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Foreword

In studies of elites, historians have been generally reluctant to offer too close a definition, considering the capaciousness of the term to be its principal merit. 'Useful on account of its very generality', the notion of elites has often been broadened, however, as to lose any precision as an analytical tool.¹ For the Cambridge–Rome–Paris international research project on elites in the High Middle Ages (2002–9), the label of elite thus applied to ‘all those who enjoy a high social position, which means possession of wealth, power and knowledge that is recognised by others.’² Elsewhere, historians have urged a broad understanding of elite since the names given to leading men in the Middle Ages were also diverse – in cities, the name of *domini viri* thus frequently alternated with *nobiles, potentes, milites, consules*, and so on.³ The application of the idea of elite to the peasant countryside, although yielding a more nuanced understanding of rural society, has in its turn identified a further ‘social group with blurry boundaries’ that stands in need of semantic accommodation.⁴

The difficulty with the notion of elite is that it is a historically bounded term that acquired currency little more than a hundred years ago. During the course of the nineteenth century, the old social order with its hierarchies of power dissolved under the combined forces of industrialisation and popular revolution, and the ideological certainties of the Old Regime were eroded. A new order was discerned, comprising the masses and the crowd on the one side and a new ruling class on the other. Although associated with Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca and Robert Michels, the distinctions that they made were to a large extent anticipated by François Guizot, who posited the existence, above the ‘floating mass of the population’, of a ‘natural aristocracy’, who ‘through their acquired positions, their fortunes and their habits bring to public affairs the most natural authority.’⁵ It was, however, Mosca and Pareto who coined the term of elite (Michels stuck with oligarchy) and attempted to establish the mechanisms by which they exerted influence. Along with Michels, both sought to understand elites as emerging from the organisational demands of modern society, which required special skills and expertise. As Michels put it, ‘Whoever says organisation says oligarchy.’⁶

⁵ Guizot, *De la Démocratie*, Paris, 1849, pp. 23, 90–1. Of course, one may look for antecedents at length, ranging from Nietzsche to the Social Darwinists. Mosca was thus highly influenced by the Austrian Darwinist and race-theorist Gumplowicz, and so on.
A leadership group was thus to be found at the forefront of every profession and organisation, although it was subject to periodic change and renewal, history being, in Pareto’s lapidary formulation, ‘the graveyard of elites’.\(^7\) Only a small section, however, comprised the political elite, exerting influence through ‘force and fraud’ (Pareto), or as an organised minority who ‘have some attribute, real or apparent, which is highly esteemed and very influential in the society in which they live’ (Mosca).\(^8\) Mosca was, however, alert to the mechanisms by which the ruling elite maintained its hegemony, positing a ‘political formula’ or ruling class ideology, which served as a legitimating discourse.\(^9\)

The relationship between theories of a political elite and the Marxist idea of a ruling class has been occasionally fruitful, even though the one deals with organisations and power and the other with control of the means of production. For a few social scientists, sections of the political elite and ruling class overlap to the extent of constituting a ‘power-elite’ that combines economic, political and military leaderships, and which is cohesive, self-sustaining and self-serving.\(^10\) For the majority, however, the complexity of the modern state prevents any single elite emerging to political predominance. Instead, there is a functionally-divided ‘multiplication of elites’ and a corresponding ‘disassociation of powers’, which prevents any single elite obtaining a position of hegemony and which urges instead negotiation, consensus and coalition-building. In this way, elite theory is tamed and made the servant of pluralist democracy.\(^11\)

Historians do not need social scientists to tell them how to do their job, although the reverse is not always the case. Nevertheless, in this instance sociology raises questions and gives stresses that historians might do well to consider.

First, there is the condition of nineteenth-century modernisation under which elite theory first developed. Rather than scrap the notion of elites as an anachronism in the pre-modern period, it is surely, however, sensible to see the term as usefully including those groups who wielded influence while yet standing outside the conventional hierarchies of esteem. The challengers to noble hegemony fit most suitably here—merchants, financiers, rural outsiders and the many new men who came to prominence through the ‘professionalisation’ of office. In a sense, the contributors to the present volume know this, but are just not saying so! For their essays are predominantly concerned with precisely these groups. We will notice, moreover, in the historical literature more generally that the term of elites is most commonly used in relation to the towns, thus intersecting with the further neologism, although in this case a sixteenth-century one,

of ‘patrician’. Although attractive, it is, however, disingenuous to use elite exclusively in the sense of non-noble, for it overlooks the retained political, social, economic and cultural influence exercised by the nobility in the modern period. In many respects, the nobility remained over centuries the premier elite which the members of all other elite groups sought either to emulate or to join.

Secondly, Pareto’s observations on the graveyard and circulation of elites carry obvious resonances for the historian, even if Pareto himself was less than clear whether he was talking about individuals moving in and out of elites or of one elite being replaced by another. As far as nobilities are concerned, it would seem that in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries lineages expired as a consequence of either biological or economic failure at a rate of very roughly 15% every 25 years, with the consequence that about over half of the nobility was replenished every century. Or to use another measure, where renewal was less an option: of the English, Irish and Scottish Jacobite lordships and honours created after 1689, 107 of the 170 recipient families, or 63 per cent, had vanished within a century of their investiture. All this may be put down to natural churn. Processes of replenishment as well as strategies of survival might, however, have the consequence of altering the substance of the elite so significantly as to render it qualitatively different from what had gone before. The involvement of later medieval and early modern noblemen in commercial enterprises is well-attested; likewise their recruitment into the state administration. The observation that the English nobleman of the late fifteenth century was distinguished by his castles, armouries and armed retinue, whereas his successor 200 years later had his Palladian mansion, political connections and pocket boroughs is applicable across a large part of the continent. In similar fashion, elites in towns experienced substantial alterations, even though some families were able to make the leap from one form of mercantile endeavour to another, variously moving from venturing to merchant-partnerships and then into the rental market. Some became nobles, just as noblemen themselves became increasingly urbanised. The speed of change prompted many towns to construct closed corporations, barring outsiders from government and its perquisites—hence, the several hundred cittadini who dominated the Corfiot Consiglio generale and established an exclusive and hereditary right both to power and to the accompanying revenues of high office.

Thirdly, the functional definition of elites stands in the way of the proposition that there was a single power-elite in any of the lands and kingdoms of late medieval and

early modern Europe. Indeed, princely courts acted very much as the centres in which the interests of the various elite groups were negotiated and reconciled. Rulers were alert to the need to broker agreements and build consensus. Charters, decrees and electoral compacts issued in the late Middle Ages thus frequently drew attention to the way in which their publication had taken place in the presence or with the agreement of assembled great lords, nobles, churchmen and others. In time, these groups would formally stabilise into estates and would bargain with each other, as well as with the ruler, in two-, three or even four-chamber assemblies that brought together noblemen, clergy, burghers and some categories of peasant.

Relations between elites were less institutionally mediated in the Romanian principalities and in parts of South-Eastern Europe. In Wallachia and Moldavia, the government passed in the early eighteenth century to princes appointed by the Sultan, usually from among the wealthy Greek merchant or Phanariot community of Constantinople. These brought with them retinues of kinsmen, favourites and creditors, who for their own profit carved up the fiscal apparatus. Given that the Phanariot princes were replaced or alternated every few years, we would appear to have here a veritable circulation of elites! Nevertheless, side by side with these parvenus were representatives of the old boyar families, who continued to hold both influence and office right through to the nineteenth century. Thus, of the register of Wallachian boyar families drawn up by the Russian army in 1829, 44 were scions of families that may be traced back to at least the seventeenth century, and only eleven were of Phanariot descent. This hidden ‘power-elite’ doubtless owed its extraordinary longevity to its control of the resources of the countryside and to the absence of alternative social forces, such as townsfolk or a wealthy clerical estate, on which the princes might build politically. Marital strategies of endogamy also helped prevent the dissipation of boyar wealth and contributed to social cohesion.  

Fourthly, elites once they had emerged to political and social dominance often cemented their authority through ideological formulations. Besides appealing to a natural order of society that justified hierarchy and inequality, noblemen, townsfolk and privileged rural communities might also invent histories for themselves that led back to a mythologised or classical past. Several contributions to the present volume attest to this phenomenon. Even individual families were not averse to constructing elaborate genealogies that established their historical pre-eminence in a town or region. More usually, however, authority was projected through symbolic and visual means, in the rituals by which new councillors were appointed in towns, in theatrical entrées and tableaux, or in ceremonies such as Nuremberg’s famous Lenten Dance,

---

which advertised the exclusivity of the town’s forty Ratsfähig families. Architectural display reinforced elite status. In towns, the Ringbürger built ostentatious houses around the market square, often ornately decorated in the latest styles, like the Black House and Bandinelli Palace in Lviv. According to the census made in Wilno in 1636, wealthy guildsmen, councillors, no less than seven former burgomasters and a burgomaster’s widow dominated the triangular market square, building for themselves ornate two- or three-storey brick houses.

In the countryside, icons of power took the place of the municipal architecture of status. The late medieval castle was not just a defensive work, but designed to awe the senses through its sculptured setting: hence this description from the mid-fourteenth century Gawain poet—‘a castle the comeliest a knight ever saw, set in a meadow surrounded by a park, enclosed by a thick palisade of spikes, which enclosed many trees in its circuit of more than two miles.’ Although we cannot determine the designed landscape in which it sat, the late medieval manor house (curia nobilitaris) at Pomáz in Hungary emphasised for its part the lineage and religious devotion of its owners, the Cykó family, for it was conjoined to a twin-towered church, which loomed over the rest of the complex and which provided the family’s place of burial. The living quarters were luxurious and with their decorated stoves, glass windows and elaborate decoration were intended to impress. This was the residence of a family that belonged to the upper layer of the common nobility. Aristocratic homes of the same period often retained strongly fortified walls, but these might be supplemented (as at Trenčín) with elegant apartments including a large ceremonial or knights’ hall, courtyards for jousting and tournaments, a jewel garden, and adjacent deer parks. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, these fortress-palaces were superseded by ‘prodigy houses’ built in the late Renaissance or baroque style and surrounded by cultivated woodland, hunting grounds and ornamental gardens.

In the Romanian principalities and the Balkans more generally, icons of power played only a minor role. Castles performed an exclusively military function. Wealthy merchants and boyars resided mostly in urban settings, in block-like stone houses and sometimes towers, often with external stair cases and verandas. Display was largely confined to the interior, taking the form of silk furnishings, imported rugs and multi-colour stucco.

---


25 Thus, for instance, at Bytča, Bernolákovo, Holič, Oponice etc.
work. In the Romanian principalities, the decorations on stove tiles suggest that some of the motifs and trappings of knighthly society were prized, with images of chivalric and mythological scenes, heraldic emblems and depictions of hunting, dances and courtly love. Appropriations of this type were, however, rare. Coats of arms thus barely figured as symbols of status. Social position was more frequently manifested in the colour and style of clothing, giving strong visibility to distinctions of rank. For members of the political and commercial elites, turbans or tall hats, baggy trousers and long coats were until the nineteenth century the usual manner of dress. Thereafter, western fashions prevailed – if only because they were more convenient for waltzes and quadrilles.

Symbolic means of communication are important for the study of elites. In so far as communication is a two-way process, it provides the critical linkage between elites and masses. The most obvious criticism of historical investigation into elites is that it supposes politics and power to be a matter of networks and chains of influence, which through family, business and other common activities establish group cohesion and collective agency. Elites and their clients thus become the drivers of historical development, and it is their ‘self-interest, meaning a fierce Hobbesian competition for power and wealth and security, [that] makes the world go round.’ The detailed study of elites, often through prosopography, is intended to expose this dynamic, often through the sort of case studies given in the present volume. In this scheme, ideology plays little role, save as opportunism, and the masses themselves become the simple objects of manipulation—as Guizot saw, a floating population denied agency on account of its susceptibility to persuasion.

Nevertheless, the means by which elites projected their power – be this through their castles or homes on the Ring, in civic display and ritual, or in fashion – were not directed at a blank canvas. They depended for their success upon, at the very least, their recognition as symbols of authority and, more importantly, upon the participation of broader sections of the population in the acting out of their abstract meaning. As elsewhere, theatrical performances and costumes were intended to reconcile ‘the political metaphysic with the existing distribution of power.’ Audiences were expected to respond, enacting out their own parts in these public demonstrations of social inequality, either by organising reciprocal displays, participating in status-laden displays, and thus playing a role in the perpetuation of hierarchical structures.

---


30 Guizot, De la Démocratie, p. 23.

processions, or donning apparel appropriate to their rank.\textsuperscript{32} To be effective, rituals in the sense of a chain of symbolic actions required reciprocating responses. They did not create of themselves legitimacy but depended for their power upon the reactions of the audience, which by its involvement and approbation made these displays not only reflective but also paradigmatic of the social order and thus of elite hegemonies. To paraphrase Clifford Geertz, in the theatres of pre-modern polities, the elites of princes, noblemen, merchants and prelates may have been the impresarios, but the peasants and common folk were the supporting cast, stage crew and audience.\textsuperscript{33}

Martyn Rady


\textsuperscript{33} Geertz, \textit{Negara}, p. 13.
Introduction

During the Cold War, social history was under-represented in Central and Eastern European historiography. Since most of the countries of this region were behind the Iron Curtain, historians suffered serious ideological restrictions, forcing them to research those topics which the political regime prioritised. The legacy of the totalitarian regime may be traced in the research published at that time, since historians were required to emphasise those aspects which more or less strictly adhered to the Marxist paradigm of interpretation. Elites of any kind were far too sensitive a subject, and were thus only rarely admitted as a topic of historical study, being largely marginalised at least in medieval research. Instead the members of elites were seen through the lens of ‘class struggle’, mostly negatively, and were counted as belonging to the class of exploiters, implacably opposed to the exploited, who were far more favoured in the historiography of the day. Only in one single aspect of research did the totalitarian ideology allow a measure of objectivity in the study of elites. This was in respect of the wars fought by the people north of the Danube to preserve their rights and autonomy in the face of great power expansionism of the time, first and foremost the Ottoman Empire. Thus although the social and political elite may well have been largely motivated by sectional and class interests, the various privileged categories who made up this group found themselves (so it was argued) having to rally a ‘people’s war’ to safeguard the integrity of their states.

What then does an elite stand for? A general survey might suppose that an elite is the group of people who unite all that is best and most valuable in a society. An elite changes over the course of time, however, just as society itself changes periodically. The medieval world also had its elite – or rather, its elites, since as this volume shows, there were several categories. The principal difficulty for the historian interested in the subject lies in identifying the members of these groups, since a specific methodology must be used for any such undertaking. The historian of the Middle Ages and early-modern period must find a number of criteria which can be applied to reveal the existence of such a social group, and among these criteria must be family origin, along with wealth and attendant prestige, and perhaps public office or a position in the social hierarchy of the day. The first criterion is one of the most important, since in the Middle Ages family origin was often the determining factor in a person’s career path. It was one thing to be born into a humble family on the margins of society who worked the soil by the sweat of their brow, and another thing entirely to come from a well-known family which formed part of the privileged power elite. The study of families is the domain of history’s ancillary science of genealogy and remains of great help to those interested in the study of elites, offering useful tools for case studies and analysis. We have also mentioned power; the control of power, or relations with power structures, represents another criterion worthy of consideration in the study of elites. The exercise of power,
Introduction

or proximity to power, has always conferred a special position on those at the top of the social pyramid, opening the way to prestige, public office and its attendant wealth, privilege, and to landed estates and the revenues attached. Prestige conferred a certain moral authority, and whoever enjoyed prestige also enjoyed a measure of respect. Public office came as a secondary attribute, significant at the socio-economic level at which these social actors operated. Privilege in itself presupposed that members of the elite held a special position relative to the law and to the ruler, being often exempt from tax and other obligations under a particular law or its provisions. All the attributes mentioned here are interconnected and cannot be considered separately, so that we must also mention the landed estates and revenues which made up the wealth of a given individual – most often, but not always, a member of the nobility. Try as we might, there is no way to view these people in isolation from their lands and incomes, which came in the form of estates or parts thereof, whether acquired by purchase or by inheritance, as rents and taxes, commercial activates or even the manual trades.

All these attributes are relevant throughout late medieval and early-modern Europe with little local variation, and thus also in the times, places and realms discussed in the present volume. We have chosen to focus on the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries in Central and Eastern Europe. This span of time includes the far-reaching changes that society in this part of the world underwent at the end of the Middle Ages, during the Renaissance and Reformation, and subsequently when in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries society was re-shaped, even before the ideas of the Enlightenment had their revolutionary effect. We have chosen to focus on Central and Eastern Europe since due to its position between East and West, the transformations of early modernity took effect more slowly here, and only gradually took root in the region. The territories discussed here present many common features but also several differences. They have a common history from the fifteenth century, when the kingdom of Hungary and the Romanian and Serbian principalities joined forces against Ottoman expansion in Europe, through to the eighteenth century, when the same states and other, newer actors (Austria, Russia) tried to push the Ottoman Empire back to the East. Over time the local elites took action or reacted in similar or in different ways. Members of the elites fought with the sword and by diplomacy to preserve the political identity of their home territories, and sometimes collaborated with those who threatened that identity in the same way that they dealt with all interested parties. For all that, the Ottoman presence in Eastern Europe and the impact of Ottoman suzerainty led to certain peculiarities at the level of elites, who by comparison with similar groups in the West seem to have been more ‘rooted in the past’. The local nobility tried to retain its privileges and dominant position in society, while the urban patriciate – itself showing tendencies to aristocratisation – lacked the necessary capital and economic power to trade any further afield than with the Ottoman Levant. The permeability of the nobility, especially in the Romanian Principalities, was a characteristic feature that has left clear traces in the extant sources especially from the mid-sixteenth century, when foreign trade and the sizeable profits to be made from the middle- and long-distance export-trades allowed Balkan merchants, especially Greeks, to enter the ranks of local aristocracies once they had bought landed estates and settled in these lands, most often by marrying into the local noble clans. The legal mechanisms intended to prevent foreigners from buying arable lands, such as the right of protimisis,
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were deftly side-stepped, not least because the princes of Wallachia and Moldavia increasingly needed funds. Given the extent of corruption in the Ottoman Empire, they relied heavily on the persuasive power of hard cash in their dealings with the Porte, thus facilitating the rise of rich merchants into the ranks of the social and political elite in the Romanian Principalities. Thus there is a case to be made that the permeability of the political elite contributed indirectly to the instability of the economic elite, who could join the ranks of nobility by buying great tracts of land; this took significant sums of capital out of economic circulation and hindered the formation of durable, commercial family companies by foreign merchants settled north of the Danube.

None of these considerations, however, can be applied in the region and period under discussion in the absence of sources. The work of drawing up an inventory of source types, and of identifying and making sense of the sources themselves, weighs heavily on historians. The first requirement is knowledge of at least one vernacular or written language of the day. Here the characteristic diversity of Central and Eastern Europe causes problems. To study the Polish or Hungarian elites, the historian needs to know Latin as well as Polish, Hungarian and German. Scholars researching the very varied elite groups south of the Danube find Ottoman Turkish and Greek indispensable, not to mention Italian, needed for any study of relations with the powers of the Italian Peninsula, the Western Balkans and elsewhere. Studying elites north of the Danube requires Old Slavonic, Romanian, Greek and Latin. This linguistic variety can be deceptive, offering the illusion of a wealth of sources. Typologically speaking, sources are documentary (from official papers to considerable amounts of private correspondence) and narrative (all kinds of chronicles and travel memoirs), sigillographic, heraldic, epigraphic and archaeological. Quantitatively and qualitatively speaking, scholars setting out to study elites in the western Balkans and Central Europe are best placed, having access to rich archives, while in the case of elites in the lands north of the Danube, the archives are extensive and rich mainly starting from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

What kind of elites, then, do we encounter in these regions? The situation is very diverse, given that we are dealing with elites in constant motion, even though mobility varied by place and by period. If we take the example of the less well-known principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, we find that the political elite of the fifteenth century was made up of the great local boyars, close relatives of the reigning princes and officials of the princely courts, usually also holding great landed estates, with ties to the Transylvanian-Hungarian or the Polish world. We may count alongside them the economic elite, made up of members of the urban patriciate, great merchants who were Romanian, Greek, Italian, German, Hungarian or Armenian by origin, living in the inland towns or the port towns of the Danube and the Black Sea. They traded Oriental goods into Europe, owned ships and dealt with merchants in Transylvania, Poland, Genoa, Venice, Ragusa or Constantinople. Going forward to the eighteenth century, we encounter the same elites in the same region, though much changed. The great boyars continue to make up the political elite, although at this point they are close to rulers who hailed from the Phanar district of Constantinople. We also find many Greeks among the political elite, who come from south of the Danube and have close ties to the power structures of the Ottoman Empire. The economic elite has also changed, with fewer Germans, Hungarians and Italians and more Greeks, Armenians, Jews and even Turks
(although they did not have the right to own property in the Romanian Principalities),
doing business in the region or in Constantinople. There is also the church elite, again
with a strong Greek presence, comprising high dignitaries of the Orthodox Church,
abbots of the great monasteries – many of them directly subject to monasteries on Mount
Athos – and parish priests in the towns. This elite group is located somewhere between
the political and economic groups, since its members had a certain amount of influence
at the princely court and administered great sums of money alongside their religious
duties, while metropolitan and local bishops, like the monasteries, held considerable
lands and also owned property, vineyards, houses and places of business (shops, taverns
and inns) in the towns. Political and economic developments in the region also left their
marks on the local society, the most evident consequence being that some able, talented
individuals rose to the top of the social hierarchy, though others were driven into
poverty. Nevertheless, in every period the fundamental principles for identifying elites
and understanding their role in society remain public office, land ownership, houses,
money, influence and relations with the central authorities. Things were little different
from Poland, which passed from the heights of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to
collapse and partition at the end of the eighteenth, to Hungary, which within a century
went from a regional power, giving emperors and powerful kings to Europe (Sigismund
of Luxemburg and Matthias Corvinus) to falling under direct Ottoman rule after the
disaster at Mohács, crushed by the forces of Suleiman the Magnificent. Certainly we
must also bear in mind the local political and religious climate, where the great nobles
on the one hand and the Catholic or Protestant churches on the other had a decisive
influence. The Balkans by contrast enjoyed a period of relative stability in the period
examined here, being controlled for the most part by the Ottomans, who were able to
impose their political, social and economic system without great upheavals once they
had dissolved the political and administrative structures of the old Christian states and
swept away the exhausted opposition of the former nobility.

The current volume focuses on understanding the mechanisms which explain elite
formation in Central and Eastern Europe, and on identifying the members of these elites.
We have tried to select scholarly articles and specialist studies from the many countries
of this part of Europe that show the scope of the subject and demonstrate both the
elements common to local elites and the important differences between them.

Cristian Nicolae Apetrei’s contribution may be seen as a short synthesis of his subject
of study; here he analyses the typology of noble houses in Wallachia and Moldavia,
classifying them by the buildings’ functions and by their role in social representation.
Foreign influences from south of the Danube and from Central Europe were assimilated
into local building techniques and often integrated to suit local conditions, with the
resulting symbiosis yielding an architectural style which could be tailored to the secular
buildings of the noble courts in the Romanian Principalities.

Alexandru Simon’s article discusses a group living in Moldavia under the reign of
Stephen III the Great (1457–1504) who were distinct both ethnically and as taxpayers:
the Jews. Until recently it had been believed that they had played an entirely marginal
role in fifteenth-century Moldavia, but Simon’s research shows that their numbers was
much more significant and they made up 5–10% of the urban population. Jews settled
in towns, coming from Hungary, from Poland or from lands conquered by the Mongols.
Simon bases his arguments in this article on Venetian sources and the chronicle of Elijah Capsali, chief rabbi of the Jewish community of Candy (Venetian Crete), who wrote that Stephen the Great’s persecution of these Jews was at the root of the first conflict (1473/74–1479/80) between the Moldavian prince and Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror. In this context, Jews who were most probably members of the urban elite were caught up not just in this conflict, but also in Stephen the Great’s quarrel with the Genoese, who had great influence in Moldavia’s port towns.

Olga Kozubska-Andrusiv looks at the urban elite in Lviv, an important commercial centre in late medieval Poland. As in neighbouring Romania, the topic was avoided in the Communist period, when the term ‘elite’ was almost non-existent in the discourse of social history. Kozubska-Andrusiv is interested in the Lviv elite from the moment of their appearance in the extant record in the later fourteenth century through to the town’s sudden decline in the latter seventeenth. Her research shows that this elite was made up of the rich and influential men occupying the town’s principal offices (the head of the town court – Latin advocatus/German Vogt, and the members of the town council – Latin domini Consules/German Herren). One particular feature here was the multi-ethnic and multi-religious character of Lviv, where German/Catholic citizens controlled the town’s major institutions, leading to segregation among the townsfolk; the Ruthenian/Orthodox were gradually blocked from public office, while the Armenians developed their own autonomous structures led by an advocatus chosen from among their number (just as in Moldavia). Kozubska-Andrusiv also uses the sources to analyse urban elite strategies of self-representation, using data on the annual elections to the town council and information from chapel inscriptions, altars, tombstones, chroniclers of the time etc. Her article also includes several short case studies on some of the most important Lviv families.

Alexandr Osipian also uses the case of Lviv in a comparative analysis of how the town’s Polish and Armenian elites related their own communities’ mythological or historical origins. This discourse around identity became more elaborate as the taste for reading spread, and as the spirit of competition increased, all in a setting where economic and administrative rivalry for the reins of power in the town deepened the particularisation of identities among the ethnic groups that made up Lviv’s urban community. No wonder then that in their search for more illustrious ancestry, the Polish patriciate decided that they descended from the Germanic warriors of the Late Antiquity, while the Armenians claimed that the origins of their community went back to the later thirteenth century, when they were invited to settle in the town by the Ruthenian Prince Daniel (1238–1264).

Laurenţiu Rădvan looks at a category which has been under-researched in Romanian historiography: the urban patriciate. Romanian historians ignored this elite group for a long time, since for various reasons (including ideological) they were less inclined to look at social history. Analysis of written sources held in archives in Wallachia, Moldavia, Transylvania and Poland shows that merchants in towns south and east of the Carpathians (called dobri liudi in Old Slavonic, or oameni buni in Romanian), both locals and newcomers from elsewhere, were engaged in trade with high-value Oriental goods, with metal tools and wares, wine, fish or livestock (especially merchants from Moldavia) which brought them significant incomes. Just like members of the patriciate
in the older cities of Europe, they too had richly decorated houses and held large sums of money which they would often loan out. The tendency was for these patricians to gain public office in town for themselves or for members of their families, but above and beyond this, many aimed to enter the ranks of the local nobility (the boyars). Although the sources do not reveal much about political involvement by members of the Wallachian or Moldavian patriciate, Rădvan’s research shows that they were not disconnected from events in the two principalities. Some of them even had ties to the kings of Hungary, while others took part in the struggles between pretenders to the throne and suffered persecution as a result. All of this reveals a dynamic category of powerful, wealthy men who were well placed to respond to events in the region.

Gerassimos D. Pagaratis discusses in his article the situation of Greek elites in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on the Mediterranean islands which formed part of the Venetian Republic’s maritime possessions. Using an illuminating case study of the Pandis family of Corfu, he shows how urban and rural elites appealed for justice to support their right to sit in the local administrative institutions. The local Greeks adapted very quickly to the rules imposed by the Venetian authorities, so that local Orthodox elites were made up of rich merchants, ship-owners, higher clergy, large landowners and those who upheld public order and formed the standing army.

Greeks in the diaspora likewise knew how to integrate themselves into society in the regions where they settled, where many rose notably far and fast in society. Ştefan Aftodor examines one such case, looking at the social and political-administrative trajectory of members of the Constantinopolitan Greek Caradja family, who settled in the Romanian Principalities in the sixteenth century. In Wallachia and Moldavia, Caradja boyars came to hold very important offices and accumulated extensive landholdings, joining the ranks of the richest and most influential members of the Romanian Principalities’ social and political-administrative elite in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Szymon Kazusek’s article focuses on the situation of the heterogeneous municipal elite of Cracow and its role in the economic life of the former Polish capital. Although it lost its privileged position as capital of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth to Warsaw in the late sixteenth century, even in the following century Cracow remained a city with a prosperous and influential merchant elite, multi-ethnic and multi-confessional, involved in the profitable middle- and long-distance trade. Wealthy merchants from the Italian Peninsula were strongly represented among the merchant elite in Cracow, outnumbered only by the Poles themselves, while the Jews were a numerically smaller minority but actively involved in foreign trade. Using statistical data on the orientation of Poland’s foreign trade through Cracow, on the involvement of the city’s different ethnic groups in the transactions recorded in extant sources and on the destinations of goods exported from the city, Kazusek rightly emphasises that the ‘wealthy Cracow merchants were only part of the Cracow patrician elite, alongside craftsmen, doctors, pharmacists and lawyers’.

There is no doubt that the free professions formed a social and professional elite, an integral part of the urban patriciate through their expertise and abilities in fields which not everyone could master. In respect of finance, the members of these free professions most certainly did not have equality of income, their earnings depending instead on
individual fame, on their career path and not least on the circles in which they moved and the ties they formed. Cristian Luca follows the professional career and reputation of one such person, the Danish physician Hans Andersen Skovgaard, in an article based on unpublished seventeenth-century sources which shed light on his activity, still too little-known, as a member of the Christian elite in Constantinople. Skovgaard won fame as doctor to the Venetian embassy at the Porte, a post which proved to be a professional springboard for him, opening the way to a lucrative contract as doctor at the princely court in Iaşi, in the Principality of Moldavia, and also gave him the necessary credentials for high Ottoman officials to seek his services. From his position as attendant doctor to the prince of Moldavia and to Porte dignitaries, Hans Andersen Skovgaard increased his earnings by selling secrets garnered in these political circles to Venice and to the Habsburgs. Thus his profession as doctor went in parallel with his secret work as a paid spy, an activity which Skovgaard successfully pursued from his arrival in Constantinople from the Italian Peninsula, until his unexpected death in the summer of 1656.

Anişoara Ionaşcu offers a case study from seventeenth-century Moldavia of the residence in Buciuleşti (Neamţ County) of the wealthy boyar Dumitraşco Ştefan. A member of the principality’s political and social elite, Dumitraşco Ştefan held for a long time the important office of grand logothete, a post of considerable influence in the princely council (Divan). From this position, Dumitraşco Ştefan built up sizeable landed estates and took care to instruct his son, Gheorghe Ştefan, who not only followed in his father’s footsteps to head the princely chancery but even seized the Moldavian throne, deposing Vasile Lupu in 1653. Dumitraşco Ştefan’s residence in Buciuleşti was thus one of the great country seats of the day and a centre of power for this boyar family, intended as an architectonic whole to display the owner’s social standing and his position in the political and social hierarchy of the principality.

Rafael-Dorian Chelaru’s article tackles the social status and professional activities of Catholic elites from the Western Balkans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These Balkans Catholics were Christian subjects of the Porte and under its direct rule for around two centuries, confessionally beholden to the local Roman Catholic hierarchy. These Western Balkan elites traded goods with the Ottoman Empire, Central Europe and the Italian Peninsula and were valued go-betweens, especially in times of war, given the multiple ties that the Ottoman Balkan lands had with Venice and Ragusa. From this merchant elite, Chelaru selects the wealthy and influential Bosnian family of the Brnjaković and analyses how its members used their ties with Ottoman dignitaries both locally and centrally and with leading Catholic hierarchs to occupy positions as privileged partners to the political and ecclesiastical elites. They also played a direct part in preserving religious freedom and obtaining tax exemptions for the Catholic communities in Bosnia. Chelaru’s study traces the Christian families who formed the Catholic elites in the Western Balkans for generations, especially the Matković family from Olovo, the Campsi and Vladagni from Scutari, the Bogdani and Masarecchi (Mazrreku) from the sandjak of Prizren, the Bolizza (Bolica) from Cattaro, the Bubić from Budva, the Blancus (Bardhi) from Sappa, and the Scura from Durazzo.

Gheorghe Lazăr’s study looks at a class of merchants in Wallachia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who may be considered part of the elite, the moneychangers. The lack of a local currency in the Romanian Principalities and the circulation of several
foreign denominations in parallel created favourable conditions for these merchants, who were known south of the Carpathians by a name of Turkish origin, *zarafi*. Lazăr explains the world in which these merchants conducted their business and the conditions of their trade in Bucharest and Târgoviște, the major towns of Wallachia. He introduces the well-known, most active *zarafi* of the period, many of them Greek by origin, particularly Ivan, commercial agent to prince Constantin Brâncoveanu, who held his money on deposit at the Zecca in Venice, or Nikos Papas and his son Panayotis, who also had profitable dealings with Venice. Lazăr’s research shows that by the end of the eighteenth century the Wallachian crisis of liquidity – from which the moneychangers profited – had grown so bad that the authorities were forced to forbid the export of large sums of money from the country, and even then this measure did not have the desired results.

Marius Păduraru and Claudiu Neagoe use published and archival sources to shed light on the dynamic economic life of Bucharest during this same period, the long reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu (1688–1714), an era of lively economic activity in Wallachia, in which the city’s wealthy merchants accumulated capital and subsequently invested significant amounts in purchasing houses and shops in Bucharest and landed estates in the country. The authors trace how the merchants in the capital organized themselves as a guild and identify the most prominent characters of this group, the merchant elite of Bucharest, including such influential figures as Manos Apostolos and Nikos Papas from Epirus, who were engaged in the middle- and long-distance trade supplying the princely courts and Brâncoveanu’s entourage. The Wallachian merchant elite was not just involved in business but also actively supported cultural and religious life, financing the printing of religious books or the building or renovation of Orthodox churches and monasteries.

Christina E. Papakosta relates the history of the *armatolos* Aggelis Sumillas, originally from Ioannina, who worked at first in Ottoman service keeping order and collecting taxes in a mountainous region in the southernmost part of the Pindus, then served Venice from 1684, marching in August of that year with a thousand men to occupy Lefkada alongside Venetian troops under the command of admiral Francesco Morosini. Sumillas is a typical example of an individual from the Greek community who was able to join the ranks of the local notables in the Ionian island of Lefkada through military service in war, earning material rewards from the Venetian authorities for his bravery in fighting the Ottomans. In 1696 Alessandro Molin, the admiral of the Venetian war fleet, rewarded Aggelis Sumillas for his services to the Republic of St. Mark and gave him 33 parcels of land in Vonitsa. Five years later, on 12 November 1701, Doge Alvise Mocenigo granted Sumillas 930 acres of land in plots spread over almost the entire island of Lefkada. Sumillas’ military service to the Serenissima was rewarded at the highest level when he was awarded the prestigious title of *cavaliere di San Marco*. A self-made man, Sumillas joined the ranks of the Lefkada Greek elite by his own efforts and, having chosen a new Ionian home for himself and his family, left his heirs the property and prestige which allowed their successful integration into the island community.

The articles brought together in this volume start by setting out some aspects essential for understanding the role of elites in Central and Eastern Europe during the Middle Ages.
and early modern period, and in doing so they also contribute to a clearer overall image of the development of the urban patriciate in this region. This view of the dynamics of the socio-professional groups that made up the urban elites clearly shows that everywhere in Central and Eastern Europe the wealthy merchants proved to be vectors of economic and social progress. The noble elites who owned large landed estates owed their influence and high position in the social hierarchy to birth and wealth and to close relations with the central authorities, who entrusted them with offices and gave them an interest in the exercise of government through the administrative responsibilities they assumed. Several case studies in this volume shed light on the social rise, in different countries and at different moment in the course of history, of the *hominis novi* who by their own abilities built up material wealth and sizeable inheritances which allowed them rapid access to the local elites, often also benefiting from favourable political and economic circumstance. A volume such as the present work enriches the academic literature, yet its findings represent only one step in the larger enterprise to understand more clearly the role of elites in European history.

C.L. & L.R.
Bucharest, Galați and Iași, May 2013
Elites at home: Romanian aristocratic houses in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries

Cristian Nicolae Apetrei

The background

Romania’s tumultuous history means that not a single civil structure has been fully preserved from the Middle Ages. This explains why medieval civil architecture has largely become a research field for medieval archaeologists rather than for architectural historians. Over the last half-century, archaeologists have collected a critical mass of data on civil architecture from the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries. A large gap in the history of Romanian civilisation has finally been bridged. Nevertheless, the considerable increase in the number of excavations has been accompanied by only a few studies that aim to systematise the mass of data and place it in the evolution of Romanian architecture – even less so in the European context. This explains why studies published so far have failed to notice that many of the newly excavated structures show common features, both architecturally and from the perspective of the social standing of the individuals who commissioned them.

This paper sets out to argue that all Romanian social elites preferred one type of residential building from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, to identify its origins, and finally to explain the causes of its prevalence in elite circles.

Defining the Romanian mediaeval elites

To formulate a definition of Romanian elites, we will use two principles which divide late medieval society vertically and horizontally. First, we will employ a horizontal hierarchy according to the role played in society, the classical distinction of the three social orders: oratores, bellatores and laboratores. These categories will then be differentiated vertically according to wealth. As a result, for the purposes of this paper
Elites will mean the upper social strata in Wallachia and Moldavia, who enjoyed personal freedom.

In order of importance, first place goes to the upper class of nobility. This category includes first and foremost the rulers of the two principalities. In its origin, the institution of prince was closely related to pre-state nobility: the prince (Romanian: domn from Latin: dominus, and mare voievod) is the one among the rulers of pre-state political structures (Romanian: voievozi) whose supremacy was recognised by the others. Furthermore, after the extinction of the dynasties established by the founding fathers of the principalities, customary arrangements meant that princes were elected from among the nobility.3

According to Romanian law, a nobleman (Romanian: boier; English: boyar) was a landowner. This led to a fairly large class of nobility in the principalities, as in the neighbouring kingdoms of Hungary and Poland. Differences in rank within the nobility stemmed from access to power. Assuming state functions allowed some nobles to expand their estates and to exercise considerable influence on princely policies; they comprised the class of the grand boyars, which over the following centuries would become synonymous with boyar. By contrast, the rest of the nobility were called petty boyars. Together with the serfs, petty boyars bore the brunt of taxes necessary for tribute payments to the Ottoman Empire as suzerain power.4

To give clarity, the Orthodox clergy needs to be analysed separately. In fact, the clergy was not recognised as an order with special interests, as it was always made up of two segments: on the one hand the higher clergy and on the other, the ordinary priests and monks.5 The former comprised metropolitan bishops, bishops and the abbots of large monasteries (Romanian: egumen, stareț), whose way of life closely resembled that of the boyars. Their position depended on the whim of the princes; most came from noble or even princely families, and they ruled the church institutions in the same manner as landowners ruled their domains. On the other hand, the lesser clergy shared the fate of the poor (free or serf) who sustained the crushing fiscal pressure of the state.6

The last component comprised the townsfolk, made up of craftsmen and merchants. As before, it was made up of two distinct layers: the wealthy townsfolk known as urban patricians, and the ordinary townsfolk. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, urban patricians were merchants and craftsmen, predominantly of German and Hungarian origin. During the sixteenth century this ethnic makeup changed as Germans and Hungarians were assimilated into the Romanian population, to be replaced by Greeks.

---


5 This mentality is revealed in the 18th–19th centuries when the first political writings appear. See here V. Georgescu, Ideile politice şi Iluminismul în Principatele Române, Bucharest, 1972, pp. 88–9; K. Hitchins, Românii, 1774–1866, Bucharest, 1998, pp. 169–70.

Sephardi Jews and Armenians from the Ottoman Empire. Well connected to the large commercial networks of long-distance trade in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea, these three new ethnic groups essentially took charge of foreign trade in the Romanian Principalities in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. The lower urban stratum was continuously dominated by Romanian craftsmen and tradesmen, joined by two social categories without personal freedom: serfs and Gypsy slaves.

Residences of Romanian medieval elites: a typology

The range of residential buildings attributed to elites in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries is limited to a few types. Written documents are not very helpful, however, in the way they describe material structures according to the vocabulary of the time. The words used by the majority of sources (chancery documents) are decidedly technical in nature, and cannot be used as semantic references. Nor are other types of sources more precise; therefore the few correlations that can be drawn are largely irrelevant. For instance, a construction indicated as ‘домь’ (Romanian: casă; English: house) in the votive inscription is called ‘полата’ (Romanian: palat; English: palace) by a chronicle writer. Faced with such a situation, it seems appropriate to use modern terminology, obviously accompanied by a relevant description of the types indicated. Therefore, in the following classification we will simultaneously use the two-fold criteria of horizontal and vertical organisation of space. Each type will be accompanied by a table detailing the town of origin, the type of archaeological complex the buildings belonged to, the individuals who commissioned them or lived there, and the construction technique used. The overall purpose is statistical. We are unfortunately unable to compile statistics associating the types described in the tables to the number of residential buildings discovered, however desirable this might be. The main obstacle is the lack of precision in the results of archaeological research conducted in the cities of the two principalities, where dozens of residential buildings have been excavated (most made of wood). While research papers have been partially published, these are not amenable to statistical

---


9 L. Djamo, ‘Contribuţii la studiul lexicului documentelor slavo–române’, Slavoromanica, 8 (1963), p. 147. At times these sources use various words for the same structure. See Apetrei, Reședințele boierești, p. 58.

We will consequently use a number of sites to document the types of homes, most of them containing only one residential building. Finally, we will show how the few sites containing multiple residences do not contradict our conclusions but support them. Thus even though the statistical indicator obtained is less than precise, it is still capable of capturing the general lines of the buildings analysed here.

Type 1: The one-storey simple residence. This category includes surface constructions, divided into individual small lots built on a simple tract of land (row housing). Materials and techniques used included masonry (stone and/or bricks), wood (timber-frame technique) or mixed construction. The cases known to us place this type in the residential circles of the nobility and urban patriciate. Western researchers, accustomed to a rural habitat dominated by surface houses, may be surprised by the classification of such residences as noblemen’s houses. However, Romanian conditions of the time indicate that rural and urban habitats were dominated by wooden residences, buried or semi-buried in the ground, even though the number of both rural and urban surface residences increased over the course of the sixteenth century. In this context, one reason why they are associated with the social elites is their relative superiority: they are a rarity among other residences, and their structure is clearly superior both in quality and in quantity. Moreover, there is a second, much more solid argument: based on written sources some of these buildings, especially stone- or brick-built residences, may be attributed with certainty to representatives of the social elites (in most cases nobility).

The reasons are manifold: evaluations were conducted for quantity, globally, without separating results by type of residence; types of residences were described with confusing terminology; generic evaluations were made for the 14th–17th centuries without reference to specific centuries. See thus A. Păunescu & D. Mihai, ‘Tipuri de locuinţe documentate arheologic la Oraşul de Floci, com. Giurgeni, jud. Ialomiţa’, Ialomiţa: Studii şi comunicări de istorie, arheologie, etnografie, 3 (2000), p. 86; P.-V. Diaconescu, Arheologia habitatului urban târgoviştean: Secoalele XIV–XVIII, Târgovişte, 2009, p. 16.


Apetrei, Reşedinţele boiereşti, pp. 13–5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Town/county</th>
<th>Complex of origin</th>
<th>Resident/commissioning individual</th>
<th>Construction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baia/Suceava</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bărlad/Vaslui</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corni/Neamţ</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Mixed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Domneşti/Argeş</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Giurgeni/Ialomiţa</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Liteni/Suceava</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orhei/Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Suceava/Suceava</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame Mixed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suslăneşti/Argeş</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type 2: Multistorey (tower) residence developed horizontally. This type includes simple constructions, organised horizontally in multiple spaces built in rows, and vertically with two storeys. However, there are two exceptions where the residence had three storeys: a cellar, ground floor and first floor.\(^{14}\) The residences known to us from this period were built of masonry (stone and brick) and are found in princely residential complexes (castles, courts and monasteries) and those belonging to the boyars (courts and monasteries).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Town/county</th>
<th>Complex of origin</th>
<th>Resident/commissioning individual</th>
<th>Construction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bistriţa/Neamţ</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buda/Buzău</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cătălui/Călăraşi</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Firizu/Mehedinţi</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hotin, Ukraine</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moldoviţa/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Netezi/Neamţ</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Polata/Gorj</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Probota/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Putna/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Runcu/Gorj</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyars</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Town/county</th>
<th>Complex of origin</th>
<th>Resident/commissioning individual</th>
<th>Construction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Slatina/Neamț</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Suceava/Suceava</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Suceava/Suceava</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Suceviţa/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Târgu Neamţ/Neamţ</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type 3: *Multistorey residence developed vertically (tower).* This type includes round and rectangular towers. Documented situations indicate that all known cases had a defensive role (as a donjon) as part of a castle or *curia* (court). All known cases relate to princely residences.

- **No**
- **Town/county**
- **Complex of origin**
- **Resident/commissioning individual**
- **Construction technique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Town/county</th>
<th>Complex of origin</th>
<th>Resident/commissioning individual</th>
<th>Construction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iaşi/Iaşi</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poienari/Argeș</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suceava/Suceava</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Târgovişte/Dâmboviţa</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turnu/Teleorman</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type 4: *Simple residence with cellar.* This type includes two-storey buildings: one storey raised above the surface (the inhabited space) and the other for the most part under ground level (the cellar). Materials and construction techniques include masonry (stone and/or bricks), wood (timber frame) and mixtures of both. From a social perspective, this type of residence is closely related to all elite groups under analysis: princes, boyars, clergy, and wealthy townsfolk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Town/county</th>
<th>Complex of origin</th>
<th>Resident/commissioning individual</th>
<th>Construction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baia/Suceava</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bistriţa/Neamţ</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bradu/Buzău</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cernica/Ilfiov</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Comana/Giurgiu</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cozia/Vâlcea</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Town/county</td>
<td>Complex of origin</td>
<td>Resident/commissioning individual</td>
<td>Construction technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curtea de Argeş/Argeş</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Curtea de Argeş/Argeş</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Filipeşti de Târg/Prahova</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hârlău/iaşi</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hinăteşti/Vâlcea</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mironoşti/Giurgiu</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Orhei/Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Mixed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Orhei/Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Piatra Neamţ/Neamţ</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Piscani/Argeş</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Piteşti/Argeş</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Polata/Gorj</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Proboţa/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Putna/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Râmnicu-Vâlcea/Vâlcea</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strehaia/Mehedinţi</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Suceava/Suceava</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Suceava/Suceava</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Timber frame Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Suceviţa/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Metropolitan bishop</td>
<td>Mixed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Târgovişte/Dâmboviţa</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Târgovişte/Dâmboviţa</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Town/county</td>
<td>Complex of origin</td>
<td>Resident/commissioning individual</td>
<td>Construction technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Târgovişte/ Dâmboviţa</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Târgovişte/ Dâmboviţa</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Metropolitan bishop</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Târgu Jiu/Gorj</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Târgu Trotuş/ Bacău</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Townsfolk</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vadu Anei/Ilfov</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Timber frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Vaslui/Vaslui</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vâcăreşti/Prahova</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Boyar</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Vodîţa/Mehedinţi</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Voroneţ/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type 5: Complex residence (palace). This class includes large buildings divided into multiple residential spaces, built on double or multiple tracts of land. Usually, buildings had one cellar and ground floor, but there are instances where a building had three levels: cellar, ground floor and first floor. The cellar could follow the same floor plan for the entire building or could be restricted to part of the building. Materials and construction techniques included masonry and mixed systems. The group comprises several examples, either in princely residences situated in capital cities or in monasteries erected by princes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Town/county</th>
<th>Complex of origin</th>
<th>Resident/commissioning individual</th>
<th>Construction technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bistriţa/Neamţ</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Mixed system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Putna/Suceava</td>
<td>Monastery</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Târgovişte/ Dâmboviţa</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Târgşor/Prahova</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clear conclusion from this review of typologies is that the most prevalent residence type is the simple residence with cellar (Type 4) which can be documented at

---

The conclusion is also supported by the finding that the urban sites at Târgovişte and Suceava each offer between 30 and 40 such residences. The only type to rival these numbers is the simple residence with one level (Type 1). The site at Bârlad, in Vaslui county, provides around twenty residences, while the urban sites of Suceava and Orhei together provide another ten. Especially worth noting is not only the prevalence of this residence type, but also its diffusion; in other words, it is remarkable that it was adopted by all social elites, which explains the large number of such constructions discovered. Putting together these two observations, we may postulate that the simple residence with a cellar was the main type of civil construction used by Romanian social elites in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. We may also add that no other type had such wide social diffusion, which means that the simple residence with cellar may be considered as the typical residence of the nobility in the Romanian Principalities in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries.

The residence of the Romanian nobility in detail

Although such a residence combined a cellar and ground floor, we must add that externally, it resembled a tower. In the majority of cases the cellar walls would be raised several feet above ground level, to allow for the incorporation of windows or air vents. In large buildings, the interior might be sectioned off into two or three naves by means of massive masonry arch vaults or wooden pillars. Arcades served as pressure relievers for the vaults (usually longitudinal barrel vaults) or as intermediary points of support for wooden ceilings. Access to the lower level was by a descending corridor (with or without steps) called gârlici, either outside or inside the building. The latter variation occurred only in stone- or brick-built structures, and seems to have been a later development. Regardless of variation, these corridors accessing the cellar are found both on the long and short sides of the structure, in various layouts. The raised ground floor is the least known part of the building. We believe that smaller residences (especially wood-built) had only one room, and that large residences were divided into multiple living spaces. The latter could employ wooden panels, masonry walls or a mixture of both. We have very little data on the amenities of these residences. The only detail documented by archaeological research is the regular presence of terracotta tile chimneypieces. The high quality of many terracotta tiles indicates that these chimneypieces were not only practical, but also most likely a sign of social distinction. A similar symbolism could have been attached to the access way to the raised ground floors, usually an outside

staircase supported by one of the long walls of the corridor to the cellar. The staircase led to the front door, where the extrados of the corridor formed a small covered platform or pavilion (Romanian: *foişor*) supported by wooden pillars or columns. This was where the lord of the residence would most likely address his vassals and servants gathered in the courtyard.\(^{17}\)

**The origins of the Romanian noble residence**

The typical residence of Romanian nobility did not develop out of earlier, indigenous trends.\(^{18}\) Current archaeological data on the civil architecture of the preceding period (eleventh to thirteenth centuries) give details on the ordinary residences of commoners. Prevalent among these were buried residences (Romanian: *bordei*) and half-buried small scale residences, as was also the case in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. The very few residences that do not fit this pattern and which may be associated to residents from the pre-state social elites likewise lack elements that could connect them to the type of construction analysed here.\(^{19}\)

Consequently, we must place its origins outside the Romanian medieval sphere, within neighbouring areas of the Byzantine-influenced Balkans or East-Central Europe. Surveying these areas, we have come to the conclusion that similar residences can only be encountered in medieval Hungary. Here, this type of structure belongs to the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, and presents all the variations found in the Romanian area (wood, masonry and mixed elements). In addition, we can also state that the social spectrum of the residents was similar to that in Romanian principalities, as archaeological research links them to the residences of royalty, nobility, clergy, and urban elites.\(^{20}\)

There were probably two avenues of influence southward and eastward from the Carpathian Mountains. The first was acculturation through permanent connections between the Hungarian kingdom and the two principalities, both before and after they became states: connections which took the form of temporary Hungarian annexation

---


of several regions, political relationships of vassalage between the Hungarian kings and Romanian princes, and also strong trade relations with the eastern part of the kingdom (Transylvania). Without a doubt, these relations offered the Romanian elites the opportunity to borrow the forms of Hungarian Gothic art, as we can observe in the fourteenth century. Historians of Romanian medieval art include here sculptures in stone and wood, attire, religious and lay silverware and even pottery.\(^{21}\) However, we must also add to the list civil architecture, because, like the other ‘aulic’ arts, it could meet the need for ostentatious shows of power. The first grand voivode of Wallachia is a case in point. A vassal to Hungarian King Charles Robert of Anjou, and considered one of the most powerful people in the kingdom,\(^{22}\) Basarab I erected in Argeş, around 1340, the oldest residence with a cellar in Wallachia,\(^{23}\) an exact replica of one of the royal Anjou residences in Visegrád.\(^{24}\)

The second avenue of influence comprised demographic movements over the course of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, from Transylvania into the future Romanian principalities.\(^{25}\) This migratory movement especially involved ethnic German and Hungarian settlers, who arrived in Wallachia and Moldavia for economic reasons, but also included Romanians, mainly political and religious refugees. We know for a fact that immigrants to the Principalities included representatives of the elites; at the very least, there is clear evidence for Germans and Romanians.\(^{26}\) On the other hand, archaeological research shows that the elites of the time were familiar with the type of residence we have discussed: it was used by Germans in Sighișoara in the thirteenth century, and by Romanian noblemen in the fourteenth.\(^{27}\) For the latter, the case of Bogdan I, founder of the independent Moldavian state, is illustrative. Before conquering the territory of the Romanians beyond the eastern Carpathians, he was voivode of the Romanians in Maramureș, a region of Transylvania, where he and his large family lived in a wooden house with a cellar and a raised ground floor.\(^{28}\) Between 1370–80 and in the early fifteenth century, his descendants built in Suceava two similar residences, one of

---

\(^{23}\) N. Constantinescu, Curtea de Argeș, 1200–1400. Asupra începuturilor Țării Românești, Bucharest, 1984, pp. 34–5 and Fig. 4.
\(^{24}\) Buzás & Szőke, ‘A visegrádi vár és királyi palota’, Fig. 11.
\(^{25}\) See Rusu, Castelarea carpatică, pp. 456–7, with similar remarks regarding the beginnings of Romanian military architecture.
wood and one of stone, which are the oldest known in Moldavia, leading to the premise that they followed the model brought over the mountains by their founding father.

The prevalence of the noble residence in Romanian civil architecture: several considerations

The considerations we have offered so far are sufficient to justify why the princes of Wallachia and Moldavia chose the simple residence with cellar, and also explain its diffusion in urban areas. However, the preference shown by other Romanian elites requires additional arguments. The starting point is of course its adoption by the princely courts in Argeş and Suceava. As these residences are the oldest types of buildings in each principality, it is believed that they acted as a role model for local elites, be these lay or religious. The social standard reflected in this type of residence was just one of the reasons why it gained prevalence in Romanian civil architecture. But, surely, other reasons, especially economic, must have played an important role.

One reason was that it answered the needs of the lordly household in the Principalities. It provided large cellars with low, constant temperatures suitable for storing the agricultural produce that boyars, clergy and even the urban patriciate (who owned rural domains) would collect in kind from their dependents, including grains, vegetables, fruit, and especially wine. Close to the northern limit of wine-growing Europe, the Principalities produced significant amounts both for personal consumption and for export to countries such as Poland or Russia.

Romanian elites did not have incomes comparable to those in Western Europe, and the relatively low cost of a simple residence with cellar must have been a close second economic motivation. There were several causes here: the local population dwindled in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and demographic growth was very slow; feudal domains were usually modest in scale and cases of dozens of villages were rare; the state’s fiscal revenue always superseded that of the feudal lords, an important part

34 Apetrei, *Reşedinţele boiereşti*, p. 244.
of which went to the Ottoman Empire as tribute and other types of political payments; long periods of acute political instability were marked by changes of princes and attacks from neighbouring powers; and princely political power was insufficient to protect urban elites from competition by foreign merchants, or to ensure their monopoly. These circumstances surely limited the construction sector, and especially the use of masonry, as is demonstrated in the buildings erected by the nobility. A further indicator is the number of castles built, which is very low compared to Western Europe. Thus it becomes evident that the Romanian elites could not afford to invest deeply in civil and defensive architecture, and duly chose a relatively cheap and easily built type of residence.

The simple residence with cellar indeed answered these needs, as it could be built using construction materials readily available in the Principalities. The vast forests preserved until the nineteenth century provided high-quality timber, while the rich river system provided stone for construction. Neither needed prior preparation, and master masons were only brought in from Transylvania for more important stone buildings. The simple residence with cellar proved to be, therefore, a flexible model open to adaptation to the resources of the individuals who commissioned such residences.

Conclusions

The simple residence with cellar represented the favourite type of civil construction over the course of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. Far from being the result of an evolution of indigenous rural forms, it represents a new example of adoption of Central European models and adaptation to Romanian medieval culture. Its adoption and prevalence resulted from a combination of the need to affirm social prestige, construction costs and the practical necessities of everyday life. This probably explains the prevalence of this nucleus of cellar, ground floor, gâărcii (corridor) and pavilion in elite civilian architecture in the Principalities towards the mid-seventeenth century. More than that, in the following centuries, with the increase in the standard of living in rural areas, this nucleus was adopted by the more affluent peasantry, becoming one of the common types of peasant residence. We may conclude that over the course of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, prestige and practical utility determined the vertical dissemination of this type of residence within Romanian society from top to bottom.

38 Only two such sites are currently known, built around the end of the 16th century, see Apetrei, Reședințele boierești, pp. 245–6.
40 See Apetrei, Reședințele boierești, pp. 124–5.
In July 1504, Stephen III of Moldavia, the only Greek-rite crusader fighting alongside Rome and Venice after the fall of Byzantium, died; by the 1570s, he was worshipped as a saint in the Orthodox Church. He had won fame in the wars against Mehmed II. In the early 1520s, a well-trained Jewish scholar and administrator from Venetian Crete, Elijah Capsali (c. 1485–c. 1550), wrote that the Jews had actually been the cause of the (first) war between Stephen and Mehmed (1473/1474–1479/1480). Persecuted by Stephen, they had turned to the Sultan, who had immediately marched against the Moldavian ‘tyrant’. Capsali, however, did not explicitly mention the source of the dispute between Stephen III and the Jews (dated some time before 1475).

Educated in Padua and Venice, well-versed in the political art of hiding history behind words, but also with significant Venetian administrative experience (he was condestabile of the Jews of Crete on several occasions), Elijah Capsali wrote in fact that Stephen III had tried to force his Jewish subjects (especially the merchants) to pay ransom. According to Capsali’s main work, Seder Elijahu Zuta (The Minor Chronology of Elijah), written around 1523, which developed in a much more analytical and less descriptive manner the Dibrey ha-Yamin le Malkhut Venezia (The Chronicle of the Venetian Realm) of some six years earlier, Stephen III had imprisoned all Jews from ‘a settlement’ (probably one of his Black Sea or Danubian ports) and demanded that they each pay a thousand gold pieces, for if not, I will take out the right eye of each of you and shame all the sons of Israel [The Jews retorted that] We are Turkish subjects and you will not be able to treat us as slaves and neither will you be able to touch our fortunes. The ruler of Moldavia however prevailed, angered moreover by the fact that the Jews, like the several Genoese living in Moldavia, did not regard themselves as his subjects, but as the subjects of another – greater – (foreign) authority: the Ottoman sultan, or the Crimean city of Caffa.

This history apparently completed the markedly negative inter-confessional and inter-religious contemporary image of Stephen III of Moldavia (never directly accused during his lifetime of being a ‘schismatic’, a rarity both for a Greek-rite Christian monarch and for a ruler who had spent a significant part of his first year of reign in the anti-unionist camp). During his main ‘crusader period’ (from the mid-1470s to the mid-1480s), he was accused of (mainly financial) oppression by the Hussites whom he had initially sheltered and by the Armenians, who in 1476 formed a special military unit in Stephen’s host facing Mehmed II’s invading army. By 1479 the Armenians had to turn to the Sultan against the prince; Mehmed intervened in their favour and Stephen immediately
stopped his abuses, at least according to Ecumenical Patriarch Maximos III Manases’ letter to the Republic of Venice after the conclusion of the Ottoman–Venetian peace, in which he praised the Sultan’s tolerance and power. In fact the conflict narrated by Capsali rounds out another image of Stephen III, glorious in particular in the Latin rite world, as the Greek-rite’s crusader arm. The victories of the Ottomans had ‘converted’ the Jews into another fifth column of the new power. After 1453, they were even viewed as the Ottoman guardians of Constantinople, where under Mehmed II their chief rabbi was Elijah’s uncle, Moses Capsali. Stephen III, the new hope of the Cross, could not be dissociated from the Jewish problem, exacerbated by holy wars and Muslim and Christian administrations. Crusaders, old and new, needed money. Not all costs could be covered through booty and the promises of monarchs. Crusader finance was further complicated by the disputes between Venice, Stephen III and Mathias Corvinus, the official captain of the crusaders’ mission in the East. Fiscal pressure could not be allowed to increase indefinitely, even in a holy cause—charges of tyranny, often synonymous in medieval speech with fiscal excesses, significantly contributed to the desertions that Stephen overcame with great difficulty in 1476 when Mehmed II invaded Moldavia.1

---

In mid-spring 1475, the impact of Stephen’s victory against Mehmed’s army at Vaslui grew daily. Venice sent the experienced diplomat Paolo Morosini to Rome, instructed to present not only (realistic) military options, but also financial solutions (as a basis for crusade negotiations) for support from Matthias and Stephen, ‘voivode of Serbia and Moldavia’, against the Ottomans. As elsewhere in Christendom, the Jews of Hungary and Moldavia represented a very useful financial option, given that despite previous commitments neither the Italian powers nor the Latin-rite neighbours of Matthias and Stephen appeared willing to take the Cross in any meaningful manner. Fifteen years earlier at the Diet of Mantua, Venice, still anxious to avoid war with Mehmed II, had instructed her envoy to explain to Pope Pius II that she could barely raise 5,000 ducats from the Jews in her lands, which was not worth the effort. Venice’s position had changed radically, probably due also to Morosini. He knew Hebrew, had worked as an administrator of Venetian finances, and a few years earlier had written a treatise ‘against the perfidy of the Jews’ dedicated to Paul II. His recent missions in the Orient, especially to the Turkmen ruler of Azerbaijan, Uzun Hassan, who apparently used Jewish resources and networks on a large scale, had strengthened Morosini’s conviction that the Jews had to be extensively exploited for the greater cause of the Cross.

Passages from the ‘military half’ of Morosini’s instructions in Latin, as presented to the papal curia after discussions based on the ‘financial half’ of the instructions, were extracted by the Republic of Venice to facilitate negotiations]. […] Exercitus igitur hoc ordine conficiendus/ bellumque quatripartito inferrendum opera precium arbitrantur, quo celerrime maxima Europae parte pellendum hostem non dubitant. Polonous namque Serenissimus Rex [Casimir IV Jagiello] facile ex-/pertioribus bello Polonis ac Boemis vigintiquinque millium conflagit exercitum;/ sumptuque simul Stephano Servie sive Mundavie Vayvoda [Stephen III of Moldavia] cum quinque millibus,/ transacto Danubio per Bulgariam per hostem invadant. Ungarie vero Serenissimus Rex [Matthias Corvinus]/ cum vigintiquinque millibus ex suis militia aptioribus et experist [!] per Serviam/ et iuxta Bossinam partier aggrediantur hostem […]. Morosini was not discussing huge military figures, going by other projects from the same year, 1475, according to which Matthias commanded over 100,000 soldiers from Hungary, Wallachia and Moldavia. From this point of view too, the Venetian project of 1475 featured several of the points Morosini had presented for the Republic at the Reichstag

1–4 (2007), pp. 25–39; Simon, ‘The Costs and Benefits of Anti-Ottoman Warfare: Documents on the Case of Moldavia (1475–1477)’, Revue Roumaine d’Histoire, 48, nos. 1–2 (2009), pp. 37–53 (in May 1477, Stephen asked Venice again for money in order not to make peace with the Ottomans, and was reminded that in summer 1475 he had made over 100,000 ducats profit from Christian prisoners and goods from Crimean Caffa, just conquered by the Ottomans). In comparison to Stephen III’s Moldavia, note also the unexpectedly favourable conditions enjoyed by the Jews in Hungary during Matthias’s reign, unlike the reigns of most of his predecessors since the end of the 13th century (N. Berend, At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and ‘Pagans’ in Medieval Hungary c. 1000–c. 1300, Cambridge, 2001, pp. 39–40, 91–100). King Matthias Corvinus also had a Jewish army corp, similar to Stephen III’s Armenian military corp of 1476; the existence of such ethnic-religious military cores, in particular in the cases of well-defined communities consisting especially of merchants or traders such as the Armenians and Jews, implied an Armenian or Jewish population of at least 5,000 souls. This Jewish army corp was part of Matthias’ triumphant parade through Vienna when he took it from Frederick III Habsburg in summer 1485 (see also Simon, Ștefan cel Mare și Matia Corvin. O coexistență medievală, Cluj-Napoca, 2007, pp. 279–80).
of Regensburg in 1471, when the idea of sending the Wallachians against the sultan had also resurfaced. The major difference between the two presentations was that by 1475, following Matthias’s recent anti-Ottoman actions, Frederick III of Habsburg lost his primacy in the crusade. In parallel, Venice fuelled the tensions between Matthias (her ‘strange ally’) and Stephen (whom she had promoted as an eastern crusader alternative) by further confusing their areas of interest. Serbia had been ‘awarded’ to Stephen but was also an old Hunyadi target for Matthias, just as it had been for his father John, who had further been promised Bulgaria, which Venice now ‘granted’ to Stephen, though less publicly. There were grounds enough both for the project’s success and for its failure, as Morosini well knew – even if only because he had passed through Moldavia at the time of the battle of Vaslui, and his testimony had fortified the credibility of the victory in Italy, used with Venetian exaggeration and disinformation (a year earlier, the Republic had even invented ‘crusader victories’ for her new favourite Stephen III of Moldavia).

