

Leonid Żytkowicz

DIRECTIONS OF AGRARIAN DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH- EASTERN EUROPE IN 16TH - 18TH CENTURIES

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Both the history of South-Eastern Europe and the conditions of the economic development of its particular countries are extremely varied. The mountain ranges of the Alps and the Carpathians separate it from Western and Central Europe. There were no water routes to link it with the Adriatic and the great Venetian market. The route across the Black Sea was long and at the time of interest to us was closed by the Turks.

Elsewhere, we have tried to divide into "zones" the lands "east of the Elbe" — a term of convenience — on the basis of the conditions and forms of development of agrarian relations.¹ We have divided the countries of South-Eastern Europe into two separate zones. One of them includes Hungary within her historical boundaries. This zone is distinguished by the fact that its feudal class had engaged in trade in agricultural produce prior to cultivating it on their own estates. From the mid-16th century they were encouraged in setting up farms by the growing possibilities

¹ L. Żytkowicz, *W sprawie badań porównawczych nad genezą i rozwojem folwarku pańszczyźnianego* [About the Comparative Studies of the Origin and Development of Manorial Farm], in: *Spółczeństwo. Gospodarka Kultura. Mélanges M. Małowist*, Warszawa 1974, pp. 438 - 440.

of selling crops on the home (urban) market, as well as by the large demand of the Habsburg army during the wars with Turkey. The export of grain was small as compared with the export of slaughter animals and wine.²

The next zone includes the countries which had been conquered by Turkey. This conquest had interrupted their economic and social development and incorporated them into a political and economic organism, alien to Europe, and imposed on them by the Turkish military feudalism. But there were vital differences between the group of countries directly incorporated into the Turkish empire (Bulgaria, Bosnia-Herzegovina) and the vassal countries such as the two principalities of Rumania and Transylvania. In the latter, their own feudal class survived, its members owning a considerable part of the landed estates. The rest went into the endowment of the ruling prince and church institutions. This had a vital impact on the development of the agrarian conditions in those countries. Following the defeat at Mohacs (1526) and the wars of 1541 - 42, the central part of Hungary including Budapest remained under Turkish rule for the next 150 years.

Because of special natural conditions — the climate and vast steppes — the countries of South-Eastern Europe developed on a large scale the cultivation of vine, as well as sheep and cattle breeding for export. These two branches of production became very important to their economy and created conditions for an earlier economic growth of the feudal class, particularly in Hungary.

I. HUNGARY AND COUNTRIES OF THE HUNGARIAN CROWN

The economic development of the gentry in the 15th and 16th centuries was not a specific Hungarian phenomenon (for it included many European countries). The studies carried out so far seem to indicate that the price movement concerning farm crops in

² See Zs. P. Pach, *Die Getreideversorgung der ungarischen Städte vom XV. bis XVII. Jh.*, "Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik," vol. CLXXIX, 1966, pp. 146 - 158. M. Małowist has devoted much attention to the situation in Hungary: *Wschód a Zachód Europy w XIII - XVI w.* [*The East and West of Europe in the 13th-16th Centuries*], Warszawa 1973, pp. 191 - 211, 340 - 350. In principle, we agree with him.

Hungary was parallel to that in other European countries.³ The price of corn in neighbouring Austria rose considerably by the end of the 15th century. The situation was similar in Poland.⁴ It was not the war with Turkey that caused a rise in the demand for agricultural produce, for the gentry traded in it even earlier.⁵

The feudal class could be active in two directions: the organisation of own production or organisation of sales of crops cultivated by peasants. In Hungary — unlike in Poland and some other countries — the feudal lords first engaged in trade in agricultural produce and only later in its cultivation.

The involvement of the feudal class in economic activity was of great importance to Hungary's internal development, and some Hungarian historians connect it with the "departure" of their country from the heretofore line of development, considered parallel to that of Western Europe, and its embarking upon a new path, which resulted in the development of farm and serf economy and the consolidation of the bases of feudalism.⁶

³ T. Vittman, "Revolucija cen" i ejo vlijanije na Vengriju vo II pol. XVI v., "Sredne veka," vol. XX, 1961, pp. 175 - 188; S. Hoszowski, *Revolucija cen w Srodkowej Europie w XVI i XVII w.* [*Price Revolution in Central Europe in the 16th and 17th Centuries*], "Kwartalnik Historyczny" (hereafter KH), vol. LXVIII, 1961, No. 2, p. 299; V. Zimanyi, *Mouvement des prix hongrois et l'évolution européenne (XVI^e - XVIII^e ss.)*, "Acta Historica Academiae Sc. Hungaricae" (hereafter AH), vol. XIX, 1973, p. 310.

The author could use Hungarian studies only through their summaries in other languages. But it seems that the large number of publications in West-European languages makes it possible for the foreign reader to learn enough about the internal history of Hungary, and thus about her agrarian relations, to be able to compare them with those in the neighbouring countries.

⁴ S. Hoszowski, *op. cit.*, p. 301, 306; V. Zimanyi, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

⁵ Cf. for instance, F. Maksay, *Gutswirtschaft und Bauernlegen in Ungarn im XVI Jahr.*, "Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte" (hereafter VSWG), vol. XIV, 1958, No. 1, p. 34.

⁶ See, for instance, Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung im 16 - 17 Jahrh.*, Budapest 1964, pp. 31, 223 - 224; F. Maksay, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 - 41; I. Sinkovics, *Le "servage héréditaire" en Hongrie aux 16 - 17 s.*, in: *La Renaissance et la Réformation en Pologne et en Hongrie*, Budapest 1963, pp. 51 - 52; cf. also Zs. P. Pach, *Problemy razvitiya marksistskoj istoričeskoj nauki*, AH, vol. XII, 1966, No. 1/2, where the author sees two opposite trends in the development of agrarian relations in Hungary in the 16th century: (i) small peasant property, and (ii) big manorial property. This no longer fits the present views of Hungarian scholars. Also the notion of capitalist elements in 16th century Hungarian agriculture has been dropped.

The premises of the development of the gentry trade in farm produce were as follows: (i) accumulation by the feudal class of considerable stocks of farm crops in the form of feudal rent; (ii) relative weakness of towns; (iii) political and social supremacy of the feudal lords and their trading privileges which made it possible to use extra-economic pressure both when purchasing peasant farm produce and in creating a sales market in their own estates.

Let us note that when speaking of farm produce we have in mind not only corn but also — perhaps even primarily — wine and stockbreeding.⁷ The gentry trade hit not only peasants but also towns because the gentry became a dangerous competitor. The anti-town policy of the Hungarian gentry served the same purpose for it was aimed — and in that it was probably similar to the situation in Poland — at maintaining high farm produce prices and lowering the prices of artisan products.⁸

In the neighbouring countries the economic involvement of the gentry followed a different direction. For instance, in Bohemia the gentry engaged in the profitable breeding of fish and the manufacture of beer.⁹ In Poland, it began to grow its own corn. Naturally, the direction of the economic activity of the feudal class depended on the conditions in the given country. It is much more difficult to answer the question why the Hungarian gentry — even after crushing the peasant rising of 1514 — preferred to base the sale of farm crops on surpluses from peasant farms gained in the form of feudal rent than develop own production.

Through the feudal rent (tithe paid to the manor) as much as 10 per cent of peasant crops went into the landlord's granaries. The same applied to wine and livestock. The rent of a church — or royal — tithe could double the amount to one-fifth (quint) of the peasant's crops. The compulsory purchase of the peasant pro-

⁷ Zs. P. Pach, *Problemy razvitija ...*, pp. 127 - 128.

⁸ Zs. P. Pach, *Getreideversorgung der ungarischen Städte ...*, p. 152; idem, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung ...*, p. 37; cf. I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 - 60; L. Makkai, *Die Hauptzüge der wirtschaftlich-sozialen Entwicklung Ungarns in 15 - 17 Jahrh.*, in: *La Renaissance et la Réformation*, p. 43.

⁹ Cf. A. Mika, *Feudální velkostatek v jižních Čechách (XIV - XVII stol.)*, in: "Sborník historický," vol. I, 1953, pp. 129 - 137, 169 - 181, 194 - 197.

duce was another way in which the feudal class could increase the amount of disposable goods.¹⁰

The gentry trade in Hungary was a typically feudal form of trade, primarily because of the trading rights granted by royal privileges and resolutions passed by the Diet. The landlords enjoyed the *regalia minora* i.e. retail sale of wine (*educilatio*), sometimes of beer, later spirits; monopoly of mills; monopoly of slaughter houses; exemption from customs duties imposed on articles *de propria allodiatura*.¹¹

In the 16th and first part of the 17th centuries the Hungarian gentry won new rights in this field: in 1550 it was granted pre-emption for agricultural produce at market prices. The latter reservation was not respected and in fact prices were established by the squire.¹² In 1608, in contravention of privileges held by towns, the Hungarian Diet demanded that exclusive rights for exporting wine abroad be granted to the gentry. The royal decree of 1618 confirmed the exemption of the gentry from customs and tolls. In 1625, the *comitatus* (counties) won the formal right to regulate prices and pays; actually, they exercised that right prior to the granting.¹³ The same rights were enjoyed by the Croatian gentry.¹⁴

The need to guarantee sales was another aspect of the phenomenon. Probably the towns and the army did not exhaust the supply, since the feudal lords had resorted to the creation of a compulsory market on their own estates. Somewhere around 1570, the obligation to buy drink at the landlord's pub appears

¹⁰ I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

¹¹ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 19, 23, 44-46; I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, p. 54; cf. Zs. P. Pach, *En Hongrie au XVI s.*, : "Annales", vol. XXIII, 1968, No. 6, pp. 1218-1219. Cf. I. Szabo, *A magyar mezőgazdaság története a XIV sz. az 1530-as évekig*, Budapest 1975; in this work, published posthumously, the author emphasized that a considerable position in the income from large estates—besides the money rent—was occupied by the sale of peasant products obtained through rent in kind. The manorial own production was of secondary importance. The prevalence of peasant production declined slowly during the 16th century. *Compte rendu de P. Sandor*, in: AH, vol. XXIII, 1977, pp. 466-468.

¹² T. Vittman, *op. cit.*, p. 173; I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

¹³ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, p. 41.

¹⁴ F. Čulinović, *Krest'janskije vosstanija v Horvatiu*, Moskva 1959, pp. 44-45; J. V. Bromlej, *Krest'janskoe vosstanie 1573 g. v Horvatiu*, Moskva 1959, p. 163.

to have been general. Yet, this monopoly did not apply throughout the year but from Easter, or April 24th, to Michaelmas (September 29th). Anyway, the dates could be arbitrarily settled *pro arbitrio domini terrestris*. The retail sale was rarely based on own production, rather on natural tribute, granting of church tithe or pre-emption for peasant-made wine. The fact that in some parts of the country cultivated fields had been turned into vineyards shows how profitable the wine business was at the time.¹⁵

Even the landlord's own serfs, both the landless and impoverished, and those growing corn for sale, had, of necessity, to buy grain sold by the manor. It came from the same source as wine. Partly, it was obtained from compulsory sales. In the first stage, the manorial production was nil or negligible.¹⁶

Trade in cattle or rather in oxen for slaughter was more complicated. As distinguished from trade in corn, it was export-oriented — to Austria, Moravia, south Germany etc. It consisted mostly of oxen bred by the gentry. The organisation of breeding was easier than the organisation of corn growing, or wine production. Moreover, the oxen were purchased in urban markets by agents of the gentry and big nobles. After 1526, they were also supplied from territories occupied by the Turks.¹⁷

Worth noting was the trend—also prominent in Poland—to expand the range of the gentry trade by including non-agricultural goods such as salt, iron, herrings and other commodities, naturally in the form of compulsory additions.¹⁸

All this not only limited the peasant's share of the free market but also caused a *sui generis* economic isolation of particular estates, turning them into "closed markets."¹⁹ Yet, the Hungarian

¹⁵ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 18 - 20; idem, *En Hongrie au XVI^e s. ...*, pp. 1213 - 1215; L. Makkai, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

¹⁶ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 22 - 23; idem, *En Hongrie au XVI^e s. ...*, pp. 1219 - 1220; I. Acsady, *Istoriija vengerskogo krepostnogo krest'janstva*, Moskva 1956, p. 186; F. Maksay, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 - 41.

