

The computer and non-numerical information: on the evolution of the class of landlords in Romania (1857-1918)

Liveanu, Vasile; Gavrilă, Irina

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Liveanu, V., & Gavrilă, I. (1988). The computer and non-numerical information: on the evolution of the class of landlords in Romania (1857-1918). *Historical Social Research*, 13(1), 75-88. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.13.1988.1.75-88>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

The Computer and Non-Numerical Information. On the Evolution of the Class of Landlords in Romania (1857-1918)

*Vasile Liveanu (f) and Irina Gavrilă**

Abstract: In order to illustrate the potential of using computers in the processing data from non-numerical sources, we have chosen a question of socioeconomic history. A well established thesis in historiography, sociopolitical analysis and belletristic literature, holds that, during the second half of the 19th century, a great part of the former boyars and their descendants ruined themselves. They lost their estates because they could not pay the debts incurred for luxury expenses and, especially in Moldavia, also for productive purposes. The higher production costs' in Moldavia were supposed to have caused a greater indebtedness and a more thorough ruin of the ancient boyar families of this province.

It is well known that, the computer also processes non-numerical information. Perhaps from the point of view of saving intellectual labor, processing of non-numerical historical information will turn out to be the most efficient application of computers in historical research. In order to illustrate the potential of using computers in the processing data from non-numerical sources, we have chosen a question of socioeconomic history. A well established thesis in historiography (1), sociopolitical analysis (2) and belletristic literature (3), holds that, during the second half of the 19th century, a great part of the former boyars (4) and their descendants ruined themselves. They lost their estates because they could not pay the debts incurred for luxury expenses and, especially in Moldavia, also for productive purposes. The higher production costs in Moldavia were supposed to have caused a greater indebtedness and a more thorough ruin of the ancient boyar families of this province. This conception is based on facts observed by authors of various books and on certain isolated stati-

* Edited by Konrad H. Jarausch.- Adress all communications to: Irina Gavrilă, Institutul Istorie N. Iorga, Bulevardul Aviatorilor 1, Bucuresti, Romania.

stical figures, without being supported by general statistics regarding landownership transfer.

Since such general data have not been collected, we could not proceed to a direct quantitative verification of the thesis of the ruination of old boyar families through the sale of their indebted estates. However this idea implies that in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century, the composition of the landlords class changed through the disappearance of an important part of the families of landlords which existed before the Cuza's reforms (5); the former landowners were replaced by persons originating in other families than among the landlords of 1864. It was our intention to verify this second idea quantitatively; more precisely we wanted to obtain general statistical information on certain aspects of the evolution of the composition of the landlords class. For this purpose we used data which offered an image of its structure at several successive moments in the entire country.

There is no point in presenting the archival files or published sources which offer incomplete information, concerning only certain regions of the country or certain categories of estates. We will only say that our selection was the necessary consequence of the absence of other, more complete, precise and accurate sources. The shortcomings of our documentation will be discussed in order to the difficulties we met with, the way in we tried to overcome them and the limits of our conclusions. We drew upon the following sources:

1. Registers of Voters for the Ad-hoc Assemblies of 1857

These meetings were convened to express the demands of the population of the Romanian Principalities. The voters were only males. Those who had the right to elect the boyar deputies to these assemblies (convened before the abolition of boyar ranks) had to meet the following requirements: a) to be themselves boyars of at least 30 years of age; b) to possess estates with an area of at least 142 ha. The country registers of the names of all electors of boyar deputies in Wallachia (published in the »Official Gazette« of Wallachia) and Moldavia who went to the polls, have been preserved (6). These registers give the names of nearly all the boyars owning at least 142 ha in 1857. Only the names of large boyars landlords, who were less than 30 years of age, and of the Moldavians who did not go to the polls were missing. But this was only a small number because the political struggle had involved all the able-bodied persons. The number of those entered in registers of voters for boyars deputies, without being entitled to it, also limited. The register did not contain women (widows of boyars, orphans, the unwedded daughters of boyar families etc.), owning at least 142 ha.

In contrast to the three sources presented hereafter, the voter registers of 1857 were based on persons and make it possible to specify the cases in which the same name was borne by different owners. In the registers of 1857, there appear, for instance, two persons with the name of Miclescu. In this case, we have counted the surname Miclescu twice.

