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HALYCH AND GALICIA (UNTIL 1772) IN THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE RULERS OF MOLDOVA. EXPERIENCE OF THE SOURCE STUDIES AND PERIODIZATION

Myroslav Voloshchuk

Abstract

The article is devoted to the image of Halych and the Galicia (Halych land) in the pages of written sources primarily of Moldovan origin from the archival and library collections of Romania. The author assumes that Halych and Galicia occupied a significant place in the foreign policy of the rulers of Moldova, first of all due to the so-called ecclesiastical memory. Galician Metropolitan Antony, having consecrated the first Moldovan bishop on the hills of Krylos (ancient Halych) in 1387, contributed to the establishment of the separate Moldovan Metropolitanate of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. That’s why, during the crisis of the non-institutionalized Kingdom of Rus’ at the turn of the 14th–15th centuries, the representatives of the Moldovan House of Mușat and their successors tried in every possible way to consolidate the neighboring territories of Pokuttia and the Halych land. According to the periodization we can single out four long periods: 12th century – 1359; 1359–1538; 1538–1699 and 1699–1772. The most active is the second period, when a number of Moldovan rulers, first of all Stephen III the Great, actively tried to put their plans in practice. After the defeat of Peter Rareș's troops near Obertyn on August 22, 1531, and subsequent unsuccessful attempts to reverse the situation in skirmishes with the crown troops of Poland (and in fact, the Ruthenian Voivodeship), which took place until 1538, the Princes of Moldova gave up their intentions, eventually turning into the vassals of the Turkish Ottoman dynasty. They took part in the campaigns of their suzerains to Podolia until 1699, for example in 1620–1621 or 1672, but practically could not set independent tasks for themselves. After the conclusion of the Peace of Karlowitz in 1699 and the restoration by the Kings of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of control over Kamianets in Podolia, which had been a part of the Ottoman Porte for 27 years as a separate eyalet, the Halych land de facto ceased to suffer from the enemy attacks from the south. Halych, its monastic centers entered, rather, the times of closer interaction.
with the Orthodox monasteries of Moldova. A prominent place among them was occupied by the Great Skete in Manyava – equally revered by the rulers of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Moldova, the Cossack Hetmanate and Muscovy (later – the Russian Empire). A complex of published and unpublished sources from the archives and libraries of Bucharest, Cluj, Iași, Suceava, Brașov and Botoșani systematically and comprehensively reflects the outlined relationships. Unfortunately, it does not seem possible currently to find the lost fragments of chronicles of Galician provenience in the Romanian collections, which under various circumstances were taken outside the territory of their origin. The largest part of the sources counts various monuments of the church literature – the living witnesses of very close inter-monastic relations of the 14th–18th centuries.
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It is no secret that modern Ukrainian-Romanian relations are at one of the highest points of partnership, mutual understanding and good-neighborliness, caused primarily by Russia’s invasion and the beginning of a full-scale war against Ukraine on February 24, 2022. Despite the considerable number of problems from the last 30 years or more (lawsuits around the Snake Island, the problem of the Danube River shelf, other cross-border obstacles), both countries managed to achieve qualitative changes in the bilateral relationships. This is not only related to the absence of contradictions around a language (as, for example, inspired by Viktor Orbán’s Hungarian government), school education, the status of the national minorities, but also to Romania’s comprehensive support for Ukraine’s Euro-Atlantic course, the expansion of a cross-border cooperation in various directions, and after the Russian invasion – to the support of the Ukrainian refugees, aid with the logistics of supplying of Western weapons, medicines, transit of the Ukrainian grain, etc. During the last year, the transport connection between Ukraine and Romania has also significantly improved due to the opening of a small railway traffic on the Rakhiv – Valea Vișeului – Rakhiv section and the planning of a similar one between Chernivtsi and Suceava. It seems that our countries have never been so close to each other, despite the hostile intentions to weaken this partnership or even break it by the inciting of a military conflict in Transnistria.
At the same time, we must note that this kind of cooperation needs further efforts. It is not only the lack of any connection between Ukraine and Romania on the 40-kilometer section of the common border in the Ivano-Frankivsk region and the Maramureș county, which would significantly simplify a communication and generally improve the standard of living in the adjacent mountainous areas of both countries. The humanitarian component of the bilateral relations, interdepartmental cooperation, and more active academic cooperation need significant improvement, as I’ve seen during October 2022 – July 2023, while conducting the scientific research in the archives and libraries of Romania.

