
TRANSYLVANIAN REVIEW

Vol. XIX, Supplement No. 5: 2, 2010

**Recent Studies on
Past and Present
II.
Power, Belief and Identity**

Edited by

OVIDIU CRISTEA • GEORGE LAZĂR • ANDI MIHALACHE
• ALEXANDRU SIMON

ROMANIAN ACADEMY

Chairman:
Academician **Ionel Haiduc**

CENTER FOR
TRANSYLVANIAN STUDIES
Director:
Academician **Ioan-Aurel Pop**

Publication indexed and abstracted in the Thomson Reuters Social Sciences Citation Index®, in Social Scisearch® and in the Journal Citation Reports/Social Sciences Edition, and included in EBSCO's and ELSEVIER's products.

Recent Studies on Past and Present

Editor
ALEXANDRU SIMON

On the cover:
STUDIUM GENERALE (15th CENTURY)

Printed in Romania by COLOR PRINT
66, 22 Decembrie 1989 St.,
Zalău 450031, Romania
Tel. (0040)260-660598;
(0040)260-661752
www.colorprint.ro



Transylvanian Review continues the tradition of **Revue de Transylvanie**, founded by Silviu Dragomir, which was published in Cluj and then in Sibiu between 1934 and 1944.

Transylvanian Review is published 4 times a year by the **Center for Transylvanian Studies** and the **Romanian Academy**.

EDITORIAL BOARD

CESARE ALZATI, Ph.D.
Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione, Istituto di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea, Università Cattolica, Milan, Italy
HORST FASSEL, Ph.D.
Institut für donauschwäbische Geschichte und Landeskunde, Tübingen, Germany
KONRAD GÜNDISCH, Ph.D.
Bundesinstitut für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa, Oldenburg, Germany
HARALD HEPPNER, Ph.D.
Institut für Geschichte, Graz, Austria
PAUL E. MICHELSON, Ph.D.
Huntington University, Indiana, USA
ALEXANDRU ZUB, Ph.D.
Chairman of the History Section of the Romanian Academy, Director of the A. D. Xenopol Institute of History, Iași, Romania

EDITORIAL STAFF

Ioan-Aurel Pop	Virgil Leon
Nicolae Bocșan	Ioan Bolovan
Vasile Sălăjan	Raveca Divricean
Alexandru Simon	Nicolae Sucală-Cuc
Rudolf Gräf	

Translated by

Bogdan Aldea—English
Liana Lăpădatu—French

Desktop Publishing

Edith Fogarasi
Cosmina Varga

Correspondence, manuscripts and books should be sent to: **Transylvanian Review, Centrul de Studii Transilvane** (Center for Transylvanian Studies) 12-14 Mihail Kogălniceanu St., 400084 Cluj-Napoca, Romania

cst@acad-cluj.ro
www.centruldestudiiitransilvane.ro

Contents

• Editors' Note	5
<hr/>	
• I. Defining Borders – Defining Societies	7
<hr/>	
I.1. The Written, the Painted and the Imagined	
Some Considerations regarding <i>Historia Ducum Venetorum</i> Șerban Marin	9
Il <i>Lexicon Marsilianum</i> e la lexicografia rumena nel seicento Levente Nagy	29
Historical Tradition, Legend and Towns in the Moldavian Chronicles Laurențiu Rădvan	41
I.2. Church, Law, State and Profit	
Histoire du développement de la législation canonique et civile ayant pour objet les biens temporels de l'Église Liviu-Marius Harosa	67
Confessional Identity – National Identity. The Elites of the Romanian Greek-Catholic Church and the Catholic Autonomy from Hungary during the Dualist Period (1867-1918) Ion Cârja	89
Aspects modernisateurs dans les discours politiques de Elemér Gyárfás András Máté	105
Contribution of Romanian and European Legal Elite to the Definition of the <i>Unjust Enrichment</i> Concept Ciprian Paun	115
<hr/>	
• II. Roads to Modernity – Returns to the Past	141
<hr/>	
II.1. Modern Forms of Medieval Legacies	
Between the Memory of the Customary and the Code of Law: Crimes, Penalties and Social Identities in Pre-Modern Moldavia (17 th Century – First Half of the 18 th Century) Cătălina-Elena Chelcu	143
Reinventing Middle Age: the inauguration of the statue of Stephen the Great (Iași, 1883) Liviu Brătescu	157

The Cult of Brătianus Between the Two World Wars in Romania: Actors, Characters, Means and Forms of Expression Ovidiu Buruiană	173
II.2. The Birth of a Society	
Le rôle social de la promenade à Bucarest et à Iassy (première moitié du XIX ^e siècle) Dan Dumitru Iacob	195
Nobility and Power in Moldavia at the Beginning of the 19 th Century Cristian Ploșcaru	209
Fils égaré ou traître incurable ? La figure du contrerévolutionnaire dans l'imaginaire politique roumain du 1848 Nicolae Mihai	227
<hr/>	
• III. The West in the East – The East in the West	251
<hr/>	
III.1. Oriental Fears and Aims	
Ideological and Practical Means of Survival in Front of the Ottoman Empire in the Late 1400s Alexandru Simon	253
Geopolitics and strategies in the Black Sea region (1939-1947) Mioara Anton	273
Shaping the Image of the Enemy in the Political Cartoons During the Cold War Paul Nistor	285
III.2. <i>Drang nach Osten</i> and Survival in the East	
Tekendorf – von einer sächsischen Gemeinde zu einer Glaubens- und Nationalitätengemeinschaft Mihai Draganovici	301
Deutsche Schulen in Rumänien während des Ersten Weltkrieges Carmen Patricia Reneti	313
The Repatriation of the Germans from Latvia and Romania at the Beginning of World War II: Some Comparative Aspects Bogdan-Alexandru Schipor	333
<hr/>	
• List of Authors	343

Historical Tradition, Legend and Towns in the Moldavian Chronicles

LAURENȚIU RĂDVAN

HOW THE emergence and evolution of medieval towns are reflected in chronicles has not sparked too much interest in the research field so far. Given the treatment that this information has received in chronicles, their authors did not seem to take a direct interest in how towns formed, how they were organized, their vibrant urban life, and not even their inhabitants. This appearance can be deceiving, however, since a closer look reveals that ancient texts are ripe with references to urban settlements.

DUE TO the vastness of this subject, we will undertake to examine the way it was perceived in late medieval literature in Moldavia, focusing on the 17th-18th centuries. We will stop on chronicles in this period, since they contain the most substantial amount of information. Our point of reference will be the 'classics': Grigore Ureche, Miron Costin, and Ion Neculce, with their known works. We did not include Dimitrie Cantemir here, since he distinctly bridges the chronicler spirit, of noting the events of the time, specific to the medieval world, and the encyclopaedic spirit, closer to modern thought. The latter foregoes the changes that historical literature and other fields undergo starting with the latter half of the 18th century and the next. Our research will seek to identify the most relevant testimonies of chroniclers on towns, as well as historical and literary insights into them.

THE FIRST chronicler we will study will be Grigore Ureche. We do not intend to engage here in the large controversy on the paternity of the chronicle he is credited with, a controversy which has yet to be settled.

Study financed through EU, ESF, POSDRU, 89/1.5./S/61104 (2010-2013) Project

Recently, N.A. Ursu has reopened the file on *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*, and has come up with several arguments which attribute the work to Simion Dascălul, so far considered only an interpolator; the interpolations of Misail Călugărul were also challenged. Regardless of whether the work was written by Simion or Ureche, we may say for sure that Ureche's contributions make up a large part of the chronicle which reached us today¹. Our research sets to create a historical study of the chronicle text, to look at the validity of its claims on towns, rather than to attribute its information to one chronicler or the other.

The work that Ureche is usually credited with parts ways with the tradition of court chronicles in the previous century, in that it belongs to a layman, and not to a clergyman, and it promotes a literary and political vision distinct from that of Ureche's forerunners². *Letopisețul* is not dedicated to anyone in particular, but originates in the author's wish to leave for times to come his own version on the past history of Moldavia, thereby revealing a keen sense of history on the part of the chronicler³. Moreover, it is the first Moldavian chronicle to be preserved in Romanian and the first where an author ponders over the Latin roots of Romanians. Here are the first statements on history as a 'cultural asset', which must not be lost. Recording and passing on traditions and noteworthy past events was meant to elevate a nation in the eyes of its neighbours:

[...] chroniclers [...] are keepers of time and harbourers and contemplators of great deeds, so they would not remain trivial, and their neighbours to say that they were indolent or ignorant or not steeped in history⁴.

History could also be a reason for national pride. Ever since the chronicle attributed to Ureche, we will notice that chroniclers begin to expand their historical horizon, which leads us to separate 17th-18th century chronicles from the earlier ones, which were more limited in scope and language.

