„OVIDIUS" UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANȚA
DOCTORAL SCHOOL
DOMAIN: THEOLOGY

SUMMARY DOCTORAL THESIS
RELATIONS OF MOLDOVA WITH THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPOL IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 14th CENTURY AND IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 15th CENTURY

COORDINATOR:
Fr. Prof. Dr. Nechita RUNCAN

PHD STUDENT:
Fr. Bogdan Tudor GAVRILĂ

CONSTANȚA
2019

INTRODUCTION

      1.1. Argument and objectives of the research

      1.2. Relevance and topicality of the research

      1.3. Current state of the art research

      1.4. The methodology used

      1.5. Short frame of the paper

CHAPTER I - MOLDOVA BETWEEN POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DIMENSIONS: A HISTORICAL RADIOGRAPHY OF POLITICAL RELATIONS IN THE XIVTH CENTURY

      1.1. Methodologies of research and understanding of the ecclesiastical relationship between Moldova and Byzantium: configuration of the State-Church report

      1.1.1. Principles of ecclesiastical organization in Moldova and the relationship with the political dimension

      1.1.2. Domain polarity and ecclesia: radiography of the evolution of the Moldovan society (14th-15th century)

      1.2. The political context in Moldova in the 14th century - preconditions for the establishment of the ecclesiastical structure

      1.2.1. Founding of Moldova and state independence until 1367

      1.2.2. The political report of Moldova to Hungary Poland between 1367-1370

      1.2.3. Independent position of Moldova against the Angevin system in the period 1370-1382

      1.2.4. Moldovan vassalage to Poland - a policy of integration into the world circuit (1382-1387)

      1.3. Moldova between the two poles of Christianity: Rome and Byzantium (14th century)

      1.3.1. Moldova's assertion in Christianitatis - Christian Republic

      1.3.2. Exit of Moldova from the jurisdiction of Rome and intentions of Catholic proselytizing

CHAPTER II - THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MITROPOLIA OF MOLDOVA. CONDITIONS, POLITICAL FACTORS, RELIGIOUS CONSEQUENCES

      2.1. Byzantium and its importance in the impression of Orthodox Christianity in the Euro-Asian area

      2.1.1. The congruence between the politician and the Church in the Byzantine Empire or the prefacing of the Christian mission

      2.1.2. Patriarchate of Constantinople - catalyst in the historical development of Eastern Christianity

      2.2. Southeastern European political-religious context of the Moldovan ecclesiastical constitution

      2.3. Establishment of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova (1381-1386) - chronological decryptions of the ecclesiastical constitution and functioning

      2.3.1. Dating of the founding of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova and its relation with the Archdiocese of Ohrida in the works of the Moldovan

chroniclers: Dimitrie Cantemir, Miron Costin, Axinte Uricariul, Vasile Buhăescu Cămăraşul

2.3.2. The thesis of the founding of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova by Iuga through the collaboration with the autocephalous Archdiocese of Ohrida

2.3.3. The thesis of the granting of autocephaly to the Church of Moldova by Emperor Ioannes VIII Palaiologos

2.3.4. The Metropolitan Church of Maurovo and the Metropolitan Church of Moldova (Moldova) were two distinct eparchies?

2.3.5. The Bishopric of Asprokastron and the Bishopric of Moldova - one and the same ecclesiastical entity?

2.3.6. The Hirotonia of Joseph Muşat in the context of the ecclesiastical relation with the Latin Metropolis of Halici. Historical-critical reconsiderations

2.4. Creation of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova: June 1380 - July 1381. Ekthesis Nea and Notitia episcopatuum

2.5. The founding of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova: the initiative of the Byzantine Patriarchate, consequence of the political factors of the country or the will of the people?

CHAPTER III - CANONIC RECOGNITION OF THE MITROPOLIA OF MOLDOVA (1401) AND THE DEPARTURE OF AN ECCLESIASTIC CRISIS BETWEEN CONSTANTINOPOL AND MOLDOVA

3.1. The Moldovan-Byzantine dispute that prefaced the recognition of the metropolis by Constantinople: the moment of its beginning and its context

3.1.1. The appointment of Joseph as the metropolitan and the fury of Jeremiah

3.1.2. Suceava authorities' refusal to accept Greek metropolises named from Constantinople: premise of conflict

3.1.3. Concomitance of the Byzantine Patriarchate conflict with the Polish King Wladyslaw Jagiello and the Church of Moldova

3.1.4. A new phase of the conflict between Stephen I of "Rusovlahiei" and the Patriarchate of Constantinople (1395): the appointment of the pope Peter as patriarchal exarch for the Metropolitan of Moldova

3.1.5. The Ecumenical Patriarchate Initiative to regulate religious relations with Moldova: the mission of Metropolitan Jeremiah of Mitylene

3.1.6. The second intention to overcome the conflict: Archbishop Michael de Bethleem (1397)

3.2. Moldovan-Byzantine diplomatic development in defining the Moldovan ecclesiastical structure

3.2.1. Historiography of the documents certifying the recognition of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova by the Byzantine Patriarchate

3.2.2. Moment July 26, 1401: Moldova secures its entry into oikoumene

3.2.3. Bringing the relics of Saint John the New to Suceava

3.3. Recognition of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova - the integration of the Church in the State and the State in the Church according to the Byzantine matrix

CHAPTER IV - THE EVOLUTION AND DIMENSION OF MOLDOVA'S RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE BIZANAN AFTER 1401

