

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Nerijus Babinskas

MOLDOVA XIV A. VIDURYJE – XVI A. VIDURYJE KAIP SOCIALINĖS
STRUKTŪROS TIPOLOGIJOS PROBLEMA

MOLDOVA IN THE MIDDLE OF 14TH – MIDDLE OF 16TH CENTURIES AS A
PROBLEM OF TYPOLOGY OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka
Humanitariniai mokslai, istorija (05 H)

Vilnius, 2010

Disertacija rengta 2002 – 2010 metais Vilniaus universitete

Disertacija ginama eksternu

Mokslinis konsultantas:

prof. habil. dr. Edvardas Gudavičius (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas:

prof. dr. Alfredas Bumblauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

Nariai:

prof. habil. dr. Edvardas Gudavičius (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

prof. habil. dr. Zenonas Norkus (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, sociologija - 05 S)

prof. dr. Zigmantas Kiaupa (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

prof. dr. Šarūnas Liekis (M. Romerio universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija – 05 H)

Oponentai:

doc. habil. dr. Alvydas Nikžentaitis (Lietuvos istorijos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

doc. dr. Rimvydas Petrauskas (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, istorija - 05 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Istorijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2010 m. rugsėjo 30 d. 13 val. Istorijos fakulteto 330 auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto 7, 01513 Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2010 m. rugpjūčio 25 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje

Problems on which the current thesis is focused are determined by limitations and narrowness of the theoretic premises which prevail in Moldavian as well as in Romanian historiographies. This historiographic situation „imprisoned“ the typological interpretation of Moldavian society in the period before the Otoman domination into quite narrow range. Both Romanian and Moldavian historians from pre-communist period made systematic attempts to find feudalism in the juridical sense in medieval Moldova. In the communist era situation has changed but historians got into even narrower Procrustes' bed because of the ideological reasons: it was obligatory to apply unilinear Marxist-Leninist schema to medieval Moldova. It is natural that at least, according to published texts, nobody among Romanian neither Moldavian historians had any doubts that Moldova before the Otoman domination (as well as later) was feudal in the sense of Marxist socioeconomic formation. There are no signs of renewal in the post-communist/post-soviet Romanian and Moldavian historiographies neither (at least from the point of view of classic Marxism). Actually, there are only two prevailing tendencies: or Marxism is rejected at all, or there is a repeating of cliché from communist historiography which sometimes even take rather simplified and distorted shapes. Such a situation in both Romanian and Moldavian historiographies does not correspond neither a quantity of accumulated empirical data nor a quantity of adequate solutions to more particular issues and problems. It directly results *the first problem*: I dare to claim that there is no adequate, conceptualized and debated enough interpretation of socioeconomic structure of early Moldova based on classic Marxist theory of modes of production/formations yet (I am inclined to name this trend of Marxism as endosocietal, i.e. „internal“). In the communist era Romanian sociologist Henri H. Stahl elaborated very original conception of medieval societies of ancestors of Moldavians and Romanians but in general it was ignored by the both communities of historians. So, we can make a parallel between the conception of tributalism formulated by Stahl and the Gudavičius'/Bumblauskas' conception of Lithuanian peripheral feudalism which was not discussed well enough among Lithuanian historians neither.

Nevertheless there is an exception in Romanian historiography which is worth of mentioning. A Romanian historian Bogdan Murgescu together with his colleagues have published a series of texts in which economic history of medieval and early modern Valahia and Moldova was interpreted from the point of view of world-system theory (I

am inclined to name this trend of Marxism as exosocietal, i.e. „external“). I do not doubt that this approach in the context of Romanian historiography looks innovative. All the same, one should pay one's attention to the fact that world-system theory is relevant only in case one has an intention to analyse dynamics of society in synchronous profile. But if one is going to study peculiarities of the evolution of particular society the analytic potential of world-system theory is minimal. It results *the second problem* of the current research. In fact, as already in 1970s an American sociologist Daniel Chirot wrote, one can not model the internal evolution of peripheral society in an adequate way ignoring the external impact. And exactly the world-system theory explains principles how the external impact functions. On the other hand, the American scholar did not reject the concept of mode of production either (he was only inclined to rename it as a political economy). Thus, there were already formulated methodological landmarks for further researches of peripheral societies: to combine both Marxist approaches (formations'/modes' of production and world-system theories). Chirot himself applied his innovative methodological attitude in his study of an Valahian case (from the middle of 13th century until the beginning of the 20th century).

Nevertheless even Chirot did not set a purpose to clarify a set of criteria in a strict way on the basis of which one could apply a combined Marxist approach and a typology of societies. Because of that reason in the work of Chirot we can find some inconsequences: some types of political economies were based on the combination of both Marxist approaches while others were based only on world-system theory. It follows *the third problem* of the dissertation: we have no systematic set of criteria for the typology of peripheral pre-capitalist societies yet.

