkish traders got great profit from selling goods that they bought, by pressure, at very low price. Constantin Mavrocordat, in his third reign, decided to make a stand regarding the illegal trade practiced by the Turks, because this situation prevented the urban residents from collecting the taxes for the princely court (N. Grigoraș, 1942; M. M. Alexandrescu – Dersca, 1961). Once they found themselves into this situation, the townsfolk tried to obtain the money for the taxes pawning their goods. So, houses, lands, stalls were irremediably lost, becoming the property of the Turkish or Greek usurers (I. Caproșu, 1970; I. Caproșu, 1971). In the 18th century, the court continues its unconscious policy of

oppressing the urban residents, and so, parts of the central towns centre or, sometimes, the whole centre was given to some particulars (who get the right to found other towns) or eparchies. The new owners even had signets of the respective town. It's the case of the town of Șchei on which signet appears the name of the boyar Ștefan Prăjescu (D. Ciurea, 1956). Starting with the last two decades of the 18th century, we witness the foundation of numerous towns related, especially, to the agricultural goods trade. These methods, which obviously violated the rights of the townfolk, started many misunderstandings which were the subject of many petitions or law suits, the phenomenon continuing until the 19th century. And so it is created the image of a suffocating atmosphere for the urban inhabitants.

Externally, once the episode of the anti-Ottoman fight was closed, which concentrated all the social forces for a common aim, to maintain the independence of the Romanian Countries, the 17th and the 18th centuries were characterized, from the political point of view, by a continuous institutional degradation beginning with the princely court, combined with the incapacity of the ruling class to adopt to the modern tendencies. In the context of a lack of an army force or diplomacy of its own, which had kept its internal specific organization, follows a sinuous line dictated by the interests of the Powers around it and marked by many military conflicts. Beyond the elaboration of some generous projects of alliance between the Romanian princes, with or without external support, against the Ottoman domination, which didn't materialize because of a boyars class oscillating and obstinate about any status change, it was noticed in time that the petty reasons of the great Powers, noticed even by the contemporaries (Șt. Ștefanescu, 2000), can

be placed in the first place of the effort to try and explain the failure of the emancipation trials. Resuming the "Oriental issue" in the second half of the 17th century emphasized not only the fragility of the idea to have an outspoken opposition to the Imperial power, but also the high political dependence of the Romanian Countries on the Porte, which were forced to send military contingents into campaigns initiated by the Ottomans in different parts of Central or Eastern Europe (C. Șerban, 1974, C. Șerban, 1980).

A regressive factor, which was constantly present and affected the political and economical evolution of the Moldavian society was represented by the perpetuation, in this period, of the military conflicts in the area between the Carpathians and the Nistru river as a sign of rivalry between the neighbor forces. The Turkish-Polish conflicts, which took place mostly in Moldavia, along with the devastating campaigns of the Cossacks and Tatars, conflicts between the claimants to the throne supported by external forces, plus the many Russian-Austro-Turkish wars from the whole 18th century contributed to the instability climate (C-tin. Căzănișteanu, 1981), affecting all the social classes, and to a pretty high level, the urban residents. As political and administrative centers, the towns were favorite targets of the incursions on the Moldavian territories, because of the superior intra and inter-urban and because of the possibility of a quick supplying. The robberies and the destructions endured by the townfolk was only a side of the problem, the direct one. Indirectly, but equally hard to bear, acted the obligations of quartering the belligerent armies or occupying armies, the lack of a secure climate which could stimulate the production or the exchange activities and,

not the last, the diseases spread in these conditions, that caused great loss in the urban area, as a consequence of the demographic concentration.