2. Nominal Polls of Landowners, Created by the Rural Law of 1864

These rolls were drawn up for counties and small rural districts as a result of a circular of 1872 of the Minister of Finance. Included were inter alia, the names of all private landlords of 1864, of all the socmen put in possession of land, the category to which they belonged (7) and the area which they received. Because all these rolls have been preserved in the files of the agrarian reform of 1864 of the State Archives in Bucharest, we could draw-up a list of all private landed properties in Romania before the agrarian reform, with the names of their owners, the commune and county in which they were located, the number and categories of socmen etc..

By the *»name of an owner«* on the rolls of 1864, 1905 and 1918, we understand the combination between a certain year, a surname and a certain first name. The same holds for the *»surname«* of an owner on the rolls of the same year. For instance, we have considered that Grigore Ghica and Ion Ghica represent two names of owners and two surnames of Ghica. Although the expression *»the number of surnames on the 1864, 1905 and 1918 rolls«* acquires a somewhat unusual meaning, this procedure is dictated by the objective of our research.

In certain cases, however, one person possessed several estates and in other cases different owners had the same name. We do not possess the necessary information to resolve these cases. For instance, in the nominal rolls appear two properties whose owner was named Nicolae Chiriac. Because we do not know if only one real owner existed or not, we are concerned not with the *owners* but the *names of owners* of 1864 (or 1905 or 1918). In other words, in our calculations, *»Nicolae Chiriac«* represents only one name of an owner and *»Chiriac«* only one surname, a fact which has to be taken into account in the interpretation of the results obtained (8).

We have divided the names of owners into categories, depending on the number of socmen on our list in front of each name. In order to specify the evolution of the big owners' class composition a cautious approach would be to take into initial consideration, the names of owners with more than 10 socmen (9).

3. The General Yearbook of Romania on 1905 (10)

It indicates the names of »rural owners« under each commune. At that time by rural owners were understood to be the big landowners, of at least 100 ha. As a consequence, the *Yearbook* yields a list of the names of big owners in the entire country, indicating the commune (communes) where there were estates (or shares of estates held in joint possession), belonging to a bearer of the same name. Once again the same name might have been borne by several owners (11).

Of course, errors were made in the drawing up the yearbook. While big landlords were omitted it is likely that such cases were only a few, because the landlords were well known, and the editors were keen not to leave out someone interested in buying the *Yearbook* for reasons of prestige. More frequent were the cases in persons holding big estates but were eager to exhibit what seemed to be a superior social status were included among owners (12). Such possible errors have to be taken into account in using the *Yearbook*. However this source has to be utilized because it offers the only possibility for reconstructing a list of the names of almost all the big owners at the beginning to the 20th century, on the eve of the great peasant uprising of 1907.

4. The Files of the Agrarian Reform After the First World War

The files on »The agrarian reform of 1921«, kept at States Archives in Bucharest, contain documents issued since 1919 about the implementation of the agrarian laws enacted after the First World War. We collect from these documents data on the situation of as many estates of ancient Romania as possible, at the moment when the Decree of expropriation of 18. December 1918 was adopted. We studied the files for the years 1919-1931, because later files were unlikely to offer the information looked for. This data allowed us to prepare a list of 1.283 names of owners who possessed 1.385 estates with at least 100 ha arable land in December 1918. The incompleteness of these data does not constitute an insuperable obstacle because the number of cases does permit us to sample and make statistical inferences. In comparison with the data of the *1905 Yearbook*, the postwar data have the advantage of being related to a precisely limited category; estates over 100 ha of arable land.

The computer was *inter alia* used for the creation of alphabetical lists of landowners, one of each for the years 1857, 1864, 1905, 1918. For each big owner a number of other informations was also entered, such as the county and the commune where they had estates, the boyars' ranks for the list of

1857, the number of socmen for the list of 1864, the size of the estates for the list of 1918 etc. For the year 1864, the total number of socmen which the owner of several estates disposed of was also computed. The computer was also used for comparing the list of names of big owners and selecting the names of owners, found in two lists as well as of the information about the respective owners.

