

THE 88 YEAR-LONG (1644-1732) STRUGGLING FOR FREEING FROM THE STATUTE OF *RUMÂN* OF THE *MOȘNENI* FROM THE VILLAGE OF BUSU FROM MEHEDINȚI COUNTY

Ileana CIOAREC*

Abstract: In the last years of the 16th century, the ruler Michael the Brave legitimated *rumânia* (serfdom) in Wallachia, as a socio-juridical status of a certain part from the population of the Romanian state situated between the Carpathians and the Danube, through an “establishment” that bears its name. Numerous historians and sociologists (A. V. Gâdei, Constantin Giurescu, Constantin C. Giurescu, I. C. Filitti, H. H. Stahl, Dinică Ciobotea) have made a priority from the studying of this document with constitutional type provisions, due to its importance in ascertaining a new age in the Romanian social history (1595-1746). The classical studies of the historians Constantin Giurescu and Constantin C. Giurescu have remained a landmark in the Romanian historiography, on addressing this topic, being based on 80 documents, known at the moment of the research.

The other documents present the consequences of Michael the Brave’s Establishment, the ruler who both unified all the Romanians and made some dependant on the land they worked on: he who lived on other person’s land had to be serf of the landlord whose estate he was dependent on, at the moment of the enforcement. They refer only to special enforcements, following the sentence of the ruler Michael the Brave. The dependence established by Michael the Brave created a new category of serfs, who, in the entire 17th century, were called the *dependent serfs*, the *estate dependent serfs* or the *inheritance dependent serfs*.

Here is a definite example of the socio-juridical transformations from the Romanian society, at the half of the 17th century, begun during the ruling of this voivode, considered “the greatest ecclesiastic founder from the history of the Romanians”. In 1644, Matei Basarab, in his preoccupation to create landed properties for the monasteries built by himself, bought (took in serfdom) several villages. Among the villages that he bought for completing the estate of Strehaia monastery, there was the village of Busu.

Therefore, between 1644 and 1732, the dwellers from the village of Busu experienced the complexity and the mobility of the social evolution from the Romanian society.

Keywords: the village Busu, freeing, rumân, Strehaia monastery, Michael the Brave’s Establishment

* 3rd Degree Scientific Researcher, PhD., “C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor” Institute for Research in Social Studies and Humanities from Craiova, of the Romanian Academy; Email: ileanacioarec@yahoo.com.

In the last years of the 16th century, the ruler Michael the Brave legitimated *rumânia* (serfdom) in Wallachia, as a socio-juridical status of a certain part from the population of the Romanian state situated between the Carpathians and the Danube, through an “establishment” that bears its name. Numerous historians and sociologists (A. V. Gâdei¹, Constantin Giurescu², Constantin C. Giurescu³, I. C. Filitti⁴, H. H. Stahl⁵, Dinică Ciobotea⁶) have made a priority from the studying of this document with constitutional type provisions⁷, due to its importance in ascertaining a new age in the Romanian social history (1595-1746). The classical studies of the historians Constantin Giurescu⁸ and Constantin C. Giurescu⁹ have remained a landmark in the Romanian historiography, on addressing this topic, being based on 80 documents, known at the moment of the research.

Although the number of the written documents was rather significant, Constantin Giurescu was appreciating that “they give us quite few clarifications on addressing the establishment”¹⁰. The first proof is the muniment of Radu Mihnea Vodă, from the 24th of April 1613, in which it is specified the fact that Michael the Brave had delivered his sentence on addressing Oprea and Ion from Băbeni, accused by Cârștian from Ohaba of fleeing from his estate during the ruling of Mihnea Turcitul. In the muniment, there was mentioned that Oprea and Ion from Băbeni, during the period of time when Mihnea Turcitul was the ruler of Wallachia, fled from the estate of Cârștian from Ohaba, wandering until the ruling days of Alexandru cel Rău. During the ruling of Alexandru cel Rău, the two settled on the estate of court marshals Pârveu and Radu from Slivitești. In that place, they

¹ A. V. Gâdei, *Contribuție pentru istoria socială a țărânimii noastre și pentru istoria raporturilor economice dintre țărani și proprietari*, Bucharest, 1904.