Passages from the ‘financial half’ of the instructions received by Morosini in late March or early April 1475 […] Et perché stante le firmi tra fra la Maiesta Imperiale [Frederick III Habsburg], li Re de Polana [Casimir IV Jagiello] et de Boemia [Wladislaw II Jagiello], et il Re de Ungaria [Matthias Corvinus] et/ temendo loro, che ogni auctione et grandezza de forze che li habe ad dare el pon. Luy le habe ad/ volgrie contro de loro, non è da credere ch’el dicto Re [Matthias] posse may usire del suo regno per andare contro el Turco, se ad questo non sia facto debito proveditione. Se ricorda che a casone, ch’el dicto Re de Ungaria/ possi andare ad resistere allo inimicho et sucorre alle cose cristiane con gente utile et experta/ ch’el pontifice [Sixtus IV] li provedi, et manda quanto havera ricevuto delle decime de Chiexesi [i. e. the members of the clergy] et vigessime de Zudei in/ Italia. Mediante li quali, et le decime et vigessime de «Chiexesi et de> Zudei del suo regno, el [Matthias] possi fare quello pui numero de bona et experta gente <proveniente> (?) del suo stato et de Valachia [i. e. Moldavia], ch’el potrà/ al meno fin al numero de 25° in zoia […] dale contribuzione de decime et vigessime de Zudei, drino contradire li Signori de Italia, essendo […] ci fermò de loro questa pocha summa, et essendo loro subvenuti dal pon delle vigessime de li seculari delli loro stati […]]. Morosini knew that financing the crusade was at least as difficult as supporting it politically, and most often implied a political double-game, which he himself played and which was quite familiar to the Wallachians. At Regensburg in 1471, where Frederick III had appointed Morosini imperial councillor, Wallachian crusader involvement had been discussed once more, but depended on Matthias returning to the anti-Ottoman front as the only one whom the Wallachians would follow – as Venice too was forced to admit. Yet Matthias was at open war with Frederick. Meanwhile, John Vitéz and Janus Pannonius, the Hungarian friends of Morosini’s old patron, Cardinal Bessarion, together with Casimir IV, plotted Matthias’s dethronement. When Matthias withstood the attack, Venice had to reconsider her position. Although Frederick III still considered Stephen III, who had aided Matthias against the conspirators in 1471, his captain in Wallachia, Stephen chose to support Hungary and not Austria. In 1475, Morosini and Venice presented the dispute between Matthias and Frederick as virtually settled, but entangled Matthias in western and eastern tensions, especially after his marriage alliance with Ferdinand of Aragon, king of Naples, Venice’s main Italian adversary. The same ‘duplicitous’ factors applied in the ‘crusader case’ of the Jews. The major political
effects of working with the Jews were obvious and accepted (both favourable to the Republic, in Uzun Hassan’s case, and unfavourable, in Mehmed II’s case). However, there was the need for money, most easily obtained through violent pressure, and also a ‘more modern’ humanist antisemitism, which Morosini also embraced. Furthermore, in the case of the Jews there existed neither a basic Christian common ground, nor a Union of Florence that could have justified rapprochement and compromise based on the Turkish problem, as when Stephen III (and then Bogdan III and Stephen IV) and Wallachian subjects became Rome’s only Greek-rite crusaders after 1453. Although the Christian side was aware of practical conditions justifying a different approach, in crusader relations to the Jews matters were knowingly pushed to the limit. The only one who most likely refrained was Matthias, otherwise in great financial need, while Venice and – apparently – Stephen went (violently) after the money. It was therefore perhaps no accident that a pogrom took place in Venice in 1480, a few months after the official announcement of peace between the Porte and the Republic that left Venice with her pride wounded – since then she began calling herself the Serenissima – and with finances bleeding – at least as important as her injured pride.

In 1475, Roman funding to Matthias for Hungary and Moldavia was to be (at least) supplemented through contributions from the Jews in the areas under his authority, both nominal and real. Venice and other powers already perceived Matthias as Moldavia’s suzerain, even if only in matters affecting crusading, before the Moldavian–Hungarian treaty of Iași of July 1475. Jewish contributions were significant and justified enough for the lords of Italy, reluctant about such ‘co-financing agreements’, to keep their lay subjects’ vigessimae. At average Hungarian monthly wages of two florins for a foot-soldier and three florins for a rider, the sum required for the king’s campaign, at least three months long if it were to be successful with a minimal effective force of 25,000 men (as proposed by Morosini), mostly cavalry, exceeded 170,000 florins (one Hungarian florin was the equivalent of one Venetian ducat). Given the expenses involved over the same time span for 5,000 Moldavian riders, the sum eventually exceeded 200,000 florins (most often the Moldavians earned Hungarian wages or slightly below; one reason for increasing crusader interest in the Wallachians in the 1460s and early 1470s was that the Wallachians cost up to 50% less than the other soldiers – mainly Western, and especially German – that were to join the Hungarians against the Ottomans).  

---

This was a solid crusader expedition plan, well calculated and argued. Stephen III was included not only by name or common purpose, but also through the fiscal edifice sustaining the plan. More than the use of tithes, the use of the Jewish taxes to support Stephen’s cavalry indicates that he was, at least from Rome’s and Venice’s perspective, legally a member of the judicial and military structures of western Christendom as the Oriental spearhead of her crusade. The Venetian calculus further reveals that the Jews in Moldavia were a non-negligible financial (and perhaps demographic) quantity. The proportion of 5:1 that Venice established between Matthias’s and Stephen’s armies roughly reflects the populations of Hungary, with at best three million inhabitants, and Moldavia, with around half a million before the Ottoman campaign of 1476. If we apply these proportions to the Jewish funding for the crusade, the result is a far more numerous Jewish population than previously admitted. In Hungary the tendency has been to limit estimates to approximately 5,000 Jews, which is impossible as Matthias had a Jewish military corp of between 500 and 1,000 men and the minimum proportion between general population and soldiers in non-military communities such as the Szeklers and Wallachians was 1:10. Minimum figures for Jewish populations would therefore be 10,000 in Hungary and 1,500 in Moldavia (maximum estimates would be 2.5 times greater). Significant numbers of Jews had fled Hungary due to Louis I of Anjou’s persecutions in the 1360s, coming to Moldavia together with the ‘founder’ of the new state, Bogdan I. However, more Jews apparently came from the east and south, from territories dominated by Muslim powers, in particular the Tartars, with whom the Jews collaborated and who for at least half a century controlled the urban centres at the mouths of the Danube and Dniester. Another significant contingent of Jews came from Poland, moving south with their traditional Armenian rivals, the old protégés of the

Moldavian rulers. The largely urban Jewish communities represented up to 20% of the population of Moldavian boroughs, towns and cities, an urban population that, as in the rest of the region and in Hungary, stood for between 5% and 10% of the total population. Such a percentage placed the Jews on a par with the Armenians, Germans (Saxons) and Italians (mainly Genoese) in respect of commercial urban power, and probably above the Wallachians and Hungarians. Elijah Capsali’s text thus has a different weight.3

3 For questions of medieval Wallachian demographics, see Papacostea, ‘Populaţie şi fiscalitate în Țara Românească în secolul al XV-lea: un nou izvor’, Revista de istorie, 33, no. 9 (1980), pp. 1779–86; Papacostea, ‘Din nou cu privire la demografia Țării Românești în secolul XV’, Revista de istorie, 37, no. 6 (1984), pp. 577–81. For the Jews and other urban communities in the Principalities: M. Cazacu, ‘La tolérance religieuse en Valachie et en Moldavie depuis le XIVe siècle’, in: Histoire des idées politiques de l’Europe centrale, eds C. Millon Delsol & M. Maslowski, Paris, 1998, pp. 109–25; unfortunately, the source for the Jewish exodus from Hungary to Moldavia and Wallachia in the 1360s is not clearly indicated); L. Rădvan, At Europe’s Borders: Medieval Towns in the Romanian Principalities, Leiden & Boston, 2010, pp. 439–42. For the Jews of Hungary in the late 1400s, an overview: A. Kubinyi, ‘Ethnische Minderheiten in den ungarischen Städte des Mittelalters’, in: Städtische Randgruppen und Minderheiten, eds B. Kirchgässner & F. Reuter, Sigmaringen, 1986, pp. 183–99; A. Kubinyi, ‘Zur Frage der Toleranz im mittelalterlichen Königreich Ungarn’, in: Toleranz im Mittelalter, eds A. Patschovsky & H. Zimmermann, Sigmaringen, 1998, pp. 187–206 (pp. 191–6). For populations and social structures: Simon, Ștefan cel Mare și Mateia Corvin, pp. 238–46, 279–80. For the exchange rates of the era: Ş. Pamuk, ‘Money in the Ottoman Empire, 1326–1914’, in: An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1914, eds H. Inalcik & D. Quataert, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 947–80 (951–6). For medieval urbanisation, see also W. W. Munhardt, ‘Urbanization, Culture and the Dutch Origins of the European Enlightenment’, in: The International Relevance of Dutch History, eds K. van Berkel & L. Goei, Amsterdam, 2010, pp. 141–77 (in these matters: pp. 143–4). For a general mobilisation in Wallachia or Moldavia in the 1470s, we must accept a ratio of 1:15 between the population of the state and its great army, as in the case of other projects from 1475. Wallachia was then listed with 38,000 soldiers and Moldavia with 32,000. In effect, the professional army of Moldavia consisted at best of 12,000 men, of which about half could have been regarded as the real standing army, including the troops stationed in Moldavia’s fortresses (under Peter IV Rareș in the 1530s, 3,000 soldiers were in permanent paid service to the ruler, apparently forming a sort of personal guard). In Hungary the number most likely fluctuated between 20,000, maybe even 25,000, in the 1460s, and around 40,000 including the approximately 8,000 border soldiers stationed at the Ottoman frontier, as well as different paid auxiliaries of the Crown. In the age of the Jagiellonians the number of soldiers in paid annual royal service did not exceed 8,000, and in the years to come the king could rely on 25,000 soldiers, at best, if the troops of the barons joined him. On these matters, starting with various case studies of battles and military decisions of the 1460s and 1470s, see: A. Kubinyi, ‘Die südlichen Grenzfestungen Ungarns am Ende des Mittelalters’; in Kubinyi, Matthias Corvinus. Die Regierung eines Königreiches in Ostmitteleuropa 1458–1490, Herne, 1999, pp. 188–201; P. Fodor, ‘The Simurgy and the Dragon. The Ottoman Empire and Hungary (1390–1533)’, in: Fight against the Turk in Central–Europe in the First Half of the 16th Century, ed. I. Zombori, Budapest, 2004, pp. 9–35 (see especially, pp. 19–24); Simon, ‘The Arms of the Cross: Stephen the Great’s and Matthias Corvinus’ Christian Policies’, in: Between Worlds, vol. I (Stephen the Great, Matthias Corvinus and their Time), eds L. L. Koszta, O. Mureșan & Simon, Cluj-Napoca, 2007, pp. 45–86 (pp. 62–65); Simon, ‘Brancho’s Son and the Walachians: A Milanese Perspective on the Battle of Baia (I–II)’, Historical Yearbook, 7 (2009), pp. 187–200, and ibid, 8 (2010), pp. 195–220. A possible method of estimating the number of Jews in Moldavia should start from the 1,000 gold pieces per person that Capsali records Stephen III demanding as ransom from the Jewish merchants. The sum was most likely expressed in Turkish aspers. In ducats or florins it would represent a small fortune that at times not even the wealthier Moldavian boyars were able to take out of the country. The sum was thus smaller, at 20–25 ducats; in the 1470s the exchange rate between ducats and aspers fluctuated between 1:40 and 1:50. Depending on the duration of their involvement in the campaign (from 3 to 6 months), and on the wages paid to the cavalry (probably less than the 3 ducats/florins paid to a Hungarian cavalryman, yet not below 2 ducats/florins), the 5,000-strong crusader army corp commanded by Stephen III in Morosini’s project would have cost at least 30,000 and at most around 80,000 ducats (the last figure is strikingly similar to the sum sent by Venice to her captain Stephen III of Moldavia at the end of 1492, to defend her interests at the border of the Ottoman Empire, from which the Republic feared war). Assuming that Capsali was referring to a tax on all of Stephen III’s
The Jews did not start the confrontations between Stephen III of Moldavia and Mehmed II. Instead, the decisive factors were Stephen’s Pontic–Genoese and Danubian–Wallachian disputes, Venice’s failures against the Ottomans, Papal and Byzantine émigré plans in Italy, and Uzun Hassan’s Oriental actions. However, given Venetian calculations after the battle of Vaslui, we must accept that the Jews and their money also fed the conflict on the eve of the direct clash between prince and Sultan in summer 1476. Capsali emphasised the link between Stephen’s persecution and Mehmed’s Moldavian campaign, and personalised their conflict as marked by human and financial sacrifice and excesses beyond the limits of their characteristic pragmatism. Indeed, in 1475 and especially in 1476, in the months preceding the Moldavian campaign, both Mehmed II and Stephen III sacrificed family members, lives and money, as neither was willing to settle their conflict and both were under growing influence and pressure from those calling for more blood – Latin and Greek Christians among Stephen’s crusaders, Muslims on Mehmed’s side. The Moldavian domestic consequences of the conflict are difficult to estimate, although due to the urban position of the Jews these directly influenced the fate of the ports. In winter 1474/1475, the harbour towns welcomed the Ottomans; Stephen III retook them shortly after Vaslui. In the summers of 1475 and 1476, the harbours withstood Ottoman attacks. In 1484, they fell forever to the Ottomans. The list of those supposedly to blame for this disaster was long from the beginning, and Venice too featured. In late 1492, however, Ottoman fear of the Republic and Stephen’s growing regional importance after Matthias’s death in 1490 officially reconciled Venice to the prince, who (once again) became her captain-general in the East, paid at least 70,000 ducats to represent her interests at the European borders of the Ottomans. Remembering the crusader failures of 1476 and 1484 and under their influence, Stephen III built and rebuilt princely courts and churches with this money. The restoration of relations between Suceava and Venice swayed the Republic of St. Mark not to release any more delicate information on the prince’s actions, as she had done in 1477 when Stephen had tried to coerce her to grant more subsidies. Consequently, in all likelihood, Elijah Capsali’s voice remained isolated, although the Republic’s attitude had gradually evolved over the last decades, becoming more tolerant in its attitude towards those Jews

Jewish subjects, the numbers of the Jewish communities in Moldavia fluctuated in the mid-1470s between 1,500 and 4,000 souls, i.e. between roughly 0.3% and 0.9% of total population and 3% to 8% of an urban population of 10% of the total population of the country, or 6% to 16% of an urban population of only 5% of the total. This would be the safest interpretation, although cast in doubt by the almost five decades between the events narrated in Moldavia and Capsali’s chronicle, by the currency used in Venetian Crete where he wrote (naturally the Venetian ducat), by the fact that medieval taxation was generally imposed per family, not per subject (although the so-called Opferpfennig was collected in the Holy Roman Empire from all Jews above the age of twelve, for which see P. Rauscher, ‘Widerspenstige Kammerknechte. Die kaiserlichen Massnahmen zur Erhebung von Kronsteuer und Goldenem Opferpfennig in der Frühen Neuzeit’, Aschkenas. Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden, 14 (2004), pp. 313–63), and also by the existence of a Jewish quarter in a city such as Cetatea Albă (the main harbour at the mouths of the Dniester) since the 14th century, inhabited by around 10,000 people (Gh. I. Brătianu, Marea Neagră, ed. V. Spinei, Bucharest, 1988, p. 89). In the end, we must stress that (only) in the 1930s did the Jews represent (at least) 4% of the total population of Greater Romania, probably double in the eastern parts of the state (see ‘Populaţia României’, in: Enciclopedia României, vol. I, Bucharest, 1938, p. 148).
who had either lived for generations or only arrived recently in the vast lands of St. Mark.  

Consequently, interpreting the Jewish problem in Stephen III’s Moldavia as a matter of antisemitism must be submitted to a prudent and balanced analysis, and, further, cannot be separated from the problem of Helena, Stephen III’s daughter by Evdochia Olelkovic of Kyiv, who in 1482 married Ivan Ivanovich, son and heir of Ivan III of Moscow, and was later accused of being a key member of the influential sect of the so-called ‘Judaisers’: see G. Vernadsky ‘The Heresy of the Judaizers and the Policies of Ivan III of Moscow’, *Speculum*, 8, no. 3 (1933), pp. 436–54; D. Cyzevskij, ‘Die Judaisierenden und Hussiten Litterarische Lesefründe’, *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 17, no. 1 (1940), pp. 120–2; J. V. A. Fine Jr, ‘Feodor Kuritsyn’s Laodikiiskoe Poslanie and the Heresy of the Judaizers’, *Speculum*, 41, no. 3 (1966), pp. 500–4; it should also be noted that Feodor Kuritsyn, Ivan III’s envoy to Buda and Suceava, who concluded the Hungarian–Moldavian–Muscovite alliance of 1483, played an essential part in the spread in the Greek rite environment of Hungarian–Moldavian stories about Vlad III Dracula of Wallachia. It is possible that after 1484 antisemitic feelings spread (this might be one possible interpretation of an image at the Moldavian monastery of Putna, where Stephen III was buried, from the spring of the year following the Ottoman conquest of the southern Moldavian harbours. See the image and information in *Repertoriul monumentelor și obiectelor de artă din timpul lui Ștefan cel Mare*, ed. M. Berza, Bucharest, 1958, pp. 295–6, doc. 89). It is (equally) possible that such feelings were rapidly neutralised after the Ottoman–Moldavian peace of 1486 (this is the possible meaning of Stephen III’s decrees in favour of the Armenians, Greeks and Jews, the main non-Muslim associates of the Ottomans, mentioned under his nephew Stephen IV in 1526; see the source in *Izvoare și mărturii*, vol. I, pp. 155–6).
Urban elites of Lviv: emergence, development, and self-representation

Olga Kozubska-Andrusiv

This article focuses on the urban elites of Lviv from the second half of the fourteenth century (when the relevant written sources become available) to the second half of the seventeenth century (when, after the Cossack wars, the town entered a period of gradual decline), showing the main features of the formation and development of the elite and its members’ strategies for securing and advertising their social status. Due to its economic and political power Lviv, capital of the Rus’ Palatinate (Galician Rus’, Red Rus’), is a remarkable, almost exceptional urban centre in the historical regions of present-day Ukraine. The town secured its outstanding position through a wide range of royal political, legal, and economic privileges, such as the full staple right for oriental goods in the second half of the fourteenth century. The town was thus able to attract wealthy people seeking new markets and opportunities for profit, which, together with growing autonomy for the urban government, led to the development of a social group which can rightfully be called an urban elite.

Ukrainian historiography on social and political elites developed within the so-called ‘statehood trend’ (of which the main representative was V. Lypynsky, 1882–1931), which focused on the history of the state and the role of national elites in the process of state-building.1 Characteristic of this trend was the study of recognised ‘statehood periods’ in Ukrainian history: Kievan Rus’ (often called ‘the Princely times’), the Het’manshchyna,2 and the revolution of 1917–21 in Ukraine. On the one hand this was a reaction against the ‘populist school’ (headed by V. Antonovych and M. Hrushevsky) that declared the history of the Ukrainian people its principal subject; on the other, it became necessary to re-construct the national past in parallel with the construction of a national state. The topic of urban elites, however, was not a focus for the national

---


2 Hetmanschina is a term developed to designate Ukrainian territories ruled by the Cossack Hetman from the mid 17th century till 1764; a synonym for the ‘Cossack State’. See Entsylklopedia istorii Ukrainy, vol. II, ed. I. Smoliy, Kyiv, 2004.
historical narrative at that time,\textsuperscript{3} and one reason for this could be that the indigenous Ukrainian population was in the minority in towns and poorly represented, if at all, in the elite stratum.\textsuperscript{4}

Another reason was that not every town had a social upper stratum that could be regarded as an urban elite: a narrow group of citizens who governed the city and controlled its social, economic and charitable institutions.\textsuperscript{5} To develop a local elite, a town (urban community) needed a high degree of autonomy providing political power, and substantial economic strength supplying a steady source of income for the local upper stratum and enabling a distinctive way of life, presenting and legitimising their exceptional position through material and symbolic means in public spaces. At the time, not many towns in the historical regions of present day Ukraine offered circumstances favourable to the development of urban elites (as mentioned above, Lviv was an exceptional case). Smaller, economically weaker, politically insignificant towns were in the majority, their urban institutions and inner life dominated by private owners or royal representatives, and they could not provide the necessary ground for the development of urban elites. These towns only confirm the thesis that economic stagnation encourages social stagnation.\textsuperscript{6}

During the Soviet period, Ukrainian historiography, following the official Marxist ideology, avoided ‘elite questions’ altogether – the term ‘elite’ was practically absent in the discourse of social history – and spoke instead of ‘ruling classes’/’exploiters’ and ‘the common folk’, giving clear preference to the latter.

After Ukraine became an independent state in 1991, the topic of social elites became very popular. The revival of scholarly interest went in parallel with discussions on elites in contemporary society, conducted by journalists, political experts, and politicians. Unlike previous periods which preferred such synonyms as ‘aristocracy’, ‘nobility’, ‘upper social strata’, ‘ruling classes’, etc., nowadays the term ‘elite’ has become widespread both in mass media and in scholarship. A great deal of post-Soviet research

\textsuperscript{3} Even though there are a number of works on urban social history in Ukrainian lands written by Ukrainian and Russian historians during the late 19\textsuperscript{th}–early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, little has been published on urban elites as such. See thus M. Vladimirsky-Budanov, \textit{Nimetske pravo v Polschhi i Lytvi}; V. Anonowych, \textit{Ukrainski mista}; D. Bahaliy, \textit{Magdeburzke pravo na Livoberezhny Ukrayini}, as published in the two-volume edition: \textit{Rozvidky pro mista i mishchanstwo na Ukraini–Ray v XV–XVIII w.}, 2 vols, Lviv, 1903–1904. I. Linnichenko’s study of the social groups of Galician Rus’ also included a chapter on burgheers (the other two chapters dealt with nobility and peasants respectively). See I. Linnichenko, \textit{Cherty iz istorii sosloviy v Yuho–Zapadnoy Galitskoy Rasi XIX–XX v.}, Moscow, 1894.

\textsuperscript{4} Two important works of the time on the urban elite of Lviv (‘patricians of Lviv’) were by the Polish historians W. Loziński & J. Skoczek. See Loziński, \textit{Patrycyiat i mieszczaństwo lwowskie w XVI i XVII wieku}, Lviv, 1902; Skoczek, \textit{Studia nad patrycjatem lwowskim wieków średnich}, Lviv, 1929.


focused once more on the state, and on representatives of state power. Prominent authors of Soviet Ukrainian historiography (often former specialists in the history of the Communist party) easily converted to the newly-restored ‘statehood trend’, promoting ideas they had previously decried as ‘bourgeois and nationalist’. Many others, however, especially of the younger generation, approached the subject of social elites from new perspectives and interpreted local source materials using methodologies taken from western scholarship (for instance, the history of mentality, as in the case of N. Yakovenko). As in earlier times, the term ‘elite’ traditionally meant the aristocracy, or members of the Cossack upper military and administrative ranks (political elites), although in some cases secular intellectual and church elites were also considered. Studies on urban elites sometimes focus on later periods such as the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and most likely consider not the ruling stratum, but the so-called ‘intelligentsia’, the intellectual elite involved in political activity. New work on the ruling elites of Lviv has also been written in the past decade. The available literature demonstrates that there were different categories of elite, and that different groups were recognised as elites at different times and from different points of view. Being time- and context-specific, the concept of elite must be clarified on each occasion. Thus we start with a question: who would be recognised as belonging to the urban elite in late medieval and early modern times?

The town council and the emergence of urban elites

No definition of the urban elite could possibly exclude tenure of high political office: this remains one of most important criteria for elite membership, and is a definition used by most historians. Indeed, the decisions taken by the political elite, their activities and attitudes exercised a strong influence on both the physical appearance of their towns and the quality of life of the inhabitants. The main characteristic of urban elites in Poland (of which Galician Rus’ was a part), as elsewhere in Catholic Europe, was access to political power in an administratively autonomous urban centre; other attributes

---


Urban elites of Lviv

were wealth, privilege and signs of social prestige. All these applied to members of urban governments in the larger royal towns. For instance, Z. Noga’s study of Cracow identified local town councillors as the ruling elite, since they made political decisions affecting the urban community, or at least could influence such decisions, and they dominated other urban institutions such as the body of judges (collegium scabinale). The example of Lviv confirms this idea: once developed, the town council gradually assumed control over the inner life of the whole community, began to represent the town at official ceremonies such as coronations, and regulated the inner life of the town.

The structures of urban government in Lviv in the latter fourteenth century were: the town court (collegium scabinale), headed by an advocatus (German Vogt) and the town council (collegium consulaire) with its burgomaster. The first known list of six town councillors is from 1353: nos igitur consules tunc in consilio existentes: Thimo, Henricus Platner, Cunate de Stunow, Iacetus de Jaroslav, Johannes de Memil, Iaklo faber, denique Brunone tunc advocatiam tenente [ac alys omnibus civibus infrascriptis nostris dilectis fratribus et amicis (…)]. This list was copied into a document from 1359, when that year’s councillors (Pescone de Gniezna, Nicolao Czambor, Symone, Nicolao rutheno, Nicolao Kisielink) confirmed the rent of the local mill set by their predecessors in 1353.

Initially the advocatus in Lviv, as in other towns, was the landowner’s representative, who administered the urban community on his behalf and exercised justice, presiding over a local court of scabini chosen from the citizens. Once a community gained the advocatia, this increased urban autonomy, since the advocatus became an official appointed (elected) by the town councillors, dependent on the urban authorities and not on the owner (in this case the king). Prince Wladyslaw of Opole issued a charter in 1378 granting Lviv the advocatia and the right to choose an advocatus from among the councillors.

The charter of 1378 also contains the earliest information on how the urban government was to be formed and elections to the council conducted: councillors were to be elected by the citizenry, with subsequent confirmation by the ruler (in reality by his local representative, the starosta). It is evident from the document that the governing institution was to a great extent formed by members of the community (although it is not clear whether ordinary citizens were meant here), and that the composition of

13 The office of advocatus was hereditary and had a number of privileges attached: for instance, an advocatus, serving as intermediary between the lordly landowner and the community, received 1/3 of court fees, a part of local taxes, plots of land and shops free of tax, etc. All material and financial benefits were incorporated into the city finances in 1378.
16 Volumus etiam quod cum supradiicti cives cosules ipsorum de scitu tamen nostro eligerint et per nos supradiicti consules confirmati fuerint, extunc idem consules electi advocatam de medio ipsorum, quem voluerint debent eligere quando et quociens ipsorum placuerit voluntati. See Privilegia civitatis Leopoliensis, p. 41.
government could be changed (at least partially) every year.\textsuperscript{17} The town accounts books from 1404–1414 confirm such rotations, listing annually elected councillors: \textit{sub Anno Domini 1405 hii electi sunt ad consulatum: Petrus Eyzenhuttel, Johannes Sommerstein, Nicolaus Gebel, Conradus Rippen, Nicolaus Schmedfeld, Nicolaus Berner, sub Anno Domini 1406 hii electi sunt ad consulatum: honesti Petrus Eyzenhuttel, Johannes Worst, Nicolaus Berner, Nicolaus Rewssse [former scabinus], Andreas Clug [former scabinus], Petrus Kurschner; sub Anno Domini 1407 hii electi sunt ad consulatum: honesti Johannes Worst, Neco Rewssse, Petrus pellifex, Clug Andris, Weynko Weydenburg et Johanne de Styna.} Annual elections did not prevent councillors from being chosen again: in A. Czolowski’s opinion, it was even required that some (usually three out of six) councillors from the previous year stay with the new members in the next year.\textsuperscript{18} Early lists of councillors and judges reveal that members of the \textit{collegium scabinorum} were often elevated into the council (\textit{collegium consulorum}), as were other office holders (such as town scribes) as well as the kinsmen of councillors.

The document from 1359 refers to a certain \textit{Nicolaao rutheno} among the councillors, suggesting that indigenous Orthodox Ruthenians (Ukrainians) were not excluded from election to urban governing institutions at this time. Yearly lists of councillors used in the mid-nineteenth century by D. Zubrzycki, author of the ‘Lviv Chronicle’, referred for instance to Hanuszko Czerkes (1407), Nicolaus Reuse (1410), Neco Reusse (1411), and Jan Czerkis Rusin (1418), whom most historians (including Zubrzycki himself) saw as Ruthenians, given that Ruthenians were accepted to citizenship in Lviv. At the same time, it is possible that councillors of Ruthenian origin had already converted to Roman Christianity, and could thus represent ‘Romans’ in the town. It has also been pointed out that the ethnonym \textit{ruthenus} or \textit{Reusse} may sometimes signify a place of residence or origin, and not ethnic or religious identity.\textsuperscript{19} Thus the question of whether or not Ruthenians were excluded from election to the council at the early stages of its existence remains open. Later, approximately from the sixteenth century onward, there is no evidence that members of the Orthodox community of Lviv were admitted to the governing institutions. On the contrary, religious differences became a reason for segregation, and Ruthenians complained in petitions to the king that the council even considered their oath invalid in the town court (\textit{coram iure et iudicio civili Leopoliensi testimonium talium hominum ritus Ruthenici […] non admittitur}).\textsuperscript{20}

Another Christian community of Lviv, the Armenians, managed to develop their own court headed by an Armenian \textit{advocatus} (for instance \textit{Bogdan advocatus armenorum}, mentioned in 1386),\textsuperscript{21} and enjoyed a great degree of jurisdictional autonomy. Armenians

\textsuperscript{17} See Kapral, \textit{Urzędnicy miasta Lwowa}, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{19} Kapral, \textit{Urzędnicy miasta Lwowa}, p. 8.
were rarely accepted as citizens and did not take part in urban government; their separate jurisdictional standing was only annulled by the Austrian government in 1784.\textsuperscript{22}

Potential candidates offered considerable sums to be elected to the council. This money went into a common consular fund and was then shared equally among members, regardless of whether a consul had voted for a candidate or against him.\textsuperscript{23} The consular fund, separate from the city finances, was raised from different sources: fines, fees for acceptance to the town law (citizenship), incomes from landed estates (the villages of Zbra and Sykhiv), a part of the wine excise, revenues from the consular mill on a tributary of the Poltva river, and certain fees paid by guilds; moreover, councillors were freed from paying state and communal taxes, and permitted to brew and sell alcohol beverages without paying duty.\textsuperscript{24}

The superior position of the town councillors is evident from the titles found in the documents: they were called \textit{domini Consules} in Latin, or \textit{Herren}, ‘lords’, in documents written in German. Distinctions became especially prominent later on, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. D. Zubrzycki remarked in his ‘Chronicle’ under the year 1538 that councillors also used the title \textit{Spectabilis}, usually reserved for high state dignitaries (for instance the Palatine of Radom, Spytek from Tarnow, was addressed as \textit{Spectabilis et Magnificus}).\textsuperscript{25} Until 1662, a member of Lviv council enjoyed the title \textit{Spectabilis et Famatus Dominus}, while an ordinary citizen was only \textit{Ingenuus}, \textit{Honestus} or \textit{Providus}. After the ennoblement of Lviv in 1658, councillors took the title \textit{Nobiles et Spectabiles Domini}, judges \textit{Nobiles et Honorati}, and the whole community became the \textit{Honorata Communitas}. An academic degree also secured a special title. A doctor in medicine or philosophy became \textit{Egregius} and \textit{Nobilis}, while a doctor of law was \textit{Nobilis et Clarissimus}.

\subsection*{Oligarchisation of the urban government and ‘aristocratisation’ of the elite}

Available sources from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries do not mention any communal unrest caused by abuses of power or the usurpation of public finances by councillors.\textsuperscript{26} The situation changed in the early sixteenth century, around 1519, when the community accused the council of spending public money for its own purposes, and the king organised a special commission to investigate, which included Stanislaw of Chodecz (from 1501 to 1529 the \textit{palatinus} of the Rus’ Palatinate), his brother Otto and Archbishop Bernard of Lviv. The commission established a new institution to manage

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} S. Bara\'cz, \textit{Rys dziejów ormiańskich}, Tarnopol, 1869, p. 141.
\item \textsuperscript{23} D. Zubrzycki, \textit{Kronika miasta Lwowa}, Lviv, 1844, p. 20.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Ibid, pp. 21–2.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid, p. 143.
\item \textsuperscript{26} This was interpreted as a ‘democratic period’ in the formation of the city government since local citizens, referred to in documents as \textit{fratibus et amicis}, were involved in elections. See J. Ptasnik, ‘Walki o demokratyzacje Lwowa od XVI do XVIII wieku’, \textit{Kwartalnik Historyczny}, 39 (1925), p. 228.
\end{itemize}
public property (the *Lonheria*) and developed a new order of urban administration called the *Plantatio regiminis Civitatis* (no text preserved).  

The new order modified the terms of the town council’s composition significantly. The office of councillor became life-long, and after a member’s death the council would appoint the next member from among the judges (*scabini*) through co-option, without the consent of the citizens. Moreover, councillors doubled in number, so that from then on the council consisted of twelve (rather than six) members who exercised their duties by rotation: six councillors, the *consules residentes*, sat for one year and were then replaced by the other six (*consules antiqui*) in the next year. Such re-organisation made the council of Lviv a closed oligarchic institution, virtually independent of the rest of the community, so that modern scholars have seen it as a step backward in the development of local government and as a change ‘from democracy to aristocracy’.

In addition, the new order brought the local ruling elites more independence from the state authorities, comparable to that enjoyed by the towns of Cracow or Poznan where similar developments had previously taken place: in Cracow at the end of the fifteenth century and in Poznan in 1504. There, however, new councillors were appointed by the *wojewoda/palatinus* (in Cracow) or by the king (in Poznan), and not by the council itself as in Lviv. The new governor (*starosta/capitaneus*) Nikolaus Odnowski (Herburt), who succeeded the brothers Chodecz in the post, questioned the exclusive rights of the town council in Lviv and claimed that the appointment of new councillors belonged to him, as royal representative. Nevertheless, the councillors obtained a special privilege from the king in 1541, confirming their rights and strengthening their position. The privilege declared that Lviv councillors could indeed elect new members from the *Collegium Scabinale*, while the *starosta* was to appoint only the royal burgomaster. Thus by the mid-sixteenth century, the ruling elite in Lviv had gained unprecedented autonomy and practically full control over the government.

Interpreting communal conflicts in Lviv, historians from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have presented these in contemporary terms as ‘struggles for democratisation’, seeing the deterioration of citizen rights and freedoms and oligarchisation of the ruling stratum as the main source of riots. However, the first known conflict from 1519 was about the misuse of city finance by members of the town council. Moreover, the new election order was only questioned in 1541, not by a member of the urban community, but by the nobleman and royal official Nikolaus Odnowski. Apparently, ‘democracy’, as understood by modern historians, was not the primary concern for Lviv burghers at that time.

It was not until 1576 that citizens (merchants and guilds, together with the *collegium scabinale*) prepared a petition that listed the abuses done to the community by the ruling

---

27 The noblemen and archbishop were commissioned by the king to settle the conflict between the citizens and the council, when citizens blamed the councillors for the misuse of public funds. See Zubrzycki, *Kronika*, p. 129.
29 Czołowski, *Pogłąd*, p. 32.
elites, and sent it to the king with their complaints about governmental ill practices. The petition described a deplorable state of administration in Lviv: spending and incomes of the town were not controlled, money was wasted, and royal decrees ignored; councillors abused their power and protected relatives and friends, so that one family ruled the city (this was a reference to the Szolz family, when Wolf Scholz was burgomaster, one of his sons an advocatus, others judges, his sons-in-law councillors, etc.). However, the main motive of the petitioners was monetary: because of the double coronation in Poland in 1576, burghers had to pay a double tax that year as well as finance the town’s defences. At the same time they found out that villages belonging to urban landed estates were a source of private income for councillors who did not themselves pay tax. The protesters asked King Stephan Báthory to reform the administration of public finances as well as the elections to urban government: that is, to terminate co-option and life-long tenure for councillors, to reduce their number to six, and to reinstate communal control over the urban finances.

A century later, the Lviv chronicler and councillor, B. Zimorowicz, gave a strongly negative verdict on the turmoil of 1576, calling the complaints groundless and presenting the protest as an attack on the existing social order and local authorities by ‘handworkers’ (mechanici) and ‘plebs’, and also assuring his readers that the king, rex aequissimus, had not recognised their claims. Symptomatic here is Zimorowicz’s negative attitude towards artisans, and the association of ‘mechanical work’ with plebs. Apparently, growing social exclusivity was associated with the gradual elimination of the craft guilds from political and social pre-eminence – a process observed in other European cities at the time. This should be connected to social values formed under the influence of humanism: elite consciousness, a sense of respectability and prestige were very much in accordance with the views of classical authors, in particularly Cicero. Wholesalers, large-scale traders, and rentiers belonged to the urban elites, whereas people who worked with their hands, practitioners of the ‘vile mechanical arts’ usually did not. Just as trade on a large scale was ennobling, while small-scale trade was demeaning, and just as trade per se was more respectable than industry, so within the craft sector differences in prestige and respectability developed: between crafts with a commercial element and those that worked solely with their hands. Manufacturers of

30 J. Ptasnik, for instance, saw the reason for this delay in protests in the great fire of 1527, which destroyed almost the whole town and distracted citizens from their rights and freedoms, see Ptasnik, ‘Walki’, p. 244.
31 Czołowski, Pogląd, p. 34.
32 The custom was to collect taxes for the coronation of a new king. However, 1576 witnessed two coronation ceremonies: first of Stephan Báthory and then of Queen Anna.
34 This process was mentioned by A. Cowan, who has noted the exclusion of artisans from urban elites and the gradual disappearance of artisan councillors in European towns after 1600; see Cowan, Urban Europe, pp. 59–60.
35 ‘Trade, if it is on a small scale, is to be considered vulgar; but if wholesale and on a large scale, importing large quantities from all parts of the world and distributing to many without misrepresentation […] seems to deserve the highest respect.’ See Nicholas, Urban Europe, p. 143.
luxury goods (e.g. jewellers) also enjoyed higher esteem than everyday artisans such as potters or coopers, and goldsmiths were often mentioned among the Lviv councillors.

Returning to the events of 1576, we should point out that the king in fact acknowledged the complaints of the Lviv citizens, but did not want to cancel the rights of the council which he had confirmed at the beginning of his rule. Instead he introduced a new institution, the Quadrangintavirat or college of forty (as had already been done in Cracow – ad normam Cracowiensium), comprising twenty merchants and twenty craftsmen who were to watch over the use of urban property and control spending, the introduction of new taxes, and all decisions regarding the life of the community made by the council. The royal decree issued in Malbork in 1578 to settle this conflict became a fundamental law regulating relations between the council and the community, and gave urban government its final shape. From then on, the government consisted of three institutions, the Ordo Consularis, Ordo Scabinalis et Ordo Quadraginta virorum, the latter headed by the Regens Communitas. The first Ordo Quadraginta virorum in Lviv also included two Ruthenians, Lesko and Khoma Babych.

Under pressure from the urban communities, a similar third Ordo had been established in most of the larger towns in Poland: besides Cracow (1521), also in Lublin (1522), Gdansk (1526), Warsaw (1578) and others. These institutions consisted of twelve, twenty, forty, sixty or even a hundred members representing the community, craftsmen and merchants in different proportions, and elected in different ways (elected by the whole community, by guild masters, nominated by town councillors, etc.).

Nevertheless, the foundation of such an institution in Lviv did not undermine the growing monopoly of the town council, nor prevent further conflicts between the council and community. Councillors found it possible to disregard royal decrees, pursuing policies convenient to themselves but not necessarily to the whole community, and persecuting or bribing the leaders of communal protests that followed. The Ordo Quadrangintavirorum soon came under consular control and became dominated by the richest members of the urban community and was seen as a first step in the career leading towards the college of judges or into the council itself, and thus into the ruling elite.

37 Zubrzycki, Kronika, p. 181.
38 Ibid, p. 204.
40 D. Zubrzycki quoted a royal rescript issued in 1661, ordering Lviv councillors to elect judges from the college of forty men; see Zubrzycki, Kronika, p. 403.
The end of the Middle Ages and beginning of modernity in European towns is characterised by the emergence of a new group within the urban elites: people with a university degree (‘academics’), especially lawyers. Remaining on the margin at first, they managed to break into the centres of urban power later (especially from the later sixteenth century) thus forming in the urban milieu the so-called functional elite. Scholars have interpreted this process as a tendency towards ‘bureaucratisation and rationalisation’ in urban government. Set apart from merchant–councillors without special training for government and administration, an educated professional gained access to the elite stratum not through birth or wealth, but precisely through his education and professional qualities, decisive factors for his mobility and advance.

Written sources from Lviv start to mention urban office-holders with university degrees in the fifteenth century: one of the earliest examples dates from 1425, when a petition to the king was written per manus Vicentii Artium Baccalaurei ac Notarii civitatis Leopoliensis. The scribe Vincent Baccalaureus, who later also became a judge/scabinus, appears to have been one of the first graduate clerks in the urban government. In 1457, the town council accepted a certain Stanislaw Brunowski from Przemysl as syndic pro defendendis causis civitatensibus, who did not have an academic degree. Local lawyers and other learned functionaries did not advance hastily through the social ranks and, for instance, the yearly wage of Stanislaw Brunowski was ten hryvnas or marcas, equal to the amount the council had paid for a book (a manuscript?), the Flores Legum (10 marcas communis pecuniae super librum Flores Legum). The annual salary of an ‘intellectual’ worker such as this syndic appeared to be less than that of a ‘non-intellectual’: when Lviv councillors hired a shepherd, they agreed to pay him eight
The sum was considerable, even taking into account that the shepherd most likely had to pay his assistants.

References to councillors with academic degrees date from the sixteenth century: for instance, the yearly register of Lviv councillors notes Dr. Stanislaus Wilczek, elected in 1513, who became advocatus in 1516. In 1514, the town scribe Michael Magister was elected councillor (continuing at the same time his office as scribe), and in 1527 he received a royal privilege granting him benefits from the royal mill in Lviv. The same register of councillors mentions Stanislaus Mozancz, doctor of medicine and previously a judge (scabinus), elected in 1529. Paulus Novicampianus (Kampian), also a doctor of medicine, occupied the office of city doctor in 1560 and reached the position of burgomaster in 1587. Doctor juris utriusque, that is a ‘doctor of canon and civil laws’, Nicolaus Galazinus was elected councillor in 1562. Interestingly, not lawyers, but doctors of medicine prevailed among the ‘academics’ in Lviv. Documents in the town archive show that the council of 1616 included three medical doctors, Martinus Novicampianus (son of Paulus), Stanislaw Dibovicius (Dybowicki) and Paulus Hepner, and only one graduate lawyer, Stanislaw Krystanowicz IuD. In 1669, six out of twelve Lviv councillors were doctors, and doctors of medicine were again in the majority: Valerianus Alembek PhD et MD, Jacobus Jozefowicz PhD et MD, Benedictus Tomiecki IuD et MD, Jacobus Krauz PhD et MD, Matthias Kuczankowicz IuD, and Joannes Dobromirski MD. It seems that the profession of doctor was preferred in the burghers’ milieu of Lviv, as is evident for instance from the testament of medical doctor Paulus Boim (who became a councillor in 1627), where he advised his son (also a doctor) to direct his children to study medicine in Italy ‘because to us, people plebeiae conditionis, this way is honorifica, utilis et gloriosa; moreover, per successionem from parents per traditionem secreta medica may be passed on.’

Ego, Benedictus Adamus Tomiecki, Philosophiae in Cracoviensi, Mediciniae in universitate Patavina, Juris utrisque in Sapientia Romana creatus Doctor – this line from the testament of Lviv councillor Benedictus Tomiecki, quoted by W. Łoziński, illustrates a possible ‘educational geography’ for a Lviv citizen wishing to study and

48 Ibid, p. 111.
49 Kapral, Urzędnicy, pp. 88–9.
50 Ibid, 88.
51 Zimorowicz, Leopolis triplex, pp. 131, 137. Commenting on this, D. Zubrzycki noted that the king also granted all profits from a special device used at this mill to refine flour: totum seu integrum proventum et omnimodum utilitatem, quam ex instrumento ad cribrandam, seu purgandam farinam in dicto molendino non pridem aptato quod vulgo Pithel dicitur. Zubrzycki concluded that this method of refining was probably unknown before in the region, and that Michael Magister was the first to introduce it. See Zubrzycki, Kronika, p. 152.
52 Kapral, Urzędnicy, p. 93.
53 Ibid, p. 121.
54 Ibid, p. 143.
55 Łoziński, Patrycyiat, p. 117.
56 Benedictus Tomiecki, IuD and MD, was a scabinus during 1651–1667 and a councillor in 1667–1683; he was elected burgomaster in 1678. See Kapral, Urzędnicy, p. 413.
with the necessary means to finance his wishes.\textsuperscript{57} In the already quoted chronicle \textit{Leoplis triplex} (1672) and in the list of prominent men of Lviv entitled \textit{Viri illustres civitatis Leopoliensis} (written 1658–1660, printed in 1671),\textsuperscript{58} Bartolomej Zimorowicz particularly praised those whose resources were meagre and whose origin was of little help in climbing the social ladder, but who nevertheless did so. Apparently seeing their careers as similar to his own, he glorified contemporary ‘self-made’ men born to ‘obscure parents’ and reaching the apex of local society through their knowledge and talents. One of these was Stanislaw Krystanowicz, who ‘being born to simple parents was able to prove the verse that a [humble] origin should not be an obstacle to someone with talents’,'\textsuperscript{59} Krystanowicz visited Germany, Italy, France (\textit{Gallia}) and Britain, was granted the doctorate in law and became a syndic and later a councillor in the town. Lauding his colleague, Zimorowicz called him a ‘self-born councillor’ – \textit{consul ex se natus} – to highlight personal virtues as the reason for social success.

Another example of quick advance which Zimorowicz commemorated was that of Stanislaw Dybowicki (\textit{Dybovicius}), born in Peremyshl’/Przemysl to unknown parents, ‘a thinker who lit his own way’ and ‘taught himself’ in foreign academies and in the schools of Aesculapius.\textsuperscript{60} He became a councillor in Lviv, but also accepted a position as doctor at the Polish royal court and accompanied King Sigismund III on his Moscow campaign.\textsuperscript{61} The glorification of ‘self-made councillors’ advancing socially through their intelligence, knowledge, and skills, projects an idealised and fictive picture: it does not acknowledge that social advance was typically secured by useful connections (e. g., marriage) with a patrician family, and not by personal virtues alone. Zimorowicz’s own career is illustrative of this trend.

The presence of councillors with doctoral titles did not automatically mean the ‘professionalisation’ of Lviv’s government, and certainly did not signify the displacement of one social group by another. \textit{Doctores} were often the offspring of consular families, or married into such families. As W. Łoziński observed, it was often a family tradition for a member of the local elite to receive a proper education (a doctorate), to become a successful merchant and later a councillor, and perhaps eventually to hold office at
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A doctoral title did not divert citizens from participation in long-distance trade: doctor Groswaier travelled with his goods to Gdansk, while doctor Alembek traded in spices and wine (goods in any case with medicinal uses). Thus educated councillors, as a rule, did not signify homini novi, professionals in the urban government who succeeded due to their knowledge and skills alone, but represented the same milieu adapting to new challenges, seeing new perspectives and gaining further signs of social distinction. Even though it was sometimes possible for competent and diligent citizens of ‘obscure birth’ to reach the top of urban society, a successful marriage and useful connections with ruling families were still the main prerequisites. On the other hand, a royal decree from 1661 ordered that only doctores could be employed as town scribes and syndics, which certainly followed from the need to professionalise the urban administration. Furthermore, a few years later (1664) during his visit to Lviv, the king required that scribes and judges be chosen from among the learned men (viros literatos), who need not necessarily be settled citizens (if not, they were obliged to buy property in the town within one year). As a result, a doctoral title could be an important factor in social advance in the seventeenth century.

**Strategies of self-representation**

A high degree of social inequality requires continuous justification of existing hierarchies and power relations, so that those belonging to the lower stratum can be persuaded to accept their lot. Besides religious arguments, the ruling elite adopted symbolic means to lend their position of power a positive light as well as involving the plebs through certain rituals. Bringing together the whole urban community, public ceremonies and rituals were a good occasion for the elite to highlight their superior status; they were perfect events for ‘the staging of power.’ Public processions and ceremony are often investigated to reconstruct the social hierarchy of a given town. Unfortunately, there is no information on public processions in Lviv; the main civic ritual which can be grasped in its general features was the annual election to the town council (as performed in the sixteenth century). Even though elections under the order established in the sixteenth century (which introduced co-option and life-long tenure for councillors) were not elections as such, and did not bring real changes to the composition of the council, the ritual of election seemed to be important for contemporaries and was duly and majestically performed every year.

---
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67 The elections in Lviv were described by Denys Zubrycki, author of the Kronika miasta Lwowa, on the basis of documents held in Lviv municipal archives, during 1838–39; see Zubrycki, Kronika, pp. 14–22.
Elections in Lviv took place on 22nd February, *in festo Cathedrale s. Petri*, and were organised as a special celebration for the whole town. The day before, a councillor or the scribe of the council personally invited the *starosta* as royal representative to honour the event with his presence; similar invitations also went to the Catholic clergy of the cathedral, who were to celebrate a solemn mass. At the same time, the burgomaster sent his servant to invite the guild masters (*Zechmeister*) to the mass. Servants were also sent to invite minor church officials, the school rector, and his pupils. The council traditionally donated seven large candles to the cathedral: two for the *Confraternia Litteratoris*, two for the altar of the council, and three for the main altar. As a further sign of distinction, councillors and judges had special seats in the cathedral, close to the high altar. After the Holy Mass, councillors gathered in the town hall for their last meeting while the town closed its gates and summoned citizens to the market square. When all had arrived, two councillors invited the *starosta* to the council room and prepared to receive members of the community involved in urban government. The *advocatus* and college of judges (*Collegium Scabinorum*) were the first to enter, laying the seal and court records before the *starosta* and council. They were followed by a guardian of the town gates (*Proconsul Nocturnus*), with servants and gate-keepers submitting their keys. Next came custodians of the hospitals and other religious foundations established by the urban government, guild masters, and heads of confraternities, all bringing their insignia. The burgomaster thanked all of them for their service. After all this, it was time to elect burgomasters for the next year from among three candidates, chosen by the councillors from their own ranks. The *starosta* was the first to select among these three names a royal burgomaster (*Proconsul Regius*); then members of the community selected a *Proconsul Communitatis*, and the remaining candidate became a ‘consular burgomaster’ (*Proconsul Dominorum Consulum*). The council and newly elected burgomasters took an oath, repeating the words read by the town scribe and swearing loyalty to the king, represented by the *starosta*; the latter was then solemnly escorted by two councillors to the Armenian Church (later Armenian cathedral), where the Armenian elders also swore an oath. An *advocatus* was then elected (either from among the councillors or from the college of judges), and the council presented a yearly account of the town’s finance, which was approved by selected citizens. Guilds had to elect their masters and send them to the town hall the next day to take an oath before the council.

Again, these elections did not bring changes to the governmental institution of Lviv, since the only elected officials appear to have been the three burgomasters and the *advocatus*, chosen from the same group of people every year. The role of the royal representative appeared to be rather limited: his duty was to select the royal burgomaster from three candidates (later from six *consules residentes*) previously chosen by the councillors from among themselves. The description of the elections shows that not all

---

68 These details also point to social distinctions within the community: royal and church officials were honoured by members of the urban government personally, while guild masters apparently had lower standing and received an invitation from a servant.

69 Appointed by the *starosta*, the royal *burgomaster* took office for the first four weeks after the elections; he was then followed by the ‘communal *burgomaster*’ and after four weeks by the consular, so that they ruled one after another. However, the royal *burgomaster* started first in the year and finished the last. See Zubrzycki, *Kronika*, p. 18.
citizens took part in the ceremony, but only those immediately involved in the urban administration. The hierarchy of urban officials can be seen from the order in which they appear in the council room; moreover, the whole procedure emphasised the council’s separate (or rather, central and elevated) position in contrast to the rest of the community (including the college of judges), often referred to as ‘commoners’ (*vulgus*).

The elections were organised as an urban celebration of great importance, and any deviation from the rules of this ritual or insufficient respect shown to members of the urban elite was punished (by fine or imprisonment). The elections’ importance lies in the display of social consensus, symbolically represented in solemn procedures as well as in the divine legitimacy granted to the elite through the Mass. These elections were not merely procedural, but rather meticulously staged rituals demonstrating unanimity and unity, which served through presence and performance to preserve the stability of the social order, and through which the social foundations of power were concealed, or at least kept latent.  

Ecclesiastical space also offered possibilities for self-propaganda. As has been mentioned, the council had its own chapel (the *capella dominorum consulorum*) in the Latin cathedral, consecrated by the archbishop in 1454. But individual members of the elite were also eager to obtain a chapel for themselves and their families, to found an altar, erect a tombstone, or establish a memorial tablet in this space. The cathedral (which at the same time was the urban parish church) became the main and most desirable stage for self-representation for the local upper stratum. It reflects a process which intensified earlier elsewhere in Europe, at the beginning of the late medieval period: the appropriation of public sacred space for personal use, when a large number of private individuals carved out spheres of influences in churches by obtaining hereditary rights to hundreds of chapels and filling them with decorations and liturgical instruments, donating chantries and selecting chaplains. Emphasising their personal success in the competitive urban environment, these patrons created numerous decorated spaces that competed for prominence and for the viewer’s attention in the church interior.

Cathedral interiors from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries mostly did not survive later reconstructions and restorations, partially due to the need to accommodate further private foundations. It is no surprise that the most profound restoration, initiated by Archbishop Sierakowski in the eighteenth century, aimed particularly at bringing order to the chaotically built and decorated interior (there were some thirty altars and numerous tombstones, which left little space for visitors) and at reducing the number of memorials. Some inscriptions from the first half of the seventeenth century have
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survived, having been copied by Szymon Starowolski and published in his chronicle *Monumenta Sarmatarum* (1632).75

In the restricted space of the cathedral interior, the chapels, altars, tombstones, and memorial tablets of rich burghers were situated next to those of the nobility, high royal officials, and archbishops. Lviv archbishops (e. g. Peter Starzechowski (1554), Paulus Tarlo (died 1565), Jan Sienienks (1582), Jan Prochnicki (1633) and others) or state dignitaries such as Stanislaw Żółkiewski palatinus Russie (1588), Stanislaus Lanckoronski palatinus Podoliae or Sigismund Ligenza (1559) caputaneus of Lviv had their tombstones close by the tombstones and tablets of members of the urban elite: famatus Stanislaus Hanel 1570, honesta Katarzyna Brzezinska (1529) the wife of Lviv councillor Szymon Brzezinski, councillor Iacobus Szulz, Auratus Eques (1634), councillor Stanislaus Smieszek and his wife Barbara Urbanowna; councillor Caspar Schegel medicus (1623), for whom Hedwigis Anserinowna, maiesta coniunx, commissioned an alabaster tablet; councillor Iacob Gidelczyk, medicus doctor cons. Leopoliensi, quem studium scientem virtus amabilem honor illustrem vivere Post mortum fecit; Paulus Hepner, councillor Phil. ac med. doctor, commissioned an epitaph for his parents in 1634, etc. Indeed, the cathedral’s interior contained the most comprehensive (and densely built) gallery of prominent men connected to the town at that time.

Typically, burghers’ memorial tablets were adorned with eloquent, even pompous, inscriptions lauding the deceased. According to Zimorowicz, the following words were carved on the tabula sepulchralis of Nicolaus Gelazinus (1580): *Oraculum urbis, turis antistes sacer, legum sequester, cosilii opulens penu, flumen feracis aureum eloquentiae, Gelazinus ille, cui nec ante habuit parem, nec post habebit quantacunque haec civitas.*76 Zimorowicz himself in the chronicle *Leopolis triplex* called Gelazinus primus in civitate ex consulatu legum doctor.77 In this way epitaphs presented not so much an image of a pious Christian, but rather of a great man renowned for his moral virtues, statecraft, education, professional skills and eloquence; the image of a man who deserved to be at the apex of society, even after death.

Some representatives of the ruling elite left more prominent ‘statements’ in the ecclesiastical space, commissioning richly decorated altarpieces and chapels. For instance, councillor Johannes Szolz Wolffowicz commissioned an abundantly curved alabaster altar for the chapel of the Holy Cross in 1595 (later removed from the cathedral into the church of St. Nicolas), regarded as one of the most prominent pieces of Renaissance art created in Lviv.78 The composition also included figures of the donor and his wife.

Two Renaissance chapels – that of the Kampians and that of the Boims – are all that is preserved today of the numerous private foundations built in or around the cathedral by members of the elite. Paulus Kampian took over the chapel built at the northern wall of the cathedral in the late sixteenth century: the chapel had previously
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belonged to the aristocratic family of Strumilo, by then extinct. He assigned 1000 florins to this foundation and appointed a chaplain to serve masses. Building started in the 1580s and the chapel’s façade was probably designed by the famous Lviv architect Paulus of Rome; it contained three large reliefs, depicting scenes from the life of Jesus. The interior is splendidly decorated with marble of different colours; a richly carved altar also included the busts of Paulus and his son Martin, who completed the chapel. The altar in the chapel could possibly have been founded (or co-founded) by another Lviv councillor, Stanislaw Dybowicki (1618), according to the inscription: Stanislaus Dybovicius Premisl. Serenis. Sigismundi III Regis Poloniae Procerum regni medicus Physicus, civitatis huius Consul, pauperum et viduarum Patronus et tutor huius altaris fundator hoc in tumulo iaceo [...] The chapel of the Boims was built by Georg Boim (Georgius Boim e Pannonia eiurata Haeresi Catholicus factus, et civis et consul) outside the cathedral, in the cemetery (it is the only preserved cemetery chapel on this site). According to Zimorowicz, Boim finished his chapel (called here sacellum turbinatum) after three years in 1610. Its western façade of sandstone is fully covered with reliefs (indeed a ‘carousel’ of themes) and reveals the influence of the late German Renaissance. Similarly abundant carved decorations could be seen inside: especially impressive is the cupola with stucco decorations. Two fresco portraits (of Boim and his wife) were painted on the eastern façade facing the street.

In some exceptional cases, private foundations grew out of popular devotions, for instance to a miraculous icon, and could even compete with the cathedral itself. This was the case with the Domagalicz chapel that did not survive the restoration of the eighteenth century. When Catherine, a daughter of the Lviv scabinus Wojciech Domagalicz and of Catherine (née Wolfowicz), died in 1598, an icon of the Virgin Mary with Jesus (with an image of the late Catherine herself) was commissioned and placed on the cemetery wall near her burial place, not far from the cathedral’s presbytery. Soon the icon became famous for its miracles and was transferred to the councillors’ chapel inside the cathedral. Nevertheless the family decided to make a private foundation, to display the relic in a family shrine. In 1644 Jan Domagalicz, Catherine’s brother and an office-holder at the court of King Wladyslaw IV, and Jacob Gidelczyk, husband of Catherine’s sister, a medical doctor and councillor, clashed over the right to build a family chapel for the icon. Unable to resolve the dispute, each founded a separate chapel of his own (both next to the cathedral), but royal support brought Jan Domagalicz the icon for display. Domagalicz endowed his foundation with 1000 złoty, and assigned the right of patronage to the urban council.

The Domagalicz chapel became very popular and started to receive numerous donations from private individuals as well as from corporations. During the reconstruction of 1765–77, Archbishop Sierakowski dissolved many chapels, inter alia
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the famous Domagalicz foundation, since religious services here had become so popular that they overtook services in the cathedral itself, and ‘were conducted so loudly that it disturbed the Mass in front of the main altar’.

Because of patronage rights, the town council opposed demolition of the chapel and even appealed to Rome, but this time it did not win: the chapel was demolished and the icon relocated to the main altar of the cathedral. The archbishop was driven by a rational plan to establish order and unity in the chaotically developed ecclesiastical site, but, as in this case, an old sense of rivalry also emerged in relations between the urban and ecclesiastical authorities of Lviv, whenever matters of patronage rights or the financial accounts of religious foundations were in question. This failure to defend the right of patronage indirectly points to the urban elite’s loss of a great deal of influence and importance by the eighteenth century.

The aspiration for a prestigious burial place and the love of God alone could not explain the striving for a memorial in the Latin cathedral. Other powerful motivations were the spirit of competition and the desire to commemorate one’s name beside those of other *viri illustri* in the town’s main ecclesiastical space. Chapels, altarpieces, and memorial tablets in the cathedral became ways for members of the elite to mark their presence within the upper stratum of contemporary Polish society and stage their power.

Moreover, in ecclesiastical spaces, urban elites were able to transform their economic capital into ‘religious capital’, bringing them social recognition and prestige. Founding chapels and commissioning altarpieces, members of the upper stratum also demonstrated their religious virtues and legitimised their position through visual conformity with the social values and ideas of Christian rulers.

Another prominent and eloquent means of self-representation for every urban government was the building of the town hall, and Lviv was no exception. Here, the town hall and its tower, built in the late fourteenth century on the market square, were frequently reconstructed, enlarged and re-decorated, especially in Renaissance times. The most extensive rebuilding process was initiated by Martin Kampian, councillor and burgomaster. Emphasising the burgomaster’s practicality, B. Zimorowicz in his chronicle *Leopolis triplex* (1672) noted that Kampian ordered all those town dwellers who used to spend their time idly sitting in taverns, drinking, gambling and making disorder, caught and put to work; and even parents themselves brought their indolent sons to the building site.

The reconstruction aimed not only at restoring the town hall, making the tower taller and more impressive, but also at commemorating Kampian himself and his fellow councillors. A pompous inscription confirms this (*D.O.M. Ops mihi cives, opitus reges, opera Martine ostendo Campiane tua, A. D. 1619*), as does his coat of arms on the tower. Coats of arms and trademarks of Kampian’s
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fellow councillors were placed on the tower beneath the gallery running over the clock (these designated Szolz-Wolfowicz, Lorencowicz, Syxt, Anserinus, Alembek, Kampian himself and Mieszakowski). Such a display of personal symbols was apparently rooted in the Renaissance tradition of embellishing architecture with representations of *uomini famosi*, or cycles of famous men, of undisputed significance. This system of exemplary memorialisation in the decoration of municipal edifices, princely palaces and judgment chambers was a form of monumental secular art in Renaissance Italy, whence it spread to other European centres, forming the basis of modern ‘public’ art.

Modern historians have interpreted the tower as a kind of a triumphant column ‘where Lviv patricians consigned their names to posterity, decorating it with their signs (German: *Gemerk, Handelszeichen*), coats of arms, patriotic thoughts, pious prayers and symbols.’ Unfortunately, the old town hall has not survived (the tower collapsed in 1826, and the whole complex was built anew in the Classicist style) so the Latin inscriptions that covered the walls both inside and out are known mostly from Szymon Starowolski’s *Monumenta Sarmatarum*.

What norms, values, and ideals did the ruling elites declare in moralising sentences carved or written on the walls? The inscriptions praised work and diligence, virtues and integrity, but especially numerous were those related to wisdom, prudence and unbiased justice, comparing unjust government to robbery. Sentences about justice on the outside were matched by those carved inside (*Silent leges inter arma. Vigilantibus omnia feliciter succedunt. Domus iure consultī totius Oraculum Civitatis, in eadem bona causa triumphat*). There was also a large painting of the Last Judgment (*imago maius*) inside the court room, a subject typical for court rooms in many European towns. The town hall with its court was seen as a source of justice and guarantee of proper social order; it embodied the strong ties between elective government, the pursuit of justice and the common good. At the same time, the image of the Last Judgment was to remind councillors and judges that they should be unbiased and just, since they too would be judged after death.