The formation of the administrative and political background of both Ukraine and Romania is very similar from a historical point of view. It’s known that the administrative land division in Ukraine, proposed at the dawn of the 90s of the 20th century by the opposition to the communist majority in the Verkhovna Rada was not implemented (the old division into regions, introduced in 1932, remained). But, in the history of Romania, there are clearly visible contours of several main regions of which it consists – Moldova (including southern Bukovina), Wallachia (Muntenia and Oltenia), Transylvania (in addition – Banat, Crișana, Maramureș) and Dobruja (Dobrogea). Undoubtedly, the historical past of each part of modern Romania is connected with the communities of different identities, languages, cultures, and traditions, the unifying element of which during the 19th–20th centuries gradually became the Romanian language and the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen royal dynasty (1866–1947).

However, in the historical retrospect, bilateral relations often went far beyond the interests of only the ruling dynasties, for example in Moldova, Wallachia or Transylvania, because their foreign policy was influenced by the rulers of the Kingdoms of Poland (after 1569 the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) and Hungary, the Crimean Khanate, and the Ottoman Porte, atamans (then – hetmans) of the Sich and Cossacks Hetmanate, Moscow tsars or Austrian emperors. Therefore, during the 12th–18th centuries, we can talk about a regional specificity of the bilateral relations, in which the “Galician component” remained one of the most important.

Its importance is determined by the historical circumstances of the formation of these relations. Halych city, the name of which is still a subject of debate, and hence the delineation of the land (Галицька земля, Galicia, Галичина) and its inhabitants (галчиани) were formed in a very close interaction with the elites of the neighboring territories, in particular, the middle and lower Dniester and Prut basins. Studying the
history of Halych and the Galician land until 1772 (the First Partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as a result of which the lands of the Ruthenian Voivodeship became a part of the possessions of the Habsburg dynasty¹), we can single out four long important stages in the multifaceted connections of local Ruthenian and not only Ruthenian elites with the elites of the neighboring countries, mainly Moldova, Wallachia and, to a lesser extent, Transylvania.

1. (from the 12th century till 1359)

The mentioned period, which is historically reconstructed primarily due to the letopises of Rus’, to sources of Hungarian and Greek provenience, and to archaeological investigations, allows us to clearly establish the expansion of the so-called first Galician Rostislavovid dynasty (1084–1198/9) in the lower reaches of the Dniester and Prut rivers during the middle and the second half of the 12th century. The strongholds of the princes here were Bârlad and Galați². The control over the delineated territories was not permanent due to the frequent threat of the Cumanian invasions, as well as the interests of the Asen family (1187–1280) in the restored Bulgarian state since 1187, which was formed through the close interaction of the Cumanian, Wallachian, and Bulgarian elites. But at the beginning of the 13th century, the sources allow us to record the military expeditions against the Cumanians by the Prince Roman Mstyslavovych († 1205)³ – the founder of the Romanid dynasty (1198/9–1323) in Halych land. The so-called Galician Ponyzzia, which covered a part of the territory of the later Moldovan Principality, remained in the sphere of influence of the Galician Princes at least until the Mongol invasion in Europe in the 13th century. But the defeat of the united Rus’ian-Cumanian forces on May 31, 1223 in the battle on the Kalka River and the departure of a part of the defeated Cumanians to Hungary caused serious changes in the control of the territories adjacent to the southeastern Carpathians. Therefore, the Hungarian Árpáds (895–1301), who received the possibility to use a title of the Kings of Galicia and Lodomeria (Galitiae Lodomeriaeque Rex) at the beginning of the 13th century, became in practice and repeatedly the rulers of the Galician land and its southern outskirts⁴. The Teutonic Order knights, settled in Transylvania in 1211 by the Hungarian King Andrew, were the guarantors of the border security in this section until 1225, but after their expulsion, this role was played by the Cumanian troops⁵.
However, the large-scale multi-stage campaigns of the Mongols to Rus’ in 1236–1242 and to the countries of Europe caused the transfer of lands of the middle and lower reaches of the Dniester, Prut, and partly of the Danube to the protectorate of the Chingissids. Therefore, the restoration on the Galician throne of the Romanids in the person of Prince Danylo, even after his coronation at the end of 1253, did not give the prospects of very active control over the once adjacent southern lands, which had to maintain a certain ecclesiastical unity with the Galician diocese of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, established in the middle of the 12th century.