² Constantin Giurescu, *Studii de istorie socială. Vechimea rumâniei în Țara Românească și legătura lui Mihai Viteazul. Despre rumâni. Despre boieri*, Bucharest, 1943; Idem, *Studii de istorie*. Anthology, printing supervision and introduction by Dinu C. Giurescu, Bucharest, 1993.

³ Constantin C. Giurescu, “Așezământul” sau „legătura” lui Mihai Viteazul, in “Analele Universității din București”, series Istorie, XIX, 1970, no. 1.

⁴ I. C. Filitti, *Oameni dependenți și cultivatori în Principatele Române în secolele XV-XVIII*, in “Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice”, s. III, t. XIII (1933); Idem, *Despre “legătura” lui Mihai Viteazul*, in “Revista istorică română”, II (1932); Idem, *Proprietarii solului în Principatele Române până la 1864*, Bucharest, 1935.

⁵ Henri H. Stahl, *Probleme confuze în istoria socială a României*, Bucharest, 1992.

⁶ Dinică Ciobotea, “Așezământul” social al domnitorului Mihai Viteazul, Craiova, Helios Publishing House, 2002.

⁷ Dinică Ciobotea, Ileana Cioarec, *Valoarea juridică a legăturii lui Mihai Viteazul*, in “Anuarul Institutului de Cercetări Socio-Umane «C.S. Nicolăescu-Plopșor»”, no. VIII/2007, pp. 73-80.

⁸ Constantin Giurescu, *Vechimea românilor în Țara Românească și legătura lui Mihai Viteazul*. Memorial read at the Romanian Academy, in the meeting from 8/21 May 1915, in “Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secției Istorice”, S.2., t. XXXVII (1914-1915), p. 495 and next; see the second edition, supervised and completed by Constantin C. Giurescu in vol. *Studii de istorie socială*, Bucharest, 1943, pp. 9-124; the third edition, supervised by Dinu C. Giurescu in vol. *Studii de istorie*, Bucharest, Eminescu Publishing House, 1993, pp. 307-336.

⁹ Constantin C. Giurescu, “Așezământul” sau “legătura” lui Mihai Viteazul, pp. 58-63; Idem, *Probleme controversate în istoriografia română*, Bucharest, Albatros Publishing House, 1977, pp. 32-75.

¹⁰ C. C. Giurescu, *Studii de istorie*, p. 328.

were found by the Establishment of Michael the Brave, which was provisioning that: “who, wherever they are, shall remain there settled for ever”. During the ruling of Radu Mihnea, deacon Ghinea, the son-in-law of Cârştian, complained to the ruler, sustaining that Oprea and Ion from Băbeni had been serfs of his father-in-law, Cârştian. Making his judgements, the ruler sentenced that the two should remain servants of Pârveu and Radu, owing to the fact that the Establishment of Michael the Brave had found them in those places: “that the previously mentioned *rumâni* (serfs) had been found at the previously mentioned boyars. Thus, Voivode Michael, his Grace, decided through the establishment, any who would find themselves wherever, shall be *rumân* forever, regardless the place”... “and I do not wish to change the establishment of Voivode Michael”¹¹.

The other documents present the consequences of Michael the Brave’s Establishment, the ruler who both unified all the Romanians and made some dependant on the land they worked on: he who lived on other person’s land had to be serf of the landlord whose estate he was dependent on, at the moment of the enforcement. They refer only to special enforcements, following the sentence of the ruler Michael the Brave. The dependence established by Michael the Brave created a new category of serfs, who, in the entire 17th century, were called the *dependent serfs*, the *estate dependent serfs* or the *inheritance dependent serfs*.

The process of becoming a serf also included the peasants who were independent from the socio-juridical point of view, the *moşneni* (free peasants) or *cnezi*, mentioned in the documents of the time. In the social history, the process through which there was made the passage towards serfdom, took place in the same time with the process of becoming a *cneaz*, as a reaction against the first one. The both processes continued in the 17th-18th centuries too, with new regulations established during the rulings of Simion Moghilă (1600-1602), Radu Şerban (1602-1611)¹², Radu Mihnea (1611-1616), Matei Basarab, displaying variations in intensity and amplex, according to the economic and political circumstances. The complexity of the two processes led to the occurrence of new social categories. Amongst the rulers who continued to transform the “establishment” of Michael the Brave, Matei Basarab played a significant part. In his 22 year-long ruling, he proved to be a great legislator, besides being a patron, to whom it is credited the printing of the Code of Laws.