The next group of inscriptions legitimised the social order and presented the ruling elite as ordained by God (*Honor debetur iis, quos Deus honore dignatus est*), educated men (‘philosophers’) whose rule made the town happy (*Felix civitas, cui paesunt philosophi*). Since many councillors had received a university education, the
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inscription about philosophers could imply that in the case of Lviv this social ideal has been reached, and the town was happy, being ruled by learned men.

Self-fashioning as statesmen and bearers of wisdom was developed further, and local educated citizens were also praised in the *Viri illustres civitatis Leopoliensis* (1671) by Zimorowicz, a councillor and burgomaster of Lviv. The genre of ancient Roman exemplary literature became very popular in Renaissance times, offering biographies of famous men whose lives could serve as moral lessons (a well known example is the *De viris illustribus* by Petrarch: a collection of thirty-six short biographies of prominent Romans, beginning with Romulus). These parallel the galleries of *uomini famosi* in the visual arts, which we have already mentioned. With few exceptions, Zimorowicz did not present biographies, but rather lists of famous men – office holders both secular and ecclesiastical in Lviv. Educated citizens garnered special praise from the author: he dedicated his work to *civium litteratorum*, and compiled a list of learned men separately in the text. The author focused mainly on his contemporaries or recent predecessors, however, rather than on historical personalities. The text was printed in Lviv in 1671 and Zimorowicz could witness its reception by fellow citizens, which suggested that as well as offering moral lessons, the author had found a suitable form and good reason to applaud the urban elite to which he belonged himself. It was probably to these generations of great citizens that the inscription on the town hall referred: *Gloria maiorum posteris lumen*.

Similar intentions can be found in the same author’s *Leopolis triplex*, dedicated to *Senatus Leopoliesis nobilissimis Viris Dominis Consulibus*. Here, Zimorowicz wanted to thank the councillors who had elevated him from his ‘plebeian dirt’ (*e caeno plebeio extraxit*) and to glorify his mother town, the best part of which they were (*cuius potior pars estis*). The introduction is full of patriotic eloquence (e. g. *solus amor patriae ratione valentior omni*) and not free from the author’s soaring self-esteem: he assigned himself the role of the Livy of Rus’ (*Livius Roxanus*). The author asked for friendly acceptance of ‘literary Lviv and its architect’ (i. e. himself), since the Lviv of brick would stand for a long time, but the ‘Lviv of letters’ (his chronicle) forever.

The chronicle begins with the history of the Rus’ Palatinate, an etymology of its name and a geography, and divides the history of the town into three principal periods: Ruthenian, German and Polish. In the last, Polish period of history, numerous passages mention distinguished citizens, mostly fellow-councillors of Zimorowicz, and praise their civic virtues and knowledge. Very often examples from antique history (especially Rome) or metaphors from antique mythology are used to describe events in Lviv. Like the Italian humanists who exalted their home cities, seeing aspects of ancient Rome
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replicated in their own experience, Zimorowicz’s declared goal was to transform his mother town from Ruthenian into Roman (patriam […] e Russica Romanam pro virili mea facerem). Constant references to ancient Rome draw our attention to the author’s attempt to emulate the Roman Res Publica and its order in the case of Lviv: the town council is Senatus Leopoliensis, the councillors senatores or patricii. Often the deeds of local townsfolk found their parallel in those of Roman citizens: e.g. opponents of the council were compared to Catiline (apparently for his attempt to overthrow the Roman Republic); prominent senatores were greeted more civitatis Romanae antique.

Allusions to ancient Rome can also be found in an earlier text on Lviv’s history, the Topographia Leopoliensis (1603) by Johan Alnpek, also a councillor of Lviv. The author gave characteristics of the four religious groups in Lviv (Catholics, Orthodox, Armenians and Jews), reserving the most flattering words for those of the Roman faith. It seems that belonging to the Roman Church became another argument justifying the segregation policy which the urban elite applied to members of other Christian communities, legitimising their own monopoly on political power: contemporary Catholic urban elites thus saw themselves as the ‘Romans’ of Lviv.

Symptomatic here is a passage from Zimorowicz referring to litigation between citizens and Armenians around 1600, where he mentions that Tacitus had already written in his Annals that the Armenians hated the Romans, and that the former had not changed since then. Behind this lay the circumstance that the urban government imposed on the Armenians (as well as on Orthodox Ruthenians, as non-Roman Christians) various limitations on their commercial activities, as well as prohibitions on settling outside their own district (and no more than seventy-three Armenian houses were allowed in the town overall); Armenians who owned buildings on the market square (the most prestigious part of the town) were forced to sell these to Catholics and never reside there again. The specific causes of the conflict did not, however, prevent Zimorowicz from drawing parallels between his own days and ancient times, demonstrating similarities and continuities in relationships between Romans and non-Romans, thus implying that the Romans of Tacitus did not differ from the ‘Romans’ of Lviv.

Ancient Romans, the Roman Republic and the merits of elective government belonged to the civic ideals, if not the ideology, adopted and expressed by the urban intellectual elite in Lviv. Senatus Populusque Leopoliensi (SPQL) was often used by the town council on different formal occasions, following the SPQR Senatus Populusque Romanus. For instance, SPQL was carved in a memorial inscription to councillor
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Lorenzowiczc, near the entrance to the town hall: Martinus Campianus Consul, Senatus Populusque Leopoliensi Joanni Julio Lorenzowicz ob civem servatum decrevit, 1618.105 SPQL was inscribed onto the golden memorial plaque in the cathedral donated to the Virgin Mary.106 The abbreviation became a formula of the social order in Lviv, signifying the ‘republican’ aspirations of the local ruling elite. The urban community was seen as a free republic with its government bound by the council and by law, and the model was ancient Rome.107 Undoubtedly for the contemporary urban elite, a ‘republic’ equalled ‘freedom’: freedom from rule by an external power, and the freedom to be ruled by their own (i.e. by members of the community).108 Emphasis on the republican features of the Lviv senatus and the civic virtues of local senatores, frequent parallels to the history of ancient Rome, and inventing ‘Romans’ from local Catholics in writings by the local intellectual elite, all served the same purpose: to construct and promote a ‘Roman republican’ identity for the town.

At the same time, the urban elite’s attitude to their fellow-citizens in the same Roman Church resembled Roman patrician attitudes toward the plebs, as is evident from Zimorowicz’s writings. His special detestation of ‘commoners’ was usually expressed in passages narrating communal conflicts, when the vulgus civium turned adversus rectores suos.109 The ‘republican ideology’ was well suited to justify both a superior position for the ‘Romans’ in relation to other religious groups, and a higher standing for members of the elite within the community of Catholics (senatores, rectores, patricii as opposed to plebs, vulgus).

**Portraits of the elite**

Although it is not possible to trace a history of the first families that formed the ruling elite of Lviv, some observations can be made. Lists of councillors and judges show that the Stecher family (whose founder was the first known advocatus in Lviv, arriving in the late thirteenth century and probably organising the local community under German law) stayed in government well into the fifteenth century. However, practically no families who belonged to the local upper stratum in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries survived into the sixteenth: such consular families as the Stecher, Sommerstein, Wasserbrot, Goldberg, Eisenhuttel or Cornberg ceased to exist. Some died out, others lost their fortunes (with the fall of Constantinople, and the Ottoman siege of Caffa in the Crimea in 1475, long distance-trade through Lviv collapsed and had to adapt to the new circumstances), so that the beginning of the early modern period was

marked by changes in the Lviv elites. The early sixteenth century is thus marked by transformation not only in the constitution of urban government, but also in its personal composition. Despite the process of ‘oligarchisation’, the upper stratum of Lviv was not a ‘closed’ elite: it is possible to observe a constant influx of new people into the governing institutions. As has been mentioned, it was possible to join the elite circle through business association or by marriage; in some cases, members of the nobility entered the ranks of councillors accepting town law, as in the case of Jan Gulinski, who ‘due to his Christian modesty ignored human pride’ and became a citizen and councillor of Lviv, abandoning his noble title.

The Scholz

The clan of Scholz-Wolfowicz was probably the most prominent among the patrician families of the sixteenth century. The founder, Wolfgang Szolz, moved to Lviv from Wroclaw in 1523. References to his contacts with the upper stratum of Polish society imply that he had an established position before moving to Lviv. He married a daughter of Haaz, a Lviv councillor, thus entering one of the richest and most influential families in town. According to Zimorowicz, the couple had twelve daughters and twelve sons. Johan Alnpek remarked that the clan of Scholz-Wolfowicz grew very large, that many families were related to it ‘running like rivers into the sea’ (quasi rivi ad hoc unum mare) and that it was difficult to find a citizen not related to the family (in fact, Alnpek’s mother was from the Wolfowicz). Thus it is unsurprising that burghers saw the government occupied by the Scholz-Wolfowicz.

It is known that Wolfgang’s offspring took the family name Scholz-Wolfowicz in order to differentiate themselves from the families of Wolfgang’s brothers Stanzel Scholz (later Scholz-Stanzel) and Hanush Scholz. Emperor Rudolf II of the Holy Roman Empire ennobled the three Szolz brothers in 1595, but the family continued its burgher occupations, trading and participating in urban government.

Of the three brothers, the most prominent was Johan Scholz-Wolfowicz (died 1653), according to his contemporary Dominic Hepner (a member of the same social milieu) lectu et admiratione dignus. His testament reveals the scale of Johan’s wealth and aspirations. He left to his son a house on the market square ‘with a cannon belonging to it’ and a large, richly decorated armoury, and military equipment for his six servants; he valued his possessions at not less than 50,000 złoty, which also included three villages near the town: Honchari, Vilshanytsia and Dobrovliany. Among Johan’s greatest
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concerns was the Holy Cross chapel, his foundation in the Catholic cathedral of Lviv. He carefully enumerated all incomes for its maintenance, and how it should be decorated, lit, and cleaned.\textsuperscript{117}

Melchior Scholz-Wolfowicz, a brother of Johan, traded in salt and dry fish, also supplying the royal court. An inventory compiled after his death reveals rich decorations in his house, including no fewer than thirty-seven paintings on canvas, ‘majolica’ (probably porcelain ornaments imported from Italy) and numerous arrases. As burgomaster, Melchior organised a watch in the town that consisted of fifty armed servants (fifteen of whom were his own men), and issued ordinances on urban security.\textsuperscript{118}

A different line descended from Stanislaw (Stancel) Scholz, whose offspring took the name Stancel-Scholz: he came to Lviv from Swidnica in 1543. He was involved in a variety of businesses, in long-distance trade (and even had contacts with the Moldavian rulers), owned a storehouse in Lviv, and organised industrial enterprises, particularly mining. Stancel Scholz received land rich in iron ores in the Busk region (north of Lviv) for the purposes of extraction and smelting. His task was to build furnaces and produce iron; he was granted ten years of tax exemption, and the right to found settlements there under German law.\textsuperscript{119}

Two other members of the Scholz, Jacob (died 1643) and Caspar (died 1662), both had doctoral titles. Jacob received a doctorate in law from the Bologna academy and, rare among Lviv citizens, the title \textit{eques auratus Sancti Romani Imperii}, Knight of the Golden Spur.\textsuperscript{120} The title was not hereditary and was granted for services to members of functional elites of the Holy Roman Empire (often of gentry or burgher origin) as well as to humanists and learned men.\textsuperscript{121} Little is known about Jacob’s life, so that W. Łoziński assumed that this title was related to his study in Bologna, since it was granted in 1621 to Jacob and to another Lviv citizen, Bartolomej Majernicki, through their professors Pompeus Blanchino and Camil Gypsio.\textsuperscript{122}

Dr. Caspar Scholz married a daughter of the prominent Lviv councillor Martin Kampian. Apart from a building on the market square, a whole street (Tempytczowska) in the town belonged to him, as well as a landed estate near the town. As with his relatives, Caspar’s testament listed much gold, silver, decorated weapons etc., but as an educated man he also left an impressive library of approximately two hundred books which included works by Plato, Aristotle, Livy, Plutarch, Sallust, and other classical authors.
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\textsuperscript{122} Łoziński, \textit{Patrycyat}, pp. 81–82. Since the title was bestowed upon such persons as Isaac Newton (H. S. E. Isaacus Newton Eques Auratus – inscription on his burial place in Westminster Abbey), Theodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573–1655), physician to James I and Charles I, and John Benet (d. 1627) \textit{eques auratus, legum doctor}, we can conclude that the title was connected to the ennoblement of doctoral degree-holders in recognition of their talents (as in the case of Jerzy Eleuter Szymonowicz-Siemioginski, c. 1660–1711, a painter from Lviv born into a burgher family and member of the St. Luke Academy in Rome, who received the title in 1688).
He himself composed verses in Latin, such as the panegyric written for the marriage of Lviv councillor Johan Alnpek to a daughter of Cracow citizen Stanislaw Brykner.\footnote{Łoziński, Patrycyat, p. 83.}

**The Kampians (Novicampianus)**

Not so illustrious as the destiny of the Scholz was that of another great Lviv family, the Novicampianus,\footnote{The name Novicampianus was derived from Nowopole (that is ‘a new field’ or Koniecpole in Poland – the native place of the family) and soon shortened to Kampian.} which practically lasted for only two generations but contributed glorious as well as tragic pages to the town’s history. The doctor of medicine Paulus Novicampianus, whose brother was a professor in the Cracow academy and tutor to Prince Jan Sigismund, was accepted to Lviv town law in 1560. Marrying in Lviv, he became related to the two influential families of Temrycz and Ganshorn through his wife Anna.\footnote{Łoziński, Patrycyat, pp. 84–5.} He soon entered the town council and was elected a burgomaster. Written sources yield much evidence of this doctor’s gloomy, harsh and grasping character: he lent money, mercilessly pursued debts, raised duties on the tenants on his estates, was constantly prosecuting someone or other in court and was regularly sued himself.

Only one person fought Paulus courageously and without fear, his neighbour Paul Abrahamowicz, a pharmacist who managed to win case after case by appealing, bringing new proofs and new witnesses to court.\footnote{Witnesses found it difficult to tell the truth, since as Abrahamowicz himself remarked ‘they are afraid of the lord doctor, because he is an official of this town and used to revenge’ (ibid, pp. 85–6).} It might have come as a shock to Kampian had he known that his son Martin would marry Elizabeth, a daughter of his enemy Abrahamowicz, upon his return from Italy after his father’s death.\footnote{Łoziński interprets this story as a local version of the family war between the Montagues and Capulets (ibid, p. 86).}

The years 1620–23 were especially hard for the town: war, hunger, plague and fire all struck in less then four years. Ten thousand people died from plague in Lviv and around four thousand houses were destroyed by fire in 1623 alone. A lack of money and enormous debt (35,000 złoty) would lead the urban government to default.\footnote{Among the creditors were Martin Kampian, Melchior Scholz and the Jesuits, whose loan of 14,000 was especially large (ibid, p. 90).} *Ex puro ergo patriam suam amore*, as a royal commissioner recorded in the process of settling the problem, Dr. Marin Kampian offered his help, giving 20,000 złoty for twelve years to cover the most urgent debts, but securing this loan by taking estates from the city in pledge. The interest amounted to only 3,000 złoty (and could be paid off in one year rather than twelve), so that Martin was seen as a great patriot and saviour of his town (Zimorowicz, for instance, called him *princeps senatus* and *urbis columen*).\footnote{Ibid, pp. 91–2.} However, catastrophes (plague and fire) continued to strike Lviv, and Kampian gave another 4,800 złoty for communal needs (this time without interest or security) which the council
recorded in the account books, together with an expression of gratitude in testūmonium boni vīri.130

Page after page, the urban records reveal how the whole urban economy fell into Kampian’s hands: for instance, the council assigned him duties from the village of Kulparkiv that belonged to the town, libere et benevole; profits from Lviv mills and fishing rights; market tolls; the right to exploit the local forests and so on. W. Lozinski remarked that Kampian was the only person with the courage and resources to pay the ruined town’s debts, and the only one with the energy and determination to recoup his loan.131 His energetic administration brought the urban economy into order (even making a profit of 7,377 złoty) and allowed it to pay back its most burdensome debts, a loan from the Jesuits, thus freeing the town from ‘Jesuit captivity’.

Citizens, however, slowly started to protest his strict and sometimes harsh rule, until finally Erazm Syxt, also a doctor of medicine and councillor, openly confronted Kampian. Zelo et amore civitatis atque injuris opressorum motus, as Syxt himself justified his actions, he compiled a list of Kampian’s abuses, which included injustice to the town and seeking private profit, privatisation of urban landed estates, oppression of the weak and poor, the establishment of a private prison where innocent people were held, disrespect toward fellow citizens, and so forth. All three orders of the town (the council, college of judges and college of forty) sued Kampian before the royal court, and without awaiting the king’s decision excluded him from the council. This was despite the fact that Kampian had practically restored the urban finances, renewed public buildings, and released the town from its heaviest debts. He opened court cases against the town council, protesting defamation, but suddenly fell ill and died before final settlement of the conflict.132

Zimorowicz

The outstanding career of J. B. Zimorowicz (1597–1677) is an excellent example of social mobility, a consul ex se natus in his own words. A prolific writer and member of the council, he was born to a simple urban family: his father was a stonemason, Stanislaw Ozimek. Little is known about his education, and his biographer, K. Heck, assumed he did not have much schooling (probably from a private teacher or the cathedral school in Lviv).133 Zimorowicz started his career as one of the numerous assistants in the town chancellery (employed in transcribing court cases) and a defender in court, where he probably changed his surname Ozimek to Zimorowicz to distance himself from his humble origin. He gained citizenship with the help of the rich goldsmith and councillor Nicolaus Sędimiracki, whose relative Katherine Duchnicowna he married, daughter of another goldsmith. This marriage brought him into contact with important families in

130 Ibid, p. 93. A contemporary author wrote of him O virum vere Martinum! implying that Kampian, like St. Martin, covered the poor ruined city with his robe.
133 Heck, Życie i dzieła Bartolomeja i Szymona Zimorowiczów (Ozimków) na tle stosunków ówczesnego Lwowa, Cracow, 1894, pp. 62–3.
Lviv and secured him success in his career. In 1640, after the death of the council scribe whom he assisted, Zimorowicz took over the chancellery. He became a judge (scabinus) in 1646 and councillor in 1648, and was appointed royal burgomaster at the same time. Starting life as a young poet and scribe, he had finally become accepted in the midst of the local ruling elite. As an office holder, he also participated in commerce, trading copper and grain; he bought an estate with a vineyard not far from the High Castle of Lviv, which became his summer residence. As a representative of the town he took part in the royal election of 1648. At that time his wealth amounted to 40,000 Polish złoty, to which should be added a yearly income as councillor of 2,000–3,000 złoty.

However, not only trade and professional activities brought him prosperity and secured his social advance: Zimorowicz married four times, and each of his wives came from wealthy and influential families. After the death of Katherine, he married Sophia, a daughter of the rich Armenian merchant, Awedykowicz, in 1654, which brought him one-third of a building near the Dominican friary as well as 10,000 złoty in cash. She died after one year, giving birth to a daughter. In 1656 he married Rosalia Groswaier, daughter of a councillor, who brought her husband shares in two buildings in Lviv, two households near the town and a mill. Successfully managing his possessions, Zimorowicz bought a building on the market square that had previously belonged to the Kampian family and settled there. After Rosalia’s death he remarried once more in 1663, and again his wife appears to have been a daughter of a local councillor (Jadwiga Krall): she gave birth to three children and died in 1675, two years before Zimorowicz.

These examples demonstrate the possible ways by which newcomers might enter the urban elite of Lviv. Coming from other regions where they most likely already had established positions, the Scholz and Kampian joined the local upper stratum through marriage. Marriage was also an important strategy for newcomers from other social milieus, as in the case of Zimorowicz, whose wealth and status grew after useful associations with consular families. Urban elites in Lviv represented a dynamic and ambitious group, usually well educated and sure of their role and importance in the town. They made their fortune in different ways, being involved not only in trade but also in money lending, industry and the professions (e.g. doctors), investing in land and property.

The local upper stratum was not a ‘closed’ or hereditary elite. There were no statutory divisions, as in Venice where hereditary distinctions were established between the nobili (patricians), cittadini (citizens, but in reality semi-privileged merchants, notaries and servants of the state) and popolani; nothing like the Tanzstatut in Nuremberg, or the exclusive brotherhoods and guilds in other German towns. Many European urban elites underwent a process of evolution in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth
centuries, whereby the external form and function of the elite remained unchanged but its composition altered. The same process could be clearly observed in Lviv.

Conclusions

The history of the town council of Lviv can be traced from the latter fourteenth century, when it was already a fully-formed and functioning institution seeking to expand its autonomy by acquiring the *advocatia* in 1378. The involvement of citizens in the yearly election (secured by the privilege of 1378) and rotation in the ranks of the town councillors observed in the fifteenth century suggest that the community was able to exercise a certain degree of influence on the composition of the council. Moreover, we notice a constant influx of new members into the government, possibly also including Ruthenians. Important changes in the composition of the urban elite took place at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. Moreover, to protect their monopoly on power the councillors gained control over the appointment of their successors (after 1519) and kept their offices for life, which set up a trend towards greater social exclusion. The council not only limited the participation of other burgurers in decision-making, but also secured a greater degree of autonomy from the royal representative.

Even though the upper stratum of Lviv was not a ‘closed’ urban elite, the town council controlled its own composition and carefully selected candidates to join the ranks. The functional elite in the urban government of Lviv also usually originated from the same milieu, including such highly-regarded professions as jurisprudence, medicine, or administration.

A considerable degree of social exclusion made it necessary to legitimate existing relations and present the superior position the elite had chosen for itself as a positive, justified, and indispensable part of the proper social order. Many strategies were applied to reach this goal:

– The ceremonies of yearly election were staged to manifest unanimity and concord between the ruling elites and the ruled, at the same time emphasising the distinctiveness, civility, honour and power of the former. The ritual of yearly election served as an annual manifestation and confirmation of the existing social order in the town, and thus affirmed the ruling elites’ superior position.

– Memorial practices, quite apart from serving the love of God and hope for eternal life, represented a suitable means to demonstrate status to the general public. Therefore, ecclesiastical space became a stage where members of the urban elite could visually locate themselves alongside representatives of the nobility and high clergy. At the same time, religious foundations and rights of patronage over religious and charitable institutions presented town councillors as proper Christian rulers and pious members of the community.

– Secular space provided a wide range of possibilities for self-representation. The buildings of the town council were used to propagate civic values and good order with relevant inscriptions and images, as well as to designate those able to bring those values

138 Ibid.
into being, i.e. the town councillors, whose presence was indicated by their signs and coats of arms. In the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries, the elite of Lviv reached the peak of its political and economic power and Renaissance style became the visual expression of the urban upper stratum’s ambitions and aspirations, embodied in secular and ecclesiastical architecture and artwork.

– Justification of the exceptional social standing enjoyed by the councillors went in parallel with the creation of an image of men renowned for their statecraft and learning (viri illustribus civitatis Leopoliensis) in literary works by the local intellectual elite, who themselves belonged to the council. Following the humanist tradition, the intellectual elite constructed and propagated an idea that the order of the Roman res publica was replicated in Lviv. Promoting this ‘public image’, the council adapted the formula S.P.Q.R. from ancient Rome and turned it into Senatus populusque Leopoliensis (S.P.Q.L.), as often happened in other European towns such as Antwerp, Brussels, Florence, Nuremberg, Wrocław, and elsewhere. Its republican aspirations offer one more proof that in late medieval and early modern times Lviv saw the same tendencies as other towns in Europe.
The construction of historical identity among Polish and Armenian patricians in Lviv, 1570s–1670s

Alexandr Osipian

In the history of social mobility, the issues of the rotation of elites and adoption of newcomers into the upper classes are of interest to historians and social scientists alike. The urban patriciate in late medieval and early modern Europe offers a good example of such adoption and rotation, since it saw a constant process of social advancement whereby common people – mostly townsfolk – were elevated into the upper classes and nobility. At the same time as adopting newcomers from the richest grands bourgeois, the urban elite (noblesse de ville) lost its own grandest members to the nobility.

To belong to the patriciate was more a social than a juridical phenomenon. A profession – advocate, merchant, physician, apothecary – and a certain amount of wealth, even membership of an urban council, were not in themselves sufficient to create the social prestige or dignity (honorabilité) needed to ascend to the nobility. An ambitious patrician aspiring to further social advancement should live ‘nobly’, in the ‘style of a gentleman’, without labouring or selling merchandise. An applicant should also provide witnesses to testify that not only he, but his parents and grandparents as well, had ‘lived nobly’ in the sight of all. Great wealth made social breakthrough possible, but the main problem was that ‘the launching of the dynasty was invariably the same: the gentry had sprung from trade, something it sought to hide from prying eyes and kept as dark as possible’.1 On the other hand, the geographical mobility of burghers, and merchants in particular, made it possible to hide plebeian origins in a new place. Many burghers came from abroad, as was particularly true in the case of pre-modern Poland, or from remote provinces. Many ambitious patricians, unable to invent their own noble lineage, found it easier to construct a collective genealogy for their privileged group that would serve two purposes – to support their aspirations to ennoblement, and to detach themselves from urban commoners and newcomers. Thus, they were preoccupied with creating a usable past. As Bo Stråth points out, ‘History does not exist “out there”, waiting to be discovered, but is permanently invented in order to give meaning to the present – and to the future – through the past.’2 New restrictions on the ennoblement of plebeians

introduced by the Polish nobility in the 1570s hastened the patricians’ search for a prestigious collective genealogy.

According to Bo Stråth, ‘the problem with concepts like construction is threefold. First, construction connotes a building industry, it connotes social engineering, indeed it even connotes manipulation. Given this, it is not unreasonable to argue that the production of symbols, images and myths is an elite undertaking, that this construction/invention is simply the elite’s manipulation of the masses. But cohesion and community may also be constructed from the grassroots level and may challenge the meaning assigned to events and situations by elite groups.’

This article focuses on urban patrician efforts to construct their collective historical identities in accordance with their aspirations for ennoblement. The main aim of the paper is to investigate how a model of the past, constructed by the nobility to legitimate its privileged status, was applied by the urban elites for their own further social advancement. A good example of extreme social and ethnic complexity – the city community of Lviv in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – provides us with a perfect test case in this respect. This is a unique example illustrating a particular pattern of development, but can serve in its way as evidence about other urban elites. It has the further advantage of being well documented. The time-frame begins in the 1570s, when the Polish Diet restricted access to noble status for foreigners and plebeians, in the wake of which a usable past was constructed and contested in trials between the wealthy Armenian merchants and the city magistrate, which ended in the 1670s, when both competing groups within Lviv’s elite completed the construction of their historical identity and ennoblement. Comparison of how the Armenian and Polish patricians ‘discovered’ the respective collective genealogies that they needed for further social advancement can help better understanding of the general trend. Finally, there is the issue of which resources the two groups used, and how.

Social advancement and its restriction in early modern Poland

In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the Polish nobility (szlachta) gained many privileges and restricted the power of the king. On 26 April 1496, King Jan I Olbracht granted the Privilege of Piotrków, increasing the nobility’s feudal power over their serfs. It bound the peasant to the land, as only one son (not the eldest) was permitted to leave the village; townsfolk (mieszczanstwo) were prohibited from owning land; and positions in the Church hierarchy could be given only to nobles. On 23 October 1501, nobles gained the right of non praestanda oboedientia permitting them to disobey the king or his representatives and to form confederations in armed rebellion against the king or state officers, if they thought that the law or their legitimate privileges were being infringed. On 3 May 1505, King Alexander I (1501–1506) granted the act of Nihil novi nisi commune consensu (‘nothing new except by common consent’), forbidding the king to pass any new law without the consent of the nobility assembled in Sejm and Senat, and thus greatly strengthening the nobility’s political position. Basically, this act transferred legislative power from the king to the Polish Diet, the Sejm. Also in 1505,
a Sejm law forbade noblemen to engage in trade or commerce, with the penalty of the loss of noble status. The end of the Jagellonian dynasty in 1572 and the introduction of elective monarchy enabled the nobility to establish a monopoly of political power in Poland. Thus by the 1570s, the szlachta had become a separate, closed, hereditary estate, jealously guarding its rights and privileges, and all means of entry.

According to Fernand Braudel, ‘The headiest days of the sixteenth century, for example, from as early as 1470 until say 1580, were […] an age of accelerated social promotion throughout Europe […]. A bourgeoisie emerging from the background of trade was climbing by its own efforts to the highest place in contemporary society. During the last years of the century by contrast, with the reversal of the secular trend, or at any rate a prolonged intercyclical depression, the societies of continental Europe put up the barriers once more’; he suggests that the process of social mobility ‘was twofold – in the course of this long century, a section of the nobility disappeared and was immediately replaced, but once the gaps had been made good the door swung to behind the newcomers.’

Braudel also pointed out that despite obvious time-lags and diversities between countries, ‘social developments had a tendency to be synchronized throughout Europe’. In the Polish kingdom, the urban elite’s growing aspirations to ennoblement and the ‘noble way of life’ became evident in the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. These were caused mostly by noble policies towards the cities; these centuries witnessed growing discrimination against townsfolk by the nobility, who ruled the country through their dominance in the Sejm and whose main concern in urban politics was for their private towns and boroughs. Promoted by their lords, these private urban settlements were among the factors which caused the economic decline of the old royal towns in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Noble status was very attractive for city patricians, not only as a sign of prestige but also because it freed them from many taxes. As a rule, urban patricians were ennobled in return for giving loans to the king, rarely through service at the courts of magnates and senators, through ecclesiastical service, or through marriage to a noblewoman. The nobleman Walerian Nekanda Trepka (1585–1640) in his treatise Liber chamorum, written in 1626, counted 2,500 false noblemen in early seventeenth-century Poland, half of them ‘burghers’ sons.’

The Polish aristocrat Krzysztof Opalinski (1611–1655) suggested in his treatise ‘On the means of increasing and developing towns and on their bad management’, published in 1650, that towns should have the right to hold landed estates and even send deputies...

5 Ibid, p. 477.
to the Sejm. But these prerogatives of the nobility were to be granted only to urban communes, not to particular burghers. Opalinski also explained that he had in mind to protect noble privileges, not to diminish them or share them with the patriciate. He wrote, ‘If the middle class was free of oppression and contempt then, I assure you, it would not press so much for the gentry’s preeminence as it does now, whether it wants it or not.’ Respecting burghers’ rights would thus put a stop to their desire – at least on the part of the patrician elite – to enter the gentry, a desire which caused so much anxiety to the nobility in the first half of the seventeenth century.

There were three ways to be ennobled in the early modern Polish kingdom.

Adoption (adopcja) was the basis of ennoblement, being a legal act issued to a person of lower class (often a foreigner). This pure form of ennoblement took place when the person of lower class was adopted into a clan and into its coat of arms (herb) by its armigerous representative(s). The first recorded ennoblement took place in 1419 when Szymon Szczecina, burgher of Brzesc Kujawski, was ennobled for his deeds during the war against the Teutonic Knights. The szlachta was rightly cautious, however, believing that not all ennobled persons were worthy of this honour. Its apprehension was further justified by the rapid increase in the number of ennoblements for merits which seemed doubtful to the szlachta. It should not be surprising, then, that the szlachta sought to defend itself against usurpers through many acts passed by the Sejm.

In the kingdom of Poland, ennoblement (nobilitacja) was also granted by the monarch. From 1578 this was done by the king and Sejm together, after the latter passed the Plebeiorum Nobilitatio, depriving the sovereign of his power to give new grants of ennoblement. The only exception to this rule was ennoblement on the battlefield for outstanding bravery; all other cases were first to be submitted to the Sejm and receive approval from the Upper House (Senat). From 1641, ennoblement was by the Sejm alone. At first nobilitacja (royal grant of ennoblement) followed the rules of adoption, entitling many ennobled persons to bear existing coats of arms already used by different noble clans and share in all privileges of the nobility. However, in 1633 the Sejm passed a law which put a definitive end to the adoption and granting of old coats of arms, after which every new nobleman had to have new arms created specifically for him. Finally, from 1678 ennoblement could be granted only to a Catholic.

Indygenat or naturalisation was the third official way to join the Polish nobility, applying only to foreigners of noble origin (indigenatus). The procedure involved here

---

9 The capital city of Cracow was granted nobiliary rights as early as the end of the 15th century, while the town council of the capital of Vilnius was ennobled in 1568, and thus gained the right to send deputies to the Seym (Wyrobisz, ‘Attitude’, p. 87). But their role was mostly symbolic; these urban deputies had to ask noble deputies, senators and the king to address the particular affairs of their towns. Wyrobisz, ‘Power and Towns in the Polish Gentry Commonwealth: The Polish–Lithuanian State in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, in: Cities and the Rise of States in Europe, A. D. 1000 to 1800, ed. C. Tilly & W. P. Blockmans, Boulder, 1994, p. 151.


11 For example, there was a curious situation in the University of Cracow, where after ten years of service the professors were granted a noble title for life in accordance with the 1535 statute of King Sigismund I (1506–1548). After twenty years of service, however, this grant became hereditary. Because many of those ennobled were priests, their privileges could be passed on to their brothers or male lineal descendants. A. Kulikowski, Heraldyka szlachecka, Warsaw, 1990, p. 26.
was also fairly difficult. The first act of indygenat was recorded in 1519, granted to Jan Frezer of Wissemburg. Before 1573, that is under the Jagellonians, applicants for such grants had only to take an oath of loyalty and prove their noble descent. During the period of elective monarchy, however, the requirement of the oath was so strict that even the families of kings were not exempt. Such was the case with two nephews of King Stephen Báthory (1576–1586), the Cardinal Andrzej and Baltazar, granted indygenat in 1588 for their service in the war with Muscovy (1579–1582) and in the battle at Byczyna with Archduke Maximilian (1588). From 1573 onward, the Sejm’s terms for such grants became more and more demanding. First, a candidate had to demonstrate his services to the country; secondly, he was obliged to prove noble status in his country of origin before the Crown or Lithuanian Chancellery; thirdly, he had to take a personal oath of loyalty to the king and Rzeczpospolita (the Commonwealth) in the Sejm in the presence of the Upper and Lower Houses. Next, he had to purchase an estate before the next session of the Sejm.

Arrogance toward townsfolk and peasantry was affirmed and elaborated in the culture of Sarmatism, or Sarmatian ideology. Noblemen were proclaimed the sole descendants of the Sarmatians, who had ruled Eastern Europe in ancient times. Townsfolk and peasantry became descendants of the subjugated Slavs. Noblemen saw military service as the only way to obtain noble status. Thus, to be a warrior became synonymous with being a nobleman (szlachcic).

It is hardly surprising that wealthy Armenian and Catholic patricians in Lviv began to emphasise their ancestors’ noble origins. Under the influence of Sarmatism, the writings of local Catholic humanists transformed early German settlers in Lviv into German mercenaries (stipendiarii Germani) in the service of King Casimir III, who conquered Galicia and allegedly settled his German warriors in the city in the 1340s.

Armenian merchants in search of their new historical identity

From the very beginning, Lviv was a multiethnic city inhabited by Ruthenians, Armenians, Jews, Tatars and Saracens. German merchants and artisans, mostly from Poland and Silesia, were invited by the Ruthenian prince Daniel (1238–1264) in the mid-thirteenth century, and all these urban ‘nations’ were under the protection of the prince and his successors. After the Polish conquest of Galicia in 1349, local German townsfolk (cives catholici) became the dominant community as the Polish kings

13 Before being elected King of Poland, Stephen Báthory or Báthory István was Prince of Transylvania.
16 See historical works by M. Miechowski (1517), M. Bielski (1554), M. Kromer (1555), A. Guagnini (1579), M. Stryjkowski (1582), and S. Sarnicki (1587).
supported the Catholics. On the other hand, the rights of other urban ‘nations’ were guaranteed and confirmed by King Casimir (Kazimierz) III in 1356, when the city was granted German law (ius theutonicum), the Magdeburger Recht. Thus, Lviv became Lemberg, also known as Lwów or Leopolis.

Non-Catholics (schismatici) were not accepted into city governance. All members of the city magistracy were Catholics. Economic opportunities for non-Catholics and Jews were also restricted. The only economic niche which the Catholic city authorities allowed the Armenians was the eastern trade. On the other hand, the royal chancery used Armenian merchants as interpreters, and some were diplomats or spies, listed as such in royal service. They also provided loans to the king in cases of emergency. For all these reasons, Polish kings protected the Armenian community.

The city magistracy, controlled by the Catholic patricians, made successive efforts to restrict Armenian judicial autonomy. A royal decree of 1469 abolished the office of Armenian judge (advocatus, wójt). Further decrees of 1476 and 1510 established a new order, where the court of Armenian elders was headed by the city judge.

In the latter sixteenth century there was an evident growth of tension between the Catholic patricians, who gradually made magistracy offices their hereditary domain, and the Armenian community, mainly for economic reasons. Using capital accumulated in the Oriental trade, Armenian merchants began to push their Catholic competitors out of the Lviv market.

In a trial held in 1578 before the recently elected king, Stephen Báthory (1576–1586), the Armenians stated that they were citizens of Lviv and that their ancestors were not restricted in their rights, and they showed the king the old charters which they had received from his predecessors. The representatives of the magistracy stated that the ‘Armenians are not equal [to them] because of the difference in languages and religion,’ that is, that they were not citizens (cives) of Lviv but strangers and infidels. To obtain equal rights with Catholic burghers in Lviv, local Armenians stated that their ancestors

---

19 Ł. Charewiczowa, *Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacyj schyzmatycznych i żydów we Lwowie XV–XVI w.*, Lviv, 1925.
22 *Prywilei natsionalnych hromad mista Lvova (XIV–XVIII st.),* ed. by M. Kapral, Lviv, 2000, p. 146.
23 Ibid, pp. 147–8.
had been invited by the Galician prince Daniel, and presented the old, short charter.26 The king granted the local Armenians equal economic rights with the Catholics.27

There had been numerous trials between the magistracy and Armenian community in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but the Armenians had never used the charter of Prince Daniel before. In every trial, they had shown the king the royal decrees issued to the Armenian community by his predecessors. Daniel’s charter was of no relevance, since after the Polish conquest of Galicia in 1349 and the re-foundation of Lviv as Lemberg in 1356, charters issued by the Ruthenian princes lost their judicial power, and their land grants to the local nobility were translated into Latin and confirmed by the Polish kings in the latter fourteenth century, after which the Ruthenian originals fell out of use.

In 1578, the Armenians used Daniel’s charter for the first time to prove that they were not newcomers in Lviv, their ancestors having settled there at the moment the city was founded by Prince Lev, son of Daniel. Thus, the remote past – the epoch before the Polish conquest – hitherto neglected, became a crucial argument in this and in further trials.

My point is that ‘the old, short charter’ of Prince Daniel, which the Armenians showed King Stephen Báthory in 1578 and then disclosed to the Catholic archbishop of Lviv, Jan-Dymitr Solikowski, in 1597, may have been a letter of protection by the prince to Armenian merchants. Such letters granted free passage – salvum conductum – for merchants, and guaranteed their protection in the domains of a certain lord or state. Extant letters were granted to foreign merchants by Ruthenian and Lithuanian princes, by khans of the Golden Horde and by the republics of Genoa and Venice in their overseas domains in the late thirteenth and in the early fourteenth century.28 By adding new details, Armenians could transform this letter of free passage into Daniel’s charter of invitation to their ancestors, founding their settlement (locatio) in his domains.

In 1597, the Catholics submitted a complaint to the court of King Sigismund III (1587–1632). They conceded the Armenians’ statement that their ancestors had been invited, but accused Armenian warriors of participating in hostile incursions against Poland led by Prince Daniel or his son Lev/Leon, together with the Tatars, in the 1250s–1280s:

‘Lviv was founded around 1280 by Leon, son of the Ruthenian prince Daniel. This Daniel died around 1263 or 1264. Thus the Armenians were invited earlier, since they connect their invitation with the aforementioned Daniel. At that time, the city of Lviv did not exist yet. Accordingly there is no doubt whatsoever that they were invited not to

27 Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad, pp. 298–300.
the city of Lviv, but to the lands of Rus’ to wage war alongside Daniel, the Ruthenians and the Tatars against the Kingdom of Poland, as recorded in the chronicles of the kingdom in the time of Prince Lesco Czarny. Further, even if the Armenians later lived in accordance with Leon’s privileges – which we never admit as legitimate – all these privileges they lost in accordance with the law of war when a part of Rus’, with the city of Lviv, was taken by the sword and ruled by King Casimir in 1340. Thus Lemberg was founded by his ordinance, not by that of those previous princes of Rus’, as shown by the first privilege of Cazimir granted in Sandomierz in 1356.29

Thus the Armenians – good subjects in 1578 – were turned into the descendants of Poland’s enemies. In April 1600, the royal court in Warsaw considered the Lviv magistracy’s complaint. The renewed decree proclaimed equal rights for the Armenians in general, but limited their opportunities in many particular cases.

In the latter thirteenth century Tatar troops, accompanied by their Ruthenian allies, passed through the Galician principality to devastate neighbouring Poland. However, there is no record in either the Polish or the Ruthenian chronicles of Armenian participation in Tatar and Ruthenian raids on the Polish kingdom. To construct this historical accusation against the Armenians’ ancestors, the patricians used certain sentences about the princes Daniel and Lev, and about the foundation of Lviv, briefly mentioned in the history of Poland, De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum libri XXX, by Martin Kromer (1512–1589). The patricians also twisted some sentences from other texts, as well as the fact that Armenians living in Lviv used Tatar as a language of everyday conversation.30

Kromer mentioned Lviv for the first time in 1280, in connection with the war between the Ruthenian Prince Lev and the Polish Prince Leszko Czarny (Lesco Niger).31 There is also a story included among other events and dated to 1261, about how Prince Daniel defeated the troops of other Ruthenian princes and made them his vassals, and established a quasi-monarchy in southern Rus’. In 1254, he was crowned by the papal legate Cardinal Oppiso with a crown sent by the pope, on condition that he join with the Roman Catholic Church and participate in military actions against the Tatars. However, Daniel ignored his obligations and, together with the Tatars and pagan Lithuanians, laid waste the Christian countries.32 Thus in Polish historical tradition, Prince Daniel and his son Lev were seen as the enemies.

Kromer’s historical work was very popular in the latter sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, being published in Latin in 1555, 1558, 1568 and 1589, in German in 1562, and in Polish in 1611. Kromer was born into a burgher family of German immigrants

---

31 M. Cromerus, De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum libri XXX, Cologne, 1589, p. 171.
in Biecz, in southern Poland. His work represented a particularly authoritative source of historical knowledge for Polish townsfolk, being mentioned seven times in the Latin and German editions in testamentary inventories of Catholic burgher libraries in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Lviv. In 1552, he was ennobled and granted a coat of arms for diplomatic services to the kings Sigismund I and Sigismund II. In 1573 Kromer became prince-bishop of Warmia (Ermland). Thus in the eyes of contemporary and later generations of the urban elites, Kromer embodied their aspirations for career and ennoblement; his life was a model for the urban patricians, and his history of Poland shaped their historical imagination for a century. Kromer’s career and royalist vision of Polish history also made his work authoritative at the royal court. Along with the coming of print and spreading interest in national history among the Polish nobility and urban patriciate, Kromer’s work provided public discourse about the past with a well-defined historical framework. The Lviv patrician, J.-B. Zimorowicz, called Kromer ‘the most brilliant among Polish historians’ and wrote of ‘the most brilliant writers of Polish history and the head of them – Kromer’.

The second stage in the making or rather re-making of the usable Armenian past in Lviv was the period of fierce religious conflict which divided the Armenian community in the 1630–1650s, partly overlapping with the larger military conflict of 1648–58 which threatened the very existence of Polish statehood.

The Armenian narrative of invitation gradually changed in the 1620s and 1630s. This new perception of the past was influenced by two factors, education and reading. Many young Armenians received a Renaissance education in the Academy of Zamość, founded in 1595. The Polish translation of Kromer’s history was published in 1611, and thus became accessible to Armenian readers. This new, well-educated generation of Lviv’s Armenian elite realised that neither Daniel nor Lev, discredited in Kromer’s history, could be a credible authoritative figure in their past. The religious conflict of the 1630s stimulated a search for a new ‘founding-father’ of the Armenian diaspora in Ruthenian lands.

When in 1641 King Władysław IV (1632–1648) renewed the old royal decrees submitted to him by the Armenians, these included a short charter issued by the Ruthenian prince Feodor/Theodore, son of Dmitry. His title and domains were not further specified, nor was there any date. ‘From Prince Teodor, son of Dmitry, to the Armenians of Kosochac(ean): Come under my hand and I shall grant you freedom for three years.’

While translating the original letter from Ruthenian into Latin in the royal chancellery

34 J. Skoczek, Lwowskie inwentarze biblioteczne w epoce renesansu, Lviv, 1939, p. 45.
35 Finkel, Marcin Kromer, p. 34.
36 Ibid, p. 36.
37 Zimorowicz, Leopolis tripex, pp. 29, 55.
39 This document in Ruthenian was lost in the mid-19th century. The original content of Feodor’s letter is known to us thanks to Prof. F.–X. Zachariasiewicz (1770–1845): Oto Kniazia Teodora Dmytrowicza Kosochackim Armenom: Prefidili na moju ruku dam wam wolnost na try lita; Zachariasiewicz, Wiadomość oOrmianach w Polszcze, Lviv, 1842, p. 10.
on 18 October 1641, the Armenians had included in the Latin copy information they needed for the trial with the Catholic patricians. According to the extended and updated charter, the prince invited Armenian warriors to help him in battle, and allowed them to settle anywhere in his domains: ‘The charter issued by Feodor, [son of] Dmitry, Prince of Rus’, translated from Ruthenian into Latin, granted to the Armenians in the year 1062 AD in these words: Theodor Grand Prince of Rus’, son of Demetr, to the Armenians of Kosohac(ean). Whosoever wish to come here, they should come to my aid, and I will grant them freedom for three years. And when you are with me, you might freely go wherever it please you.’

Since no title for the prince was indicated in the Ruthenian original, in Latin translation he was easily transformed into a Grand Prince of Rus’. Along with other documents submitted by the Armenians in 1641, the extended Latin copy of Feodor’s charter was transcribed into the *Matricularium Regni Poloniae*. The Armenians then received the Latin copy from the royal chancellery, which they used as officially confirmed proof in future trials.

In 1654 the Armenians won the trial and obtained equal rights with the Catholics from King Jan Casimir (1648–1668). The royal decree mentions that Armenians had shown the king ‘a charter issued by Prince Dmitry in 1062, when for the first time the Armenian nation was accepted and invited as a great army for the military assistance and public interest of the lands of Rus’. And this charter of the afore-mentioned prince of Rus’ granted Armenians the permission to live and settle everywhere in this province. Thus, Armenians who in 1641 were invited to help the prince, became by 1654 a ‘great army’ (*in quantitate notabilis exercitus*) invited ‘for the military assistance and public interest’ (*in subsidium belli et ex necessitate publica*). In 1062, Rus’ was independent and almost entirely absent from Kromer’s history. Therefore, the very moment of invitation was moved outside the frame of Kromer’s narrative.

---

40 ‘privilegium Theodori Demetrii Ducis Russiae ex Ruthenico idiomate in latinum transpositum in a. Dni millesimo sexagesimo secundo Armenis datum, cujus ea sunt verba: Ecce Magni Duci Theodori Demetrii filii Kosohacensibus Armenis, qui huc volunt venire, veniant in auxilium meum, et ego vobis dabo libertatem ad tres annos et cum fueritis apud me, ubi quis voluerit, illuc ibit libere’; italics to indicate new words interpolated into the Latin translation of 1641 are mine. Quoted in: F. Bischoff, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Armenier in Lemberg*, Vienna, 1864, p. 4; S. Barącz, *Rys dziejów ormiańskich*, Tarnopol, 1869, pp. 60–61. In 1062 there was no Ruthenian prince of that name. The Armenians were actually using a letter issued – perhaps in 1382 – by the Volhynian prince (1377–93) Feodor, son of Lubart (the Lithuanian prince Lubart was baptised as Dmitry), inviting Armenian merchants into his principality, this being a typical safe conduct (*salvum conductum*) granted to foreign merchants by the local ruler for passage in his domains.

41 Armenians submitted a confession of faith to the new Polish King Jan Casimir (1648–1668) in 1652. However, before accepting it, the king required that it also be countersigned by the Armenian Katholicos Philippos. Philippos duly confirmed the confession in his pastoral letter to the community of Lviv on 12 February 1653. After the agreement with Katholicos Philippos in 1653, Armenian elders concluded a thorough and detailed agreement with Bishop Torosowicz on 11 November 1654 (Schütz, ‘An Armeno-Kipchak Document’, pp. 308–9).

42 ‘Imprimis autem privilegium Demetrii ducis anno millesimo sexagesimo secundo, quo primum tempore natio Armenica in subsidium belli et ex necessitate publica in provinciam Russiae in quantitate notabilis exercitus adscita et vocata fuerit, privilegiumque ipsis speciale ab eodem duce Russiae ubivis locorum habitandi et incolendi concessum fuerit producerent’ (*Privyilei nationalnych hromad*, p 334). The name Feodor and patronymic Dmytrowicz, traditional for Ruthenian Orthodox onomastics, when translated into Latin as ‘Theodori Demetrii’ were sometimes perceived by Catholic readers as a double name, ‘Theodor–Dmitry’. This could explain why in some cases Feodor/Theodor was substituted by Dmitry.
Thanks to the ‘charter of Feodor/Dmitry, Grand Prince of Rus’, the imagined Armenian warriors accused in 1597 of being enemies of Poland were in 1654 officially rehabilitated. Thereby, the Armenian elite of Lviv received official confirmation tracing their group genealogy to brave warriors in service to the Grand Prince. In the short time between 1654 and 1659, King Jan Casimir ennobled at least four rich Armenian merchants of Lviv who had subsidised the king and the defence of Lviv during the war against the Cossacks, Tatars and Muscovites in 1648–55.43

Inventing collective genealogy in Leopolis Triplex: German warriors as the ancestors of Polish patricians in Lviv

Professor Bernd Schneidmüller’s characterisation of changes in urban historical consciousness in late medieval Germany could easily be applied to seventeenth-century Lviv: ‘It is important to note that urban historiography was subject to a general process by which urban society increasingly split into strata. When the patriciate emerged as an authority endowed with a God-given right to rule, urban chroniclers, when describing the origins of their city as a social body, no longer focused exclusively on the emancipation of the city dwellers from their lords […] [Now] […] city chroniclers […] were far more interested in explaining the royal acts of favor that had fostered the development of their cities. They integrated the community of burghers into the history of realm […]. Moreover, they avoided a conceptual division between the sphere of the citizen and the feudal world of lords and knights. This type of urban historical consciousness was not oriented toward dissent between the commune and the lords of the town. Instead, it underscored a basic level of consent between all actors as to the overall importance of urban growth.’44

Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz (Iosephus Bartholomaeus Zimorowicz, 1597–1677) began his career as an assistant city scribe. During the 1620s, he fulfilled the functions of a palestrant, comparable to those of a modern lawyer, and represented the Armenian community in its relations with the city magistracy. Zimorowicz’s four marriages with the daughters of city patricians in 1629, 1654, 1656, and 1663 helped his career.45 In 1629 Zimorowicz obtained citizenship of Lviv, and in 1640 became a secretary of the city council. In 1646, he was co-opted into the city jury (lawa, scabinat – the court of the bench). In 1648, Zimorowicz was co-opted into the city council (rada) and headed the self-governance of Lviv, occupying the highest office of burgomaster (burmistrz,
In November 1648, Zimorowicz took part in the election of the new king in Warsaw, being one of Lviv’s two representatives in the elective Sejm. In 1654, Zimorowicz held the office of city judge (advocatus, wójt – head of the court of the bench).

Among Zimorowicz’s many religious, lyrical, and historical works, his magnum opus is a history of Lviv, the Leopolis triplex. Zimorowicz started to collect source materials from the city’s archive in the 1650s. The main core was written between 1665 and 1667. Lviv’s past was described in chronological order from the thirteenth century down to 1597, the year of the author’s birth. Then, around 1670, Zimorowicz continued his narrative down to 1633 and added at the beginning a dedication to the city’s Senate, and long passages of text not directly connected with Lviv/Lemberg’s history, but devoted to political and military relations between Poland and Rus’ from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. In 1671, Zimorowicz published a book on ‘the famous men of Lemberg,’ Viri illustres civitatis Leopoliensis, a series of brief biographies of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century urban patricians.

Thus, the life of Zimorowicz stands as an example of a successful career; he was born into the family of an urban mason and ended life as a patrician and owner of a house on the prestigious market square. He used his talents, judicial as well as literary, to defend and glorify the urban elite, into which he was accepted by his career and marriages. Zimorowicz dedicated his magnum opus, Leopolis triplex, to the city’s Senate ‘and with the same pen, signed by early fortune, my suburban talent is graced with the insignia of the consuls’, and emphasised that the work expressed his gratitude to the patricians who helped him to make a successful career, and to the Senate who had ‘pulled a plebeian from the dirt with its hand’.

Zimorowicz entitled his main historical work the Leopolis triplex, that is ‘Leopolis in three parts,’ and divides the city’s history into three. In the first part, he describes its early history as Ruthenian Leopolis, from the foundation of Lviv by the Ruthenian Prince Lev (Leo), son of Daniel, around 1270. According to Zimorowicz, Lev used the new town to store the booty he and his Tatar allies had seized during their incursions into Poland. The second part starts with the conquest of the city by the Polish King Casimir III (1333–1370) in 1340. Zimorowicz named this period German Leopolis, since Casimir III allegedly settled his German mercenaries there, who in turn transformed Lviv (Lwihorod) from a semi-barbarian town (oppidum) into a city (urbs) called Lemberg. According to Zimorowicz, these Germans had assimilated into the local Polish townsfolk by the mid-sixteenth century. Thus he named the third part Polish Leopolis, from 1551 until his own days.

46 Heck, Józef Bartłomiej Zimorowicz, pp. 30–1.
48 Zimorowicz, Leopolis triplex, p. 4.
49 The 13th century Ruthenian chronicle Ipatievskaya letopis’ mentions Lviv/Lwów for the first time under 1256. Zimorowicz gave 1270, since his main source for this period was Kromer’s De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum.
50 Zimorowicz, Leopolis triplex, pp. 39, 40.
Zimorowicz delivered his concept of the temporal division of the city’s history in the opening part of the *Leopolis triplex*:

‘Threefold Lviv in one [city] I discover:

1270. The first is Ruthenian, founded by the Ruthenian Prince Lev, or drafted rather than built. Thereby, like all ancient creations, it was shapeless, primitive, crude, and more like a military camp than a city, initially called Lviv-town.

1340. The second is German, taken from the Ruthenians by Casimir commonly called the Great, then purified by Polish flame, and improved with stone walls, Saxon law, a German garrison, and called Lemburg.

1551. Thirdly, after the previous two came the Poles, whose it is till now. The notables [of the city] in accordance with local custom married Polish girls, and as a result gradually transformed themselves: since foreign (German) habits gradually diminished, the native way of life and local language (Polish) took over from the foreign.’

At the beginning of the second part of *Leopolis triplex*, Zimorowicz placed a long and detailed account of the virtues of the Germans and how they civilised the city. In reviewing the events of 1345 and immediately thereafter, Zimorowicz wrote, ‘In the ancient era, Tacitus testified in his Roman history that there are no other people who could surpass the Germans in warcraft and in loyalty.’ Then he quoted Martin Kromer, the most famous Polish historian of the sixteenth century, who emphasised the role of the Germans in urbanising Poland: ‘When [Casimir III] saw Poland and Ruthenia not well civilised, and poorly inhabited because of the plague [of 1348] and constant wars, he invited Germans and granted them lands in Subcarpathia and on the borderland with Hungary. Their communities exist in Ruthenia until now […]. By their efforts and deeds, Poland began to be settled with many villages and towns, since these Germans were much better than the Poles in managing and developing this country.’

Then Zimorowicz interrupts quoting from Kromer, remarking, ‘And even today a traveller through villages and towns can easily see where the Germans live, and where the Poles. And he can see that the urban fortifications need repair in those towns which were founded by Germans, but are now inhabited and ruled by Poles.’ Zimorowicz then quotes Kromer again to emphasise not only Casimir III’s particular favour to the German settlers in Lviv, but his general protection of townsfolk and peasants: ‘And Casimir favoured these Germans as well as other [that is Polish] townsfolk and peasants. And he forbade his governors and even aristocracy and noblemen to oppress them with works, and taxes, and other burdens. That is why he was known as the king of peasants

---

51 Ibid, p. 37.
52 ‘in olim apud Tacitum proclamatum quasi inaudivisset Casimirus, multum bellicae laudi, plurimum constantiae Germanorum indulsit, regiae suae, castrorum urbiumque primiarum custodia illis credita’ (ibid, pp. 61–2).
54 ‘ita ut facile etiamnum appareat per pagos et oppida iter facientibus, ubi illi, ubive Poloni habitent, videmusque ruere muros quorundam oppidorum, ab illis, quod vel nomina testificantur, conditorum, posteaquam a Polonis habitantur et administrantur’ (ibid, pp. 62–3).
and plebeians. He allowed not only the Germans to use their Saxon or Magdeburg law, but also granted it to his own Poles.\(^55\)

Zimorowicz, citing Kromer extensively, thus criticised the contemporary nobility whose politics caused the decline of Polish cities and townsfolk. At the same time, aware of the long tradition of Polish Germanophobia, he found it necessary to explain Kromer’s favourable view of the Germans: ‘These and many other praiseworthy examples of German habits are described in detail by the chronicler-bishop [Kromer], glorious by his life and talent. It is worth adding that [he] a Pole praises the rival nation [Germans], with whom [the Poles] have inherited quarrels for glory and battles for virtues. But the virtues even of rivals are praiseworthy.’\(^56\)

Zimorowicz then describes how Casimir III’s German mercenaries settled in Leopolis and transformed themselves into burghers, emphasising the German domination in Lviv, which after the conquest was founded anew under Magdeburg law: ‘[Casimir] granted that the Germans rule over other indigenous people and defend the city.’\(^57\)

According to Zimorowicz, ‘Whatsoever holy and preeminent Leopolis now has, was borrowed from the *primaeval Germans*, in particular piety, loyalty to monarchs, care for fellow citizens, hospitality to foreigners. In earlier days Leopolis was barbarian and excluded from the mystic body of true believers […] With the arrival of the Germans, [Leopolis] freed itself from these monstrous superstitions […] \(^58\) Thus Zimorowicz juxtaposes ‘superstitions’ of the ‘schismatic’ (Orthodox) Ruthenians with the good mores of local Germans, the ‘true believers’ of the Roman Church.

Zimorowicz then enumerates the virtues of the ‘primeval Germans’, mostly derived from Tacitus’s *Germania*. ‘Finally, most importantly for me, they introduced to Lviv good habits, which according to Tacitus the Germans respect more than law.’\(^59\)

Zimorowicz could use the model introduced by German humanists in the sixteenth century. The *Germania* was first published in 1476, and over the next five decades was printed, mostly in German-speaking, countries in as many as six thousand copies.\(^60\) A classical text of unquestionable authority in humanist eyes, the *Germania* fulfilled deep desires: the obstinate German search for a national identity in its own right found a past characterised by specific values very different from Roman ones, being a past that in present times of instability offered a stable foundation for nation-building. The Tacitean

---

55 ‘Fuit autem in eos, Teutonos inquam, et in ceteros oppidanos et agrestes propensior et indulgentior Casimirus, nec eos gravioribus laboribus vel exactionibus, aut ullis injuriis praefectorum suorum, sive adeo procerum atque nobilitatis premi passus est, animadvertendo in eos, qui aliquid eiusmodi ausi essent, ita ut vulgo rusticorum sive plebeiorum rex vocaretur. Nec ipsos modo Teutonos iure suo Saxonico seu Magdeburgensi uti permisit, sed suis quoque Polonis id indulsit.’ (Cromerus, *De origine et rebus*, p. 214; Zimorowicz, *Leopolis triplex*, p. 63).


57 ‘Germanis solis regimen in reliquos indigenas tutelamque urbis tradit’ (ibid, p. 64).

58 ‘Quidquid igitur sancti aut egregii Leopolis ad praesens habet, totum id a primaevis Teutonibus accepit, maxime vero pietatem in superos, reverentiam in principes, caritatem in domesticos, hospitalitatem in externos. […] Adventu Germanorum monstrosis superstitionibus exonerate est’ (ibid, p. 64).

59 ‘[…] ad extremum, quod apud me palmare, bonos mores, quales apud Germanos plus, quam bonas leges, valere Tacitus attestatur’ (ibid, p. 65). Cf.: ‘boni mores valent quam alibi bona leges’ (*Germania*, 19).

emphasis on German customs and morals was particularly welcome, since the majority of humanists intended history to reveal the morally superior past and to teach its readers to embrace lost values.  

At the same time Zimorowicz transformed Tacitus’s primitive Germans, living their simple life in the forests, into promoters of urban civilisation on the eastern periphery of Europe (ex magistris milium magistros civium). In 1356 Casimir III granted Lemburg – actually the Catholic urban community – Magdeburg law. Zimorowicz’s entry for this year extolled the leading role of the ‘primeval Germans’ in the military and civil life of the city, with the epigraph ‘Germans are teachers of war and citizens’ (Germani belli et civitatis magistri). Zimorowicz based his account on two well-known Roman models: 1) when the permanent legionary camps, situated mostly on the Rhine and Danube, gradually became towns (examples being Vindobona/Vienna, Castra Bonnensis/Bonn, Castrum Mogontiacum/Mainz, Argentoratum/Strasbourg), and 2) when legionary veterans were granted parcels of land on the borderlands, in colonies named after the Roman emperors, their relatives or powerful officeholders (such as Colonia Agrippina/ Cologne). In both cases these military settlements were mostly founded on the site of former native burghs, and gradually civilized the conquered natives in their province. Thus, Zimorowicz portrayed his ‘primeval Germans’ with Roman features:

‘Germans, eager for praise, and stimulated by the king’s grace, fulfilled all Casimir’s orders. Industrious in peace, brave in war, and in both situations faithful, Germans earned great rewards from the king. He settled them, not yet veterans but nevertheless deserving, on the fertile fields, granted them their native law, freed them from land taxes, made them city officeholders, making military instructors into teachers of citizens, so that Leopolis might rightfully be called Casimir’s colony, but the king, gracious even to enemies, left the city its old name.’

The ‘primeval Germans’ brought with them a legislature, the symbols and practices of urban self-government, and trade and handicraft; they built churches and hospitals in Lviv, and established a school.

Ethnic origins as social marker: patrician aspirations to ennoblement

There were further differences between the ‘good old’ Germans of Tacitus and those presented by Zimorowicz. Tacitus, and the German humanists, emphasised that the Germans were ‘aboriginal, and not mixed at all with other races’.  

62 ‘1356. Germani belli et civitatis magistri. Germani quoque laudis avidi et propensione regia velut classico exciti, abunde votis Casimiri satis facientes, pace sollertes, bello strenui utrobique fideles, prolixam regis munificentiam provocarunt. Illos nondum veteranos et iam emeritos in uberes campos deduxit, legibus patriis, immunitatibus agraris, vacationibus castrensis demulsit, ex magistris milium magistros civium constituit, ut merito Leopolis colonia Casimiriana dicenda esset, nisi eam pristino nomini princeps, hostibus etiam aequus, reliquisset’ (Zimorowicz, Leopolis triplex, p. 67); hostibus etiam aequus refers to the recently-conquered Ruthenians.
63 Ibid, pp. 68–9.
64 Germania, 1.
their old mother tongue unmixed and unadulterated’ (Justus Georg Schottelius, 1648). By contrast, Zimorowicz wrote that the ‘primeval German’ settlers of Lviv ‘mixed in marriage with the local Ruthenian women’ (Amazonum Russicarum confixi). They then continued to intermarry, this time with the Poles: ‘The intermixing of these two nations [Germans and Poles] was constant’. Finally, the Germans were assimilated into Polish society. One should not forget that in contemporary discourse, mingling with others was seen as a sign of degradation. But Zimorowicz ‘married’ his ‘primeval Germans’ with local women, to show how the contemporary Polish patricians of Lviv had inherited their symbolic capital.

