

**ON THE METROPOLITANATE OF SEVERIN “IN”
TRANSYLVANIAN FELEAC: THE ARCHBISHOP
IN TRANSYLVANIA AND THE PROFESSORS
OF THE GREEK FAITH IN THE NORTH***

*Alexandru Simon***

Keywords: Severin, Feleac, Transylvania, Peri, Mukachevo, Matthias Corvinus, Wladislaw II Jagiello, Bishop John (of Mukachevo), Prior Hilarius (of Peri), reformation, Church Union, dynasty

Cuvinte cheie: Severin, Feleac, Transilvania, Peri, Mukachevo, Matia Corvin, Vladislav al II-lea Jagiello, episcopul Ioan (de Mukachevo), egumenul Hilarie (de Peri), reformă, unirea Bisericii, dinastie

The medieval history of the village of Feleac is the byproduct of several “selected” charters and a succession of Hungarian and Romanian desires.¹ The medieval ecclesiastical history of the Wallachians in Transylvania is the “bastard offspring” of interconfessional disputes and of archival losses.² The Reformations “cleared” minds and “reshaped” ethnicities (1500s–1700s, and even later).³ Few “certainties” have consequently survived, which is particularly true in the case of the Union of Florence (1439) and of its spread.⁴

* The article is part of larger analysis. The other parts include “Privilege and Hierarchy – Village and Church: A Wallachian Case from Medieval Transylvania,” (*Croatica Christiana Periodica*, 47, no. 1 (2023), in press, and “An Ecclesiastical Crossroad in Transylvanian Feleac? Bishop Makarios of Halych, Archbishop Daniel and Isaac the Treasurer” *Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis*, 22 (2023), in press.

** Academia Română, Centrul de Studii Transilvane Cluj-Napoca, str. Mihail Kogălniceanu, nr. 12–14, e-mail: alexandrusimon2003@gmail.com

¹ Valeria V. Marchiș, *Feleacul: schiță monografică* (Cluj, 1934), 29–30 (still not outdated).

² For an overview of sources and historiography, see also Al. Simon, “The Florentine Union and the Late Medieval Habsburgs in Transylvania on the Eve of World War I: On the Institutional and Scholarly Impact of Augustin Bunea,” in *Science and Catholicism in the Universities of South-East Europe 1800 to 1920* (= *South-East European History*, 7), eds. Ana Biočić, Iva Mršić Felbar (Vienna – Oxford, 2023), in press.

³ Ioan Drăgan, *Nobilimea românească din Transilvania. 1440–1514* (Bucharest, 2000), 401–403.

⁴ From the rather recent Romanian historiography: Marius Diaconescu, “Les implications confessionnelles du Concile de Florence en Hongrie,” *Medievalia Transilvanica*, 1, nos. 1–2

The churchly history of Feleac is largely a political history. Connecting it to grand-scale decisions is possible, tempting and yet risky.⁵ The number of relevant sources is rather reduced and quite unchanged since the 1800s.⁶

Greek Rite Transylvania between Severin and Peri, and Mukachevo

According to the Greek Catholic *Transylvanian School* (late 1700s to the early 1800s)⁷, the Metropolitanate of Severin (Szörény)⁸ was the canonical and political foundation of the Metropolitanate of Transylvania, whose seat was that of Severin relocated within the voivodate.⁹ The first known archbishop that resided in Feleac, Daniel¹⁰, did indeed write to the Transylvanian Saxon

(1997): 29–62; Adrian Andrei Rusu, *Ioan de Hunedora și românii din vremea sa* (Cluj-Napoca, 1999), 89–106; Iulian Mihai Damian, *Ioan de Capestrano și cruciada târzie* (Cluj-Napoca, 2011), 102–114; Dan Ioan Mureșan, “Bessarion et l’Église de rit byzantin du royaume de Hongarie (1463–1472),” in *Matthias Corvinus und seine Zeit: Europa am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit zwischen Wien und Konstantinopel* (=Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 410), eds. Christian Gastgeber, Ekaterini Mitsiou, Ioan-Aurel Pop, Mihailo St. Popović, Johannes Preiser Kapeller, Al. Simon (Vienna, 2011), 75–92; as well as Vasile Alexandru Barbolovici, *Conciliul de la Ferrara-Florența (1438–1439)* (Cluj-Napoca, 2019), 67.

⁵ None of the other “non-urban” residences of Transylvanian hierarchs were the subject of distinct analysis (by this we mean foremost Geoagiu, in the south, Vad, in the north, and maybe even Râmeț in the centre). Feleac is, in fact, the only exception to “this rule”.

⁶ For instance: Ilarion Pușcariu, *Mitropolia românilor ortodocși din Ungaria și Transilvania*, I (Sibiu, 1899); Augustin Bunea, *Ierarchia românilor din Ardeal și Ungaria* (Blaj [Blaj,] 1904).

⁷ David Prodan, *Supplex libellus valachorum* (Bucharest, 1984²); Nicolae Bocșan, *Contribuții la istoria iluminismului românesc* (Timișoara, 1984); Pompiliu Teodor, *Sub semnul Luminilor. Samuil Micu* (Cluj-Napoca, 2000); Laura Stanciu, *Iluminism central european. Școala Ardeleană. 1700–1825* (Cluj-Napoca, 2010); *Școala Ardeleană*, I-IV, ed. Eugen Pavel (Cluj-Napoca, 2018).

⁸ See Petru Maior, *Istoria Bisericii Românilor*, ed. Ioan Chindriș, I (Bucharest, 1995 [1813]), 96–97; Samuil Micu, *Istoria românilor*, ed. I. Chindriș, (Bucharest, 1995 [1805]), 110–111.

⁹ Ana Dumitran, “The Chronology of the Murals in the Râmeț Monastic Church (Alba County, Romania) Based on a Reevaluation of the Dating of the Narthex Inscription,” *Museikon*, 4 (2020): 109–162, at 126–127 (an attempt also to shift attention towards Râmeț).

¹⁰ The dedicace of the tetraevangelion commissioned by Daniel (25 October 1488) read in the, at present most, used lecture, and rendering, of the text (see immediately below): Произволеніѣмъ вѣща и поспѣшеніе(м) с(ы)на и дѣист(е)омъ св(а)таго, съврѣши(с)а сѣи н(а)ш(е)га архиеп(ис)к(о)па кур данила, въ дѣни вел(и)каго крал(ѣ) маѣаша. въ песи(?) на имѣ фалѣцѣ влизу мѣста коложвар, идеже и цр(ѣ)ква създа пр(ѣ)п(о)д(о)внѣи м(а)т(е)ри нашеи параскеви. Влѣт(о) зччз м(ѣ)с(а)ца вк(томврѣа) кѣ д(ѣ)н(и) (Victor Popa, “Considerații critice cu privire la Mitropolia Transilvaniei în secolul al XV-lea și al XVI-lea și a raporturilor ei cu Moldova,” *Mitropolia Banatului*, 8, nos. 7–9 (1958): 387–436, at 408–409). A translation (adjusted from Cristian-Nicolae Daniel, *Coping with the Powerful Other: A Comparative Approach to Greek-Slavonic Communities of Rite in Late Medieval Transylvania and the Banat* [PhD thesis (Central European University) (Budapest, 2014), 122], could read: *By the will of the Father and the help of the Son and with the work of the Holy Spirit, this book of the four*

city of Braşov (Kronstadt, Brassó) in his capacity of *metropolite of Severin and Transylvania*.¹¹ Alike Bishop Makarios of Halych before (certainly in the late 1460s), Daniel had authority over the *Greek* rite Christians in Saxon territories (that – on *Latin* rite level – were subjected directly to the archbishop of Esztergom and not to the bishop of Transylvania).¹²