A true breakthrough, the chronicle attributed to Ureche also includes some thoughts on Moldavian towns. Since it looks at the country's history from its early stages and up to late 16th century, part of these explorations are also focused on early urban life, that the author, as well as his interpolators, especially Simion Dascălul, subordinate to the *descălecat* (which has the meaning of *foundation*). More notably, the latter is the first to approach the emergence of a town:

And it is also thus that the târg at Baia was said to be founded (descălecat) by some Saxons, who were potters; it also thus that Suceava was said to be founded by Hungarian furriers, called suci in their language, and Suceava is called furriery in their language. [Other towns are ascribed to the Genovese]: Also in this country were there strongholds that the Genovese built in times past: the stronghold at Suceava and the stronghold at Hotin and Cetatea Albă and

*the stronghold of Chilia and Cetatea Neamțului and Cetatea Nouă at Roman, where the earth caved underneath and the stronghold fell to pieces*⁵.

The foundation of towns is a recurring topic in the chronicle. Axinte Uricariul ties the emergence of Roman to the ruler by that same name: *And he [Roman I] built the târg of Roman after his name, as he testifies in his document, which is in the Pobrata monastery*⁶. Misail Călugărul (or Simion Dascălul, according to N.A. Ursu⁷) makes one of the most interesting claims, linking the emergence of towns to voivod Iuga, whose reign was very brief: *[Iuga] had founded (descălecat) towns throughout the country, in good places, and built for them ocoale around [...]*⁸. Misail is also credited with the testimony on the emergence of Iași: *Voivode Ștefan had founded Iașii and to praise the Lord began building the church of martyr Necolai*⁹, while Panaitescu attributes to Ureche (Axinte Uricariul according to Velciu¹⁰) the note on the foundation of another town, Hârlău: *it was in 6995 [1487] that voivode Ștefan had founded (a descălecat) Hârlăul, wherein he built the stone church and the princely enclosures, with their walls, which still stand today*¹¹.

Instead, the town of Suceava is mentioned when the Metropolitan Church is founded and the relics of St John the New are brought in: *And in the year 6923 [1415] they had brought in with great expense the relics of Saint John the New from Cetatea Albă, from the heathens, and set them in town, in Suceava, at the Metropolitan Church [...] to keep and uphold his seat*¹². Where other towns are concerned, the chronicle mentions them in relation to events, mostly negative, such as invasions or forays by the Mongols, Poles, Wallachians or Turks. For instance, the towns of Cernăuți and Botoșani only feature several times in such moments¹³. In this case, the source is easily identifiable: the Old Slavonian chronicles in the 15th-16th centuries, events being quoted without any further additions¹⁴.

A MAJOR STEP ahead for historical accuracy, but also for where literature and style are concerned is made by Miron Costin, believed to be *the most learned of Moldavian chroniclers*¹⁵. He focuses on an age that was closer to his day, and he was also involved in many of the events depicted. Costin's historical comments provide more insight than those of his predecessor, who was too busy with the military and political side of history, without leaving room for opinions that would show any in-depth perception of it. Miron Costin is also superior to Ureche in his status as the first historian to write a history of Romanians, his works (including *De neamul moldovenilor*, *Cronica polonă* and *Poema polonă*) proving that the author had a historical scope that extended beyond the local history of Moldavia¹⁶. Some of his works are historical, but also diplomatic in their intent, the chronicler wishing to promote his country by its culture in front of neighbouring powers¹⁷. It was not rare that his texts give consideration to the Romanians in other Romanian territories¹⁸. The chronicle attrib-

uted to Ureche had as well taken a step forward over its precursors, by indicating an understanding of the Latin origin of Romanians (*our origins are in Rome*), even though the author still had difficulties explaining it: *our language draws on many others, and our tongue is still mixed with that of our neighbours*¹⁹. Instead, Miron Costin proves to have a much deeper knowledge of our Roman origin, which is expressed in absolute terms: *So no one is to doubt that [Romanians] have their roots in Rome*²⁰. Miron Costin is also among the first to promote an unbiased and critical practice in writing history, lashing against the so-called *basne*, the fabrications of Simion Dascălul on the origin of the Moldavians²¹.

Miron Costin was familiar with towns, both in Moldavia, and in neighbouring lands, especially in Poland, where he lived 20 years²². He travelled for military or diplomatic purposes all around the Eastern and Central parts of Europe, from Walachia to Neuhäusel (nowadays in Slovakia) or Istanbul²³. His works, especially *De neamul moldovenilor* or *Poema polonă*, mention on several occasions various towns, but he prefers to stop over strongholds, possibly due to a sense of nostalgia for past times, when Moldavia was as well a country with powerful fortresses²⁴. Among others, Costin relays some interesting details to us. In the Focșani-Odo-bești area, the ruins of Milcovia were still visible in his time (*the rubble [...] on the Milcov, north of Focșeni*), which Dimitrie Cantemir also refers to (he places them not far from the Mera monastery). By relying on Ureche, they both mistake it for another stronghold, Crăciuna²⁵, which was in fact on the Siret river²⁶. There was also a stronghold near Soroca, and Costin ascribes its durability to voivode Petru (probably Petru Rareș)²⁷. The chronicler does not forget to draft several town lists, which he organizes across districts²⁸, and also inserts several legends where towns are mentioned. They also include the one on the emergence of Moldavia. A noteworthy detail is that, when describing the battles fought by the Hungarians and the Mongols (Cumans, actually) in king Ladislas' time, Miron Costin cites a theory on the origin of the name of Siret, which is also mentioned by Simion Dascălul (and integrates it in the text on *the origin of Moldavians*, compounded by the much railed-against legend of the robbers who colonized Maramureș)²⁹. However, unlike the one considered to be Ureche's interpolator, who wrote immediately before Costin, the latter added another detail, namely that the battle with the Mongols took place where the town of Roman was later erected: *the Mongols were attacked in Siret, and the battle was waged in Roman [...]. And, although the town of Roman did not stand there yet, it was built in memory of the place where victory was gained*³⁰. Miron Costin was convinced that the town of Roman owes its emergence to Roman I: *under his reign [Roman] was the town of Roman built, bearing his name*³¹.

Further on, in the same work, which describes the actions of Dragoș, Miron Costin credits him with bringing Saxon craftsmen in Wallachia, who were transferred by him *near the mountains*, and wrote about towns that *were mostly founded by Saxons, and it was them, along with the Hungarians, that also created*

the vineyards. Suceava is given the same interpretation as the one by Simion Dascălul, who believed that town owed its emergence to some furriers coming from Hungary³². Manuscript C of *Poema polonă* also provides the only considerations by Costin on the organization of towns: *in towns, the voiti are called șoltuzi, and they have the pârgari in their service, whose name is Hungarian*³³.

WRITTEN IN a style closer to personal memories, Ion Neculce's chronicle continues that of Miron Costin, taking the history of Moldavia up to the first rulers called Phanariotes. Neculce proved to have a remarkable sense of continuity, which led him to take over from where Costin stopped, who also continued Ureche's chronicle. This understanding of history writing shows that these scholar-boyars felt they were engaged in a common effort, and not an individual one, the writing of their country's history, which they tried to relate to the history of the world at large. Neculce compensates his lack of education in Polish schools possessed by his forerunners by the experience he had gathered in a true *cursus honorum* of local offices, but also by the years spent in Walachia (where his uncle was *stolnic* Constantin Cantacuzino), as well as in Russia and Poland. All this allowed him to expand his political scope and to better understand the place Moldavia had in the area. Also, this experience reinforced his belief that Russia was the only one that could rid the country of Ottoman rule³⁴.

Since we wrote only late, in the 18th century, and since he succeeded other chroniclers who had dealt with early Moldavia, Neculce focused less on this topic and much less on the emergence of towns. His only note on this matter can be found in *O samă de cuvinte*, where Neculce records the information which ascribes *the foundation (descălecat) of the town of Siret*³⁵ to Dragoș, who had supposedly established here *his seat*, and *built a zamcă, an earthen stronghold, and therein princely houses and stone church*, the church of the Holy Trinity. Dragoș's consort was allegedly Saxon and had possibly founded the Catholic church in town³⁵. It was also in his compilation of stories that Neculce passes on an anecdote, late and probably genuine³⁶, regarding prince Gheorghe Ștefan. It was said that, when crossing with troops from Transylvania into Moldavia, he had commanded the *șoltuz* in Roman to pay a winebarrel to a herdsman³⁷. The towns are otherwise mentioned in the same context as with the other chroniclers, as places where rulers have their seats or where various events occur, mostly unfortunate: battles, natural disasters, epidemics or boyars being beheaded, with even one of the chroniclers sharing this fate: Miron Costin³⁸.