CHAPTER V - DISTRIBUTION OF BYZANTIC ELEMENTS IN MOLDOVA (XV CENTURY). CONTINUITY OR DISCONTINUITY UNDER RELIGIOUS REPORT

    This doctoral thesis, entitled RELATIONS OF MOLDOVA WITH THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPOL IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 14th CENTURY AND IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 15th CENTURY, intends to decrypt historically, religiously, politically and culturally the connections in their various aspects between the new Romanian state established and the religious center of Eastern Christianity, Bizan. My research aims at analyzing the very important episode in the religious life of Moldova, namely the establishment and confirmation by the Byzantine Patriarchate based on the canonical logic and jurisdiction specific to Orthodox Christianity. This episode opens the fifteenth century (1401) and practically generates a new structure of the political relationship between Byzantium and Moldova. For these reasons, my analysis will have an interdisciplinary dimension taking place historically, religiously, politically, culturally.

    It should be mentioned that the traditional motivation attributed by the Romanian historiography of the founding of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova is to obtain the political legitimacy of Byzantium, meant to give the young voivodal power solidity both from the external perspective and through the connection with the internal realities. Thus it was reached the "completion of the state construction", as

pointed out by Stefan Gorovei, a process that is included among "the three essential historical trends that led to the emergence of the two Romanian political entities, in the fourteenth century: 1) the aggregation of the existing political formations in the same territorial framework, 2) the creation of the supreme institutions of the Power, secular and ecclesiastical, and 3) the emancipation of the territories of the two states and their autonomous affirmation in the plane of international relations ". The founding of the Metropolitan of Moldova represented "the result of the meeting between the political will of the" Voivodal Power "to complete its inaction by obtaining its own source of spiritual legitimacy and the effort of the ecumenical Patriarchate to recover the lost positions in Eastern Europe in favor of Catholicism" in favor of Catholicism. that Moldova's tendency to gain ecclesiastical independence from Rome was blocked by the policy of Ludovic de Anjou. Thus one might think that, by establishing the Metropolis, a decisive act of the Byzantine emperor and the ecumenical patriarch, Moldova entered the "Byzantine Commonwealth", "the passage from Rome to Constantinople" inaguring what was called the "Byzantine period" .

Practically now the Byzantine relations of Moldova with the Constantinopolitan patriarchy begin, political, historical relations that have taken official, diplomatic shape. The founding act of the Moldovan Metropolis certifies Moldova's diplomacy with Byzantium. But things were not so simple. In the case of Moldova, the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not look forward to recovering its positions nor to give legitimacy to the Eastern Carpathian Voivodeship. The documents kept suggest a completely different development of the facts, they also highlight serious difficulties of communication and information between the two sides. "Unlike other Orthodox states, says Liviu Pilat, the entry of Moldova into the Byzantine Oikumene was done in a specific way - in a more plastic language, we could say on the back door. Far from unfolding in a harmonious environment, the Moldovan-Byzantine relations have degenerated, in a short time, into an open conflict, characterized not only by the absence of any spiritual legitimacy, but also by the anathema of the political elite and of all the Moldovan believers. " .

The Byzantine world exerted a Christian-Orthodox configuration on the religious life and Romanian culture. For Romanians, the realities of the Byzantine Empire are deeply integrated into their own institutional and cultural traditions so that we can consider the Byzantine world only from a distance from the object of scientific research or passive contemplation, as Virgil Cândea said: "The evocation of this world is met at we with affection and pride because we feel Byzantium as a great measure of ours, therefore we understand any sign of appreciation of its values as a tribute to the origins of the Romanian civilization ".

At the end of a careful examination of the political, ecclesiastical and economic relations between Romanians and the Byzantine Empire, in the 9th-15th centuries (direct and indirect), establishing the variable diagram of the interest expressed by Constantinople, either for the Ponto-Danubian region , either for the Romanian territories from the south or north of the Carpathians, Liviu Pilat in his work "Between Rome and Byzantium. Society and power in Moldova (XIV-XV century) "drew attention to the moment when" the real Byzantium disappeared at the

threshold between the XV and XVI centuries, its place is taken by an ideal Byzantium that will last through its institutions, literature and art. , a Byzantium perpetuated by the structures of Mount Athos and the Ecumenical Patriarchate and with which the Romanian voivodeships will develop relations of a particular consequence ".

In all areas we find a strong transfer of Byzantine values in the social life and cultural creation of the medieval Romanian countries. This transfer, often indirectly, did not mean no bulk, non-selective takeover, no servile imitation. Alexandru Elian's conclusion regarding Moldova and Byzantium in the fifteenth century can be generalized, according to this report: "For Moldova in the fifteenth century, the Moldovan-Byzantine report focuses especially on defining the ecclesiastical structure, and the Byzantine influences are it sums up, especially in the absence of richer and more extended direct contacts, the acceptance and fruition of a prestigious culture style - the Byzantine style -, whose importance for Eastern Europe is comparable, if not superior, to that which the Romanesque or Gothic style and - they had won it in the European West ". "Byzantium, as Valentin Georgescu pronounces, is greater by the involuntary help he provided to others to be born different from him, than by the faithful implantation of his face, which was at the same time inimitable, irreversible and, until in the end, imperfect and transient. "

The present paper aims to develop the relations of Moldova with Byzantium under religious relation, by means of the canonical incorporation of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova into the whole of historical Christianity. Thus an important chapter is outlined in the history of the Romanian Orthodox Church, and the critical reporting of this event helps to a correct understanding of the Moldovan-Byzantine relations until 1453, when Constantinople was conquered by the Turks.