At first, the northern territories outside of the counties of the Voivodate of Transylvania, placed under the authority of the *stavropighia* of Peri since 1391¹³, were not subjected to the hierarch that resided in Feleac. Following King Wladislaw II's order issued at the bequest of future cardinal Thomas Bakócz, bishop of Eger¹⁴, Peri was removed from under the authority of the

*gospels was made at the request of our most sanctified Archbishop Kyr Daniil in the days of King Matthias. It was written in the name of Feleac, close to the City of Cluj, where a church was erected as well, dedicated to the Most Holy Nother Paraskeva. In the year 6997, in the month of October, on the 25th day. The tetraevangelion, and its silver binding cover donated by Isaac in 1498, went lost within a couple of decades at most after the exhibition of the Transylvanian Roumains in Sibiu, in 1905 (Analele Asociaţiunii pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român, 6, nos. 11–12 (1905): 275). Earlier readings of the manuscript inscription contained various “nuances”, such as (1) [...] most sanctified Archbishop of Severin Kyr Daniil [...], (2) [...] in the days of the great King Matthias [...] (3), after the dating: Written by the last of the sinners, Lazar (Silviu Dragomir, “Notițe istorice,” Revista Teologică, 5, nos. 14–19 (1911): 503–504). Additional comments are most strenuous, as, like Victor Popa (in 1958), Emil Turdeanu, who republished the dedicace, did not have access to the original (“Manuscrisse slave din timpul lui Ștefan cel Mare,” Cercetări Literare, 5 (1943): 101–240, at 176). In effect, the only Slavonic source regarding the history of the hierarchs in Feleac that can be still checked today (within the limits imposed by various restorations) is the *graffito* from 1516 that mentioned the metropolite III... The *graffito* was – as it now seems – unknown to historians and theologians prior to Popa's edition in 1958.*

¹¹ According to letter, calendared by Ioan Bogdan (in *Documente și regeste privitoare la relațiile Țării Rumânești cu Braşovul și Ungaria în secolul XV și XVI* (Bucharest, 1902), no. 27, p. 308), and later lost (like some other sources). Daniel asked the city council to fine with 3 florins each *Greek* rite Christian, under their secular authority, that leaved *outside the law*. In the absence of the Slavonic original, we can only speculate about what that *law* meant.

¹² Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor, XV–1. Acte și scrisori din arhivele oraşelor ardelene Bistrița, Braşov, Sibiu, 1358–1600*, ed. Nicolae Iorga (Bucharest, 1911) (Hurmuzaki), no. 125, p. 71 (1469). The expansion of Makarios' authority may have been both a result of Matthias' victory over the Transylvanian rebels of 1467 and part of a *Latin-Greek* compromise, as, since 1468, by royal order, *schismatics* had to pay the tithe if they lived in *terris Christianorum*, that is lands formerly inhabited by *Latin* rite Christians (see Hurmuzaki, II–2. 1451–1510, ed. Nicolae Densușianu (Bucharest, 1891), no. 162, p. 182).

¹³ Recently: Macarie Motogna, Șerban Turcuș, “Mănăstirea din Perii Maramureşului între *charistikariat* și *stavropighie*,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “George Barițiu”*, 61 (2022): 35–53.

¹⁴ Peri was in Maramureş (county and land). Maramureş stood under the *Latin* rite power of the bishops of Eger, as already emphasized in Makarios – of (Ruthenian) Halych's – case in 1466 (Menyhert Erduhelyi, “Magyarországi görög Katholikusok a Mohács vész előtt,” *Katolikus Szemele*, 11 (1897): 28–56, at 46, note 1). Additionally, Bakócz, the son of a serf from Ardu

persent and future bishops of Mukachevo (Munkács) and placed under the control of the *present and future archbishops in Transylvania* (1494).¹⁵ The royal decision was motivated by the lasting conflict between Peri and Mukachevo.¹⁶ It followed the meeting of Levoča (Leutschau, Lőcse) where the Jagiellonian brothers had decided to dethrone Stephen III of Moldavia¹⁷ and to replace him with Sigismund, the youngest of late Casimir IV's living lay sons.¹⁸ In return, the decision of Wladislaw II may have rightened a wrong done by Matthias Corvinus, eager to secure support for his son's royal succession in the late 1480s¹⁹ (Mukachevo had been granted by him to John Corvinus).²⁰

The “Wallachian Master” of the Eastern Parts of the Hungarian Realm

In late November 1498, that is between the royal dismissal of Bartholomew Drágffy, the hereditary patron of Peri (September), and the Feleac donation of Isaac, the treasurer of Moldavia (December), as well as possibly the Peri donation of the chancellor of Moldavia, John Tăutu (undated)²¹, Wladislaw II Jagiello

(Erdőd, Erded), the main residence at the time of the Drágffys (as noted by Vilmos Fraknoi, *Erdődi Bakócz Tamás élete* (Budapest, 1888), 6) the – now *Latin* rite – patrons of Peri, had a vested political interest in these affairs. Bakócz was soon caught/ involved in the anti-Jagiellonian conspiracy of Maximilian I and Stephen III.

¹⁵ Ioan Mihály de Apșa, *Diplome maramureșene din secolele XIV și XV* (Sighet, 1900), no. 352, pp. 600–601 (Visegrád, 14 May 1494). The original text read: [...] *Ita tamen quod ipse frater Hilarius Prior, et sui successoris episcopo de Munkats sui ordinis reverentia, archiepiscopo vero de Transylvania, modernis et futuris, veluti superioribus suis debitam subiunctionem et obedientiam praestare debeant et teneantur* [...]. In general, little attention was paid to the fact that in 1494 Peri was already under Mukachevo's authority.

¹⁶ See an unjustly neglected study Alexandru Cziplé, “Documente privitoare la Episcopia din Maramurș,” *Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice*, 2nd series, 38 (1916): 251–376, at 253–255. A forged charter, allegedly issued by Ruthenian duke Theodore Koriatović, in the days of Louis I of Anjou (1360), legitimized the Bishopric of Munkács.

¹⁷ On the Jagiellonian family congress (mid-April/ prior to 22 April until early May/ after 5 May), see also Katarzyna Niemczyk, “Moldau in polnischen und ungarischen Politik. Das Treffen in Levoca 1494,” *Codrii Cosminului*, 21, no. 1 (2015): 101–114, here at 104–106.

¹⁸ E.g., Natalia Nowakowska, *Church, State and Dynasty in Renaissance Poland: the Career of Cardinal Fryderyk Jagiellon (1468–1503)* (Aldershot, 2007), 46, 66 (a highly sensitive matter).

¹⁹ Foremost András Kubinyi, “Die Komitatsgespanschaften im Jahr 1490 und das Problem der Thronfolge von János Corvin,” in Idem, *Matthias Corvinus. Die Regierung eines Königreichs in Ostmitteleuropa. 1458–1490 (=Studien zur Geschichte Ungarns, 2)* (Herne 1999), 113–137.

²⁰ Antal Hodinka, *Munkácsi gör. szert. püspökség okmánytára, I. 1458–1715* (Ungvár [Uzhhorod], 1911), no. 6, pp. 7–9 (omitted however by both Cziplé and Mihályi).