In 1633, at the beginning of his ruling. Matei Basarab introduced a decision, according to which the fugitive serf, “who would find himself in the my town of Câmpulung” four years before, that is at the end of Alexandru Iliaş’s ruling

¹¹ *Documente privind istoria României*, B, *Ţara Românească*, 17th century, vol. II, Bucharest, Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1951, p. 177.

¹² Petre P. Panaitescu, *Dreptul de strămutare a țăranilor în Țările Române (până la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea)*, in “Studii și materiale de istorie medie”, vol. I, 1956, pp. 103-104 he assumed, relating to the content of a document from Matei Basarab that read “all the debts and plunders and thefts and burglaries, all of them, were annulled by Voivode Şerban, became inexistent, to be remembered that during the ruling of Radu Şerban there was an amnesty that encompassed the flee of the serfs too”.

(1627-1629), shall be regarded as a town dweller, loved by the people in the town, and all the peasants, and shall be left in peace by all the people and my servants, shall not be sent away from the town, to corrupt the payment of the due taxes, but to be precisely as the townsmen. And those who had been living since the days of Leon Vodă (1629-1632) – continues decreeing Matei Basarab – shall try to find their origins, their birthplaces¹³. Therefore, the master of the serfs were not allowed anymore to bring back the fugitives that the law had found at Câmpulung, four years before, and there were brought back only those settled after 1629, after the census from that year.

It was also Matei Basarab who, before the 7th of April 1644, put into practice the law according to which there was forbidden the resettlement of the serfs, between the two “censuses of the thaler”, which represented the fiscal censuses¹⁴.

Here is a definite example of the socio-juridical transformations from the Romanian society, at the half of the 17th century, begun during the ruling of this voivode, considered “the greatest ecclesiastic founder from the history of the Romanians”. In 1644, Matei Basarab, in his preoccupation to create landed properties for the monasteries built by him, bought (took in serfdom) several villages. Among the villages that he bought for completing the estate of Strehaiia monastery, there was the village of Busu.

The village of Busu appears mentioned in a document on the 14th of December 1644. The moment coincides with the loss of quality of village dwelled by free people. On that date, the villagers Ianoș, Manea, Stancul ș.a., along with their sons, sold their freedom. They became serfs of Matei Basarab, along with their lands, for 38,000 aspri¹⁵. The selling act from the 14th of December 1644, signed by 10 dwellers of Busu, was specifying that they sold themselves to be serfs, “willingly and without being constrained”.

Few years after, on the 6th of March 1653, Matei Basarab gave the village and the bought serfs (mentioning them again: Ianăș with his son Radu, Manea with his son Lațco, Stan with his son Zaharia, Gligorie with his sons Stancu and Dragul, Dan with his sons, Dragota, Lepădat and Vasile; Marin with his sons Pârvul and Radul and his nephew after Pârvu, Stan; Dobrul with his sons Radul and Dragomir; Ursu, brother of Marin, with his sons Vasile and Radul; Lupul and Radul¹⁶) to the monastery of

¹³ C. D. Aricescu, *Istoria Câmpulungului, prima rezidență a Țării Românești*, Bucharest, 1857, p. 176; Ștefan Trâmbaciu, *Istoricul obștii Câmpulungenilor musceleni în evul mediu și prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea*, Bucharest, Semne Publishing House, 1997, p. 99.

¹⁴ Dinică Ciobotea, “Așezământul” social al domnitorului Mihai Viteazul, p. 83.

¹⁵ SJAN Dolj, Collection Manuscripts, Manuscript 7, f. 20.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 2-4. Voivode Matei Basarab donated a veritable domain to his foundation from Strehaiia. Through the muniment from the 6th of March 1650, there was given the village of Strehaiia (“the entire village with all the boundaries and the serfs, and with all the revenue”), Stângăceaoa din Dos and Stângăceaoa din Față (“with all the serfs and with all the revenue”), Bresnița de Sus (“with all the boundaries and the serfs, with all the revenue”), Bresnița de Jos (“with all the sold serfs”), a part from the village of Vlădășești (without the serfs), Coșcodia (“with all the boundaries and the

Strehaia, his foundation. In the muniment of submission, there was mentioned the entire history of the village. There was mentioned that the village of Busu was belonging to the ancestors of the ruler Mihai Basarab, up until the age of Michael the Brave, when “it became the property of the ruler’s possessions, being considered princely village”¹⁷. It preserved this statute until the ruling of Radu Mihnea, when the serfs from Busu bought themselves back from him, along with their estates¹⁸.