¹⁷ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 20, 21; idem, *En Hongrie au XVI^e s.*, p. 1216; F. Maksay, *op. cit.*, p. 40; L. Makkai, *Der ungarische Viehhandel 1550 - 1650*, in: *Der Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas 1450 - 1650*, Köln, 1971, p. 501.

¹⁸ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, p. 82; I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

¹⁹ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 82 - 83.

peasant was not completely ousted—similarly as in Poland—from the urban markets. Else it would be hard to understand how the peasant came to have money to make purchases at the landlord's. It seems plausible that only the Fifteen-Year War (1593-1606) caused a slump in the commercial production on peasant farms, or more accurately, on those which could afford it.²⁰

Here it might be worth while to quote, after J. Sinkovics, an extract from the instruction given in 1564 by the widow of the Palatine Thomas Nádasdy to the manager of the estate of Kamizsa (Transdanubia): "Please, try to extract a profit from everything, from trade of every kind, from purchase, breeding, and sale of cattle, from the purchase of honey, wine, hides etc., depending on what you will deem useful."²¹ How vividly does this recall the contemporary recommendation of a Polish magnate A. Gostomski!²²

From the gentry trading in agricultural produce there was only a step to own manorial production for sale. Hungarian historians date the first stage in the development of manorial farms in their own country to the years 1530-1540. We shall not discuss here the size and social organisation of the manorial farms in Hungary. Lately, interesting studies of villein and hired labour against the background of the pattern of social forces in the country have been published by Zs. P. Pach and G. Szekely.²³

*

Here the question arises, what was the impact of the emergence and development of allodial farms on the future and situation of peasant farms. The answer is not easy because of the lack of any systematic source studies, and all the more so as at

²⁰ E.g. Zs. Kirilly et I. N. Kiss, *Production des céréales et exploitations paysannes en Hongrie aux XVI^e et XVII^e s.*, "Annales", vol. XXIII, 1968, No. 6, p. 1228.

²¹ I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

²² A. Gostomski, *Gospodarstwo* [A Manorial Farm], Wrocław 1951, p. 109: "So that he sold all and bought nothing".

²³ Zs. P. Pach, *Corvées et travail salarié dans les exploitations seigneuriales de la Hongrie des XVI^e et XVII^e s.*, in: *Paysannerie française, paysannerie hongroise XVI^e-XX^e s.*, Budapest 1973, pp. 75-102, and particularly pp. 83-84; Gy. Székely, *Le passage à l'économie basée sur la corvée en Europe Centrale et Orientale et l'année 1514*, "Études Historiques Hongroises," Budapest (hereafter EHH), vol. I, 1975, pp. 309-329.

the turn of the 16th century a savage war (called the Fifteen-Year War) ravaged Hungary. Thus, it is difficult to differentiate the impact of two factors, the development of the allodial farms and war destruction. Anyway, it is quite certain that the decline of peasant farms can be gauged from their shrinking acreage and the loss of draught animals.²⁴

On the other hand, though, despite the general depression, the differences in the property status of the peasant population in Hungary were considerable, to wit the existence of peasant farms using hired labour. It has been rightly emphasized that the nominal size of a farm could have been very different from the actual one, because the peasants cultivated land which did not formally belong to their farms, e.g. forest clearings; they could also obtain much higher yield than would appear from the size of their farms and services for the squire.²⁵ The mere fact of the cultivation of vines, maize, millet or buckwheat (the last two were exempt from the tithe) prompts a different scale in assessing the size of a farm and its production capacity than in the case of a corn monoculture.²⁶

What part of his crops and of his labour force did the Hungarian peasant — or in any country of the Hungarian Crown — give to the squire in the form of feudal rent? Some years ago this vital question was raised by Zs. P. Pach. Unless we have misunderstood the author, the rent i.e. the fee in kind and the labour amounted to 60 per cent of the peasant's production.²⁷ But is it proper and methodically correct to sum up rent in kind and rent in labour?

The basic tribute was made up of the decima and the nona — altogether the quint; it swallowed up 20 per cent of the harvest.

²⁴ The estate of Nemetújvár (Germ.: Güssing) is a good example, see V. Zimanyi, *Der Bauernstand der Herrschaft Güssing im 16 und 17 Jahrh.*, Eisenstadt 1962, pp. 276 - 288.

²⁵ V. Zimanyi, *Mouvement des prix hongrois...*, pp. 87 - 89; the author refers to the lists of damages sustained by peasants; the size of the losses is supposed to bear witness to their considerable prosperity.

²⁶ As above; cf. I. Balassa, *Der Mais in Ungarn*, "Acta Ethnographica," vol. V, 1956, pp. 106 - 113.

²⁷ Zs. P. Pach, *Über einige Probleme der Gutswirtschaft in Ungarn in der ersten Hälfte des XVII Jahrh.*, in: *Deuxième Conférence Internationale d'Histoire Economique 1962*, Paris 1965, vol. II, pp. 228 - 229, 232.

Using a very general assessment and adding the remaining tributes and fees, that percentage could be raised to 30. The same amount should be deducted for sowing, not to mention other production expenses. There remains 35 - 40 per cent to satisfy all the other needs, above all, food and sale. The latter was possible only in the case of largish farms having a marketable surplus. Zs. P. Pach has tentatively estimated the corvées as amounting to three days a week from each farmstead. This may mean 50 per cent of the human and draught labour force in the case of a farm having only one cart. Considering the present state of studies, it would be difficult to make those estimates more accurate.

*

Hungary, like the neighbouring Moravia and Bohemia, had no transport routes favourable to the development of large exports of corn to the west: the Danube flows the wrong way. Overland transport is profitable only under very special conditions. So, of necessity, the Hungarian export of corn was practically limited to the neighbouring Austria. It was a border type of trade, bilateral to a certain extent, for Austrian corn could also be bought in Hungary.²⁸ The negligible sales prospects abroad were only partly compensated with home demand. As mentioned earlier, besides towns, an important customer emerged during the Turkish wars: the numerous Habsburg army. But this "war boom" ended by the close of the 17th century. At the same time, own consumption of the manor began to rise very considerably. The Habsburg conquests, confirmed in the peace of 1699, opened the question of access to Adriatic ports.²⁹

Better known is the size of the export of corn from Hungary — mainly to Austrian countries — after 1770. In some years, it exceeded 100 thous. tons.³⁰ At that time, the Vienna government undertook big road works and river regulation in order to link

²⁸ Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 84 - 85.

²⁹ See I. Karaman, *Trgovinska magistrala Sisak—Karlovac—Rijeka i merkantilistička politika bečkog dvora u godinama 1749 - 1767*, "Starine", vol. LIII, Zagreb 1966, pp. 263 - 312.

³⁰ Gy. Benda, *Production et exportation des céréales en Hongrie (1770 - 1870)* in: *Paysannerie française...*, pp. 188 - 194 and maps.

Trieste and Rijeka with their Austrian and Hungarian-Croatian hinterland.

The high position on the Hungarian export list occupied by wine was probably due to two reasons: not all the neighbouring countries were able to produce wine for their own demand: the cost of wine transport was much lower than that of grain transport in relation to the value of those commodities. In Little Poland's customs houses Hungarian wine was noted at least since 1519. The known customs records show relatively small or even negligible quantities, but the figures are fragmentary.³¹ I. N. Kiss estimates the export of Hungarian wine to Poland in 1610 - 1611, i.e. on the morrow of the destructive Fifteen-Year War, at some five million litres a year, which amounted to the value of 1.5 - 1.6 million forints.³² According to H. Prickler's estimates, the production of the Hungarian Burgenland alone (as far as we know, there is no Hungarian name for it) in the 15th - 18th century amounted to an average of some 30 million litres a year. L. Makkai has estimated the entire annual production of Hungarian wine at 135 million litres. In 1650 - 1657, most of the exports went to Silesia (83.4 per cent); the rest to Poland (7.2 per cent), Bohemia (4.7 per cent), Moravia (4.4 per cent) and Saxony (0.3 per cent). Probably, the Hungarian wine travelled via Silesia to Great Poland, perhaps also to other parts of the Polish Commonwealth. In some years the wine was exported also to Austria and Bavaria.³³ The example of the vineyards belonging to Count Csaky at Tarcal (west of Tokay) shows that the production of wine was very profitable since the owner bought more vineyards and reduced the growing of corn and cattle breeding. The net profit from the wine sales is supposed to have amounted in 1638 to as much as 200 per cent in rela-

³¹ R. Rybarski, *Handel i polityka handlowa Polski w XVI st.* [Poland's Trade and Commercial Policy in the 16th Century], vol. I, Warszawa 1958, pp. 120 - 121; vol. II, pp. 178, 183, 199 - 228, 241, 257.

³² This would equal the value of some 80 thous. oxen for export. See I. N. Kiss, *Die Rolle der Magnatengutswirtschaft im Grosshandel Ungarns im 17 Jahrh.*, in: *Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas...*, p. 480.

³³ H. Prickler, *Zur Geschichte des burgenländisch-Westungarischen Weinhandels in die Oberländer Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien und Polen*, "Zeitschrift für Ostforschung", vol. XIV, 1965, pp. 497 - 498, 514 - 515; see R. Rybarski, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 120; L. Makkai, *La structure et la productivité de l'économie agraire de la Hongrie au milieu du XVII^e s.*, in: *Spółeczeństwo—Gospodarka—Kultura...*, p. 205.

tion to the production costs (in money expenses). Half the vineyards were cultivated by serfs and this should be taken into account when estimating their profitability. The production risks were great for the harvest oscillated in the ratio of 1 : 3. Polish merchants were the main customers of Tarcal wines.³⁴

The export of oxen began much earlier. For instance, in 1492, Danish, Frisian, Eiderstad, Polish, Hungarian and Russian oxen appeared on the market in distant Cologne.³⁵ Possibly, the order on the list does not indicate the position in the hierarchy of supplies. According to I. N. Kiss's estimates, by the end of the 15th century, cattle for slaughter constituted 55 - 60 per cent of the total of Hungarian exports; other products of breeding — 10 per cent, wine — 5 - 6 per cent. The remaining 20 - 25 per cent was made up of copper. Also according to the books of 19 customs houses on the western frontier, in 1542, cattle amounted to as much as 87.5 per cent of the total value of exports; other animals — nearly 6 per cent, foodstuffs — 3.82 per cent, hides and furs — 2.21 per cent.³⁶

The Turkish conquest of central Hungary did not stop the export of oxen to the west. The Turkish fiscal authorities were interested in customs revenue, so on the territories ruled by the Turks and sparsely populated breeding for export developed apace.³⁷ Irrespective of the studies of Hungarian historians, it has been recognised that German towns had difficulties in getting their meat supplies from mid-16th century up to the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War.³⁸

³⁴ I. N. Kiss, *op. cit.*, pp. 468 - 470.

³⁵ I. N. Kiss, *Der Agrarcharakter des Ungarischen Exports vom 15 bis 18 Jahrh.*, "Jahrbuch der Wirtschaftsgeschichte", Berlin (hereafter JWG), vol. I, 1978, p. 153; H. Wiese, *Die Fleischversorgung der nordwesteuropäischen Grossstädte vom XV bis XIX Jahrh.*, "Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik", vol. CLXXIX, 1966, p. 134.

³⁶ G. Ember, *Zur Geschichte des Aussenhandels Ungarns in XVI Jahrh.*, Budapest 1960, p. 16; *idem*, *Ungarns Aussenhandel mit dem Westen um die Mitte des XVI Jahrh.*, in: *Der Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas...*, pp. 86 - 93. I. N. Kiss, has been critical of the results of G. Ember's studies (*Die Rolle der Magnatengutswirtschaft...*), p. 451.