The contacts between the Galician and Moldovan elites and bilateral church dialogue were preserved after the move of the Metropolitan of Kyiv Kirill II to Vladimir on Klyazma in the middle of the 13th century, and hence after the decision of the Constantinople Patriarch Athanasius I and Emperor Andronikos II Paleologus in 1302/3 to elevate the Galician diocese to the level of a Metropolitanate. This situation contributed to the more active inclusion of the Moldovan elites in the political life of the non-institutionalized Kingdom of Rus’. These elites were noted from time to time in the first half of the 14th century as witnesses of the conclusion of documents of the last Romanids. We can notice among them, for example, Oleksandr Moldaovych and Borys Krakula, mentioned in the letters of Yuri Boleslav Troydenovych († 1340), which was sent on February 11, 1334 to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order Luther von Braunschweig († 1355). Borys Krakula was also noted in one of the letters written in Volhynian Volodymyr on October 20, 1335 to another Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, Dietrich von Altenburg († 1341).

We are talking about the representatives of the Moldovan elites, which were in very close, probably family, relations with the Romanids, maybe due to the matrimonial ties. They also inherited certain heraldic symbols of power of the Galician boyars, in particular, the image of the jackdaw with folded wings.

In general, a careful analysis of the heraldic symbols of power allows us to record, on the eve of the formation of the Moldovan Principality in 1359, the using by the new elites of the old Galician official symbols (as personal and family coats of arms) of the non-institutionalized Kingdom of Rus’, which after 1340 became the object of an inter-dynastic struggle between the Piasts of the Kingdom of Poland and the Principality of Mazovia, the Anjou dynasty on the thrones of Hungary and Poland, the Lithuanian Gediminids, and the nomads and the Moldovan Mușats. The coats of
arms of the local nobility, both of Ruthenian and Moldovan, included the elements of personal and family signs in the Ruthenian tradition, or belonging to the Kingdom of Rus’ in general\textsuperscript{10}. But Mușats did not take part in the struggle for the inheritance of the Romanid dynasty. We can talk only about a certain \textit{translatio imperii} that spread from the Galician territories in the southern direction in the middle and the second half of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, the details of which can only be guessed.

2. (1359–1538)

The outlined period is marked by an extremely active confrontation between the Principality of Moldova and the Kingdom of Poland over the borderlands known since 1395 as Pokuttia\textsuperscript{11}, which in a broader historical and geographical sense remained a part of the Galician land, later the Galician Starost of the Ruthenian Voivodeship (after 1434). The first border conflicts were practically provoked after the death of the King of Hungary and Poland, Louis I of the Anjou dynasty in 1382, and the division of the inheritance between his daughters – the elder Maria († 1395) and the younger Jadwiga († 1399) who married in 1386 Władysław II Jagiełło († 1434)\textsuperscript{12}. In Summer of 1387, as a result of the marriage and the Union of Krevo (between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania) which was concluded a year earlier, a large Polish army marched into the cities of the Halych land (Yaroslav, Przemyśl, and Lviv), forcing the local Hungarian rulers to surrender. The only one who resisted for some time was the castellan of Halych – Benedict. However, after receiving the appropriate guarantees and land grants, he left the city, having it handed over to the Jagiellonians\textsuperscript{13}. Under these circumstances the ruler of Moldova, Peter I Mușat († December 1391), soon took an oath of vassal loyalty to Władysław II Jagiełło on September 26, 1387 in Lviv, and on January 27, 1388, granted him a loan of 4,000 silver rubles. In the case of non-repayment of the debt until 1391, the King of Poland promised to pledge the city of Halych with its \textit{volost}\textsuperscript{14}, which later will be permanently called Pokuttia and will appear in the inter-dynastic agreements of both parties for quite a long time\textsuperscript{15}.