²¹ A few complementary notes are in order: (1) John Tăutu's donation, a psalter, ended-up as the property of the Bishopric of Mukachevo; no date was seemingly inscribed in the psalter, only the name of chancellor Tăutu was recorded (Turdeanu, “Manuscrise slave,” 179–180); (2) *Lațcu*

instructed the authorities of the County of Maramureş to defend the (Wallachian) Peri Monastery against the abuses of (Ruthenian) bishop of Mukachevo, John²² (afterwards, we know nothing about either the Peri Monastery or the Bishopric of Mukachevo until the 1550s)²³. According to Wladislaw II in 1498, although he was a *Graecae fide professor* (!), John, had acted against the provisions of the charter issued for Peri by the Ecumenical Patriarch Anthony IV (1391)²⁴, and attempted to seize control over Peri in the summer of 1497²⁵ (the king made no

(Ladislav/ *Laczko*) Câdea, a trustee of John Hunyadi, had (already) donated in 1448 a silver binding of a(nother) tetraevangelion to the major Moldavian Monastery of Neamţ (A.A. Rusu, “Datarea ferecăturii evangheliarului lui Laţcu Cînde de la Mănăstirea Neamţ,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie* A.D. Xenopol, 22, no. 2 (1985): 743–746); (3) Cristian Daniel avoided in his CEU PhD thesis, *Coping with poweverful other* (2014), any reference (and hence any citation of the dedicace) to the donation of Isaac (for the text: Turdeanu, “Manuscrise slave,” 177; Maria-Magdalena Székely, “Isac, vistiernicul lui Ștefan cel Mare,” in *Vocația istoriei. Prinos profesorului Șerban Papacostea*, eds. Ovidiu Cristea, Gheorghe Lazăr (Brăila, 2008), 567–604, at 599; a translation would read: *God’s serf, Isaac the treasuer bound this tetraevangelion for the Metropolitanate in Feleac, in the year 7006, December*); (4) the year of Isaac’s donation was also read as 1497 (placing the donation right after his and Tăutu’s release from Polish captivity in October), in accordance with the Byzantine calendar (i.e. New Year fell on 1 September), yet in Moldavia, in spite of the usage of the Byzantine calendar, the New Year was, like in Hungary and Poland, on 1 January until 1572 (Sorin Iftimi, “Ceremoniile Curții domnești. La Crăciun, Anul Nou și Bobotează (secolele XVII-XIX),” in *Spectacolul public între tradiție și modernitate. Sărbători, ceremonialuri, pelerinaje și suplicii*, eds. Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu, Maria Pakucs Willcocks (Bucharest, 2007), 43–78, at 56, and note 52); (5) last but not least, Bogdan Petriceicu Hașdeu, who first drew attention to the binding, erroneously thought – otherwise his reading was identical to subsequent ones – that Isaac was not treasurer of Moldavia, but ban of Craiova, i.e., of Oltenia/ Western Wallachia (see *Analele Academiei Române. Partea administrativă și desbaterile*, 2nd series, 3 (1880–1881): 41).

²² See Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 7, 9–10 (Buda, 29 November 1498). Also in *Diplome maramureșene* (ed. Mihályi), no. 360, 624–625; Cziple, “Documente,” no. 5, 287–288.

²³ E.g., the next document in Hodinka’s *Okmánytára*, I (no. 8, 11–12) was from fall 1551. Such documentary lacunas are not uncommon in the “Hungarian ecclesiastical history” of Greek rite Christians and are seemingly connected both to Mohács and the Reformation.

²⁴ A very favourably (for Peri) tailored Latin translation of the patriarchal charter from 13 August 1391 was presented to Wladislaw before the king issued his charter of 14 May 1494 in favour of Peri, and also Feleac (*Documente maramureșene*, no. 62, 109–111). For the original Greek text: *Fontes Historiae Daco-Romanae*, eds. Haralambie Mihăescu, Radu Lăzărescu, Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, Tudor Teoteoi, IV. *Scriitori și acte bizantine. Secolele IV-XV* (Bucharest, 1982), no. XLV–34, 230–233 (text based on the classical edition by Franz Miklosich, Joseph Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, V. *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani MCCCXV-MCCCCII* (Vienna, 1862), no. 326, 156–157).

²⁵ *Diplome maramureșene*, no. 352, 600 ([...] *tamen venerabilis frater Ioannes episcopus de Munkach Graecae fidei professor, in aestate proxime praeterita, contra huiusmodi indulta praefati patriarchae* [...]; only some minor spellings differ in the Hodinka and Cziple editions).

mention of Feleac/ *the archbishop in Transylvania* in spite of his earlier decision of May 1494 in favour of Peri).²⁶

The previous year (1497), when bishop John of Mukachevo had attacked Peri, “the protectorate” of Feleac, and Drágffy, and Stephen III of Moldavia (the same had happened to the Transylvanian estates of Stephen already by spring 1497)²⁷, the anti-Jagiellonian *conspiracy* of Maximilian I of Habsburg and Stephen III prevented Stephen’s dethronement by John Albert, king of Poland and Wladislaw II’s younger brother (August–October 1497).²⁸ The *conspiracy* of Maximilian and Stephen nearly costed the king of Hungary and Bohemia his rule in Buda (like later in 1505, King Wladislaw had left for Prague in April 1497 and returned only in early fall).²⁹ Without Wladislaw’s consent, Drágffy then came to Stephen’s aid³⁰, yet, fearful of the impact of John Albert’s potential

²⁶ When he had also referred to the patriarchal charter of 1391 mentioned again in this document of 1498. The problem may have been the relation between Feleac and the Great Church. It is possible that, if such a relation existed at all (prior to Neagoie Basarab in the 1510s and his potential actions), it passed only through Stephen and the *Greek* rite Church of Moldavia, (finally) under the voivode’s control. Within less than a year, on 12 July 1499, the hierarchs of Moldavia confirmed the Peace of Hârlău between Hungary, Poland and Moldavia (on this quite unique treaty between realms: Al. Simon, “Fiii lui Ștefan cel Mare și soția la Pacea de la Hârlău (1499),” *Revista Arhivelor*, 125, nos. 1–4 (2018) [2022]: 65–81).

²⁷ For the often-neglected sources: *A Tomaj Nemzetségbeli Losonczy Bánffy család története. Oklevéltár, II. 1458–1526*, ed. Béla Iványi (Budapest, 1928), no. 244, 348–349; Zsigmond Jakó, *A kolozsmonostori konvent jegyzőkönyvei, II. 1485–1556* (Budapest, 1990), no. 3010, 153.

²⁸ I.-A. Pop, Al. Simon, “*Partes Transilvane intrabunt et te de tota terra tua disperdent*: Maximilian I de Habsburg către Ștefan cel Mare după Codrii Cosminului,” (I-II) *Transilvania*, NS, 5, nos. 1 and 2 (2021): 21–42, 60–78, II, Appendix, 63–72 Manfred Hollegger, “Im Osten nichts Neues? Kernräume der Politik Maximilians I.,” in *Das Wiener Fürstentreffen von 1515. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Habsburgisch-Jagiellonischen Doppelvermählung*, eds. Bogusław Dybaś, István Tringli (Budapest, 2019), 125–148, in this case foremost 143–144.

²⁹ The Hungarian turmoil of 1497 was well-known since Johann Christian von Engel’s *Geschichte des Ugrischen Reiches* (III–2 (Vienna, 1813), 83–86). In Hungary, Stephen III of Moldavia enjoyed – quite astonishingly – the support of count-palatine Stephen Szapolyai, the father of future king John, the leader of the “nationalist party”, as well as a known opponent of Maximilian I. It is therefore quite understandable why the most recent analysis of the Jagiellonian Diets of Hungary stopped in 1496 (Tibor Neumann, “Királyi hatalom és országgyűlés a Jagelló-kor elején,” in *Rendiség és parlamentarizmus Magyarországon. A kezdetektől 1918-ig*, eds. Tamás Dobszay, András Forgó, Iván Bertényi ifj, Géza Pálffy, György Rácz, István M. Sziájtó, (Budapest, 2013), 46–54). Evidently, new researches (and new sources) are much needed.