³⁷ L. Makkai, *Der Ungarische Viehhandel 1550 - 1650...*, pp. 483 - 506; Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, p. 16; J. Pere nyi, *Villes hongroises sous la domination ottomane aux XVI^e - XVII^e ss.*, in: *La ville balkanique XVe - XIXe ss.*, Sofia 1970, p. 30.

³⁸ H. Wiese, *op. cit.*, pp. 135 - 137.

Lately, I. N. Kiss has attempted to calculate the export of oxen for the whole period from the end of the 15th century to the 18th century inclusive. In the best years, it may have amounted to 200 thousand beasts a year. This great trade declined almost to nil in the second half of the 17th century because of the anti-feudal peasant risings and wars with Turkey. It was revived only in the fourth decade of the 18th century.³⁹ From the mid-18th century, the export of Hungarian oxen was eclipsed by corn and wool.⁴⁰

After the conquest by the Turks of part of the Hungarian territory, the demand for foodstuffs increased in the part of the country under the Habsburg rule: due to migration, the population grew and the military garrisons increased. This "war boom" was at the roots of the development of landlord economy in the Habsburg part of Hungary. Rightly, it seems, scholars have turned their attention to the great fluctuations in this boom and the big differences in the conditions of agricultural sales.⁴¹ The Habsburgs, in order to lessen the financial costs of maintaining an army, developed their own allodial farms on government estates. Moreover, the state used to rent the church tithes.⁴²

Were the 16th and 17th century Hungarian towns a good market for Hungarian agriculture? It certainly grew in importance as the war boom subsided in the first half of the 17th century. In the second half of the 16th century that market had been monopolised by big landlords. It is not clear why the Hungarian towns were to experience supply difficulties since local corn could not be exported to the West and why high prices were maintained on the urban market.⁴³

³⁹ I. N. Kiss, *Der Agrarcharakter des ungarischen Exports...*, pp. 154 - 162 and table.

⁴⁰ L. Makkai, *op. cit.*, p. 483; G. Ember, *Zur Geschichte des Ausenhandels Ungarns in XVI Jahrh...*, p. 18, gives a list of Hungarian exports to the West in 1767; livestock was supposed to amount to as much as 51.8 per cent of the value of the entire export; this calculation is not valid because the author has omitted wine and wool.

⁴¹ I. Sinkovics, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 - 51; F. Maksay, *op. cit.*, p. 43; Zs. P. Pach, *Die ungarische Agrarentwicklung...*, pp. 42 - 43.

⁴² Zs. P. Pach, *Getreideversorgung der ungarischen Städte...*, pp. 150 - 151; Zs. Kirilly et I. N. Kiss, *op. cit.*, p. 1212.

⁴³ Zs. P. Pach, *op. cit.*, pp. 147, 152.

The conditions were different in the territories under Turkish rule: the native population had left the towns. The authorities created colonies of officials and the military, inhabited by Islamised Bosniaŕs, as well as by Turks. The economic links between those towns and their hinterland were negligible for they provisioned themselves either in south Hungary or even in Serbia whence artisans flowed into them.⁴⁴

The situation in Croatia was similar to that in Hungary. The export of oxen to Venice — and perhaps to other towns in northern Italy — was probably a permanent feature.⁴⁵ But not the export of corn because of the slight production capacity of a small, mountainous country with primitive methods of soil cultivation.⁴⁶ The relatively well urbanised Dalmatian coast and the islands in the Adriatic were not self-sufficient. Yet, certain amounts of corn were supplied by their merchants to Venice. It could be Croatian corn.⁴⁷ The export caused high prices and the Croatian Diet regulated them, at least in the period 1528 - 1603. Probably because of army demand, the kings used to prohibit the export of corn, e.g. in 1560, 1567 and 1573.⁴⁸ Transport to ports was effected by caravans. Some big landlords, e.g. Zrynyi or Mikulitch, are known to have engaged in trading. They would sell agricultural produce received from peasants as tribute. The presence of the armed forces, particularly in the border zone of Croatia, created opportunities for sales on the spot, without incurring the difficulties and costs of export. Local peasants could also engage in this trade if they had any surpluses. The wars with Turkey and

⁴⁴ J. Perényi, *Villes hongroises sous la domination ottomane...*, pp. 25 - 31.

⁴⁵ J. V. Bromlej, *op. cit.*, pp. 80 - 81; F. Gestrin, *Trgovina slovenskego zaledja s primorskimi mesti od XIII do k. XVI st.*, Ljubljana 1965, p. 172; *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije*, vol. II, Beograd 1960, p. 400. It is hard to say where does the figure of 80,000 oxen exported annually come from and whether it is anywhere near the real figure.

⁴⁶ J. V. Bromlej, *op. cit.*, p. 82; F. Gestrin, *op. cit.*, p. 171; N. Klaić, *O razvitku feudalne rente u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji u XV i XVI st.*, "Radovi Filozofskog Fakulteta u Zagrebu. Odsjek za povijest," vol. III, 1960, p. 53.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Istorija Jugoslavii*, vol. I, Moskva 1963, p. 153; M. Mirković, *Ekonomska historija Jugoslavije*, Zagreb 1958, pp. 59, 102 - 104.

⁴⁸ R. Bićanić, *Počeci kapitalizma u hrvatskoj ekonomici i politici*, Zagreb, 1952, pp. 6, 8.

frontier disturbances had an adverse impact on the slight production capacity of the country.

The Habsburgs were very much interested in the export of agricultural produce through Adriatic ports : from Austria through Trieste, and from Hungary and Croatia through Rijeka. It is possible in this connection that the internal customs duties in Croatia and Slavonia were abolished in 1715.⁴⁹ The same purpose was to be served by the building of roads, corn storehouses at reloading points, and the regulation of the river Kupa.⁵⁰ All this yielded only moderate results ; the transport of corn was still both costly and risky because of the numerous natural barriers.⁵¹ Export rose considerably only in the second half of the 18th century, when Karlovac became an important centre of the corn trade. At the turn of the 18th century, some 117 thous. tons of corn were said to be carried a year.⁵² We do not know, how much of this corn came from Croatia.

Probably oxen were a more important export item than corn. They went in two opposite directions : to Venice and to Vienna. At the end of the 18th century this export is supposed to have attained the considerable figure of some 60 thous. beasts a year. The export of pigs was also considerable, some 100 thous. animals a year, but some of them came from Serbia and Bosnia. We do not know how these estimates were drawn up and it is quite possible that they have been exaggerated.⁵³

We do not know anything about the wine trade, although we do know that in Croatia, the vineyards were the main, besides corn, branch of production.

⁴⁹ *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije*, vol. II, p. 1010.

⁵⁰ A. Blanc, *La Croatie Occidentale*, Paris 1957, p. 249 ; I. Karaman, *op. cit.*, pp. 263, 292, 302 ; P. Krajasich, *Die Militärgrenze in Kroatien*, Wien 1967, pp. 197 - 200 ; S. Gavrilović, *Prilog istoriji seljačkih nemira u Pokuplju od kraja XVII do kraja XVIII st.*, "Historijski Zbornik", vol. XVI, 1963, pp. 70 - 75.

⁵¹ M. Mirković, *op. cit.*, pp. 196 - 197.

⁵² A. Blanc, *op. cit.*, p. 258 ; M. Mirković, *op. cit.*, pp. 192, 195, 208 - 209 ; *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije*, vol. II, p. 1012.

⁵³ *Istorija naroda Jugoslavije...*, pp. 1011 - 1012 ; M. Mirković, *op. cit.*, pp. 192 - 194.

II. RUMANIAN LANDS

The studies of the agrarian history of the two Rumanian principalities, unlike those of Transylvania, are difficult because of the small amount and one-sidedness of source information. The lack of treasury material is truly surprising, if one considers the strongly developed fiscal system and the share of the state in the exploitation of the peasant population by way of a centralised rent. There are practically no statistics for the studies of the period between the 16th and 18th centuries. It is possible to surmise that it is precisely this lack of sources that has caused — or at least contributed to — the fact that the studies of Rumanian historians have mainly concentrated on the legal and social position of the peasants. A certain deviation from such an approach to agrarian history is noticeable in the works of S. Columbeanu, F. Constantiniu, I. Corfus and V. Mihordea.

The same categories of feudal landed property existed in the Rumanian territories as in the rest of Europe: gentry's (*boyar*), church, both metropolitan and monacal, ducal (*hospodar*) and free peasants' (*ražesi*) property. However, the conditions there did not favour the emergence of large estates, as was the case in Poland, Hungary and even Transylvania.⁵⁴ But single fortunes — particularly of the *hospodar* treasurers — amounted sometimes to any number between 120 and 180 villages;⁵⁵ the estates of rich monasteries numbered 25 - 30 villages, and those of the metropolis exceeded one hundred.⁵⁶

Attachment to the soil (*legătură de glie*), enacted in the 16th century during the rule of Michael the Brave, was a lengthy process and should not be considered in the context of a single legal act. It seems that, in contradistinction to the earlier opinions of

⁵⁴ We owe our knowledge of the agrarian relations in Transylvania to the fundamental work of D. Prodan, *Iobăgia în Transilvania în secolul al XVI-lea*, vol. I - III, București 1967 - 1968.

⁵⁵ V. Mihordea, *Relațiile agrare din secolul al XVIII-lea în Moldova*, București 1968, pp. 67 - 68; *idem*, *Maîtres du sol et paysans dans les principautés roumaines au XVIIIe s.* București 1971, pp. 59 - 60.

⁵⁶ I. Donat, *Le domaine princier rural en Valachie*, "Revue Roumaine de l'Histoire," București (henceforward RRH), vol. VI, 1967, p. 204; S. Columbeanu, *Date privitoare la economia agrară din țara Românească în prima jumătate a sec. al XVIII-lea* "Studii Revista de Istorie," București, vol. XV, 1962, No. 1, p. 112.

P. P. Panaitescu, the adscription was not prompted by the need to provide a sufficient number of hands to work on boyar farms and by the development of the goods and money economy, but by fiscal considerations. The purpose was to obtain a stable settled population bound with services and taxes payable to the state, while the feudal class wished to secure its share in exploiting the peasants.⁵⁷ It is worthwhile to recall that in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania the serfdom of the peasants preceded the development of manors. There the aim was to prevent the migrations of the people in a sparsely populated country.⁵⁸

In connection with serfdom and the lord's *demesne*, it should be noted that corn cultivation was not of primary importance to the country's economy in the period under survey.⁵⁹ Although P. P. Panaitescu considered the "conquest through work of unproductive wilderness" of capital importance in the history of Rumania, nevertheless he concluded that up to the beginning of the capitalist era, it was breeding — not farming — that constituted the main resource of the country.⁶⁰ Among the contemporary historians V. Mihordea is of the opinion that in 18th century Moldavian economy was mainly concerned with livestock breeding while up to mid-18th century corn cultivation came second; it was only in the second half of that century that it began to gain in importance.⁶¹ F. Constantiniu is of the same opinion as concerns Wallachia: he, too, sees the growing role of corn cultivation only in the later half of the 18th century.⁶² In Bessarabia farming did not come into its own until the mid-19th century.⁶³ Even in Oltenia during the Austrian occupation of 1718 - 1739, when the presence of a numerous army raised the demand for corn, its culti-

⁵⁷ P. Panaitescu, *Dreptul de strămutare al țăranilor în Țările Române*, "Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie", București (henceforward "Studii și Materiale"), vol. I, 1956, pp. 64, ff.

⁵⁸ H. Łowmiański, in *Historia Polski [History of Poland]*, vol. I, part 2, Warszawa 1957, p. 246.