I set an aim of the research taking into consideration prevailing tendencies in Moldavian and Romanian historiographies which were clarified in the description of the problems of the research. The aim is as follows: to reinterpret the conception of the social structure of early Moldova which dominates in Moldavian/Romanian historiography (i.e. feudalism in the sense of Marxist socioeconomic formation). I can achieve my goal only after defining clearly the criteria and formulating the typological scale which should be based on those criteria.

There is a constipation which makes the aim of the current thesis more accurate: since the aim is *conceptual reinterpretation* of already existing knowledge about the

medieval Moldavian society, I restrict my research only on empirical data which is already available in historiography and I do not set a task to find and use any new written sources.

In my effort to achieve the set aim I formulate tasks of the dissertation as follows:

1. To define in a clear and precise way main concepts and categories which are relevant in the current research;

2. To reveal in a representative way diversity of Marxist theories of universal history as a relevant context to the current research and to expose advantages and disadvantages of particular theories, to find out whether they have any explanatory and analytic value or not;

3. to define methodological premises of compatibility of combining of two Marxist approaches: classic (formations'/modes' of production theory) and world-system;

4. to define a systematic set of criteria which would be applicable to typologise pre-capitalist societies from the point of view of classic Marxism;

5. on the basis of the defined set of criteria to formulate a typological scale which would be applicable for classification of social structure of pre-capitalist societies from the point of view of classic Marxism;

6. to formulate a principled combined typological scale on the basis of criteria of both approaches;

7. to expose an impact of productive forces to the development of relations of production in medieval Moldova (in the middle of the 14th – in the middle of 16th centuries);

8. to reveal all essential characteristics of social structure of medieval Moldova until the Ottoman domination which could enable to determine the type of Moldavian society (a scale of classic Marxism);

9. on the basis of data available in historiography to estimate a character and intensity of an impact of external factor on the socioeconomic development of early Moldova (in the middle of 14th – in the middle of 16th centuries);

10. to determine a type of Moldavian society in the middle of 14th – in the middle of 16th centuries based on both scales: that of classic Marxism and the combined one.

I would like to ground the novelty of the dissertation using three arguments: theoretic-methodologic, thematic and historiographic.

Theoretic-methodologic argument. Combination of two Marxist approaches and application of both of them in the case study is an absolute methodological innovation in Lithuanian historiography (this combination is unique). Darius Žiemelis in his recently (in 2009) sustained doctoral thesis compared systematically both Marxist approaches and exposed their advantages and disadvantages which could be revealed in the case study. Nevertheless he did not propose any strategy of combination of both approaches.

In general application of two theories simultaneously is not an unique in Lithuanian historiography. Edvardas Gudavičius in his texts has interpreted a place of Lithuania in world history from the point of view of combination of two theories: classic Marxist (formations‘) and the one of civilizations.

In the historiography of the other countries the combination of both Marxist approaches and application of this methodology in the case study is already known. In this context, first of all, I would like to mention works of American sociologist Daniel Chirot and Russian historian Nikolay Kradin.

Clear and accurate definition of basic criteria which should enable to typologise various pre-capitalist societies in a standardized way is a crucial thing. Such a set of typological criteria as a character of exploitation (individual/collective) and a character of relation between direct producer and means of production (individual/collective) was not formulated in a clear, coherent way in Lithuanian historiography before neither. One can find attempts like this at least in Anglosaxon historiography but in another context (eg. texts of Robert Brenner).

No doubt, we could also regard as methodologic innovation the „calibration“ of two typological scales and their application in the particular case study. It allows to move the discussions about the variation of Marxist conception of evolutions of societies into another, more systematized context.

Thematic argument. Lithuanian historiography is especially poor from the point of view of subjects of general history. There are only very few texts dedicated to the problems of history of medieval Moldova and no one at all dedicated to social history of Moldova in Lithuanian historiography. Researches of other peripheral societies are necessary in order to discuss conceptions of Lithuania as also one of peripheral societies

(for example, the conception of peripheral feudalism) in a wider comparative context and to elaborate its adequate spatial and chronologic models.

Historiographic argument. The complex critical analyses of Moldavian/Romanian medieval and theoretic historiography accomplished in the current dissertation from the relevant point of view also should be treated as a quite new and provocative phenomenon in respect to Moldavian and Romanian historiography. It is possible that radical reinterpretation of the nature of medieval Moldavian society will encourage discussions among Moldavian and Romanian historians themselves and will make some contribution into renovation of historiographies of those countries.

Methods of the dissertation. Speaking in general any historian in his/her research and cognitive activities uses two main methods: historical and logical. The aim and tasks set in the current thesis nevertheless influenced a choosing of some specific methods and this is also a reason why some methods prevail in respect to the others. Besides universal logical methods (analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction), I would like to distinguish three main methods which were applied in my research: *historical–systemic, historical–typological and comparative.*

The aim of the thesis defined as conceptual reinterpretation of already existing knowledge about Moldavian medieval society determined the *historiographic* nature of this research. It means that texts of historians should be treated as sources.