The problem of the military conflicts which affected the urban life during the 17th and 18th centuries can be found both in the narrative sources and in the documentary ones. For the beginning of the 17th century the attention is kept by the fights for the throne between the Movilești, which had the Polish support, and Ștefan Tomșa, supported by the Ottomans, (Buletinul "Ioan Neculce", 1921; *Documente privind Istoria României A. Moldova*, 1951-1957) which lasts until 1617. In fact, a German traveler noted in 1611 the bad conditions from Moldavia's capital town. The townsfolk take part actively in the epoch's events, being on Ștefan Tomșa's side, at his call, against the boyars' rebellion from 1615 (M.Costin, 1965). Their action will be hardly punished, because when the Movilești came back, all the traders from Iași were robbed. In 1622 we find out about the burning of the town by the Polish armies, in the context of the dismissal of Alexandru Iliăș (M. Costin, 1965). During the reign of Vasile Lupu, Tatar and Cossack incursions provoked great damage to the Moldavian towns (villages, towns, all burning and robbing), while Iași was all burnt (M. Costin, 1965). The fights for the throne between Gheorghe Ștefan and Vasile Lupu, as well as Timuș Hmielnicki's incursions (V.Ciobanu, 1997) left a lot of memories in the epoch, many towns being burnt and a lot of deeds lost. The incursion of the Polish king Jan Sobieski represented another factor which perturbed the political stability, which was already fragile, the capital being burnt once again (I. Neculce, 1963).

The circumstances of losing Căminuța to the Turks, surrounding Vienna, the

returning of the disorganized armies, devastated Moldavia, the people leaving massively the cities and villages (V. Lascu, 1969). To this sad aspect contributed the passing of the Tatars for Liov in 7206 (1697) (Buletinul "Ioan Neculce", 1924).

The 18th century began the series of the Russian-Austro-Turkish wars, together with the impetuous affirming of the expansionist interests of Russia and Austria. There was a big difference in the perception about Russia's actions during the military conflicts from 18th century in Moldavia between the pre-war ("bourgeois") historiography and the after-war ("communist") one. The first tries to show the intention of Russia to add, as fast as possible, Moldavia to its political and administrative system, and the second presents a romanced situation, insisting on the protective role of Russia, on the military collaboration between two peoples and on the benefic influence on the Moldavian state's organization. There were deliberately omitted the mentions about the Tsarist representatives' abuse, which were noted in the chronicles. The conflicts were often accompanied by longer or shorter occupation periods: in 1739 (the Russian army), September 1769-October 1774 (the Russian army), 1787-1792 (the Austrian army) and 1788-1792 (the Russian army) when Moldavia was administratively divided between the Austrians and the Russians. In addition to this there was a rise of the Turkish garrison establishments in the occupied territories. (C. Căzănișteanu, 1981) Because there are no statistics which to register the money needed for quartering obligations, we can only guess that they were way over Moldavian population's possibilities (villagers, traders, crafters) who had to pay a lot of other taxes too.

This declaration becomes obvious if we consider the fact that the administration

was formed mostly of boyars, divided into two groups, pro Russian (local) and pro Turkish (Greek influenced), functioning as fiscal pressure agents for the other social classes. During the war between 1735-1739, the boyars, who were interested in eliminating the Ottoman monopoly, assured Russia that its armies will find plenty of supplies in Moldavia (C. Șerban, 1956). The dedication of a part of the feudal class was supported by the willing attitude of Russia's representatives, who wanted to keep the old privileges.

Concerning the other social classes' position against the Russian-Austro-Turkish wars (M. D. Matei, 1953) and the involving of their representatives into the battles voluntarily, we can identify some exaggerations of the post-war historiography. The abundance of witnesses about enrolling the peasants, the most oppressed social class, in the Russian war detachments, can have another explanation than the one of a powerful anti-Ottoman feeling. The peasants were animated, not necessarily by the state interests which, in fact, were not a familiar to them, being aware of the fact that a new price didn't mean a new bailiff too, but also by food supplying reasons. In respect of the urban residents' involvement, their role was not so well documented. But it is certain that when the towns were threatened, the town's residents took part in the defensive efforts, because they wanted to avoid the perturbation of the specific activities (M. Kogălniceanu, 1874). Because of the lack of an army of their own, the Moldavian princes would passively assist to the events in progress, playing the messengers between the belligerent camps, having as an only goal to reign as long as possible (V.Ciobanu, 1970).