⁵⁹ See S. Columbeanu, *Grandes exploitations domaniales en Valachie au XVIII s.*, București 1974, p. 77.

⁶⁰ P. Panaitescu, *Viața feudală*, București 1957, pp. 33, 38.

⁶¹ V. Mihordea, *Relațiile agrare...*, p. 271.

⁶² F. Constantiniu, *Relațiile agrare din țara Românească în secolul al XVIII-lea*, București 1972, pp. 96, 201.

⁶³ N. A. Mohov, *K voprosu o sootnošenii zemledelija i skotovodstva v ekonomike Moldavii XIV - XVIII vv.*, "Ežegodnik po agrarnoj istorii Vostočnoj Evropy", (henceforward "Ežegodnik"), 1960 (1962), p. 107.

vation was less important than breeding.⁶⁴ It is difficult to judge whether it is true that boyar landowners developed a relatively stronger corn economy than church landowning bodies. After all, the provisioning of monasteries must have been on a considerable scale.⁶⁵

Breeding constituted an autonomous branch of production, not a service in respect of farming. It was a very extensive form of breeding, though some authors emphasize that it was a settled one which means that *transhumance* included the breeding stock, not the population. It consisted in the movement of herds to the mountains or uplands in summer.⁶⁶ Breeding was developed both on peasant farms and on the lord's demesne as indicated by the fact of the universally imposed obligation of cutting and harvesting hay for the squire.⁶⁷ Of little importance are probably the observations made by foreign travellers and quoted by some scholars.⁶⁸ Some light is shed on this question by the information that at the end of the 16th century the Moldavian hospodar received 65,670 sheep as *goștina*; this means that altogether there must have been more than 650,000.⁶⁹ At the end of the 18th century Moldavia was supposed to have supplied Constantinople with 200 - 300 thousand sheep a year.⁷⁰ Sheep, oxen and pigs were the main items of Rumanian export during a long period.⁷¹

Why did the peasants prefer to engage in animal husbandry than in corn growing and did breeding have an impact on the country's agrarian structure? Probably the reason lay in the level of the productive forces. The primitive farming technique resulted in poor crops. On the other hand the sparsely populated Rumanian lands had plenty of space for grazing cattle and sheep. It

⁶⁴ S. Papacostea, *Oltenia sub stăpînirea austriacă (1718 - 1739)*, București 1971, p. 67.

⁶⁵ V. Mihordea, *Relațiile agrare ...*, p. 70.

⁶⁶ P. Panaitescu, in *Viața feudală ...*, pp. 15, 18; N. A. Mohov, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁶⁷ V. Mihordea, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁶⁸ P. Panaitescu, *op. cit.*, p. 22 (after Paul of Aleppo); cf. S. Columbeanu, *op. cit.*, pp. 93 - 102.

⁶⁹ N. A. Mohov, *op. cit.*, p. 90 (the author has not elucidated the proportion of the *goștina* to the level of breeding).

⁷⁰ P. Panaitescu, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

⁷¹ G. Penelea, *Les foires de la Valachie pendant la période 1774 - 1848*, București 1973, pp. 76, 98; V. Mihordea, *Maîtres du sol ...*, pp. 42 - 43 (based on travellers' accounts).

should also be noted that the herds as chattels could be more easily than sowing hidden from the sharp eyes of the fiscal authorities, as well as during the disturbances and hostilities. It was easier to organise an escape or even to settle abroad. Possibly, animal husbandry made easier the Wallachian colonisation which covered great spaces beyond the Rumanian borders.

It was certainly due to animal husbandry that the common use of land survived longer in Rumania than would have been possible in the case of farming *sensu stricto*. Certainly breeding lessened the demand for consumer grain, influenced the form of the feudal rent, both the services and the tribute in kind, and even the forms of resistance to the feudal exploitation.⁷² Not to mention the whole sphere of the way of life, customs and mores of the peasant population connected with stock breeding and shepherding.

The cultivation of vineyards and the production of wine were the most important other occupations of the Rumanian peasants. The Rumanian feudal lords early obtained the monopoly of wine sales to their own serfs; the Porte was not interested in the supplies of wine to the followers of the Prophet, so the Turkish monopoly did not hamper the production for sale.⁷³ The feudal lords, both secular and spiritual (monasteries) obtained wine from two sources: own production and tribute. Some monasteries in Moldavia and Wallachia owned extensive vineyards stretching over hundreds of acres and earned considerable sums of money from the sale of surpluses left after meeting their own consumption.⁷⁴ Altogether, the money income obtained from this source was often higher than from the sale of corn (own or tithal) and animals taken together, despite the use of hired labour in the vineyards which meant considerable financial outlay.⁷⁵ Wallachian wine (this name seems to have denoted also Moldavian wines) were exported to Poland, Russia, Transylvania and even — probably only

⁷² Taxes on livestock raising have been listed by N. A. Mohov, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁷³ Cf. *Istoria României*, vol. II, Bucureşti 1962, p. 830.

⁷⁴ S. Columbeanu, *op. cit.*, p. 104 - 105.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 106 - 120.

sporadically — to Hungary.⁷⁶ Transport proceeded overland. The conquest of Bukovina by Austria in 1775, stopped the export of Moldavian wines to Poland.⁷⁷

Bee-keeping was done, first and foremost, on the landlord's farm, especially on church estates, for peasants had to pay the tithe twice for bee-keeping — to the landowner and to the state. Honey and wax were export articles both to Turkey and to central and East-European countries. The bee-keeping methods were rather primitive.⁷⁸

There are really no data which would help determine what part of the population engaged in grain cultivation and what part in breeding and grazing ; nor is it possible to establish the relation of cultivated fields to the total surface of the country. Even as late as the mid-19th century, the lands destined for breeding, i.e. pastures and meadows were said to exceed twice the fields under crops. Rumanian historians are right when they note the numerous mentions in documents since the middle of the 16th century about the clearings (*laz, curătură, séciuri, etc.*) which are to be interpreted as an indication of the accretion of cultivated fields and breeding-grounds.⁷⁹

Contrary to many countries in Central and Eastern Europe, in Rumania the state intervened into the relations between the peasant and the lord. The many attempts at establishing and regulating peasants' obligations were one form of this intervention. Two categories of hospodar regulations in this field should be distinguished: (i) detailed and (ii) general.

⁷⁶ M. A. Peljach, *Vinogradarstwo i vinodelie v moldavskom feodalnom gosudarstve*, "Ežegodnik", 1964 (1966), pp. 304 - 305 (after D. Cante-mir).

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 309 - 311.

⁷⁸ S. Columbeanu, *op. cit.*, pp. 103 - 104 ; V. Mihordea, *Relațiile agrare ...*, pp. 34 - 35.

⁷⁹ Cf. *Istoria României*, vol. II, p. 827. Lately, S. Olteanu (*Les pays roumains à l'époque de Michel le Brave*, București 1975, pp. 24 - 27) has pointed, in a general way, to some progress in agriculture in Rumanian lands at the end of the 16th century : increase in the area under cultivation, number of mills, the appearance of plough with iron coulter.

Ad (i). They were the result of the appeals to the hospodar in disputes about services. There were an untold number of them, often of strictly local and particular character.⁸⁰

Ad (ii). These were regulations of a general nature, establishing the size of the services e.g. regulations issued in 1740, 1741, 1742, 1745, 1749, 1755, 1756, 1766, 1768, 1778, 1780 (*Pravilničiasca Con-dica*). They all exhibit the tendency towards a uniformity of services probably in order to prevent flights of the peasant population. If that was so, then they would be of similar importance as the famous resolution of the Toruń Sejm in Poland, passed in 1520, which introduced one day of serf-labour a week as standard. The frequency of the prince's regulations may be evidence of their small impact in practice. They never exceeded the maximum of 24 days a year. So it can be generally accepted that up to the third quarter of the 18th century the development of serf-labour in Rumania remained in the initial stage and did not indicate any tendency of the feudal class to establish their own farms growing corn for sale.⁸¹

Certain facts in the last quarter of the 18th century pointed to changes in the development of the agrarian relations in Rumania. It should be remembered that this was a time of considerable livening up of the economy in the region of the Black Sea. At the same time the treaties of Kutchuk Kainardji in 1774, improved the conditions of the Rumanian supplies to Turkey, thus creating incentives for the production of corn for sale. This should have increased the demand for labour on the master's farms. Yet the number of service days did not change much. The upper limit of boyar demands stopped at 24 days a year, in Moldavia at 36. Despite this, Rumanian historians conclude that from the end of the

⁸⁰ F. Constantiniy, *Relațiile agrare...*, pp. 149, 152, 189; idem, *Quelques aspects de la politique agraire des Phanariotes*, RRH, vol. IV, 1965, No. 4, pp. 672-673; V. Mihordea, *Maitres du sol...*, pp. 174, 210, 211, 213; idem, *Relațiile agrare...*, pp. 153, 156, 219; G. I. Brătianu, *Dovă veacuri de la reforma lui Constantino Mavrocordato 1746-1946*, București, 1947, p. 71.

⁸¹ V. Mihordea, *Relațiile agrare...*, pp. 149-158; idem, *Maitres du sol...*, pp. 96-97; J. C. Ciubotariy, *Așezămintele agrare moldovenești 1766-1832*, "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie", A. D. Xenopol, Jași vol. V, 1968, pp. 87-120 — the author gives a not very systematic review of orders concerning villein service, issued by hospodars and other persons in settling conflicts between the peasants and the masters.

18th century villein service—not the tithe—became the principal basis of the feudal lords' income from farming. It is easier to apply this conclusion to a later period, between the Organic Regulation of 1831 and the enfranchisement reforms of 1864.⁸²

The well-known statement by K. Marx on the villeinage of the Rumanian peasants, which constituted the main tribute paid to the ruling class, and on the devouring hunger for additional work, felt by the boyars, referred to precisely that period.⁸³

It seems that the exploitation of the Rumanian peasants by the feudal class was much lower than in many other neighbouring countries, where villein service amounted to up to 4 - 5 days a week, besides fees in kind and money. Yet, the economic status of the Rumanian peasants was very low and caused desertion abroad. This state of affairs was, to a large extent, due to the simultaneous exploitation by the state in the form of centralized rent.⁸⁴ As mentioned earlier, the existence of the centralised rent caused that the Rumanian peasant had not ceased to be the subject of the ruling prince, was subordinated to his jurisdiction and could appeal to him in disputes with his lord. Free peasants were allowed to own land, but payments to the state were a heavy fiscal burden. For instance, according to approximate estimates, in 18th-century Moldavia the ratio of the manor rent to the centralised one was 1 : 6, sometimes even 1 : 8.⁸⁵ The state could enforce payment in a more severe way than the feudal lords. The village community was responsible for the regular payment of taxes and any kind of services for the state.⁸⁶ Their peak came in the 18th century.

⁸² F. Constantiniy (*Relațiile agrare ...*, pp. 173 - 174) remarks that the attempts at organising own manorial farms may indicate the wish of the owners to exercise their influence on economic decisions and, consequently, on the size and structure of grain crops; cf. A. Oțetea, *Le second asservissement des paysans roumains 1746 - 1821*, "Nouvelles Etudes d'Histoire," București (heceforward NEH), vol. I, 1955, pp. 304 - 312.

⁸³ Cf. A. Oțetea, *op. cit.*, pp. 328, 341.

⁸⁴ A terrible picture of the Rumanian peasant's life is contained in the letter by the boyar Golesso of 1826, quoted by M. Emerit, *Les paysans roumains depuis le traité d'Adrianople jusqu'à la libération des Turcs (1829 - 1864)*, Paris 1937, pp. 47 - 48.

⁸⁵ A general description of peasants' obligations to the state is given by P. G. Dmitriev, *Turecko-fanariotskij gnet i ego vlijanie na genezis kapitalizma v krest'janskom hozjajstve Moldavii II pol. XVIII v.*, "Ežegodnik," 1964, pp. 446 - 447, 450.