In the theoretic part of the thesis have been formulated premises of the application of methods enumerated before, i.e. carried out necessary procedures which enable to use mentioned methods in the part of the case study. First of all, using descriptive method there were represented the most essential elements of Marxist theories of universal history: main concepts and categories. Exactly on the basis of them Marxist theories explain causes of historical process and principles of functioning of human societies. I apply the method of structural and functional analysis in my representation of relevant general theories and after that I compare them among themselves (a comparative method is also applied then I present classification of universal models of history). I also apply a procedure of *decomposition of systems* for both main Marxist theories, i.e. I distinguish the most important subsystems in the functional and structural senses of whole social system of medieval Moldova which are necessary to study in order to be able to apply historical–systematic method (structural-functional analysis).

In the part of the case study a historical–systematic method is realised: factographic data about the socioeconomic reality of medieval Moldova in the period until the Ottoman domination which is accumulated in Moldavian/Romanian historiography is analysed from the points of view of structure and functions.

In the chapter 4 historical–typological method is applied in the most consequent way: on the basis of already defined criteria the type of medieval Moldova is determined using at first the scale of classic Marxism and then, if during the research I find out that it is necessary, using the combined scale of both Marxist approaches. Besides, on the basis of already defined typological characteristics some other peripheral European societies of the middle ages are typologised and then compared with Moldova.

The structure of productive relations. If one wants to define who is the exploiter in a particular society one should find out who controls means of production. This an essential segment of any society's structure which Yuriy Semionov names an exploitative cell and I am inclined to name it as an *exploitative subject*. In one's turn if one wants to define a *mode of exploitation* one should find out how surplus extraction and redistribution functions in a particular society. This is no doubt also an essential element of relations of production of any kind. And finally, nature of connection between direct producers and means of production reveals one more fundamental element of relations of production – *productive cell* or productive unit. We should keep in our mind that Marxist understanding of a mode of production includes not only a process of production but also a mechanism of surplus extraction as well as redistribution. Thus, a productive cell also functions as a *obligatory unit*. So, I am inclined to distinguish the three most important elements of relations of production: exploitative subject, obligatory unit and a mode of exploitation which connects previous two.

No doubt, one should keep in his/her mind that an entirety of relations of production in a particular case never is pure homogeneous. That is a reason why the issue of hierarchy of criteria is always relevant. One should find out which are two main social classes in a particular society. Those two classes and the way how they function as exploiters and direct producers will reveal basic exploitative subject and basic obligatory unit.

The relevant classification of Marxist models of universal history.

Contemporary Russian theoreticians of history Bondarenko, Korotayev, Kradin classifying all possible models of universal history have distinguished four groups of theories: two main – unilinear schema of development (evolutionism, modernisation theories etc.) and those of civilizations – as well as two in-between – world-system and multilinear evolution. From this list only those are relevant for us which could be connected with Marxism, so I can exclude theories of civilizations. Besides, the first and the fourth groups could be united. The third group I would like to rename as dependency theories (despite the fact that there are some differences between dependency theories and world-system approach but they are not essential). On the other hand, I agree that the group of dependency theories deserves to be treated as independent item of classification of Marxist models of universal history.

So, after correction of Bondarenko's, Korotayev's, Kradin's classification and applying for our purposes (i.e., only typology of Marxist theories is relevant), I can represent very clear and simple dichotomous schema: 1) evolutionist theories, 2) dependency theories of global scale.

Evolutionist theories one can also treat as diachronic (temporal) and endosocietal („internal“), since one applying theories of this kind wants to reveal tendencies of development in the sequence of time. Meanwhile one can describe dependency theories of global scale as synchronic (spatial) and exosocietal („external“), because they explain how system of societies function as a coherent entirety at some point of time. So, those theories accent external relations among societies.

As one can remember the group of evolutionist theories is united (joint). Now I would like to elaborate internal subclassification of this group. The starting point would be another classification which was proposed by almost the same team of Russian theoreticians of history (Korotayev, Kradin, Linsha). According to those three authors there are four subgroups of evolutionist theories: unilinear, bilinear, multilinear, non-linear. I am convinced that non-linear schema is already step aside from Marxism, so this subgroup I can exclude.

Finally we have a classification which is relevant to our research as follows:

1. Evolutionist theories:
 - a. Unilinear,

- b. Bilinear,
- c. Multilinear.

2. Dependency theories of global scale.

Exploitative subject and productive/obligatory unit as main criteria of classification of modes of production/political economies. Now I would like to represent a classification of the two most important elements of mode of production, i.e. exploitative subject and productive/obligatory unit.

We can distinguish three types of exploitative subject: individual (IE), group (GE, clan), class (CE) as well as we can distinguish three types of obligatory unit either: individual (IP), group (GP), communal (CP).