³⁰ Cf. *Materialy do dziejów dyplomacji polskiej z lat 1486–1516 (Kodeks zagrzebski)*, ed. József Garbacik (Wrocław – Warsaw – Krakow, 1966), no. 14, 33; *Hurmuzaki*, XV–1, no. 241–242, 148–149. Marius Diaconescu attempted to “spin the story” in the favour of the Hungarian court, by redating (contrary to older Hungarian historiography and archival records) a post 1515 (undated moreover) source to 1498 (“Mobilizarea oastei maghiare in 1497 in subsidium et tutelam wayvode Moldaviensis,” *Analele Putnei*, 12, no. 2 (2016): 35–52).

death, the voivode of Transylvania persuaded the voivode of Moldavia not to crush the Jagiellonian monarch (Stephen III had to content himself with the decimation of John Albert’s retreating host).³¹

Needless therefore to say that the most controversial aspect concerning the Greek rite ecclesiastical hierarchy in Transylvania in the second half of the 15th century remains the involvement of Stephen III of Moldavia.³² The vast majority of sources regarding his time as a most wealthy landowner in Transylvania (1489/1492–1504) were lost.³³ This is in fact quite natural³⁴ in retrospective. Already at the death of King Matthias Corvinus, Maximilian I of Habsburg had asked the Transylvanian estates to accept Stephen III of Moldavia as “governor” on his behalf (in August 1490).³⁵ Four years later (in January 1494), Stephen was known as the *count of Transylvania* in Vienna and Venice.³⁶ Three years later (in May 1497), with Venice’s aid, the alliance between Maximilian I and Stephen III included John Corvinus (whom Stephen had eventually abandoned, in spite of the oath sworn to late King Matthias).³⁷

³¹ Stephen III’s “official chronicle” (what was preserved of it) blamed Drágffy for halting the voivode of Moldavia. Apparently, in order to become a king, one had to slay a king.

³² The most violent critiques were voiced by A.A. Rusu, “Ștefan cel Mare și Transilvania. Un inventar critic, date nevalorificate și interpretări noi,” *Analele Putnei*, 1, no. 2 (2005), 91–122 and Ștefan cel Mare și moldovenii din vremea sa (Cluj-Napoca, 2022), 9–10, 286, 295.

³³ This applies not only to “Transylvanian administrative documents”, but also to the voievode’s correspondence with the Saxon city of Brașov. Very intense until 1487, the exchange of messages is reduced to one single letter from Stephen between that date and his death in 1504 (see chiefly I. Bogdan, *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare*, II (Bucharest, 1913). The “turning-point” (around 1488) coincides with the first mention of Archbishop Daniel.

³⁴ For a “medieval survey” of the modern circumstances (1848–1947), see I.-A. Pop, Al. Simon, *Re de Dacia: un proiect de la sfârșitul Evului Mediu* (Cluj-Napoca, 2018), 104–105, 188.

³⁵ Document first published by Friedrich Firnhaber, “Beiträge zur Geschichte Ungarns unter der Regierung der Könige Wladislaus II. und Ludwig II. (1490–1526),” *Archiv für Kunde Österreichischer Geschichtsquellen*, 2, no. 2 (1849), 375–552, at no. 10, 409–410. The proclamation of Maximilian (now apparently lost as well, after 2012) is most intriguing because Stephen III was met with fierce local opposition when he attempted to (re?)take control of the Transylvanian estates, regranted to him by Wladislaw II in 1492. Stephen was able to properly handle his possessions only after Bartholomew Drágffy remained the only voivode of Transylvania in 1494 (for an overview: *Acta et epistolae relationum Transylvaniae Hungariaeque cum Moldaviae et Valachia* (=Fontes Rerum Transylvaniacrum, 4, 6), ed. Endre Veress, I. 1468–1540 (Budapest, 1914), no. 39–41, 45–47). Stephen’s estates, Ciceu and Cetatea de Baltă (Küküllővár, Kokelburg) then came under attack in 1497.

³⁶ See also *Hurmuzaki*, VIII. 1376–1650 [ed. Ioan Slavici?] (Bucharest, 1894), no. 34, 29.

³⁷ Recently: Suzana Miljan, Al. Simon, “Jedna isprava iz mletačkog arhiva ili kako je Ivaniš Korvin postao plemićem Venecije,” *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 38 (2020) [2022]: 263–267, at 264).

The Northern and Southern Return of the Failed Corvinus Heir

Duke John had been the first to take action against the claims of Mukachevo, based on forgeries, proven also by the duke himself (February 1493).³⁸ Bartholomew Drágffy had just been appointed voivode (co-voivode at first) of Transylvania.³⁹ Within a year, John was in open conflict with palatine Stephen Szapolyai⁴⁰, as well as with Stephen III of Moldavia.⁴¹ The context of John's intervention and his previous royal Hungarian failure suggest that Matthias Corvinus, Bartholomew Drágffy and Stephen III had been "complacent" and, for personal gains⁴², had accepted the Ruthenian forgery in the late 1480s (in 1488?).⁴³

³⁸ Foremost: Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 6, 7–9 (Mukachevo, 6 February 1493); Cziple, "Documente," 255; Rus, "Giovanni Corvino," 69. John personally came to Mukachevo

³⁹ *Magyarország világi archontológiája. 1458–1526*, Norbert C. Tóth, R. Horváth, T. Neumann, T. Pálósfálvi, I. Főpapok és bárók (Budapest, 2016), 87. Bartholomew Drágffy and Ladislas Losonczi were first recorded as voivodes of Transylvania and counts of the Szeklers on 19 January.

⁴⁰ On the intriguing dispute: T. Neumann, "A gróf és a herceg magánháborúja (Szapolyai István és Corvin János harca a lipői hercegségért)," *Századok*, 148, no. 2 (2014): 387–426.

⁴¹ Stephen's first mention as *count of Transylvania* came in the context of his conflict with John: [...] *sono su le armi el Conte Stephano di Transilvania cum el Duca Zuam Corvino* [...] (in *Hurmuzaki*, VIII, no. 34, 29; the Venetian report, sent from Vienna on 27 January 1494, was registered by the Republic of Saint Mark on 17 February 1494). Stephen was named *count of Transylvania* by Habsburg supporters and Venetian subjects until mid-1496, when the *Serenissima* and Maximilian I began reconciling duke John and *count* Stephen (Pop-Simon, *Re de Dacia*, 51–53). The reconciliation also coincided with the death of Stephen's Moldavian heir and co-owner of the Transylvanian estates, Alexander (26 July 1496), the son-in-law of the sole – since fall 1494 – voivode of Transylvania, Bartholomew Drágffy.

⁴² These gains are obvious in Matthias' case (he had made his wanted heir, John, lord of Mukachevo). In Stephen's case, Ruthenian Mukachevo can be connected to the Ruthenian attacks in Podolia against Casimir IV, sponsored – since precisely 1488 – by Stephen (see L. Pilat, "Ștefan cel Mare, Mesih Pașa, «răscoala» lui Mucha și preliminariile războiului moldo-polon," *Analele Putnei*, 15, no. 1 (2019): 69–88), supported by Matthias (Krzysztof Baczkowski, *Walka o Węgry w latach 1490–1492. Z dziejów rywalizacji habsbursko-jagiellońskiej w basenie środkowego Dunaju (=Universitas Jagiellona. Acta Scientiarum Litterarumque. Schedae Historicae*, 116) (Krakow, 1995), 82–83). The cupbearer of Matthias, as well as "secretary", Bartholomew, in the king's personal service since 1467 (R. Horváth, "A bélteki Drágfiak és a királyi udvar kapcsolata a Hunyadiak korában," in *A Szilágyság és a Wesselényi család (14–17. század)*, eds. Géza Hegyi, András W. Kovács (Kolozsvár, 2012), 167–212, at 183–186, 205–210), was about to marry his daughter to Stephen's son and heir, Alexander (1489) and may not have been very inclined to intervene in the favour of Peri.