Relations between Byzantium, more precisely between the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and Moldova in the second half of the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth century constituted, due to the moment of establishment and confirmation of the Moldovan metropolis, a topic of wide debate in the Romanian academic space. Beginning with the 19th century and continuing with the new discoveries of manuscripts that provide information on this Moldovan-Byzantine report, the Romanian historians' research has advanced in offering more articulated information chronologically and descriptively from the facts, observing an effervescence of debates. given to this topic.

We note here some of the most relevant historical-critical productions that focused on the relationship between Moldova and the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 14th-15th centuries: Liviu Pilat, *Între Roma şi Bizanţ. Societate şi putere in Moldova (secolul XIV-XV),* Editura Universităţii Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iaşi, 2008; Ştefan S. Gorovei*, La începutul relaţiilor moldo-bizantine: contextul întemeierii Mitropoliei Moldovei*, in "Romanii in istoria universala", III, coord. I. Agrigoroaiei, Gh. Buzatu, V. Cristian, Iasi, 1988; A. Pippidi, *Tradiţia politică bizantină in Ţările Române in secolul XVI-XVIII*, Bucureşti, 1983; Şerban Papacostea, *Întemeierea Mitropoliei Moldovei: implicaţii central şi est-europene*, in "Romanii in istoria universala", III, coord. I. Agrigoroaiei, Gh. Buzatu, V. Cristian, Iasi, 1988; Alexandru Elian, *Moldova şi Bizanţul in veacul al XV-lea*, in „Cultura moldoveneasca in timpul

lui Ştefan cel Mare", Bucureşti 1964; Valentin Georgescu, *Bizanţul şi instituţiile româneşti până la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea*, Bucureşti 1980; C. Erbiceanu, *Istoria Mitropoliei de Moldova şi Suceava*, Iaşi, 1888; I. Mitrea, *Influenţa bizantină in cultura materială şi spirituală din regiunea subcarpatică a Moldovei in secolele VI-X*, in *Studii şi Cercetări de Istorie Veche (şi Arheologie)*, 30, nr. 2, 1979; Prof. Emilian Popescu, *Completări şi rectificări la Istoria Bisericii Moldovei şi la relaţiile cu Bizanţul in prima jumătate a secolului al XV-lea*, in „Teologie şi Viata", anul III, nr. 4-7, aprilie-iulie 1993; Ciprian Zaharia, *Iosif I Muşat întâiul mare ierarh roman. Noi marturii privind viaţa culturală şi spirituală a Moldovei in secolele XIV şi XV*, Huşi, 1987; Alexandu I. Gonţa, *Mitropolia şi Episcopiile moldoveneşti in secolul al XIV-lea*, in „Mitropolia Moldovei şi Sucevei", 1958, nr. 1-2; Nicolae Şerbănescu, *Mitropolia Moldovei şi Sucevei. 600 de ani de la prima menţiune documentara a existentei e*i, in „Biserica Ortodoxa Română", an CIV, 1986 etc.

As our analysis is aimed at a historical analytical research exercise, the general method we used is the historical one, as it allowed us to bring to the best attention the historical-political and religious framework of relations between Moldova and the Byzantine Patriarchate in the century. XV. This method also gives us the possibility to critically and correctly evaluate the data and information related to the 1401 event, to discern on the basis of new advances in the research of the subject what is historically correct and false.

As sources I used historical documents relevant to the researched topic: Darrouzes, J., *Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae,* Paris, 1981; *Documenta Romaniae Historica,* A. *Moldova,* vol. II *(1384-1448),* întocmit de C. Cihodaru, I. Caproşu, L. Şimanshi, Bucureşti, 1975; *Documenta Romaniae Historica, A. Moldova*, vol. I (1449-1486), întocmit de L. Şimanshi, Georgeta Ignat, D. Agache, Bucureşti, 1976; *Documente privind istoria României. Veacul XIV, XV,* A. *Moldova (1384-1475),* Bucureşti 1954; *Documente privitoare la istoria romanilor* culese de E. de Hurmuzaki, vol. I, partea 2: *1345-1450,* culese, adnotate şi publicate de Nic. Densuşianu, Bucureşti, 1890; *Fontes Historiae Daco-Romanae (Izvoarele istoriei Romaniei),* vol. IV: *Scriprtores et acta Imperii Byzantini saeculorum IV-XV (Scriitori şi acte bizantine, secolele IV-XV),* edit: H. Mihăescu, R. Lăzărescu, N.Ş. Tanaşoca, T. Teoteoi, Bucureşti, 1982; Haller, Johannes ed., *Concilium Basiliense*, vol. I.–V, Basel, 1896–1904; Mansi, Gian Domenico (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio editio nova* vol. XXIX.-XXXI, 1961; Miklosich, Fr., Ios. Muller, *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani*, Vindobonae, MDCCCLX-MDCCCLXII, 1860-1862; *Monumenta Conciliorum generalium seculi XV.*, Scriptorum, vol. I., II. and III, Vienna, 1857–1895; Năsturel, P.S., *Facsimile de texte şi documente bizantine din veacurile XIV-XV privitoare la istoria Bisericii Române*, Bucureşti, 1946; Parthey, G., *Hieroclis Synecdemus et Notitiae Graece Episcopatuum, accedunt Nili Doxapatrii Notitia patriarchatuum et Locorum nomina,* Berolini, 1866 şi Sylvester Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, ed. and trans. V. Laurent, *Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores* 9, Rome, 1971.