On the table bellow I singled out nine possible combinations of exploitative subject and obligatory unit of various types:

TABLE No 1: all possible combinations of every type of exploitative subject and productive/obligatory unit:

	IE	GE	CE
IP	feudalism	Clan feudalism	Agent/bureaucratic politarism
GP	Archaic feudalism	Archaic clan feudalism	Archaic politarism
CP	Semi-feudalism (communal)	Clan semi-feudalism	Communal politarism

It is quite easy to give a typical example of feudal mode of production: France under the rule of Capetian dynasty (987-1328 AD). We can take as a case of semi-feudalism Kievan Russia, the ancient Egypt of the Old Kingdom period can serve as an example of agent/bureaucratic politarism (bureaucratic variation) or China at least in some periods (then communities have disintegrated). Otoman epmpire (in 15th – 16th centuries, for instance), Delhi sultanate (1206-1526 AD) in India and Moscovian state/Russia from the end of the rule of Ivan the Terrible (1547-1584 AD) untill the beginning of the rule of Peter I (1682-1725 AD) can be examples of communal politarism.

I am inclined to treat a group exploitative subject as well as a group obligatory unit as undeveloped and preserved transitional types and correspondingly those combinations

of basic elements which include at least one those elements of transitional type as secondary taxons of the classification. Main types are noted by bold characters.

Nevertheless one should keep in one's mind that communities (of direct producers) existed in any pre-capitalist society despite the fact to which type a particular society belongs. On the other hand, communities differ as well as their functions. I can state that the type of productive as well as obligatory unit determines the type of community. It means that classification of types of productive/obligatory units is based on the typology of communities which I am going to represent bellow.

Community as a point of departure of obligatory unit classification. I would like to support Umberto's Melotti's statement who claimed that, according to texts of Karl Marx himself, a type of community is a decisive factor which determines alternative social development. It means that types of communities which Marx himself has singled out are worth of attention. As one can remember Marx has distinguished three types of communities: Asiatic (and Slavonic as transitional), Ancient and Germanic. In the case of Moldova in the 14th – 16th century only two types are relevant: Asiatic and Germanic.

There is no private property of land then we deal with Asiatic communities. Member of Asiatic community are only holders. Supreme and single property of land is concentrated in the hands of monarch (or of a chef of a tribe, or of a patriarch of a family clan). A member of community is only a co-holder of joint property. Community is a substance and a particular individual is an accident.

Marx did not elaborated enough a concept of Slavonic community: we can only find some hints regarding this concept in his texts. If to judge according to those hints, a Slavonic community was quite similar to an Asiatic one and it could be treated as a variation of it. Nevertheless the Slavonic one is a little bit modified and because of that reason is slightly more akin to the Germanic community. According to Melotti, the Slavonic community is more dynamic and more inclined for transformation during its development.

According to Marx, the Germanic type of community differs essentially from the Asiatic one. The Germanic community is an union of independent subjects (proprietors of land). In reality the community exists only in a form of meetings of land proprietors in this case. In a case of Germanic communities the public fund of land (*ager publicus*) also

exists as in a case of Ancient community. But this is only an appendage of an individual property. In this case a household of every family is a unit of production.

Since, as I have already mentioned before, an Ancient type of community is not relevant in the current research and Slavonic one is not conceptualized clear enough, I am going to use only the dichotomous Germanic/Asiatic (individualistic/collectivistic) typology of communities.

Mode of exploitation as a criterion of classification of modes of production.

The only adequate and correct typology of modes of exploitation which I know has been formulated by British mediaval historian Chris Wickham (1950–). He proposed a simple dichotomous schema based on rent/tax distinction. This binomial schema is absolutely acceptable for me but it proposes nothing new beside the criteria of exploitative subject and obligatory unit which I already have formulated before. So, modes of exploitation can be treated only as a secondary and additional criterion of typology of pre-capitalist societies.

The *scale* of antagonistic pre-capitalist modes of production. Keeping in my mind arguments which I presented in the theoretic part of the thesis I would like to propose two variations of typological scale:

- 1) a scale of modes of production in which the factor of external impact is ignored as secondary;
- 2) a scale of political economies in which parameters of internal structure as well as of external impact are considered and combined.

A scale of modes of production is represented in the table No 1. There one can find nine possible combinations of both criteria of endosocietal typology. Here I would like to propose a list of four main types of modes of production:

- 1) feudalism,
- 2) semi-feudalism (or *communal feudalism*),
- 3) agent/bureaucratic politarism,
- 4) communal politarism.

A problem of „graduations“ of the scale of political economies. Formulating this kind of scale I have an intention to base on the contribution of Imanuel Wallerstein (concepts of world-economy and world-empire), Daniel Chirot (concepts of communal-trading and protocolonial political economy) and Nikolay Kradin (a conception of

exopolitarian mode of production and the classification of nomad empires). First of all, I should define relations among the most important concepts.