⁴³ This dating is tempting because of Matthias' deed for the Saint Nicholas Monastery in Mukachevo (Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 3, 4), and because of the first mention – half a year later – of archbishop Daniel and the Saint Paraskeva (cathedral) church in Feleac on 25 October 1488 (Popa, "Considerațiuni critice," 408). However, King Matthias' document from 1 May 1488 did not mention a bishop or a bishopric in Mukachevo. We must stress out that, though the

During the wars for the throne of Hungary, Mukachevo, granted by Matthias to John in view of his (failed) succession⁴⁴, sided with Wladislaw II Jagiello against both his rivals, his brother, John Albert in particular, and Maximilian I of Habsburg, after John’s acknowledged defeat and, for the time being, accepted Wladislaw as his suzerain.⁴⁵ After he secured a truce with John Albert in February 1491, the Jagiellonian king of Hungary then embraced the false – Greek rite – claims of Mukachevo, led by bishop John, in order to preserve their Ruthenian and anti-Polish goodwill (July 1491).⁴⁶

Unsurprisingly, the king did not recall John’s intervention of 1493 when, in May 1494, he restored Peri’s rights (under Feleac’s authority however).⁴⁷ Wladislaw did not mention either Bartholomew Drágffy, whose family had owned and was to own the sizeable Peri estate.⁴⁸ Still, in September 1494, Wladislaw made Bartholomew Drágffy sole voivode of Transylvania and then

document from 1 May 1488 appears authentic (Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Országos Levéltár (MNL OL), Budapest, Diplomatikai Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény (DF), [no.] 226518), its place of issue, Győr, does not coincide with the Hunyadi monarch’s known itinerary (see R. Horváth, *Itineraria regis Matthiae Corvini et reginae Beatricae de Aragonia (1458–1476–1490)* (Budapest, 2011), 128; Matthias spent the entire year in Vienna and its vicinity).

⁴⁴ E.g., A. Kubinyi, “Két sorsdöntő esztendő. 1490–1491,” *Történelmi Szemle*, 33, no. 1–2 (1991): 1–54, at 10; T. Neumann, “Békekötés Pozsonyban-országgyűlés Budán. A Jagelló-Habsburg kapcsolatok egy fejezete (1490–1492),” (I-II) *Századok*, 144, no. 3 (2010): 335–372; 145, no. 3 (2011): 293–347, at 340. The Hungarian events of 1490–1491 still form a puzzle.

⁴⁵ T. Neumann, “A zavaros idők Szabolcs, Szatmár és Bereg megyékben (1490–1492),” in *Az ecsedi Báthoriak a XV–XVII. században*, eds. Sarolta Szabó, N.C. Tóth (Nyírbátor, 2012), 93–104, at 98–99, 103). In the turmoil caused, chiefly in the territories of modern Slovakia and Ukraine, by John Albert’s campaign, Drágffy too, officially loyal to Wladislaw II, had plundered his way to success in Bereg County, in the immediate vicinity of Maramureș.

⁴⁶ Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 4, 51 (Szekéshérvár, 31 July 1491). Wladislaw’s deed provided the first known royal acknowledgement of a bishop of Mukachevo (i.e., John).

⁴⁷ *Diplome maramureșene*, no. 352, 600 (absent from the Slovak copies in MNL-OL, DF).

⁴⁸ Bartholomew Drágffy was not mentioned either in the royal deed from November 1498, issued however after Bartholomew had been removed from his office of voivode of Transylvania. The explanation may reside in the fact that – at some point prior to 1442 (I.-A. Pop, „Le conseguenze dell’unione religiosa di Firenze nella contea di Maramureș (nella parte orientale del Regno d’Ungheria), rispecchiate in alcuni documenti del 1442,” in *Tradizioni e istituzioni religiose nello spazio culturale italo-romeno tra Medioevo e prima età moderna* (=Nuovi Studi Storici, 124), eds. Alvisse Andreose, Massimo Miglio, I. Damian, Antonella Dejure, Christian Grasso (Rome, 2022), 89–106, Appendix, no. 1–3, 103–106) – the Drágffys had donated/ pawned/ sold the estate of Peri to the local monks. The estate did indeed change hands between the monks and the Drágffys (even Mukachevo gained control over it in 1530) until the 1550s, when the Bishopric of Mukachevo succeeded to secure possession of Peri and its lands following the death of Gáspár Drágffy (see in particular M. Diaconescu, “Un episcop necunoscut: Gavriil de Mukačevo, 1577,” in *Relații româno-ucrainene. Istorie și contemporaneitate*, eds. Viorel Ciubotă, Vasile Marina (Satu-Mare, 1997), 175–184, at 179).

left against John's main ally, Lawrence Újlaki, duke of Bosnia.⁴⁹ Yet by 1497, John Corvinus and Lawrence Újlaki had regained and even increased their powers, and stood – alike Bartholomew Drágffy – at Maximilian of Habsburg's and Stephen of Moldavia's side.⁵⁰

The Greek Rite Balance of an “Underrated” Jagiellonian Monarch

In late 1498, in relation to Peri and Mukachevo, shepherded by the learnt professor of the Greek faith, Bishop John⁵¹, (designation employed in the same royal deed for *Hilarius*⁵², the prior of Peri⁵³ and already used by the king in regard to the same prior in 1494)⁵⁴, Wladislaw II had some supplementary con-

⁴⁹ Tamás Fedeles, *A király és a lázadó herceg. Az Újlaki Lőrinc és szövetségesei elleni királyi hadjárat (1494–1495)* (Szeged, 2012). Relations between John and Wladislaw had been good earlier. Wladislaw (and Bakócz) used John also as counterweight to palatine Stephen Szapolyai.

⁵⁰ See also Pop-Simon, “*Partes Transilvane intrabunt*,” II, Appendix, 64 (for both dukes and the voivode of Transylvania). We recall the title source: *Modus conspirationis Romanorum regis Maximiliani cum Stephano, waywoda Moldavo, contra statum serenissimi principis domini Wladislai, Dei gratia regis Hungarie, Bohemie etc. et similiter contra statum serenissimi principis domini Alberti, Polonorum regis, primus initam cum prefata maiestate regis Hungarie et strictissimo iuramento firmatam perpetuam pacem et concordiam*. The king of Hungary and not the king of Poland (who invaded Moldavia) was deemed the conspiracy's main target.

⁵¹ See Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 7, 10 ([...] *tamen venerabilis frater Iohannes, episcopus de Monkach, Grece fidei professor* [...]). The royal “academic” designation has to be emphasized. Bishop John was not – explicitly – named either *schismatic* or *uniatic* in that tense context.

⁵² His name was rendered under various forms in historiography. *Hilarius* would be the most common one. Additionally, the prior was referred to – certainly by Hodinka – also as *Gelasius* (Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 7, p. 9; in the summary of the royal document from 27 November 1498). The latter may have indeed been Hilarion's successor (cf. Dumitran, “The Chronology”, 149). Hilarion was not an uncommon name among priest and monks in the Wallachian environment. In 1494, Hilarion was the metropolite of *Ungrovlachia* (see *Documenta Romaniae Historica*, B. Țara Românească, I. 1247–1500, eds. P.P. Panaitescu, Damaschin Mioc (Bucharest, 1966), no. 247, 401–405). Hilarion was deemed the first bishop of Vlad (1523). Yet he was deemed bishop (without any mention of the name of his diocese) only in 1533 by the Saxon city of Bistrița. However, at that time, Athanasios, Peter IV Rareș's trustee (and later mortal foe), was bishop of Vad since 1531 (*Hurmuzaki*, XV–1, no. 495, p. 271; no. 685, 366; *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldovei și Țării Românești*, ed. E. Veress, I. *Acte și scrisori (1527–1572)* (Bucharest, 1929), no. 624, 337). This situation too is quite relevant for the known late medieval ecclesiastical history of the Wallachians.