WE SHOULD ask ourselves: how much historical ground do the chroniclers' writings have? How much of what they have written is just legend, and how much historical tradition, be it popular or scholarly, relayed for generations and generations? What was the source of their infor-

mation? Even the chroniclers confess to having sought inspiration in several places. On the one hand, they relied on external sources, useful to create a background for many of the events involving medieval Moldavia. Most are works written in the Polish or Hungarian lands, which the chroniclers were more familiar with, as they had been educated outside the country, especially in the Polish environment. The main sources of chronicles also include the so-called *letopiseț unguuresc* (*Hungarian Chronicle*), chronicles in Walachia, the chronicle of Joachim Bielski, that of Martin Kromer, the *Cosmography* of Gerard Mercator, the *Sarmatiae Europae descriptio* of Alexander Guagnini (translated into Polish by Martin Paszkowski), the chronicle of Poland by Paul Piasecki, that on the history of Transylvania by L. Toppeltin, and others³⁹. For the internal history, they could rely on court chronicles⁴⁰, as well as on newer ones. Simion Dascălul, Miron Costin and Neculce suggest that a certain Eustratie *logofătul* had already written a chronicle (called *Letopisețul moldovenesc*), in Romanian or Slavonic, but it did not reach modern times⁴¹. Historical tradition, transmitted orally, was a major source for chroniclers when other sources were not too helpful. The preface of the chronicle attributed to Ureche confirms this: *the first writers did not find any written word [...], but rather wrote from stories they heard one from the other*. In the addition that Simion Dascălul is credited with, he claims that he wished to complement Ureche's work and took some of his sources from: [...] *documents in our language*⁴², meaning the internal texts he had access to. Neculce, in *O samă de cuvinte*, refers us directly to the source of his historical accounts: *A collection of words heard from man to man, from men old and ancient, which are not written in the chronicle, but were written here [...]*⁴³. The same Neculce mentions that not all the stories (especially the ones called *basne*) must be frowned upon as unsubstantiated fabrications, when referring to certain accounts, such as those referring to the Poles who ploughed Dumbrava Roșie or to the origin of Movilă family name: *this is why I do not believe it to be a fabrication*⁴⁴. For more recent events, chroniclers used the testimonies of the time, adopted from contemporaries; they were personal witnesses to some⁴⁵.

Those involved in elucidating the sources used by chroniclers were not too concerned with identifying or settling the authenticity of information on towns, and mainly focused on political matters. A recurring topic in the chronicles mentioned is the *descălecat* or the foundation of towns and the contribution of foreigners, both Saxon and Hungarian. Miron Costin took the most decisive stance in this matter, along with Ureche, who mentions several towns, such as Baia and Suceava. This topic comes to complement ideas expressed on the emergence of Moldavia, which features, by putting together information relayed by foreign chronicles and those in local tradition, as a new country, which appeared in a deserted, and then populated place⁴⁶. Archaeological research revealed that areas east of the Carpathians were indeed faced with a significant population

decrease during Mongol domination. This all changed from mid 14th century on, when this land came under Hungarian influence, and then became a distinct principality⁴⁷. The *deserted* land of Moldavia must however be approached as those *terra deserta* in Transylvania or even Poland, mentioned as well in the context of colonisations and already thoroughly discussed. Beyond the Carpathians, the Saxons answered the call of the Hungarian kings and settled in areas around the future towns of Sibiu, Orăștie, Sebeș, Sighișoara, Mediaș, Brașov and Bistrița. The southern parts of Transylvania are indicated as *deserta* in royal documents, and this was also why they had been granted to the newcomers. Romanian historiography challenged the notion of an unpopulated territory in southern Transylvania, especially since this was an area densely inhabited by Romanians, confirmed by findings and narrative sources. Various arguments as to the meaning of *terra deserta* were brought⁴⁸, so we will not repeat what has already been said, but will present another argument that supports the existence of a Romanian population here. The argument comes from one of the neighbours, Poland. It was here, in the borderlands of Greater Poland (in Naklo, Wiele? and in the Lubusz diocese), that colonists were granted lands called *deserta* by documents. Piotr Górecki's research has shown that by *deserted land* one did not refer to unpopulated land, but to one with poor crops and no in-come for the Church (for men of the Church, income meant tithes)⁴⁹. Transylvania was inhabited by Romanians, who were Orthodox and paid no tithes to the Catholic Church, so it is easy to understand why the area mentioned above was granted to colonists who, along with the benefits they brought for the king, were also Catholic. The royal authority relied on colonists since the land inhabited by the *schismatic* was considered *desertum*, lacking any Western religious or even economic organization. Even though in the frontierland, left unpopulated to defend the kingdom's borders (the system of *indagines*, *gyep?*), we may admit that the population had been evacuated, it is hard to believe this happened in a very wide area⁵⁰. If we cross into Moldavia, we will notice that we are dealing with a territory inhabited by an Orthodox population, which is suggested by sources both before the *descălecat*, and after it. Some-where south or east of the mountains (in the east, more likely), after the bishopric of Cumania was established (1227), 13th century documents mention the *valahi*, who have their own *pseudoepiscopis*, and who had *Grecorum ritum*⁵¹. The same Orthodox in the Moldavian area, this time after Moldavia was founded and had emerged as a principality, would strive via their leaders to officially create religious establishments in their own country, a process which was set in motion under Petru I⁵². This is why Dragoș and his men, representatives of the Catholic king of Hungary, in whose name they came to seize this land, met a non-Catholic population here. The recreation of the ancient Catholic bishopric of Cumania, this time called *the bishopric of Milcovia* (1347)⁵³, clearly reveals that this land needed to be organized on political, demographical,

but also on urban grounds. What had previously existed here, a world at the edges of Europe, under the sway of Mongol heathens, did not meet Western standards, which was much better organized in those times.

Back to the foundation of towns, which is an integral part of the foundation process for the entire country (*descălecatul*), we may say that it captures the state of affairs in early Moldavia. Other sources have already told us what the chroniclers confirmed as well, that Baia, Siret or Suceava are among the first urban settlements in the country. As for Baia, Simion Dascălul indicates that he found his inspiration in a form of the so-called *Letopiseț ungiuresc*, which did not endure to this day⁵⁴. The role of Saxons in the foundation of Baia is supported by recent research⁵⁵. Baia is one of the few medieval Moldavian towns where ample archaeological research was undertaken, which was not only aimed at churches of times past, but also ancient dwellings and their inventory. Unfortunately, their scope fell short of the entire surface of the old town. An analysis of the discovered dwellings led researchers to claim that we might argue for a systematic topographic outline of inhabited space. The parcellation of land is rigorous and resembles the Transylvanian one. Archaeologists had a hard time pinpointing a date when this parcellation occurred (before or after the German colonists moved in)⁵⁶. What we know for a fact is that settlers took up residence here after an older pre-urban settlement was set on fire, after this territory came into the hands of the troops dispatched by the Hungarian king in mid 14th century (Dragoș?)⁵⁷. It was in Poland and Hungary as well that settlers had a new land to set themselves up, while the *locator*, the one bringing them here, was charged with measuring and distributing the land⁵⁸. In Baia, it is possible he had received land previously used by the locals and devastated after the conquest. Since the locals were not accustomed to a rigorous parcellation, the newcomers were the ones that reshaped the plots. The fact that they did apply the new layout is suggested by another detail specific to town outlines in the rest of Europe: the existence of a central marketplace⁵⁹. On its sides, dwellings are more frequent than on secondary streets, indicating that the new inhabitants sought to make the most of what little space they had, since the trading venue was most proficient here⁶⁰. Baia is different than other towns in the Romanian-inhabited area, where traditional local markets were open and did not follow any specific outline. Along with the marketplace, there were traces of stone-paved roads and houses with tiled stoves, only specific at that time to princely residences or towns in Central Europe or Transylvania⁶¹. Research confirms that settlers began arriving in Baia in mid 14th century, before the Principality of Moldavia finished emerging. The Hungarian king encouraged their settling east of the Carpathians for political reasons, to reinforce control over this area. We can rightfully credit him with granting the first privilege for the community here. Political reasons were compounded by economic issues. Settlers could harness the resources of the place and direct

them towards markets in Transylvania. A proof to a shift in economic focus is provided by the ceasing of trade exchanges with southern areas⁶². The newcomers also had special legal rights. The leader of the community could preside over very severe cases and pass capital punishments, a rare occurrence in Moldavian towns⁶³. It was from this period that the town seal was kept, which was marked by the symbol of a decapitated stag, whose head is looking onward and is bearing Christ on a cross between the horns, St Hubert's symbol. The legend is Latin: *SIGILLUM CAPITALIS CIVITATIS MOLDAVIE TERR(A)E MOLDA-VIENSIS (The Seal of the capital city Moldavia in the Moldavian Country)*⁶⁴.

Chroniclers seem relatively determined in their belief that Roman was built by the ruler with the same name. Some historians accept that a link existed between Roman I and this town, others deny it, but no one could express a coherent statement on how Roman could influence the town's emergence. Under the name of *Roman's târg*, the settlement is also noted by the Kiev list⁶⁵. Despite Roman's short reign, between 1391 and 1394, the years 1387 and 1396, when the list of Kiev was drafted, allow us to connect the list and the growth of *Roman's târg*⁶⁶. It was assumed that Roman, as Petru I's brother, resided in the stronghold he built here prior to his reign⁶⁷. Ever since 1386, *dominus* Roman issued a document concerning some Polish merchants robbed in Moldavia⁶⁸. The two brothers were probably on good terms, since Roman is mentioned in the document whereby Wladyslaw Jagiello, king of Poland, asks Petru for a loan totalling 4000 silver roubles (1388). The king vows to return the loan and pledges the town of Halych and its land as a guarantee for *Roman and his [Petru's] children*⁶⁹. Roman is noted before the *children*, since he was already considered a follower to the throne, as he was also ruling as associate. He was preferred as a successor to the throne, at the expense of Petru's two sons⁷⁰. There have been attempts to connect the town of Roman with another Roman character, who had supposedly lived before Petru I⁷¹. This another Roman is not mentioned anywhere. Romanian historical tradition noted one single Roman for this age, the prince from 1391-1394. The adoption of the ruler's name involves foundation or relocation on new grounds. A similar case exists in Poland, that of the town of Kazimierz, founded by king Casimir III in 1335⁷².