After the death of Voivode Matei Basarab, in 1654, while Constantin Șerban (known as the “Pug”) was the ruler of Wallachia, the serfs given, along with the estate of Busu, to the monastery of Strehaia, bought their freedom again, with 360 gold coins, making the confession that, in fact, they had been compelled by Matei Basarab for “distresses”, which actually meant for the taxes they had to pay.

On the 6th of March 1660, the monastery of Strehaia solicited the ruler of Wallachia to reconfirm its possession on the estate and to not acknowledge the freedom from serfdom, obtained by the dwellers of Busu in 1654. Voivode Grigore Ghica decided that it would remain serfs only the ones that, after the buying back, did not subscribe for service¹⁹, along with their land. When, in 1673, there was founded again, at Strehaia, a bishopric, it was brought forward, once more, the issue of the serfs from the lands in its possession. For this reason, on the 1st of June, Chirca, great Ban of Craiova, Vintilă, great cupbearer, and Barbu Filișanul, great purveyor, empowered the Bishop Daniil “to include all the serfs from the village of Bresnița, and again Bresnița, from Coscodia, and from Albulești, and from Busul” (Busul)²⁰. In the document, there was mentioned that the Father Superior Vasile, dissatisfied with the fact that the bishop Daniil had not taken any measure against the serfs, addressed to the ruler Grigore Ghica, sustaining that the serfs refuse to obey. The ruler, considering the declaration of the Father Superior, decided that the serfs, remaining in the possession of the monastery of Strehaia, would be those who were not in service. All the serfs in service were “to be serfs of the holly bishopric, further on”. After leaving their service, all the serfs had the obligation to obey the monastery of Strehaia²¹.

On the 29th of June 1674, the ruler of Wallachia, Voivode Duca, empowered the archbishop Daniil and the monks from the monastery of Strehaia “to take all the serfs from the villages of the bishopric, which are Dol Bresnița and Gor Bresnița and Albuleștii Coșcodia and Busul, which had been subscribed for service in the treasury,

serfs, with all the revenue”) and Drăgulești that is called Busul (“and the serfs that sold themselves to his grace, with their sons and inheritance from one boundary to the other”) – D. Bodin, *Episcopia Strehaii*, in “Datina”, X, 1932, no. 7-12, p. 149.

¹⁷ Anca Pororo, *Documente Mănăstirii Strehia (1499-1859)*, Craiova, Sitech Publishing House, 2011, p. 25.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁹ Cf. Anca Pororo, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

²⁰ Niculae Șerbănescu, *Despre Episcopia Strehaii*, in “Mitropolia Olteniei”, year VI, 1954, no. 9-10, p. 490; Anca Pororo, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

²¹ *Ibidem*.

and have been missing the paying of the due service, and are not registered for the treasury, but have been taking in both the institution of the prince and the bishopric”²².

Few years later, during the ruling of Șerban Cantacuzino (1679-1688), some of the serfs bought their freedom back from the monastery (“giving gypsies, in their place, for the monastery...”), remaining only three households of serfs (Vasilie with his sons, Fota, Costandin and Matei, and Ionasci brother of Vasilie with his sons – Ion, Pârvul, Matei, Gavrilă, Barbul and Georgie, and Bălaci with his son Ion). In April 1703, Ștefan, the Father Superior of the monastery of Strehaia, complained to the ruler Constantin Brâncoveanu that several serfs from Busu are refusing to obey, affirming that they bought themselves back and are trespassing the boundaries of the estate. On the 20th of April in the same year, Constantin Brâncoveanu designated 12 boyars living next to the boundary, to go to the specific place and decide the border of the estate of Busu and to find if those serfs did buy themselves back²³. The conflicts between the serfs and the monastery continued in the following years too. Thus, on the 29th of January 1732, Father Superior of the monastery of Strehaia addressed to the Austrian administration, affirming that some of the serfs from Busu trespassed the boundaries of the estate, which was the possession of the monastery. The High Administration, trying to put an end to the conflict, designated Barbu Otetelișanu, along with 12 boyars living next to the boundary, to go on the spot and find “all the details that shall be written down, having your signature and seal”²⁴.