For seventeenth-century patricians, this meant abandoning their forefathers in favour of those who had preceded them in Lviv, going all the way back to King Casimir III’s conquest of Galician Rus’. It is impossible to explain why Zimorowicz constructed such a history if we focus exclusively on surviving primary sources, or on the historical realities of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Zimorowicz was not a disinterested, dispassionate observer. He was not simply describing Lviv’s urban society in his time, but articulating a view of it from a particular position within that society, that of an ennobled magistrate. According to Simona Cerutti, the sources which historians use are often (not always) documents which claim something (rather than just describe something). It is time to ask such questions as: What claims to legitimacy does Zimorowicz express here? Who are these claims made to? And how?

In fact the early Germans settled in Lviv long before the Polish conquest of the 1340s. These Germans were merchants and artisans, mostly from Poland and Silesia, invited by the Ruthenian Prince Daniel (1238–64) in the mid-thirteenth century. After the Polish conquest of Galician Rus’ and Lviv in 1349, local German townsfolk (cives catholici) became the dominant community as the Polish kings supported the Catholics. The new influx of German burghers to Lviv, mostly still from Poland and Silesia, continued in the fifteenth century and they became the majority group. Ottoman conquests in the northern Black Sea region in the 1470s and 1480s dramatically changed the trade in which the German merchants of Lviv were involved. Thus, the economic power of the older patriciate radically declined in the late fifteenth century.

68 ‘They are called Mysos, since they are mixed mixture of diverse peoples’ (‘Mysos vocatos, id est, miessancy mieszani, ex diversis gentibus’); see S. Sarnicki, *Annales, sive de origine et rebus gestis Polonorum et Lituanorum, libri octo*, Cracoviae, 1587, p. 65. The author includes Polish words in the Latin text – *miessancy mieszani* – to explain to his Polish readers the etymology of the name Mysos and the ignoble nature of these people. ‘The concept of purity was used to justify the position of certain social group. In early modern Europe ‘purity of blood’ was officially essential for high status. Elsewhere the nobility often described their social inferiors as unclean to prevent social mobility.’ (P. Burke, *History and Social Theory*, Cambridge, 1992, p. 63).
In the later sixteenth century, a new patriciate emerged in Lviv, themselves newcomers to the city. Some were migrants from the German or Silesian cities, some from Hungary, Italy and Crete, but most were ethnic Poles. The most obvious example might be Paul (Pawel) Kampian (ca. 1527–1600). The son of a serf, Mikolaj Wosczyna, Paul attended the Cracow Academy and in 1556 graduated as a Doctor of Medicine from the University of Bologna. He invented his new surname Novus Campianus (Novicampianus, Novicampius) by Latinising the Polish name of his native village, Nowopole or New Field. In 1560, Paul Kampian settled in Lviv and gained citizenship. There, he married Anne Grynwald (Grinvalt), evidently of German origin, and began his career in the city government. Paul Kampian was accepted into the patriciate, being co-opted into the city council in 1584. His son Martin (Marcin) Kampian (1574–1629) was the embodiment of the alliance of the German and Polish elites in Lviv and the most powerful member of the city council in 1617–27, subsidising the city with large sums of money and controlling the most profitable parts of the communal economy. I suggest that Zimorowicz modelled his ‘political archaeology of virtues’ after the biography of the patrician Kampian family. Zimorowicz thus started his early career when Martin Kampian’s power was at its height and called him ‘first in [the city] Senate’ (princeps senatum) and ‘the pillar of the city’ (urbis columen). When the city council accused Kampian of numerous abuses of Lviv’s budget and property, Zimorowicz defended him in the city court in 1627–29.

People’s actions do not so much reveal objective facts as state claims, intentions and proposals. When we feel confident about whom we are, we do not talk about it, and generally only in periods of crisis do we look for a new identity and social community. The new urban elite constituted by the newcomers needed a sense of common ancestry. Historical continuity had to be invented by creating an ancient past.

Zimorowicz deliberately called the primeval German settlers (primaevi Teutoni) whom he had invented ‘our ancestors’ (veteres nostri). In the introduction to the third part of his text, *Leopolis Polonica*, Zimorowicz states: ‘In a short time, the German minority was assimilated by the Polish majority just as the larger sea assimilates rivers. The Germans accepted Polish habits, rites, and clothing. [Then] Poles and Germans ruled the city together.’ Thus Zimorowicz establishes genealogical ties between the ‘primeval Germans’ as Lviv’s founding fathers and contemporary Polish patricians, who shared their virtues. These inherited virtues, as well as glorious warrior ancestry, yielded an important starting point for the Lviv patricians’ ambition to obtain noble status. By emphasising Casimir III’s role as the protector of Lviv and of townsfolk in general, Zimorowicz may have intended to dedicate the *Leopolis triplex* to the Polish king of

---

74 Cerutti, ‘Microhistory’, p. 27.
his time, Jan Casimir (1648–68), who had granted Lviv’s local patricians noble status in 1661 after the city had demonstrated its loyalty during the political and military crisis of 1648–60. The motto ‘ever-loyal Leopolis’ (Leopolis semper fidelis) was applied to the city’s coat of arms in 1658 by Pope Alexander VII. The Leopolis triplex, which Zimorowicz wrote in 1665–1667, could be an expression of patrician gratitude to the king. Unfortunately for Zimorowicz, Jan Casimir was dethroned in 1668, which may explain why Zimorowicz finally dedicated his opus to the city council, which he called the Senate.

Moreover, while describing migration into Lviv, Zimorowicz emphasises the difference in social status and in how the Germans and Poles settled in Lviv. If the ‘primeval Germans’ were mercenaries in service to King Casimir III, who allowed them to settle in Lviv to protect and civilise his new domains in Ruthenia, Zimorowicz in entries for the years 1348 and 1362 described Polish migrants by contrast as miserable refugees looking for food and asylum, with corresponding stories of famine and plague in Poland. In both cases, Zimorowicz records, many Poles fled their country to Ruthenia because Casimir III had ordered the refugees to be fed from the royal granaries in Lviv. Then the king settled survivors in Lviv. Opening the third part, Leopolis Polonica, Zimorowicz writes that because of the bad harvest in Poland in 1551, many newcomers fled from Mazowia to fertile Ruthenia, and some of these settled in Lviv. Thus he constructs ethnically divided genealogies for different social strata in contemporary Lviv. If the brave German warriors were ancestors of the city’s patricians, miserable Polish refugees were ancestors of the city’s plebeians. This explanatory scheme follows the early modern model of Sarmatism, the myth that Polish noblemen were descendants of warlike Sarmatian nomads while peasants were the descendants of subjugated Slavs. Since urban patricians could not be the ‘descendants’ of Sarmatians, Trojans or Romans, Zimorowicz in a more modest way provided them with German ancestors – brave warriors in royal service – whom, in turn, he portrayed with superior German and Roman virtues.

This model also reflects the belief, typical for pre-modern societies, that every ethnic group maintains its innate features of temperament, and that virtues and shortcomings are hereditary, like titles, jobs, offices, property, social status, and so on. Finally, urban commoners could not aspire to the dominant social position in Lviv occupied by the patricians, who were the descendants of brave German stock and thereby inheritors of noble virtues. Zimorowicz further develops this point in a funny story, ridiculous only at first glance. In 1578 Wałęty Wąsik, an artisan from Lviv, was ennobled by the king for his heroic destruction of Polotsk castle during the war against Muscovy. Wąsik was granted a noble surname, Polotynski, and a coat of arms. Drunk, he behaved like a hooligan in

77 Zimorowicz, Viri illustres, pp. 330–7. In the introduction to the Leopolis triplex, Zimorowicz mentioned the ennoblement of the city at the Sejm: ‘And Lviv […] in public speeches of the general estates of the kingdom was called the ornament and stronghold of Rus’[…]’. ‘At Leopolim […] publico amplissimorum ordinum regni oraculo decus et munimen Russiae appellatam […]’ (Leopolis triplex, p. 4).

78 Cynarski, ‘The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology’. See also: E. Kulicka, ‘Legenda o rzymskim pochodzeniu Litwinów i jej stosunek do mitu sarmackiego’, Przegląd historyczny, 71, no. 1 (1980), pp. 1–21. The same model was elaborated in Renaissance Hungary, where the nobility was proclaimed descendants of the Huns who had conquered Pannonia in the fifth century and the locals made their serfs.
Lviv, was imprisoned but soon pardoned and released by the city magistrates, because such behaviour was seen as typical of ‘new nobles.’ Nevertheless, the ‘new noble’ felt offended and went to Warsaw, probably to file a lawsuit against Lviv’s magistrates in the royal court. In Warsaw, he drowned in the Vistula River and, Zimorowicz concludes, ‘sunk his ennoblement together with himself’. With this tragicomic story Zimorowicz emphasised the attitude of his patrician milieu that urban plebeians or ‘commoners’ should not be granted noble status even for military deeds, but that ennoblement must be reserved only for the urban elite.

**Conclusion**

If Lviv’s wealthy Armenian merchants proved their right to citizenship and their noble origins in the royal court, the main concern of Polish patricians was to establish and maintain their dominant position in the city. While Polish patricians used a well-developed model, introduced by German humanists and based on Tacitus’ *Germania*, Armenians were more creative in their interpretation of the available local sources. Both competing groups made deliberate efforts to introduce their respective narratives within the framework of Kromer’s history of Poland, keeping in mind the Sarmatist concept of warlike forefathers from abroad. In order to maximise their chances of ennoblement, Armenian merchants argued in the royal court that they were not ‘foreign newcomers’ and advertised their secret missions, diplomatic and military service, and financial assistance to the king. By contrast the Polish patricians, represented by Zimorowicz, based their aspirations to noble status on invented, illustrious foreign forebears, opening the chance for subsequent ennoblement via *indygenat*. When Jan Casimir ennobled Lviv in 1661, this entitled the city to send deputies to the Sejm. However, only the Catholic patricians were ennobled, because they were members of the magistracy which sent the deputies.

Patricians were not merely passive users of the nobility’s patterns. They were very inventive and demonstrated creativity in using these patterns. Zimorowicz transformed the model of German autochthonous origin, introduced by German humanists in the sixteenth century, into a myth of conquest, based on the Polish–Sarmatian model of autochthonous peasants being conquered by foreign warriors. If the Polish nobility appealed to Sarmatism as its historical argument for the noble Commonwealth, Zimorowicz made Casimir III the main character in his narrative of the re-foundation of Lviv with the help of allegedly German mercenaries. It is well known that urban patricians were loyal royalists, who relied on the king’s protection and on his initiative for their ennoblement. While the German humanists emphasised the ascetic simplicity of their warlike, forest-dwelling ancestors, Zimorowicz transformed his ‘primeval Germans’ into bearers of urban civilisation, establishing new foundations of urban community (*civitas*) in the ‘semi-barbarian’ province inhabited by the Ruthenians.
Urban elites in the Romanian Principalities of the Later Middle Ages

Laurențiu Râdvan

Over the course of time, towns became increasingly complex social environments, strongly appealing to outsiders. The main occupations of townsfolk entailed the production and sale of various goods, allowing them more easily to amass wealth and ascend the social and economic ladder. Medieval urban society was divided into several layers, with this structure more obvious in western and southern Europe, and less so in eastern regions, a perspective which can be explained by the more numerous and detailed historical sources available in the west. Based on the sources available, this paper will focus on a peripheral region of Europe, the Romanian Principalities, which has attracted less attention from historians.

The urban upper classes included a small category of influential citizens. We will refer to them as ‘the patriciate’, using a designation traditional in the historiography. We will not go into details regarding the origin of the term, since the subject has been widely debated in western historiography by such scholars as Henri Pirenne, Werner Sombart and A. B. Hibbert, who credit either the tradesmen involved in international trade or the local noblemen that adapted to this trade as its creators. What is certain is that the patriciate was defined by several main features, with minor variations from one region to the next: involvement in the high-value goods trade, especially long-distance trade; owning and circulating large amounts of money, which allowed them not only to acquire lands and houses within and outside towns, but also to entertain special relations with the authorities; and control over the main representative offices in the towns. All these gave the patriciate influence and prestige, with its members often being found around the mainstays of political power (the noblemen and princes). Moreover, the sixteenth century saw a shift in attitudes towards influential townspeople in Europe once they became more involved in the process of governing, holding administrative offices and taking part in representative assemblies.

Regional historians have claimed that this category did indeed exist in the Romanian Principalities, but they have not shown any great interest in looking for it. Most studies of urban centres in this area devote little space to the broader social context. Radu Manolescu took the first step in investigating the medieval patriciate in 1970, with an
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article identifying members of the urban patriciate in Moldavia and Wallachia, based largely on foreign sources. He was followed several years later by Konrad G. Gündisch, who looked at the specific case of Bistriţa, a Saxon town in Transylvania; later Ştefan S. Gorovei devoted a study to the Moldavian patriciate, mainly using seventeenth-century sources. Almost a decade ago, I first focused on this subject in a study dealing with Wallachia alone. Now, more than forty years after Manolescu’s first substantial study of the patriciate, I have decided to return to the topic, using more recent interpretations of the sources and extending the scope of my research, thus making it easier to identify members of the urban patriciate in the Principalities. I have also highlighted the serious limitations which hinder deeper insight into the urban patriciate of the area.

Towns were late to emerge in the two principalities, compared to their counterparts in Central and even Eastern Europe. In the neighbouring kingdoms of Hungary and Poland, the process of urbanisation was in full flight in the second half of the thirteenth century, following the invasion of the Mongols, who seized areas east and south of the Carpathians. After 1300, the political crises which ravaged both Hungary and the Mongol world led to the emergence of the two principalities, first Wallachia and then Moldavia. The strengthening of political structures ran parallel with a far-reaching process of urbanisation in an area which had been devoid of towns ever since the fall of the Roman Empire. With no previous pattern to follow, the towns here borrowed features from their neighbours and especially from Transylvania (dependent on Hungary) and Ruthenia (dependent on Poland). These features were disseminated by German and Hungarian settlers, brought first by the Hungarian kings who wished to seize political and economic power in the area and then by their successors, the local rulers who wished to enforce their own authority. The communities which created the first and oldest towns in the principalities, imitating urban structures typical of Central Europe, were organised with internal autonomy, giving their inhabitants individual freedom, the right to freely own land inside the town limits, the right to work (especially in trade and crafts) and the right to elect their representatives, who would preside over internal matters, most likely in accordance with German law. Moreover, the local terminology supports the theory of the Transylvanian influence in Wallachia and the Polish influence in Moldavia, as will be seen below.
The fifteenth century saw the climax of towns in the principalities, which entered the medieval economic network linking Central Europe to the Levant, Buda and the Transylvanian towns to the Danube, and Cracow and Lviv to the Black Sea. The local markets attracted many Hungarian, Polish, Italian, German, Armenian, Ragusan or Turkish merchants, due to the wide array of raw materials on offer: grain, salt, honey, wax, livestock, hides, fish, wine, etc. Goods were traded in the town marketplaces or at the fairs that began to be held around the towns from at least the fifteenth century onwards. The commercial focus of these towns was obviously influenced by their suzerain states. Wallachian merchants fitted their trading network into the paths trodden by their Hungarian counterparts, while the Moldavians joined Polish networks. Economic developments in the principalities involved towns as well and are important since they allow us, by resorting to foreign sources, to identify an urban patriciate who took an active part in international trade.\(^8\)

We have previously suggested that the state of the sources is a major obstacle in establishing the status of this elite social group. The disappearance of town archives has deprived us of a significant source of information on urban society in the principalities, and the surviving documents related to urban life are scattered among other archives (especially those of the monasteries). Sources of particular interest for our topic are the documents on trade relations between Moldavian and Wallachian towns and similar centres in Transylvania and Poland, preserved in the archives of Brașov, Sibiu, Bistrița, Lviv and Cracow. There are several categories to be distinguished in these documents: customs registers of merchandise entering the towns; registers of citizenship, mentioning those who became citizens of a particular town; correspondence on various matters, settlement of disputes, the confirmation of status for people coming in to do business, and so on. Internal sources are an entirely different matter, since we can rely on only a handful of documents which refer to transactions involving land, houses and villages, as well as to trials or to urban assemblies in certain towns. Narrative sources give us the least information regarding the patriciate, since internal chronicles focus on events of the time, while external accounts (made by travellers) include at best physical descriptions of towns, and lack detail on the local communities of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

We prefer to take a regional approach to the subject, since although the two principalities followed similar and almost parallel paths, there were some differences to do with the political and economic orientation of towns in each region. Wallachian towns traded with the Levant and had close ties with the Saxon centres in southern Transylvania (Brașov and Sibiu), while Moldavian towns were closer to trading partners in northern Transylvania (Bistrița) and South-Eastern Poland (Kamieniec-Podolski, Lviv and Cracow). This can be explained not only by regional aspects and proximity, but also by how the towns in the principalities emerged. Some of the colonists crossing the Carpathians to the south, who had a decisive role in creating such Wallachian towns as Câmpulung, Râmnicu Vâlcea or Târgoviște, came from southern Transylvania, just as some Germans from the Bistrița-Rodna area crossed the mountains to the east and settled in Baia, Neamț or Suceava, in Moldavia. The first towns to emerge were those

\(^8\) Ibid, pp. 223–9, 431–7.
in Wallachia (after 1290), then in Moldavia (after 1345–47). For our period of interest (the fifteenth and first part of the sixteenth), data regarding towns is more extensive for Wallachia than for Moldavia.

Some members of the patriciate from towns south and east of the Carpathians certainly descended from among the founders of these settlements. As was the case in other parts of Central Europe, the settlers who had crossed the mountains were led by *locatores*, one or several persons charged with organising the new settlement by the lord of the land who had requested the group to settle there. A relevant example for the foundation of a town as *civitas libera* is that of Prenzlau (today in Germany, close to Poland). Here, a short distance from an older Slavic settlement, Duke Barnim I of Pomerania contracted eight *fondatores* from Stendal, Saxony, to create a new settlement in 1234–35. These eight, who were probably to some degree related, were granted 300 *Hufen* (around 4,800 ha) to be distributed to settlers, each of the *fondatores* being entitled to 160 ha for himself and the right to build mills; one became the duke’s representative. Apart from several local variations, many settlements in medieval Poland and elsewhere followed a similar pattern. We mention this example since it obviously indicates that those coordinating the creation of a settlement had superior privileges, were granted more land, and more importantly became the representatives of the lord of the land, which also carried financial and legal implications.

Sources make no mention of the emergence of towns in the Romanian Principalities, with the exception of Câmpulung. The chronicles of Wallachia record the ‘making’ of this town by Negru Vodă, the legendary founder of the principality, who supposedly brought settlers here from Transylvania. The tombstone for one such newcomer is preserved in the Catholic church of Câmpulung: *comes* Laurentius, who died here in or shortly after 1300. He was probably the leader of the Saxons who settled the town, and must have coordinated the arrival of the colonists, which lent him a privileged status. Along with the office of *comes*, he was granted better land, and possibly even some income. This position allowed his direct or lateral descendants to become part of what
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would become the urban patriciate. However, this is a singular case. No other town has preserved any names related to the early stages of settlement. In the neighbouring town of Râmnic, the witnesses to a 1389 document include three persons with German and Hungarian names, who may be related to the first settlers who arrived here at the turn of the century: Bars, Mădricica and Mogoş.13

Solid documentation which might include the names of townspeople only begins to appear from the fifteenth century. Still in Râmnic, sources mention several craftsmen such as the ‘grandmaster’ Laslău (proto-meşter in the original), whose position suggests a structured hierarchy of craftsmen in this town, with Laslău at the fore. Such a person could only be a member of the town elite, as is suggested not only by his position and craft but also by the fact that he owned vineyards, one of these being sold in 1440 to a monastery for 600 vedre. Since the vadra, a local unit of measurement for liquids, amounted to approximately 12.88 litres,14 it follows that Laslău received in kind around 7,700 litres of wine, a large quantity which could only be sold in town, probably in his own tavern. This wine might have appealed both to locals and to the inhabitants of Transylvania. A 1413 privilege obtained by the inhabitants of Braşov from Mircea the Old set a six-ducat tax on wine barrels bought in Wallachia.15

On the subject of wine, documents suggest that townspeople derived a significant income from its sale. Throughout Central and Eastern Europe, Walloon and German colonists alike introduced new and efficient techniques in viticulture; they can be found in Austria,16 then in Hungary on the river Tisza, where they planted grapevines from the Tokaj region.17 A specific feature for many Hungarian towns is that they relied not only on trade and mining, but also on winemaking. From the fourteenth century onwards, viticulture played an ever-increasing role in the economy of towns such as Esztergom, Sopron, Székesfehérvár, Győr, Buda and Bratislava. Between 60% and 80% of inhabitants owned vineyards in western Hungary. In many towns, the sale of wine brought more profit than artisan industries.18 The German colonists reached Transylvania, where a 1206 charter granted by King Andrew II to the Saxons in Cricău, Ighiu and Romos gave them the right ‘not to pay anyone any tax for the vineyards they have planted’.19 From

15 DRH, D, vol. I, p. 197, doc. 120; Documente privitoare la istoria românilor culese de Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki (hereafter Hurmuzaki, Documente), vol. II/2, Bucharest, 1891, p. 293, doc. 262.
here, they crossed into Wallachia and Moldavia, where they engaged in viticulture near towns. Later documents from the seventeenth century confirm that the townspeople of Câmpulung, Târgoviște and Pitești were exempt from certain taxes for the vineyards they owned; those in Câmpulung even had a monopoly on the sale of wine in their town. Over time, documents multiply and we are even more certain that many townspeople engaged in wine growing and selling. We cannot, however, estimate the percentage of population involved in this pursuit, just as we cannot determine whether this was their sole occupation or whether it only complemented other professions. It was more likely complementary, as in the case of meșter Laslău of Râmnic.

However, the economic circumstances of Wallachia made trade the main pursuit of the townsfolk, while crafts and agriculture played a secondary role. For the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, trade with the Transylvanian towns offered the townspeople of Wallachia, and especially the merchants, the possibility of amassing wealth and expanding their influence. Commercial relations with Brașov and Sibiu were shifting, influenced by the privileges these towns obtained south of Carpathians, originally based on the special status that the king of Hungary had obtained for his merchants in the early days of Wallachia in the fourteenth century. Louis of Anjou had attempted in 1358 to secure exemption from customs for Brașov merchants who travelled to the Danube. Because of the difficulties involved in settling the status for the Wallachian territory in question, we are not sure whether the privilege had any effect there. Ten years later in 1368, negotiations clarified the status of the Brașov merchants, who obtained exemption from customs for their trade south of the Carpathians. Further exemptions were added for trade around the mouths of the Danube, granted by a so-called ‘Prince of Tatars’, Dimitrie. The town of Brașov consolidated its status by gaining a staple right from King Louis in 1369, as well as the monopoly for wax brought from south of the Carpathians and the freedom to take merchandise to Vienna. The staple right was initially applied only to Polish and German merchants, but soon also applied to those arriving from Wallachia, from the first part of the fifteenth century at the latest.

24 DRH, D, vol. I, p. 86, doc. 46; ibid, p. 90, doc. 49.
25 Huruzaki, Documente, vol. 1/2, p. 146, doc. CX.
The first document requiring Wallachians to sell merchandise in Brașov dates back to 1468. The relationship between merchants from towns south and north of the mountains was inequitable from the start. Wallachians were forced to sell at the Brașov market price, while Brașov merchants could travel freely throughout Wallachia. A few princes (Radu the Handsome, Neagoe Basarab) attempted to limit the negative impact of this imbalance, and introduced a more equitable system: a few towns south of the mountains (Câmpulung, Târgoviște and Târgșor) benefited from temporary staple rights. The inhabitants of Sibiu also enjoyed a trade privilege, granted by King Louis in 1351, which allowed them to carry merchandise throughout the kingdom. In 1382, Louis granted Sibiu the staple right, foreign merchants being forbidden to carry goods sold in Sibiu to Wallachia. As customs records show, the Brașov market most often welcomed merchants from towns such as Câmpulung, Târgoviște, Argeș, Târgșor, Gherghița, Buzău or Brăila, while Sibiu was the favoured destination for the neighbouring settlements of Râmnicu Vâlcea and Argeș, along with Pitești or Câmpulung. Some townspeople also traded with markets south of the Danube (among them Ragusa), but these only gained importance after conditions in the Balkans stabilised after 1453 and Wallachia came under Ottoman influence. Thereafter trade with the Porte intensified, and Wallachian towns saw ever more Turkish and Greek merchants. These rivalled local merchants and those in Brașov, who did not take kindly to this competition. Regardless of their place of origin, merchants brought goods that were finer than those manufactured or available in Wallachia: spices, pepper, saffron, ginger, cloves, etc. These wares were brought directly from the Levantine market, along the Danube or overland on the main Balkan roads. Along with spices, foreign merchants brought fine cloth woven made in Ypres, Bruges, Louvain, Nuremberg and Cologne.

27 Hurmuzaki, Documente, vol. XV/1, p. 69, doc. 121.
32 Rădvan, At Europe’s Borders, p. 227.
33 D. C. Giurescu, Țara Românească în secolele XIV și XV, Bucharest, 1973, p. 45; Panaitescu, Mircea cel Bătrân, p. 125.
34 Gr. Tocilescu, 534 documente istorice slavo–române din Țara Românească și Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul (1346–1603), Bucharest, 1931, p. 90, doc. 95.
French, Polish and Bohemian cloth, fine garments and shoes (sheepskin coats, furs, boots, fur caps, caps or hats), and ropes, but also metals and metal wares (iron, swords, spears, knives or bows). Foreign merchants had no monopoly on these products, which were also brought south of the Carpathians by local merchants. The townsfolk of Târgovişte were exempt from all customs duties in the country, except for those in their own town. They bought and sold cloth, weapons, ironware, garments and horses in the main markets of the country. The economic circuit was completed by exports from Wallachia, which included raw commodities from working the soil or subsoil, and from animal husbandry. Among these were many agricultural products.

In approaching this topic we primarily rely on the customs records in Braşov and Sibiu, which have been partially published and are the focus of many studies by Romanian historians. The members of what we now refer to as the town patriciate traded high-value items, which brought a reliable income. Radu Manolescu’s analysis of the categories of travellers to Braşov in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries has revealed that great merchants exported fewer local goods (since this was the domain of lesser merchants), and were more heavily involved in importing and carrying foreign items from the west or east. A well-documented example is that of Rădilă from Câmpulung, who conducted major business deals. The amounts of money he put into circulation and his dealings with the ruler of the country suggest that he was an influential man. In 1503, Rădilă features in the records of Braşov with no fewer than 39,000 ‘knives’ from Styria (culelli Stewrer, probably various metal tools), altogether worth 468 florins. Sometimes, business among merchants also gave rise to disputes, usually related to non-payment. When such disputes could not be settled directly or via various town representatives, the ruler was asked to step in. Shortly after 1503, Radu the Great sent a letter to Braşov on Rădilă’s behalf, claiming that he was still awaiting payment for 18,000 ‘knives’ that he had sold there. Rădilă had had similar trouble before but in a different context, when he was told that since he had vouched for another merchant in the delicate matter of recovering prisoners taken by the Turks, he owed forty florins. Rădilă declared that the money had been wrongly confiscated from him. To get his money back and see justice done, he was aided not only by his fellow citizens but also
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37 The Transylvanian towns also imported Italian cloths from Florence, Bergamo, Verona etc.; see S. Goldenberg, ‘Comerțul, producția și consumul de postavuri de lână în țările române (sec. XIV–jumătatea sec. XVII)’, Studii. Revistă de istorie, 24, no. 5 (1971) p. 881.
38 DRH, D, vol. I, 191, doc. 118; ibid, pp. 197–8, docs 120-1.
40 Bogdan, p. 88, doc. LXV; ibid, p. 241, doc. CCII; ibid, p. 221, doc. CLXXV; Hurmuzaki, vol. XV/1, 69, doc. 121; Iorga, Scrisori și zapise de meșteri români, . vol. I, Bucharest, 1926, doc. I.
42 Manolescu, ‘Comerțul’, p. 189.
43 Quellen, vol. I, pp. 49–50. According to the customs book, one knife=1.2 dinars (1 Hungarian florin=100 dinars); the price seems to be the same in Sibiu and Brașov (B. Murgescu, Circulația monetară în țările Române în secolul al XVI-lea, Bucharest, 1996, p. 103).
44 Bogdan, Documente privitoare la relațiile, p. 221, doc. CLXXV.
by the rulers Basarab the Young and Vlad the Monk. Not limiting himself to the trade in metal goods, he was also involved in the equally profitable spice trade; in 1500, he is mentioned in Sibiu, carrying saffron.

Another excellent example is that of Dragotă from Argeş. The customs registers of Sibiu mention him in 1500 purchasing no fewer than 109,000 ‘knives’ worth 1,308 florins, which he was to bring to Wallachia; in return, he brought in oriental merchandise worth 745 florins. In another record of the transport of goods, a certain Dragotă, no doubt a great merchant, took 70,500 ‘knives’ out of Sibiu, worth 846 florins. M. Pakucs has added the amounts mentioned in these records and determined that in 1500 Dragotă circulated goods worth over 6,700 florins in Sibiu, of which the goods he himself brought in were worth 4,300 florins (the bulk of these being made up of oriental merchandise). Dragotă was no stranger to losses; he had to recover a 1,300-florin debt from Nicolaus Prol of Sibiu, his supplier of ‘knives’ (and most likely the recipient of his oriental goods), who had died in the meantime, also owing money to several other great merchants, in some cases large amounts; Chirca was owed 5,000 florins and Niciu, 3,000 florins. It is likely that this unrecovered debt made Dragotă associate with the merchants from Târgovişte, then the Wallachian capital, who traded in Braşov. Dragotă’s influence and power are indicated by the fact that he was named individually in the business contract, while the merchants in Târgovişte were mentioned collectively and anonymously.

The Wallachian merchants realised what profits they could derive as brokers between east and west. In exchange for spices and other expensive eastern goods, they brought in metal tools, and their role in this process is revealed by the fate of these ‘knives.’ Despite being manufactured in Styria, the ‘knives’ became known as ‘Wallachian knives’ south of the Danube, since they were brought into the Ottoman Empire by Wallachian merchants. Passing through the markets of Skopje, Adrianopolis and Bursa, they finally reached Egypt through Antalya. But Wallachian merchants were not the only middlemen in this trade; they bought the ‘knives’ from Austrian and Transylvanian merchants, and resold them to Levantine merchants.

These figures also reveal the financial and economic power of some Wallachians at a time when iron was very expensive and few could afford it. The registers in Braşov note separately the arrival of great merchants from Wallachia, who are recorded as mercatores magni seu grandi. Fifty grand merchants from six towns are mentioned in 1503: 16 from Târgşor, 10 from Câmpulung, 10 from Gherghiţa, 7 from Târgovişte (including
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47 For Dragotă, see also Pakucs-Willcocks, Sibiu–Hermannstadt, pp. 131–3.
49 Ibid, p. 301.
50 Pakucs-Willcocks, Sibiu–Hermannstadt, p. 133.
51 Bogdan, Documente privitoare la relaţiile, p. 345, doc. CCXCIX; Hurmuzaki, Documente, vol. XV/1, pp. 152–5, docs CCLXXXIX–CCLXXXII.
52 Tocilescu, 534 documente, p. 451, doc. 450.
an Armenian, designated as such), 5 from Bucharest, and 2 from Buzău, bringing in merchandise worth 63,600 florins, in 121 shipments. The Sibiu register of 1500 also reveals the significant role of wealthy Wallachian townspeople in trade with this town, although this was not on the same scale. In the same year products worth 6,350 florins were carried south, and 48.3% of this amount was covered by the great merchants. The remainder was traded by the lesser merchants who specialised in peddling low-value goods. By contrast, the great merchants dominated the market for eastern goods, where they held 89.2% of market share.

We must first determine the connection between those holding economic power in towns and those holding the main representative offices. In the principalities, towns had the right to internal autonomy and the townsfolk were entitled to elect a representative each year, called a județ in Wallachia and a şoltuz in Moldavia, along with a town council made up of 12 pârgari. The few documents preserved confirm that the județes and the pârgari were great merchants themselves. Thus Ştefin, a județ from Râmnic, came to attend to his business in Sibiu, where his merchandise had been seized for a debt along with that of other pârgari from Râmnic; the goods were worth 200 ducats. The Wallachian ruler asked the townsfolk of Sibiu to settle this matter. As a respected and influential man, Ştefin, along with other townspeople and reputable boyars, was called to witness a donation by Radu the Great to Iezer monastery and the donation of a vineyard to the monastery of Bistrița. Stoica Hurduzău and Vlaicu, județes from Câmpulung, or Sava, județ of Târgoviște, were in a similar situation. Some were elected for several years in office, due to their position and the prestige they acquired in their towns. Many of them witnessed various documents long after leaving office, which shows the respect they enjoyed in their communities. Neacșu – at some point județ in Câmpulung – is the author of the first document of any length written in Romanian to

57 From Lat. scultetus/Germ. Schultheiss/Pol. sołtys, respectively Lat. advocatus/Germ. Vogt/Pol. wójt. For the relation between these offices and German law, see W. Kuhn, ‘German Town foundation of the Thirteenth Century in Western Pomerania’, in: The Comparative History of Urban Origins (cf. footnote 10), part 2, pp. 549–52.
59 S. Dragomir, Documente nouă privitoare la relațiile Țării Românești cu Sibiul în secolul XV și XVI, Bucharest, 1927, p. 34, doc. 25; ibid, p. 38, doc. 28.
60 DRH, B, vol. III, p. 11, doc. 4.
61 Ibid, p. 11, doc. 4; ibid, p. 102, doc. 47.
be discovered so far, a letter to the judex of Brașov in which he offers details of Turkish troop movements along the Danube.\(^\text{63}\) He was no stranger to trade, the main pursuit of the urban elites, as the Brașov registers mention him on several occasions as a ‘great merchant,’ individually or in association with another citizen, or requesting the aid of the județ in Târgoviște or of the ruler to recover sums of money.\(^\text{64}\) The theory that a județ belonged to the urban patriciate is also supported by recorded acts of charity. We find them making donations to churches, or even building places of worship: Dobre, județ of Craiova, donated land to the monastery at Jitianu,\(^\text{65}\) and Gherghina, județ in Câmpulung, built the Șubești church in the town in the mid-seventeenth century.\(^\text{66}\) But members of the town council, the pârgari, also tried to keep up. Just like the județes, they too conducted business; examples are Tatul and Sarchiz from Râmnicul Vâlcea, or Miheea pârgar from Târgoviște (with the same ‘knives’).\(^\text{67}\)

Members of the patriciate based their economic power on the money they made. Some gathered enough to start ventures less typical of townspeople, by purchasing villages, like Dreancea pârgar in Târgoviște, who in 1512 bought half of Cocorăști village for 7,700 aspers. Such actions indicate a wish to draw closer to the boyars, the upper social group with a different status, a trend seen in other parts of Europe as well.\(^\text{68}\) However, at the time a good way to enter this privileged group was not through the accumulation of land, but by marrying into one of the noble families of the country. Dreancea pârgar had already taken this step, by marrying the daughter of a princely official.\(^\text{69}\)

Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century sources do not clarify whether the patriciate owned land in the town or outside it. Some great merchants reinvested their money in trade, especially since the region gradually became affected by a lack of cash when local coins ceased to be minted in the late fifteenth century in Wallachia and the late sixteenth in Moldavia.\(^\text{70}\) This is one reason why some purchased goods on credit, paying money onward when they received it from buyers (hence the many trials caused by a delay in payment). Aside from reinvesting in their business, it is hard to tell what they did with the surplus. The only option we have is to determine the financial strength of these great merchants by comparing prices at the time. For instance, the price of a Wallachian village around 1500 varied widely, from 1,400 to 3,000 aspers (28–60 florins)\(^\text{71}\) and up

\(^{63}\) Tocilescu, 534 documente, p. 457, doc. 456.


\(^{67}\) Dragomir, Documente, p. 23, doc. 13; ibid, p. 25, doc. 34; ibid, p. 38, doc. 28; Bogdan, Documente privitoare la relațiile, p. 345, doc. CCXCIX.


\(^{70}\) Murgescu, Circulația monetară, pp. 44, 148–9.

to 25,000 aspers (500 florins); in 1451–1550, the average price of a village was 12,000 aspers (with prices increasing steadily from one decade to the next, and soaring wildly after 1520). Solid information on town property prices also dates back to around 1500. Whereas a boyar bought a plot of land in Târgovişte for only 6 florins in 1493, in 1512 a woman sold a house with a cellar to another boyar for 5,000 aspers (100 florins). Comparing these figures with the value of merchandise circulated by some of the great merchants in Wallachia, we may form an idea of their financial power, even though we have no confirmation as to how they had spent their money. In 1500, Dragotă of Argeş arrived in Sibiu with five shipments of merchandise worth almost 4,300 florins, and brought to Wallachia four shipments worth 2,440 florins. Discounting any losses or other costs, the result is a substantial difference of 1,860 florins which could theoretically be reinvested in merchandise, just as it could be used to buy land, houses, and vineyards, within or outside town.

Archaeological research confirms that grand merchants could afford to erect fairly comfortable houses in their town of residence. Among other amenities, these houses might be provided with tiled stoves in the Transylvanian style, adopted in urban centres south of the Carpathians since the latter fourteenth century. Such a home has been excavated in Târgovişte, dated to exactly this period, with pot- and disc-shaped stove tiles and depictions of knights. Another house with cellar, dating back to the earlier fifteenth century, has been described in Râmnic and belonged to a cloth merchant. Travellers who passed through this town noticed ‘much better and more opulent houses’ than in Bucharest, where ‘houses were mostly made of wood and clay, small but habitable’. Similar discoveries, dating to the later fourteenth century, have been made in Argeş. The town of Floči is unique since it ceased to function as a town in the eighteenth century and was gradually abandoned by its inhabitants, allowing extensive archaeological excavations that have revealed several wooden surface dwellings (around 150 in total), dating back to the sixteenth century. Most had two relatively large rooms heated by stoves, some also furnished with tiles, suggesting differences in status between townspeople. Since they were made of wood, the houses frequently fell victim
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72 This is a special case. The price of 25,000 aspers for the villages of Cornățel and Descoperești is explained by the presence there of a small market-place, which brought significant income to the owner (DRH, B, vol. I, p. 374, doc. 234).
to fire, a not uncommon occurrence in the Middle Ages. One point of note is that the inhabitants rebuilt their houses on the same plot of land, following the foundations and original footprint of the old dwelling. Several workshops where metal and bone were processed have also been uncovered, as well as traces of a large brick building, which probably served commercial purposes.\textsuperscript{81} All these show that the elite could afford to live in much better conditions than the populace.

Another characteristic specific to the patriciate was to make deals with family members or with other representatives of the elite.\textsuperscript{82} Stoica, son of Rădilă, first become the associate of his father and then took over his business in Braşov.\textsuperscript{83} The sons of Neacşu from Câmpulung likewise associated with their father, in the fish trade.\textsuperscript{84} Members of a wealthy Armenian family in Râmnic are attested to in several documents of the time: in 1485, a certain Hacicu witnessed a purchase by the abbot (the hegumen) of Govora monastery, along with other townspeople of high standing, all referred to as jupan.\textsuperscript{85} In 1495, Ivan, Hacicu’s brother, was the next to act as witness, in the donation of a vineyard, along with some of the townspeople noted in the previous document.\textsuperscript{86} By contrast Hacicu’s son, whose name remains unknown, was apparently bankrupted after an unsuccessful business deal with a Jew (he sold his wealth, houses and vineyards to repay his debt). He did however request the assistance of Radu the Great, who wrote in his favour to recover another debt from a merchant in Braşov.\textsuperscript{87} Although sources provide insufficient evidence for marriages, it was likely that these were arranged on the same social level. A relative of Hans the sheepskinner in Târgovişte married a tailor,\textsuperscript{88} and perhaps other members of the patriciate followed the same pattern. Others tried to move up the social ladder in the same way as Dreancea pârgar, mentioned above.

In comparison to other areas in Europe, it is much harder to prove that the patriciate in Wallachia was politically involved. Very few surviving documents attest to representatives of the urban elites taking part in political matters of the day. Numerous documents indicate the ruler’s intervention on their behalf in defence of their financial interests, but these relate indiscriminately both to the great merchants and the lesser ones. Although we suspect that rulers devoted more energy to aiding the first group, we do not have enough evidence to confirm this. The status of the urban patriciate is indirectly confirmed by the support they received from other important figures of the time, such as the kings of Hungary. In 1427, King Sigismund of Luxemburg intervened

\textsuperscript{82} See Manolescu, ‘Comerțul’, p. 204.
\textsuperscript{83} Quellen, vol. I, p. 50; ibid, vol. III, pp. 192, 197 and others.
\textsuperscript{84} Tocilescu, \textit{534 documente}, p. 456, doc. 455.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid, p. 411, doc. 252.
\textsuperscript{87} Bogdan, \textit{Documente privind relațiile}, p. 234, doc. CXCV.
\textsuperscript{88} Iorga, \textit{Scriori și zapise}, p. 1, doc. I.
on behalf of _fidelis noster_ Gašpar of Câmpulung, who requested a dispensation to marry a relative.\(^89\) Prince Alexandru Aldea wrote in favour of Gašpar’s son, Ioan, in 1431, who had some debts to collect; Ioan was called _nobilis viri_ and _domini nostri et nostrum continuum servitorem_.\(^90\) A certain Petermann in Câmpulung was present in Rome in the entourage of King Sigismund in 1433 for his coronation as emperor. In July of the same year, Petermann himself asked Pope Eugene IV for indulgences for those who visited and contributed to the repair work at St. Jacob’s church in Câmpulung.\(^91\) Petermann’s special relationship with the king is also proven by the fact that he was granted a place to settle in Transylvania for him and his family after they left Wallachia, probably for political reasons.\(^92\) A prominent townsman of Câmpulung was periodically chosen as _goţman_ (Germ. _Gottesmann_, Lat. _vitricus_), to administer the property of the Catholic church in town.\(^93\) One such was Iohannes, _generosus dominus_ and _custos_ of the church of St. Jacob, where he was buried in 1373.\(^94\) Only a man capable of remarkable acts of charity could have been called a _generosus dominus_, and such a man would hold moral and economic sway over a city or parts of it.

In respect of terminology, we have sought to single out terms which capture the specific status of persons in an urban society. Such terms exist in the principalities, and have their western counterparts. The _maiores_ or the _meliores_ (‘higher’, ‘better’) in the Latin documents,\(^95\) the well-to-do who enjoyed the prestige coming from the possession of wealth, are mentioned in Old Slavonic documents as ‘good people’ (_dobri liudi_), often issuing these documents along with the town officials.\(^96\) They are sometimes called ‘the good and elderly’,\(^97\) their age and wealth being reliable signs of integrity and wisdom. Internal documents also call them the ‘great townspeople’ (although only rarely up to the seventeenth century), and when they appear, they are noted together with the ‘lesser townspeople’, reflecting an urban society which included not only the elite, but also the
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\(^{89}\) Iorga, _Acte şi fragmente cu privire la istoria românilor_, vol. III, Bucharest, 1897, p. 82.
\(^{92}\) DRH, D, vol. I, p. 356, doc. 256.
\(^{93}\) _Călători străini_, vol. V, p. 264.
\(^{94}\) A. M. Del Chiaro Fiorentino, _Revoluţiile Valahiei_, ed. S. Cris-Cristian, Iaşi, 1929, pp. 11–2.
general town population of small merchants and craftsmen (townsfolk from all walks of life, ‘high and low’). The term ‘good people’ was adopted in Wallachia to define part of the social elite, but could be assigned to other categories, not only to the townsfolk. Boyars as well as peasants could be ‘good people,’ according to the social environment captured by the documents. Along with its meaning of ‘wealthy and influential,’ a ‘good man’ is also a man of high moral standing. The contemporary understanding opposed ‘good people’ to ‘bad people’ (zi liudi). At one point, Vlad Dracul wrote to the citizens of Brașov (around 1438–1446), requesting that ‘bad people’ coming from Wallachia with stolen horses should be stopped: ‘since they robbed this country of its horses [...] and should they be found with stolen horses, they should be harmed, as bad people.’ In similar fashion, Radu the Great sent a letter to Brașov, requesting that the town set free a group of his men who had worked on the bridges at Orate, on the Dâmbovița river, claiming that ‘they rightfully served my reign […] if they should be bad people, they shall suffer the worst and foulest and most heinous death at my hands.’ These documents highlight the ruler’s attitude, supporting the ‘good people’, considered the foundation of society. A ‘good man’ who broke the law, written or unwritten, established by custom or by decree of the prince, lost this status and became a ‘bad man.’ The ‘good people’ in towns could thus only be the elite.

One of the first mentions of a ‘good man’ can be found in a letter of Vlad Dracul, who wrote to Brașov about Zanvel of Târgoviște, who had been killed and robbed in Transylvania. The ruler requested that all Zanvel’s possessions be returned, and the list of these shows him to have been very well-off: 250 florins, 500 hyperpyrons, a pouch with 300 aspers and a golden ring worth 10 florins. The clothes he was wearing are signs of affluence in their own right: Ypres clothing, a sword and a cap. He was part of the local patriciate, and also on intimate terms with the ruler, who allowed only one week for the perpetrator to be found and punished and the wealth to be returned to his heirs.

Members of the urban patriciate also featured under the umbrella term for merchants in Old Slavonic documents, i. e. cupeț, just as those at the top of urban society were also honoured by the term jupan (such as Hacicu from Râmnic or Gherghe from Argeș), which was otherwise usually a term that applied to boyars. From the seventeenth century onwards, the word jupan is more frequently used in Romanian in reference to the social elites, including merchants.

100 Bogdan, Documente privitoare la relaţiile, p. 227, doc. CLXXXIX.
It may be more difficult to create a picture of the Moldavian patriciate in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, since there are fewer sources here, even though more towns emerged there than in Wallachia. We can, however, focus on a set of similarities. East of the Carpathians, the townspeople were also a single category of free people who held privileges. There were the same differences in economic power separating rich from poor, just as the urban patriciate included highly-placed members of the community: the șoltuz and pârgari, along with the merchants and craftsmen who did business abroad. The only particular trait is that the towns were not as ethnically homogeneous. Whereas Romanians were prevalent in Wallachia, along with some Saxons and Hungarians especially in Câmpulung, Râmnic, and Târgovişte, Moldavia displays a more complex situation, with many towns inhabited by significant groups (even a majority) of Germans, Hungarians, Armenians and Ruthenians. By contrast, the terminology in internal documents stays the same: the phrase ‘good people’ (dobri liudi) refers to the urban elite in Moldavia as well. These ‘good people’ are first mentioned in 1449, intervening to reconcile a master of a mint with a pârcălab. Some names are mentioned on this occasion, among them those of two voiti (one being the Armenian voit) and a customs officer.\(^{105}\)

While in the case of Wallachia the customs records of towns such as Braşov and Sibiu are essential for at least a partial insight into the scope of the business carried out by the great merchants, for Moldavia we must turn to the documents preserved in Lviv, then in Poland, one of the main Moldavian trading partners.\(^{106}\) Like Braşov or Sibiu, Lviv enjoyed a staple right granted by King Louis in 1380, applying to all merchandise coming from the east.\(^{107}\) Even so, relations between Moldavian and Polish merchants were less tense, since the Moldavian rulers acted to compensate the imbalance in relations between the two sides.\(^{108}\) But what kinds of merchants were involved, and what did they trade with Lviv? Their names suggest Germans, Armenians, Romanians, Greeks, Italians and Ruthenians. The Germans and Ruthenians mostly inhabited towns in north Moldavia, the Armenians can be found in all major towns (Suceava, Siret, Iaşi, Roman, Vaslui), the Greek and Italian merchants preferred the towns by the sea (most obviously, Chilia and Cetatea Albă, which traded with Constantinople and Italian towns), while Romanians were present in all towns.\(^{109}\)

One of the first references to Moldavian Germans travelling to Lviv comes from 1421, when we learn that Nicolas Hecht from Baia had decided no later than 1400 to bequeath to Lviv the debts owed him by Wittram, a merchant in the town. Hecht was
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107 Louis I of Hungary was also king of Poland, 1370–82. For details on the medieval history of Lviv, see O. Kozubska–Andrusiv, Urban Development and German Law in Galician Rus’ during the Thirteenth–Fifteenth Centuries, PhD dissertation, Central European University, Budapest, 2007, esp. pp. 103–14.
108 Alexandru the Good’s privilege to the merchants of Lviv in 1408 contains a special provision that Poles wishing to sell cloth in Moldavia could do so only in Suceava, the main customs post of the country (M. Costăchescu, Documentele moldovenesti înainte de Ștefan cel Mare, vol. II, Iaşi, 1932, p. 630, doc. 176).
quite rich, since he had a significant debt to call in: 5 gold marks, 55 silver marks, plus 43 złoty, 20 groschen, and cloth. A number of Moldavian Armenians can be found in Lviv in the mid-fifteenth century, such as Agopşa, Sahac and Cocea from Suceava, or Şimco and Hreor from Siret, who bought and sold various goods worth hundreds of florins, and sometimes even lent money to other merchants. A 1547 document tells us of a certain Colciu from Suceava, whose town residence had been broken into and robbed of numerous ‘fine items, silver, gold, jewels and pearls’. Also in the sixteenth century, the Italian Giulio Mancinelli mentions the Armenians in Iaşi, telling us that ‘they are far richer and more well-to-do than all the others, thanks to their spice trade’.

The large number of Germans and Armenians in Moldavian towns gave them special standing in Lviv, a town largely controlled by Germans and inhabited by many Armenians. This is partly why the registers in Lviv record the names of many Moldavian merchants of these ethnicities (from Siret, Baia, Suceava, Roman, Hotin), who received citizenship. The first such appears in 1407, Iakusch Zomersteyn filius Cunradi from Siret, then one year later Johann, a craftsman from Baia. Between 1411 and 1510, twenty-seven others follow. Some are craftsmen: tailors, leatherworkers, a tanner, a goldsmith; where no profession is mentioned, we assume that the new citizen was a merchant. The situation in Cracow was similar: from 1403 to 1500, it granted citizenship to sixteen merchants from Moldavia, among them one Peter from Neamţ (1445) and Gregorius Wlach (1485). In 1435, a merchant from Cetatea Albă is recorded as far afield as Poznań. All this is significant since some of those receiving citizenship in major Polish towns can be identified as members of the patriciate from Moldavian towns, being men with enough economic power and sufficiently solid relations with Polish merchants to be accepted as citizens. They were merchants in the international trade, or specialised craftsmen such as goldsmiths, which further suggests that they were members of the local patriciate. Furthermore, many of them came to Lviv or Cracow.


113 I. Corfus, Documente privitoare la istoria României culese din arhivele poloneze. Secolul al XVI-lea, Bucharest, 1979, p. 139, doc. 68.


bearing letters of recommendation (litteris recommendatoriis) from their own towns, and were supported by their business partners in Poland.

A particular case is that of the V ollata family from Cetatea Albă, who probably had Greek origins; some members of the family had Greek names (Iurgi, Caloian, Dimitrie), and some were even referred to as grecus. The first prominent family member was George (Iurgi) V ollata, son of Fotios, who received a safe-conduct in 1469 from the Genoese, allowing him to bring merchandise to Caffa and the other Genoese lands in the Crimea; in the same year, his son Dimitrie is noted selling pepper in Lviv. George was an older and more reputed merchant, and his business dealings in the Levant (Constantinople, Crete) date back to 1437–38 if not earlier, as a book of accounts kept by the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer shows. Some scholars hold that this Iurgi is one and the same as ‘pan Iurghici’, a castellan (pârcălab) in Cetatea Albă in 1443 and member of the ruler’s council without office until 1447. His special relation with the ruler, his status as a great merchant, and his high rank in the town hierarchy gave George control over the fortress near the town. Sources reveal the V ollatas as middlemen in the trade with eastern goods from Italian ports, carried overland to Poland and onwards to Germany. They bought cloth from Lviv, which they sold for good money in Moldavia. Dimitrie V ollata did not limit himself to business in Poland, for we find him in Transylvania and even Wallachia, where he was on excellent terms with the ruler: on two occasions, Prince Vlad the Monk wrote to Brașov requesting that some debts be paid to ‘our friend, jupan Dimitrie V olata’. Also in Cetatea Albă a certain merchant called Caloian is frequently noted after 1466, who lent money and goods to Polish and Armenian traders and was very influential (called famoso negociatori de Albo Castro or famoso Kaliano Greco de Albo Castro). He had enough capital to lend hundreds of florins to several merchants within one day. Although other historians see him as a separate character, we believe him to be a member of the V ollata family, especially
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118 Iorga, Studii istorice, p. 290, doc. XVIII; ibid, p. 292, doc. XXVII.
120 Manolescu, ‘Cu privire la problema patriciatiului’, p. 94. In 1468, Georgius Volatta was named citadino de Mocastro, being a friend of Gregorio de Reya, consul at Caffa (Iorga, Acte şi fragmente, vol. III, p. 43).
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126 Iorga, Studii istorice, pp. 282–3, docs I–II; ibid, p. 288, doc. XIV; ibid, p. 292, docs XXIV–XXVII.
127 Ibid, p. 293, docs XXXII–XXXVI.
128 He is considered such in Iorga, Istoria comerţului românesc, epoca veche, 2nd edition, Bucharest, 1925, p. 154 and in Manolescu, ‘Le problème du patriciat’, p. 33.
since he is called Caloian Vollata in several documents. A true dynasty of merchants was thus created: Caloian’s son, Duca, carried on the family trade, from 1481 onwards and even after Cetatea Albă was conquered by the Turks in 1484. Since these great merchants traded with the Italian centres via the Black Sea and the Ottoman Empire (where they could travel based on a 1456 privilege), they were certainly wealthy enough to have their own ships. The Lviv privilege of 1472 refers to them as engaged in overseas trade (mercatores transmarini Walachie).

As well as all of the above there were many Romanians, called valachi in Lviv documents. One great merchant, who came to Lviv on various business, was Nicolae Brânză from Siret. In 1477, he lent 128 florins to two Armenians in town, and received a house as surety. Thirty years later, Nicolae died in Lviv and his heirs claimed his goods and the money they found (floreni tartaricales, aspre antique, denari, grossis valachicis etc.), as well as silverware and a stone-built house in Lviv, along with other merchandise in his native town. Further evidence for this merchant’s high standing is the presence of a şoltuz, a pârgar, and a butcher from Suceava (1507) among those witnessing the claims against the estate.

Lviv was one of Moldavia’s most important trading partners in the late Middle Ages, but it was not the only one. The Transylvanian towns of Braşov and Bistriţa complete the list. In the early sixteenth century, ten merchants from Suceava and three from Baia are named in Braşov as mercatores magni, with merchandise amounting to almost 5,300 florins. Nicula from Suceava stands out among them, bringing five shipments of cloth and spices, altogether worth 1,474 florins and 57 aspers. The value of the goods these great merchants sold reveals their economic strength. Some worked with very large amounts, like the merchants in Baia, two of whom brought products worth over 100,000 aspers (c. 2,000 florins) to Braşov in 1529–30, an amount well over half the value of all goods brought across the mountains in those years by Moldavian merchants. A certain Ivan şoltuz from Vaslui is noted in Braşov as a livestock drover, the main occupation for many Moldavian merchants. This serves to confirm that office holders in these towns also dealt with long-distance trade. Relations with Bistriţa intensified from the sixteenth century onwards, especially once the town had received its staple right in 1523, but also after it was annexed to Moldavia for a few decades, from 1529 to around 1535.
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No customs records were kept, but we have access to correspondence on various topics between town leaders in Moldavia (especially Suceava and Baia), and those in Bistriţa. Among others, the documents capture the vast trade exchanges between the two sides, even though the amounts do not seem as high as in Sibiu, Braşov or Lviv (amounts under 100 florins).

The Moldavian patriciate had money, but what did they use it for? Reinvestment aside, we may assume that they purchased houses and land, even though there is no information for the fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries, because of the small number of documents preserved. Archaeological research in Moldavia has revealed that the rich lived in houses with cellars and heated with brick stoves. We will also find tiled stoves from the fifteenth century onwards, with various decorative patterns, such as those in Suceava and Baia. They were conscious of belonging to a separate group, taking pride in their status and their position in town. They were definitely involved in the political life of the principality, but the few extant sources do not allow for interpretation in this respect either.

We do however possess some clues as to the interest of the rich in securing better education for their children. In the fifteenth century, well-to-do townsfolk sent their children to study in Poland, especially at the university created by King Casimir III in Cracow in 1364. The annual register of graduates starting in 1400 includes the names of students from Baia, Bacău, Suceava, Roman, Trotuș, Hârlău, Iași and Siret. Most of the names are German: Jacobus Andree, Mathias Filczkopoter, Simon Johannis Vikerle, Johannes Michaelis, Laurencius Andree Burger, but there are also Hungarian names such as Emeric, along with names with a local ring such as Michael Stephan, Michael Thoma etc. There were also Moldavian students in Prague and Vienna. Jacob ‘de Moldanie’ (1402) and Jacob ‘de Molda’ (1410), probably from Baia, studied in Prague. Vienna records Ladislaus Blasy (1441) and Laurencius (1448), both from Baia. In Prague and Vienna, some of these young students were recorded as pauper, since they were probably of modest means.

Fate did not always smile on the patriciate. Wallachian chronicles mention an incident involving the townspeople of Târgovişte, whom Vlad the Impaler believed to be guilty for the death of his brother and punished. The ‘grand’ and elderly (the patriciate) were

impaled, whereas the younger townsfolk were taken at Easter with their families to work on the Poenari stronghold (around 1457). In Moldavia, at the siege of Cetatea Albă, the Turks negotiated with five of the most important men in town (homeni principali), and the Cronica moldo-germană mentions that after the conquest the Ottomans ‘took with them the better people (das best Volck) to Constantinople’. A 1488–89 Ottoman tax register includes information on 1,099 families relocated from Cetatea Albă to Istanbul and Galata. A yearly tax is also noted for 660 families, amounting to over 250 aspers per year for 38 families; the high taxation suggests that some in these families were part of the patriciate when the Turks assaulted the town.

Some final statements are in order. Some major categories are conspicuously lacking in the social landscape discussed here: the guilds, priests and boyars. The first are absent for no other reason than that they only rose to prominence in the late sixteenth century, and especially in the seventeenth. Wallachian and Moldavian craftsmen were aware of these organisations, and some were members of Transylvanian guilds. ‘The Brotherhood of St. John’ for bootmakers in Sibiu came to include three artisans from Argeş and two from Baia (1484–99), and the furriers’ guild in Braşov also had two members from Câmpulung (1489–1509). Townsfolk in Moldavia had their sons learn crafts from artisans beyond the mountains. In 1436, Prince Ilie I asked the townspeople of Brăsov to assist the son of a tailor from Roman, sent by his father to learn how to cut cloth. Several decades later, in 1472, Johannes Rymer of Suceava wrote to the judex of Bistriţa about an apprentice from Suceava, learning the craft of tanner in Bistriţa. The apprentice needed a certificate to vouch for his skills, possibly to become a journeyman. In the mid-sixteenth century, documents in Brăsov note the arrival of young Moldavians wishing to learn crafts. The lack of detailed documents prevents us from ascertaining the existence of guilds in towns in Moldavia (or in Wallachia, for that matter) organised along the model of those in Transylvania or Poland. The first clearly
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149 Manolescu, ‘Cu privire la problema patriciaturii’, p. 92.


documented guild emerges at Suceava, in Moldavia (the brotherhood of wallpainters) in 1570.\textsuperscript{156}

We have also excluded the urban clergy. The reason here is that priests were more attached to their own world with its specific rules and hierarchies, but also because sources allow us to discern their specific status in town only later, after 1600.\textsuperscript{157} There are lay priests, of interest to us due to their relations with urban parishioners, and monks, more closely connected to their brethren behind monastery walls. The Saxons in Câmpulung are a case of their own with the right to choose their parish priest, as in the royal towns of Transylvania, where churches were considered \textit{exempta plebania}.\textsuperscript{158} In Moldavia, data on the right of Catholics to elect their own parish priest is unclear. Later records suggest this happened in Iaşi, but the communities in Cotnari, Baia, Neamţ, Bacău, Huşi or Trotuş may have enjoyed the right as well.\textsuperscript{159} Regardless of whether they were elected or not, Orthodox or Catholic, parish priests were essential to urban society, not only because their spiritual duties were of paramount importance, but also since their word weighed heavily. This is also why, especially from the sixteenth century onwards, town priests are more often mentioned by local authorities as guarantors for the validity of the documents they issued.\textsuperscript{160}

As for the boyars, there were even fewer of them in towns before the sixteenth century. They resided especially in towns where the most important princely courts were located: Argeş, Târgovişte, Bucharest, Suceava or Iaşi.\textsuperscript{161} Aside from courtiers, other boyars were still predominantly rural, and town life began to appeal to them only after 1500, when they began to purchase more land in towns (except for Câmpulung, where only the locals could own property).\textsuperscript{162} As they accumulated houses, lands and even market stalls, the economic strength of the boyars increased and they began, like the monasteries, to compete with townspeople, a process also found in Central Europe.\textsuperscript{163} With no statistical data, we can only infer that the patriciate, the priests, and the few boyars in towns were a minority at the end of the Middle Ages. The largest part of the community was made up of small merchants and craftsmen.

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{163} Miller, \textit{Urban Societies}, pp. 107–8.
\end{flushright}
In the sixteenth century the general features of urban society went through a slow but steady transformation. Greeks, Jews, and Armenians, mostly arriving from the Ottoman Empire, began to join the patriciate, gradually replacing the now Protestant Saxons and Hungarians, whose numbers decreased as rulers began to persecute them on religious grounds.\textsuperscript{164} We may see this transformation as a shift to a new patriciate, involved more in business with the east than with Central and Western Europe. This shift occurred after Hungary was conquered. Buda became an eyalet and the Romanian Principalities gradually focused their economy on trade with the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{165} The tendency for part of the new patriciate was to join the boyars, to obtain higher status than that of the townsfolk. Some merchants used their intimate relations with the boyars and the ruler to gain privileged positions.\textsuperscript{166} This trend is not specific only to the principalities, since the patriciate was also in constant change in Central and Western Europe. Many outsiders who settled in towns sought to amass wealth by trade and attain urban offices which brought them benefits. In a short while, they entered into the families of the old patriciate or nobility.\textsuperscript{167} Sources have not allowed us to create a full portrait of the patriciate in the Romanian Principalities. We might identify more elements which place members of this elite on a par with similar groups in towns of Central and Western Europe: their involvement in the lucrative international trade; the large amounts of money they amassed, as well as their lands, houses, and vineyards in towns. It goes without saying that they also had privileged relations with the Church, the boyars, and even the ruler, who intervened on their behalf. They were also literate and had an altogether luxurious lifestyle, compared to the rest of the townspeople. We still need to discover other facets of this group: their relations among themselves, their level of involvement in the politics of the time, their personal priorities and their family life.

\textsuperscript{164} By the mid-sixteenth century, the Hungarians and Saxons of the two principalities had turned to Protestantism, provoking harsh reaction from local princes who believed that Orthodoxy was threatened. Persecutions were undertaken mainly in Moldavia, by Ştefan Rareş (1551–1552), Alexandru Lăpuşneanu (1552–1561, 1564–1568) and Ştefan Tomşa I (1563–1564). For sources, see: Călători străini, vol. II, pp. 99, 131–2, 140–1, 266–7; Călători străini, vol. V, pp. 25, 81; also M. Crăciun, Protestantism şi ortodoxie în Moldova secolului al XVI-lea, Cluj-Napoca 1996. Armenians were also persecuted, but some returned later to Moldavia: G. M. Buiucu, Cănt de jâlire asupra armenilor din țara vlahilor de diaconul Minas Tokatçii, Bucharest 1895, pp. 31–44; H. Dj. Siruni, ‘Mărturii armenişti despre România extrase din Cronica armenilor din Cameniţa’, Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secţiunii Istorie, 3\textsuperscript{rd} series, 17 (1935–36), pp. 271–7.

\textsuperscript{165} Manolescu, Comerţul, pp. 73–8.