It was therefore possible to make automated comparisons as well as order and aggregate non-numerical information: names of persons, communes, counties, etc.. Because over 14.000 names (with corresponding information) had to be processed, »manual« sorting would have needed a long time of routine work. The computer therefore saved this work and provided lists which facilitated further interpretation.

We will present some conclusions of the comparisons made. We wanted to know, in the first place, how many of the big boyar owners of 1857 had a surname which appears on the list of the landlords of 1905. The following example may illustrate our procedure. The list of 1857 and that of 1905 shows the following names of owners from the Asian family:

1857	1905
Asian Alecu	Asian Ecaterina
Asian Gheorghe	Asian Gheorghe
Asian Tudor	

In this case we concluded that the surname of three big owners of 1857 can be found again among the landlord surnames of 1905 or that three surnames on the list of 1857 appeared again on the list of 1905.

In the total of 1.409 big boyars of 1857, only 925 surnames were found again among on the complete list of 1905. In other words, 484 or 34.3% of the surnames on the roll of 1857 are not found again on the list of 1905. What is the significance of this fact? The disappearance from the 1905 list of a surname entered in the 1857 roll may have at least one of the two following explanations. It was possible that in the 1857-1905 period, all the boyars of that surname and/or their heirs had lost the position of big owners as a result of the sale or the division of their estates. It was likewise possible that the boyars' estates on the first list were not lost, but that in 1905 no person bearing the surname entered in the 1857 list, should be alive. In the latter case the land of big owners from 1857 was transmitted through succession either to persons with another surname (including married daughters or nieces) or to juridical persons (13).

We have to take into consideration the following: if a boyar on the 1857 list and/or all his heirs had lost their position of big owners by 1905 or if another boyar of 1857 had died and did not have descendants with the same name alive in 1905, but there existed other bearers of the same sur

name, the respective surnames were not included in the percentage of 34.3 percent which was indicated above. For instance, on the 1857 roll nine Moldavian boyars with the name of Rosetti appear. Because this surname also appears on the list of big owners, none of these Rosettis was included among those surnames had disappeared from the 1905 list. But comparing the genealogy of the Rosetti family with our lists, we could establish that from among the Moldavian Rosettis of the 1857 list, two (Alecuc and Lascari) had no direct descendant alive in 1905 and two others (Dumitru and Grigore) had descendants with the same surname who were alive in 1905 but had no more estates (14).

Moreover, the presence of the same surname on the list of big owners of 1857 and 1905 can be the consequence of pure coincidence of names of persons without kinship ties among them. These considerations suggest that the above figures indicate the minimum percentage of boyars on the 1857 list who were not big owners of 1905 and who did not have heirs or other offsprings with the same surname. At least 34.3 percent from among the boyar owners of a minimum 142 ha of 1857 were not big owners in 1905 and did not have descendants and other relatives with the same surname among the landlords of 1905, because, in the meantime, all their surname bearers had died or no longer had enough land to qualify as big owners (15).

The share of boyars on the 1857 roll whose surnames had disappeared from the list of 1905 was 40.9 percent (202 of 493) in Moldavia and only 30.6 percent (282 of 916) in Wallachia. The difference confirms the impression of the authors evoked at the beginning of the study that a greater proportion of the Moldavia gentry was ruined than the Wallachian gentry. This difference has now a more precise quantitative dimension. The difference is important but not large.

The proportion of the surnames on the 1857 list which do not appear any longer on 1905 list is greater in the case of small boyars than in the case of big boyars. 36.5 percent of the surnames of small boyars on the 1857 list (16) and only 27.6 percent of the surnames of the big boyars (17) on the same list had disappeared after 58 years from the list of the landlords' surnames. This is not surprising, because the big boyars had a greater economic power (18).

Comparing also the counties where the estates were located shows for the country as a whole that only 452, i.e. only 32 percent of the boyars' surnames on the 1857 list appear again in the same county on the 1905 list. This figure means that minimum 68 percent of the persons on the 1857 list did not appear in 1905, either among the owners of estates in the county where they did possess one in 1857 or among those who had relatives with the same surname in that county. It was, of course, possible that an owner of 1857 or his/her heirs left the same county, but kept or acquired estates

in other counties. Nevertheless the figure of 68 percent illustrates the amplitude of the circulation of the titles of ownership (through sale, exchange, dowry of girls, succession etc.) in the period 1857-1909.