The last serfs were freed on the 6th of July 1732, being released by the Father Superior Partenie. Nonetheless, the releasing/buying back from serfdom (... to be freed from serfdom by the “monastery”) was done without getting the land too, the estates of Drăgulești (also called Busul), Leotești and Grădiștea (except for the parts of estate of Păianul and of Pătru and Coandă from Albulești) being given to the monastery of Strehaia. The ending of the process through which the serfs from Busu bought themselves back, which lasted for 78 years, ended in 1732²⁵. The two who drafted the “Monastery of Strehaia Register”, from 1852, S. Marcovici and Gr. Alecsandrescu, noted on the margin of the document from the 14th of December 1644: “To be known that, on the 16th of June 7240 [1732], these serfs from Drăgulești, from which some have been tried, some have been released, according to the documents, and all the serfs have remained free, without possession of land; and their entire land remained to the saint monastery” ...²⁶.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 44.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 76.

²⁵ On addressing the historical process that instituted/sanctioned *rumânia* as a socio-juridical condition of some of the population that lived in villages, starting with the Dependence Act/Establishment of Michael the Brave, re-evaluated by Matei Basarab, and perpetuated until the ruling of Constantin Mavrocordat in 1746 – see Dinică Ciobotea, “*Așezământul*” *social al domnitorului Mihai Viteazul*, Craiova, Helios Publishing House, 2002, passim.

²⁶ SJAN Dolj, Collection Manuscripts, Manuscript 7, f. 20.

Within the long process of freeing from serfdom, there can be placed the episode from the 18th of August 1686, on addressing the selling of part of land from the border of Busu's estate, by those who had bought back their freedom with money. Among them, there were Lațco, son of Mâine, Zaharia, son of Stan, Stanciu, son of Gligorie, Coanda, daughter of Bălaci and Arco, grandson of Gromoia. The selling was done by Bogdan, and his cousin, Dragomir from Grecești. Only that the monastery did not accept the situation and denounced both the sellers and the buyers. The suit took place "at the mansion from Cerneți"²⁷, where there was also the ruler Șerban Cantacuzino with the Council of the country. The sentence of the price was that the monastery of Strehaia to preserve its estate, with all the serfs, and "the buyers shall look for their money at the sellers, who sold with bad intention and treacherously"²⁸. Perhaps, as far as we are concerned, this decision contributed to a great extent to the releasing from serfdom from 1732, due to the fact that the monastery had been permanently arguing with the serf who would not let the land in its possession²⁹, and had not expected the vanishing of the consequences of the already mentioned decision.

The people from Busu, who became freemen (*moșneni*), again managed to satisfy their material needs, owing to the fact that they also had land in possession in the south part of Grecești, and at the boundary with the estates of Ochioiu, Gogoșu and Paia, always solidary with the freemen from Grecești and Săcenii. The force of the freemen, resulted from the solidarity of the villages, was moreover evidenced in the relations with the estates possessed by the Monasteries of Tismana and Motru in Corzu and Ochioiu. They were involved in suits with the monastery of Tismana. On the 8th of June 1767, Voivode Alexander gave a mandate to 12 boyars for the suit of the monastery of Tismana, with the foreigners from Secu and Busu, who had taken the part of the monastery from din Corzu³⁰. On the 8th of July 1767, the same ruler mandated 4 boyars to choose the estate of Corzu and Busu of the monastery of Tismana³¹. The harshest persecution for the possession of land was at the estate of Piatra or Ochioiu of the Monastery of Motru. Since the beginning, the donors of the Hermitage of Troacaia (also called Drocăie) – the boyars from the family Păianu, Ioniță and Pârveu Gubăvceni, sons of Vasile Păianu, and Ioniță son of the captain Preda Păianu – did not specify the dimensions and the boundaries of the Hermitage of Troacaia. The donation from 1708 for the monastery of Gura Motrului became a great dispute between the freemen from Grecești, the Metropolitan Church of Wallachia, owner of the estate of Gogoșu, Ruxandra Păianca, wife of a cavalry commander, from Paia in 1787, descendant of Brâncoveanu family, owners of the estate of Bărboiu and the monastery of Gura Motrului. The freemen from Grecești, along with their neighbours from Busu and Secu, all freemen, several times – in 1748³², 1751, 1778³³, 1781³⁴, 1787³⁵ – were

²⁷ Anca Pororo, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

²⁸ *Ibidem*.