In many cases where no text documents the principles which underlie a town's creation, we must seek other signs in the outline of that settlement. A few Romanian researchers (Eugenia Greceanu and Emil Ioan Emandi among them) have shown that, to a certain extent, town outlines in Moldavia and Wallachia follow principles encountered in settlements created by German colonists throughout Europe⁷³. Their theories were disregarded. The town outline for Roman has no less than three parallel streets stemming from the main marketplace which separated the settlement and the stronghold⁷⁴. The road entering town from south-west also stopped in the marketplace and the area that these streets delimited is set apart

by a very dense parcellation⁷⁵. The parallel outline of streets and the existence of a regular marketplace in the centre contradict the wide-spread assumption of Romanian historians, who believe that most towns grew spontaneously by themselves. Towns without a deliberate outline grew over time, without any specific order, along the roads that entered the settlement and converged into one central point, where both the marketplace and the seat of local authority existed (the ruler's residence). Instead, parallel streets developed as part of a planned evolution, since this type of development only partly relied on the course of older roads. These streets followed a straight line, indicating that they did not evolve by themselves, but following a precise indication of the plots that bordered them. The type of urban evolution based on two or more parallel streets, connected by a marketplace at the end can also be found in other Moldavian towns (Suceava, Iași), in Walachia (Câmpulung, Pitești) or Transylvania (Sibiu, Cluj, Brașov, Bistrița)⁷⁶. The town seal provides further arguments. It has a Latin legend, an obvious indication that it was created by and for a group of Catholic settlers: + S(IGILLUM) CIVIUM DE FORO ROMANI + (+ *The seal of townspeople in the târg of Roman* +)⁷⁷. The legend reveals that when the community was granted the right to self-representation by such an item, the settlement had not completely graduated to town status.

We have already shown that Neculce tied the emergence of the town of Siret to Dragoș. This story is not present in any of the previous chronicles, neither that of Ureche, nor that of Miron Costin. Neculce did not rely on Nicolae Costin's *Letopiseș* either, even though he was his contemporary and was familiar with this chronicle. He only mentions the building of the Volovăț church by Dragoș, without mentioning other details⁷⁸. It follows that this story was the result of his creative work, drawing on oral accounts that circulated in the Siret area⁷⁹. Another oral account, recorded in modern times, considered Sas, son of Dragoș, to be the one who had erected the residence and the church⁸⁰. In this case, recent researches do not fully back up the information in the chronicle, but do not completely invalidate its claims. What is certain is that Catholic colonists played a major part here as well, as they were responsible for urbanizing the settlement. We do not know whether Dragoș brought the settlers or not, but when Lațcu ruled, they were here, since this ruler had negotiated the creation of a bishopric in Siret in 1371. For the Catholics, but also for the Dominican monks arriving here, Margaret, mother to Petru I, built the church of St John the Baptist. The church's location, in the middle of the marketplace, shows the important role German settlers had in creating the town, its significance in the community being proven by St John's presence on the seal⁸¹. This is one of the few central marketplaces in Moldavia where a church stands in its middle. Only Suceava is another instance of this, with the Armenian church of St Mary. In other towns, the church or the churches only bordered the marketplace. The German's vast pres-

ence in Siret is proven by the town's mention in documents as an influential Catholic centre⁸², but also by the grey ceramic that is associated with them⁸³. The settlers occupied the central area of the settlement, where research indicated high habitation density. The dense dwellings, their line of work and the items uncovered led archae-ologists to claim that in the latter half of the 14th century the settlement had the features of an urban centre⁸⁴.

In Suceava, archaeological excavations indicate a substantial growth of the inhabited space for the end of the 14th century, which is apparently owed to the arrival of a group of foreigners. On a timeline, their arrival coincides with this town becoming a capital for the country under Petru I, who also built two strongholds near the town. We can easily identify the place where the Armenian community dwelled, in the north-west quarter of the town. Since they were mostly merchants, the Armenians had the marketplace as their landmark. However, we cannot accurately locate where Saxons and Hungarians settled, since no Catholic church of the time has survived to this day. The fine grey ceramic, which is attributed to Germans, was found all over town, and in the neighbouring stronghold of Șcheia as well⁸⁵. Previous researchers believed their presence here can only be related to the construction work on the ruler's palace and two nearby strongholds, but an expansion in the scope of items uncovered shows we are dealing with simple tradesmen and artisans⁸⁶. A approach to the Catholic community in Suceava only becomes more intricate if we were to admit they built a Catholic church near the palace of the prince. A short distance from it, the church, relatively large, does give rise to certain dilemmas. The ruler would not have allowed any such construction to be built without setting up or allowing Catholics to settle in there, since the church catered to their spiritual needs and not to the Catholic entourage of the ruler, as it was claimed⁸⁷. The palace also had within it (in the garden), its own Catholic church, whose inception stage is not however known⁸⁸. To further complicate things, it was recently asserted that the church discovered near the palace actually housed an Orthodox monastery, dated 1395⁸⁹. The identity of this building is still disputed, since it had a pair of towers by its facade, towers which are not a feature in Orthodox buildings. This church, whether Catholic or not, vanished at the beginning of the 15th century. Further north, a new Catholic church emerged⁹⁰.

Modern outlines confirm the existence of a central, trapezium-shaped marketplace in Suceava, which was later broken down into two sub-markets. Urbanistic research by Emil Ioan Emandi showed that the initial outline and surface for this marketplace were of around 20 hectares, while the town had around 100 hectares in the Middle Ages⁹¹. The marketplace also relied on the Saxons and Hungarians settling in at the end of the 14th century, on the north-east side, and of the Armenians, on the north-west. The relatively regulated features of the area, as well as the two parallel streets that developed at its end indicate a certain par-

cellation of the land. Later outlines confirm a high density in plots, which were rectangular in shape. As with other towns, the narrow side of the plot, facing the street, had the houses aligned contiguously⁹². This judicious land use is backed up by archaeological research, which located the cellars beneath the medieval houses⁹³. To conclude, in Suceava, the grounds for this town's emergence involved two separate groups, the Catholics (Saxons/ Hungarians) and the Armenians, who could only settle in the marketplace and near the ruler's palace with his consent and support.

All this supports the significant role played by foreign settlers in urbanizing Suceava. The interpretation regarding the Hungarian name of Suceava is encountered both in Miron Costin's work, and in that of Simion Dascălul, and even though the former was aware of the latter's contributions⁹⁴, it may stem in an explanatory legend that circulated at the time, without being actually invented by one of the chroniclers. The so-called Transylvanian origin of Simion Dascălul⁹⁵ was supposedly the cause of this information, even though linguistic research on the Simion's language in the chronicle does not support this theory⁹⁶. In Hungarian, *szűcs* indeed meant *furrier* and since a sizeable Catholic community, with its own church, had lived in Suceava up to mid-16th century, the legend probably connected it with previous historical facts.

It was still on the subject of Suceava that Grigore Ureche mentions the building of the St Demetrius church by Stephen the Great *in the târg*, to celebrate the victory in Codrul Cosminului (where he had called for St Demetrius' help)⁹⁷. Even though archaeologists claimed this place of worship actually belonged to Peter Rareș⁹⁸, part of the historians also take into consideration the theory of this church being first built by Stephen⁹⁹.

THE ENVIRONMENT of former colonists arriving into Moldavia also ties in with other traditions, that chroniclers combined with accounts extracted from foreign chronicles. The legend of the Roman robbers, combined with the battles against the Mongols waged by St Ladislav, inserted by Simion Dascălul, were supposedly based on the same *Hungarian chronicle* mentioned above. Petre P. Panaitescu supports the theory that it existed¹⁰⁰, while I.C. Chițimia, Dumitru Velciu and others believe Simion Dascălul had never laid eyes on any such work¹⁰¹. Along with possible sources in the Polish environment (for the story of the robbers), we cannot rule out a possible influence from a version of the *Moldavian Russian Chronicle*¹⁰², that Simion may have had access to¹⁰³. As for St Ladislav's battles against the Mongols, he may have added information from other sources in the Catholic Hungarian environment of Moldavia¹⁰⁴. Towns here had, until mid-16th century, major Hungarian communities (especially in the Lower Country), where St Ladislav was also worshipped, a widespread practice in the Hungarian environment. A significant detail is that the seal from

the modern period of the Catholic community in Bârlad allegedly had the image of St Ladislav kneeling and looking at Virgin Mary, seated on a cloud¹⁰⁵. We are not aware of how old this seal was, but it is the presence of St Ladislav that gives rise to a dilemma. We would have considered this seal to be of recent date if Marco Bandini, when mentioning the earthen stronghold near Bârlad, would not have recorded another local account, which included Ladislav:

[...] *two stadia away from the market town, there lay the ruins of a Mongol fortress, on the shore of the Bârlad [river], where the Mongols had defended when king Ladislav pursued the Scythians victoriously around 1236.*

This is one of the two occurrences when St Ladislav is mentioned in Bandini's *Codex*¹⁰⁶. Coincidentally, Simion Dascălul's fabrications, those connecting the colonization of Maramureş by Roman robbers and the battles against the Mongols to the same Ladislav were recorded at the same time as Bandini travels through Moldavia¹⁰⁷. St Ladislav's worship had reached full flight in the 14th century, and he was worshipped because he had battled the heathen, in a time when new battles were waged, this time with other pagans, the Mongols; from Hungary, through settlers, this cult reached Moldavia¹⁰⁸. It was no accident that I.C. Chişimia saw this legend, as well as that of Iaţco the beekeeper, as grounded in popular tradition¹⁰⁹. Previously, Petre P. Panaitescu, following Onciul's line¹¹⁰, accepted a possible scholarly origin from Hungary, without taking into account the fact that Hungarians crossing into Moldavia could have perpetuated the legend as part of the cult of St Ladislav, writing into it information which had to do with their own tradition and which regarded Hungarian campaigns against the Mongols in mid-14th century. Even though it was placed against an inappropriate historical background and was adopted inadequately by chroniclers, this information can be a starting point towards the emergence of Hungarian communities in Moldavia, an emergence which is also related to the emergence of towns.

Other details in chronicles regarding towns are probably founded on real fact, even though time left its traces, and some further additions distanced them from the original corpus of information. The extensive work undertaken by Stephen the Great in Iaşi was misinterpreted later on by chroniclers, who attributed to him *the foundation (descălecat) of the târg*, even though the town had already existed for a century¹¹¹. If this information were not be a fabrication, as those ascribed to Simion Dascălul or Misail Călugărul, it could lead to a possible confirmation by Stephen of the old town privilege, as he had done in Vaslui and Bârlad¹¹². The statement which credits voivode Iuga with the foundation of towns, villages, and *ocoale* must have also had its grounds. The author of the interpolation adopted the account which claimed that one of the first Moldavian rulers had played an important part in the development of the country at

one point. Since this ruler could not have been Iuga, who only ruled for approximately one year, it was another ruler who had partly been the drive behind this process. Two rulers fit this profile: Peter I (chronicles do not provide too much information on him) and Alexander the Good. They both had longer reigns, and both were tactful in their internal and external policies; in their time, the country began to push forward and to develop. The fact that, when it describes Alexander the Good's reign, Misail Călugărul provides a lot of information on the administrative and clerical organization of the country could hint at Alexandru. On the other hand, Peter I is the one who erected several strongholds, and also contributed greatly in the development of Suceava and Siret¹¹³.

The presence of the Genovese in chronicles as the founders of strongholds can be explained by the significant part they played in the 14th-15th centuries in some of Moldavia's oldest towns, Cetatea Albă and Chilia. After 1261, the Mongols allowed the Genovese to set up in their lands in Crimea (at Caffa and Sugdaia), then in Cetatea Albă. In the latter, the Genovese are first mentioned in 1290¹¹⁴. Cetatea Albă develops from mid 14th century on and the modification of the main path in the "Mongol route," which already crossed Moldavia in c. 1380, contributed to the town's emergence. After a final Mongol episode¹¹⁵, Cetatea Albă enters the dominion of Moldavian princes (c. 1377-1378)¹¹⁶ which were mainly interested in owning the fortress, but also the customs point, which brought significant income¹¹⁷. On the mouth of the Danube, Kilia was at an even greater advantage, thanks to the same Genovese merchants. A settlement with probable Byzantine origins existed here at least since the 13th century, and was mentioned in the 1241 invasion¹¹⁸. Recent research claims that two settlements existed by the Danube, at Kilia: a Byzantine stronghold, called Licostomo, on an island where the Kilia branch flowed into the sea, and another, Kilia, further within, on the waterway. The precise location of the two is still debated¹¹⁹. Kilia owes its ascent to the decline of its rival town, Vicina, whose commerce was dealt a heavy blow after the Genovese-Byzantine war of 1351-1352. Afterwards, the Byzantines lost their foothold on the Lower Danube, and Kilia entered Genovese control¹²⁰. Notary Antonio di Ponzò's 1360-1361 records show the town to have had a very active trade, with a wealthy and highly mobile Genovese colony¹²¹. In one single century, Kilia went through various reigns: Wallachia, Moldavia, and Hungary¹²². From 1465 until 1484, the town, and the stronghold itself, rebuilt on the other bank of the Danube by Ștefan the Great (1479) belonged to Moldavia¹²³. As was the case of Cetatea Albă, it is assumed that the townspeople of Kilia enjoyed autonomy. Essentially, these harbours by the sea emerged on Byzantine foundations, with Genovese contributions and in a climate ensured by Mongol domination. The impact that these towns had on other Moldavian urban centres was mostly economic, and it affected trade before anything else. The rulers had political and military interests here, namely special strategic

positions and bringing supplementary income in the treasury. The two towns were not long under Moldavian rule. Moldavian rulers held Cetatea Albă for around one hundred years, while Kilia was in this situation for only three decades.

The Genovese were then a major factor in urbanizing towns by the Danube and Dniester deltas, as well as in erecting fortresses here. Even so, chroniclers overstated the importance of these sailing merchants, since they had a minor role within the country, with economic, rather than military contributions. We must not, however, rule out completely the contribution of Italian builders in the construction of the fortresses at Hotin, Suceava or Neamț, without it being documented by sources. The construction type falls into a pattern used at that time in Poland¹²⁴, and architects have identified some wall fragments which would support the theory that specialists from the Polish-Baltic areas participated in the works¹²⁵.

Whereas relatively frequent mention is made to towns in chronicles, especially to large urban centres, where the main events unfolded, the townspeople do not enjoy the same popularity. With the exception of several anecdotic accounts (Neculce), the townspeople seem to weigh little in the affairs of Medieval Moldavian society. Other categories, such as the peasants, do not receive better treatment¹²⁶. Even though the chronicles were limited in their perception of social aspects, the townspeople were indeed secondary in social, demographic or economic matters. They were few in number, and, even if some are wealthy and influential¹²⁷, their power was no match to that of the boyars. The inconsistent policies of the rulers, as well as the destructions they suffered (pillaging, fires, earthquakes) prevented towns from reaching the prominence that similar settlements in Western Europe had.

The attitude that chroniclers had towards towns was influenced by their origin and background. They were all boyars, and some, like Ureche, was a descendant of the old boyars of Moldavia. Based on documents preserved, those conducting research on his family, especially Ștefan S. Gorovei and Dumitru Velciu, state that the oldest certain traces revealing the age of the Ureche male line reach Stephen the Great. Boyars named Ureche are also present in Alexander the Good's council, but they could not be directly associated with the future Ureche family. Instead, a connection appeared on the female line, so the roots of the family could even reach the first rulers of the country¹²⁸. We cannot rule out that some of the information adopted in the chronicle (initially by Ureche and then by Simion Dascălul), which cannot be explained by written sources, had their source in the oral accounts kept, in the scholar's family, or in other boyar families¹²⁹. Their members displayed an awareness of their belonging to a special category of people, the elite of the country, so we may consider them as true 'repositories' of historical information. This is why accounts preserved orally (but also in writing, indirectly, via property documents) in old boyar

families could play a major role in transmitting historically-significant information over time.

MODERN RESEARCH confirmed a large part of the chroniclers' statements, and even those of the interpolators, and this reinforces the historical value of the information on the emergence of Moldavia and of its towns. Some of these statements are certainly not derived from written sources used by chroniclers, but from local historical tradition. We should also reconsider the role of interpolators, since not all their interferences with the text compromised the original chronicles, and not all introduced false information. Some even came to complement the chronicle, even though they did not match the style and the clarity of the original.

Of course, we can criticize the chronicles and their authors for the inaccuracy of their information, especially when it comes to the early days of the country. However, in our desire to make up for the lack of solid historical sources, we would be asking too much of them. Their authors did not intend to provide us with a historical source, but with their own view on the history of their country, a view which could only be biased¹³⁰. The fact that they turned into a historical source has to do with a later approach, when historical research matured and, using the chronicles, proposed several historical theories regarding events of the past. Chroniclers were the historians of their time, and, despite their serious limitations, must be judged as such.