The figures quoted until now refer only to boyars with properties of at least 142 ha, which were entered in the rolls of voters of 1857. The boyars of this category who did not reach the age of 30 years, those omitted by a (wilful or unwilful) error from the roll and who, in Moldavia, did not go to the polls, could not be taken into consideration in our calculations. The size of our sample is however sufficiently large and our conclusions cautious and flexible enough so that they should not be essentially affected by the incompleteness of data. At any rate the now available sources, suggest an image of the process of the evolution of the big landlordship that cannot be ignored.

In contrast to the voters 1857 the list drawn up on the basis of the nominal rolls prepared in connection with the implementation of the 1864 agrarian reform is more complete. Moreover the list of owners with over 10 socmen of 1864 also includes the estates of less than 142 ha. Hence, the last list contains as many as 2.329 names of owners (19).

The greater number of the names of owners on the 1864 list also explains why the absolute number 1.293 surnames, found again on the big owners' list, is bigger than the number of surnames on the 1857 list which were found again in 1905. However, the absolute number and, especially, the *percentage* of the surnames on the 1864 list which were not found again on that of 1905 are also bigger than those on the 1857 list, not kept on that of 1905. Fully 1.036 or 44.6 percent of the surnames of owners with over 10 socmen of 1864 do not appear on the 1905 list.

This could indicate that the proportion of those who no longer counted among the landlords of 1905 was bigger for the owners on the 1864 list than the owners on the 1857 list. This fact might be explained by the presence of a greater proportion of owners with surfaces less than 142 ha on the 1864 list who were weaker from an economic viewpoint. In order to formulate a valid conclusion we must however wait until for further comparisons and aggregations which still be in progress.

The comparisons made so far indicate the minimal size the ruination and extinction of the ancient boyars owners and of the families of big landlords. Its extent is perhaps smaller than the monographs quoted at the beginning of this article seemed to suggest. But we must not forget that its total size is likely to have been bigger.

The decline of a part of the ancient landlords was associated with the influx of persons originating in other social strata than the landlords before 1857 and big owners before 1864. We will now deal with this second process, starting with the situation of 1905.

In the first place the number of big owners increased strikingly. In comparison with 1.409 boyar owners of at least 142 ha, registered on the 1857 roll and in comparison with the 2.329 names of owners with over 10 socmen of 1864, the *1905 Yearbook* includes 4.683 names of big owners. In comparison to 1857, the increase can be explained only partly by fact than in 1905 the limit beyond which a property was considered big decreased from 142 ha to 100 ha. The number of »rural owners« in the Yearbook was also twice as big as the one on the 1864 roll in which smaller owners were also entered.

In the first place the increase in the number of landlords was related to various forms of division of ancient estates. The estates could be divided between the heirs of their owners in the sixth and seventh decades of the past century and between the buyers of various parts of estates. Of course, some of the new owners preferred to hold the estates *pro indiviso*, in which case the estates were not partitioned physically, but only with respect to pecuniary rights and charges. Each of the persons which held estates *pro indiviso* was naturally registered in the *Yearbook* as owner. Though a good part of the ancient boyars had maintained itself in the landed gentry's ranks the division of the ancient estates was one process that made it possible for the majority of big rural owners in 1905 to consist of persons originating from other strata than those of the big owners of 1857-1864.

Indeed, among the total of 5.256 properties (and shares of property owned in common) in 1905 57.8 percent (3.039) belonged to owners whose surnames did not appear on the 1857 roll. Because the appearance of certain 1857 surnames on the 1905 list often resulted from fortuitous coincidences and not family ties (20), it seems that at least 57.8 percent of the big properties suggested by the entries of the *1905 Yearbook* belonged to men originating in other families than those of 1857 boyars. This finding reflects the sale of the ancient boyar family estates to rich persons of a non-boyar origin, and the penetration of persons from other social milieus (through marriage into ancient boyar families etc.).

From among the 4.683 surnames of big owners of 1905, as many as 2.870 do not appear on the 1857 roll of big boyar owners. Though the number of persons' names does not indicate an equal number of real persons, the minimum percentage of big owners of 1905 originating in families, other than those of the big boyar owners of 1857, was about 61.2 percent.