The Chirot's concept communal-trading political economy is applicable in the case then a particular society is involved into zone of essential impact of any world-economy. The protocolonial political economy is involved into area of of essential impact of any worl-empire correspondingly. The concept of communal-trading political economy reflects both external impact and internal social structure and because of that reason correspondes my methodological principles. On the contrary, the concept of protocolonial political economy expresses only the nature of external impact (the dependence in respect to the centre of world-empire) and ignores peculiarities of internal social structure. That is a breach of the principle of the combination of both approaches and is not acceptable to me.

From the first sight, it seems that the Kradin's concept of nomad empire is a functional equivalent to Wallerstein's world-empire, but actually if one is to analyse the entire Kradin's classification of nomad empires one should be forced to change his/her mind. Nomad empires of the first type (tributary) used to exploit neighbouring agricultural societies using methods of „distant exploitation“ (episodic „gifts“, robbery, unequal trade, regular tribute etc.). As one can see, so called methods of distant exploitation almost coincide with methods of external exploitation enumerated by Yuryi Semionov (only usury does not fit since it is „internal“). Thus, we can link tributary type of nomad empires (and in some cases even identify) with Wallerstein's worlds-economies, but not with worlds-empires. Besides, we can also treat Chirot's concept of the communal-trading political economy as a case of Kradin's tributary nomad empires. In fact, I am inclined to treat the mentioned Chirot's concept as an equivalent of Kradin's exopolitarian (or xenocratic) mode of production (but only under the condition that a transit kind of trade is prevailing). As regards the second and the third type of nomad empires singled out by Kradin, no doubt, both should be linked directly with the Wallerstein's concept of world-empire.

An interpretation of exopolitarian mode of production is a little bit problematic. For example, Semionov claims that external methods of exploitation (also usury) are parasitic and they can not form a separate mode of production but only hangers-on to the others. On the other hand, Kradin criticizes Semionov's opinion and states that in the

case of the exopolitarian mode of production an entire society of exploiters correlates with dependent societies as with a unit (cell) of production (war and non-economic violence should be understood as a mode production in this case). If the product extracted from dependent societies prevails in the consumption of exploiters' society it means that in this case one can speak about exopolitarian mode of production. Semionov based his classification of modes of exploitation on the question whether any mode of exploitation is realised during the process of production or later. This criterion is not persuasive because, for example, a rent in kind is realised in exactly the same way as a tribute of nomad empire extracted from dependent agricultural societies.

On the other hand, in the case then goods which prevail in the circulation are made in the country which is involved in some world-economy, one can not link this country directly with methods of distant exploitation and a tributary nomad empire (and exopolitarian mode of production correspondingly). This is the case then the impact on internal development is based not on the political dependence but on commercial (market) relations. Of course, it is quite usual that relations of dependence of both kinds exist to some degree side by side but nevertheless the nature of commercial (market) relations as a case dependence differs. So, if a kind of dependence described above prevails one can single out a case of trading political economy in the strict sense.

Thus, I can single out two variations of political economy:

- 1) xenocratic political economy,
- 2) trading political economy.

TABLE No 2: all possible combinations of four main types of endosocietal scale with both types of singled out political economies:

	Xenocratic PE	Trading PE
Feudalism	Feudal xenocratic	Feudal trading
Semi-feudalism	Semi-feudal xenocratic	Semi-feudal trading
Agent/bureaucratic politarianism	Agent/bureaucratic politarian xenocratic	Agent/bureaucratic politarian trading
Communal politarianism	Communal politarian xenocratic	Communal politarian trading

Now I would like to represent examples which correspond every type singled out theoretically.

Kingdom of Naples in the 16th century (then it belonged to Spain) is an example of feudal xenocratic political economy (PE), Valachia during the Otoman domination is a case of semi-feudal xenocratic PE (this is exactly the case which Chirot treats as a protocolonial PE). As an example of bureaucratic politarian PE serves China under the Yuan dynasty (1280-1368 AD). Babilonia as a satrapy of Persia (5th – 4th centuries BC) was a case of communal politarian xenocratic PE. Very good example of feudal trading PE is marine empire of Portugal (in the 15th – 16th centuries) and semi-feudal trading – Kievan Russia. I am not able to give an example of bureaucratic/agent politarian xenocratic PE economy but there is no difficulties to give an example of communal politarian trading PE: the Laotian state in the 14th – 17th centuries or the state of Songhay in Western Africa in the 14th – 16th centuries.

CHARACTERIZATION OF MOLDOVA'S ENDOSOCIETAL TYPE. As I defined in the theoretic part of the thesis there are two most important criteria of endosocietal classification: 1) exploitative subject, 2) obligatory unit and 3) a mode of exploitation which links those previous segments of structure of mode of production. The third criterion is only secondary.