The forementioned close contacts developed also due to permanent ecclesiastical ties. So, precisely in 1387, with the blessing of the Galician Metropolitan Anthony († 1391), Peter Mușat achieved the consecration of Jeremiah († 1401) as the head of the Orthodox Church
of Moldova, confirming the tradition of long-standing bilateral relations with the ecclesiastical and secular elites of the Halych land. Despite the excommunication and the attempts of the Exarchs of Constantinople in 1391 to understand the situation, Peter Muşat did not back down, and his successor Alexander the Good († 1432) achieved on June 26, 1401, the official recognition of Joseph as the Metropolitan of Moldova with the residence first in Rădăuţi and later in Suceava. This event coincided with another crisis in the Metropolis of Halych and its entering in 1401 under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv. That’s why, all subsequent Metropolitans of Moldova, without exaggeration, continued to cultivate the church traditions of the Krylos Hill in Halych, emphasizing at the same time the Princes’ peculiar right of political control over, from their point of view, a sacred land. However, under Romanus († 1393/1400) and Alexander the Good, the relations with Władysław II Jagiełło were based on the rulers of Moldova’s recognition of themselves as vassals of the King of Poland, in accordance with the oath of vassal loyalty made in 1393 and then on March 12, 1402 (confirmed on August 1, 1404 in Lviv). But after the victories of the Polish-Lithuanian-Ruthenian-Moldovan army over the knights of the Teutonic Order in 1410 and 1422 and due to the aggravation of the inter-dynastic relations, in 1431 Alexander invaded Pokuttia and occupied Kolomyia and Snyatyn, supporting the great Lithuanian Prince Švitrigaila († 1452). This campaign did not have positive consequences for the Moldovan Prince, but it opened up a series of additional opportunities for his successors to capture the border areas.

For example, the son of Alexander the Good from his second wife Anna, Prince Ilya († 1448), having first taken an oath of vassal loyalty to Władysław III († 1444) on June 5, 1433 in Suceava, and then on September 19, 1436 in Lviv, received the Castle of Halych as a separate possession. His successors, Roman II († 1448) and Alexander II († 1455), the cousins and vassals of Casimir IV († 1492) could count on the King’s refuge in the borderland of Kolomyia in the case of losing the Moldovan throne. On the other hand, the rival of the mentioned brothers – Bogdan II († 1451) never gave up his predatory invasions into the neighboring lands of the Ruthenian Voivodeship with the aim of countering the same attacks into Moldova.