The structure of the scientific approach develops during five balanced chapters, with related subchapters, as follows. Chapter I - Moldova between the

political and religious dimensions: a historical X-ray of political relations in the fourteenth century - aims to introduce us in the context of the presence of Moldova on the political and religious scene of the fourteenth century, a context that will shape the way in that this Romanian space will develop its relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople. To this end, the historical framework of the founding of Moldova, the political relationship between Hungary and Poland between 1367-1370, an independent position of Moldova vis-à-vis the Angevin system in the period 1370-1382 and the vassalage of Moldova to Poland - a bit of integration into the world circuit were explored (1382-1387). Another topic absolutely necessary for the research was the location of Moldova between the two poles of Christianity: Rome and Byzantium (14th century), a reality that helps us to better understand the pattern of influence that Byzantium exerted on Moldova from an ecclesiastical point of view. .

Chapter II - Establishment of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova. Conditions, political factors, religious consequences - opens with a number of details about the importance and role of the Byzantine Patriarchate played in the ecclesiastical development of Moldova. In this regard, the first two sub-chapters of this chapter are reserved for specifying the importance of Byzantium in the impression of Orthodox Christianity in the Euro-Asian area and the South-East European political-religious context of the Moldovan ecclesiastical constitution. Practically, this section introduces us to the theme of the second part of this chapter, namely the establishment of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova (1381-1386). Here were considered the following analysis vectors: dating of the founding of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova and its relation with the Archdiocese of Ohrida in the works of the Moldovan chroniclers: Dimitrie Cantemir, Miron Costin, Axinte Uricariul, Vasile Buhăescu Cămăraşul, the thesis of the founding of the Moldovan myth with the autocephalic Archdiocese of Ohrida, the thesis of the granting of the autocephaly of the Church of Moldova by Emperor Ioannes VIII Palaiologos, the ordination of Joseph Muşat in the context of the ecclesiastical relationship with the Latin Metropolis of the Halice, aiming, finally, at an answer to the question of the founding of the Metropolis of the Metropolis Byzantine patriarchy, consequence of the country's political factors or the will of the people?

Chapter III - Canonical recognition of the Metropolitan of Moldova (1401) and overcoming an ecclesiastical crisis between Constantinople and Moldova - explores the crisis stage of the relations between Moldova and Byzantium, following the systematic presentation of this situation: the appointment of Joseph as a metropolitan and Jeremiah's apology, the Suceava authorities' refusal to accept the Greek metropolises named from Constantinople, the concomitant conflict of the Byzantine Patriarchate with the Polish King Wladyslaw Jagiello and the Moldavian Church, the appointment of the pope Peter as patriarchal exarch for the Metropolitan of Moldova, the mission of the Metropolitan of Moldova. and Archbishop Michael of Bethleem (1397). The last section of this chapter is reserved for the official recognition of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova by the Byzantine Patriarchate on

July 26, 1401, an event also consecrated by bringing the relics of Saint John the New to Suceava.

Chapter IV - The evolution and dimension of the relations of Moldova with Byzantium after 1401 - intend a historical analysis of the continuity of the Moldovan-Byzantine relations during the Moldovan metropolitans: Joseph I Muşat, Gregory, Damian, Ioachim, Theoctist I, by specifying the pendency of the ecclesiastical orientation Moldova either to Byzantium or to Rome. This becomes a contour of evidences by carefully observing the way of participation of the Moldovan hierarchy at the Ferrara-Florence Synod.

Chapter V - Dissemination of Byzantine elements in Moldova (15th century). Continuity or discontinuity under religious relation - it is carried out on two general sections, namely: Byzantine cultural prints in the Moldovan religious and social space, respectively the help of the Moldovan gentlemen of the Athonite monasteries - consequence of the Moldovan-Byzantine ecclesiastical relations, in order to provide an answer if Byzantium whether or not it exercised its imprint on Moldova from a religious and cultural point of view during the fifteenth century.

The present doctoral thesis aimed at a historical exploration of the religious relations between Moldova and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Eastern Christianity during the fifteenth century, in particular, and in an extension of the framing of diplomatic and cultural relations in the complex of historical-political reality between Byzantium. and Moldova. My focus was on the problem of recognizing the metropolitan ecclesiastical structure by Constantinople, following the causes of the conflict between the two ecclesiastical entities, the conditions of reconciliation and the effects of the confirmation of the canonical communion. In this order of ideas the historical-political context of this event from 1401 was pursued.

In the second half of the fourteenth century, although it had recognized two other autocephalous Churches with the rank of patriarchs, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople enjoyed great prestige within Orthodoxy. Even the churches that declared their autocephaly did not do so in order to undermine the dignity of the patriarch of Constantinople, but because so did the newly created political and national interests. The two sovereigns of the Balkans wanted to strengthen their independence from the Byzantine Empire and on the church line, by organizing the national autocephalous churches. Of course, these changes restricted the jurisdictional area of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which thus exercised this right with great difficulties in the former Byzantine territories conquered by the Turks. Under these conditions, the Ecumenical Patriarchate showed a strong resistance to the autocephaly aspirations of some churches, on the one hand because it wanted to maintain the prestige of Constantinople at least on the church line, if politically it became weaker, and on the other hand there was the fear that the local Churches in the Balkans, but especially in the Romanian countries and Russia, would not enter the sphere of influence of the Catholicism supported by the kings of Poland and Hungary and tolerated by the Romanian rulers.