⁵³ Hodinka, *Okmánytára*, I, no. 7, 10 (prior to the mention of Bishop John: [...] *in persona religiosi fratri Hylarii Grece fidei professoris* [...]). We must add that Peri Monastery had been among the first Greek rite centres in the Kingdom of Hungary to accept the Union of Florence (see Diaconescu, “Les implications,” 34–36; Pop, “Le conseguenze,” 104–106).

⁵⁴ See *Diplome maramureșene*, no. 352, 600 ([...] *venerabilis et religiosus frater Hilarius, prior claustrisive monasterii ecclesiae Beati Michaelis Archangeli in Maromarus fundati, Graecae fidei professor* [...]); Alexey Petrov, Древнѣйшія грамоты по истории Карпаторусской церкви и

cerns.⁵⁵ In the cases of major Greek rite appointments (the metropolitan seat of Rus’ in Kyiv)⁵⁶, Wladislaw’s father, Casimir IV (1466⁵⁷, 1481⁵⁸, 1488/1489⁵⁹), and brother, John Albert (1494/1495)⁶⁰, both kings of Poland, and (grand-) dukes

иерархии 1391–1498 г./ *Nejstarší doklady k historii karpatsko-ruské církve a hierarchie 1391–1498* (Prague, 1931), esp. 124–130 (no. 4), 131–132 (no. 5), 134–137 (no. 6), for 1491, 1494, 1498.

⁵⁵ The relation between Feleac and Mukachevo had been – voluntarily (we can now say) – left unclear in May 1494 by Wladislaw II, and – potentially foremost – by the bishop of Eger, Thomas Bakócz from Drágffy Ardu. As a prelate, he had jurisdiction over Latin rite Maramureş and, as acknowledged in the charter, had inspired the royal document. “Besides”, the report on the conspiracy of Maximilian I and Stephen III was preserved in the archive of the Slovakian branch of the Erdödi Bakócz family (MNL OL, DF 278383).

⁵⁶ See Borys A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kievan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge, MA, 1996), 52, 321 (note 41).

⁵⁷ Esp. Andrei Pliuzov, “On the Title «Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus’»,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 15, no. 3–4 (1991): 340–353, at 344, 352. Kyiv’s pro-Ottoman option of 1466–1467, when, with Casimir IV’s approval, metropolite Gregory, named the Bulgarian, chose the Great Church over the Papacy, probably played a part in Stephen III’s decision to abandon Matthias’ anti-Ottoman campaign planned for the summer of 1467 and side with the Hungarian rebels centred in Transylvania. Its voivodes, the brothers Peter and Sigismund of Svätý Jur, nominally headed the failed rebellion, but Matthias spared their lives (Al. Simon, “Notes and Documents on the Southern Background of Matthias Corvinus’ Bohemian War,” *Studia Mediaevalia Bohemica*, 4, no. 2 (2012): 75–94).

⁵⁸ Casimir IV chose Symeon as metropolite of Rus’ and successfully petitioned for the Great Church’s approval after, in spring 1481, he had crushed the rebellion of Michael Olelkovich, the brother of Stephen III’s first wife, Evdokia († 1467) and the leader of the unionist Ruthenian nobles that had addressed Pope Sixtus IV directly, yet unsuccessfully in 1476 (still useful Michael Hrushevsky, *A History of Ukraine* (New Haven, CT, 1941), 139–140). Casimir executed Olelkovich (August 1481), only after he had received, the latest in July 1481, Patriarch Maximos III’ confirmation of Symeon’s nomination as metropolite (see also Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 52, 320, note 40).

⁵⁹ The royal nomination and the patriarchal confirmation of Jonah Hlezna as metropolite “coincided” with (1) Matthias’ Greek rite actions in Eastern Hungary (in Feleac and in Mukachevo), (2) the talks for the Papal endorsed entente between Matthias and Stephen III (Casimir IV’s personal vassal since 1485), and, foremost, with (3) the – long awaited (by Krakow) – conclusion of the Ottoman-Polish two year truce in March 1489 (see also *Codex epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti* (= *Monumenta Medii aevi res gestas Poloniae illustrantia*, II, XI–XII, XIV), I. 1384–1492, eds. August Sokolowski, Józef Szujski (Krakow, 1876), no. 249–250, 253–254; additionally, Innocent VIII supported Ivan III of Moscow against Casimir IV).

⁶⁰ The nomination of Makarios as metropolite, supported by both John Albert, king of Poland, and his brother Alexander, duke of Lithuania, came in the aftermath of the three-year extension of the Ottoman-Polish truce in April–June 1494 (Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations (15th–18th Century). An Annotated Edition of ‘Ahdnames and Other Documents* (= *The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage*, 18) (Leiden, 2000), Appendix, nos. 3–4, pp. 201–208), which “coincided” with the Jagiellonian family congress in Levoča (April–May 1494). Nevertheless, Patriarch Maximos IV was reluctant to accept Makarios at first (possibly because

of Lithuania⁶¹, had asked for – and received – the blessing of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, under firm Ottoman grip on those occasions.⁶² However, none of the known *berats*⁶³, issued by Ottoman sultans for the ecumenical patriarchs

the latter had been involved in the petition sent to Sixtus IV two decades earlier). Makarios was killed by Tartars in 1497 (Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 320–321, notes 41–43). The Golden Horde, under Khan Mengli Ghiray, supported Stephen III against John Albert that year (see also Gorovei-Székely, *Princeps omni laude maior*, 325).

⁶¹ The situation was highly complex. A summary could read: (1) Following the election of John Albert as king of Poland and of his younger brother Alexander as duke of Lithuania (1492), the Krewo Union (1385) between Poland and Lithuania was basically suspended until the death of John Albert and Alexander's election as king of Poland (1501). (2) Jonah Hlezna, the metropolitan of Kyiv (1488/1489–1494), supported by King Casimir IV († 1492) apparently encouraged an anti-unionist *reconquista* in the diocese of Halych that may have had John, the bishop of Mukachevo, as its (Hungarian) spearhead, hence the conflict between Mukachevo and (unionist) Peri. (3) At the end of John Albert's failed campaign against Stephen III, the bishop of Smolensk, Joseph Bolharynovich (*the Bulgarian*), soon to be nominated (late May 1498) as metropolitan of Rus' by Alexander (who had not joined his brother's campaign), asked, in winter 1497–1498, the ecumenical patriarch Nephon II whether or not to follow the Union of Florence, to which Nephon responded positively in April 1498, under condition that Joseph upheld the Greek rite, as did the Greeks under Venetian dominion. (4) Most of the above-written is known – only – from Russian and Ruthenian sources, notoriously unreliable, or biased at least (Oskar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)* (= *Sacrum Poloniae Millennium*, 5) (Rome, 1958¹), 109–112; Alexander Baran, *Metropolia Kioviensis et Eparchia Mukačoviensis* (= *Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni*, II, 1, 10), Rome, 1960²), 24–25, 32–34; Ihor Mončak, *Florentine Ecumenism in the Kyivan Church: The Theology of Ecumenism applied to the Individual Church of Kyiv* (= *Opera Graeco-Catholicae Academiae Theologicae*, 63–64) (Rome, 1987), 206–210; Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 52–53, 321, note 47). Joseph Bolharynovich was confirmed as metropolitan of Rus' by the new patriarch Joachim I in September 1499, immediately after the “crusader” Peace of Hârlău, sealed between Moldavia, Poland and Hungary (July 1499), and confirmed by the hierarchs of Moldavia. Within less than a year and a half, when Jan Albert was struggling to turn the truce of March 1500 into a lasting agreement with the Porte (reached in July 1501), the same metropolitan of Kyiv acknowledged the authority of Pope Alexander VI.