⁸⁶ See V. Costăchel in *Viața feudală ...*, p. 98; H. H. Stahl, *Les anciennes communautés villageoises roumaines*, București 1969, p. 53.

We shall not record here the evolution of the views on the meaning and significance of the legislation enacted by the hospod-ad Constantine Maurocordato in 1746 for Wallachia, and 1749 for Moldavia, which freed the population bonded in villeinage.⁸⁷ It can probably be assumed that it was a concession to the peasants, which was deemed indispensable in view of the financial needs of the state which was being increasingly burdened by the exigencies of Turkey, and also because of the growing needs of the ruling prince and the feudal class. The point was that in the time preceding the issuing of those laws, peasants fled *en masse* abroad thus reducing the number of tax-payers. The two laws were aimed not only at the prevention of desertion but also at encouraging the fugitive to return. Moreover, various categories of the population were made equal with regard to services to the overlord (*vecini, rumâni*). Did all this change the position of the peasants in any significant way? ⁸⁸ Emancipation was not linked to granting land property, nor with enfranchisement from services and — it seems — did not introduce any vital changes into the organisation of the feudal dominium in Rumania. The liberated groups of population gradually merged into the single category of villeins (*ciâcași*) and assumed a new form of dependence: secondary serfdom.⁸⁹

In the development of the lord's demesne two periods can be easily distinguished: from the middle of the 15th century to the treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji (1774), and a later one, up to the enfranchisement reforms. In the first period, the demesne must not be identified with farming and corn growing. It included, besides ploughland, pastures, meadows, woods, vineyards, vegetable gardens, mills, fulling mills, distilleries, sawmills, taverns and even market stalls.⁹⁰ The origin of the demesne is quite clear, its

⁸⁷ D. Dragnev, *Agrarnoe zakonodatel'stvo K. Maurocordato*, "Ežegodnik," 1961 (1963), pp. 252-261. V. Mihordea (*Relațiile agrare...*, p. 25) agrees with him; F. Constantiniy, *Quelques aspects...*, pp. 667-688.

⁸⁸ F. Constantiniy, *Relațiile agrare...*, pp. 95, 111-113, 129-142.

⁸⁹ A. Oțetea, *op. cit.*, pp. 299 sq.; *idem*, *Le second servage dans les Principautés Danubiennes (1831-1864)*, NEH, vol. II, 1960, pp. 325 sq.

⁹⁰ In relation to forests the demesne covered not only hunting but also the full exploitation of forest resources. See V. Costachel, *Unele considerații privind rezerva seniorială în Țara Românească și Moldova în sec. XV*, "Analele Universității C. J. Parhon," *Istorie* No. 21 (1961), pp. 26, 30-31.

purpose was to increase the overlord's income. Anyway, it was not something peculiar to Rumania, but could be found anywhere in Europe. In the period under survey trading done on those lands consisted not so much in selling the surplus of own production as in profits from monopolies. The manorial monopolies ultimately developed only in the 18th century and included: taverns, and so also the sale of wines and spirits, mills (only water mills?), fulling mills, bridges, fishing in manorial waters, bread ovens, the provisioning of serfs with meat and groceries.⁹¹ We do not know whether all these monopolies of the feudal class had spread over the whole territory of the two Rumanian principalities. The records of revenues of Wallachian monasteries of 1739 (49 monasteries) and 1740 (53 monasteries) indicate the role of monopolies in the structure of the overlord's income: 59.8 per cent and 61.2 per cent respectively were obtained from the sale of wines and spirits, and 25.9 and 25.2 per cent respectively from the sale of grain and livestock. In absolute figures, the sums were not large: they fluctuated between 459 - 600 thalers a year.⁹²

The transformation of the demesne into commercial estates came later, in the 19th century, as a matter of fact. In 1828, the principle was formulated, and later incorporated in the Organic Regulation of 1831, that one-third of the land was to belong to the overlord and two-thirds to the peasants. Probably, it was just a formal principle which was not always followed in practice.⁹³

Another interesting phenomenon was the leasing of estates which became general in Rumania from the end of the 18th century. This may mean that the feudal class was not interested in farming and preferred careers in the civil service. F. Constantiniu sees this as an effect of the westernisation of the Rumanian boyars. The new way of life required financial means of which

⁹¹ V. Mihordea, *Relațiile agrare...*, pp. 213 - 214, 253, 256; S. Columbeanu, *Grandes exploitations...*, pp. 123 - 142.

⁹² S. Columbeanu, *Date privitoare la economia agrară din țara Românească în prima jumătate a sec. al XVIII-lea*, SR, vol. XV, 1962, No. 1, pp. 111 - 134; idem, *Grandes exploitations...*, p. 152.

⁹³ Cf. I. C. Filitti, *Proprietatea solului în Principatele Române până la 1864*, București 1934, p. XIV; see A. Oțetea, *Considerații asupra trecerii de la feudalism la capitalism în Moldova și Țara Românească*, "Studii și Materiale, de Istorie Medie," vol. IV, 1960, pp. 327, 330.

a lease assured a permanent and steady supply.⁸⁴ It seems, however, that the origin of this phenomenon was not so simple. In Poland it emerged much earlier, at the end of the 16th century and has not been properly studied so far. It should not be forgotten that leasing an estate meant the giving up of part of the income in favour of the tenant; moreover, the temporary holder could ruin the estate.

Another question arising in this connection is whether there existed a free corn market in the Rumanian principalities in the period up to the 18th century. Such a question seems natural in view of the existing Turkish monopoly in corn and the slight degree of the country's urbanisation. Do the sums recorded in monacal accounts as income from corn sales indicate the existence of a corn market? They were small sums, a few score thalers a year; we do not know whether they came from free sales or had been paid in by the prince's treasury for obligatory deliveries to Turkey. It seems that the urban communities had difficulties in getting food supplies. This seems to be indicated by the existence of municipal villages under municipal law which were bound to supply agricultural produce at current prices. Also, at least part of the shepherd population probably purchased corn as the natural conditions did not always favour the growing of grain in mountainous areas and in the foothills where breeding and pastures were mainly concentrated. It would be reasonable to suppose that it was only the restriction of the Turkish monopoly after 1774, and its final abolition in 1829 as well as the general economic livening up which in the last quarter of the 18th century included the Black Sea coast, together with the growth in demand for corn in Western Europe — that all this created conditions favourable to the development of corn growing in Rumania both for the home market and for export abroad.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ F. Constantiniy, *Relațiile agrare...*, pp. 188 - 189.

⁸⁵ J. S. Grosul, N. A. Mohov, P. V. Sovetov (*Osobennosti perehoda ot feodalizma k kapitalizmu na jugo-vostoke Evropy*, "Voprosy Istorii," 1965, No. 11, p. 62) emphasize the existence of two zones in European countries under the Turkish rule: the Balkan countries and the Danubian principalities. The authors draw attention to the many similarities between the second zone and the countries of Eastern and Central Europe.

*

The lands of the two Rumanian principalities are considered a transition zone between the Balkan zone under the Turkish occupation, and Hungary and Transylvania where the agrarian relations were more like those in the other countries of the Hungarian Crown. The fact that during a long period, animal husbandry and grazing were the main occupation of the people, not farming i.e. corn growing, was a specific feature of the agrarian relations in Rumanian territories. Access to foreign markets was closed by the Turkish monopoly in agricultural produce and, partly, in animals. This explains the slight, almost negligible importance of the manorial commercial farms — and, thus, of the service rent — during many centuries similarly as in the lands south of the Danube under the Turkish rule. The Rumanian feudal class lacked economic incentives for the development of commodity production. Its economic activeness was mainly limited to the exploitation of feudal monopolies which gave it considerable economic benefits. This was the reason for the prevalence there of the rent in kind (tithe).⁹⁶ The country's political situation and the liabilities in respect of the Turkish state caused the strong development of the centralised rent which became a very painful form of exploitation of the rural population. It was only the gradual loosening of the dependence of the Rumanian principalities on Turkey, the simultaneous development of demand for agricultural produce, and the general economic livening up of the Black Sea zone, that caused the agrarian relations in Rumanian lands to become more like those which had just fallen into obsolescence in Central and Eastern Europe.

⁹⁶ F. Braudel, in the first edition of his outstanding work, *La Méditerranée et le Monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, Paris 1949, p. 642, pointed to a certain parallelism between the export of corn from Baltic countries to Western Europe and export from Balkan countries and Rumania to Constantinople. In both cases this large export was said to have caused similar effects such as the attachment of peasants to the land in Poland and Russia, and in the Rumanian principalities. This view of Braudel's had been endorsed by O. L. Barkan, a Turkish historian, and by some Rumanian historians. However, both in Rumanian and Soviet literature Braudel's opinion in respect of Rumanian lands has been refuted, the authors arguing that their commercial production of cereals was unimportant up to the early 19th century, and was secondary to animal hus-

III. THE BALKAN COUNTRIES UNDER TURKISH RULE

The Turkish conquest of Slavonic countries on the Balkan peninsula occurred in the hundred years between 1393 and 1496 : Bulgaria fell in 1393 - 1395, Serbia in 1459, Bosnia in 1463, Herzegovina in 1482, Zeta (Montenegro) in 1496. This disrupted the hitherto social and economic development process of those lands not only by incorporating them into a foreign political organism, but also by imposing the equally foreign forms of Turkish military feudalism. The significance of the Turkish conquest for the destiny of the defeated nations has been variously assessed by historians. Lately, the Bulgarian historian N. Todorov has firmly opposed the earlier opinions, which exaggerated the consequences of the conquest as a prolonged economic disaster. According to Todorov, the Turkish conquest did not stop the economic development of the Bulgarian towns.⁹⁷ The breakdown came later.

The Turkish state, lusting for conquests, needed enormous material means to wage wars. They were to be supplied by the conquered countries. The new agrarian system was to serve this pur-

bandry and wine production. Moreover, the compulsory deliveries of cereals and animals to Constantinople at prices imposed by the customer could not have the same economic and social results as free trading. In the second edition of his book (Paris vol. I, 1966, p. 528), F. Braduel indirectly acknowledged the arguments of his opponents by saying that the Rumanian lowlands "have very early been excluded from the Mediterranean circuit : Constantinople's huge stomach monopolized them for itself". The outcome of this polemic — though it should have aroused no doubts from its very beginning — is quite vital to the assessment of the development of agrarian relations in the Rumanian principalities : it was not parallel to that of the majority of the countries "east of the Elbe". The fundamental difference lies in the fact that the compulsory deliveries of corn to Constantinople did not induce the local feudal class to be economically active and to develop commercial farming. The Rumanian feudal class did not obtain profits comparable to those of the feudal lords in countries where export assumed the form of free trading.

⁹⁷ N. Todorov, *Balkanskijat grad XV - XIX vek*, Sofia 1972, pp. 19, 30, 50 - 54, 428 - 429 ; cf. M. Małowist, *op. cit.*, pp. 352 - 357. *Ikonomikata na B'ulgarija do socialističeskata Revoljucija*, ed. Natan Žak et al., Sofia 1969, devoted only 124 pages or 18 per cent of the text to the period of the Turkish domination. This part of the book was written by B. Cvetkova and S. C onev. We have reviewed this book in "Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych," (Poznań), vol. XXIV, 1975, pp. 166 - 170. F. Braduel has remarked on the "neglect" of the Turkish occupation in the historiography of Balkan countries, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 112. However, there is no lack of monographs devoted to that period.

pose, too. It was a feudal system under which the members of the ruling class received payment in the form of income from land or other sources in exchange for military service or other functions in the service of the state. The native feudal class — those who had survived the raids and conquests — was deprived of material foundations. More of them survived in Bosnia and Herzegovina and gradually underwent Islamisation. The monasteries came off rather better for they obtained exemption from obligations towards the state.⁹⁸

The stabilisation of the new political relations, and particularly the removal of the hostilities to other territories, created objective conditions for the development of the Balkan lands which merged into one large economic zone. The Turkish war machine needed not only foodstuffs but also industrial production. Thanks to this the conditions became favourable to the development of towns and trading. The deepening social division of labour created good prospects for internal trade. The sparsely populated empire needed people and possibly this is the explanation of the relatively good status of peasants in the Balkans at the beginning of the Turkish rule. The Balkan countries, though, unlike Hungary, did not constitute a foreground of the theatre of war, could be considered its deep hinterland, the basis of army provisioning.