Also, it should be noted that the Patriarchate of Constantinople faced the sometimes very insistent demands of the Byzantine emperors for unification with

Rome, the eleventh century being marked by the influence of Empress Ana de Savoya, the wife of Emperor Andronicus III, who was Catholic , on her son, Emperor John V the paleologist. He, wishing to obtain at any price military support for stopping the Ottoman offensive in Europe, personally went to the court of King Ludwig the Great of Hungary in 1366, who had the urge to ask the emperor not only to adhere to the Catholic faith, but also rebooting according to the Catholic ritual as he had done with the "heretics and schismatics" Bulgarian and Greek Orthodox from Vidin, which after the conquest of the city he rebooted with the support of the Franciscan monks. The intention manifested by the Buddha was finalized by Emperor John V in Rome in 1369. Accompanied by members of the imperial family and high dignitaries, but absent representatives of the Byzantine clergy, the emperor embraced Catholicism through a lavish official ceremony in front of the church of the Saint Peter on October 21, 1369. The Emperor received the kiss of peace from the Pope after he, first kneeling, kissed his leg. It was, however, a purely personal act, which did not involve the Orthodox Church, and was categorically rejected by Patriarch Filote Kokkinos, who demanded not only the clergy and believers in the empire, but also the Orthodox in Syria, Egypt, the Balkans and Russia to remain steadfast in their faith.

Amid the tension between the emperor and the patriarch regarding the union with Rome, a new element of religious policy appeared that worried the patriarch and undermined his authority. Around 1381, an "agreement" was concluded between the emperor John V and the Nile patriarch (1379-1388), by which new church prerogatives were granted. He decided the election of the patriarch, the metropolitans, the bishops, their promotion and transfer from one chair to another, their summons to the capital whenever necessary, their remittance to their residence, and he also received from them an oath of faith.

New elements also appeared in Russian-Byzantine church relations in the second half of the fourteenth century. Starting with 1325, the metropolitan of Kiev moved his residence to Moscow, and the victory of the great diner Dimitrij Ivanovic Donskoj over the Tatars in Kulikovopolje on September 8, 1380 meant not only the development of the Russian state, but also the increase of the prestige of the Russian Church. It came at a time of crisis between Russia and Byzantium, the great king Vasile I forbidding the mention of the Byzantine emperor who vassalized the Turks, saying: "We have a Church, but no emperor." Patriarch Antony IV (1389-1390; 1391-1397), upholding the prestige of the emperor, wrote to the great priest: "It is impossible for a Christian to exist, but no emperor. The empire and the church form a unity and a community, and it is impossible for the two to be separated. Listen to the apostle Peter, who writes in his first epistle: Fear God, honor the emperor. He does not say "emperors", not to think that every people would have an emperor, but he says "emperor", to show that there is only one emperor of the whole world ... but if Christians have acquired the title of emperor for their rulers, this is against nature and law as a result of tyranny and power. Which parents, which councils, which canons are talking about these emperors? Always and everywhere, they speak of a single

emperor whose laws, commandments and decisions are for the whole world, which only Christians proclaim and abide by ".

At the same time, the old spiritual center of the Russians, Kiev, passed into the possession of the Lithuanians in 1365. They claimed from the ecumenical patriarch the title of "metropolitan of the whole of Russia" for the first of the hierarchs of their cemetery. To the refusal of Byzantium, the Bulgarian Patriarch of Târnovo was granted this title in 1353. In these circumstances, the Patriarch of Philotheus sent a second metropolitan to Kiev and the whole of Russia, in 1354, to Moscow, in Alexei's person. Thus, in the years 1355/1356 there were in Constantinople two metropolitans of the whole of Russia who disputed their jurisdictional rights. After the death of the Lithuanian metropolitan in 1362 and until 1375, there was once again a single metropolitan of the whole of Russia, residing in Moscow, after which, under the pressure of the Lithuanians, the patriarch of Philotheus appointed a second metropolitan. It follows that the Church of Russia was subject to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but more for the purpose of its legitimacy and its hierarchies.

The position of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Polish-Moldovan-Russian space can also be characterized by the church situation of the Halici. In the twelfth century there was a bishopric dependent on the metropolis of Kiev. Although between the years 1303-1305 the Emperor Andronicus II the Paleologist (1282-1328) elevated it to the rank of metropolis with five suffragan bishops (Vladimir, Peremisl, Lukk, Turov and Helm), in 1328 it was transformed again in the episcopate dependent on Kiev. Patriarch John of the XIth Kalekas (1334-1347) conferred on the seat of Haliciu again the rank of metropolis in 1341, being demoted for the second time in 1347.

In 1349 the Russian cnésates of Haliciu and Lwow were annexed by King Cazimir the Great (1333-1370) to Poland, which had extended its borders in 1352 to the gates of Moldova. In order to assume the supremacy in these Russian churches, the king asked the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1370 to grant the bishopric of Haliciu the status of metropolis, removing it under the influence of Kiev and passing it into the direct jurisdiction of Constantinople. Patriarch of Filote Kokkinos and the patriarchal synod approved in May 1371 the elevation of the bishopric of Haliciu to the rank of metropolis and the election of the metropolitan Antonie (1371-1391), who in order to provide bishops of Helm, Turov, Peremisl and Vladimir, had to go to "The former Metropolitan of Hungary, so that, together with it, he can make elections and ordination".