Bogdan II’s son, Stephen III the Great († 1504), built a foreign policy in an absolutely different way. Having obtained the power after the murder of his father and, as a result, a long internal political crisis, he established relations with Casimir IV, recognizing himself as royal vassal on April 4,
1459, on the condition that the King did not support any other claimants to the throne of Moldova. On March 2, 1462, in Suceava, the King of Poland was declared the sole suzerain of the lands of Moldova, with a prohibition on the alienation of any of its territories and obligations to return the lost\textsuperscript{25}. During the intensification of the Turkish expansion, Stephen III took the oath of vassal loyalty to Casimir IV in 1485 in Kolomyia, as stipulated by the Suceava agreement\textsuperscript{26}. However, as a result of the Polish-Turkish negotiations (including the agreement of 1487) and the invasion to the Ruthenian Voivodeship by the troops of Mukha, provoked by the Prince of Moldova, in 1490–1492, the relations with the King of Poland deteriorated. After the death of Casimir IV and the raising to power of his brother John I Albert († 1501), the provocations from Stephen III triggered a large-scale campaign of the crown army (consisting of units of Poles, Ruthenians and troops of the Teutonic Order) into Moldova in 1497. The campaign led to Stephen’s defeat in the Battle in the Kozmin’s forest on 26 October and the loss of Pokuttia\textsuperscript{27}. In response, the Moldovan campaign from 1498 ended with the burning of Halych, Terebovlia, Buchach, Pidhaitsi, and as a consequence the new agreement with the King of Poland adopted in 1499 did not mention any vassal obligations from Stephen III. The acquired lands were under his authority until his death on July 2, 1504\textsuperscript{28}. With the transition of the throne of Moldova to Bogdan III the Blind († 1517) and of the Polish throne to Alexander († 1506), and then to Sigismund the Old († 1548), the Moldovan ruler wanted to consolidate his status with the Jagiellonian dynasty by marrying the youngest sister of King Alexander, Elizabeth († 1517)\textsuperscript{29}. As a sign of goodwill, he even returned to Alexander the border lands of Pokuttia, which during 1498–1506 were under the rule of the Mușats\textsuperscript{30}. However, Alexander died, and Sigismund the Old rejected Bohdan III’s proposal, provoking another invasion of the Moldovan, Tatar, and Turkish forces into the Ruthenian and Podolian Voivodeships in 1506 and 1509. The invaders looted Terebovlia suburbs, captured Pidhaitsi, Kamianets, and sieged Halych and Lviv\textsuperscript{31}. At the same time, the crown forces invaded Moldova. The war led to the conclusion of an agreement on January 23, 1510, according to which the Mușats were relieved of their vassal obligations to the Jagiellons\textsuperscript{32}. During the rule of Bogdan III’s successor – Stephen IV († 1527), in August 1518, Sigismund the Old reached another agreement to stop the Turkish expansion\textsuperscript{33}. However, the raising to power of Stephen III’s illegitimate son, Peter Rareș († 1538) in Moldova, which coincided with the defeat of the Hungarian troops of Louis II († 1526) by the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent.
(† 1566) at Mohács on August 29, 1526, opened the next stage of the struggle for the lands of Pokuttia and the Halych land.

As a result of the war between 1530–1532, with the key defeat of the Moldovan forces in the Battle of Obertyn on August 22, 1531, a peace treaty was concluded such that Peter Rareș renounced his claims to Pokutta. However, he did not abandon the hope of causing a wider Polish-Turkish conflict, for which there was no hope after the conclusion of the agreement between Suleiman I and the King Sigismund in 1533. During the next Turkish-Tatar invasion to Moldova, on the one hand, and the Polish invasion, on the other, Peter Rareș once again confirmed he had no claim to Pokuttia in a peace agreement with the King, on August 28–31, 1538. However, Petru Rareș lost the throne in his homeland.

Under the sons of Peter Rareș Ilya († 1562) and Stephen IV († 1552), Moldova was under the complete control of the Ottomans. There were no special encroachments to Galicia and Pokuttia from their side. Moreover, in 1547, Ilya, like his father, despite his dependence on the Turks, took the oath of loyalty to Sigismund the Old.

3. (1538–1699)

After the death of Peter Rareș and his sons, the active phase of the struggle between the rulers of Moldova over the heritage of Halych, Halych land and Pokuttia (sacred to them and economically attractive) practically ended. The throne of Moldova ceased to be the exclusive prerogative of the Mușat dynasty, because the proteges of the Ottomans (from the elites of other countries in the Balkans) could often get the power in the country. Therefore, the situation in the country was far from the intentions of its rulers, to conduct an active foreign policy in the direction of the neighboring starosts of the Ruthenian Voivodeship. The internal political conflicts became frequent in Moldova, as they were increasingly joined by the Sich Cossack units and various types of adventurers and criminals.

At the same time, we should note that other historical territories of modern Romania, in particular Wallachia and Transylvania, remained on the margins of the active contacts with both secular and ecclesiastical elites of the Halych land during the 14th–16th centuries. For the Wallachian Basarab dynasty, which came under the pressure of the Turkish protectorate before the Mușats, the sacred heritage of Halych was of no value. During the reign of the Voivode of Wallachia Nikolae Aleksandru († 1364), the
local Orthodox Church left the Patriarchate of Tarnovo and became the subordinate to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, having gained the status of an autonomous Metropolitan\textsuperscript{37}. The situation in Transylvania was even more different, because this vast territory was a part of the Kingdom of Hungary until 1526. Only after the defeat of Louis II at Mohács and until 1541, it existed as a separate, sovereign Principality of actually three “nations” – Magyars, Saxons and Szeklers, with the practicing of Catholicism, the presence of Protestant communities of the Calvinists and, in some places, the Orthodox Church\textsuperscript{38}. Until the end of the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries, the local elites did not show anything but a commercial interest in the Halych land from within the Ruthenian Voivodeship\textsuperscript{39}.