Now I shall describe Moldova using criteria which I have pointed out. Let's start from the exploitative subject. I claim that in Moldova in the 15th century one can talk about private (seignioral) landowning but there are some specific features which are worth of attention: on the one hand, during all the period relevant to us remained not apportioned joint landownership, on the other hand, disposing of land was very restricted. It means that the seignioral landowning was group rather than individual during the entire period I am interested in. So, correspondingly the exploitative subject was group rather individual as well and besides of quite primitive form. Nevertheless, the analysis of juridical aspect of seignioral landownership did not reveal us clear enough whether it corresponds respective economic power or not. Because of that reason I shall use an additional criterion – I shall define the prevailing mode of exploitation. The most important task would be to determine the proportion between private and state surplus product raising. Unfortunately, there is no direct statistical data about the period I am interested in. Nevertheless, I have some indirect indicators which allow me to make a

provisorial estimation. One should keep in one's mind that in medieval Moldova: nobility (at least laic nobility) had not fiscal immunity, seignioral obligations were quite modest (since the extensive mode of agriculture prevailed), direct producers (peasants) were not detached from the military service, majority of slaves belonged to the ruler or his spouse, a considerable part of incomes of nobility consisted of maintenance for the service to a monarch; towns paid the same taxes and did the same obligations as the unprivileged part of rural population (and besides they paid some additional ones), the level of urbanization in Moldova by the middle of 16th century had reached 8%. Keeping all tendencies listed above in my mind I am inclined to draw a conclusion that even by the middle of the 16th century the scale of state surplus product raising was no less than private (seigniorial). It means that it is reasonable to talk about *class exploitative subject* in Moldova even before the 16th century (there is no doubt that later centralized surplus product raising prevails).

Let's now pass on the issue of obligatory unit. As I claimed in the theoretic part of the thesis, the most important indicator in this case is definition of the type of community. Only in a case of prevailing two-field tilling system communities tend to evolve in Germanic (individualistic) way. The extensive agriculture of Moldova certainly blocked the possibility to Moldovian communities to evolve in Germanic way. It is obvious that in Moldova we deal with collectivist type of community (it does not matter if we would name it Asiatic or Slavonic).

Finally, from the point of endosocietal typology I draw two the most generalizing conclusions:

1. If one regard a group exploitative subject as dominating then Moldova could not be ascribed to any of four main types; it should be interpreted as a case of *clan semi-feudalism*;
2. If one take a class exploitative subject for prevailing then the social structure of medieval Moldova should be ascribed to the type of *communal politarism*. In my opinion, this interpretation of social structure of early Moldova corresponds totally to Stahl's conception of tributalism.

EXOSOCIETAL TYPOLOGY OF MOLDOVA. First of all, I would like to remind that my exosocietal typology will be based on two variations of political economies: xenocratic and trading.

I am convinced that essential question the answer to which will determine conclusions of entire exosocietal typology will be connection between transit trade and the genesis of Moldavian statehood. So, the answer to the question lies in the dichotomy of conception regarding the genesis of Moldavian principality: Nicolae Iorga's versus Șerban Papacostea's. Chirot's prognosis that Iorga's conception (the most famous Romanian historian stated that transit trade was decisive factor during the genesis of Moldavian state) will be rehabilitated has not confirmed: after the fall of the communist regime in Romanian historiography the contrary opinion still prevails (Papacostea, Murgescu). On the other hand, neither Romanian, nor Moldavian historiography did not answer some questions yet (how did the Valachian ruler Basarab manage to accumulate 7000 silver marks by 1330 AD? What was the main source of wealth of Moldavian monarch Peter Musat if he lent 3000 silver roubles in the end of 14th century to Polish king and Lithuanian grand duke Vladislav Iagiello?).

Thus, the conclusion drawn of exosocietal typology is twofold either: it was a trading political economy (clan semi-feudal or communal politarian trading economy) or the exosocietal factor was not decisive enough and thus is able to be ignored. In the second case only the conclusions of the endosocietal typology are valid.

After all, it is very important to state that whatever "typological diagnosis" one chooses, on the basis of criteria determined in the thesis, the social structure of Moldova before the Otoman domination could be treated as feudal in no way.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Three categories of productive forces should be singled out: active (social), passive (natural) and intermediate (demographic).
2. The relation between active and passive productive forces should be defined as follows: the passive productive forces is a gift of nature and not an achievement of human beings; they get involved into the process of production and become productive

forces as such (in a proper sense) only on condition that some society reaches certain point of development of active productive forces.

3. Level (an indicator of productivity of pure social kind, it is connected with development of active productive forces) and condition (total social productivity) of productive forces determines nature of productive relations.

4. Multilinear Marxist models of universal history have not lost their scholarly relevance but their further elaboration is meaningful only under the condition if one defines typologic criteria in a precise way.

5. There are two typologic criteria of relations of production (and mode of production correspondingly): productive/obligatory unit and exploitative subject.

6. Three categories of productive/obligatory unit (individual, group, communal) as well as of exploitative subject (individual, group, class) should be singled out.

7. Classification of productive/obligatory units is based on the typology of communities sketched by Karl Marx himself.

8. If one wants to define a type of any peripheral society in a proper way one must combine both Marxist methodologies: endosocietal (theory of modes of production) and exosocietal (world-system theory).