The provision is very important for the church context in the Romanian Countries. First of all, the prestige enjoyed by the metropolitan of the Romanian Country, a feudal state full of political, economic and cultural affirmation. The act was issued only two years after the passing of Emperor John V to Catholicism, when the rulers of the Romanian Country defended their sovereignty against the claims of the Hungarian crown and asked the Ecumenical Patriarchate to establish the second metropolis in Severin (1370) to stop the propaganda. .

Secondly, it was shown that in the vicinity, apart from the metropolis of Kiev and the whole of Russia in Moscow (which of course was not pleased with the creation of the new metropolis, due to the narrowing of its jurisdictional area), there

was no other metropolis, that is, another hierarchy. with the same rank with which to collaborate. Therefore, in Moldova, the second Romanian feudal state in full affirmation, there was no metropolitan seat in 1371.

However, this does not exclude the existence of a bishop in the court of the Moldovan ruler, and the rector from Rădăuți writes before Joseph two names: Nicolae and Stefan, who were bishops here.

The fact that the ruler Peter I Mușatinul asked Metropolitan Antonie de Haliciu to appoint two bishops, Joseph and Meletie, leads to the conclusion that the Lord wanted to keep the episcopal seat in Rădăuți, where Meletie was to be installed, and in the fortress. Suceava, to have a metropolitan, Joseph, who was his relative. This was due to the political situation, because the recognition by Rome or Constantinople of an ecclesiastical province meant the inclusion of the new state in the political map of Europe. The ruler Peter I Mușatinul, like Nicolae Alexandru Basarab of the Romanian Country, needed such recognition, which he did not want from the King of Poland (before whom he had to pay a feudal tribute to Lwow in 1387, and who was a Catholic). , but from the Byzantine sovereign, but which the metropolitan of Haliciu could not grant, even if he belonged canonically to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but from a higher church court, and this was the patriarch of Constantinople.

At the same time, however, the ruler of Moldova could not ignore the king to whom the feudal tribute had been brought, and who politically dominated this area, recognizing the Byzantine emperor as a political sovereign, whom the Russian ashes no longer recognized, and seeking military help. on the courts of the Western kings. Therefore, it is considered that the request of the ordination of the two Moldovan bishops to Haliciu was an act of respect, both formal and formal, towards the King of Poland. As for the ecclesiastical act itself, it was not required a church court not recognized by Constantinople, but a metropolitan who was a member of the patriarchal synod, who was authorized to appoint bishops for the White Fortress, which was part of the state led by Peter I Muscat. In addition, the ruler did not require the modification of an existing state of affairs, but the recognition of a hierarchy chosen by him and the country's boyars, to be installed in the metropolitan seat established by the Ecumenical Patriarchate as early as 1386, which is referred to as the "Chancery Manual". on September 1, 1386.

Although such a request was not new to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, it was categorically refused by Patriarch Antony IV (1389-1390; 1391-1397). Taking into account the experience of the Serbian Church, with which the conflict was resolved only in 1375 and the tensions of Russian-Byzantine relations, which could lead to the repetition of the case of Stefan Dusan in relation to the imperial and church titles, the Ecumenical Patriarchate was absolutely interested in maintaining at least authority church of Constantinople in south-east Europe. Therefore, we believe that even the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not even want anyone to violate its prerogatives, and the attitude of the Moldovan ruler was considered such an attempt.

From the patriarchal documents it appears that neither the origin of Metropolitan Joseph nor his ordination in Haliciu were the essential reasons for the

start of the conflict between Moldova and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, but it is further assumed that she wanted to impose her authority as the first Eastern Church, which was to be the more respected by the gentleman, the boyars and the hierarchs of Moldova, as long as she had been expressly requested by the great din of Moldova, is right from the political perspective, but which had profound implications for the Church in the feudal concept of the state-Church unity.

Without a doubt, this case does not exclude the one formulated by Stefan Gorovei, according to which, on the one hand, Patriarch Antony, returning to the patriarchal chair, wanted to give a lesson to the Byzantine sovereign, who had made use of the "agreement of 1381", and on the other hand, that Jeremiah, the rightful metropolitan of Moldova, having to endure the humiliation of the Moldovans who considered Joseph a rightful metropolitan, caused the conflict. Even after the recognition of Metropolitan Joseph, he was still pressuring Constantinople, in the years 1407-1408, for his recognition as the canonical metropolitan of Moldova.

The ruler Peter I Muscat, who was the son of a Catholic mother (Margareta-Musata), himself married a Catholic princess, having in his country a Catholic bishopric in Syet, established by Lațcu Voda (1365-1375) in 1370 and which theoretically he could following the example of Emperor John V regarding Catholicism, he had to know that an Orthodox sovereign is bound to remain obedient to the patriarchal authority. This was all the more important for Metropolitan Joseph, who had dared to become a bishop without his consent. This is also explained by the fact that after the conflict was resolved on July 26, 1401, the suspicion continued to plague the metropolitan, and he had to submit once again to the humility of a thorough investigation by the delegates of Patriarch Matei, Hieronymite Gregory and deacon Manuel Arhon. His situation was clarified after the return of the delegates and by the express decision of Patriarch Matei, who recognized him as Metropolitan of Moldova despite the opponents of the synodal meeting, but with the express support of Emperor Manuel II the Paleologist.