Entrepreneurship and Social and Political Power in the Ionian Islands from the late sixteenth century to the first decades of the seventeenth: some case studies from Venetian-ruled Corfu

Gerassimos D. Pagratis

I. The time

From the mid-sixteenth century the Venetians faced increasing competition in shipping and trade in the eastern Mediterranean, both from the Ottomans and from those west Europeans (French, English and Dutch) who had acquired capitulations from the Sublime Porte permitting them to trade on favourable terms. The intense competition in commerce, combined with other factors such as the frequent conflicts in which the Venetian State was embroiled, inevitably reduced the profitability of their shipping enterprises. From this time on, many members of the Venetian nobility, for whom seafaring and trade in the Levant were not just economic mainstays but also the precondition for a political career, began to diversify their investments, turning to land and the Italian peninsula. Agriculture gave landowners income without personal effort, but also grand residences in the city and countryside, and underpinned a lifestyle oriented towards the ostentatious display of wealth and social status. Agriculture was practised in parallel with participation in shipping enterprises, which were managed with increasing frequency from ashore.¹

This essay examines whether the adoption of this process by the Venetian nobility led to any detectable analogous cases or impact upon the Most Serene Republic’s Ionian subjects, for whom the fashion was to imitate the lifestyle of their overlords. The cases discussed here concern Corfu in the last third of the sixteenth century and the early

years of the seventeenth, based on documents pertaining to the legal dispute between members of the Corfiot Pandis family and the *Communità* of the island.

II. *The space, the institutions, the people*

At this point some clarification is needed on the legal status of Venetian subjects, and on where the events analysed here took place.

The distinction between the privileged nobility and (from the late Middle Ages) the *cittadini* of Venice on the one hand, and on the other their subjects, who as entrepreneurs were disadvantaged by the Venetian State, was the tool that allowed the Venetians to exploit their possessions in an essentially colonial manner. The nobility kept control of the so-called ‘rich trade’, which involved the most profitable goods such as spices, expensive textiles and other low-bulk, high-cost items. The role of the *cittadini* was limited, in law at least, to supplying their home region with the so-called ‘democratic products’, foodstuffs and raw materials, and transporting these to the city of Venice. Subjects were strictly forbidden from participating in foreign trade. This ensured the stability of Venice’s own intermediary commercial character and also ensured the deployment of local shipping, as well as state revenues from taxation.²

The pressure exerted on Venice from the early sixteenth century by deleterious international circumstances (wars in Italy but also against the Ottomans, growing competition in the Mediterranean trade, limited profits in maritime enterprise, abandonment of the galley routes, and investments on the Italian mainland) forced the Serenissima’s authorities to grant tax relief.

The introduction of tax reductions and exemptions to attract foreigners and subjects who would agree to feed the Rialto market, and the concession to subjects of licenses to import spices to Venice when the state’s galleys were unable to carry the whole cargo, indicate the changes underway in the status of disadvantaged entrepreneurs. These changes however were tacit rather than acknowledged, since the Republic never officially abolished the legal distinction between the Venetian nobles and *cittadini* on the one hand, and their subjects in the Levant on the other, which reflected the distinction between conqueror and conquered.³

The subjects, although at a disadvantage compared with the privileged merchants of Venice, in their turn exercised similar power relations within their own local societies, taking advantage of the superiority that participation in urban councils gave to a small minority of the population in each region, called by the Venetians the *cittadini* (citizens).

Despite local peculiarities, the institution of the *Communità*, the urban council in the Greek Venetian world, represents the Greek equivalent of the communes that developed in the cities of Italy and Western Europe after the decline of feudalism and the rise of

---


³ Pagratis, ‘Venice, Her Subjects and Ships’, *passim*. 
cities. As in Western Europe, the communities of Venetian-ruled Greek regions passed through various phases, during which the power of the feudal lords gradually diminished and the power of the emerging bourgeoisie correspondingly increased.

In the Venetian islands of the Ionian Sea, in particular, participation in councils secured, beyond political rights, social status and the possibility to benefit economically by election to salaried public offices, and by acquiring on favourable terms the right to collect taxes or hold public property, such as lakes, salt pans, and so on.

Over time the distinction between the cittadini and the rest of the population became increasingly apparent, eventually giving the cittadini the prestige of an enviable elite. The need to establish strict conditions of eligibility for membership in the councils indicates that alongside the cittadini, a dynamic group of people pressed for inclusion in their ranks. In Corfu the process of consolidating criteria for membership in the Communità, as in several of the Ionian Islands, such as Zakynthos (Zante) and Kythera (Cerigo) but not Cephalonia, took place during the first half of the seventeenth century, with the stipulation that a number of requirements be met by both new members and active cittadini. More specifically, current or candidate members of the urban council should: a) be born on the island, or domiciled there for a long time, b) reside permanently in the city of Corfu, and c) meet three conditions: to have been born of legitimate marriages, never to have practised any manual trade themselves, nor might their parents or grandparents have done so or any other relative, and to lead a reputable life in the civic community.

III. The case of the Pandis family

The case of the Pandis family, discussed here, began to preoccupy the Communità of Corfu at a time when debate on the conditions of eligibility for citizenship took on very specific forms. The end of the Pandis family’s dispute with the Communità coincides with the finalisation of criteria for inclusion some thirty years later. These coincidences, as well as the arguments and forces that the Communità recruited in the dispute, suggest that the case of the Pandis family could be seen as one of those key experiences that transformed prevailing views about the political meaning of the term cittadino and prompted the elaboration of defined conditions and rules governing the council’s activities.

Andreas Pandis’s claim to enter the urban council, to which he believed he rightfully belonged, provoked strong opposition from its representatives, the sindici. Overall, their dispute can be divided into five phases:

---

5 For a historical synthesis of the institution of urban councils throughout the Greek Venetian-ruled world, see A. Papadia–Lala, Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων στον ελληνικό χώρο κατά την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας (13ος–18ος αι.), Μια συνθετική προσέγγιση, Athens, 2004.
6 Papadia–Lala, Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων στον ελληνικό χώρο; Pagratis, Κοινωνία και Οικονομία στο βενετικό κράτος της Θάλασσας: οι ναυτιλιακές επιχειρήσεις της Κέρκυρας (1496–1538), Athens, 2013, chapter 3.
7 Ibid.
A. On 9th September 1585, Andreas Pandis submitted an appeal against the Communità to the Venetian administration’s local court on Corfu (henceforth the reggimento), which took five years to arrive at its decision, issued on 28 September 1590.

B. Fifteen years later, from 1605 until 1607, the appeal submitted by Yeoryios Pandis, son of Andreas, to the auditores of Venice was heard and refused.

C. In 1609 the Communità began its counter-attack, culminating in 1610/1611 in the Senate’s acceptance of the criteria they proposed for inclusion in their ranks. At this stage, probably in 1611, the Senate of Venice was forced to reject a new request from the Pandis family, about which we have only indirect information.

D. Despite repeated failures, from 1613 to 1614 Arsenios Pandis, nephew of Andreas and son of Yeoryios, submitted his request once more to the reggimento, and was finally vindicated.

E. His jubilation was short-lived, however, as in 1615 the Communità responded by sending a delegation (ambascieria) to the Venetian Senate, which forthwith cancelled the inclusion of Arsenios Pandis in the urban council, thereby terminating this dispute.

A 1. The first phase 1585–1590

Andreas’ arguments in his submissions (9 September 1585 and 23 October 1585) were intended to convince the reggimento that he had all necessary qualifications to sit in the urban council, to elect and be elected, were based on historical data relating to the Pandis family’s arrival on the island, on his father Stamatis’ achievements, and on proof of the urban lifestyle of himself and his relatives going back two generations.

The presentation of family history began with Yeoryios, ‘patriarch’ of the Corfu branch of the Pandis family, who hailed from Sparta, where he was one of the notables (uno dei primati). Thence he came to Corfu, probably sometime in the last two decades of the fifteenth century, settling permanently in Lefkimmi, in the southern part of the island, where he lived till the end of his days.

Andreas Pandis’s strongest card was his father Stamatis, a well-known ship-owner and skipper on vessels with capacities of 400–500 botti (240–300 tons), which had been built in Corfu or purchased elsewhere. With these ships ‘he travelled the world’ (navigava per il mondo), carrying cargoes or trading on his own account.

Success at sea in the Republic of Venice, whose power was based at least at the peak of her prosperity on maritime trade, was a desirable qualification for Venetian nobles, as

---

8 For more on the reggimento of Corfu see Pagratis, The Reports of the Venetian Baili and Provveditori of Corfu (16th century), Athens, 2008, Introduction.
9 Γενικά Αρχεία του Κράτους, Ενετοκρατία/General State Archives of Corfu, Enetokratia (hereafter GSA, Enetokratia), b. [archival envelope] 11, fz. [filza] 7, fol. 1r: ‘[…] intrar, balotar et esser balottato nel consegio general di questa magnifica comunità […]’.
10 The document actually says ‘Arta, part of the Morea’ (‘Arta, parte della Morea’). This information is of course controversial, as Arta is in Epirus and not in the Peloponnese. The solution seems to be given by Pandis himself, who says that the mother of the scholar Antonios Eparhos was a Pandis, indicating that the word Arta in the Italian probably incorrectly replaced the word Sparta; GSA, Enetokratia, b. 11, fz. 7, fols. 2r, 8v, 9r.
11 GSA, Enetokratia, b. 11, fz. 7, fol. 3v.
it was considered to give them the maturity and experience for a political career. What held for the nobility was an unshakeable argument for their subjects too. Stamat\'s achievements in shipping can also be confirmed from other sources. We know for example that from 1528 until 1564 he participated in short-term maritime ventures, sometimes as an investor and sometimes as a captain on his own ships or those of third parties. By 1548 he had owned at least three ships of over 300 tons, built at his own expenses in Corfu and elsewhere. One of these was chartered to carry rice to Alexandria, and to sail from Egypt bound for Nauplion. Before 1537 his largest vessel had a capacity of 256 tons (400 botti). On a trip to Venice in 1552 he was registered in the city’s Greek fraternity.

A landmark moment in Stamati’s life was his involvement in the events of 1537 on Corfu. As his son Andreas related, in this year Stamatis, following the Venetian fleet with two ships chartered and equipped at his own expense, broke the Ottoman blockade of the island and delivered food to the besieged residents. Then pirates captured him, but he managed to escape and return to Corfu, where he died.

Venice typically rewarded heroism of this kind, for which our only testimony is that of his son Andreas but which nobody contested directly. Such deeds constituted proof of her subjects’ faith in and devotion to the State. In the case of Stamatis Pandis, it is testified that he made no attempt to obtain compensation from the Venetian State for his deeds. What Stamatis, creator of the shipping company, did not seek, his descendants did, for whom Stamatis’ successes at sea were to be strong arguments in their efforts to improve their political and social status.

In the manner of his life, Andreas maintained that he was doing exactly what a cittadino ought. In other words, he was travelling and trading over long distances, either in collaboration with his father or independently. He had acquired the ‘knowledge of the world’ desirable in cittadini, and had allied himself with citizen families, marrying his two sisters to members of powerful families on the urban council; Andreas Arcoudis, who in 1614 was one of the few persons who had the honour of living in the Old Fortress of Corfu, and Vidos Rodostamos. After a long absence from the island on business,
in 1572 Andreas married Stamatella, daughter of the cittadino Cristodoulos Bacos, and resided permanently in Corfu.\textsuperscript{18}

As he states in his memorandum, he had his own house in the town of Corfu and lived on income from investments in commerce, from a craft workshop, from collecting taxes on behalf of the Republic and from the rent of baronies belonging to Venetian noble families.\textsuperscript{19}

To reinforce his arguments, Andreas stressed that he had never undertaken manual labour or served in garrisons on the island, suggesting instead service in the militia (cernidi).\textsuperscript{20} He also maintained that his connection with rural Corfu, in particular the region of Lefkimmi, was tenuous; his relatives did not live there either, except one who had moved to the village during the siege of 1537 because he had lost his father. He maintained too that his father Stamatis, like himself, had lived respectably in the city (\textit{vita civile et honorata}) when not travelling.\textsuperscript{21}

A 2. \textit{The issue of the Pandis family’s permanent residence} in the countryside was to be the Achilles’ heel of Andreas’s claims. The sindici (council representatives) put this very high on their list of counter-arguments and were vindicated by almost all witnesses, who confirmed that many members of the Pandis family were living permanently in the countryside.

The \textit{Communità} secured and submitted to the reggimento documents issued by the Treasury (\textit{Camera Fiscal}) of Corfu proving the low social status of the Pandis family, which demonstrated that over the past several years some members of the Pandis family, such as Yannis son of Petros, a cousin of Andreas, and his son Petros, from Melikia of Lefkimmi, were involved in manual trade.\textsuperscript{22} Moreover, the sindici pointed out, neither Andreas’ father Stamatis nor his grandfather Yeoryios had ever claimed the right to join the urban council, and Andreas himself had reached the age of sixty before so doing.\textsuperscript{23}

A 3. \textit{The witnesses}

The two sides agreed on a common list of ten questions, and agreed to summon an equal number of witnesses from Lefkimmi and from the maritime trade circles in which both Andreas and his father were active. Witness testimony generally addressed the following issues:

Many members of the Pandis family, from its ‘founder’ Yeoryios onwards, had lived continuously in Lefkimmi. One of these was Nikolaos Pandis, Stamatis’ brother and Andreas’ uncle, who resided in Melikia, a village in Lefkimmi region, where he eventually died childless, having lived a peasant life (\textit{vita rusticale}). Andreas’ cousin,
Yannis Pandis, son of Petros, had his permanent residence (loco et foco) in Melikia, together with his family. As for Stamatis, it was said that in the intervals between his voyages he lived in Lefkimmi. Nikolaos Bogdanos argued that even Stamatis had been involved in manual work.

A small number of witnesses said that Andreas also lived permanently in Lefkimmi, operating small vessels such as grippos with his brother Yeoryios. However, most witnesses testified that Andreas had for many years owned and lived permanently in a house in the town of Corfu, and visited Lefkimmi only on business, such as to buy wines or to lease, together with his brother Yeoryios, a fief owned by the Catholic Church in Corfu.

Many witnesses confirmed the council’s second contention, namely that the Pandis family had engaged in manual activities. The charge was levelled first against Andreas, who was said to have worked as a sailor on ships. The justification for including the seafaring profession in the manual trades is revealing for the council’s objectives: ‘the competence of seafarers is to load and unload ships, to cast anchor […], to row, to carry the goods out from the boat on their backs […] and if it so happens that after that occupation they become ship-owners or captains, they will always be dirty from handling’.

According to this concept, even wealthy captains would remain excluded from the urban councils if as young men they had served on ships as sailors or deckhands, which for most people of the sea, excepting the nobility, was almost a prerequisite for maritime careers. So neither would Stamatis have met the conditions for citizenship (cittadinanza); his previous service as a deckhand and sailor on small ships (caramousalia) was censured by the Communità.

Also included among the manual and mechanical trades was the sale of wines, in which according to testimony Andreas Pandis had been involved thirty years earlier (1556), in both the port of Melikia (Lefkimmi) and the harbour of Mandraki, the military sector of the port of Corfu. His customers were probably the crews of warships, to whom Andreas sold wine from his boat.

Based on the testimony of witnesses and the memoranda of the two sides, on 28 September 1590 the reggimento of Corfu issued its decision, rejecting Andreas’ request and freeing the Communità of any liability to the other party. Thus Andreas Pandis lost...
the chance to better himself and his parents socially, and to some extent this happened not so much because of his way of life as that of his parents.

**B. The appeal**

Fifteen years later in 1605, by which time Andreas had died, his only son Yeoryios decided to resume his father’s legal battle in another court, where he felt he had more chance of success. Considering himself wronged by the decision of the *reggimento* in 1590, he filed an appeal (*lettera di apelacione*) to the *Auditori* of Venice. His main argument was that his father had married the daughter of a *cittadino*, which in his view should automatically have given eligibility for membership of the urban council. However, Yeoryios failed to convince the Venetian authorities, which two years later rejected his request.

**C. The Communità’s counter-attack – the secret weapon of the Pandis family (1609–1611)**

Meanwhile, more and more candidates for membership of the urban council of Corfù were invoking arguments similar to those presented by the Pandis family. Judging by the messages from the *Communità* to the Venetian Senate, this phenomenon peaked during the second decade of the seventeenth century.

The Corfiot council was forced to move quickly to repel the threat to its privileged space. In 1609 their representatives asked the Senate to inform them whenever there were petitions to join their ranks, so that they could demonstrate that at least some of these cases, such as that of the Pandis family, had already been rejected by lower offices.

Just at this critical stage the Pandis family chose to resubmit their request to the Venetian Senate, as we learn from a proposal by the *Communità* of Corfù from 15 April 1611. We do not know exactly when the Pandis request was submitted, but it must have been before April 1611 and not in 1612 as the Corfiot envoys claimed. This document indirectly informs us that the request was rejected by the Venetian Senate.

---

32 GSA, *Enetokratia*, b. 11, fz. 7, fol. 14r.
33 The *Auditori vecchi delle sentenze o avogadori civili*, a three-member tribunal founded in 1284, judged appeals against decisions made not only by various departments of the Venetian State, but also by the Venetian governments of overseas possessions. See A. Da Mosto, *L’Archivio di Stato di Venezia*, vol. I, Rome, 1937, p. 85.
34 GSA, *Enetokratia*, b. 11, fz. 7, fol. 14r.
37 GSA, *Enetokratia*, b. 11, fz. 7, fol. 17r.
38 Yotopoulou–Sissilianou, pp. 430-3.
After this latest failure, the council believed that it was now rid of the Pandis family’s vexatious claims. However, contrary to their expectations the case was restarted, a development that caused the sindici considerable discomfort. They were unable to understand why the Pandis family were so persistent, after their claim had been rejected by all relevant instances. Moreover, every mission to Venice cost the Communità money. Finally, possible acceptance of the Pandis family’s claim would open the way for membership in the council to others of humble origin, causing discontent among the cittadini, who, as the sindici pointed out, would be forced to share their privileges with persons of inferior social status.39

The sindici were prepared to show understanding if, for example, the persistence of the Pandis family were based on service to the Venetian State. Did Stamatis Pandis’ aid to beleaguered Corfu qualify as service to the Republic? – But this was not all: there was also the inference that the Pandis family ‘had attempted something unheard of, to claim the award of citizenship by special grace, and even by resorting to foreign leaders.’40

The sindici does not disclose in this document which ‘foreign leader’ could have changed the outcome of thirty years of fruitless dispute between the Pandis family and the Communità. The only reference to his identity is a note at the end of the document, which states: ‘At the request of Cardinal Borromeo, the Pandis family resorted to the Most Serene Republic to obtain citizenship, but their application was rejected by the Council of the Pregadi.’41

This is the first and last mention by name in the documents that relate to the dispute, of the person who had mediated for the Pandis family to join the Communità. In the absence of specific information, we can only speculate on the services the Pandis family had offered Cardinal Borromeo to persuade him to intervene in their favour with the Venetian Senate. We know, for example, that the Pandis family developed closer relations with the Catholic Church while managing its revenues in Lefkimmi. The Pandis family’s kinship with the Eparhos may well have played a key role; the most famous member of this family was Antonios Eparhos, a renowned scholar of the sixteenth century who had collaborated with various humanist popes and for whom he had procured manuscripts in the Levant. From cardinals such as Cervini and Farnese, Eparhos had secured protection and subsidies, while he enjoyed the friendship of other cardinals, among them Gaspare Contarini, Pietro Bembo and Carlo Borromeo, on whose behalf he searched for codices. As Yotopoulou-Sissilianou notes, Cardinal Carlo Borromeo ‘writes to Eparhos with deepest appreciation for his ability to discover books useful to and even supportive of the Catholic Church’.42

This new adventure ended positively for the Communità of Corfu, despite the worry caused by Borromeo’s intervention in support of their adversaries. The Venetian

39 GSA, Enetokratia, b. 11, fz. 7, fols. 16’–18’.
40 GSA, Enetokratia, b. 11, fz. 7, fol. 17’.
41 GSA, Enetokratia, b. 11, fz. 7, fol. 18’.
42 Borromeo became Cardinal during the tenure of his uncle Pope Pius IV, and played a central role in reorganising the Catholic Church in the third sessions of the Council of Trent (1561–1563). For his philanthropic activities during the famine that struck Milan and other Italian cities in 1571 he was canonised a saint; see Yotopoulou-Sissilianou, p. 69, note 5, p. 219.
Senate’s rejection of this last request from the Pandis family may have strengthened the self-confidence of the Community and led to a further hardening of its attitude.

Now was the chance to shut the door forever on people such as the Pandis family. So in 1610, the urban council banned entry to those who lived in the countryside.\(^{43}\) A new delegation to Venice in 1611 complained of the reggimento’s acceptance of Dimos Masarakis’ application to join the urban council without prior consultation as to his suitability.\(^{44}\) In response the Venetian Senate met the council’s demands with a decree issued on 18 November 1611, confirming previous decisions on the terms of membership of the urban council. Its terms were as follows: Applicants had to prove to the reggimento that they met the three conditions of citizenship (*cittadinanza*). The *Communità* would have the opportunity to object to the candidature and to examine witnesses. However, the final and irrevocable decision would be taken by the reggimento, which could approve the request by the votes of three of its four members (*bailo*, *provveditore* and *capitano*, and their two advisors). But for candidates seeking membership by special dispensation even if they did not have the required qualifications, the only competent public office was the Venetian Senate, where the candidate had to secure two-thirds of the votes.\(^{45}\)

Reading between the lines of this Senate decree, there is evident discomfort that the supreme governing body of the Venetian State should be so frequent involved in such minor issues as the cases presented here. Evident too is Venice’s intention to strengthen the ability of the various urban councils in her possessions to select their new members.

D. After these events, this long dispute would normally have been closed. But even now Arsenios Pandis was unwilling to let the matter rest. In 1613 he appeared again before the reggimento, prepared to continue his family’s efforts for social advancement.

This new effort followed all the typical steps of procedure: first, Arsenios and the *Communità* submitted their memoranda, then the witnesses answered the predetermined questions and finally the reggimento issued its decision.

The Pandis family and the *Communità* each supported their established positions. Then the two sides agreed to a list of thirty-two questions and seven witnesses.

The witness statements give us some new information. It should be noted, however, that some witnesses seem to have been well-disposed towards the Pandis family, among them Tzouannes Vlassis, Arsenios’ best man, and Nikolaos Bacos, brother of Andreas Pandis’s wife and uncle of Arsenios.\(^{46}\)

After the second discussion closed on 28 May 1614, the reggimento of Corfu accepted the request of Arsenios Pandis. This development is surprising, since it went against all previous decisions by the Venetian administrative offices and the reggimento. We do not know whether Cardinal Borromeo intervened with the reggimento to tilt the balance decisively in favour of the Pandis family. Be that as it may, Arsenios succeeded where all previous petitioners of his family had failed. Thus in 1614, he made the old dream of sitting in the urban council of the Corfiot community come true.

---

\(^{43}\) E. Lunzi, *Della condizione politica delle Isole Ionie sotto il dominio Veneto*, Venice, 1858, 270.

\(^{44}\) Yotopoulou-Sissilianou, pp. 421–5.

\(^{45}\) GSA, *Enetokratia*, b. 11, fz. 8, fols. 2–2v, 25v.

\(^{46}\) GSA, *Enetokratia*, b. 11, fz. 8, fol. 12v.
E. But the reggimento had committed a serious mistake: it had violated a key term of the Venetian Senate’s decree of 18th November 1611, under which the reggimento was to invite council representatives to examine the candidate, before issuing its decision. On the grounds of this omission, the Corfiot sindici decided to send a new delegation to Venice, which in 1615 asked the Senate to cancel the inclusion of Arsenios Pandis in the urban council, as well as three other similar cases, those of Camillos Planoudis and the brothers Constantinos and Antonios Chessaris.47

At this point everything was very simple. The Senate of course would not rescind its decree, and so approved the Corfiot request. Thus the Pandis family found themselves once more out of the council, this time permanently. For a few more years, the numerous applications for inclusion from people who typically did not meet the new criteria would continue. Henceforth, however, the Communità felt itself to be on firmer ground, thanks to legal confirmation of its interests.

Conclusions

The case of the Pandis family is a typical example from a period of intensive debate on eligibility for the body of cittadini in Corfu. It is, however, also an exception for a number of reasons, including the uncommonly long course of the dispute. The protracted litigation is indicative not only of how important the Pandis family considered their claim, but also of the extent of their connections.

The case of the Pandis family is eminently suitable for drawing conclusions in the domain of history of mentalities, in respect not only of the content of such terms as citizenship and urban conduct, but also of the social prestige of trade. For the Pandis family, everything started when one of them escaped from his everyday livelihood and locale, and managed to play an important role in the maritime trade of the eastern Mediterranean. Stamatis did not personally use his profits from shipping companies, contacts and social recognition for his own social advancement, but his descendants sought to change their social and economic status, citing Stamatis’ and their own conduct. In earlier times, before 1540 or shortly after, there would probably have been no problem in achieving this goal. Now, however, certain perceptions on the preconditions of membership in the category of cittadino were already established.

What were these preconditions?

A cittadino should have a permanent residence in the town of Corfu, despite occasional journeys to the countryside, where he could attend to business.

A cittadino should live by revenues from the land, from the rent of baronies, from collecting taxes, from the management of public property, from shop-keeping and from trade. Trade, however, was not seem uniformly, particularly in respect of maritime activity. The position of captain and/or owner of seagoing ships was considered desirable, with-career prospects, but working on ships as a cabin boy or sailor, which

47 Yotopoulou-Sissilianou, pp. 430–3.
inevitably meant engaging in manual labour, was frowned upon. Also included in manual activities, and hence incompatible with citizenship, was participation in the retail trade, even if that presupposed maritime voyages, such as selling wine, which Andreas Pandis had done in the past.

However, as the case discussed here shows, even the excellent social status of merchants and ship-owners in Venice, compared to other areas of Western Europe, was insufficient for entry to the urban council, for a non-manual pedigree was also required. This development had a greater effect on self-made men who had not inherited a shipping company from their father and who therefore had gone through the various stages of the maritime profession, which inevitably included manual work. In Corfu ship-ownership alone was no longer sufficient guarantee of status, echoing what was happening over the same period in Venice. Despite the remarkable steeliness of the Pandis family in a struggle lasting thirty years, it was unable to overcome the obstacles put in the way of its social advance.
The Caradjas: patterns of influence and integration in the Wallachian elite in the late sixteenth and seventeenth century

Ștefan Aftodor

The important and well-known Caradja family, which claimed Byzantine origin, had a significant political and economic role in Wallachian history, especially during the Phanariot regime (1716–1821) when its members even held the princely throne. This article focuses on this family’s beginnings on Romanian territory, especially in the first half of the seventeenth century, on how the first Caradjas integrated into the Wallachian elite, and on their role in a veritable network of political and economic interests based on client relationships.

The presence and ascent of the Caradja boyars in Wallachian political and social life were related to changing international circumstances, as marked by the apogee of the Ottoman Empire in the later sixteenth century. Oppressive Ottoman rule north of the Danube had important consequences for political life in the Romanian Principalities of the time. The rulers appointed by the Porte came to the two principalities accompanied by their favourites, relatives or members of their entourage. Many of these were involved in commerce in Constantinople and the Balkans or influential in the politics of the Ottoman Empire; they duly became members of the Princely Councils of Wallachia and Moldavia, the Divans. Indeed, the ascent of Levantine high officials (commonly known collectively as Greeks, especially in chronicles and various external sources, although Greeks undeniably formed the majority) in the institutions was a historical phenomenon which started in the later sixteenth century and increased in the seventeenth, especially during the reigns of Radu Mihnea (1611–26).

The first of the Caradjas, Mihalcea, developed his political career in Wallachia under these circumstances. We should note from the outset that there is no evidence of a Byzantine aristocratic lineage for the Caradja family, and no documents that

---

1 Murad IV, in a letter to Sigismund III Vasa of Poland on 30 August 1630, emphatically reasserted that ‘Transylvania and Moldavia, [and] Wallachia belong to the countries dependent on us, are mainly our properties and under our protection, since our great ancestor, our Sultan Suleyman’ (M. A. Mehmet, Documente turcătii privind istoria României, vol. I, Bucharest, 1976, p. 156).


unambiguously show the family’s descent from the time of Argyros Karatzas, protokouropalates and dux of Philippopolis during the Comneni emperors. What we do know is that from the end of the sixteenth century the grand ban (governor) Mihalcea, the first eminent member of a family of rather obscure origin, was linked with some of the most important events in Wallachia. Certainly, his ascent was based on trade, mostly in Constantinople (according to some sources he supplied the Ottoman army as well as trading in cattle and salted meat), but he appeared at the forefront of political life during the reigns of Peter Cercel (1583–85) and Michael the Brave (1593–1601), proving his outstanding military and especially diplomatic qualities as a statesman. In fact, Mihalcea was mentioned as holding the highest dignity in Wallachia, grand ban of Craiova, in a document of Peter Cercel from 5 September 1583 listing all members of the Divan. Referring to Mihalcea Caradja’s position in the Wallachian elite, Peter Cercel’s Genoese secretary Franco Sivori wrote unambiguously that in 1585 he was ‘one of the most prominent [...] the most important man in Wallachia after the Prince [...] of much soul and great experience’. Sivori believed that ‘the ban Micali [Mihalcea] was 50 years old’, ? The Hungarian chronicler Stephen Szamosközy’s account a decade later confirms Sivori’s portrait, relating that ‘Michael ban, who knew the Italian language [...] distinguished himself from all the other boyars [...] and enjoyed great prestige before his people due to his age and famous wisdom’. Mihalcea Caradja served Peter Cercel faithfully during his reign, as well as in the difficult years that followed the Porte’s order to depose him in the spring of 1585. Indeed, Mihalcea followed Cercel to Transylvania, and after his arrest made numerous efforts to have the former prince released. Thus Mihalcea left for Rome in April 1586, along with François Ponthus de la Planche and Radu the seneschal, to seek Pope Sixtus V’s (1585–90) support, in the hope of papal intervention for Peter Cercel’s release from the Transylvanian fortress of Chioar (Kővár). The result was encouraging, since Sixtus wrote to Stephen Báthory of Poland, prince of Transylvania, to intervene and release the former ruler of Wallachia, on 21 June 1586. Mihalcea also visited Cracow and Venice on these diplomatic missions, but we do not know his role in the events that led to Peter

---
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Cercel’s escape from Transylvania, or in the attempts to regain the throne from Venice and Constantinople, which ended tragically with the former prince’s execution in 1589.

Mihalcea Caradja contributed to Michael the Brave’s impressive achievements in 1594–1601, and indeed his political career reached its peak in those years. Historical works have fully emphasised Mihalcea’s role during the reign of his kinsman Michael the Brave. The prince’s kinship with his devoted boyar explains why Michael uses the extraordinary appellation ‘vlastelin’, roughly translatable as ‘high lord’ or counsellor, but Mihalcea’s military and diplomatic skills were equally decisive in respect of the privileged status he had with the ruler. Despite his age, Mihalcea Caradja assumed the military responsibilities Michael entrusted to him after starting his revolt against the Ottomans on 13 November 1594. Mihalcea ban defeated Ottoman forces sent against Aaron the Tyrant, ruler of Moldavia, near Silistra in the first half of March 1595 or earlier. A report from Constantinople dated 21 March 1595 expressed the concern caused especially by the looting of Silistra: Y les da una gran cuidado especialmente el saco de Silistra que dizen ha sido de gran consideración.

Mihalcea helped Michael the Brave not only the battlefield and but also through diplomatic missions to Transylvania and the Habsburg Empire. In the spring of 1595, Michael sent Mihalcea to Prague to negotiate Habsburg support against the Ottomans. Mihalcea then joined the Wallachian ruler in his journey to Transylvania at the end of 1596, where they met Prince Sigismund Báthory, after which Mihalcea went to meet the Habsburg Emperor Rudolf II once more. Michael the Brave wrote on 5 January 1597 to the Emperor from Alba Iulia that he had sent his envoy, ‘our good counsellor,

---


11 Andreescu, *Restitutio Dacie*, vol. III, p. 369, showed that ‘kinship could only be possible by marriage’.

12 Michael the Brave called him this on 28 May 1594; he had already been grand ban during Peter Cercel’s reign; see *Documenta Romanae Historica, B. Țara Românească* (hereafter DRH, B), vol. XI (1593–1600), ed. Mioc, Şt. Ştefănescu et al., Bucharest, 1975, doc. 56, p. 78. For vlastelin, see Neagu Djuvara, ‘Les Grands Boiars ont-ils constitué dans les principauté roumaines une véritable oligarchie institutionnelle et héréditaire?’ *Südost-Forschungen*, 46 (1987), pp. 22–3.

13 *Istoria Țării Românești de când au descălecat pravoslavnicii creștini (Letopisul Cantacuzinesc)*, in: *Cronicari munteni*, vol. I, ed. M. Gregorian, Bucharest, 1961 (hereafter Letopisul Cantacuzinesc), pp. 116–8. See also Michael the Brave’s plea to the Duke of Tuscany, where he wrote that ‘un mio barone chimato Bano Mihalcea’ had crossed the Danube on the ice and defeated ‘a certain Ştefan vodă [Stephen Bogdan, son of the former Moldavian ruler Iancu the Saxon]’ who was trying to overthrow Aaron the Tyrant of Moldavia; see MVCE, vol. I (*Documente externe*), Bucharest, 1982, doc. 228, p. 637.


Mihalcea ‘ban’ and asked him to trust the words of ‘our chief boyar’. Mihalcea’s involvement in negotiations with the Habsburgs and the fact that he enjoyed the prince’s confidence may raise the question of whether he decisively inspired Michael the Brave’s policy towards Transylvania. The answer, for several reasons, is yes.

First, Mihalcea Caradja knew the situation in the region very well and, as one commentator observed, ‘enticed’ Michael ‘into this Transylvanian war’. Further, Mihalcea was one of those who urged Michael the Brave to keep Transylvania after the battle of Şelimbăr (28 October 1599), in which he defeated the Transylvanian prince Andrew Báthory. Paolo Giorgio wrote to Rudolf II from Alba Iulia on 18 November 1599 that ‘li Baroni Valacchi e particolarmente li Buzesti hanno per male che il voivoda resta in questo Paese et che per se l’occupi; ma li baroni Serbi e Greci sono molto contrarii alla opinione loro.’ Indeed, Mihalcea advised Michael not to yield Transylvania to the Habsburg Empire in April 1600. Without placing too much emphasis on negotiations between Michael the Brave’s envoys and the court at Prague, we may note that Mihalcea was the most involved of Michael the Brave’s diplomats in negotiations with the Habsburg Empire, in what Ştefan Andreescu has called the ‘diplomatic battle’ for Transylvania.

We should also mention that Mihalcea ‘ban’ insisted in his negotiations with the court in Plzeň on 8 January 1600 that the Habsburgs recognise Michael the Brave’s rule in Transylvania. David Ungnad and Carlo Magno, the Emperor’s representatives, met Michael the Brave in Alba Iulia and wrote in their reports of 11/12 February 1600 that Michael was ‘greatly angered at Mihalcea, as he had exposed and treated with Your Majesty beyond his orders’, which were that ‘he wished to remain the absolute owner, governor and master in Transylvania’. In fact, Mihalcea accurately expressed the prince’s requirements, but the Habsburg preference was to reject and procrastinate. As we learn from Rudolf’s II letters to Michael the Brave dated 3 and 11 February 1600, he promised financial aid but acknowledged Michael’s hereditary rule only over Wallachia. Moreover, Mihalcea Caradja spent February and March close to the Emperor’s court, continuing negotiations with the Habsburgs. Michael the Brave sent very clear instructions to Mihalcea in January and March 1600 that he wished to rule Transylvania and Wallachia dynastically (‘to be in his ownership [...] and that of his sons). Moreover, Michael sought to be endowed with ‘the same powers as the former rulers of the Principality’.

20 Iorga, Un izvor, pp. 101–2.
Mihalcea ban continued negotiations with the Emperor’s commissioners David Ungnad and Carlo Magno, as well as with the ambassador Bartholomew Pezzen, after his return to Alba Iulia in late March or early April 1600. The ‘diplomatic triumph’ whereby the Emperor acknowledged Michael the Brave as governor of Transylvania was mainly due to Mihalcea Caradja’s efforts. However, it came too late, on 12 September 1600, as Michael’s defeat at Mirăslău meant the loss of Transylvania in September 1600.

Further evidence relevant for plans involving Transylvania, as well as for the close ties between Michael the Brave and Mihalcea Caradja, is that Mihalcea received the fortress and estate called Uioara (Marosújvár) from Michael, and that in May 1600, while Michael the Brave was on campaign to conquer Moldavia, Mihalcea was ‘this illustrious voivode’s’ deputy and supreme counsellor in Transylvania. We should also note that Mihalcea ban was one of the few boyars who stood by Michael after his defeat and during his months of wandering, and shared the same tragic end at Câmpia Turzii on 9/19 August 1601. However, Mihalcea Caradja’s exceptional political career was also favoured by his rapid integration into the great Wallachian boyar families, through marriage to Marula of Cocorăști. His acceptance into the Wallachian political elite was a real fact, proven by the name used in some private correspondence of ‘Mihalcea ban from Cocorăști’.

Despite his violent death near Turda on 19th August 1601, on General Basta’s orders, as a consequence of his close relationship with Michael the Brave, Mihalcea ban was a typical case of the ‘integration’ of Greek – or in a broader sense Levantine – officials into Wallachian society from the later sixteenth century onwards. Mihalcea and Marula from Cocorăști had a son, Pătrașco, who died without issue, and three daughters who all married eminent Wallachian boyars. These matrimonial alliances brought Mihalcea

26 Hurmuzaki, Documente, vol. XII, doc. CMLXXVII, p. 618; see also DRH, B, vol. XI, doc. 357, p. 503.
27 Hurmuzaki, Documente, vol. XII, p. 929; Iorga, Scrisori de boieri, scrisori de domni, 2nd edition, Vălenii de Munte, 1925, p. 44.
28 N. Istvánfy, Historiarum de rebus Ungaricis libri XXXIV, in: MVCE, vol. II, p. 38, noted that ‘Mihalcea ban, one of the highest officials, aged over 70 years old, was captured and tortured for a long time, and finally killed in prison’; see also I. Crăciun, Cronicarul Szamosközy și însemnările lui privitoare la români, 1566–1608, Cluj, 1928, p. 159.
29 D. Plesia, ‘470 de ani de la săvârșirea mănăstirii Dealu. Mănăstirea Dealu, necropolă domnească și ceva despre frământările interne din Țara Românească în veacul al XVI-lea’, Acta Valachica, 3 (1971), pp. 141–54, Table E, holds that Marula was descended from Caplea, sister of Radu the Great.
31 Crăciun, Cronicarul Szamosközy, p. 159.
33 Preda married the grand clucer Radu Buzescu, Mihna married Drăghici the sword-bearer from Cârstești, son of Oprișor the logothete from Mânești, and Maria (Marica) married Badea the sword-bearer from Albești; see D. M. Sturdza, Grandes families de Grèce, d’Albanie et de Constantinople. Dictionnaire historique et généalogique, Paris, 1983, p. 257.
close relationships with the great Wallachian boyars families of Buzescu, Băleanu, and Rudeanu.34

Mihalcea Caradja purchased villages for over 142,000 aspers: Brăileşti, Plăşoi, Răduleşti (all in Slam Râmnic or Brăila counties); Moşăştii/Măcreşti (Slam Râmnic County); Dudeşti Orleşti, Călugărenii lui Manea, Călugărenii Stoicăi, Vărăştii cu Balta Albă38 and Periaţii lui Manea (all Brăila County).39 Mihalcea promised the last two villages as a dowry for his daughter Preda’s marriage to Radu Buzescu; he also had possessions in Transylvania.40 His domains further included the villages his wife Marula brought as dowry: Cocorăştii, Stoeneşti, Măneştii de Jos (Prahova County) and Piscanii de la Pod (Dâmboviţa County).41 Thus Mihalcea owned at least fourteen villages in Wallachia.

34 Drăghici and his brothers Hrizan Seneschal and Nan Seneschal of Bărbăteşti were grandsons of Dragul, the gate-keeper of Măneşti, uncle of Stanca, who was Michael the Brave’s wife. A document dated 28 July 1634, attests that the ‘nun Magdalene, daughter of the ban Mihalcea from Cocorăști’, was in fact the nun Marica, whose marriage to Badea, sword-bearer of Albești, linked Mihalcea to the boyars of Băleni. Grăjdana Băleanu (sister of Udrea Băleanu and wife of Leca from Cătun) was the ‘ancestress’ of Preda sword-bearer (husband of Stanca, daughter of Pârvu logothete Rudeanul), son of Badea sword-bearer of Albești. DRH, B, vol. XXXI, doc. 28, pp. 24–44; ibid, vol. XXIV, doc. 339, p. 454; Catalogul documentelor Țării Românești, vol. IV (1633–1639), ed. M.–D. Ciucă, S. Vătafu Găitan & D. Duca Tinculescu, Bucharest, 1981, no. 631, p. 299; no. 1184, p. 527; no. 1536, p. 667.
The villages of Mihalcea Caradja’s domains all passed to Radu Cocorăscu, son of Vlad the logothete of Bârboiulești, who took the name Cocorăscu from his first wife Elena, Mihelea Caradja’s daughter, and also acquired the right to buy Cocorași and Stoenesti villages. Pătrașco’s early death prevented the continuity of Mihalcea Caradja’s family through the male line, and the female line through his daughters was no more fortunate.

The Caradja boyars in the seventeenth century

An unexplained problem in Romanian historiography is the relationship between Mihalcea and others of the Caradja family settled in Wallachia and Moldavia after 1620, although some historians, such as I. Karadja, I. C. Filitti, Mihail Dimitru Sturdza and more recently Mihai Țipău, have proposed genealogies. According to Filitti and Sturdza, John (Ianache) Caradja was the brother of Pavlache Caradja, the constable Apostolache and Costea (Costas), high Greek officials established north of the Danube. We know for sure that there were four Caradja brothers, Pavlache ban, Apostolache and Costea, both constables, and Iordachi, and two sisters, Bălaşa and Asanina, wife of Thomas Vlastos. A Thomas Vlastos from Constantinople is also mentioned after 1618–20 as present in Târgoviște, probably on business, thus during the reigns of Alexander Iliaș and Gavril Movilă.

Mihalcea may have been the brother of Constantin Caradja, grandfather of Costea (Costas), Pavlache, Apostolache and Iordache, present in Wallachia after 1620.

The presence of Ianache and the four Caradja brothers north of the Danube was due to the protection they enjoyed from prince Radu Mihelea and other rulers appointed by the Porte in the early seventeenth century. This protection was closely related to the fact that Ianache and the four Caradja brothers were nephews of a powerful merchant, Skarlatos

---

Grama, an important figure with considerable influence on politics in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{50} Grama was married to Cocona, Constantin Caradja’s daughter. At the same time, Ianache was the son of one of Grama’s sisters. The relationship between the rulers and the Caradjas became stronger when Radu Mihnea married his son Alexander Coconul to Ruxandra, Grama’s daughter.\textsuperscript{51}

Skarlatos Grama’s influence and power are proven by his role in the cattle trade in Constantinople. Sultan Ahmed I himself intervened in his favour (calling Grama the imperial \textit{saigiu}, grand merchant of animals) in a letter to Radu Mihnea.\textsuperscript{52} His relatives and connections, as well as his ability to influence events in Constantinople, were so great that he maintained good relations with rival candidates for the thrones of the Romanian Principalities, including Radu Mihnea, Alexander Iliaş, Gavril Movilă and Stephen Tomşa II.

Moreover, in correspondence Radu Mihnea called Ianache Seneschal ‘my good friend’\textsuperscript{53} and offered him the village of Vaideei (Ialomiţa County). Ianache was mentioned for the first time in Wallachia in March 1614,\textsuperscript{54} when he held the dignity of Grand Seneschal in Moldavia under Stephen Tomşa II.\textsuperscript{55} He was thus the favourite of both princes at once. In Moldavia, Ianache purchased many villages, forming a relatively large domain (of 16 villages),\textsuperscript{56} and refounded the church St. Sabbas at Iaşi.\textsuperscript{57} Ianache Caradja was one of the few Levantines who owned lands both in Moldavia and Wallachia, buying nine villages in Wallachia, mostly during the reign of Alexander Iliaş (1616–18) and all in Ialomiţa County: Vaideei,\textsuperscript{58} Cetăţele,\textsuperscript{59} Pârliţi,\textsuperscript{60} Deşiraţi,\textsuperscript{61}
Ştefan Aftodor

Gherghineşti/Ghergheşti, Cuiburi, Siraca and Slăvica. All rulers between 1611 and 1632 confirmed him in these estates and granted him privileges for the village of Văidei.

Ianca paid significant amounts for the villages mentioned here, over 1328 ughi (gold ducats), buying the most important estates from established boyars such as Dumitraşco Filipescu, Socol Cornăţeanu, Oancea the logothete of Cuştureni, Nenciu palatinus (brother-in-law to Oancea the logothete), Radu Slăviceanu, Oprea the logothete of Mâneşti and Bârbateşti, Staico of Bucov and others.

Grama’s nephew is especially known in Wallachia for the foundation that bears his name, the Slobozia of Ianache, which is more correctly the Văidei monastery in the village of that name. Ianache donated all the villages that he purchased to this religious foundation in Ialomiţa County.

The Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo, in his journey to Wallachia, recalls ‘a monastery dedicated to St. Michael and all angels, called the Slobozia of Ianache or exempted vakuf of Ianache’ on the Ialomiţa river, noting Seneschal Ianache’s act of donation in the village of Văidei (Ialomiţa) and privileges granted for that purpose by the Romanian rulers. For example, Prince Leon Tomșa exempted the villages of Cetăţele and Văidei (Ialomiţa County) from fiscal obligations, ‘as they had been devastated and enslaved by the Tatars in the days of Alexander Cononul, and jupan Enachi [Ianache], former seneschal of Moldavia, nephew of Scarlet [Skarlatos], and brought ‘Russian and Moldavian strangers without tribute, and settled them there in those sheepfolds, to take care of the cattle’.

Jupan Ianache built the monastery, one of the richest in Wallachia, ‘known as Slobozia later, [subordinated to] the monastery at Mount Athos Dochiariou’.

After the death of Ianache Caradja sometime between 1630 and 1632, his wealth passed to the ruler Matthew Basarab (1632–54) when the prince confiscated the estates, offering half of the village of Cetăţele to Constantine Cantacuzenus. However, Basarab soon reconsidered and allowed Ianache Caradja’s will to stand so that the ‘villages, estates and the serfs’ went to the Văidei monastery.
Ianache’s death did not prevent the successful integration of his family. Of Greek origin, they put down strong roots in the Romanian Principalities, especially in Moldavia. However, the first Caradja brother to permanently settle north of the Danube was Pavlache, first attested in the second reign of Radu Mihaia. Nevertheless, it was only during his son Alexander Coconul’s reign that Pavlache achieved high dignities. Mentioned as a grand constable of Alexander Coconul since 1626, he certainly held this function between 8 January and 25 August 1627, when he was replaced by Gligorie of Poiana (Pavlache himself had replaced Bratu of Uești, a relative of Radu Mihaia). Pavlache reached his political peak during Leon Tomșa’s reign, with the dignities of grand sword-bearer and grand ban.

The enthronement of Matthew Basarab (September 1632), after a revolt by the Wallachian boyars against princes imposed by the Porte and their Levantine attendants, put the Caradja family under strain. Confiscation of Ianache’s estates was a logical part of Basarab’s measures against the Greek/Levantine boyars and those who had supported Radu Iliaș.

Caradja boyars against Matthew Basarab?

In this context, the reign of Matthew Basarab considerably affected the interests of the Levantine high officials who had dominated Wallachian political life in the previous period, explaining the hostility of such powerful Greek families as the Celebi, Catardji and even Caradja. Indeed, repeated confrontations between Matthew Basarab and the Moldavian ruler Vasile Lupu brought the Caradja boyars to the forefront of events. Thus, we read in Radu Popescu’s chronicle of connections between Costea Caradja, collaborator of Vasile Lupu, and his brothers from Wallachia, Pavlache ban and Apostolache the constable, ‘great boyars’, and their role in efforts to persuade the Wallachian boyars to betray their prince, Matthew Basarab. ‘In these times there was a Vizir, friend to Vasile Lupu, who asked Vasile Lupu to depose Matthew voivode, which he did; and Vasile Lupu sent Costea Caradja […] to persuade the boyars with good words and promises from Vasile Lupu, as Costea had his brothers, Pavlache ban and

---

72 Ianache was alive in 1630 (ibid, vol. XXIII, doc. 82, pp. 147–50) and dead by 1633 (ibid, vol. XXIV, doc. 123, p. 166).
73 Pavlache, together with Radu palatinus, was judge of Craiova; see Catalogul documentelor Țării Românești, vol. III (1621–1632), eds Ciucă & Duca Ținăscu, Bucharest, 1978, no. 74, p. 53.
74 Stoicescu, Dicționar, p. 146.
77 However, most returned to Wallachia in 1633/1634. See DRH, B, vol. XXIV, doc. 14, p. 15; Letopisețul Cantacuzinescă, p. 353.
78 For these aspects see Iorga, Istoria românilor, vol. VI (Monarhi), ed. Andreescu, Bucharest, 2000, p. 54.
Apostolache the constable, great boyars, to speak to them, to turn the others. Basarab learnt of this plan, and was able to thwart the coup: ‘Costea Caradja, Vasile Lupu’s man [...] when he saw this, rode with his two sons, and went down the Argeş at Ciocăneşti, and they crossed the Danube to Dîrstor, and went to voivode Vasile, and told him what had happened and what they had done.’ Radu Popescu refers to this incident in the context of the Battle of Ojogeni–Nenişori of 1639, but also confirms the previous conflict in 1637, essentially another attempt by Vasile Lupu to overthrow Matthew Basarab. Contemporary Transylvanian sources record a conspiracy against Matthew amongst ‘men close to him’ but this is probably a chronicler confusing events.

Although we cannot exclude the Caradja brothers’ implication in the conspiracy against Basarab, their involvement can only have been brief, since Pavlache Caradja is otherwise known to have had good relations with Basarab, who called him the ‘honourable boyar of my reign, pan Pavlache ban’ and confirmed him in possession of the village of Iaroslăveştii (Vlaşca County). Moreover, Pavlache participated in the Assembly of 1636, and in 1637 continued to be one of the grand boyars of the country. He is also attested to after 1639. Even though not part of the Divan, and thereby of second rank, the Caradjas remained in Wallachia and continued to integrate into the boyar class. During Matthew Basarab’s reign, Levantine high officials in general occupied one-fifth of seats in the Divan, compared to Radu Mihnea’s reign when they had previously occupied about three-fifths.

The family of Pavlache Caradja

We do not know the identity of Pavlache’s first wife, but we know that he had a son by this marriage, Mihalache, whose godfather at marriage was Matthew Basarab himself and who became vtori (second) sword-bearer under Constantine Şerban Basarab.
From his marriage to Mary, his second wife, Pavlache had a son, Matthew, and three daughters, Neacşa, Elena and Stanca. Elena Caradja married Radu Leurdeanu (son of Stroe Leurdeanu), a high official at the turn of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{89}

**The estates of Pavlache Caradja**

Pavlache ban mainly focused on purchasing estates in Vlașca County: Clejani, Iaroslăvești, Câșmanăști, Cacaleți,\textsuperscript{90} Ogreseni.\textsuperscript{91} His most important possession was the village of Clejani, since documents mention him as ‘Pavlache ban from Clejani.’ His son gradually bought several estates in Ciocănești (Ilfov County),\textsuperscript{92} and Popești (Saac County).\textsuperscript{93} We find that his brother Matthew, called ‘son of Pavlache’, also bought some estates in the same village.\textsuperscript{94} Nevertheless, we must emphasise that although Pavlache held the highest dignity of all the Caradja brothers, being appointed grand ban, he purchased relatively few estates.

Our own opinion is that Pavlache Caradja ban did not die by order of the Moldavian prince Vasile Lupu.\textsuperscript{95} In a document dated 5 August 1646 we find that Mary, ‘after the death of my husband Pavlache ban […] buried him in the Holy Monastery of Babele of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist’.\textsuperscript{96} However, after Pavlache’s death, his heirs Mihalache and Matthew slipped down the ranks of the boyars; Mihalache was merely a sword-bearer and captain.


\textsuperscript{93} Ibid, vol. XXXVII, doc. 10, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{94} Ibid, vol. XXXIV, doc. 14, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{95} As presented by Filitti, *Arhiva Gheorghe Grigore Cantacuzino*, p. 254; Iorga, *Studii și documente cu privire la istoria românilor*, vol. IV (*Legăturile principatelor române cu Ardealul, de la 1601 la 1699*), Bucharest, 1902, pp. 239–40; *Călători străini*, vol. VI, p. 290. Paul Cernovodeanu was the first to clarify this.

\textsuperscript{96} DRH, B, vol. XXXI, doc. 240, p. 263.
The last Caradja in Wallachia: Apostolache the constable

Apostolache the constable came later to Wallachia, and is first attested to on 9 October 1633. He was married to Voichiţa of Ojogeni, daughter of Iannis purveyor of Ojogeni and Vlădaia, granddaughter of Radu Cocorăscu, grand logothete to Matthew Basarab. His brothers-in-law were Ianache of Berileşti and Udrea Doicescu, the latter being a high official in the last two years of Matthew Basarab’s reign. Voichiţa and Apostolache Caradja had no issue, but nevertheless he left his wife the third part of his assets in his will of 20 July 1651. The same document gives us valuable clues about this boyar’s lifestyle and importance. Regarding his outstanding debts, Apostolache writes ‘and no one should seek for money from me, for I never had any money in the house, and I had little money but that from “outside” with which I fed and bought estates’. The expression ‘outside’ most likely refers to the Greek boyar’s Balkan/Constantinopolitan origins. If we also mention Apostolache’s generous wedding gifts to Voichiţa (200 ughi, and numerous goods) then we can infer the path followed by the Greek boyar.

However, Apostolache’s merchant activities benefited from protection from his uncle, the merchant Skarlatos Grama, and even from his brother-in-law, Thomas Vlastos. After accumulating significant wealth, Apostolache invested money to buy estates in Wallachia, where he settled and married Voichiţa of Ojogeni. A document mentions

---

102 Ibid.
an Apostolos who was a drover on the Constantinople livestock route, which would explain his function as princely deputy in Floci town, a place of transit for these stock drives.

---

**The estates of Apostolache Caradja**

Although he did not hold the highest dignities, Apostolache was more dynamic than his brother in acting to establish a domain. Most of his possessions were purchased around the villages of Măstăneşti (Saac County), where he founded a monastery, and Ojogeni (Ialomiţa County), his wife’s place of birth and their residence.

Besides the dowry from his wife, he purchased land to increase his domain, buying estates especially in the years 1640–50, during Matthew Basarab’s reign. There is evidence to show that Apostolache spent at least 2,000 *ughii*, an amount that does not seem extraordinary, but was certainly significant. In addition to the estates of the two villages already mentioned, Apostolache and Voichiţa also owned the villages of Cârligu and Lăcureni (both in Buzău County), Bărbuleştii, Păpeni, Lindiceştii, Lipăreşti and Togozeni (all in Ialomiţa County), Gruiu, Sperl and Goran.
Ştefan Aftodor
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(Prahova County), Popeşti (Saac County, bought for 360 ughi from the sons of Pavlache ban), Fundeni (Ilfov County) and Făcăiani (Ialomita County), this last inherited by Voichiţa from her mother Vlădaia. We may also mention the vineyards at Vaideei and the Jugureni, and a pond at Câmpu.

In respect of the lie of the estates, we can conclude that Apostolache concentrated his ownership coherently in two important areas. The first was situated around Ojogeni, where Apostolache and his wife had their residence. The estates of Ojogeni and those of Lipăreştii, Togozeni, Slătioarele, Lindiceşti and Bărbuleştii were between the Cricova Sărată mouth of the Prahova River, the Ialomita, and the lower course of the Sărata. Apostolache Caradja left the estates bought in these villages to his wife. The second region was in Saac County, not far from the first region, and near his foundation, the Măstăneşti monastery in the village of the same name. Unsurprisingly, Apostolache donated all the nearby estates of Popeşti, Fundeni Lucăreni and Glodeni to the monastery. We must underline that both the Măstăneşti monastery and his kinsman Ianache’s foundation at Vaideii were subject to Dochiariou monastery on Mount Athos. Moreover, Măstăneşti monastery became famous as Apostolache’s Cell (Schitul Apostolache) and was administered by Vaideei monastery from 1677.

In his will of 20 July 1651, Apostolache left his estates in Togozeni, Ojogeni, Lipăreştii, Bărbuleşti, Nenişorii and Tohani to his wife Voichiţa, adding many further goods: valuables, garments, ‘and the third part of the cows, horses, mares, oxen, beehives’. We should note that the document was written by his brother-in-law Ianache of Berileşti but that Apostolache signed in Greek, without adding the name Caradja, as his nephew Mihalache the sword-bearer would do. Matthew Basarab, confirming Voichiţa’s inheritance, conceded that Apostolache had decided the fate of his wealth ‘ever since they had been to Jerusalem. However, despite the will, Apostolache’s death without issue opened a case between the Caradja family and Voichiţa. Thus Thomas Vlastos ‘of Constantinople’, Apostolache’s brother-in-law and Costea Caradja’s representative, came to claim Apostolache’s residual estate, mostly because he had been invited by Basarab to clarify the inheritance situation. During the trial that followed
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120 Ibid.
between Thomas Vlastos on the one side, and Voichiţa from Ojogeni and ‘her people’ on the other. Matthew Basarab appointed three grand boyars and three merchants to judge the case, all of Greek origin: Constantin Cantacuzenus, Ghinea Brătășanu, Ghiorma Alexeanu, Velisarie, Dona and Panaitoi Głobotsaris. Voichiţa won the case, since Apostolache had clearly left his entire fortune to his wife and monastery. However, Voichiţa proved magnanimous, awarding ‘jupan Thomas seneschal […] 333 golden ducats […] and 3 horses’ for his expenses in coming from Constantinople to Wallachia.

In conclusion, we can say that the Caradja boyars presented here demonstrated the ability to negotiate important matrimonial alliances skilfully, as we see them related to great Wallachian boyar families such as the Măneşti, Berileşti, Buzescu, Băleanu, Leurdeanu, Doicescu and Cocorăscu over six decades. Nevertheless, Caradja integration in Wallachia was far from a great success in the long term, compared to that of other Levantine families such as the Karydis and Cantacuzenus. Although Pavlache and Apostolache were two important representatives of the Caradja family who settled permanently in Wallachia, Pavlache’s successors did not reach the highest dignities or the Wallachian throne. His brother Costea’s descendants settled in Moldavia, where his son, a grand seneschal in Moldavia (1695–1705) and kaymakam (princely deputy) in Wallachia (1737) secured an important role for the Caradja family in the history of the principalities throughout the Phanariot period; ultimately, Nicholas Caradja (1782–1783) and Ioan Caradja (1812–1818) reached the throne.

125 Among them Preda the purveyor (Buzinca’s son) and the brothers Udrea and Colţea Doicescu; see ibid, vol. XXXII, doc. 142, p. 155.
The municipal elite of Cracow and its role in the economic life of the city in the seventeenth century

Szymon Kazusek

The state of research on the economic life of seventeenth-century Cracow, especially on its trade, is already far advanced. This is not, however, the case for research on the elite of Cracow and its environs at the time. From among the publications so far, we especially mention works by Stanisław Kutrzeba and Jan Ptaśnik, 1 Jan M. Malecki, 2 Marian Wołanński, 3 Honorata Obuchowska-Pysiowa, 4 Jan Pachoński, 5 Francis W. Carter, 6 Jacek Wijaczka, 7 Zdzisław Noga 8 and Janina Bierniarzówna, which have shed new light on issues surrounding the business activity of the Cracow patriciate, especially in the seventeenth century. 9 All these publications reveal much about Cracow’s foreign trade in 1604 and 1650, and also about economic exchange between Cracow and Silesia in the years 1600, 1609, 1619, 1629, 1639, 1644, 1654, 1664, 1674 and 1684. There is also some information on Cracow’s trade with Silesia during both the Thirty Years’ War.

5 J. Pachoński, Zmierzch sławetnych. Życie mieszczańskim w Krakowie w XVII i XVIII wieku, Cracow, 1956.
The municipal elite of Cracow

War\textsuperscript{10} and the Swedish invasion (1655–1660),\textsuperscript{11} as well as on relations with Lviv in the later seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{12} Furthermore, we may find data on Jewish participation in the Cracow trade in the mid-seventeenth century,\textsuperscript{13} and the economic role of the Scots in the sixteenth and the earlier seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{14} It is also worth noting here the extensive studies of Jewish participation in the economic life of the city, given in the two volumes published before the Second World War by Majer Bałaban and in more recent work by Gershon D. Hundert.\textsuperscript{15}

We also have much information on the seventeenth-century book trade.\textsuperscript{16} Also worth mentioning are studies of relations with Krems in Austria during the period, especially in the seventeenth century,\textsuperscript{17} and on connections between Cracow and Bohemia in the same century.\textsuperscript{18} Special attention should be paid to works considering Cracow’s involvement in the export of Polish lead\textsuperscript{19} and import of Italian textiles in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{20}

All these publications, to a greater or lesser extent, discuss some aspect of Cracow’s engagement in economic activity. Apart from these works, many other publications treat upon the involvement of Cracow and its patrician elite in the economic life of the country. There is no place to list them all here.

In the first half of the seventeenth century, there were huge changes in the Cracow long-distance trade. The town’s economic connections had peaked, and were starting to collapse. As Jan M. Malecki emphasises, even in the first decades of the seventeenth

\textsuperscript{10} I. Borón, \textit{Handel Górnego Śląska z Krakówem w dobie wojny trzydziestoletniej (na podstawie Krakowskich ksiąg celnych)}, Gliwice, 1995.
century Cracow was economically well placed. Cracow’s waning importance in trade resulted from very deep changes in European trade, mainly connected with the lesser importance of the trade routes that ran through Cracow and of markets connecting the countries of Central and Eastern Europe with Western Europe. These transformations were strongly correlated with a slow reduction in the city’s political importance. The Thirty Years’ War, by limiting contacts between Cracow and the west, had an effect on the development of the economic life of the city. Other limiting factors were plague and the Swedish occupation shortly after the disease had subsided.

Shortly before the economic crisis, Cracow was the most important trade centre in Little Poland (Małopolska). At the beginning of the 1640s the city was inhabited by 19,800 people, or 30,000 people together with its environs. In 1699 the city of Cracow had about 10,300 inhabitants, and after the Great Northern War only 6,800. Significant influences on demographic change included the Swedish occupation, as described in the historiography, and the epidemics and floods that afflicted the city several times in the later seventeenth century. Among the most important other factors affecting the city’s economic development and the life of its inhabitants we should mention repeated outbreaks of plague in the years 1651–1652, 1657–1658, 1660–1662, in 1664, at the end of the 1660s, and in the period 1675–1681. All these are only some of the reasons that indirectly led to the city’s economic decline. Against this background, well-known

24 Pachoński, Zmierzch sławetnych, p. 391; Friedberg, ‘Kraków w dobie Odrodzenia’, p. 203.
26 For further details, see Kazusek, Żydzi w handlu, pp. 47–52.
Cracow merchant families saw a change-over of generations, with significant effects on the city’s capacity to generate capital.\textsuperscript{29} Much information on trends in the development of Cracow’s economic ties can be gathered by analysis of the city’s income from customs duties. The municipal accounts books reveal that Cracow’s highest income from customs duties was from the early 1620s to the 1640s.\textsuperscript{30} Research on the economic life of other cities in old Poland reveals that in this period they were, like Cracow, in good economic condition.