In 1711, in the context of the Russian-Turkish peace, the Tatars burnt and robbed

the towns of Galați and Focșani and they enslaved the citizens (N. Camariano, A.Camariano-Cioran, 1965). Also the town of Bârlad "remained only a field" (N. Costin, 1976, p.339-340). During the conflicts from 1716-1718 the chroniclers render a catastrophic image: Germans and soldiers robbed and oppressed in the country and many people died from hunger or immigrated. Many died from plague and the princely courts were burnt (M. Kogălniceanu, 1874). In the same circumstances, we find out that in 1716 the traders from Roman and Adjud were robbed by the Austrians (N. Camariano, A.Camariano-Cioran, 1965). In 1769, the town of Tecuci "remained empty" (Arhiva Românească, 1860, p. 140). The presence of the foreign troops, as well as the precarious hygiene conditions, led to the spreading of some devastating epidemics. In the third reign of Mihai Racoviță, the reports talk about a plague which lasted six months (N. Camariano, A. Camariano-Cioran, 1965). Between 1736-1739, the plague hit the Romanian Countries again (C. Căzănișteanu, 1981), and, between 1769-1774, the Moldavian towns were so affected, that the grave diggers couldn't handle the situation anymore so the bodies were left to be eaten by dogs, worms or wild animals. In fact, this is a period when the grave digger guilds flourish in the most of Moldavian towns (C. Șerban, 1972).

Facing these endless wars, the indifferent attitude of the court, the abuse from the laic and clerical feudalism or the abuse from the Ottoman subjects, the town's residents fought back not only once. In 1612 when the bishop of Roman tried to violate the town's privileges, the townsfolk shouted that there was not an eparchy but a market (E. Melchisedec, 1874-1875). In 1620 the residents of Iași made a stand against the Turks (M. Costin, 1965). In 1653, the hostility

of the citizens from Hotin against Vasile Lupu's regime, materialized in the refusal to give in the town (*Istoria României*, 1964). In 1655, the movement of the paid soldiers involved the citizens of Iași, too (*Istoria României*, 1964). An interesting episode is the riot led by Hâncu and Durac, caused by the big taxes and by the violation of their rights. To the meeting organized by the mutineers participated tax-gatherers and courtiers and citizens from towns and two monks from each monastery (Al. I.Gonța, 1989). In 1711, when the troops of the Tsar entered in Iași, the urban residents paid the Turkish traders back (I. Neculce, 1975). The 18th century is full of such riots of the urban residents, which reveals their active participation at the political life of the Moldavian state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Arhiva Românească, 1860, volumul I, ediția a II-a, București;

** Buletinul "Ioan Neculce", 1921, 1924, fascicolul 1, 2, Iași;

****Istoria României*, 1964, volumul III, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București, 1259 p;

*****Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor A. Moldova*, 1951-1957, volumul V, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București

Alexandrescu – Dersca, M.M., 1961, *Despre regimul supușilor otomani în Țara Românească în veacul al XVIII-lea*, Studii. Revista de Istorie, extras, numărul 1, anul XIV, p. 87-113;

Antonovici I., 1912, *Documente bârladene*, volumul II, Bârlad;

Camariano N., Camariano A.-C., 1965, *Cronica Ghiculeștilor*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 808 p.;

Caproșu I., 1970, *Rolul capitalului camătăresc în aservirea micii proprietăți*

din Moldova, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D.Xenopol", Iași, tomul VII, p. 107-137 ;

Caproșu I., 1971, *Camătă și cămătari în epoca fanariotă*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D.Xenopol", Iași, tomul VIII, p.27-59;

Căzănișteanu C-tin., 1981, *Urmările războaielor ruso-austro-turce din secolul al XVIII-lea asupra Țărilor Române*, Revista de Istorie, București, tomul 34, numărul 2, p.259-269;

Cihodaru C., 1964, *Sfatul domnesc și sfatul de obște în Moldova (sec. XV-XVIII)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D.Xenopol", Iași, tomul I, p.55-85 ;

Cihodaru C., 1968, *Rascoala din anul 1653 din Moldova*, (serie nouă), secțiunea III, Analele Științifice ale Universității "Al.I.Cuza" din Iași, tomul XIV, p. 103-109;