⁶² The patriarchs in question are Dionysus I (1466–1471, 1488–1490), Maximus III (1476–1482), Maximus IV (1491–1496/1497) and Nephon II (1486–1488, 1496/1497–1498, 1502). Each of them, chiefly the latter, is a controversy in his own right (e.g., Ovidiu Olar, O. Cristea, “*Giochi di pazienza. Viața Sf. Nifon și istoria Țării Românești: un sfânt și un domn ideal*,” in *Români și Creștinătatea Răsăriteană (secolele XIV–XX)*, ed. Petronel Zahariuc (Iași, 2021), 11–65; I.-A. Pop, Al. Simon, “Ștefan cel Mare și Cetatea Albă la sfârșitul secolului al XV-lea,” in *Vocație și devotament profesional. Studii în onoarea lui Aurel Chiriac la 70 de ani* (= *Crisia*, 51, suppl. 1), eds. Gabriel Moisa, Ioan Goman, Sorin Șipoș (Oradea, 2021), 68–74).

⁶³ On the *berats* (sultanic diplomas of investiture) for hierarchs, see most recently Tom Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan: Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries* (Oxford, 2015), 61, 123; Phokion Kotzageorgis, “The Newly Found Oldest Patriarchal *Berat*,” *Turkish Historical Review*, 11 (2020): 1–27, at 2–3, 7–10.

prior to Mohács (in 1476⁶⁴, in 1477⁶⁵, in 1483⁶⁶ and in 1525⁶⁷), named a (metropolitan) Greek rite seat situated under Buda’s secular power as subject to the shepherd of the Great Church (the ecclesiastical thrones of Rus’, Wallachia or Moldavia were listed in return).⁶⁸ Albeit these absences, still 1498, when brother John Albert came under Ottoman – retaliatory⁶⁹ – attacks (Sultan Bayezid II too had supported Stephen III in 1497)⁷⁰, Wladislaw II was also despartely looking for an extension of the Hungarian-Ottoman truce of spring 1495.⁷¹ By early autumn 1498, Bayezid II agreed to the extension.⁷²

The Jagiellonian king, stronger than met the traditional historiographical eye⁷³, therefore attempted – and apparently succeeded – in addressing the Peri-Mukachvo feud in a most balanced manner in November 1498 (at that time, seemingly, only Drágffy’s removal favoured the king).⁷⁴ He did not reprimand

⁶⁴ Kotzageorgis, “The Oldest Patriarchal *Berat*,” 3–7, edited in Appendix, no. 1, 17–24.

⁶⁵ First included in (!) Bülent Ari, *The First Dutch Ambassador in Istanbul: Cornelis Haga and the Dutch Capitulations of 1612* (PhD thesis (Bilkent University, 2003), Appendix, no. 21, 254. Edited by Hasan Colak and Elif Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church as an Ottoman Institution: A Study of Early Modern Patriarchal Berats* (Istanbul, 2019), no. 1, 67–68, 195.

⁶⁶ See Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Δέκα τουρκικά έγγραφα για την Μεγάλη Εκκλησία (1483–1567)* (Athens, 1996), no. 1, 157–162; Salakides, *Sultansurkunden*, no. 1, 33–38.

⁶⁷ Zachariadou, *Δέκα τουρκικά*, no. 7, pp. 174–178; Colak–Bayraktar-Tellan, *The Orthodox Church*, no. 3, pp. 71–72, 198–199. We also note the gap between *berats*: 1483–1525/ 42 years.

⁶⁸ In 1525, the Metropolitanates of Wallachia and Moldavia featured most proeminently in the *berat* issued by Sultan Süleyman I for Patriarch Jeremias I, who was embroiled in a bitter conflict with Prochor, archbishop of Ohrid, over precisely Wallachia and Moldavia, “via” the Serbian Patriarchate/ Archbishopric of Peč (see Maxim, “Les relations”, 83–108).

⁶⁹ See I.-A. Pop, “A 1499 Italian Source on the Ottoman-Polish-Moldavian Rappports,” in *Laudator temporis acti. Studia in memoriam Ioannis A. Božilov*, ed. Ivan A. Biliarsky, I. *Religio, historia* (Sofia, 2018), 391–401. Though he allowed the Ottoman-Polish three-year truce of 1494 to elapse, and albeit the fact that Stephen III was Bayezid II’s vassal, John Albert failed to receive from Alexander VI “the status” of crusade for his Moldavian campaign.

⁷⁰ O. Cristea, “*Tanto conflictata, lassa e destructa de fredo e fame*: The Epilogue of an Ottoman Expedition in Poland (November 1498-February 1499),” *Il Mar Nero*, 10 (2020): 171–180.

⁷¹ Al. Simon, “The Hungarian Crown and the *Vlachs* in the Ottoman Empire,” *Macedonian Historical Review*, 2 (2011): 79–91 (since already autumn 1492, Wladislaw’s Ottoman policy was quite ambitious). The truce was concluded prior to April 1495 through the agency of Peter More, possibly a relative of More from the days of John Statileo and Antun Vrančić. Apparently, the same Peter More then served as emissary between Maximilian I and Stephen III in 1497–1498 (e.g., Pop-Simon, “*Partes Transilvane intrabunt*,” II, Appendix, 64).

⁷² *Materialy*, nos. 15–18, pp. 35–49; Kołodziejczyk, *Ottoman-Polish Diplomatic Relations*, 82.

⁷³ For instance: Bence Péterfi, “Aus Siebenbürgen in die Steiermark. Der Lebenslauf von Jakab Székely († 1504),” in *Andreas Baumkircher und das ausgehende Mittelalter*, eds. Rudolf Kropf, Gert Polster (Eisenstadt, 2015), 273–296; Martyn Rady, “Re-thinking Jagiello Hungary 1490–1526,” *Central Europe*, 3, no. 1 (2005): 3–18, at 7–8.

⁷⁴ The long Hungarian Diet (April-June 1498), convened after the turmoil of the previous

Bishop John of Mukachevo for his transgression of 1497⁷⁵ and he did not return the patriarchal *stavropighia* of Peri under Mukachevo's control.⁷⁶ He did all that without naming either the pope in Rome (Alexander VI at that time)⁷⁷ or the patriarch in Constantinople (Joachim I, recently appointed).⁷⁸ Wladislaw appeared in complete command⁷⁹ of the Church (es, *Latin* and *Greek* rite) of his

year, was yet to prove its valour for the subsequent reign of Wladislaw. 1498 witnessed above-all the rise of John Corvinus as major political figure (see M. Rady, "Jagiello Hungary," in *Decreta regni mediaevalis Hungariae*, IV. 1490–1526, eds. F. Döry, Péter Banyó, M. Rady, János M. Bak (Budapest – Idyllwid, CA, 2012), XI–XLVII, at XIII).

⁷⁵ *Diplome maramureşene*, no. 352, 600. The correlation between Bishop John's actions against Peri, the attacks on the Transylvanian estates of Stephen III and John Albert's Moldavian campaign seemingly escaped scholarly attention and is worth further inquiry.