²⁹ SJAN Dolj, Collection Manuscripts, Manuscript 7, ff. 21-23; on addressing the sentence of the ruler from the mansion of Cerneți also see SANIC, Record no. 714, f. 932.

³⁰ SANIC, Manuscripts. 336, ff. 85-86.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

³² SJAN Dolj, Collection Manuscripts, Record of the Monastery of Gura Motrului, ff. 206-207.

reported by the fathers superior of the monastery of Gura Motrului that they had supposedly trespassed the boundary of the estate of Piatra, at some point called Ochioiu of the Monastery of Motru³⁶. On the spot, to choose the boundary for the monastery, there met the people from Gogoșu and the representatives of the Metropolitan Church of Wallachia, along with those of the boyars, owners in Bărboi, Botoșești and Paia, or the freemen from Grecești, Busu and Secu. They would always acknowledge the possession of the freemen from Grecești over the estate of Ochioiu, in the corner of which, there were met the boundaries of the estates of Bărboi, Scăești, Gogoșu and Paia. The cause was to acknowledge whether the estate of Piatra had belonged to the estate of Gogoși or Ochioiu. Any agreement was almost impossible. At some point, there was established the surface of the estate of the Monastery of Gura Motrului, to the size of a *moș*³⁷, the lawful possession of a group of freemen from Grecești, that is 210 fathoms. On the 9th of November 1748, the former great *medelnicer* (a boyar that would pour water for the prince to wash his hands and would serve the meals), Leon, subprefect of Mehedinți County too, established the parts owned by the freemen from Busu, Secu and Grecești, and the monastery of Motru, in the estate of Ochioiu: “all the land of Ochioiu has two thousand four hundred fathoms, the given surface [...], from which the people from Grecești bought the fourth part, that is three hundred and fifty fathoms, each *moș* having two hundred and ten fathoms; then, the people from Grecești also bought the parts of three *moș*, of six hundred and thirty fathoms, the bought surface of the people from Grecești being of nine hundred and eighty; thus, the freemen from Busu and Secu and the Monastery of Motru remained with two *moș*, resulting four hundred and twenty fathoms”. The freemen confessed that “a *moș* is the donation of the monastery of Motru, that is two hundred and ten fathoms, and a *moș* remained for the people of Bus and Secu, that is two hundred and ten fathoms” ...³⁸

In the next decades, after the last serfs from Busu obtained their freedom, in 1732, the village of Busu was entirely owned by the freemen. The censuses from 1819³⁹ and 1831⁴⁰ recorded it as an estate of the freemen.

Therefore, between 1644 and 1732, the dwellers from the village of Busu experienced the complexity and the mobility of the social evolution from the Romanian society.

³³ SANIC, Metropolitan Church of Wallachia, CLXVIII/41 bis, CLXVIII/43.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, CLXVIII/44

³⁵ *Ibidem*, CLXVIII/59.

³⁶ Dinică Ciobotea, Dumitru Cojocaru, *Documentele Mitropoliei Țării Românești pentru satul și moșia Gogoșu din județul Dolj*, în Dinică Ciobotea, Gabriel Croitoriu (coord.), *Istorie, cultură și civilizație în Piemontul Bălăciței. Studii și documente*, Craiova, Sitech Publishing House, 2013, pp. 525-579.

³⁷ SJAN Dolj, Collection Manuscripts, Record of the Monastery of Gura Motrului, ff. 206-207.

³⁸ *Ibidem*.

³⁹ Ioana Constantinescu, *Structuri socio-fiscale în județul Mehedinți după Catagrafia din decembrie 1819*, in “Mehedinți, istorie și cultură”, I, Drobeta-Turnu Severin, 1978, p. 200.

⁴⁰ Ion Donat, Ion Pătroi, Dinică Ciobotea, *Catagrafia obștească a Țării Românești din 1831*, Craiova, Helios Publishing House, 1999, p. 4.