Some historians trace the origins of the Turkish agrarian and legal system to the principles of the Koran: all the lands belong to Allah but the Caliph disposes of them. Nobody could be granted possession of land. The feudal land tenure was that of temporary fief (*timār*) destined for the upkeep of the holder. *Per analogiam* to the European medieval relations the *timār* could be likened to the conditional fief called *beneficium*. In some ways *timār* resembles the Russian *pomestje*, well known in the 16th century. The fief holders were the sultan's horsemen known as *sīpāhīs*, otherwise knights, equites. Yet private property (*mülk*) did not quite vanish. There were small estates enjoying the right of inheritance

⁹⁸ B. Cvetkova, *K'm v'prosa za klasovite različija v b'lgarskoto obščestvo prez epohata na turskoto vladicestvo*, "Istoričeski Pregled," Sofia (henceforward IP), vol. VIII, 1950, No. 2, pp. 166 - 174; A. E. Vacalopoulos, *Traits communs du développement économique et social des peuples balkaniques et du Sud-Est Européen à l'époque ottomane*, "Balkan Studies," vol. XVI, 1975, No. 1, pp. 155 - 159.

and alienation. They usually included buildings, orchards, vineyards, small farming plots. The members of the ruling dynasty and high state dignitaries managed to accumulate considerable private properties. The exchange of *mülk* land for *vakif* or pious foundation with the reservation of part of the income for the founder, his descendants and relatives constituted a form of assuring income to the heirs and protection against confiscation. In some countries, *vakiflar* were very numerous and survived the Turkish rule.⁹⁹

The holders of *timārs* were entitled to certain income. Bulgarian historians have drawn attention to the existence of *timārs* the revenues of which came, to considerable extent, from market fees and tariffs, customs dues or simply from taxes. They can be described as urban *timārs*. The holders were not exclusively revenue collectors since they exercised a certain authority over the inhabitants. This is of great importance for the understanding of the new agrarian system.¹⁰⁰

The incomes of the *sīpāhīs* were made up of the rent collected from the population and of their own farms called *hassa çiftlik*. These were not large or else there were not any. Probably they were mostly the equivalent of a peasant farmstead. Besides tilling land, they included vineyards, fishing ponds, mills, orchards, gardens. They were cultivated with "own oxen" or by sharecroppers (*ispoldži*) bound to pay half their income to the lord. They could also be leased to peasants on the same conditions as other farms. In such cases the difference between *hassa çiftlik* and the rest of the *timār* would disappear.¹⁰¹

The system of *timārs* came to its peak in the 15th century. A sui generis legalisation of it as a bounding system came during the rule of Mehmed II, the Conqueror (1451 - 1481). This primitive system did not favour the development of productive forces in agriculture. Generally speaking, historians agree that it began

⁹⁹ V. P. Mutafčieva, *Agrarnite otnošenija v Osmanskata imperija prez XV - XVI v.*, Sofia 1962, p. 88; M. Begovič, *Vakufi u Jugoslaviji*, Beograd 1963, pp. 54 - 57.

¹⁰⁰ V. P. Mutafčieva, *Sur le caractere du timar ottoman*, "Acta orientalia," vol. IX, 1959, No. 1, p. 57.

¹⁰¹ R. Veselinovič, *Vojvodina, Srbija i Makedonija pod turskom vlašću u II pol. XVII v.*, Novisad 1960, pp. 29 - 30.

to disintegrate at the end of the 16th century. Naturally, this does not mean the disintegration of feudalism or its crisis.¹⁰² According to the studies to date, there were two reasons for this: (i) the already mentioned economic livening up of towns which increased the demand for agricultural produce, and (ii) the decline of the money purchasing power, well known in Europe at the time. Thus the profitability of *timārs* diminished for it was assessed by the state in terms of money. At the same time the burdens towards the state increased because of wars with the Habsburgs and later with Poland. Both the position of the peasants (*raya*) and of the *sīpāhīs* worsened. There were also changes in the structure of the feudal class: the new overlords — let us call them the feudal aristocracy — obtained large enfeoffments called free *timārs* enjoying special rights.

The Turkish laws provided for the loss of a *timār* if the duty of military service had not been fulfilled. This made it easier for influential people to grab *timārs*. The state revenues were increasingly farmed out, especially from the middle of the 16th century. This applied to *timārs*, too. All this favoured the concentration of land in the hands of the feudal aristocracy, thus speeding up the disintegration of the *sīpāhī* system. The unsuccessful wars and defeats (1683) caused that in 1688 - 1689 and 1716 - 1718, war hostilities reached as far as Serbia with a wave of devastation and depopulation in its wake.¹⁰³

The peasant farm remained the basic or rather the only productive unit in agriculture. It was the *baština*, well known from the previous period. The local population retained a limited right to inherit land provided they discharged their obligations towards the feudal master (*sīpāhī*) and the state and systematically cultivated the land.¹⁰⁴

The burdensome Turkish exploitation hampered the development of productive forces in agriculture, and of production. For example, the author of a detailed account, H. Dernschwamm,

¹⁰² Cf. e.g. V. Čubrilović, *Oko proučavanja srednjevekovnog feudalizma*, "Istoriski Časopis," vol. III, 1952, pp. 187 - 203.

¹⁰³ B. Cvetkova, *Otkupna sistema v Osmanskata Imperija XVI - XVIII v.*, "Izvestija na Institutu za Istorija", Sofia (hereafter INI), vol. XI, 1960, No. 2, pp. 195 - 197 ff.

¹⁰⁴ K. Bastaić, *Timarsko vlasništvo u feudalnom sistemu osmanlijske Turske od XV do XVII st.*, Zagreb 1958, pp. 103 - 104.

a learned scholar from Leipzig university and a keen observer who in 1553 - 1555 travelled through Bulgaria with an embassy of Ferdinand I, along the line Niš—Sofia—Plovdiv—Adrianople, i.e. across the most fertile regions, was struck by the fact that the fertile lands were mostly neglected, overgrown with weeds, although there remained distinct traces of their previous cultivation. The author explained it by the exploitation on the part of the Turks, and particularly by the burdens imposed by the state. In the light of this account it seems correct to agree with Stefan Gerlach's note made during his travels in 1573 - 1578: "The Bulgarians cultivate only an area sufficient for their maintenance, in order to have their daily bread [...] The peasants say: if we cultivate more land, the Turks will take away the crops."¹⁰⁵

All the kinds of feudal rent were in use in the Balkan countries under the Turkish rule: its most important component part was the tithe which applied to all the crops and to all the branches of production in general. Actually, it could amount to 50 per cent of the harvest, because the state authorities often established its amount in accordance with general standards without concerning themselves with the actual state of production.¹⁰⁶ Tribute in kind was imposed on sheep raising: every twentieth beast; money fees on the breeding of pigs—because of the Koran. Besides, money fees were to be paid for all branches of production. There also existed the institution of manorial monopoly, including the sale of wines.¹⁰⁷ Payment in labour was slight because as a rule the sipāhīs, did not run their own farms; it was limited to a few days a year, most often in a vineyard. There were also transport and other services.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ H. Dernschwamm, *Dnevnik't ...*, Sofia 1970, pp. 24, 36 - 39, 44, 185 - 191, 194 - 195; S. Gerlach's account is quoted by Ž. Natan, *Ikonomičeska istorija na B'lgarija*, Sofia 1957, p. 96.

¹⁰⁶ B. Cvetkova, *Za stopanski oblik i za feodalnite zad'ženija na njakoi selišča v Rodopite*, "Rodopski Sbornik", vol. I, 1965, pp. 41 - 61; M. Mirić, *Ekonomski razvoj u Srbiju od doselenja Srba*, Zagreb 1939, p. 119.

¹⁰⁷ V. Mutafčieva, *Feodalnata renta ... v Osmanskata imperija črez XV - XVI v.*, INI, vol. VII, 1957, pp. 178 - 194; M. Sokoloski, *Prilog kon proučavanjeto na tursko-osmanskiot feudalni sistem ...*, "Glasnik na Institut za Nacionalna Istorija", (Skopje), vol. I, 1958, part 1, pp. 181 - 186.

¹⁰⁸ V. Mutafčieva, *op. cit.*, pp. 168 - 171; M. Mirić, *op. cit.*, p. 127; M. Sokoloski, *op. cit.*, p. 160; V. Vukosavljević, *Istorija seljačkog društva*, vol. I, Beograd 1953, p. 306 ff.

The non-Moslem population had to pay a poll tax to the state and various services such as transport, building, military, etc. Moreover, there was an extensive system of obligations and extraordinary tributes, particularly during wars: compulsory deliveries of food, cattle and other provisions. One of the forms of the state's availing itself of the feudal rent was the compulsory purchase of agricultural produce. Such being the case, it is difficult to answer the question: what part of his farming production had the peasant to give up both to the *sipāhī* and the state. V. Mutafčieva has, by way of exemplification, estimated it at one-third or one-half, and by the end of 16th century, even at four-fifths.¹⁰⁹ In the 16th century the custom began to spread of replacing fees in kind as well as labour by money payments. The growth of fiscalism increased the desertions of peasants. Empty timārs began to result.¹¹⁰ Yet, it should be noted that in Serbia, during the Austrian occupation (1718 - 1739), the burdens were much heavier than under the Turkish rule and the local population would flee across the border — to Turkey.¹¹¹

The question of serfdom and adscription is not clear and historians are of two opinions: (i) the peasant was attached to the land he lived on and was personally in bond to "his" *sipāhī*, and (ii) the peasant was personally free and could leave the farmstead.¹¹²

The followers of the first assertion refer to the juridical attachment of the peasant to the land, and in particular to the ordinances about the obligatory return of a fugitive peasant during a length of time determined by law, and applying even to the descendants of the fugitive ("the lamb belongs to the owner of the sheep").

¹⁰⁹ V. Mutafčieva, *Agrarnite otnošenija ...*, pp. 145, 244; according to M. Ninčić (*Istorija agrarno-pravnih odnosa srbskago težaka pod Turcima*, Beograd 1920, part 1, p. 31), in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina a "proportional" tribute (*harač*) was levied i.e. adapted to the yield of the soil; it did not, generally, exceed one-tenth of the yield.

¹¹⁰ V. Mutafčieva, *Agrarnite otnošenija ...*, p. 220; eadem, *Feodalnita renta ...*, pp. 169, 197.

¹¹¹ M. Mirić, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

¹¹² Ch. Christov, *Agrarnite otnošenija v Makedonija ...*, Sofia 1964, pp. 24 - 27; V. Mutafčieva, *Agrarnite otnošenija ...*, p. 187; M. Mirić, *op. cit.*, p. 112; this subject has been tackled by many authors.