With this, not only did Moldovan-Byzantine church relations normalize, but the political alliance between the Byzantine sovereign and the other Orthodox sovereigns was strengthened, in view of the anti-Ottoman coalition facilitated by the elimination of Sultan Baiazid I by Timurlenk's victory in Ankara, on July 38, 1402. , an important place occupied by the godly and worthy ruler of Moldova Alexander the Good (1400-1432), supported by Metropolitan Joseph.

In conclusion, we can say that the recognition of the Metropolitan Church of Moldova and its owner, Joseph, after a conflict of about 15 years, is specific to the political-religious relations of Constantinople with the Southeast European space in a period when, in parallel with the decline In the Byzantine Empire, other Orthodox feudal states (Bulgaria, Serbia, the Romanian Countries and Russia) asserted that in order to consolidate their political sovereignty they demanded autocephaly or church autonomy vis-à-vis the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Because the political decline of the empire did not mean the danger of church authority, the Patriarchate of Constantinople did not readily recognize these working conditions, and this, all the more difficult when it came to the confirmation of the local hierarchs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alexe, Ştefan, *Sinodul de la Ferrara-Florenţa (1438-1439) şi participarea Bisericii Ortodoxe Romane*, în „Ortodoxia", an XL, 1989, nr. 4, pp. 19-36.

2. Anastos, M. *Aspects of the Mind of Byzantium (Political Theory, Theology, and Ecclesiastical Relations with the See of Rome)*, Ashgate Publications, Variorum Collected Studies Series, 2001.

3. Barbu, Daniel, *Byzance, Rome et les Roumains. Essai sur la production politique de la foi au Moyen Age*, Bucureşti 1998.

4. Barbu, Daniel, *Faits historiques et fictions historiographiques: La δεσποτεία de Mircea le Grand et le „Despoiat" de Silistra,* în „Revue des etudes Sud-Est Europeennes" XXIV, 1986, 4, p. 313-322.

5. Barbu, Daniel, *Pictura murală, din Ţara Românească în secolul al XVI-lea,* Editura Meridiane, Bucureşti, 1986.

6. Brezeanu, Stelian, *O istorie a Imperiului Bizantin*, Editura Albatros, Bucureşti 1981.

7. Buhăescul, V. Cămăraşul, „Istoria Ţării Româneşti şi a Moldovei", în *Revista pentru Istorie, Arheologie şi Filologie*, XIV, 1913/1914

8. Constantinescu-Iaşi, Petre, *Bizantinismul în România. Influenţe bizantine asupra artei româneşti,* Bucureşti, 1925.

9. Corfus, I, *Pagini de istorie românească în noi publicaţii poloneze*, în *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie şi Arheologie din Cluj*, v, 1968.

10. Costăchescu, M., *Documente moldoveneşti înainte de Ştefan cel Mare,* vol. I, Iaşi, 1931.

11. Cotovanu, Lydia, *Deux cas paralleles d'Oikonomia byzantine applique aux metroppolites Anthime Kritopoulos de Severin et Cyprian de Kiev, de Petite-Russie et des Lituaniens (deuxieme moitie du XIVe siecle)*, „Revue Roumaine d'Histoire", XLIII, 2004.

12. Elian, Al., „Die Byzantinischen Studien In Rumanien. Bemerkungen und Erganzungen zu einem „Abriss der Rumanischen Byzanlinistik", *Balcania*, V, 1, 1946.

13. Elian, Al., „Moldova şi Bizanţul în secolul al XV-lea"*,* în *Cultura moldovenească în timpul lui Ştefan cel Mare,* Bucureşti, 1964.

14. Georgescu, Valentin Al., „Instituţiile statale româneşti de sine stătătoare"*,* în *Constituirea statelor feudale româneşti,* Bucureşti, 1980, pp. 209-250.

15. Georgescu, Valentin Al., *Bizanţul şi instituţiile româneşti până la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea,* Bucureşti, 1980.

16. Georgescu, Valentin Al., *L'idee imperiale byzantine et les reactions des realties roumaines (XIVe-XVIII^s siecles). Ideologie politique, structuration de I'Etat et du droit,* în „Byzantina", anul II, 1971, pp. 311-339.

17. Gheorghiu, Vasile, *Lecţionarul evanghelic grecesc din Iaşi* (ms. 194) Bucureşti, 1940.

18. Gorovei, Ştefan S., *Îndreptări cronologice la istoria Moldovei în veacul al XIV-lea*, în "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie si Arheologie A. D. Xenopol", X, 1973, pp. 99-120.

19. Gorovei, Ştefan S., *Întemeierea Mitropoliei Moldovei în contextul relaţiilor moldo-bizantine*, în „Teologie şi Viata", 1993, nr. 8-10, pp. 28-53.

20. Gorovei, Ştefan S., *La începuturile relaţiilor moldo-bizantine*, în volumul „Romanii în Istoria Universala", III, 1, Iaşi, 1988, pp. 853-879.

21. Grecu, V., *Bizanţul şi catolicismul în trecutul nostru îndepărtat*, în „Studii Teologice", an II, 1950, nr. 9-10, pp. 556-568.