⁷⁶ This would have – certainly – been an option, for Bartholomew Drágffy was no longer voivode of Transylvania in November 1498 (*Magyarország világi archontológiája*, I, 87–88). We must therefore connect Wladislaw's attitude towards Mukachevo and Peri also to John Corvinus new power in the realm. As already in fact in 1493, Duke John was both the lord of the "aggressor" (Mukachevo) and the defender of the "oppressed" (Peri).

⁷⁷ With focus on the "Eastern question", see chiefly L. Pilat, O. Cristea, *The Ottoman Threat and Crusading on the Eastern Border of Christendom during the 15th Century (=East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450, 48)* (Leiden – Boston, 2018), 275; Halecki, *From Florence to Brest*, 116–119; Mončák, *Florentine Ecumenism*, 252–270. On divided Lithuania at the end of the 15th century, see also S.C. Rowell, "Whatever Kind of Pagan the Bearer Might be, The Letter is Valid. A Sketch of Catholic-Orthodox Relations in the Late-Mediaeval Grand Duchy of Lithuania," *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, 18 (2013): 47–65, here at 48–51.

⁷⁸ In autumn 1498 (a more precise dating is impossible) Joachim I replaced Nephon II as patriarch and embarked on a grand journey that returned Georgia (inclined towards Rome) under the authority of the Great Church and confirmed her authority over Mount Athos. Joachim has received quite some attention in Romanian historiography after 2000 (Petre Ş. Năsturel, "Radu Vodă cel Mare și patriarhul de Constantinopol Ioachim I-ul," *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie*, 20 (2022): 23–31; D.-I. Mureşan, "Patriarhia ecumenică și Ștefan cel Mare. Drumul sinuos de la surse la interpretare," in *In memoriam Alexandru Elian*, ed. Vasile V. Muntean (Timișoara, 2008), 87–187, at 165; L. Pilat, "Vizita patriarhului de Constantinopol Ioachim I în Moldova," in *Contribuții privitoare la istoria relațiilor dintre Țările Române și Bisericile răsăritene în secolele XIV–XIX*, ed. P. Zahariuc (Iași, 2009), 75–80).

⁷⁹ Hence, the king made no mention of the *Latin* rite patriarch of Constantinople (in 1498, as already in 1494). The latter's authority had already been rejected by King Matthias (in the mid-1470s the latest). Involved both in the Peri-Mukachevo-Feleac "triangle" (1494), as well as in (or just "caught-in") the *conspiracy* of *Latin* rite Maximilian I and *Greek* rite Stephen III (1497–1498), when, towards the end of the *conspiracy*, he became archbishop of Esztergom (December 1497), Thomas Bakócz from Drágffy Ardud, educated in Padua and Venice, was then – a decade later – elected to the Venetian controlled throne of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople (1510). Although eager for glory and power and most determined to control "Wallachian affairs" (e.g., Diaconescu, "Peșitorii nepoatei", 58, 61), and even though the throne of Esztergom granted him "nearly patriarchal" powers (see László Mezey, "Az esztergomi érsekség primáciává fejlődése (1000–1452)," *Vigilia*, 41, no. 6 (1976): 368–374, at 372), Bakócz († 1521), a cardinal moreover

realm, like the kings of old, Sigismund of Luxemburg and Matthias Corvinus.⁸⁰ The Greek rite *archbishop in Transylvania* of 1494 resided after all on the royal estate of Feleac, not on any other type of property.⁸¹

The origins of the new Greek rite ecclesiastical architecture of Transylvania (of the eastern parts of the Kingdom of Hungary) laid in the final stages of Matthias Corvinus’ policies.⁸² This is not uncommon for Hungary at the end of the Middle Ages.⁸³ In return, the existence of the new structure(s) spanned above-all the troubled decades of resilient Jagiello Hungary that – “additionally” and apparently – paid the dues of centuries of kingship.⁸⁴

DESPRE MITROPOLIA SEVERINULUI “DIN” FELEACUL TRANSILVAN: ARHIEPISCOPUL DIN TRANSILVANIA ȘI PROFESORII DE CREDINȚĂ GRECĂ DIN NORD

Rezumat

Istoria medievală a satului Feleac este produsul a diverse documente “selectate” și a unei succesiuni de dorințe maghiare și românești. Istoria ecleziastică medievală a românilor din Transilvania este “produsul ilegitim” al disputelor interconfesionale și al pierderilor arhivale. Reformele “au curățat” mințile și “au reorganizat” etnicitățile (secolele XVI-XVIII

since 1500, never made use of his new title among the Greek rite Christians of Transylvania. As Latin patriarch of Constantinople, Bakócz was the rightful superior – i.e., a “Papal vicar” – of all Greek rite Christians (that acknowledged Rome’s authority) chiefly after the Ottoman conquest of Byzantium in 1453 (that turned the the Ecumenical Patriarchate into a “Turkish captive”).

⁸⁰ To which one could – rather easily – add Louis I of Anjou (e.g., Norman Housley, “King Louis the Great of Hungary and the Crusades, 1342–1382,” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 62, no. 2 (1984): 192–208). Alike Thomas Bakócz’s Latin patriarchal case above, this topic too still has much information (as well as interpretation) to offer to scholarship.

⁸¹ This makes the shortage of relevant (Hungarian above-all) sources on the ecclesiastical seat even more conspicuous, especially during Bakócz’s patriarchal reign (1510–1521) that certainly coincided with the mention of metropolite III in Feleac at Wladislaw II’s death (1516), explicitly mentioned in the inscription carved by (arch-) priest Philip of Hațeg.

⁸² For reasons that still elude us, but rather likely date back to the Hungarian-Romanian-Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Greek-Catholic disputes (Cecilia Cârja, *Biserică și politică. Înființarea Episcopiei de Hajdudorogh (1912)* (Cluj-Napoca, 2012), 174–206), Feleac and Mukachevo, both risen in the same year 1488, were seldom viewed together in Romanian historiography

⁸³ The abovementioned feature is – naturally – intimately connected to John Corvinus’ royal succession, successions in fact (Kubinyi, “Die Komitatsgespanschaften,” 113–137).

⁸⁴ The attention paid, by John Thuróczy in his *Chronicle* (printed in 1488 under the royal auspices of Matthias Corvinus) and by Antonio Bonfini in his *Decades* (submitted to Wladislaw II Jagiello in 1492), to most expedient royal coronation of Mary, late Louis I of Anjou’s child (1382), seems relevant in this context (cf. Benedek M. Varga “Making Maria Theresia ‘King’ of Hungary,” *The Historical Journal* 64, no. 2 (2021): 233–254, at 237–238).

și chiar mai târziu). Puține “certitudini” au supraviețuit, ceea ce este valabil în mod particular în cazul Unirii de la Florența (1439) și al răspândirii ei.

Istoria bisericească a Feleacului este în mare măsură o istorie politică. Conectarea ei la marile decizii este posibilă, tentantă, dar și riscantă. Numărul surselor relevante este redus și a rămas cam același din secolul al XIX-lea și până astăzi.

Conform Școlii – greco-catolice – Ardelene (sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea – începutul secolului al XIX-lea), Mitropolia Severinului a fost fundația canonică și politică a Mitropoliei Transilvaniei, al cărui scaun era cel al Severinului, mutat în interiorul voievodatului. Primul arhiepiscop care a rezidat în Feleac i-a scris într-adevăr orașului săsesc transilvan Brașov în calitate sa de mitropolit al *Severinului și al Transilvaniei*. Precum anterior episcopul Macarie de Halici (sigur la sfârșitul anilor 1460), Daniel avea autoritate peste creștinii de rit grec din teritoriile săsești (care, la nivelul ritului *latin*, erau subordonate direct arhiepiscopului de Esztergom și nu episcopului Transilvaniei).