□

Notes

1. N.A. Ursu, 'Letopisețul Țării Moldovei până la Aron Vodă. Opera lui Simion Dascălul' [The Chronicle of the Land of Moldavia up to Voivode Aron: The Work of Simion Dascălul] (I-II), *AIIAI*, XXVI (1989), pp. 363-379; [*AIIIX*] XVII (1990), pp. 73-101 (namely the conclusions: pp. 94-101).
2. Ureche seems to have had *Eustratie logofătul* (chancellor) as his forerunner, whose work was, however, lost (*Letopisețul Țării Moldovei* [The Chronicle of the Land of Moldavia] edited by P.P. Panaitescu (Bucharest, 1958), pp. 24-25, 39-40). Even though the existence of Eustratie was also challenged, the fact he is referenced so often by various chroniclers leads us to believe that the person and his work were real.
3. Dumitru Velciu, *Grigore Ureche* (Bucharest, 1979), pp. 190-191.
4. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, p. 73 (see Panaitescu's considerations at p. 29).
5. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

7. Ursu, 'Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei' (II), pp. 95-96.
8. Ureche, *Letopiseșul*, p. 75.
9. Ibid., p. 103.
10. Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, p. 270.
11. Ureche, *Letopiseșul*, p. 108.
12. Ibid., p. 78.
13. Ibid., pp. 116-117, 136, 140, 152.
14. *Cronicile slavo-române din sec. XV-XVI publicate de Ioan Bogdan* [The Slavic-Romanian Chronicles from the 15th-16th Centuries published by Ioan Bogdan], edited by P. P. Panaitescu (Bucharest, 1959), pp. 11-12, 20-21, 78, 91.
15. Nicolae Cartoian, *Istoria literaturii române vechi* [The History of the Old Romanian Literature], editors Rodica Rotaru, Andrei Rusu (Bucharest, 1996), p. 286.
16. Miron Costin, *De neamul Moldovenilor* [On the <Origins of the> Moldavians], in Idem, *Opere* [Works], edited P. P. Panaitescu (Bucharest, 1958) p. 241. This edition also includes *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei* [The Chronicle of Moldavia], *Cronica polonă* [The Polish Chronicle], *Poema polonă* [The Polish <Epic> Poem].
17. According to Dan Zamfirescu (*Contribuții la istoria literaturii române vechi* [Contributions to the History of the Old Romanian Literature] (Bucharest, 1981), p. 117), Miron Costin, by his *Cronica polonă*, opens the way to *the diplomacy of culture, conducted by the means of journals which would inform foreigners on the country, the land, the history of the Romanians*.
18. Costin, *Letopiseșul*, pp. 47-50; Idem, *Cronica*, pp. 202-209, 215, 217.
19. Ureche, *Letopiseșul*, p. 67.
20. Costin, *Poema*, p. 220.
21. Costin, *De neamul Moldovenilor*, pp. 242-243, 247, 260. Neculce (*Opere. Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei și O samă de cuvinte* [Works. *The Chronicle of the Land of Moldavia and A Sum of Words*], edited by Gabriel Ștrempel (Bucharest, 1982), p. 158) also takes a similar stance in the preface to his chronicle.
22. He studied in Bar, Podolia (Costin, *Opere*, pp. 7-9).
23. D. Velciu, *Miron Costin. Interpretări și comentarii* [Miron Costin: Interpretations and Comments] (Bucharest, 1973), pp. 58, 119-122.
24. Costin, *Cronica*, pp. 205-206; Idem, *Poema*, pp. 222-223; Idem, *De neamul moldovenilor*, pp. 265-266.
25. Dimitrie Cantemir, *Descrierea stării de odinioară și de astăzi a Moldovei* [The Description of the Ancient and of the Present State of Moldavia], II, edited by Dan Slușanschi, Valentina Eșanu, Andrei Eșanu (Bucharest, 2007), p. 156; Costin, *De neamul Moldovenilor*, p. 266;
26. I. Bogdan, *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare* [The Documents of Stephen the Great], II (Bucharest, 1913), no. 139, p. 311. For the location of Crăciuna, see Constantin Cihodaru, 'Cu privire la localizarea unor evenimente din istoria Moldovei: Hindău, Direptate, Crăciuna și Roșcani' [On the Location of certain Events in the History of Moldavia: Hindău, Direptate, Crăciuna and Roșcani], *AIILAI*, XXIX (1982), pp. 629-631.
27. Costin, *Cronica*, p. 205.

28. Costin, *Cronica*, pp. 216-217; Idem, *Poema* (version C), pp. 390-391.
29. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 68-69.
30. Costin, *Poema*, p. 228.
31. Ibid., p. 235.
32. Ibid., pp. 232-233; see also Adolf Armbruster, *Dacoromano-Saxonica. Cronicari români despre sași. Români în cronica săsească* [Romanian Chroniclers on the Saxons. The Romanian in Saxon Chronicles] (Bucharest, 1980), p. 162.
33. Costin, *Poema* (version C), p. 391.
34. I. Neculce, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei și O samă de cuvinte* [The Chronicle of the Land of Moldavia and A Sum of Words], edited by Iorgu. Iordan (Bucharest, 1956), pp. 12-13; D. Velciu, *Ion Neculce* (Bucharest, 1968), pp. 159-160.
35. This account is not included in the above-quoted edition Iordan. It was found in mss. 254, f. 177 and included in edition Ștrempel, pp. 161-162.
36. Constantin C. Giurescu, 'Valoarea istorică a tradițiilor consemnate de Ion Neculce' [The Historical Value of the Traditions recorded by Ion Neculce], in *Studii de folclor și literatură* [Studies in Folklore and Literature], edited by H.H. Stahl et al. (Bucharest, 1967), p. 471.
37. Neculce, *Opere*, p. 183.
38. Miron Costin was killed at Roman in 1691, by order of Constantin Cantemir (Velciu, *Miron Costin*, pp. 117-119).
39. P.P. Panaitescu, *Influența polonă în opera și personalitatea cronicarilor Grigore Ureche și Miron Costin* [The Polish Influences on the Work and Characters of the Chroniclers Grigore Neculce and Miron Costin] (Bucharest, 1925), pp. 20-37, 83-106; Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 36-47; Costin, *Opere*, pp. 30-31; Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, pp. 271-305.
40. Published in *Cronicile slavo-române*.
41. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 24-25, 39-40; Panaitescu, *Influența polonă*, pp. 53-57. References in chronicles: Costin, *Poema*, p. 220; Idem, *De neamul moldovenilor*, pp. 242-243, 260-261; Neculce, *Opere*, pp. 157-158. Velciu (*Grigore Ureche*, pp. 237-242) disputes the existence of this chronicle too.
42. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 64-65.
43. Neculce, *Opere*, p. 161.
44. Ibid., p. 158.
45. Costin, *Letopisețul*, p. 166; Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, pp. 305-307.
46. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 66-71; Costin, *Poema*, pp. 229-233. See also *Cronicile slavo-române*, p. 156, 160.
47. Nicolae Zaharia, Mircea Petrescu-Dîmbovița, Emanoil Zaharia, *Așezări din Moldova de la paleolitic până în secolul al XVIII-lea* [Settlements in Moldavia from the Paleolithic to the 18th Century] (Bucharest, 1970), pp. 141-143, 148.
48. Ștefan Pascu, *Voievodatul Transilvaniei* [The Voivodate of Transylvania], I (Cluj, 1972²), pp. 126-128; Thomas Năgler, *Așezarea sașilor în Transilvania* [The Settlement of the Saxons in Transylvania] (Bucharest, 1981), pp. 149-154.
49. Piotr Górecki, *Economy, Society, and Lordship in Medieval Poland, 1100-1250* (New York-London, 1992), pp. 273-275.

50. Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary, 895-1526* (London, 2001), pp. 73-74; Nágler, *Așezarea sașilor*, p. 143;
51. Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor* [Documents regarding the History of the Romanians], I-I, edited by Nicolae Densușianu (Bucharest, 1887), no. 83, p. 108 (*Hurmuzaki*); *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, D, *Relații între Țările Române* [Relations between the Romanian Countries], I, edited by Șt. Pascu et al. (Bucharest, 1977), no. 9, p. 20 (DRH, D).
52. Ștefan S. Gorovei, *Întemeierea Moldovei. Probleme controversate* [The Foundation of Moldavia. Controversial Problems] (Iași, 1997), pp. 174-196.
53. DRH, D, I, no. 34, p. 63. The issue of reactivating the former bishopric of Cumania was debated ever since 1332 (*ibid.*, no. 22, p. 45).
54. *Cronici slavo-române*, pp. 156, 160; Ureche, *Letopiseșul*, pp. 46, 71.
55. Details in L. Rădvan, *At Europe's Borders: Medieval Towns in the Romanian Principalities* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 458-465.
56. Eugenia Neamțu, Vasile Neamțu, Stela Cheptea, *Orașul medieval Baia în secolele XIV-XVII* [The Medieval Town Baia in the 14th-17th Centuries], II (Iași, 1984), pp. 40-42, 46-47.
57. *Ibid.*, I (Iași, 1980), p. 22; II, p. 16.
58. Heinz Quirin, 'The Colonial Town as Seen in the Documents of East German Settlement', in *The Comparative History of Urban Origins in Non-Roman Europe: Ireland, Wales, Denmark, Germany, Poland and Russia from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century*, II (=BAR, International Series, CCLV), edited by H.B. Clarke, Annegret Simms (Oxford, 1985), pp. 509-510.
59. *AIR*, I (1865), 2, no. 290, p. 21
60. V. Neamțu, *Istoria orașului medieval Baia (Civitas Moldaviensis)* [The History of the Medieval Town Baia] (Iași, 1997), pp. 118-119, 153-154; *Orașul medieval Baia*, I, p. 156; II, p. 42;
61. *Orașul medieval Baia*, I, pp. 36-37; 128-139; II, pp. 45-46.
62. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 101-102; II, p. 245.
63. Teodor Bălan, *Documente bucovinene* [Documents from the Bukovina], II (Cernăuți, 1934), no. 87, pp. 163-164.
64. Al. Lapedatu, 'Antichitățile de la Baia' [Antiquities from Baia], *BCMI*, II (1909), p. 64; Emil Vîrtosu, 'Din sigilografia Moldovei și Țării Românești' [From the Sigillography of Moldavia and Walachia], in *Documente privind istoria României, Introducere* [Documents regarding the History of Romania. Introduction], II (Bucharest, 1956), pp. 461-465; Șt.S. Gorovei, 'Am pus pecetea orașului' [We put the Seal of the City], *MI*, XII (1978), 2, p. 36.
65. *Novgorodskaiia pervaiia letopisi starșego i mladșego izvodov*, edited by A.N. Nasonov, M.N. Tihomirov (Moscow, 1950), p. 475.
66. Alexandru Andronic, 'Orașe moldovenești în secolul al XIV-lea în lumina celor mai vechi izvoare rusești' [The Moldavian Towns in the 14th Century in the Light of the Oldest Russian Sources], *RSL*, XI (1965), pp. 205-210; *Tezaurul toponimic al României. Moldova* [Romania's Toponymic Thesaurus], I-4, edited Dragoș Moldovanu (Iași, 2005), pp. XXXIII-XXXV ('Toponimia Moldovei în cartografia europeană