N. Todorov has recently strongly attacked the thesis about adscription. Without denying the existence of legal provisions about the compulsory return of a fugitive, he emphasizes that the state was not interested in the full adscription of the peasant. It was enough if the land was cultivated and the rent came in regularly. The cases of compulsory return of fugitives were rare. In practice, it was impossible to carry it out. The author supports his assertion pointing to the strong inflow of the peasant population to towns.¹¹³ Turkish historians have gone even farther, O. L. Barkan asserting that in Turkey the peasant never lost his free status, and in result of conquests all peasants immediately would become free men. But even Barkan had to admit that a *raya* could not leave without his *sipāhi's* agreement and without paying the fees due. Lately, S. Divitçi-Oglu has asserted that the peasant was personally free and the principle of attachment to the feudal estate was not fulfilled. Among the Serbian historians, S. V. Vukosavl'evic has acknowledged the peasant's personal freedom and his freedom to leave the farm.¹¹⁴ It seems that it might be possible to reconcile these two opposing attitudes considering that the slight, or practically negligible economic active-ness of the feudal class caused the principle of adscription or rather attachment to the farm not to be carried out in full.¹¹⁵

Official sources seldom mention the economic situation of the peasant population. It is hard to say to what extent the reports of European travellers are reliable. The studies carried out by S. Dimitrov point to a differentiation in this respect: e.g., according to tax records concerning 50 hamlets in the district of Tirovno for the years 1690 - 1720, some 20 per cent of the peasants were farm labourers; nearly 5 per cent were unattached; only 5.5 per cent of the taxpayers have been assessed by the author

¹¹³ N. Todorov, *Sur quelques aspects du passage du féodalisme au capitalisme dans les territoires balkaniques de l'Empire Ottoman*, "Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes", vol. I, 1963, No. 1/2, p. 117; idem, *Sur certains aspects des villes balkaniques au cours des XV^e - XVI^e ss*, in: *Actes du XII^e Congrès International des études byzantines*, vol. II, Beograd 1964, pp. 230 - 231.

¹¹⁴ V. Vukosavl'evic, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 306.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Ch. Christov, *Agrarnite otnošenija . . .*, pp. 16, 23 - 24.

as belonging to a more prosperous group.¹¹⁶ In the opinion of J. Tadić, the social and economic position of the peasants—at least in the 16th century — was the same in all the Balkan countries under the Turkish rule. Balkan historians emphasize the worsening situation of the rural population from the end of the 16th century and connect it with the beginning of the disintegration of the Turkish military feudalism.

Thanks to F. Braudel's studies we know that the Mediterranean countries suffered from a lack of grain surpluses. This scholar has painted a suggestive picture of corn travelling between various countries of that region. As concerns the Balkan countries which interest us here, two zones can be easily distinguished: the Adriatic and the Black Sea. The dividing line could approximately be drawn along Ljubljana—Niš—Sofia—Salonica. Almost all the fertile lands to the north-east and east of this line belong to the Black or Aegean Sea basin. The rest — mountainous areas difficult to cultivate — lie in the Adriatic zone. It was an area depending on the import of grain, both because of the harsh natural conditions and the primitive farming methods; an area more fit for livestock raising and grazing than land cultivation. In addition, the Dalmatian coast controlled by Venice was relatively well urbanised and was near the big Venetian market. As is known, at times the Venetian republic experienced considerable food shortages. The busy and prosperous Dubrovnik republic was in a similar, and even more difficult situation, compelled as it was to meet two-thirds of its demand with imports mostly from the Aegean Sea region but also from other Balkan countries and even Italy. Information about the export of grain from Dubrovnik seems less reliable. It could have been re-export because the merchants there had obtained permissions from the Turkish authorities for the purchase of considerable quantities of corn, and also used to buy it despite the valid Turkish ban.¹¹⁷ The export of

¹¹⁶ S. Dimitrov, P. Stojkov, *Socialna diferencijacija sred seljačstvo v Trnovsko k'm kraja na XVII i načaloto na XVIII v.*, INI, vol. XIV/XV w., 1964, pp. 187 - 189.

¹¹⁷ F. W. Carter, *The Commerce of the Dubrovnik Republic, 1500 - 1700* "The Economic History Review," II Series, vol. XXIV, 1971, No. 3, p. 388; M. Aymard, *Venise, Raguse et le commerce du blé pendant la seconde moitié du XVI^e s.*, Paris 1966, pp. 40 - 41 (map); F. Braudel, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 528 - 529, 537 - 538; M. Malowist, *op. cit.*, pp. 212 - 214, 363; unfortunately, we could not make use of: R. Paci, *La "Scala" di Spalato*

corn from the mouth of the river Neretva in the neighbourhood of the port of Plače also seems uncertain as Bosnia was not a country with a profitable balance of trade.¹¹⁸ On the other hand, it seems that Albania had some surpluses, all the more so as she was exempt from supplying corn to Constantinople. It was probably the Turkish owners of large vassal estates in that region that supplied corn to the market. During the maritime wars, merchants from Dubrovnik managed to import corn — probably by caravan routes — from the distant valleys of the Sava and the Drava.¹¹⁹ The inhabitants of poor Montenegro looked for corn in distant Wallachia and even Moldavia.¹²⁰

All this points to great difficulties in provisioning experienced in the Adriatic zone of the Balkan peninsula. And what about the Black Sea region which was rich in fertile lands? The degree of urbanisation in those areas was low; according to N. Todorov's estimates, the urban population amounted to some 8 per cent. This does not include the capital of Istanbul, a very populous city in the 16th century. The supplying of the capital was a serious problem for the government which would organise compulsory deliveries even from the outlying Rumanian lands.¹²¹ In this connection, beginning in the mid-16th century, the Turkish authorities issued severe bans on the export of corn abroad. They were not always effective, particularly in the zone of the Aegean Sea, and Greece became, from the mid-16th century to the 18th century, a big corn exporter.¹²² The export from Bulgaria by sea was slight: only Varna, which sometimes obtained permission from the sultan, could be used for this purpose.¹²³

e il commercio veneziano nei Balcani fra cinque e seicenti, Venezia 1971.

¹¹⁸ B. Hrabak, *Izvoz žitarica iz Bosne i Hercegovine u Primorje od kraja XIII do poč. XVII v.*, "Godišnjak Društva Istoričara Bosne i Hercegovine," vol. XIV, 1964, pp. 123, 138, 195; M. Aymard, *op. cit.*, p. 144; F. Braudel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 262-264; J. Tadič, *L'unité économique des Balkans et la Méditerranée à l'époque moderne*, "Studia Historiae Oeconomicae," (Poznań), vol. II, 1968, p. 40.

¹¹⁹ M. Aymard, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

¹²⁰ B. Cvetkova in *B'lgarsko-rumynski vr'zki i otnošenija*, vol. I, Sofia 1965, p. 114.

¹²¹ N. Todorov, *Balkanskiyat grad...*, p. 30; M. Malowist, *op. cit.*, pp. 217-316.

¹²² M. Aymard, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47, 125.

¹²³ For the last time in 1551, according to M. Aymard (*op. cit.*, p. 46); cf. map in this author's book, p. 40-41.

The local trading between the rural areas and the towns was not easy because of the numerous internal customs duties and tolls, the privileges of the great feudal lords and state monopolies. But the many legal provisions are evidence of the growing role of the home market.¹²⁴ Where did the corn deliveries to the market come from? The timār common holders could supply the tithe corn and the privileged holders of the free timārs grain from their own farms. M. Aymard has quoted several examples. According to him, the peasant deliveries in the Adriatic zone, ceased in the middle of the 16th century, which does not seem to be clear enough.¹²⁵ Recently, the Greek historian Sp. I. Asdrachas, has tried to calculate the commodity production of peasant farms in the Balkans on the basis of fairly widely dispersed material. The results prompt some reservations because the author has assumed a very low own consumption of under 200 kg of corn per head a year. Anyway, his calculations are of a rather theoretical nature.¹²⁶ Of course, the fact that peasants sold corn should not arouse any doubts. This was a vital necessity irrespective of whether their own needs were or were not satisfied.

Contrary to F. Braudel, it can be assumed that the Black Sea had not been cut off from the West by the Turks either completely or durably,¹²⁷ while the Danube became a brisk trade route — in both directions. Also some of its tributaries became important inland waterways, such as the Sava, Drava and Morava. This is indicated by the statutes granted by the Turkish authorities to riverine ports and landing stages. Belgrade became a large inland port, particularly after 1541, when it ceased to be a frontier fort; it was an important centre of supplies for the Turkish army. Probably part of the military supplies found its way to the market. The amounts were not large but the fact itself points to the huge

¹²⁴ B. Cvetkova, *Prinos k'm izučavaneto na turskija feodaliz'm*, INI, vol. V, 1954, pp. 106 - 107; Ch. Christov, *Agrarnite otnošenija ...*, p. 27; N. Filipović, *Pogled na osmanski feudalizam*, "Godišnjak," vol. IV, 1952, pp. 145 - 146.

¹²⁵ M. Aymard, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 - 51.

¹²⁶ Sp. I. Asdrachas, *Aux Balkans du XVe s. : Producteurs directs et marché*, "Etudes Balkaniques," vol. VI, Sofia 1970, No. 3, p. 37. The author assumes a yield of three grains out of one.

¹²⁷ F. Braudel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 104 - 105.

demand for corn.¹²⁸ On the lower Danube, Braila was a big handling port to which sea-borne cargoes were brought.¹²⁹ For instance, in 1673 and 1674, the imperial envoy, J. Ch. von Khindsberg, noticed a big traffic of ships on the lower Danube, on the border of Dobrudja (Isakcea, now Černavoda), which delivered supplies for the army from Hungary, Serbia, Wallachia and Bulgaria.¹³⁰ From Macedonia and south Serbia, exports went through Salonika; from the regions east of the river Struma — through the port of Kavala or overland to Adrianople; from southern Bulgaria by the river Maritsa.¹³¹

The question of the price revolution, much emphasized by F. Braudel¹³² has recently been extensively studied by L. Berov. He has found that the prices of agricultural produce (mainly of wheat) rose at the turn of the 16th century. According to him, the peasants did not profit by this rise because of the simultaneous rise of the feudal burdens and the prices for artisan products. It may be assumed that the movement of prices contributed to an increase in corn trade irrespective of whether it was a consequence of the price revolution in countries of the Western and Central Europe or of reasons independent of it. It should be remembered that the Turkish empire was, in a sense, a world of its own. Did the "price revolution" really accelerate the disintegration of feudalism in Balkan lands?¹³³ We shall better leave the answer to more competent authors.

On the other hand, one of the factors of the disintegration of feudal relations in the agricultural economy of Balkan countries was certainly the *çiflik* or big commercial farm on which the owner — or rather holder — did not personally work but where

¹²⁸ B. Hrabak, *Beograd kao žitno tržište i žitarstvo šire Beogradske okoline u XVI v.*, "Godišnjak Muzeja Grada Beograd," vol. IV, 1957. pp. 59 - 67.

¹²⁹ R. Samardžić, *Belgrade, centre économique de la Turquie du Nord au XVI^e s.* in: *La ville balkanique XV^e - XIX^e ss.*, Sofia 1970, pp. 37 - 39; I. Erdel'janović, P. T. Nikolić, *Trgovački centri i putevi pa srpskoj zeml'i*, Beograd 1899, p. 235.

¹³⁰ M. Ionov, *Die bulgarischen Länder vor 300 Jahren im Spiegel der Tagebücher von Johann Chr. von Khindsperg (1672 - 1674)*, Sofija 1973, p. 364.

¹³¹ J. Tadić, *op. cit.*, pp. 34 - 35; M. Aymard, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 - 41 (map), 45.

¹³² F. Braudel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 468 - 471.