22. Gruia, Şt. Pop, *Moldova în sinodul de unire din Florenţa, 1439,* în „Revista Teologica", an XI, 1921, nr. 1-3, pp. 57-71.

23. Josanu V., *Sfântul Ioan cel Nou şi Cetatea Albă. Reactualizări,* „Memoria Antiquitatis", XXII, 2002, p. 505-510.

24. Josanu V., *Un episod al afirmării şi consolidării statalităii româneşti la răsărit de Carpaţi: înfiinţarea Mitropoliei Moldovei,* „Ioan Neculce. Buletinul Muzeului de Istorie a Moldovei", s.n., XIX, 2013.

25. Laurent, V., *Les droits de l`empereur en matiere eclesiatique. L`accord de 1380/1382*, în *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 13, 1955.

26. Laurent, V., *Les droits de l'empereur en matiere ecclesiastique. L'accord de 1380/82,* „Revue des Etudes Byzantines", XIII, 1955.

27. Laurent, V., *Les Momeires du Grand Ecclesiarque de l`Eglisede Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438—1439),* Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1971.

28. Laurent,V. *Aux origines de l'Eglise moldave: Le metropolite Jeremie et l'eveque Joseph,* „Revue des Etudes Byzantines", V, 1947.

29. Lazaris, Stavros, "L'empereur Jean VIII Paléologue vu par Pisanello lors du concile de Ferrare – Florence", *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 29, 2007, p. 293-324.

30. McManus, Stuart M., "Byzantines în the Florentine polis: Ideology, Statecraft and Ritual during the Council of Florence", *Journal of the Oxford University History Society*, 6, 2008.

31. Meyendorff, J. *Project de Concile Oecuménique en 1367: un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul,* în: Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Washington, nr. 14/ 1958

32. Meyendorff, J., *Byzantium and the rise of Russia: A study of Byzantino-Russian relations în the fourteenth century,* New York, 1981.

33. Minea I., *Informaţiile româneşti ale cronicii lui Jan Dlugosz*, Iaşi, 1926.

34. Minea, Ilie, *Principatele române şi politica orientală a împăratului Sigismund,* Bucuresti, 1919.

35. Năsturel, Petre Ş., *Urmările căderii Ţarigradului pentru Biserica românească,* în "Mitropolia Olteniei", XI, 1959.

36. Neamțu, V, „Afirmarea Țării Moldovei în cadrul politic european sub conducerea lui Ștefan cel Mare", în *Istoria Românilor, Compendiu,* vol. II., 1976.

37. Panaitescu, P. P., „Lupta comună a Moldovei și Poloniei împotriva cavalerilor teutoni", în *Revista de istorie.* vol. IV (1960), p. 225-238.

38. Panaitescu, P. P., „Marea adunare a țării, instituție a orânduirii feudale în țările române", în *Studii,* an X (1957), nr. 3, p. 153-165.

39. Panaitescu, P. P*., Hrisovul lui Alexandru cel Bun pentru episcopia armeană din Suceava (30 iulie 1401)*, în *Revista Istorică Română,* IV, 1934, p. 44-56.

40. Panaitescu, P. P., *La route commerciale de Pologne a la mer Noire au Moyen Age,* în *Revista Istorică Română,* III, 1973.

41. Panaitescu, P. P., *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei R.P.R.,* vol. I, București, 1959.

42. Pippidi, A. *Tradiția politică bizantină în Țările Române în sec. XVI-XVIII,* București, 1983.

43. Pippidi, Andrei, *Monarhia în Evul Mediu romanesc. Practica și ideologie,* în "National și universal în istoria romanilor", Bucuresti 1998.

44. Pippidi, Andrei, *Tradiția politică bizantină în Țările Române (sec. XVI-XVIII),* Editura Corint, 2004.

45. Pliguzov, A., *On the Title „Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus",* „Harvard Ukrainian Studies", XV, 1991.

46. Randa, Al., *Le Sud-Est european, partie integrante de l`Europe,* apărut în „Revue des Etudes Roumaines" vol. VII-VIII (1961), pp. 129-136.

47. Rezachievici, Constantin, *„Despoția" lui Mircea cel Bătrân - o problemă de titulatură: între realitate și ficțiune* în „Revista arhivelor", 1, 1986, pp. 12-32.

48. Rosetti, R. , *Despre unguri și episcopiile catolice din Moldova,* ARMȘI, XXVII, 2, 1905.

49. Rosetti, R., „Pomelnicul de la Bistrița și rudeniile de la Kiev și de la Moscova ale lui Ștefan cel Mare", în *Analele Academiei Române,* Mem. Secț. 1st., Seria a III-a, t. XXII, 1939-1940.

50. Rosetti, R., „Une supposition erronee sur la politique d'Etienne le Grand", în *Academie Roumaine, Bulletin de la Section Historique,* an IV, 1927.

51. Sudmann, Stefan, *Das Basler Konzil: Synodale Praxis zwischen Routine und Revolution,* Frankfurt-am-Main 2005.

52. Sykora, Jan *Poziția internațională a Moldovei în timpul lui Lațco: lupta pentru independență și afirmare pe plan extern,* în *Revista de Istorie,* 8/29, 1976.

53. Tafrali, O., *Bizanțul și influențele lui asupra țării noastre,* Institutul de Arte Grafice C. Sfetea, București, 1914.

54. Zbuchea, Prof. univ dr. Gheorghe, *Istoria Bizanțului,* București 1994.