9. In case of pre-capitalist societies the external impact can be twofold (a particular society can be involved into world-empire or a particular society can be involved into world-economy). Correspondingly there are two types of political economies which should be named as xenocratic and trading.

10. There was animal raising which prevailed in the structure of the Moldovian agriculture in the middle of 14th – in the middle of 16th centuries (and later on).

11. Low density of the population and surplus of land suitable for cultivation enabled to preserve the archaic and rather primitive technique of agriculture (slash and burn/fallow agriculture prevailed) correspondingly.

12. The peculiarities of the Moldavian agriculture in the period before the Otoman domination determined the conservation of archaic social relations (communities of collectivistic type, clan-kin landowning among the nobility).

13. The most essential characteristics of social structure of Moldova in the middle of 14th – in the middle of 16th centuries which enable to define it's endosocietal type are following:

- a. the productive/obligatory unit was a community of collectivist type;
- b. the clan-kin type of landowning of nobility prevailed. On the other hand, it is important to emphasize that the state exploitation of the direct producers was not less intensive than private. It means that there is no monosemous answer to the question about the prevailing type of the exploitative subject in the society of Moldova before the Ottoman domination. It could be group as well as class at approximately the same scale.

14. On the basis of endosocietal features described above I can state that from this point of view we can treat the social structure of Moldova in the middle of 14th – in the middle of 16th centuries as a hybrid of *clan semi-feudal* and *communal politarian* type.

15. Because of the very limited basis of written sources and ambiguity of conceptions in the Romanian/Moldavian historiography determined by the state of written sources there could be twofold exosocietal typology of medieval Moldova:

- a. Moldova was involved into European-Middle East world-economy (*trading political economy*);
- b. exosocietal factor was not important enough for Moldova in the relevant period and is able to be ignored.

16. Combining both Marxist methodologies (endosocietal and exosocietal) there is a twofold interpretation either:

- a. as a hybrid of *clan semi-feudal trading* and *communal politarian trading* political economies;
- b. exosocietal factor was not important enough for Moldova in the relevant period and is able to be ignored, i.e. the result presented in the conclusion 14 remains valid.

REZIUMĖ

Darbo problemos išplaukia iš teorinių prielaidų ribotumo, kuris absoliučiai vyrauja tiek rumunų, tiek moldavų istoriografijoje. Tai „įkalino“ Moldovos visuomenės iki Osmanų imperijos įsiviešpatavimo tipologines interpretacijas siauruose rėmuose. Iki-komunistinėje rumunų ir moldavų istorinėje literatūroje viduramžių Moldovoje buvo ieškoma feodalizmo teisine prasme. Komunistinėje eroje situacija pasikeitė, tačiau istorikai dėl ideologinių priešasčių pateko į dar ankštesnę „Prokrusto lovą“: viduramžių Moldovai noromis nenonoromis teko taikyti vienalinį penkianarę marksizmo-leninizmo schemą. Nenuostabu, kad, bent jau sprendžiant iš tekstų, niekas iš rumunų ir moldavų istorikų nesuabejojo, kad Moldova iki Osmanų įsivyravimo (o taip pat ir jiems viešpataujant) buvo feodalinė marksistinės formacijos prasme. Posovietinėje tiek rumunų, tiek moldavų istoriografijoje taip pat nedaug nepavyko išvelgti teorinio medievistikos atsinaujinimo marksistinė prasme (bent jau klasikinio marksizmo) požymių: arba marksizmo iš viso atsisakoma, arba gana primityviu pavidalu referuojamos komunistinio laikotarpio istoriografijos klišės. Tokia padėtis moldavų ir rumunų medievistinėje istoriografijoje neatitinka sukaupto empirinių duomenų ir atskirų klausimų adekvačių sprendimo kiekio. Iš to išplaukia *pagrindinė problema*: drįstume teigti, jog iki šiol neturime adekvačios konceptualiai reflektuotos ir pakankamai išdiskutuotos ankstyvosios Moldovos socioekonominės struktūros interpretacijos paremtos klasikine marksistinė gamybos būdų/formacijų teorija (disertacijos autorius šią marksizmo kryptį būtų linkęs vadinti endosociuminiu, t.y. „vidiniu“ marksizmu).

Darbo naujumą galima pagrįsti trimis argumentais: teoriniu metodologiniu, teminiu ir istoriografiniu.

Teorinis metodologinis argumentas. Dviejų pargindinių marksistinių visuotinės istorijos traktuočių derinimas ir kombinuotas taikymas konkretaus atvejo tyrimui yra visiška metodologinė naujovė lietuvių istoriografijoje, nors tokių bandymų jau būtų anglosaksiškoje ir rusiškoje istoriografijose (Danielio Chiroto ir Nikolajaus Kradino darbai).