The comparison between the 1905 list with that of 1864 leads to similar results. From any of the big owners of 1905 we found 1.878 surnames also on the list of owners with over 10 socmen of 1864, that is only 65 more than the surnames which are also on the 1857 roll. These persons in 2.387 estates, that is only 70 more than those landlords from the 1857 roll. Sixty percent from among the names of big owners in the *1905 Yearbook* originated in other families than those of 1864 and they held at least 64.7 percent of the estates reflected in its entries (21).

How did the composition of the gentry evaluate after 1905? The files of the agrarian reform made after World War I permit two samples, one drawn from the totality of all landlords affected by the laws of 1918-1921 and the other one extracted from the totality of all owners of these estates. We are talking about the estates with more than 100 ha arable land and their owners (22).

The estates subject to expropriation after World War I were divided into two categories, depending on whether their owners had surnames found on the 1857 list. The owners of estates could similarly be divided into two categories according to the presence of their surnames on the preceding lists. These two samples of estates and owners for 1918 resulted from a natural and historical selection process (23), from the concatenation of hazards which provoked the loss of some of the documents drawn up in connection with the implementation of the agrarian reform and the conservation of others, which could be consulted by us. We have no reason to believe that this chance process favoured the survival of the name of the owner families on the 1857 and 1864 lists and the loss of the other names. On the contrary, it seems plausible that the chances of the conservation of a landlord's name were independent of his/her presence or absence on the 1857 list or on that of 1864. Since our lists could be considered as random samples for the characteristic studied by us, we calculated the confidence intervals for the percentage of interest. The results of the calculations are presented in tables 1 and 2.

63.7 percent among the 1.324 estates in 1918, included in our sample, had owners whose surnames are not on the list of boyar big owners of 1857. With 99 percent probability, the percentage of estates of this type was located between 59.6% and 66.5% among all those affected by the agrarian reform laws after World War I. We can admit the hypothesis that in comparison with 1905, this percentage had somehow grown at the risk of potential error of 1 percent (24).

Among the 1.324 names of landlords in our sample, 63.3 percent are not found earlier on the 1857 list. If one were to take this percentage at face value, one might conclude that the percentage had increased in comparison with 1905, when it was only of 57.8 percent. But with a probability of 99 percent, the range extended between 59.8 percent and 66.8 percent. Thus the hypothesis cannot be excluded that the 1918 percentage discussed above was kept at the level of 61.32 percent. The results of our calculations are thus also compatible with the hypothesis that in 1918 the percentage was the same as in 1905.

Moreover, it appears from table 1, that the percentage of the estates owned by persons whose surnames did not figure on the 1864 roll ranges from 46.5 percent to 53.6 percent of the 1918 estates at the 99 percent probability level. From among all 1918 landlords affected by the reform,

the percentage of surnames which are not to be found on the 1864 roll was, with the same probability of 99 percent, located between 48.8 percent and 56.1 percent. We can suggest the hypothesis that the last two percentages have decreased in comparison with 1905 at a risk of only 1 percent.

The available information suggests the conclusion that the proportion of 1918 landlords originating in families other than those of owning over 10 socmen in 1864 somewhat decreased in comparison with 1905. The possibility that these percentages would have been only a little under 50 percent cannot be excluded. This shows that during the period 1905-1918, the importance of the persons originating in the families which in 1864 had had over 10 socmen without being a part of the boyars big owners of 1857 increased. This fact highlights one of the strata from which the newcomers came in the ranks of the landed gentry during the period 1905-1918.

Our data further suggest another essential conclusion. Though the proportion of landlords originating in families other than those of big boyar owners of 1857 could remain the same in 1918 as in 1905, the proportion of estates increased that was held by persons originating in other families than those of big boyar owners of the sixth decade of the last century. The difference between the evolution of the two proportions is explained by the frequency of cases in which a landlord held several estates. On the eve of the agrarian reform of 1918, the majority of estates owners, who held the majority of estates, consisted of men stemming from other families than those of big boyar owners of 1857. During the seven decades from the convening of the Elective Assemblies of 1837, the composition of the class of big owners had changed significantly with important consequences for the entire sociopolitical life of the country. The massive penetration in the ranks of the landed gentry (which due to the electoral system based on qualification had the preponderant role in the leadership of state) of persons coming from the outside the big boyars owners before 1857, facilitated the transformation of Romanian society in a bourgeois direction, according to the requirements of capitalistic development.