In the mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century, the cities of the Ruthenian Voivodeship became a refuge for the Moldovan rulers who fled from the Turkish persecution. They did not seek to conquer these cities by the force of arms. There was, for example Peter Stolnik, who became a Moldovan Prince in September 1552 under the name of Alexandru Lăpușneanu († 1568). Before becoming prince, he had been hiding in the neighboring lands of the Kingdom of Poland\textsuperscript{40}. As a vassal of the King, he ruled until his death.

On the other hand, in Lviv, by the order of Sigismund II Augustus, in March 1564, the rival of Alexander, Stephen VII Tomșa, who in August 1563 forcibly won the throne of Moldova, without receiving approval from Istanbul or Cracow, was executed\textsuperscript{41}. In the capital of the Ruthenian Voivodeship, another Moldovan Prince and Kish ataman – Ivan Pidkova († 1578) was executed. He pretended to have a claim to the Moldovan throne as a brother of one of the successors of Stephen VII’s – John III the Terrible († 1574)\textsuperscript{42}, also a vassal of Sigismund II. On September 28, 1582, Iancu Sasul, the Lutheran Prince on the throne of Moldova, was also executed in Lviv by the order of King Stephen Báthory († 1586)\textsuperscript{43}.

Other Moldovan Princes, who showed an interest in the occupation of Pokuttia were also subjected to disbelief and imprisonment in the Halych land. Thus, after taking the oath of vassal loyalty to Sigismund II Augustus in 1569, Bogdan IV Lăpușneanu († 1574/7), who as a child grew up at the King’s court, fell into prison in the castle of Jezupol, where he spent two months\textsuperscript{44} in the winter of 1572, due to a misunderstanding with the elites of the Galician elders, in particular with the Zborovsky family. Before the accession to the throne of Moldova in 1591, Alexander Lăpușneanu’s son Aaront the Tyrant († 1597), who recognized the suzerainty of the King Sigismund, resided from time to time in the Ruthenian Voivodeship\textsuperscript{45}. A special attention should be given to Ieremia Movilă († 1606), who
became the Prince of Moldova in 1595 as a vassal of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth\textsuperscript{46} with the support of its elites, from whom, in fact, he came through the mediation of the Wiśniowiecki, Korecki and Potocki families\textsuperscript{47}. With the support of the nobility of the neighboring Ruthenian and Podolia Voivodeships, Simion Movilă († 1607) became the Prince of Moldova in 1595, then Constantin Movilă († 1612) in 1606, Alexander Movilă († after 1616) in 1630, and Moise Movilă in 1630 († 1661)\textsuperscript{48}. Princes Constantin Movilă and Miron Barnovschi Movilă († 1633), as well as George III Ducas († 1685) and Stephen Petriceicu († 1690), who died and were buried in Lviv, owned real estate in the neighboring starosts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth\textsuperscript{49}.

During the rule of Movilă family’s representatives in Moldova, their support of the Orthodox churches and monasteries in the Ruthenian Voivodeship (in particular, Kolomyia, Lviv, Manyava, Tlumach, Uhornyky etc.) after the Union of Brest in 1596 notably intensified, and was preserved by the following Princes who were no longer related to them with such close family relations: for example, Vasile († 1661), Stephen Lupu († 1661), George Ghica († 1664) Eustratie Dabija († 1665), Iliaș Alexandru († 1666), Stephen Petriceicu, Dimitrie Cantemir († 1723), Nicholas Mavrocordatos († 1730), John Mavrocordatos († 1747), Mihai († 1744) and Constantin Racoviță († 1764), Grigore II Ghica († 1752), Scarlat Grigorie Ghica († 1766), Constantin Mavrocordatos († 1769), Grigore († 1769) and John Theodore Callimachi († 1780)\textsuperscript{50}. They all used the Romanian language while preserving the Cyrillic alphabet since the 17th century\textsuperscript{51}. During the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries there was an increasing number of examples of usage of the Ruthenian heraldic elements by Moldovan noblemen (lords of the council, župan etc.), as well as by untitled nobility – domestic servants and minor officials – who, much more willingly than nobles, used old official coats of arms on their seals, rather than the personal and family signs. According to preliminary estimates, the image of a jackdaw, for example, occurs on about 15% of the seals of the Moldovan nobility from the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries. Figures of a double-headed eagle, a lion, an eagle, a lily, a rose, etc. were also very popular.