- veche (cca. 1395-1789)' [Moldavia's Toponymy in the Old European Cartography (c. 1395-1789)].
67. Constantin Rezachevici, *Cronologia critică a domnilor din Țara Românească și Moldova. a. 1324-1881* [The Critic Chronology of the Rulers of Walachia and Moldavia (a. 1324-1881)], I (Bucharest, 2001), pp. 456-457.
 68. P.P. Panaitescu, *Mircea cel Bătrân* [Mircea the Old], edited by Gheorghe Lazăr (Bucharest, 2000), pp. 284-285; Șt.S. Gorovei, *Mușatinii* [The Mușat Family] (Bucharest, 1976), p. 31.
 69. Mihai Costăchescu, *Documentele moldovenești înainte de Ștefan cel Mare* [Moldavian Documents prior to Stephen the Great], II (Iași, 1932), no. 164, p. 605.
 70. Șt.S. Gorovei, *Dragoș și Bogdan, întemeietorii Moldovei* [Dragoș and Bogdan, the Founders of Moldavia] (Bucharest, 1973), pp. 154-156; Matei Cazacu, 'Lucius Apronianus = Roman I^{er}, prince de Moldavie? À propos de l'expédition polonaise de 1359 en Moldavie et de son écho en Pologne au XV^e siècle', *BBRF*, VIII (1980-1981), pp. 257-272.
 71. Șt.S. Gorovei, 'Istoria în palimpsest: Moldova dinainte de Moldova' [Hidden History: Moldavia before Moldavia], *RI*, NS, VI (1995), 1-2, p. 172; Idem, *Întemeierea Moldovei*, pp. 43-44.
 72. Paul W. Knoll, 'The Urban Development of Medieval Poland, with Particular Reference to Kraków', in *Urban Society of Eastern Europe*, edited by Bariša Krekic (Berkeley, 1987), p. 104.
 73. Eugenia Greceanu, 'La structure urbaine médiévale de la ville de Roman', *RRH*, XV (1976), 1, pp. 39-56; Eadem, *Ansamblul urban medieval Pitești* [The Medieval Complex Pitești] (Bucharest, 1982); Emil Ioan Emandi, *Habitatul urban și cultura spațiului. Studiu de geografie istorică. Suceava în secolele XIV-XX* [Urban Habitat and the Culture of Space: Study of Historical Geography. Suceava in the 14th-20th Centuries] (Iași, 1996), pp. 263-268, 294-301; Teodor Octavian Gheorghiu, 'Suceava medievală – geneză și evoluție până în prima parte a secolului al XVI-lea. Elemente morfo-structurale' [Medieval Suceava: Genesis and Evolution until the Middle of the 16th Century: Morpho-Structural Elements], *HU*, XII (2004), 1-2, pp. 81-82.
 74. *Călători străini despre Țările Române* [Foreign Travellers on the Romanian Countries], II, edited by Maria Holban et. al (Bucharest, 1970), p. 139.
 75. Greceanu, 'La structure urbaine', pp. 41-53.
 76. Paul Niedermaier, 'Dezvoltarea urbanistică și arhitectonică a unor orașe transilvănene din sec. al XII-lea până în sec. al XVI-lea' [The Urban and Architectural Development of Certain Transylvanian Towns. 12th-16th Centuries], in *Studii de istorie a naționalității germane și a înfișării ei cu națiunea română* [Studies on the History of the German Nationality and on her Fraternisation with the Romanian Nationality], I, edited by Lajos Bányai (Bucharest, 1976), pp. 143-144.
 77. Virtosu, 'Din sigilografia', pp. 475-476.
 78. Nicolae Costin, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei* [The Chronicle of the Land of Moldavia] edited by Constantin A. Stoide, Ioan Lăzărescu (Iași, 1976), pp. 74-75.
 79. Giurescu, 'Valoarea istorică', p. 443, 476; Velciu, *Ion Neculce*, pp. 162-163, 167-169.

80. Simeon Reli, *Oraşul Siret în vremuri de demult* [The City of Siret in Ancient Times] (Cernăuţi, 1927), pp. 20-23, 94.
81. DRH, A, *Moldova* [Moldavia], I, edited by C. Cihodaru et al (Bucharest, 1975), no. 1, p. 1; Vîrtosu, 'Din sigilografia', pp. 476-477.
82. *Hurmuzaki*, I-2, edited by N. Densuşianu (Bucharest, 1890), no. 131, p. 168.
83. Mircea D. Matei, 'Câteva consideraţii pe marginea începuturilor oraşului Siret, în lumina celor mai recente descoperiri arheologice' [Some Considerations on the Beginnings of the City of Suceava in the Light of the Most Recent Archaeological Discoveries], *RM*, XVII (1986), 2, pp. 21-23.
84. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-25.
85. Paraschiva-Victoria Batariuc, 'Din nou despre ceramica cenuşie de la Suceava' [Again on the Dark Ceramics from Suceava], *AM*, XXV (2002), pp. 220-232.
86. Gheorghe Diaconu, Nicolae Constantinescu, *Cetatea Şcheia. Monografie arheologică* [The Fortress of Şcheia. Archaeological Monograph] (Bucharest, 1960), pp. 72-82; M.D. Matei, *Contribuţii arheologice la istoria oraşului Suceava* [Archaeological Contributions to the History of the City of Suceava] (Bucharest, 1963), pp. 48-57, 131-151; Batariuc, 'Din nou despre ceramica', p. 232.
87. M.D. Matei, *Civilizaţie urbană medievală românească. Contribuţii (Suceava până la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea)* [Romanian Medieval Urban Civilization: Contributions. Suceava until the Middle of the 18th Century] (Bucharest, 1989), pp. 59-60.
88. *Călători străini*, V, edited by M. Holban et. al (Bucharest, 1973), pp. 25, 182.
89. *Hurmuzaki*, XIV-1, edited by Nicolae Iorga (Bucharest, 1915), no. 41, p. 18; Petre Ş. Năsturel, 'D'un document byzantin de 1395 et de quelques monastères roumains', *TM*, VIII (1981), pp. 345-351.
90. *Călători străini*, V, pp. 181-182. Gh. Diaconu, 'Contribuţii la cunoaşterea culturii medievale de la Suceava în veacurile XV-XVI' [Contributions to the Study of the Medieval Culture in Suceava. 15th-16th Centuries], *MCA*, 6 (1959), pp. 913-923.
91. Emandi, *Habitatul urban*, pp. 299-300.
92. *Atlas istoric al oraşelor din România/ Städtegeschichteatlas Rumäniens, A, Moldova/ Moldau*, fasc. 1, *Suceava*, edited by M.D. Matei (Bucharest, 2005), maps V-VII; Emandi, *Habitatul urban*, pp. 263-268.
93. Gh. Diaconu, 'Observaţii cu privire la urmele vechiului târg al Sucevei în vremea marilor asedii otomane şi polone din veacul al XV-lea' [Observations on the Traces of the Old Market of Suceava during the Great Ottoman and Polish Sieges of the 15th Century], *SMIM*, I (1956), pp. 267-274; M.D. Matei, E.I. Emandi, *Cetatea de scaun şi curtea domnească din Suceava* [The Residence Fortress and the Princely Court of Suceava] (Bucharest, 1988), pp. 158-162.
94. Costin, *De neamul moldovenilor*, p. 242-243.
95. Cartoian, *Istoria literaturii române vechi*, p. 253.
96. Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, pp. 199-203.
97. Ureche, *Letopiseţul*, p. 103, 115.
98. M.D. Matei, Alexandru Rădulescu, Al. Artimon, 'Bisericile de piatră de la Sf. Dumitru din Suceava' [The Stone Churches from St. Demetrius in Suceava], *SCIV*, XX (1969), 4, pp. 547-548; Matei, *Civilizaţie urbană medievală românească*, pp. 154-156.