Research shows that the most important region linked economically with Cracow was Silesia, which was responsible for as much as 53\% of the city’s turnover in foreign trade. In second place came Bohemia and Moravia with 12\%, then the Italian lands (10\%), Germany (9\%), Austria (7\%), Hungary (6\%) and Gdańsk (3\%).\textsuperscript{31} The latter was a ‘keystone’ in trade with Scandinavia and western Europe.\textsuperscript{32} From among the Silesian towns, Wrocław had the largest share in economic contacts with Cracow, with 33\% of the whole Silesian trade, while Opava took second place (13\%)\textsuperscript{33}. Wrocław most often delivered products from Nuremberg and Leipzig, while Opava sent articles from Moravia and the Duchy of Styria, which were then taken eastward from Cracow to Lithuania and elsewhere. Leather and furs were brought in via Lublin and Brest from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and from Russia, while articles from the Ottoman Empire came in to Cracow from Lviv, still the centre of exchange for products from Turkey, Moldavia, Wallachia and Persia and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{34}

A crucial role in the economic life of the city, and especially in foreign trade at the time, was played by wealthy Cracow merchants of Italian, German, Austrian, Czech, Hungarian, Jewish or Scottish origin.\textsuperscript{35} The ancestors of many had settled in the city as early as the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{36} Their financial potential and economic activity were very diverse, which argues for strong stratification within this group, also shown by the level of gift-giving by Cracow merchants in 1643 and 1667.\textsuperscript{37}

A strong diversity can be seen in the foreign trade of Cracow from the beginning of the seventeenth century (1604), not only in respect of the frequency of deliveries of products but also in the value of articles traded. Research shows that 174 merchants

\textsuperscript{29} The problem is given a more thorough treatment in A. Górski, \textit{Zapatywania i stosunki gospodarcze w Polsce XVII wieku}, Warsaw, 1923, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{31} Obuchowska-Pysiowa, \textit{Udział Krakówa}, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{33} Obuchowska-Pysiowa, \textit{Udział Krakówa}, p. 66.
\textsuperscript{37} Archiwum Państwowe w Krakówie, \textit{Archiwum miasta Kraków}, sygn. 2944, 3–9; ibid, sygn. 2945, 4–80.
traded in products worth less than 10,000 złotys overall, which amounted to 94.5% of the merchants’ association, which then stood at 185 members. Thus the group of the richest merchants, trading products worth more 10,000 złotys, had only 11 members, mostly trading in textiles, garments and fancy goods (46.48% of the total value). The most enterprising merchant was Andrzej Leber, who was known for importing steel and metal wares and could boast a turnover of 34,688.5 złotys. By comparison, the turnover capital of Jan Rap, the second richest merchant, was estimated at 20,717.5 złotys, while Jakub Cymerman took third place with ‘only’ 18,678.5 złotys. From the perspective of an ordinary consumer in Cracow or nearby at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Andrzej Leber’s turnover capital was approximately equivalent to e. g. 6,713 quarters of beef, 7,031 tubs of butter, 45,245 gallons of wine, 104,065 shirts, 43,360 pairs of shoes, 26,016 carts of fire-wood, 10.7 million bricks, or 2,812 oxen.

The most enterprising Cracow merchants, together with the approximate value of products that they traded in 1604, are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merchant</th>
<th>Value traded (złoty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrzej Leber</td>
<td>34,688.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Rap</td>
<td>20,717.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakub Cymerman</td>
<td>18,678.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerio Montelupi</td>
<td>17,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Wizembergowa</td>
<td>11,927.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio Del Benino</td>
<td>11,509.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariano Del Chiaro</td>
<td>11,370.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulio Del Pace</td>
<td>11,367.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasper Bank</td>
<td>10,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michał Leri</td>
<td>10,509.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca Del Pace</td>
<td>10,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composition of Cracow town council in the seventeenth century reflected the role of trade in the city. From findings to date, we may conclude that about 80 merchants sat in the town council: 55–60% of the whole assembly. These merchants represented the most important branches of trade, engaged in the trade in cloth, blue silk, spices, wines or metal wares. The group included the following representatives of
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38 Obuchowska-Pysiowa, *Udział Krakowa*, p. 84.
39 Ibid, p. 86.
40 Approximation only, because we do not have a complete data set from 1604; E. Tomaszewski, *Ceny w Krakowie w latach 1601–1795*, Lviv, 1934, pp. 37, 43, 49, 61, 85, 93, 114.
42 For the composition of the town council from this period, see Noga, *Urzędnicy miejscy Krakowa*, pp. 59–121.
Cracow’s patriciate: Jan and Franciszek Cyrus, Antoni Frączkowicz, Jan Furmankowicz, Paweł Hippolith, Gabriel Ochocki and Marcin Paczoska, clothiers, Ludovico Bianchi, Girolamo Pinocci and Giovanni Benedetto Savioli, mercers, Jakub Celest in the spice trade, Grzegorz Klausnic, Wojciech Schedel, Jakub and Kasper Celest, trading in metal wares. All these names were also known for their participation in Cracow’s national and foreign trade. It is remarkable that of 31 councillors who were clothiers, as many as 21 were active during the war with Sweden.

In the first half of the seventeenth century the Cracow councillor Andrzej Belza traded in foreign cloth, as did Hieronim Schober, while Andrzej’s father Hieronim traded in leather. Anther active merchant of the early seventeenth century was Andrea Cellari, from a merchant family of Milan. Giovanni Benedetto Savioli had contacts with Italy and Austria. Together with Ludovico Fantucci he established a trading partnership which imported cloths and silks and exported leather and lead. Domenico Montelupi was involved in trade on a huge scale and was a servitor to King Sigismund III since 1610, and his younger brother Carlo was also a king’s servitor since 1614. Other distinguished merchants were Pietro Antonio Pestalozzi, Raffaele Del Pace, Bartolomeo Conroni and Marcantonio Moriconi, active in trade with Austria and Italy. Savioli maintained economic contacts with Warsaw, Lublin, Lviv and Jarosław. As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, Krzysztof Schedel had extensive trade contacts with foreign countries, importing metal wares from the Duchy of Storia, the German lands or Silesia. He had contacts with Lviv and Gdańsk, and traded in Hungary. Sometime later, he became involved in the book trade, bringing books from Vilnius and Warsaw, Lublin and Poznań among other sources. Michal Krauz and Walenty Smidt


also appear to have been very active in their businesses. All of these names are just some examples of the most enterprising representatives of the patriciate; there were many more like them in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Further proof of the strong position of Cracow merchants is the level of their wealth, shown in the number and location of their properties within the city walls and excellently presented in property registers from 1632 and 1649, supplemented and confirmed by a list of property and owners from 1655. We should emphasise that, judging by these records, the group of merchants was strongly diverse when it came to their possessions. From 281 townsmen whose profession could be determined (and from 343 property-holders overall) as many as 85 were involved in trade. They composed 55–60% of the whole assembly of councillors, among them representatives of all the most important branches of trade: clothiers, mercers and traders in spices, wines and metal wares. They owned 103 properties from an overall number of buildings of 386, a little over 27%. It is clear that the majority of the group derived their incomes from foreign trade. 27 of them were Cracow councillors. Overwhelmingly many of the elite had their own stalls in the Cracow market place. It should also be added that merchants’ widows owned some property (16 tenement houses) and were often known for successfully running their family businesses.

We should also mention the participation of Jews from the Kazimierz district in the foreign trade of Cracow and environs. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Jews from this part of Cracow predominated amongst people of Jewish faith involved in trade. In 1604 there were 57 Jews trading between Cracow and foreign countries, 44 of these from Cracow’s environs. In 1604 Jews were only 6.2% of the overall number of merchants taking part in foreign trade. Study of the Cracow customs register from 1636 reveals that in comparison to 1593, the Jewish share in trade with Prague and the Moravian towns had dropped considerably. At the same time there was an increase in contacts with Hungary and Silesia and also with the Ruthenian Voivodeship, including especially Jaroslaw, Lviv and centres in Royal Prussia (Toruń), which were important elements in Cracow’s transit trade. The number of ‘foreign’ transports organised by Jewish merchants in 1650 amounted to 159, or 12.44% of all entries on foreign trade from Cracow.

Study of the books of Warsaw’s customs house reveals that of the Cracow merchants rafting their wares down the Vistula River in the first half of

58 Rejestry gospód w Krakowie z lat 1632 i 1649 ze zbiorów Biblioteki Naukowej PAU i PAN w Krakowie i Biblioteki Jagiellońskiej, ed. K. Follprecht, Cracow, 2005.
60 Ibid, pp. 18–9.
62 Obuchowska-Pysiowa, Udział Krakowa, p. 105.
64 Wijaczka, Handel zagraniczny, p. 120.
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The seventeenth century, 5.2% were Jews. The overall number of entries documenting Jewish participation in Cracow’s trade in the years 1648–60 was 4339, of which 881 or 25.47% recorded foreign contacts. Jews were especially interested in trading with Silesia and the German lands. The number of transports between Cracow and these regions was 87.96% of all entries recording foreign trade at the time.

Among the Jewish merchants, special attention should be paid to Dawid Zysel, Efraim Cukiernik, Jachym Kacz, Jonas Zachariaszowicz, Lewek Hesterczyk, Marek Józefowicz, Ruben Salomonowicz, Samuel Józefowicz, Samuel Lazarowicz, Szaja Wolfowicz or Wolf Popper (Bociyan). Another important merchant was Salomon Włochowicz, trade agent for Władysław IV Vasa and Jan Kazimierz, involved in salt and other trades. In the first half of the seventeenth century all of these were actively engaged in trade with Silesia, Hungary, Spiš, Austria and Moravia. Wolf Popper founded a synagogue in the Kazimierz district in 1620. An example of the scale of Jewish merchant activity is that in 1636 Szymon Wolf, a Cracow Jew, organised as many as 109 transports of goods, mainly to Lublin, Lviv, Jarosław, Przemysł and abroad, amounting to 17% of all entries for Jewish merchants. A polemical work by Sebastian Miczyński brought up the ‘problem’ of the excessive role of Jewish merchants in Cracow’s trade.

Scots living in Cracow or its environs played a crucial role in the economic life of the city, as shown by recent studies. Early in the seventeenth century the most active Scottish merchant was Kilian Smith. In the first half of the century we also encounter Alexander and Thomas Dixon, Daniel Forbes and Jacob Carmichael (Jakub Karmichel). Scottish merchants had economic ties with the German lands, Austria, Hungary and Slovakia, Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, and with numerous towns within Poland, and simultaneously were very active as stall holders within Cracow’s city walls.

An important role in the economic life of the city, especially in Cracow’s foreign trade in the first half of the seventeenth century, went to foreign merchants who were not themselves the town elite but had very close economic contacts with its representatives. Year by year, the overall number of foreign merchants involved in the Cracow trade was only a little smaller than the number of Polish merchants. 235 foreigners participated in the city’s foreign trade in 1604, among them Hungarians (43.5%), Silesians (42%), Czechs and Moravians (7.6%). Much lower were the numbers of merchants from
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67 Ibid, p. 320; see also Kazusek, *Handel żydowski*, Index.
71 S. Miczyński, *Zwierciadło Korony polskiej. Urazy ciężkie i utrapienia wielkie, które ponosi od Żydów, wyrażające synum koronnym w Roku Pańskim 1618*, no place of publication, 1648.
Germany (2.8% of the total), Austria (0.9%), Italy (0.5%), and Gdańsk (2%). It should also be emphasised here that these merchants did not run large enterprises. The richest merchant from the group, the Nuremberg exporter of leather Hannus Kerner, brought products worth 7,281 złotys overall in 1604. The rest of these merchants had much less money.

In the latter seventeenth century we will notice a slow decrease in Cracow’s importance on the economic map of the Commonwealth. One reason for this was certainly changes on the European continent, including the Turkish wars. The city was unable to rebuild its potential after the war with Sweden. It is also worth remembering the influence of the Thirty Years’ War, which directly affected Cracow’s relations with Silesia, Bohemia and Moravia. Consumer demand in Cracow society was severely reduced.

At a time of stagnation and regress, representatives of Cracow’s town council appear to have been very active in the economic life of the city. The councilors Piotr Golecki, Sebastian and Stanisław Kłosowicz, Marcin Paczoska, Wojciech Sztamet, Andrzej Wegrzynowic and Sebastiano Zacherla were all involved in the cloth trade, Marco Antonio Federici, Antonio Luchini and Girolamo Pinocci traded in blue silk, Michał Behm, Ventura Briganti, Jan Krakier, Marcin Lochman, Antonio Luchini, Jan Markiewicz and Jan Gaudenty Zacherla were involved in the trade in colonial goods, while Krzysztof and Stanisław Krauzowie dealt in metal wares, importing from Wrocław and Austria and exporting to Lviv, Przemyśl, Rzeszów, Lublin and Kańczuga. Stanisław Michał Segnitz also had well-developed foreign contacts; he was the son of Kaper, a famous spice trader who had come from Nuremberg, and had economic contacts with Silesia, Toruń and Gdańsk. Jan Sroczyński traded with Wrocław and Jarosław. All these names are frequently found in Cracow customs books of the latter seventeenth century.

The members of the Cracow patriciate presented above represent the most famous Cracow families, leading the economic, social and cultural life of the city through trade and patronage. It should be added that this group of wealthy Cracow merchants was only part of the Cracow patrician elite, alongside craftsmen, doctors, pharmacists and

---

75 Obuchowska-Pysiowa, *Udział Kraków,* p. 97.
76 Ibid, p. 99.
78 Mazzei, *Itinera mercatorum,* p. 25.
80 Ibid, p. 12
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lawyers.84 We should remember that the elite also included people unconnected to the town council. However, the merchants’ financial potential gave them the power within the council to decide on the city’s most important problems, including those connected with its economic life. Certainly the number of prominent Cracow townsmen could be broadened with very little effort, as could the complexity of aspects of the city’s economic life; however, this would beyond the extent of this study.

84 Bieniarzówna, Mieszczanstwo Krakowskie, p. 42; see also Noga, Krakowska rada, pp. 7–8.
The professional elite in mid-seventeenth century Constantinople: the Danish physician Hans Andersen Skovgaard (1604–1656) in the last decade of his life and career

Cristian Luca

Hans Andersen Skovgaard was born either in 1600, or in 1604 as more recent research suggests, at Elsinore (Helsingør) on the north-east coast of the Danish island of Zealand, as the son of a local Lutheran curate. Skovgaard studied under the famous Danish doctor, biologist, philologist and archaeological pioneer Ole Worm (1588–1655), professor at the University of Copenhagen, who had trained at the University of Padua and travelled extensively in Italy, where he had met many significant scholars of the day including the naturalist Ferrante Imperato (1550–1615). Indeed, Imperato’s natural science museum in Naples inspired him to found the Museum Wormianum in the Danish capital. In 1620 Hans Andersen Skovgaard was a student at the University of Copenhagen, and two years later, in 1622, continued at the University of Wittenberg, which many Nordic students chose for their studies as it was considered the ‘Lutheran Rome’. While at Wittenberg, Skovgaard corresponded with Worm, telling him that he had begun to study iatrochemistry under the renowned German physician Daniel Sennert (1572–1637). From 1625 Hans Andersen Skovgaard studied at the University of Padua with the help of a stipend from the Royal House of Oldenburg and grants from the mathematician

---

2 O. P. Grell, ‘’Like the bees, who neither suck nor generate their honey from one flower’’. The Significance of the peregrinatio academica for Danish Medical Students in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries’, in: Centres of Medical Excellence? Medical Travel and Education in Europe, 1500–1789, ed. Grell, A. Cunningham & J. Arrizabalaga, Farnham & Burlington, 2010, p. 180.
3 Ibid.
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Thomas Fincke (1561–1656), and took the opportunity to visit many of the Italian cities (Pisa, Rome, Siena, Venice, etc.). The theoretical and practical courses at the medical school at Padua were among the most advanced in seventeenth-century Europe. It was at Padua that the celebrated English physician William Harvey (1578–1657) had taken his medical degree in 1602, before finding fame for his revolutionary discovery of the circulation of blood. Although Skovgaard would never reach such professional heights as the Englishman, he gave courses in anatomy at the University of Pisa for which he was well paid, even if it seems that in the end he never took a doctorate in medicine from Padua. Nevertheless, he would go on to become a well-regarded doctor in Constantinople and attend to highly-placed Ottoman dignitaries.

Skovgaard appears in the sources of the time Italianised as Giovanni Andrea Scoccardi, under which name he gained fame as a doctor in Constantinople. After 1628, or in 1632 at the latest, he was doctor at the Venetian embassy to the Porte, and later would go on to be an effective agent for the Serenissima’s spy network in the Ottoman capital. He hoped that by serving Venetian diplomatic interests he would be able to obtain a medical position in the St. Mark city, and settle there with his family. Probably on the recommendation of Giovanni Antonio Grillo, grand dragoman of the Venetian embassy at Constantinople, the Moldavian prince Vasile Lupu offered Hans Andersen Skovgaard the post of doctor to the princely court in Iaşi in September 1641,
and also guaranteed that he could practise freely in the city.\textsuperscript{17} The Dane had already been to Moldavia in 1634 with the uncle of his future bride, the Venetian merchant Francesco Borisi, who was trying to recover a debt from the heirs of the Cretan Constantine Battista Vevelli which had been owed to the late Bernardo Borisi.\textsuperscript{18}

As court doctor in Moldavia, Skovgaard would receive an annual salary of 1,500–1,600 Spanish reales, in pieces of eight, from September 1641, and an additional one-off payment of 500 thalers, in leeuwendaalders, to cover expenses.\textsuperscript{19} Skovgaard received 900 Spanish reales of the agreed salary in advance, and 300 thalers for the costs of moving from Constantinople to the Moldavian capital.\textsuperscript{20} Even though he hoped to practise in Venice,\textsuperscript{21} Skovgaard was forced by lack of any positive response from the government of the Serenissima to accept the Moldavian prince’s offer, and moved to Iaşi.\textsuperscript{22} He stayed there for six or seven years, interrupted by trips back to Constantinople to see his family, whom he had left in the relative safety of the Italian–Levantine community in Pera. His stay in Moldavia was profitable not just because he was practising there as a doctor in a privileged position at the princely court, but also because he was offered occasional payments by the Venetian and Habsburg embassies at the Porte, whom he supplied with political, diplomatic and military secrets garnered from Moldavian courtiers.\textsuperscript{23} On 7 December 1646 Jerzy Kutnarski, Lupu’s Polish secretary, arrived in Warsaw and visited the Venetian ambassador Giovanni Tiepolo, delivering letters from the prince and from Doctor Hans Andersen Skovgaard. Tiepolo reported in his dispatch to the doge Francesco Molin and the Senate: ‘yesterday a secretary of the prince of Moldavia came to me in the morning, with letters from the prince himself and from his doctor, Siccardi [sic!]’.\textsuperscript{24} Thus Skovgaard was still in Moldavia in late 1646, and probably early the next year as well. At some point in 1647 or 1648, Skovgaard resigned his post as doctor to


\textsuperscript{18} Archivio di Stato di Venezia/State Archives of Venice (hereafter ASV), \textit{Bailo a Costantinopoli. Atti protocolli}, b. [=archival envelope] 284, unnumbered doc. (January 1634).

\textsuperscript{19} Vătămanu, \textit{Voievozi şi medici}, pp. 140, 142–3.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, pp. 142–3.

\textsuperscript{21} In a letter dated 10\textsuperscript{th} August 1641, Skovgaard asks the former \textit{bailo} Alvise Contarini for help in obtaining a medical position in Venice; see Hurmuzaki, \textit{Documente}, vol. VIII, doc. DCCVII, pp. 500–1.
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the princely court and left Iaşi, returning to his family in Constantinople and working to further Venetian interests as their agent. He had an ideal cover as a doctor, being well-regarded and widely known as such in the Ottoman capital.

Hans Andersen Skovgaard’s correspondence of 1642–43 with Francesco Ingoli, Secretary of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide,25 and his close cooperation with the Franciscan missionary Bartholomew Bassetti26 prove that the Danish physician had converted from Lutheranism to Catholicism before his arrival in Moldavia. This probably happened during his studies in Italy, or later in Constantinople before his Catholic wedding to Franceschina Borisi, a devout woman who had received a convent education in Capodistria.27 His letters, written in a ceremonial style and using rhetoric tropes typical of the correspondence of Catholic missionaries in Eastern Europe, show that Skovgaard had an unexpectedly sincere piety and was devoted to the Roman Catholic rite.28 Thus, in the light of these contemporary sources, it can be clearly stated that Skovgaard had converted to Catholicism, and that during his stay in Moldavia he was one of the Catholic residents in the capital of the principality.

Hans Andersen Skovgaard married in Constantinople some time before March 1641,29 his bride being Franceschina Borisi,30 daughter of the late grand dragoman at the Venetian embassy, Marc’ Antonio Borisi. Franceschina Borisi had earlier been married to the Venetian merchant Pellegrino Testa, called Fortuna, in 1618 or 1619.31 This marriage was annulled sometime after 1623 when their only child Asanina was born,32 after which Pellegrino Testa settled in Moldavia,33 while Franceschina Borisi remained in Constantinople with her daughter.34 By 1641 Asanina Testa Borisi had already left her mother’s home and started her own family. Hans Andersen Skovgaard and Franceschina Borisi had a daughter, who was baptised a Catholic and named Gioia, although she

29 ASV, Bailo a Costantinopoli. Cancelleria, b. 317, unnumbered doc. (13 March 1641), unnumbered doc. (7 December 1649).
30 Ibid, fols 13r–13v, 34r–35r.
33 ASV, Bailo a Costantinopoli. Lettere, b. 110, unnumbered docs (8 March 1636 and 25 November 1636); Luca, ‘Note documentare’, p. 100; Luca, ‘Il bailaggio veneto di Costantinopoli’, p. 118.
34 ASV, Bailo a Costantinopoli. Atti protocolli, b. 282, unnumbered doc. (30 March 1620).
is also found in sources of the time as Elena Scoccardi.\(^{35}\) Gioia Skovgaard/Scoccardi married in Constantinople the doctor Giovanni Mascellini (1612–75), originally from Pesaro,\(^{36}\) and they had several children, ‘as many sons as daughters,’\(^{37}\) one of these being Laura Mascellini, who would marry the dragoman Giacomo Tarsia.

Francesco Mascellini, one of the two sons of Giovanni Mascellini and Gioia Skovgaard, took an apprenticeship as dragoman, *giovane di lingua*, at the Venetian embassy from 1685 to 1697.\(^{38}\) This Francesco Mascellini was very probably the father of Giovanni II Mascellini, ‘Pubblico Dragomano’ in 1748,\(^{39}\) and Giansesina and Anna ‘di lui sorelle, permanenti qui in Pera di Costantinopoli’.\(^{40}\) Giovanni II Mascellini in turn was the father of Giovanni Battista, Paolo and Mario Mascellini, all of whom followed in his footsteps, first as dragoman apprentices and then as the Serenissima’s dragomans at the Porte in the decades leading up to the fall of the Venetian Republic.\(^{41}\)

Shortly after his marriage to Franceschina Borisi, Skovgaard helped his in-laws in settling some matters of Borisi family property. Thus on 12 August 1641 he signed a contract for his sister-in-law Cecilia Borisi Brutti, who was leasing a house in Pera to the merchant Andrea Bonanini for the sum of 150 Spanish reales a year.\(^{42}\) In signing, Skovgaard used the Italianised form of his name, ‘Giovan‹nni› Andrea Scoc‹c›ardi’.\(^{43}\) At the end of August he left Constantinople for Iaşi, as shown in a document notarised for Cecilia Borisi Brutti appointing Paolo Vecchia as ‘the representative for the honourable doctor Scoc‹c›ardi’,\(^{44}\) her brother-in-law, to administer all goods and properties since she could neither read nor write, and did not feel able to manage affairs on her own.\(^{45}\)

---


41. ASV, *Bailo a Costantinopoli. Cancelleria*, b. 320 I, unnumbered doc. (16–17 July 1776); ibid, b. 329, unnumbered docs (1, 3 and 19 June 1797; 4 August 1797; 3 September 1797); Luca, ‘Il bailaggio veneto di Costantinopoli’, p. 119.


43. Ibid.

44. Ibid, unnumbered doc. (31 August 1641).

45. Ibid, unnumbered doc. (12 August 1641).
In January 1645 Hans Andersen Skovgaard bought a house in the former Genoese colony of Pera from the brothers Giovanni, Domenico, Antonio and Niccolò Piron, who had inherited it from their father, the Constantinople merchant Stefano Piron. Giovanni Piron, dragoman apprentice at the Venetian embassy, negotiated the sale with Skovgaard, and the two of them agreed that the Piron brothers would receive 600 Spanish reales for the house in two successive payments of 350 and 250 reales. A relative of the brothers, Maria Piron, heard of the sale and came forward to say that the sons of Stefano Piron owed him 500 Spanish reales, and straight away asked the bailo Giovanni Soranzo to confiscate the 150 reales (!) which Doctor Skovgaard had just paid them. Even if we add this further 150 reales to the agreed sale price of 600, however, Skovgaard was still making a good purchase here, since 750 reales was a low price for such a house in Constantinople at the time. By buying the Piron family property, the Dane now had a house in Pera where he lived with his wife Franceschina Borisi and their daughter Gioia after his return from Moldavia and until summer 1656.

During these years in the Ottoman capital, Hans Andersen Skovgaard was able to overcome the proverbial Venetian distrust of foreigners, at least after marrying into the family of the late grand dragoman, Marc' Antonio Borisi. It was probably in the wake of his marriage to Franceschina Borisi that Skovgaard was officially accepted as a paid informant by the Serenissima’s embassy in Constantinople, and his hard work in the service of Venetian interests would be fully acknowledged by the government of the Republic of St. Mark. In 1650 Venice was fighting fiercely with the Porte in the War of Candia, so that Venetian diplomats in Constantinople desperately needed information on enemy troop movements and on the rate at which the shipyards of the Ottoman Arsenal were building warships. The Venetian embassy was of course under close watch and the bailo Giovanni Soranzo had been imprisoned by order of the Grand Vizier, while the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary Giovanni Cappello, sent from Venice to sound out the possibilities of ceasefire negotiations with the Porte, had been detained at Adrianople along with his secretary Giovanni Battista Ballarino. Given the difficulties under which their diplomats stood and the impossibility of gathering any intelligence by those means, it became vital for the Republic that they recruit trustworthy informants who could report from Constantinople about military matters and the Porte’s foreign policy. To this end the central authorities, the Inquisitori di Stato and Consiglio dei Dieci, authorized the bailo, in November 1650, ‘to use the services of doctor Scoccardi [Hans Andersen Skovgaard] and of Balsarini, formerly [Venetian] consul on Chios,'
Cristian Luca

presently in Constantinople, and of one of the [embassy] dragomans to send news from the Porte to the Senate'.

Thus it was that, armed with a perfect cover as doctor and belonging, as a Danish subject, to a nation that was neutral in the Ottoman–Venetian war, Skovgaard became a key figure in the Serenissima’s spy network. For the correspondence between the ambassador, Giovanni Cappello, and Skovgaard, it seems that the Danish doctor was entrusted with the perilous task of building contacts with the French ambassador, Jean de La Haye, who passed on secret messages from the Venetian authorities. Skovgaard’s services to Venice at a time when the war with the Ottomans made it almost impossible for the Republic’s merchants to freely travel anywhere in the empire were much appreciated, and were doubtless well rewarded to reflect the risks he took, putting his own life and the freedom of his family at stake. If exposed he would certainly have been condemned to death and his wife and daughter enslaved, but Hans Andersen Skovgaard was soberly following the goal he had set himself some time ago, that of a position as doctor in the Republic of Venice where he could live, with his family, in the city on the lagoon. Records show that from 1650 until 1656, when he died in the Ottoman capital, the Dane faithfully served Venetian interests, carrying out very dangerous missions in Constantinople to procure political and military secrets, and that he was directly involved in the deaths of renegades in service to the Porte.

The secretary Giovanni Battista Ballarino writes clearly in his dispaccio of 5th January 1654 that Skovgaard and his son-in-law, the doctor Giovanni Mascellini, were among Venice’s best and most trusted informants in Constantinople. The Danish doctor was not so well thought of, however, by the French embassy, since he had promised his daughter in marriage to the secretary of ambassador de La Haye before changing his mind and marrying her to Doctor Mascellini instead. In May 1654, Skovgaard adroitly used the contacts he had built up with highly-placed Ottoman figures in his professional capacity as a doctor to gather intelligence useful to Giovanni Cappello, even trying to obtain support from certain dignitaries at the Porte to plead with the Sultan and Grand Vizier for the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to be allowed to leave Adrianople, where he had been detained, for Constantinople. The doctor did not balk at taking part in black operations aimed at eliminating renegades who had offered their technical and military expertise to the Ottoman war effort. Thus Skovgaard supplied the Franciscan Giovanni Locatelli, guardiano of the Monastery of the Virgin Mary in Pera and secretly in service to the secretary Giovanni Battista Ballarino, with medicinal preparations containing lethal doses of poison, used to kill three renegades

---

52 Preto, I servizi segreti, p. 253; on de La Haye’s support to Venetian diplomats in Constantinople, see Pedani-Fabris, Elenco degli inviati diplomatici veneziani, p. 36; De Zanche, Tra Costantinopoli e Venezia, pp. 77–8; Luca, ‘Alcuni “confidenti” del bailaggio’, p. 302.
53 ASV, Consiglio dei X. Parti Secrete, fz. 45, unnumbered doc. (letter from Skovgaard to Ballarino, showing that he and his son-in-law Mascellini, were informants for the Venetian embassy at Constantinople); for part of what follows, see also Luca, ‘Alcuni “confidenti” del bailaggio’, p. 302–4.
54 ASV, Consiglio dei X. Parti Secrete, fz. 45, unnumbered doc.
55 ASV, Consiglio dei X. Parti Secrete, fz. 44, unnumbered doc.
who were considered especially dangerous. Secretary Ballarino, who had initiated the assassination, reported its success in a ciphered dispatch to the Inquisitori di Stato sent from Adrianople on 13th April 1655: ‘the death [killing] of Navagiero and the demise of the signori Arbanosovich and Grillo, altogether cost 60 reales more than the sum of 500 which Your Excellencies had approved’. Following this successful elimination, the Consiglio dei Dieci received a secret report from Constantinople in August 1655 that ‘Scoccooardi [Skovgaard] was awaiting new orders from Venice. His son-in-law, Giovanni Mascellini, who had been doctor to the Wallachian princes since 1648, first to Matthew Basarab (1632–54) and then to Constantine Şerban Basarab (1654–8), regularly supplied the Venetian authorities with intelligence gathered in Wallachia that he considered useful to the Sereníssima’s interests.

In 1656 intelligence from the Ottoman Empire was still sparse, and hard to send to Venice, so that when the Consiglio dei Dieci learnt in December that ‘secretary Ballarino has been forced to leave Constantinople’ they tried to get news from the Empire, sending to the Porte a certain Cesare Balbi with the mission ‘with the help of the dragomans, under the cover of a merchant or some other cover, to remain there and to send accurate news about Turkish preparations and movements’. Given the Venetians’ difficulties in sending intelligence to their capital on Ottoman military and political developments, the value of informants such as the two doctors, Skovgaard and Mascellini, is evident.

After the sudden death of his father-in-law, Hans Andersen Skovgaard, sometime in the second half of 1656, Giovanni Mascellini continued to serve Venetian diplomacy, particularly after his return to Constantinople, and in 1661 carried letters from Venice via the Habsburg ambassador to the grand chancellor Ballarino, in Adrianople. His professionalism and excellent reputation won Mascellini the privileged position of doctor to the Sultan and other Ottoman high officials. Although well-paid as a doctor in Constantinople, Giovanni Mascellini continued sporadically as a Venetian informant,

---

57 ASV , Inquisitori di Stato, b. 418, unnumbered doc. (13 April 1655).
58 ASV, Consiglio dei X. Parti Secrete, fz. 45, unnumbered doc. (August 1655).
60 ASV, Consiglio dei X. Parti Secrete, fz. 45, unnumbered doc.
62 In spring 1661 Giovanni Mascellini returned from his native town of Pesaro, where he had most likely been attending to family matters, to Constantinople (Archivio della Sacra Congregazione ‘De Propaganda Fide’/Historical Archive of Congregation ‘De Propaganda Fide’ at Rome, Scritture originali riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali, vol. 277, fol. 156).
63 ASV, Inquisitori di Stato, b. 418, unnumbered doc. (27 June 1661).
64 Vătămanu, Voievozi şi mediçi, pp. 160–1; Pippidi, ‘Quelques drogmans’, p. 151; Giovanni Mascellini corresponded with the grand dragoman of the Porte, Panayotis Nicoussios (ASV, Consiglio dei X. Parti Secrete, fz. 46, no. 2), who wrote to him from Candia on 25 February 1667 and 10 March 1668 (ibid, unnumbered docs).
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and in 1668 asked the secretary Giovanni Pietro Cavalli to be accepted officially as a regularly-paid ‘trusted agent’.\(^65\)

Hans Andersen Skovgaard’s unexpected death in unknown circumstances at the age of only 52, at the height of his career, has long required further clarification by historians studying his life and works. The late Romanian doctor and historian of medicine, Nicolae Vătâmanu, concludes, in the absence of more exact information from the sources, that ‘news from April 1657 shows that the doctor [Skovgaard] had died some time before this date. Earlier news about his successor from 28\(^{\text{th}}\) February 1656, suggests that Scoccardi [i.e. Skovgaard] was dead’.\(^66\) Vello Helk, the distinguish Danish historian of Estonian origin, writes in a short article published in the early 1980s in a medical journal in Copenhagen that ‘[Skovgaard] returned [from Moldavia] to Constantinople where he died, probably in 1656’.\(^67\)

An unpublished Venetian source allows us here to clarify and narrow down the time of the death of Doctor Skovgaard. The source is a submission of 7 April 1656 from Matteo Piron\(^68\) to the chancery of the Venetian embassy in Constantinople, addressed to the secretary Giovanni Battista Ballarino and asking him to sequester the sum of 433 Spanish reales in pieces of eight, and 70 Ottoman aspers, from the sale in October 1655 of the dragoman Pasquale II Navon’s\(^69\) house in Pera.\(^70\) Let us allow the source to speak for itself:

‘Io Matteo Perone [Piron], devotissimo servo di Vostra Signoria Illustrissima, vengo supplichevolmente suplicarLa mi facia gratia di far sequestrar a nome mio in mano del Signore Andrea Scoccardi [Skovgaard] per la summa di reali effettivi da otto numero quattrocentotrentatre, aspri 70, della vendita della casa del Signor Pasquale de NAVON, come Vostra Signoria Illustrissima [ha] visto dal sequestro antecedente fatto da me sotto li 17 otubrio [October] 1655, havendo fatto Vostra Signoria Illustrissima termine di giorni trenta che mi debba dar satisfacione, e già sono dui mesi e mi va menando con parole senza effetto, et assicuro che non restarà vano da dovuto effetto, et fine Li bacio reverentemente le vesti. Di Pera, adì 7 aprile 1656.’\(^71\)

\(^{65}\) ASV, Inquisitori di Stato, b. 418, unnumbered doc.; in 1672, Giovanni Mascellini secretly informed the bailo Giacomo Querini of political matters of interest to the Republic of St. Mark (ASV, Inquisitori di Stato, b. 148, fol. 62).

\(^{66}\) Vătâmanu, Voievozi și medici, p. 147.

\(^{67}\) Helk, ‘Hans Andersen Skovgaard’, p. 128; see also Helk, Dansk–norske studierejser, p. 69; I offer here my warm thanks to Dr. Vêlo Helk and the staff of the Royal Library of Copenhagen, who were uncommonly helpful in preparing a Danish bibliography on the life and works of Hans Andersen Skovgaard, and sent excerpts from specialist publications that would otherwise have been inaccessible to me.


\(^{70}\) ASV, Bailo a Costantinopoli. Cancelleria, b. 317, fol. 18\(^{\text{r}}\)–18\(^{\text{r}}\).

\(^{71}\) Ibid.
A note added in the secretary’s own hand at the end of the text confirms that in early July 1656 Skovgaard was still alive and working in Constantinople: ‘3 July 1656, delivered personally to Doctor Scoccardi [Skovgaard]’.\footnote{72} We do not know how Skovgaard was involved in the sale of the dragoman Pasquale II Navon’s house in Pera, but it seems that the sum to be sequestrated may have passed through his hands. At some point after 3 July 1656 he died unexpectedly, a sudden end to a rising career that had brought him much success, despite the fact he had never completed the doctorate in medicine at the University of Padua.\footnote{73}

Hans Andersen Skovgaard was a representative figure of the professional elite which gradually took shape in Western and Central–Eastern Europe in the late sixteenth century and in the century that followed. Doctors, apothecaries, tutors, scribes and scholars, jewellers, moneychangers etc., formed a professional elite aware of their value on the marketplace, who set out in search either of well-placed posts or of ways to exercise their particular skills freely and profitably. The Danish doctor chose to settle in Constantinople, drawn there by the chance to earn good money in a market where there was considerably less competition than in the great cities of Western Europe, where doctors were more numerous and indeed where most of them had completed their studies. Skovgaard was also attracted to the life of a citizen of the Italian towns, which he had got to know whilst studying at Padua and travelling in Venice, Siena, Pisa and Rome. He hoped to obtain a position as doctor in Venice itself and to bring his wife and daughter to live there. Although he did not succeed in this goal, his work as doctor to the princely court in Moldavia and as a spy in Venetian and Habsburg service shows us a man who had an open eye for opportunity and was ambitious, professional, tenacious and capable.

\footnote{72}{Ibid.}
\footnote{73}{Grell, “Like the bees”, p. 189.}
Moldavian rural elites: the boyar Dumitraşco Ştefan and his residence in Buciuleşti (Neamţ County)

Anişoara Ionaşcu

Dumitraşco Ştefan, son of the logothete Ştefan Ceaurul and father of the future prince Gheorghe Ştefan, was actively involved in Moldavian political life, holding important positions in the Divan as governor of Upper Moldavia during the second reign of Stephen Tomşa II and then as grand logothete. A complex personality, described by the noble chronicler Miron Costin as holding office ‘in all Divans’ and being required ‘to mend the affairs of the country as best he could’, Dumitraşco’s marriage to Zinica, daughter of the boyar Mogâldea, brought him advantageous ties to important noble families of the day, including her numerous relatives.

From 1608 to 1620, Dumitraşco Ştefan held no office, managing the family fortune after his father’s death and increasing it by lending money against pledged properties.

He took his place among the dignitaries towards the end of the first reign of Alexander Iliaş, on 7 September 1621, when he became governor of Upper Moldavia, an office which he would hold until the end of the first reign of Stephen Tomşa II. He was then appointed grand logothete of Lower Moldavia, probably due to his kinship by marriage with the prince.

Shortly after Radu Mihnea’s return to the Moldavian throne, Dumitraşco Ştefan was appointed grand logothete, replacing Ionaşcu Gheanghia. He held the chancery for seven

---

years, under the reigns of four princes (Radu Mihnea, Miron Barnovschi, Alexander Coconul, and Moise Movilă), from November 1623 until his death in November 1630.

Dumitrașco Ștefan was one of the most important high officials of the time, accumulating significant wealth, as proven by the assessment roll of his estate, which included an inventory of all his properties and a family chronicle. Drawn up in 1627, the assessment roll lists ‘the villages and lands owned and bought by Dumitrașco Ștefan, the grand logothete, together with his lady Zinica, daughter of Mogăldea boyar’. It also refers to kinship with rulers and important landowners of the country in the early seventeenth century and has been thoroughly analysed along with other sources on his family by the historian Petronel Zahariuc.

Grand logothete Dumitrașco Ștefan built rural residences in the villages Rădeni (today Rădeana), and Bogdana, both in Bacău County, an estate for which he went to law against the monastery of Berzunți, as recorded on 22 July 1659, and Buciulești, in Neaț County, a village purchased from the heirs of the logothete Bucium.

The first historical source on the village of Buciulești is dated 24 February 1602, when Prince Ieremia Movilă confirmed the division of logothete Condrea Bucium’s estate (along with those Gypsies who remained on it) between his widow, Antemia, and his children. ‘Half of the village of Buciulești with the mill ford on the river Bistrița’ is mentioned among the domains in this document. Two years later, the village was mentioned in four documents issued by Ieremia Movilă in October 1604, specifying at the end that they ‘were written in Buciulești, in the camp, on the river Bistrița’.

Extensive data on Buciulești and on the history of the rural residence built there can be found in the assessment roll of Dumitrașco Ștefan, which lists his estates as of 20

9 Zahariuc, Țara Moldovei în vremea lui Gheorghe Ștefan, p. 36; see also Iacob, Țara Moldovei în vremea lui Ștefan Tomșa al II-lea, p. 139.
10 Ibid.
11 Costin, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei, p. 135.
18 Ibid. The ruler and court halted there while on a pilgrimage following an epidemic of plague, travelling from Galata monastery, 3 July 1604, to Davideni, 29 October 1604; see D. Ciurea, ‘Date privind situația internă a Moldovei la sfârșitul secolului al XVI-lea și începutul secolului al XVII-lea’, Studii. Revistă de istorie, 8, nos 5–6 (1955), pp. 113–4.
April 1627. Dumitrașco relates the history of the village, starting with its location: ‘Buciulești village, situated on the Bistrița river, with mills and property in Neamț County’, belonged in the late sixteenth century to Condrea Bucium, former grand logothete and its first owner, and was then divided into four parts. Thereafter, the sons of Condrea Bucium, Gregorie and Vasile, pledged the village to Ştefan Ceaurul, whose name was also taken by Dumitrașco Ştefan. The brothers received 200 rams from Tazlău monastery in exchange for the pledge, indicating that Ştefan Ceaurul now owned the village. Nevertheless, we note further down that three parts of this village were owned by Ionașco, Vasile Buciulescu’s son-in-law, and his wife Tofana, meaning that the pledge was eventually redeemed from logothete Ştefan Ceaurul. However, they later had to sell back these three parts, this time to logothete Dumitrașco Ştefan, who gave them 500 gold coins to pay for the ‘five dowry chests with riches’ stolen by the two brothers of the wealthy Cretan merchant and dignitary Constantine Battista Vevelli.

Dumitrașco Ştefan eventually owned all of Buciulești, buying the share held by the sword-bearer Georghie and his wife Nastasia, to whom he paid ‘150 thalers, good money [i. e. in coin]’. The remaining fourth part was purchased from Condrea Borcea, son of Condrea Bucium’s sister Acsinia. Gheorghe Arapul, former court purveyor, gave Dumitrașco Ştefan his land from Buciulești in exchange for part of the village of Costeni that prince Vasile Lupu confirmed for him, along with other properties, on 27 March 1635. All these sellers gave Dumitrașco Ştefan their shares and the village was confirmed as being in his full possession in a document issued by prince Miron Barnovschi. Dumitrașco Ştefan reunited the estates at Buciulești through repeated purchases. The grand logothete then built a manor and court chapel, now a small ruin. The rural

20 Ibid. See also G. I. Lahovari, C. I. Brătinanu, Marele Dicționar Geografic al României, vol. I, Bucharest, 1898, p. 667 (giving brief information on the geography of the village, and on the court chapel on the left bank of the Bistrița, in an advanced state of ruin at the end of the 19th century).
21 DRH, A. Moldova, vol. XIX, doc. 186, p. 244 (where we are told ‘it first belonged to boyar Bucium’). On Condrea Bucium, see Stoicescu, Dicționar al marilor dregători, p. 296; a descendant of a grand boyar family attested to since the 15th century, he was grand logothete of Lower Moldavia (20 March 1580–15 May 1583).
22 Stoicescu, Dicționar al marilor dregători, p. 296.
23 Ibid, p. 329; his father was the grand logothete Ştefan (son of grand logothete Gavril, former scribe of the princely chancery from 5 November 1568 to 12 July 1578) during the reigns of Ştefan Răzvan (29 July 1594–18 May 1595) and Michael the Brave (23 June–27 July 1600). Grand logothete Ştefan Ceaurul founded the boyar family Ştefan (Ceaurești), which played an important role in the 17th century when they gave Moldavia a prince, Gheorghe Ştefan, son of Dumitrașco Ştefan.
24 DRH, A. Moldova, vol. XIX, doc. 186, p. 224; see also Ciocan, ‘Date noi despre logofătul Dumitrașco Ştefan’, p. 784.
residence of Buciulești was built, according to the inscription on the chapel, at the same
time as the church, around the year 1630.\(^{29}\)

After the death of grand logothete Dumitrașco Ștefan in November 1630, his eldest
son, Gheorghe Ștefan, inherited the estate of Buciulești and lived there until he became
the ruler of Moldavia. The early-eighteenth-century chronicler, Ion Neculce, recorded
that ‘when Gheorghe Ștefan was a landowner, a grand logothete, he started from Iași
to go to Buciulești, being then a widower, and he met a poor lady, young and beautiful,
namely Safta of the Boești family, and after they climbed into the carriage, against the
will of the lady, they returned the carriage to his house.’\(^{30}\)

Of his courts and the wealth he accumulated, Miron Costin wrote in the seventeenth
century: ‘he was a famous nobleman with many properties, with unequalled lands and
courts, like no other landowner’.\(^{31}\) One can assume from the chronicle that he was not
only a skilled grand logothete, but also a good manager, concerned for his own prestige
and that of his house. Such a fortune could not be earned but with determination, work
and scrupulous attention, and his residence is proof of his economic power and ambition.

Tracing the history of Buciulești and, implicitly, the key events which took place
there, we find that a number of important events took place at the residence in 1653. After
Gheorghe Ștefan, son of Dumitrașco Ștefan, took the throne of Moldavia, deposing Vasile
Lupu who had promoted him again to grand logothete, he ordered the former prince’s
relatives, the cupbearer Alexander and the constable Enachie, sons of grand hetman
Gavrîl, brother of the former ruler, to be put to death at Buciulești manor.\(^{32}\) Vasile Lupu’s
wife, with her son Ștefâniță and two noblemen loyal to the former ruler, the Cantacuzino
brothers – the grand palatinus Toma and the grand treasurer Iordache – were also brought
there; of the two sons of grand hetman Gavrîl, we learn that ‘both brothers were to be
imprisoned and killed’.\(^{33}\) The Cantacuzinos escaped unharmed, thanks to the timely
intervention of the prince of Wallachia, Constantin Șerban Basarab.\(^{34}\) Probably many
assets seized then were kept at Buciulești, as after being deposed, Gheorghe Ștefan fled
the country, ‘reaching Buciulești and Comănești, and then he entered the mountains, in
the Hungarian Country’, i.e. the neighbouring Principality of Transylvania.\(^{35}\)

All these events show that the manor of Buciulești functioned not only as a residence,
but also as a seat of power, and occasionally as a prison. After he became prince, the
former grand logothete, Gheorghe Ștefan, saw it as the best place to solve important
political matters in secrecy.

---

32 Ibid, p. 168 (‘Alexander the cupbearer and Enachie the constable, Gavrîl hetman’s sons and the former
ruler’s nephews, were tortured to death in Buciulești’).
33 Ibid, p. 169.
34 Ibid; these events are also reported by the chronicle’s continuation, see Neculce, *Letopisețul Țării
Moldovei*, pp. 184–5.
35 Costin, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*, p. 182; Ciocan, ‘Date noi despre logofătul Dumitrașco Ștefan’, p. 785.
Gheorghe Ștefan only enjoyed the comfort of his manor of Buciulești for a short while, as, after almost five years of rule, he lost the goodwill and trust of the Ottoman Sultan and Grand Vizier, as well as the support of neighbouring allies, and was consequently forced into exile in Transylvania and then in Western Europe. All his attempts to regain the Moldavian throne were ineffectual, and exhausted his financial resources.\textsuperscript{36}

Vasile Lupu’s son, Ștefăniță Lupu, who became ruler of Moldavia (1 December 1659–29 September 1661), would punish his father’s usurper and the whole family, seizing their assets, although this was not so severe a punishment as Gheorghe Ștefan himself had inflicted in the past.\textsuperscript{37} According to a document issued on 11\textsuperscript{th} June 1663, ‘the ruler Ștefan Vasile [Lupu] took this village [Buciulești] from the former ruler Gheorghe Ștefan, with other villages and lands he had owned’ and offered them to grand logothete Racoviță Cehan, father-in-law of Alexander Coci, son of Gavril hetman, the brother of Vasile Lupu.\textsuperscript{38}

However, Racoviță Cehan only held Buciulești village and the residence of the Ștefan family for a few years, since on 11 June 1663 the estate passed into the possession of Ecaterina Dabija, after an exchange of villages between the two. The boyar received two villages, Iurești (Lâpușna County) and Șercani (Orhei County), which extended the assets of the Cehan boyar family in north-east Moldavia, in exchange for the ‘village Buciulești with the residence’. The agricultural productivity of the land and the market value of the residence built at Buciulești are shown in the written document of the exchange agreement; the new owner affirmed that ‘this village Buciulești is better’, for which reason she exchanged ‘a village for two villages, so that she could precisely adjust the exchange’.\textsuperscript{39}

Until December 1717, Moldavian documents mention nothing more of the estate of Buciulești. On that date we discover that prince Mihai Racoviță had seized Buciulești from his brother-in-law, Vasile Ștefan Ceaurul, formerly grand steward, ‘with the neighbours, the mill, and all assets’ and given it to his brother, the hetman Dumitrașco Racoviță.\textsuperscript{40} This seizure was a result of foreign military interventions in Moldavia in the context of the Ottoman–Austrian war which started in 1716, when Vasile Ștefan Ceaurul headed a local rebellion, leading a part of the boyars against their ruler and carrying out a series of robberies in the country.\textsuperscript{41} The prince would duly punish them and seize three villages: ‘I [Mihai Racoviță] took from him three villages, namely: Buciulești

\textsuperscript{36} For details on the last decade of his life, spent in exile, and his financial situation at the time, as well as his requests for help from some royal courts of Europe, see Zahariuc, Țara Moldovei în vremea lui Gheorghe Ștefan, pp. 514–36.

\textsuperscript{37} Gh. Ghibănescu, 

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{40} Th. Codrescu, Uricariul sau colecțiune de diferite acte care pot servi la istoria românilor, vol. IX, Iași, 1887, pp. 158–9; the same document is given in Gh. Ghibănescu, ‘Iași și lăsăt Sulina la o duminică între 1617–1727’, Ioan Neculce, 8 (1930), p. 180 (here dated 20 December 1717).

\textsuperscript{41} Codrescu, Uricariul, pp. 158–9.
from Neamţ [County], and Hălăuceşti from Suceava [County], and Spinoasa.'

Thus we can conclude that the village was again in the possession of Ceaureşti family at this point, owned by the grand steward Vasile Ceaurul, grandson of the hetman Vasile Ştefan Ceaurul.

Although we do not know exactly when descendants of the Ceaureşti family regained the village and manor of Buciuleşti, we believe that it was during the reign of Eustratie Dabija (September 1661–September 1665), who returned the fortune to Vasile Ştefan Ceaurul, brother of the deposed Gheorghe Ştefan. Vasile Ştefan Ceaurul and his descendants held the village and the manor until December 1717, when the estate passed to the Racoviţă family. After this date, there is little evidence of the fate of Buciuleşti village, the last records of its existence being found in the censuses of 1772 and 1774.

Evidence shows that later, in the mid-nineteenth century, the locals abandoned Buciuleşti village, since it had been ‘ruined by the Bistriţa floods, and the village moved [was relocated] under the hillside of Podoleni’. The flooding of the Bistriţa severely damaged the residence and chapel.

The court chapel of Buciuleşti, dedicated to St. Parascheva, was built in 1630, not long before Dumitraşco Ştefan’s death. According to the Slavonic inscription, the church in the village of Podoleni, ‘by the will of the Father and with the help of the Son and by commitment to the Holy Spirit, this holy church dedicated to our all-pious mother St. Parascheva was built by the noble Dumitraşco Ştefan, grand logothete, and his wife Maria, and their children […] in the year 7138 (1630) October 20’. The art historian Gheorghe Balş emphasised that the church displayed characteristic seventeenth-century architecture, as an example of Wallachian influence in the art of neighbouring Moldavia. The plan was simple: a nave with an altar, two less prominent interiors and a narthex, and on the southern side a bell tower like those of the churches in Bălineşti, Mirăuţi, Şerbeşti, Bozieni and Paşcani, all of which were founded in the seventeenth century. All the arches have decorations within

---

43 Stoicescu, Dicţionar al marilor dregători, p. 450.
44 Ibid.
46 Balş, Bisericile şi mănăstirile moldoveneşti, pp. 109–10, giving the inscription formerly preserved in the church of the neighbouring village of Podoleni.
48 Balş, Bisericile şi mănăstirile moldoveneşti, pp. 108, 110.
49 Ciocan, ‘Date noi despre logofătul Dumitraşco Ştefan’, p. 789; Zahariuc, Ţara Moldovei în vremea lui Gheorghe Ştefan, p. 26, footnotes 26–8. His wife, Zinica or Zenica, appears under this name in written documents and church records and with the names Maria or Maria–Zinica in commemorations and church images. The last variant is only found in the church which the family founded at Râdeana.
50 Balş, Bisericile şi mănăstirile moldoveneşti, p. 108.
51 Ibid, pp. 106–8, for architectural details specific to the 17th century and similarities with other churches founded by Dumitraşco Ştefan in Aroneanu and Râdeana.
the wall plan and have the extrados marked by bricks built up on their wider faces, following Byzantine and Wallachian models.\footnote{Ibid, p. 106; see also I. D. Ştefănescu, ‘Un monument uitat: Biserica din Buciuleşti’, Revista Istorică Română, 16, nos 1–4 (1946), pp. 63–6.}

A large part of the chapel, the north-west corner of the nave, more than half of the narthex, and half of the tower have collapsed. The banks on which the courtyard and court chapel were built have been washed away by the waters of the Bistriţa, which ran close to the complex of buildings.\footnote{Balş, Bisericile și mănăstirile moldovenesti, p. 108.}

This church, a court chapel built to serve the boyar’s family, also served as a place of burial, since the founder Dumitraşco Ştefan, his wife Zinica (who died not long after her husband, in the same ecclesiastical year), and one of his sons, Gligoraş, were all buried here.\footnote{Ciocan, ‘Date noi despre logofătul Dumitraşco Ştefan’, pp. 789, 791, Appendix 2, p. 3; Zahariuc, Țara Moldovei în vremea lui Gheorghe Ştefan, p. 36.}

Our paper has briefly analysed the phases of construction and ownership of the rural residence built in 1630 in the village Buciuleşti, Neamţ County, a manor where Dumitraşco Ştefan, one of the most influential boyars in the Principality of Moldavia at that time, lived in the first decades of the seventeenth century. Dying young, he left his three sons Gheorghe, Vasile, and Gligoraş significant buildings, having built up no fewer than three manors in the villages of Rădeni (Rădeana) and Bogdana, both in Bacău County, and Buciuleşti (Podoleni) in Neamţ County. The manor house and court chapel at Buciuleşti belonged to his descendants, and witnessed a series of important events. The manor was the residence of the Ceaureşti boyar family, and the chapel held the tombs of several family members: the couple who founded the complex, Dumitraşco Ştefan and his wife, Zinica, and their son, Gligoraş.

This manor house, built in 1630, was not just a residence, but also functioned as a seat of power, the scene for resolving political issues. It was intermittently owned by the founder’s descendants until the eighteenth century, when it passed to the Racoviţă family. As mentioned before, in the nineteenth century the village was abandoned by locals, who relocated under the hillside of Podoleni because of the frequent floods on the Bistriţa, which ruined a great part of the court and manor.
Catholic elites and Ottomans in the Western Balkans (seventeenth to eighteenth centuries)

Rafael-Dorian Chelaru

On July 22 1735 the apostolic vicar of Bosnia, Matja Delivić, wrote to the secretariat of the Congregation for the Propagation of Faith: ‘In altri tempi, et inanzi la Guerra di Vienna, erano riche case de’ Mercanti Cattolici in Bosna, le quali sostentavano e la persona del Vescovo et il decoro della dignità per l’honor della nazione. Le guerre causarono falimenti in molti e gl’altri fuggendo le terre crudeli si sono translatati e stabiliti nelle città della Dalmazia’.  

While researching in the Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of Faith, I came across a volume containing around 61 documents from the period 1649–99 concerning one of the wealthy Bosnian noble families of merchants mentioned by Delivić, the Grubišić or Brnjaković from the town of Olovo (‘Plumbeum’ in Latin). The documents had been issued by the Papacy, the Habsburg Emperor Leopold I, the bishops of Bosnia, the provincials of the Franciscan province of Bosna Argentina, the guardians of some Franciscan monasteries from Bosnia and by several Catholic communities including those at Olovo, Sarajevo and Mitrovica. In general, all these letters attest to the generous material support this family gave to Catholicism in Bosnia.

2 Archivio Storico della Congregazione per l’Evangelizzazione dei Popoli, Scritture riferite nei Congressi della Sacra Congregazione – Bosnia, Miscellanea (hereafter APF, Bosnia), vol. 3. The name Bernjakovich has several variants such as Bernakovitch, Barnacovich or Brnjakovitch. In this study, I will use the modern form Brnjaković.
4 Several of these documents were published as resumés and a very few in full text by E. Fermendžin, O. F. M., Acta Bosnanae potissimum ecclesiastica, cum insertis editorum documentorum regestis ab anno 925 usque ad annum 1752, Zagreb, 1892, pp. 514–6. The archival reference provided by Fermendžin for these documents is Biblioteca Vaticana, Ottoboniano, vol. 927.
The history of the family has been summarily treated in a few articles, mostly in Croatian.\(^5\) The earliest family member mentioned in the available documents is Andreas (Andrija) Brnjaković, who was born to Catholic parents (Bernardo and Maria) in 1605 and died in 1689.\(^6\) According to the diploma issued by Emperor Leopold I on 12 June 1659, confirming Andreas Brnjaković as a nobleman of the Empire, he was married to Maria Ljubičić and had seven children: Filip, Jacob, Franciscus, Stephen, Laurentia, Francisca and Catherina.\(^7\) Filip and Jacob were mentioned repeatedly as official procurators (‘benefattori e procuratori’) of the Bosnian Catholics in relations with the Ottoman authorities.\(^8\) Another son, Matthew (Matija), not mentioned in 1659, was confirmed by Pope Clement X as Bishop of Belgrade on December 20 1675, at the age of twenty-four, and ruled the diocese until 1707.\(^9\)

In 1649 Bishop Marian Mrnavić of Bosnia confirmed the title of *liber baro* of Olovo on Andreas, as the family archive had been destroyed by a fire which also severely damaged the local Franciscan monastery in which it was kept. This title went back to the pre-Ottoman period, at least according to the imperial diploma from 1659 which mentioned that the Brnjaković’s noble status had been suspended during the Turkish occupation. Moreover, the family seems to have been grand landowners in the old Bosnian kingdom – in 1661 Leopold I formally re-confirmed Andreas Brnjaković in ownership rights over twenty possessions in Bosnia (among them Banja Luka), which had been taken by the Ottomans.\(^10\) Recognition of their merits in supporting Catholicism in Bosnia also brought them the title *della Milizia Aurata* (or *Cavaliere del Speron d’Oro*), which Pope Innocent XI granted to Jakob and Filip on December 23 1686.\(^11\)

In his letter of 1649 (the oldest preserved in the volume), Bishop Mrnavić praised Andreas and his family for defending the Catholic Church in Bosnia against the ‘abuses’ of the Ottomans, without giving further details either of these abuses or of the actions taken to prevent them. The papal bull from 1675 was equally unforthcoming. Nevertheless, several of the merits attributed to this family were described in detail in letters sent to Rome by the provincials of Bosna Argentina and the guardians of the monasteries of Olovo, Fojnica, Sutješka and Višovač. According to their testimonies, the Brnjaković paid large sums of money to the Ottomans to recover churches, monasteries or other valuables, confiscated mainly during the Cretan war (1645–69). For example, in 1681

---


6. Ibid, p. 474 – letter issued by Marian Mrnavić, bishop of Bosnia, on 16 August 1653, recommending Andreas Bernjakovic to the imperial court in Vienna. Andreas’s death is mentioned in a letter from 10 June 1689 by the provincial of Bosna Argentina, Mihail Radnić.


8. See the letter of Provincial Marko of Vassilievo, 28 December 1676 (Fojnica) – APF, *Bosnia*, vol. 3, fol. 44. According to Antonio of Travnik, Marko’s predecessor, Filip Brnjaković was appointed in 1675 as ‘procurator’ of the Province to be sent to Rome for the Jubilee – Fermendžin, *Acta Bosnae*, p. 515.


11. Ibid, fols 88, 90.
Josephus Barišić, guardian of the monastery at Olovo, testified that Filip Brnjaković had ransomed the monastery’s liturgical items, sequestrated by Turkish creditors for a debt of over 7,000 reals (at an annual interest of 25%). In 1683, the same Filip obtained Ottoman permission for the Franciscans of Olovo to re-build and adorn their church and monastery; in 1689, the Brnjaković brothers were praised for saving the same monastery ‘con effusione di denaro e di preghiere’ from the destruction promised by the commander of the Ottoman armies in Bosnia. They also obtained fermans granting tax exemptions for the Catholic clergy, as in 1693 when a poll tax of four sultanins imposed on the Catholic clergy was annulled by Brnjaković’s intervention. They were also praised for their efforts in securing Bosnian Franciscan privileges, and for helping many friars be released from the Ottoman prisons. Almost all this was achieved by direct intervention at the Sultan’s court in Constantinople, proving the family’s significant influence in high circles of the Ottoman state. In their turn, and to compensate these services, the friars bribed the pasha of Bosnia in 1693 to stop his maltreatment of Jacob, accused of having secured permission for the Franciscans to wander the Catholic villages to assist their parishioners and thus, allegedly, damaging the fields of Turkish landowners.

Not everything went smoothly between the two sides, however: in 1696, Cardinal Colloredo informed the Propaganda Fide that Franciscans from the monasteries of Sutješka and Olovo had not come to Spalato (Split) to settle their debts with Filip Brnjaković, who in turn mentioned in 1695 that he faced opened hostility from the Franciscan Marco Socianin.

The Brnjaković dossier also contains several letters testifying to their assistance to Catholic communities in Bosnia, obtaining various rights and exemptions from the Ottomans (through fermans generally issued in exchange for money), such as the exemption from devshirmé for the Catholics of Olovo, or the exemption from the obligation to house the Sultan’s couriers for the community of Mitrovica. In 1693, the Catholic community of Sarajevo testified that the Brnjaković had paid a total of 818,250 aspers in 1680–9 to preserve the Roman faith in the town.
The economic and social position of this family of merchants in Ottoman Bosnia led the imperial envoy Ferdinando Marsigli to describe them in 1699 as ‘direttori di tutto il traffico del Seraglio fra la Turchia e Italia’. He added in the same letter: ‘questa famiglia è stata da Turchi molto stimata e amata e ha avuto sempre un indiscibile credito per l’abilità ed esperienza grande nel traffico si in Venezia, Ancona e Napoli che tutta la Turchia europea’ and thus ‘unici che in questa materia possano avvantaggiare lo Stato della Maestà Vostra’. It is obvious that in the late seventeenth century the Brnjaković were the most prominent Catholic family in Bosnia, benefitting especially from their trading networks and resources. However, as early as 1698 they were already moving into Habsburg territories after the great fire in Sarajevo in 1697 destroyed all their belongings (after which the Ottomans decided to transfer the capital of the eyalet to Travnik from 1703 until 1850). In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Brnjaković joined the Habsburg (and later Hungarian) nobility under the name of Bernathffy of Olovacz.

The Brnjaković case is a rare documented example of a local Catholic elite family who seem to have played an important role in the early modern Ottoman Balkans, both in its economic and social life and in the religious affairs of the region. Particularly notable in the Brnjaković file preserved in the Vatican archives is the obvious instrumentalisation of such documents by members of this family, particularly Filip and Jakob, to legitimise their elite status in Bosnian society in relations with the Papacy and especially with the Habsburg Emperor. Their gambit to assume elite status was accepted, which would ensure their similar status in the Habsburg territories, in turn with the help of the Roman Curia.

Thus, the main scope of the present article is to investigate and describe the structure of these elites and their relations with Ottoman authorities in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Western Balkans (namely Bosnia and Albania), and to see how these relations created their social role within the Catholic communities. To my knowledge, no study has addressed this topic so far, with the notable exception of several biographical accounts of prominent individuals who made a major contribution to cultural developments in the region.