The preservation of heraldic symbols of power and of the historical memory of Pokuttia and the Halych land could serve as the reason for bringing Turkish proteges on the throne of Moldova, such as Alexandru IV Iliaș in 1620–1621, Constantin Cantemir († 1693) in 1673, as well as for their involvement in the campaigns of the Ottomans against the
Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which passed mainly through Pokuttia and the Galician territories. The peace treaty between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Ottoman Porte, signed on January 16, 1699 in Karlowitz, concluded this stage in the relationships with the rulers of Moldova. A considerable layer of information about the bilateral relationships, in the form of microfilm copies is available in the National Archives of Romania in Bucharest.

4. (1699–1772)

The Treaty of Karlowitz and the end of the long war of the European countries against the Ottoman he marked the beginning of the fourth and, in our case, the final stage of the contacts between secular and ecclesiastical elites of the Moldovan Principality, on one hand, and the Ruthenian Voivodeship within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, on the other. One of the results of the Turkish defeat was the withdrawal of their troops from Podolia Eyalet and, in particular, from Nahiyah in Chortkiv, where the Ottoman dynasty ruled from 1672 to 1699.

At the same time, for Moldova, the following long time from 1703 to 1849 was marked by the fact that the Sultan appointed on the throne princes from among the Istanbul Greek Phanariots (representatives of the Greek elites who did not leave Constantinople after its fall on May 29, 1453, but lived in a special quarter, set aside for them). Among the Turkish proteges in Moldova we can notice the Cantemir family (who repeatedly sought the rapprochement with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and after its weakening – with the Russian Empire), the Mavrocordat family, as well as the Ghica family derived from Mavrocordat. The mentioned period is marked by a gradual decrease of inter-family relations at the borderline with the Pokuttia-Galician territories, which became the place of repeated quartering of the Moscow and Swedish forces during the years of the Northern War (1700–1721), and of regular wars of Muscovy (later – the Russian Empire) against the Ottoman Porte in 1710 –1713, 1735–1739 and 1768–1774. Starting from 1769, Moldova was controlled by the Russian military administration.

The Moldovan elites, dependent on the Ottomans, but in search for the support of the Russian Romanovs and deprived of independence in making decisions, often invaded the neighboring Sniatyn and Galician Starost, which were under the rule of the Potocki family. Thus, in 1723,
by the order of Joseph Potocki († 1751), the pro-Moscow pretender to the Moldovan throne Demitrie (according to other sources, Constantine) Cantemir was captured and imprisoned in Stanislaviv (now – Ivano-Frankivsk). This caused a scandal between Warsaw and Saint Petersburg, and eventually through the mediation of Augustus III († 1763) Cantemir was released. However, the Moldovan pretender remembered this unfortunate episode of his biography and, in July-August 1739, during the next Russian-Turkish war, while leading a Cossack unit, caused a lot of trouble in the Pokutria region, between Kuty and Snyatyn. Tysmenytsia was robbed on August 10, and then Stanislaviv was besieged. But the attackers retreated after several unsuccessful assaults.