Nemažiau svarbus yra autoriaus atliktas aiškus bazinių kriterijų leidžiančių vienareikšmiškai tipologizuoti ikikapitalistines visuomenes apsibrėžimas. Eksploatacijos pobūdžio (individuali/kolektyvinė) ir tiesioginių gamintojų siejimo su gamybos

priemonėmis (individuali/kolektyvinė) tipologinės dichotomijos irgi niekada nebuvo aiškiai suformuluota lietuvių istoriografijoje. Metodologine teorine novacija neabejotinai laikytinas ir dviejų tipologinių skalių „sukalibravimas“ bei jų pritaikymas konkrečiam tyrimui. Tai leidžia perkelti diskusijas dėl marksistiškai suprantamos visuomenių evoliucijos variantų ir tipų į kitoki – susistemintą – kontekstą.

Teminis argumentas. Lietuvių istoriografijoje kaip reta skurdu visuotinės istorijos siužetų. Lietuvių istorikų darbų skirtų viduramžių Moldovos problematikai beveik, o viduramžių Moldovos socialinei istorijai visiškai nėra, nors kitų periferinių visuomenių tyrimai būtini norint platesniame lyginamajame kontekste diskutuoti apie Lietuvos ikikapitalistinės periferinės visuomenės koncepcijas (pvz., periferinio feodalizmo) ir plėtoti jos istorijos laikinius ir erdvinis modelius.

Istoriografinis argumentas. Disertacijoje atlikta kompleksiška kritinė moldaviškosios ir rumuniškosios medievistinės bei teorinės istoriografijos analizė tyrimui aktualiu aspektu taip pat galėtų būti traktuojama kaip naujas ir provokatyvus reiškinys moldaviškosios bei rumuniškosios istoriografijos atžvilgiu. Galima tikėtis, kad radikali XIV a. vidurio – XVI a. vidurio Moldovos visuomenės struktūros reinterpretacija paskatins diskusijas tarp pačių Moldovos ir Rumunijos istorikų ir prisidės prie šių šalių istoriografijos teorinio metodologinio atsinaujinimo.

Svarbiausi tyrimo rezultatai:

1. Remiantis apsibrėžtomis bazinėmis endosociuminėmis charakteristikomis galima konstatuoti, kad iš šios perspektyvos Moldovos socialinė struktūra XIV a. viduryje – XVI a. viduryje apibūdinama kaip *klaninio pusinio feodalizmo ir bendruomeninio politarizmo* hibridas.

2. Dėl šaltinių bazės ribotumo ir iš to išplaukiančios atinkamos tematikos moldaviškoje/rumuniškoje istoriografijoje išsakytų pozicijų ambivalentiškumo Moldovą XIV a. viduryje – XVI a. viduryje iš egzosociuminės perspektyvos galima tipologizuoti dvejopai:

- a) Moldova buvo įtrauktą į Europos-Vidurinių Rytų pasaulį-ekonomiką (*prekybinė politinė ekonomija*, o pagal kombinuotą tipologiją – *klaninės pusiau feodalinės prekybinės ir bendruomeninės politarinės prekybinės politinių ekonomijų hibridas*),
- b) egzosociuminis veiksnys nebuvo pakankamai reikšmingas ir todėl ignoruotinas.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nerijus Babinskas was born in Klaipėda in 1974. In 1992 he entered Vilnius university, Faculty of History. In 1996 he got BA, in 1999 – MA. From 2002 to 2006 he was a doctoral student at Vilnius university, Faculty of History. From 2001 to 2007 Babinskas worked in the Publishing Institute of Encyclopaediae and Sciences as a subject editor, from 2007 – in the publishing house “Baltos lankos” as a project’s manager. From 2005 he works at Vilnius university, Faculty of History as an assistant professor.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS:

1. *Tributalizmo koncepcija: S. Amino, J. Haldono ir H. H. Stahlio sampratų lyginamoji analizė* [The concept of tributalism: a comparative analysis of S. Amin’s, J. Haldon’s and H. H. Stahl’s Approaches] // *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*. 2009, t. 24, 178-194.
2. *Socialinių santykių bizantiškosios civilizacijos šalyse VII–XIV amžiuje tipologijos metmenys* [An outline of typology of social relations in the countries of the Byzantine civilization in 7th – 14th centuries] // *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*. 2005, t. 16, p. 9-18.
3. *Feodalizmo Vakarų Europoje genezė ir reikšmė pasaulio istorijos procesui: L. Vasiljevo ir E. Gudavičiaus sampratos* [Genesis of feudalism in Western Europe and its influence to the process of world history] // *Lietuvos istorijos studijos*. 2004, t. 14, p. 9-17.
4. *The Concept of Tributalism: A Comparative Analysis of S. Amin, J. Haldon and H. H. Stahl’s Approaches* // *Revista Română de studii Baltice și Nordice*, 2009, nr. 1, p. 65-85.
5. *Политические отношения ВКЛ и Молдовы в 1430-1447 гг.* [Political relations between Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moldova in 1430-1447] // *Revista de istorie a Moldovei*, 2008, nr. 3, p. 3-15.