Ciobanu V., 1970, *Confederația de la Bar și implicațiile ei pentru Moldova (1768-1771)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D.Xenopol", Iași, tomul VII, p.279-290;

Ciobanu V., 1997, *Românii în politica est central europeană (1648-1711)*, Editura Institutul European, Iași, 191p. ISBN 973-586-036-8;

Ciurea D., 1956, *Orașele și târgurile din Moldova în cadrul perioadei de descompunere a feudalismului*, Studii și Comunicari Științifice, Istorie, Iași, anul VII, fascicolul 1, p.97-105;

Ciurea D., 1956, *Sigiliile medievale ale orașelor din Moldova*, Studii și Comunicari Științifice, Istorie, Iași, anul VII, fascicolul 2, p.157-164;

Ciurea D., 1964, *În legătură cu problema monopolului feudal în Moldova (câteva date noi și precizări)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie "A.D.Xenopol", Iași, tomul I, p.139-145;

Ciurea D., 1969, *Precizări în problema evoluției mării proprietăți feudale din Moldova în secolele XVII – XVIII*, Studii. Revista de Istorie, numărul 1, p.161-183;

Ciurea D., 1975, *Situația social-economică a Moldovei în timpul domniei lui Vasile Lupu*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, tomul XII, p.165-170 ;

Ciurea D., 1977, *Evoluția așezărilor și a populației rurale din Moldova în secolele XVII-XVIII*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, extras, tomul XIV, p. 123-155;

Ciurea D., 1980, *Evoluția și rolul politic al clasei dominante din Moldova, în secolele XV-XVIII*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, XVII, p.159-228;

Ciurea D., 1987, *Aspecte din situația socială a Moldovei în secolele XVII-XVIII*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, XXIV/2, p. 141-155;

Condurachi I. D., 1920, *Soli și agenți ai domnilor Moldovei la Poartă în secolul al XVII-lea*, București ;

Columbeanu S., Șerban C., 1962, *Destrămarea feudalismului și începuturile capitalismului*, Studii. Revista de Istorie, numărul 6, anul XV, p.1527-1543;

Corivan N., 1956, *Formele de aservire a țăranimii moldovene în secolul al XVII-lea și începutul secolului al XVIII-lea*, Studii și Comunicări Științifice, Istorie, Iași, anul VII, fascicolul 1, p.75-93;

Corivan N., 1956, *Mijloacele de cötropire a pământurilor țăranilor liberi din Moldova în secolul al XVII-lea*, Studii și Comunicări Științifice, Istorie, Iași, anul VII, fascicolul 2, p.89-107;

Costin M., 1965, *Opere I* (Ediție critică îngrijită de P.P.Panaintescu), Editura pentru literatură, București, 325p. ;

Costin N., 1975, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei de la zidirea lumii până la 1601 și de la 1709 la 1711*, Editura Junimea, Iași;

Cronț Gh., 1960, *Dreptul de ctitorie în Țara Românească și Moldova*, Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie, București, volumul IV, p.77-116 ;

Gonța Al. I., 1989, *Legăturile economice dintre Moldova și Transilvania, în secolele XIII-XVII*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 252p. ;

Grigoraș N., 1942, *Dregătorii târgurilor moldovenești și atribuțiile lor până la Regulamentul Organic*, Iași ;

Grigoraș N., 1942, *Orașele Moldovei și populațiile de origine străină, Cetatea Moldovei*, Iași anul III, volumul V, numărul 4, p. 3-16 ;

Grigoraș N., 1970, *Proprietatea funciară și imobiliară a meseriașilor, negustorilor, boierilor și mănăstirilor din orașele moldovenești. Regimul și rolul ei (sec. XV-XVIII)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași , tomul VII, p.83-106;

Grigoraș N., 1971, *Abuzurile și corupția membrilor aparatului de stat feudal din Moldova (sec.XV-XVII)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, VIII, p. 99-117;

Grigoraș N., 1974, *Imunitățile și privilegiile fiscale în Moldova (de la întemeierea statului și pînă la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea)*, Revista de Istorie, tomul 27, numărul 1, p.55-77;