Inter-church relations, cemented by centuries of previous close ties, developed a little bit differently. In our specific case, the question of the fate of texts with a historical content, which according to the church tradition, were traditionally compiled in Rus’ and were given in the scientific literature the title letopis is of great interest. The letopis tradition, preserved to a certain extent in Volhynia, in the lands of modern Belarus and Russia, due to the systematic rewriting, editing and continuation of the early texts, is practically unknown in the case of the Halych land. The first information about Halych and Halych land in the 11th–12th centuries came from the 13th century, from Kyiv—mostly from Volhynia etc. Sometimes fragments of letopises of Galician provenience (possibly from Przemyśl) are present in Polish historiography, for example in the Annals of Jan Długosz from the 15th century. Also, we know a few examples of letopises of Galician provenience dating from the Early Modern times. Undoubtedly, they are based on oral tradition on early Galician written texts, on the personal experience of the witnesses-compilers or of informants of the writers. However, it has not yet been possible to find authentic original materials of Galician origin that have survived in Rus’. At the same time, the number of monasteries where the letopises were made at least since the 12th century remained significant until the end of the 18th century, when the Austrian government closed and dissolved them. After that, as it is known, a huge amount of the liturgical, and sometimes historical literature, often from the neighboring Ruthenian and Podolia Voivodeships, arrived with the monks to Moldova and Wallachia (less often – to Transylvania).

Therefore, the scientific research in the archives and libraries of Romania should also help to find at least a part of this lost heritage. It is also known that, for Moldova and Wallachia, the letopises (and to a
lesser extent the chronicles) remained the main kind of written text with historical content until the end of the 18th century; see, for example, the officially compiled letopises from the time of Stephen III the Great in the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century (Moldovan-German, Moldovan-Rus’ian or Moldovan-Polish chronicles) and those from the time of his successors, for example – Peter Rareș (Metropolitan Roman Makariy), Alexandru Lăpușneanu (the Abbot of the Kyprian Assumption Monastery, Euthymius), Peter IV the Lame († 1594) (monk Azariy) etc.\footnote{60}, describing the circumstances of the emergence of the Moldovan state in the 14th century. Perhaps the highest level of virtuosity in historiography was reached during the times of Grigore Ureche, Miron Costin, Nicolae Costin, Ion Neculce\footnote{61}, Simion Dascalul\footnote{62}, Demitrie Cantemir\footnote{63}, etc. This helped to the preservation of historiography until the 18th century. There was also a monastic tradition of historiography (for example, at the Putna monastery). It is well known that individual samples of this type are kept in Saint Petersburg today. At the same time, until the 18th century, letopises were written in Old Bulgarian language, which clearly testifies to its origins – from the Kyivan-Galician Christian tradition and the subsequent Bulgarian-Serbian layering. Therefore, considering the close inter-monastery and inter-church ties in general, we kept hoping to find unknown examples of letopises, specifically of Galician provenience.

Another important task was to record the volume of the handwritten and possibly printed book production (first of all, the liturgical literature, pomenyks, gospels, church chants, etc.) of Galician origin in a broad sense and which at different times and under different circumstances were outside the boundaries of their origin. The record of what was found should allow to establish the routes of entry and to specify the mechanisms of migration of such a substance. And, finally, the work with the already published sources and with those which are not yet ready for publication, first of all the charters, was supposed to give an answer to the question about the dynamics of the bilateral relations in different planes and at different times.

In accordance with the chronology, periodization and typology of the relationships between the elites of the state of the Rostislavovids and Romanids (including the non-institutionalized Kingdom of Rus’), the Ruthenian Voivodeship as part of the Kingdom of Poland and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Principality of Moldova and to a lesser extent Wallachia and Transylvania, we have focused our efforts on the processing of the funds in the National Library of Romania (Bucharest),
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the Library of the National Academy of Sciences (Bucharest), the National Archives with the branches in Botoșani, Brașov, Bucharest, Cluj, Suceava, Iași, as well as the National Art Gallery in Bucharest, the Bucovina Museum in Suceava, etc. At the same time, we have also considered the potential of the archival and library funds of a number of monasteries (Dragomirna, Coșula, Putna, Sucevița, etc.), which were probably in closest contact during the 17th–18th centuries with similar Orthodox monastic centers in the historical Halych land, being in the range of mutual common influences64. Unfortunately, it was beyond our capabilities to study the private collections – also known in Romania and available sometimes to the Romanian colleagues.
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