¹³³ L. Berov, *Dviženieto na cenite na Balkanite prez XVI - XIX v i evropejskata revolucija na cenite*, Sofia 1976, pp. 172 - 180 and passim.

he organised production and collected the revenue. The Balkan *çiftlik* differed from the manorial farm in the meaning of the term accepted in Western and Central Europe; it grew not from the *hassa çiftlik*, mentioned earlier, and the *sîpâhîs* — except in Albania — were neither his founders nor users. The founders of *çiftlik*s (*çiftlik sahibîya*) were usually officials, merchants, usurers, the military, suppliers to the state, later janissaries, even institutions such as monasteries and Orthodox churches. They were formed as a result of the concentration of lands within a *timâr* by way of buying out or the economic ruination of peasants, plain robbery or the occupation of wastelands. Thus a class of enterprising *çiftlik sahibîya* emerged, who became a new factor of the exploitation of peasants. In principle, they retained the difference between what they got from the peasants working on a *çiftlik* and what they gave the *sîpâhî* in virtue of his rights as a *timâr*' holder. In some cases *çiftlik*s were quite large up to several hundred hectares. Beside tilling land they could also raise stock and engage in bee-keeping and milling.¹³⁴

The first information about the new type *çiftlik*s appeared at the end of the 16th century (in Bosnia apparently since the end of the 15th century) — although the many meanings of the term *çiftlik* may suggest some doubts in the interpretation. Anyway, Bulgarian historians emphasized the existence of a large number of *çiftlik*s in the 17th century.¹³⁵ It is difficult to assess even approximately the percentage of land covered by them. It depended probably on local conditions. In some parts of the country it is said to have amounted to several score per cent of the total surface. The new-type *çiftlik*s seemed to have fitted very well into the feudal formation. The *timâr*' system in Bulgaria and Macedonia was abolished only in 1832 - 1834, but the land continued to be *de iure* the property of the state.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ In the account of von Khindsperg's journey of 1672 - 1674, the term *Edelhof* has been used to denote a *çiftlik*; see M. IONOV, *op. cit.*, pp. 340 and 354.

¹³⁵ N. Todorov is of a different opinion: he thinks that the *çiftlik*s began to emerge only in the 17th century; see N. Todorov, *Nekotorye voprosy statuta i oblika balkanskogo goroda XVI - XVII v. in: Trudy 25 Meždunarodnogo Kongressa Vostokovedov*, vol. II, 1963, pp. 498 - 499.

¹³⁶ We have dealt with *çiftlik*s in a separate article: *Powstanie i rozwój czyflików w krajach bałkańskich pod panowaniem tureckim* [The Emergence

An analogy comes to mind naturally : the *çiftlik* and the large estates using serf-labour in Poland and some other countries. The development of both was due to the feudal relations of production and growth of demand for agricultural goods, particularly corn. But, contrary to what happened in Balkan countries, the founder and owner (user) of the manorial farm in Poland was the lord of the estate, whereas the *çiftlik* originated in consequence of the activeness of a new social group, more enterprising and with more financial means than the *timār*' holders. Thus, the *çiftlik* resulted not from the economic activity of the feudal class, rather to the contrary. For these reasons, the *çiftlik sahibiya* did not wield such an authority over the peasants as the feudal lord in Poland did, and in Balkan countries neither serfdom nor regular peasants' villein service developed. The "Polish kind" of agricultural system : large estates of the gentry farmed by the forced labour of the peasantry consolidated the basis of the feudalism, while the *çiftlik* — although it never lost its feudal character — certainly accelerated the disintegration of the Turkish military feudalism.

CONCLUSIONS

The vast lands, with which we have been concerned here, differed very much — we have agrarian relations in mind — from Central and Eastern Europe. But they were also a very differentiated area, as was mentioned before. The most distinct line separated the territories termed the lands of the Hungarian Crown, and particularly the part which had remained under the Habsburg rule. Here, the development of the agrarian relations was, generally speaking, similar to that in the countries of Central Europe north of the Carpathians, although netither the farm belonging to the nobles nor forced labour of the peasants did attain such a high degree of development. On the other part of Hungary, but primarily on the Rumanian and Balkan lands, the Turkish rule deepened the gap between those countries and the rest of Europe more than would seem consequent upon their geo-

and Development of çiftliks in Balkan Countries under the Turkish Rule] in : *Stowianie w dziejach Europy* (Mélanges H. Łowmiański) Poznań 1974, pp. 243 - 250. *Ibidem*, the literature on the subject is quoted.

graphical position and natural conditions. Nor would it be possible to speak of the economic unity of the vast territory extending from the southern shores of the Baltic to the Balkans as a separate entity, or of the links and development analogies between all the countries of Central Europe.¹³⁷ On the contrary, the economic bonds between the countries of the Danube basin (an approximate term) and the countries north of the Carpathians were relatively slight, while the contrasts and opposites prevailed over the similarities and analogies in development.

The entire area, dealt with in this article, came under the impact of the increased demand for agricultural produce and foodstuffs in general as well as for raw materials of agricultural origin. Yet, it was not a foreign corn market similar to that of the West-European market which affected Poland. Contrary to Poland, South-Eastern Europe became a producer and supplier not so much of corn but of animals, mainly oxen for slaughter and sheep, but also of wine, particularly from Hungary. But only Hungary — primarily in the zone free of Turks — was able to sell those articles to European countries on a large scale. The Rumanian principalities and other Balkan countries, on the other hand, became compulsory suppliers of corn and slaughter animals to Turkey, particularly to Constantinople, at the time a large consumer centre. The economic and social consequences of the compulsory deliveries were not and could not be the same as those of free trade. And really they were different from those factors which caused the large export of corn from Poland to the West. The same can be said, *mutatis mutandis*, about the economic results of the export of oxen from Hungary to the West and of the compulsory deliveries of corn and slaughter animals from Rumania and the Balkans to Turkey. The compulsory deliveries did not assure the inflow of money from abroad to the same extent as free trade, and did not create economic incentives for the development of production.

¹³⁷ Cf. J. Gierowski, *L'Europe Centrale au XVII^e s. et les principales tendances politiques*, Moskva 1970, pp. 1-3 (paper at the Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, reprint), viz.; *Europe "entre la Baltique, les Alpes Orientales et les Balkans"* was said to be an "entité à part."

In all those areas the manorial farm did not develop as it did in Poland and in her neighbouring countries. Perhaps — for it is a known fact that it is extremely difficult to explain why something did not happen — one of the reasons was that villein service was of little or no use as a basic form of the organisation of the production of wine and breeding (grazing) of cattle and sheep. But we should like to draw the readers' attention to other circumstances also, even if it is only a supposition. We deal here with the very sparsely populated countries. According to I. N. Kiss's estimates, the population of Hungary in the 16th century amounted to under six, and according to the 1707 census, ten inhabitants per 1 sq. km.¹³⁸ The Rumanian lands did not fare much better, since at the close of the 18th century, Wallachia and Moldavia (without Bessarabia) had probably 12 inhabitants per 1 sq. km,¹³⁹ nor did certainly the Balkan countries under the Turkish rule. This sparsity of population doubtless hampered the organisation of corn production on a large scale. Moreover, those territories had plenty of mountainous regions which facilitated the flights of the population with their herds of cattle and flocks of sheep from the fiscal exploitation and robberies during wars. The long political frontiers favoured such flights in the Rumanian principalities.

The centralised rent payable to the state in Rumania and in the Balkan countries was probably the reason why the state did not entirely give up its jurisdiction over the peasants, and intervened between the villagers and the feudal class; e.g. in Rumania by way of orders regulating the size of peasant service. A peasant could appeal to a state court in cases against the lord.

The manorial farm selling corn — and the *çiftlik* may be considered such a farm — developed very late in the Black Sea zone, as a matter of fact, only beginning with the last quarter of

¹³⁸ I. N. Kiss, *Der Agrarcharakter des ungarischen Exports vom 15 bis 18 Jahrh.* "Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte," vol. I, 1978, pp. 155 - 160. In both cases the author refers to his earlier works. By the end of the 16th century, the average population density in Great Poland, Little Poland and Mazovia was 21.3 inhabitants per 1 sq.km, and by the end of the 18th — 27.5. I. Gieysztorowa, *Badania nad historią zaludnienia Polski* [Studies of the population history in Poland], "Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej," vol. XI, 1963, No 3/4, table 6 on p. 543.

¹³⁹ This much can be assumed on the basis of estimates and calculations done by Rumanian scholars. F. Constantiniy, *Relațiile agrare ...*, p. 59; S. Columbeanu, *Grande exploitations ...*, pp. 35 - 38 ff.

the 18th century. This development was due to two factors: the loosening of the Turkish monopoly for food deliveries (or the improvement in the financial conditions of those deliveries) and the general economic livening up in the Black Sea zone. The opening of the straits in 1774 was certainly of great importance. Here, we should recall the contemporary interest evinced by the Polish great lords and the gentry, who owned estates in the Ukraine, in Black Sea trade, as well as the colonisation by Russia of Black Sea steppes and the lands called New Russia, where serfdom was great lords and the gentry, who owned estates in the Ukraine, interesting to compare it with the development of the "secondary serfdom" in Rumania which replaced the serfdom abolished in 1746 and 1749.¹⁴⁰

There are also certain analogies between the tenancy of landed property, widespread in Poland, and later in Rumania, on the one hand, and the *çiftlik* in the Balkans on the other. Both the tenants and the Balkan *çiftlik sahibiya* became a new factor of exploitation. They retained the difference between what they got from the peasants and what they obtained from their own farms, and the amount they were bound to hand over to the holder of the estate (the *sipāhi* in the Balkans). Both, i.e. the Polish tenant and the *çiftlik sahibiya* must have had considerable financial means (can they be called circulating capital?). We still do not know much about the role and function of tenancy in Poland.¹⁴¹ Probably both the tenant and the *çiftlik sahibiya* contributed to the greater exploitation of the producer, and certainly to the devastation of the estate and, consequently, to its lower productivity and lower level of the productive forces. After all, they were only temporary users.

Practically the whole zone of interest to us—except the Habsburg part of Hungary—remained on the sidelines (at least up to the last decades of the 18th century) of the great exchange of agricultural produce and livestock for industrial goods effected between Central and Eastern Europe, and Western Europe; nor

¹⁴⁰ See notes 82 and 89.

¹⁴¹ We do not know what, e.g., was the social structure of the tenants: gentry, townsmen, perhaps even rich peasants and Jews; how profitable was the tenure to both sides.

did it have any contacts with highly developed countries which constituted the "active belt of the continent,"¹⁴² not only because of transport difficulties but also because of political circumstances. But was it really "a world of cheap food" since, as pointed out earlier, in some regions corn was transported by draught animals over considerable distances?¹⁴³ Does not all this undermine the fairly popular opinion about the economic dualism of Europe in the late feudalism? If we must use the term "economic dualism" — although we feel that it is not adequate to the reality of the time — it should not perhaps be used in respect of territories which are the subject of this article. However, they are also a part of Europe.

It would be doubtless instructive to compare the agrarian development of the Balkan countries with other countries under the Turkish rule, on the other side of the Bosphorus. It would create a certain "symmetry" in our deliberations and would, perhaps, make it possible to define the agrarian system in South-Eastern Europe as a separate specific zone of the Turkish Europe. But it would be beyond our possibilities. Would, on the other hand, a comparison with Western Europe be fruitful and of use? It seems that the similarities and analogies would not reach here beyond the general features of the feudal system.¹⁴⁴ And another thing. We have concentrated on the development and forms of the agrarian production, whereas the mining production played a considerable role in the economy of Hungary and the Balkan countries.¹⁴⁵ Thus, have we not restricted our field of vision?

A more detailed knowledge of the history — in the broadest sense of the term — of the countries of South-Eastern Europe may certainly help a better understanding of what occurred in Central Europe, north of the Carpathians; perhaps no less than the history of Western Europe. The to date studies of Hungarian, Ru-

¹⁴² F. Braudel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 474.

¹⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 126.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, vol. II, pp. 62: "the similarities and analogies are striking". But the author has not developed that thought.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. M. Malowist, *op. cit.*, pp. 193 - 208, 226 - 235; yet, in F. Braudel's opinion (*op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 517): "Agriculture is decisive in all matters" — in fact, not only in the Balkans but in the whole Mediterranean region.

manian, Bulgarian, Yugoslav (the order does not imply a hierarchy of scientific attainments) and others scholars have revealed a great deal. It is possible to foresee that a fuller use of Turkish sources, rather difficult of access, and the application of comparative methods will allow a better reconstruction of the past of the countries under study and will take us nearer to a scientific synthesis.

(Translated by Krystyna Kępcicz)