23 Ibid.
24 In a letter to the Propaganda Fide Congregation on 15 December 1698, Filip and Jakob asked for subsidies, pleading the loss of all their valuables in the Sarajevo fire. On 26 January 1699, the cardinals of the Congregation approved financial aid of 500 Roman scudi – Fermendžin, Acta Bosnae, pp. 533–5.
26 Most of these individuals were Catholic clergymen, who benefited from support granted by the Roman Curia in its efforts to revitalise Christian culture in the Ottoman Balkans. See for example studies on the biography of the Bishop of Scutari and Skopje, Pjetër Bogdani: O. Marquet, Pjetër Bogdani. Lethra dhe dokumente nga Arkivi i Kongregatës ‘de Propaganda Fide’ si dhe nga Arkivat Sekrete të Vatikanit, Shkodër, 1997; L. Marlekaj, Pietro Bogdani e l’Albania del suo tempo, Palo del Colle (Bari), 1989. Some brief data on Catholic clergy in the Western Balkans until 1650 can be found in E. Borromeo, Voyageurs occidentaux dans l’Empire ottoman (1600–1644). Inventaire des récits et étude sur les itinéraires, les monuments remarqués et les populations rencontrées (Roumélie, Cyclades, Crimée), 2 vols, Paris, 2007.
To define and describe those social groups (or networks) that can be called Catholic elites in the early modern Ottoman Balkans we must consider both clergy in high ecclesiastical positions (bishops, archbishops) and those Catholic families and individuals perceived by their co-religionists and the Ottoman authorities as wielding authority and influence. We use the term elite in its broadest sociological sense, retaining for our particular case the elements of power and authority exerted both vertically (over the lower strata of laymen and clerics) and horizontally (especially in relation with the Ottomans). However, for the better contextualisation of our argument, it is also necessary to recall the outlines of the juridical status of Catholic communities, as established by the Ottoman state.

Most contemporary sources on the confessional landscape of the early modern Balkans acknowledge that, apart from the wide frame of dhimmi status, the position of Catholics in the Ottoman Empire was at least until the late nineteenth century more unstable than that of the Orthodox, mainly because their spiritual centre, the Roman Curia, was situated outside the Ottoman boundaries. In the eyes of the Turks, the pope could not legally act as guarantor and administrator over his flock as the Orthodox Patriarchs did, technically because he had not been granted a special berat for the purpose by the Sultan himself—and, moreover, the papacy never requested such a document, probably because it would not have received it. Furthermore, the Sultans never officially recognised the Latin patriarchal vicar of Constantinople (a post held by the Franciscan Provincial of the Orient). Given this situation, in the Ottoman juridical system the Catholics were under the nominal authority of the Patriarch of the Armenians, along with the Nestorians and Jacobites. However, the bishops and archbishops appointed by Rome to administer Catholic communities in Ottoman territories requested berats from the Sultan and usually received these on an individual basis, provided that suitable gifts and payments were made. These documents empowered their recipients with full spiritual and ecclesiastical authority over all Catholic communities within the limits of their dioceses or archdioceses (practically, they became the leaders of their dioceses, the bayrak-dar). Moreover, ecclesiastical superiors holding a berat were also entitled to administer all properties of the church, as well as those properties which remained intestate after the

27 For a good survey on the political and sociological theories of elites and masses, see M. Hartmann, The Sociology of Elites, New York, 2007.

28 B. J. Slot, Archipelagus Turbatus, Les Cyclades entre colonisation latine et occupation ottomane, c. 1500–1718, vol. I, Istanbul, 1982, p. 110; T. Stoianovich, ‘Factors in the decline of Ottoman Society in Balkans’, Slavic Review, 21, no. 4 (1962), p. 628. It is perhaps significant that the official representatives of the Catholic community in Constantinople were the Magnifica Comunità di Pera, essentially a body of laymen. Because the Latin Patriarchal Vicar was not recognised by the Turks, in 1682 the Propaganda Fide withdrew his right to administer ecclesiastic properties in the Ottoman capital. See Borromeo, ‘Le clergé catholique face au pouvoir ottoman: les brevets de nomination (berât) des évêques et des archevêques (17ème siècle)’, in: Contacts and Controversies between Muslims, Jews and Christians in the Ottoman Empire and Pre-Modern Iran, eds C. Adang & S. Schmidke, Würzburg, 2010, p. 209. Catholics under the Ottomans could obtain certain privileges, such as those granted by the status of subjects of Catholic powers from Western Europe, but only on individual basis.

29 In most cases, Rome selected its bishops and archbishops for dioceses in Ottoman territories either from among the Italian alumni of missionary colleges, or from local clergy who had studied in Italy.

30 In some cases, support from influential ambassadors at the Sultan’s court could make the process much easier – Slot, Archipelagus Turbatus, vol. I, p. 110.
The death of their former Catholic owners. Failure to obtain a berat left a bishop unable to support his jurisdiction before a Turkish court (kadi). The berats granted to Catholic bishops were similar to those issued for the Orthodox high clergy, the only differences being the absence of any superior central authority and the lack of any formal guarantee against forced conversions. Elisabetta Borromeo’s arguments suggest that the Ottomans most probably regarded their Catholic subjects as a multitude of communities scattered throughout the Empire, each community with its own religious leader (parish priest, bishop or archbishop), rather than as a single, united, body.

Consequently, two main juridical implications can be drawn for relations between the Ottomans and their Catholic subjects. First, conversion could be legally and even deliberately pursued (usually following reprisals in times of military conflict with Christian states such as the Habsburg Empire and Venice). Forced conversion of Orthodox communities and individuals was by contrast formally forbidden, as mentioned expressis verbis in their berats. Secondly, Catholic clergymen, even if they held a berat, could be prevented from performing their spiritual activities unless they paid significant sums of money and offered other gifts to local Ottoman officials. Ecclesiastical sources from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries offer many examples of such ‘abusii’ and it would be superfluous to give even a short list. Setting aside inherent exaggerations and dramatisations, these sources make it clear that Catholic clergy and laymen depended heavily on the goodwill of the authorities, and a key element in this equation was the nature of relations between the two sides.

The topos stressing Ottoman greed affecting Catholic clergy was widespread in correspondence between the Propaganda Fide and missionary clergy in Bosnia and Albania. Some nuances appear though: the archbishop of Antivari, Andrija Zmajević, noted in 1674: ‘essendo loro [i.e. the Ottomans] della natura de’ cani, a(i) quali dandosi l’osso vengono a tacere, e permettono si faccia quello che si vuole’. Despite these burdens on their financial resources, many Catholic clerics were aware that such extraordinary contributions were the only occasional impediments to the free exercise of the Roman faith. Diplomacy toward the Ottomans (understood also as ‘humility’) was also strongly advised – in 1671, the apostolic visitor in the dioceses of Sappa and Scutari, Stefano Gaspari, criticised Giorgio (Gjergj) Vladagni, Bishop of Scutari: ‘invece di rendersi humile alli Turchi, tratta con loro cosi aspramente’.

The available berats granted to Catholic clerics usually specified that inheritances over 5,000 aspers were to be transferred to the property of the Sultan; this limit also held for the Orthodox Church. See Borromeo, ‘Le clergé catholique’, p. 209.

Ibid, p. 211.

The berats granted to Catholic clergy do not mention any interdiction on conversion. Apparently (or euphemistically), many forced conversions were not completely forceful – the Ottomans offered conversion to Islam as a way to avoid the death penalty.

In most cases, local Ottoman officials justified their requests (regarded as ‘abusii’ by the Catholic bishops and archbishops) with the necessity of issuing the formal safe-conducts (yol tezkiresi) for travel in the province.


P. Bartl, Albania Sacra. Geistliche Visitationsberichte aus Albanien, vol. I (Diözese Alessio), Wiesbaden, 2007, p. 120.
The ‘abusive’ requests by the Ottomans often led to the involvement of leaders of the local community, who would then assist the clerics in question. In most cases, however, their identity is not mentioned except in commendatory letters. As we have seen, the Brnjaković file contains many such letters. In the Albanian lands, in 1765, a certain Giovanni (Gjani) Canci from Scutari, when asking the Propaganda Fide to accept his son into a missionary college in Italy, mentioned that he had been granted the title of ‘cavaliere domestico papalino’ by Pope Benedict XIV in recognition of his merits in protecting Catholic clergy and laymen from Scutari against the greed of Ottoman officials: ‘sofferti mille travagli dall’ingordigia dell’Ottomani’. Like Brnjaković, Canci was probably a merchant (he did not specify his status) and I will add here that merchants were the only social category, alongside the clergy, that could constitute a non-Muslim elite in pre-modern Ottoman society, due to their economic potential. In his famous study, Trajan Stoianovich pointed out the importance of merchants as the most mobile and influential category in Balkan Orthodox society – this also holds true for Catholic society in the region, although to a much lesser extent.

According to the available sources, the percentage of indigenous merchants within the total Catholic population living in the Ottoman territories, especially in Bosnia and Albania, seems to have been significantly smaller than in the Orthodox case. For example, in 1618 the Archbishop of Antivari, Marino Bizzi, noted that in Macedonia and northern Albania the large majority of Catholic inhabitants were very poor, surviving by agriculture and some petty local trade, the only exception being the few Catholics from Antivari whose income was provided by their lands leased to local villagers. In Bosnia, the Brnjaković family seem to have been an exceptional case, given their role in supporting the local Catholic structures; another rich family of indigenous merchants were the Matković from Olovo, who supplied one of the first Jesuit missionaries to Turkish Hungary, Simon Matković. In an account of Catholicism in Bosnia from 1655, Bishop Marian Mrnavić affirmed that most Catholics were peasants, with the exception of a very few merchant communities from Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Olovo and other towns. Most trading activity and trade routes from Bosnia were controlled by the Ragusan merchants, who had colonies in two towns, Novi Pazar and Prokuplje, and a large community in Sarajevo (which however was not organised as a colony), in his

37 APF, Albania, vol. 12, fol. 428.
40 Litterae missionariorum de Hungaria et Transilvania (1572–1717), vol. V, ed. I. G. Tóth, Rome & Budapest, 2008, pp. 3168–9. I have not been able to identify any other references to this family.
41 Fermendžin, Acta Bosnae, p. 477. The author also included a list of Bosnian noble families (ibid, pp. 560–1) among them the Branković of Jaje, mentioned in 1683 by the ex-guardian Pietro Marino as benefactors of the Franciscan monastery in Jerusalem (ibid, p. 517).
Catholic elites and Ottomans in the Balkans

letter of 1735, cited above, Delivić might have included them in the number of the rich merchant families from Bosnia. In Albania, local Catholic merchants (and those from the Italian diaspora) were a more significant presence, and even tried to influence the Roman Curia’s appointments to Albanian dioceses. In 1681, six Catholic merchants from the diocese of Sappa asked the Prefect of the Propaganda Fide to remove the Dalmatian missionary Donatus Jelić as bishop of Sappa, invoking the hostility between the Albanians and Dalmatians (including here the Ragusans), which could have affected the stability of Catholicism in the area.

The Propaganda Fide often used Albanian merchants (as in most cases in the Ottoman territories) as intermediaries to transfer payments due to the missionaries, or transport liturgical items necessary for the religious service in needy communities. Such a merchant was Mihail Campsi from Scutari, most probably a kinsman of the local bishop, Paolo Campsi (in office 1742–71), who is reported in 1765 administering money transfers from the Roman Curia to missionaries in Albania. Campsi probably had trading connections in Italy through the port of Ancona (mentioned in the source cited), which was along with Ragusa and Venice a key port of transit for commerce between the Ottoman Empire and the Italian peninsula. We know little else about the Campsi family, except that Bishop Paolo Campsi was the son of the missionary Pietro (Pjetër) Campsi. The biography of another member of this family, Giovanni (Gjani) Campsi, student of the Illyrian college in Loreto, close associate of the Zadar Archbishop Vincentius (Vičko) Žmajević and canon of the Zadar chapter for more than forty years, was analysed in detail in a recent article. For the moment, we can remark on resemblances with the Brnjaković, especially the combination of significant trading activities and high clerical rank, which might have given the Campsi a high social standing. The Radovani family from eighteenth-century Durazzo may be another

---

43 Significant groups of local Albanian merchants appear in the towns only in the second half of the eighteenth century. See O. Daniel, ‘Le processus d’islamisation dans les villes d’Albanie aux XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles’, in: Structures sociales et développement culturelles des villes Sud–Est européennes et adriatiques aux XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles. Actes du colloque interdisciplinaire, Venice 27–30 mai 1971, Bucharest, 1975, p. 240. However, Daniel refers to Muslim merchants, while Catholic merchants are not discussed. Most probably, many of these merchants were based outside Ottoman territories.

44 APF, Albania, vol. 2, fols. 541–542; another letter sent to the Propaganda Fide on the same subject is dated October 1682 (ibid, fol. 605), both sent from Venice. The signatories were Giovan Gecci, Colla Quinzia, Michail Radovani, Marin Angeli, Giorgio Drusi and Marco Bocha.


46 APF, Albania, vol. 11, fol. 168.

47 Some high clerics from the Western Balkans chose Ancona as a place of refuge. In his report from 1671, the visitor Gaspari mentioned that the Bogdani family, who managed to make a 5,000 Venetian ducats deposit in Ragusa from their income as archbishops of Skopje and bishops of Scutari, intended to buy land near Ancona to settle there (APF, Visite e collegi, vol. 34, fol. 27).


49 L. Čoralić, ‘Zadarski kanonik – Skadranin Giovanni Campsi’, Radovi Zavoda povijest znanosti Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti Zadru, 47 (2005), pp. 291–303. This Giovanni Campsi was a member of a group of Albanian immigrants who took refuge in the neighbouring Venetian territories.
example: the archbishop of Durazzo, Nicolaus Radovani (in office from 1752 to 1774), had a nephew Andreas, a merchant, who in 1769 is mentioned in a letter preparing to leave Ancona by sea with a fellow merchant to return to his native town.\textsuperscript{50}

Moreover, one and the same person could combine clerical duties with commerce; I have been able to document this especially in the case of Albania. A detailed report on the status of the dioceses of Sappa and Scutari, drafted in 1671 for the Propaganda Fide by the apostolic visitor Stefano (Stjefën) Gaspari (an Albanian native from Kruja, bishop of Sappa in 1673–80),\textsuperscript{51} provides several examples of local parish priests engaged in trade, sometimes in collaboration with Muslim merchants. A special case is the parish priest Pietro (Pjetër) Trumsci (or Trumsci) from the diocese of Scutari, of whom Gaspari notes that he went several times to Venice with another parish priest, Stefano Corucci from the village of Boiana, and with some fellow Turks to sell merchandise. According to Gaspari, Trumsci was in conflict with his superior, Bishop Pjetër Bogdani, whom he threatened several times, even with death.\textsuperscript{52} Bishop Bogdani himself complained to the Propaganda Fide of having been forced by the Ottomans to appoint Trumsci as his vicar.\textsuperscript{53} Another negative example in Gaspari’s report is that of the parish priest of Chella (archdiocese of Durazzo), Giorgio (Gjergij) Scorgna, who was accused of practising one of the most infamous forms of trade, namely selling Christians as slaves to the Turks.\textsuperscript{54}

Criticism of such ‘amicizie’ and ‘commercia’ between Catholic priests and Ottomans in the Balkans is another widespread topos of many early modern missionary sources, expressing the mental distance between a centre dominated by a rigid juridical and theological framework and a periphery where confessional boundaries were much more easily transgressed, even by clergy, not to mention laymen. What scandalised Gaspari in particular was the incidence of such connections (trading partnerships, kinship etc.), whereby local priests secured their own control over parishes and even over whole sees. In many cases, missionaries and bishops appointed by Propaganda Fide to the Turkish territories confronted strong resistance and opposition from the local clergy when trying to perform their duties. The hostile attitude shown by Franciscans from the province of Bosna Argentina in the seventeenth and especially the eighteenth century against many bishops of Bosnia (who were nominated by the Habsburg emperor) was determined by their special juridical status granted by the Ottomans since 1463 (for example the Bosnian Franciscans were the only dhimmis in the Balkans – with the exception of

\textsuperscript{50} APF, \textit{Bosnia}, vol. 12, fol. 610.

\textsuperscript{51} APF, \textit{Visite e collegi}, vol. 34, fols 4–114. It is perhaps worth mentioning here that Gaspari was accompanied and supported during his visitation by the brothers Pietro and Nicolò Cottari from Scutari, probably merchants.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, fol. 16. In the same report, Gaspari gave a more nuanced picture, adding that Bishop Bogdani was not really the innocent party, as he had taken advantage of Trumsci’s generosity, lodging for free in the vicar’s house for three years. Furthermore, Gaspari affirmed that Bogdani promised to appoint Trumsci either archbishop of Antivari or bishop of Pulati (Puliti). See ibid, p. 27.


\textsuperscript{54} APF, \textit{Visite e collegi}, vol. 34, fol. 83. Gaspari also criticised Scorgna for having good relations with the Ottoman commander of Durazzo, Sinan beg. Many missionary sources refer to Catholics from the Ottoman territories as being involved in the Christian slave trade with the Ottomans.
Ragusan merchants – allowed to wear Turkish clothes, carry weapons and ride horses). The Franciscans succeeded in controlling most parishes in Bosnia and even the see of Belgrade (until 1686), often with the strong support of local Ottoman commanders. This is one of the many accusations listed for example in a polemic from 1650, entitled *Raggioni perch’il clero di Belgrado non vole episcopo frate di Bosna* and sent to the Propaganda Fide.

This text does not mention that some Bosnian Franciscans had Muslim relatives, even amongst Ottoman officials, who could be used for example to settle ecclesiastic conflicts or win elections in their province. In the 1630s Andreas (Andrija) of Kamengrad, the Provincial of Bosnia, threatened the bishop of Ragusa, Albertus Rengić, that he would appeal to his Muslim relatives and friends to have Rengić impaled unless he stopped exercising his authority over Bosnian territory. The Franciscan Martinus Bargugliani, elected in 1631 as Provincial of Bosnia, came from a largely Muslim family, a detail that helped him secure the support of Ottoman officials. In 1637, Marian (Marijan) Mrnvić, superior of the monastery of Sutjeska and later nominated by the Habsburg emperor bishop of Bosnia, was elected Provincial by a council held in Kreševo, following pressure from Mrnvić’s kinsman, the local bey Sinanović. The Mrnvić family also held the see of Bosnia from 1631 until 1660, and that of Duvno (Hercegovina) from 1645 to 1655. Marian’s successor, Nicolaus Ogramič from Olovo (also called Nicolas Plumbensis), mentioned in a letter of 1673 that he had over a hundred relatives in Požega, a town with a Muslim majority, and it is highly probable that some of these relatives were Muslim. Outside Bosnia, we find the Franciscan bishop of Drivasto


(Drivost, Macedonia), Jeronim Lučić (1636–41), who had three Muslim brothers (Alia, Behrem and Pervan).\(^{62}\) While local Bosnian Franciscans built their authority through close relations and even kinship with the Turks, the Minorites from the neighbouring areas such as Ragusa seem to have done without such ties. The annals of the Bosnian Franciscans mention for the year 1600 a certain Blasius from Gradac, ‘vir ob eximias virtutes magnae etiam apud Turcas auctoritatis’, who built five parish churches in Gradac, Jassabia and Chelmo to benefit the Catholic communities and, of course, the Order.\(^{63}\) This Blasius (or Biagio) from Ragusa was the administrator of the diocese of Mostar (named Steffanensis in the papal records) from 1599 to 1624.\(^{64}\) The provincials and guardians of the Franciscan province of Bosnia represented the only Catholic clerical elite in the eyalet, even during the eighteenth century when the number of friars decreased dramatically due to massive migration to the Habsburg territories.\(^{65}\) In the case of the sandjak of Albania, the situation proved rather different. The only presence of Catholic monastics in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a small missionary group of Observant Franciscans (six friars on average) scattered throughout the villages of northern Albania, whose presence and activity was inconstant due to the Albanian riots and Ottoman wars against the Habsburgs and Venice.\(^{66}\) The local Albanian Catholic clans (such as the Mirdita, Klimenti, Dukagjini, Shkreli, Hotti, Kastrati, Koçaj, Pulati etc.) were ministered mainly by local parish priests, who were heavily criticised by apostolic visitors such as Gaspari not only for their close relations with the Ottomans, but also for their ignorance and illiteracy. Nonetheless, in many rural, mountainous areas, these priests were truly influential religious leaders, recognised by the clans and supported by the Turks. On the other hand, the clerics appointed to the two archbishoprics of Antivari and Durazzo, and their suffragans,\(^{67}\) were all educated in the pontifical colleges, either in Rome or Loreto, and some even held doctorates in theology. The majority of these bishops and archbishops originated from local families, who enjoyed a sort of noble status in the Ottoman territory and could secure the hereditary transmission of some ecclesiastical offices. The Albanian family of Bogdani from the

\(^{62}\) A biography of the bishop is given in K. Draganović, ‘Biskup fra Jeronim Lučić, njegovo doba i njegovo izvješće svetoj stolici o prilikama u Bosni i Slavoniji (1638)’, *Croatica Christiana Periodica*, 6 (1982) pp. 73–99, includes several letters to Rome by Lučić, underlining his successes against attempts by the Orthodox Patriarch, Cyril Lukaris, to subdue Catholics in the Western Balkans.


\(^{64}\) Borromeo, *Voyageurs occidentaux*, p. 501.

\(^{65}\) Some data on Bosnian Franciscan developments after 1700 is given in Baotić, *Relazioni tra la Chiesa e l’Islam*, p. 57.


\(^{67}\) The Archbishopric of Antivari had jurisdiction over the sees of Scutari, Sfacci, Zadrina, Alessio, Corbino. The Archbishopric of Durazzo included the sees of Croja, Stefano (Mostar), Benda, Canovia and Albania.
sandjak of Prizren, mentioned above, held the archdiocese of Skopje between 1656 and 1689; the famous writer and grammarian Pjetër Bogdani, Andrea’s nephew, was also Bishop of Scutari (1656–77) and apostolic administrator of Antivari (1656–71).68 The Bogdani were related to the Masarecchi (Mazrreku) family of Prizren,69 and thus to Pietro Masarecchi, Archbishop of Antivari (1624–35) and apostolic administrator of Serbia and Turkish Hungary (1631–5).70

The Vladagni family from Scutari produced several bishops in Albania: Georgius (Bishop of Alessio, 1656–92), Nicolaus (Bishop of Alessio, 1692–703 – proposed in 1682 by the six Albanian merchants from Sappa to replace Donatus Jelić),71 Anton (Bishop of Scutari, 1729–40), Lazarus (Bishop of Sappa–Sarda, 1746–9; Archbishop of Antivari, 1749–86), Georgius (who followed his father Lazarus as bishop of Sappa–Sarda, 1750–65).72 In Scutari we also find the Campsi family, already mentioned, with Pietro Campsi and his son Paulus as bishops of Alessio and Scutari. The Blancus (Bianchi, Bardhi in Albanian) family from the town of Sappa (Nënshat) held the local see from 1594 until 1646 with Nicolaus Blancus (1594–1620), and his nephews Georgius Blancus (1623–35, thereafter Archbishop of Antivari until 1644, then Bishop of Sappa once more until 1646) and Franciscus (Frang Bardhi, Bishop of Sappa and administrator of the see of Pulati 1635–44).73 In Durazzo, the Scura family held the local archdiocese through Marco Scura (1640–56),74 his nephew Nicolaus Carpineus (1657–70) and Pietro Scura (1720–37).75 In most cases, the sources speak of their families as being of noble origin or considered as such.

68 On the biography of the Bogdani family see Marlekaj, pp. 9–167. Pjetër Bogdani was the first to draft a grammar and vocabulary of the Albanian language and a catechism in Albanian.

69 Pjetër Bogdani’s mother was member of the Masarecchi family.


71 Between 1698–1700 Nicolaus Vladagmi was also vicar of the archbishopric of Durazzo. See Hierarchia catholica, vol. V, p. 190.


73 Hierarchia catholica, vol. IV, pp. 86, 305; ibid, vol. V, p. 347; ibid, vol. VI, p. 367. In a report drafted in 1641, Franciscus Blancus included a short laudation of the town of Sappa and the importance of his predecessors for local Catholicism: ‘In Epirotic (Albanian), this town is known as Ndenscati (Nënshat), meaning “under Sapa” (1), from which derives the title of the bishop, Bishop of Sapatingis. It is known for certain that four bishops come from this village: George Summa (Gjergj Suma), Tosolo Bianchi (Tozol Bardhi), Nicholas Bianchi (Nikollë Bardhi) and the afore-mentioned Gjergj Bardhi, now Archbishop of Bar. The last three made great efforts to rule and to protect the Christian faithful from the impiety of the Muslims over the last ninety years, right up to the present bishop, Francis Bianchi (Frang Bardhi), their relation and successor. The family and lineage of the Bardhis is considered noble in Albania.’ See R. Elsie, Early Albania: a Reader of Historical Texts, 11th–17th Centuries, Wiesbaden, 2003, pp. 184–5 (also available online at http://www.albanianhistory.net/texts16-18/AH1614.html).

74 Marco Scura was one of the leaders of the Catholic Albanian uprising of 1648–9 against Ottoman rule. See Granata, ‘L’Albania e le missioni italiane’, p. 231; S. Skendi, ‘Religion in Albania during the Ottoman rule’, Südost-Forschungen, 15 (1956) p. 317.

The case of the Bardhis, bishops of Sappa for several generations, deserves special attention. The see of Sappa comprised the land of Zadrimë, granted the status of a vaqf during the reign of Suleyman the Magnificent when a certain Pasha of Dukagjini built thirty bridges at his own expense. This status privileged the Christian inhabitants of the region, who thus came under the direct authority of the Sultan, resulting in a significant decrease in taxes and a degree of internal autonomy. According to a report drafted in 1641 by Bishop Frang Bardhi, ‘the province of Zadrima is governed like a republic because, several times a year, they all gather together from house to house, in particular the elders, who are their leaders, in order to keep up the said bridges. [...] The head of the assembly of the people of Zadrima is the bishop, but he must originate and be born in Zadrima. The bishop, however, endeavours to avoid the honour because the assembly always takes the side of the Turks.’ Although the case of Sappa is exceptional in the Western Balkans, it illustrates the social status that could on occasions be acquired by Catholic clergymen.

I have not discussed here the role of elites in Catholic Albanian clans from the northern mountainous areas, who were particularly important during the seventeenth century, especially when various projects for anti-Ottoman coalitions were drafted and mediated by Catholic clerics such as Nicola Mekajshit (1600–3), Pjetër Budi (1610–22), Gjergj Bardhi (c. 1630), Marco Scura (1646–9), and Pjetër Bogdani (1689), nor the exotic figure of Yahya Sultan, as studies by Peter Bartl and Noël Malcolm have addressed the question extensively.

---


77 Francisca Blancus mentioned in the same report of 1641 that Catholics from Zadrimë could even entrust a parish priest to represent them at the Sultan’s court. Such a priest was Peter Bianchi (Pjetër Bardhi), parish priest in Blinisht and Gjadër, according to the bishop ‘an important figure who was twice in Constantinople last year on behalf of the bishop and people of Zadrima with regard to the urgent needs of the Church and people of Zadrima.’ See Elsie, *Early Albania*, pp. 184–5. Given their shared name, it is highly probable that this Peter Bianchi was a relative of the bishop.

78 In his report of September 1621 sent to Rome, Pjetër Budi, Bishop of Sappa, underlined his personal connections with the local Catholic leaders, but also with the Muslims: ‘the chiefs of these peoples [i. e. the northern Albanian tribes] are for the most part relatives of mine and very close friends, as are the main leaders of the Muslims in that country who have betrayed their souls’ (Elsie, *Early Albania*, p. 174).


82 We may add the collection of documents edited by I. Zamputi, *Dokumente të shekujve XVI–XVII për historinë e Shqipërisë*, vol. III, Tirana, 1990, which is particularly important for the anti-Ottoman projects involving Albania in the first half of the seventeenth century.
There are some examples of Catholic elite families based outside Ottoman Bosnia and Albania (mainly in the Venetian territories) who had strong connections in neighbouring Ottoman lands and were also involved in administering spiritually to Catholic communities. In a memorandum dated around 1677 and sent to the Propaganda Fide, the future Bishop of Scutari (1677–86), Dominic Bubić, referred to his family from Budva (in so-called ‘Venetian Albania’) as ‘casa nobile e primaria di quella città’, who had close connections with the Ottoman commanders in Antivari, where he served as vicar for Archbishop Andreas (Andrija) Zmajević. According to Bubić, he accompanied his superior in the visitation of the archdiocese and ‘l’ha introdotto con mezzo di Turchi governatori suoi amici per la diocese d’Antivari con honori e sodisfazioni universali’. Zmajević himself was also a Dalmatian from Venetian Albania, native to Perasto (near Cattaro), from a local Catholic family which supplied two archbishops of Antivari: Andreas (1671–94) and Vincentius (1701–13), both alumni of the Urbanum missionary college in Rome. Another Dalmatian family with connections in the Catholic milieu of the Ottoman Balkans were the Bolizza (Bolica) of Cattaro. Francesco Bolizza, ‘cavaliere di San Marco’ since 1616, corresponded extensively with the cardinals of the Propaganda Fide on various issues concerning the missions to Albania, and was involved in the Albanian uprising of 1648–9. His brother Mariano Bolizza travelled much in the sandjak of Scutari in northern Albania, and in 1614 delivered a detailed report of the military potential of local Christian communities. Another family member, Luca, from the Bolizza–Grbčić branch, was recommended by Andreas Zmajević in 1675 as a missionary to Risano and Castelnuovo, his family being ‘stimata a questi confini e meritevole appresso quella S. C. per li continui aiuti che ha dato e da a’ suoi ministri nelle parti d’Albania’.

Such examples could be multiplied by thorough research in the archives, and a prosopographical study on Catholic elites in the Balkans is certainly needed. This article intends only to draw the main outlines of the topic, without any claims to be exhaustive. As a preliminary conclusion, I think that we can only speak of indigenous Catholic elites in the Ottoman Western Balkans only when wealthy merchant families were able
to control and mediate relations between the local communities and the Ottomans, or when local ecclesiastical structures gained sufficient legitimacy in the eyes of their co-religionists and managed to ensure the support of the Ottoman authorities through kinship and other types of collaboration (including trade). As we have seen from Gaspari’s report, many parish priests in Albania were tightly connected to the local Ottoman grandees; here, more than in Bosnia, the missionary sources speak of many local networks of collaboration between local clergy and the Ottomans, networks which their superiors found almost impossible to dismantle. We can assume that these priests represented a sort of petty Catholic local elite, although the missionary sources place them in the large category of rude and illiterate peasants. Families such as the Bogdani, Vladagni, Bardhi and others (many of them acknowledged as having noble status), can be considered a genuine clerical elite, and it is to be noted that their social position was an obvious consequence of the frailty of the Catholic confession under the Sultan until the nineteenth century. Like their co-religionists who shared two conflicting authorities, in most cases these elites, on account of their dual horizon, were split between loyalty towards the Ottoman state and spiritual and material links with the Catholic world, often with dramatic consequences for individual careers.

In the absence of a clear juridical status, the Ottomans allowed the emergence and existence of local Catholic elites only on an informal basis and under continuous financial pressure. The Bosnian Franciscans seem to have been an exception, but even in their case, kinship with local Ottoman officials and support from merchant families such as the Brnjaković were of primary importance. On the other hand, the support of local communities, geographical advantages and strong clan solidarities (as in northern Albania) could to a certain degree ensure the existence of an elite able to resist Ottoman pressure. As Frang Bardhi noted in 1641: ‘it has been shown that the bishop can best withstand confrontations with the infidels if he is united with the country.’

---

89 A significant part of the correspondence between Catholic clergy from the Ottoman Balkans and the Propaganda Fide deals with various internal jurisdictional and territorial conflicts, often involving the local communities.

90 Elsie, *Early Albania*, p. 185.
Merchant-moneychangers in Wallachia (from the seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth century)

Gheorghe Lazăr

Wallachia’s lack of its own currency, and the parallel circulation of several different coinages, created a situation favourable to the appearance of merchant-moneylenders – known in Romanian by the Turkish loanword zaraf – who dealt in the traditional merchant activities of buying and selling wares but who also changed money, indicating that they doubtless had a good knowledge of the value of the various coins. It should be acknowledged right from the start that for the greater part of the period under study (from the seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth century), information on these men of business is indirect and tells us little of the practical side of their money-changing activities or of their other commercial activities. Most information comes down to us from documents registering ordinary land transactions, where they are recorded either as buying or selling property or witnessing the deed. This being the case, the present study will first of all attempt to identify the historical moment when merchants involved in money-changing are mentioned as zaraf, and how far we can speak of a fixed geographical region within which they practised their trade. Information from documentary sources will also be used in an attempt to establish the number of those involved in this activity and their increase over time (doubtless symptomatic of a certain measure of economic growth), and to fix the details of the career trajectory of some of the more important merchants who became involved in this trade. The second part of the study will present a sketch of Wallachian merchants’ involvement in the profitable currency markets, particularly from the mid-eighteenth century when such activity was driven by steep devaluations in currency in both the Ottoman Empire and that of the Habsburgs.

Documents of the time reveal that most zaraf came from the ranks of foreign merchants, being variously Greeks, Armenians, or Jews, and that only a few of them were local; they were ordinarily concentrated in specific areas of the towns or great trade fairs, and especially in the two Wallachian princely residences of Bucharest and Târgovişte. Thus at Târgovişte the various coins circulating in the realm might be changed at specific

---

locations. A document of 1614 thus reported that the town judge and city fathers had confirmed Iane (Iannis), son of the former steward of the principality Gheorghe Ergopul (Gheorghios Ergopoulos), in his right of inheritance to four grocers’ shops along with the ‘place of the moneychangers’ which his father had left him.2 Documents for Bucharest first mention such a place during the reign of Şerban Cantacuzino (1678–88), when a clothier, Petru, sold the merchant Mihul two shops located ‘on the High Street or the Main Street (Uliţa cea Mare) above the money-changers’, near to the princely palace, showing that here too there was a district where those who needed the services of the money-changers could seek them out.3

Certainly, this relatively late documentary evidence of a particular site where the money-changers could be found should not mislead us into believing that the trade was not carried out before; for example, documents mention a zaraf by the name of Iane in Bucharest as early as 1634, when he was involved in various land deals.4 It is more the case that only a few documents survive from this period and that most merchants engaged in money-changing as an additional activity.5 In both Western and Eastern Europe at the time, we cannot speak of the role of merchant existing à temps complet.6 Merchants also had other occupations, more or less closely linked with their commercial interests; they traded in goods, or acted as money-lenders, or were tax-farmers, and this helps explain the rather scarce mention of money-changers in documents from the earlier seventeenth century.7

The number of zaraf–money-changers mentioned in the documents increased however from the later seventeenth century, when sources mention no fewer than sixteen such merchants involved in the currencies trade;8 their number would reach 34 by the end of the eighteenth century. Among these we may mention the zaraf Iane9 who in 1689 was obliged to return a shop which he had bought from the monastery of Radu Vodă in Bucharest when the abbot exercised his right of pre-emption.10 Iane is also found in the accounts books of prince Constantin Brâncoveanu (1688–1714),

---

9 Biblioteca Academiei Române (hereafter BAR), [collection] Documente istorice, XLIII/123b.
10 Direcţia Arhivelor Naţionale Istorice Centrale (hereafter DANIC), [collection] Mănăstirea Radu Vodă, XXIII/29.
which record that he was offered 21 thalers to offset his expenses in ‘gathering taxes at Odriiu [Adrianople’].\textsuperscript{11} There is also the zaraf Manta, son of the merchant Iane\textsuperscript{12} and married to a member of the Olănescu boyar family;\textsuperscript{13} the zaraf Sima;\textsuperscript{14} and the zaraf Anghelache, nephew of the patriarch of Jerusalem,\textsuperscript{15} to name only a few. We should also mention the zaraf Manolie, whom we encounter in 1672 buying a plot of land from the yuzbasha Ianache, near the old monastery of Saint George,\textsuperscript{16} one of the most important commercial districts in Bucharest at the time. About a year later, on 14 May 1673, the judge and the city fathers confirmed his right of ownership in a document which also reveals that the zaraf Manolie had ‘built houses and a coaching inn’ on the land, and was as a result involved in a number of lawsuits during the reign of Antonie Vodă of Popeşti (1669–72).\textsuperscript{17} This is also early documentary evidence of one of the oldest merchant coaching inns in Bucharest.\textsuperscript{18}

Within the context of a liquidity crisis, which frequently became chronic,\textsuperscript{19} we can say that anyone and everyone who habitually had to deal with large sums of money would have needed the services of the money-changers; this particularly applied to the grand boyars and the princes themselves. We might mention the example of prince Constantin Brâncoveanu, considered the first ‘great capitalist’ in Wallachia; his private registers reveal that he frequently called on his two trusted agents, Ivan the zaraf and Zamfir, merchant guildmaster,\textsuperscript{20} for help in changing a sum of 32,000 thalers into 13,000 gold pieces to be held at the Zecca in Venice.\textsuperscript{21} There the money was administered with the help of two members of the well-known Greek Karayannis merchant family,
Michael and Nikolaos. At present, little is known of Ivan the zaraf, although we may assume that he was also involved in the Venice trade, but the same sources reveal that the guildmaster Zamfir collected the tobacco tax along with other merchants, bringing the prince the sum of 8,500 thalers, ‘with 600 thalers kept back for their wages’. We also know that Zamfir was the son-in-law of a well-known merchant of the time, Manul, and that as well as commerce and money-changing he also practised usury, thereby amassing a large fortune. Sadly his son Constantin made no use at all of the business connections which his father had built up, and frittered away the fortune which he had inherited, leaving debts on his own death which were so great that his widow Andreiana was forced to seek the prince’s protection to be ‘left in peace and unmolested by [her husband’s] creditors and relations’ who were trying ‘to get their hands on what her husband had left her, so that she would be left without even her dowry, which he had long since squandered’. For all that, the most representative figure, whose career shows what profits may be made in the money-changing business, is the zaraf Nica Papa (Nikos Papas), originally from Epirus. A recently-published Venetian notarial document signed by George Hypomenas, doctor and philosopher of Trebizond, and Anton Maria Del Chiaro records Nica Papa as the son of another merchant, Pano Dili Papa, and he was in Wallachia from around 1675, when we find him paying 30 ughi (gold pieces) to buy parcels of a vineyard from abbot Filothei of Focşani; the property, in the village of Cârlige, had been originally donated to the monastery by a nun called Magda. Sadly, as mentioned at the beginning of this study, the documents at our disposal do not allow us a detailed view of how money-changing was actually conducted, and this holds true in the case of Nica Papa as well. Thus the fragmentary information in the documents does not permit us to do anything more than sketch out the career of Nica Papa Zarafis. Nonetheless, the fact that every time he is mentioned in the documents he is described as zaraf is sufficient

23 This is probably the same Ioan zaraf who on 2 December 1702, together with his partner Gheorghe Andreanin, son of Nicolae of Craiova, empowered Nikolaos Karayannis to sell the 48 packages of wax which they had sent (Luca, Țările Române și Veneția, p. 250).
26 BAR, Documente istorice, LXXXVIII/50.
27 In Bucharest, he owned a number of premises in the Ulița Bărbierilor [Barbers’ Street] (DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CXXIII/2), houses (which he received in dowry from his father-in-law; DANIC, Mănăstirea Radu Vodă, XXXIV/37), a coaching inn which he had bought from the monastery of Sârindar (BAR, F. LXXXI/492), and vineyards on the slopes at Scâeni (DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, LXII/13).
28 DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCVI/15, CCXLV/4, CCXLV/5.
29 DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCLIV/2.
30 Luca, Țările Române și Veneția, p. 318, note 575; Luca, ‘Greek and Aromanian merchants, protagonists of the trade relations between Transylvania, Wallachia, Moldavia and the Northern Italian Peninsula (second half of the 17th–first half of the 18th century)’, Transylvanian Review, 19, Suppl. 5 (2010), p. 327, doc. IV.
31 DANIC, Mănăstirea Râmnicu Sărat, VI/2.
proof that money-changing was his principle commercial activity (although it does not exclude his involvement in other branches of commerce), which doubtless also explains the influence he enjoyed in his day, and the large fortune which he built up during the course of his life.

A partial but revealing glimpse of the size of this fortune is offered by the will that Nica Papa drew up in 1715 (or 1716?), at Bucharest, in the presence of highly-placed Greek churchmen and Wallachian merchants. Thus he left the greater part of his estate to his son Panaiotis (Panayotis), who was also charged with carrying on his business; the wealth was on deposit either ‘here in Bucharest’ or in Venice, where it is either held ‘in the hands of my dear friend Nicolai Caraiani [Nikolaos Karayannis]’ or deposited at the Zecca. Panaiotis, the son, is mentioned by Anton Maria Del Chiaro, the Italian secretary of prince Constantin Brâncoveanu, as ‘figliuolo di quel famoso Nica Saraffi’. Other beneficiaries of Nica Papa’s will were also members of his family. Thus he bequeathed 2,092 thalers to a daughter, Margarita, even though ‘she had received enough at her first marriage, when she also had her mother’s dowry’ and he disapproved of her second marriage to the boyar Costea; the bequest was left on the condition that she did not pester her brother Panaiotis. An unnamed daughter-in-law, probably the wife of Panaiotis, was left a number of valuable items, pride of place going to jewellery which included twelve rings in various styles, a large gold goblet, two collars of gold coins ‘large and small’ (one collar containing 240 coins and the other 200), a small cross and a gold bracelet with ruby studs. His wife Alexandra also received many jewels – a collar of 200 coins ‘large and small’, six pairs of ear-rings, and so on, along with other ‘trifles which are in my casket’. He also left various sums of money to his brother Dimos and three sisters Despa, Aspra and Tantza, as well as to his nephews Nikos (Tantza’s son) and Anastasios (Aspra’s son), and so forth. Similarly Nica Papa bequeathed to his adopted daughter, Tinca, a house in Bucharest which he bought a long time before from the metropolitan Antim, and also asked for a dowry to be arranged as had been agreed (according to his instructions). The rich money-changer’s generosity also extended to some of the religious establishments in Bucharest, to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, to specified monasteries in his homeland of Pogoniana, and to high Orthodox dignitaries such as Bishop Euthimios of Pogoniana and Metropolitan Hierotheos of Ioannina. The Stelea church in Bucharest was also singled out for particular gifts, having already received a number of objects in earlier donations, liturgical ornaments and a candelabra. In the will, 500 thalers were earmarked to the church and his son was instructed ‘to have silver candlesticks made for the church’. This generosity can be explained by the fact that this was where Nica Papa’s mother was buried, and that he also wished to be interred there.33

Money-changing, along with other commercial interests, was also the foundation of his son’s fortune. The son is mentioned in documents either as Panaiotis Hadji Nicu or Panaiotis Nicu Sarafi. Like his father, he maintained links with important members of

the important Greek community in Venice, and did business with them, even marrying into their families, and he travelled there repeatedly, importing luxury products, which were highly sought-after by the Wallachian nobility. At the same time, given these connections with the Venetian business world and the prestige which he enjoyed, he was frequently called upon by members of the Cantacuzino family to represent their financial interests there, or asked for his testimony in the matter of the deceased prince Constantin Brâncoveanu’s deposits at the Zecca.

Returning to the case of Nica Papa Zarafis, there is no question that money-changing was the basis not only of the wealth he had at his disposal at the time of drawing up the will, but also, at least in part, of the general prestige which he enjoyed in the eyes of his contemporaries. Above all, we must bear in mind that Nica Papa enjoyed close relations with prince Constantin Brâncoveanu, and he had close commercial ties to several important figures in the powerful Venetian Greek community, such as his associate Nikolaos Karayannis or the Glykis family. We know that one of his daughters married Nikolaos Glykis, grandson of the founder of the famous Greek printing house at Venice, and was the mother of the last of the line, Michael Glykis. It was from here that Nica Papa sought, with the help of his associates, to fill and dispatch as quickly as possible the ‘exorbitant orders’ of his prince and the princely family for fine cloths, silks and sugared luxuries, since any delay on his part or displeasure on the part of his highly-placed customer could well threaten his life, as Nica Papa states in the preamble.

---


35 On 4 July 1734, Teodor Ioannu of Ioannina announced that he had returned from Venice with a cargo of silk (Iorga, Studii şi documente, vol. IV, p. 85).


38 This assertion is supported by, for instance, the fact that his name features as one of the five trustees ‘from the merchant guild’ whom the Metropolitan of Wallachia, Antim Ivireanul, appointed to oversee his monastery in Bucharest (A. Ivireanul, Opere, ed. G. Ștrempel, Bucharest, 1972, p. 328).


42 In September 1716 he asked the same contact to send him Venetian silk to the value of 2,000 ducats, See Iorga, ‘Câteva știri’, p. 311; Luca, Țările Române și Veneția, p. 274.

43 In January 1702 Nica Papa took delivery of sugared goods from Venice which he had ordered on behalf of the prince and his family. See Luca, Țările Române și Veneția, p. 279.
to his will (‘the daily straits of my life here and the impossible demands of the princes, and the ceaseless threats and dangers to my life from such straits’).

In our opinion, any attempt to analyse and understand Nica Papa’s success in the world of commerce must also consider his close relation with important members of the boyar elite, both in the Divan (Privy Council) and among the prince’s retinue, with the Cantacuzino family the most telling example here. Here too we can speak of a reciprocity of ‘services rendered’ between both sides. On the one hand, Nica Papa was able to use his connections in Venice to secure the much sought-after luxury products which the boyar families needed to display and maintain their social status, and he could also advance them sums of ready cash, as they not infrequently needed. On this last point, it seems highly relevant that among Nica Papa’s debtors, along with a motley crew of lesser servants and hired hands, monks, merchants and Jews, there featured several members of the most prominent boyar families of the time; we encounter the names Brătășanu, Dădescu, Fălcoianu, Pârșcoveanu, Urdăreanu, Filipescu, Greceanu and many others. On the other hand, Nica Papa was not shy in calling on these families’ influence for various favours when it served his interests. Evidence for this is furnished by a document written sometime from 1716 to 1718 but previously very little remarked upon, in which the abbot of Saint Catherine’s monastery in Bucharest, Filotheos, recounted his tribulations over a land deal between the monastery under his care and Asan the grand sluger (supplier of foodstuffs to the princely court). According to this source, the monastery had owned a plot of land ‘here in the city of Bucharest’ during the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu, ‘bordering upon the prince’s house’, and the boyar Asan ‘had sought to buy it’ from the holy fathers. Since the monastery was ecclesiastically subordinate (as a metochion) to the mother house of Saint Catherine at Sinai, abbot Filotheos wrote to Athanasios of Sinai, asking him to rule on the transaction. The abbot–archbishop replied that the monastery could sell it, as long as it received either a landed estate or vineyards in return. However, the reply reached Bucharest just at the moment when Constantin Brâncoveanu was deposed and imprisoned by the Sublime Porte, and the sluger Asan shared his master’s fate. Thus the planned exchange could not take place, and Nica Papa sought to take advantage of the situation. Given that he already owned a house ‘near the monastery’, he wanted to add the plot in question and called on two prominent members of the Cantacuzino family, with whom he had a long and close relationship.

Abbot Filotheos found himself summoned by these two, who prevailed upon him to allow Nica Papa to buy the land; by his own account, at first he

---

44 Iorga, Opere economice, p. 622; Camariano-Cioran, L’Épir, pp. 100–4.

45 See the document of 10 February 1719, whereby Mihai Cantacuzino former grand comis declared that in seeking to settle the affairs of business between his father, the grand marshal Mihai Cantacuzino, and the zaraf Nica Papa, he owed the zaraf’s son Panaitis the sum of 3,000 groschen for 48 packets of wax, having just received the money from Nikolaos Karayannis at Venice, along with a further 2,709 old groschen. By signing the document, Mihai Cantacuzino undertook to settle the debts from his father’s estate, paying the money either at Venice or in Wallachia, and affirmed that the money would not be deducted from his father the marshal’s donation to the pauper hospital at Colțea (BAR, Documente istorice, DCCCXXVI/3). Some years later Panaitis Hagi Nica was named as a trustee by the same Mihai Cantacuzino comis, in which function he tried to settle the affairs between his father and Nikolaos Karayannis, and also to retrieve the money which his father had deposited at the Venice bank (Iorga, Studii și documente, vol. IV, p. 85).
tried to resist ‘in every way’, referring to the founding fathers’ command that ‘the land is not to be divided but to be kept whole’; in the end, his two interlocutors told him that ‘if he did not sell it with his consent, then they would make him sell it without’. Abbot Filotheos gave in to the two great boyars’ bullying tactics and agreed to sell the land to Nica Papa for the sum of 100 thalers. Matters did not end there, however, since after the tragic death of Ştefan Cantacuzino and his father in 1716 and Ioan Mavrocordat’s enthronement, the sluger Asan ‘also came […] from exile in Anatolia, where he had been imprisoned’, returning to Bucharest where he bought the land ‘for 613 thalers in old money, in ready cash’, a sum which the abbot then used to buy vineyards for the monastery.\textsuperscript{46}

Thirdly and finally, any discussion of Nica Papa’s financial success and how he attained it must also take into account his methods of investment, which may be said to include certain modern features. Thus in a period when most merchants and other investors preferred to invest the greater part of their liquid capital in buying land,\textsuperscript{47} Nica Papa spent only modest amounts in such purchases.\textsuperscript{48} Instead, it seems that Nica Papa preferred to put a share of his profits into buying jewellery. Jewellery represented a high-value, low-bulk investment which could be easily carried when times were hard; another share of his profits was deposited, with the help of his associates, into the bank at Venice, as his will reveals.

The case of Nica Papa Zarafis has parallels in the careers of the zaraf Sima (active in the mid-eighteenth century, himself the son of a great merchant and considered the founder of the noble house of Orășcu)\textsuperscript{49} and of the zaraf Ştefan (mentioned in documents of the latter eighteenth century, and married into the noble house of Izvoranu).\textsuperscript{50} Money-changing was often combined with merchant ventures, although the degree of commercial activity differed.

In the class of money-changers we must include those merchants who became involved in currency dealing from the later eighteenth century onwards, and who made significant profits from the great discrepancy between official exchange rates and market rates. The prospect of large profits and the relative ease of transacting such business, which was far less exposed to the standard difficulties of commerce, led to such activity booming in the later eighteenth century within the context of precious metal transfers between the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires. The growing imbalance between the official values and the market rates for the coins minted by these two empires, along

\textsuperscript{46} Potra, Documente Bucureşti, pp. 269–271, doc. 182.
\textsuperscript{47} On the importance of land as a ‘safe haven’ and its value for Wallachian merchants, see Lazăr, Les marchands en Valachie, pp. 254–8.
\textsuperscript{48} We know of only three instances in forty years in which Nica Papa made such purchases; the document from 1675 by which he purchased vineyards in Cârlige, another from 1710 whereby Constantin Brâncoveanu confirmed his ownership of several ‘shops here in the market at Bucharest (Iorga, Studii şi documente, vol. IV, pp. 74–9) and the purchase of a house with cellar in the street of St. George the Old, which he bought from the metropolitan Antim on 19th September 1715 for the sum of 200 thalers (ibid, pp. 75–6).
with their extraordinary diversity, were two equal factors which made the currencies-trade much more appealing for these merchants than trade in other wares. Under such conditions, currency speculation was more than just one form of commerce among many others for merchants in Wallachia, as was the case in Western Europe, but rather ‘one of the principle means of primitive capital accumulation’. The prospect of reliable profits tempted most of the great merchants of Wallachia into this field, especially those of Bucharest, so that it became a constant factor in the country’s economy and commercial life. Among these merchants we may mention Teodor Constantin Cincu, Elefterie Ioan, Mărgărit Ioan, Teodor Anastasiu, Stavru Spiru, Panaiotis Hagi Nicu, Demeter Polizu and others.

One example is provided by the activity of Teodoran Cincu, one of the most important Bucharest merchants of the latter eighteenth century, and here we present a brief sketch of his money-changing operations as far as they can be reconstructed. Trade in the Ottoman silver *icusar* across the Ottoman–Habsburg border had reached such proportions that it overshadowed his trade in Leipzig wares. Alongside his partnership with his cousin in Sibiu (Hermannstadt), Ioan Cincu, Teodoran Cincu accordingly signed in September 1792 a further contract with a merchant of Brașov (Kronstadt), Mihail Țumbru, with the two partners undertaking to share a capital equivalent to 10,000 florins, in Ottoman money. The information at our disposal tells us that in the period November 1792–March 1793, Teodoran Cincu sent 101,750 groschen and received 88,385 florins in *icusar*, while in the period 1 January 1793–27 June 1793 his agents in Constantinople, Alexandru and Mihail Vasiliu, received the sum of 113,843 from the *tarabhane*, the Ottoman treasury, for the coins they sold. We do not have comparable information for the currency which Teodoran Cincu traded through his cousin in Sibiu, Ioan Cincu, but it can be supposed that here the sums were fairly large given that in August 1792, he sent him 10,000 florins in Dutch guilders to buy *icusar*. The whole operation was eased by having some of the money collected by intermediaries, including his nephews Elefterie and Mărgărit Ioan, and Teodor and Ioan Anastasiu; the coin was brought to Bucharest, whence it was sent to Constantinople for sale through a well-organised network which also included Ottoman and Austrian officials. The profit was usually sent back to Bucharest or Vienna by means of letters of credit or drafts, which were often sold or offered to the prince or his agents at a hefty interest. The scarcity of *icusar* on the market and the rising exchange rate, combined with the difficulty of sending money from Constantinople to Vienna and Bucharest and the steps taken by the authorities to stop the trade, persuaded Teodoran Cincu to stop his partnership with Mihail Țumbru

---

53 Ibid, p. 75.
for the time being since, as he wrote in a letter to his associate, ‘it no longer makes sense to risk my money for a profit of less than 12% annually.’

Nevertheless, the two of them resumed the trade a few years later in 1795–6, when a new influx of precious metals from the Ottoman to the Habsburg Empire began, and this time they traded in extindar (an Ottoman silver coin). Once they decided to liquidate the business, it showed profits of 13,909 for the period from 23 June 1795 to 30 May 1796 and 12,055 groschen from 24 May 1796 to 30 June 1796.

The currency trade would continue through the first three decades of the nineteenth century, with one of the most important economic players to become involved being the merchant Hagi Moscu, who also made great gains. As in the case of Teodoran Cincu, Hagi Moscu had a well-organised network to collect and sell coins in the necessary quantities. His agents included the Vlastu brothers in Vienna, the merchant Hagi Constantin Pop in Sibiu, and the Glăvan brothers with their trading company in Constantinople.

The liquidity crisis which hit Wallachia in the later eighteenth century was a direct result of the intense coin trade, and determined the reaction from the central authorities, who tried to at least blunt the worst of its negative effects through a series of administrative measures and punitive steps. Thus on 6 May 1796 the prince Alexander Morouzi laid down a series of measures, proclaiming that some of the merchants ‘here in Bucharest engage in no other sort of trade than to collect old moneys and take them off into foreign countries […] which is most detrimental’. Among the measures taken was a law prohibiting merchants from taking money out of the country without the authorities’ approval when they were in Constantinople on business; if such approval was granted, the merchant might not take more than 500 thalers worth in coin with him. One of the methods most often used to circumvent the princely order was to hide coins in casks of wax, so that a further law ordered that from then on, wax intended for export should be melted down and poured into its barrels only in the presence of the head of the excise or his men, and that it would only be allowed across the border in casks bearing the seal of this official. Only then would merchants ‘be free to take such wax out of the country’.

Such prohibitions were repeatedly proclaimed from the end of the eighteenth century right up to the eve of the Regulamentul Organic [Organic Regulation] (1831/32), proving that the measures taken were only minimally effective.

In conclusion, we can say that the absence of its own currency and of banking institutions, such as existed in Western Europe, created the conditions for a ‘professional’ class of money-changers to appear in Wallachia, as did the wide range of coins in circulation. Among the money-changers, the merchant–zaraf occupied a privileged position, and most of these were also involved in trade with a variety of other wares. With liquid assets at their disposal at any given moment, and a good knowledge of the various
coins in circulation, many of them succeeded in accumulating sizeable fortunes during the course of their lives, which is a clear indication that this was a profitable activity. *Zaraf* money-changing went through a ‘traditional phase’ until the mid-eighteenth century, operating side by side with other commercial activities. Thereafter this type of commerce entered a new phase brought about by the rapid currency depreciation in the Ottoman Empire as well as in the Habsburg lands, when money-changing became a commercial activity in its own right yielding significant profits.
Greek merchants in Bucharest during the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu

Marius Păduraru and Claudiu Neagoe

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Bucharest was the most important city in Wallachia, hosting the prince’s court, the Princely Council of the grand boyars (Divan) and the Metropolitan Church.1 A grand fair (iarmaroc),2 an important trading occasion, was also held in Bucharest.3 To foreign visitors it did not look like a Western city, being a wide settlement with modest outskirts and ‘houses built above ground, with roofs of straw or bark.’4 At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Bucharest had over thirty parishes, each with a wooden or brick-built church.5 Some sources speak of around 50,000 inhabitants in the city.6 Houses of stone and roofed with shingles were only located around the premises of the princely palace, and belonged either to grand boyars or to wealthy merchants.7

Starting in the later seventeenth century, especially after the princely court settled in Bucharest during the reign of Gheorghe Ghica (November 1659–September 1660),8 the local market became ‘very large and rich’.9 During the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu

---

5 Panait, ‘Oraşul Bucureşti’, p. 54.
6 A.-M. Del Chiaro, Revoluţiile Valahiei, ed. S. Cris-Cristian, Iaşi, 1929, p. 7; see also Călătorii străini, vol. VIII, p. 372. Some historians consider the population of Bucharest no greater than 40,000 inhabitants in 1700 (Panait, ‘Oraşul Bucureşti’, p. 51). Indeed, reports of foreign travellers in the mid-eighteenth century seem to confirm this. A Catholic bishop of Nikopol, Antonio Becich, wrote when visiting Bucharest in 1745 that there were about 10,000 houses (Călătorii străini, vol. IX, ed. Holban, Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru & Cernovodeanu, Bucharest, 1997, pp. 324–5), i. e. 50,000 people if we accept the demographic coefficient of five usually applied by historians per dwelling (Şt. Ştefănescu, Demografia, dimensiune a istoriei, Timişoara, 1974, p. 129).
7 Chishull, Călătorii în Țara Românească și Transilvania, p. 199.
Greek merchants in Bucharest

(October 1688–March 1714), Bucharest developed, recording a diversification and increase in craft production as well as more intense trading (Transylvanian Saxon merchants and those from the south of the Danube, i.e. from the Ottoman Empire, were bringing in more and more foreign products).\(^{10}\) A Russian cleric recorded a large market (bazaar) in Bucharest at the beginning of the eighteenth century, as well as other markets where Turks and Christians traded together.\(^{11}\) The trading area was along the main street, *Ulița Mare* or *Ulița cea Mare* (today Lipscani), where most shops were of brick; behind these were wooden dwellings, outbuildings and gardens.\(^{12}\)

As was also the case with craftsmen, merchants (*negustori, neguțători, cupeți*) represented a dynamic social and professional category. They were either Wallachians or foreigners; Saxons from Brașov (Kronstadt) and Sibiu (Hermannstadt), Albanians, Aromanians, Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Turks from south of the Danube, and a smaller number of Venetians and Ragusans.\(^{13}\)

At the beginning of the 1630s, the merchants gathered in a professional association (*vătășie*), led by Gheorghe *vătaf*.\(^{14}\) Later, this association gained in importance and was reorganised as a guild (*breaslă*), led by a guildmaster (*staroste*), the first being Iorga *vătaf za cupeți*, mentioned in 1661.\(^{15}\) He remained guildmaster of the Bucharest merchants until sometime before 30 June 1667 when he is mentioned as ex-guildmaster (*biv staroste*) together with his successor, a certain Manu *staroste*.\(^{16}\)

During the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu, many merchant guildmasters are documented in Bucharest: Proca (4 June 1690),\(^{17}\) Ianuț (Enuță, 1694–1695, 30 November 1696),...
1695 and 20 August 1696)\(^\text{18}\), Ianuș (7 August 1696),\(^\text{19}\) Iorga (17 September 1696),\(^\text{20}\) and Vasile hagi staroste (8 March 1698),\(^\text{21}\) and Gheorghe (25 September 1700)\(^\text{22}\) in the late seventeenth century; in the eighteenth century Zamfir (6 May 1700, 26 June 1707),\(^\text{23}\) son-in-law of the merchant Manu,\(^\text{24}\) Neacșu (1 August 1713),\(^\text{25}\) and Stavru/Stavros son

\(^{18}\) Mentioned during 1694–5, see Condica Marii Logofeții (1692–1714), ed. M. Băzgan, Pitești, 2009, doc. 42, p. 43. On 30 November 1695, Ianuș, ‘starostea de neguțători ot București’, bought from Fota, son of Sarul arbășașul from Câlinești and his sons lane, Dima and Dumitrașcu, a vineyard (2 pogoane [acres]) and house in Dealul Câlineștilor, paying 60 thalers, as well as barren land (6 pogoane) with trees for 23 thalers; see Direcția Arhivelor Naționale Istorice Centrale-Historical National Archives of Romania at Bucharest (hereafter DANIC), Collection Mănăstirea Sărindar, IV/12. A document dated 20 August 1696 mentions him as the supervisor of the Greek Church, together with Iorga ‘biv staroste’ and Manul (Condica Marii Logofeții, doc. 65, 84; see also ibid, doc. 74, p. 95–6).

\(^{19}\) Potra, Documente privitoare la istoria orașului București, doc. 69, p. 112.

\(^{20}\) ‘Iorga biv starostea za neguțători’ is mentioned in February 1671 (Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, doc. 16, p. 34); he was staroste again on 3 June 1673 (Potra, Documente privitoare la istoria orașului București, doc. 25, p. 73). Probably he is the same person mentioned on 17 September 1696 as the brother-in-law of logothete Iano H. Cocorscă (Biblioteca Academiei Române/Library of the Romanian Academy [hereafter BAR], [collection] Documente istorice, CDLXXXVII/2); and son of grand logothete Radu Cocorscă. See N. Stoicescu, Dicționar al marilor dregători din Țara Românească și Moldova (sec. XIV–XVII), Bucharest, 1971, 154. Iorga, who was still alive in 1704, married Ancuța, the daughter of Gheorghe Condica-Mihălcescu, grand pitar (bread supplier to the princely court). Their daughter, Zamfira, was the wife of the wealthy merchant Manos Apostolos. Together with Șerban Cantacuzino (Cantacuzenii), formerly grand cupbearer, he and his son-in-law, Apostolos Lazaros, Iorga contributed to the reconstruction of Șelari church in August 1700 (Inscripții mediévîle ale României, vol. I (Orașul București, 1395–1800), ed. Al. Elian, C. Balăn et al, Bucharest, 1965, no. 477, p. 431). On 15 April 1703, Iorga staroste was in Adrianople, where he and 29 other boyars received cafîans as a sign of approbation from the Ottoman Grand Vizier as members of the retinue when Constantin Brâncoveanu’s reign was confirmed by the Sultan (R. Greceanu, Istoria domniei lui Constantin Basarab Brâncoveanu Vâvod (1688–1714), ed. A. Iliș, Bucharest, 1970, p. 145. Documents of the time also mention another Bucharest merchant with the same name. Having no direct descendants, on 15 March 1702 he and his wife, Neaga, and his nephew, Stan, gave to Sărindar monastery the convent of Dealul Boldeștilor in Cepturenilor Valley, Saac County. The two founders, husband and wife, offered financial support for the construction of the monastery and cell along with lands and vineyards, and all that was necessary for the holy mass, i. e. books and silver liturgical vessels embellished with gems. At the end of this deed, written and embellished by the logothete Iar, the merchant Iorga applied his seal and signed in Romanian Cyrillic; see DANIC, Mănăstirea Sărindar, IV/4, document published in its entirety by the historian Gheorghe Lazăr from a photograph in the Library of the Romanian Academy: Gh. Lazăr, ‘Testamente negustorești din Țara Românească’, Revista de istorie socială, 8–9 (2003–2004) doc. 3, pp. 419–21. It is probable that both his ancestors and those of Iorga staroste had Greek origins; Iorga is a name of Greek origin.

\(^{21}\) DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCVII/7. Probably the same Vasile ‘staroste de neguțători’ was married to Cerna; they died before 14 March 1700, as recorded on the tombstone from Colțea church. See Inscripții mediévîle ale României, vol. I (Orașul București), no. 71, p. 230.

\(^{22}\) He signed in Greek (DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCXXXVIII/1).

\(^{23}\) He signed in Greek; see DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCCLXXXII/5; Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, doc. 45, p. 81.