99. P.-V. Batariuc, 'Biserici dispărute la Suceava' [Lost Churches from Suceava], *HU*, XV (2007), pp. 181-183.
100. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 46-47.
101. Ioan C. Chițimia, *Probleme de bază ale literaturii române vechi* [Fundamental Problems of the Old Romanian Literature] (Bucharest, 1972), pp. 253-260; Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, pp. 226-237.
102. *Cronicile slavo-române*, pp. 154-160.
103. Gheorghe I. Brătianu, *Tradiția istorică despre întemeierea statelor românești* [The Historic Tradition on the Foundation of the Romanian States], edited by Valeriu Râpeanu (Bucharest, 1980), pp. 155-156; Panaitescu, *Influența polonă*, pp. 35-37; Brătianu (*Tradiția istorică*, p. 166) sees in this king *Laslău* ("craiul Laslău") a synthesis of several historical figures: St. Ladislav, king of Hungary, voivode Ladislav of Transylvania and Ladislav IV the Cuman, king of Hungary.
104. See also Cartoian, *Istoria literaturii române vechi*, pp. 252-253.
105. Iosif Gabor, *Dicționarul comunităților catolice din Moldova* [The Dictionary of the Catholic Communities in Moldavia] (Bacău, 1996), p. 44.
106. Marco Bandini, *Codex. Vizitarea generală a tuturor bisericilor catolice de rit roman din Provincia Moldova, 1646-1648* [Codex. The General Visitation of All Roman Rite Catholic Churches in the Province of Moldavia. 1646-1648], edited by Traian Diaconescu (Iași, 2006), pp. 104-106. Bandini also relates that pieces of St Ladislaus's relics were embedded on a cross in the Catholic church of Hârlău (Ibid., p. 232).
107. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, pp. 68-69.
108. Details in Gábor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses: Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 173-194, 361.
109. Chițimia, *Probleme de bază*, pp. 257-260.
110. Dimitrie Onciul, *Originile principatelor române* [The Origins of the Romanian Principalities] (Bucharest, 1899), pp. 96-99; Panaitescu, *Influența polonă*, p. 36, note 1; see Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers*, p. 189, and the legend of St Ladislav's divine intervention in favour of the Hungarians and the Szeklers who fought with the Mongols around 1345.
111. Ureche, *Letopisețul*, p. 103.
112. DRH, A, III, edited by Leon Șimanschi et al. (Bucharest, 1984), no. 96, p. 188; no. 151, p. 279.
113. Rădvan, *At Europe's Borders*, p. 531, 536.
114. Gh. I. Brătianu, *Recherches sur Vicina et Cetatea Albă* (Bucharest, 1935), p. 102; no. 40, p. 176; Virgil Ciocîltan, *Mongolii și Marea Neagră în secolele XIII-XIV. Contribuția Cinghizanizilor la transformarea bazinului pontic în placă turnantă a comerțului euro-asiatic* [The Mongols and the Black Sea in the 13th-14th Centuries: The Contribution of Genghis Khan's Heirs to the Transformation of the Pontic Basin into the Turntable of Euro-Asiatic Trade] (Bucharest, 1998), pp. 22-31, 129-144.
115. Gh.I. Brătianu, 'Demetrius Princeps Tartatorum (Ca. 1360-1380)', *RER*, IX-X (1965), pp. 42-46.
116. Gorovei, *Întemeierea Moldovei*, pp. 200-210. See also Victor Spinei, *Moldova în secolele XI-XIV* (Chișinău, 1994²), pp. 382-385; Șerban Papacostea, *Geneza statu-*

- lui în evul mediu românesc. Studii critice* [The Genesis of the State in the Romanian Middle Ages. Critic Studies] (Bucharest, 1999²), p. 118
117. *Documentele moldovenești*, II, no. 176, p. 630.
118. Aurel Decei, 'L'invasion des tatars de 1241/1242 dans nos régions selon la Djami ot-Tevarikh de Fâzl ol-Lah Râsid od-Din', *RRH*, XII (1973), 1, pp. 120-121.
119. Octavian Iliescu, 'Localizarea vechiului Licostomo' [The Location of the Ancient Licostomo], *Studii*, XXV (1972), 3, pp. 452-453.
120. Ș. Papacostea, 'De Vicina à Kilia. Byzantins et Génois aux bouches du Danube au XIV^e siècle', *RESEE*, XVI (1978), 1, pp. 69-78.
121. Published by Geo Pistarino in *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare: atti rogati a Chilia da Antonio di Ponzò (1360-1361)* (Genoa, 1971).
122. C.C. Giurescu, *Târguri sau orașe și cetăți moldovene din secolul al X-lea până la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea* [Towns or Cities and Fortresses. 10th Century-Mid 16th Century] (Bucharest, 1997²), p. 221; P.P. Panaitescu, 'Legăturile moldo-polone în secolul XV și problema Chilieii' [Moldavian-Polish Relation in the 15th Century and the Problem of Chilia], *RSL*, III (1958), pp. 98-102; Idem, *Mircea cel Bătrân*, pp. 361-362; Ștefan Andreescu, *Din istoria Mării Negre (genovezi, români și tătari în spațiul pontic în secolele XIV-XVII)* [From the History of the Black-Sea: Genovese, Romanians and Tartars in the Pontic Space in the 14th-17th Centuries] (Bucharest, 2001), pp. 39-42, 46-48.
123. *Cronicile slavo-române*, p. 34.
124. Adrian Andrei Rusu, *Castelarea carpatică. Fortificații și cetăți din Transilvania și teritoriile învecinate (sec. XIII-XVI)* [Fortresses and Castles from Transylvania and the Neighboring Territories. 13th-16th Centuries] (Cluj-Napoca, 2005), pp. 469-472.
125. Mariana Șlapac, *Cetăți medievale din Moldova (mijlocul secolului al XIV-lea-mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea)* [Medieval Fortresses from Moldavia. Mid 1300s-Mid 1500s] (Chișinău, 2004), p. 112, 114-118.
126. Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, p. 332.
127. N. Iorga, *Relațiile economice ale țărilor noastre cu Lembergul* [The Economic Relations of our Countries with Lvov], I (Bucharest, 1900), pp. 30-31; Radu Manolescu, 'Cu privire la problema patriciatului în orașele Țării Românești și Moldovei (sec. XV-prima jumătate a sec. XVI)' [On the Problem of the Patricians in the Cities of Walachia and Moldavia (15th Century-First Half of 16th Century)], *Cumidava*, IV (1970), pp. 93-95; Matei, *Civilizație urbană medievală românească*, pp. 94-97. See also Șt.S. Gorovei, 'Cu privire la patriciatul orașenesc în Moldova medievală. Câteva observații preliminare' [On the Urban Patricians in Medieval Moldavia: Some Preliminary Observations], *AIIAI*, XXV¹ (1988), pp. 253-265).
128. Details in Velciu, *Grigore Ureche*, pp. 7-29.
129. Chițimia, *Probleme de bază*, pp. 322-325.
130. See also discussion on Costin in Velciu's, *Miron Costin*, pp. 148-150.

Abbreviations

- AIIAI = *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie A.D. Xenopol* [Yearbook of the A.D. Xenopol Institute of History and Archaeology] (Iași)
AM = *Arheologia Medievală* [Medieval Archaeology] (Reșița)
BAR = *British Archaeological Reports*
BBRF = *Buletinul Bibliotecii Românești din Freiburg* [Bulletin of Romanian Library in Freiburg<-in-Breisgau>]
BCMI = *Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice* [Bulletin of the Commission for Historical Monuments] (Bucharest)
HU = *Historia Urbana* (Bucharest-Sibiu)
MCA = *Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice* [Archaeological Materials and Researches] (Bucharest)
MI = *Magazin Istorică* [Historical Magazine] (Bucharest)
RER = *Revue des Études Roumaines* (Paris)
RESEE = *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* (Bucharest)
RI = *Revista Istorică* [Historical Review] (Bucharest)
RM = *Revista Muzeelor* [Museums' Review] (Bucharest)
RRH = *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* (Bucharest)
RSL = *Romanoslavica* (Bucharest)
SCIV = *Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche* [Studies and Researches in Ancient History] (Bucharest)
SMIM = *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie* [Studies and Materials in Medieval History] (Bucharest)
TM = *Travaux et Mémoires* (Paris)

Abstract

Historical Tradition, Legend and Towns in the Moldavian Chronicles

How the emergence and evolution of medieval towns are reflected in chronicles has not sparked too much interest in the research field so far. Given the treatment that this information has received in chronicles, their authors did not seem to take a direct interest in how towns formed, how they were organized, their vibrant urban life, and not even their inhabitants. This appearance can be deceiving, however, since a closer look reveals that ancient texts are ripe with references to urban settlements.

Keywords

Moldavia, chronicles, urban settlements, historiography, tradition