On the one hand, the operations of comparison, sorting and aggregating which the computer performed on non-numerical historical information, facilitate in a subsequent stage simple statistics (summations, calculation of percentages), thereby specifying the quantitative dimensions of a process of qualitative change in the composition of the classes of big owners.

On the other hand, the processing of non-numerical information is important in its own right, since it helps the elaboration of studies independent of the quantitative aspects of history. For instance, the alphabetic indexes of big owners, drawn up with the computer's help, constitute a precious tool for biographic research. They will be useful for anybody who intends to find out whether one of the personalities of the political, cultural and social elite of 1857-1905 originated in a family of big owners and

where he had his property etc.. The experience briefly presented above therefore seems to confirm the usefulness of computers for processing the non-numerical historical information.

Table 1

YEAR	ESTATES	ESTATES OS 1857		ESTATES NOS 1857		ESTATES OS 1864		ESTATES NOS 1864	
		ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)	ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)	ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)	ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1905	5226	2217	42.1	3039	57.8	2387	45.0	2869	54.5
1918	1324	479	36.1	845	63.7	660	49.9	664	50.1
		40 · 32		59.6 · 66.5		33 · 46		46.5 · 53	
		CONF.INT.		CONF.INT.		CONF.INT.		CONF.INT.	

ESTATES OS 1857 (1864) = estates whose owner had the same surname as that of an owner in the 1857 (1864) roll

ESTATES NOS 1857 (1864) = estates whose owner did not have the same surname as that of an owner in the 1857 (1864) roll

CONF.INT. = confidence interval with 99 percent probability

Table 2

YEAR	NAMES OF LANDLORDS	SURNAMEN FR 1857		SURNAMEN NFR 1857		SURNAMEN FR 1864		SURNAMEN NFR 1864	
		ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)	ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)	ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)	ABSO- LUTE	% OF (2)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1905	4683	1813	38.7	2870	61.2	1878	40.1	2805	59.8
1918	2534	459	36.7	794	63.3	595	47.8	658	52.5
		37.2 · 40.2		59.8 · 66.8		43.9 · 49.2		48.8 · 56.0	
		CONF.INT.		CONF.INT.		CONF.INT.		CONF.INT.	

FR 1857 (1864) = which is also found on the 1857 (1864) roll

NFR 1857 (1864) = which is not also found on the 1857 (1864) roll

CONF.INT. = confidence interval with probability of 99 percent

NOTES

- 1) A.D. Xenopol, *Domnia lui Cuza Voda, partes a doua*, Bucharest, pp. 153-154 (this volume reproduced a monograph dedicated by Xenopol to Cuza in 1902); N. Iorga, *Geschichte des Rumänischen Volkes im Rahmen seiner Staatsbildung*, 2. Band, Gotha 1905, p. 4; Radu Rosetti, *Pentru ce s-au rasculat taranii*, Bucharest 1907, pp. 256-257.
- 2) C. Dobrogeanu-Gherea, *Opere complete*, vol. 2, Bucharest 1976, pp. 76-77; *Razesul de la Scurta* (A.P. Braescu), *Evolutia partidelor*. Bucuresti 1896, pp. 24-25.
- 3) For instance, in the novels *Tanase Scatiu* by Duiuiu Zamfirescu and *Sfirsit de veac w Burcuresti* by Ion Marin Sadoveanu.
- 4) The boyar ranks were abolished in 1858.
- 5) The agrarian reform adopted in 1864 under Cuza's reign had abolished the *corvee* and the other feudal services to which the peasants were obliged by law and, at the same time, transferred into property of the former socmen the plots of the estate over which they had only a right of use (in exchange of the *corvee*).
- 6) Ghenadie Petrescu, D.A. Stürza, D.C. Stürza, *Acta si documente relative la istoria renasterii Romaniei*, vol. VI, part. I, Bucuresti 1896, pp. 1-30.
- 7) There were three categories of socmen depending on the number of cattle which they possessed and the surface of land they were entitled to.
- 8) Because 4.380 properties and 3.661 names of owners were listed; the *number of owners* would exceed the *owner's names* registered on the rolls by 16.4%.
- 9) An Owner on whose estate, in 1864, were put in possession of land two foremost peasants, five middle peasants and three larger peasants in 1864, disposed of at least 56.1 ha of arable land in Wallachia and least 80.7 ha of arable land in Moldavia.
- 10) *Anuarul General al Agriculturii, Comertului si Industriei Romaniei pe 1905*. Bucuresti 1905. The Yearbook was drawn up with the assistance of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Bucharest and of the government (*ibidem*, p. 16).
- 11) The *1905 Yearbook* shows 4.682 names of private rural owners. Sometimes, the same name of a rural owner appears in several communes; in such cases there is an owner with several estates or the same name was borne by different persons. For this reason, the number of entries is greater, namely 5.256. In the unlikely case that no landlord would have held several states, the maximum number of landlords hidden behind 4.682 names would have been about 12.3 percent greater than the number of names.