Grigoraș N., 1977, *Privilegiile fiscale în Moldova (1741-1821), (I)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, tomul XIV, p. 41-53;

Grigoraș N., 1981, *Privilegiile fiscale în Moldova (1741-1821), (II)*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie

“A.D.Xenopol”, Iași, tomul XVIII, p.183-200;

Kogălniceanu M., 1874, **Cronicele României**, volumul III, ediția a-II-a, București ;

Lascu V., 1969, *Documente inedite privitoare la situația Țărilor Române la sfârșitul secolului XVII*, Anuarul Institutului de Istorie , Cluj, extras, tomul XII, p.231-265 ;

Matei M. D., 1953, *Despre poziția claselor sociale din Moldova și Țara Românească față de războiul ruso-turc din 1768-1774*, Studii. Revista de Istorie, numărul III, anul 6, p.53-77;

Maxim M., 1993, *Țările Române și înalta Poartă. Cadrul juridic al relațiilor româno-otomane în evul mediu*, București;

Melchisedec, Episcop, 1874-1875, **Cronica Romanului și a Episcopiei de Roman**, volumele I-II, București ;

Mihordea V., 1969, *Vinăriciul domnesc și vădrăritul*, Studii. Revista de Istorie, tomul 22, numărul 6, p.1077-1101;

Neamțu V., 1956, *Răscoala din Moldova din primavara anului 1633*, Analele Științifice ale Universității “Al.I.Cuza” din Iași, (serie nouă), secțiunea III, tomul II, fasciculele 1-2, p.19-34;

Neamțu V., 1963, *Frământări sociale în orașul Iași în primele decenii ale secolului al XVII-lea*, Analele Științifice ale Universității “Al.I.Cuza” din Iași, (serie nouă), secțiunea III, tomul IX, p. 57-67 ;

Neculce I., 1975, **Letopisețul Țării Moldovei**, Ediția Iorgu Iordan, București ;

Nistor Ion, I., 1943-1944, *Clasele boierești din Moldova și privilegiile lor*, Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice, București, extras, seria III, tomul XXVI, p. 511-550 ;

Oțetea A., 1960, *Considerații asupra trecerii de la feudalism la*

capitalism în Moldova și Țara Românească, Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie, volumul IV, p.307-390;

Panaite V., 1997, **Pace, război și comerț în Islam. Țările Române și dreptul otoman al popoarelor (secolele XV-XVII)**, Editura All, București, 523p. ISBN 973-571-186-9;

Panaitescu P.P., 1947, **Interpretări Românești. Studii de istorie economică și socială**, Editura Univers, București;

Sibechi Gh., 1979, *Contribuții privitoare la unele aspecte economice din ocoalele domnești ale Moldovei în secolele XV-XVIII*, Studii si Comunicari. Muzeul Judetean de istorie si etnografie Focsani, extras, p. 45-60 ;

Șerban C., 1956, *Relațiile politice româno-ruse în timpul războiului ruso-turc din 1735-1739*, Analele Româno-Sovietice , Seria Istorie 4 (16) , anul X, seria III, p.113-133 ;

Șerban C., 1968, *Tîrgurile și orașele medievale românești. Considerații generale*, Studii și Cercetari Economice, București, extras, volumele I-II, p.159-165 ;

Șerban C., 1972, *Breslele de ciocli din Moldova în secolul al XVIII-lea*, Din istoria luptei antiepidemice în România (Studii și note) extras, p.83-94 ;

Șerban C., 1974, *Les preliminaries de l'epoque phanariote*, Extrait du volume symposium “L'epoque phanariote”. Institute for balkan studies, Thessaloniki, p.29-39 ;

Șerban C., 1980, *Români și problema orientală (1683-1713)*, în Revista de Istorie, București, tomul 33, numărul 10, extras , p.1945-1970;

Ștefănescu Șt., 2000, *Principatele Române la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea și începutul secolului al XIX-lea. Factori de presiune externă și reacții de identitate internă*, Memoriile Secțiunii Științifice de Istorie și Arheologie, București, Seria IV, tomul XXIII, extras, p.45-50;