Greek merchants in Bucharest

of Stathis from Ioannina.26 Guildmasters had to negotiate differences and agreements between members of the guild. They also confirmed trade agreements and various deals concluded between members, resolved mercantile disputes regarding shops or the sale of goods,27 and witnessed deeds of conveyance or confirmation, and donations.28

Documents issued during the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu provide plentiful information about local and foreign merchants, giving a nearly complete picture of the economic and commercial life of Bucharest in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Beside local merchants,29 the documents of the time attest the presence of a significant number of foreign merchants from south of the Danube, mostly Greeks, Albanians, Aromanians, Bulgarians, and Serbians. All together were erroneously known at the time as Greeks.30 Among others, the following are worth mentioning: Mihu (in a series of documents between 1674 and 1707),31 Dima (16 June 1688),32 Defta (24 January 1685, 1 September 1693–31 August 1694, 4 December 1695),33 Lambros Manos (15 February 1690, 8 February 1696, 17 June 1699, 1 March 1709),34 Anastasios (9 July


27 On 4 June 1690 a group of merchants led by Proca staroste found in favour of the merchant Manul in his dispute with his colleague Defta; both had shops in Ulița cea Mare. Not long before, Defta had blocked the narrow street that bounded the two shops, but that piece of land belonged to jupân Manul, in other words to Manos Apostolos; see Documentele epocii brâncovenești, doc. 17, p. 74.


29 The merchants included in this category were as follows: Manu, mentioned in various documents from January 1685 to 19 January 1701 (Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, p. 47; Condica Marii Logofeții, doc. 206, pp. 293–4); Ion (22 February 1702) (Potra, Documente privitoare la istoria orașului București, doc. 82, p. 124); Petrea (2 February 1706) (A. Ilieş, ‘Însemnări de pe cartea veche românească’, Studii și materiale de istorie medie, 6 (1973), doc. 4, pp 351–2); Radu (1 August 1713) (Potra, Documente privitoare la istoria orașului București, doc. 108, p. 143); Manea (18 June 1714) (DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCXV/1); Mihai the draper signed in Romanian on two documents, 6 May 1700 and 18 March 1708, and also on 20 December 1714, when he wrote his will (Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, doc. 45, p. 81, doc. 46, p. 83, doc. 51, p. 91; Lazăr, Testamente negustorești din Țara Românească, doc. 4, p. 424); the merchant Tudorache, the son of the merchant Tudor, is mentioned in ‘the year 7204’ (1 September 1695–31 August 1696), 8 March 1697 and 5 July 1698 (Condica Marii Logofeții, doc. 122, p. 163; Potra, Documente privitoare la istoria orașului București, doc. 77, p. 120; Documentele epocii brâncovenești, doc. 195, p. 227).


32 DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCLXIII/4; he is probably to be identified with Dima, son of Ghica arbănășul from Călinești, Prahova County, mentioned on 16 June and 25 November 1693 (Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, doc. 31, pp. 60–1, doc. 32, pp. 62–3).

33 Signed both in Romanian (DANIC, Mănăstirea Radu Vodă, XXI/29; Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, doc. 30, p. 60) and in Greek (DANIC, Mănăstirea Radu Vodă, XXI/28).

34 I. C. Filitti, Arhiva Gheorghe Grigore Cantacuzino, Bucharest, 1919, doc. 706, p. 224; known as Lamba the furrier in Romanian documents; he always signed in Greek (Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, doc. 25, p. 51, doc. 37, p. 68, doc. 42, p. 74, doc. 54, p. 96).
1690, 4 April 1691, 8 March 1698, 1 March 1709), son of the merchant Michalis Veriotis, Stama (15 May 1699). Iannis/Iane (16 February 1696, 2 December 1700, 13 March 1701, 16 March 1701) and Manos Apostolos (20 August 1696, 6 May 1700, 25 September 1700 and 22 April 1710), and Nikos Papas from Epirus, the moneychanger, mentioned in documents from Wallachia as ‘the merchant of Bucharest’, who had close relations with the Greek community of Venice.

Beside the ‘Greek’ merchants were some Venetians and Venetian Greeks, such as Girolamo Campagnano (1698–1700) and Ioannis Kazolis (17 May 1710). All traded intensively, both within and beyond Wallachia.

The merchants were registered on a Treasury list and had to contribute, as a guild, to the exchequer by paying 4,000 ugi (Hungarian gold florins), in four quarterly instalments (ruptoare/rumtoare), but were exempt from paying other local taxes (dăjdii). Likewise, the merchants of Brașov, as foreigners coming to trade in Bucharest, had to pay 1,000 thalers yearly, in four quarterly instalments.

These foreign merchants mingled easily with the local merchants and boyars, either through trade, or quite often becoming relatives through matrimonial alliances. Thus, Defta the merchant, a Greek judging by his signature, married Ancuţa, daughter of Arvat/Harvat sword-bearer from Izvor; their son Pătraşcu became a merchant like his father. Ancuţa’s dowry, beside other goods, was an estate at Dănciuleşti in Vlaşca County. In 1693–4, probably due to some financial shortfall, Defta and Ancuţa sold a large part of the estate (650 stânjeni) to Cornea Brăiloiu, grand cupbearer. Soon after, on 4 December 1695, the couple had to sell a further 400 stânjeni to Partenie, the abbot of Radu Vodă monastery in Bucharest. Defta and Ancuţa donated another 200 stânjeni to the same monastery to have prayers said for themselves and their parents.
The origins of the merchant Mihu, ‘the son of the Serbian Ivan from Târgovişte’, are also foreign. He is attested for the first time on 12 December 1674. He is mentioned as witness in various real estate transactions, as selling parts of some estates and especially as a buyer of houses, shops and land in various documents from 1677–9, 1684, 1686, 1693–4, and 1700; he also supervised the construction of Colţea Monastery and founded the wooden church of Bradu–Boteanu. He had become a monk by August 1707, when he signed as ‘Misail monahu [the monk]’. As a merchant, he succeeded in marrying his two daughters to wealthy people. One married Cârstea Bogdaproste, a well-known merchant from Târgovişte, while the other, Vişa, married the palatinus Gavril Drugănescu, a close friend of the Cantacuzenus. These matrimonial alliances allowed Mihu to consolidate his position in the business world as well as to climb the social ladder due to the relationship with the powerful noble family of the Cantacuzenus.

Another merchant, Iane, bought a plot of land (named Cumpeniţa) on 16 February 1696 to build a house in Bucharest together with Soare the furrier, paying 200 thalers to Nedelco the cupbearer, his wife Dumitrana and their children Matei and Constantin. The land was located between the land of Răduş the soap maker and that of Lamba the furrier. It was bought ‘with the approval of all the neighbours’, as was the custom. A few years later, on 13 March 1701, Constantin Brâncoveanu supported Iane the merchant, who had asked his help in his litigation with Jipa the innkeeper, who had borrowed 420 thalers from Iane against a pledge of vineyards on Câlineşti hill in Saac County. The prince ordered some neighbours (megiaşi) to determine the value of the vineyards and the answer came very soon, three days later on 16 March: their value was only 357 thalers. On 2 December 1700, when he sold his vineyard at Făget, on Dealul Târgoviştei, to the grand aşa Ianache Văcărescu for 30 thalers, Iane signed again in Greek.

One of the most important merchants from Bucharest at that time was Maxim the bead merchant, the son-in-law of Ilie the furrier, from whom he bought four shops in the parish of St. George the Old, on Boiangiilor Street, on 15 April 1712. Two years later, on 15 February 1714, he was mentioned again, this time buying goods for 1,200 thalers from Constantinople, a deal mediated by the Greek merchant Manos Apostolos, to

---

49 DANIC, Mitropolia Ţării Româneşti, CCLV/1; see also Ionaşcu, Documente bucureştene, doc. 17, pp. 35–6.
50 Documentele epocii brâncovenesti, doc. 237, p. 265.
51 DANIC, Achiziţii Noi, MMDCCCI/5.
52 DANIC, Mitropolia Ţării Româneşti, CCVIII/3.
whom we have already referred. Maxim promised to pay back the amount to Manos in only two and a half months, by 1 May of that year, so we can conclude that his business was profitable. Maxim was married to Maria, with whom he had a son, Constantin, and a daughter, Maria. Being seriously ill, Constantin wrote his will on 6 February 1735 and expressed a wish to be buried ‘in the holy church of Colţea, inside the church, where my father and my mother are buried’.  

Manos Apostolos, also known as Manos the draper, was the son of the merchant Apostolos Lazaros from Epirus, who had been living in Wallachia since 1678 when he bought land to build a house in Şelari street in Bucharest. He was married some time before 1710 to Zmaranda, the daughter of the merchant Iorga Lipănescu, guildmaster of the Bucharest merchants. Manos Apostolos is mentioned on 20 August 1696 as the financial supporter and supervisor (ispravnic) of reconstruction works at the Greek church in Bucharest, which had been destroyed by fire. This suggests that the merchant was highly respected in the Greek community of Bucharest at the time. Later, he acted as witness in a document written on 6 May 1700. In autumn of the same year, on 25 September, he exchanged some properties with a colleague, Mihu, who we mentioned earlier. Manos Apostolos gave Mihu ‘a shop in Uliţa cea Mare’ in exchange for a plot of land (‘13 plots long and wide, from the road to the stones of master Gheorghie Perticolii’), which was probably used as an accessway. Ten years later, on 22 April 1710, the Epirote bought from Captain Fota from Caracal, brother-in-law of the merchant Maxim, a plot of land in Uliţa Mare in Bucharest, near the Şerban Vodă Inn, and on 10 September of the same year he bought from Dumitraşcu, son of Mihai clucer (purveyor of grains and foodstuffs to the princely court) from Netoţi, Săcuieni County, some ‘plots of lands for building houses’ in Târgovişte.

Like his father before him, Manos Apostolos maintained excellent relationships with the ruler of Wallachia, Constantin Brâncoveanu, helping him with his business in Transylvania, especially in the Saxon cities of Braşov and Sibiu, where he was often sent as a messenger when what was to be communicated ‘could not be written on paper, because of certain dangerous situations’. The Wallachian prince insisted that Manos

53 At the beginning of the 18th century there was another Manu merchant (cupeţ) living in Bucharest, of Romanian origin and mentioned in a document issued by Constantin Brâncoveanu on 19 January 1701. He was married to Despa, the daughter of Nedelco clucer, and his brothers-in-law were Iorga şifar and Nedelco (Ionaşcu, Documente bucureştene, p. 47; Condica Marii Logofetei, doc. 206, pp. 294–5).
54 DANIC, Mitropolia Ţării Româneşti, CCVI/11.
56 Ionaşcu, Documente bucureştene, p. 16, doc. 73, p. 124.
58 Ionaşcu, Documente bucureştene, p. 48.
59 Condica Marii Logofetei, doc. 65, p. 84.
60 Ionaşcu, Documente bucureştene, doc. 45, p. 81.
61 DANIC, Mitropolia Ţării Româneşti, CCXXVII/8.
63 Ibid, CCXXVII/11.
64 Lazăr, ‘În umbra puterii’, p. 631.
Apostolos receive the title of baron of the Holy Roman Empire on 24 May 1713. Manos was also directly involved in commerce with Venice, whence he brought goods on commission for Brâncoveanu himself.

In 1712–3, Manos Apostolos offered financial support to Metropolitan Antim Ivireanul so that he could have three works printed in Târgovişte. This reveals that Manos also contributed to the cultural life that characterised the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu.

From the information presented here we may conclude that during the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, a number of merchants from south of the Danube, most of them Greek, came and stayed, permanently or temporarily, in Bucharest, the most important economic and political urban centre of Wallachia. Some increased their fortune by buying houses, shops and estates, or by practising foreign and domestic commerce or usury. Those with significant capital could benefit from matrimonial alliances and thus became relatives to the local boyars, and even received certain privileges and protection from the ruler of the country.

During the reign of Constantin Brâncoveanu, Bucharest developed spectacularly as merchant production increased and became more varied, and trade exchanges intensified due to an increase in the quantity of foreign goods brought by the Saxons from Transylvania and by merchants from south of the Danube, from the Ottoman Empire. The commercial area was situated along the main street of the town, Ulita Mare or Uliţa cea Mare (today Lipscani), where the majority of shops were brick-built; in their courtyards were the houses of wood inhabited by merchants, as well as annexe buildings and gardens.

These merchants (neguţători, cupeţi) could be either local Wallachians or foreigners, such as Saxons from Braşov or Sibiu, Greeks, Albanians, Aromanians, Armenians, Jews and Turks from south of the Danube, as well as smaller numbers of Venetians and Ragusans. All merchants from south of the Danube were known as ‘Greeks’, although they were not only Greeks, but also Albanians, Aromanians, Bulgarians and Serbs.

---


66 Ibid, p. 629; see also Luca, Țările Române și Veneția, pp. 154, 275, 323.

67 The works were Rugăciuni în toate zilele săptămânii, Pilde filosoficeşti and Maxime filosoficeşti; see A. Erich, ‘Antim Ivireanul – o figură luminoasă a spiritualităţii medievale româneşti’, Valachica. Studii şi cercetări de istorie şi istoria culturii, 19 (2006), p. 262.

68 Lazăr, ‘În umbra puterii’, p. 629.


APPENDIX

1. 1688 ‹7196› June 16th. The merchant Dima sells to Apostol the clucer five pogoane (acres) of vineyard on the hill of Bucharest, on the estate of the Wallachian Metropolitan Church, for 65 thalers.

† Ade că eu, Dima cupeţ, scriu şi mărturisescu cu acesta al mieu zapis, ca să fie de bună credinţă la mâna dumnealui clucerului Apostolului, cum să se ştie că i-am vândut dumnealui nişte vii în Dealul Bucureştilor, pe moşiia Mitropoli®i, însă pogoane 5, drept bani gata, taleri 65. Şi mi-au dat dumnealui aceştii bani, toţi gata şi deplin, în mâna mea. Iar eu i-am dat dumnealui aceste pogoane ce scriu mai sus, ca să-i fie dumnealui moşie stâţătoare în vêci.
Și când am făcut această tocmeală, fost-au mulţi boiari mărturie, care vor iscâli mai jos.
Iar eu, pentru credinţa, mi-am pus numele mai jos, ca să să crează. Ionie 16 dni, leat 7196 ‹1688›.

Az, Dima cupeţ
Costandin Brâncoveanul vel logofât, mărturie
† Radul vornic, martur
† Mihai clucer, mărturie
Az, Radul, snă Hagiu, mărturie
Az, Dumitru căpitanul, martur
Az, Radul logofât za pimniţă, martur.¹

DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Româneşti, CCLXIII/4.
Romanian original, paper (29 x 20), difolio, filigree, seal ring.

¹ Autograph signatures.

2. 1693, September 1st–1694, August 31st, 7202, Bucharest. The merchant Defta, son-in-law of Arvat sword-bearer from Izvor, his wife, Ancuţa, and their son, Pătraşco, sell to grand cupbearer Cornea Brăiloiu their estate at Dănciuleşti, Olt County, measuring 650 stânjeni; the amount paid is not mentioned.

† Ade că eu, Defta neguţătoriul, ginerile lui Arvatu spătariul ot Izvor, împreună cu jupâneasa mea, Ancuţa, şi cu fie nostru, Pătraşco, scris-am şi mărturisim cu acestu al nostru zapis, ca să fie de bună credinţă la mâna dumnealui, pan Cornea Brăiloitu vel peharnic, cum să să ştie, că noi, de a noastră bună voe, de nimenea siliţi, am venit de am făcut tocmeală cu dumnealui, de i-am vândut den partea noastră de moşie de la Dănciuleşti ot sud Vlaşca, în latu stânjăni 650 şi în lungu, den apa Elhoveţului, den sus până […]¹, den câmpu, den pădure, de<-> apă, cu tot venitul, dă priste tot hotarul, care moşie iaste alătarea pre lângă hotarul satului Gâşteştii, ce au fostu a lui Matei biv vel vistiari, care o au dat de pomeană la sfânta mănăstire a Radului Vodă, hramul Sfânta Troiţă. Şi am vândut dumnealui această moşie ce scrie mai sus, în preş stânjânul po bani [...]¹, cin taleri [...]¹, şi cu ştirea tuturor rudeniilor noastre, pentru că această moşie ne-au
fostu și noao o seamă de zestre, iar și de cumpărătoare. Și am luat acești bani, ce sântu mai sus ziși, toți deplin de la dumnealui, în mâinile noastre.

Dereptu aceia și noi încă am dat acestu al nostru adevărat zapis la mâna [umnealui]², ca să aibă a ținerea și a stăpâni dumnealui această moșie, stânjani [...]¹ în lat, și în lungu de la hotar până în hotar, precum mergu și alte moșii, să-i fie dumnealui moșie stătătoare și coconilor dumnealui ohabnică în veci.

Și la tocmeala noastră au fostu boiai mărturii, carei vor iscăli mai jos.

Și noi, pentru mai adevăra credință, ne-am pus pecețile și iscăliturile, ca să-și crează.

Și am scris eu, Mihai, snă Stan logofăt ot Târgoviște, vă nastol u București, cu voia și cu învățătura Deftii neguțătorului, meașeta [...],¹ leat 7202 ‘1693 September 1–1694 August 31’.

† Δεφτως στρεγο τα ανοθεν²
† Ancuța, jupâneasa jupânului Deftii cupet
† Πατρασκος Τόδερ το στρεγο τα ανοθεν³
Alicsandru vel vornic, mărturie
Diicul Rudeanul vel logofăt, mărturie
† Şerban vel vistiar, mărturie
Costandin Şîrbéi vel clucer, mărturie
† Şerban Cantacuzino vel comis, mărturie
† Az, Stoichița comis Ploșcan, mărturie
Matei Filipescul biv vel stolnic, mărturie
Barbul Fârcășanul vel pitar, mărturie
Radul Golescul vel agă, mărturie
† Az, Tudur, sânu Tudura paharnic ot Izvor, mărturie
† Az, Ghincea, snăi Tudoria pâharnic ot Izvor
Luca vtori vistiar, mărturie
Pâtru Otbédeanul vel căpitan za dărăbanți, mărturie
Şărban clucer Bojoreanul, mărturie.⁴

DANIC, Mănăstirea Radu Vodă, XXI/28.
Romanian original, paper (44,5 x 30,3), difolio, filigree, missing two thirds of the second tab, stained and torn along the fold, with three ring-seals; with a modern abstract.
Romanian transcript: Ms. 256, tab 685.

1 Reconstructed word, the document is stained.
2 Defta: ‘the above is true.’
3 Pătrașcu Toader: ‘the above is true.’
4 Autographs signatures.
3. 1695 (1704) November 30th. Fota, son of Sarul the Albanian from Călinești, and his sons, Iane, Dima, and Dumitrașco sell to master Ianuț, merchant guildmaster from Bucharest, two acres of vineyard on Călinești Hill, for 60 thalers.

† Adeca eu, Fota, feciorul Sarului arbănașul ot Călinești, împreună cu feciorii mei, anume: lane i Dima i Dumitrașco, dat-am zapisul nostru, ca să fie de bună credință la mâna dumnealui, jupânului Ianuț, starostea de neguțători ot București, cum să să știe, că i-am vândut dumnealui o vie cu casa, în Dealul Călineștilor, însă vie lucrată, pogoane 2. Și am tocmît pogonul po taleri 30, care fac taleri 60.

Și iar i-am mai vândut dumnealui, loc sterpu cu pomet, pogoane 6 și 3 cezvârți. Și am tocmît pogonul po taleri 3 pol, care fac taleri 23, cin cup taleri 83.

Și am dat dumnealui această vie lucrată și cu locul cel sterpu cu pometul, de a noastră bună voie, făr de nicio silă, șă cu știrea tuturor vecinilor den sus șă den jos. Și am luat aceștia bani, căți scrîu mai sus, toți gata în mâinile noastre.

Și am dat dumnealui acesta al nostru zapis, că să aibă dumnealui a stăpânirea aceste vie cu bună pace, să-i fie dumnealui moșie, dumnealui și coconilor dumnealui, căți Dumnezeu îi va dărui, moșie ohabnică în vechi.

Și la tocmeala noastră tâmplatu-se-au multă boiari și neguțători mărturii, carii vor iscăli mai jos.

Și noi, pentru mai adeverită credință, ne-am pus mai jos pecețile și iscăliturile, șă se creează.

Și am scris eu, Vasilie logofăt, cu învățătura Fotei arbănaș. Noemvrie 30 dni, leat 7204 (1695).

† Εγω ο Φωτης στρεγω τα ύπωθεν.1
† Eu, Iane, sin Fotî
† Eu, Dima, sin Fotî
† Eu, Dumitrașco, sin Fotî
Diicul Rudeanul vel logofăt, mărturie
Șerban vel vistier, mărturie
† Λέκα Γγήκας, μάρτυρας2
† Az, Milil, mărturie
† Κωσταντινος, ιερεας εκ χωραν Καλημέστι, μαρτηρώ τα ύπωθεν3
† Eu, Jipa, sin Lecăi ot Călinești, mărturie.4

DANIC, Mănăstirea Sărindar, IV/12.
Romanian original, paper (31 x 21), difolio, filigree, folds torn; four fingerprints.

---

1 I Fota: ‘the above is true.’
2 Leca Ghica witness.
3 Constantin priest from the village of Călinești, ‘true to the above.’
4 Autograph signatures with the exception of the first four.
4. 1695 (1695) December 4th. Defta, merchant of Bucharest, and his wife Ancuța, daughter of Arvat sword-bearer of Izvor, sell to Partenie, abbot of Radu Vodă Monastery, 400 stânjeni of their estate at Dânciulești (Olt County), near the property they had sold earlier to the grand ban Costea Brăiloiu. As the latter had traded the estate at Dânciulești with the abbot of Radu Vodă Monastery, the new purchase was made under right of pre-emption. For prayers to be said for themselves and their parents, Defta and Ancuța donated other 200 stânjeni of land to the same monastery, in addition to the 400 sold for 33 bani.

† Adecă eu, jupânul Defta neguţătorul den Bucureşti, înpreună cu jupâneasa mea, Ancuța, fata lui Arvat spătar ot Izvor, scriem şi mărturisim cu acestu al nostru zapis, ca să fie de bună credinţă la mână sfântiţii sale, părintile Partenie, egumenul ot Radul Vodă, cum să să ştie, că i-am vândut o moşie de la Dânciulești, dâşpre otarul Găşteştilor, care moşie iaste în hotarul moşii iici care om vândut mai nainte, dumisale Cornii Brăiloiul vel ban. Deci, dumnealui dându acea moşie schimbu egumenului de la Radul Vodă, pentru moşiiia Jugurăni, deci, jupânului Defta mai avându moşie de vânzare, și mai căzându-i-să a o cumpăra iar egumenului-i ot Radul Vodă, s-au tocmît den bună voia lor, de au mai vândut egumenului Partenie stânjini 400 în lat; și în lungu mérge din vâlceaoa otarului mânăstirii, până în Elfovâ, precum mérge și alaltă moşie a mea. Şi tocmeala re-au fost stânjinul po bani 33. Şi afar dentr-acèste 400 de stânjini, am mai dat la sfânta mănăstire pentru pomana, ca să ne pomenească părinții și pre noi, încă stânjini 200, care să fac preste t[ot]¹ stânjini 600. Şi am luat toți banii deplin, pen-am vândutu, în mâinile nostre.

Dereptu aceaia, și noi încă am dat acestu zapis al nostru la mână sfântiţii sale, ca să stăpânească sfânta mănăstire cu pace, în veci.

Și când s-au făcut acestu zapis, fost-a boiari mărturie, care să vor iscăli la zapis.
Și noi, pentru mai adeverată credință, ne-am pus iscăleturile mai jos, ca să să crează.
Și am scris eu, Negoiță, logofăt za divan, Târgovișteanul, cu învățătura dumnelor. Pis meașeța dichemvrie 4 dni, leat 7204 (1695).

† Eu, Defta
† Eu, Ancuța
Cornea ban, mărturie
Diicul Rudeanul vel logofăt, mărturie
Ianachi Văcărescul vel agă, mărturie
Luca vtori vistiar, mărturie
Bunea Grădișteanul vel armaș, mărturie.²

DANIC, Mănăstirea Radu Vodă, XXI/29.
Romanian original, paper (30,1 x 20,4), difolio, filigree, the fold is little tear and stained, stuck down.
Romanian transcript: Ms. 256, tab 686.

1 Word reconstructed as the document was stained.
2 Autograph signatures.
5. 1696 <7204> February 16th, Bucharest. Nedelco the cupbearer, son-in-law of the logothete Şerban Popescu, his wife Dumitrana and their sons Matei and Constantin sell a plot of land named Cumpeniţa in Bucharest, inherited from Dumitrana’s grandfather, the grand ban Radu Popescu, to Iane the merchant and Soare the furrier of Bucharest, for 200 thalers.

† Adeca eu, Nedelco păharnic, ginerele lu Şărban logofăt Popescul, împreună cu jupânea mea, cu Dumitrana, şi cu feciorii noştri, anume: Matei i Costandin scriem şă mărturisim, cu acesta al nostru zapis, ca să fie de bună credinţă la mâna a dumnealui jupân lane neguţătoriul şă a jupân Soare cojocariul ot Bucureşti, ca să să ştie, că am făcut tocmeală cu dumnealor, de le-am vândut un locu de casă, Cumpeînita, de aici dên Bucurêşti, între locul lu Răduş săpunariul şă al Lambei cojocariul, care locu şă Cumpeînita ne iaste de la moşul nostru, banul Radul Popescul. Şă l-am vândut dumnealor, derept bani gata taleri 200, de a noastră bună voe, făr de nicio silă, cu ştirea tuturor vecinilor noştri ce sănt împrejurul acestui locu. Şă am luat aceştii bani toţi gata şă deplin în măinele noastre, ca să le fie dumnealor acest locu şă Cumpeînita de moşâe stătătoare şi ohabnică în veci, dumnealor şi feciorilor dumnealor, căţi Dumnezeu le va dârui.

Şă la tocmeala a noastră fost-au multii boari şă neguţători mărturie, care-i vor iscăli mai jos.

Şă pentru mai adeverită credinţă, ne-am pus şă noi iscăleturile şă peceţi mai jos, ca să să crează.

Şă am scris eu, Matei Sânboteanul, cu învăţătura a dumnealor. Pis u Bucureşti, meašea fevruarie 16 dni, leat 7204 <1696>.

† Nedelco paharnic
Dumitrana Popeasca
† Az, Matei Popescul
† Az, Costandin Popescul
† Radul vel clucer za arie, mărturie
† Drăguşin vistier Merișanul, mărturie
† Panait Custoras, martor.
† Cernica biv vel armaş, mărturie
† Preda postelnic Izvoranul
† Neculai, snă Oprii vel şătrar, martur
† Ghinea ceauş agiescu, martur
† Cârstea cojocar, mărturie
† Γεώργιος Φωκάς, μάρτυρας
† Az, Riga armaş, sin Corbescul, martur
† Gheorghie cojocar, martur
† Nan căpitan Stăfănescul, mărturii
† Az, Costandin clucer Lomotescu, marturii
† Bârcă Cojăscul, martur
Eu, Mihul cavaful, mărturie
Andronache, snâi Radului săpunar, martur
Nedelco armaş, martur

---

1 Gheorghios Focas witness.
Greek merchants in Bucharest

† Tudose, sin Mihul cavaful, martur.²

DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCLV/1.
Romanian original, paper (32,8 x 22,3), difolio, filigree, the fold slightly torn, with two ring-seals.
Romanian transcript: Ms 131, tab 128 (with August).
Mentioned: Ionașcu, Documente bucureștene, pp. 35–6.

² Autograph signatures.

6. 1696 <7205> September 17th. Logothete Iane Cocorăscu sells his estate in Bărbulești, total area 125 stânjeni at 66 bani/stânjen, for a debt amounting to 62.5 lei to his brother-in-law, Iorga the guildmaster.

† Adeca eu, Iane logofăt Cocorăscul, scris-am zapisul mieu la mâna dumnelui, cumnatului Iorgăi starostii, cum să să ştie, că fiind eu dumnealui nişte bani datoriu şi neavând banii să-i dau, i-am vândut dumnealui moşiia de la Bărbuleşti, însă stânjâni 125, stânjânu po bani 66, care fac lei 62 pol, care moşie ne-au râmas nevândută după trăsura ce am tras cu părintele igumenul dă la Cotroceni. Şi rămâindu-mi mie această moşie, nevândută călugărîlor dă la Cotroceni, o am vândut cuminatului Iorgăi starostii, ca să-i fie dumnealui moşie stătătoare în veci.
Şi când i-am vândutu această moşie dumnealui, fost-au mulţi boeri mărturie, carii vor iscălit mai jos.
Şi pentru credinţă, am iscălit mai jos.
Şi am scris eu, cu mâna mea, mesetă septembrie 17 dni, leat 7205 <1696>.
Az, Iane logofăt Cocorăscu.
† Μάνος Αποστόλου, μαρτυρώ τα άνωθεν.
† Az, Ion, sin Manu ot Piteşti, mărturie.

BAR, Documente istorice, CDLXXXVIII/103.
Romanian transcript.

1 † Manos Apostolos: ‘the above is true.’

7. 1698 <7206> March 8th, <Bucharest>. In the dispute between the merchant Ion and Anastasie, son of the merchant Michalis Veriotis of Bucharest, Constantin Brâncoveanu, prince of Wallachia, confirms to the latter full ownership of a shop in town, received as dowry from his mother-in-law, Ilinca, wife of the merchant Mihai Zmailă.

† Milostieiu Bojieiu, Io Constandin voevod i gospodină, davat gospodstvo mi sie poveleane gospodstva mi, lui Anastasie, snă Mihai cupeţul Verioti de aici, den Bucureşti, ca să fie volnic cu această carte a domniioi méle, de să aibă a ţinérea şi a stăpâni, aici, în oraşul domniioi méle, în Bucureşti, o prăvălie la Uliţa [...] ,¹ care prăvălie iaste a lui dă

¹ Blank in original.
zestre, de la soacră-sa, jupâneasa Ilinca, ce au fostu a lui Mihai neguţătorul Zmailă şi o au fostu cuprinsu de o au luat Ion neguţători, zicând cum că iaste această prăvălie ă-l lui, dată dă zestre, iar nu a lu Anastasie. Şi având pricină întru dănșii, au mersu de s-au întrebat de faţă, înaintea neguţătorilor, anume: hâgi Vasile staroste i Iauţă biv staroste i Iorga biv staroste i Manul neguţătoriul.

Deci, aceştii neguţători, ce scriu mai sus, le-au luatu seama pre amăruntul şi foarte bine şi cu dreptate au adevăratu, cum că această prăvălie iaste a lui Anastasie, dată dă zestre, iară nu iaste a lui Ion neguţătoriul, precum zice el, nici are vreo treabă cu această prăvălie. Şi după adeverinţă au judecat, cum să-ş ţie Anastasie prăvăliaia ce scrie mai sus, cu bună pace de cătră Ion neguţătorul, iar Ion neguţătorul să-ş caute prăvăliaia lui, ce are de zestre, precum am văzutu domnii mea şi carta neguţătorilor de judecată, cum iaste mai sus zis.

Dreptu acéia şi domnii mea încă am dat această carte a domnii méi lui Anastasie neguţătoriul, ginerile lui Mihai neguţătorul Zmail, ca să aibă a ţinea şi a stăpâni această prăvălie ce scrie mai sus, cu bună pace de cătră Ion neguţătorul, să-i hie moşie stătătoare, lui şi feciorilor în veac, pentru că au râmas Ion neguţătorul de judecată.


DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCVI/7.
Romanian original, paper (32,2 x 21,6), difolio, filigree, restored.

8. 1699 <7207> May 15th, <Bucharest>. Stama, merchant of Bucharest, and his wife, Dumitrana, daughter of Cârstea Bogdaproste, sell to the merchant Manos Apostolos, known as Manos the draper, their town house with cellar in the parish of St. Nicholas, for 320 thalers.

† Adeca eu, Stama neguţător dăn Bucureşti, împreună cu jupâneasa mea, anume: Dumitrana, fața jupănu Cârstei Bogdaproste, scriem și mărturisim, cu acest al nostru zapis, ca să fie de bună credință la măna dumnelui, jupănu Manului postăvar, cum să să știe, că i-am vândut dumnelui casele noastre și cu pîmnița și cu tot locul, cât iaste în grădină, dăn uleiă până în bolovanii Perdicuilii, de aici dăn București, la mahalaeu lui Sfântu Neculae, drept bani gata taleri 320. Și am luat acești bani toți dăplin în mâinile noastre. Și le-m vândut dumnelui, de a noastră bună voe și nesiliți dă nimeni, și cu știrea totutur oamenilor noștri, și cu a vecinilor, însă, care loc și case au fostu ale jupănu Cârstei, dă cumpărătoare de la jupănu Iani Etro, și mi le-au fostu dat noo dă zestre. Iar acum, neputându noi ca să le ținem, i le-am vândut dumnelui, pe cum mai sus scrieș, ca să fie dumnelui acestă casă și loc să moșie stătătoare și ohabnică în veci, dumnelui și coconilor dumnelui, căți Dumnezău i va dărui.

Și cându i le-m vândut dumnelui, fost-ău mulți neguțători mărturie, care mai jos vor iscăli.

Și noi, pântru mai adevărată credință, ne-am pus pecițile și iscăleturile mai jos, ca să să creză.

Și am scris eu, Ion săn Manole ot Pitești, cu zisa dumneloi. Mai 15 dni, leat 7207 <1699>.
DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCXXVII/6.
Romanian original, paper (33,3 x 22,2), difolio, filigree.

9. 1699 <7207> June 4th, <Bucharest>. Acting as third party in the sale of Dumitrana’s house in Bucharest to the merchant Manos Apostolos for 270 thalers, Iane of Stăncești promises that if the seller or her relatives change their mind and annul the transaction, he will pay an interest of 10% per annum as long as the money is in his keeping.

† Adică eu, Iane de la Stăncești, scriu şi mărtuiesc cu acesta al mieu zapis, ca să fie de bună credinţă la mâna dumnealui, jupânu Manului postăvariul ot Bucureşti, cum să să ştie, că cumpărându dumnealui casele Dumitrani, de aici, den Bucureşti, dirept taleri 2701, şi temându-să că-i vor întorce bani своi, frate-său, sau alte rudiinii de ale ei, şi nu-i vor da bani своi curând, nici nu vor iscăli, ce vor sta bani своi la noi, să aibă a să socoti pre anu, la zécea unul, pre câte luni vor sta bani своi la noi. Iar de vor iscăli rudenii lor, sau i vor da bani своi, să aibă a-m da acestu zapis al mieu, şi să-ş ţie dumnealui zapisul care i-s-au făcut pre case.

Şi pentru credinţa am iscălit, ca să crează, şi mi-am pus şi pecétea. Ionie 4 dni, 7207 <1699>.
† Eu, Iane de la Stăncești.2

DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCXXVII/7.
Romanian original, paper (22,2 x 16,4), difolio, filigree, with seal ring.

---

1 The thaler amount repeated in Arabic numerals.
2 Autograph signature.
10. 1700 <7209> September 25th. The merchant Mihu exchanges real estate with the merchant Manos Apostolos: the former cedes land 13 palme (=3.20 meters) wide in Uliţa cea Mare in Bucharest, receiving in exchange a shop on the same street.

† Adécră eu, Mihul, dat-am zapisul mieu, ca să fie de bună credinţă la măna dumnealui, Manului Apostol, cum să să ştie, că am făcut cu dumealui scimbui, dă me-au dat o prăvălie în Uliţa cea Mare, dăspre păna cu curții, care prăvălie are vecini den sus pe Radul, feciorul Diamandi croitur, și den jos iaste vecin Dragomir și Lāe, precum arată și zapisul clucerului Nedelco. Și eu i-am dat dumealui loc, palme în largu 13 și în lungu, din ușă păna în bolovanii ‹lui›, jupân Gheorghie Perticolii, care loc îm iaste și mie de cumpărătoare de la Costandin, fecior lui Cârstei Bogdaproste, care loc să-l stăpânească dumealui și coconii dumnealui, cătți Dumnezău iși va dări, să-l stăpânească în veci.

Și cându s-au făcut acestă tocmeală, fost-au și alții mărturie, care vor iscăli mai jos. Și pentru mai adăvărata credință, ne-am pus iscălitura mai jos, ca să să creaza.

Și am scris eu, Ncoe la Fiteșean, cu voia lor. Septemvrie 25 dni, leat 7209 <1700>. Însă, care loc îmi iaste și mie de cumpărătoare de la ginere-mieu, Costandin.

Mihul cupeț
Γαυργιος Προκου σταροστας, μάρτυρας
† Ιωάν, μάρτυρας
P‹opa› Vasilie ot Colțea, mărturie. 3

DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCXXVII/8.
Romanian original, paper (32.8 x 22.8), difolio, filigree.

1 Gheorghe Proca staroste, witness.
2 Ioan witness.
3 Autograph signatures.

11. 1700 <7209> December 2nd. The merchant Iane, grandson of Andrei and son-in-law of the priest Pavlache from Târgoviște, sells to grand ağa Ianache Văcărescu a vineyard on Târgoviște Hill, in Făget, for 30 thalers.

† Adécră eu, Iane neguțătoriul, nepotul jupâneului Andreiu, zet popei lui Pavlache den Târgoviște, scriu și mărturisescu cu acestu al mieu zapis, ca să fie de buna credință la măna dumealui, pan Ianache Văcărescul vel agă, cum să să ştie, că avându eu o păragină de vie și cu livadea ei, cât mărge, în Dealul Târgoviștiei, în Făget, care păragină o ‹au› cumpărat și unchie-mieu, Andrei neguțător, de la jupâneasa Alicesandra, ce au fostu a lui Costandin chiurciubașa, de la leatul 7187. Și fiindu această păragină și cu livadea ei, în polile vii dumisale, și pre dăn sus, alătura cu livadea popei Irini, și tot o am ţinut pre seama noastră, până acum, cu bună pace.

Iar când au fostu acum, trebuindu-mi mie bani, și mai căzându-i-să dumealui a o cumpăra, fiind în polile vii dumisale, eu, dă bună voia mea și de nimenilea silit, am mersu la dumealui și am făcut tocmeală, de o am vândutu dumisale derept bani gata, taleri 30. Și am luat acești bani toți gata și deplin, în mâinile mele.

Derept acelă și eu încă am dat acestu zapis al mieu la măna dumealui și împreună și cu zapisese cele vechi, ca să ție și să stăpânească dumealui această moșie, ce serie mai
sus, cu bună pace, să-i fie dumisale moşie stătătoare și cuconilor dumisale de moştenire în vechi.

Și când am făcut aceast zapis, fost-au boiari mărturii, carei mai jos să vor iscăli.
Și eu, pentru mai adevărată credință, am iscălit cu mâna mea, ca să să crează.
Și am scris eu, Negoiță logofețelul, cu zisa și învățătura lui. Pis measeța dicemvrie 2 dni, leat 7209 <1700>.

† Γεώργιος Φωκάς, μάρτυς
† Matei, sin Fotei ot Ghimpați.  

DANIC, Achiziții Noi, MMDCCCII/5.
Romanian original, paper (32,5 x 21,5), difolio, filigree.

1 Ioan Nicolau: ‘the above is true.’
2 Gheorghios Focas witness.
3 Autograph signatures.

12. 1710 <7219> September 10th, Târgoviște. Dumitrașco, son of Mihai the clucer of Netoți, with his wife Zamfira, daughter of Necula from Pitești, and his cousin Gligorașco, son of Gavrilă the cupbearer of Râfov, sell to the merchant Manos Apostolos some houses in Târgoviște; the amount paid is not specified.

† Adeca eu, Dumitrașco, snă Mihai clucer ot Netoți, împreună cu făméia mea, anume: Zamfira, fata juțâului Nicolui ot Pitești, și împreună cu vâru-mieu, Gligorașco, snă Gavrilă paharnic ot Râfov, nepot lui Iancu ot Pitești, dat-am zapisul nostru, ca să fie de bună credință, la mâna juțâului Manului Apostol neguțător, precum să să știe, că i-am vândut dumnealui niște locuri de case, ce au fost cumpărat<e> de Ianache vistiar și de juțâul Necula ot Pitești, dă la Zota, snă pan Parascari doftorul, dupre cum arată și zapisele céle vechi, care i-am dat dumnealui, care loc iaste pă lângă casele dumnealui, care le-au cumpărat de la Stan, snă Procăi ot Târgoviște. Și le-am vândut de bună voia noastră, dirept bani gata taleri [...].  

Deci, acești bani i-am luat noi în mâinile noastre, toți deplin, ca să-i fie dumnealui moșie stătătoare și ohabnică în vechi, dumnealui și coconilor dumnealui, căți Dumnezeu îi va dărui. Iarăși, de s-ar scula altcînaș cu vreo gâlceavă, să avem a trage noi gâlceava, iar dumnealui să stăpânească cu pace.
Și când s-au scris acest zapis, fost-au mulți omeni buni, cari vor iscăli mai jos, marturie.
Și noi, pentru adevărată credință, am iscălit mai jos, cu mâinile noastre, ca să să crează.
Și am scris eu, Costandin, snă Pătru abagiu ot București, cu zisa dumnealui, și marturisesc céle care scrie mai sus. Septembrie 10 dni, leat 7219 <1710>, ot Târgoviște.

† Eu, Dumitrașco logofăt, snă Mihai clucerul ot Netoți
† Eu, Gligorașco, sin Gavrilă paharnicul ot Râfov
† Eu, Zamfira, fămeie lui Dumitrașco

1 Blank in original.
13. 1712 ‹7220› April 15th. Ilie the furrier and his wife Stana, daughter of Prodan the aba merchant of Bucharest, sell to the merchant Maxim, their son-in-law, four shops in Bucharest, parish of St. George the Old, on Boiangilor Street, for 250 thalers.

† Adeca eu, Ilie cojocarul, dăpreună cu fămeie mea, anume: Stana, ginerile lui Prodan abagiu ot București, dat-am zapisul nostru la mâna dumnelui Macsim cupațul, ginerile mieu, ca să fie dă bună credință, perecum să știe, că având eu 4 prăvălii în mahalao lui Sveati Ghiorghie cel Vechi, pă Ulița Boiangilor, în colțul zidului domnescu, și aceste prăvălii țin tot dă o moșie, dă Ulița Boiangilor până în Ulița Bărăților, și otăraște dă sus cu prăvăliile sfintii mănăstiri Radului Vodă și dă jos cu Stoica abagiu, ginerile lui Dumitru abagiu ot București. Însă, această moșie, cu aceste prăvălii, și mie-m săntu dă cumpărătore dă la socră-mea, Voica, și dă la cumnații miei, Enachie i Lazăr ot București. Deci, până acum am stăpânit, iar acum, neputându să le mai stăpănescu, le-am vândut ginerelui mieu, Macsim cupaț, pântru că mai avându el parte dău-ace moșie, dată dă zestre, încă mai dănainte, și câzându-i să dumisale, m-am tocmit cu dumnelui, dă a noastră bună voe, nesilit dă nimăn, și i-am vândut drept bani gata, taleri 250, adăvărat taleri 250. Şi am luat acești bani toți gata în mâinile nostră.

Dreptu aceie, i-am dat al nostru zapis, ca să stăpânească dumnealui și coconii dumnelui, căci Dumnezeu va dă. 
Și cându s-au făcut acestu zapis, au fostu mulți boeri mărturie, care să vor iscăli mai jos.

Și noi, păntre credință, am iscălit cu mâinile nostre, ca să creză. Aprilie 15 dni, leat 7220 ‹1712›.

† Eu, Ilie cojocar i Stana, vinzători
† Eu, Ion, ginerile junpăului Ilie
† Eu, Loțca, sin Ilie
Eu, Statema
† Eu, Manea logofăt, marturie
† Γιαννεόκης Ιωάννου, μάρτυρας.1

DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CC VIII/3.
Romanian original, paper (34 x 23), difolio, the fold torn and glued.
Romanian transcript: Ms 131, tab 134v.

1 Ianache Ioan witness; the last three are autograph signatures.
14. 1714 (7222) February 15th. Maxim the bead merchant pledges to reimburse the merchant Manos Apostolos 1,200 thalers, the value of the goods he received from the latter, by 1 May 1714, and if the agreement is not concluded to pay interest on this amount.

† Adeca eu, Macsim margeariul, dat-am zapisul mieu la mana dumnealui, jupanului Manul, ca sa fie de buna credinta, precum sa sa stie, ca am luat da la dumnealui marfa da treaba pravaliilor de taleri 1200, insa o mie si doao sute de lei, care acesti bani, am pus zi cu dumnealui sa-i dau, da acum pan la luna lui mai, zi intai, fara da nici un cuvant, insa zlat zangerlai da Tarigrad. Iar nedand eu acesti bani da bun voe, si de s-ar face vreo cheltuiala sau vreo zecuiiala, sa fie toata da la mine, pentru ca asa mi-au fost tocmeala cu dumnealui.

Și eu, pentru bună credința, am iscălit mai jos, ca să să creadă. Februarie 15 dni, leat 7222 (1714).

† Eu, Macsim margeariul, platnic
† Eu, Gheorghie al lui Vasiliiie, martur
Μανθις Λαμπρατωμητο μαρτιρο
† Mihai postăvar, martur
† Dima Titin, martur.

DANIC, Mitropolia Țării Românești, CCVI/11.
Romanian original, paper (31,8 x 20,5), difolio, filigree, the fold a little torn and stained, stuck down.

1 Manta Lambratomitul witness.
2 Autograph signature.
From armatolos to cavaliere di San Marco: Aggelis Sumillas
(seventeenth to eighteenth centuries)

Christina E. Papakosta

To Marina and Björn

Τ’ είν’ ο μεγάλος ο καπνός στη Σίβιστα τη ράχη;
Μήνα δαμάλια ψένουνε, μήνα βουβαλομούσκια;
Ουδέ δαμάλια ψένουνε, κι ουδέ βουβαλομούσκια,
ο Αγγέλ-Σουμήλας πολεμά κι ο Χρήστος Βαλαώρας,
με την Τουρκία του Καρλέλιου, όλο Γενιτσαραίους,
δεν είνα μια, δεν είνα διώ, δεν είνα πέντε ή δέκα,
είναι χιλιάδες δέκα τρεις, χιλιάδες δέκα πέντε.
Τρεις μέρες κάνουν πόλεμο, τρεις μέρες και τρεις νύχτες.
Ερούμενε ο Τζαφέμπεης από 'να δέντρο πίσω:
’Αγγέλη, δώσε το σπαθί, και Χρήστο, το τουφέκι,
αν τη ζωή σας θέλετε και γρόσια με τη φούχτα!""[1]
Κ’ οι δύο του απολογήθηκαν, κ’ ένα του λένε λόγο:
’Τι λες αυτού, παλιότουρκε! Τι λες, παλιομουτάτη!
Τα τιμημένα τ’άρματα δε δίνονται στους Τούρκους
tους πολέμοιν αδιάκοπα, όσον να τακιστούνε.""[1] (1686)

---

1 * The current paper constitutes a preliminary study of the patriarch of the Sumillas family, who lived and was active mainly on the island of Lefkada in the 17th century. Soon I will publish all data that I have gathered about the family in a separate, independent work. I would like to express my thanks to Marina Diamandouros-Kommer, Björn Kommer, Maria Doukakis, Eleni Grapsa and to my George, without whose help this study could not have been accomplished.

The poem refers to Aggelis Sumillas and Christos Valaoritis who, together with their men, fought bravely, day and night, against the Ottomans; see A. Valaoritis, Βίος, Επιστολές και Πολιτικά κείμενα, eds G. P. Savvidis & N. Likourgou, Athens, 1980, p. 241.
At the end of the seventeenth century an unknown folk poet described the deeds of two warriors, Aggelis Sumillas and Christos Valaoritis. The two men bravely fought the Ottoman troops in the region of Xiromero (sandjak of Karleri). This is a true event. We are in the years immediately after the occupation of Lefkada, Preveza and Vonitsa by the Venetian army under Francesco Morosini in 1684. Sumillas and Valaoritis, together with other klephths and armatoloi, drove back the Ottoman forces under Djafar Agha (1,500 infantry and 300 cavalry) with Venetian blessing. They then attempted to establish a sui generis regime of independence by collecting taxes in the region. This provoked both the Ottomans and the Venetians, whereupon Morosini rushed to the area. Who were the two men of the folk song? We know a great deal about Christos Valaoritis, since he was the ancestor of the poet Aristotelis Valaoritis. For Aggelis however, the information that we have is scant indeed.
Aggelis Sumillas, called Vlachos, was born in Ioannina, probably in the mid-seventeenth century, while it was under Ottoman rule. The first reference we have dates back to 1684, when Sumillas was appointed by the Ottoman administration and served as armatolos in Agrafa. Seeing the Venetian successes in the Ionian Sea around the Amvrakikos Gulf area, he decided to turn against the Ottomans together with the armatoloi Mikros Chormopoulos from Agrafa and Panos Meintanis.

According to the historian Konstantinos Sathas, these three had at that time lost their armatolikia. Acting as klephts and taking advantage of the political instability in the region, they now turned against both the Ottomans and the Venetians. It seems that this is why the Venetians arrested them in the area of Vonitsa and put them aboard a Venetian ship bound for the Serenissima, to be put on trial. However, during the voyage the ship was captured by Algerian pirates near Dalmatia. With the help of the three men, the crew managed to defeat the pirates and were rescued, whereupon Morosini incorporated Sumillas, Meintanis and Chormopoulos into the Venetian army headed for the Ionian


9 P. Aravantinos, Χρονογραφία της Ηπείρου των τε ομόρων ελληνικών και ιλλυρικών χωρών διατρέχουσα κατά σειράν τα εν αυτάς συμβάντα από του σωτηρίου έτους μέχρι του 1854, 2 vols, Athens, 1856–87, passim.

10 With a body of 1,000 men he maintained the security of the region and collected taxes; Machairas, H Λευκάς επί ενετοκρατίας, p. 281. The mountainous Agrafa marks the southernmost continuation of the Pindos, and was as early as 1385 the site of regular clashes between Venetians and Ottomans. From the time of sultan Mehmet II, it enjoyed a privileged status; Ottomans were forbidden to live in the villages, which were governed by a local council and whose residents communicated freely with the surrounding areas. Because of this air of freedom, clashes often occurred. Armatoloi were responsible for suppressing robberies, maintaining order and collecting taxes, which were sent directly to the Sublime Porte, while they and their families were exempt from tax; see M. A. Gkiolias, Συμβολάς στην ιστορία του κοινωνικού και πολιτισμικού χώρου της Ευρυτανίας και των Αγράφων κατά την Τουρκοκρατία, Athens, 1986, pp. 10, 20, 29, 31–2. For the armatoliki of Agrafa, see Ρ. Ι. Vasiliiou, ‘Το αρματολίκι των Αγράφων και ο Αλέξανδρος Μαυροκορδάτος στη διαμάχη Γάου–Καραϊσκάκη’, Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης, 19 (1956), pp. 15–21; Tsiamalos, Οι αρματολοί της Ρούμελης, pp 143–4. For the actions of klephts and armatoloi in Xiromero and Valtos see Ferentinos, Ιστορία της Ακαρνανίας, passim and especially p. 48, with extensive bibliography.

Sea in 1684. This version of events has not so far been confirmed by archival research in the General State Archives (Archives of the Lefkada Prefecture).

It is certain that Aggelis Sumillas joined the Venetians with a thousand men and helped occupy Lefkada in August 1684. Thereafter, Aggelis arrived in Chimara and roused the inhabitants of the city, distracting the Ottoman troops then gathering to defend the Preveza fortress. Later, Sumillas and his men followed the Venetian troops to the Ionian Sea and fought on their side in the Peloponnesus. During clashes between the Venetians and Ottoman, both his brother Stergios and his first cousin Dimos were killed. After Venetian victories in 1696, Alessandro Molin, Capitano Generale da Mar, rewarded Aggelis for his services to the Republic and gave him 33 assets (beni) in Vonitsa. In return Sumillas would henceforth be required to pay 200 golden coins to the Venetian government each year, and was exempt from any other tax.

Two years later, in November 1698, residents of Agrafa sent a letter to the Provveditore General da Mar requesting the renewal of Sumilla’s appointment in the region’s armatoliki. At that time, Aggelis must already have settled permanently in Lefkada. The island suffered from the plague and among the victims was Dimitris, Sumillas’s son. The Aggelis family was facing severe financial straits, which is perhaps why we find him submitting a request in 1701 to the central Venetian administration, mentioning all that he and his family had done for Venice and requesting a grant of land to support his family. Such a grant would, he explained, also help the men who had campaigned

---

12 This fictional incident was first recorded by Sathas, Η κατά τον ΙΖ’ αιώνα επανάστασις, based mainly on the following folk song about Aggelis, Meidanis and young Chormopulos, arriving from Agrafa to Arta and captured in Vonitsa:

‘Μη νάναι χιόνια στα βουνά, μη νάν’ πανιά ‘πλωμένα.
Μη ναν Αγγέλης πώρχεται, Αγγέλης και Μεϊτάνης.
Και το Μικρό Χορμόπουλο πώρχετ’ από τ’ Αγγίγα.
Με τα μπαϊράκια ανοικτά τα κόκκινα και τ’ άσπρα.
Στην Άρτα παν και κόνεσαν, στην Βόνιτσα τους πιάνουν.
Μιά φούστα εξαγνιάντασε [...]’

Until now, all scholarship on Sumillas has simply reproduced Sathas’ description of events.

13 For Sumillas’ contribution in the events of 1684 see T. Kandiloros, Ο αρματολισμός της Πελοποννήσου 1500–1821, Athens, 1924, p. 38. See also Γενικά Αρχεία του Κράτους – Αρχεία Νομού Λευκάδας/General State Archives – Archives of the Lefkada Prefecture (hereafter GSA – Lefkada), 014.02.028/5, fols. 29r–29v: ‘supplica del capitan Angeli Sumilla nell’eccellentissimo Pien Collegio’ (15 September 1701).


16 GSA – Lefkada, 014.02.028/1: terminazione of Alessandro Molin (16 June 1696); GSA – Lefkada, 01.01.03.003, fol. 43r; notification of the decision (mandato) to captain Aggelis Sumillas (7 January 1699): ‘contribuendo capitan Angeli Sumilla doicento reali annualmente alla publica Cassa per li beni.’

17 I owe this information to my friend and colleague Vasilis Siakotos.


with him, and their families. He particularly emphasised that he had settled in Lefkada and had built a house with his own money, in which he lived (domicilio fabbricato in questa piazza). Before taking a decision on his request, the Venetians asked for information on Aggelis from their officials in the Peloponnesus, the Sindici Inquisitori di Morea, who knew the services that the Sumillas family had performed. Eventually, a decision (ducale) of Doge Alvise Mocenigo on 12th November 1701 granted him 310 cadi of land (=930 acres). Two thirds of the land granted was cultivated, while the rest was not. The plots of land were spread over almost the entire island of Lefkada. Furthermore, the Venetian administration honoured Aggelis by awarding him the very prestigious title of cavaliere di San Marco, borne by distinguished Venetian officials, civilians and military. Among the knights was Francesco Morosini himself. The title conferred no economic benefits on the holder; a knight could bear the insignia of the
Order, i. e. uniform, belt and sword, gold spurs and other appurtenances of a knight, and of course be paid the appropriate respect by all.

The large property granted to him made both family members and other residents of Lefkada envious. It could not have been easy to accept that a former klepht/armatolos, until recently living on the edge of society, was to be incorporated into the community of the island and endowed by Venice with extensive real estate. Litigation began in the first decade of the eighteenth century and continued until 1864, when the Ionian Islands were integrated into the Greek state. Three voluminous dossiers were drawn up to support these claims, the study of which reveals valuable information about Aggelis which can be used to compose an initial portrait.

Sumillas was still alive in September 1708, and must have died in November of the same year. On 30 November 1708, Xanthi, wife of the cavaliere Sumillas, visited the public notary Georgios Barbarigo to rent a garden; this is the first time she is described as a widow. After her husband’s death, his estate passed to his wife and two sons Petros and Ioannis. Aggelis also had four daughters (Anna, Apostòlo, Maria and Milia), who do not seem to have taken a share of the paternal estate; they had probably married while their father was still alive. Petros owned property and dealt in shipping and trade.

According to legend, the sword Aggelis used in battle, a prize of war, was bought by an Ottoman officer and sent as a gift to Ali Tepelenli Pasha of Ioannina (Valaoritis, Β. Ποιήματα και πεζά, eds G. P. Savvidis & E. Tsantsanoglou, Athens, 1981, pp. 435–6).

‘decorar il capitan Angeli Sumilla detto Vlacco col titolo di Kavaliere di San Marco, con tutti gli onori e prerogative salite del grado’ – GSA – Lefkada, 014.02.028/1, ducale kapitan Angeli Sumilla (12 November 1701).


The first to raise claims was Aggelis’ nephew Thodoris Sumillas, son of Stergios. See for example GSA – Lefkada, 014.02.028/5, fol. 19 (14 May 1708), 20 (15 May 1708).

Fragmentary copies are kept in the GSA – Archives of the Lefkada Prefecture. We owe these handwritten copies to the archivist of the Ionian State, Angelo Benvenuti, who transcribed extensive parts of these files. So far his motive for such laborious copying is unknown, for no subsequent publication is known to have been forthcoming.

GSA – Lefkada, 014.02.028/1, ducale of Alvise Mocenigo (149 May 1708); see Γεώργιος Μπαρμπαρίγος, Δημόσιος νοτάριος της Αγίας Μαύρας, Βιβλίο πρώτο, 1707–1709, ed. E. Grapsa, Lefkada, 2006, doc. 47, pp. 82–4.

Despite our research in the Deaths Registry in the Archives of Lefkada, we have found no record of Aggelis’ death. For the year of his death, only one book has survived, that of the church of St. Nicolas (26 July 1700–16 June 1841), but it contains no relevant entry. Despite our study of the notarial records, we have so far been unable locate Aggelis’ will. However, we have discovered the will drawn up on 31 January 1728 by his wife Xanthi, GSA – Lefkada, Notary Archive, Notary Ioannis Gavallas, reg. 14, fol. 46 (31 January 1728).

GSA – Lefkada, Τεθωρακίστης, act 70, 106–107 (30 November 1708).

Chortis, Συμβολή στην οικονομική ιστορία της Λευκάδας, pp. 256, 263.
Christina E. Papakosta

document dated 14th December 1757. Ioannis seems to have lived mostly by managing his lands. Furthermore, in 1726 we learn that he was secretary of the Preveza fisheries.

Let us now try to complete the portrait of Aggelis Sumillas. Born in Ottoman-occupied Ioannina in the mid-seventeenth century, probably a man of significant physical strength, he chose to serve as armatolos in the area of Agrafa. We do not know whether he had previously been involved in banditry, as was usually the case. Foreseeing Venetian potential in the region of Amvrakikos (Ambracian) Gulf after 1684, he put himself under the command of the future Doge, Francesco Morosini. This proved to be a beneficial decision. For services rendered to the Serenissima Repubblica di San Marco, he was richly rewarded and garlanded with high honours. However, he did not receive immediate social recognition in the place where he chose to live.

He was not among the 51 residents of Lefkada who in 1685 petitioned Morosini to be allowed to form a civil council (Comunità) to take care of local administration. Sumillas’ absence is understandable when we consider that at this time he was fighting alongside the Venetians, and it does not seem that he was interested in other rewards beyond the material. From archival discoveries so far, we cannot say that his alleged ethnic distinctiveness (Aggelis Sumillas, called Vlachos) limited his participation in communal matters. Neither can we consider his possible exclusion from the process of council formation. In the ten years that Aggelis seems to have lived on the island, he took no office at the local level. Nor does it seem that any member of the Sumillas family participated in the Comunità over the years, until the late eighteenth century, or took any office.

So far no evidence has come to light about how (or whether) the local community welcomed the cavaliere Aggelis from Ioannina. People occasionally raised claims on the land that he was granted, sometimes successfully, sometimes unsuccessfully. His privileges and titles were envied by many. Christos Valaoritis, who had also fought together with his son Moschos under the Venetian flag, believed that he had not been rewarded as he deserved and complained repeatedly to the Venetians until he and his son were also granted land and titles. To arouse the pity of the Venetians he sent Moschos to secure his request, who had lost his hand in the Venetian–Ottoman war.

---

40 GSA – Lefkada, Notary Archive, Notary Ioannis Gavallas, reg. 12, fols. 42r–42v (14 January 1726).
42 One source has the Sumillas among the 70 families of Lefkada from which members of the civic council were elected (Valaoritis, Βίος, Επιστολές και Πολιτικά κείμενα, p. 19). Archival research so far has revealed no evidence for Sumillas’ presence on the council until the arrival of the French in 1797.
43 We should note that information from the archives of Lefkada about the organisation and operation of the Comunità is indirect. The archive of the Comunità does not exist today, since it was burnt by the French when they arrived in Lefkada in summer 1797; see Machairas, Πολιτική και διπλωματική ιστορία της Λευκάδος, vol. I, Athens, 1954, pp. 40–1.
45 Sathas, Η κατά τον ΙΖ αιώνα επανάστασις, pp. 31–2.
However, Aggelis’ descendants seem to have become integrated into the local community. In March 1738 their place of origin is given as da Santa Maura (from Lefkada), although it is almost certain that they were not born on the Ionian island. Investing their profits from the land they had inherited from their father, they gained financial standing and social recognition. Strategic marriages with prominent families of the island helped their social advancement significantly. Ioannis, Aggelis’ second son, married Zarbafenia Servou, sister of Meletios. Ioanni’s sister, Maria, married Nikolaos Psomas, whose father Apostolos had served Venice during the war in 1684 and was among those who petitioned Morosini after the occupation of the island for privileges and a charter for Lefkada. The Serenissima granted him land in the early eighteenth century. Finally, Aggelis Sumillas, grandson of cavaliere Aggelis, married Zacharenia Valaoritis.

The children and grandchildren of Captain Aggelis followed the example of all reputable islanders with significant financial status, donating land to build churches and consolidating their donations by active participation in the fraternities. In 1724, Petros and Ioannis Sumillas offered the land on which the cleric Georgios Klonaris built the church of St. Anargyroi Cosmas and Damianos. The two brothers probably took part in the church fraternity as proprietors. Whether or not they participated, they always looked after the church and attended regularly. Another indication of the family’s high social status is that family members were buried inside the churches of the island. An example is Ioannis Sumillas, son of the cavaliere, buried on 22 February 1754 inside St. Spyridon church.

46 GSA – Lefkada, 014.02.028/5, document with date 17 May 1738.
50 GSA – Lefkada, Notary Archive, Notary Spiridon Kozis, reg. 16, fols 14–16’ (2 October 1820): will of Zacharenia Valaoritis, widow of the late Aggelis Sumillas.
51 For the religious fraternities in the Ionian region, see Karidis, Ορθόδοξες αδελφότητες και συναδελφικοί ναοί στην Κέρκυρα (15ος–19ος αι.), Athens, 2004, with extensive bibliography.
52 Despite our efforts we have not been able to locate and consult the Capitolare (Charter Map) of the church.
53 Study of the parish registers reveals many ceremonies carried out in St. Anargyroi for members of the Sumillas family. The Archive of Lefkada holds the registers of baptisms (1728–1842), deaths (1727–1842) and marriages (1731–1842). For the history of the church see Machairas, Ναοί και μοναί Λευκάδος, pp. 147–150; Rontogiannis, ‘Η Χριστιανική τέχνη στη Λευκάδα’, pp. 130–2.
54 GSA – Lefkada, 014.02.028/5: ‘copia tratta dal libro de morti della chiesa di San Spiridion, 1760, 30 ottobre stile vecchio’. Burial in the interior of the church was reserved to the founders, their families and prominent members of Lefkada society. The Sumillas family was not among the founders of the church of St. Spyridon. For a brief history of the church, see Machairas, Ναοί και μοναί Λευκάδος, p. 128. On the history of the church see ibid, pp. 82–92; Rontogiannis, ‘Η Χριστιανική τέχνη στη Λευκάδα’, pp. 122–6.
Aggelis Sumillas did not remain alive in local memory. Although legend made him a protagonist in many folk songs, the Leukadians forgot him. Studying one census of the Ionian State reveals that streets were named mainly after prominent and wealthy families who lived there.\textsuperscript{55} We have the calle Settini, calle Petrizzopulo, calle Lazzari and calle Valaoriti.\textsuperscript{56} There is no Soumilla street. It should be noted that in the early nineteenth century Petros Sumillas lived in the city of Lefkada, counted among the wealthy and reputable citizens, even bearing a title of nobility. Local society decided to honour Captain Aggelis after the mid-twentieth century, when a small alley that leads to the western pier was named ‘Vlachaggelis Sumillas’.

\textsuperscript{55} GSA – Lefkada, 07.01.04.002 and 07.01.04.004.
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