- 12) A comparison ~~between~~ the 1905 Yearbook and other sources permitted us to identify a number of tenants included among the rural owners in the commune where they held estates only under lease. A fiscal census of 1905 showed 4.117 juridical and natural persons as owners of over 100 ha arable land, a figure which than is smaller than the 1805 number, represents a considerable shape.
- 13) The disinheritances of ~~descendants~~ were limited by law and were rare.
- 14) ~~Radu R. Rosseti~~ Familia Rosseti, Bucuresti. We also recall the inclusion of persons (such as tenants etc.) which in fact were not big owners on the 1905 roll.
- 15) ~~The percentage of surnames on the 1857 list~~ which disappeared from the 1905 list does not permit conclusions regarding the percentage of persons who had lost their position of big owners during the period between these lists. In order to formulate such conclusions, we would need data on the number of persons who, during this period, bore various surnames on the 1857 roll, special genealogical studies etc..
- 16) 92 of 333 respectively
- 17) ~~392 of 1076~~ respectively.
- 18) When the 1857 rolls of voters were drawn up, the boyars were divided into three classes in Wallachia and into two classes in Moldavia; the boyars who held the highest offices constituted the first class in both principalities; big boyars one understood as those of the first class.
- 19) ~~As we mentioned, one and the same name~~ of an owner on the 1864 list could have been borne by several rural owners.
- 20) We are referring to names which are frequent in Romania, such as Constantinescu, Ionescu, Petrescu, Popescu, Vasilescu, etc.. The frequency of these names in the boyar families of 1857 is explained by the penetration among the gentry of the epoch of the Organic Regulations of numerous persons originating in the bourgeoisie, civil servants etc. (see Dan Berindei, Mutations dans la classe dirigeante valaque au cours du deuxième quart due XIX^e siècle, in: Genealogica et Heraldica, Reports of the 14th International Congress of Genealogical and Heraldics Sciences in Copenhagen 25-28 August 1980, (1982) pp. 359-363 and Paul Cernovodeanu, La structure sociale de la classe des boyards roumaine pendant sa dernière étape d'existence institutionnelle (1831-1858), in: Comunicaciones al XV Congreso Internacional de las Ciencias Genealogica y Heraldica, Madrid 19-26 IX 1982 (1983), pp. 429-443.
- 21) As we have seen, among the boyar big owners of 1857, the proportion of those who had kept the position of landlords was greater

than in the totality of owners with over 10 socmen of 1864. The proportion of landlords of 1905, originating in the families of owners with over 10 socmen of 1864 remained nevertheless somewhat greater than of those originating in the families of boyar big owners of 1857, because the absolute number of big owners of the 1864 list was greater than that of on the 1857 roll.

- 22) **Very few** owners of at least 100 ha arable land succeeded in evading the expropriation, since in avoiding any litigation, thus by us refer, failing to be documented.
- 23) **For the** general notion of random sample irrespective of the type of the characteristic studied and the way its values are distributed, see G. Udny Yule and M.G. Kendall, *Introducere in teoria statisticii*, Bucuresti 1969, p. 389.
- 24) The **comparision between a percentage calculated on the basis of** random sample with another percentage is a different problem from that of estimating confidence intervals, since the former is included in the verification of statistical hypothesis which we do not discuss here.